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Abstract

Positive psychology (PP) is commonly associated with the theory and research of positive psychological qualities, positive states, and positive aspects of life. Yet, in reality, it includes some of the most difficult, painful, and challenging experiences that are commonly encountered during the course of a lifetime. This article offers an overview of PP and explores the emergence of second wave positive psychology (SWPP), a field concerned with the philosophical and conceptual complexities of the notion of “positive,” and considers the dialectical nature of flourishing through the dynamic interplay of both positive and negative experiences.

Where Did Positive Psychology Come From?

Psychology is the scientific study of people that looks at their minds and behaviors. Psychology became recognized as a discipline during the 17th century when the French philosopher René Descartes introduced the concept of treating the mind and body as separate entities, whereas previously there had been a more holistic approach to health. During the following four centuries, psychology tended to focus on the study of human failings and frailties with the intention of helping restore people back to “normal” or “average.” This “disease model” appeared to be mostly preoccupied with disorders and dysfunction and less concerned with what caused people to flourish and do well.

A shift occurred in 1998 when psychologist Martin Seligman became president of the American Psychological Association. During his inaugural speech, he stated that psychology should represent all aspects of the human experience, and to that end, he emphasized the need to examine the elements of what enables people to succeed and live a full and meaningful life. This led to the formation of PP, a new branch of psychology born from the desire to balance the discipline as a whole and to provide a forum for scholars to explore the “brighter sides of human nature” (Linley & Joseph, 2004, p. 4). The primary purpose of PP was to address the previous deficit while rightfully acknowledging past efforts. That is, the intention was to focus on the area that had been underemphasized—the positive aspects of human life—not to replace one set of concerns with another. (Folkman & Moskowitz, 2003).

Although the concept of PP was welcomed and embraced by many, it also attracted critics. Some questioned the value of this new field of psychology (McNulty & Fincham, 2012). Their concern was that PP appeared to focus on the positive to the exclusion of anything that could be regarded as negative (Lazarus, 2003). Others expressed concern that PP ignored the contributions of existential and humanistic psychologies, both of which have provided an expanded vision of human flourishing and represent important precursors to PP (Friedman & Robbins, 2012; Medlock, 2012; Schneider, 2011). However, the PP’s intention was to study the positive aspects of the human experience in their own right rather than just seeing them as tools for prevention, coping, health, or other desirable outcomes. Rather than seeing hope, courage,
optimism, and joy as useful in reducing pathology, the intent of PP was to begin to understand those qualities that make life worth living in the first place (Csikszentmihalyi, 2003).

As PP grew in popularity, other voices from both inside the field (e.g., Wong, 2011) and outside (e.g., Held, 2004) pointed out that in certain circumstances some of the qualities that were presented as positive could result in a negative effect. For example, “unrealistic” optimism was linked to an underappreciation of risk that could lead to health-risk behaviors such as smoking (Weinstein, Marcus, & Moser, 2005) and gambling (Cummins, Nadorff, & Kelly, 2009). Although Seligman (1990) had himself previously pointed to the usefulness of retaining a degree of cynicism in order to maintain a realistic view of life and to counterbalance any effect of an overoptimistic view, the association between PP and the “bright side” of life prevailed. Some critics highlighted the potential negative outcomes that could be a result of behaviors regarded as positive, while others suggested that so-called negative states could sometimes be instrumental in the creation of positive outcomes. For example, anger can provide a catalyst to change a situation that is having a negative effect on an individual’s well-being (Tavris, 1989). It was suggested that attempts to separate the positive from the negative may be counterproductive and fail to appreciate that some of the most meaningful positive aspects of life are often inspired by negative circumstances (Harvey & Pauwels, 2003; Lazarus, 2003).

While these criticisms leveled against PP might have appeared to undermine the discipline, they were in fact instrumental in the emergence of what has become known as second wave positive psychology (Ivtzan, Lomas, Hefferon, & Worth, 2015), or positive psychology 2.0 (Wong, 2011).

**Second Wave Positive Psychology**

SWPP is concerned with the original concepts of PP, including flourishing and the range of positive qualities (Fave, Brdar, Freire, Vella-Brodrick, & Wissing, 2010), but with some social and cultural differences that distinguish it from what might now be regarded as first wave positive psychology (FWPP; Ivtzan et al., 2015; McNulty & Fincham, 2012; Wong & Wong, 2012). The rest of this article explores some of the new perspectives of SWPP that distinguish it from FWPP, focusing especially on the dialectics of well-being.

