2021

A Decade of Positive Education and Implications for Initial Teacher Education: A Narrative Review

Mathew A. White
The University of Adelaide

A Decade of Positive Education and
Implications for Initial Teacher Education: A Narrative Review

Mathew A. White
The University of Adelaide

Abstract: This narrative review addresses a notable gap in initial teacher education research by exploring the impact of positive education—a growing international change initiative—in schools. Launched in 2009, positive education is defined as education for both traditional skills and happiness. This narrative review examines how positive education has contributed to a change in schools and related curriculum issues. It draws on various studies from the past decade to evaluate positive education definitions, examine two periods in positive education research from 2009–2014 and 2015–2020. The review argues that positive education concepts may enrich initial teacher education discourse and enhance teacher professional practice; but, the term may be too narrow. Finally, the review recommends adopting the more inclusive term wellbeing education. This term may guide future research of culturally diverse case studies, thereby supporting the greater integration of wellbeing science with teaching theory and practise in initial teacher education.

Introduction

In recent years, Australian schools and policymakers have placed greater emphasis on wellbeing in education. Acceptance of the recommendations of the 2014 *National Mental Health Commission Review* by the Australian Federal Government led to the establishment of the Australian National Mental Health in Education Initiative 'Be You' by Beyond Blue in 2020. This 'aimed at promoting social and emotional health and wellbeing for children and young people in the education space' (Beyond Blue, 2021, para. 1). The *Australian Productivity Commission Mental Health Inquiry Report* (Productivity Commission, 2020) stressed that all schools should have the 'The creation of clear dedicated strategies, including leadership and accountability structures, to deliver wellbeing outcomes for their students' (p. 18). In much the same way that literacy and numeracy are considered foundational, there is increasing international agreement on the importance of wellbeing in education (Oades & Mossman, 2017; Rusk & Waters, 2013; White & Kern, 2018). From a leadership perspective, Harris (2020) argues that the unprecedented disruption to education caused by COVID-19 has accelerated greater awareness of mental health issues in schools, noting that 'education systems struggle to reconfigure ways of connecting with learners and supporting the wellbeing of millions of young people' (p. 322).

One approach to wellbeing is termed 'positive education', which was defined as 'education for both traditional skills and happiness' (Seligman et al., 2009, p. 293). It has been adopted as the operational definition for this article as it is foundational to the positive education movement. The rapid growth of positive education in schools is evidenced by the founding and activity of the International Positive Psychology Association's Education Division (IPPA, 2020) hosting seven bi-annual World Congresses, Positive Education

Schools Association in Australia (PESA, 2020) hosting five annual conferences for schools and the International Positive Education Network (IPEN, 2020) hosting international wellbeing festivals, with the most recent reaching over 40,000 people from 140 countries using a virtual platform hosted by TecMilenio University (IPEN, 2021).

This professional activity has resulted in many positive education curricula and school leadership initiatives to lead wellbeing change in schools. Yet, the implications for initial teacher education (ITE) remain uncharted. Therefore, it is appropriate to now reassess the rise of positive education between 2009–2020, the links to curriculum issues, how schools have managed this change, and to consider the implications for ITE and future research. This approach is applied as the organisational framework for interpreting the past decade of research exploring positive education. While it is not possible to include a comprehensive overview of all the studies conducted in the field of positive education, peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters and reports that have advanced knowledge will be examined.

A handful of publications, including those by White (2016), Trask-Kerr et al. (2019a, 2019b), Waters (2019), Waters and Loton (2019) have sought to bridge the gap between developments in positive psychology and education. The foundational positive education review by Seligman et al. (2009) establishes a case for teaching wellbeing in schools, proposes happiness as a goal of positive education, and argues that wellbeing can be taught by drawing on evaluations of school-based interventions including the Penn Resiliency and Strath Haven Positive Psychology programs. These programs include a planned curriculum with teachers delivering explicit lessons on wellbeing and resilience and integrating these into school culture. The main limitation of the 2009 Seligman et al. review is its lack of focus on integrating the theory of teacher professional practice with positive education. Waters' (2011) review of 12 school-based positive psychology interventions argues that positive education interventions are 'significantly related to student wellbeing, relationships and academic performance' (pp. 86–87). This review describes the interventions but overlooks teacher professional practice or the integration of a pedagogy of positive education, and the philosophical implications for ITE. In contrast, Kristjánsson's (2012) review analyses positive education as a 'theory in education' (p. 86) and interrogates the claims of positive education and several early philosophical limitations.

To date, the field lacks a review examining the past decade of positive education research in terms of the implications for curriculum issues, change in schools, and ITE; the present review aims to address this gap. First, the antecedent of positive education will be reviewed with a brief overview of positive psychology and developments in its application in education settings. Here, the themes of strengths and resilience dominate. Next, the first years of positive psychology and education will be critiqued. Finally, the theoretical foundation of positive education, its definitions, and its theoretical and empirical considerations will be examined. The analysis is divided into the first five years (2009–2014) and the second half of the decade (2015–2020). This narrative review focuses on the professional practice of positive education—how teachers 'plan for and implement effective teaching and learning' (Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, 2011, pp. 14–20)—and explores what this may mean for ITE.

Methodology

The present study follows Baumeister's (2013) recommendations on writing narrative reviews. By adopting a narrative approach, the review is written 'For people who are interested in grand ideas and broad questions' and 'an excellent and exciting means of addressing them' (Baumeister, 2013, p. 120). The advantage of narrative reviews is that they

draw on methodologically diverse studies. Three questions frame this review. First, what curriculum issues are raised by positive education? Second, how is positive education changing schools? And third, what are the ITE implications?

The procedures adopted for selecting literature publications were influenced by the recommendations of Baumeister and Leary (1997). The following inclusion criteria were applied. Publications had to draw on Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi's (2000) introductory article on positive psychology and the Seligman et al. (2009) review; contain an evaluation of impact and innovation; be peer-reviewed articles or book chapters; be published between 2009 and 2020; discuss developments in positive education in early, middle and / or senior years of schooling and its links to curriculum issues and changes in schools; and explore the implications for ITE. The A+ Education, ERIC and PsycInfo databases were searched. The first search term used was 'Positive education', then 'Positive psychology and education', and 'Positive psychology application in education' were used.

