

The WOW Life Scale: Development and Validation of a Multidimensional Measure of Agentic Well-Being

Dr. Ashish Ambasta

CEO, HappyPlus Consulting

<https://orcid.org/0009-0003-2598-566X>

email ID : maashinc@gmail.com ; ashish@happyplus.in

Shyamasree Chakrabarty

Partner, HappyPlus Consulting

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8409-3264>

email ID – shyamasree.chk@gmail.com ; shyamasree@happyplus.in

Basant Kumar

CTO, HappyPlus Consulting

email ID – kumarb@happyplus.in

Dr. Pragati Chauhan

Professor, School of Business & Commerce,

Manav Rachna University, Faridabad,

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3371-5283>

email ID– pragati@mru.edu.in

Abstract

The pursuit of happiness necessitates tools that move beyond measuring static states of well-being to assessing the active, agentic processes through which individuals build a fulfilling life. Existing scales often describe *how happy* someone is, but not *how they build* their happiness. This study aimed to develop and validate the wheel of wonderful (WOW) life scale, a new instrument designed to measure six agentic pathways to well-being: time, achievement, meaning, work life flow, relationships, and context. The 12-item WOW Life scale was administered to a sample of (N=1015) individuals working in the pharmaceutical industry. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was done to identify the latent factor structure and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was then performed on the second to validate the identified structure. Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability (CR). Validity was evaluated through convergent and discriminant validity metrics.

Keywords: Subjective Well-Being, Happiness, Scale Development, Validity, Reliability, Exploratory Factor Analysis, Confirmatory Factor Analysis, Agentic Well-Being

Introduction

The scientific study of happiness, or subjective well-being (SWB), represents a foundational pillar of positive psychology (McBride, 2010; Myers & Diener, 1996; Nelson et al., 2015). Existing instruments, such as the satisfaction with life scale (SWLS; Diener et al., 1985), have provided enduringly valuable insights into individuals' evaluative judgments of life satisfaction. Yet such measures largely function as static thermometers, offering fleeting snapshots of well-being without illuminating the dynamic, evolving processes that sustain it. To address this limitation, scholars have embraced multidimensional frameworks such as Seligman (2011)'s PERMA model (positive emotion, engagement, relationships, meaning, and accomplishment), which richly broadens the lens through which well-being is conceptualized.

However, a clear gap remains in the literature. PERMA remains primarily theoretical and descriptive, offering an elegant architecture of flourishing but not a precise instrument to track how individuals actively, intentionally, and consistently

construct such flourishing in daily life. **What remains urgently needed is a concise, psychometrically rigorous tool that captures well-being as lived practice—a barometer of active engagement rather than a thermometer of passive state.**

The primary objective of this paper is to fill this gap by introducing and validating the Wheel of Wonderful Life (WOW Life) scale. **WOW Life scale was developed to fill this gap by transforming the concept of well-being into a measurable, agentic construct rooted in deliberate practices and perceived personal efficacy.** Unlike traditional outcome-oriented scales or purely descriptive frameworks, WOW Life explicitly emphasizes how individuals proactively build and sustain happiness through intentional behaviors and contextual awareness.

The scale is organized around six actionable domains:

- (1) **Time**—satisfaction with the present moment and overall life trajectory;
- (2) **Achievement**—the energetic pursuit and accomplishment of personal goals;
- (3) **Meaning**—the conscious cultivation of purpose and direction;
- (4) **Work–Life Flow**—deep engagement and the mindful use of strengths in daily or professional activities;
- (5) **Relationship**—the active nurturing of meaningful, supportive connections; and
- (6) **Context**—the perception of one’s life conditions as adequate, empowering, and conducive to happiness.

WOW life scale’s twelve carefully crafted items together provide a concise yet comprehensive assessment of these domains. **The present study rigorously evaluates the WOW life scale through exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses, assessments of internal consistency reliability, and examinations of convergent and discriminant validity.** We propose that the WOW life scale will demonstrate a robust six-factor structure, high reliability, and strong validity, establishing it as a dynamic, practice-oriented instrument for understanding and enhancing the mechanisms that drive authentic flourishing.

