

Instrument Flourishing Adolescence Scale: Validating a Comprehensive Well-being Measure Using the Rasch Model

Diki Herdiansyah¹, Rohmatus Naini²

^{1,2} Guidance and Counseling Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Ahmad Dahlan University, Indonesia

Corresponding author : diki2000001013@webmail.uad.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 25 June 2025

Revised 02 July 2025

Accepted 15 July 2025

Keywords:

Adolescents

Flourishing

Guidance and Counseling

Rasch

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to develop and validate the instrument flourishing adolescence scale (I-FAS) as a comprehensive tool to measure adolescent flourishing, particularly for use in guidance and counseling contexts. The instrument was developed based on five key dimensions: psychological, social, subjective, emotional, and spiritual well-being. The development process included theoretical framework analysis, item construction, expert validation, and a pilot test to assess clarity and readability. Revisions were made before large-scale testing. A quantitative approach was used to evaluate the psychometric properties of the instrument through the Rasch Model. Data were collected via an online survey from 400 junior and senior high school students in Yogyakarta. The results showed that the I-FAS met the unidimensionality criteria, with a raw variance explained of 31.4%, exceeding the 20% threshold. The instrument also demonstrated strong internal consistency (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.92), high person reliability (0.90), and item reliability (0.99). The item difficulty range was acceptable, with the most difficult item having a measure of +1.89 and the easiest -1.76. Five items were identified as misfitting and considered for revision. These findings support that the I-FAS is a valid, reliable, and culturally relevant instrument for measuring adolescent flourishing. The inclusion of spiritual well-being provides added value in cultural contexts where spirituality plays a key role. The I-FAS can assist counselors and educators in identifying student needs and designing targeted interventions to support their well-being and development.

ISSN: 2722-2365 (Online) 2722-2357 (Print)

Introduction

Adolescent well-being is one of the topics that continues to be a major concern in psychology and education studies. Adolescents, as a transitional age group between childhood and adulthood, face significant psychological, social, and emotional challenges (Maulidiya et al., 2024; Mental, 2019; Nayak et al., 2022; Rapee et al., 2019). At the adolescent level, their well-being is often influenced by many factors, both internal and external, which can have a long-term impact on their development. One concept in positive psychology that is now gaining attention in well-being studies is the concept of “flourishing” or optimal development, which describes a condition in which individuals are not only free from disorders or stress, but can also develop optimally in various dimensions of life (Herdiansyah et al., 2024; Herdiansyah & Puteri, 2023).

Flourishing is a multidimensional concept that encompasses psychological, social, subjective, emotional, and spiritual well-being. In addition, flourishing is a term that refers to a condition in which individuals achieve optimal well-being characterized by happiness, life satisfaction, and maximum self-potential development (Herdiansyah et al., 2024; Prizmić-Larsen et al., 2020; Rule et al., 2024; VanderWeele, 2017). In the context of adolescent development, flourishing is an important indicator for understanding optimal well-being and serves as a guide for interventions aimed at improving the quality of life of adolescents (Herdiansyah & Puteri, 2023). Flourishing adolescents demonstrate high levels of engagement in meaningful activities, have positive social relationships, and possess the ability to face life's challenges in a constructive manner.

Flourishing, as a concept that describes the optimal condition of humans in various aspects of life, has been studied by many experts from different perspectives. Therefore, the aspects that constitute flourishing vary. Keyes (2002, 2007); Keyes and Haidt (2003) identify flourishing as consisting of three main components: emotional well-being, psychological well-being, and social well-being. Emotional well-being includes positive affect, happiness, and life satisfaction; psychological well-being includes self-acceptance, personal growth, purpose in life, environmental mastery, autonomy, and positive relations; while social well-being includes social acceptance, social actualization, social contribution, social coherence, and social integration. Seligman (2011, 2018) argues that a person can be said to be flourishing if they have five main aspects: positive emotions, engagement, relationships, meaning and purpose, and accomplishment/competence. Meanwhile, Butler and Kern (2016) state that

these various aspects are multidimensional, thus providing a more detailed description of a person's flourishing profile.

The instrument flourishing adolescence scale (I-FAS) was developed to provide a comprehensive measurement of adolescent flourishing by incorporating five key dimensions: psychological, social, subjective, emotional, and spiritual well-being. These five aspects were selected to reflect a holistic view of adolescent development, particularly in diverse cultural contexts where spiritual well-being plays a vital role. In addition, Biswas-Diener (2009); Diener et al. (2010) developed a concept for measuring psychological flourishing based on the social and psychological well-being theories of various experts. The aspects identified by Diener include meaning and purpose, supportive and rewarding relationships, engagement and interest, contribution to the well-being of others, competency, self-acceptance, optimism, and being respected. Huppert and So (2009) developed the components of flourishing from several theories and research results by Jahoda, Ryff, Keyes, Seligman, and Diener. Huppert & So added aspects such as competence, emotional stability, engagement, meaning, optimism, positive emotion, positive relationships, resilience, self-esteem, and vitality. While these frameworks have informed the development of various flourishing instruments across disciplines, they often lack an explicit spiritual dimension and may not fully capture the unique well-being needs of adolescents. Therefore, the development of I-FAS addresses this gap by integrating all five dimensions to ensure a more precise and culturally relevant measurement of adolescent flourishing.

