



ARTIGO

Avaliação no contexto de carreira com base na Teoria Social Cognitiva de Carreira: onde estamos e para onde vamos?

Career Assessment Based on Social Cognitive Career Theory: Where Are We and Where Are We Headed?

Evaluación de Carrera Basada en la Teoría Social Cognitiva de la Carrera: ¿Dónde Estamos y Hacia Dónde Vamos?

Maiana Farias Oliveira Nunes¹

orcid.org/0000-0003-4891-5982
maiana.nunes@ufsc.br

Manoela Ziebell de Oliveira²

orcid.org/0000-0003-0243-5115
manoela.oliveira@puccrs.br

João Carlos Caselli Messias³

orcid.org/0000-0002-6487-4407
profjoaomessias@gmail.com

Alexsandro Luiz De Andrade⁴

orcid.org/0000-0003-4953-0363
alexsandro.andrade@ufes.br

Recebido em: 31 out. 2024.

Aprovado em: 02 set. 2025.

Publicado em: 11 dez. 2025.



Este é um artigo de acesso aberto distribuído sob a licença [CC-BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), que permite a cópia e redistribuição do material em qualquer formato e para qualquer finalidade, desde que a autoria original e os créditos de publicação sejam mantidos.

Diana Aguiar Vieira⁵

orcid.org/0000-0002-5191-4457
dianavieira@iscap.ipp.pt

Marco A. P Teixeira⁶

orcid.org/0000-0001-7981-9788
mapteixeira.psi@gmail.com

Rodolfo A. M. Ambiel³

orcid.org/0000-0002-3921-8547
ambielram@gmail.com

Thaline da Cunha Moreira⁷

orcid.org/0000-0002-6484-8583
thacmoreira@gmail.com

Resumo: A Teoria Social Cognitiva de Carreira (TSCC) tem se consolidado nos últimos 30 anos, com um aumento notável no número de pesquisas realizadas no Brasil. Um dos avanços mais expressivos é a disponibilização de instrumentos avaliativos voltados aos fenômenos investigados nesta teoria. O objetivo deste artigo é apresentar a evolução teórica dos modelos da TSCC e gerar um panorama dos instrumentos avaliativos disponíveis no Brasil. São descritos instrumentos para avaliação dos interesses profissionais, da autoeficácia, das expectativas de resultados, e de barreiras e suportes, além de suas evidências de validade e precisão. Observou-se uma maior quantidade de instrumentos sobre interesses e autoeficácia e que todos os fenômenos chave da TSCC dispõem de instrumentos com evidências de validade e precisão adequadas para uso em pesquisas. Discute-se as conquistas teóricas e metodológicas obtidas nas pesquisas nacionais, assim como os aspectos que ainda demandam maior investimento de novas investigações.

Palavras-chave: autoeficácia; interesses profissionais; escolha profissional;

¹ Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC), Florianópolis, Santa Catarina, Brasil.

² Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul (PUCRS), Porto Alegre, Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil.

³ Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Campinas (PUC-Campinas), Campinas, São Paulo, Brasil.

⁴ Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo (UFES), Vitória, Espírito Santo, Brasil.

⁵ Instituto Politécnico do Porto (IPP), Porto, Portugal.

⁶ Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), Porto Alegre, Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil.

⁷ Centro Universitário de Jaguariúna (UnifAJ), Jaguariúna, São Paulo, Brasil.

orientação vocacional; desenvolvimento profissional.

Abstract: The Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) has consolidated over the past 30 years, with a notable increase in the number of studies conducted in Brazil. One of the most significant advances is the availability of assessment instruments for the phenomena investigated in this theory. This article aims to present the theoretical evolution of the SCCT models and provide an overview of the assessment instruments available in Brazil. Instruments for evaluating professional interests, self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and barriers and supports are described, along with their evidence of validity and reliability. The authors observed a more significant number of instruments on interests and self-efficacy. All critical phenomena of the SCCT have instruments with adequate validity and reliability evidence for research use. The discussion focuses on national research's theoretical and methodological achievements and aspects that require further investigation.

Keywords: self-efficacy; professional interests; career choice; vocational guidance; professional development.

Resumen: La Teoría Social Cognitiva de la Carrera (TSCC) se ha consolidado en los últimos 30 años, con un notable aumento en el número de investigaciones realizadas en Brasil. Uno de los avances más significativos es la disponibilidad de instrumentos de evaluación enfocados en los fenómenos investigados en esta teoría. El objetivo de este artículo es presentar la evolución teórica de los modelos de la TSCC y ofrecer un panorama de los instrumentos de evaluación disponibles en Brasil. Se describen instrumentos para la evaluación de los intereses profesionales, la autoeficacia, las expectativas de resultados y las barreras y soportes, además de sus evidencias de validez y precisión. Se observó una mayor cantidad de instrumentos sobre intereses y autoeficacia, y que todos los fenómenos clave de la TSCC cuentan con instrumentos con evidencias de validez y precisión adecuadas para su uso en investigaciones. Se discuten los logros teóricos y metodológicos alcanzados en las investigaciones nacionales, así como los aspectos que aún requieren nuevas investigaciones.

Palabras clave: autoeficacia; intereses profesionales; decisión profesional; orientación vocacional; desarrollo profesional.

Introduction

The Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT), formulated by Lent, Brown, and Hackett in 1994, integrates concepts to understand the formation of interests, academic and career choices, and performance outcomes. Grounded in Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory (1986), SCCT highlights the importance of self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and goals in career development. These mechanisms interact with personal and contextual factors, helping to explain how individuals exercise agency in their trajectories and face

challenges throughout life (Lent et al., 1994; Lent & Brown, 2020). The theory also applies broadly to diverse populations, allowing for the tailoring of interventions to address specific issues, such as contextual barriers and lack of social support, promoting more effective and sustainable career decisions. It stands among the most studied and applied career theories, alongside constructivist and constructionist approaches. In practice, it provides a robust foundation for developing interventions that enhance individuals' confidence in their abilities and help them create career paths more aligned with their realities and aspirations (Lent & Brown, 2020). It is essential to mention that, for SCCT, the term "career" refers to decisions and actions within academic and work domains, focusing on both the content/outcomes of choices (Lent et al., 1994) and the decision-making processes (Lent & Brown, 2013).

