
Title	Why grateful adolescent athletes are more satisfied with their lives: The mediating role of perceived team cohesion
Author(s)	Lung Hung Chen, Ying Hwa Kee and Mei-Yen Chen
Source	<i>Social Indicators Research</i> , 124(2), 463-476. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11205-014-0798-0
Published by	Springer

This is the author's accepted manuscript (post-print) of a work that was accepted for publication in the following source:

Chen, L. H., Kee, Y. H., & Chen, M. -Y. (2015). Why grateful adolescent athletes are more satisfied with their lives: The mediating role of perceived team cohesion. *Social Indicators Research*, 124(2), 463-476. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11205-014-0798-0>

Notice: Changes introduced as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing and formatting may not be reflected in this document.

The final publication is also available at Springer via <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11205-014-0798-0>

1 Running head: Gratitude and Life Satisfaction

2

3 **Why Grateful Adolescent Athletes are More Satisfied with Their Lives:**

4 **The Mediating Role of Perceived Team Cohesion**

5

6 Lung Hung Chen

7 Department of Recreation and Leisure Industry Management,

8 National Taiwan Sport University, Taiwan

9

10 Ying Hwa Kee

11 National Institute of Education

12 Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

13

14 Mei-Yen Chen

15 Graduate Institute of Sport, Leisure, and Hospitality Management

16 National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan

17

18

19 **Author Note**

20 This article is based on reanalysis of data that was collected for first author's doctoral thesis
21 which under the supervision of the third author.

22

23 **Acknowledgement**

24 The first author's work on gratitude was supported by 2012 project of elastic salary for
25 outstanding scholar, Ministry of Education, Taiwan.

26

27 Corresponding author: Lung Hung Chen

28 Address: P.O. Box59182, 10012 Taipei, Taiwan.

29 Tel: 886-937148789

30 Email: fjudragon@gmail.com

31

1 **Why Grateful Adolescent Athletes are More Satisfied with Their Life:**

2 **The Mediating Role of Perceived Team Cohesion**

3 Life satisfaction is an important indicator of well-being. It refers to one's cognitive judgment of
4 life whereby individual compares life circumstances with a self-imposed standard (Busseri &
5 Sadava, 2011). As such, individuals report high life satisfaction if they perceived their life
6 circumstances are in line with their own standards (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985).
7 Research found that life satisfaction correlated with diverse optimal psychological functions like
8 physical health and self-esteem across different populations ranging from children, adolescents
9 to older adults (Chow, Au, & Chiu, 2008; Gana et al., 2013; Gilligan & Huebner, 2007; Hoy,
10 Suldo, & Mendez, 2013; Huebner, 1994; Leversen, Danielsen, Birkeland, & Samdal, 2012). Of
11 which, adolescents' life satisfaction has attracted researcher's attention (Proctor, Linley, &
12 Maltby, 2009a, 2009b) because they are in a critical stage of life in terms of their overall
13 development (Arnett, 1999). Similarly, adolescent athletes' life satisfaction can not be ignored
14 because they are a special population which faces both academic stress and competitive pressure,
15 and is worthy of our attention (Chen & Wu, 2014).

16 Sport psychologists usually put their attention on pushing athletes to their limitations rather
17 than placing considerations on athlete's mental health (Reinboth & Duda, 2006). This may
18 aggravate athletes' psychological functioning to the point that maladjustments such as burnout
19 (Eklund & Cresswell, 2007; Goodger, Gorely, Lavalley, & Harwood, 2007), eating disorder
20 (Blaydon, Lindner, & Kerr, 2002; Engel et al., 2003), and depression (Armstrong & Oomen-
21 Early, 2009) are developed.

22 A better understanding of antecedents that lead to adolescent athlete's life satisfaction is
23 important for counteracting the effects of ill-being. As research on positive psychology gained

1 momentum (Seligman, 2008; Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000; Sheldon & King, 2001), it
2 has been found that positive traits, emotions, and behaviors serves to contribute to individual's
3 well-being, including life satisfaction. Of which, gratitude – a generalized tendency to recognize
4 and respond with grateful emotion to the roles of other people's benevolence in the positive
5 experiences and outcomes that one obtains (McCullough, Emmons, & Tsang, 2002, p. 112) –
6 was found to promote life satisfaction reliably (Chan, 2013; Froh, Bono, & Emmons, 2010;
7 Kaczmarek et al., 2013), and is the construct of interest in the current study.

8 One obvious gap that remains in the literature is the lack of complete understanding of the
9 mechanisms between gratitude and life satisfaction. Earlier research such as those conducted by
10 Toussaint and Friedman (2009) found that affect is a potential mediator. Lambert, Fincham,
11 Stillman, and Dean (2009) indicated that gratitude leads to lower materialism and thereby
12 enhancing life satisfaction. Since investigating mediators would contribute to our knowledge of
13 how gratitude might exert its effect on life satisfaction, we undertook a study to examine a
14 potential mediators based on theory of gratitude (Emmons & Mishra, 2010); specifically,
15 perceived team cohesion which is a dynamic process that reflects the tendency for a group to
16 stick together and remain united in the pursuit of its instrumental objectives and/or for the
17 satisfaction of member affective needs (Carron & Brawley, 2000, p. 94). According to this
18 definition, perceived team cohesion can be divided into task-oriented and social-oriented
19 cohesion. The former emphasize on team members consociating to pursue their instrumental
20 goals while the later focus on individual cognitively evaluate how strong they are affectively
21 connected with members. In the current study, we focused only on the social aspects of cohesion
22 because of gratitude as a construct is more relevant to be examined with reciprocally-altruistic
23 relationships than with goal attainment. In the subsequent paragraphs, we reviewed literature on

1 gratitude and then proposed reasons to explain why perceived team cohesion would be a
2 mediator.