**The Dialectics of Well-Being**

One of the most poignant and distinguishing features of SWPP is the appreciation of the dialectical nature of well-being (Lomas & Ivtzan, 2015). Dialectic refers to the “tension or opposition between two interacting forces or elements” (Dialectic, n.d.). This tension describes how binary opposites are also jointly connected; interdependence exists between the two—one cannot exist without the other. Consider as an example dark and light, or up and down: one only exists in relation to the other. In the context of PP, the concept of the dialectic explains how what is regarded as negative is at the same time necessarily bound with its polar opposite, positive. This is not to suggest that the relationship between the two is fixed or static; rather, it is of a dynamic nature where new phenomena may occur through a process of movement between the two.

Dialectic change was first conceptualized by Hegel (1812) who described how the development of a new outcome occurs through a process of thesis-antithesis-synthesis. Consider the development of an idea: for example, a suggestion that all people are essentially good (the thesis) is opposed by the counterview that all people are essentially bad (the antithesis).
Disputation between these opposing views creates tension. However, a new proposal that all people have the potential to be both good and bad (the synthesis) creates a new perspective. The synthesis represents a new position in which agreement exists where it did not before and yet the truth of both views is still preserved (Mills, 2000).

The emergence of FWPP and subsequently SWPP provides an excellent example of the dialectic model. Psychology was focused on the negative (the thesis). PP challenged psychology by focusing on the positive (the antithesis). SWPP proposed that attention should be placed on both the negative and the positive, as both can result in the same positive outcomes; and in so doing, SWPP became the synthesis, uniting psychology and PP by incorporating aspects of both into a new position that transcends and extends the original viewpoints (Mills, 2000). The following section explores how, with this inextricable intertwining of the positive and negative, in certain circumstances seemingly positive emotions can be detrimental to well-being just as negative emotions can sometimes lead to outcomes of increased well-being.

The Negative of Positive and the Positive of Negative

It is difficult to label emotions as either positive or negative, as they are fundamentally contextually dependent (McNulty & Fincham, 2012). The following discussion explores examples of this complex relationship.

Optimism and Pessimism

Although, as previously mentioned, Seligman (1990, p. 292) warned against the danger of becoming overoptimistic, PP presented optimism as a necessary ingredient to well-being while regarding pessimism as adverse. Empirical work has highlighted the problems that can occur as a result of undue optimism, particularly in regard to an underappreciation of risk (Weinstein et al., 2005), and longitudinal research has suggested that children who possess a combination of optimism and humor, described as cheerfulness, have an increased mortality risk (Friedman, Tucker, Tomlinson-Keasey, Schwartz, & Al, 1993). Conversely, other research has shown that optimism is associated with longevity (Giltay, Geleijinse, & Zitman, 2004). It appears, therefore, that the most important factor when considering the positive and/or negative effect of optimism is to consider the context in which it appears. People are advised to be optimistic about the future only when positive thinking can have an influence on the outcome (Peterson, 2000, p. 51).

If the pitfall of overoptimism is regarded as an example of when positive can be regarded as negative, what about optimism’s antithesis, pessimism? Is there evidence that pessimism can in some circumstances provide a positive outcome? First, total pessimism (a fatalistic assumption of the worst) must be distinguished from strategic pessimism (anticipatory fault finding and problem solving). Total pessimism, being without hope and accepting one’s existential hopelessness, is found in Buddhism (Hayes, 2002), and one can argue that comfort may be found from such a belief. So-called defensive pessimism is a strategy of deliberately having low expectations and negative thinking about future outcomes, which may help individuals cope with anxiety so that they experience better performance and personal growth (Norem & Chang, 2002). Depending on the circumstances and motive, both optimism and pessimism can result in positive outcomes.

journal.existentialpsychology.org
Self-Esteem and Humility

In general, higher levels of self-esteem are associated with increased well-being. Trzesniewski et al. (2006) found that adolescents with lower self-esteem were more likely to be involved in criminality, had worse job prospects, and suffered from poorer mental and physical health in adulthood. However, attempts to raise children’s self-esteem may have a negative effect in their later years if they discover that their own positive self-appraisals fail to live up to expectations in the more competitive adult world (Seligman, 1995, p. 27). Rather like individuals who experience the pitfalls of overoptimism, those who have an overinflated sense of their own capabilities may attempt tasks that they are not capable of achieving. This can result in a damaging blow to their self-esteem, particularly in cases where external validation and success depend on achieving these goals (Baumeister, Smart, & Boden, 1996).