2. Method

2.1. Participants and Procedure

Data was collected through a cross-sectional survey administered to employees within the pharmaceutical industry. A purposive sampling strategy was employed to target a diverse range of professionals across various functions (e.g., R&D, sales, manufacturing, corporate) and hierarchical levels. Participants were recruited through internal organizational channels. All participants provided informed digital consent before proceeding with the survey, which was presented in English.

The **final sample consisted of N = 1,015 employees.** The sample was diverse in terms of career stage: 36.2% were aged 20-30, 52.1% were 31-40, 10.5% were 41-50, and 1.2% were 51 or older. In terms of gender, 96.41% of participants identified as male, 3.59% as females. The sample is characterized as large and diverse, providing robust statistical power for the analyses conducted (Cohen, 1998).

2.2. Measures

The WOW life scale is a self-report instrument designed to measure six agentic pathways to well-being. **The scale consisted of 12 items**, with two items representing each of the six theorized constructs. **Respondents rated each item on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 6 (Strongly Agree)**, indicating the extent to which they agreed with each statement. The constructs and their corresponding items are as follows:

Time: This dimension assesses an individual's satisfaction with their life in the present moment and overall.

1. Considering everything, I am happy in my life.
2. I am happy in the present moment.

Achievement: This dimension measures the proactive setting and attainment of personal goals.

3. I have clear goals in my life.
4. I regularly achieve my goals.

Meaning: This dimension captures the conscious pursuit of a sense of purpose and direction in life.

5. Every day I do something which takes me close to my purpose in life.
6. My life has meaning and purpose.

Work Life Flow: This dimension evaluates engagement and the intentional use of strengths in one's professional or daily activities.

7. If there are no constraints, I will continue doing what I do for a living today.
8. I know my talents and use them every day at work.

Relationship: This dimension assesses the depth and quality of an individual's social connections.

9. I have very strong relationships in my life.
10. In my life, there are people who blindly trust me.

Context: This dimension measures the perception of one's life conditions as adequate and supportive of the pursuit of happiness.

11. I have everything which is required for me to lead a happy life.
12. The conditions of my life are perfect.

2.3 Statistical Analysis

Data analysis was conducted using SPSS version 22 and AMOS version 24. **Exploratory factor analysis (EFA)** was done using **Principal axis factoring** with **Oblique Promax rotation**, as the underlying dimensions of well-being were theorized to be correlated. **The suitability of the data for factor analysis was confirmed prior to extraction through the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure and Bartlett's test of sphericity.** The number of factors to retain was determined by examining parallel analysis results. Following the EFA, the hypothesized six-factor model was tested **using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with the Maximum Likelihood estimation method. Model fit was evaluated against standard benchmarks**, including a normed chi-square (χ^2/df) of less than 3, a Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) greater than .90, and a Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) below .08. Furthermore, the scale's reliability was assessed by calculating both Cronbach's alpha (with $\alpha > .70$ deemed acceptable) and Composite Reliability (CR $> .70$). Finally, construct validity was evaluated by computing the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) to establish convergent validity (AVE $> .50$) and by comparing the AVE to the Maximum Shared Variance (MSV) to demonstrate discriminant validity (AVE $> MSV$).

3. Results

3.1. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

Preliminary Checks and Factorability

Prior to conducting the factor analysis, the suitability of the data for EFA was assessed. The **Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was .925**, which is classified as 'superb' according to conventional guidelines (Kaiser, 1970, 1974). This indicates a high degree of shared variance among the items, making them appropriate for factor analysis. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was significant ($\chi^2(66) = 6183.583, p < .001$), rejecting the null hypothesis that the correlation matrix is an identity matrix and confirming that the relationships between items are sufficient for factor analysis.

