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The scientific study of well-being has been strongly influenced by ideas from a number of related fields, including different areas of psychology. Two major philosophical traditions—hedonia and eudaimonia—underscore much of our current understanding of well-being, and are reflected across early and contemporary psychological theories of well-being. These traditions help delineate the various conceptualisations of well-being and its components; moreover, these traditions influence which research questions are asked, and where and how answers are sought. This has resulted in a plethora of categories and terms referring to similar, yet distinct, concepts such as: well-being, happiness, optimal or positive experiences, life satisfaction, and flourishing. Given the difficulties of distinguishing these concepts, this article aims to provide clarity by delineating the major orientations in positive psychology. We provide a “road-map” to theories and models of well-being found within positive psychology, thereby providing a starting point from which an integrative framework of theories and models of well-being can be developed. To that end, also included in this review is a selection of well-being models that lie beyond the traditional frameworks. We conclude with a consideration of several criticisms that have been directed at positive psychology, and provide recommendations for future directions.
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Although positive psychology is considered a “new” field of inquiry, its origins can be traced to several philosophical traditions. These philosophical traditions provide a foundational framework within which positive psychology theories can be understood. Utilizing a philosophical framework, this review maps out numerous theories and models of well-being (see Figure 1). To provide as complete a guide as possible, a selection of well-being perspectives and models that stand tangential to the traditional philosophical frameworks are also considered.

Utilitarian Philosophical Tradition

Utilitarianism, promoted by the likes of Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832) and John Stuart Mill (1806–1873), focuses on the greatest happiness for the greatest number (Brulde & Bykvist, 2010). Within positive psychology, utilitarianism is most often manifested as maximizing happiness within specific groups of people. For example, although positive psychology has primarily focused on individual well-being, Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000) specifically recognized positive institutions as an important aspect within positive psychology. Interest is steadily growing in applying a positive psychology approach within institutions such as business organisations (Peterson & Park, 2006; Shahnawaz, 2009), law (Huang & Blumenthal, 2009), and community wellness (Schueller, 2009).

Virtue Philosophical Tradition

Virtue philosophies propose that individual character strengths should be utilized in the development and maintenance of happiness because they enable pleasure and other positive experiences (McMahom, 2006; Peterson, Ruch, Beermann, Park, & Seligman, 2007). These theories suggest that virtues, such as bravery or diligence, can be cultivated through awareness and effort, and used to develop good character over time through practice and wisdom (Biswas-Diener, Kashdan, & Minhas, 2011). Virtue philosophy is evident in the thinking and research of positive psychology related to character strengths. Inspired by Aristotle’s notion and description of virtues as traits that epitomize a good person living “the good life,” the diagnostic manual Character Strengths and Virtues: A Handbook and Classification (Peterson & Seligman, 2004) categorizes strengths and virtues that have been consistently identified across cultures and across historical periods as those which facilitate thriving.

Hedonic and Eudaimonic Philosophies

Eudaimonia and hedonia constitute a basic divide in well-being theories (Carlisle, Henderson, & Hanlon, 2009; Deci & Ryan, 2008a), despite suggestions to abandon these separate classifications (Kashdan, Biswas-Diener, & King, 2008). For example, Waterman et al. (2010) suggested that distinguishing between feeling pleasure and doing pleasurable things would be a more useful categorisation of happiness than maintaining the distinctions between hedonia and...
eudaimonia. Nevertheless, the hedonic and eudaimonic philosophical traditions are commonly viewed as the major philosophical orientations evident within positive psychology.

Hedonia, the pursuit of pleasure (Huta, Park, Peterson, & Seligman, 2006; Miquelon & Vallerand, 2008), and eudaimonia, a way of life wherein individuals strive to be better by using talent and making meaning (Huta et al., 2006; Waterman, 2007), give rise to conceptually distinct theories. Simply put, hedonia refers to feeling good, while eudaimonia refers to functioning well (Keyes & Annas, 2009). Although the relationship between hedonia and eudaimonia is positive (Huta & Ryan, 2010; Huta et al., 2006; Vittersø & Søholt, 2011), and the terms conceptually overlap (Deci & Ryan, 2008a; Waterman et al., 2010), they are distinct.