Measures of flourishing, such as the MHC-SF/LF by (C. L. M. Keyes et al., 2008; Lamers et al., 2011; Petrillo et al., 2015), wellbeing module items on the european social survey by (Huppert & So, 2013), flourishing scale by (Diener et al., 2010), PERMA profiler by (Butler & Kern, 2016), flourishing-at-work scale—short form by (Rautenbach & Rothmann, 2017), flourishing-at-work scale—short form by (VanderWeele, 2017), and digital flourishing scale by (Janicke-Bowles, 2024), have contributed greatly to understanding and measuring various dimensions of Flourishing. However, these instruments have several limitations that need to be considered, such as being more focused on specific contexts or populations, workplaces or technology use, making them less suitable for the adolescent population in general.

In addition, in the instruments that have been developed, there is one component that is often overlooked, namely spiritual well-being. The majority of existing instruments do not adequately accommodate the dimension of spiritual well-being. In fact, spiritual well-being is

an important aspect of well-being that includes feelings of peace, harmony, and connection with something greater than oneself (Behera, 2020; Božek et al., 2020; Fisher, 2011). This dimension is important to consider because it can affect overall well-being. Many studies show that spirituality has a significant relationship with flourishing (McEntee et al., 2013; VanderWeele, 2017b). Spiritual well-being includes aspects such as the search for a deeper meaning in life, a connection with something greater than oneself, and a deep inner balance.

Therefore, developing new instruments that are more holistic and comprehensive is an important step to overcome the limitations of existing instruments. New instruments that are more comprehensive and inclusive, covering the component of spiritual well-being, are very important because to understand an individual's well-being holistically, instruments are needed that can measure psychological, social, emotional and spiritual aspects. The integration of spiritual well-being will provide a more complete and in-depth picture of individual well-being (Barber & Cook, 2024; Behera, 2020; Božek et al., 2020; Fabricatore et al., 2000; Kreitzer, 2012; Muarifah et al., 2024). In many cultures, spirituality plays an important role in daily life and individual well-being (Devender Sharma et al., 2024). Instruments that ignore this dimension become less relevant or valid in certain cultural contexts. A more comprehensive instrument will enable the development of more targeted and effective interventions to improve individuals' wellbeing in various dimensions of their lives. By incorporating the dimension of spiritual wellbeing, this instrument will be more relevant in various cultural contexts that value spirituality.

In an effort to fill this gap, researchers aim to develop a flourishing instrument focused on adolescents by incorporating the dimension of spiritual well-being instrument flourishing adolescence scale (I-FAS), a new instrument that will be tested for validity and reliability as a more comprehensive measure of adolescent well-being. The development of the instrument flourishing adolescence scale (I-FAS) began with an in-depth literature review of the concept of flourishing and its components. Based on this review, the concept of flourishing in adolescents in this study consists of five aspects, including psychological well-being, social well-being, subjective well-being, emotional well-being, and spiritual well-being. These aspects were then integrated into the items to be compiled in the instrument flourishing adolescence scale (I-FAS). To better understand the aspects and indicators in the concept of flourishing, this can be seen more clearly in Figure 1.

Figure 1. The Concept of Flouris



Method

This study used a quantitative approach with an instrument validation study design, which aimed to develop and test the validity and reliability of the instrument flourishing adolescence scale (I-FAS) measurement tool. The research design used was cross-sectional, with data collection conducted once through an online survey using a closed questionnaire (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). The instrument consists of 50 statements based on five main aspects of adolescent well-being, namely: psychological, social, subjective, emotional, and spiritual. These five aspects were chosen to provide a comprehensive picture of flourishing in adolescents, referring to the theories of well-being developed by Keyes (2002) and various subsequent developers.

The item development process was carried out through several important stages. First, an in-depth theoretical study was conducted to formulate operational definitions for each aspect. Second, items were developed based on the conceptual indicators of each aspect. Third, the content validity of the items was assessed by experts. After revisions based on expert input, a pilot test was conducted to evaluate the clarity and readability of the items. The results of these trials are used to refine the wording before distribution in the main study. Data is collected from 400 students aged 11–19 years from junior high schools and high schools in the city of Yogyakarta. Each item in the questionnaire uses a four-point Likert scale, with answer options ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). This four-point

scale was chosen to encourage respondents to take a clear stance without choosing a neutral answer.

Data analysis was performed using the Rasch Model with the assistance of Winsteps software version 3.73, which was chosen for its ability to objectively evaluate item and instrument quality based on item response theory. The first step in the analysis was to test the unidimensionality of the instrument by assessing the percentage of “Raw Variance Explained by Measures” and the value of “Unexplained Variance in 1st Contrast” from Output Table 23. The criteria for unidimensionality used were if the variance explained by the measure was $\geq 20\%$ and the eigenvalue of the first contrast was < 2.0 . Next, an analysis of item fit was conducted using the Outfit and Infit Mean Square (MNSQ) values with an ideal range of 0.5–1.5, as well as the Z-standard (ZSTD) value, which is expected to be between -2.0 and +2.0. The Point-Measure Correlation (PTMEA CORR) value was also examined, which shows the consistency of the item with the construct, with an ideal positive value of > 0.3 . In addition, the reliability of the instrument was also measured through the reliability index provided by the Rasch model, namely person reliability and item reliability. These reliability values indicate measurement consistency from both the respondent and item sides, with an ideal minimum value of 0.80 to be considered reliable.