3 Gratitude is originally defined as a general tendency to response to people's benevolence
4 with positive emotions (McCullough, Kilpatrick, Emmons, & Larson, 2001). More recently,
5 Wood, Froh, and Geraghty (2010) extended the scope of gratitude as a life orientation toward
6 noticing and appreciating the positive in the world (p. 891). This definition is broader than the
7 original definition because it covers fuller sources of gratitude, such as towards nature and spirit
8 which emphasize the cognitive aspects of gratitude. It has been suggested that grateful people
9 have several remarkable characteristics, such as they are more sensitive to the benefits received
10 from another moral agent, especially when the cost is high for the benefactor. Grateful people
11 also more likely to behave prosocially to the benefactor or a third party which increased the
12 likelihood of receiving support from the benefactor and becoming a social resource that can be
13 used when needed (McCullough et al., 2001).

14 Previous research indicated a reliable relationship between gratitude and life satisfaction
15 (e.g., Chen & Kee, 2008; Sun & Kong, 2013; Wood, Joseph, & Maltby, 2008). One possible
16 explanation is that be that grateful people possess a have focus (Wood, Maltby, Stewart, &
17 Joseph, 2008) that direct them to concern on what they already have rather than what they do not
18 have. In this regard, gratitude would reduce the discrepancy between self-imposed standard and
19 real environment which sustain and promote people's life satisfaction over time (McCullough et
20 al., 2002).

21 Although the direct link between gratitude and life satisfaction was evidenced in the
22 literature, the mechanisms underline the relationship was relatively less investigated (Sun &
23 Kong, 2013; Tsang, Carpenter, Roberts, Frisch, & Carlisle, 2014; Watkins, 2004). One of the

1 perspectives to explain this link is that gratitude promotes altruistic behaviors that built and
2 maintain positive relationship with others which becoming social resources (Emmons & Mishra,
3 2010). For example, Bartlett, Condon, Cruz, Baumann, and Desteno (2012) found that
4 manipulating gratitude would facilitate inclusive behaviours (Study 2) indexed by showing a
5 greater preference for throwing to the benefactor even though it would cost the beneficiary. In
6 this regard, the chain of reciprocity established by gratitude might be an antecedent for
7 individual's well-being.

8 Following this perspective, we proposed that perceived team cohesion could be a potential
9 mediator between gratitude and well-being. Team cohesion refers to a dynamic process in which
10 individual subjectively stick to the team and the degree to which team members united (Carron
11 & Brawley, 2000). High perceived team cohesion means that individuals perceive themselves to
12 be in a supportive, warm, and united atmosphere psychologically (Terry et al., 2000; Uruk,
13 Sayger, & Cogdal, 2007).

14 One key contribution we hope to make is to extend the understanding on the effects of
15 gratitude on perceived team cohesion beyond dyadic associations. Previous studies mainly focus
16 on dyadic associations (e.g., Algoe, Gable, & Maisel, 2010; Lambert, Clark, Durtschi, Fincham,
17 & Graham, 2010). By investigating perceived team cohesion, our knowledge of the effects of
18 dispositional gratitude could be extended beyond what we already knew about effects of
19 gratitude on diet associations, partly because contexts like family or sports team emphasize on
20 how one interacts with members that goes beyond a particular dyad While it is known that
21 gratitude stimulates reciprocally-altruistic behaviors (Chang, Lin, & Chen, 2012), this study
22 would provide additional evidence to show that gratitude also lead individual's sense of
23 connection with team members subjectively. More specifically, perceived team cohesion

1 involves two kind of social interactions in one's perception at the same time: how strong one
2 feels attached to his/her team, and how well one interacts with each other. Perceived team
3 cohesion can be regarded as specific form of social bond among members that is not directed to a
4 single person, and that had not been examined within the gratitude literature.

5 We hypothesize a positive link between gratitude and perceived team cohesion because
6 psychological functions of moral barometer and moral motive are rooted in gratitude
7 (McCullough et al., 2001). Both heightened moral barometer and moral motive supports
8 prosocial behaviour that can be beneficial for perceived team cohesion. First, moral barometer
9 entails that grateful individual are more sensitive to change in one's social relationship. In other
10 words, grateful individuals tend to notice the provision of benefits by another moral agent more
11 easily. Furthermore, a review of literature by Emmons and Mishra (2010) suggests that gratitude
12 enhances the retrievability of positive autobiographical memories. When those provisions of
13 benefits and positive autobiographical memories stimulated by gratitude are retrieved repeatedly,
14 a sense of unity would be enhanced. In addition to effects at the perception level, gratitude could
15 also lead to behavioral change, and that may strengthen the link with perceived team cohesion.
16 Secondly, there is also the effect related to moral motives. Here moral motive refers to the notion
17 that gratitude leads people to behave prosocially to the benefactor or even towards an unrelated
18 third party (McCullough et al., 2001). Supporting this view, Chang et al. 2012 used social
19 network analysis to demonstrate that gratitude generates upstream reciprocity. That is, the notion
20 of helping an unrelated third party after being helped. In other words, gratitude leads to a
21 chain/network of upstream reciprocity and strengthen the structure of organization (Chang et al.,
22 2012). Since moral barometer and moral motive are associated with gratitude, it is hypothesized
23 that the relationship between gratitude and perceived team cohesion exists.