**Hedonic Philosophical Tradition**

Hedonism is evident in philosophical traditions ranging from the Indian Carvaka school of thought (Billington, 1997) to the Greek Cyrenaic school (Brülde, 2014). Modern psychological perspectives define hedonia as the pursuit of pleasure, gratification, and comfort (Huta et al., 2006); thus, emphasising positive emotions (Kahneman, Diener, & Schwarz, 1999). Although critical for pleasure in the short-term, positive affect evoked by hedonic activity does not endure beyond the activity itself (Huta et al., 2006; Waterman et al., 2010). Furthermore, individuals engaged in primarily hedonic activities tend to report lower life satisfaction and meaning in life (Huta & Ryan, 2010).

**Subjective well-being.** Subjective well-being (SWB; Diener, 1984), a term often used interchangeably with “happiness,” refers to the levels of positive affect, low levels of negative affect, and a high degree of overall life satisfaction. Although, technically, “life satisfaction” is not a solely hedonic concept, SWB is primarily considered to be a gauge of hedonic well-being (Deci & Ryan, 2008a; Ryan & Deci, 2001; Waterman et al., 2010). Keyes (2005) referred to the subjective evaluations that individuals make regarding their emotions and life satisfaction as emotional well-being.

---

*Figure 1. Roadmap of well-being orientations for illustrative purposes. See the online article for the color version of this figure.*
Eudaimonic Philosophical Tradition

Aristotle coined the term *eudaimonia* to refer to that which made life worth living through the realisation of potential (Russell, 2007). Thus, Aristotelian eudaimonia was not a state or a feeling, but a way of life (Keyes & Anns, 2009; Ryan, Huta, & Deci, 2008). Similarly, contemporary definitions within psychology also consider eudaimonia to be a way of life, wherein an individual strives to be better by developing themselves through their talents and use of virtues, and by generating meaning from the resulting personal growth (Huta et al., 2006; Waterman, 2007).

Eudaimonia often requires engaging in effortful, sometimes difficult, activity. Although challenging pursuits often entail the production of negative affect in the short-term, effortful pursuits lead to greater overall well-being in the long-term (Higgins, 2006; Seligman, Parks, & Steen, 2005). However, although eudaimonic activity contributes to higher life satisfaction, greater meaning in life, increased positive affect, and greater potential to reach one’s best self, it is tiresome on its own (Huta et al., 2006; Huta & Ryan, 2010; Waterman et al., 2010). In fact, Huta and Ryan (2010) demonstrated that individuals with an exclusive eudaimonic focus experienced fatigue and a loss of perspective, which required hedonic activity for rejuvenation.

Eudaimonic Psychological theories of well-being.

**Humanistic theories.** Humanists began a movement to the positive aspects of psychology by proposing theories focused on the qualities of healthy individuals and their routes to wellness. To illustrate, a selection of humanistic theorists and their respective theories follow.

Alfred Adler (1870–1937) believed that lifestyle and life goals are directed toward success; individual values and attitudes are associated with these life goals. Thus, the Adlerian construct of well-being involves an active, creative, and selective choice of life opportunities in connection with what one values, considers meaningful, and hopes for (Adler, 1956).

Considered the founder of humanistic psychology, Abraham Maslow (1908–1970) was the first psychologist to systematically study excellence to define the scope of human potential. The term *self-actualization*, coined by Maslow (1968), refers to the use of talents and potentialities, and emerged as the final need in Maslow’s well-known “Hierarchy of Needs.” Self-actualization involves making choices based on growth, self-awareness, and accepting responsibility for one’s actions. Furthermore, self-actualization entails peak experiences—events in which individuals feel intense, positive emotions whereby life is reaffirmed.

Carl Rogers (1902–1987) believed that individuals were naturally in a state of full functioning, which is when individuals are self-actualizing, and open to both positive and negative experiences (Rogers, 1961). Such individuals trust their feelings, set their own obligations, are accountable to themselves, and do not mechanically accept convention; thus, fully functioning individuals achieve their ideal selves.

