OPEN ACCESS

ESCOLA DE CIÊNCIAS DA SAÚDE E DA VIDA

PSICO

Psico, Porto Alegre, v. 56, n. 1, p. 1-15, jan.-dez. 2025
e-ISSN: 1980-8623 | ISSN-L: 0103-5371

http://dx.doi.org/10.15448/1980-8623.2025.1.47144

ARTIGOS

Contribuições Da Psicologia Positiva Na Avaliação Psicológica

Contributions of Positive Psychology to Psychological Assessment
Las Aportaciones de la Psicología Positiva a la Evaluación Psicológica

Tatiana de Cassia Nakano[1]
orcid.org/0000-0002-5720-8940
tatiananakano@hotmail.com

Ana Cláudia Souza Vazquez[2]
orcid.org/0000-0002-7760-9266
anasv@ufcspa.edu.br

Camélia Santina Murgo[3]
orcid.org/0000-0003-3932-7580
camelia@unoeste.br

Alexandra Cecília Portalanza-Chavarría[4]
orcid.org/0000-0002-9782-5089
aportalanza@uees.edu.ec

Claudia Hofheinz Giacomoni[5]
orcid.org/0000-0002-9183-8591
giacomonich@gmail.com

Cláudio Simon Hutz[5]
orcid.org/0000-0002-3252-7339
claudio.hutz@gmail.com

Recebido em: 17 nov. 2024.
Aprovado em: 26 out. 2025.
Publicado em: 12 dez. 2025.

Resumo: A psicologia positiva tem se mostrado um movimento de grande crescimento nas últimas décadas, marcando-se por seu caráter multidisciplinar. O impacto desse movimento na área da avaliação psicológica é foco do presente texto teórico, visto que o processo de construção de medidas de avaliação de construtos positivos permitiu a compreensão das características individuais na expressão de comportamentos, a objetividade e o *status* científico necessário para o campo, possibilitando a medição objetiva dos construtos enfocados pela psicologia positiva. Uma revisão dos principais instrumentos existentes no contexto brasileiro é apresentada, contemplando ferramentas internacionais que foram adaptadas e/ou validadas para uso no país, aquelas que foram desenvolvidas no Brasil e as que se encontram aprovadas para uso profissional. Além disso, a aplicação da psicologia positiva na avaliação psicológica no contexto organizacional e educacional foi apresentada, de forma a ilustrar a amplitude de aplicações que a área pode alcançar.

Palavras-chave: Avaliação; Medidas; Testes.

Abstract: The movement of positive psychology has experienced great growth in recent decades, largely due to its multidisciplinary nature. This theoretical text emphasizes the impact of this movement in psychological assessment, since it enabled the development of measures to assess positive constructs, enabling the understanding of individual characteristics as expressed in behaviors, as well as providing the objectivity and scientific status necessary for the field of positive psychology, allowing the objective measurement of positive psychological constructs. An overview of the main instruments available in the Brazilian context is presented, including international tools that have been adapted and/or validated for use in Brazil, as well as those that have been developed locally and those approved for use by professionals. Further, we introduced the application of positive psychology in psychological assessment in an organizational and educational context, to demonstrate the broad range of applications that can be made from this field.

Keywords: Assessment; Measures; Tests.

Resumen: La psicología positiva es un movimiento de gran crecimiento en las últimas décadas, caracterizada por su carácter multidisciplinar. El impacto de este movimiento en la evaluación psicológica es el foco de este texto teórico. El proceso de construcción de medidas de evaluación para constructos positivos permitió la comprensión de las características en la expresión de las conductas, la objetividad y el estatus científico necesario para el campo, permitiendo la medición objetiva de los constructos enfocados por la psicología positiva. Se presenta una revisión de los instrumentos existentes en Brasil, abarcando herramientas internacionales que han sido adaptadas y/o validadas para su uso en el país, aquellas que fueron desarrolladas en Brasil y aquellas que están aprobadas para uso profesional. Se presentó la aplicación de la psicología positiva en la evaluación psicológica en el contexto organizacional y educativo,

[1] Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Campinas (PUC-Campinas), Campinas, São Paulo, Brasil.
[2] Universidade Federal de Ciências da Saúde de Porto Alegre (UFCSPA), Porto Alegre, Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil.
[3] Universidade do Oeste Paulista (Unoeste), Presidente Prudente, São Paulo, Brasil.
[4] Universidad Espíritu Santo (UEES), Samborondón, Equador.
[6] Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), Porto Alegre, Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil.

con el fin de ilustrar la amplitud de aplicaciones que el área puede alcanzar.
Palabras clave: Evaluación; Medidas; Pruebas.