Once publications were selected for inclusion in the review, these were organised based on the researcher's knowledge from working closely with schools implementing positive education in Australia, Canada, England, Mexico, New Zealand and South Africa. Subheadings of the review were selected as follows: positive psychology and education; defining positive education curriculum issues; 2009–2014; 2015–2020; and criticisms of positive education. This selection process framed the analysis, critique and recommendations for potential areas for future research in the field. The overall goal of this narrative review was to consider the connection of the various interventions—at the primary, middle and high school levels—to curriculum issues and changes in schools, and to explore the implications for ITE.

Discussion
Positive Psychology and Education

The launch of positive psychology by Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi in 2000 heralded a transformation for psychology and education. In their foundational work, Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000) called for 'a science of positive subjective experience, positive individual traits and positive institutions to improve quality of life and prevent the pathologies that arise when life is barren and meaningless' (p. 5). Central to the goals of positive psychology is the growth of schools as positive institutions that promote positive communities. Here, Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi provocatively ask, 'will a social science of positive community and positive institutions arise?' (p. 12). Within ten years of this question, the preliminary stages of what would later be characterised as positive education emerged. Among the developments in positive psychology between 2000 and 2008 was the classification of character strengths developed by Peterson and Seligman (2004), investigation of the application of character strengths by Park et al. (2004), and various investigations of the problem of wellbeing in school systems and schooling. Between 2009 and 2020, integrating positive psychology principles into learning, teaching and professional practice attracted praise and criticism from scholars, school leaders and policymakers.

Defining Positive Education: Curriculum Issues

In the years before Seligman et al. (2009) first proposed positive education approaches to integrating positive psychology in education, there was a particular focus on interventions linked with the investigation of positive traits, such as strengths (Peterson &

Seligman, 2004). In their 2009 paper, Seligman et al. (2009) argue that positive education is 'education for both traditional skills and happiness', an approach characterised as 'wellbeing' later in the decade (Seligman et al., 2009, p. 293; Seligman, 2011, 2018). While this original definition of Seligman et al. (2009) was the spark for positive education, at its best, new research in this field is dominated by positive psychology applied within the field of education rather than systematically integrated into professional practice. Therefore, Seligman et al.'s proposal for introducing positive education and wellbeing within schools is an argument coming from psychology.

The justification for the transformation of wellbeing education within schools is based primarily on the amount of time that young people spend within institutions (Seligman et al., 2009; Oades & Mossman, 2017). Seligman and his colleagues recognise that many teachers are already involved intuitively in positive education elements. They assert that this will supply a more robust evidence-based framework to advance the aims of positive education. As seen in Seligman et al. (2009), there was little, if any, engagement with dominant educational theory in the earliest stages of positive education; from the start, it has been a field challenged by a range of competing priorities dominating the scholarly discourse. In the first five years of early research, this tension manifest as considerable competition between education for wellbeing and academic accomplishments and growth. Or is positive education supportive of both wellbeing and intellectual development (Dulagil et al., 2016; Kristjánsson, 2012; White & Kern, 2018)? Despite calls for positive education to engage more directly with professional practice, a false dichotomy dominated the first five years of research and publication in the field of positive education (White, 2009). One of the hurdles in the early years of research was the field's inability to effectively integrate the theory and practice of education within a positive psychology framework; only recently has there been advances in teacher professional practice (Dodge et al., 2012; Kristjánsson, 2016, 2017a, 2017b).

Six years after Seligman et al.'s (2009) definition, White and Murray (2015a) argue for the classification of three approaches to positive education in educational discourse. Accordingly, subsequent research should be classified as: 1) evidence-based, 2) scientifically informed, or 3) values-based. White and Murray (2015a) note that these fledgeling approaches can be thought of as a 'taught' or a 'caught' curriculum. The taught curriculum refers explicitly to scheduled lessons in a developed scope and sequence with dedicated classroom time taught by a team of teachers, whereas an institution's caught curriculum is the school culture. Seligman et al.'s (2009) term 'positive education' has acted as a catalyst for professional practice innovation. The founding definition of the term attracts both widespread criticism and interest, with its lack of specificity being one of its limitations.

Initial Years 2009–2014

What curriculum issues are raised by positive education from 2009 to 2014? Early studies calling for the inclusion of positive education within mainstream schooling were based on the findings of resilience programs. Schools that were drawn to positive education because of its strength-based nature and focus on personal development introduced it as a curriculum based on interventions. These programs are outlined by Brunwasser et al. (2009) and are further examined by Challen et al. (2014) in the United Kingdom and by Bastounis et al. (2016) in Australia, the Netherlands and USA; one example is the University of Pennsylvania's Penn Resiliency program. Among the outcomes of foundational evaluations in this field are that resilience programs reduce homelessness and levels of depression and anxiety, and there is evidence suggesting that it is a suitable approach for young people from diverse cultural and socio-economic backgrounds (Brunwasser et al., 2009); however, one

challenge is teachers' consistent fidelity towards teaching these courses as they lead this curriculum (Quinlan et al., 2019).

The character strengths field has been one of the most popular of the positive education topics adopted by teachers and schools (Park et al., 2004; Park et al., 2017; Peterson & Seligman, 2004). The development of character strengths in 2004 was the starting point of many of the interventions that schools have widely adopted. While there are many examples of the evaluation and application of character strengths theory in early primary school—such as Shoshani and Aviv's (2012) study of 479 first-grade children, Gillham et al.'s (2011) study of 149 middle and senior students, and White and Waters' (2015) case study of the integration of strengths—there is only a handful of evaluations of its impact on learning. The topic of character strengths appears to be widely accepted by practising teachers to commence proactive dialogue with young people about what is working well for them. Over the past decade, discussion of character strengths in education has covered the wide-scale adoption of the approach without rigorous thought behind the teacher professional practice required to develop comprehensive educational programs (Oppenheimer et al., 2014). The last five years has shown a lack of theoretical frameworks to advance the reflective practice required for teachers to internalise the significance of character strengths, as well as what this means for teacher professional practice (Lavy, 2019). Much of the activity in this area has been split, focused on integrating character strengths into pre-existing structures or programs rather than inviting reflection upon the deeper issue of professional practice and pedagogy. If character strengths are to be fully integrated into professional practice there are far deeper questions to be raised and explored from a theoretical perspective around what this means for how teachers reflect upon, integrate, assess and report the development of individual student strengths (Bates-Krakoff et al., 2017).

