



## Construct Validity of Ryff's Psychological Wellbeing Version Using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

Farida Aryani<sup>1</sup>, Nur Fadhilah Umar<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Guidance and Counseling, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia  
Email: farida.aryani@unm.ac.id

<sup>1</sup>Guidance and Counseling, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia  
Email: nurfadhilahumar@unm.ac.id

(Received: 09-06-2021; Reviewed: 17-02-2022; Accepted: 22-08-2022;  
Available online: 23-08-2022; Published: 29-08-2022)



This is an open-access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License  
CC-BY-NC-4.0 ©2020 by author (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

**Abstract.** The purpose of this study was to adapt the psychological well-being measurement tool in the Indonesian version that had been developed by Ryff, and to measure the level of validity and reliability of the scale on a wider sample. The design in this study is a quantitative research design. The population of this study are students who live in the city of Makassar, teachers who work in the city of Makassar, and employees who work in the city of Makassar. The sampling technique in this study used cluster random sampling, with the withdrawal of the number of samples using the slovin method, therefore it was found that the number of samples in this study were 1182 respondents consisting of 707 students, 160 teachers at the high school stage, and 313 employees. The data analysis technique in this study used an inter-factor test using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) using JASP 13.1 for IOS. The results of this study indicate that the Indonesian version of the well-being psychological scale shows a high fit index model for each type of sample. Therefore it can be concluded that the Ryff psychological well-being scale is valid and reliable for measuring individual well-being in Indonesia.

**Keywords:** Construct Validity, Ryffs Psychological Wellbeing, Scale, Confirmatory Factor Analysis.

## INTRODUCTION

Psychological Well-being is a psychological variable that measures the well-being of an individual in his work environment. Psychological well-being is proven to positively influence a person's career engagement, academic engagement (Mayangdarastri & Khusna, 2020). (Wikanestri & Prabowo, 2015) suggests that low psychological wellbeing tends to be owned by entrepreneurs who also have below average incomes. The results of research conducted by (Rendón, Villalobos, Rovira, & Leiva, 2020) found that psychological well-being has a significant influence on academic achievement. Furthermore, the results of a study

by Glozah (2013) revealed that psychological well-being, social support and academic stress felt by students have an influence on each other.

Psychological well-being is an aspect of psychological well-being or feelings of peace, where individuals who have good well-being will be able to accept their own strengths and weaknesses (Lee, Kubzansky & VanderWeele, 2021). Individuals who have self-acceptance contribute positively to increasing academic achievement and work performance (Grace, 2020). However, measurements related to well-being are difficult because individual standards of happiness differ from one another. In addition, cultural and language differences are also factors that result in different welfare constructs in one

place and another (Gallagher & Long, 2020; Ryff & Singer, 2006). While welfare is a very interesting theme to study and measure in Indonesia. The attractiveness of well-being as a measurement theme is due to the fact that well-being contributes positively to mental health both as students and workers. Therefore, this study aims to adapt the welfare measurement tool in the cultural context in Indonesia.

The psychological well-being scale previously existed which was developed by Ryff in 2014. This scale is a one-factor scale that measures well-being as a whole, the level of individual welfare through 6 dimensions. According to (Henn, Hill, & Jorgensen, 2016) one of the aspects contained in psychological well-being is the aspect of success of the individual functioning positively including feelings of growth and development, self-development, and also the use of the environment. Therefore, career well-being affects individual acceptance of himself and his work environment, individuals' ability to master their environment, the ability to be autonomous, the ability to build positive relationships with others, personal growth, and individual goals in life (Sumule, 2012). Steiner & Spurk (2019) explained that well-being is not only related to work activities such as satisfaction with the career pursued but also related to non-work activities such as harmony in the family environment and having productive leisure time both for yourself and the environment. The work that is carried out to the maximum has an important role to develop the capacity and adaptability and create better changes in the world of work. In this case career development becomes an important part for the health and well-being of each individual (Rendón, Pérez, Rovira, & Leiva, 2020)

Several research results show that career well-being contributes positively to empathizing, self-acceptance and acceptance of others, work professionalism, self-management and resilience (Ellis, 1986; Kossek et al., 2014; Wulandari, 2013). Chinyamurindi (2019) says that career well-being has helped foreign workers to do their jobs well. While (Chen, Tsai, & Lei, 2013) found that some doctors tend to be dissatisfied with their performance and feel that their work is lacking in maximum and lack of benefits which then affects low commitment to work, poor self-care and low self-well-being. The results of the study show that someone who has good well-being directly contributes positively to their

ability to work well and achieve the best results they strive for (Warr & Nielsen, 2018).

