



DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF THE TOXIC POSITIVITY SCALE

By

Fathimah Aulia Rahma¹, Haifa Ersasalsabila², Nurfitriani Khofifah³, Saeful Rachman⁴, Siti Khansa A. Firdaus⁵, Naera Zhafira Azkiati Zamzami⁶, Novita Sari⁷

^{1,2,3,4,5,6,7}Departement of Sosial and Humaniora, Universitas Muhammadiyah Bandung, Indonesia

Email: haifaersa@gmail.com

Article Info

Article history:

Received Dec 25, 2025

Revised Jan 05, 2026

Accepted Jan 28, 2026

Keywords:

Toxic Positivity

Instrument Development

Validity

Reliability

Factor Analysis

ABSTRACT

A This study aims to develop and validate a measurement instrument based on Goodman's (2022) theory. A quantitative approach was employed, utilizing 22 developed items of toxic positivity to verify the three aspects according to Whitney Goodman's theory. The research sample consisted of 205 participants. The sampling technique used was convenience sampling, categorized under non-probability sampling. Data analysis involved several tests, including content validity using Aiken's V, prerequisite testing via KMO and Bartlett's tests, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), and reliability testing using Cronbach's Alpha. The Aiken's V analysis, involving 6 raters and a 5-point scale, yielded a value of 0.77. The results of the data feasibility test using Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) showed a value of 0.780, which falls within the "fairly good" category. The EFA revealed a consistent three-factor structure: Invalidation of Emotion, Shame Disguised, and Denial. Furthermore, the Cronbach's Alpha reliability test yielded a coefficient of 0.791, indicating that the instrument possesses good internal consistency and is suitable for use. Consequently, 11 items were identified as valid for measuring toxic positivity. This scale is an appropriate instrument for measuring toxic positivity behavioral tendencies. The implication of this study is the availability of a validated psychological measurement tool to identify patterns of toxic positivity.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Fathimah Aulia Rahma

Departement of Sosial and Humaniora, Universitas Muhammadiyah Bandung, Indonesia

Email: haifaersa@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

The relationship of today's social civilization upholds the values of positivism as the basis for welfare, satisfaction, and individual life success. In the concept of positive psychology, the positive potential possessed by individuals is the main aspect in adapting and self-actualization in the social sphere to the maximum, so that individuals are able to achieve an optimal prosperous life (MacIntyre, 2019). Through the positivism approach, it is believed that individuals can exert their maximum potential in achieving a level of life satisfaction biologically, physiologically, and mentally (MacIntyre, 2019). However, the development of social interaction faced by individuals has various different aspects that make individuals not always able to apply positivism in their daily lives.

Social perceptions that consider positive attitudes, emotions, and actions as the main aspects in achieving social satisfaction and well-being, make today's society tend to repress negative emotions that are considered to be obstacles in optimizing one's potential. This phenomenon is increasingly known as *Toxic*

positivity, in which individuals will continue to strive to encourage positive attitudes, so that both negative attitudes and emotions that have the potential to arise can be repressed or ignored without the need to be explicitly displayed in the individual's daily behavior (Goodman, 2022). This phenomenon tends to be more often faced in individuals with the age range of early adulthood to intermediate adulthood.

Quoting Goodman (2022), *toxic positivity* is a form of advice that is basically intended to provide positive encouragement, but in practice it often makes individuals feel silenced, punished, and not understood. When a person uses *toxic positivity*, he or she indirectly conveys that negative emotions should not exist or should not be felt. Thus, *toxic positivity* can be understood as a form of social and cultural encouragement to constantly think positively, even in uncomfortable or difficult situations. In this context, individuals tend to suppress and ignore negative feelings in response to social demands to always look "okay" and happy. As a result, the pressure to "always be positive" can cause individuals to close off access to their own emotions in order to maintain those positive images, which ultimately leads to inner conflict and decreased psychological well-being.