Given the relevance and applicability of SCCT, this article aims to describe and analyze the assessment instruments of the central variables of SCCT available for use in Brazil. To achieve this goal, we will first present the five models proposed by SCCT, followed by the instruments available in the Brazilian context for evaluating interests, self-efficacy beliefs and sources of self-efficacy, outcome expectations, barriers, and support—the most explored variables in the various proposed models. In addition, we will highlight their psychometric properties, application contexts, and relevance in the field of career and vocational guidance in Brazil.

Throughout its development, the proponents of the Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) have created five independent yet interrelated theoretical models. The initial models formulated by Lent, Brown, and Hackett (1994) encompass (1) interest development, (2) occupational choices, and (3) performance in the chosen activity. Lent and Brown expanded the theory with the career satisfaction model (4), analyzing well-being in educational and occupational contexts while considering personal and contextual variables (Lent & Brown, 2006; 2008). Finally, the social cognitive model of career self-management

(5) focuses on how people manage normative tasks and cope with the challenges associated with career preparation, entry, adaptation, and change (Lent & Brown, 2013). This model applies to multiple process aspects of career behavior and development, and it addresses the dynamic ways in which people negotiate normative developmental tasks (e.g., career decisions, job search) and less predictable events and crises (e.g., job loss).

Recently, Lent and Brown (2020) emphasized the importance of operationalizing the models to promote career sustainability throughout life. The models are based on scientific evidence and Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory (1997), incorporating triadic reciprocity (i.e., reciprocal interrelations between behavior, beliefs, and context) and agentic capability (i.e., the competence to manage one's behavior in response to environmental demands, barriers, and support, linked to self-reflection, self-monitoring, proactivity, and self-regulation).

The models share key variables, such as self-efficacy beliefs, outcome expectations, intentions, goals, and proximal and distal contextual influences, which play specific roles across the different models, such as predicting interests or forecasting exploration goals and actions. We developed supplementary material presenting a summary of the models, their objectives, principal components, and year of publication. Next, we will detail conceptualizations of critical SCCT phenomena and the assessment instruments available in Brazil.

Professional Interests

In the inaugural SCCT article, Lent et al. (1994) described the development of professional interests as patterns of preference, indifference, or aversion toward relevant vocational activities and professions resulting from the interaction between innate personal characteristics and cultural and educational influences, especially during childhood and adolescence. Personal traits and one's context influence learning experiences, which predict self-efficacy beliefs and

outcome expectations, thereby shaping preferences or aversions for certain activities. Rounds and Su (2014) expand this definition, positioning interests as preferences for activities, contexts, and associated outcomes that guide and motivate behaviors in specific contexts. Recent studies confirm that interests have significant predictive power for career choices, success, and satisfaction (Hoff et al., 2021; Nye, 2022). Interests guide the selection of activities and are crucial for professional success and personal satisfaction, underscoring their theoretical and practical importance.

From a structural perspective, John Holland's Interest Model (1959, 1997), widely studied and accepted due to solid empirical support (Nauta, 2010), classifies interests into six primary types (RIASEC) based on personality and context: Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, and Conventional. Each person exhibits a predominant combination of two or three interest types, forming a unique profile of preferences (Holland, 1997). Various instruments assess vocational interests in Brazil, though improvements in their psychometric properties are needed (Noronha et al., 2003), as well as theoretical and conceptual refinements (Nunes et al., 2008; Lamas, 2017). Literature reviews highlight that interest assessment tools are consistently among the most studied by researchers in the field (Ambiel et al., 2017; Ambiel & Polli, 2011; Barros & Ambiel, 2020; Noronha & Ambiel, 2006). A specific review of interest assessment in Brazil identified ten instruments with different origins and theoretical foundations (Ambiel et al., 2016). The two most frequently used instruments were the Career Counseling Scale [Escala de Aconselhamento Profissional (EAP)] and the Self-Directed Search (SDS).

The EAP, developed in Brazil by Noronha et al. (2007), is based on activities from various professions that require higher education. With 61 items on a 5-point Likert scale, the EAP assesses the frequency with which a person would perform certain activities, divided into seven dimensions or areas of professional interest: Exact Sciences,

Arts and Communication, Biological and Health Sciences, Agrarian and Environmental Sciences, Bureaucratic Activities, Human and Social Applied Sciences, and Entertainment. Validity studies show that the EAP effectively differentiates students from different courses and is reliable, with Cronbach's alpha values between 0.79 and 0.94 in a diverse sample of 762 university students. As of 2019, over 30 articles based on Brazilian samples confirmed its robustness in terms of validity (Ambiel et al., 2019). Although atheoretical, the instrument's technical manual states that the definition of interests aligns with that of SCCT by Lent et al. (1994).

In Brazil, most studies on the Self-Directed Search (SDS) - developed in the U.S. based on Holland's Interest Model by Holland and his collaborators - employ the fourth edition of the instrument (Primi et al., 2010). Brazilian's fifth edition (Ambiel et al., 2024) comprises 252 dichotomous items across the six RIASEC types distributed in three scales (Activities, Competencies, and Occupations), along with a 14-item self-assessment on a seven-point scale. Research cited in the technical manual has demonstrated validity based on internal structure and relationships with other variables, such as interest and personality instruments. The authors did not observe any significant differences between in-person and online applications. Regarding reliability, Cronbach's alpha (0.89 to 0.91) and McDonald's Omega (0.92 to 0.94) were calculated for the total sample and subsamples, showing similar consistency.

Self-Efficacy in the Career Context

The concept of self-efficacy, developed by Bandura (1977; 1986), was first applied to the vocational context by Betz and Hackett (1981; Hackett & Betz, 1981), addressing gender differences in career choices and their relation to self-efficacy. In Brazil, self-efficacy has been widely studied within career development subdomains, becoming one of the most prominent variables (Remor et al., 2020). Bandura (1977; 1986; 1997) defines self-efficacy as the belief in one's ability to perform actions in specific domains successfully.