Although humility is not a true antithesis of self-esteem, it is often regarded as such. It is considered to be a positive characteristic when represented by “a genuine modesty” and to be of great value when characterized by “respectfulness, willingness to admit imperfections, and a lack of self-focus or self-serving biases” (Rowatt, Ottenbreit, Nesselroade, & Cunningham, 2002, p. 198). A central tenet of Buddhism is that an exaggerated sense of self (ego) and a lack of humility are a root cause of suffering that generates unwholesome states, such as greed for self-reward and hatred for that which threatens oneself. Consequently, the art of “forgetting of the self” is considered a strategy to overcome these perils (Tangey, 2005, p. 411). From a dialectical point of view, the synthesis of self-esteem and humility is a positive yet humble sense of self through self-acceptance (Wong & Fry, 1998).

Freedom and Restriction

Freedom is regarded as essential to well-being (Ryan & Deci, 2000), and yet it has been suggested that an excess of freedom, a life with no boundaries or constrictions, can be troubling (Yalom, 1980). In modern society, with expanded opportunities for self-determination, it is argued that freedom and autonomy can become excessive to the extent that they can be experienced as a kind of tyranny, which leads to increased dissatisfaction with life and clinical depression (Schwartz, 2000).

Limiting one’s freedom can be not only beneficial to well-being but liberating too. According to Buddhist principles, a restriction of choice can actually create freedom. Rigid monastic rules are designed to reduce the number of decisions that are regularly made on a daily basis, such as what to wear and what to eat. Being able to think less about these trivial choices frees the mind to engage in “non-conceptual and focused” attention, which is highly valued by meditators (Heine & Wright, 2008, p. 14). Following routines and disciplined patterns of behavior in other areas of life has also been found to be beneficial to well-being (Aarts, Paulussen, & Schaalma, 1997). Creating strategies to resist impulsive inclinations and desires in preference to long-term goals, such as maintaining health or earning credentials, enables one to achieve more beneficial outcomes (Mischel, Shoda, & Rodriguez, 1989). A synthesis of freedom and restriction may lie in the distinction between “freedom from” and “freedom to” (Frankl, 1963). “Freedom to” refers to an attitude in which one has the courage to assert and pursue one’s core values that can exist even in the most restrictive of conditions. Such restriction might be through a self-imposed choice, as in a monastic environment, or through imprisonment, as in the case of Frankl, who was held captive in a wartime concentration camp.
Forgiveness and Anger

Forgiveness is generally regarded as beneficial to both the giver and receiver. Forgiveness-based therapies have been successful in treating posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) following spousal abuse (Reed & Enright, 2006). However, in some circumstances, forgiveness can result in individuals acquiescing to harmful situations they might otherwise be compelled to resist or change. Evidence from studies on abusive relationships suggests that people who excuse their abuse based on external factors like stress and are more forgiving of these transgressions are at greater risk from ongoing abuse (McNulty & Fincham, 2012).

Anger is frequently presented as a destructive emotion (Beck, 1999), but there are times when it may be a more appropriate response to wrongdoing than forgiveness and, in the long run, promote well-being. Anger can be considered a “moral” emotion in response to an ethical or moral infringement (Tavris, 1982). However, this does not suggest that all acts of anger are appropriate or justified. By no means are all acts of anger virtuous; anger can be selfish and/or antisocial, but there are occasions when people may be motivated to redress injustice on behalf of a third party without any apparent advantage to themselves (Haidt, 2003, p. 856). There are examples of “righteous anger,” for instance, when anger is exhibited in an effort to make the world a better place than it is, such as in the fight for civil rights or equality (Siegel, 2009). Fighting oppression need not necessarily include feelings of anger, as has been demonstrated by people like the Dalai Lama, who is guided by compassion and love for everyone, including those regarded as antagonists. Dr. Martin Luther King (1958/2007) said, “As you press on for justice, be sure to move with dignity and discipline, using only the weapon of love. Let no man pull you so low as to make you hate him” (p. 345).

Happiness and Sadness

As discussed at the beginning of this chapter, the subject of happiness has been arguably the main focus of PP, but pursuing the happiness can cause problems that create its opposite. PP has made a clear distinction between hedonic, or subjective, well-being (Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999) and eudaimonic, or psychological, well-being (Ryff, 1989). Eudaimonic happiness is sometimes judged as being deeper, more fulfilling, and less rudimentary than hedonic happiness. This attitude can be traced back as far as Aristotle, who described eudaimonic happiness as an “activity of the soul that expresses virtue” and condemned mere hedonic pleasures as a “life suitable to beasts” (cited in McMahon, 2006, p. 36). This perspective suggests that experiencing hedonic happiness could be an obstacle in achieving the richer states of well-being.