1 As higher perceived team cohesion indexed a positive interpersonal relationship which can
2 be considered as social resource, theories like conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989)
3 and broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions (Fredrickson, 1998, 2004a) can be used to
4 explain the link between perceived team cohesion and life satisfaction. Those theories
5 emphasized on possessing resources would help people resist difficulties, thereby increasing
6 well-being. Conservation of resources theory suggests that when threats of resource loss become
7 a stressor for the individual, psychological distress will be resulted. In contrast, an individual
8 who retains more resources would cope with challenges better. Similarly, broaden-and-build
9 theory also suggests that certain positive emotional experiences would further build a specific
10 resource. For example, gratitude stimulates reciprocally-altruistic behaviors which build social
11 resources that can be drawn upon in the future (Fredrickson, 2004b). Therefore, perceived
12 higher team cohesion might lead athletes to believe that they have reliable resources to be
13 mobilized in general situations and in hardships. Systematic research also provided relevant
14 evidences to support social oriented cohesion related to low depression and low tension while
15 had a opposite relationship with vigor (Terry et al., 2000).

16 Based on the reviewed relationships above, we proposed a process model to investigate why
17 grateful athletes are more satisfied with their life. We speculate that gratitude firstly relates to
18 perceived team cohesion because grateful athletes are cognitively and behaviorally cohesive with
19 their team members, which in turn contributes to overall life satisfaction. In sum, we expected
20 gratitude would positively related to perceived team cohesion and life satisfaction. In addition,
21 athlete perceived team cohesion was hypothesized to positively linked with life satisfaction
22 which supported a mediated model.

23

Method

1 **Participants and Procedures**

2 Convenience sampling was used in this study and three hundred adolescent athletes (male
3 = 197; female = 103) involved in diverse sports (e.g., track and field = 157, taekwondo = 50,
4 handball = 32, badminton = 32, cycling = 9, swimming = 7, sailing = 6, tennis = 2, table tennis =
5 2, judo = 1, pool = 1, and soccer = 1) were recruited from high schools in Taiwan with a mean
6 age of 16.8 years old ($SD = .88$). Athletes trained more than five times a week and competed at
7 the national level. Self-report questionnaires were administered to the athletes in a quiet
8 classroom setting. They returned the completed questionnaires to the administrator in the
9 envelopes provided. Confidentiality and anonymity were assured. One research assistant served
10 as the survey administrator and answered questions raised by athletes. Participation in the study
11 was on a voluntary basis and each participant received 50 NTD (approximately USD 1.6) as a
12 token of appreciation.

13 **Measurements**

14 ***Dispositional gratitude.*** The Gratitude Questionnaire (GQ) was developed by
15 McCullough et al. (2002) to assess an dispositional gratitude. The GQ contains six items and its
16 reliability and validity has been well-established. For the Chinese version, Chen, Chen, Kee, and
17 Tsai (2009) translated the GQ into the Taiwanese version and examined the reliability and
18 validity. The GQ-T contains only five items because one item in GQ-T was dropped due to non-
19 significant factor loading. Chen et al. also reported that GQ-T was positively correlated with
20 optimism, happiness, extraversion, agreeableness, and negatively correlated with neuroticism. In
21 addition, GQ-T had been used in athlete samples (Chen & Kee, 2008). In the current study,
22 adolescent athletes indicated their responses on a 6-point Likert scale, with responses ranging
23 from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (6). Cronbach's alpha in this study was .80.

1 the correlations were as expected. However, it should be noted that coefficients less than .13 are
2 not significantly correlated.

3 Structural equation modeling with maximum likelihood (ML) estimation was used to
4 estimate the fit of each model using the LISREL 8.80 statistical package. The fit indexes used in
5 this study are non-normal fit index (NNFI), comparative fit index (CFI), and standardized root
6 mean square residual (SRMR), and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA)
7 recommended by Hu and Bentler (1999). The general cutoffs for accepting a model for NNFI
8 and CFI were equal to or greater than 0.95, and equal to or less than 0.08 for the SRMR, and less
9 than 0.05 for the RMSEA (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Hu and Bentler (1999) emphasized that model
10 fit evaluation should be based on the above criteria and not be over-generalized. Therefore, in the
11 current study, rules proposed by them were used for reference.

12 A nested-model approach was used to examine the mediated models (Mossholder, Bennet,
13 Kemery, & Wesolowski, 1998). The partially mediated model included all potential paths
14 between latent variables while the fully mediated effect model is nested in partially mediated
15 model (see Figure 1). Chi-square difference test ($\Delta\chi^2$) and Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), a
16 measure of model fit adjusted for parsimony (Burnham & Anderson, 2002) were used to
17 determine which model was preferred. If the models comparison was significant then the model
18 with smaller chi-square value is to be preferred (MacCallum, Browne, & Sugawara, 1996).
19 Regarding the AIC, Burnham and Anderson (2002) suggested that AIC differences of 0 to 2
20 show little difference between the competing models, whereas differences of 4 to 7 show more
21 support for the model with the lowest AIC.

