
Flourishing Scale at work

Proprietà psicometriche

Annamaria Di Fabio¹

Sommario

Lo scopo del presente lavoro è quello di verificare le proprietà psicometriche della *Flourishing Scale at Work* per avere uno specifico strumento per valutare il flourishing in relazione al lavoro. I partecipanti sono 130 lavoratori italiani. Sono state esaminate le proprietà psicometriche della scala in termini di dimensionalità, attendibilità e validità concorrente. L'Analisi Fattoriale Confermativa mostra una struttura unidimensionale. La scala mostra anche una buona attendibilità e validità concorrente. I risultati sottolineano che la *Flourishing Scale at Work* è uno strumento valido e attendibile per rilevare il flourishing in relazione al lavoro.

Parole chiave

Flourishing at work, Proprietà psicometriche, *Flourishing Scale at Work*, Contesto lavorativo.

¹ Director of the International Research and Intervention Laboratory «Work and Organizational Psychology for Vocational Guidance, Career Counseling, Talents and Healthy Organizations» and of the International Research and Intervention Laboratory «Cross-Cultural Positive Psychology, Prevention, and Sustainability», Department of Education, Languages, Intercultures, Literatures and Psychology (Psychology Section), University of Florence, <https://www.forlilpsi.unifi.it/vp-30-laboratori.html>.

Flourishing Scale at work

Psychometric properties

Annamaria Di Fabio¹

Abstract

The present study aims at verifying the psychometric properties of the Flourishing Scale at Work in order to have a specific instrument to evaluate flourishing in relation to work. Participants were 130 Italian workers. The psychometric properties of the scale in terms of dimensionality, reliability and concurrent validity were examined. Confirmatory Factor Analysis showed a unidimensional structure. The scale also showed good reliability and concurrent validity. The results emphasised that the Flourishing Scale at Work is a valid and reliable instrument to assess flourishing related to work.

Keywords

Flourishing at work, Psychometric properties, Flourishing Scale at Work, Work context.

¹ Director of the International Research and Intervention Laboratory «Work and Organizational Psychology for Vocational Guidance, Career Counseling, Talents and Healthy Organizations» and of the International Research and Intervention Laboratory «Cross-Cultural Positive Psychology, Prevention, and Sustainability», Department of Education, Languages, Intercultures, Literatures and Psychology (Psychology Section), University of Florence, <https://www.forilpsi.unifi.it/vp-30-laboratori.html>.

In current times, the well-being of workers is particularly at risk (Di Fabio & Kenny, 2016b, 2019), considering the instability and precariousness that affect the 21st century world of work (Blustein et al., 2019; Peiró et al., 2012) aggravated by the crisis introduced by the Covid-19 pandemic (Gori, Topino, & Di Fabio, 2020). The study of well-being is thus central in organisational research, particularly in the healthy organisations framework (Di Fabio, 2017b; Di Fabio et al., 2020; Di Fabio & Peiró, 2018; Peiró et al., 2020), which attempts to combine healthy business with healthy workers for healthier and more sustainable organisations (Di Fabio, 2017a).

In the research area relative to well-being, two approaches emerged: hedonic well-being (Kahneman, Diener, & Schwarz, 1999) and eudaimonic well-being (Ryan & Deci, 2001). Hedonic well-being refers to the achievement of pleasure and the avoidance of pain (Kahneman et al., 1999), it includes both an affective component characterised by the prevalence of positive rather than negative emotions (Watson et al., 1988) and a cognitive component of evaluation as life satisfaction (Diener et al., 1985). Eudaimonic well-being is related to self-realisation (Ryan & Deci, 2001), emphasising life meaning, authenticity and purposefulness (Waterman et al., 2010).

In the current challenging period, the interest is above all on eudaimonic aspects of well-being connected with meaning (Di Fabio & Blustein, 2016) and meaning at work (Steger et al., 2012) but also on aspects linked to the flourishing of individuals (Diener et al. 2010) at work.

Flourishing is defined in terms of socio-psychological prosperity and refers to «self-perceived success in important areas such as relationships, self-esteem, purpose, and optimism» (Diener et al., 2010, p. 143).

The flourishing construct is traditionally evaluated through the Flourishing Scale (Diener et al., 2010), a short tool consisting of eight items that provides a total flourishing score. The scale exhibits good psychometric properties in terms of dimensionality and reliability and shows positive relationships with other measures of well-being. An Italian version of the Flourishing Scale (Di Fabio, 2016) exists with good psychometric properties.