Akin to Maslow’s concept of peak experiences, Mihalyi Csikszentmihalyi (1934–present) proposed a theory of optimal experience exemplified by the positive state of flow (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). Achieving flow necessarily entails engaging in activities that are increasingly psychologically complex—activities that challenge one’s skills while simultaneously providing a sense of skill mastery and competence (Rathunde & Csikszentmihalyi, 2006). Flow is a pleasing state, although individuals do not appreciate the situation as such while it is occurring. Csikszentmihalyi’s theory of optimal experience also emphasizes the importance of finding meaning through the pursuit of goals.

As a group, humanistic theories of well-being stress the awareness of human needs, individual choice and responsibility in meeting those needs, and the importance of individual resolve to create a meaningful life. Humanists focused on positive qualities, and addressed questions about what makes life worthwhile. Humanists were criticized, however, for proposing concepts that were difficult to define, measure, and test. As a result, second generation eudaimonic well-being theorists included conceptual definitions and assessments. Two contemporary eudaimonic theories of well-being are outlined below.

**Psychological well-being.** Reflecting health, wellness, and full-functioning, Ryff’s (1989) model of psychological well-being (PWB) consists of six dimensions: (a) autonomy (i.e., a sense of independence that emerges from taking responsibility for one’s actions and acting on one’s own behalf); (b) environmental mastery (i.e., the ability to choose and create fitting environments for growth by utilizing one’s ability to control both internal and external factors); (c) personal growth (i.e., the development of personal potential via the tackling of new challenges); (d) positive relationships, which are vital to well-being and reflect an individual’s ability to empathize and show affection; (e) purpose in life, which emerges when an individual sets goals for his or her self within an overall meaningful direction for their life; and (f) self-acceptance (i.e., knowing, liking, and ultimately accepting, oneself). Although not without criticism (e.g., Springer, Hauser, & Freese, 2006), a body of research and intervention literature exists supporting the validity and effectiveness of this six-factor model of well-being in predicting, and enhancing, individual well-being (see Ryff, 2014 for review).

**Self-determination theory.** Developed by Ryan and Deci (2000) as a model of eudaimonia, self-determination theory (SDT) considers competence (feelings of effectiveness and efficiency in the completion of task), autonomy (having choice and control over behaviour geared toward intrinsic goals and rewards), and relatedness (the feeling of belongingness one has with others) to be the three innate, and fundamental, psychological needs that are integral to optimal well-being. Although utilizing similar constructs to those found in Ryff’s PWB, an important theoretical difference exists: in SDT, well-being is *fostered* by the concepts of environmental mastery, autonomy, and personal relationships, while in Ryff’s PWB, these concepts are used to *define* well-being (in conjunction with the dimensions of personal growth, purpose in life, and self-acceptance). Well-being is attained when individuals meet these three SDT needs through goal pursuits. A plethora of research supports the validity and efficacy of SDT across diverse domains of interest and application ranging from the work place (Gagné & Deci, 2005) to video games (Ryan, Rigby, & Przybylski, 2006) to academics (Black & Deci, 2000; see also Deci & Ryan, 2008b for literature review).

There is considerable overlap between these two contemporary eudaimonic theories of well-being. Both perspectives include individual dimensions relating to behaviour, activity, or goals, in addition to having a social dimension. Additionally, both of these perspectives offer an explanation for well-being, and suggestions as to how individuals can maximize their own well-being by...
pursuing eudaimonic goals, meeting key psychological needs, and/or engaging in activities that promote eudaimonic living.

Social well-being. Another important indicator of eudaimonia is social well-being—how well one is functioning in their social life—which considers the quality of one’s relationships with other people, the neighbourhood, and the community (Keyes & Shapiro, 2004). This encompasses five dimensions of sociality: integration, contribution, coherence, actualization, and acceptance (Keyes, 1998). Social well-being complements eudaimonic aspects of well-being that emphasise functioning well in one’s private life, such as PWB.