Findings and Discussion

Findings

In this study, construct validity testing was conducted using the Rasch Model to evaluate how well the measurement instrument reflected the intended construct. This validation process involved 50 statements consisting of five main aspects, designed to measure various dimensions relevant to the construct under study. Each statement in this instrument was analysed based on a mathematical model developed in the Rasch Model, which aims to ensure that the items used have good and reliable measurement quality. Table 1 below presents details of the statement items grouped according to these five aspects, each of which plays a role in describing various elements of the construct being tested. Thus, this approach is expected to provide a clearer picture of the extent to which this instrument can be trusted to accurately measure the intended construct.

Table 1. Distribution of Items before Performing Rasch Model Analysis.

Variable	Aspect	Indicator	Σ
Flourishing	Psychological Well-being	Menentukan Keputusan hidup secara mandiri (<i>autonomy</i>)	8
		Menguasai lingkungan dan mengelola kehidupan sehari-hari secara efektif (<i>environmental mastery</i>).	
		Mengembangkan diri dan merasakan pertumbuhan pribadi (<i>personal growth</i>).	
		Menerima diri secara positif, termasuk kekuatan dan kelemahan (<i>self-acceptance</i>).	
	Subjektive Well being	Kepuasan Hidup (<i>life satisfaction</i>)	8
		Affect Balance	
		Keterlibatan dalam Aktivitas Bermakna (<i>Engagement in Meaningful Activities</i>)	
		Optimisme (<i>Optimism</i>)	
	Social Well being	Kemampuan menavigasi tuntutan sosial	14
		Integrasi Sosial (<i>Social Integration</i>).	
		Kontribusi Sosial (<i>Social Contribution</i>)	
		Koherensi Sosial (<i>Social Coherence</i>)	
		Penerimaan Sosial (<i>Social Acceptance</i>)	
		Adaptasi Sosial (<i>Social Adaptation</i>)	
	Emotional Well being	Hubungan Sosial Positif (<i>Positive Social Relationships</i>)	
		Pengelolaan Emosi (<i>Emotion Regulation</i>)	10
		Kepuasan Emosional (<i>Emotional Satisfaction</i>)	
		Pengalaman Emosional yang Bermakna (<i>Meaningful Emotional Experiences</i>)	
		Keterlibatan Emosional (<i>Emotional Engagement</i>)	
		Kesadaran Emosional (<i>Emotional Awareness</i>)	
	Spiritual Well being	Makna dan Tujuan Hidup (<i>Meaning and Purpose in Life</i>).	10
		Kedamaian Batin (<i>Inner Peace</i>)	
		Harmoni dengan Nilai Pribadi (<i>Harmony with Personal Values</i>)	
		Rasa Syukur (<i>Gratitude</i>)	
		Transcendensi (<i>Transcendence</i>)	
Total			50

Table 2. Reliability test criteria

Statistics	Criteria	Interpretation
Cronbach's Alpha (KR-20)	<0.5	Low
	0.5 – 0.6	Moderate
	0.6 – 0.7	Good
	0.7 – 0.8	High
	>0.8	Very High
Item dan Person Reliability	<0.67	Low
	0.67 – 0.80	Sufficient
	0.81 – 0.90	Good
	0.91 – 0.94	Very Good
	>0.94	Excellent

Table 3. Summary Statistik

No	Information	Results
1	The person measure	0,73
2	Cronbach's Alpha	0,92
3	Person reliability	0.90
4	Item reliability	0.99

Based on the summary statistics analysis above, Person Measure shows the average value of respondents in the flourishing instrument provided. Referring to Table 3 above, it can be seen that the logit value of Person Measure obtained is 0.73. Referring to the provisions in the Rasch Model, if the Person Measure value is more than 0.0 logit, then in this study, respondents tend to agree more with the statements in various items.

Cronbach's alpha aims to measure reliability, namely the interaction between the person and the item as a whole. Based on Table 3 above, it can be seen that the Cronbach's alpha value obtained is 0.92. Referring to the Cronbach's alpha value criteria in the Rasch Model, this value is classified as very good, namely > 0.8.

Person Reliability indicates the consistency of respondents' answers. Based on the figure above, it can be seen that the Person Reliability value obtained is 0.90. Referring to the Person Reliability value criteria in the Rasch Model, this value falls into the good category, which ranges from 0.81 to 0.90.

Item Reliability indicates the quality of the items used in the instrument. Based on the image above, it can be seen that the Item Reliability value obtained is 0.99. Referring to the Item Reliability value criteria in the Rasch Model, this score falls into the Excellent category, which is >0.94.

The next analysis in Table 4 presents the Item Measure results, which focus on the items that are most difficult and easiest for respondents to agree with.

Table 4. Item Measure

Item number	Coefisien Measure	Description
40	+1,89	the most difficult item to approve
47	-1,76	the easiest item to approve

Based on the Item Measure analysis above, it can be seen from the measure column that item number 40 with a value of +1.89 logit is the item that respondents find most difficult to agree with in the flourishing instrument provided. Meanwhile, item number 47 with a value of -1.76 logit is the item that respondents find easiest to agree with.