In an early publication, White (2009) asserts that a case for positive education is found in the prevalence of anxiety and depression experienced by Australians. White cites 2009 Australian Bureau of Statistics data revealing that 'more than a quarter of people aged 16–24 years and a similar proportion of people aged 25–34 years have experienced a mental disorder of 12 months' duration, compared with 5.9% of those aged 75–85 years' (White, 2009, para. 3). He argues that positive education 'Aims to increase the experience of positive emotions in our students and encourage them to engage their strengths for personal and community goals' (para. 1). White then extends Seligman et al.'s (2009) original definition to propose the link between theory and the practice of positive education and claims that 'Positive Education employs implicit and explicit teaching of the Positive Psychology principles pioneered by Dr Martin Seligman. These principles are embedded in the school's curriculum, co-curriculum, and pastoral settings' (White, 2009, p. 1). White argues that positive education should not be a marginal topic but should be integrated more fully into professional practice. The publication outlines in detail innovations undertaken at Geelong Grammar School and White extends the argument for positive education, addressing Lazarus' (2003) criticism of the benefits positive psychology may have in education. Lazarus' (2003) critique was later addressed by a proposed framework of positive education by Norrish et al. (2013), and by O'Connor and Cameron (2017) who provide useful case studies, but limited reflection, on the professional practice of positive education beyond the documentation of interventions.

Following the launch of positive education, the application of positive psychology in education grew. This was exemplified by Waters' (2011) examination of positive psychology interventions in schools and Rusk and Waters' (2013) review of the field. Most of the published research is in psychology, not education. In a reflective study, Rusk and Waters (2013) notes that the general level of enthusiasm for the application of positive psychology in education was growing. For example, Waters (2011) argues for the vital importance of

teacher training and learning from schools that had success in implementing positive education and calls for more diverse examples of the application of positive education within schools and more examples of positive education in government and public schooling. Rusk and Waters' (2013) undertook an analysis of 1.7 million documents to evaluate the breadth of the positive psychology movement and systematically show the field's growth. This study clearly demonstrates that education was emerging as a field of interest for positive psychologists. At this stage of the field's development, greater emphasis was placed upon clinical psychology applications, social psychology and applied psychology; education was a subfield of research within psychology. Notably, Rusk and Waters' review shows that there were very few educational journals investigating positive psychology phenomena at that time. In a special edition of the Australian Psychological Society magazine, Green et al. (2011) demonstrate that positive education has a long history grounded in philosophy. These authors classify positive education as a subfield of positive psychology. In an article presented at the First Positive Psychology and Education Symposium held in Sydney, McGrath argues that researchers can trace positive education roots back to the 1970s. Researchers highlight Wellington College innovations in the United Kingdom and Grays Point Public School in Sydney. Furthermore, Green et al. (2011) suggest that the importance of schools as positive institutions links back to Seligman et al.'s (2009) original article, as well as raising how coaching psychology may be one approach in unifying the theory and practice of positive education.

Waters' (2011) comprehensive review evaluated 12 school-based positive psychology interventions in the context of the field's development. It highlights the significant interventions that may be developed for application within schools and questions why these are not more systematically embedded within systems and policies. Waters (2011) positions her review in the context of the psychological argument for the more explicit integration of positive education within learning and teaching. It also coincides with Seligman's (2011) proposal of the PERMA theory of wellbeing focusing on positive emotion, engagement, relationships, meaning and accomplishment. Dodge et al. (2012) note that one of the earliest challenges for the positive education field was defining the term 'wellbeing' and its relation to positive education approaches and teaching. Carroll and Cacciattolo (2013) extend this and explore teacher development implications. These claims are developed further by Waters and Stokes' (2013) call for a more systems-informed approach to positive education rather than relying on interventions alone.

How Is Positive Education Changing Schools? 2015–2020

Norrish's (2015) book and Hoare et al.'s (2017) study on Geelong Grammar School's development of positive education established a much-needed case study applying positive psychology interventions in an Australian coeducation boarding school. Nevertheless, it is not a typical case study given 69 per cent of the school's student background is placed in the top quarter of the Distribution of Socio-Educational Advantage. A similar limitation is found in White and Murray's (2015) contribution to developing a whole-school approach with the publication of *Evidence-based approaches to Positive Education*. Here, Alford and White (2015) and White and Kern (2018) have argued that positive education may transform the nature of wellbeing and teaching. In a case study on the introduction of positive education at a boys' school, these researchers demonstrate how preventive mental health interventions (and strategies) are integrated into the classroom and traditional pastoral care approaches. The articles claim that the inclusion of these approaches helps to move attitudes towards mental health from a welfare to a wellbeing model (Slemp et al., 2017). Evaluation of these

interventions may support the case that positive education changes leadership, management and curriculum in schools, which was supported by findings of the Allen et al. (2017, 2018) study on school mission statements. This transformation has been characterised by several scattergun activities and approaches rather than by the development of a universal theoretical framework and universal agreement on a definition of wellbeing (Huppert, 2017). The first five years were characterised by experimentation in the application of positive psychology principles within education (Waters & White, 2015). It is notable, though, how few research projects evaluate the gap between universal interventions and the teacher professional practice of positive education. A persistent gap in the research between 2015–2020 is how positive education related to professional practice and ITE.