Introduction

Positive psychology (PP) emerged in the late 1990s, diverging from the intense focus on psychopathology and dysfunction, exhibiting rapid growth and a transdisciplinary nature (van Zyl & Rothmann, 2022). Maslow coined the term in 1954, but its greatest influence was when Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000) emphasized the excessive focus placed on negative traits, pathology, and repairing psychological damage, while neglecting positive aspects of human behavior. It emerges as the "fifth force" in psychology, which can be compared, in terms of importance, with psychoanalysis, behaviorism, humanism, cognitivism, and multiculturalism (Yakushko & Blodgett, 2021).

PP has developed as a scientific discipline applied, and has, in a short period of time, expanded to fields well beyond psychology, becoming an interdisciplinary area of research (Ackerman et al., 2018). At the same time, it has become increasingly widespread in many areas of psychology, including clinical, educational, counseling, organizational, developmental, community, social, and public health psychology (Wissing, 2022).

To improve the quality of human life, PP has been characterized as a movement that encompasses a wide range of constructs (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). The cumulative and coherent knowledge generated by the study and measurement of positive constructs utilizing scientific perspectives, methodologies, and procedures (Ryff, 2022) helps eliminate the notion that positive constructs are either unscientific self-help psychology or pseudoscience without evidence (Ackerman et al., 2018).

The movement of positive psychology (PP) has been centered on the investigation of virtues, strengths, positive emotions, positive communities, and positive work environments since then, including diverse constructs such as resilience, creativity, positive affect, flow, forgiveness, gratitude, passion, mindfulness, hope, optimism, meaning in life, well-being, happiness, justice, character strengths, life satisfaction, motivation, civility, wisdom, among others (Ciarrochi et al., 2022). The movement included research that examines the emotions, forces, processes, conditions, and relationships that promote ideal functioning and flourishing among individuals, groups, and institutions (Waters et al., 2021), focusing on identifying, developing, evaluating, and intervening in constructs that promote well-being at an individual, organizational, and social level (Carr et al., 2020).

Lopez and Snyder (2004), argues that the development of positive psychology within psychological assessment is marked by the measurement of positive constructs related to well-being and flourishing, whose relevance has been empirically supported through valid and reliable psychometric instruments. The significant growth in positive psychological assessment measures has shed light on previously invisible psychological processes that have proven relevant to understanding human behavior focused on the development and well-being of people in different contexts (Constantini et al., 2022; Donaldson et al., 2021; Moskowitz et al., 2021). The increasing level of psychometric quality of the instruments, despite the need for constant advances, has led to an ever-greater influence of positive psychology in practice, with a significant development in the use of psychological assessment measures of positive constructs.

In relation to interventions, an important contribution of PP is that it ceases to possess a remedial focus (when it turns to treating existing disorders or difficulties) to focus on interventions that are both remedial and preventative (seeking to prevent the development of problems or disorders before they occur) (Owens & Waters, 2020). The collective efforts of researchers, professional societies, practitioners, and the public have led to the development of several theories, methodologies, and approaches to measure, explain, and develop the conditions necessary for individuals, communities, and societies to flourish

(Lomas et al., 2020). The change in perspective proposed by positive psychology was therefore also applied to the evaluation process. In this context, this theoretical study will address the contributions of positive psychology to psychological assessment.

The role of positive psychology in psychological assessment

Psychological assessment has historically focused on diagnosing disorders within a medical framework. After the Second World War, the field of psychological assessment began to emphasize psychological suffering, problems, and disorders in response to this new demand (Pureza et al., 2012). A good example of this is the first psychological test, developed in 1900 by Binet in response to a request from the French government to identify children with some type of developmental disorder (Bueno & Ricarte, 2017).

