



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Relations between Parenting Styles and Character Strengths in University Students

Meltem YILDIZ^a 

^aBursa Uludağ University, Bursa, Turkey

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 09.06.23

Accepted: 14.01.24

KEYWORDS

Character strengths, Parenting styles, University students, Gender.

ABSTRACT

From childhood onwards, parents are the first and most meaningful moral guides in a person's life. Character strengths are morally valuable qualities that contribute to making a person a good individual and leading a good life. The parenting styles of parents, who are the most important moral guides of human beings, may be related to which character strengths will be more dominant in their children. Based on this, the present study, aimed to reveal the relationship between the character strengths of individuals aged 19-25 studying at university and the parenting styles of their mothers and fathers. The study was conducted on 248 university students (77% female, 23% male) aged between 19-25 years (mean age 20.85). The method of the present study is the relational research method, which is a subtype of descriptive research. In the study, the Character Strengths Inventory (VIA-IS-P) developed by McGrath (2019) and adapted to Turkish culture by Demirci et al. (2021) was a study on the character strengths of university students. The Parental Attitude Scale developed by Kuzgun and Eldeleklioglu (2005) was used to evaluate the parenting styles of their parents. According to the results of the study, significant gender differences were found in the character strengths in all the other virtues with the exception of the virtue of justice. As a result of the calculated correlations, it was determined that all character strengths except humor under the virtue of transcendence and the forgiveness and modesty character strengths of under the virtue of temperance showed significant relationships with the parenting styles of the parents of the university students. Looking at the findings of the regression analysis, it was determined that authoritative motherhood and authoritative fatherhood styles significantly predicted all character strengths under the virtues of courage, wisdom, justice, and humanity.

Character strengths are located at the midpoint of moral competence and direct the person to desire and do what is valuable and good. Character strengths, which can also be defined as morally valuable personality traits, are largely stable universal traits that emerge through thinking, feeling, wanting, and acting that are effective in helping oneself and others (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). University life is a productive environment to study character strengths (Lounsbury et al., 2009). Based on this idea, many studies have been conducted on the character strengths of university students in recent years. These studies have revealed that the character strengths of university students are strongly related to many positive life outcomes and skills, such as university satisfaction, general success average, general life satisfaction, and subjective happiness

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR Meltem YILDIZ, meltemyildiz@uludag.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-4535-6903, Bursa Uludağ University, Bursa, Turkey.

This is an article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License. As the original work is properly cited, reproduction in any medium is permitted.

© 2024 The Authors. Turkish Journal of Counseling Psychology and Guidance is published by Turkish Psychological Counselling and Guidance Association

(Bachick et al., 2021; Lounsbury et al., 2009; Griffin, 2014; Kaya, 2022), adaptive coping strategies (Schaper, 2020; Wiepking, 2020), university adjustment (Grinhauz et al., 2022), student's perception of success (Griffin, 2014). In some studies in the part of the character strengths literature related to university students, the relationship between university students' psychological distress, such as the need for psychological counseling, test anxiety, substance use, depression, perceived stress, anxiety, and character strengths was examined (Anjum & Anjad, 2016; Bachick et al., 2021; Bernebee -Say, 2020; Griffin, 2014; Kaya, 2022). Researchers' interest in this topic has increased as studies in the literature have revealed the strong link between university students' character strengths and many positive outcomes. This increasing interest has led many researchers to examine whether the character strengths of university students vary according to their demographic characteristics and the variables explaining character strengths.

Among the demographic characteristics that may be related to the character strengths of university students, most of the studies have been conducted on gender. In many studies conducted with university students, significant differences were found between male and female students in terms of character strength scores. In many studies, female students scored higher than male students, especially in character strength categories such as love, kindness, justice, gratitude, forgiveness, prudence, leadership, perseverance, teamwork, appreciation of beauty and excellence. Male students had higher scores in the areas of creativity, judgment, perspective, courage, and self-regulation (Karris, 2007, Linley et al., 2007; Murrell, 2015; Niemiec, 2013; Noronha & Martins, 2016; Shimai et al., 2006; Zhang & Chen, 2018). According to the study of Ekşi et al. (2022), female university students scored higher than male students in the dimensions of inquisitiveness and caring character strengths. In terms of self-control, which is the last dimension of three-dimensional character strengths, no significant difference was found according to gender (Ekşi et al., 2022). Many studies have revealed differences on demographic characteristics such as gender as well as positive contributions to the individual's life. The studies were generally conducted with individuals from individualistic cultures. In the study of Ekşi et al. (2022), which was conducted with individuals from the same culture as the participants of the current study, twenty-four character strengths were not examined in detail. The present study aims to address this gap in the literature. In addition, the ever-expanding literature has led researchers to investigate the variables that explain character strengths. Existing research has examined which psychosocial environmental factors help explain character strengths and found that positive parenting is strongly associated with children's character strengths (Peterson & Park, 2007; Raimundi et al., 2019; Sukkyung & Kim, 2016).

From childhood, parents are the first and most meaningful moral guides for the individual (Hawkins, 2005). Character strengths that are revealed by benefiting from more than one culture, author, and text are also morally valuable features that make a person a good person and enable them to reach a good life (Allan, 2015). According to Park (2004), good parenting is one of the factors that have an important effect on the development of character strengths that are at the core of moral competence. Many studies on high school students have revealed that positive parenting behaviors have an increasing effect on character strengths (Ngai, 2015; Raimundi et al., 2019; Liu & Wang, 2021; Loton & Waters, 2017; Luo et al., 2021). Positive parenting behaviors, such as parental warmth, can help adolescents develop character strengths by giving them a sense of autonomy and security, and by increasing emotional communication between parents and children (Liu & Wang, 2021; Schafer, 2011). According to Baumrind (1998), the authoritative parenting style, which expresses positive parenting, is associated with positive character development. It helps children internalize and maintain positive behaviors and strong character and regulates the relationship between character strengths and life satisfaction.

Parents who are authoritative by nature want answers and want their children to follow their own directions. Such parents develop a set of rules for their children and examine their children whether they follow these rules. They support their children in every aspect of life (Baumrind, 1991). The authoritative parenting style provides structure to the individual and helps them internalize and maintain positive behaviors and strong character (Berge et al., 2010). According to Vaden's (2001) study with college students, those who reported that their parents exhibited an authoritative parenting style were more likely to achieve higher principled moral development scores, while those who reported that their parents exhibited authoritarian parenting styles were

more likely to achieve lower principled moral development scores. In a study that longitudinally investigated the relationship between parenting styles and the internalization of values in the prioritization, regulation, and realization of individual values from adolescence to young adulthood, it was determined that participants who defined their parents as more authoritative internalized values more (Williams & Ciarrochi, 2019). According to a study conducted on high school students on character strengths, which means values that can be seen in behavior, authoritative parenting significantly regulates the relationship between character strengths and life satisfaction (Saleem et al., 2020).

The moral development of children is affected by general parenting style as well as by parental gender. (Gilligan & Wiggins, 1987; Parke, 1995; Smetana, 1993, 1999). A mother's emotional involvement is more strongly linked to her children's moral activities than a father's (Spinrad et al., 1999). Character strengths are defined as positive traits reflected in mental, emotional, and behavioral dimensions that are morally valued as distinct from temperament and other personality styles (Dahslgaard et al., 2005; Peterson & Seligman, 2004). In a study conducted with high school students, it was determined that mothers with an authoritative parenting style scored higher on their children's character strengths under the virtue of humanity than mothers with a neglectful parenting style. Similarly, children of fathers who adopted the authoritative parenting style also scored higher on character strengths under the virtue of humanity than those of neglectful fathers (Mo, 2019). Studies in the literature on the predictability of the child-rearing styles of parents of different genders on the character strengths of their children were generally carried out with individuals in high school. Considering the view that the influence of parenthood does not end in childhood and continues until young adulthood (Kriegbaum et al. 2016; Newcomb, 1997), it would not be an unrealistic expectation to think that the parenting styles of their parents will still be effective in the character strengths of university students.

In reviewing the literature on character strengths, it was noted that studies of parenting styles have generally been conducted with high school students. In these studies, a limited number of character strengths under a single virtue rather than all twenty-four character strengths were examined. Considering the fact that the parenting styles used by parents in raising children are effective in the psycho-social development of individuals throughout their lives, it is thought that it is necessary to strengthen the literature with studies on university students. For this reason, this study aimed to explore the relationship between the character strengths of 18-25 year olds studying at university and the parenting styles of their mothers and fathers.

The following questions were asked in relation to this primary objective:

1. Is there a significant difference between male and female university students' character strengths under the virtues of transcendence, courage, wisdom, justice, temperance, and humanity?
2. Is there a significant relationship between the character strengths of university students under the virtues of transcendence, courage, wisdom, justice, temperance, and humanity and their parents' parenting styles?
3. Do the parenting styles of their parents significantly predict the character strengths of university students under the virtues of transcendence, courage, wisdom, justice, temperance, and humanity?

Method

Procedure

Data collection started on 8 November 2022 and was completed on 15 February 2023. The sample of the study was determined by means of a random sampling method. This research is of a descriptive nature. In the research, the relationships between the character strengths and parenting styles of university students were examined within the scope of simple relational designs. For the collection of data, approval was obtained from the Bursa Uludag University Social and Human Sciences Research and Publication Ethics Committee on October 27, 2022. Online scale forms were shared with Bursa Uludag University Press and Public Relations Unit to be delivered to all undergraduate students at the university. Online scale forms were sent to student e-mails by this unit. Data collection was terminated when the number of estimators for multivariate regression analysis exceeded the recommended number of participants (Akbulut & Çapık, 2022), taking into account the number of estimators being more than four and small effect sizes according to Cohen's classification.