Both hedonic and eudaimonic theories of well-being reflect specific, distinguishable types of happiness; however, each perspective by itself is a fallible marker of well-being (Carlisle et al., 2009). Hedonic well-being, with its focus on feelings, neglects functioning, in addition to neglecting important sources of well-being. Eudaimonic theories tend to stress functioning at the expense of knowing how individuals actually feel about their lives. Thus, neither hedonia or eudaimonia alone constitute a complete understanding of well-being; both perspectives are vital to happiness. Therefore, it is recommended that both a hedonic and a eudaimonic approach be used when examining and assessing well-being (Henderson & Knight, 2012; Huta & Ryan, 2010).

Combining the Four Philosophical Traditions

Authentic Happiness

Seligman’s (2002) authentic happiness framework of well-being identifies three pathways conducive to happiness: pleasure, engagement, and meaning. Together, these pathways reflect all four of the philosophical traditions. The first pathway, the pleasant life, is focused on the maximization of positive emotions; thus, the pleasure pathway reflects a hedonistic orientation. The second pathway, engagement, is driven by the philosophical traditions of both eudaimonia and virtues. Connecting individuals to their activities, engagement is fostered by utilizing character strengths and virtues that facilitate thriving, including grit, zest, love of learning, and bravery (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). The third pathway, meaning, is strongly associated with the eudaimonic perspective (Steger, 2012). The meaning pathway includes using one’s strengths in the service of positive institutions; thus, also reflecting the utilitarian perspective.

PERMA

In 2011, Seligman revised his authentic happiness model of well-being and proposed the model of PERMA. The PERMA model maintains the original authentic happiness pathways—pleasure (P), engagement (E), and meaning (M)—while adding two additional pathways: positive relationships (R) and accomplishments (A). The inclusion of positive relationships in the PERMA model supports Christopher Peterson’s often quoted mantra of positive psychology, that “Other People Matter.” The relationships pathway reflects a eudaimonic philosophy via Keyes’ (1998) social well-being, and a utilitarian philosophy in suggesting that happiness can be attained by promoting the happiness of others (Brülde & Bykvist, 2010). The final pathway—accomplishment—is achieved by applying one’s skills and efforts toward a specific and fixed goal. It has been proposed that achieving, learning, and pursuing mastery at both an individual and group level can be a distinct pathway to attaining happiness, which may have the potential for overlap with the other pathways (Diener & Diener, 2011).

Numerous studies, including cross-national studies, have supported the link between the original authentic happiness pathways and well-being, and the theory’s comprehensive concept of “the full life” (Chan, 2009; Gabriele, 2008; Headey, Schupp, Tucci, & Wagner, 2010; Park, Peterson, & Ruch, 2009; Vella-Brodrick, Park, & Peterson, 2009). Research also supports the important role that positive relationships (both individual relationships and group relationships via community social support) have in initiating and maintaining happiness (Boehm & Lyubomirsky, 2009; Delle Fave, Brdar, Freire, Vella-Brodrick, & Wissing, 2011). There is limited empirical validation of the comprehensive PERMA framework and its proposal that well-being rests upon the five pillars of positive emotions, engagement, relationships, meaning, and accomplishment. Research which has directly tested the PERMA model is, however, supportive of its validity (Coffey, Wray-Lake, Mashek, & Branand, 2014).

Flourishing

Keyes (2002, 2005) proposed the term flourishing to refer to the state of complete mental health. Keyes’ complete mental health model places positive mental health and well-being orthogonal to the presence of psychopathology, rather than placing mental well-being along a continuum of mental health and psychopathology. Specifically, flourishing not only includes positive evidence of healthy functioning (e.g., feeling good and functioning well), but also denotes an absence of psychopathology. Flourishing is contrasted with languishing, a state of stagnation and emptiness denoted by markers of psychopathology and the absence of positive mental health. Keyes’ broad measure of flourishing incorporates PWB, SWB, and social well-being (Keyes, 1998). Flourishing, therefore, combines aspects of all four philosophical traditions. (See Keyes, 2007 for a review of findings supporting this complete mental health model).