The very act of pursuing happiness may be detrimental to its attainment. Theorists like Frankl (1963) have recognized that happiness is something that arises as a by-product of something else (e.g., finding happiness in the search for meaning). The concept that the desire for happiness is the root of unhappiness lies in the teachings of Buddhism where the act of resisting what exists in the present and wishing for something better is what is considered to create the dissatisfaction that one hopes to relieve. As Mill (1873/1970) once stated, “Those only are happy who have their minds fixed on some object other than their own happiness” (p. 100). Cybernetic self-regulation theory suggests that dysphoria results from the discrepancy between expectations and reality (Carver & Scheier, 1990). Cultural pressure may result in happiness being regarded as a social norm (Mauss, Tamir, Anderson, & Savino, 2011), and critics have suggested that PP contributes to this perception with its “tyranny of positive thinking” (Held,
2002). If happiness is expected to be experienced by everyone, then failure to be happy may attract blame and stigmatization toward those who do not achieve it (Ahmed, 2007; Ehrenreich, 2010).

The possibility also exists that those who attain a modest amount of satisfaction with life may become complacent—that is, they may think that life is as good as it can be. Such thinking could lead to the acceptance of iniquities, what Marxist theorists call _false consciousness_, a state of mind that prevents people from acting in their own interests (Jost, 1995). This theory suggests that people need a certain amount of discomfort before they are motivated to create a better life for themselves, one which may be more conducive to well-being.

Sadness has been described as an aesthetic emotion (Thoolen, Ridder, Bensing, Gorter, & Rutten, 2009) or a sign of one’s ethical sensitivity (Christiansen, Oettingen, Dahme, & Klinger, 2010). It is an authentic response to a tragic situation. For bereaved parents, for instance, their intense feelings of grief are an expression of their love, and they provide “a way to maintain a connection to a beloved deceased child” (Thieleman & Cacciatore, 2013, p. 6). In these circumstances, sadness is an appropriate response that needs to be respected. Although flourishing involves elevating and positive emotions, there needs also to be space and opportunity to experience sadness and poignancy regarding “the transitory nature of things” (Woolfolk, 2002, p. 23). The concern is that PP as FWPP may contribute to an attitude that sadness is a condition to be alleviated, when sadness is an inherent part of the human condition and not a medical disorder (Horwitz & Wakefield, 2007, p. 225).

There may be a growing tendency to medically treat as diseases what are natural and normal responses to life (Szasz, 1960). This approach can cause people to feel inadequate or broken and, in severe cases, result in involuntary treatment and detainment in psychiatric care (Matthews, 2000). States of sadness may have the positive purpose of helping individuals discover the people and things they care about and may be a source of inspiration. In PP, it is important to not pathologize negative experiences like sadness and yet still be able to provide interventions to enable those who wish to alleviate their stress and improve their well-being.

These previous examples show that because phenomena are dependent on context, it is difficult to determine whether particular phenomena are positive or negative. The main components of dialectical appreciation are the following:

- the principle of appraisal
- the principle of covalence
- the principle of complementarity

The principle of appraisal describes the difficulty in categorizing a particular phenomenon as either positive or negative because all phenomena are contextually dependent. The principle of covalence is the notion that many of the aspects of functioning and flourishing involve both positive and negative elements. Together, the principles of appraisal and covalence lead to the more expansive principle of complementarity, which proposes that flourishing is dependent on the subtle dialectical interaction of both the light and dark aspects of life.

The next section considers the principle of covalence by looking at posttraumatic growth (PTG) and love.

**Posttraumatic Growth**

Prior to the identification of PTG, there was acknowledgement of the distress created by the experience of trauma. PSTD was introduced into the _Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-III)_ by the American Psychiatric Association (1980) in the aftermath of
the Vietnam War. However, it soon became apparent that adverse traumatic events did not affect everyone in the same way, and four possible responses to adversity were identified (O’Leary & Ickovics, 1994):

- **succumbing** (drastically impaired functioning)
- **survival** (with impairment)
- **resilience** (returning to pre-adversity baseline levels of functioning)
- **thriving** (recovering to experience even higher levels of functioning than pre-adversity)