Participant

The research group consists of 248 university students (190 female and 58 male). Participants ranged in age from 19 to 25 (Mean age = 20.85, SD=2.11). Demographic information about the participants is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Sample

		<i>n</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Gender	Female	190	76.6	0.77	0.42
	Male	58	23.4		
Age	19	93	37.5	20.85	2.11
	20	52	21.0		
	21	32	12.9		
	22	19	7.7		
	23	9	3.6		
	24	9	3.6		
	25	34	13.7		
Faculty	Education	118	47.6	4.00	3.97
	Arts & Sciences	30	12.1		
	Fine Arts	3	1.2		
	Law	2	0.8		
	Economics and Administrative	30	12.1		
	Theology	6	2.4		
	Architecture	1	0.4		
	Engineering	20	8.1		
	Sport Sciences	1	0.4		
	Health Sciences	9	3.6		
	Medicine	7	2.8		
	Veterinary Medicine	4	1.6		
	Agriculture	17	6.9		
Grades	1	109	44.0	2.10	1.18
	2	58	23.4		
	3	29	11.7		
	4	52	21.0		

Measures

Character Strengths Inventory (VIA-IS-P). Developed by Peterson and Seligman (2004) to determine the character strengths of adults, the 240-item VIA Character Strengths Inventory was revised by McGrath in 2019. This revised inventory was adapted to Turkish culture by Demirci et al. (2021). The inventory, which consists of ninety-six items (Sample Items: “I rarely hold a grudge.”, “I always finish what I started.”, “I can be trusted with my promises.”), is scored with a 5-point Likert scale. It has twenty-four sub-dimensions that contain each character strength. The 24-dimensional model that emerged in the exploratory factor analysis conducted to examine the validity of the inventory adapted to Turkish culture showed an acceptable fit in the confirmatory factor analysis. When the reliability coefficients were calculated within the scope of the sub-dimensions of the inventory, the lowest 0.63 and the highest 0.89 were found. The corrected item-total correlations of the inventory ranged between 0.27 and 0.83. For test-retest reliability, the inventory was administered to 99 university students at 2.5-months intervals. As a result of this application, subscale reliability coefficients ranged from 0.52 to 0.84, with an average calculated as 0.73. (Demirci et al., 2021). For this study, the scale's internal consistency coefficient was recalculated, lowest 0.51 and highest 0.86.

Parental Attitude Scale. The scale, which was first developed by Kuzgun (1972) to evaluate the parental attitudes of university students, was later rearranged by Kuzgun and Eldeleklioglu (2005). The scale consists of 40 items (Sample Items: “She tries to dominate me.”, “She forced me to eat food I did not like, thinking it would help.”, “She accepted me for who I am.”) measuring mother attitudes and 40 items (Sample Items: “When we are together, our relationship is very friendly.”, “I can talk about my problems with him.”, “He always wanted me to do well in exams.”) measuring father attitudes. The scale scored with a 5-point Likert scale, consists of three sub-dimensions for each parent: authoritative, protective, and authoritarian attitude. The scale was administered to 100 university students to determine the validity of the scale. It was found to be divided into two factors as a result of exploratory factor analysis. It was determined that the positive factor loadings of the items in the first factor were related to authoritative attitude, and the negative factor loadings were related to authoritarian attitude. The factor loadings of the items measuring authoritative attitude ranged between 0.53 and 0.70, and the factor loadings of the items measuring authoritarian attitude ranged between 0.48 and 0.68. The items in the second factor were found to be related to protective-demanding attitude. The factor loadings of the items measuring the protective-demanding attitude ranged between 0.31 and 0.56. The results of the reliability study of the scale showed that the internal consistency coefficient for the authoritative attitude dimension was 0.89, the internal consistency coefficient for the protective attitude dimension was 0.82 and the internal consistency coefficient for the authoritarian attitude dimension was 0.78 (Kuzgun & Eldeleklioglu, 2005). For this study, the internal consistency coefficient of the scale was recalculated and it was found to be 0.91 for authoritative motherhood, 0.87 for protective motherhood, 0.84 for authoritarian motherhood, 0.94 for authoritative fatherhood, 0.88 for protective fatherhood, and 0.84 for authoritarian fatherhood.

Data Analysis

The differentiation status of the character strengths of university students according to gender was examined with the t-test for Independent Samples. The relationship between the character strengths of university students and parenting styles was examined with the Pearson Product-Moments correlation. In addition, the predictor of the character strengths of the university students by the parenting styles of the parents was examined using the Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Forward method. The assumptions of missing data, extreme values, normality, multicollinearity, linearity, and homogeneity of variances were examined for the continuous variables related to the analyses to be made in this study. Since data is collected from the online platform, there is no missing data in the data set. Mahalanobis values were calculated for outliers, and 15 outliers were excluded from the analysis. In this study, the skewness and kurtosis values of all continuous variables ranged between +1 and -1, and it was accepted that the univariate normal distribution was provided. For the multivariate normal distribution, data sets were allocated for each dependent variable, and scatter diagrams were analysed in these data sets. In the 24 scatter diagrams examined, the fact that the shapes show elliptical distributions shows that the assumption of multivariate normal distribution is met. Considering the binary correlations between the independent variables for the multicollinearity problem, the fact that the correlations are not above 0.80 indicates that there is no multicollinearity problem. In addition, for each regression analysis, it has been confirmed that there is no multicollinearity between the variables, which may pose a problem, since the VIF values are less than 10., the tolerance values are greater than 0.2. Scatter plots were used to examine the linearity and homogeneity of variances, and it was assumed that the errors were normally distributed because the residuals were randomly distributed around zero in a rectangular shape.

The interpretation of the effect size of the significant difference in the t-test for Independent Samples was based on Cohen (1988). According to Cohen (1988), if the calculated score for d is less than 0.2, the effect size can be considered weak. If the effect size is 0.5 or medium, and if it is greater than 0.8, the effect size can be considered strong (Cohen, 1988). Ratner's (2009) classification was used to evaluate the magnitude of the Pearson Product-Moments correlation coefficient. Accordingly, the correlation coefficient sizes between 0 and 0.30 indicate a low level of correlation, values between 0.30 and 0.70 indicate a medium level of correlation, and values between 0.70 and 1.0 indicate a high level of correlation (Ratner, 2009). The interpretation of the effect size indices of the multiple linear regression equations was based on Cohen (1988). According to Cohen (1988), if the effect size index of a regression equation is 0.02, it is small; if 0.15 is medium and 0.35, this equation has a wide effect.

Table 2. The Mean and Standard Deviations of Variables

Variables	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skewness Statistic	Std. Error	Kurtosis Statistic	Std. Error
TRANSCENDENCE							
Appreciation of beauty and excellence	248	3.82	0.77	-0.64	0.16	0.20	0.31
Gratitude	248	3.44	0.87	-0.24	0.16	-0.45	0.31
Hope	248	3.46	0.82	-0.34	0.16	-0.11	0.31
Humor	248	3.62	0.92	-0.31	0.16	-0.66	0.31
Spirituality	248	3.81	0.87	-0.89	0.16	0.69	0.31
COURAGE							
Bravery	248	3.59	0.63	-0.31	0.16	0.28	0.31
Honesty	248	4.18	0.55	-0.59	0.16	0.27	0.31
Perseverance	248	3.38	0.89	-0.07	0.16	-0.40	0.31
Zest	248	3.08	1.01	0.04	0.16	-0.73	0.31
WISDOM							
Creativity	248	3.78	0.78	-0.44	0.16	-0.07	0.31
Curiosity	248	3.66	0.81	-0.50	0.16	0.05	0.31
Love of learning	248	3.93	0.79	-0.54	0.16	-0.33	0.31
Judgment	248	4.06	0.59	-0.59	0.16	0.63	0.31
Perspective	248	3.48	0.79	-0.24	0.16	0.07	0.31
JUSTICE							
Fairness	248	3.67	0.78	-0.35	0.16	-0.21	0.31
Leadership	248	3.35	0.95	-0.29	0.16	-0.33	0.31
Teamwork	248	4.01	0.59	-0.26	0.16	-0.17	0.31
TEMPERANCE							
Forgiveness	248	3.36	0.82	-0.18	0.16	-0.31	0.31
Modesty	248	3.63	0.71	-0.35	0.16	0.34	0.31
Prudence	248	3.71	0.74	-0.62	0.16	0.82	0.31
Self-Regulation	248	3.32	0.83	-0.33	0.16	-0.24	0.31
HUMANITY							
Kindness	248	4.06	0.70	-0.87	0.16	0.93	0.31
Love	248	3.69	0.96	-0.47	0.16	-0.57	0.31
Social Intelligence	248	3.74	0.70	-0.26	0.16	-0.24	0.31
PARENTING STYLES							
Authoritative motherhood	248	57.23	12.47	-0.66	0.16	-0.14	0.31
Protective motherhood	248	32.98	9.87	0.59	0.16	0.14	0.31
Authoritarian motherhood	248	20.48	7.11	0.91	0.16	0.73	0.31
Authoritative fatherhood	248	50.92	14.14	-0.21	0.16	-0.75	0.31
Protective fatherhood	248	33.48	11.26	0.77	0.16	0.27	0.31
Authoritarian fatherhood	248	23.86	7.91	0.55	0.16	-0.09	0.31

Results

Significant differentiation of the character strengths of university students according to their gender was examined with the t-test for independent samples and the findings are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Findings regarding the significant differentiation of character strengths of university students according to gender

	Variable	Groups	n	\bar{X}	SD	t	Sd	p	d
TRANSCENDENCE	Appreciation of beauty and excellence	Male	58	3.54	0.91	-	78.35	0.01	0.46
		Female	190	3.91	0.70	2.91			
	Gratitude	Male	58	3.15	1.03	-	79.35	0.01	0.41
		Female	190	3.53	0.80	2.60			
	Hope	Male	58	3.35	0.91	-	246	0.25	-
		Female	190	3.50	0.79	1.17			
	Humor	Male	58	3.93	0.95	3.02	246	<0.001	0.46
		Female	190	3.52	0.89				
Spirituality	Male	58	3.63	1.10	-	75.34	0.13	-	
	Female	190	3.86	0.78	1.54				
COURAGE	Bravery	Male	58	3.73	0.61	1.98	246	0.05	0.29
		Female	190	3.55	0.63				
	Honesty	Male	58	4.23	0.57	0.79	246	0.43	-
		Female	190	4.17	0.54				
	Perseverance	Male	58	3.31	1.06	-	79.83	0.58	-
		Female	190	3.40	0.84	0.56			
	Zest	Male	58	2.94	1.03	1.26	246	0.21	-
		Female	190	3.13	0.99				
WISDOM	Creativity	Male	58	3.96	0.79	2.01	246	0.05	0.29
		Female	190	3.73	0.78				
	Curiosity	Male	58	3.81	0.74	1.60	246	0.11	-
		Female	190	3.61	0.82				
	Love of learning	Male	58	3.94	0.85	0.10	246	0.92	-
		Female	190	3.93	0.78				
	Judgment	Male	58	4.09	0.67	0.49	246	0.63	-
		Female	190	4.05	0.57				
Perspective	Male	58	3.35	0.84	-	246	0.16	-	
	Female	190	3.52	0.78	1.43				
JUSTICE	Fairness	Male	58	3.72	0.83	0.53	246	0.60	-
		Female	190	3.66	0.77				
	Leadership	Male	58	3.26	1.04	-	246	0.40	-
		Female	190	3.38	0.92	0.84			
	Teamwork	Male	58	3.95	0.61	-	246	0.39	-
		Female	190	4.03	0.59	0.86			
TEMPERANCE	Forgiveness	Male	58	3.17	0.92	-	246	0.05	0.29
		Female	190	3.42	0.79	2.02			
	Modesty	Male	58	3.69	0.79	0.79	246	0.43	-
		Female	190	3.61	0.69				
	Prudence	Male	58	3.86	0.87	1.58	80.15	0.12	-
		Female	190	3.67	0.69				
Self-Regulation	Male	58	3.22	0.94	-	83.93	0.34	-	
	Female	190	3.36	0.80	0.96				
HUMANITY	Kindness	Male	58	3.87	0.76	-	246	0.02	0.38
		Female	190	4.12	0.68	2.35			
	Love	Male	58	3.33	0.98	-	246	<0.001	0.51
		Female	190	3.81	0.92	3.44			
	Social Intelligence	Male	58	3.63	0.75	-	246	0.16	-
		Female	190	3.78	0.69	1.40			