So, it can conclude that career well-being is an essential indicator in measuring performance indicators and a person's attachment to their career.

According to (Ryff & Keyes, 1995), psychological well-being is an encouragement to perfect and realize one's true potential. This urge can make a person surrender to the situation and improve the situation in his life. When someone surrenders to a situation, it will make psychological well-being low; on the contrary, it will increase his psychological well-being when someone tries to improve his life situation. Ryff, Friedman, Morozink, & Tsenkova (2012) explained that psychological well-being is closely related to the willingness for individuals to maintain well-being, self-preservation, the capacity to face difficulties in life and try to rise from a problem. Therefore, psychological well-being refers to an assessment of a person's feelings about their daily life activities. This feeling is a mental state, both positively and negatively. Adverse mental conditions, such as life dissatisfaction and anxiety. Favourable mental conditions, such as self-realization and self-actualization. Stenhoff, Steadman, Nevitt, Benson, & White (2020) revealed that psychological well-being is relevant to positive psychological functions such as personal growth, autonomy and also environmental mastery.

According to (Ryff & Keyes, 1995), psychological wellbeing consists of 6 main dimensions to assessment of themselves as unique individuals. measure a person's psychological health: (1) Autonomy: The dimension of autonomy concerns how a person's ability to self-determination (self-determination) has the freedom and ability to regulate one's behavior; (2) Environmental mastery: This dimension concerns a person's subjective feelings regarding the ability to choose, create and manage the environment around him so that one is with his psychological condition to develop himself. (3) Personal Growth: This dimension concerns a person's desire to develop his / her potential continuously, in this case, known as the fully function person. When individuals can function fully, they can be open to all challenges and new learning experiences to become aware of the environment around them; (4) Positive Relations with others: The fourth dimension includes how someone can love and build interpersonal relationships with others based on

trust. When a person can build positive relationships with other people, they will have feelings of love, affection, sympathy, deep friendship, and the ability to judge others well; (5) The Purposes in Life: in this dimension, assumed that when individuals have faith, they can determine direction, purpose and meaning for their lives. Thus, Individuals who have psychological wellbeing means that they have a clear understanding of the purpose of life they are living; (6) Self-Acceptance: The dimension of self-acceptance includes a person's ability to accept all one's strengths and weaknesses as a whole. According to Hayat & Suryadi (2014), self-acceptance is one of the characters that helps individuals actualize themselves, accept themselves as they are and provide a positive

The six dimensions of psychological well-being (Ryff & Keyes, 1995) developed an instrument known as the Ryff psychological well-being scale. This instrument consists of 18 items consisting of 10 unfavorable items and 8 favorable items, with 7 answer choices, namely 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Disagree, 4 = Doubtful, 5 = Somewhat Agree, 6 = Agree, and 7 = Strongly Agree.

Although this psychological well-being scale has high validity and reliability as a standard measuring tool. However, this measurement tool is not necessarily suitable when applied in Indonesia. Limitations due to cultural diversity, language and individual welfare standards are the factors causing this measuring instrument to be re-tested regarding the level of validity and reliability of the scale (Maulana, Khawaja, & Obst, 2019; Purnama, Farozin, & Astuti, 2022). Adaptations related to the psychological well-being scale have been carried out by (Hayat & Suryadi, 2014), although the respondents were teenagers. Therefore, this study aims to adapt to the psychological well-being scale to respondents with wider coverage. It consist of school counsellors, students, and employees. Therefore, this study aims to test the validity and reliability of the psychological well-being scale by (Ryff & Keyes, 1995) on respondents of school counselors, employees, and high school students to obtain a scale capable of measuring individual well-being on a wider range of individual characteristics (Black & Halstead, 2021; Gilbreath & Benson, 2004).

## METHOD

This study's population were teachers/school counsellors, students, and employers in South Sulawesi registered in the 2020 academic year. Sampling uses the proportional stratified random sampling method, a stratified sampling method where homogeneous population groups are identified based on similar characteristics (Zhang et al., 2020). The following steps carried out the sampling method: 1) recording the number of counsellors in SMA / SMK, students and employees in each city and district in South Sulawesi province in 2020. 2) Based on counsellor data, several cities and districts were selected, namely Makassar, Maros, Gowa, Jenepono, and Wajo. 3) The results of the selected cities and regencies are sorted into high school schools and offices, considered to represent the characteristics of the respondents.