22 We first built a measurement model using structural equation modeling (SEM) with
23 maximum likelihood estimators, in which: (1) gratitude was indicated by its five items, (2)

1 perceived team cohesion was indicated by nine items, and (3) life satisfaction was represented by
2 five items. More specifically, we specified athlete's gratitude to predict perceived team cohesion
3 and life satisfaction; and perceived team cohesion to predict life satisfaction, which is a partially
4 mediated model. Results indicated the fit of this partially mediated model was all above Hu and
5 Bentler's (1999) recommendations ($\chi^2 = 378.07$, $df = 149$; NNFI = 0.97; CFI = 0.97; SRMR =
6 0.043; RMSEA = 0.072; AIC = 460.07) and all standardized factor loadings were significant at p
7 $< .001$ and higher than .51 at least. In this partially mediated model, gratitude had a positive
8 effect on perceived team cohesion ($\beta = .51$) and life satisfaction ($\beta = .17$), whereas perceived
9 team cohesion had a positive effect on life satisfaction ($\gamma = .32$).

10 We also examined the fully mediated model, in which athlete's gratitude predicted life
11 satisfaction through perceived team cohesion. Results indicated that the fit of this fully mediated
12 model also reached Hu and Bentler's (1999) suggestions ($\chi^2 = 383.71$, $df = 150$; NNFI = 0.97;
13 CFI = 0.97; SRMR = 0.049; RMSEA = 0.072; AIC = 463.71) and all standardized factor
14 loadings were significant at $p < .001$ and higher than .51 at least. In the fully mediated model,
15 gratitude also had a positive effect on perceived team cohesion ($\beta = .51$) and perceived team
16 cohesion had a positive effect on life satisfaction ($\gamma = .40$).

17 To determine the most preferred model, we performed the Chi-square and AIC differences
18 test. The chi-square difference test indicated a significant difference ($\Delta\chi^2 (1) = 5.64$, $p < .05$),
19 which suggests that the model with smaller chi-square value is preferred, that is, the partially
20 mediated model. In addition, the AIC differences test was 3.64 which also supported that the
21 partially mediated model is preferred. In sum, we presented the detail information of partially
22 mediated model in Figure 2.

23 **Supplementary Analysis**

1 We also conducted supplementary analysis because two items in GCEQ contains both
2 task and social aspects of cohesion, and we suspect that might reduce the strength of conclusions.
3 Therefore, the two items (*I want to work on more challenges with my group* and *we can help*
4 *each other on the challenges*) were excluded from analysis. For the analysis of the partially
5 mediated model, the model fit was good ($\chi^2 = 195.00$, $df = 101$; NNFI = 0.97; CFI = 0.98; SRMR
6 = 0.04; RMSEA = 0.056; AIC = 265.00). The fully mediated model also demonstrated a good fit
7 ($\chi^2 = 201.32$, $df = 102$; NNFI = 0.97; CFI = 0.98; SRMR = 0.049; RMSEA = 0.057; AIC =
8 269.32). To determine the most preferred model, we performed Chi-square and AIC differences
9 test again. The chi-square difference test indicated a significant difference ($\Delta\chi^2(1) = 6.23$, $p <$
10 $.05$), which suggests that the model with smaller chi-square value – the partially mediated
11 model – is preferred. In addition, the AIC differences test was 4.32 which also supported the
12 notion that the partially mediated model is preferred. Since the supplementary analysis also
13 corresponds to the main results, we concluded that the two items should not bias our conclusions,
14 and that partially mediated model was most preferred.

15 Discussion

16 In this study of adolescent athletes, we extended previous work on the relationships
17 between gratitude and life satisfaction (e.g., Chen & Kee, 2008; Sun & Kong, 2013; Wood,
18 Joseph, et al., 2008) by examining the plausibility of perceived team cohesion as a mediator.
19 While we hypothesize a positive link between gratitude and perceived team cohesion given the
20 association of the former with psychological functions of moral barometer and moral motive
21 (McCullough et al., 2001) thereby leading to prosocial behaviour, little is known about the
22 relationships between gratitude, perceived team cohesion and life satisfaction. The current
23 findings fill this gap in the extant literature as we reported that the partially mediated model is

1 preferred, supporting the notion that gratitude improves perceived team cohesion, and in turn
2 promotes life satisfaction. In addition, this study would have several crucial implications for the
3 literature and was discussed as below.

4 As previously alluded to, the promotion of adolescent athletes' well-being is important
5 because the youth athlete population faces both academic stress and competitive pressures.
6 Failing to cope with such pressures could lead to burnout and premature curtailment of their
7 athletic career (Gould, Tuffey, Udry, & Loehr, 1996, 1997; Gould, Udry, Tuffey, & Loehr, 1996).
8 We suggest that gratitude to be developed among adolescent athletes to inoculate against the
9 maladaptive consequence of academic and competitive pressures. In particular, our
10 demonstration of perceived team cohesion as a mediator within the gratitude-life satisfaction
11 relationship points to the possibility that heightened sense of gratitude, could lead to improved
12 perceived team cohesion, thereby improving one's life satisfaction. Since the promotion of team
13 cohesion has always been much valued by coaches and sport psychologists (Carron & Brawley,
14 2000), the potential for enhanced sense of gratitude to lead to both perceived team cohesion and
15 overall well-being provides practitioners another avenue to build cohesive and psychologically
16 healthy sports teams. Currently, research on the impact of gratitude on athletes' psychological
17 health and peak performance is lacking. The demonstration of improved team cohesion as an
18 explanation for life satisfaction with its origin in gratitude should hopefully spur more research
19 in this area.