Alternative Conceptualisations of Well-Being Outside of the Four Philosophical Traditions

Other approaches to well-being are not fully encompassed by the four philosophical traditions of utilitarianism, virtues, hedonia, and eudaimonia. In this section, we examine two additional frameworks: a psychological framework set forth by Diener and Ryan (2009), and a hybrid class of well-being models that combine theory and research from varying paradigms. Just as the conceptualizations of well-being thus far described often overlap or incorporate more than one philosophical tradition, the theories of well-being described in the following section often straddle two or more of the categories set forth in these alternative frameworks.

Psychological Framework of Well-Being Theories

Diener and Ryan (2009) classified contemporary theories of well-being into six categories: telic theories, top-down versus bottom-up theories, cognitive theories, evolutionary theories, the-
ories of temperament and personality, and relative standard theories.

Telic theories. Telic theories propose that well-being or happiness is achieved when goals are reached or needs are fulfilled. Ryan and Deci’s (2000) SDT can be categorised as both a telic theory and a eudaimonic theory.

Top-down versus bottom-up theories. Both top-down and bottom-up well-being theories conceptualise well-being in terms of its parts. However, bottom-up theories view well-being as a state that arises from accumulations of incremental experiences of positive affect, while top-down theories view well-being as a trait arising from inherited or habitual propensities to experience the world in a specific manner (e.g., optimism).

Cognitive theories. These theories are related to top-down theories in that they propose that cognitive processes determine individual well-being. Cognitive theorists focus on processes including bias, attention, memory, and present-orientation; they examine the ways in which individuals remember events, which aspects of situations receive an individual’s focus, and the manner in which individual’s belief systems filter perceptions. SDT (Ryan & Deci, 2000) can be classified as a cognitive theory, in addition to being a telic theory, in that the autonomy aspect of well-being (i.e., the choice of goals and control of behaviour directed to achieving those goals) is related to an individual’s self-efficacy beliefs.

Lyubomirsky and Dickerhoof (2010) proposed the construal model of happiness to explain the differences between happy people and less happy people. This model focuses on the cognitive interpretations of events and the choices that individuals make in generating happiness. For example, Lyubomirsky and Dickerhoof found that happier people used more humour and ruminated less on negative events, than did less happy people.

Evolutionary theories. Evolutionary theories of well-being recognise the evolutionary value of positive emotions and well-being. For example, Fredrickson’s (1998, 2001, 2006) “broaden-and-build” model of positive emotions and well-being proposes that positive emotions broaden attention and lead to the expansion and accumulation of social, physical, and intellectual resources that may be accessed in the present and future (Fredrickson, Cohn, Coffey, Pek, & Finkel, 2008; Johnson, Waugh, & Fredrickson, 2010; Kok et al., 2013). The broadened perspective that results from feelings of happiness may alert individuals to opportunities for resource enhancement and mobilize them to take advantage of these (Nesse, 2009; Nesse & Ellsworth, 2009). Fredrickson’s broaden-and-build model can also be categorised as a bottom-up theory of well-being, in that it proposes that well-being arises from a steady accumulation of incremental experiences of positive affect.

Theories of temperament and personality. Research shows that temperament and personality explain significant variance in well-being. For example, the personality trait of extroversion is strongly positively correlated with well-being, happiness, and positive affect (Diener & Lucas, 1999; Lucas & Fujita, 2000; Rusting & Larsen, 1997; Zelenski, Sobocko, & Whelan, 2014). Research suggests that genetic inheritance of personality traits and temperament plays a significant role in well-being (Lykken & Tellegen, 1996; Lyubomirsky, Sheldon, & Schkade, 2005). However, caution must be exercised when interpreting demographic statistics related to the heritability of happiness and subsequently applying them to individuals. As the plethora of well-being theories within positive psychology evidences, any specific individual’s level of well-being and happiness is a unique combination of a myriad of factors including genetics, life circumstances, and personal choices. All of these facets interact together, with each facet influencing the others in an idiosyncratic manner (Biswas-Diener, 2013).