It is a variable that helps predict which actions people will undertake, the effort they expend to achieve their goals, and the persistence they will display when facing obstacles. Positive self-efficacy beliefs stimulate effort and potential development, even in the initial absence of skills.

Conversely, negative beliefs limit exposure to new experiences and delay skill development (Bandura, 1986; 1997). Due to the specific nature of self-efficacy, it should be analyzed in specific contexts to avoid confusion with other psychological phenomena and enhance practical and theoretical validity. Additionally, specific assessment provides greater practical utility and improves the testing of theoretical hypotheses (Bandura, 1997, 2001).

Self-efficacy (SE) related to specific occupational activities refers to confidence in one's ability to perform tasks within specific domains, such as arts and culinary skills. The Occupational Activities Self-Efficacy Scale (Nunes & Noronha, 2011) is a Brazilian self-report instrument that assesses SE for occupational activities across the six RIASEC types. Composed of 100 items on a five-point Likert scale, the scale measures confidence levels from low (1) to high (5). Validity studies involved participants aged 14 to 52, primarily up to 18. Principal component and Rasch analyses confirmed the items' internal structure and psychometric characteristics aligned with the model. The components, with high alpha coefficients, indicated coherent groupings: Social ($\alpha=0.91$), Realistic ($\alpha=0.89$), Enterprising ($\alpha=0.91$), Conventional ($\alpha=0.91$), Artistic ($\alpha=0.93$), and Investigative ($\alpha=0.93$). The scale demonstrated validity concerning personality traits and vocational interests and proved relevant in exploring the relationships among SE, outcome expectations, and perceptions of support and barriers (Nunes, 2009; Nunes & Noronha, 2011). These results support the scale as a valuable tool for assessing SE in occupational contexts.

The Work Transition Self-Efficacy Scale, developed in Portugal and adapted to Brazil (Vieira et al., 2006), aims to assess self-efficacy in transitioning from higher education to the job market.

The scale is composed of 28 items, divided into three factors: self-efficacy in work adaptation, self-efficacy in emotional regulation, and self-efficacy in job seeking, using a six-point Likert scale, with higher scores indicating greater self-efficacy. The initial study by Vieira et al. (2006) reported Cronbach's alphas of 0.91 for adaptation, 0.93 for emotional regulation, and 0.85 for job seeking. Subsequent studies in Brazil showed variations in precision indices: Fleming (2015) confirmed psychometric adequacy, with alphas between 0.84 and 0.92. Uchida (2017) reported less favorable results for job seeking ($\alpha=0.52$), while adaptation and emotional regulation had alphas of 0.80 and 0.79. Martins (2019) conducted a confirmatory factor analysis, supporting the original structure without item elimination, with composite reliability between 0.83 and 0.94.

The Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale, initially developed by Taylor and Betz (1983) as part of the Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy Scale (CDMSE – Short Form), was adapted for Brazil by Dantas and Azzi (2015) using a Portuguese version. This instrument assesses individuals' confidence in performing tasks necessary for career decision-making, consisting of 25 items on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from "not confident" (1) to "completely confident" (5). The Brazilian adaptation identified three factors: (1) Career Development and Job Entry ($\alpha=0.89$), including information gathering and participating in selection processes; (2) Academic and Career Choice ($\alpha=0.85$), focusing on self-assessment and goal selection for courses; and (3) Career Planning Reassessment ($\alpha=0.77$), related to problem-solving. The adaptation included semantic analysis, expert evaluation, verbal reflections, and exploratory factor analysis.

Another available instrument is the Professional Self-Efficacy Scale, developed by Teixeira and Gomes (2005) and later adapted in Brazil by Teixeira et al. (2019). The scale assesses university students' belief in their ability to perform professional activities effectively, reflecting confidence in their performance. In the revised version (Teixeira et al., 2019), the scale has nine

items, with responses on a 1 to 5 scale indicating the respondent's level of agreement with each statement regarding how they think, feel, or act. This scale has validity evidence based on internal structure and convergent validity, with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.83.

Outcome Expectations

Outcome expectations refer to beliefs about the possible consequences of actions (Brown & Lent, 2019). According to Bandura (1986), these consequences can be physical, social, or self-evaluation-related. Outcome expectations are context-dependent, and measures typically seek to quantify positive expectations, i.e., the belief that outcomes will be beneficial. However, some measures evaluate negative expectations (e.g., Suh et al., 2024), which act as inhibitors of behavior rather than motivating behavioral engagement (Bandura, 1986; Fouad & Guillen, 2006). In Brazil, we have identified three instruments assessing career-related outcome expectations.

The Job Search Outcome Expectations Instrument, developed by Oliveira (2024), is a unidimensional scale that assesses outcome expectations during job searching. It comprises five items covering social, material, and self-evaluation expectations. Respondents rate how much they agree with each statement about what may happen if they continue job searching over the next two months (from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). Tests of validity evidence conducted with a sample of undergraduate and graduate students indicate that the fit indices were adequate, except for RMSEA, which was above expectations (CFI= 0.96; TLI= 0.92; RMSEA= 0.15; SRMR= 0.051), and the reliability was $\omega=0.75$.

The Career Decision-Making Outcome Expectations Scale was adapted for Brazil by Salvador (2022) from the original scale by Lent et al. (2017). This unidimensional instrument, consisting of eight items, assesses positive expectations for engaging in exploratory career behaviors. Respondents indicate their degree of agreement on a five-point Likert scale. Confirmatory factor analysis, conducted with higher education par-

ticipants, showed a good fit for the unifactorial model ($\chi^2 = 170.15$ [20]; CFI = 0.98; TLI = 0.98; RMSEA [90% CI] = 0.15 [0.11 – 0.14]), with high reliability ($\alpha = 0.93$).