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$

Table 3 shows that in the virtues of transcendence; appreciation of beauty and excellence, gratitude and humor, there were significant differences between male and female students in terms of character strengths. A difference in the appreciation of beauty and excellence in character strength was found in favor of female students ($t(78.35) = -2.91, p < 0.05$). A significant difference with a weak effect size was found between male and female students in terms of appreciation of beauty and excellence character strength. Based on this, it can be said that female students had more appreciation of beauty and excellence character strength in than male students. Regarding the gratitude character strength, a significant difference with a weak effect size was found in favor of the female students ($t(79.35) = -2.60, p < 0.05$). Based on this, it can be said that female students have more gratitude character strength than male students. A significant difference with a weak effect size was found in favor of male students in terms of humor character strength ($t(246) = 3.02, p < 0.01$). Based on this, it can be said that male students have more humor character strength than female students.

Looking at Table 3 for character strengths under the virtue of courage, it is seen that bravery differs significantly by gender. A significant difference with a small effect size was found in favor of the male students with regard to the bravery character strength ($t(246) = 1.98, p < 0.05$). Based on this, it can be said that male students have more bravery character strength than female students.

In Table 3, of the character strengths under the virtue of wisdom, only creativity has a significant gender difference. A significant difference with weak effect size was found in favor of male students in terms of creativity character strength ($t(246) = 2.01, p < 0.05$). Based on this, it can be said that male students have more creativity character strength than female students.

Looking at Table 3 for character strengths under the virtue of justice, it was noted that none showed a significant gender difference. When character strengths were examined under the virtue of temperance, it was found that only forgiveness had a significant gender difference. Regarding forgiveness, a significant difference favoring female students was found with a weak effect size ($t(246) = -2.02, p < 0.05$). Based on this, it can be said that female students have more forgiveness character strength than male students.

Table 3 shows that kindness and love, which are character strengths under the virtue of humanity, differ significantly according to gender. A significant difference with a weak effect size was found in favor of female students in terms of kindness character strength ($t(79.35) = -2.35, p < 0.05$). Based on this, it can be said that female students have more kindness character strength than male students. A significant difference in favor of female students with a moderate effect size was found for the love character strength ($t(246) = -3.44, p < 0.01$). Based on this, it can be said that female students have more love character strength than male students.

Correlation Analysis

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Analysis was used to determine the relationships between the students' character strengths and parenting styles, and the results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4 shows that all character strengths, except humor under the virtue of transcendence, are significantly related to the parenting styles of university student's parents. The appreciation of beauty and excellence character strength showed low positive and significant relationships with authoritative motherhood and authoritative fatherhood ($r = 0.20, p < 0.01$) and authoritative fatherhood ($r = 0.15, p < 0.05$) styles. It has been determined that the gratitude character strength has a moderately positive relationship with authoritative motherhood ($r = 0.43, p < 0.01$) and authoritative fatherhood ($r = 0.30, p < 0.01$) styles, and a low level of negative and significant relationships with protective motherhood ($r = -0.27, p < 0.01$), authoritarian motherhood ($r = -0.29, p < 0.01$), protective fatherhood ($r = -0.15, p < 0.05$) and authoritarian fatherhood ($r = -0.17, p < 0.01$) styles. It has been found that the hope character strength has a low level of positive relationship with authoritative motherhood ($r = 0.29, p < 0.01$) and authoritative fatherhood ($r = 0.19, p < 0.01$) styles and a low level of negative relationship with protective ($r = -0.19, p < 0.01$) and authoritarian motherhood ($r = -0.16, p < 0.05$) styles.

Looking at Table 4 in terms of character strengths under the virtue of courage, it is seen that all character strengths of university students have significant relationships with their parents' parenting styles. It is seen that the bravery character strength ($r = 0.16, p < 0.05$) has a low-level positive and significant relationship with the

authoritative motherhood style. It has been determined that honesty character strength has a low level of positive relationship with authoritative motherhood ($r = 0.28, p < 0.01$) and authoritative fatherhood ($r = 0.24, p < 0.01$) styles, and low level of negative and significant relationships with protective motherhood ($r = -0.15, p < 0.05$), authoritarian motherhood ($r = -0.16, p < 0.05$), protective fatherhood ($r = -0.14, p < 0.05$) and authoritarian fatherhood ($r = -0.16, p < 0.01$) styles. It has been determined that perseverance character strength has a low level of positive relationship with authoritative motherhood ($r = 0.21, p < 0.01$) and authoritative fatherhood styles ($r = 0.27, p < 0.01$), and a low level of negative significant relationship with authoritarian fatherhood style ($r = -0.22, p < 0.01$). On the other hand, it was determined that the zest character strength showed a moderate relationship with the authoritative motherhood style ($r = 0.32, p < 0.01$), and a low-level positive relationship with the authoritative fatherhood style ($r = 0.25, p < 0.01$), and a low-level negative relationship with the protective motherhood ($r = -0.17, p < 0.01$) and authoritarian motherhood styles ($r = -0.18, p < 0.01$).

Table 4 shows that all the character strengths included under the virtue of wisdom are significantly related to the parenting styles of the students' parents. It has been found that the creativity character strength has a low level of positive relationship with authoritative motherhood ($r = 0.25, p < 0.01$) and authoritative fatherhood ($r = 0.23, p < 0.01$) styles, and a low level of negative significant relationship with authoritarian motherhood style ($r = -0.15, p < 0.05$). It is seen that the curiosity character strength has a low level of positive relationship with authoritative motherhood ($r = 0.24, p < 0.01$) and authoritative fatherhood styles ($r = 0.26, p < 0.01$), and a low level of negative relationship with authoritarian fatherhood style ($r = -0.13, p < .05$). It has been determined that the love of learning character strength has a low level of positive and significant relationship with authoritative motherhood ($r = 0.22, p < 0.01$) and authoritative fatherhood styles ($r = 0.27, p < 0.05$). It has been found that the judgment character strength has a low level of a positive and significant relationship with the authoritative motherhood. ($r = 0.15, p < 0.05$) and authoritative fatherhood styles ($r = 0.14, p < 0.05$). On the other hand, it was determined that the perspective character strength had a low level of positive and significant relationship with the authoritative motherhood style ($r = 0.17, p < 0.01$).

Looking at Table 4 in terms of character strengths under the virtue of justice, it is seen that all the character strengths of university students have significant relationships with their parents' parenting styles. It was determined that the fairness character strength showed a low-level positive relationship with authoritative motherhood ($r = 0.13, p < 0.05$) and authoritative fatherhood styles ($r = 0.19, p < 0.01$), and a low-level negative significant relationship with protective motherhood ($r = -0.13, p < 0.05$) and authoritarian fatherhood styles ($r = -0.15, p < 0.05$). It has been determined that leadership character strength has a low level of positive and significant relationship with authoritative motherhood ($r = 0.22, p < 0.01$) and authoritative fatherhood styles ($r = 0.16, p < 0.05$). On the other hand, it was determined that teamwork character strength had a low level of positive and significant relationship with authoritative motherhood ($r = 0.29, p < 0.01$) and authoritative fatherhood styles ($r = 0.25, p < 0.01$).

When Table 4 is examined, it is seen that self-regulation and prudence, which are character strengths within the virtue of temperance, show significant relationships with the parenting styles of university student's parents. It has been determined that prudence character strength has a low level of positive and significant relationship with authoritative motherhood ($r = 0.19, p < 0.01$) and authoritative fatherhood styles ($r = 0.15, p < 0.05$). On the other hand, it was determined that self-regulation character strength showed a low-level positive relationship with authoritative motherhood ($r = 0.24, p < 0.01$) and authoritative fatherhood styles ($r = 0.27, p < 0.01$), and a low level negative significant relationship with authoritarian motherhood ($r = -0.15, p < 0.05$) and authoritarian fatherhood styles ($r = -0.18, p < 0.05$).

Looking at Table 4 in terms of character strengths under the virtue of humanity, it is seen that all character strengths of university students have significant relationships with their parents' parenting styles. It has been found that kindness character strength has a low level of positive correlation with authoritative motherhood. ($r = 0.29, p < 0.01$) and authoritative fatherhood ($r = 0.23, p < 0.01$) styles, and a low level of negative significant relationship with protective motherhood ($r = -0.18, p < 0.01$), authoritarian motherhood ($r = -0.17, p < 0.01$), protective fatherhood ($r = -0.16, p < 0.05$) and authoritarian fatherhood styles ($r = -0.16, p < 0.05$). It has been determined that that the love character strength has a low level of positive relationship with authoritative motherhood ($r = 0.29, p < 0.01$) and authoritative fatherhood ($r = 0.20, p < 0.01$) style, and a low level of

negative significant relationship with protective motherhood ($r = -0.17, p < 0.01$) and authoritarian motherhood styles ($r = -0.17, p < 0.01$). On the other hand, it was determined that social intelligence character strength showed a low level of positive and significant relationship with authoritative motherhood ($r = 0.23, p < 0.01$) and authoritative fatherhood ($r = 0.19, p < 0.05$) styles.