The Rasch model can also analyse Item Fit Order, which is used to determine item fit and misfit. The results of the Item Fit Order are presented in table 5. One of the steps to determine item fit and misfit is to add the MEAN and S.D. values, then compare them with the INFIT MNSQ value. A logit value greater than the sum of MEAN and S.D. indicates a misfit item

Table 5. Item Fit Order

Mean=1.00; SD=0.15; Ideal Value Logit=1.00 + 0.19=1.19		
Item number	Coefisien Measure	Description
7	+1,59	Misfit

48	+1.42	Misfit
50	+1.41	Misfit
28	+1.36	Misfit
42	+1,22	Misfit

Based on Table 5 above, the ideal logit value obtained is 1.19. Thus, there are 5 items that fall into the misfit category (rejected items), namely item number 7 with a value of +1.59, number 48 with a value of +1.42, number 50 with a value of +1.41, number 28 with a value of +1.36, and number 42 with a value of +1.22.

Table 6. Distribution of Items after Conducting Rasch Model Analysis

Variable	Aspect	Indicator	Σ
Flourishing	Psychological Well-being	Menentukan Keputusan hidup secara mandiri (<i>autonomy</i>)	7
		Menguasai lingkungan dan mengelola kehidupan sehari-hari secara efektif (<i>environmental mastery</i>).	
		Mengembangkan diri dan merasakan pertumbuhan pribadi (<i>personal growth</i>).	
		Menerima diri secara positif, termasuk kekuatan dan kelemahan (<i>self-acceptance</i>).	
	Subjektive Well being	Kepuasan Hidup (<i>life satisfaction</i>)	8
		Affect Balance	
		Keterlibatan dalam Aktivitas Bermakna (<i>Engagement in Meaningful Activities</i>)	
		Optimisme (<i>Optimism</i>)	
	Social Well being	Kemampuan menavigasi tuntutan sosial	13
		Integrasi Sosial (<i>Social Integration</i>).	
		Kontribusi Sosial (<i>Social Contribution</i>)	
		Koherensi Sosial (<i>Social Coherence</i>)	
		Penerimaan Sosial (<i>Social Acceptance</i>)	
		Adaptasi Sosial (<i>Social Adaptation</i>)	
		Hubungan Sosial Positif (<i>Positive Social Relationships</i>)	
	Emotional Well being	Pengelolaan Emosi (<i>Emotion Regulation</i>)	10
		Kepuasan Emosional (<i>Emotional Satisfaction</i>)	
		Pengalaman Emosional yang Bermakna (<i>Meaningful Emotional Experiences</i>)	

Spiritual Well being	Keterlibatan Emosional (<i>Emotional Engagement</i>)	7
	Kesadaran Emosional (<i>Emotional Awareness</i>)	
	Makna dan Tujuan Hidup (<i>Meaning and Purpose in Life</i>).	
	Kedamaian Batin (<i>Inner Peace</i>)	
	Harmoni dengan Nilai Pribadi (<i>Harmony with Personal Values</i>)	
	Rasa Syukur (<i>Gratitude</i>)	
	Transcendensi (<i>Transcendence</i>)	
Total		45

The term used in instrument validity testing using the Rasch model is item unidimensionality (Sumintono & Widhiarso, 2015). Item unidimensionality can be used to test and evaluate whether the instrument used is capable of measuring what it is supposed to measure and accurately representing data from variables so that the items can be considered valid (Muntazhimah et al., 2020). An instrument can be said to be unidimensionality when it meets two requirements, namely the raw variance explained by measure value is not less than <20%, meaning that if the raw variance explained by measure value is in the range of 20%-40%, the instrument can be said to be sufficient, 40%-60% the instrument is considered 'good', and >60% the instrument is considered 'very good'. The second requirement is that the unexplained variance in the first to fifth constructs is less than 15% each (Sumintono & Widhiarso, 2015). The results of the unidimensionality test for the flourishing instrument can be seen in Table 7.

Table 7. Dimensionality

NO	Description	Value 1	Value 2	Value 3	Value 4
1	Total raw variance in observations	72.9	100.0%		100.0%
2	Raw variance explained by measures	22.9	31.4%		31.4%
3	Raw variance explained by persons	7.2	9.9%		9.9%
4	Raw Variance explained by	15.6	21.5%		21.5%

items					
5	Raw unexplained variance (total)	50.0	68.6%	100.0%	68.6%
6	Unexplnd variance in 1st contrast	4.2	5.7%	8.3%	
7	Unexplnd variance in 2nd contrast	2.6	3.6%	5.3%	
8	Unexplnd variance in 3rd contrast	2.4	3.3%	4.7%	
9	Unexplnd variance in 4th contrast	2.2	3.1%	4.5%	
10	Unexplnd variance in 5th contrast	1.8	2.5%	3.7%	

Based on Table 7, it can be seen that the value of raw variance explained by measures obtained by the instruments in this study is 31.4%, which indicates that the unidimensionality requirement of at least 20% is met.

