

**Uses of Strength-Based Interventions for people with serious mental illness: A critical review**

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Social Psychiatry</i>
Manuscript ID	ISP-15-0147.R1
Manuscript Type:	Review Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Tse, Samson; The University of Hong Kong, Social Work and Social Administration Tsoi, Emily; The University of Hong Kong, Social Work and Social Administration Hamilton, Bridget; University of Melbourne, School of Health Sciences O'Hagan, Mary; Freelance mental health service consultant, Shepherd, Geoff; Centre for Mental Health, Slade, Mike; King's College London, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience Whitley, Rob; McGill University, Douglas Hospital Petrakis, Melissa; Monash University, Department of Social Work
Keywords:	case management , recovery, positive psychology, community mental health
Abstract:	<p>Background: For the past three decades, mental health practitioners have increasingly adopted aspects and tools of strengths-based approaches. To provide strengths-based intervention and to amplify strengths relies heavily on effective interpersonal processes.</p> <p>Aim: This paper is a critical review of research regarding the use of strengths-based approaches in mental health service settings. The aim is to discuss strengths-based interventions within broader research on recovery, focusing on effectiveness and advances in practice where applicable.</p> <p>Method: A systematic search for peer-reviewed intervention studies published between 2001 and December 2014 yielded 55 articles of potential relevance to the review.</p> <p>Results: Seven studies met the inclusion criteria and were included in the analysis. The Quality Assessment Tool for Quantitative Studies was used to appraise the quality of the studies. Our review found emerging evidence that the utilisation of a strengths-based approach improves outcomes including hospitalisation rates, employment/educational attainment, and intrapersonal outcomes such as self-efficacy and sense of hope.</p> <p>Conclusions: Recent studies confirm the feasibility of implementing a high-fidelity strengths-based approach in clinical settings and its relevance for practitioners in healthcare. More high quality studies are needed to further examine the effectiveness of strengths-based approaches.</p>

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

For Peer Review

1  
2  
3 **Title:** Uses of strength-based interventions for people with serious mental illness: A  
4 critical review

5  
6 **Running title:** Review of strength-based interventions

7  
8 **Authors:**

9 Samson Tse, PhD

10 Corresponding author

11 Department of Social Work and Social Administration, The University of Hong Kong,  
12 Centennial campus, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong.

13 Email: [samsont@hku.hk](mailto:samsont@hku.hk)

14 Telephone: +852-3917-1071

15  
16  
17 Emily WS Tsoi, Doctoral Candidate

18 Department of Social Work and Social Administration, The University of Hong Kong,  
19 Hong Kong.

20 Email: [ewstsoi@connect.hku.hk](mailto:ewstsoi@connect.hku.hk)

21  
22  
23 Bridget Hamilton, PhD

24 School of Health Sciences, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia.

25 Email: [bh@unimelb.edu.au](mailto:bh@unimelb.edu.au)

26  
27  
28 Mary O'Hagan

29 6th Floor, West Block, Education House, Wellington, New Zealand.

30 Email: [mary@maryohagan.com](mailto:mary@maryohagan.com)

31  
32  
33 Geoff Shepherd, PhD

34 Centre for Mental Health, London, United Kingdom.

35 Email: [geoff.shepherd@centreformentalhealth.org.uk](mailto:geoff.shepherd@centreformentalhealth.org.uk)

36  
37  
38 Mike Slade, PhD

39 Health Service and Population Research Department, Institute of Psychiatry,  
40 Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London, United Kingdom.

41 Email: [mike.slade@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:mike.slade@kcl.ac.uk)

42  
43  
44 Rob Whitley, PhD

45 Douglas Hospital Research Centre, McGill University, Montreal, Canada.

46 Email: [robert.whitley@mcgill.ca](mailto:robert.whitley@mcgill.ca)

47  
48  
49 Melissa Petrakis, PhD

50 Department of Social Work, Faculty of Medicine, Nursing and Health Sciences,  
51 Monash University, Melbourne, Australia.

52 Email: [melissa.petrakis@monash.edu](mailto:melissa.petrakis@monash.edu)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 **Title:** Uses of Strength-Based Interventions for people with serious mental illness: A  
11 critical review

12  
13  
14 **Abstract**

15  
16 **Background:** For the past three decades, mental health practitioners have increasingly  
17 adopted aspects and tools of strengths-based approaches. To provide strengths-based  
18 intervention and to amplify strengths relies heavily on effective interpersonal processes.  
19  
20

21  
22 **Aim:** This paper is a critical review of research regarding the use of strengths-based  
23 approaches in mental health service settings. The aim is to discuss strengths-based  
24 interventions within broader research on recovery, focusing on effectiveness and  
25 advances in practice where applicable.  
26  
27

28  
29 **Method:** A systematic search for peer-reviewed intervention studies published between  
30 2001 and December 2014 yielded 55 articles of potential relevance to the review.  
31  
32

33  
34 **Results:** Seven studies met the inclusion criteria and were included in the analysis. The  
35 *Quality Assessment Tool for Quantitative Studies* was used to appraise the quality of the  
36 studies. Our review found emerging evidence that the utilisation of a strengths-based  
37 approach improves outcomes including hospitalisation rates, employment/educational  
38 attainment, and intrapersonal outcomes such as self-efficacy and sense of hope.  
39  
40

41  
42 **Conclusions:** Recent studies confirm the feasibility of implementing a high-fidelity  
43 strengths-based approach in clinical settings and its relevance for practitioners in  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 healthcare. More high quality studies are needed to further examine the effectiveness of  
10 strengths-based approaches.  
11  
12

13  
14  
15  
16 **Keywords**

17  
18 Case management, recovery, positive psychology  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Introduction

Serious mental illnesses and their associated symptoms are distressing and debilitating for individuals experiencing the conditions, as well as for families and concerned significant others (Petrakis, Bloom, & Oxley, 2014; Sin, Moone, & Newell, 2007). With the advent of medications that reduce many distressing symptoms, there has been considerable advocacy focusing on personal recovery (Anthony, 1993; Liberman & Kopelowicz, 2002; Roberts & Wolfson, 2004). Strengths-based approaches represent an articulation of mental health's philosophy on recovery (Anthony, 1993; Leamy, Bird, Le Boutillier, Williams, & Slade, 2011; Whitley, 2010). Although promoting wellbeing or building on a person's strengths are hardly new concepts to mental health practitioners, qualities such as self-efficacy, social problem solving, sense of purpose, empathy, humour, resilience, and hope have only been systematically studied in recent decades (Norman, 2000; Whitley, 2010). As such, a team of researchers sought to quantify strengths in a systematic manner (Linley et al., 2007). In their attempt, an exhaustive review was conducted for literature in psychology, philosophy and social work, and 24 character strengths (e.g., creativity, persistence, social intelligence and hope) were subsequently identified that are considered to underpin our universal

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 understanding of the latent construct of 'character strengths' as applying to the general  
10 population.  
11  
12

13  
14  
15  
16 Regarding the operationalization of strengths-based practices, Norman (2000)  
17 categorized strengths into two levels. The first level is personal level, and the indicators  
18 of strengths are self-efficacy, realistic appraisal of the environment, social problem-  
19 solving, sense of direction or mission, empathy, humour, adaptive distancing and  
20 androgynous sex role behaviour. The second level is called the interpersonal level, and  
21 the indicators in this level are positive caring relationships, positive family environment  
22 or other forms of intimate environment that help to foster resiliency and strengths.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32  
33  
34 Across the range of strengths-based approaches to mental health care, there is a focus on  
35 inter-personal processes working with the strengths of the individual and their  
36 community to achieve client-defined goals and personal recovery (Slade, 2009; Smith-  
37 Merry, Freeman, & Sturdy, 2011). The underpinning of these approaches is the  
38 philosophical commitment to attending to human capacity first rather than human  
39 deficiency (Scott & Wilson, 2011). It assumes that every person can build a meaningful  
40 and satisfying life defined by an individual's own terms (Rapp & Goscha, 2012). Rapp  
41 and Goscha (2012, see 'The purpose, principles, and research results' pp.51-69) and  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Marty, Rapp, and Carlson (2001) provide a useful account of what constitutes the  
11 critical elements of strengths-based intervention approach.  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 The present paper is a critical review of research (for typology of reviews, see Grant &  
17 Booth, 2009) on strengths-based approaches, which is one of the seven pro-recovery  
18 practices mentioned in an earlier publication by Slade et al. (2014). The present authors  
19 are experts from five countries. The aim is to present and discuss pertinent issues  
20 surrounding strengths-based practices within broader research on recovery, with a focus  
21 on effectiveness and cross-cultural analysis. The three research questions are: (1) What  
22 are the general characteristics of the studies selected for the present review (including  
23 specific cultural elements)? (2) What is the empirical evidence for the effectiveness of  
24 strengths-based practice with regard to specific outcome measures (including if there is  
25 any evidence of negative effects)? (3) What are the advances in practice or new features  
26 revealed in the present review, compared with the last empirical review of effectiveness  
27 of the strengths perspective by Staudt, Howard, and Drake (2001)?  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

## 45 **Methods**

### 46 *Data sources*

47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 We searched six electronic databases for studies published between 2001 and December  
11 2014: Applied Social Sciences Index and Abstracts, PsycArticles, PsycInfo, Social  
12 Services Abstracts, Sociological Abstracts, and MEDLINE. Studies published prior to  
13 2001 were excluded because another empirical review published in 2001 covered these  
14 earlier studies (Staudt et al., 2001). The search terms used included two components: (i)  
15 intervention: 'strengths model'; or 'strengths-based' or 'strengths perspective' and (ii)  
16 clinical condition: 'mental illness'; or 'bipolar'; or 'schizophrenia' or 'psychiatr\*'.  
17  
18 Following the initial search, two independent reviewers (ST and ET) screened titles and  
19 abstracts. The full texts of potentially relevant peer-reviewed papers on intervention  
20 studies were further examined to determine eligibility (Figure 1). Any discrepancies in  
21 judgment were settled by a discussion between the two reviewers.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

<Insert Figure 1 Here>

#### *Inclusion and exclusion Criteria*

A study was included in the review if it satisfied all of the following criteria: (i) published in or after 2001, (ii) published in a peer-reviewed journal, (iii) written in English, (iv) was an intervention study using strengths-based intervention as the treatment, (v) provided a description of the intervention in the article, and (vi) used any

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 quantitative design (i.e., randomized controlled trial or other quasi-experimental type  
11 studies). The inclusion criteria were consistent with the nature of critical review and  
12 were chosen to ensure that the included studies will address the set research questions  
13 (Grant & Booth, 2009). Because Blow and colleagues' (2000) research was not  
14 included in the earlier review by Staudt and colleagues (2001), we included it in this  
15 review. We excluded qualitative studies and opinion/commentary papers because they  
16 did not include empirical evidence on the effectiveness of strengths-based interventions,  
17 which was our second research question.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