Table 4. Findings on the relationships between university students' character strengths and parenting styles

	V	AEM	PM	ANM	AEF	PF	ANF
TRANSCENDENCE	Appreciation of beauty and excellence	0.20**	-0.07	-0.12	0.15*	-0.01	-0.02
	Gratitude	0.43**	0.27**	-0.29**	0.30**	-0.15*	-0.17**
	Hope	0.29**	0.19**	-0.16*	0.19**	-0.10	-0.12
	Humor	0.12	0.05	-0.01	0.08	0.11	0.03
	Spirituality	0.36**	0.18**	-0.28**	0.24**	-0.11	-0.14*
COURAGE	Bravery	0.16*	0.04	0.01	0.08	0.12	0.03
	Honesty	0.28**	-0.15*	-0.16*	0.24**	-0.14*	-0.16**
	Perseverance	0.21**	-0.03	-0.11	0.27**	-0.11	-0.22**
	Zest	0.32**	0.17**	-0.18**	0.25**	-0.04	-0.12
WISDOM	Creativity	0.25**	-0.04	-0.15*	0.23**	0.06	-0.11
	Curiosity	0.24**	-0.07	-0.10	0.26**	-0.05	-0.13*
	Love of learning	0.22**	-0.07	-0.11	0.27**	-0.03	-0.10
	Judgment	0.15*	-0.01	-0.08	0.14*	-0.02	-0.08
	Perspective	0.17**	0.04	-0.11	0.11	0.07	0.01
JUSTICE	Fairness	0.13*	-0.13*	-0.06	0.19**	-0.10	-0.15*
	Leadership	0.22**	-0.07	-0.11	0.16*	0.01	-0.04
	Teamwork	0.29**	-0.03	-0.12	0.25**	-0.03	-0.09
TEMPERANCE	Forgiveness	0.12	-0.03	-0.05	0.13	0.01	-0.06
	Modesty	0.04	-0.06	0.00	0.05	-0.10	-0.06
	Prudence	0.19**	0.01	-0.11	0.15*	-0.01	-0.10
	Self-Regulation	0.24**	-0.02	-0.15*	0.27**	-0.09	-0.18**
HUMANITY	Kindness	0.29**	0.18**	-0.17**	0.23**	-0.16*	-0.16*
	Love	0.29**	0.17**	-0.17**	0.20**	-0.05	-0.10
	Social Intelligence	0.23**	0.05	-0.12	0.19**	0.09	-0.04

Note: * $p < 0.05$, ** , $p < 0.01$, AEM= Authoritative motherhood, PM= Protective motherhood, ANM= Authoritarian motherhood, AEF= Authoritative fatherhood, PF= Protective fatherhood, ANF= Authoritarian fatherhood.

Regression Analysis

In the study, the Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Forward method was applied to determine whether parenting styles predict the character strengths of university students, and the findings are given in Table 5.

Table 5 shows that the parenting styles of the parents of university students significantly predict the character strengths within the virtue of transcendence except for humor. It is seen that there is a predictor variable in the regression equation related to appreciation of beauty and excellence character strength, and this analysis was completed in a single step. Only authoritative motherhood was included as the predictor variable in the regression equation. The adjusted R^2 value for all variables in the analysis is 0.04. In other words, authoritative motherhood explains 4% of the appreciation of beauty and excellence character strength of university students. The fact that 4% of the appreciation of beauty and excellence character strength of university students is explained by authoritative motherhood shows that other variables explain 96%. At the same time, this

regression analysis has a small effect size index ($f^2 = 0.042$). The fact that the explained variance is low or the effect size index is at a small effect level shows that the predictor in this analysis is not very effective on the appreciation of beauty and excellence character strength of university students. The standardized β coefficient of the predictive variable of authoritative motherhood is 0.20. Looking at the sign of the regression coefficient, shows that there are positive and significant relationships between authoritative motherhood and the appreciation of beauty and excellence character strength of university students. According to this, it can be said that the mothers of university students who have appreciation of beauty and excellence character strength interpret their child-rearing styles more democratically.

When the analysis results in Table 5 are examined in terms of the gratitude character strength under the virtue of transcendence, it is seen that there is only one predictor variable in the regression equation, and this analysis was completed in one step. Authoritative motherhood was included as a predictor variable in the regression equation. The adjusted R^2 value for all variables in the analysis is 0.19. In other words authoritative motherhood explains 19% of the gratitude character strength. The fact that 19% of university students' gratitude character strength is explained by the authoritative motherhood variable shows that other variables explain 81%. At the same time, this regression analysis has a medium effect size index ($f^2 = 0.23$). The low explained variance, and the moderate effect size index indicate that the predictor in this analysis is partially effective on the gratitude character strength of university students. The standardized β coefficient of the predictive variable of authoritative motherhood is 0.43. Looking at the sign of the regression coefficient, shows that there are positive and significant relationships between authoritative motherhood and the gratitude character strength. Accordingly, it can be said that university students with the gratitude character strength interpret their mothers' child-rearing styles more democratically.

Looking at Table 5, it is seen that there is only one predictor variable in the regression equation related to hope, which is another character strength under the virtue of transcendence, and this analysis was completed in one step. Authoritative motherhood was included as a predictor variable in the regression equation. The adjusted R^2 value for all variables in the analysis is 0.08. In other words, authoritative motherhood explains 8% of the hope character strength. The fact that 8% of the hope character strength of university students is explained by the authoritative motherhood variable shows that other variables explain 92%. At the same time, this regression analysis has a small effect size index ($f^2 = 0.09$). The low explained variance and the small effect size index show that the predictor in this analysis is not very effective on hope character strength in university students. The standardized β coefficient of the predictive variable of authoritative motherhood is 0.29. Looking at the sign of the regression coefficient, shows that there are positive and significant relationships between authoritative motherhood and hope character strength. Accordingly, it can be said that university students with the hope character strength interpret their mothers' child-rearing styles more democratically.

When the analysis results in Table 5 are examined in terms of spirituality character strength under the virtue of transcendence, it is seen that there is only one predictor variable in the regression equation, and this analysis was completed in one step. Authoritative motherhood was included as a predictor variable in the regression equation. The adjusted R^2 value for all variables in the analysis is 0.12. In other words, authoritative motherhood explains 12% of the spirituality character strength of university students. The fact that 12% of university students' spirituality character strength is explained by authoritative motherhood shows that other variables explain 88%. At the same time, this regression analysis has a small effect size index ($f^2 = 0.14$). The fact that the explained variance is low or the effect size index is also at a small effect level shows that the predictor in this analysis is not very effective on the spirituality character strength of university students. The standardized β coefficient of the predictive variable of authoritative motherhood is 0.36. Looking at the sign of the regression coefficient, shows that there are positive and significant relationships between authoritative motherhood and spirituality character strength. Accordingly, it can be said that university students who have the spirituality character strength interpret their mothers' child-rearing styles more democratically.

Looking at Table 5, it is seen that the parenting styles of the university student's parents significantly predicted all the character strengths within the virtue of courage. It is seen that there are two predictor variables in the regression equation related to the bravery character strength, and this analysis was completed in two stages. Authoritative motherhood was included as the first important predictor variable, and authoritarian motherhood was entered as the second variable in the regression equation. The adjusted R^2 value for all variables in the

analysis is 0.06. In other words, authoritative and authoritarian motherhood explains 6% of the bravery character strength. The fact that independent variables explain 6% of university students' bravery character strength shows that other variables explain 94%. At the same time, this regression analysis has a small effect size index ($f^2 = 0.064$). The low explained variance and the small effect size index show that the predictors in this analysis are not very effective on the bravery character strength of university students. It is the variable authoritative motherhood with the bravery character strength and the highest standardized β coefficient ($\beta = 0.39$). When the signs of the regression coefficients are examined, shows that there are positive significant relationships between all predictors and the bravery character strength. According to this, it can be said that university students with bravery character strength are more likely to evaluate their mothers' child-rearing styles as more authoritative or authoritarian.

When the analysis results in Table 5 are examined in terms of honesty character strength under the virtue of courage, it is seen that there is only one predictor variable in the regression equation, and this analysis was completed in one step. Authoritative motherhood was included as a predictor variable in the regression equation. The adjusted R^2 value for all variables in the analysis is 0.07. In other words, authoritative motherhood explains 7% of the honesty character strength of university students. The fact that 7% of university students' honesty character strength is explained by authoritative motherhood shows that other variables explain 93%. At the same time, this regression analysis has a small effect size index ($f^2 = 0.08$). The fact that the explained variance is low or the effect size index is at a small effect level shows that the predictor in this analysis is not very effective on the honesty character strength of university students. The standardized β coefficient of the predictive variable of authoritative motherhood is 0.28. Looking at the sign of the regression coefficient, shows that there are positive and significant relationships between authoritative motherhood and honesty character strength. According to this, it can be said that university students who have honesty character strength interpret their mothers' child-rearing styles more democratically.

Looking at Table 5, it is seen that there is only one predictor variable in the regression equation associated with perseverance, another character strength under the virtue of courage, and this analysis was completed in one step. Authoritative fatherhood was included as a predictor variable in the regression equation. The adjusted R^2 value for all variables in the analysis is 0.07. In other words, the authoritative fatherhood explains 7% of the perseverance character strength. The fact that the authoritative fatherhood variable explains 7% of university students' perseverance character strength shows that 93% is explained by other variables. At the same time, this regression analysis has a small effect size index ($f^2 = 0.08$). The low explained variance and the small effect size index show that the predictor in this analysis is not very effective on the perseverance character strength of university students. The standardized β coefficient of the predictive variable of authoritative fatherhood is 0.27. When the sign of the regression coefficient is examined, shows that there are positive and significant relationships between authoritative fatherhood and perseverance character strength. Accordingly, it can be said that university students who have perseverance character strength their fathers' child-rearing styles more democratically.