20 Another contribution arising from this study is that we showed the effects of gratitude at
21 the levels of team cohesion rather than between dyads. As the questions on team cohesion was
22 asked based on their perception of their group getting close together emotionally, and the extent
23 to which the activities helped to foster a sense of group cohesion, it was an assessment of their

1 perception of team cohesion and not towards a particular individual (Glass & Benshoff, 2002).
2 The distinction between one's perception towards dyads and team cohesion is that the
3 interactions in the former tends to be more intimate compared to the latter. The effects of
4 gratitude on the relationship between dyads has been well-established in other research (Algoe &
5 Stanton, 2012; Chang, Li, Teng, Berki, & Chen, 2013; Joel, Gordon, Impett, MacDonald, &
6 Keltner, 2013; Kubacka, Finkenauer, Rusbult, & Keijsers, 2011; Lambert et al., 2010). In the
7 study, we further demonstrate that the effects of dispositional gratitude could be extended to
8 one's perception towards the more global team climate. Our result provided additional evidence
9 to support the claim that dispositional gratitude would exert its effect at the group level both
10 behaviorally (Chang et al., 2012) and perceptually. This is a non-trivial observation because it
11 serves to suggest that one's dispositional gratitude could help bring about general appreciation of
12 the team's collective emotionality, even without evidence of fulfilling intimate relations at the
13 dyad level. Simply put, a team of athletes with a heightened sense of gratitude at the
14 dispositional level could be more receptive of team members' contributions in general compared
15 to a team of athletes with a lower sense of gratitude.

16 There are some future directions worthy of further investigated. For example, does gratitude
17 also stimulate members to be united across different types of group such as family and
18 organization? This is a important issue because most people do not live alone and heavily rely on
19 the supports from their social groups (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Therefore, a cross-validation
20 of current results would contribute to literature as influential antecedent of cohesion are further
21 identified. In addition, the pursuit of a richer understanding of the concept of team cohesion
22 could be another way to enhance our knowledge. According to its definition (Carron & Brawley,
23 2000), team cohesion can be further distinguished into two components. One is on how

1 individual subjectively stick to the team, and the other is the degree to which team members stay
2 united. Investigating whether the two pathways have the same importance by linking gratitude
3 and life satisfaction is a worthy research direction because that could lead to the development of
4 more precise intervention that enhance people's well-being more effectively.

5 When referring our results, there are limitations in the present study that should be noted.
6 First, this being a cross-sectional study could be limited in its establishment of causal effects.
7 Secondly, the participants in this study are drawn from a predominantly collectivistic Asian
8 society. There may be cultural effects of collectivism in play affecting both gratitude and
9 perceived team cohesion in this sample. The applicability of this model in the individualistic
10 culture needs to be further verified. Third, the current study only focuses on the social aspect of
11 cohesion. However, does dispositional gratitude also exerts its effect on task oriented cohesion
12 and what is the consequence it may be? Those questions are worthy further investigated in the
13 future study.

14 Despite the highlighted weaknesses, the present study serves as important contribution to
15 the literature as a better understanding of the effects of gratitude on well-being among the
16 sporting population is warranted. The current study demonstrated that the process by which
17 gratitude predicts life satisfaction among adolescent athletes is through heightened perceived
18 team cohesion. As team cohesion is in itself much valued, researchers and practitioners should
19 consider the potential of gratitude to be a precursor to both perceived team cohesion and
20 psychological well-being in the future.

References

- 1
- 2 Algoe, S. B. , Gable, S. L., & Maisel, N. (2010). It's the little things: Everyday gratitude as a
3 booster shot for romantic relationships. *Personal Relationships, 17*, 217-233.
- 4 Algoe, S. B. , & Stanton, A. L. (2012). Gratitude when it is needed most: Social functions of
5 gratitude in women with metastatic breast cancer. *Emotion, 12*(1), 163-168. doi:
6 10.1037/a0024024
- 7 Armstrong, S., & Oomen-Early, J. (2009). Social connectedness, self-esteem, and depression
8 symptomatology among collegiate athletes versus nonathletes. *Journal of American*
9 *College Health, 57*(5), 521-526. doi: 10.3200/JACH.57.5.521-526
- 10 Arnett, J.J. (1999). Adolescent storm and stress, reconsidered. *American Psychologist, 54*(5),
11 317-326.
- 12 Bartlett, M.Y., Condon, P., Cruz, J., Baumann, J., & Desteno, D. (2012). Gratitude: Prompting
13 behaviours that build relationships. *Cognition & Emotion, 26*(1), 2-13. doi:
14 10.1080/02699931.2011.561297
- 15 Baumeister, R. F. , & Leary, M. R. . (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal
16 attachment as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 497-529.
- 17 Blaydon, M. J., Lindner, K. J., & Kerr, J. H. (2002). Metamotivational characteristics of eating-
18 disordered and exercise-dependent triathletes: An application of reversal theory.
19 *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 3*(3), 223-236.
- 20 Burnham, K. P., & Anderson, D. R. . (2002). *Model selection and multimodel inference: A*
21 *practical information-theoretic approach* (Second ed.). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- 22 Busseri, M. A., & Sadava, S. W. (2011). A review of the tripartite structure of subjective well-
23 being: Implications for conceptualization, operationalization, analysis, and synthesis.