The population regarding the number of teacher/school counsellors in SMA/SMK in the 2019-2020 academic year in the province of South Sulawesi is 1675. The sample size was determined using the Slovin method (Ryan, 2013) with a probability value of 0.05. The sample size obtained was 168 teachers/school counsellors consisting of 88 girls and 80 boys. The student respondents selected randomly with a sample size of 707, consisting of 360 male students and 357 female students consisting of five districts. Employee respondents have a sample size of 315, consisting of 165 male employees and 150 female employees from various occupational sectors, namely private and civil servants. The selection of respondents from teachers, students and employees aims to represent development stages in adolescents and adults.

The data analysis technique used the confirmatory analysis test using the JASP for windows application. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is used to examine the relationship between factors of a psychological construct that is measured according to CFA measurements including test indicators such as Chi-Square (CMIN/Df < 2.00), RMSEA < 0.08), TLI > 0.95), and

reliability test use McDonald's ( $>0.6$ ), as well as Cronbach Alfa ( $> 0.60$ ) (Brown & Moore, 2012).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Result

#### a. CFA Test Results on Student Respondents.

Based on the results of trials conducted by researchers on 707 students in South Sulawesi, it can be seen in table 1.

**Table 1.** CFA results on the student respondents

	N	Reliability		Validity				
		McDonald's	Cronbach's	RMSEA	GFI	CMIN/DF	CFI	TLI
<b>Psychological Wellbeing</b>	<b>707</b>	<b>0.713</b>	<b>0.716</b>	<b>0.073</b>	<b>0.947</b>	<b>2558.97/153</b>	<b>0.981</b>	<b>0.431</b>
Self-Acceptance		0.541	0.531					
Purposes in Life		0.812	0.891					
Environmental Mastery		0.701	0.770					
Positive Relation		0.645	0.642					
Personal Growth		0.653	0.593					
Autonomy		0.626	0.573					
McDonald $> 0,60$ (Reliable)								
Cronbach alfa $> 0.60$ (Reliable)								
RMSEA $\leq 0,08$ (Accepted Model)								
GFI (Goodness of Fit)= 0 ( poor fit )- 1,0 (perfect fit)								
CMIN/DF $\leq 2,0$ (Accepted Model)								
CFI $\geq 0,95$ (Accepted Model)								
TLI $\geq 0,95$ (Very Good Fit)								

Based on table 1, the reliability test results on the psychological well-being scale showed a realistic psychological well-being scale for the student respondents, as evidenced by the McDonald's value = 0.713 and Cronbach's Alfa = 0.716. In addition, the validity test on the psychological wellbeing scale showed the value of RMSEA = 0.073, GFI = 0.947, CMIN / DF = 2558.97 / 153, CFI = 0.981. Based on the goodness of fit, the one-factor model is acceptable. It means that all items are proven to measure only one thing,

namely, psychological well-being. However, in this measurement model, the value of TLI = 0.43 or Good moderate fit, or several items are correlated, so it concluded that some items are multidimensional.

#### b. The results of the CFA test on teacher respondents

Based on the results of trials conducted by researchers to 160 school counsellors in South Sulawesi, it can be seen in table 2:

**Table 2.** CFA results on the teachers/school counsellor

	N	Uji Reliabilitas		Uji Validitas				
		McDonald's	Cronbach's	RMSEA	GFI	CMIN/DF	CFI	TLI
<b>Psychological Wellbeing</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>0.658</b>	<b>0.683</b>	<b>0.025</b>	<b>0.952</b>	<b>671.64/153</b>	<b>0.344</b>	<b>0.257</b>
Self-Acceptance		0.436	0.412					
Purposes in Life		0.220	0.133					
Environmental Mastery		0.315	0.229					
Positive Relation		0.540	0.422					
Personal Growth		0.264	0.133					
Autonomy		0.201	0.053					
McDonald $> 0,60$ (Reliable)								
Cronbach alfa $> 0.60$ (Reliable)								
RMSEA $\leq 0,08$ (Accepted Model)								
GFI (Goodness of Fit)= 0 ( poor fit )- 1,0 (perfect fit)								

---

CMIN/DF  $\leq$  2,0 (Accepted Model)  
 CFI  $\geq$  0,95 (Accepted Model)  
 TLI  $\geq$  0,95 (Very Good Fit)