In literature, some attempts were made to develop scales to measure flourishing at work, such as the Flourishing-at-Work Scale (FAWS; Rothmann et al., 2019), which consists of 33 items measuring 10 dimensions of the emotional, psychological and social aspects of flourishing in the work context in South Africa. There is also a short form of this scale (17 items), again applied to the South African context (Rautenbach & Rothmann, 2017). The FAWS is a scale with a consistent number of items also in its short form (more than double the items that comprise the traditional Flourishing Scale by Diener et al., 2010).

With the aim of creating a very brief scale to specifically measure flourishing at work, starting from the eight items of the Flourishing Scale (Diener et al.,

2010) and adapting them to the work context, the Flourishing Scale at Work was developed by Di Fabio. Hence, the present study aims at verifying the psychometric properties of the Flourishing Scale at Work in order to have a specific instrument to evaluate flourishing at the workplace.

The availability of a specific tool to detect flourishing at work could be particularly promising in two ways. First, it could open new research perspectives in the framework of healthy organisations (Di Fabio, 2017b; Di Fabio et al., 2020). Second, it could expand the stimuli of the Well-being movement (Robertson & Cooper, 2010; Johnson et al., 2018), which emphasises the value of building the well-being of workers, enhancing both work performance and reducing negative outcomes.

Method

Participants

Participants were 130 workers from different Italian regions, both freelance (53.84%) and employees (46.16%). There were 70 males (53.85%) and 60 females (46.15%); mean age 45.12 ($DS = 13.09$).

Measures

The *Flourishing Scale at Work* (by Di Fabio). This tool comprises 8 items for which participants have to express their agreement on a seven-point Likert scale (from 1 = «Completely disagree» to 7 = «Completely agree»). Examples of items are: «*I carry out purposeful and meaningful work*»; «*My social relationships at work are supportive and rewarding*». The psychometric properties of this tool will be examined in this study.

The *Meaningful Life Measure* (MLM, Morgan & Farsides, 2009; Italian version by Di Fabio, 2014). The measure comprises 23 items with a format from 1 = «Strongly disagree» to 7 = «Strongly agree». It has a total score and five dimensions: Exciting life (example of item «Life to me seems always exciting»), Accomplished life (example of item «So far, I am pleased with what I have achieved in life»), Principled life (example of item «I have a personal value system that makes my life worthwhile»), Purposeful life (example of item «I have a clear idea of what my future goals and aims are»), Valued life (example of item «My life is significant»). Cronbach's alpha for the total score used in this study is .85.

The *Work And Meaning Inventory* (WAMI, Steger et al., 2012; Italian version by Di Fabio, 2018). The inventory comprises 10 items with a format from 1 =

«Strongly disagree» to 7 = «Strongly agree». It has a total score and three dimensions: Positive meaning (example of item «I have found a meaningful career»); Meaning making through work (example of item «My work helps me make sense of the world around me»); Greater good motivations (example of item «I know my work makes a positive difference in the world»). Cronbach's alpha for the total score used in this study is .80.

Procedure

Administration took place collectively, by specialised personnel and in compliance with privacy laws and informed consent. The order of administration was counterbalanced to control the effects that could arise from the order of presentation.

Data Analysis

The factorial structure of the Flourishing Scale at Work was verified with Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) using the statistical program AMOS. The adequacy of the model was analysed using different fit indices such as the ratio between the value of χ^2 and the degrees of freedom (χ^2/df) (values between 1 and 3 are indicators of a good fit). Further indices were also considered, such as: the Comparative Fit Index (CFI, Bentler, 1990) and the Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI, Tucker & Lewis, 1973) (values above .90 indicate a good adequacy of the model; Bentler, 1990); the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) and the Standardized Root Mean Squared Residual (SRMR) (Browne & Cudeck, 1993) (values below .08 indicate a good fit). The reliability of the Flourishing Scale at Work was also verified by calculating the Cronbach's alpha and the correct item-total correlations. In addition, to verify concurrent validity, correlations of the Flourishing Scale at Work with the MLM and the WAMI were examined using the r Pearson coefficient. Positive and statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) correlations of the *Flourishing Scale at Work* with the MLM and WAMI were considered indicators of concurrent validity. Values < 0.30 indicated weak correlations; $0.30-0.50$ moderate correlations; > 0.50 strong correlations (Cohen 1992).

Results

To verify the unidimensional structure of the Flourishing Scale at Work, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was carried out. The Goodness of Fit indices are reported in Table 1. TLI, CFIA, RMSEA, and SRMR showed adequate values.

Table 1

Goodness of Fit Indices (N = 130).

<i>Flourishing at Work</i>	χ^2/gdl	TLI	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR
	2.04	.95	.97	.08	.07

Cronbach’s alpha coefficient and corrected item-total correlations were calculated. Cronbach’s alpha was .89. The correct item-total correlations, all positive and significant, ranged from .81 to .60.