Relative standard theories. Relative standard theories of well-being involve comparisons between standards (e.g., one’s well-being is compared with a standard of well-being based on one’s past, other individuals, ideals, or actual conditions). Two related theories within this category are adaptation theories and hedonic treadmill theories. Adaptation theories propose that people compare their current level of well-being to their remembered past level of well-being (Brickman, Coates, & Janoff-Bulman, 1978; Lyubomirsky, 2011). This theory also proposes that when individuals repeat behaviours in an attempt to achieve a previous affective state, these behaviours garner less powerful effects than during previous occurrences. Brickman and Campbell (1971) referred to this process as the “hedonic treadmill.”

Set-point theory (e.g., Headey, 2008, 2010) postulates that life goals play little role in well-being, and major life events are postulated to account for only transitory effects on well-being. Life events are associated with changes to levels of happiness, but these are, as described by adaptation theory, only temporary, as individuals eventually adapt and return to biologically established points. However, people do not necessarily adapt to everything that is experienced (Diener, Kahneman, & Helliwell, 2009); individual’s well-being “set-points” can change over time (Diener & Biswas-Diener, 2008), and different types of experiences can produce different types of adaptation (Hsee, Yang, Li, & Shen, 2009). Adaptation and habituation to circumstances are complex and nuanced processes with regard to their effects on well-being.

Hedonic adaptation prevention. Building on set-point theory, the hedonic adaptation prevention model (Sheldon, Boehm, & Lyubomirsky, 2012; Sheldon & Lyubomirsky, 2012) identifies two main factors in the erosion of happiness: growing aspirations and the decline of positive emotions over time. The hedonic adaptation prevention model suggests that individuals can thwart hedonic adaptation to positive events, and increase their happiness, by savouring their positive life changes well after they have occurred, and by finding ways to engage with these changes in varied ways. It also suggests that people should not focus too quickly on future aspirations after current positive events, because by doing so, they diminish their present happiness.

Hybrid Models and Theories of Well-Being

Hybrid models and theories of well-being combine theory, research, and philosophy from varying paradigms. Two examples of hybrid models of well-being are Lyubomirsky et al.’s (2005) sustainable happiness model and Wong’s (2010) existential positive psychology (EPP).

Sustainable happiness model. This model proposes that multiple factors account for well-being (Lyubomirsky et al., 2005). Three main elements are identified as contributing to happiness: genetics, circumstances, and personal choice. All six categories of well-being theories proposed by Diener and Ryan
Critical theories of well-being are incorporated into this model. For example, bottom-up theories of happiness are used to explain the positive affect that results from experiences, top-down trait theories are used to account for hereditary aspects of well-being, and cognitive theories are used to account for cognitive influences on well-being such as perception and focus across situations and personal choices.

**Existential positive psychology.** Wong's (2010) EPP is an amalgamation of existential psychology and positive psychology that integrates both positive and negative aspects of human life and existence. Wong suggested that only by addressing the totality of life's experiences and existential questions can one improve the human condition, and increase individual well-being and flourishing. EPP addresses the four existential anxieties addressed by Yalom (1980)—meaning in life, isolation, freedom, and death—in addition to addressing two “positive” existential anxieties—identity and happiness. Wong expanded the category of happiness by specifically denoting spiritual happiness as a distinct type of happiness. This is in line with van Dierendonck's (2012) proposition that spirituality can be conceptualised as a fourth key psychological need, in addition to the three SDT needs (Ryan & Deci, 2000) of competence, autonomy, and relatedness. The EPP hybrid model of well-being includes the utilitarian, virtue, hedonic, and eudaimonic philosophical traditions, in addition to incorporating the existential philosophical tradition.

It is important to note that many of the theories of well-being that we have connected to a eudaimonic philosophical tradition, also address existential concerns. For example, meaning in life is addressed in Ryff's (1989) PWB, in Ryan and Deci's (2000) SDT, in Seligman's (2002) authentic happiness theory, and in Keyes' (2002, 2005) flourishing model. Additionally, existential concerns regarding isolation are evident in the relationship component of SDT and Seligman's (2011) PERMA, and in Keyes' (1998) social well-being. Existential concerns regarding freedom are evident in the autonomy aspect of SDT.