---

Based on table 2, the reliability test results on the psychological well-being scale showed a realistic psychological well-being scale for the teacher respondents, as evidenced by the McDonald's value = 0.658 and Cronbach's Alfa = 0.683. The validity test on the psychological well-being scale showed the value of RMSEA = 0.025, GFI = 0.952. Based on the Goodness of Fit, it indicates the fit model. It concluded that the model with one factor is acceptable, which means that all items are proven to measure only psychological well-being. However, in this measurement model, the CFI value does not meet the Accepted model criteria ( $<0.95$ ),

namely 0.344 and the TLI value = 0.43 ( $<0.95$ ) or, in this case, Good moderate fit and CMIN / DF  $>$  2.00. Several items are correlated, so it can conclude that some items are multidimensional. Although there are still some substandard model test requirements, the value is the closest to the standard. Therefore, model modifications are made by excluding some items for this model to be well accepted.

### c. CFA test results on the employee respondents

Based on the results of trials conducted by researchers on 315 employees in South Sulawesi, it can be seen in table 3.

**Table 3.** CFA results on the employee

	N	Uji Reliabilitas		Uji Validitas				
		McDonald's	Cronbach's	RMSEA	GFI	CMIN/DF	CFI	TLI
<b>Psychological Wellbeing</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>0.768</b>	<b>0.755</b>	<b>0.028</b>	<b>0.971</b>	<b>1645.71/153</b>	<b>0.535</b>	<b>0.473</b>
Self-Acceptance		0.535	0.531					
Purposes in Life		0.388	0.195					
Environmental Mastery		0.508	0.391					
Positive Relation		0.585	0.505					
Personal Growth		0.263	0.230					
Autonomy		0.495	0.365					
McDonald $>$ 0,60 (Reliable)								
Cronbach alfa $>$ 0,60 (Reliable)								
RMSEA $\leq$ 0,08 (Accepted Model)								
GFI (Goodness of Fit)= 0 ( poor fit )- 1,0 (perfect fit)								
CMIN/DF $\leq$ 2,0 (Accepted Model)								
CFI $\geq$ 0,95 (Accepted Model)								
TLI $\geq$ 0,95 (Very Good Fit)								

Based on table 3, the reliability test results on the psychological well-being scale showed a realistic psychological well-being scale for the employee respondents, as evidenced by the McDonald's value = 0.768 and Cronbach's Alfa = 0.755. The validity test on the psychological well-being scale showed the value of RMSEA = 0.028, GFI = 0.971. Based on the Goodness of Fit Indicates model, it can be concluded that the model criteria with one factor are acceptable. It is just that, in this measurement model, the value of the CFI criteria does not meet the accepted model criteria ( $<0.95$ ), which is 0.535 and the TLI value = 0.473 ( $<0.95$ ) or in this case, it is close to the standard value of a good criterion and CMIN / DF  $>$  2.00. Therefore, several items are mutually

correlated. It concluded that some items are multidimensional. Although there are still some substandard model test requirements, the value is the closest to the standard. Therefore, for this model to be well received, modification of the model was carried out by not including several items.

### Discussion

This study uses a basic assessment structure factor using measurable structural modeling. We first examine the data at the item level, to check whether the measured structural factors are adjusted using some minimal measure. In order to analyze the welfare structure in more depth at the item level, we conducted a confirmation factor analysis (JASP) on the third

cluster sample data. The first relates to the study of the level of welfare of students and then towards teachers and through workers. Likewise, it can be interpreted that the positive and negative influence items each display a high degree of internal consistency.

The well-being scale is a psychological construct that measures happiness that is specifically constructed to explain self-acceptance, goals in life, environmental mastery, positive relationships, self-development, and autonomy that students, teachers, and employees who live in cities have gone through Makassar (Dodd, Dadaczynski, Okan, McCaffery, & Pickles, 2021). Various research results show that subjective Well-being contributes positively to learning achievement in the ability/performance at work of each individual, these findings indicate that life satisfaction and achievement correlate more strongly with each other (Arthaud *et al.*, 2005; Fretwell and Greig, 2019). This result does not have a strong influence on other variables, because work or learning pressure has a positive correlation with one's performance (Bhagat, 1982; Warr & Nielsen, 2018).