Toxic positivity is often associated with concepts or theories in the context of positive psychology. However, in the concept of positive psychology, there is no terminology that suggests individuals to reject, ignore, or emphasize any form of problems or negative emotions faced by individuals (MacIntyre et al., 2019), as applied to the concept of *toxic positivity* itself. Held (in MacIntyre et al., 2019) stated that there is a risk of the emergence of a "tyranny of positive attitude" in the application of positive psychology itself, which is a condition when the demand to always think positively actually causes adverse psychological consequences.

Toxic positivity is characterized by an individual's tendency to suppress or reject negative emotions as a form of response to life experiences (Jain et al., 2024). The emphasis on negative emotions in individuals with high levels of *toxic positivity* can have a detrimental impact on overall psychological well-being. Manifestations of *toxic positivity* can appear in various forms, such as advising a person to focus only on the positive side of a loss, believing that positive thinking alone can solve the whole problem, implying that the situation at hand can still get worse, or criticizing individuals who express negative feelings (Upadhyay et al., 2022).

Rejection of negative emotions is counterproductive because it inhibits the process of adaptation and psychological recovery from the distressing experience. When individuals continuously suppress negative emotions and ignore complex problems, this has the potential to cause emotional repression that can increase anxiety levels (MacIntyre, 2019). In the long run, behaviors and attitudes based on *toxic positivity* can be internalized in an individual's daily life, so that they unknowingly contribute to psychological vulnerability and destructive processes towards oneself.

Research by Kojongian and Wibowo (2021) indicates that toxic positivity behavior often arises due to inequality of experience between individuals and their interlocutors. The perpetrator's lack of understanding of the crisis situation experienced by the individual causes a lack of empathy, so the response given, even if it is intended positively, actually has a destructive impact. Furthermore, Goodman (2022) elaborates on the complexity of *toxic positivity* through five fundamental aspects. The first is denial, where individuals are defensive about bad situations and reject negative emotions because they feel hindered from being happy. Second, there is *shame* disguised as positivism, which triggers self-criticism when negative emotions arise. The third is emotional suppression, which is the tendency to suppress or bury negative feelings. Fourth, *gaslighting behavior*, which manipulates an individual's perception of reality to the point of doubting the validity of their own feelings. The last is emotional invalidation, which is the tendency to underestimate or ignore the significance of negative emotions in order to maintain a positive image.

A number of previous studies have shown that the emphasis on emotions has a significant negative impact on the management of individual emotions. Gross and John (2003) found that individuals who suppressed their emotions tended to experience negative emotions with higher intensity as well as express positive emotions at a lower level. In addition, the strategy of emotion suppression was also found to be negatively related to the level of psychological well-being. Similar findings were put forward by Campbell-Sills et al. (2006), who stated that emotion suppression does not effectively reduce feelings of inadequacy

comfortable when the individual is faced with a stimulus that triggers negative emotions. Furthermore, research by Wood et al. (2009) shows that inauthentic positive statements about oneself can actually worsen an individual's emotional state. Based on these findings, it can be concluded that a forced positive mindset, otherwise known as *toxic positivity*, does not provide adaptive benefits for individuals and can even have a detrimental impact on mental health.

Based on the results of previous research and the meaning of the term *toxic positivity* put forward by experts, this study aims to develop a measurement tool that can identify the potential of individuals in showing *toxic positivity* behavior. Lubna and Achmad (2023) stated that *toxic positivity* behavior is increasingly found in generation Z and millennials, especially in the current digital era, as a result of the intensity of social media use. Therefore, the development of this measurement tool is expected to be the first step in understanding the phenomenon more deeply, as well as helping in formulating strategies to minimize the negative impact caused by *toxic positivity* on individuals.

Research on *the phenomenon of toxic positivity* in Indonesia is currently still relatively limited. Therefore, this research was conducted to enrich research related to the topic. The results of this research are expected to provide theoretical contributions and become a reference for the development of academic studies in the future.



2. RESEARCH METHOD

Research methodology is a way or technique to obtain information and data sources that will be used in research. (Widyastuti et al., 2024). This research uses a quantitative method, which is a systematic scientific study of parts and phenomena and the causality of their relationships. Quantitative research is defined as the systematic investigation of phenomena by collecting measurable data by performing statistical, mathematical or computational techniques. Quantitative research is mostly carried out using statistical methods used to collect quantitative data from research studies, with the aim of developing and using mathematical models, theories or hypotheses related to natural phenomena. The measurement process is a central part of quantitative research because it provides a fundamental relationship. (Abdullah, et al., 2021).