The Outcome Expectations Scale [for the context of entrepreneurship] was adapted by Silva, Bello, Machado, and Oliveira (2024) from an instrument by Lanero et al. (2016). This scale contains 14 items and assesses individuals' perceptions of the likelihood of achieving positive outcomes as entrepreneurs, organized into two dimensions: extrinsic and intrinsic outcomes. Participants respond on an eight-point Likert scale, ranging from 0 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The Brazilian version demonstrated validity in its bi-dimensional structure and showed good overall reliability ($\alpha = 0.88$).

Barriers and Supports

In SCCT, supports and barriers are relevant contextual variables considered proximal influences on behavior in the Career Self-Management Model (Lent & Brown, 2013). Supports facilitate career development, while barriers inhibit it (Lent et al., 2000; Lent et al., 2003). SCCT suggests that favorable contexts, with high support levels and fewer barriers, strengthen goals and the likelihood of achieving them (Lent & Brown, 2006). Supports and barriers directly impact self-efficacy beliefs, outcome expectations, and goals, moderating the relationships among these variables (Lent & Brown, 2013; Lent et al., 1994). Beyond the objective presence of supports and barriers, it is crucial to consider individuals' perceptions of their availability (Lent et al., 2000). We have identified three instruments for assessing career-related supports and barriers in Brazil.

The Contextual Supports and Barriers in Job Search Scale, developed by Oliveira (2024), assesses perceptions that may influence job search efforts. The support scale includes 16 items organized into instrumental support ($\omega=0.91$) and emotional support ($\omega=0.93$). The barriers scale has 22 items divided into six factors: race/ethnicity ($\omega=0.96$), sex/gender ($\omega=0.92$), age ($\omega=0.92$), social discouragement ($\omega=0.85$), financial difficulties

($\omega=0.76$), and restricted job market ($\omega=0.75$). Participants respond on a five-point Likert scale about the likelihood of encountering the situations expressed in the items. The instrument was based on literature and interviews with HR professionals, underwent content and semantic analysis, and demonstrated validity through confirmatory factor analysis, indicating structural equivalence across demographic groups (men and women, Caucasian and non-caucasian individuals).

The Career Contextual Perspectives Inventory (CCPI) was adapted for Brazil by Frutoso and Oliveira-Silva (2023) and consists of three scales assessing different aspects of career perspectives. The Barrier Perception Scale, comprising 28 items, measures individuals' perception of the likelihood of encountering barriers, subdivided into four factors: Ethnic-Racial Discrimination ($\omega = 0.89$), Work-Family Conflict ($\omega = 0.88$), Career and Job Uncertainty ($\omega = 0.92$), and Gender Discrimination ($\omega = 0.92$). The Barrier Overcoming Scale also has 28 items, evaluating respondents' confidence in overcoming barriers with similar factors. The Career Support Scale, with 11 items, explores perceptions of received support and consists of three factors: Social Support and Encouragement ($\omega = 0.86$), Access to Mentors ($\omega = 0.83$), and Financial Support ($\omega = 0.65$). The adaptation revealed partial retention of the original factorial structures of the inventory.

The Career Barriers Perception Inventory (CBPI) was adapted for Brazil with university students (Melo et al., 2020), based on the Portuguese version by Cardoso (2009). The adaptation included semantic modifications and dimensional reduction procedures, resulting in four dimensions assessed on a seven-point Likert scale: Lack of Support (e.g., "Having little information about possible educational alternatives"), Gender Discrimination (e.g., "Being discriminated against by the employer for having children"), Ethnic Discrimination (e.g., "Not being as well paid as colleagues of another race/ethnicity"), and Opportunity Restriction (e.g., "Not having adequate educational opportunities"). Studies on the CBPI in Brazil (De Andrade et al., 2023; Melo

et al., 2021) indicate that women in public service perceive more barriers than men and that black and mixed-race participants report higher levels of ethnic discrimination and lack of support barriers.

Table 2 presents the main characteristics of the instruments used to assess SCCT's core variables in Brazilian samples, detailing structure (number of items and dimensions), reliability, and study samples. This diversity of tools demonstrates SCCT's adaptation to the Brazilian context, allowing for an in-depth analysis of individuals' perceptions regarding career development and labor market challenges. Additionally, including measures that consider personal and contextual factors is crucial for guiding career interventions that address the specificities of each participant and the Brazilian socio-cultural environment.

Table 1 - Instruments, number of items and dimensions, reliability and samples of validation studies in Brazil

Scale and Authors	Items, Dimensions, Reliability	Sample in Validation Study
Career Counseling Scale (EAP) [Escala de Aconselhamento Profissional (EAP)], (Noronha, 2007)	61 items; Dimensions: Exact Sciences (α items = .97 university students; .98 high school; α individuals = .98 university students; .80 high school); Arts and Communication (α items = .97; .97; α individuals = .86; .81); Biological and Health Sciences (α items = .99; .98; α individuals = .86; .82); Agrarian/Environmental Sciences (α items = .99; .99; α individuals = .88; .85); Bureaucratic Activities (α items = .99; .98; α individuals = .86; .88); Applied Human/Social Sciences (α items = .98; .98; α individuals = .79; .71); Entertainment (α items = .97; .98; α individuals = .76; .70)	762 university students (59% women) and 950 high school students (64.7% women).
Self-Directed Search (SDS) (Ambiel et al., 2024)	252 dichotomous items; Dimensions: Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, and Conventional; Scales: Activities, Competencies, and Occupations, plus a 14-item self-assessment; α = .89 to .91 and ω = .92 to .94 for the full sample and subsamples	1,276 individuals, predominantly female, ages 14 to 56
Self-Efficacy for Occupational Activities Scale (Nunes & Noronha, 2011)	100 items; Self-efficacy for occupational activities in the areas of Social (α =.91); Realistic (α =.89); Enterprising (α =.91); Conventional (α =.91); Artistic (α =.93); Investigative (α =.93)	1,219 individuals ages 14 to 52 (88.4% under 18)
Self-Efficacy in Work Transition Scale (Vieira, Soares & Polydoro, 2006)	28 items; Dimensions: work adaptation self-efficacy (α =.93), emotional regulation self-efficacy (α =.93), and job search self-efficacy (α =.85)	351 final-year students at a public university in Brazil, ages 14 to 49
Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale (Dantas & Azzi, 2015)	25 items; Dimensions: career development and job entry (α =.89); academic and professional choice (α =.85); career planning reassessment (α =.77)	198 high school students from public schools in São Paulo
Professional Self-Efficacy Scale (ECDU) (Teixeira et al., 2019)	Study 1: 53 items; Dimensions: professional self-concept clarity, professional project decision, professional self-efficacy, professional locus of control, and career planning. Study 2: 31 items; Dimensions: career identity (α =.82), career decision (α =.88), expanded exploration (α =.81), professional self-efficacy (α =.65), and professional locus of control (α =.83)	Study 1: 5 expert judges, 8 university students, and 706 university students (452 women), mean age 23.54 years (SD=5.06). Study 2: 351 students (7th to 10th semesters), 221 female, mean age 25.8 years (SD=6.63)