The concept of PTG has been defined as “positive change that occurs as a result of the struggle with highly challenging life crises” (Tedeschi & Calhoun, 2004, p. 1). A wealth of studies has collaborated this concept and found that a large number of people who have suffered trauma, ranging from illness (e.g., Koutrouli, Anagnostopoulos, & Potamianos, 2012) to natural disasters (Pooley, Cohen, O’Connor, & Taylor, 2013), also experience some degree of PTG. From the perspective of SWPP, PTG is dialectic in a number of ways. Positive changes are reported to arise from a negative experience; that is, they are “set in motion by the encounter with difficult life situations” (Calhoun & Tedeschi, 2013, p. 6). Although it is not inevitable that people will experience positive change following a negative experience, it is possible that they may increase their personal strength (e.g., by becoming more creative or more mature), experience enhanced (i.e., closer and more appreciative) relationships, have an altered life philosophy (e.g., increased existential awareness and meaning making, including finding meaning in the trauma), change priorities (e.g., focus less on material goals and more so on greater appreciation of life), and possess enhanced spirituality. PTG offers another dialectical element in that it is an ongoing process in which the positive and negative are continually intertwined. Studies show that PTG tends to coevolve in conjunction with the ongoing distress (Dekel, Ein-Dor, & Solomon, 2012), and well-being and ill-being can coexist, as reported by Bassi et al. (2014) in relation to multiple sclerosis. In the case of people who do not experience PTG immediately after a trauma, there is still the possibility of finding some degree of it later. This may be as basic as just surviving the event to carry on with life and enjoy occasional moments of happiness and relief from their hardship. Arguably, most people will experience some degree of hardship and suffering in their lives, and Buddhism suggests that suffering is a common aspect of life unless one has attained a certain peak of psychospiritual development (Hayes, 2002).

Distress and growth may be not only copresent in PTG but also in some ways codependent. Altered life philosophies and priorities, such as a new appreciation of life, may be established with the recognition that life is fragile and fleeting. Indeed, it has been suggested that some character strengths cannot be cultivated or fully developed without a person experiencing some suffering and hardship (Wong, 1995). Well-being depends on a complex balance and compatibility of both the positive and negative. Perhaps this aspect of PTG can be compared to the Japanese art of *kintsugi*, a process of repairing broken pottery by rejoining the broken pieces with seams of gold. Once broken, the article can never be restored to its original condition, but the process of *kintsugi* transforms it into something more beautiful and stronger than it was originally. Emphasis is placed on what has been added rather than lost. The process may be repeated many times, adding to the pottery’s value, but first there must be some sort of accident or trauma (“Kintsugi,” 2014).
Love

Like PTG, the nature of love is also inherently dialectical. There are many ways of defining love, which is represented by many emotional relationships. Six types of love were defined by Lee (1973):

- Eros (romantic, passionate)
- Ludus (flirtatious, playful)
- Storge (filial, fraternal)
-Pragma (rational, sensible)
- Mania (possessive, dependent)
- Agape (unconditional, selfless)

C. S. Lewis (1971) said, “To love at all is to be vulnerable. Love anything and your heart will be wrung and possibly broken” (p. 13). Love can be subject to many woes, such as imposed separation and the loss of feelings, and the fear of love’s loss may cause anxiety or jealousy. It has been suggested that “love and hate are indeed impossible to disentangle” (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1998, p. xiii). Clearly, love can encompass a spectrum of negative feelings.

However, the vulnerability and anguish that are often an intrinsic part of love are not aberrations but the very condition of love itself. The dialectical nature of love does not permit one without the other. To love another means to make oneself vulnerable without the certainty that this love will be reciprocated. Love, therefore, is fundamentally dialectical, a sublime blend of pain, pleasure, safety, and fear. It is not possible to determine whether love is positive or negative, as it is always dependent on context, and yet the positive and negative aspects of love are arguably co-creating. For instance, the more one invests emotionally in a relationship, the more there is to lose (e.g., if the relationship were ended by the other party). In the words of Bauman (2013), “To love means opening up to that most sublime of all human conditions, one in which fear blends with joy into an alloy that no longer allows its ingredients to separate” (p. 6).

Conclusion

SWPP is offered as a balance to PP just as PP was originally intended to be a balance to the traditional science of psychology. The dialectic approach of SWPP recognizes the dynamic relationship between positive and negative and the fact that positive outcomes and increased well-being can result from the experience of the dark side of human existence as well as from positive emotions and traits. Indeed, in some circumstances it may be necessary to suffer and struggle in order to grow and develop certain character strengths and resources. SWPP offers new perspectives on human flourishing in this evolving field.
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