The method used in this quantitative research is a descriptive quantitative method, which is a quantitative research method with a problem formulation that combines research to explore or photograph the social situation to be studied thoroughly, broadly, and in-depth. It aims to systematically describe the facts or characteristics of a particular population or a certain field factually and carefully (Abdullah, et al., 2021).

Based on the urgency found in the field, the researcher decided to compile a psychological measuring tool regarding *toxic positivity* behavior. This is based on the fact that in Indonesia there is no official measuring tool that measures this behavior. In addition, the results of initial data collection show that people are still unfamiliar with the term *toxic positivity* and have not understood its meaning in depth.

Participants

The participants involved in this study were in the age range of 18 – 53 years which was in the stage of early adult development to intermediate adulthood, while the number of study respondents was 205 respondents. The survey was conducted first in small groups as an effort to see field conditions related to *toxic positivity* behavior. The results of the initial survey showed that many people experienced *toxic positivity*, but they did not realize and understand that this behavior was included in the category of *toxic positivity*. After the initial data collection, a large amount of data was taken with a total of 205 respondents. This small group is commonly referred to as a sample, while a large group is commonly referred to as a population. A sample is a part of a population that has certain characteristics or circumstances that will be researched by Riduwan in Abdullah, et al., 2021 whereas, Population is a generalized area consisting of objects or subjects that have certain qualities and characteristics that are determined by the researcher to be studied and then drawn conclusions (Sugiyono, 2016)

Sampling in the study was carried out using the *Non-Probability sampling* technique with a specific convenience *sampling approach*. According to Sugiyono (2016) *Non Probability Sampling* is a sampling method in which not all members of the population have the same opportunity to be selected

into samples. Uma Sekaran (2013) explained that *convenience sampling* is a sampling procedure by selecting the most accessible respondents to be used as research subjects. As the term implies, this technique focuses on collecting information from the most accessible members of the population (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016). The use of this technique is based on the availability of elements and the ease of the researcher in reaching respondents at the right place and time.

Research Instruments

The data collection technique used is a questionnaire (*Google Form*). This technique was chosen because it allows researchers to study and know the attitudes, behaviors, and characteristics of individuals efficiently. A questionnaire is a form of questionnaire that contains questions that must be filled in by respondents. In addition, researchers also used this questionnaire to find out the number of individuals who experienced or were exposed to *the toxic positivity* phenomenon in a predetermined age range.

Questionnaire is a data collection technique that is carried out by giving a set of questions or written statements to respondents for them to answer. Questionnaires are an efficient data collection technique if the researcher knows exactly the variables to be measured and knows what can be expected from the respondents. In addition, questionnaires are also suitable for use if the number of respondents is large enough and spread over a large area. Questionnaires can be in the form of closed-ended or open-ended statement questions, can be given to respondents directly or sent by mail, or the internet (Sugiyono, 2013).

Based on the construct and aspects that have been determined, the researcher compiles a *blueprint* of the measuring instrument as a reference in the development of the instrument. *The blueprint* contains a mapping between *the toxic positivity construct* with aspects of measurement, behavioral indicators, number of items, and item direction (*favorable and unfavorable*). The preparation of *this blueprint* aims to ensure that each item developed has a clear relationship with the aspect being measured and represents the construct well.

Table 1. *Blueprint*

Yes	Aspects	Indicator	F	UF
1	Invalidation Emotion	Responding to complaints in self-defense or even ignoring them	1,2, 3,4	
		Receiving support without first being listened to for their true emotional needs	5	
2	Shame Disguised	Feeling guilty for feeling negative emotions	6	
		Feeling that showing negative emotions will make others uncomfortable or perceived weak	7	8
3	Denial	Avoid negative feedback	10	11
		Trying to think positively in situations that don't wear	9	

Development of measuring tools and data analysis techniques

The development of measuring tools in this study refers to the stages of development of the psychological scale as stated by Azwar (2005). The development process is carried out systematically to ensure that the resulting instrument has a strong theoretical basis and meets psychometric requirements.