Scale and Authors	Items, Dimensions, Reliability	Sample in Validation Study
Job Search Outcome Expectations Instrument (Oliveira, 2024)	5 items; Unidimensional: outcome expectations during job search $\omega=.75$	563 individuals (19.7% undergraduates, 80.3% college graduates) seeking employment for at least one week from all regions of Brazil, predominantly women (74.8%), Caucasian (62.7%), mean age 30.75 years (SD=7.81), earning up to three minimum wages (59.3%), and unemployed (55.4%)
Career Decision-Making Expectations Scale (Salvador, 2022)	8 items; Unidimensional: positive outcome expectations from engagement in career exploration behaviors ($\alpha=.93$)	Stage 1: 1,483 participants, mean age 34.82 years (SD=11.06), 83.6% female, 48.7% pursuing or completed postgraduate studies. Stage 2: 150 women ages 22 to 53 (M=36.39; SD=6.16), mothers of children up to 12 years old.
Outcome Expectations Scale [for the context of entrepreneurship] (Silva, Bello, Machado, & Oliveira, 2024)	14 items; Dimensions: intrinsic outcomes ($\alpha=.75$), extrinsic outcomes ($\alpha=.87$); total scale $\alpha=.88$	249 entrepreneurs and self-employed workers (70.51% women), mean age 20.5 years (SD=9.7; 58.07% entrepreneurs, 19.21% self-employed).
Contextual Supports and Barriers in Job Search Scale (Oliveira, 2024)	16 items; Dimensions: instrumental support ($\omega=.91$) and emotional support ($\omega=.93$). 22 items; Dimensions: racial/ethnic barriers ($\omega=.96$), gender barriers ($\omega=.92$), age barriers ($\omega=.92$), social discouragement barriers ($\omega=.85$), financial difficulty barriers ($\omega=.76$), and restricted job market barriers ($\omega=.75$)	563 individuals (19.7% undergraduates, 80.3% college graduates) seeking employment for at least one week from all regions of Brazil, predominantly women (74.8%), White (62.7%), mean age 30.75 years (SD=7.81), earning up to three minimum wages (59.3%), and unemployed (55.4%)
Career Barriers and Support Inventory (Frutoso & Oliveira-Silva, 2023)	Barrier Encounter Scale: 28 items; Dimensions: gender discrimination ($\omega=.92$), job and career uncertainty ($\omega=.91$), work-family conflict ($\omega=.90$), ethnic-racial discrimination ($\omega=.89$), job dissatisfaction ($\omega=.86$). Barrier Overcoming Scale: 28 items; Dimensions: gender discrimination ($\omega=.92$), job and career uncertainty ($\omega=.90$), work-family conflict ($\omega=.80$), ethnic-racial discrimination ($\omega=.90$), job dissatisfaction ($\omega=.81$). Career Support Scale: 11 items; Dimensions: social support and encouragement ($\omega=.85$), access to mentors ($\omega=.82$), and financial support ($\omega=.75$)	Exploratory Factor Analysis: 499 participants. Confirmatory Factor Analysis: 859 participants. Predominantly women, single undergraduate students with a family income above three minimum wages and an average age of 28.
Career Barriers Perception Inventory (CBPI) (Melo, Silva, & De Andrade, 2020)	16 items; Dimensions: lack of support ($\omega=.81$); gender discrimination ($\omega=.82$); ethnic discrimination ($\omega=.86$); opportunity restriction ($\omega=.81$)	358 graduates in business administration (57.8% female), with a mean age of 26.94 years (SD = 6.03).

Discussion

This study analyzed the main instruments for assessing the core variables of the Social Cognitive Career Theory adapted for Brazil, focusing on self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and career supports and barriers. Despite the scientific literature growth in studies on vocational interests (Barros & Ambiel, 2020), a limited number of adapted instruments were identified for evaluating self-efficacy beliefs and sources, as well as outcome expectations. This situation may reflect the practical and scientific emphasis on career choice processes among high school and university students (Ambiel et al., 2017; Ambiel & Polli, 2011; Noronha & Ambiel, 2006). However, such a phenomenon does not extend to the other variables of the model. The outcome expectations, for instance, vary according to the anticipated relevant consequences in different contexts, making it challenging to operationalize this construct through measurement instruments. There is no single outcome expectations instrument applicable to all situations or populations. In addition, we obtained the information presented in this study from unpublished theses and dissertations and a book from the Brazilian Association of Career and Vocational Guidance Congress, indicating that these studies are recent and not widely disseminated. This highlights the need to develop specific measures that consider the behaviors or outcomes assessed.

Also, a comparison with international studies reveals significant differences, particularly regarding the perception of barriers. Financial barriers are often more emphasized in the United States, while in Brazil, issues of discrimination and lack of institutional support are equally relevant. This difference underscores the need to use locally adapted and validated instruments to avoid inappropriate generalizations and to offer support aligned with the needs of the Brazilian population. Adapting and validating theory-based instruments face challenges due to Brazil's cultural particularities. The results indicate partial retention of the instruments' original factor structures, emphasizing the importance of se-

mantic and conceptual adjustments to ensure the instruments' suitability to the specificities of the Brazilian population. Despite some psychometric limitations identified in specific instruments, they enable professionals to understand their clients' difficulties better and provide interventions more attuned to local realities.