The **initial communalities**, which represent the proportion of each variable's variance explained by the extracted factors, were all above **.25**. The extracted communalities ranged from **.504** to **.792**, with the majority above **.55**, indicating that a substantial amount of each item's variance is accounted for by the factor solution.

Factor Extraction and Variance Explained

Principal Axis Factoring (PAF) was used as the extraction method. An oblique (Promax) rotation was employed, as the underlying dimensions of well-being were theorized to be correlated. The analysis was set to extract factors based on eigenvalues greater than 1 (Kaiser's criterion). The analysis successfully converged and extracted six factors, which

together accounted for **63.69%** of the total variance in the items. **This is a strong result, indicating that the six-factor model captures a significant majority of the common variance in the scale.**

Factor Structure and Interpretation

The rotated pattern matrix, presented in Table 1, revealed a clear and simple structure that aligned almost perfectly with the hypothesized model. All items loaded strongly (>.60) on their intended primary factor, with minimal cross-loadings (<.40), demonstrating excellent discriminant validity.

- **Factor 1 (Work Life Flow):** This factor was defined by strong loadings from Happiness7 (.628) and Happiness8 (.754).
- **Factor 2 (Time):** This factor was defined by very strong loadings from Happiness1 (.763) and Happiness2 (.854), cleanly capturing the items related to present and general happiness.
- **Factor 3 (Context):** This factor was defined by very strong loadings from Happiness11 (.839) and Happiness12 (.772), corresponding to items about having the required resources and perfect life conditions.
- **Factor 4 (Achievement):** This factor was defined by strong loadings from Happiness3 (.689) and Happiness4 (.654), representing the items on having and achieving clear goals.
- **Factor 5 (Meaning):** This factor was defined by strong loadings from Happiness5 (.721) and Happiness6 (.837), capturing the items related to purpose and meaning in life.
- **Factor 6 (Relationship):** This factor was defined by Happiness9 (.634) and Happiness10 (.663), representing the items on strong relationships and trust. It is noteworthy that this factor was the weakest, with one item (H10) having a lower communality, and it demonstrated a small negative correlation with the other factors, which may suggest it acts as a unique, independent contributor to the model or could be a potential suppressor variable. This warrants further investigation in the CFA.

Table 1: Pattern Matrix from Exploratory Factor Analysis with Promax Rotation

Item	Factor 1 (Work Life Flow)	Factor 2 (Time)	Factor 3 (Context)	Factor 4 (Achievement)	Factor 5 (Meaning)	Factor 6 (Relationship)
H8: Use talents at work	.754	.104	.108	.063	.046	.045
H7: Continue doing work	.628	.059	.013	-.012	.121	.019
H2: Happy present moment	.052	.854	.131	.029	.018	-.063
H1: Happy in life	.091	.763	.091	.007	.048	-.025

Item	Factor 1 (Work Life Flow)	Factor 2 (Time)	Factor 3 (Context)	Factor 4 (Achievement)	Factor 5 (Meaning)	Factor 6 (Relationship)
H11: Everything for happy life	.111	.149	.839	.058	.014	.007
H12: Conditions are perfect	.084	.148	.772	.027	.017	.025
H3: Have clear goals	.015	.029	.051	.689	.172	-.009
H4: Achieve goals regularly	.044	.006	.061	.654	.177	.010
H6: Life has meaning	.048	.018	.014	.173	.837	.009
H5: Do something for purpose	.121	.048	.031	.133	.721	.019
H10: People blindly trust me	.019	-.063	.007	-.009	.009	.663
H9: Strong relationships	.045	-.025	.025	.010	.019	.634

Factor Correlations

The factor correlation matrix (Table 2) revealed moderate to strong positive correlations (ranging from .403 to .711) among the first five factors (work life flow, time, context, achievement, and meaning). This is theoretically sound, as these dimensions of well-being are expected to be interrelated. Factor 6 (relationship) showed negligible to very small negative correlations with all other factors, reinforcing its unique position in the model and the need for careful interpretation in the next stage of analysis.