The initial stage of development begins with the formulation of a construct, namely toxic positivity, which is compiled based on the conceptual framework proposed by Goodman (2022). At this stage, the researcher conducts a theoretical study to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the characteristics and manifestations of toxic positivity behavior. Furthermore, the determination of the measurement area (domain) is carried out by identifying the main aspects that represent the construct. Based on the study, toxic positivity is mapped into three main aspects, namely *emotional invalidation*, *shame disguised*, and *denial*.

The next stage is the operationalization of the construct, which is the process of elaborating aspects into measurable behavioral indicators. These indicators are then used as the basis for the preparation of the blueprints of measuring instruments. Based on the grid, the researchers compiled 22 initial items designed to represent each aspect of toxic positivity. Item writing is carried out by paying attention to the rules of psychological scale writing, including language clarity, context suitability, and the use of favorable and unfavorable items.

items that have been compiled then go through a content review process (content validity) through expert judgment. The assessment of the validity of the contents is carried out using the Aiken's V index to assess the suitability of the item with the constructed being measured. Items that meet the eligibility criteria are then proceeded to the empirical testing stage, while items with values close to the minimum limit are still considered based on their theoretical relevance.

The next stage is an empirical analysis of the research data. The data obtained from 205 respondents were first analyzed through data feasibility testing using Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity to ensure the fulfillment of factor analysis prerequisites. After the data is declared feasible, a construct validity test is carried out using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). This analysis aims to identify the structure of the factors that are formed as well as select items that have an adequate contribution to the constructed being measured. The results of the EFA show the formation of three factors that are consistent with the theoretical framework, namely *emotional invalidation*, *shame disguised*, and *denial*.

After the factor structure is obtained, reliability testing is carried out using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient to determine the level of internal consistency of the measuring instrument. The results of the analysis show that the toxic positivity scale has reliability that is in the good category, so it can be concluded that the items in this scale are able to measure constructs consistently.

Based on the overall stages of development and analysis that have been carried out, the items that pass are then assembled into the final measuring tool. Thus, the toxic positivity measurement tool developed in this study has met the requirements for content validity, construct validity, and reliability, making it feasible to use as an instrument to measure the tendency of toxic positivity behavior in adult individuals.

3. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Data responden

Based on the research conducted on as many as 205 respondents, an overview of the demographic data of the subjects based on age, gender and province of residence as presented in table 2 can be obtained. The study participants ranged in age from 17 to 55 years, with a predominance in the early adult age group in their 20s. The participants were mostly female. Data collection involved participants from various regions in Indonesia, both from Java Island and outside Java, with the dominance of domicile in the West Java region and followed by DKI Jakarta.

Item analysis



The results of the reliability test for each pass are presented in table 3. All items had *item-rest correlation* above the minimum limit, indicating that each item was able to distinguish respondents with different levels of toxic positivity and contribute positively to the total score of the scale. The highest correlation values were found in Item 6 and Item 7, indicating a strong contribution to consistency, while the items with the lowest values remained in the sufficient category and were still worth defending. Overall, there are no items that degrade the measurement quality

Table 2. Respondent Description

Total Participants	Total Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Men – men	57	27,9%
Women	148	72,1%
Age		
17 – 20	51	25%
21 - 30	114	55,4%
31 – 40	8	3,9%
41 - 50	28	13,7%
51 - 55	4	2%
Province		
West Java	147	71,5%
DKI Jakarta	28	13,7%
Sumatra Selatan	1	0,49%
Central Java	17	8,3%
Banten	2	0,9%
East Java	5	2,4%
Lampung	1	0,49%
Kalmantan Barat	1	0,49%
East Kalimantan	1	0,49%
West Sumatra	1	0,49%
Riau	1	0,49%

Tabel 3. Item Rest correlation

Item	Item-rest correlation	Item	Item-rest correlation
Item 1	0.287	Item 7	0.612
item2	0.487	Item 8	0.573
Item 3	0.360	Item 9	0.316
Item 4	0.349	Item 10	0.363
Item 5	0.557	Item 11	0.470
Item 6	0.639		