### 28 29 *Quality assessment*

30  
31 The quality of the studies was assessed using the *Quality Assessment Tool for*  
32 *Quantitative Studies* developed by the Effective Public Health Practice Project of  
33 McMaster University, Canada (National Collaborating Centre for Methods and Tools,  
34 2008). We assessed both the internal and external validity of a study, as well as the  
35 following criteria: (i) selection of participants, (ii) study design, (iii) confounders, (iv)  
36 blinding, (v) data collection methods, (vi) attrition, (vii) statistical analysis, and (viii)  
37 intervention integrity. This tool has been deemed appropriate and satisfactory for  
38 assessing the risk of bias in public health research (Armijo-Olivo, Stiles, Hagen, Biondo,  
39 & Cummings, 2012). The ratings for each component are computed into a single global  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 rating score for the study, with zero weak ratings indicating a ‘strong’ rating overall,  
10 one weak rating indicating a ‘moderate’ rating, and two or more weak ratings indicating  
11 a ‘weak’ rating (National Collaborating Centre for Methods and Tools, 2008). The two  
12 reviewers (ST and ET) independently carried out the quality appraisal and any  
13 discrepancies were settled following discussions between the two reviewers and  
14 members of the wider author team. Every team member helped to evaluate the  
15 interpretations of the results and to write specific sections of the manuscripts.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

## 27 **Results**

### 28 *Selection of studies*

29  
30 The search terms generated 619 articles, not including duplications already removed by  
31 the databases. We then identified 55 studies that provisionally met the inclusion criteria  
32 for peer-reviewed intervention studies. After obtaining the full texts of these 55 articles,  
33 48 articles were excluded as they did not meet the inclusion criteria for a variety of  
34 reasons (Figure 1). For example, some of the articles that were excluded focused on the  
35 conceptual or theoretical aspects of strengths-based approaches or the development of  
36 measurement scales, and in some other cases, although the word ‘strength’ was referred  
37 to in the published studies, no detail was provided about how a strengths-based  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 approach was executed in the intervention. Hence, only the seven articles that met  
10 inclusion criteria were included in the review.  
11  
12

### 13 14 15 16 *Quality assessment*

17  
18 The overall agreement rate between the two reviewers was 71%, and discrepancies were  
19 settled after discussion and clarifying interpretation of the studies. Table 1 presents the  
20 results of the quality assessments of the studies. Overall, the majority of the studies  
21 were of moderate to weak quality. Of the seven studies, four did not describe or control  
22 for confounders in the analysis, and four studies received a ‘weak’ score for the blinding  
23 component, which meant that blinding was either not incorporated into the study design  
24 or not described in the article.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34  
35  
36 <Insert Table 1 Here>  
37  
38  
39

### 40 41 *Study characteristics*

42  
43 All of the studies were conducted in developed, high income, Western countries such as  
44 the United States, Canada (Mireau & Inch, 2009), and Sweden (Björkman, Hansson, &  
45 Sandlund, 2002). All of the participants were adults already known to mental health  
46 services and affected by severe and persistent mental illness. The studies had diverse  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

research designs: randomised controlled trials, pre-post designs, between-group comparison, and mixed methods (qualitative and quantitative); follow-up periods for the studies varied between eight and 36 months (Table 1). The most common research designs were cohort studies with non-randomised controls. Only one study's design achieved a 'strong' global rating (Green, Janoff, Yarborough, & Paulson, 2013). Three others were rated as 'moderate' (Barry, Zeber, Blow, & Valenstein, 2003; Björkman et al., 2002; Blow et al., 2000), and the other three as 'weak' (Fukui, Davidson, Holter, & Rapp, 2010; Fukui et al., 2012; Mireau & Inch, 2009).

There was also considerable confounding of the strengths-based approach within the complex, multifaceted interventions, making it difficult to attribute outcomes to this element as opposed to other variables. In a previous review, Staudt et al. (2001) commented that 'The effects of treatment modality and treatment intensity were confounded in these studies... It is unknown whether it was simply the additional services or specific type of services provided that contributed, in some cases, to improved outcomes' (Staudt *et al.*, 2001, p.17). This comment remains accurate.

*Effectiveness of strengths-based interventions*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 The results suggest that a strengths-based approach is associated with (i) reducing the  
11 duration of stay in hospital (Björkman et al., 2002; Blow et al., 2000; Fukui et al., 2012);  
12  
13 (ii) increasing service satisfaction (Björkman et al., 2002); (iii) improving general  
14  
15 attitudes with respect to recovery-relevant dimensions (e.g., self-esteem, self-efficacy,  
16  
17 personal confidence, sense of hope, life satisfaction; Barry et al., 2003; Fukui et al.,  
18  
19 2010; Green et al., 2013); (iv) facilitating greater goal attainment (i.e., improving  
20  
21 employment and educational outcomes; (Green et al., 2013); and (v) general increased  
22  
23 utilisation of services (Barry et al., 2003; Mireau & Inch, 2009). In Mireau and Inch's  
24  
25 (2009) study, these positive changes were reflected in increased job satisfaction and  
26  
27 improved staff morale: 'Optimism and hopefulness directed toward the client is  
28  
29 contagious, with counsellors having increased job satisfaction and morale while clients  
30  
31 experience success in achieving their goals' (Mireau & Inch, 2009, p.68). However  
32  
33 these improvements should be interpreted with caution given the variable quality of the  
34  
35 research designs and evidence (Table 1).  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 There was one instance of negative results. Björkman et al. (2002) found that the group  
44  
45 receiving strengths-based case management had *worse* social network and symptom  
46  
47 scores post-intervention when compared with the group receiving standard care. The  
48  
49 outcomes in relation to symptom improvement were also inconclusive (Barry et al.,  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

2003; Björkman et al., 2002; Fukui et al., 2010; Green et al., 2013). In an earlier commentary, due to the seriousness of psychiatric symptomatology such as suicidality and persecutory delusions, Taylor (2006) strongly cautioned against using only a strengths-based approach completely isolated from medical treatment approaches.

### *Advances in practice*

Staudt et al. (2001) concluded in their earlier review that 'It remains unclear whether and how strengths-based CM (case management) differs from other CM models and what components are unique only to strengths-based CM' (Staudt *et al.*, 2001, p.17). This highlights the need for a clearer specification of strengths-based intervention, and it is therefore reassuring that, in the present sample, six out of the seven selected studies (Barry et al., 2003; Björkman et al., 2002; Fukui et al., 2010; Fukui et al., 2012; Green et al., 2013; Mireau & Inch, 2009) included descriptions of what strengths-based practices entail. For example, they cited the *Pathways to Recovery* (Ridgway & Bledsoe, 2002, cited in Fukui et al., 2010) and the *Strengths-Based Brief Solution-Focused Counselling* (cited in Mireau & Inch, 2009). Another example is the application of the *Strengths Model Case Management* (SMCM; Rapp & Goscha, 2012). In Fukui et al. (2012) study, case management teams were able to reach high SMCM fidelity, which meant that SMCM was being implemented (Table 2). Several studies compared

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 strengths approaches with Assertive Community Treatment (ACT), a well-defined  
10 model that includes a similarly high level of intensity to SMCM. Nevertheless, there  
11 was variability in the degree of detail provided regarding the interventions that were  
12 used. Direct measures of strengths were weak.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18  
19  
20 In one of the later studies, the engagement of peer supporters working with  
21 professionals in providing a strengths-based group programme highlighted an important  
22 new development (Green *et al.*, 2013). Peer supporters or peer support workers refer to  
23 individuals with lived experience of mental illness who are recruited, trained, and  
24 supported to use this experience to support other peers during recovery (Davidson,  
25 Bellamy, Guy, & Miller, 2012; Repper & Carter, 2011).  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 <Insert Table 2 Here>  
37  
38  
39

## 40 **Discussion**

### 41 *Study design and intervention effectiveness*

42  
43 The overall results of this critical review are comparable to the results of a recent meta-  
44 analysis of clinical trials of strengths-based practice (Ibrahim, Michail, & Callaghan,  
45 2014). First, both the current critical review and recent meta-analysis considered that  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 only a small number of clinical studies met the requirement of a moderate level of  
11 quality (Barry et al., 2003; both of these trials were included in the present review and  
12 the meta-analysis; Björkman et al., 2002). There is a pressing need for further good  
13 quality, well-designed clinical trials to examine the effectiveness of strengths-based  
14 practices. Second, both of the reports have found that the effect of strengths-based  
15 interventions on service users' level of symptoms was either inconclusive (e.g.,  
16 Björkman et al., 2002; Green et al., 2013) or less favourable in comparison to other  
17 service delivery models (Ibrahim et al., 2014). On the other hand, compared to the study  
18 by Ibrahim et al. (2014), the present review holds a more positive view of strengths-  
19 based approaches. For example, the present review found that the approach was  
20 associated with some favourable employment and educational outcomes, whereas the  
21 meta-analysis found no significant difference between the strengths-based approach and  
22 other service delivery models. This may be explained by differences in methodological  
23 approaches between the two reports.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 A critical review is typically narrative by nature, and it aims to provide 'an opportunity  
44 to 'take stock' and evaluate what is of value from the previous body of work. It may  
45 also attempt to resolve competing schools of thought. As such, it may provide a 'launch  
46 pad' for a new phase of conceptual development and subsequent 'testing'' (Grant &  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Booth, 2009, p.93). However, a meta-analysis uses ‘techniques that statistically  
11 combine the results of quantitative studies to provide a more precise effect of the results’  
12 (Grant & Booth, 2009, p.94). The analysis by Ibrahim et al. (2014) included five studies  
13 between 1991 and 2003 and all the studies had control groups. The current review  
14 included seven studies between 2000 and 2013, and six of the studies had a control-  
15 group design.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

#### 25 *Comprehensive application of a strengths-based approach*

26  
27 The current review found that there was improved but still limited operationalization of  
28 strengths-based practices. Below, we discuss each stage briefly: assessment,  
29 intervention, and monitoring.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 It is possible to conduct a strengths assessment in mental health service delivery  
37 contexts and practice. A systematic review identified 12 published approaches to  
38 strengths assessment: five quantitative measures and seven qualitative methods (Bird et  
39 al., 2012). The Strengths Assessment Worksheet (SAW) is the most widely utilized and  
40 evaluated qualitative assessment method (Rapp & Goscha, 2006, 2012). The Client  
41 Assessment of Strengths, Interests and Goals (CASIG) has the strongest psychometric  
42 evidence (Lecomte, Wallace, Caron, Perreault, & Lecomte, 2004), and the SAW and  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 CASIG assessments have been tentatively recommended for use in practice. Other  
11 approaches to assessing strengths have also been published, such as use of the VIA-  
12 Strengths (Park, Peterson, & Seligman, 2006) approach in mental health services  
13  
14  
15  
16 (Resnick & Rosenheck, 2006).  
17

18  
19  
20 To provide strengths-based intervention and to amplify strengths is a person-centred  
21 process. Interpersonal styles such as coaching are helpful in facilitating a focus on  
22 strengths (Bora, 2012; Shepherd, Boardman, & Slade, 2008). The present review  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 underlines the high level of engagement that is fostered by the strengths approach, the  
28  
29  
30  
31 significance of the level/intensity of contact, the active and outreaching role of workers  
32 (including peer supporters) that arise from the approach. Blow et al. (2000) matched the  
33  
34  
35  
36 intensive contact and practical outreach elements across ACT and SMCM and found  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

To provide strengths-based intervention and to amplify strengths is a person-centred process. Interpersonal styles such as coaching are helpful in facilitating a focus on strengths (Bora, 2012; Shepherd, Boardman, & Slade, 2008). The present review underlines the high level of engagement that is fostered by the strengths approach, the significance of the level/intensity of contact, the active and outreaching role of workers (including peer supporters) that arise from the approach. Blow et al. (2000) matched the intensive contact and practical outreach elements across ACT and SMCM and found positive outcomes. Assertiveness alone may not be well received. The service users also value the positive tone, warmth of engagement, and prize the optimistic tone of strengths-focused brief interventions (Mireau & Inch, 2009).