As a result of the emergence of positive psychology, the field of psychological assessment was also transformed, as its foundations were used to structure and develop this new movement, to facilitate objective measurement of the constructs that were the focus of PP (Zanini et al., 2023). Therefore, a significant amount of attention has been given to the development and measurement of positive constructs. PP embraces scientific rigor, analyzing its practices and interventions and encouraging the development of instruments that can serve both as evaluation tools for individuals and institutions and as tools for analyzing the effectiveness of practices.

As an example, literature reviews may be cited. According to Ackerman et al. (2018), 972 empirical articles have been published about positive psychology, and 312 measures were developed between 1998 and 2014. In another study, 1336 articles were identified between 1999 and 2013, with about 750 of these containing empirical tests of positive psychology theories, principles, and interventions (Donaldson et al., 2014). In a meta-analysis of 347 studies involving over 72,000 participants from 41 countries, Carr et al. (2021) found an extensive evidence base supporting the effectiveness of positive psychology interventions. The data demonstrate that PP is devoted to using rigorous scientific methods to understand human behavior in its optimal state (Donaldson et al., 2014).

The process of developing measures for evaluating positive constructs assumed global contours, according to Oliveira and Nakano (2023), allowing the understanding of individual characteristics in the expression of behaviors, as well as the objectiveness and scientific standing required for the movement.

A growing number of instruments was readily available in the international context for measuring aspects of well-being, such as life satisfaction, psychological strengths, and positive emotions (Vázquez et al., 2009). Literature indicates that many instruments have been developed in recent years to measure various aspects of well-being. A literature review conducted by Linton et al. (2016) revealed that there are 99 instruments for measuring well-being. Among them, Bohlmeijer and Westerhof (2021) highlight, as the most used, the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule, the Satisfaction with Life Scale, Ryff's Scales of Psychological Well-being, the Warwick-Edinburg Mental Well-Being Scale, the Flourishing Scale, and the Mental Health Continuum Short Form, as well as demonstrating that self-reports of well-being are valid and reliable.

The first years of PP in the Brazilian context were marked by a lack of evaluation instruments (Lima et al., 2023) with a clear need for adaptation and development of measures. Nascimento and Vasconcelos (2016) highlighted the involvement of the psychological assessment (PA) field in ANPEPP (the National Association for Research and Graduate Studies in Psychology) since its early years, in the 1980s. ANPEPP was established to foster national networks for scientific exchange and cooperation among psychology research centers and scholars, which has led to significant advances in the movement. The authors demonstrate that PA working groups within ANPEPP have expanded substantially, reflecting their growth,

diversity of collaborations among researchers and topics, and the increasing quality of their scientific output. From a historical perspective, it was within the scope of ANPEPP's PA working groups that the first group focusing on Positive Psychology (PP) and creativity was established in 2014, comprising researchers from all five regions of Brazil. Since then, publications involving psychological instruments and empirical studies in PP have increased markedly, representing an important milestone in the development of Positive Psychology in Brazil through the field of psychological assessment (ANPEPP, 2025).

During a literature review conducted by Pureza et al. (2012), a much smaller number of measures were identified, and seven instruments were used in the study: Overall Job Satisfaction, Satisfaction with Life Scale, Subjective Well-being Scale, Subjective Happiness Scale, Flow Identification Questionnaire, and Rosemberg Self-Esteem Scale. Similarly, a survey carried out by Scorsolini-Comin and Santos (2010) also indicated that there were only a limited number of instruments: Positive Affect/Negative Affect Scale (PANAS) and its extended version, Positive and Negative Affect Schedule - Expanded Form (PANAS-X), Oxford Happiness Inventory (OHI), Life Satisfaction Inventory: Form A, Subjective Happiness Scale (SHS) and Subjective Well-being Scale (EBES). Because only the latter is a national instrument, the authors indicated that at the time, the development, adaptation, and investigation of the psychometric qualities of the instruments were necessary, as most of them were international instruments used in Brazilian research without adequate rigor to ensure their effectiveness.