When the analysis results in Table 5 are examined in terms of the zest character strength under the virtue of courage, it is seen that there is only one predictor variable in the regression equation, and this analysis was completed in one step. Authoritative motherhood was included as a predictor variable in the regression equation. The adjusted R^2 value for all variables in the analysis is 0.10. In other words, authoritative motherhood explains 10% of university students' zest character strength. The fact that 10% of university students' zest character strength is explained by authoritative motherhood shows that other variables explain 90%. At the same time, this regression analysis has a small effect size index ($f^2 = 0.11$). The fact that the explained variance is low or the effect size index is also at a small effect level indicates that the predictor in this analysis is not very effective on university students' zest character strength. The standardized β coefficient of the predictive variable of authoritative motherhood

Table 5. Regression Findings on Whether Parenting Styles predict University Students' Character Strengths

	Dependent Variables	Predictive Variables	β Coefficient *	Std. Error	Std. β coefficient	R	Adj. R^2	Change Statistics R^2 Change	p
TRANSCENDENCE	Appreciation of beauty and excellence	Constant	3.13	0.23		0.20	0.04	0.04	<0.001
		AEM	0.01	0.00	0.20				<0.001
	Gratitude	Constant	1.71	0.24		0.43	0.19	.19	<0.001
		AEM	0.03	0.00	0.43				<0.001
	Hope	Constant	2.38	0.24		0.29	0.08	0.08	<0.001
		AEM	0.02	0.00	0.29				<0.001
Spirituality	Constant	2.39	0.24		0.36	0.12	0.13	<0.001	
	AEM	0.03	0.00	0.36				<0.001	
COURAGE	Bravery	Constant	1.91	0.42		0.26	0.06	0.04	<0.001
		AEM	0.02	0.01	0.39				<0.001
		ANM	0.03	0.01	0.31				<0.001
	Honesty	Constant	3.49	0.16		0.28	0.07	0.08	<0.001
		AEM	0.01	0.00	0.28				<0.001
	Perseverance	Constant	2.53	0.21		0.27	0.07	0.07	<0.001
		AEF	0.02	0.00	0.27				<0.001
	Zest	Constant	1.59	0.29		0.32	0.10	0.10	<0.001
		AEM	0.03	0.01	0.32				<0.001
	WISDOM	Creativity	Constant	2.14	0.33		0.32	0.10	0.02
AEM			0.01	0.01	0.18	.02			
PF			0.01	0.01	0.19	.01			
AEF			0.01	0.01	0.19	.02			
Curiosity		Constant	2.92	0.19		0.26	0.06	0.07	<0.001
		AEF	0.02	0.00	0.26				<0.001
Love of learning		Constant	1.76	0.50		0.32	0.10	0.03	<0.001
		AEF	0.03	0.01	0.51				<0.001
		ANF	0.03	0.01	.30				<0.001
Judgment		Constant	3.65	0.18		0.15	0.02	0.02	<0.001
		AEM	0.01	0.00	0.15				.02
Perspective		Constant	2.26	0.38		0.21	0.04	0.02	<0.001
		AEM	0.02	0.00	0.23				<0.001
		PM	0.01	0.01	0.14				.04
JUSTICE	Fairness	Constant	3.14	0.18		0.19	0.03	0.04	<0.001
		AEF	0.01	0.00	0.19				<0.001
	Leadership	Constant	2.41	0.28		0.22	0.04	0.05	<0.001
		AEM	0.02	0.01	0.22				<0.001
	Teamwork	Constant	2.29	0.39		0.33	0.10	0.03	<0.001
		AEM	0.02	0.00	0.48				<0.001
	ANM	0.02	0.01	0.25	.01				
TEMPERANCE	Prudence	Constant	3.06	0.22		0.19	0.03	0.04	<0.001
		AEM	0.01	0.00	0.19				<0.001
	Self-Regulation	Constant	2.53	0.19		0.27	0.07	0.07	<0.001
		AEF	0.02	0.00	0.27				<0.001
HUMANITY	Kindness	Constant	3.12	0.20		0.29	0.08	0.09	<0.001
		AEM	0.02	0.00	0.29				<0.001
	Love	Constant	2.44	0.28		0.29	0.08	0.08	<0.001
		AEM	0.02	0.01	0.29				<0.001
	Social Intelligence	Constant	2.24	0.33		0.29	0.08	0.03	<0.001
		AEM	0.02	0.00	0.32				<0.001
	PM	0.01	0.01	0.20	<0.001				

* Non-standardized β Coefficient

is 0.32. When the sign of the regression coefficient is examined, shows that there are positive and significant relationships between authoritative motherhood and the zest character strength. According to this, it can be said that university students who have the zest character strength interpret their mothers' child-rearing styles more democratically.

Looking at Table 5, shows that the parenting styles of the university students' parents significantly predicted all the character strengths within the virtue of wisdom. It is seen that there are three predictor variables in the regression equation related to the creativity character strength, and this analysis was completed in three stages. Authoritative motherhood, protective fatherhood, and authoritative fatherhood were included as predictive variables in the regression equation. The adjusted R^2 value for all variables in the analysis is 0.10. In other words, authoritative motherhood protective and authoritative fatherhood explain 10% of university students' creativity character strength. The fact that 10% of the creativity character strength of university students is explained by authoritative motherhood, protective and authoritative fatherhood shows that other variables explain 90%. At the same time, this regression analysis has a small effect size index ($f^2 = 0.11$). The fact that the explained variance is low or the effect size index is at a small effect level shows that the predictors in this analysis are not very effective on the creativity character strength of university students. The variables with the creativity character strength and the highest standardized β coefficient are protective and authoritative fatherhood ($\beta = 0.19$). When the signs of the regression coefficients are examined, shows that there are positive and significant relationships between all predictors and creativity character strength. According to this, it can be said that university students who have the creativity character strength interpret their mothers' child-rearing styles as more democratic and their fathers' child-rearing styles as more protective or democratic.

When the analysis results in Table 5 are examined in terms of the curiosity character strength under the virtue of wisdom, it is seen that there is only one predictor variable in the regression equation, and this analysis was completed in one step. Authoritative fatherhood was included as a predictor variable in the regression equation. The adjusted R^2 value for all variables in the analysis is 0.06. In other words, the authoritative fatherhood explains 6% of the curiosity character strength. The fact that 6% of the curiosity character strength of university students is explained by the authoritative fatherhood variable shows that other variables explain 94%. At the same time, this regression analysis has a small effect size index ($f^2 = 0.064$). The fact that the explained variance is low and the effect size index is small shows that the predictor in this analysis is not very effective on the curiosity character strength of university students. The standardized β coefficient of the predictive variable of authoritative fatherhood is 0.26. Looking at the sign of the regression coefficient, shows that there are positive and significant relationships between authoritative fatherhood and creativity character strength. Accordingly, it can be said that university students who have the creativity character strength to interpret their fathers' child-rearing styles more democratically.

In Table 5, it is seen that there are two predictor variables related to the love of learning, another character strength under the virtue of wisdom, and this analysis was completed in two stages. Authoritative fatherhood and authoritarian fatherhood were included as predictive variables in the regression equation. The adjusted R^2 value for all variables in the analysis is 0.10. In other words, authoritative and authoritarian fatherhood explain 10% of university students' love of learning character strength. The fact that 10% of university students' love of learning character strength is explained by authoritative and authoritarian fatherhood shows that other variables explain 90%. At the same time, this regression analysis has a small effect size index ($f^2 = 0.11$). The fact that the explained variance is low or the effect size index is at a small effect level shows that the predictors in this analysis are not very effective on the love of learning character strength of university students. Authoritative fatherhood is a variable love of learning character strength, the highest standardized β coefficient ($\beta = 0.51$). When the signs of the regression coefficients are examined, shows that there are positive significant relationships between all predictors and the love of learning character strength. Accordingly, it can be said that university students who have a love of learning character strength interpret their fathers' child-rearing styles as more democratic or authoritarian.

When the analysis results in Table 5 are examined in terms of the judgment character strength under the virtue of wisdom, it is seen that there is only one predictor variable in the regression equation, and this analysis was

completed in one step. Authoritative motherhood was included as a predictor variable in the regression equation. The adjusted R^2 value for all variables in the analysis is 0.02. In other words, authoritative motherhood explains 2% of the judgment character strength of university students. The fact that 2% of the judgment character strength of university students is explained by authoritative motherhood shows that other variables explain 98%. At the same time, this regression analysis has a small effect size index ($f^2 = 0.02$). The fact that the explained variance is low or the effect size index is also at a small effect level indicates that the predictor in this analysis is not very effective on the judgment character strength of university students. The standardized β coefficient of the predictive variable of authoritative motherhood is 0.15. Looking at the sign of the regression coefficient, shows that there are positive and significant relationships between authoritative motherhood and judgment character strength. Accordingly, it can be said that university students with judgment character strength interpret their mothers' child-rearing styles more democratically.

Looking at Table 5, it is seen that there are two predictor variables in the regression equation related to perspective, which is another character strength under the virtue of wisdom, and this analysis was completed in two stages. Authoritative and protective motherhood were included as predictor variables in the regression equation. The adjusted R^2 value for all variables in the analysis is 0.04. In other words, authoritative and protective motherhood explains 4% of university students' perspective character strength. The fact that 4% of the perspective character strength of university students is explained by authoritative and protective motherhood shows that other variables explain 96%. At the same time, this regression analysis has a small effect size index ($f^2 = 0.04$). The fact that the explained variance is low or the effect size index is at a small effect level indicates that the predictors in this analysis are not very effective in the perspective character strength of university students. Authoritative motherhood is the variable with perspective character strength and the highest standardized β coefficient ($\beta = 0.23$). When the signs of the regression coefficients are examined, shows that there are positive significant relationships between all predictors and the perspective character strength. Accordingly, it can be said that university students who have the perspective character strength interpret their mothers' child-rearing styles as more democratic or protective.

When the analysis results in Table 5 are examined, it is seen that the parenting styles of the university student's parents significantly predict all the character strengths within the virtue of justice. It is seen that there is only one predictor variable in the regression equation for predicting fairness character strength, and this analysis was completed in one step. Authoritative fatherhood was included as a predictor variable in the regression equation. The adjusted R^2 value for all variables in the analysis is 0.03. In other words, the authoritative fatherhood explains 3% of the fairness character strength of university students. The fact that 3% of the fairness character strength of university students is explained by authoritative fatherhood shows that 97% is explained by other variables. At the same time, this regression analysis has a small effect size index ($f^2 = 0.03$). The fact that the explained variance is low or the effect size index is also at a small effect level indicates that the predictor in this analysis is not very effective on the fairness character strength of university students. The standardized β coefficient of the predictive variable of authoritative fatherhood is 0.19. Looking at the sign of the regression coefficient, shows that there are positive and significant relationships between authoritative fatherhood and fairness character strength. Accordingly, it can be said that university students who have fairness character strength interpret their fathers' child-rearing styles more democratically.

Table 5 shows that only one predictor variable is associated with leadership another character strength under the virtue of justice. Authoritative motherhood was included as a predictor variable in the regression equation. The adjusted R^2 value for all variables in the analysis is 0.04. In other words, authoritative motherhood explains 4% of the leadership character strength of university students. The fact that 4% of the leadership character strength of university students is explained by authoritative motherhood shows that other variables explain 96%. At the same time, this regression analysis has a small effect size index ($f^2 = 0.04$). The fact that the explained variance is low or the effect size index is at a small effect level shows that the predictor in this analysis is not very effective on the leadership character strength of university students. The standardized β coefficient of the predictive variable of authoritative motherhood is 0.22. Looking at the sign of the regression coefficient, shows that there are positive and significant relationships between authoritative motherhood and leadership character strength. Accordingly, it can be said that university students with leadership character strength interpret their mothers' child-rearing styles more democratically.