**Critiques of Positive Psychology**

Criticism of positive psychology have been made by people within and without the field. Seligman's (2002) theory of authentic happiness was criticised for not recognising that is, for many people, individual happiness can be secondary to concerns and desires regarding religion, family, relationships, culture, and/or social groups (Pedrotti, 2007; Richardson & Guignon, 2008). The expanded PERMA model (Seligman, 2011) has been charged by critics as being, yet again, overly grounded in Western assumptions that individuals can attain happiness solely through themselves (Christopher, Richardson, & Slife, 2008; Dieser, 2005). Similarly, the conceptual model of Peterson and Seligman's (2004) work on character strengths and virtues has been criticised as being overly individualistic (Biswas-Diener, Linley, Govindji, & Woodston, 2011), in addition to having overlooked cultural strengths such as hospitality and honour (Biswas-Diener, 2013). Calls have been made for the development of indigenous positive psychologies (Lambert, Pasha-Zaidi, Passmore, & York Al-Karam, 2015). Peterson and Seligman's (2004) measurement-drive approach to subdividing strengths and virtues has been criticised for being incompatible with 'Virtue Ethics' and Aristotle's whole person focus (Powers, 2005; Schwartz & Sharpe, 2006).

As Waterman (2013) noted, “the relationship between the fields of humanistic and positive psychology has been marked with continued tension and ambivalence” (p. 124). Waterman suggested that these tensions stem from differing philosophical and theoretical foundations that may ultimately prove to be incompatible for large segments of both the positive psychology and humanistic psychology communities. In contrast, others have noted the overlap in thematic content and theoretical presuppositions, particularly with respect to eudaimonic happiness, and have expressed optimism (albeit, guarded) for a rapprochement between the two fields (Friedman, 2008; Robbins, 2008).

Positive psychology's near exclusive focus on “positive” emotions has been questioned, and some have urged that the field examine how “negative” emotions and experiences relate (and perhaps even contribute) to well-being (Kashdan & Biswas-Diener, 2014; Kashdan & Steger, 2011). A related critique is that the emphasis on positive experiences and emotions has left the question of any potential disadvantages of “too much happiness” relatively unexplored (Gruber, Mauss, & Tamir, 2011).

Although when introducing positive psychology in 2000, Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi highlighted the connections between positive psychology and physical health, relatively meagre attention has since been paid to the physical body and its role in facilitating well-being. Indeed, as Hefferon (2013) pointed out, in the over 7,000 books written on positive psychology, “there are only brief references to physical activity, touch, nutrition, etc.” (p. ix) despite the extensive research evidencing various physical mechanisms involved in enhancing both short-term pleasure and longer-term eudaimonic well-being.

The criticisms noted above are being addressed. For example, research has been conducted which acknowledges, and evidences, well-being costs related to high levels of some strengths and virtues (Grant & Schwartz, 2011). Researchers are examining moderators that impact the relationship between character strengths and well-being (Allan & Duffy, 2014; Khan & Husain, 2010) and moderators that enhance prosocial behaviour (Thomson & Siegel, 2013).

Promising work is occurring with regard to community and organisational well-being, such as Fox Eades (2008)”Celebrating Strengths” school-based program that shifts emphasis from the individual to the collective good, and Garcea and Linley's (2011) work on building positive organisations. Examples of national policy aligned with well-being indicators are increasing being documented as various governments recognise their expanded role in improving the lives of citizens (Helliwell, Layard, & Sachs, 2012). Progress is also being made with regard to the examination of the good life and conceptualisations of well-being between, and across, diverse cultures (for a review, see Knoop & Delle Fave, 2013). However, much work remains to be done.

**Future Directions for Positive Psychology**

Positive psychology has experienced impressive growth since its formal inception in 2000, with theories of well-being continuing to emerge and evolve. As evidenced by the theories and models reviewed in this article (see Figure 1), the types of questions that are asked with regard to happiness, and how
happiness and well-being are understood, depend on which orientation is used and to what purpose.