We recommend diversifying samples for future research, including workers from different sectors and age groups. Additionally, as suggested by Lent and Brown (2020), exploring the effectiveness of interventions based on SCCT principles in organizational and educational contexts is essential. These strategies allow for an understanding of career decision-making processes across various life stages and an assessment of the sustainability of these decisions. Continuing these studies will contribute to consolidating knowledge that enables more effective and contextualized interventions in Brazil.

References

- Ambiel, R. A. M., & Polli, M. F. de. (2011). Análise da produção científica brasileira sobre avaliação psicológica em orientação profissional. *Estudos Interdisciplinares em Psicologia*, 2(1), 103–121.
- Ambiel, R. A. M., Campos, M. I. de, & Von Zuben Campos, P. P. T. (2017). Análise da produção científica brasileira em orientação profissional: Um convite a novos rumos. *Psico-USF*, 22(1), 141–151. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-82712017220112>
- Ambiel, R. A. M., Lamas, K. C. A., & Melo-Silva, L. L. (2016). Avaliação dos interesses profissionais no Brasil: Revisão da produção científica. *Avaliação Psicológica*, 15(n. esp), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.15689/ap.2016.15ee.01>
- Ambiel, R. A. M., Noronha, A. P. P., Alves, B. de P., & Barros, L. de O. (2019). Evaluación de los intereses profesionales: Revisión de estudios com a escala de asesoramiento profesional. *Psicología para América Latina*, 31, 1–14.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Bandura, A. (2001). Guía para la construcción de escalas de autoeficacia. *Evaluar*, 1(2), 1–37.

- Barros, L. O., & Ambiel, R. A. M. (2020). Instrumentos de avaliação psicológica em orientação de carreira: Análise da produção nacional. *Psicologia: Ciência e Profissão*, 40(e203346). <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-3703003203346>
- Brown, S. D., & Lent, R. W. (2019). Social cognitive career theory at 25: Progress in studying the domain satisfaction and career self-management models. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 27(4), 563–578. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072719852736>
- Dantas, M. A., & Azzi, R. G. (2015). Adaptação brasileira da escala de autoeficácia na tomada de decisão de carreira. *Revista Brasileira de Orientação Profissional*, 16(2), 149–160. Disponível em http://pepsic.bvsalud.org/scielo.php?script=sci_issues&pid=1679-3390-&lng=pt&nrm=iso
- De Andrade, A. L., Marques, A. C. R., & de Melo, M. R. (2023). Barreiras na carreira feminina no serviço público. *Revista Pensamento Contemporâneo em Administração*, 17(4), 140–159. <https://doi.org/10.12712/rpca.v17i4.59923>
- Fleming, S. C. R. (2015). *Envolvimento acadêmico e autoeficácia na transição para o trabalho: Um estudo com universitários concluintes* (Master's Dissertation). Federal University of Bahia, Salvador, Bahia. <https://repositorio.ufba.br/bitstream/ri/21266/1/Disserta%C3%A7%C3%A3o%20de%20Mestrado%20em%20Psicologia%20na%20UFBA.Autora-Silvia%20Fleming.pdf>
- Fouad, N. A., & Guillen, A. (2006). Outcome expectations: Looking to the past and potential future. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 14(1), 130–142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072705281370>
- Frutoso, D. G., & Oliveira-Silva, L. C. (2023). Inventário de barreiras e suporte na carreira: Evidências baseadas na estrutura interna. *Revista Psicologia: Organizações e Trabalho*, 23(4), 2736–2746. <https://doi.org/10.5935/rpot/2023.4.24706>
- Holland, J. L. (1959). A theory of vocational choice. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 6, 35–45. <http://doi.org/10.1037/h0040767>
- Holland, J. L. (1997). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments* (3rd ed.). Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Lamas, K. C. A. (2017). Conceito e relevância dos interesses profissionais no desenvolvimento de carreira: Estudo teórico. *Temas em Psicologia*, 25(2), 325–338. <https://doi.org/10.9788/TP20172-16Pt>
- Lanero, A., Vázquez, J.-L., & Aza, C. L. (2016). Social cognitive determinants of entrepreneurial career choice in university students. *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship*, 34(8), 1053–1075. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242615612882>
- Lent, R. W., & Brown, S. D. (2006). On conceptualizing and assessing social cognitive constructs in career research: A measurement guide. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 14(1), 12–35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072705281364>
- Lent, R. W., & Brown, S. D. (2008). Social cognitive career theory and subjective well-being in the context of work. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 16(1), 6–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072707305769>
- Lent, R. W., & Brown, S. D. (2013). Social cognitive model of career self-management: Toward a unifying view of adaptive career behavior across the life span. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 60(4), 557–568. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033446>
- Lent, R. W., & Brown, S. D. (2019). Social cognitive career theory at 25: Empirical status of the interest, choice, and performance models. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 115, 103316. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2019.06.004>
- Lent, R. W., & Brown, S. D. (2020). Career decision making, fast and slow: Toward an integrative model of intervention for sustainable career choice. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 120, 103448. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103448>
- Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. (1994). Toward a unifying social cognitive theory of career and academic interest, choice, and performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 45(1), 79–122. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1994.1027>
- Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. (2000). Contextual supports and barriers to career choice: A social cognitive analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 47(1), 36–49. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.47.1.36>
- Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., Schmidt, J., Brenner, B., Lyons, H., & Treistman, D. (2003). Relation of contextual supports and barriers to choice behavior in engineering majors: Test of alternative social cognitive models. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 50(4), 458–465. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.50.4.458>
- Lent, R. W., Ireland, G. W., Penn, L. T., Morris, T. R., & Sappington, R. (2017). Sources of self-efficacy and outcome expectations for career exploration and decision-making: A test of the social cognitive model of career self-management. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 99, 107–117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.01.002>
- Martins, I. R. C. (2019). *Autoeficácia na transição universidade-trabalho e adaptabilidade de carreira em finalistas do ensino superior* (Master's Dissertation). University of São Paulo, São Paulo, São Paulo. <https://doi.org/10.11606/D.59.2020.tde-20112019-214750>
- Melo, M. R., Martins-Silva, P. O., & Andrade, A. L. (2020). Inventário de percepção de barreiras de carreira: Estudo com universitários. *Revista Brasileira de Orientação Profissional*, 21(1), 67–80. <https://doi.org/10.26707/1984-7270/2020v21n107>
- Melo, M. R., Martins-Silva, P. O., Andrade, A. L., & Moura, R. L. (2021). Barriers, adaptability, employability, and satisfaction: Career perceptions of business students. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 25(6), e190124. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-7849rac2021190124.en>
- Noronha, A. P. P., Freitas, F. A., & Ottati, F. (2003). Análise de instrumentos de avaliação de interesses profissionais. *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa*, 19(3), 275–282. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-37722003000300011>
- Noronha, A. P. P., & Ambiel, R. A. M. (2006). Orientação profissional e vocacional: Análise da produção científica. *Psico-USF*, 11(1), 101–107. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-82712006000100009>