- 1 *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 15(3), 290-314. doi:
2 10.1177/1088868310391271
- 3 Carron, A. V., & Brawley, L. R. (2000). Cohesion: Conceptual and measurement issues. *Small*
4 *Group Research*, 31(1), 89-106.
- 5 Chan, D. W. (2013). Subjective well-being of Hong Kong Chinese teachers: The contribution of
6 gratitude, forgiveness, and the orientations to happiness. *Teaching and Teacher*
7 *Education*, 32(0), 22-30. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.12.005>
- 8 Chang, Y.-P., Li, T.-S., Teng, H.-Y., Berki, Antonia, & Chen, L.H. (2013). Living with
9 gratitude: Spouse's gratitude on one's depression. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 14(4),
10 1431-1442. doi: 10.1007/s10902-012-9389-4
- 11 Chang, Y.-P., Lin, Y.-C., & Chen, L.H. (2012). Pay it forward: Gratitude in social networks.
12 *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 13(5), 761-781. doi: 10.1007/s10902-011-9289-z
- 13 Chen, L.H., Chen, M.-Y., Kee, Y.H., & Tsai, Y.-M. (2009). Validation of the Gratitude
14 Questionnaire (GQ) in Taiwanese undergraduate students. *Journal of Happiness Studies*,
15 10(6), 655-664. doi: 10.1007/s10902-008-9112-7
- 16 Chen, L.H., & Kee, Y.H. (2008). Gratitude and adolescent athletes' well-being. *Social Indicators*
17 *Research*, 89(2), 361-373. doi: 10.1007/s11205-008-9237-4
- 18 Chen, L.H., & Wu, C.-H. (2014). Gratitude enhances change in athlete's self-esteem: The
19 moderating role of trust in coach. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 26(3), 349-362.
20 doi: 10.1080/10413200.2014.889255
- 21 Chow, D. S.-K., Au, E. W. M., & Chiu, C.-Y. (2008). Predicting the psychological health of
22 older adults: Interaction of age-based rejection sensitivity and discriminative facility.
23 *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42(1), 169-182.

- 1 Diener, Ed., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R.J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction With Life Scale.
2 *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49*, 71-75.
- 3 Eklund, R., & Cresswell, S. L. (2007). Athlete Burnout. In G. Tenenbaum & R. C. Eklund
4 (Eds.), *Handbook of sport psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 621-641). Hoboken, N.J: Wiley.
- 5 Emmons, R. A., & Mishra, A. . (2010). Why gratitude enhances well-being: What we know,
6 what we need to know In K. M. Sheldon, T. B. Kashdan & M. F. Steger (Eds.),
7 *Designing positive psychology* (pp. 248-262). Oxford University Press.
- 8 Engel, S. G., Johnson, C., Powers, P. S., Crosby, R. D., Wonderlich, S. A., Wittrock, D. A., &
9 Mitchell, J. E. (2003). Predictors of disordered eating in a sample of elite Division I
10 college athletes. *Eating Behaviors, 4*(4), 333-343. doi: org/10.1016/S1471-
11 0153(03)00031-X
- 12 Fredrickson, B. L. (1998). What good are positive emotions? *Review of General Psychology,*
13 *2*(3), 300-319.
- 14 Fredrickson, B. L. (2004a). The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *Philosophical*
15 *Transactions of the Royal Society of London Series B-Biological Sciences, 359*(1449),
16 1367-1377. doi: 10.1098/rstb.2004.1512
- 17 Fredrickson, B. L. (2004b). Gratitude, like other positive emotion, broadens and builds. In R. A.
18 Emmons & M. E. McCullough (Eds.), *The psychology of gratitude* (pp. 145-166). New
19 York: Oxford University Press.
- 20 Froh, J. J., Bono, G., & Emmons, R. (2010). Being grateful is beyond good manners: Gratitude
21 and motivation to contribute to society among early adolescents. *Motivation and*
22 *Emotion, 34*(2), 144-157.

- 1 Gana, K., Bailly, N., Saada, Y., Joulain, M., Trouillet, R., Hervé, C., & Alaphilippe, D. (2013).
2 Relationship between life satisfaction and physical health in older adults: A longitudinal
3 test of cross-lagged and simultaneous effects. *Health Psychology, 32*(8), 896-904.
- 4 Gilligan, T., & Huebner, S. (2007). Initial development and validation of the multidimensional
5 students' life satisfaction scale--adolescent version. *Applied Research in Quality of Life,*
6 *2*(1), 1-16.
- 7 Glass, J. S., & Benshoff, J. M. (2002). Facilitating group cohesion among adolescents through
8 challenge course experiences. *Journal of Experiential Education, 25*(2), 268-277.
- 9 Goodger, K., Gorely, T., Lavalley, D., & Harwood, C. (2007). Burnout in sport: A systematic
10 review. *The Sport Psychologist, 21*, 121-157.
- 11 Gould, D, Tuffey, S., Udry, E., & Loehr, J. . (1996). Burnout in competitive junior tennis
12 players: II. A quantitative analysis. *The Sport Psychologist, 10*(4), 341-366.
- 13 Gould, D, Tuffey, S., Udry, E., & Loehr, J. . (1997). Burnout in competitive junior tennis
14 players: III. *The Sport Psychologist, 10*(5), 257-275.
- 15 Gould, D, Udry, E, Tuffey, S, & Loehr, J. . (1996). Burnout in competitive junior tennis players:
16 I. A quantitative psychological assessment. *The Sport Psychologist, 10*(4), 322-340.
- 17 Hart, T., Hanks, R., Bogner, J. A., Millis, S., & Esselman, P. (2007). Blame attribution in
18 intentional and unintentional traumatic brain injury: Longitudinal changes and impact on
19 subjective well-being. *Rehabilitation Psychology, 52*(2), 152-161.
- 20 Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress.
21 *American Psychologist, 44*(3), 513-524.