Although the utilitarian orientation (with its focus on collective happiness) is gaining some psychological traction, it is recommended as an area of future expansion within positive psychology research (Biswas-Diener et al., 2011; Kubokawa & Ottaway, 2009; Yen, 2010). As Biswas-Diener et al. proposed, “positive psychology is a vehicle for positive social change . . . [in that it] presents a unique opportunity to address social ills with new tools” (p. 412). Further development of well-being theories and models from a virtues philosophical orientation is also important given that character strengths and virtues are involved in physical and mental health (Froh, Sefick, & Emmons, 2008; Leontopoulou & Triliva, 2012), academic achievements (Lounsbury, Fisher, Levy, & Welsh, 2009), and job satisfaction (Harzer & Ruch, 2012; Littman-Ovadia & Steger, 2010; Peterson, Stephens, Park, Lee, & Seligman, 2014).

As the scientific study of well-being moves into the future, the use of innovative research methods is advised to expand the data used in examining the subjective content of well-being (Linley, Joseph, Harrington, & Wood, 2006; Norrish & Vella-Brodrick, 2008; Park & Peterson, 2009; Pawelski, 2011). Greater utilization of qualitative methodologies and mixed method approaches within positive psychology is also recommended (Friedman, 2008).

Relatively underdeveloped areas of study within well-being need to be expanded. These areas include: research on the beneficial effects of play and curiosity (Kashdan, 2009) and of connecting with the natural environment (Capaldi, Dopko, & Zelenski, 2014; Howell & Passmore, 2013); and the study of wisdom (Staudinger & Glück, 2011), the concept of “true self” (Schlegel, Hicks, Arndt, & King, 2009), and other-oriented hope (Howell & Larsen, 2015). The study of happiness and well-being in children and adolescents is also an important area within positive psychology to which more attention is required (Holder, 2012; Proctor & Linley, 2013), as is the application of positive psychology to substance use, addiction, and recovery research (Krentzman, 2013).

The field of positive psychology is steeped in tradition; many of its theories retroactively reflect its relationship with humanists and philosophers alike who shared a focus on positive experiences and a life well lived. The historical trajectory presented herein demonstrates the solid foundation upon which the study of well-being has been built. This foundation lends strength to the scientific study of well-being as it continues to progress and increasingly broaden its scope of attention to include not only individual character and well-being, but also the welfare of others and communities. Still a developing field, new concepts and theories will continue to emerge in positive psychology, spelling new directions for future research and providing greater clarity and insight as to the determinants of happiness and well-being. Our intention in this article was not to propose an integrative framework of positive psychology theories and models, but rather to provide a starting point from which such an ambitious endeavor could embark.

Résumé

L’étude scientifique du bien-être a été fortement influencée par des idées empruntées à divers champs connexes, notamment à des domaines de la psychologie. Deux importantes traditions philosophiques, hedonia et eudaimonia, sous-tendent nombre des connaissances actuelles sur le bien-être et trouvent écho dans les théories en psychologie sur cette notion, tant les toutes premières que les contemporaines. Ces traditions aident à délimiter les diverses conceptualisations du bien-être et de ses composants; en outre, elles influencent les questions de recherche qui sont posées ainsi que les méthodes utilisées pour y répondre et les endroits où chercher les réponses. Cette situation a donné lieu à une multitude de catégories et de termes qui définissent des concepts semblables, mais néanmoins distincts : bien-être, bonheur, expérience optimale ou positive, satisfaction de vivre, épanouissement. Étant donné la difficulté de délimiter ces concepts, cet article vise à éclaircir les distinctions en déterminant les principales orientations au sein de la psychologie positive. Il fournit un “plan” des théories et des modèles sur le bien-être en psychologie positive, en vue d’établir un point de départ pour l’établissement d’un cadre intégrateur. À cette fin, sont inclus dans la présente recherche des modèles sur le bien-être qui ne correspondent pas aux cadres traditionnels. L’article se termine par une réflexion sur des critiques à l’égard de la psychologie positive ainsi que par des recommandations pour les recherches futures.

Mots-clés : psychologie positive, eudaimonia, hedonia, bien-être, force de caractère.
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