Reliability

According to Amanda (2019), reliability is an index test that shows the extent to which a measuring instrument is reliable or reliable. That can be seen from how consistent the measurements are even though they are tested in time, and different samples. So that the test kit can be trusted by Putri et. al (2022). Reliability is a measure of measurement

credibility (Kothari, 1990; Mercer, 1991). A reliable measuring tool is not necessarily valid. But a valid measuring tool must be reliable

According to Azwar in Putri (2022), the resulting reliability value is between 0-1. Which can be interpreted that, getting closer to the number 1 indicates that The measurement tool is increasingly has a high reliability test value. Based on the results of the reliability test that the researcher has conducted, it can be found that the reliability value of the measuring instrument obtained with 205 respondents is 0.791.

Validity

Validity is the extent to which the test measures what it is meant to measure. The validity of the measuring instrument is not compromised. In general, there are three approaches to examining the validity of a measuring instrument, namely 1) content validity, 2) construct validity, and 3) criterion validity (Suryabrata, 2005). In this study, the validity testing process was carried out through two approaches, namely content validity and construct validity, so that the instrument used has a strong and accountable measurement basis. Content validity ensures that the items have been expertly reviewed and match the aspects being measured, while construct validity ensures that the structure of factors and relationships between items matches the underlying theory. Thus, the use of these two types of validity is further strengthened.

Content Validity

The validity of content or content is a statement, not a behavior that is reflected from the score obtained by the assessment instrument. The validity of the content is different from the conclusion score obtained from the assessment data. (Mesick, 1993) in Ihsan 2015. Question items in the instrument can be used to measure expected knowledge. The indicators of the validity of the content weighed are: 1) the suitability of the indicator with the question item, 2) the suitability of the question item with the aspect being studied, 3) the clarity of the language or image in the question, 4) the suitability of the question item for the sample, and 5) the suitability of the material or concept being tested. Validity checks can be carried out by several validators who are competent in their fields. Consideration for the selection of validators is because they know the domain, content, and purpose of the research study (Novikasari, 2016). In this study, 6 raters of 5 scale options were used and produced $V=0.77$ to conduct *expert judgement* on the items that had been prepared. The results of the Aiken's v validity test in this study are:

Table 4. Aiken's V Validity Results

item	V	item	V
1	0,88	7	0,83
2	0,88	8	0,79
3	0,88	9	0,71
4	0,92	10	0,79
5	0,71	11	0,79
6	0,83		

Based on results *expert judgement* shown in table 4 there are several items that obtained an Aiken's V value below the norm limit of 0.77, namely items 5 and 9, with a value of 0.71 each. Where the value of the item has a relatively small difference from the set norm, after conducting a theoretical analysis the item is considered for but continues to the next stage which is the validity of the construct.

Construct Validity

Construct validity is a description that shows the extent to which the measuring tool shows results that are in accordance with the theory (Azwar, 2005). Construct validity is commonly used for instruments that are intended to measure concept variables, which are typical performance. To determine the validity of the construct, it is necessary to carry out a theoretical review process of a concept of the variables to be measured, starting from the formulation of the construct, the determination of dimensions and indicators, to the elaboration and writing of the instrument items. (Ramadhan, *et al.* 2024)

Construct validity testing is carried out through *Exploratory Factor Analysis* (EFA) is a technique in multivariate statistical methods. The goal is to define the least hypothetical constructs or factors as dimensions, latent variables, synthetic variables, or internal attributes that succinctly explain the observed relationships between a set of measurable variables (Ersoy *et al.*, 2023).