Correlations of the Flourishing Scale with MLM and WAMI are shown in Table 2. All correlations were statistically significant and strong, highlighting good concurrent validity of the Flourishing Scale at Work with MLM and WAMI.

Table 2

Correlations of the Flourishing Scale at Work with MLM and WAMI.

	<i>Flourishing at Work</i>
MLM	.51**
WAMI	.63**

Note. N = 130. ** p < .01.

Discussions

The aim of this study was to examine the psychometric properties of the Flourishing Scale at Work (by Di Fabio) in order to have a specific and brief instrument to evaluate flourishing related to work.

The unidimensional structure of the Flourishing Scale at Work was confirmed through CFA and it is in line with the original version of the Flourishing Scale (Diener et al., 2010) and also with the Italian version of the Flourishing Scale (Di Fabio, 2016). The Flourishing Scale at Work has good reliability both in terms of Cronbach’s alpha and correct item-total correlations. Concurrent validity of the Flourishing Scale at Work is good considering its positive relationships with life meaning and above all with work meaning. These correlations show that flourishing at work is positively associated with aspects of meaning in life and particularly of meaning at work, but these constructs do not completely overlap and so flourishing at work maintains its specificity.

The findings of the present research show that the Flourishing Scale at Work is a valid and reliable instrument for detecting flourishing related to work, but limitations related to the research participants must be emphasised. With regard to the limited number of participants in the study (131 workers), future research

could be directed to larger groups. Furthermore, the group essentially included participants from certain Italian regions (not all), which limits the representativeness of the work context at a national level. Future research should therefore consider groups of participants from other geographic areas too. It would also be advisable, in the future, to evaluate the psychometric properties of the Flourishing Scale at Work in other countries, in order to be able to carry out comparative studies, favouring a cross-cultural perspective.

In spite of these limitations, the Flourishing Scale at Work can be considered a psychometrically adequate tool to detect flourishing related to work. Having a scale capable of evaluating the construct of flourishing at work in a valid and reliable way allows this construct to be studied in-depth in the working context and therefore offers the possibility of strengthening both research and interventions in line with the well-being movement (Robertson & Cooper, 2010; Johnson et al., 2018), and the healthy organisations framework (Di Fabio, 2017a, 2017b; Di Fabio et al., 2020), also considering a prevention perspective, including both primary prevention (Di Fabio & Kenny, 2015, 2016a; Hage et al., 2007) and strength-based prevention perspectives (Di Fabio & Saklofske, 2021).

References

- Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107(2), 238-246. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.107.2.238
- Blustein, D.L., Kenny, M. E., Di Fabio, A., & Guichard, J. (2019). Expanding the impact of the psychology of working: Engaging psychology in the struggle for decent work and human rights. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 27, 3-28. doi: 10.1177/1069072718774002
- Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K. A. Bollen & J. S. Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equation models* (pp. 136-162). Newsbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1), 155-159. doi: 10.1037//0033-2909.112.1.155
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71-75. doi: 10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13
- Diener, E., Wirtz, D., Tov, W., Kim-Prieto, C., Choi, D. W., Oishi, S., & Biswas-Diener, R. (2010). New well-being measures: Short scales to assess flourishing and positive and negative feelings. *Social Indicators Research*, 97(2), 143-156. doi: 10.1007/s11205-009-9493-y
- Di Fabio, A. (2014). Meaningful Life Measure: Primo contributo alla validazione della versione italiana [Meaningful Life Measure: First contribution to the validation of the Italian version]. *Counseling Giornale Italiano di Ricerca e Applicazioni*, 7, 307-315.
- Di Fabio, A. (2016). *Flourishing Scale*: Primo contributo alla validazione della versione italiana [Flourishing Scale: First contribution to the validation of the Italian version]. *Counseling. Giornale Italiano di Ricerca e Applicazioni*, 9(1). doi: 10.14605/CS911606
- Di Fabio, A. (2017a). Positive Healthy Organizations: Promoting well-being, meaningfulness, and sustainability in organizations. *Frontiers in Psychology. Organizational Psychology*, 8, 1938. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01938