- 1 Hoy, B., Suldo, S., & Mendez, L. (2013). Links between parents' and children's levels of
2 gratitude, life satisfaction, and hope. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 14*(4), 1343-1361.
3 doi: 10.1007/s10902-012-9386-7
- 4 Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. . (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis:
5 Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6*, 1-55.
- 6 Huebner, E. S. (1994). Preliminary development and validation of a multidimensional life
7 satisfaction scale for children. . *Psychological Assessment, 6*, 149-158.
- 8 Joel, S., Gordon, A. M., Impett, E. A., MacDonald, G., & Keltner, D. (2013). The things you do
9 for me: Perceptions of a romantic partner's investments promote gratitude and
10 commitment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 39*(10), 1333-1345. doi:
11 10.1177/0146167213497801
- 12 Kaczmarek, L. D., Kashdan, T. B., Kleiman, E. M., Baczkowski, B., Enko, J., Siebers, A., . . .
13 Baran, B. S. (2013). Who self-initiates gratitude interventions in daily life? An
14 examination of intentions, curiosity, depressive symptoms, and life satisfaction.
15 *Personality and Individual Differences, 55*(7), 805-810. doi:
16 org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.06.013
- 17 Kubacka, K. E., Finkenauer, C., Rusbult, C. E., & Keijsers, L. (2011). Maintaining close
18 relationships: Gratitude as a motivator and a detector of maintenance behavior.
19 *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 37*(10), 1362-1375. doi:
20 10.1177/0146167211412196
- 21 Lambert, N M., Clark, Margaret S., Durtschi, Jared, Fincham, Frank D., & Graham, Steven M.
22 (2010). Benefits of expressing gratitude: Expressing gratitude to a partner changes one's

- 1 view of the relationship. *Psychological Science*, 21, 574-580. doi:
2 10.1177/0956797610364003
- 3 Lambert, N M., Fincham, F. D., Stillman, T. L., & Dean, L. R. . (2009). More gratitude, less
4 materialism: The mediating role of life satisfaction. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*,
5 4, 32-42.
- 6 Leversen, I., Danielsen, A. G., Birkeland, M. S., & Samdal, O. (2012). Basic psychological need
7 satisfaction in leisure activities and adolescents' life satisfaction. *Journal of Youth and*
8 *Adolescence*, 41(12), 1588-1599. doi: 10.1007/s10964-012-9776-5
- 9 MacCallum, R., Browne, M. W., & Sugawara, H. M. . (1996). Power analysis and determination
10 of sample size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychological Methods*, 1(2), 130-149.
- 11 McCullough, M. E., Emmons, R. A., & Tsang, J.-A. . (2002). The grateful disposition: A
12 conceptual and empirical topography. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,
13 82(1), 112-127. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.82.1.112
- 14 McCullough, M. E., Kilpatrick, S.D., Emmons, R. A., & Larson, D.B. (2001). Is gratitude a
15 moral affect. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(2), 249-266. doi: 10.1037//0033-
16 2909.127.2.249
- 17 Mossholder, K. W., Bennet, N., Kemery, E. R., & Wesolowski, M. A. . (1998). Relationships
18 between bases of power and work reactions: The mediational role of procedural justice.
19 *Journal of Management*, 24(4), 533-552.
- 20 Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric Theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-
21 Hill.
- 22 Oishi, S. (2006). The concept of life satisfaction across cultures: An IRT analysis. *Journal of*
23 *Research in Personality*, 40(4), 411-423.

- 1 Proctor, C., Linley, P. A., & Maltby, J. (2009a). Youth life satisfaction measures: A review. *The*
2 *Journal of Positive Psychology, 4*(2), 128 - 144.
- 3 Proctor, C., Linley, P. A., & Maltby, J. (2009b). Youth life satisfaction: A review of the
4 literature. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 10*(5), 583-630. doi: 10.1007/s10902-008-9110-
5 9
- 6 Reinboth, M., & Duda, J. L. (2006). Perceived motivational climate, need satisfaction and
7 indices of well-being in team sports: A longitudinal perspective. *Psychology of Sport and*
8 *Exercise, 7*(3), 269-286. doi: 10.1016/j.psychsport.2005.06.002
- 9 Seligman, M. E. P. (2008). Positive Health. *Applied Psychology, 57*(s1), 3-18.
- 10 Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction.
11 *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 5-15. doi: 10.1037//0003-066X.55.1.5
- 12 Sheldon, K. M., & King, L. (2001). Why positive psychology is necessary. *American*
13 *Psychologist, 56*(3), 216-217.
- 14 Sun, P., & Kong, F. (2013). Affective mediators of the influence of gratitude on life satisfaction
15 in late adolescence. *Social Indicators Research, 114*(3), 1361-1369. doi: 10.1007/s11205-
16 013-0333-8
- 17 Terry, P. C., Carron, A. V., Pink, M. J., Lane, A. M., Jones, G. J. W., & Hall, M. P. (2000).
18 Perceptions of group cohesion and mood in sport teams. *Group Dynamics: Theory,*
19 *Research, and Practice, 4*(3), 244-253. doi: 10.1037/1089-2699.4.3.244
- 20 Toussaint, L., & Friedman, P. (2009). Forgiveness, gratitude, and well-being: The mediating role
21 of affect and beliefs. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 10*(6), 635-654.
- 22 Tsang, J.-A., Carpenter, T. P., Roberts, J. A., Frisch, M. B., & Carlisle, R. D. (2014). Why are
23 materialists less happy? The role of gratitude and need satisfaction in the relationship