In addition, the unexplained variance ranges from 2.5% to 5.7%, which means that it meets the specified requirement that the variance that cannot be explained by the instrument is no more than 15%. It can be concluded that the instruments used in this study can measure what they are supposed to measure.

Discussion

This study aimed to develop and validate the Instrument Flourishing Adolescence Scale (I-FAS) as a comprehensive tool for measuring adolescent well-being. The main findings of this study indicate that the I-FAS is both a valid and reliable instrument, capable of assessing various dimensions of flourishing among adolescents. The use of Rasch Model Analysis enabled a rigorous psychometric evaluation, providing evidence that the scale meets key measurement standards.

A crucial finding from the Rasch analysis was the Raw Variance Explained by Measures, which reached 31.4%. This value exceeds the commonly accepted minimum threshold of 20% for confirming unidimensionality, meaning that the instrument predominantly measures a

single underlying construct—adolescent flourishing. Thus, the unidimensional structure of the I-FAS is empirically supported, allowing for meaningful interpretation of total scores. The instrument also demonstrated strong reliability. The person reliability was 0.90, and item reliability was 0.99, indicating that the instrument consistently differentiates between individuals and items. The Cronbach's Alpha was 0.92, suggesting high internal consistency among items. The ideal logit value was found to be 1.19, with item difficulty levels ranging from +1.89 (most difficult to endorse) to -1.76 (easiest to endorse). However, five items (Items 7, 28, 42, 48, and 50) were identified as misfitting based on their infit and outfit MNSQ values and thus were considered for revision or removal.

One of the special contributions of this study is the comprehensive nature of the I-FAS, especially because it includes the spiritual well-being aspect. Most existing flourishing models—like those by Diener et al. (2010), Keyes (2002), or Huppert and So (2009)—mainly focus on psychological, emotional, and social well-being, but often do not include the spiritual aspect. This lack of spiritual dimension can make the instruments less suitable in cultural settings where spirituality is an important part of adolescents' lives, helping them find meaning and direction.

The I-FAS addresses this gap by incorporating five dimensions: psychological, social, emotional, subjective, and spiritual well-being, allowing for a more holistic measurement of adolescent flourishing. This expanded framework is particularly relevant for use in culturally diverse settings, including those where spiritual beliefs significantly influence individual well-being. By validating an instrument that includes this often-overlooked dimension, this study contributes to a more nuanced understanding of adolescent flourishing, both conceptually and psychometrically. Overall, the findings suggest that the I-FAS is a psychometrically sound tool with strong potential for use in educational and psychological assessments, particularly in culturally sensitive or diverse populations.

Overall, the instrument flourishing adolescence scale (I-FAS) has proven to be a valid and reliable tool for measuring adolescent well-being, with validity ensured through the use of the Rasch Model to ensure item fit and high reliability. These results indicate that the instrument flourishing adolescence scale (I-FAS) can be a useful instrument for assessing psychological, social, emotional, subjective, and spiritual well-being in adolescents, as well as making an important contribution to psychological interventions or policy development related to adolescent well-being in various contexts.

Flourishing is a fundamental concept in understanding well-being, particularly among adolescents, which is a crucial transitional period in individual development (Waigel & Lemos, 2023; Witten et al., 2019). Flourishing does not merely describe physical health, but also deep emotional, social, and cognitive balance, reflected in an individual's ability to function optimally. Keyes (dalam Schotanus-Dijkstra et al., 2016) describes flourishing as the pinnacle of well-being, achieved when a person feels meaning in life, has positive social relationships, and is able to manage emotions and stress efficiently. In the context of adolescents, a high level of flourishing not only affects their quality of life but also their academic potential, social skills, and resilience in facing life's challenges.

Adolescents with high levels of flourishing are able to manage their emotions very well, have constructive and supportive social relationships, and feel a high level of satisfaction with their lives. For example, research by Lyubomirsky, King, and Diener (in Verma & Tiwari, 2017) shows that individuals with high levels of flourishing are more likely to succeed in their education and professional lives. In the context of adolescents, they not only achieve academic goals more easily, but also tend to show greater involvement in extracurricular activities and have better social skills. Adolescents with high flourishing have a more optimistic mindset, can cope with anxiety and pressure that arise in their lives, and show a tendency to view life positively (Law et al., 2020). They are able to integrate meaning into their lives, which then influences their coping skills against stress that often comes in the form of exams or interpersonal challenges.

Conversely, adolescents at a moderate level of flourishing, although not experiencing significant symptoms of mental disorders, are often in a more vulnerable position to psychological stress. Adolescents in this category exhibit more moderate well-being, reflecting an imbalance between the positive and negative feelings they experience in their lives (Herdiansyah et al., 2024; Waigel & Lemos, 2023). Although they can handle academic tasks and social interactions quite well, they tend to have higher levels of anxiety and stress compared to adolescents who are highly flourishing (Law et al., 2020). In this case, even though they do not show signs of extreme languishing, they may still struggle with feelings of dissatisfaction in their lives and difficulty finding deeper meaning in their activities. According to (dalam Schotanus-Dijkstra et al., 2016), individuals in this category have lower emotional control and social engagement compared to those in the high flourishing category, but still have the capacity to function at an adequate level.