- Di Fabio, A. (2017b). The psychology of sustainability and sustainable development for well-being in organizations. *Frontiers in Psychology. Organizational Psychology*, 8, 1534. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01534
- Di Fabio, A. (2018). The work and meaning inventory (WAMI): Primo contributo alla validazione della versione italiana. [The work and meaning inventory (WAMI): First contribution to the validation of the Italian version]. *Counseling. Giornale Italiano di Ricerca e Applicazioni*, 11(1). doi: 10.14605/CS1111808
- Di Fabio, A., & Blustein, D. L. (2016). Editorial. In A. Di Fabio & D. L. Blustein (Eds.), Ebook Research Topic «From Meaning of Working to Meaningful Lives: The Challenges of Expanding Decent Work». *Frontiers in Psychology. Organizational Psychology*, 7, 1119. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01119
- Di Fabio, A., & Kenny, M. E. (2015). The contributions of emotional intelligence and social support for adaptive career progress among Italian youth. *Journal of Career Development*, 42, 48-59. doi: 10.1177/0894845314533420
- Di Fabio, A., & Kenny, M. E. (2016a). From decent work to decent lives: Positive Self and Relational Management (PS&RM) in the twenty-first century. *Frontiers in Psychology. Section Organizational Psychology*, 7, 361. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00361
- Di Fabio, A., & Kenny, M. E. (2016b). Promoting well-being: The contribution of emotional intelligence. *Frontiers in Psychology. Organizational Psychology*, 7, 1182. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01182
- Di Fabio, A., & Kenny, M. E. (2019). Decent work in Italy: Context, conceptualization, and assessment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 110(Part A), 131-143. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2018.10.014
- Di Fabio, A., & Peiró, J. M. (2018). Human Capital Sustainability Leadership to promote sustainable development and healthy organizations: A new scale. *Sustainability*, 10(7), 2413. doi: 10.3390/su10072413
- Di Fabio, A., & Saklofske, D. H. (2021). The relationship of compassion and self-compassion with personality and emotional intelligence. PAID 40th anniversary special issue. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 157. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2020.110109. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2003.10.005
- Di Fabio, A., Cheung, F., & Peiró, J.-M. (2020). Editorial Special Issue Personality and individual differences and healthy organizations. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 166. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2020.110196
- Gori, A., Topino, E., & Di Fabio, A. (2020). The protective role of life satisfaction, coping strategies and defense mechanisms on perceived stress due to COVID-19 emergency: A chained mediation model. *PLoS ONE*, 15(11), e0242402. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0242402
- Hage, S. M., Romano, J. L., Conyne, R. K., Kenny, M., Matthews, C., Schwartz, J. P., & Waldo, M. (2007). Best practice guidelines on prevention practice, research, training, and social advocacy for psychologists. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 35, 493-566. doi: 10.1177/0011000006291411
- Johnson, S., Robertson, I., & Cooper, C. L. (2018). *Wellbeing: Productivity and Happiness at Work*. (2nd ed.). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kahneman, D., Diener, E., & Schwarz, N. (Eds.). (1999). *Well-being: Foundations of hedonic psychology*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Morgan, J., & Farsides, T. (2009). Psychometric evaluation of the meaningful life measure. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 10(3), 351-366. doi: 10.1007/s10902-008-9093-6
- Peiró, J. M., Sora, B., & Caballer, A. (2012). Job insecurity in the younger Spanish workforce: Causes and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(2), 444-453. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2011.09.007
- Peiró, J. M., Bayonab, J. A., Caballer, A., & Di Fabio, A. (2020). Importance of work characteristics affects job performance: The mediating role of individual dispositions on the work design-performance relationships. *PAID*

- 40th Anniversary Special Issue. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 157. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2019.109808
- 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. doi: 10.1080/14330237.2017.1347748
- Robertson, I., & Cooper, C.L. (2010). *Wellbeing: Productivity and Happiness at Work*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rothmann, S., Van Zyl, L. E., & Rautenbach, C. (2019). Measuring flourishing@ work interventions: The development and validation of the Flourishing-at-Work Scale. In L. E Van Zyl & S. Rothmann (Eds.), *Positive psychological intervention design and protocols for multi-cultural contexts* (pp. 241-276). Cham: Springer.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). To be happy or to be self-fulfilled: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. In S. Fiske (Ed.), *Annual Review of Psychology* (vol. 52, pp. 141-166). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.
- Steger, M. F., Dik, B. J., & Duffy, R. D. (2012). Measuring meaningful work: The work and meaning inventory (WAMI). *Journal of Career Assessment*, 20(3), 322-337.
- Tucker, L. R., & Lewis, C. (1973). A reliability coefficient for maximum likelihood factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, 38(1), 1-10.
- Waterman, A. S., Schwartz, S. J., Zamboanga, B. L., Ravert, R. D., Williams, M. K., ... & Bede Agocha, V. (2010). The Questionnaire for Eudaimonic Well-Being: Psychometric properties, demographic comparisons, and evidence of validity. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 5, 41-61. doi: 10.1080/17439760903435208
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(6), 1063-1070. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.54.6.1063