When the analysis results in Table 4 are examined in terms of teamwork character strength under the virtue of justice, it is seen that there are two predictor variables in the regression equation. This analysis was completed in two stages. Authoritative and authoritarian motherhood entered the regression equation as the predictor variable. The adjusted R^2 value for all variables in the analysis is 0.10. In other words, authoritative and authoritarian motherhood explains 10% of university students' teamwork character strength. The fact that 10% of university students' teamwork character strength is explained by authoritative and authoritarian motherhood shows that other variables explain 90%. At the same time, this regression analysis has a small effect size index ($f^2 = 0.11$). The fact that the explained variance is low or the effect size index is also at a small effect level shows that the predictors in this analysis are not very effective on the teamwork character strength of university students. Authoritative motherhood is the variable with the teamwork character strength and the highest standardized β coefficient ($\beta = 0.48$). When the signs of the regression coefficients are examined, shows that there are positive significant relationships between all predictors and teamwork character strength. Accordingly, it can be said that university students who have teamwork character strength interpret their mothers' child-rearing styles as more democratic or authoritarian.

Table 5 shows that the parenting styles of university students' parents significantly predict their children's prudence and self-regulation character strengths within the virtue of temperance. It is seen that there is only one predictor variable in the regression equation related to prudence character strength, and this analysis was completed in one step. Authoritative motherhood was included as a predictor variable in the regression equation. The adjusted R^2 value for all variables in the analysis is 0.03. In other words, authoritative motherhood explains 3% of the prudence character strength. The fact that the authoritative motherhood variable explains 3% of the prudence character strength of university students shows that other variables other variables explain 97%. At the same time, this regression analysis has a small effect size index ($f^2 = 0.03$). The low explained variance and the small effect size index show that the predictor in this analysis is not very effective on prudence character strength in university students. The standardized β coefficient of the predictive variable of authoritative motherhood is 0.19. Looking at the sign of the regression coefficient, shows that there are positive and significant relationships between authoritative motherhood and prudence character strength. Accordingly, it can be said that university students with prudence character strength interpret their mothers' child-rearing styles more democratically.

When the analysis results in Table 5 are examined in terms of self-regulation character strength under the virtue of temperance, it is seen that there is only one predictor variable in the regression equation, and this analysis was completed in one step. Authoritative fatherhood was included as a predictor variable in the regression equation. The adjusted R^2 value for all variables in the analysis is 0.07. In other words, the authoritative fatherhood explains 7% of the self-regulation character strength. The fact that 7% of the self-regulation character strength of university students is explained by the authoritative fatherhood variable shows that other variables explain 93%. At the same time, this regression analysis has a small effect size index ($f^2 = 0.08$). The low explained variance and the small effect size index show that the predictor in this analysis is not very effective on self-regulation character strength in university students. The standardized β coefficient of the predictive variable of authoritative fatherhood is 0.27. Looking at the sign of the regression coefficient, shows that there are positive and significant relationships between authoritative fatherhood and self-regulation character strength. Accordingly, it can be said that university students who have self-regulation character strength interpret their fathers' child-rearing styles more democratically.

Table 5 shows that the parenting styles of university students' parents significantly predict all character strengths under the virtue of humanity. It is seen that there is only one predictor variable in the regression equation related to the kindness character strength, and this analysis was completed in one step. Authoritative motherhood was included as a predictor variable in the regression equation. The adjusted R^2 value for all variables in the analysis is 0.08. In other words, authoritative motherhood explains 8% of the kindness character strength. The fact that the authoritative motherhood variable explains 8% of university students' kindness character strength shows that other variables explain 92%. At the same time, this regression analysis has a small effect size index ($f^2 = 0.09$). The low explained variance and the small effect size index show that

the predictor in this analysis is not very effective on the kindness character strength of university students. The standardized β coefficient of the predictive variable of authoritative motherhood is 0.29. Looking at the sign of the regression coefficient, shows that there are positive and significant relationships between authoritative motherhood and the kindness character strength. Accordingly, it can be said that university students who have kindness character strength interpret their mothers' child-rearing styles more democratically.

When the analysis results in Table 5 are examined in terms of love character strength under the virtue of humanity, it is seen that there is only one predictor variable in the regression equation, and this analysis was completed in one step. Authoritative motherhood was included as a predictor variable in the regression equation. The adjusted R^2 value for all variables in the analysis is 0.08. In other words, authoritative motherhood explains 8% of the love character strength of university students. The fact that 8% of the love character strength of university students is explained by authoritative motherhood shows that other variables explain 92%. At the same time, this regression analysis has a small effect size index ($f^2 = 0.09$). The low explained variance and the small effect size index show that the predictor in this analysis is not very effective on the love character strength of university students. The standardized β coefficient of the predictive variable of authoritative motherhood is 0.29. Looking at the sign of the regression coefficient, shows that there are positive and significant relationships between authoritative motherhood and love character strength. Accordingly, it can be said that university students who have the love character strength interpret their mothers' child-rearing styles more democratically.

Looking at Table 5, it is seen that there are two predictor variables in the regression equation related to social intelligence, which is another character strength under the virtue of humanity, and this analysis was completed in two stages. Authoritative and protective motherhood were included as predictor variables in the regression equation. The adjusted R^2 value for all variables in the analysis is 0.08. In other words, authoritative and protective motherhood explain 8% of university students' social intelligence character strength. The fact that 8% of the social intelligence character strength of university students is explained by authoritative and protective motherhood shows that other variables explain 92%. At the same time, this regression analysis has a small effect size index ($f^2 = 0.09$). The fact that the explained variance is low or the effect size index is at a small effect level shows that the predictors in this analysis are not very effective on the social intelligence character strength of university students. Authoritative motherhood is the variable with social intelligence character strength and the highest standardized β coefficient ($\beta = 0.32$). When the signs of the regression coefficients are examined, shows that there are positive significant relationships between all predictors and social intelligence character strength. Accordingly, it can be said that university students with social intelligence character strength interpret their mothers' child-rearing styles as more democratic or protective.

Discussion

In this study, the relationships between the character strengths of individuals aged 19-25 and their parents' parenting styles were examined. According to the results of the study, significant gender differences were found in the character strengths within all other virtues except the virtue of justice. As a result of the calculated correlations, it was determined that all character strengths except humor under the virtue of transcendence and the forgiveness and modesty character strengths under the virtue of temperance showed significant relationships with the parenting styles of the parents of the university students. Looking at the findings of the regression analysis, it was determined that authoritative motherhood and authoritative fatherhood styles significantly predicted all character strengths under the virtues of courage, wisdom, justice, and humanity.

According to the study's findings, university students' scores on twenty-one character strengths differ significantly according to their gender. Female college students scored higher than male college students on the appreciation of beauty and excellence, forgiveness, gratitude, kindness, and love character strengths. Male university students, on the other hand, got higher scores than female students in terms of bravery, creativity, and humor. In support of this finding, in other studies conducted with university students in the literature, it was determined that female students scored significantly higher on the kindness, gratitude, forgiveness, appreciation of beauty and excellence character strengths, and male students scored significantly higher on creativity and bravery character strengths (Heintz et al., 2017; Karris, 2007; Schimai et al., 2006; Zhang & Chen, 2018). Different from the findings of the current study, there are also studies in the literature that show

that female students have higher scores on prudence, fairness, leadership, and teamwork character strengths, while male students score significantly higher on self-regulation, open-mindedness, perspective, and judgment character strengths (Karris, 2007; Schimai et al., 2006; Zhang & Chen, 2018). As a result of the studies conducted by Choudbury and Borooah (2017) with 240 university students, it was found that the character strengths of the students did not differ significantly according to their gender.

Results from this study showed that female university students came to the fore in character strengths of interest and compassion, and male university students were more prominent in character strengths that helped to reveal personal skills and characteristics. From the evolutionary perspective explaining this resulting gender difference in character strengths, women are more likely to approve of character strengths such as kindness and love, possibly because such character strengths are related to their natural evolutionary traits. From the same perspective, males are more likely to support character strengths such as bravery, judgment, and versatile perspective, possibly due to their natural, evolutionary role in hunting and foraging for survival (Brdar et al., 2011). The fact that the current finding of this study is supported by studies conducted in other cultures may be a sign of the justification of this evolutionary perspective approach. The cases where the finding is not supported can be explained by the social construction perspective (Brdar et al., 2011) and cultural values adopted by different societies (Niemic, 2013), which are effective in the emergence of gender differences in character strengths. According to the social construction perspective, men and women develop different characteristics and qualities because they have different social roles. Specifically, men tend to be tough and strong as they are more likely to develop traits such as self-confidence and invincibility and become the backbone of the family. Women are more likely to be sympathetic, attentive, and sensitive, allowing them to largely recognize the needs and emotional expressions of others (Brdar et al., 2011). According to the cultural values perspective, gender differences are largely shaped by the cultural values prevailing in individualist and collectivist societies (Niemic, 2013). In this study, which was carried out in a collectivist society, it can be said that women come to the fore in their character strengths to take care of and care for the needs of others as a requirement for individuals to behave in accordance with the social and gender roles they have acquired as a result of their socialization. On the other hand, it can be interpreted that men stand out more in planning analysis and character strengths of extroverted nature to ensure the livelihood and safety of the family.

Authoritative parenting style strongly explains the moral development of college students as expressed in certain parental behaviors that reflect non-aggressive control and positive empowerment (Vaden, 2001). The findings of this study, it was revealed that authoritative motherhood has positive and significant relationships with all character strengths of university students except forgiveness, humor and modesty. As a result of the regression analysis, it was determined that while authoritative motherhood significantly predicted the sixteen character strengths, it alone significantly predicted the appreciation of beauty and excellence, gratitude, honesty, hope, judgment, kindness, leadership, love, prudence, spirituality, and zest character strengths. It has been determined that authoritative fatherhood has positive and significant relationships with all the character strengths associated with authoritative motherhood, except for the bravery and perspective character strengths of the university students. The regression analysis showed that while authoritative fatherhood significantly predicted creativity, curiosity, fairness, love of learning, perseverance, and self-regulation character strengths, it alone significantly predicted curiosity, fairness, perseverance, and self-regulation character strengths. Supporting the results of this study, studies in the literature have also revealed that the authoritative style of mothers and their related parenting practices show significant relationships with individuals' love, kindness, emotional intelligence, and forgiveness characteristics (Gugliandolo et al., 2019; Mo, 2019; Neal, 2006; Tahir & Jabeen, 2022). Likewise, some studies have shown that maternal parenting styles have stronger relationships with outcomes in an individual's life than paternal parenting styles. It has been suggested that maternal parents affect late adolescent adjustment more strongly than paternal parents (Barton & Kirtley, 2012). Especially in collectivist cultures, mothers are considered more responsible for raising children and are generally more friendly and nurturing. In these cultures, fathers are viewed primarily as providers of economic resources for the family. For this reason, they are expected to be more rigid and less friendly (Saleem et al., 2015). In this study, which was carried out in a society with a collectivist culture, it can be said that although mothers are relatively more independent from themselves, they have more influence on the character strengths of their

university students than their fathers. During the university period, the individual starts to live in a more autonomous structure from his mother compared to the previous developmental periods. However, he will continue to maintain relations with her, especially if she has an authoritative style. This may explain the continuing influence of the authoritative mother on the individual. In addition to playing a key role in social and emotional development as the first attachment figure, mothers may also act as an important role models in moral development with their behaviors within the scope of the authoritative parenting style they adopt. In addition to being role models, it can be argued that they support the development of many character strengths in their children from an early age by supporting their children to express their thoughts and gain new experiences, and by enabling them to correct their mistakes constructively.