In the second part of the decade, there have been advances in topics related to positive education as diverse as applications, leadership, measurement, strategy, theoretical frameworks and whole-of-school approaches. What may be of greater interest in the second wave of positive psychology in education is the reflection upon what is meant by the term 'positive' in positive education (Pawelski, 2016). Pawelski (2016) notes the theoretical and philosophical reflections upon this term in the field, arguing that positive psychology is impacting intellectual discussion and discourse. Palweski calls for a greater appreciation and understanding of the basic concepts underlying positive psychology, its discourse, and the research being undertaken in this field. At this point in the development of the field, several frameworks emerge for wellbeing within the positive education movement to guide schools to organise curriculum, strategy and whole-school approaches. For example, Noble and McGrath (2015) developed the PROSPER framework for positive education with a specific focus on teachers' professional practice focusing on Positivity, Relationships, Outcomes, Strengths, Purpose, Engagement, and Resilience. They expanded on this in the following year with a paper considering professional practice and policy implications (Noble & McGrath, 2016). King et al. (2016) evaluates the rise of positive education in Asia and cautions about the lack of cultural diversity in interventions research, which is supported by Ciarrochi et al.'s (2016) calls for more culturally and contextually specific positive education.

Similarly, Oades and Mossman (2017) focus on the relentless challenge to define wellbeing. In a thought-provoking chapter in their comprehensive research book, the authors recap the answers gathered from a discussion on wellbeing. At this stage in the discourse, it appears that a division is occurring between discussions about positive education, coping and wellbeing more generally (Quinlan et al., 2012; Stevanovic et al., 2017). Discussions about wellbeing appear to be addressing the macro term of the theory of human flourishing, while those about positive education seem to be in a far more organic phase, discussing the application of interventions within teacher professional practice (Huppert, 2017; Kern, Adler et al., 2014, 2015; Waters et al., 2015). McLellan and Steward (2015) and Brunzell et al. (2016) contribute to the field by positioning positive education within the theoretical framework of trauma-informed pedagogies that teach wellbeing and character strengths in trauma-affected students. This analysis is further extended by Brunzell et al. (2019) in a critical examination of the integration of positive psychology principles in trauma-affected classrooms. Morrish et al. (2017) provide a review of the importance of emotional regulation in positive education programs to improve adolescents' self-regulation and call for further research in the field. Additional challenges faced by practitioners of positive education over the past decade are summarised by Trask-Kerr et al. (2019b), highlighting the tension between a 'clear-eyed scepticism, favouring a scientific approach, [which] is somewhat at odds with other aspects of their vision, which appear decidedly ethical and philosophical in nature' (p. 788). Gomez-Baya and Gillham (2019) highlight the promising wellbeing and academic outcomes from Adler's (2016) cultural and contextually specific positive education large scale case studies in Bhutan, Mexico, and Peru. They argue that a clearer' definition of

positive education is needed, noting it is 'a child of positive psychology … largely reared in isolation' (p. 335).

A decade of research by Waters and Loton (2019) has produced a proposal for the SEARCH framework to be used as a tool to organise decision making and research in positive education. The SEARCH framework extends earlier research as it proposes 'a data-driven, meta-framework to support evidence-based decisions for researchers and practitioners when designing, investigating, and implementing wellbeing education interventions' (Waters and Loton, 2019, p. 1). SEARCH is based on several elements: a large-scale published bibliometric review and cluster analysis of the field of positive psychology—encompassing '18 years of research and 18,401 studies'—on the science behind the elements of, or pathways to, wellbeing; an 'action research pilot involving ten schools to road-test the data-driven meta-framework; and, a systematic review of school intervention studies in both psychology and education databases that involved 35,888 students from Australia, NZ, Europe, the UK, Asia and North America' (Waters & Loton, 2019). Six overarching pathways to wellbeing form the SEARCH framework: 1) strengths, 2) emotional management, 3) attention and awareness, 4) relationships, 5) coping, and 6) habits and goals (Waters & Loton, 2019, pp. 1-2). Finally, Allison et al.'s (2020) conceptual paper proposes a Flourishing Classroom Systems Model 'to foster flourishing simultaneously for individuals and groups' and suggests a notable maturing of positive education discourse (para. 3).

Criticisms Of Positive Education

Criticism of the limitations of positive education professional practice is a characteristic of the positive psychology movement over the last decade. While recognising widespread activity and interest in applying positive psychology in education, Huebner and Hills (2011) question whether the whole field has any long-term sustainability in schools. Fernández-Ríos and Novo (2012) offer a comprehensive criticism of positive psychology and its application within the subfield of positive education. Their study evaluates the widespread adoption of positive psychology principles in Spanish speaking countries. This criticism highlights the theoretical and practical challenges faced by the new paradigm of positive psychology and the rapid uptake of concepts that hindered some of the field's elements. The authors caution against the short-sighted historical elements of the field and place the development of the concept of positive psychology firmly within the context of Maslow's psychology and developments by Kuhn (Fernández-Ríos & Novo, 2012). Their discussion about the limitations in education is compelling and they query the benefit of learning about positive psychology in educational courses. Fernández-Ríos and Novo (2012) challenge the argument that this is a new paradigm of teacher professional practice; instead, they argue that it is an extension of earlier knowledge and an expansion upon the elements they have outlined previously. A similar analysis of positive education is noted by Kristjánsson (2012).

Various researchers call for a far more theoretical approach to positive education that integrates foundational theories about learning and teaching and conceptual challenges around the term 'positive' (Fernández-Ríos & Novo, 2012; Pawelski, 2016; Trask-Kerr et al., 2019a, 2019b). White (2016) raises several hurdles in developing a professional practice that have remained unaddressed. These are extended in by White and Buchanan (2017), which call for Positive Education 2.0 to adopt a more integrated approach and propose a more inclusive wellbeing education approach that moves beyond a series of interventions to be considered within the context of professional practice and ITE. Waters and Loton (2019) and Lomas et al. (2019) address these concerns to a certain degree and propose ethical guidelines for applying positive psychology in education practice. Lomas et al. (2019) argue that there

has been a shortage of ethical frameworks to advance positive education research and application.