Finally, on the basis of our review, it appears that routine monitoring and reviewing of strengths is rarely implemented. This process involves the assessment of current and potential strengths, the activation and use of these strengths, and ambitious but not

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 unrealistic goal setting around the acquisition of new or amplified strengths. The most  
11 developed approach to integrating a focus on strengths into routine monitoring is the  
12 SMCM (Rapp & Goscha, 2012 cited in Fukui et al., 2012). Practice change has been  
13 achieved through staff training and the introduction of new strengths-based assessments,  
14 planning tools, and team discussions (Petrakis, Wilson, & Hamilton, 2013) based on  
15 Rapp and Goscha's (2012) tools and guidelines.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

#### 24 25 *The role of peer support workers in strengths-based practice*

26  
27 Two studies have assessed the impact of *Pathways to Recovery* (Ridgway & Bledsoe,  
28 2002) support groups on participants—one on peer-led groups (Fukui et al., 2010) and  
29 the other on groups co-led by a peer counsellor and a non-peer counsellor (Green et al.,  
30 2013). Both studies found considerable improvements across multiple domains  
31 including hope, self-efficacy, and social support. Further research is needed to  
32 understand how peer supporters can enhance the impact of strengths-based approaches.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 Strengths-based approaches emphasize personal and environmental strengths, as well as  
44 recognition of the character-building impact of trauma and mental distress (Peterson,  
45 Park, & Seligman, 2006; Tse, Divis, & Li, 2010). Peer supporters may have a distinct  
46 advantage over non-peer workers when it comes to personifying and practising these  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 principles. For instance, peer supporters can act as powerful role models precisely  
11 because their job requires lived experience (Davidson et al., 2012), or they can amplify  
12 a client's hope that they too can utilise strengths to move beyond their distress (Sells,  
13 Davidson, Jewell, Falzer, & Rowe, 2006). Peer support is also embedded in recovery  
14 philosophy and shares similar origins with the consumer or survivor movement (for  
15 recent reviews on effectiveness of peer support services, see Chinman et al., 2014;  
16 Lloyd-Evans et al., 2014; Trachtenberg, Parsonage, Shepherd, & Boardman, 2013).

### 27 *Applying strengths-based practices cross-culturally*

28  
29 All of the selected studies in this review were conducted in Western cultures, and  
30 beliefs with regards to one's mental health, expressions of emotions, and strengths are  
31 heavily influenced by culture (Leamy et al., 2011; Tse, Cheung, Kan, Ng, & Yau, 2012;  
32 Tse et al., 2010). The notion of 'strengths' in non-Western cultures is under-researched.  
33 The conceptualization of strengths—the forms of linguistics, metaphors, icons, or  
34 folklore traditions—is culturally specific. In Chinese, the word 'strengths' is commonly  
35 understood as 優勢 (*youshi* or superiority), 強項 (*qiangxiang* or forté), or 潛能  
36 (*qianneng* or potential). Bamboo, an evergreen plant commonly seen across Asia that  
37 thrives even in harsh weather conditions, is often used as a metaphor for strengths and  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

uprightness. In Chinese, Japanese, and Vietnamese cultures, bamboo is viewed as a virtuous symbol of tenacity and perseverance.

It is imperative to understand how cultural variations should be taken into account in the interpretation of ‘strengths’. For instance, people in Chinese communities (in some case including Korean and Japanese communities) are heavily influenced by Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism (M. H. Bond, 2010; Chen & Davey, 2008; Lu, 2001), which ‘advocate spiritual cultivation and mind-work, such as self-retrospection and self-transcendence, they admonish people to eliminate excessive desires, live a simple life and restore a clear mind’ (Lai, Cummins, & Lau, 2013, p.608). Chinese people under the influence of traditional culture may interpret ‘empowerment’ as a challenge to deep-rooted ideas of Confucianism that emphasizes self-sacrifice, harmony, benevolence, and forgiveness. Similarly, under Taoism, people tend to be more modest and they less readily name their strengths, successes, and talents (Tse et al., 2010). Therefore mental health practitioners need to be creative and culturally sensitive when helping service users in exploring and identifying the strengths and virtue of characters within themselves and the wider environment.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

In the present authors' research and clinical work, we found it helpful to highlight specific domains and invite service users to identify what they consider as their sources of strength: personal (i.e., knowledge, academic qualifications, life experience, talents, problem-solving skills, life skills, interests, character, and attitude towards life), career/occupation, religious/spiritual sphere, family, colleagues at work, friends, neighbourhoods, social groups (formal or less formal), or the wider community.

*Directions for policy, future research, and service provision*

Strengths-based, recovery-oriented approaches are increasingly relevant to and welcomed by policy makers. An example is the Irish Mental Health Commission report 'A recovery approach within the Irish mental health services: A framework for development' (Higgins, 2008) as well as a report launched by the Commonwealth of Australia, 'A national framework for recovery-oriented mental health services: Policy and theory' (Australian Health Ministers' Advisory Council, 2013). Further research in non-Western settings is important, especially considering cultural differences regarding the definition and conceptualization of strengths as noted in this review. Also, there may be cultural differences within nation states, particularly regarding ethnic minorities, indigenous people, and immigrants. Another gap in research relates to the implementation of strengths-based approaches in routine mental health settings (G. R.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Bond, Drake, McHugo, Rapp, & Whitley, 2009; McHugo et al., 2007; Whitley,  
11 Gingerich, Lutz, & Mueser, 2009). Existing research provides little evidence-based  
12 guidelines on the best approaches to training staff in strengths-based approaches. This is  
13 critically important given that much clinical training continues to focus on deficits and  
14 symptoms, fostering a paternalistic attitude toward patients (O'Hagan, 2004; Slade,  
15 Adams, & O'Hagan, 2012; Whitley, 2014). Adopting a strengths-based approach may  
16 require a 180 degree turn away from embedded attitudes of 'clinician knows best.'  
17 Finally, to support an individual to maximise one's own strengths and work toward  
18 his/her own goals, there must be a transformation within the workplace, as well as a  
19 change in the system's culture (Shepherd, Boardman, & Burns, 2010; Tew et al., 2012).  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 To conclude, there is a need for more high quality studies to further examine the  
35 effectiveness of strengths-based approaches. This review has revealed emerging  
36 evidence that the utilisation of a strengths-based approach is effective for yielding  
37 desirable outcomes, including 'hard' outcomes such as duration of hospitalization,  
38 adherence to treatment, and employment/educational attainment, as well as 'soft'  
39 outcomes such as self-esteem, self-efficacy, and sense of hope. Strengths-based  
40 approaches emphasize the autonomy, assets, and goals of the individual client, and  
41 practitioners are considered facilitators of the recovery process. Successful  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 implementation of a high-fidelity strengths-based approach in clinical settings requires  
11 collaboration from service users, staff, administrators, and policy makers.  
12  
13

#### 14 15 16 **Conflict of interest**

17 The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.  
18  
19

#### 20 21 22 **Funding acknowledgement**

23 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public,  
24 commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

- Anthony, W. A. (1993). Recovery from mental illness: The guiding vision of the mental health service system in the 1990s. *Psychosocial Rehabilitation Journal*, 16(4), 11-23. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0095655>
- Armijo-Olivo, S., Stiles, C. R., Hagen, N. A., Biondo, P. D., & Cummings, G. G. (2012). Assessment of study quality for systematic reviews: a comparison of the Cochrane Collaboration Risk of Bias Tool and the Effective Public Health Practice Project Quality Assessment Tool: methodological research. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, 18(1), 12-18.
- Australian Health Ministers' Advisory Council. (2013). *A national framework for recovery-oriented mental health services: Policy and theory*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia
- Barry, K. L., Zeber, J. E., Blow, F. C., & Valenstein, M. (2003). Effect of strengths model versus assertive community treatment model on participant outcomes and utilization: Two-year follow-up. *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal*, 26(3), 268-277. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2975/26.2003.268.277>
- Bird, V., Le Boutillier, C., Leamy, M., Larsen, J., Oades, L., Williams, J., & Slade, M. (2012). Assessing the strengths of mental health service users - systematic review. *Psychological Assessment*, 24, 1024-1033.
- Björkman, T., Hansson, L., & Sandlund, M. (2002). Outcome of case management based on the strengths model compared to standard care. A randomised controlled trial. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 37(4), 147-152.
- Blow, F. C., Ullman, E., Lawton Barry, K., Bingham, C. R., Copeland, L. A., McCormick, R., & Van Stone, W. (2000). Effectiveness of specialized treatment programs for veterans with serious and persistent mental illness: A three-year follow-up. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 70(3), 389-400. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0087648>
- Bond, G. R., Drake, R. E., McHugo, G. J., Rapp, C. A., & Whitley, R. (2009). Strategies for improving fidelity in the national evidence-based practices project. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 19(5), 569-581.
- Bond, M. H. (2010). *The Oxford handbook of Chinese psychology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bora, R. (2012). *Empowering people. Coaching for mental health recovery*. London: Rethink Mental Illness.
- Chen, Z., & Davey, G. (2008). Happiness and subjective wellbeing in Mainland China. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 9(4), 589-600. doi: 10.1007/s10902-008-9092-7
- Chinman, M., George, P., Dougherty, R. H., Daniels, A. S., Ghose, S. S., Swift, A., & Delphin-Rittmon, M. E. (2014). Peer support services for individuals with serious mental