Noronha, A. P. P., Sisto, F., & Santos, A. A. A. (2007). *Escala de Aconselhamento Profissional-EAP - Manual Técnico*. Vetor.

Nunes, M. F. O. (2009). *Estudos psicométricos da escala de autoeficácia para atividades ocupacionais* (Doctorate Thesis). University of San Francisco, Itatiba, São Paulo. <https://www.usf.edu.br/galeria/getImage/427/6937595134239266.pdf>

Nunes, M. F. O., & Noronha, A. P. P. (2011). Escala de autoeficácia para atividades ocupacionais: Estudo da estrutura interna e precisão. *Avaliação Psicológica*, 10(1), 25–40.

Nunes, M. F. O., Okino, E. T. K., Noce, M. A., & Jardim-Maran, M. L. C. (2008). Interesses profissionais: Perspectivas teóricas e instrumentos de avaliação. *Avaliação Psicológica: Interamerican Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 7(3), 403–414.

Oliveira, T. F. (2024). *O processo de procura de emprego: Um teste do modelo de autogerenciamento de carreira* (Unpublished Doctorate Thesis). Federal University of Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, Santa Catarina.

Primi, R., Mansão, C. M., Muniz, M., & Nunes, M. F. O. (2010). *SDS - Questionário de Busca AutoDirigida - Self-Directed Search* (1st ed.). Casa do Psicólogo.

Remor, G. R., Silva, D. C., Nunes, M. F. O., & Silva, N. (2020). Autoeficácia aplicada ao desenvolvimento de carreira: uma revisão integrativa. *Revista de Ciências Humanas*, 54, 1–11. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.5007/2178-4582.2020.e69963>

Salvador, A. P. (2022). *Maternidade e carreira: Teste do modelo social cognitivo para autogerenciamento* (Unpublished Doctorate Thesis). University of San Francisco, Campinas, São Paulo.

Silva, J. M. B., Bello, M. P. S., Machado, J. S., & Oliveira, M. Z. (2024). Adaptação e validação da Escala de Expectativas de Resultados (EER) para o contexto brasileiro. In M. C. P. Lassance & D. Boucinha (Orgs.), *Investigação e práticas em orientação de carreira: Cenário 2023* (pp. 84–91). ABRAOPC.

Silva, M. Z., & De Andrade, A. L. (2019). Influência da carreira e do capital psicológico em aspectos de vida e trabalho. *Psico-USF*, 24(1), 55–67. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-82712019240105>

Suh, H. N., Flores, L. Y., Johanson-Murray, R., Park, S., & Lee, F. Y. (2024). Invisibility and negative career outcome expectations among racially and ethnically diverse college students at a predominantly white institution. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 32(1), 63–78. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10690727231173729>

Taylor, K. M., & Betz, N. E. (1983). Applications of self-efficacy theory to the understanding and treatment of career indecision. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 22, 63–81.

Teixeira, M. A. P., & Gomes, W. I. B. (2005). Decisão de carreira entre estudantes de fim de curso. *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa*, 21(3), 327–334. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-37722005000300009>

Teixeira, M. A. P., Oliveira, M. C. D., Melo-Silva, L. L., & Taveira, M. C. (2019). Escalas de desenvolvimento de carreira de universitários: Construção, características psicométricas e modelo das respostas adaptativas. *Revista Psicologia: Organizações e Trabalho*, 19(3), 703–712. <https://doi.org/10.17652/rpot/2019.3.16557>

Uchida, J. M. (2017). *Autoeficácia na transição para o trabalho em estudantes concluintes do ensino superior* (Master's Dissertation). São Paulo State University, Campinas, São Paulo. <https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12733/1632494>

Vieira, D. A., Soares, A. M., & Polydoro, S. A. J. (2006). Escala de autoeficácia na transição para o mundo do trabalho (AETT): Um estudo de validação para a realidade brasileira. In C. Machado, L. Almeida, M. A. Guisande, M. Gonçalves, & V. Ramalho (Eds.), *Avaliação Psicológica: Formas e contextos*, 11, 293–299. Psiquilíbrios.

Appendix

SCC Models

Model	Focus	Core Variables	year
Model of Interest Development (Lent et al., 1994)	explains how an individual's interest in an activity develops based on their self-efficacy and outcome expectations and the alignment of these outcomes with their values.	- Self-efficacy expectations - Outcome Expectations - Interests	1994
Model of Career Choice (Lent et al., 1994)	explains how individuals make choices of activities by considering their self-efficacy and outcome expectations while also considering contextual barriers, such as socioeconomic and cultural factors, that can influence choices and may not always align with their interests.	- Self-efficacy expectations - Outcome Expectations - Interests - Supports/Barriers	1994