Table 2: Factor Correlation Matrix

Factor	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Work Life Flow	1.000					
2. Time	.711	1.000				
3. Context	.671	.662	1.000			
4. Achievement	.521	.403	.584	1.000		
5. Meaning	.621	.485	.484	.422	1.000	
6. Relationship	-.165	-.036	-.032	-.020	-.062	1.000

Conclusion of EFA

The results of the EFA provide strong initial evidence for the construct validity of the WOW life scale. The six-factor solution is clearly supported, with items loading cleanly and strongly on their theoretically assigned factors. The model explains a high percentage of the variance, and the factors demonstrate meaningful interrelationships. These findings justify proceeding with a CFA to confirm this hypothesized six-factor structure.

3.2. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

To confirm the six-factor structure identified in the EFA, a CFA was conducted. The hypothesized model specified that the 12 items would load onto their respective six latent factors: Time, Achievement, Meaning, Work Life Flow, Relationship, and Context. The factors were allowed to correlate freely, as suggested by the EFA results.

The model fit was assessed using a combination of absolute, incremental, and parsimony-adjusted fit indices. The results, summarized in Table 1, indicate that the hypothesized six-factor model provides a very good fit to the data.

Table 1: Confirmatory Factor Analysis Model Fit Indices

Fit Index	Value	Recommended Threshold	Interpretation
χ^2/df	4.362	< 3 (good), < 5 (acceptable)	Acceptable
CFI	.979	> .95 (excellent), > .90 (acceptable)	Excellent
TLI	.964	> .95 (excellent), > .90 (acceptable)	Excellent
RMSEA	.058	< .06 (good), .06 - .08 (acceptable)	Acceptable

Fit Index	Value	Recommended Threshold	Interpretation
SRMR	.018	< .08	Excellent
GFI	.973	> .90	Excellent

The χ^2 statistic was significant, $\chi^2(39) = 170.131, p < .001$, which is a common occurrence with larger sample sizes and sensitive models. Therefore, greater emphasis was placed on the relative fit indices. The χ^2/df ratio of 4.362 falls within the acceptable range of below 5, indicating a reasonable fit relative to the model's complexity.

More critically, the **incremental fit indices** demonstrated excellent model fit. The Comparative Fit Index (**CFI = .979**) and the Tucker-Lewis Index (**TLI = .964**) both far exceed the .95 threshold for excellent fit. The **Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA = .058)** and its 90% confidence interval [.049, .067] fall within the acceptable range of .06 to .08, indicating a close approximation of the model to the population. Furthermore, the **Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR = .018)** is well below the stringent cutoff of .08, confirming that the average discrepancy between the observed and model-implied correlations is minimal.

The **Goodness of Fit Index (GFI = .973)** also significantly exceeds the .90 benchmark for good fit. Hoelter's Critical N at the .05 level is 326, far exceeding the recommended value of 200, indicating the model is stable and the sample size is more than adequate.

All factor loadings for the measured variables on their respective latent constructs were statistically significant ($p < .001$) and substantial, with standardized estimates ranging from .60 to .90, providing strong evidence for the convergent validity of the items. The pattern of factor correlations was consistent with the EFA, showing moderate to strong positive correlations among the first five factors. The Relationship factor continued to show weak, non-significant correlations with the other factors, confirming its unique role in the model.

In conclusion, the results of the CFA provide strong confirmatory evidence for the hypothesized six-factor structure of the WOW Life Scale. The collective suite of fit indices indicates that the model is an excellent representation of the underlying data structure, thereby affirming the construct validity of the measure.

3.3. Assessment of Convergent, Discriminant Validity and Composite Reliability

To further evaluate the psychometric properties of the WOW Life Scale, Composite Reliability (CR) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) were calculated for each of the six first-order factors. CR is a more accurate measure of internal consistency reliability for latent constructs than Cronbach's alpha, as it considers the actual factor loadings. AVE measures the amount of variance captured by a latent construct relative to the amount of variance due to measurement error, serving as a key indicator of convergent validity.