This measurement scale shows convergence with the welfare index (Arthaud *et al.*, 2005). The correlation between self-acceptance and environmental mastery is closely related to one's life satisfaction, affecting balance, self-esteem and physical condition, thereby showing a clear relationship with previous research proving that welfare theory. However, these factors prove a positive relationship between relationships, autonomy, life goals, and one's self-development do not affect the relationship on the rating index. This was emphasized by (Diener, 1984), argues against one aspect that indicators of one's life goals are not obtained easily, well-being requires effort and discipline, which of course can provide long-term well-being and happiness. The relationship between the level of one's life happiness on the other hand is based on factors. The first relates to the age group, self-control (emotional, morale and level of depression) influences between individual gender groups (Gellis, McClive-Reed, Kenaley, & Kim, 2020; Nomaguchi & Milkie, 2020).

the results of the research stated that the welfare measuring instrument basically showed that people with psychological disorders experienced significant disturbances in well-being (Goodman, Doorley, & Kashdan, 2018; Ryff & Keyes, 1995). From this perspective, this

research was developed to measure individual self-evaluations that are unattainable, unattractive, or irrelevant to individuals in different places in the social structure. The awareness that culture, gender, age, ethnicity, class, and so on gives rise to different welfare concepts, so it deserves a more in-depth review (Coan, 1977) which has not been applied in many previous studies in this research variable.

## CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The results showed that all dimensions of Ryff psychological well-being, including Self-Acceptance, Purposes in Life, Environmental Mastery, Positive Relationship, Personal Growth, and Autonomy, require brief modifications to achieve a fit model. After performing factor analysis (CFA), there are items from several dimensions that have quite a lot of multidimensionality. According to the CFA test results, several items also measure other things (multidimensional). Therefore, it is advisable to: (1) It is necessary to identify beforehand to see items measuring psychological well-being, especially items that are reverse; (2) For further researchers, it is advisable to develop more in-depth items by taking into account the developmental characteristics of adolescents and adults and Indonesian culture so that they do not modify the fit model. So that the instrument measures what it should measure and produces accurate measurements.

## REFERENCES

- Arthaud-day, M. L., Rode, J. C., Mooney, C. H., & Near, J. P. (2005). *The subjective well-being construct: A test of its convergent, discriminant, and factorial validity. Social Indicators Research* (Vol. 74). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-004-8209-6>
- Bhagat, R. S. (1982). Conditions under which stronger job performance–job satisfaction relationships may be observed: A closer look at two situational contingencies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 25(4), 772–789.
- Black, N., & Halstead, E. (2021). Mental health and subjective well-being of staff in a secondary school for adolescents with severe and profound multiple learning difficulties. *British Journal of Special Education*, 48(4), 477–496.