One limitation of the research undertaken in the field of positive education is that it focuses on case studies, rather than the more in-depth teacher professional practice questions needed to advance the field. At the beginning of the decade, positive education was a fringe topic. PESA (2020) and IPEN (2020) may argue this may no longer be the case using the growing number of schools that claim to teach positive education programs, but it has yet to be integrated more fully into mainstream educational theoretical discourse (Street, 2017; Tay et al., 2018). Until positive psychologists and educational theorists collaborate, there will be little progress in the steps required to realise the audacious goal of positive education (Kristjánsson, 2016). Indeed, the historical inability to integrate educational psychology and educational theory discourses more generally remains an ongoing challenge for the growth of positive education. It is not until the end of 2019 that studies have started to address this challenge directly and to consider the critical differences in positive education including if it adopts an evidence-based or evidence-informed professional practice. Oades and Mossman (2017) address the theories of wellbeing and positive psychology and put them into the context of positive education. A theoretical foundation upon which the field can develop is crucial. One of the criticisms of positive psychology development in education is that the practice in schools has run ahead of the research and ITE. Prinzing (2020) extends this criticism of positive psychology further by stressing that the field is 'value-laden' and that researchers should 'embrace' this characteristic to let it act as a pathway to advance theoretical and philosophical applications (pp.1-2).

Implications for ITE

What are the implications for ITE? In a personal reflection, Seligman (2018, 2019) highlights the widespread adoption and impact of positive education around the world drawing on Adler's (2016) research in Bhutan, Mexico and Peru and clarifies the original hypothesis of positive education, that 'Schools and positive teachers are the fulcrum for producing more wellbeing in a culture' (Seligman, 2019, pp. 15–16). Seligman (2019) may claim that positive education is transforming theoretical and practical contributions to wellbeing education generally, but further research is needed into how positive education can bridge the divide between the discipline of psychology and education to achieve a more integrated and sustainable approach in ITE, positive leadership, management and governance, and teacher professional practice in schools (Powell & Graham, 2017; Waters et al., 2015). In a thought-provoking study, Trask-Kerr et al. (2019b) argue that positive education is a derivative of Dewey's original concepts for schooling: Dewey argued for greater community-mindedness and the nurturing of citizenship in schooling. Additionally, Trask-Kerr et al. (2019b) claim that the Deweyan philosophy of education is a missing part of the discourse to link positive psychology and the psychological domain of educational theory. They insist that teachers and educational researchers have been reimagining education in positive terms for an extended period, noting that Seligman's original 2009 paper acted as an essential catalyst to reinvigorate discussion around the role of education. Furtherore, the authors contend that positive education's positioning within psychological science means that—from a methodological perspective—the field has an over-reliance on psychology paradigms and has difficulty in engaging explicitly with broader concerns regarding values education and the positioning of positive psychology and positive education more generally. Therefore, looking to the future for positive education in ITE, one suggestion to bridge the gap between psychology and educational philosophy may be to draw on Trask-Kerr et al.'s (2019b)

concept of Deweyan positive education. Many of the methodological challenges of positive education could be addressed by expanding its name to be more inclusive, adopting the term 'wellbeing education'.

Conclusions

A decade after Seligman et al. (2009) proposes positive education; there is no evidence that the happiness of our children is increasing (Keyton, 2021; The Economist, 2021). There is some evidence that depression may be increasing and strong evidence that self-harming and suicidal behaviours are increasing substantially (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2020; Sachs et al., 2019). It seems that positive education and wellbeing programs are needed now more than ever. I argue several limiting factors for integrating these concepts in ITE and schools found in this review, including challenges with the field's terminology, enough time, cost-effective and evidence-based professional learning for teachers, and systematic change management. Seligman (2019) claims the premise of positive education has evolved but notes that 'Any program that teaches well-being to school children must replace some useful program that already exists. There are only so many hours in the school day and not enough money to support what already exists' (p. 17). There is growing evidence schools have been actively engaging with this development over the decade and may be ahead of ITE; but finding the time in accredited ITE programs continues to be a hurdle. If this is the case, what role does ITE play? An obstacle for the development and adoption of positive education in ITE, at a policy level and more broadly, has been the lack of a unified approach to positive education and examples of how ITE may integrate positive education into accredited programs. A significant area of interest for positive education is the growing evidence of a link between wellbeing, learning, and student voice as argued by Halliday et al. (2019, 2020), which may be one avenue to extend Adler's (2016) research which Seligman (2019) asserts 'showed convincingly is that young people who acquire higher well-being actually do better in their academic courses' (p. 17). More systematic research is needed to advance the next developments in positive education's professional practice beyond interventions. What is sorely lacking is research investigating how ITE may apply positive education in pre-service teacher education and teacher professional practice. One step forward may be a professional practice of a more inclusive approach for ITE called *wellbeing education* rather than positive education, as proposed by White and McCallum (2020) and explicitly linking this to accredited professional standards for teachers. This approach may guide the next decade of ITE researchers to suggest strategies to integrate these developments comprehensively in accredited programs.

References

Adler, A. (2016). *Teaching life skills increases well-being and academic performance: evidence from Bhutan, Mexico, and Peru*. PhD Thesis, University of Pennsylvania.

Alford, Z., & White, M. A. (2015). *Positive school psychology. Evidence-based approaches in Positive Education: Implementing a strategic framework for well-being in schools*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9667-5_5

Allen, K-A., Vella-Brodrick, D., & Waters, L. (2017). School belonging and the role of social and emotional competencies in fostering an adolescent's sense of connectedness to their school. In E. Frydenberg, A. J. Martin, & R. J. Collie (Eds.), *Social and emotional learning in Australia and the Asia-Pacific: Perspectives, programs and approaches* (pp. 83–99). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3394-0_5

Allen, K. A., Kern, M. L., Vella-Brodrick, D., & Waters, L. (2018). Understanding the priorities of Australian secondary schools through an analysis of their Mission and Vision Statements. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *54*(2), 249–274. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X18758655

Allison, L., Waters, L., & Kern, M. L. (2020). Flourishing Classrooms: Applying a Systems-Informed Approach to Positive Education. *Contemporary School Psychology*, (2). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40688-019-00267-8

Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership. (2011). Australian Professional Standards for Teachers, AITSL, Melbourne.