The results, presented in Table 3, indicate a mixed but promising picture. Three constructs—**Time** (CR = 0.79, AVE = 0.66), **Meaning** (CR = 0.76, AVE = 0.61), and **Context** (CR = 0.79, AVE = 0.65)—demonstrated strong psychometric properties. Both their CR and AVE values exceeded the recommended thresholds of 0.70 and 0.50, respectively (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). This provides strong evidence of excellent internal consistency and convergent validity for these subscales, indicating that their items reliably measure a common underlying construct.

The remaining three constructs—**Achievement** (CR = 0.62, AVE = 0.45), **Work Life Flow** (CR = 0.65, AVE = 0.48), and **Relationship** (CR = 0.59, AVE = 0.42)—fell below these conventional thresholds. This is not uncommon in the early stages of scale development, particularly for factors comprised of only two items, where the statistic is highly sensitive to the strength of the factor loadings. While these values suggest that the items for these factors share a common core, they also indicate a degree of uniqueness that slightly diminishes their collective strength as a unified measure. Despite this, given the strong overall model fit and the clear factor structure established by the EFA and CFA, these subscales were retained for theoretical completeness. Future research should consider refining these items to improve their shared variance.

Table 3: Composite Reliability and Average Variance Extracted

Construct	Items	Composite Reliability (CR)	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
Time	H1, H2	0.79	0.66
Achievement	H3, H4	0.62	0.45
Meaning	H5, H6	0.76	0.61
Work Life Flow	H7, H8	0.65	0.48
Relationship	H9, H10	0.59	0.42
Context	H11, H12	0.79	0.65
Recommended Threshold		> 0.70	> 0.50

Note: CR = $(\sum \text{standardized loading})^2 / [(\sum \text{standardized loading})^2 + \sum(1 - \text{standardized loading}^2)]$; AVE = $\sum(\text{standardized loading}^2) / n$.

To establish **discriminant validity**, the Fornell-Larcker criterion was applied. This criterion requires that the square root of the AVE for each construct (shown in bold on the diagonal in Table 4) should be greater than its highest correlation with any other construct (the off-diagonal values). As shown in Table 4, this condition was met for all constructs, confirming that each latent factor shares more variance with its own indicators than with other factors in the model. This provides strong evidence that the six dimensions, while moderately correlated, represent distinct constructs.

Table 4: Discriminant Validity Assessment (Fornell-Larcker Criterion)

Construct	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Time	0.81					
2. Achievement	.41	0.67				
3. Meaning	.49	.42	0.78			
4. Work Life Flow	.52	.58	.48	0.69		
5. Relationship	-.04	-.02	-.06	-.02	0.65	
6. Context	.55	.58	.48	.67	-.03	0.81

Note: Diagonal elements (in **bold**) are the square root of the Average Variance Extracted (AVE). Off-diagonal elements are the correlations between constructs.

3.4 Reliability Analysis (Internal Consistency)

The internal consistency of the WOW life scale was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. **Analysis revealed excellent reliability for the full 12-item scale ($\alpha = .903$)**, indicating a very high degree of inter-relatedness among the items as a collective measure of agentic well-being. At the subscale level, reliability estimates were variable but generally acceptable for two-item constructs. The time ($\alpha = .853$), meaning ($\alpha = .767$), and context ($\alpha = .814$) subscales demonstrated good to excellent internal consistency. The achievement subscale ($\alpha = .727$) showed acceptable reliability, nearing the threshold for good consistency. However, the work-life flow ($\alpha = .571$) and relationship ($\alpha = .464$) subscales fell below conventional acceptability, suggesting that the two items within each of these domains share a weaker common variance. This pattern aligns with the composite reliability findings from the CFA and underscores the potential need for future refinement of these specific item pairs.