These measurable variables are also referred to as observed variables, real variables, effect indicators, reflective indicators, or surface attributes. Basically, the EFA seeks to uncover the general factors underlying the structure and organization of these measurable variables. The following are the results of the exploratory analysis test that the researcher has conducted:



Table 5. Instrument Loading Factor Results

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Uniqueness
Item 1	0.899			0.250
Item 2	0.828			0.342
Item 3	0.753			0.449
Item 4	0.673			0.520
Item 5	0.497			0.689
Item 6		0.800		0.351
Item 7		0.768		0.467
Item 8		0.685		0.567
Item 9			0.925	0.145
Item 10			0.752	0.391
Item 11				0.796

Based on the *Exploratory Factor Analysis* (EFA) process carried out on items that were previously declared valid through the Aiken's V test, the EFA results showed that only some items had adequate *factor loading* values and did not undergo *cross-loading*, so these items were retained as part of the final construct. This analysis yields three main factors that correspond to the conceptual framework, namely *Invalidation Emotion*, *Shame Disguised*, and *Denial*. The first factor, *Invalidation Emotion*, loaded five items (items 1 - 5) with loading values ranging from 0.497 to 0.899, indicating that the items represented a consistent experience of emotional denial or abandonment. The second factor, *Shame Disguised*, consists of three items (items 6 – 8) that have a high load (0.685–0.800), thus depicting forms of shame emotions that are disguised and not directly expressed. The third factor, *Denial*, is formed from two main items (items 9 and 10) that have strong loading, and one additional item, item 11. Item 11 initially showed a high uniqueness value, but after further analysis based on theoretical linkages and correlations between items, the item was considered the most suitable to be included in the *Denial* factor.

Table 6. KMO and BARTLET Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy			.0780
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-square	1363.318	
	df	171	
	Sig.	.000	

In addition, the Kaiser - Meyey Olkin (KMO) Test was also used in this study. The KMO method measures the sufficiency of the sample for each variable in the model as a whole. The lower the proportion, the more suitable it is for the factor analysis carried out (Mudri & Hardjomuljadi, 2019). The results of our KMO test showed that the KMO value was at 0.780, which was in the category of quite good, so the data was considered adequate for factor analysis. This value indicates that the correlation pattern between - is quite strong and eligible for further analysis.

Table 7. Reliability Test Results

Estimate	Cronbachs' α
Point Estimate	0.791
95% CI lower bound	0.744
95% CI upper bound	0.831

Tabel 8. Item final Toxic Positivity

Item
1. When I'm sad I find it hard to show my feelings to others
2. I realized that I shouldn't show my negative feelings to others.
3. I believe that expressing negative emotions is normal and does not make me appear weak
4. I am able to show my negative feelings without feeling afraid of being judged.
5. When I try to share a problem, they immediately give a positive solution without asking how I really feel
6. I feel like my complaints are often ignored, like I shouldn't feel that way
7. I rarely show a bad mood so as not to disturb others
8. I feel comfortable expressing my concerns without feeling judged.
9. I always think of fun things when I am faced with problems
10. I feel bad when someone corners me over a problem I am experiencing.
11. I feel appreciated all the time about the trauma I experienced, without trying to compare it to the greater suffering.

The results of this study show that individual experiences related to *emotional invalidation*, *shame disguised*, and *denial* are interrelated phenomena and form a consistent construct structure in early to intermediate adult respondents. The content validity process is carried out first through Aiken's V assessment of the initial 22 items, where all items meet the minimum eligibility limit so that they can proceed to the next stage of analysis. After going through this stage, the researcher then conducts tests using *Exploratory Factor Analysis* (EFA) to identify the most suitable factor structure. The results of the EFA show the emergence of 3 aspects, namely *denial*, *shame disguised*, and *invalidation of emotions*. Most items have a *loading factor* above 0.40, with strong values on some items. The item retention criteria in the exploratory factor analysis depend not only on the *value of the factor loading*, but also on the consideration of content and theoretical validity (Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). Item 11, which initially had a high *uniqueness* value, was retained because of its theoretical relevance and positive contribution to the *denial* factor after further analysis.

Based on the ideas of Kaiser & Rice (1974) and Field (2018), data feasibility testing through the SME Test and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is a critical prerequisite stage before conducting Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). The KMO value of 0.780 obtained falls into the *category of "Middling" to "Meritorious"* according to Kaiser, which indicates that the sufficiency of the sample for factor analysis is at a sufficiently strong to good level. This result is further strengthened by the Bartlett value of 0.000 ($p < .001$), which expressly rejects the null hypothesis that the correlation matrix is an identity matrix, thus confirming that there is an adequate and significant correlation structure between variables in the data (Field, 2018). Confirmation of the feasibility of this data is a valid and solid foundation for factor extraction at the EFA stage. Thus, the data used can be considered feasible.