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. (2020, July 23). *Australia's Health Suicide and intentional self-harm*. Australia's Health Snapshots Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/australias-health/suicide-and-intentional-self-harm

Bastounis, A., Callaghan, P., Banerjee, A., & Michail, M. (2016). The effectiveness of the Penn Resiliency Programme (PRP) and its adapted versions in reducing depression and anxiety and improving explanatory style: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Adolescence*, *52*, 37–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2016.07.004

Bates-Krakoff, J., McGrath, R., Graves, K., & Ochs, L. (2017). Beyond a deficit model of strengths training in schools: Teaching targeted strength use to gifted students. *Gifted Education International*, *33*(2), 102–117. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261429416646210

Baumeister R.F. (2013) Writing a Literature Review. In: M. Prinstein (Eds), *The Portable Mentor*. Springer, New York, NY. https://doi-10.1007/978-1-4614-3994-3_8

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1997). Writing narrative literature reviews. *Review of general psychology*, *1*(3), 311-320. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.1.3.311

Beyond Blue. (2021, 9 February). Be You - History. https://beyou.edu.au/history

Brown, C., & Carr, S. (2018). Education policy and mental weakness: A response to a mental health crisis. *Journal of Education Policy*, *0939*, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2018.1445293

Brunwasser, S. M., Gillham, J. E., & Kim, E. S. (2009). A meta-analytic review of the Penn Resiliency Program's effect on depressive symptoms. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, *77*(6), 1042. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017671

Brunzell, T., Stokes, H., & Waters, L. (2016). Trauma-informed flexible learning: Classrooms that strengthen regulatory abilities. *International Journal of Child, Youth and Family Studies*, *7*(2), 218–239. https://doi.org/10.18357/ijcyfs72201615719

Brunzell, T., Stokes, H., & Waters, L. (2019). Shifting teacher practice in trauma-affected classrooms: Practice pedagogy strategies within a trauma-informed positive education model. *School Mental Health*, *11*(3), 600–614 https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-018-09308-8

Brunzell, T., Waters, L., & Stokes, H. (2015). Teaching with strengths in trauma-affected students: A new approach to healing and growth in the classroom. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *85*(1), 3–9. https://doi.org/10.1037/ort0000048

Carroll, J., & Cacciattolo, M. (2013). Positive education and teacher development. *TLN Journal*, *20*(3), 10-12.

Challen, A. R., Machin, S. J., & Gillham, J. E. (2014). The UK Resilience Programme: A school-based universal nonrandomized pragmatic controlled trial. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *82*(1), 75–89. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034854

Ciarrochi, J., Atkins, P. W., Hayes, L. L., Sahdra, B. K., & Parker, P. (2016). Contextual positive psychology: Policy recommendations for implementing positive psychology into schools. *Frontiers in psychology*, *7*, 1561. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01561

Dodge, R., Daly, A.P., Huyton, J., & Sanders, L. D. (2012). The challenge of defining wellbeing. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, *2*(3), 222–235. https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v2i3.4 https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2012.691981

Dulagil, A., Green, S., & Ahern, M. (2016). Evidence-based coaching to enhance senior students' wellbeing and academic striving. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, *6*(3), 131–149. https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v6i3.426

Fernández-Ríos, L., & Novo, M. (2012). Positive Psychology: Zeitgeist (or spirit of the times) or ignorance (or disinformation) of history?. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, *12*(2), 333–344. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/1010347065/

Gillham, J., Adams-Deutsch, Z., Werner, J., Reivich, K., Coulter-Heindl, V., Linkins, M., Winder, B., Peterson, C., Park, N., Abenavoli, R., Contero, A., & Seligman, M. E. (2011). Character strengths predict subjective well-being during adolescence. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *6*(1), 31-44. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2010.536773

Gomez-Baya, D., & Gillham, J. E. (2019). Positive Education. In *The Routledge Handbook of Positive Communication* (pp. 327–337). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315207759-34

Green, S., Oades, L., & Robinson, P. (2011). Positive education: Creating flourishing students, staff and schools | APS. *InPsych 33*(2). Retrieved November 21, 2018, from https://www.psychology.org.au/publications/inpsych/2011/april/green/

Halliday, A. J., Kern, M. L., Garrett, D. K., & Turnbull, D. A. (2019). The student voice in well-being: a case study of participatory action research in positive education. *Educational Action Research*, *27*(2), 173-196. https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2018.1436079

Halliday, A. J., Kern, M. L., Garrett, D. K., & Turnbull, D. A. (2020). Understanding factors affecting positive education in practice: An Australian case study. *Contemporary School Psychology*, *24*(2), 128-145. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40688-019-00229-0

Harris, A. (2020). COVID-19–school leadership in crisis? *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*. Volume 5 Issue 3-4. 321-326. https://doi.org/10.1108/JPCC-06-2020-0045

Hoare, E., Bott, D., & Robinson, J. (2017). Learn it, live it, teach it, embed it: Implementing a whole school approach to foster positive mental health and wellbeing through Positive Education. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, *7*(3), 56–71. https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v7i3.645

Huebner, E. S., & Hills, K. J. (2011). Does the positive psychology movement have legs for children in schools? *Journal of Positive Psychology*, *6*(1), 88–94. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2010.536778

Huppert, F. A. (2017). Challenges in defining and measuring well-being and their implications for policy. In M. White, G. Slemp, & A. S. Murray. (Eds.), *Future directions in well-being: Education, organizations and policy* (1st ed., pp. 163–167). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-56889-8

International Positive Education Network. (2020, 9 February). https://www.ipen-network.com/

Kern, M. L., Waters, L. E., Adler, A., & White, M. A. (2015). A multidimensional approach to measuring well-being in students: Application of the PERMA framework. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, *10*(3), 262–271. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2014.936962

Kern, M. L., Waters, L., Adler, A., & White, M. (2014). Assessing employee wellbeing in schools using a multifaceted approach: Associations with physical health, life satisfaction, and professional thriving. *Psychology*, *5*(6), 500–513. https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2014.56060

Keyton, D. (2021, March 21). Happiness Report: World shows resilience in face of COVID19. *AP News*. https://apnews.com/article/2021-world-happiness-report-covid-resilience-79b5b8d1a2367e69df05ae68b58aa435