Adolescents who experience low flourishing are in a very different situation. They face various difficulties in both psychological and social aspects that affect their overall quality of life. Low flourishing in adolescents is often reflected in high levels of anxiety, depression, and difficulties in establishing healthy social relationships (Herdiansyah et al., 2024). Individuals in this languishing category feel disconnected from the meaning of their lives, show deep dissatisfaction, and struggle to manage stress in their lives (Soysa & Wilcomb, 2015). This low mental health, as expressed by Myers & Diener (1995), can result in difficulties in coping with life events and uncontrolled emotions. In the context of education, adolescents with low flourishing will tend to have difficulty finding motivation to learn, face exams with higher anxiety, and may feel isolated in their social interactions (Chamizo-Nieto et al., 2021; Datu, 2018). Therefore, adolescents with low levels of flourishing require more specific interventions and more intensive support to help them develop coping skills and improve their overall well-being. Overall, differences in levels of flourishing among adolescents illustrate how well they can manage life challenges, whether social, academic, or emotional. Adolescents with high flourishing tend to have optimal mental health, while those with low or moderate flourishing may need more support to achieve better well-being.

The results of this study have various important implications, both in the field of adolescent psychology and in the development of adolescent welfare policies. With its high validity and reliability, the instrument flourishing adolescence scale (I-FAS) can be used by psychology practitioners to better understand the well-being of adolescents in a more comprehensive manner. This measurement tool makes it possible to identify specific aspects that affect their well-being, whether from psychological, social, emotional, or spiritual dimensions. With more in-depth information, more targeted interventions can be carried out to improve adolescent well-being, both in clinical and educational contexts.

In the field of school guidance and counseling, the use of the instrument flourishing adolescence scale (I-FAS) can assist in the initial assessment of students' well-being, enabling school counselors to design more specific and targeted intervention programs. For example, if a student shows low well-being in certain aspects such as social relationships or emotional stress, the counsellor can provide more focused support tailored to the individual student's needs. This is very useful in preventing more serious psychological problems that may arise in the future, such as depression or anxiety, which are often not visible on the outside.

In addition, the use of the instrument flourishing adolescence scale (I-FAS) can also enrich further research focusing on adolescent well-being by providing a reliable instrument for measuring various factors that influence their development. This instrument can also be applied in cross-cultural research to explore how adolescent well-being can be influenced by different social, economic, and cultural contexts, thereby providing broader insights into the dynamics of adolescent well-being in various parts of the world.

In the context of education, the results of this study can also encourage the development of school policies that are more supportive of adolescent well-being as a whole. Schools can work with counsellors and psychologists to ensure that the learning environment supports not only academic aspects, but also the emotional and social wellbeing of students. The instrument flourishing adolescence scale (I-FAS) provides objective data that can be used to design more inclusive policies or programmes to facilitate student wellbeing, such as self-development programmes, social skills training, or stress management.

Despite its many advantages, this study also has several limitations. One of the main limitations is the use of a limited sample, which could potentially affect the generalisation of the findings. The sample used in this study may not represent the entire adolescent population with diverse social, economic, and cultural backgrounds. Therefore, the use of I-FAS in other adolescent groups with different backgrounds needs to be further tested to ensure the feasibility and validity of this instrument. Another limitation lies in the focus of the dimensions of well-being measured by I-FAS. Although this scale is comprehensive, it is possible that some more specific or contextual aspects of adolescent well-being are not fully covered in this instrument. Researchers and practitioners need to be aware that adolescent well-being is a highly dynamic and contextual concept, which can vary depending on broader external factors, such as social changes or pandemic conditions (Hemberg et al., 2024).

Based on the findings of this study, several recommendations can be made. First, further research needs to be conducted using a more diverse sample to ensure that the instrument flourishing adolescence scale (I-FAS) can be used effectively in various adolescent groups with different backgrounds. This will also help explore whether there are significant differences in well-being between these groups, and whether this scale can be adjusted to reflect these differences. Second, although the Instrument Flourishing Adolescence Scale (I-FAS) has been proven to be valid and reliable, further research can be conducted to add or update items in this instrument so that it can cover more aspects of adolescent well-being,

including those more related to identity development or social and technological challenges that are increasingly relevant in the lives of adolescents today. Finally, practitioners who work with adolescents, such as counsellors, psychologists, and educators, are advised to adopt the instrument flourishing adolescence scale (I-FAS) as a tool in assessing the wellbeing of their adolescents. The use of this scale can help detect problems earlier and enable more targeted treatment, as well as provide a more comprehensive picture of adolescent wellbeing in various aspects of their lives.

Conclusion

This study aimed to develop and validate the instrument flourishing adolescence scale (I-FAS) as a tool to measure adolescent flourishing across five dimensions: psychological, social, emotional, subjective, and spiritual well-being. The results of the Rasch analysis confirmed that the I-FAS has strong psychometric properties, with evidence of unidimensionality, high item and person reliability, and internal consistency. These findings indicate that the I-FAS is a valid and reliable instrument for assessing adolescent flourishing.

The practical implications of this instrument are significant, especially in the context of guidance and counseling services. The I-FAS can help school counselors and educators gain a clearer understanding of students' overall well-being. With this information, they can design more targeted and meaningful interventions that address students' specific needs—whether emotional, social, or spiritual. The inclusion of the spiritual dimension also makes the instrument more culturally sensitive, allowing for its use in diverse educational settings where spirituality plays a key role in identity and development.