Once the factor structure was formed, the researcher continued the reliability analysis using Alpha Cronbach on the remaining items at 0.791, showing that all items had good internal consistency and that none of the items significantly degraded the quality of the instrument. Field (2018) emphasized that the reliability test is a critical step after factor analysis is carried out, in order to evaluate the internal consistency of each dimension that has been identified. The value of 0.791 in this context serves as a statistical confirmation that the factor structure resulting from EFA, in which most items have a *loading factor* above 0.40 and item 11 is maintained based on theoretical considerations, has formed a cohesive measurement construct.

Field (2018) also explains that *Cronbach's Alpha interpretation* should be accompanied by the "*Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted*" and "*Corrected Item-Total Correlation*" checks. None of the items significantly degraded the quality of the instrument, meaning that when every item including the 11 items that had been hypothetically retained was removed from the calculation, the *overall Alpha Cronbach* value did not experience a substantial increase. This proves that each item makes a positive contribution and does not undermine the homogeneity of the scale, so that the theory-based decision to retain a particular item in the EFA stage has been empirically validated in this reliability stage. Therefore, the structure of the meaningful factors results in a reliable scale. The value of 0.791 which is in the "good" category provides the final justification that the instrument has gone through a process of screening and theoretical consideration. The *item-rest correlation value* is also in the category of adequate to strong, thus supporting the decision to retain all items that have been filtered through EFA. These results show that the developed instruments have good quality, both in terms of factor structure and measurement consistency.



4. CONCLUSION

The results of the study showed three forms of factors, namely *emotional invalidation*, *shame disguised*, and *denial*. Based on the analysis process carried out, this measuring tool can describe these three factors quite well. This study shows that these three forms of experience are indeed interrelated and appear in many early to intermediate adult individuals. Thus, the measurement tool developed has been able to meet the initial goal of the study, which is to provide a way to identify a person's tendency to show *toxic positivity patterns* such as rejecting or covering up negative emotions.

Based on these results, further research is suggested to add other types of validity tests, such as convergent validity, discriminatory, or relationship tests with other variables, so that this measurement tool is stronger from a psychometric perspective. In addition, the aspects of the *toxic positivity* variable still need to be explored in more depth, so that the developed instrument truly describes the overall form of *toxic positivity* behavior and experience that occurs in daily life. Subsequent research is also expected to involve more specific samples.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author expresses his deep appreciation and gratitude to the main supervisor, Mrs. Novita Sari, S. Psi., M. Psi. for the guidance, direction, and support provided during the implementation of the research and preparation of this article. Gratitude is also addressed to the University of Muhammadiyah Bandung for the opportunities, facilities, and academic support that have been provided during the research process. The highest appreciation was conveyed to the psychologists involved in the validation of the content of the instrument, as well as to all adolescents who participated as respondents for their involvement and honesty in filling out the questionnaire. In addition, the author would like to thank his family and fellow students who always provide moral support, motivation, and enthusiasm throughout the research process.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abdullah K, Aiman U, Zahara F, et al. 2021. Quantitative Research Methodology Muhammad Zaini. <http://penerbitzaini.com>
- [2] Achmad, ZA, & Lubna, PNC (2023). Toxic Positive Content Uploads on Instagram in Encouraging the Growth of Generation Z's Hustle Culture. *JOSAR (Journal of Student Academic Research)*, 8(1), 72–89. <https://doi.org/10.35457/josar.v9i1.2730>
- [3] Azwar, S. (2005). *Basics of Psychometrics*. Yogyakarta: Student Library.
- [4] Azwar, S. (2005). *Compilation of Psychology Scales*, Yogyakarta: Student Library.
- [5] Campbell-Sills, L., Barlow, D.H., Brown, T.A., & Hofmann, S.G. (2006). The effect of suppression and acceptance on the emotional responses of individuals with anxiety and mood disorders. *Behavioral Research and Therapy*, 44(9), 1251–1263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2005.10.001>
- [6] Ersoy, M., Eren, E., Avci, Z. Y., & Kandemir, C. M. (2023). *Development of the Perception Scale for Flipped Learning Model*. *Anatolian Journal of Education*, 8 (1), 63 – 78. <https://doi.org/10.29333/aje.2023.815a>
- [7] Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
- [8] Goodman, W. (2022). *Toxic Positivity: Keeping It Real in a World Obsessed with Being Happy*. TarcherPerigee.
- [9] Ihsan, H. (2015). Validity of the content of the research measuring tool: the concept and assessment guide. *Journal of Educational Sciences*.
- [10] Jain, A., Tamarana, R., Santosh, U., & Singh, R. (2024). The relationship between dominant personality and toxic positivity: the mediating role of intrapersonal and interpersonal control. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 50(1), 186-195.
- [11] Kaiser, H. F., & Rice, J. (1974). Little Jiffy, Mark IV. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447403400115>
- [12] Wood, J.V., Elaine Perunovic, W.Q., & Lee, J.W. (2009). Positive Self-Statement: Strength for Some, Danger for Others. *Psychological Sciences*, 20(7), 860–866. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02370.x>
- [13] Kojongian, MGR, & Wibowo, DH (2022). Toxic Positivity: The Other Side of the Concept of Always Being Positive in All Conditions. *Journal of Psychopreneur*, 6(1), 10-25.
- [14] Kotor, JJ, & John, OP (2003). Individual differences in two processes of emotion regulation: Implications for impact, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(2), 348–362. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.2.348>
- [15] MacIntyre, PD (2016). So far so good: An overview of positive psychology and its contribution to SLAs. *Positive psychological perspectives on foreign language learning and teaching*, 3-20.