- 1 between materialism and life satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 64(0),
2 62-66. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.02.009>
- 3 Uruk, A. Ç., Sayger, T. V., & Cogdal, P. A. (2007). Examining the Influence of family cohesion
4 and adaptability on trauma symptoms and psychological well-being. *Journal of College*
5 *Student Psychotherapy*, 22(2), 51-63.
- 6 Watkins, P.C. (2004). Gratitude and subjective well-being. In R. A. Emmons & M. E.
7 McCullough (Eds.), *The psychology of gratitude* (pp. 368). New York: Oxford University
8 Press.
- 9 Wood, A. M. , Froh, J. J., & Geraghty, A. W. A. (2010). Gratitude and well-being: A review and
10 theoretical integration. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 30(7), 890-905.
11 doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2010.1003.1005
- 12 Wood, A. M. , Joseph, S., & Maltby, J. (2008). Gratitude uniquely predicts satisfaction with life:
13 Incremental validity above the domains and facets of the five factor model. *Personality*
14 *and Individual Differences*, 45(1), 49-54. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2008.02.019
- 15 Wood, A. M. , Maltby, J., Stewart, N., & Joseph, S. (2008). Conceptualizing gratitude and
16 appreciation as a unitary personality trait. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 44,
17 619-630.
- 18 Wu, C.-H., Chen, L.H., & Tsai, Y.-M. . (2009). Longitudinal invariance analysis of the
19 Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 46, 396-401. doi:
20 10.1016/j.paid.2008.11.002
- 21 Wu, C.-H., & Wu, C.-Y. (2008). Life satisfaction in persons with schizophrenia living in the
22 community: Validation of the Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Social Indicators Research*,
23 85, 447-460. doi: 10.1007/s11205-007-9136-0

1 Wu, C.-H., & Yao, G. (2006). Analysis of factorial invariance across gender in the Taiwan
2 version of the Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Personality and Individual Differences, 40*(6),
3 1259-1268. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2005.11.012

4 Wu, C. C., & Wu, C. Y. (2009). Evaluation of life-effectiveness and group cohesion for the
5 orienteering courses. *Journal of Sport and Recreation Management, 5*(2), 19-31.

6

7

1 Table 1

2 *Descriptive statistics and correlation matrix*

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1. GQ-T1	5.04	1.03																		
2. GQ-T2	4.75	1.20	.37																	
3. GQ-T3	5.22	0.95	.54	.46																
4. GQ-T4	4.68	1.07	.46	.33	.59															
5. GQ-T5	5.28	0.93	.43	.33	.58	.48														
6. Cohesion1	4.95	1.00	.34	.16	.35	.29	.29													
7. Cohesion2	4.64	1.08	.27	.13	.24	.29	.18	.61												
8. Cohesion3	4.69	1.07	.30	.18	.30	.30	.18	.68	.67											
9. Cohesion4	4.91	1.05	.31	.18	.34	.34	.29	.59	.59	.77										
10. Cohesion5	4.55	1.15	.27	.17	.27	.34	.21	.67	.61	.71	.72									
11. Cohesion6	5.13	0.97	.28	.19	.34	.30	.28	.60	.50	.67	.68	.63								
12. Cohesion7	4.78	1.03	.33	.16	.36	.33	.31	.65	.51	.63	.61	.72	.65							
13. Cohesion8	5.20	0.97	.29	.20	.39	.37	.36	.57	.43	.57	.64	.61	.63	.70						
14. Cohesion9	5.07	1.06	.26	.19	.38	.41	.31	.58	.51	.68	.68	.68	.72	.68	.73					
15. LS1	3.51	1.07	.22	.02	.14	.17	.08	.22	.17	.26	.19	.19	.19	.29	.23	.22				
16. LS2	3.60	1.41	.17	.11	.20	.15	.16	.11	.09	.14	.20	.15	.16	.22	.14	.10	.46			
17. LS3	3.89	1.20	.23	.11	.28	.21	.19	.29	.23	.29	.30	.32	.23	.37	.30	.30	.59	.46		
18. LS4	4.04	1.17	.23	.15	.24	.13	.14	.29	.17	.28	.28	.33	.24	.33	.27	.24	.52	.40	.82	
19. LS5	4.03	1.15	.21	.06	.23	.17	.17	.22	.21	.26	.29	.28	.20	.35	.28	.28	.50	.44	.67	.69

3 Note: Coefficients greater than .13 are significant at least $p < .05$. LS = life satisfaction

Figure Captions

1

2 Figure 1. Hypothesized partially (up) and fully (down) mediated model.

3

4 Figure 2. Standardized parameters for the final model.

5 Note: For the sake of clarity, the values for the residual errors were not reported. All parentheses

6 are standardized coefficients and significant at $p < .01$.