According to the findings of this study, protective motherhood has negative and significant relationships with university students' character strengths of fairness, gratitude, honesty, hope, kindness, love, spirituality, and zest. As a result of the regression analysis, protective motherhood entered the equation together with authoritative motherhood in predicting the perspective and social intelligence character strengths of the university students. It was determined that protective fatherhood had negative and significant relationships with the gratitude, honesty, and kindness character strengths of the university students. The regression analysis showed that that protective fatherhood was included in the equation with the authoritative motherhood and authoritative fatherhood style in predicting only the creative character strength of university students. In support of these findings, studies conducted with university students showed that the protective parenting style was negatively correlated with self-compassion and distress tolerance skills (Eker & Kaya, 2018; Perez et al., 2020; Yılmaz, 2009). In a study of university students, contrary to the research findings, it was determined that there were positive significant relationships between the protective parenting style and compassionate love (Eker & Kaya, 2018). In particular, it was expected that university students, who became more autonomous in all areas of their lives, would conflict with the overprotective attitudes of their parents. In the development of character strengths, which are concrete indicators of moral development, it is important for the individual to experience different life events and to make evaluations about themselves as a result of these experiences. Parents with protective parenting style undertake every task on behalf of their children and deprive them of new experiences. This may explain the inverse relationship between relevant character strengths and protective parenting style.

There is no study in the literature that explains the relationship between the protective styles of parents of different genders and the character strengths of their children. The results of the present study revealed that mothers were more effective in terms of the number of entering the regression equation in this parenting style, just as in the authoritative style. The findings of this study, which was carried out in a society with a collectivist culture, show that mothers are more connected with their university student children, even if they are in a relatively more autonomous state. For this reason, it can be interpreted that whether mothers adopt positive parenting practices, such as authoritative attitudes, or more negative parenting practices, such as protective attitudes, they have more influence on their children's moral development in general and character strengths in particular.

According to the current study, authoritarian motherhood has negative relationships with creativity, gratitude, honesty, hope, kindness, love, self-regulation, spirituality, and zest character strengths in university students. As a result of regression analysis, only the teamwork character strength of university students was included in the equation, together with authoritative motherhood in predicting character strength. Authoritarian fatherhood has negative relationships with curiosity, fairness, gratitude, honesty, kindness, perseverance, self-regulation, and spirituality character strengths. As a result of the regression analysis, entered the equation with the authoritative fatherhood in predicting only the love of learning character strength of university students. In support of these findings, studies conducted with university students showed that authoritarian parenting style was negatively correlated with self-compassion and forgiveness (Eker & Kaya, 2018; Harrison, 2012; Yılmaz, 2009). According to Ngai's (2015) study, parental control negatively predicted the honesty, bravery, perseverance, kindness, love, social intelligence, fairness, and self-regulation character strengths of individuals aged between 11 and 20. It is also known that adolescents who evaluate their parents as authoritarian have lower emotional intelligence scores (Argyriou et al., 2016). Just like the protective parenting style, the authoritarian parenting style restricts the children's acquisition of new experiences and self-evaluation within

the framework of these experiences. Unlike the protective parenting style, the authoritarian parenting style does not provide a good start for the individual to discover their positive characteristics, as it does not allow for a warm and accepting parent-child relationship. For this reason, as revealed in the findings of the current study, individuals who consider their parents more authoritarian may stay in the background in some character strengths compared to their peers.

A study conducted in North America revealed that maternal rejection hinders children's emotional self-efficacy development, but father rejection does not (Niditch & Varela, 2012). Apart from similar research results, no study has been found in the literature that explains the relationship between the authoritarian styles of parents of different genders and the character strengths of their children. The results of the present study revealed that mothers were more effective in terms of the number of entering the regression equation in this parenting style, just as in the authoritative and protective styles. According to Vaden (2001), gender inequality in families leads to parenting differences. Resources and opportunities are presented differently for different gender roles in traditional family contexts, causing parents to adopt different perspectives on justice and care (Vaden, 2001). It can be said that in addition to the differentiation in gender roles brought about by the collectivist culture in which the participant group of the present study is included, the gender inequality arising from the traditional family structure also works in favor of the mothers. Whether it is positive or negative parenting practices, the fact that mothers are the first attachment figures can also be considered as a possible factor apart from the evolutionary, social, and cultural influence. Especially when an authoritarian mother cannot offer enough closeness and warmth to the individual as the first object of love, the individual cannot be expected to develop positive internal working models. As a result, social and moral development in general and the development of character strengths in particular may be adversely affected.

Limitations

The present study contributes to the literature on the links between the parenting styles of parents and the character strengths of university students, but it also has some limitations. First of all, the simple relational design was used in this study, in which the descriptive model was adopted. In this study, in which cross-sectional data were obtained, causal inference and generalizability are limited. Future studies should use the experimental research model to detect causal relationships between relevant variables. Secondly, its generalizability is limited as the sample mainly consists of female students and people studying at a single university. Care should be taken to use different study groups in terms of gender and university in future studies on this subject. The variables discussed in the study are limited to the measurements of self-reported measurement tools. In future studies where variables affecting character strengths will be investigated, research can be planned in which the information obtained from mixed design or self-report measurement tools is supported by qualitative data collection methods. Finally, one of the limitations of this study is that it assumes that character strengths are only influenced by parental styles. In future studies where variables affecting character strengths will be investigated, variables such as temperament characteristics and early childhood experiences may be included in addition to familial variables.

Suggestions

The present study, with its findings describing the effect of the family psycho-social environment on the character strengths of university students, shows the preliminary mechanisms that can help the moral development of individuals, thus enriching the theory of character strengths and providing reference to relevant empirical studies. The findings of the current study may shed light on the practices of developing the character strengths of university students. According to Liu and Wang (2021), parents should treat their children more warmly, encouragingly and respectfully, and increase parent-child interactive activities. Because these behaviors promote a positive family psycho-social environment and ultimately strengthen the positive character (Liu & Wang, 2021). Considering the findings of the current study, the fact that university students are so related to their character strengths, even if they are in a more autonomous development period, suggests that parenting sensitivity training to be given to mothers will be beneficial in the development of individuals' character strengths from a younger age. Providing such training to caregivers responsible for individuals who have lost their mothers may be an appropriate approach to support the development of their character strengths.

Conclusion

The results of the study showed that female students scored higher, especially in character strengths under the virtue of humanity. It has been determined that university students' character strengths other than humor, forgiveness, and modesty have positive and significant relationships with the authoritative parenting style, which defines positive parenting practices. It has been revealed that protective and authoritarian parenting styles other than the authoritative parenting style do not have a strong effect on character strengths. In terms of the genders of the parents, it was determined that the parenting styles of the mother significantly predicted all the character strengths within the virtues of courage, wisdom, justice, and humanity. The fact that they showed a small effect size in terms of the level of prediction shows that the effect of parenting styles on the character strengths of university students is not very large. Other family-related variables can also be included in the process in order to examine further the effect of family on the character strengths of university students who have become more autonomous compared to other developmental stages.

Author Contributions: The concept and design of the study, material preparation, data collection and analysis were carried out by the author. The first draft and final version of the manuscript were written, read and revised by the author.

Funding Disclosure: No funding was received to assist with the preparation of this manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares that she has no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability: The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are available in the Dataverse repository, [doi: 10.7910/DVN/1QEOJM,]

Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate: All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee (Bursa Uludag University Social and Human Sciences Research and Publication Ethics Committee) and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

References

- Akbulut, Ö., & Çapık, C. (2022). Multivariate statistical analysis and required sample size. *Journal of Nursology*, 25 (2), 111-116. <https://doi.org/10.5152/JANHS.2022.970637>
- Allan, B. A. (2015). Balance among character strengths and meaning in life. *Journal of Happiness Studies: An Interdisciplinary Forum on Subjective Well-Being*, 16(5), 1247–1261. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-014-9557-9>
- Anjum, A. & Amjad, N. (2016). Character strengths and wellbeing: A discriminant analysis between young adults from counseling centres and community samples. *Pakistan Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 14, 1, 3-14. Retrieved from <https://www.gcu.edu.pk/pages/gcupress/pjscp/volumes/pjscp20161-1.pdf>
- Argyriou, E., Bakoyannis, G., & Tantaros, S. (2016). Parenting styles and trait emotional intelligence in adolescence. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 57(1), 42–49. [doi: 10.1111/sjop.12266](https://doi.org/10.1111/sjop.12266)
- Barton, A. L., & Hirsch, J. K. (2016). Permissive parenting and mental health in college students: Mediating effects of academic entitlement. *Journal of American College Health*, 64:1, 1-8. <http://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2015.1060597>
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11, 56–95. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0272431691111004>
- Baumrind, D. (1998). Reflections on character and competence. In A. Colby, J. James, and D. Hart (Eds.) *Competence and Character through life* (pp. 1-28). The University of Chicago Press.
- Berge, J. M., Wall, M., Loth, K., & Neumark-Sztainer, D. (2010). Parenting style as a predictor of youth weight and weight-related behaviors. *Journal of Youth Health*, 46(4), 331-338. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2009.08.004>
- Bernebé-Say, L. (2020). *Relationship between character strengths and lower levels of college-related stress and test anxiety* (Publication No. 82835) [Bachelor Thesis, University of Twente]. University Of Twente Student Theses