-
- [16] MacIntyre, P.D., Gregersen, T., & Mercer, S. (2019). Setting an agenda for positive psychology in SLAs: Theory, practice, and research. *Journal of Modern Languages*, 103(1), 262-274.
- [17] Mesick, S. (1993). Validity. In R. Linn, *Ethnocultural Issues in the assessment* (pp. 13-104). Phoenix: Mesick, S.
- [18] Mudri, & Hardjomuljadi, S. (2019). Analysis of Design and Development Method Factors in the Semarang – Batang Toll Road Project Section I. *Construction*, 10 (2), 39 – 56.
- [19] Murti, B. (2011). Validity and Reliability of Measurements. *Journal of the Faculty of Medicine, Sebelas University of March*.
- [20] Novikasari, 2016. Instrument Validity Test. IAIN Purwokerto
- [21] Putri, A. Noviyanti, A. & Divani, A. Development of *self-regulation measuring* tools during online learning. University of Muhammadiyah Bandung. *Psyche: Journal of Psychology of the University of Muhammadiyah Lampung*, Vol 4, No. 2
- [22] Ramadhan, M. F., Siroj, R. A., & Afgani, M. W. (2024). Validity and reliability. *Journal on Education*, 6(2), 10967-10975.
- [23] Sugiyono, 2013. *Qualitative Quantitative Research Methods and R&D* alfabeta. ISBN: 979-8433-64-0
- [24] Sugiyono. 2016. *Quantitative, Qualitative and R&D Research Methods*. Bandung: Alfabeta
- [25] Suryabrata, S. (2005). *Development of Psychological Measurement Tools*. Yogyakarta: Andi Publishers.
- [26] Upadhyay, I.S., Srivatsa, K.A., & Mamidi, R. (2022). Towards Toxic Positivity Detection. *Proceedings of the Tenth International Workshop on Natural Language Processing for Social Media*, 75–82. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.socialnlp-1.7>
- [27] Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2013). *Research methods for business: A skill-building approach* (6th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- [28] Widyastuti, TAR, et al. (2024). *Research Methodology: A Complete Guide to Writing Scientific Papers*. PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.
- [29] Worthington, R. L., & Whittaker, T. A. (2006). Scale development research: A content analysis and recommendations for best practices. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 34(6), 806–838. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000006288127>