Despite its strengths, this study has certain limitations. Data collection was limited to a specific geographic area and age group, which may affect the generalizability of the findings. Future research should test the instrument in different regions and cultural contexts, as well as explore its predictive validity and longitudinal applicability. Further development could also involve adapting the I-FAS for use by practitioners outside the school setting, such as in youth mental health services or community programs.

References

- Barber, J., & Cook, C. (2024). Integrating Spirituality Into Mental Health Care. *BJPsych Open*, 10(S1), S29–S29. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjo.2024.131>
- Behera, B. P. (2020). Spirituality and Well-Being in a Successful Life. In *Psycho-Social Perspectives on Mental Health and Well-Being* (pp. 296–314). IGI Global.

- Biswas-Diener, R. (2009). New measures of well-being: Flourishing and positive and negative feelings. *Social Indicators Research*, 39 (4), 247–266. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-009-9493-y>
- Božek, A., Nowak, P. F., & Blukacz, M. (2020). The relationship between spirituality, health-related behavior, and psychological well-being. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1997. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01997>
- Butler, J., & Kern, M. L. (2016). The PERMA-Profil: A brief multidimensional measure of flourishing. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 6(3). <https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v6i3.526>
- Chamizo-Nieto, M. T., Arrivillaga, C., Rey, L., & Extremera, N. (2021). The role of emotional intelligence, the teacher-student relationship, and flourishing on academic performance in adolescents: A moderated mediation study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 695067. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.695067>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.
- Datu, J. A. D. (2018). Flourishing is associated with higher academic achievement and engagement in Filipino undergraduate and high school students. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 19(1), 27–39. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-016-9805-2>
- Dharma, D., Sharma, A., Garg, M., Garg, M., Kapoor, H., & Sondhi, J. (2024). Review of research on the effects of spirituality on well-being and resilience. *Management Insight*, 19(02), 30–34. <https://doi.org/10.21844/mijia.19.2.4>
- Diener, E., Wirtz, D., Tov, W., Kim-Prieto, C., Choi, D., Oishi, S., & Biswas-Diener, R. (2010). New well-being measures: Short scales to assess flourishing and positive and negative feelings. *Social Indicators Research*, 97, 143–156. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-009-9493-y>
- Fabricatore, A. N., Handal, P. J., & Fenzel, L. M. (2000). Personal Spirituality as a Moderator of the Relationship between Stressors and Subjective Well-Being. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 28(3), 221–228. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009164710002800305>
- Fisher, J. (2011). The four domains model: Connecting spirituality, health and well-being. *Religions*, 2(1), 17–28. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel2010017>
- Hemberg, J., Sundqvist, A., Korzhina, Y., Östman, L., Gylfe, S., Gädda, F., Nyström, L., Groundstroem, H., & Nyman-Kurkiala, P. (2024). Being young in times of uncertainty and isolation: Adolescents' experiences of well-being, health and loneliness during the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 29(1), 2302102. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2024.2302102>
- Herdiansyah, D., & Puteri, N. H. (2023). Flourishing Bagi Mahasiswa Bimbingan Dan Konseling Sebagai Calon Helper. *JCOSE Jurnal Bimbingan Dan Konseling*, 6(1), 8–17. <https://doi.org/10.24905/jcose.v6i1.147>
- Herdiansyah, D., Puteri, N. H., & Naini, R. (2024). Studi Deskriptif: Prevalensi Flourishing Mahasiswa Dan Implikasinya Pada Bimbingan Dan Konseling. *Coution: Journal of Counseling and Education*, 5(1), 22–34. <https://journal.bungabangsacirebon.ac.id/index.php/coution/article/download/1824/1052>
- Huppert, F. A., & So, T. (2009). What percentage of people in Europe are flourishing and what characterises them. In *Proceedings of the 9th Conference of the International Society for Quality of Life Studies (ISQOLS)* (pp. 1–7).
- Huppert, F. A., & So, T. T. C. (2013). Flourishing Across Europe: Application of a New Conceptual Framework for Defining Well-Being. *Social Indicators Research*, 110(3), 837–861. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-011-9966-7>