Model	Focus	Core Variables	year
Model of Performance (Lent et al., 1994)	explains how individuals persist in their actions to achieve positive outcomes, grounded in their belief in their abilities and alignment with personal values, while also considering contextual barriers that may hinder this persistence.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Self-efficacy expectations - Outcome Expectations - Past performance - Performance goals 	1994
Model of Career Satisfaction (Lent & Brown, 2006)	explains the degree of satisfaction individuals feel in valued activities, both in school and work, when they perceive their positive results as a consequence of their abilities, self-efficacy beliefs, and contextual factors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Self-efficacy expectations - Outcome Expectations - Support/Barriers - Work Satisfaction 	2006; 2008
Model of Career Self-Management (Lent & Brown, 2013)	explains how individuals manage their professional trajectory through adaptive behaviors influenced by personality factors, contextual factors, and learning experiences, creating a feedback loop that continuously impacts their self-efficacy beliefs, goals, actions, and outcomes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Self-efficacy expectations - Outcome Expectations - Decisional goals - Support/Barriers 	2013

Minibiografia

Maiana Farias Oliveira Nunes

Psicóloga, Doutora em Psicologia pela Universidade São Francisco. Docente do PPG Psicologia da Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina. Membro do GT "Carreiras: informação, orientação e aconselhamento" da ANPEPP.

Manoela Ziebell de Oliveira

Psicóloga, Doutora em Psicologia pela Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul. Docente do PPG Psicologia da Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul. Membro do GT "Carreiras: informação, orientação e aconselhamento" da ANPEPP desde 2016. Bolsista Produtividade do CNPq 2.

João Carlos Caselli Messias

Psicólogo, Doutor em Psicologia pela Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Campinas. Pós-Doutorado em Psicologia pela Universidade Católica Dom Bosco. Docente pesquisador do Programa de Pós-Graduação *Stricto Sensu* em Psicologia da PUC Campinas. Líder do grupo "Psicologia do Trabalho e Carreira: pesquisa e intervenção". Membro do Comitê de Ética em Pesquisa com Seres Humanos da PUC Campinas. Membro do GT "Carreiras: informação, orientação e aconselhamento" da ANPEPP.

Alexsandro Luiz De Andrade

Psicólogo pela Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Doutorado em Psicologia pela Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo. Bolsista Produtividade do CNPq 2.

Diana Aguiar Vieira

I am a psychologist, researcher and Associate Professor in the area of behavioural sciences at the Porto Accounting and Business School (ISCAP), Polytechnic Institute of Porto (P.PORTO), Portugal. Former Vice-Dean of Porto Accounting and Business School (ISCAP). Founder and Director of the Coaching, Career and Personal Development Unit (2011-2018) and the Alumni Office (2012-2018), both ISCAP. Former Pro-Rector of P.PORTO, responsible for employability and building an Alumni Strategy for all the Polytechnic of Porto Schools. Founder of the ICAREalumni community (<https://icarealumni.com/>). My research interests include self-efficacy, alumni relations, career, employability, coaching, soft skills, transversal skills. Participation in several international research projects and partnerships with European and Brazilian universities.

Marco A. P. Teixeira

Doutor em Psicologia pela Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS). Professor Titular no Instituto de Psicologia, Serviço Social, Saúde e Comunicação Humana da UFRGS e coordenador do Serviço de Orientação Profissional e do Núcleo de Apoio ao Estudante da UFRGS. Coordenador do Núcleo de Estudos e Intervenções em Carreira (NEIC). Assessor ad hoc da Área de Psicologia da CAPES. Pesquisador 1C do CNPq.

Rodolfo A. M. Ambiel

Psicólogo, Doutor em Psicologia pela Universidade São Francisco. Docente do PPG Psicologia da PUC - Campinas. Editor-chefe da Revista Psico-USF (Qualis A2) entre 2016 e 2019. Editor-chefe da Revista Brasileira de Orientação Profissional (Qualis A2) entre 2020 e 2022. Ex-Presidente da Associação Brasileira de Orientação Profissional (ABOP) - gestões 2015-2017 e 2017-2019. Membro do GT "Carreiras: informação, orientação e aconselhamento" da ANPEPP desde 2016. Bolsista Produtividade do CNPq 1D.

Thaline da Cunha Moreira

Psicóloga, Doutora em Psicologia pela Universidade São Francisco, Pós-doutora em Psicologia pela PUCRS. Membro do GT "Carreiras: informação, orientação e aconselhamento" da ANPEPP desde 2018. Vice-Presidente da Associação Brasileira de Orientação Profissional e de Carreira (ABRAOPC) - gestão 2024/2025.

Endereço para correspondência

Maiana Farias Oliveira Nunes

Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina
Campus Universitário Reitor João Davi Ferreira Lima
Centro de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas – Sala 10b, bloco C
Departamento de Psicologia
Trindade, 88040-970
Florianópolis, SC, Brasil

Manoela Ziebell de Oliveira

Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul
Programa de Pós-Graduação em Psicologia
Avenida Ipiranga, 6681 – Prédio 11, Sala 902
Partenon, 90619-900
Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil

João Carlos Caselli Messias

Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Campinas
Campus II
Avenida John Boyd Dunlop, s/n
Jardim Ipaussurama, 13034-685
Campinas, SP, Brasil

Alexsandro Luiz De Andrade

Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo
Avenida Fernando Ferrari, 514
Goiabeiras, 29075-910
Vitória, ES - Brasil

Diana Aguiar Vieira

Instituto Politécnico do Porto
Instituto Superior de Contabilidade e Administração do Porto
Rua Jaime Lopes Amorim, s/n
São Mamede de Infesta, 4465-004
Porto, Portugal

Marco A. P Teixeira

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul
Instituto de Psicologia, Serviço Social, Saúde e Comunicação Humana
Rua Ramiro Barcelos, 2600 – Sala 223
Floresta, 90035-003
Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil

Rodolfo A. M. Ambiel

Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Campinas
Campus II
Avenida John Boyd Dunlop, s/n
Jardim Ipaussurama, 13034-685
Campinas, SP, Brasil

Thaline da Cunha Moreira

Centro Universitário de Jaguariúna
Rodovia Adhemar Pereira de Barros, Km 127
Tanquinho Velho, 13820-000
Jaguariúna, SP - Brasil

Os textos deste artigo foram revisados por Bruno Schroeder dos Santos e submetidos para validação dos autores antes da publicação.