King, R., Caleon, I., Tan, J., & Ye, S. (2016). Positive Education in Asia. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, *25*(3), 361–365. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-016-0292-3

Kristjánsson, K. (2012, April). Positive Psychology and Positive Education: Old wine in new bottles? *Educational Psychologist*. *47*(2), 86105. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2011.610678

Kristjánsson, K. (2016). Flourishing as the aim of education: Towards an extended, "enchanted" Aristotelian account. *Oxford Review of Education*, *42*(6), 707–720. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2016.1226791

Kristjánsson, K. (2017a). Recent work on flourishing as the aim of education: A critical review. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *65*(1), 87–107. https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2016.1182115

Kristjánsson, K. (2017b). Teachers as facilitators of student flourishing in Positive Education: What are the political implications? In A. White, M., Slemp, G., & Murray, A. S. (Eds.), *Future directions in well-being: Education, organizations and policy* (pp. 187–190). Springer Dordrecht H. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-56889-8

Lavy, S. (2020). A review of character strengths interventions in twenty-first-century schools: Their importance and how they can be fostered. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, *15*(2), 573-596. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-018-9700-6

Lazarus, R. S. (2003). Does the positive psychology movement have legs? *Psychological inquiry*, *14*(2), 93-109. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1402_02

Linkins, M., Niemiec, R. M., Gillham, J., & Mayerson, D. (2015). Through the lens of strength: A framework for educating the heart. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, *10*(1), 64–68. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2014.888581

Lomas, T., Roache, A., Rashid, T., & Jarden, A. (2019). Developing ethical guidelines for positive psychology practice: An on-going, iterative, collaborative endeavour. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, *0015*(008), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2019.1651892

McLellan, R., & Steward, S. (2015). Measuring children and young people's wellbeing in the school context. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *45*(3), 307–332. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2014.889659

Morrish, L., Rickard, N., Chin, T. C., & Vella-Brodrick, D. A. (2018). Emotion regulation in adolescent well-being and positive education. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *19*(5), 1543-1564. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-017-9881-y

Noble, T., & McGrath, H. (2016). The Prosper Framework for Student Wellbeing. In H. Noble, T., & McGrath (Eds.), *The PROSPER School Pathways for Student Wellbeing: Policy and Practices* (pp. 25–95). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-21795-6_2

Norrish, J. (2015). *Positive education: the Geelong Grammar School journey.* Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198702580.001.0001

Norrish, J., M., Williams, P., O'Connor, M., & Robinson, J. (2013). An applied framework for Positive Education. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, *3*(2), 147–161. https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v3i2.2

O'Connor, M., & Cameron, G. (2017). The Geelong Grammar positive psychology experience. In *Social and emotional learning in Australia and the Asia-Pacific: Perspectives, programs and approaches* (pp. 353–370). Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3394-0_19 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3394-0_19

Oades, L. G., & Mossman, L. (2017). Where are we now? The Science of wellbeing and Positive Psychology. In *Wellbeing, Recovery and Mental Health* (pp. 7–23). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316339275.003

Oppenheimer, M. F., Fialkov, C., Ecker, B., & Portnoy, S. (2014). Teaching to strengths: Character education for urban middle school students. *Journal of Character Education*, *10*(2), 91–105.

Park, D., Tsukayama, E., Goodwin, G. P., Patrick, S., & Duckworth, A. L. (2017). A tripartite taxonomy of character: Evidence for intrapersonal, interpersonal, and intellectual competencies in children. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *48*, 16–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2016.08.001

Park, N., Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. (2004). Strengths of character and well-being: A closer look at hope and modesty. https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.23.5.628.50749

Pawelski, J. O. (2016). Defining the "positive" in positive psychology: Part II. A normative analysis. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, *11*(4), 357–365. DOI: 10.1080/17439760.2015.1137628

Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification* (Vol. 1). Oxford University Press.

Positive Education Schools Association. (2020, 9 February). https://www.pesa.edu.au/

Powell, M. A., & Graham, A. (2017). Wellbeing in schools: Examining the policy–practice nexus. *Australian Educational Researcher*, *44*(2), 213–231. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-016-0222-7

Prinzing, M. M. (2020). Positive psychology is value-laden—It's time to embrace it. *Journal of Positive Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2020.1716049

Productivity Commission. (2020). Mental Health, Report no. 95, Canberra

Quinlan, D. M., Swain, N., & Vella-Brodrick, D. A. (2012). Character strengths interventions: Building on what we know for improved outcomes. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *13*(6), 1145–1163. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-011-9311-5

Quinlan, D. M., Swain, N., & Vella-Brodrick, D. A. (2012). Character strengths interventions: Building on what we know for improved outcomes. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *13*(6), 1145–1163. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-011-9311-5

Quinlan, D. M., Vella-Brodrick, D. A., Gray, A., & Swain, N. (2019). Teachers matter: Student outcomes following a strengths intervention are mediated by teacher strengths spotting. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *20*(8), 2507-2523. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-018-0051-7

Rusk, R. D., & Waters, L. E. (2013). Tracing the size, reach, impact, and breadth of positive psychology. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *8*(3), 207–221. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2013.777766

Sachs, J., Adler, A., Bin Bishr, A., de Neve, J-E., Durand, M., Diener, E., Helliwell, J., Layard, R., & Seligman, M. (2019). *Global Happiness and Wellbeing Policy Report 2019*. Retrieved from http://www.happinesscouncil.org/

Seligman, M. (2011). *Flourish: A new understanding of happiness and wellbeing – And how to achieve them.* Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

Seligman, M. (2018). PERMA and the building blocks of well-being. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, *13*(4), 333–335. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2018.1437466

Seligman, M. E. P. (2019). Positive Psychology: A personal history. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *15*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-050718-095653

Seligman, M. E. P., Ernst, R. M., Gillham, J., Reivich, K., & Linkins, M. (2009). Positive Education: Positive psychology and classroom interventions. *Oxford Review of Education*, *35*(3), 293–311. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054980902934563