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 illnesses: Assessing the evidence. *Psychiatric Services In Advance*, doi:  
11 [10.1176/appi.ps.201300244](https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201300244).
- 12 Davidson, L., Bellamy, C., Guy, K., & Miller, R. (2012). Peer support among persons with severe  
13 mental illnesses: A review of evidence and experience. *World Psychiatry*, *11*(2), 123-  
14 128.
- 15 Fukui, S., Davidson, L. J., Holter, M. C., & Rapp, C. A. (2010). Pathways to Recovery (PTR):  
16 Impact of peer-led group participation on mental health recovery outcomes.  
17 *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal*, *34*(1), 42-48. doi:  
18 <http://dx.doi.org/10.2975/34.1.2010.42.48>
- 19 Fukui, S., Goscha, R., Rapp, C. A., Mabry, A., Liddy, P., & Marty, D. (2012). Strengths model case  
20 management fidelity scores and client outcomes. *Psychiatric Services*, *63*(7), 708-710.  
21 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201100373>
- 22 Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: An analysis of 14 review types and  
23 associated methodologies. *Health Information & Libraries Journal*, *26*(2), 91-108.
- 24 Green, C. A., Janoff, S. L., Yarborough, B. J. H., & Paulson, R. I. (2013). The recovery group  
25 project: Development of an intervention led jointly by peer and professional  
26 counselors. *Psychiatric Services*, *64*(12), 1211-1217. doi:  
27 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201200546>
- 28 Higgins, A. (2008). *A Recovery Approach Within the Irish Mental Health Services: A Framework  
29 for Development*. Dublin: Mental Health Commission.
- 30 Ibrahim, N., Michail, M., & Callaghan, P. (2014). The strengths based approach as a service  
31 delivery model for severe mental illness: A meta-analysis of clinical trials. *BMC  
32 Psychiatry*, *14*(243).
- 33 Lai, L. H., Cummins, R., & Lau, A. D. (2013). Cross-cultural difference in subjective wellbeing:  
34 Cultural response bias as an explanation. *Social Indicators Research*, *114*(2), 607-619.  
35 doi: [10.1007/s11205-012-0164-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-012-0164-z)
- 36 Leamy, M., Bird, V., Le Boutillier, C., Williams, J., & Slade, M. (2011). Conceptual framework for  
37 personal recovery in mental health: Systematic review and narrative synthesis. *British  
38 Journal of Psychiatry*, *199*(6), 445-452.
- 39 Lecomte, T., Wallace, C. J., Caron, J., Perreault, M., & Lecomte, J. (2004). Further validation of  
40 the client assessment of strengths interests and goals. *Schizophrenia Research*, *66*(1),  
41 59-70.
- 42 Liberman, R. P., & Kopelowicz, A. (2002). Recovery from schizophrenia: A challenge for the 21st  
43 century. *International Review of Psychiatry*, *14*(4), 245-255.
- 44 Linley, A. P., Maltby, J., Wood, A. M., Joseph, S., Harrington, S., Peterson, C., . . . Seligman, M. E.  
45 P. (2007). Character strengths in the United Kingdom: The VIA inventory of strengths.  
46 *Personality and Individual Differences*, *43*(2), 341-351.
- 47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Lloyd-Evans, B., Mayo-Wilson, E., Harrison, B., Istead, H., Brown, E., Pilling, S., . . . Kendall, T.  
11 (2014). A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials of peer  
12 support for people with severe mental illness. *BMC Psychiatry*, 14(1), 12 pages.
- 13 Lu, L. (2001). Understanding happiness: A look into the Chinese folk psychology. *Journal of*  
14 *Happiness Studies*, 2(4), 407-432.
- 15 Marty, D., Rapp, C. A., & Carlson, L. (2001). The experts speak: The critical ingredients of  
16 strengths model case management. *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal*, 24(3), 214.
- 17 McHugo, G., Drake, R., Whitley, R., Bond, G., Campbell, K., Rapp, C., . . . Finnerty, M. (2007).  
18 Fidelity outcomes in the national implementing evidence-based practices project.  
19 *Psychiatric Services*, 58(10), 1279-1284.
- 20 Mireau, R., & Inch, R. (2009). Brief solution-focused counseling: A practical effective strategy  
21 for dealing with wait lists in community-based mental health services. *Social Work*,  
22 54(1), 63-70.
- 23 National Collaborating Centre for Methods and Tools. (2008). *Quality assessment tool for*  
24 *quantitative studies*. McMaster University, (Accessed 13 April, 2010). Retrieved from  
25 <http://www.nccmt.ca/registry/view/eng/14.html>. Hamilton, ON.
- 26 Norman, E. (2000). *Resiliency enhancement: Putting the strengths perspective into social work*  
27 *practice*: Columbia University Press.
- 28 Park, N., Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. (2006). Character strengths in fifty-four nations and the  
29 fifty US states. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 1 (3), 118-129.
- 30 Peterson, C., Park, N., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2006). Greater strengths of character and recovery  
31 from illness. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 1(1), 17-26. doi:  
32 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17439760500372739>
- 33 Petrakis, M., Bloom, H., & Oxley, J. (2014). Family perceptions of benefits and barriers to first  
34 episode psychosis carer group participation. *Social Work in Mental Health*, 12(2), 99-  
35 116.
- 36 Petrakis, M., Wilson, M., & Hamilton, B. (2013). Implementing the strengths model of case  
37 management: Group supervision fidelity outcomes. *Community Mental Health Journal*,  
38 49(3), 331-337.
- 39 Rapp, C. A., & Goscha, R. (2006). *The strengths model: Case management with people with*  
40 *psychiatric disabilities* (2 ed.). NY, USA: Oxford University Press.
- 41 Rapp, C. A., & Goscha, R. (2012). *The strengths model: A recovery-oriented approach to mental*  
42 *health services*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 43 Repper, J., & Carter, T. (2011). A review of the literature on peer support in mental health  
44 services. *Journal of Mental Health*, 20(4), 392-411.
- 45 Resnick, S. G., & Rosenheck, R. A. (2006). Recovery and positive psychology: Parallel themes  
46 and potential synergies. *Psychiatric Services*, 57(1), 120-122.
- 47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Ridgway, P., & Bledsoe, C. (2002). *Pathways to recovery: A strengths recovery self-help*  
11 *workbook*. Lawrence, US: Office of Mental Health Research & Training, School of Social  
12 Welfare, University of Kansas.
- 13 Roberts, G., & Wolfson, P. (2004). The rediscovery of recovery: Open to all. *Advances in*  
14 *Psychiatric Treatment*, 10(1), 37-48.
- 15 Scott, A., & Wilson, L. (2011). Valued identities and deficit identities: Wellness Recovery Action  
16 Planning and self-management in mental health. *Nursing Inquiry*, 18(1), 40-49.
- 17 Sells, D., Davidson, L., Jewell, C., Falzer, P., & Rowe, M. (2006). The treatment relationship in  
18 peer-based and regular case management for clients with severe mental illness.  
19 *Psychiatric Services*, 57(8), 1179-1184.
- 20 Shepherd, G., Boardman, J., & Burns, M. (2010). *Implementing recovery. A methodology for*  
21 *organisation change*. London: Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health.
- 22 Shepherd, G., Boardman, J., & Slade, M. (2008). *Making Recovery A Reality. Briefing Paper*.  
23 London: Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health
- 24 Sin, J., Moone, N., & Newell, J. (2007). Developing services for the carers of young adults with  
25 early-onset psychosis: Implementing evidence-based practice on psycho-educational  
26 family intervention. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, 14(3), 282-290.
- 27 Slade, M. (2009). *Personal recovery and mental illness: A guide for mental health professionals*.  
28 Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.
- 29 Slade, M., Amering, M., Farkas, M., Hamilton, B., O'Hagan, M., Panther, G., . . . Whitley, R.  
30 (2014). Uses and abuses of recovery: Implementing recovery-oriented practices in  
31 mental health systems. *World Psychiatry*, 13(1), 12-20.
- 32 Smith-Merry, J., Freeman, R., & Sturdy, S. (2011). Implementing recovery: An analysis of the  
33 key technologies in Scotland. *International Journal of Mental Health Systems*, 5(11), 1-  
34 12.
- 35 Staudt, M., Howard, M. O., & Drake, B. (2001). The operationalization, implementation, and  
36 effectiveness of the strengths perspective: A review of empirical studies. *Journal of*  
37 *Social Service Research*, 27(3), 1-21.
- 38 Taylor, E. H. (2006). The weaknesses of the strengths model. *Best Practices in Mental Health*,  
39 2(1), 1-30.
- 40 Tew, J., Ramon, S., Slade, M., Bird, V., Melton, J., & Le Boutillier, C. (2012). Social factors and  
41 recovery from mental health difficulties: a review of the evidence. *British journal of*  
42 *social work*, 42, 443-460.
- 43 Trachtenberg, M., Parsonage, M., Shepherd, G., & Boardman, J. (2013). *Peer support in mental*  
44 *health care: Is it good value for money*. London: Centre for Mental Health (available at  
45 www.centreformentalhealth.org.uk).
- 46 Tse, S., Cheung, E., Kan, A., Ng, R., & Yau, S. (2012). Recovery in Hong Kong: Service user  
47 participation in mental health services. *International Review of Psychiatry*, 24(1), 40-47.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Tse, S., Divis, M., & Li, Y. B. (2010). Match or mismatch: Use of the strengths model with Chinese migrants experiencing mental illness, service user and practitioner perspectives. *American Journal of Psychiatric Rehabilitation, 13*(3), 171-188.

Whitley, R. (2010). Rediscovering hope. *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal, 33*(3), 239-241.

Whitley, R., Gingerich, S., Lutz, W., & Mueser, K. (2009). Implementing the illness management and recovery program in community mental health settings: Facilitators and barriers. *Psychiatric Services, 60*(2), 202-209.

For Peer Review




Figure 1. Flow chart showing the summary of the literature search of strengths-based intervention studies.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

Table 1. Quality Assessment of Selected Studies

Authors	Selection Bias	Study Design	Confounders	Blinding	Data collection method	Withdrawals and dropouts	GLOBAL RATINGS: Strong= no '3' rating Moderate= one '3' rating Weak= two or more '3' ratings	Agreement between reviewers' Global Ratings (Yes/No)
1. Blow et al., 2000	2	2	1	3	1	1	Moderate	Yes
2. Björkman et al., 2002	2	1	3	2	1	1	Moderate	No
3. Barry et al., 2003	2	2	1	3	1	1	Moderate	No
4. Mireau and Inch, 2009	2	2	3	2	3	3	Weak	Yes
5. Fukui et al., 2010	2	2	3	3	1	1	Weak	Yes
6. Fukui et al., 2012	2	2	3	3	2	Not Applicable	Weak	Yes
7. Green et al., 2013	2	1	1	2	1	1	Strong	Yes
							Reviewers' agreement =	71%

Notes:  
Item quality ratings: 1 = Strong; 2 = Moderate; 3 = Weak (for details on rating descriptors, see National Collaborating Centre for Methods and Tools, 2008)