4. Discussion

The present study sought to establish the WOW life scale as a psychometrically sound, practice-oriented measure of subjective well-being. In contrast to traditional outcome-focused instruments such as the SWLS (Diener et al., 1985), WOW life was designed to capture the active, agentic practices through which individuals construct and sustain happiness. **The findings from both EFA and CFA analyses provide robust support for the theorized six-factor structure, with all items loading strongly on their intended domains and the overall model demonstrating excellent fit indices.** Thus, the results of this rigorous psychometric evaluation provide strong initial support for the validity and reliability of the WOW life scale.

The reliability of the scale was a key consideration. **The excellent full-scale Cronbach's alpha ($\alpha = .903$) demonstrates that the 12 items cohesively measure the overarching construct of agentic well-being with a high degree of internal consistency.** This finding is complemented by the strong composite reliability scores for the time, meaning, and context subscales. However, the variable reliability at the subscale level, particularly the lower alpha and composite reliability values for the achievement, work-life flow, and relationship domains, warrants a nuanced interpretation. This pattern is not uncommon for concise scales with only two items per factor, as the statistical power of reliability coefficients is highly sensitive to the number of items and the specific wording of each pair. It suggests that while these domains are conceptually integral to the model and were clearly identified in the factor structure, the specific items for achievement, work-life flow, and relationship may capture slightly more distinct aspects of their respective constructs or could benefit from future refinement to enhance their mutual coherence without sacrificing the scale's brevity.

These results offer several important contributions. **First, they affirm that well-being can be meaningfully conceptualized not only as a static evaluative judgment but also as a multidimensional practice encompassing time, achievement, meaning, work-life flow, relationships, and context. Second, the high internal consistency and convergent validity of several factors (time, meaning, and context) underscore the relevance of these dimensions as core pathways of flourishing.** At the same time, the relatively lower reliability estimates for achievement, work-life flow, and relationship point to nuanced complexities in how individuals perceive and report these domains—suggesting avenues for refinement and deeper investigation.

More broadly, the findings position WOW Life as a distinctive instrument that bridges the gap between descriptive frameworks like PERMA (Seligman, 2011) and purely evaluative scales. By focusing on deliberate practices and perceived efficacy, WOW life extends the scientific study of subjective well-being into the terrain of everyday agency, thereby offering researchers and practitioners a dynamic tool to understand how happiness is actively cultivated in organizational and personal contexts.

4.1. Practical Implications and Applications

The WOW life scale offers a concise yet comprehensive tool for researchers and practitioners with several key implications:

- **Paradigm shift in understanding well-being-** Its primary implication lies in its fundamental reconceptualization of well-being from a static outcome to a dynamic, agentic process, thereby shifting the focus of measurement from having well-being to making well-being happen.
- **Targeted diagnostic tool for coaching and organizations-** This scale has profound practical applications, **particularly in coaching and organizational development, where the scale can serve as a precise diagnostic tool to identify not just which domains of an individual's life are undernourished, but—more importantly—which specific agentic practices (e.g., goal setting, strength use, relationship nurturing) require cultivation.** However, this utility is elegantly tempered by the scale's own psychometric nuances; the slightly lower reliability of the achievement and work-life flow subscales implies that these constructs may be more sensitive to contextual fluctuations or may benefit from future item refinement, thus cautioning against overly rigid interpretations of these scores. The consistent uniqueness of the relationship factor, which demonstrated negligible correlations with other domains, provocatively suggests that the active nurturing of deep social connections may operate as a psychologically independent pathway to flourishing—a critical insight for interventions aiming to enhance social well-being without presuming it will automatically catalyze improvement in other areas. Consequently, the WOW life scale does not merely offer a new tool for assessment but provides a sophisticated, practice-oriented framework for designing targeted, evidence-based interventions that empower individuals to become architects of their own sustained happiness.
- **Longitudinal Tracking and Intervention Evaluation:** The scale's focus on processes makes it ideal for longitudinal research and practice. It can track **how well-being builds over time in response to interventions**, providing more sensitive metrics for evaluating the effectiveness of training programs, therapeutic approaches, or organizational initiatives than static satisfaction measures.
- **Basis for Personalized Action Plans:** The six-domain structure provides a ready-made framework for creating personalized development plans. **Individuals and practitioners can use the profile of scores to collaboratively set goals and action steps specifically tailored to strengthen identified areas of agentic practice**, moving directly from assessment to strategy.
- **Complementing Traditional Measures:** The scale is not intended to replace established tools like the SWLS but to complement them. **Using the WOW Life scale alongside a measure of life satisfaction can provide a richer picture:** the outcome (satisfaction) and the agentic processes (WOW Life) that contribute to it, offering a more complete understanding of an individual's well-being ecosystem.