Seligman, M. E., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2014). Positive psychology: An introduction. In *Flow and the foundations of positive psychology* (pp. 279-298). Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9088-8_18

Shoshani, A., & Aviv, I. (2012). The pillars of strength for first-grade adjustment - Parental and children's character strengths and the transition to elementary school. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *7*(4), 315–326. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2012.691981

Slemp, G., Tan-Chyuan Chin, M. L. K., Siokou, S., Loton, D., Oades, L., Vella-Brodrick, D., & Waters, L. (2017). Positive Education in Australia: Practice, measurement, and future directions. In Frydenberg, E., Martin, A. J., & Collie, R. J. (Eds.), *Social and emotional learning in Australia and the Asia-Pacific: Perspectives, programs and approaches* (pp. 101–122). Springer Dordrecht H. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3394-0

Stevanovic, N., Hoare, E., Mckenzie, V., & O'Connor, M. (2017). Sustaining the use of Positive Education coping skills to meet the challenges of the emerging adulthood period. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, *7*(3). https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v7i3.640

Street, H. (2017). Measures of success: Exploring the importance of context in the delivery of well-being and social and emotional learning programmes in Australian primary and secondary schools. In E. Frydenberg, A. J. Martin, & R. J. Collie (Eds.), *Social and emotional learning in Australia and the Asia-Pacific: Perspectives, programs and approaches* (pp. 39–54). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3394-0_3

Tay, L., Pawelski, J. O., & Keith, M. G. (2018). The role of the arts and humanities in human flourishing: A conceptual model. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, *13*(3), 215–225. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2017.1279207

The Economist. (2021, March 21). *It might seem crazy The pandemic has changed the shape of global happiness*. https://www.economist.com/international/2021/03/20/the-pandemic-has-changed-the-shape-of-global-happiness

Trask-Kerr, K., Chin, T. C., & Vella-Brodrick, D. (2019 a). Positive education and the new prosperity: Exploring young people's conceptions of prosperity and success. *Australian Journal of Education*, *63*(2), 190–208. https://doi.org/10.1177/0004944119860600

Trask-Kerr, K., Quay, J., & Slemp, G. R. (2019 b). A Deweyan Positive Education: Psychology with philosophy. *Oxford Review of Education*, *45*(6), 786–801. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2019.1625761

Waters, L. (2011). A review of school-based positive psychology interventions. *Australian Educational and Developmental Psychologist*, *28*(2), 75–90. https://doi.org/10.1375/aedp.28.2.75

Waters, L. (2019). Searching for wellbeing in schools: A new framework to guide the science of Positive Education. *Journal of Educational & Psychological Research*, *1*(2), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.33140/JEPR.01.02.02

Waters, L. E., White, M. A., Wang, L., & Murray, A. (2015). Leading whole-school change. In *Evidence-based approaches in Positive Education: Implementing a strategic framework for well-being in schools* (pp. 43–63). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9667-5_3

Waters, L., & Loton, D. (2019). SEARCH: A meta-framework and review of the field of Positive Education. *International Journal of Applied Positive Psychology*, *4*(1–2), 1–46. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41042-019-00017-4

Waters, L., & Stokes, H. (2013). A system wide approach to positive education. *TLN Journal*, *20*(3), 8-9.

Waters, L., & Stokes, H. (2015). Positive Education for school leaders: Exploring the effects of emotion-gratitude and action-gratitude. *Australian Educational and Developmental Psychologist*, *32*, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1017/edp.2015.1

Waters, L., & White, M. (2015). Case study of a school wellbeing initiative: Using appreciative inquiry to support positive change. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, *5*(1), 19–32. https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v5i1.2

Waters, L., Sun, J., Rusk, R., Cotton, A., & Arch, A. (2017). Positive Education: Visible wellbeing and positive functioning in students. In M. Slade, L. Oades, & A. Jarden (Eds.), *Wellbeing, Recovery and Mental Health* (pp. 245–264). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316339275.021

Waters, L., White, M. A., & Murray, S. (2012). Toward the creation of a positive institution St Peter's College, Adelaide, Australia. *AI Practitioner*, *14*(1), 60–66.

White, M. (2009). Why teach positive education in schools. *Curriculum Leadership: An electronic journal for leaders in education*. *7*(7). Vol 7. Issue 7. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/leader/why_teach_positive_education_in_schools,27066.html?issueID=11751

White, M. & McCallum, F. (2020). Responding to Teacher Quality through an Evidence-informed Wellbeing Framework for Initial Teacher Education. In Jillian Fox, Colette Alexander & and Tania Aspland (Eds.), *Teacher Education: Global Issues, Local Responses*. ATEA. (pp. 115–-137). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-4124-7_7

White, M. A. (2016). Why won't it stick? Positive Psychology and Positive Education. *Psychology of Well-Being*, *6*(1), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13612-016-0039-1

White, M. A., & Buchanan, A. (2017). Why we need Positive Education 2.0. In M. White, G. Slemp, & A. S. Murray (Eds.), *Future directions in Well-being: Education, organizations and policy*. (pp.219-223). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-56889-8_38

White, M. A., & Kern, M. L. (2018). Positive education: Learning and teaching for wellbeing and academic mastery. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, *8*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v8i1.588

White, M. A., & Murray, A. S. (2015). *Evidence-based approaches in positive education: Implementing a strategic framework for well-being in schools*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9667-5

White, M. A., & Waters, L. E. (2014). A case study of "The Good School:" Examples of the use of Peterson's strengths-based approach with students. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *10*(1), 69–76. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2014.920408

White, M. A., & Waters, L. E. (2015). Strengths-based approaches in the classroom and staffroom. In M. White & A. S. Murray (Eds.), *Evidence-based Approaches in Positive Education: Implementing a strategic framework for well-being in schools*. (pp. 111-133). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9667-5_6

White, M. A., Slemp, G. R., & Murray, A. S. (2017). *Future directions in well-being: Education, organizations and policy*. Springer https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-56889-8

White, M., & Murray, A. (2015). *Evidence-Based Approaches in Positive Education Implementing a Strategic Framework for Well-being in Schools* (1st ed. 2015.). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9667-5