Table 2. Table 2. Characteristics of Studies Included in this Critical Review

Author(s)	Sample Size (people with severe mental illness)	Study design	Control group	Intervention group	Description of strengths-based intervention	Results
1. Blow and colleagues (2000)	n=1,425, attrition at 32%, final n=861	Intervention-control groups design; 3-year follow up	Standard care: Traditional inpatient treatment	Three intervention subgroups: 1) Sustained treatment and rehabilitation (STARii) transitional inpatient programme; 2) Day treatment centres (DTCs); 3) Assertive community treatment (ACT) and strengths model(SM)	1) Inpatient rehabilitation incorporating several psychosocial rehabilitation components and functional skills training; 2) Partial hospitalization, structured outpatient programme, 10-25 hours/week; 3) Programme was based on ACT and SM* (Rapp and Wintersteen, 1989).	ACT users had greatest decrease in days of hospitalization (-85%), followed by DTC (-64%), STARii (-44%), and standard care (-16%). Significant three-way interaction effect of time-by-program-by diagnosis. Decreased in psychiatric symptoms for patients in STARii and ACT programmes; DTC patients became more symptomatic. ACT programme appeared to have best outcomes, but best approach for users with more serious symptoms would be to begin with STARii.
2. Björkman and colleagues (2002)	n=77	Randomized controlled trial, 36-month follow up (baseline, 18- and 36-month)	Standard care: Joint management for outpatient and inpatient, and day-care facilities, small therapeutic communities	Strengths model of case management service (SCM)	SCM* (Mueser <i>et al.</i> , 1998): Moderate emphasis on skills training and high-level service users' input; less emphasis on integration of services.	SCM was effective in the following ways: 1) Improving service satisfaction; 2) Greater reduction in need for care at 36-month follow-up; 3) Fewer days in psychiatric inpatient care. SCM group had worse social network and more symptoms at baseline compared with standard care group.
3. Barry and colleagues (2003)	n=225, attrition at 22.7%, final n=174	Intervention-control groups design; 2-year follow up	ACT (Wisconsin model)	Strengths model (SM1)	SM1* (Saleebey, 1996): Patient-centred focused on finding membership in community; training, booster sessions, group training to ensure fidelity.	SM was effective in: 1) Increasing service utilisation; 2) Reducing positive and negative symptoms; 3) Improving global life satisfaction.
4. Mireau and Inch (2009)	n=1,370	Intervention-control groups design; 3-year follow up	Regular non-time-limited counselling	Strengths-based, brief solution-focused counselling (BSFC)	BSFC* (Blundo, 2001; Saleebey, 2002): Counsellors engaged clients quickly, formed a relationship with them, and kept them focused on strengths, goals, and priorities; limited to 10 sessions.	BSFC users liked the idea of focusing on strengths. Less than 1% decided to switch to non-time-limited counselling. Dropout rate in brief therapy was half that of clients in long-term therapy. Users were

						more likely to plan to end their counselling relationship in the BSFC programme than in the non-time-limited services.
5. Fukui and colleagues (2010)	n=47, attrition at 32%, final n=32	Pre-post design; 8-month follow up	No control group; compared to results of baseline measures	Pathways to Recovery (PTR): A Strengths Recovery Self-Help Workbook	PTR* (Ridway and Bledsoe, 2002 which is largely grounded in the work by Rapp and Goscha, 2012): Users identified and pursued life goals on the basis of on personal and environmental strengths. Used self-help groups with less hierarchical relations among peers. Users completed self-assessments and action plans to observe accomplishments and to sustain motivation toward recovery.	Statistically significant improvements for PTR participants in terms of self-esteem, self-efficacy, social support, spiritual well-being, and psychiatric symptoms.
6. Fukui and colleagues (2012)	n=1,195, attrition at 33%, final n=802	Pre-post design	No control group; compared to results of baseline measures (fidelity scores and psychosocial outcomes)	Strengths model of case management (SMCM)	SMCM* (Rapp and Goscha, 2012): Goal oriented. Low caseload sizes, low supervisor-to-case manager ratio. Weekly group supervision using structured format for case presentations. Administered strengths assessment. Used personal recovery plan tools and naturally occurring resources to achieve goals; in-person service delivery.	SMCM users improved in terms of the following outcomes: competitive employment, psychiatric hospitalization, and post-secondary education rates. Service users' improvement depended on fidelity scores except in the case of independent living.
7. Green (2013)	n=82, across 5 cohorts, final n=70	Five cohorts. Cohort 1: Feasibility pilot study and development of materials. Cohorts 2+3: Ten-week randomized controlled trial (RCT) Cohort 3: delayed-intervention control group. Cohorts 4+5: Pre-post	Cohort 3: delayed-intervention control group	Strengths-based group intervention, based on service user-developed recovery workbook PTR	Groups co-facilitated by a professional mental health counsellor and a trained peer counsellor. Participants also used PTR workbook (Ridgway <i>et al.</i> , 2002).	User-developed workbook was useful. Users also reacted positively to having peer co-leaders. Duration of intervention was important; users needed enough time for reflection to work through exercises and explore key topics (about 17-18 weeks). Significant reduction of mental health symptoms and significant improvements in functioning, personal confidence, and hope were noted. Lastly, users demonstrated greater goal and success orientation.

1  
2  
3  
4 \*Notes: Key references on strength-based approaches

5 Blundo, R. (2001) Learning strengths-based practice: Challenging our personal and professional frames, *Families in Society: Journal of*  
6 *Contemporary Social Services*, 82(3), 296-304.

7 Mueser, K. T. Bond, G. R. Drake, R. E., & Resnick, S. G. (1998) Models of community care for severe mental illness, *Schizophrenia Bulletin*,  
8 24(1), 37-74.

9 Rapp, C. A., & Wintersteen, R. (1989) The Strengths model of case management: Results from twelve demonstrations, *Psychosocial*  
10 *Rehabilitation Journal*, 13(1), 23-32.

11 Rapp, C. A., & Goscha, R. (2012) *The Strengths Model: A Recovery-Oriented Approach to Mental Health Services*, New York, Oxford  
12 University Press.

13 Ridgway, P., & Bledsoe, C. (2002) *Pathways to Recovery: A Strengths Recovery Self-Help Workbook*, Office of Mental Health Research &  
14 Training, School of Social Welfare, University of Kansas.

15 Saleebey, D. (1996) The strengths perspective in social work practice: Extensions and cautions, *Social Work*, 41(3), 296-305.

16 Saleebey, D. (2002) *The Strengths Perspective in Social Work Practice*, Toronto, Allyn and Bacon.  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 (931 words)  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 **Title:** Uses of Strength-Based Interventions for people with serious mental illness: A  
11 critical review

12  
13  
14 **Abstract**

15  
16 **Background:** For the past three decades, mental health practitioners have increasingly  
17 adopted aspects and tools of strengths-based approaches. To provide strengths-based  
18 intervention and to amplify strengths relies heavily on effective interpersonal processes.  
19  
20

21  
22 **Aim:** This paper is a critical review of research regarding the use of strengths-based  
23 approaches in mental health service settings. The aim is to discuss strengths-based  
24 interventions within broader research on recovery, focusing on effectiveness and  
25 advances in practice where applicable.  
26  
27

28  
29 **Method:** A systematic search for peer-reviewed intervention studies published between  
30 2001 and December 2014 yielded 55 articles of potential relevance to the review.  
31  
32

33  
34 **Results:** Seven studies met the inclusion criteria and were included in the analysis. The  
35 *Quality Assessment Tool for Quantitative Studies* was used to appraise the quality of the  
36 studies. Our review found emerging evidence that the utilisation of a strengths-based  
37 approach improves outcomes including hospitalisation rates, employment/educational  
38 attainment, and intrapersonal outcomes such as self-efficacy and sense of hope.  
39  
40

41  
42 **Conclusions:** Recent studies confirm the feasibility of implementing a high-fidelity  
43 strengths-based approach in clinical settings and its relevance for practitioners in  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 healthcare. More high quality studies are needed to further examine the effectiveness of  
11 strengths-based approaches.  
12  
13

14  
15  
16 **Keywords**

17  
18 Case management, recovery, positive psychology  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Introduction

Serious mental illnesses and their associated symptoms are distressing and debilitating for individuals experiencing the conditions, as well as for families and concerned significant others (Petrakis, Bloom, & Oxley, 2014; Sin, Moone, & Newell, 2007). With the advent of medications that reduce many distressing symptoms, there has been considerable advocacy focusing on personal recovery (Anthony, 1993; Liberman & Kopelowicz, 2002; Roberts & Wolfson, 2004). Strengths-based approaches represent an articulation of mental health's philosophy on recovery (Anthony, 1993; Leamy, Bird, Le Boutillier, Williams, & Slade, 2011; Whitley, 2010). Although promoting wellbeing or building on a person's strengths are hardly new concepts to mental health practitioners, qualities such as self-efficacy, social problem solving, sense of purpose, empathy, humour, resilience, and hope have only been systematically studied in recent decades (Norman, 2000; Whitley, 2010). As such, a team of researchers sought to quantify strengths in a systematic manner (Linley et al., 2007). In their attempt, an exhaustive review was conducted for literature in psychology, philosophy and social work, and 24 character strengths (e.g., creativity, persistence, social intelligence and hope) were subsequently identified that are considered to underpin our universal

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 understanding of the latent construct of 'character strengths' as applying to the general  
10 population.  
11  
12

13  
14  
15  
16 Regarding the operationalization of strengths-based practices, Norman (2000)  
17 categorized strengths into two levels. The first level is personal level, and the indicators  
18 of strengths are self-efficacy, realistic appraisal of the environment, social problem-  
19 solving, sense of direction or mission, empathy, humour, adaptive distancing and  
20 androgynous sex role behaviour. The second level is called the interpersonal level, and  
21 the indicators in this level are positive caring relationships, positive family environment  
22 or other forms of intimate environment that help to foster resiliency and strengths.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32  
33  
34 Across the range of strengths-based approaches to mental health care, there is a focus on  
35 inter-personal processes working with the strengths of the individual and their  
36 community to achieve client-defined goals and personal recovery (Slade, 2009; Smith-  
37 Merry, Freeman, & Sturdy, 2011). The underpinning of these approaches is the  
38 philosophical commitment to attending to human capacity first rather than human  
39 deficiency (Scott & Wilson, 2011). It assumes that every person can build a meaningful  
40 and satisfying life defined by an individual's own terms (Rapp & Goscha, 2012). Rapp  
41 and Goscha (2012, see 'The purpose, principles, and research results' pp.51-69) and  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Marty, Rapp, and Carlson (2001) provide a useful account of what constitutes the  
11 critical elements of strengths-based intervention approach.  
12  
13

14  
15  
16 The present paper is a critical review of research (for typology of reviews, see Grant &  
17 Booth, 2009) on strengths-based approaches, which is one of the seven pro-recovery  
18 practices mentioned in an earlier publication by Slade et al. (2014). The present authors  
19 are experts from five countries. The aim is to present and discuss pertinent issues  
20 surrounding strengths-based practices within broader research on recovery, with a focus  
21 on effectiveness and cross-cultural analysis. The three research questions are: (1) What  
22 are the general characteristics of the studies selected for the present review (including  
23 specific cultural elements)? (2) What is the empirical evidence for the effectiveness of  
24 strengths-based practice with regard to specific outcome measures (including if there is  
25 any evidence of negative effects)? (3) What are the advances in practice or new features  
26 revealed in the present review, compared with the last empirical review of effectiveness  
27 of the strengths perspective by Staudt, Howard, and Drake (2001)?  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