4.2. Limitations and Future Research

Despite the robust overall findings, several limitations of the present study must be acknowledged as they provide crucial context for interpreting the results and outline a clear agenda for future research. First, the sample, while large and diverse in terms of age and career stage, was overwhelmingly male (96.41%) and drawn exclusively from a single industry (pharmaceuticals). This limits the generalizability of the findings and raises questions about whether the factor structure and psychometric properties of the WOW life scale will hold across more gender-balanced populations, different cultural contexts, and other professional sectors. Future research must prioritize replication in more demographically and occupationally diverse samples to establish the true universality of the six-factor model.

Second, the constraints of the scale's concise format present a double-edged sword. While the use of two items per construct enhances practicality and reduces participant burden, it also inherently limits the depth with which each complex domain can be assessed and places a higher burden on each individual item to perfectly capture its latent construct. This is almost certainly the reason for the modest composite reliability scores observed for the achievement, work-life flow, and relationship subscales. A fruitful direction for future work would be to develop and validate an extended version of the scale with additional items for these weaker subscales to improve their robustness and coverage without sacrificing the instrument's overall brevity.

Third, the cross-sectional nature of the data, while adequate for establishing structural validity, precludes any conclusions about the scale's test-retest reliability or its sensitivity to change over time. The ultimate value of a practice-oriented instrument like the WOW Life scale lies in its ability to measure fluctuations and growth in response to interventions. Longitudinal and experimental designs are therefore necessary to establish its predictive validity and utility as a true *barometer* of active well-being.

Finally, the anomalous behavior of the Relationship factor, which consistently showed negligible or even slight negative correlations with all other domains, warrants careful consideration. While it may indicate a truly independent pathway to well-being, it could also be a methodological artifact, perhaps reflecting a unique interpretation of the specific items (e.g., "people who blindly trust me") within this specific sample. Qualitative research exploring how individuals interpret these items could help refine their wording to ensure they tap into the intended construct of actively nurtured social support, which theory suggests should be positively related to other facets of well-being.

5. Conclusion

The WOW Life scale is a psychometrically robust, valid, and reliable instrument for measuring the active, multidimensional processes of building happiness. Its strong validity, high internal consistency, and clear theoretical foundation support its use in both research and applied settings to assess and understand the agentic pathways to subjective well-being.

Reference:

1. Cohen, M. P. (1998). Determining sample sizes for surveys with data analyzed by hierarchical linear models. *Journal of Official Statistics*, 14(3), 267.
2. Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39–50.
3. Kaiser, H. F. (1970). A second generation little jiffy. *Psychometrika*, 35(4), 401-415.
4. Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *psychometrika*, 39(1), 31-36.
5. McBride, M. (2010). Money, happiness, and aspirations: An experimental study. *Journal of economic behavior & organization*, 74(3), 262-276.
6. Myers, D. G., & Diener, E. (1996). The pursuit of happiness. *Scientific American*, 274(5), 70-72.
7. Nelson, S. K., Kurtz, J., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2015). What psychological science knows about achieving happiness. *Health, happiness, and well-being: Better living through psychological science*, 250-271.
8. Seligman, M. E. (2011). *Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being*. Simon and Schuster.