After a few years, Pires et al. (2015) reviewed the positive psychology-based instruments and found a more encouraging outcome. As a result of the research, 11 instruments were identified, with the Rosenberg Self-Esteem scale having the highest frequency, followed by the WHOQOL - Breaf, the Subjective Well-Being scale (EBES), the Marital Satisfaction scale, the Spiritual Well-Being scale, and the Life Satisfaction scale for Children, Job Satisfaction Scale, the Dyadic Adjustment Scale, the Children's Life Satisfaction Scale, the Satisfaction with Life Scale, the Coping Scale (COPE), and the Positive Affect/Negative Affect Scale (PANAS). According to the authors, there has been a significant increase in the adaptation of foreign instruments, with a particular focus on the subjective well-being construct.

In the most recent review, Reppold et al. (2019) reported significant growth in Brazil, especially in terms of the number of researchers, the availability of valid instruments, and the growth in scientific production. The authors report that Brazil had several validated and standardized instruments for assessing the main constructs of Positive Psychology. Among them were satisfaction with life, self-esteem, optimism, hope, engagement at work, quality of life, mindfulness, resilience, character strengths, and compassion. For the purposes of identifying international instruments adapted for Brazil, Lima et al. (2023) compiled a list of 23 instruments that assess a total of 14 constructs, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1 -*International Scales Adapted for Brazilian use*

Construct	Instrument
Affect	Escala de Afetos Positivos e Afetos Negativos
Friendship	Questionário McGill de Amizade
Self-compassion	Escala de Autocompaixão
Well-being	Escala de bem-estar espiritual
Character	Escala Forças de Caráter
Engagement	Escala Ultrecht de Engajamento no Trabalho
Hopeless	Escala de Esperança Disposicional para Adolescentes, *The Hope Index, Adult Dispositional Hope Scale*
Hapinness	Escala de Felicidade Subjetiva, *Steen Happiness Index*
Gratitude	*Gratitude Questionnaire*

Construct	Instrument
Mindfulness	Escala Filadélfia de *Mindfulness,* Questionário das Cinco Facetas de *Mindfulness,* Inventário *Mindufulness* Frelburg, Escala de atenção e consciência plena
Optimism	*Revised Life Orientation Test* *Youth Life Orientation Test*
Resilience	Escala de Resiliência Escala de enfrentamento
Satisfaction / adjustment in marriage	Escala de Satisfação Conjugal Escala de Ajustamento Diádico
Satisfaction with Life	*Satisfaction with Life Scale*

Source: Lima et al. (2023)

Additionally, the authors examined the scales developed in Brazil (Lima et al., 2023). There are a total of 13 scales evaluating nine different constructs: affect (Escala de Afeto Positivo e Negativo para crianças, Escala de Afeto Positivo e Negativo para adolescentes, Escala de Afetos Positivos e Negativos), self-efficacy (Escala de Autoeficácia no Trabalho), subjective well-being (Escala de bem-estar subjetivo), socioemotional skills (Escala de Competências Socioemocionais para universitários), flow (Questionário para identificação do Flow), reasons to live (Escala de Motivos para Viver), satisfaction with life (Escala Multidimensional de Satisfação de Vida para crianças, Escala Multidimensional de Satisfação de Vida para adolescentes, Escala Global de Satisfação de Vida para adolescentes), work satisfaction (Escala de Satisfação no Trabalho) and social support (Escala de Percepção de Suporte Social).

More recently, Oliveira and Nakano (2023) conducted a search in the list of tests approved in the Psychological Test Assessment System (SATEPSI), a board created by the Brazilian Federal Council of Psychology to regulate and certify the technical and scientific quality of psychological assessment instruments, to identify the current situation of positive psychology tests (Table 2). The data has been updated since it was published. By analyzing the tests that are approved and available for professional use, it was even possible to verify those that present psychometric qualities suitable for use in Brazil. This was not common in the instruments cited in the studies.