## 45 **Methods**

### 46 *Data sources*

47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 We searched six electronic databases for studies published between 2001 and December  
11 2014: Applied Social Sciences Index and Abstracts, PsycArticles, PsycInfo, Social  
12 Services Abstracts, Sociological Abstracts, and MEDLINE. Studies published prior to  
13 2001 were excluded because another empirical review published in 2001 covered these  
14 earlier studies (Staudt et al., 2001). The search terms used included two components: (i)  
15 intervention: 'strengths model'; or 'strengths-based' or 'strengths perspective' and (ii)  
16 clinical condition: 'mental illness'; or 'bipolar'; or 'schizophrenia' or 'psychiatr\*'.  
17  
18 Following the initial search, two independent reviewers (ST and ET) screened titles and  
19 abstracts. The full texts of potentially relevant peer-reviewed papers on intervention  
20 studies were further examined to determine eligibility (Figure 1). Any discrepancies in  
21 judgment were settled by a discussion between the two reviewers.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

<Insert Figure 1 Here>

#### *Inclusion and exclusion Criteria*

42 A study was included in the review if it satisfied all of the following criteria: (i)  
43 published in or after 2001, (ii) published in a peer-reviewed journal, (iii) written in  
44 English, (iv) was an intervention study using strengths-based intervention as the  
45 treatment, (v) provided a description of the intervention in the article, and (vi) used any  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 quantitative design (i.e., randomized controlled trial or other quasi-experimental type  
11 studies). The inclusion criteria were consistent with the nature of critical review and  
12 were chosen to ensure that the included studies will address the set research questions  
13 (Grant & Booth, 2009). Because Blow and colleagues' (2000) research was not  
14 included in the earlier review by Staudt and colleagues (2001), we included it in this  
15 review. We excluded qualitative studies and opinion/commentary papers because they  
16 did not include empirical evidence on the effectiveness of strengths-based interventions,  
17 which was our second research question.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

### 28 29 *Quality assessment*

30  
31 The quality of the studies was assessed using the *Quality Assessment Tool for*  
32 *Quantitative Studies* developed by the Effective Public Health Practice Project of  
33 McMaster University, Canada (National Collaborating Centre for Methods and Tools,  
34 2008). We assessed both the internal and external validity of a study, as well as the  
35 following criteria: (i) selection of participants, (ii) study design, (iii) confounders, (iv)  
36 blinding, (v) data collection methods, (vi) attrition, (vii) statistical analysis, and (viii)  
37 intervention integrity. This tool has been deemed appropriate and satisfactory for  
38 assessing the risk of bias in public health research (Armijo-Olivo, Stiles, Hagen, Biondo,  
39 & Cummings, 2012). The ratings for each component are computed into a single global  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 rating score for the study, with zero weak ratings indicating a ‘strong’ rating overall,  
11 one weak rating indicating a ‘moderate’ rating, and two or more weak ratings indicating  
12 a ‘weak’ rating (National Collaborating Centre for Methods and Tools, 2008). The two  
13 reviewers (ST and ET) independently carried out the quality appraisal and any  
14 discrepancies were settled following discussions between the two reviewers and  
15 members of the wider author team. Every team member helped to evaluate the  
16 interpretations of the results and to write specific sections of the manuscripts.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

## 27 **Results**

### 28 *Selection of studies*

29  
30 The search terms generated 619 articles, not including duplications already removed by  
31 the databases. We then identified 55 studies that provisionally met the inclusion criteria  
32 for peer-reviewed intervention studies. After obtaining the full texts of these 55 articles,  
33 48 articles were excluded as they did not meet the inclusion criteria for a variety of  
34 reasons (Figure 1). For example, some of the articles that were excluded focused on the  
35 conceptual or theoretical aspects of strengths-based approaches or the development of  
36 measurement scales, and in some other cases, although the word ‘strength’ was referred  
37 to in the published studies, no detail was provided about how a strengths-based  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 approach was executed in the intervention. Hence, only the seven articles that met  
11 inclusion criteria were included in the review.  
12  
13

### 14 15 16 *Quality assessment*

17  
18 The overall agreement rate between the two reviewers was 71%, and discrepancies were  
19 settled after discussion and clarifying interpretation of the studies. Table 1 presents the  
20 results of the quality assessments of the studies. Overall, the majority of the studies  
21 were of moderate to weak quality. Of the seven studies, four did not describe or control  
22 for confounders in the analysis, and four studies received a 'weak' score for the blinding  
23 component, which meant that blinding was either not incorporated into the study design  
24 or not described in the article.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34  
35  
36 <Insert Table 1 Here>  
37  
38  
39

### 40 41 *Study characteristics*

42  
43 All of the studies were conducted in developed, high income, Western countries such as  
44 the United States, Canada (Mireau & Inch, 2009), and Sweden (Björkman, Hansson, &  
45 Sandlund, 2002). All of the participants were adults already known to mental health  
46 services and affected by severe and persistent mental illness. The studies had diverse  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

research designs: randomised controlled trials, pre-post designs, between-group comparison, and mixed methods (qualitative and quantitative); follow-up periods for the studies varied between eight and 36 months (Table 1). The most common research designs were cohort studies with non-randomised controls. Only one study's design achieved a 'strong' global rating (Green, Janoff, Yarborough, & Paulson, 2013). Three others were rated as 'moderate' (Barry, Zeber, Blow, & Valenstein, 2003; Björkman et al., 2002; Blow et al., 2000), and the other three as 'weak' (Fukui, Davidson, Holter, & Rapp, 2010; Fukui et al., 2012; Mireau & Inch, 2009).

There was also considerable confounding of the strengths-based approach within the complex, multifaceted interventions, making it difficult to attribute outcomes to this element as opposed to other variables. In a previous review, Staudt et al. (2001) commented that 'The effects of treatment modality and treatment intensity were confounded in these studies... It is unknown whether it was simply the additional services or specific type of services provided that contributed, in some cases, to improved outcomes' (Staudt *et al.*, 2001, p.17). This comment remains accurate.

*Effectiveness of strengths-based interventions*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 The results suggest that a strengths-based approach is associated with (i) reducing the  
11 duration of stay in hospital (Björkman et al., 2002; Blow et al., 2000; Fukui et al., 2012);  
12  
13 (ii) increasing service satisfaction (Björkman et al., 2002); (iii) improving general  
14  
15 attitudes with respect to recovery-relevant dimensions (e.g., self-esteem, self-efficacy,  
16  
17 personal confidence, sense of hope, life satisfaction; Barry et al., 2003; Fukui et al.,  
18  
19 2010; Green et al., 2013); (iv) facilitating greater goal attainment (i.e., improving  
20  
21 employment and educational outcomes; (Green et al., 2013); and (v) general increased  
22  
23 utilisation of services (Barry et al., 2003; Mireau & Inch, 2009). In Mireau and Inch's  
24  
25 (2009) study, these positive changes were reflected in increased job satisfaction and  
26  
27 improved staff morale: 'Optimism and hopefulness directed toward the client is  
28  
29 contagious, with counsellors having increased job satisfaction and morale while clients  
30  
31 experience success in achieving their goals' (Mireau & Inch, 2009, p.68). However  
32  
33 these improvements should be interpreted with caution given the variable quality of the  
34  
35 research designs and evidence (Table 1).  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 There was one instance of negative results. Björkman et al. (2002) found that the group  
44  
45 receiving strengths-based case management had *worse* social network and symptom  
46  
47 scores post-intervention when compared with the group receiving standard care. The  
48  
49 outcomes in relation to symptom improvement were also inconclusive (Barry et al.,  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

2003; Björkman et al., 2002; Fukui et al., 2010; Green et al., 2013). In an earlier commentary, due to the seriousness of psychiatric symptomatology such as suicidality and persecutory delusions, Taylor (2006) strongly cautioned against using only a strengths-based approach completely isolated from medical treatment approaches.

### *Advances in practice*

Staudt et al. (2001) concluded in their earlier review that 'It remains unclear whether and how strengths-based CM (case management) differs from other CM models and what components are unique only to strengths-based CM' (Staudt *et al.*, 2001, p.17). This highlights the need for a clearer specification of strengths-based intervention, and it is therefore reassuring that, in the present sample, six out of the seven selected studies (Barry et al., 2003; Björkman et al., 2002; Fukui et al., 2010; Fukui et al., 2012; Green et al., 2013; Mireau & Inch, 2009) included descriptions of what strengths-based practices entail. For example, they cited the *Pathways to Recovery* (Ridgway & Bledsoe, 2002, cited in Fukui et al., 2010) and the *Strengths-Based Brief Solution-Focused Counselling* (cited in Mireau & Inch, 2009). Another example is the application of the *Strengths Model Case Management* (SMCM; Rapp & Goscha, 2012). In Fukui et al. (2012) study, case management teams were able to reach high SMCM fidelity, which meant that SMCM was being implemented (Table 2). Several studies compared

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 strengths approaches with Assertive Community Treatment (ACT), a well-defined  
10 model that includes a similarly high level of intensity to SMCM. Nevertheless, there  
11 was variability in the degree of detail provided regarding the interventions that were  
12 used. Direct measures of strengths were weak.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18  
19  
20 In one of the later studies, the engagement of peer supporters working with  
21 professionals in providing a strengths-based group programme highlighted an important  
22 new development (Green *et al.*, 2013). Peer supporters or peer support workers refer to  
23 individuals with lived experience of mental illness who are recruited, trained, and  
24 supported to use this experience to support other peers during recovery (Davidson,  
25 Bellamy, Guy, & Miller, 2012; Repper & Carter, 2011).  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 <Insert Table 2 Here>  
37  
38  
39

## 40 **Discussion**

### 41 *Study design and intervention effectiveness*

42  
43 The overall results of this critical review are comparable to the results of a recent meta-  
44 analysis of clinical trials of strengths-based practice (Ibrahim, Michail, & Callaghan,  
45 2014). First, both the current critical review and recent meta-analysis considered that  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 only a small number of clinical studies met the requirement of a moderate level of  
11 quality (Barry et al., 2003; both of these trials were included in the present review and  
12 the meta-analysis; Björkman et al., 2002). There is a pressing need for further good  
13 quality, well-designed clinical trials to examine the effectiveness of strengths-based  
14 practices. Second, both of the reports have found that the effect of strengths-based  
15 interventions on service users' level of symptoms was either inconclusive (e.g.,  
16 Björkman et al., 2002; Green et al., 2013) or less favourable in comparison to other  
17 service delivery models (Ibrahim et al., 2014). On the other hand, compared to the study  
18 by Ibrahim et al. (2014), the present review holds a more positive view of strengths-  
19 based approaches. For example, the present review found that the approach was  
20 associated with some favourable employment and educational outcomes, whereas the  
21 meta-analysis found no significant difference between the strengths-based approach and  
22 other service delivery models. This may be explained by differences in methodological  
23 approaches between the two reports.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 A critical review is typically narrative by nature, and it aims to provide 'an opportunity  
44 to 'take stock' and evaluate what is of value from the previous body of work. It may  
45 also attempt to resolve competing schools of thought. As such, it may provide a 'launch  
46 pad' for a new phase of conceptual development and subsequent 'testing'' (Grant &  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Booth, 2009, p.93). However, a meta-analysis uses ‘techniques that statistically  
11 combine the results of quantitative studies to provide a more precise effect of the results’  
12 (Grant & Booth, 2009, p.94). The analysis by Ibrahim et al. (2014) included five studies  
13 between 1991 and 2003 and all the studies had control groups. The current review  
14 included seven studies between 2000 and 2013, and six of the studies had a control-  
15 group design.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