- Janicke-Bowles, S. (2024). Digital Flourishing in the U.S.: Validation of the Digital Flourishing Scale (DFS) and Demographic Exploration. *Communication Studies*, 75(3), 322–341. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2023.2289688>
- Keyes, C. L. (2002). The mental health continuum: From languishing to flourishing in life. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 207–222. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3090197>
- Keyes, C. L. (2007). Promoting and protecting mental health as flourishing: A complementary strategy for improving national mental health. *American Psychologist*, 62(2), 95–108. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.62.2.95>
- Keyes, C. L., & Haidt, J. (2003). *Flourishing: Positive psychology and the life well-lived*. American Psychological Association Washington, DC.
- Keyes, C. L. M., Wissing, M., Potgieter, J. P., Temane, M., Kruger, A., & Van Rooy, S. (2008). Evaluation of the mental health continuum–short form (MHC-SF) in setswana-speaking South Africans. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, 15(3), 181–192. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.572>
- Kreitzer, M. J. (2012). Spirituality and Well-Being: Focusing on What Matters. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 34(6), 707–711. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193945912448315>
- Lamers, S. M. A., Westerhof, G. J., Bohlmeijer, E. T., Ten Klooster, P. M., & Keyes, C. L. M. (2011). Evaluating the psychometric properties of the mental health Continuum-Short Form (MHC-SF). *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 67(1), 99–110. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.20741>
- Law, D. M., Shapka, J. D., & Collie, R. J. (2020). Who might flourish and who might languish? Adolescent social and mental health profiles and their online experiences and behaviors. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, 2(1), 82–92. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.172>
- Maulidiya, A. K., Su'udi, A., & Wibowo, W. (2024). Emotional, mental disorders and depression in adolescents. *Jurnal Edukasi Ilmiah Kesehatan*, 2(2), 63–70. <https://doi.org/10.61099/junedik.v2i2.47>
- McEntee, M. L., Dy-Liacco, G. S., & Haskins, D. G. (2013). Human Flourishing: A Natural Home for Spirituality. *Journal of Spirituality in Mental Health*, 15(3), 141–159. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19349637.2013.799410>
- Mental, L. M. (2019). Mental Health in Adolescents. *Global Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disabilities*, 6(3), 45–46. DOI: 10.19080/GJIDD.2019.06.555686
- Muarifah, A., Diponegoro, A. M., Naini, R., Partini, S., Suadirman, D. H., & Zakiyah, T. A. (2024). The Prevalence of Adolescent Spirituality and Its Implication in Guidance and Counseling Services. *PROCEEDINGS OF THE 2ND ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE: Reimagining Guidance and Counselling in the Vuca Era (Aicgc 2023)*, 94.
- Myers, D. G., & Diener, E. (1995). Who Is Happy? *Psychological Science*, 6(1), 10–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.1995.tb00298.x>
- Nadhirah, N. A., Suryana, D., & binti Ahmad, A. (2022). Development and Validation Peaceful Classroom Scale: Rasch Model Analysis. *International Journal of Instruction*, 15(4), 497–514. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2022.15427a>
- Nayak, R., Manoharan, M., Prasad, L., Gladston, S., Raghuram, M., Edwin, D., & Kanthi, E. (2022). Psychological issues in adolescents. *Indian Journal of Continuing Nursing Education*, 23(1), 29–39. 10.4103/ijcn.ijcn_53_22
- Petrillo, G., Capone, V., Caso, D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (2015). The Mental Health Continuum–Short Form (MHC-SF) as a Measure of Well-Being in the Italian Context. *Social Indicators Research*, 121(1), 291–312. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-014-0629-3>
- Prizmić-Larsen, Z., Kaliterna-Lipovčan, L., Larsen, R., Brkljačić, T., & Brajša-Žganec, A. (2020). The Role of Flourishing in Relationship between Positive and Negative Life Events and

- Affective Well-Being. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 15(5), 1413–1431. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-019-09743-y>
- Rapee, R. M., Oar, E. L., Johnco, C. J., Forbes, M. K., Fardouly, J., Magson, N. R., & Richardson, C. E. (2019). Adolescent development and risk for the onset of social-emotional disorders: A review and conceptual model. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 123, 103501. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2019.103501>
- Rautenbach, C., & Rothmann, S. (2017). Psychometric validation of the Flourishing-at-Work Scale – Short Form (FWS-SF): Results and implications of a South African study. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 27(4), 303–309. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14330237.2017.1347748>
- Rule, A., Abbey, C., Wang, H., Rozelle, S., & Singh, M. K. (2024). Measurement of flourishing: A scoping review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1293943. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1293943>
- Schotanus-Dijkstra, M., Pieterse, M. E., Drossaert, C. H. C., Westerhof, G. J., De Graaf, R., Ten Have, M., Walburg, J. A., & Bohlmeijer, E. T. (2016). What Factors are Associated with Flourishing? Results from a Large Representative National Sample. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 17(4), 1351–1370. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-015-9647-3>
- Seligman, M. (2018). PERMA and the building blocks of well-being. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 13(4), 333–335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2018.1437466>
- Seligman, M. E. (2011). *Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being*. Free Press.
- Soysa, C. K., & Wilcomb, C. J. (2015). Mindfulness, Self-compassion, Self-efficacy, and Gender as Predictors of Depression, Anxiety, Stress, and Well-being. *Mindfulness*, 6(2), 217–226. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-013-0247-1>
- VanderWeele, T. J. (2017a). On the promotion of human flourishing. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(31), 8148–8156. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1702996114>
- VanderWeele, T. J. (2017b). Religious Communities and Human Flourishing. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 26(5), 476–481. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721417721526>
- Verma, Y., & Tiwari, G. K. (2017). Self-Compassion as the Predictor of Flourishing of the Students. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 4(3), 10–29. [10.25215/0403.122](https://doi.org/10.25215/0403.122)
- Waigel, N. C., & Lemos, V. N. (2023). A systematic review of adolescent flourishing. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 19(1), 79. <https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.19.1.79>
- Witten, H., Savahl, S., & Adams, S. (2019). Adolescent flourishing: A systematic review. *Cogent Psychology*, 6(1), 1640341. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2019.1640341>