- Brdar, I., Ani'c, P., and Rijavec, M. (2011). Character strengths and well-being: are there gender differences? *The Human Pursuit of Well-Being*, 95, 145–156. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-1375-8_13
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Demirci, İ., Güldal, Ş. & Ekşi, H. (2021, October). Classification and Measurement of Character Strengths: VIA-IS-P and GASC-24 Forms . E. Hamarta (Ed.), *Proceedings of 22nd International Congress on Psychological Counselling and Guidance* (pp.477-479), Ankara: Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Derneği Yayınları.
- Eker, H. & Kaya, M. (2018). Examining university students' self-compassion and compassionate love levels in terms of perceived parental attitudes. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 6, 11. <http://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v6i11.3407>
- Ekşi, H. Demirci, İ., Albayrak, İ., & Ekşi, F. (2022). The predictive roles of character strengths and personality traits on flourishing. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*, 9(2), 353-367. <http://doi.org/10.52380/ijpes.2022.9.2.534>
- Gilligan, C., & Wiggins, G. (1987). The origins of morality in early childhood relationships. In J. Kagan & S. Lamb (Eds.), *The emergence of morality in young children* (pp. 277–305). University of Chicago Press.
- Griffin, E. F. (2014). *The effects of time-perspective and character strengths on the success, psychological health and subjective well-being of undergraduate students* (Publication no: 1782842348) [Doctoral dissertation, De Montfort University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Grinhauz, A. S., Azzara, S. H., & Azzollini, S. (2022). Can character strengths predict college adjustment? A study carried out in nursing students in the Argentine Republic. *Trends in Psychology*, 1-13. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s43076-022-00215-1>
- Gugliandolo, M. C., Mavroveli, S., Costa, S., Cuzzocrea, F., & Larcana, R. (2019). The relative contribution of parenting practices in predicting trait emotional intelligence in an Italian adolescent sample. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 37(4),585–599. <http://doi.org/10.1111/bjdp.12299>
- Harrison, T. L. (2012). *Parenting styles and self-forgiveness: Are guilt and shame mediators?* (Publication no: 1466299947) [Doctoral dissertation, Trevecca Nazarene University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Hawkins, S. M. (2005). *The influence of parenting styles on the development of moral judgment in college level adolescents* (Publication no: 58825016) [Doctoral dissertation, Liberty University]. CORE.
- Heintz, S., Kramm, C., & Ruch, W. (2017). A meta-analysis of gender differences in character strengths and age, nation, and measure as moderators. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 16(4), 97-110. <http://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2017.1414297>
- Karris, M. A. (2007). *Character strengths and well-being in a college sample* (Publication no: 304889523) [Doctoral dissertation. University of Colorado]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Kaya, C. (2022). Adaptation and preliminary validation of a positive psychology assessment tool: Character strengths semantic differential scale. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 40(4) 451–464. <http://doi.org/10.1177/07342829211070404>
- Kriegbaum, K., Villarreal, B., Wu, V. C., & Heckhausen, J. (2016). Parents still matter: patterns of shared agency with parents predict college students' academic motivation and achievement. *Motivation Science*, 2(2), 97–115. <http://doi.org/10.1037/mot0000033>
- Kuzgun, Y. (1972). *Anne-baba tutumlarının bireyin kendini gerçekleştirme düzeyine etkisi*. [Unpublished Master Thesis]. Hacettepe University.
- Kuzgun, Y. & Eldeleklioğlu, J. (2005). Ana-baba tutumları ölçeği (Ergen ve Yetişkinler için). Y. Kuzgun & F. Bacanlı (Eds) *PDR'de kullanılan ölçekler* (pp.143-151). Nobel Publishing.
- Linley, P. A., Maltby, J., Wood, A. M., Joseph, S., Harrington, S., Peterson, C., Park, N. & Seligman, M. E. (2007). Character strengths in the United Kingdom: The VIA inventory of strengths. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43(2), 341-351. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.12.004>

- Liu, Q. & Wang, Z. (2021). Associations between parental emotional warmth, parental attachment, peer attachment, and adolescents' character strengths. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 120, 105765. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105765>
- Loton, D. J. & Waters, L. E. (2017). The mediating effect of self-efficacy in the connections between strength-based parenting, happiness and psychological distress in teens. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8(1707). <http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01707>
- Lounsbury, J. W., Fisher, L. A., Levy, J. J., & Welsh, D. A. (2009). An investigation of character strengths in relation to the academic success of college students. *Individual Differences Research*, 7, 52-69.
- Luo, H.; Liu, Q.; Yu, C.; Nie, Y. (2021). Parental warmth, gratitude, and prosocial behavior among Chinese adolescents: The moderating effect of school climate. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18, 7033. <http://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18137033>
- McGrath, R. E. (February 2019). *Technical report: The VIA assessment suite for adults: Developmental initial evaluation (rev. ed.)*. Retrieved from https://evada-assets.global.ssl.fastly.net/76d1ea39-a4eb-4270-b9dc-899653415f8f/assets/Technical%20Report%20Revised%20Edition%202019_1.pdf
- Mo, T. S. (2019). The effect of parenting styles on strengths of humanity: love, kindness and social intelligence in Myanmar adolescents. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 9, 8. <http://doi.org/10.7176/RHSS>
- Murrell, L. (2015). *Character strengths and well-being: Differences in social activity among college students* (Publication no: 10140545) [Doctoral dissertation. Oklahoma State University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Neal, K. L. (2006). *The relationship between children's propensity to forgive, parents' propensity to forgive and parenting practices* (Publication no: 304916872) [Doctoral dissertation. George Mason University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Niditch, L. A., & Varela, R. E. (2012). Perceptions of parenting, emotional self-efficacy, and anxiety in youth: Test of a mediational model. *Child & Youth Care Forum*, 41, 21–35. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10566-011-9150-x>
- Newcomb, M. D. (1997). General deviance and psychological distress: Impact of family support/bonding over 12 years from adolescence to adulthood. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 7, 369-400. <http://doi.org/10.1002/cbm.196>
- Ngai, S. S. (2015). Parental bonding and character strengths among Chinese adolescents in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 20(3), 317-333. <http://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2015.1007879>
- Niemiec, R. M. (2013). VIA character strengths: Research and practice (The first 10 years). In H. H. Knoop & A. DelleFave (Eds.), *Well-being and cultures: Perspectives on positive psychology* (pp. 11-30). Springer.
- Noronha, A. P. P. & Martins, D. F. (2016). Associations between character strengths and life satisfaction: A study with college students. *Acta Colombiana de Psicología*, 19 (2). <http://doi.org/10.14718/ACP.2016.19.2.5>
- Parke, R.D. (1995). Fathers and families. In M.H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting (Vol. 3): Status and social conditions of parenting* (pp. 27-63). Erlbaum.
- Park, N. (2004). Character strengths and positive youth development. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 591, 40–54. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0002716203260079>
- Perez, C. M., Nicholson, B. C., Dahlen, E. R., & Leuty, M. E. (2020). Overparenting and emerging adults' mental health: The mediating role of emotional distress tolerance. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 29, 374–381. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-019-01603-5>
- Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification*. Oxford University Press.
- Peterson, C., & Park, N. (2007). Attachment security and its benefits in context. *Psychological Inquiry*, 18, 172–176. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10478400701512752>
- Raimundi, M. J., Molina, M. F., Schmidt, V., & Hernández-Mendo, A. (2019). Family functioning profiles and character strengths in young elite athletes from Argentina. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 17(1), 32–51. <http://doi.org/10.1080/1612197x.2016.1189949>

- Ratner, B. (2009). The correlation coefficient: Its values range between+ 1/- 1, or do they? *Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for Marketing*, 17(2), 139- 42. <http://doi.org/10.1057/jt.2009.5>
- Saleem, S., Mahmood, Z., & Subhan, S. (2015). Perceived parental practices and mental health problems: Cross-cultural validation of EMBU-C on Pakistani adolescents. *FWU Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(1), 44–52.
- Saleem, M., Javed, H. A., & Durrani, A. K. (2020). Impact of character strength on life satisfaction of adolescents from Punjab: Moderating role of authoritative parenting style. *University of Wah Journal of Social Sciences*, 3, 2, 28-42.
- Schafer, R. M. (2011). *The relationship between the functions of school refusal behaviour and family environment* [Master's thesis. University of Nevada]. Digital Scholarship.
- Schaper, J. (2020). *Character strengths and coping styles in regard to perceived stress in a university student sample* (Publication No. 82327) [Bachelor Thesis, University of Twente]. University Of Twente Student Theses.
- Shimai, S., Otake, K., Park, N., Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2006). Convergence of character strengths in American and Japanese young adults. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 7: 311-322. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-005-3647-7>
- Smetana, J.G. (1993). Conceptions of parental authority in divorced and married mothers and their adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 3(1), 19-39. http://doi.org/10.1207/s15327795jra0301_2
- Smetana, J.G. (1999). The role of parents in moral development: A social domain analysis. *Journal of Moral Education*, 28(3), 311-321. <http://doi.org/10.1080/030572499103106>
- Spinrad, T., Losoya, S., Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R., Shepard, S., Cumberland, A., Guthrie, I., & Murphy, B. (1999). The relations of parental affect and encouragement to children's moral emotions and behaviour. *Journal of Moral Education*, 28 (3), 323-337. <http://doi.org/10.1080/030572499103115>
- Sukkyung, Y., & Kim, A. N. (2016). Understanding aggression through attachment and social emotional competence in Korean middle school students. *School Psychology International*, 37(3), 255–270. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0143034316631039>
- Tahir, R., & Jabeen, S. (2022). Parenting styles and psychological well-being: The role of emotional intelligence. *Journal of Professional & Applied Psychology*, 3(3), 330-342. <https://doi.org/10.52053/jpap.v3i3.119>
- Vaden, S. R. (2001). *The relationship of parenting styles to moral development in college students* (Publication no: 3029904) [Doctoral dissertation. The University of Memphis]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Wiepking, L. (2020). *The relation of character strengths, engagement coping and life satisfaction among students* (Publication No. 81676) [Bachelor Thesis, University of Twente]. University Of Twente Student Theses.
- Williams, K. E., & Ciarrochi, J. (2019). Perceived parenting styles and values development: a longitudinal study of adolescents and emerging adults. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 30(10). <http://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12542>
- Yılmaz, M. T. (2009). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin öz-anlayışları (self-compassion) ile anne baba tutumları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* (Thesis No: 249900) [Master Thesis, Selçuk University]. Council of Higher Education Thesis Center.
- Zhang, Y. & Chen, M. (2018). Character strengths, strengths use, future self-continuity and subjective well-being among Chinese university students. *Frontiers in Psychology* 9: 1040. <http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01040>