#### 25 *Comprehensive application of a strengths-based approach*

26  
27 The current review found that there was improved but still limited operationalization of  
28 strengths-based practices. Below, we discuss each stage briefly: assessment,  
29 intervention, and monitoring.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 It is possible to conduct a strengths assessment in mental health service delivery  
37 contexts and practice. A systematic review identified 12 published approaches to  
38 strengths assessment: five quantitative measures and seven qualitative methods (Bird et  
39 al., 2012). The Strengths Assessment Worksheet (SAW) is the most widely utilized and  
40 evaluated qualitative assessment method (Rapp & Goscha, 2006, 2012). The Client  
41 Assessment of Strengths, Interests and Goals (CASIG) has the strongest psychometric  
42 evidence (Lecomte, Wallace, Caron, Perreault, & Lecomte, 2004), and the SAW and  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 CASIG assessments have been tentatively recommended for use in practice. Other  
11 approaches to assessing strengths have also been published, such as use of the VIA-  
12 Strengths (Park, Peterson, & Seligman, 2006) approach in mental health services  
13  
14  
15  
16 (Resnick & Rosenheck, 2006).  
17

18  
19  
20 To provide strengths-based intervention and to amplify strengths is a person-centred  
21 process. Interpersonal styles such as coaching are helpful in facilitating a focus on  
22 strengths (Bora, 2012; Shepherd, Boardman, & Slade, 2008). The present review  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 underlines the high level of engagement that is fostered by the strengths approach, the  
28  
29  
30 significance of the level/intensity of contact, the active and outreaching role of workers  
31  
32 (including peer supporters) that arise from the approach. Blow et al. (2000) matched the  
33  
34  
35 intensive contact and practical outreach elements across ACT and SMCM and found  
36  
37  
38 positive outcomes. Assertiveness alone may not be well received. The service users also  
39  
40  
41 value the positive tone, warmth of engagement, and prize the optimistic tone of  
42  
43  
44 strengths-focused brief interventions (Mireau & Inch, 2009).  
45

46  
47 Finally, on the basis of our review, it appears that routine monitoring and reviewing of  
48  
49  
50 strengths is rarely implemented. This process involves the assessment of current and  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60 potential strengths, the activation and use of these strengths, and ambitious but not

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 unrealistic goal setting around the acquisition of new or amplified strengths. The most  
11 developed approach to integrating a focus on strengths into routine monitoring is the  
12 SMCM (Rapp & Goscha, 2012 cited in Fukui et al., 2012). Practice change has been  
13 achieved through staff training and the introduction of new strengths-based assessments,  
14 planning tools, and team discussions (Petrakis, Wilson, & Hamilton, 2013) based on  
15 Rapp and Goscha's (2012) tools and guidelines.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

#### 24 25 *The role of peer support workers in strengths-based practice*

26  
27 Two studies have assessed the impact of *Pathways to Recovery* (Ridgway & Bledsoe,  
28 2002) support groups on participants—one on peer-led groups (Fukui et al., 2010) and  
29 the other on groups co-led by a peer counsellor and a non-peer counsellor (Green et al.,  
30 2013). Both studies found considerable improvements across multiple domains  
31 including hope, self-efficacy, and social support. Further research is needed to  
32 understand how peer supporters can enhance the impact of strengths-based approaches.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 Strengths-based approaches emphasize personal and environmental strengths, as well as  
44 recognition of the character-building impact of trauma and mental distress (Peterson,  
45 Park, & Seligman, 2006; Tse, Divis, & Li, 2010). Peer supporters may have a distinct  
46 advantage over non-peer workers when it comes to personifying and practising these  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 principles. For instance, peer supporters can act as powerful role models precisely  
11 because their job requires lived experience (Davidson et al., 2012), or they can amplify  
12 a client's hope that they too can utilise strengths to move beyond their distress (Sells,  
13 Davidson, Jewell, Falzer, & Rowe, 2006). Peer support is also embedded in recovery  
14 philosophy and shares similar origins with the consumer or survivor movement (for  
15 recent reviews on effectiveness of peer support services, see Chinman et al., 2014;  
16 Lloyd-Evans et al., 2014; Trachtenberg, Parsonage, Shepherd, & Boardman, 2013).

#### 27 *Applying strengths-based practices cross-culturally*

28  
29 All of the selected studies in this review were conducted in Western cultures, and  
30 beliefs with regards to one's mental health, expressions of emotions, and strengths are  
31 heavily influenced by culture (Leamy et al., 2011; Tse, Cheung, Kan, Ng, & Yau, 2012;  
32 Tse et al., 2010). The notion of 'strengths' in non-Western cultures is under-researched.  
33 The conceptualization of strengths—the forms of linguistics, metaphors, icons, or  
34 folklore traditions—is culturally specific. In Chinese, the word 'strengths' is commonly  
35 understood as 優勢 (*youshi* or superiority), 強項 (*qiangxiang* or forté), or 潛能  
36 (*qianneng* or potential). Bamboo, an evergreen plant commonly seen across Asia that  
37 thrives even in harsh weather conditions, is often used as a metaphor for strengths and  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

uprightness. In Chinese, Japanese, and Vietnamese cultures, bamboo is viewed as a virtuous symbol of tenacity and perseverance.

It is imperative to understand how cultural variations should be taken into account in the interpretation of ‘strengths’. For instance, people in Chinese communities (in some case including Korean and Japanese communities) are heavily influenced by Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism (M. H. Bond, 2010; Chen & Davey, 2008; Lu, 2001), which ‘advocate spiritual cultivation and mind-work, such as self-retrospection and self-transcendence, they admonish people to eliminate excessive desires, live a simple life and restore a clear mind’ (Lai, Cummins, & Lau, 2013, p.608). Chinese people under the influence of traditional culture may interpret ‘empowerment’ as a challenge to deep-rooted ideas of Confucianism that emphasizes self-sacrifice, harmony, benevolence, and forgiveness. Similarly, ~~in the Taoistic concept of mental health, the virtue of tolerance and endurance may be preferred to exercising ‘self-determination.’~~ Under Taoism, people tend to be more modest and they less readily name their strengths, successes, and talents (Tse et al., 2010). Therefore mental health practitioners need to be creative and culturally sensitive when helping service users in exploring and identifying the strengths and virtue of characters within themselves and the wider environment.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 In the present authors' research and clinical work, we found it helpful to highlight  
11 specific domains and invite service users to identify what they consider as their sources  
12 of strength: personal (i.e., knowledge, academic qualifications, life experience, talents,  
13 problem-solving skills, live skills, interests, character, and attitude towards life),  
14 career/occupation, religious/spiritual sphere, family, colleagues at work, friends,  
15 neighbourhoods, social groups (formal or less formal), or the wider community.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24  
25 *Directions for policy, future research, and service provision*  
26

27 Strengths-based, recovery-oriented approaches are increasingly relevant to and  
28 welcomed by policy makers. An example is the Irish Mental Health Commission report  
29 'A recovery approach within the Irish mental health services: A framework for  
30 development' (Higgins, 2008) as well as a report launched by the Commonwealth of  
31 Australia, 'A national framework for recovery-oriented mental health services: Policy  
32 and theory' (Australian Health Ministers' Advisory Council, 2013). Further research in  
33 non-Western settings is important, especially considering cultural differences regarding  
34 the definition and conceptualization of strengths as noted in this review. Also, there may  
35 be cultural differences within nation states, particularly regarding ethnic minorities,  
36 indigenous people, and immigrants. Another gap in research relates to the  
37 implementation of strengths-based approaches in routine mental health settings (G. R.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Bond, Drake, McHugo, Rapp, & Whitley, 2009; McHugo et al., 2007; Whitley,  
11 Gingerich, Lutz, & Mueser, 2009). Existing research provides little evidence-based  
12 guidelines on the best approaches to training staff in strengths-based approaches. This is  
13 critically important given that much clinical training continues to focus on deficits and  
14 symptoms, fostering a paternalistic attitude toward patients (O'Hagan, 2004; Slade,  
15 Adams, & O'Hagan, 2012; Whitley, 2014). Adopting a strengths-based approach may  
16 require a 180 degree turn away from embedded attitudes of 'clinician knows best.'  
17 Finally, to support an individual to maximise one's own strengths and work toward  
18 his/her own goals, there must be a transformation within the workplace, as well as a  
19 change in the system's culture (Shepherd, Boardman, & Burns, 2010; Tew et al., 2012).  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 To conclude, there is a need for more high quality studies to further examine the  
35 effectiveness of strengths-based approaches. This review has revealed emerging  
36 evidence that the utilisation of a strengths-based approach is effective for yielding  
37 desirable outcomes, including 'hard' outcomes such as duration of hospitalization,  
38 adherence to treatment, and employment/educational attainment, as well as 'soft'  
39 outcomes such as self-esteem, self-efficacy, and sense of hope. Strengths-based  
40 approaches emphasize the autonomy, assets, and goals of the individual client, and  
41 practitioners are considered facilitators of the recovery process. Successful  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

implementation of a high-fidelity strengths-based approach in clinical settings requires collaboration from service users, staff, administrators, and policy makers.