- Brown, T. A., & Moore, M. T. (2012). Confirmatory factor analysis. *Handbook of Structural Equation Modeling*, 361, 379.
- Chen, D.-F., Tsai, T.-C., & Lei, S.-M. (2013). Career satisfaction, commitment, and well-being among Taiwanese pediatricians. *Pediatrics & Neonatology*, 54(3), 173–178.
- Chinyamurindi, W. T. (2019). Framing career wellbeing amongst expatriate workers: A narrative analysis. In *Theory, Research and Dynamics of Career Wellbeing* (pp. 283–307). Springer.
- Coan, R. W. (1977). *Hero, artist, sage, or saint? A survey of views on what is variously called mental health, normality, maturity, self-actualization, and human fulfillment*. Columbia U Press.
- Cobo-Rendón, R., Pérez-Villalobos, M. V, Páez-Rovira, D., & Gracia-Leiva, M. (2020). A longitudinal study: Affective wellbeing, psychological wellbeing, self-efficacy and academic performance among first-year undergraduate students. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 61(4), 518–526.
- Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *The Science of Well-Being*, 11–58.
- Dodd, R. H., Dadaczynski, K., Okan, O., McCaffery, K. J., & Pickles, K. (2021). Psychological wellbeing and academic experience of university students in australia during covid-19. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(3), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18030866>
- ELLIS, R. (1986). An Apple for the Teacher. *Teaching Statistics*, 8(1), 6–7. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9639.1986.tb00602.x>
- Fretwell, K., & Greig, A. (2019). Towards a better understanding of the relationship between individual's self-reported connection to nature, personal well-being and environmental awareness. *Sustainability*, 11(5), 1386.
- Gallagher, M. W., & Long, L. J. (2020). Assessment of well-being.
- Gellis, Z., McClive-Reed, K., Kenaley, B., & Kim, E. (2020). Meaning of life and well-being: preliminary results of the successful aging study. *Innovation in Aging*, 4(Suppl 1), 112.
- Gilbreath\*, B., & Benson, P. G. (2004). The contribution of supervisor behaviour to employee psychological well-being. *Work & Stress*, 18(3), 255–266.
- Glozah, F. N. (2013). Effects of academic stress and perceived social support on the psychological wellbeing of adolescents in Ghana. *Open Journal of Medical Psychology*, 2013.
- Goodman, F. R., Doorley, J. D., & Kashdan, T. B. (2018). Well-being and psychopathology: A deep exploration into positive emotions, meaning and purpose in life, and social relationships. *Handbook of Well-Being*. Salt Lake City, UT: DEF Publishers. DOI: Nobascholar. Com.
- Grace, G. C. A. G. (2020). Psychological Strengths Contributing to Rural Student's Academic Performance in Kadazandusun. *Moldavian Journal for Education and Social Psychology*, 4(2), 1–19.
- Hayat, B., & Suryadi, B. (n.d.). Prosiding Konferensi Ilmiah Tahunan Himpunan Evaluasi Pendidikan Indonesia ( Hepi ) Tahun 2014.
- Henn, C. M., Hill, C., & Jorgensen, L. I. (2016). An investigation into the factor structure of the Ryff Scales of Psychological Well-Being. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 42(1), 1–12.
- Kossek, E. E., Valcour, M., & Lirio, P. (2014). The sustainable workforce: Organizational strategies for promoting work-life balance and wellbeing. *Work and Wellbeing: A Complete Reference Guide, Volume III, III*, 295–319. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118539415.wbwell14>
- Lee, M. T., Kubzansky, L. D., & VanderWeele, T. J. (2021). *Measuring well-being: Interdisciplinary perspectives from the social sciences and the humanities*. Oxford University Press.
- Maulana, H., Khawaja, N., & Obst, P. (2019). Development and validation of the Indonesian Well-being Scale. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 22(3), 268–280.
- Mayangdarastri, S., & Khusna, K. (2020).

- Retaining millennials engagement and wellbeing through career path and development. *Journal of Leadership in Organizations*, 2(1).
- Nomaguchi, K., & Milkie, M. A. (2020). Parenthood and well-being: A decade in review. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 82(1), 198–223.
- Purnama, D. S., Farozin, M., & Astuti, B. (2022). The Ryff's Psychological Well-Being Scale for Indonesian Higher Education Students: A RASCH Model Analysis. *Indonesian Research Journal in Education/ IRJE/*, 6(2), 222–231.
- Ryan, T. P. (2013). *Sample size determination and power*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Ryff, C. D., Friedman, E. M., Morozink, J. A., & Tsenkova, V. (2012). Psychological resilience in adulthood and later life: Implications for health. *Annual Review of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, 32(1), 73–92.
- Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(4), 719.
- Ryff, C. D., & Singer, B. H. (2006). Best news yet on the six-factor model of well-being. *Social Science Research*, 35(4), 1103–1119.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2006.01.002>
- Steiner, R., & Spurk, D. (2019). Career wellbeing from a whole-life perspective: Implications from work-nonwork spillover and crossover research. In *Theory, research and dynamics of career wellbeing* (pp. 163–182). Springer.
- Stenhoff, A., Steadman, L., Nevitt, S., Benson, L., & White, R. G. (2020). Acceptance and commitment therapy and subjective wellbeing: A systematic review and meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials in adults. *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science*, 18, 256–272.
- Sumule, R. (2012). Psychological Wellbeing Pada Guru yang Bekerja di Yayasan PESAT Nabire.
- Warr, P., & Nielsen, K. (2018). Wellbeing and work performance. *Handbook of Well-Being*. Salt Lake City, UT: DEF Publishers.
- Wikanestri, W., & Prabowo, A. (2015). Psychological well-being pada pelaku wirausaha. In *Seminar Psikologi dan Kemanusiaan* (pp. 431–439).
- Wulandari, T. (2013). ( Studi Terhadap Guru SLB Bagian B Dan C Bagaskara Sragen ) Working Period and Subjective Well Being ( Study Toward SLB Teacher Part B and C Bagaskara Sragen ). *Aspirasi*, 4(2), 119–131.
- Zhang, G., Xue, Y., Zhang, C., Xu, B., Cheng, Y., & Ren, Y. (2020). Comparison of sampling effort allocation strategies in a stratified random survey with multiple objectives. *Aquaculture and Fisheries*, 5(3), 113–121.