#### **Conflict of interest**

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

#### **Funding acknowledgement**

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

## References

- Anthony, W. A. (1993). Recovery from mental illness: The guiding vision of the mental health service system in the 1990s. *Psychosocial Rehabilitation Journal*, 16(4), 11-23. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0095655>
- Armijo-Olivo, S., Stiles, C. R., Hagen, N. A., Biondo, P. D., & Cummings, G. G. (2012). Assessment of study quality for systematic reviews: a comparison of the Cochrane Collaboration Risk of Bias Tool and the Effective Public Health Practice Project Quality Assessment Tool: methodological research. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, 18(1), 12-18.
- Australian Health Ministers' Advisory Council. (2013). *A national framework for recovery-oriented mental health services: Policy and theory*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia
- Barry, K. L., Zeber, J. E., Blow, F. C., & Valenstein, M. (2003). Effect of strengths model versus assertive community treatment model on participant outcomes and utilization: Two-year follow-up. *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal*, 26(3), 268-277. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2975/26.2003.268.277>
- Bird, V., Le Boutillier, C., Leamy, M., Larsen, J., Oades, L., Williams, J., & Slade, M. (2012). Assessing the strengths of mental health service users - systematic review. *Psychological Assessment*, 24, 1024-1033.
- Björkman, T., Hansson, L., & Sandlund, M. (2002). Outcome of case management based on the strengths model compared to standard care. A randomised controlled trial. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 37(4), 147-152.
- Blow, F. C., Ullman, E., Lawton Barry, K., Bingham, C. R., Copeland, L. A., McCormick, R., & Van Stone, W. (2000). Effectiveness of specialized treatment programs for veterans with serious and persistent mental illness: A three-year follow-up. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 70(3), 389-400. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0087648>
- Bond, G. R., Drake, R. E., McHugo, G. J., Rapp, C. A., & Whitley, R. (2009). Strategies for improving fidelity in the national evidence-based practices project. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 19(5), 569-581.
- Bond, M. H. (2010). *The Oxford handbook of Chinese psychology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bora, R. (2012). *Empowering people. Coaching for mental health recovery*. London: Rethink Mental Illness.
- Chen, Z., & Davey, G. (2008). Happiness and subjective wellbeing in Mainland China. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 9(4), 589-600. doi: 10.1007/s10902-008-9092-7
- Chinman, M., George, P., Dougherty, R. H., Daniels, A. S., Ghose, S. S., Swift, A., & Delphin-Rittmon, M. E. (2014). Peer support services for individuals with serious mental

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 illnesses: Assessing the evidence. *Psychiatric Services In Advance*, doi:  
11 [10.1176/appi.ps.201300244](https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201300244).
- 12 Davidson, L., Bellamy, C., Guy, K., & Miller, R. (2012). Peer support among persons with severe  
13 mental illnesses: A review of evidence and experience. *World Psychiatry*, *11*(2), 123-  
14 128.
- 15 Fukui, S., Davidson, L. J., Holter, M. C., & Rapp, C. A. (2010). Pathways to Recovery (PTR):  
16 Impact of peer-led group participation on mental health recovery outcomes.  
17 *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal*, *34*(1), 42-48. doi:  
18 <http://dx.doi.org/10.2975/34.1.2010.42.48>
- 19 Fukui, S., Goscha, R., Rapp, C. A., Mabry, A., Liddy, P., & Marty, D. (2012). Strengths model case  
20 management fidelity scores and client outcomes. *Psychiatric Services*, *63*(7), 708-710.  
21 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201100373>
- 22 Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: An analysis of 14 review types and  
23 associated methodologies. *Health Information & Libraries Journal*, *26*(2), 91-108.
- 24 Green, C. A., Janoff, S. L., Yarborough, B. J. H., & Paulson, R. I. (2013). The recovery group  
25 project: Development of an intervention led jointly by peer and professional  
26 counselors. *Psychiatric Services*, *64*(12), 1211-1217. doi:  
27 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201200546>
- 28 Higgins, A. (2008). *A Recovery Approach Within the Irish Mental Health Services: A Framework  
29 for Development*. Dublin: Mental Health Commission.
- 30 Ibrahim, N., Michail, M., & Callaghan, P. (2014). The strengths based approach as a service  
31 delivery model for severe mental illness: A meta-analysis of clinical trials. *BMC  
32 Psychiatry*, *14*(243).
- 33 Lai, L. H., Cummins, R., & Lau, A. D. (2013). Cross-cultural difference in subjective wellbeing:  
34 Cultural response bias as an explanation. *Social Indicators Research*, *114*(2), 607-619.  
35 doi: [10.1007/s11205-012-0164-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-012-0164-z)
- 36 Leamy, M., Bird, V., Le Boutillier, C., Williams, J., & Slade, M. (2011). Conceptual framework for  
37 personal recovery in mental health: Systematic review and narrative synthesis. *British  
38 Journal of Psychiatry*, *199*(6), 445-452.
- 39 Lecomte, T., Wallace, C. J., Caron, J., Perreault, M., & Lecomte, J. (2004). Further validation of  
40 the client assessment of strengths interests and goals. *Schizophrenia Research*, *66*(1),  
41 59-70.
- 42 Liberman, R. P., & Kopelowicz, A. (2002). Recovery from schizophrenia: A challenge for the 21st  
43 century. *International Review of Psychiatry*, *14*(4), 245-255.
- 44 Linley, A. P., Maltby, J., Wood, A. M., Joseph, S., Harrington, S., Peterson, C., . . . Seligman, M. E.  
45 P. (2007). Character strengths in the United Kingdom: The VIA inventory of strengths.  
46 *Personality and Individual Differences*, *43*(2), 341-351.
- 47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Lloyd-Evans, B., Mayo-Wilson, E., Harrison, B., Istead, H., Brown, E., Pilling, S., . . . Kendall, T.  
11 (2014). A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials of peer  
12 support for people with severe mental illness. *BMC Psychiatry*, 14(1), 12 pages.
- 13 Lu, L. (2001). Understanding happiness: A look into the Chinese folk psychology. *Journal of*  
14 *Happiness Studies*, 2(4), 407-432.
- 15 Marty, D., Rapp, C. A., & Carlson, L. (2001). The experts speak: The critical ingredients of  
16 strengths model case management. *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal*, 24(3), 214.
- 17 McHugo, G., Drake, R., Whitley, R., Bond, G., Campbell, K., Rapp, C., . . . Finnerty, M. (2007).  
18 Fidelity outcomes in the national implementing evidence-based practices project.  
19 *Psychiatric Services*, 58(10), 1279-1284.
- 20 Mireau, R., & Inch, R. (2009). Brief solution-focused counseling: A practical effective strategy  
21 for dealing with wait lists in community-based mental health services. *Social Work*,  
22 54(1), 63-70.
- 23 National Collaborating Centre for Methods and Tools. (2008). *Quality assessment tool for*  
24 *quantitative studies*. McMaster University, (Accessed 13 April, 2010). Retrieved from  
25 <http://www.nccmt.ca/registry/view/eng/14.html>. Hamilton, ON.
- 26 Norman, E. (2000). *Resiliency enhancement: Putting the strengths perspective into social work*  
27 *practice*: Columbia University Press.
- 28 Park, N., Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. (2006). Character strengths in fifty-four nations and the  
29 fifty US states. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 1 (3), 118-129.
- 30 Peterson, C., Park, N., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2006). Greater strengths of character and recovery  
31 from illness. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 1(1), 17-26. doi:  
32 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17439760500372739>
- 33 Petrakis, M., Bloom, H., & Oxley, J. (2014). Family perceptions of benefits and barriers to first  
34 episode psychosis carer group participation. *Social Work in Mental Health*, 12(2), 99-  
35 116.
- 36 Petrakis, M., Wilson, M., & Hamilton, B. (2013). Implementing the strengths model of case  
37 management: Group supervision fidelity outcomes. *Community Mental Health Journal*,  
38 49(3), 331-337.
- 39 Rapp, C. A., & Goscha, R. (2006). *The strengths model: Case management with people with*  
40 *psychiatric disabilities* (2 ed.). NY, USA: Oxford University Press.
- 41 Rapp, C. A., & Goscha, R. (2012). *The strengths model: A recovery-oriented approach to mental*  
42 *health services*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 43 Repper, J., & Carter, T. (2011). A review of the literature on peer support in mental health  
44 services. *Journal of Mental Health*, 20(4), 392-411.
- 45 Resnick, S. G., & Rosenheck, R. A. (2006). Recovery and positive psychology: Parallel themes  
46 and potential synergies. *Psychiatric Services*, 57(1), 120-122.
- 47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Ridgway, P., & Bledsoe, C. (2002). *Pathways to recovery: A strengths recovery self-help*  
11 *workbook*. Lawrence, US: Office of Mental Health Research & Training, School of Social  
12 Welfare, University of Kansas.
- 13 Roberts, G., & Wolfson, P. (2004). The rediscovery of recovery: Open to all. *Advances in*  
14 *Psychiatric Treatment*, 10(1), 37-48.
- 15 Scott, A., & Wilson, L. (2011). Valued identities and deficit identities: Wellness Recovery Action  
16 Planning and self-management in mental health. *Nursing Inquiry*, 18(1), 40-49.
- 17 Sells, D., Davidson, L., Jewell, C., Falzer, P., & Rowe, M. (2006). The treatment relationship in  
18 peer-based and regular case management for clients with severe mental illness.  
19 *Psychiatric Services*, 57(8), 1179-1184.
- 20 Shepherd, G., Boardman, J., & Burns, M. (2010). *Implementing recovery. A methodology for*  
21 *organisation change*. London: Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health.
- 22 Shepherd, G., Boardman, J., & Slade, M. (2008). *Making Recovery A Reality. Briefing Paper*.  
23 London: Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health
- 24 Sin, J., Moone, N., & Newell, J. (2007). Developing services for the carers of young adults with  
25 early-onset psychosis: Implementing evidence-based practice on psycho-educational  
26 family intervention. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, 14(3), 282-290.
- 27 Slade, M. (2009). *Personal recovery and mental illness: A guide for mental health professionals*.  
28 Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.
- 29 Slade, M., Amering, M., Farkas, M., Hamilton, B., O'Hagan, M., Panther, G., . . . Whitley, R.  
30 (2014). Uses and abuses of recovery: Implementing recovery-oriented practices in  
31 mental health systems. *World Psychiatry*, 13(1), 12-20.
- 32 Smith-Merry, J., Freeman, R., & Sturdy, S. (2011). Implementing recovery: An analysis of the  
33 key technologies in Scotland. *International Journal of Mental Health Systems*, 5(11), 1-  
34 12.
- 35 Staudt, M., Howard, M. O., & Drake, B. (2001). The operationalization, implementation, and  
36 effectiveness of the strengths perspective: A review of empirical studies. *Journal of*  
37 *Social Service Research*, 27(3), 1-21.
- 38 Taylor, E. H. (2006). The weaknesses of the strengths model. *Best Practices in Mental Health*,  
39 2(1), 1-30.
- 40 Tew, J., Ramon, S., Slade, M., Bird, V., Melton, J., & Le Boutillier, C. (2012). Social factors and  
41 recovery from mental health difficulties: a review of the evidence. *British journal of*  
42 *social work*, 42, 443-460.
- 43 Trachtenberg, M., Parsonage, M., Shepherd, G., & Boardman, J. (2013). *Peer support in mental*  
44 *health care: Is it good value for money*. London: Centre for Mental Health (available at  
45 www.centreformentalhealth.org.uk).
- 46 Tse, S., Cheung, E., Kan, A., Ng, R., & Yau, S. (2012). Recovery in Hong Kong: Service user  
47 participation in mental health services. *International Review of Psychiatry*, 24(1), 40-47.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Tse, S., Divis, M., & Li, Y. B. (2010). Match or mismatch: Use of the strengths model with Chinese migrants experiencing mental illness, service user and practitioner perspectives. *American Journal of Psychiatric Rehabilitation*, 13(3), 171-188.

Whitley, R. (2010). Rediscovering hope. *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal*, 33(3), 239-241.

Whitley, R., Gingerich, S., Lutz, W., & Mueser, K. (2009). Implementing the illness management and recovery program in community mental health settings: Facilitators and barriers. *Psychiatric Services*, 60(2), 202-209.

For Peer Review