Table 2 - *Instruments for the assessment of positive constructs approved for professional use in Brazil*

Instrument	Construct	Indication
Bateria online de Inteligência Emocional	emotional intelligence	9 to 88
Escala de autoavaliação da motivação para aprender de alunos do ensino fundamental	motivation	7 to 16
Escala de autoeficácia no trabalho	self-efficacy	18 to 66
Escala de autoeficácia para a escolha profissional	self-efficacy	14 to 21
Escala de identificação de características associadas às altas habilidades/superdotação	giftedness	9 to 12
Escala de inteligência emocional brasileira	emotional intelligence	18 to 81
Escala de motivação para aprendizagem	motivation	7 to 16
Escala de percepção do suporte social – versão adolescentes	social support	12 to 17
Escala de percepção do suporte social – versão adulto	social support	18 to 62
Inventário de avaliação de habilidades sociais, problemas de comportamentos e competência acadêmica para crianças	social skills	6 to 13
Inventário de habilidades sociais	social skills	18 to 59
Inventário de habilidades sociais conjugais	social skills	20 to 73
Inventário de percepção de suporte familiar	family support	11 to 60

Instrument	Construct	Indication
Marcadores de Resiliência Infantil	resilience	8 to 12
Questionário de habilidades sociais, comportamentos e contextos para universitários	social skills	college sudents
Roteiro de entrevista de habilidades sociais educativas parentais	social skills	adults
Teste de Criatividade Figural Infantil	creativity	8 to 15
Teste de Criatividade Figural Infantil – versão adolescentes e adultos	creativity	14 to 87
Teste de habilidades sociais para crianças em situação escolar	social skills	7 to 15

Source: Oliveira e Nakano (2023), revised.

At the time of publication, Brazil had 19 positive quality assessment instruments. These included social skills, emotional intelligence, motivation, self-efficacy, creativity, family support, giftedness, and resilience. According to their indications for use, they cover a wide range of ages, from 6 to 87 years, evaluating from children to the elderly (n = 2), only children and adolescents (n = 8), only adults and the elderly (n = 7), or specific populations such as college students and workers. Despite this, the range of measures does not yet cover the breadth of constructs encompassed by Positive Psychology, and it is imperative that the available tools be expanded since the use of psychological instruments that assess positive constructs can complement psychological assessments performed in diverse contexts (Lima et al., 2023).

From a historical perspective, Wechsler et al. (2019) showed that psychological assessment has played a pivotal role in educational and organizational contexts, marking an international milestone in the development and application of psychological instruments. Likewise, positive psychology has made substantial progress in these domains through the empirical validation of applied constructs, their measurement, and evidence-based interventions, exemplifying its strong integration with psychological assessment (Bentivi et al., 2021; Hutz et al., 2020; Joshi & Kahn, 2024). As an example, this study will demonstrate the application in these two specific areas.

Psychological assessment and positive psychology in education

In this context, psychological assessment traditionally involves identifying the difficulties that students present, particularly those related to learning disabilities. However, with the advent of positive psychology, it has been possible to verify the importance of identifying factors that can help promote healthy development, minimize the impact of these difficulties, enhance academic performance and other life outcomes (Carr et al., 2020). Moreover, identifying strengths can assist in the development of an individualized teaching plan, based on the development of positive variables, such as resilience, autonomy, determination, well-being, character strengths, and positive affect.

As a result of the history that demonstrates the interconnections between psychological assessment and positive psychology, there has been significant progress in developing educational measures that promote not only the identification of potentialities and strengths, but also factors such as optimism, resilience, well-being, self-regulation, and self-efficacy, among others, as well as the use of instruments that contribute to verifying the effectiveness of intervention programs that facilitate positive development (Carr et al., 2020). It has been established that positive practices in the school context are effective tools that are easy to implement, improving students' mental health in the long and short term (Tejada-Gallardo et al., 2020).

As shown through a literature review, teachers also benefit from positive interventions, including reduced stress, burnout, the teaching of coping strategies, increased well-being, and the teaching of coping strategies. Furthermore, according to Kiptiony (2024), interventions have also improved relationships between teachers

and students, as well as among the institution's staff, based on communication, collaboration, trust and school climate, so that well-being, academic performance, staff satisfaction, and a cooperative school climate can be promoted.

As well as interventions, the evaluation of positive aspects has been carried out in the school context. In addition to providing valuable data on students' strengths and challenges, a robust psychological assessment instrument applied to Positive Psychology can assist in guiding interventions and educational practices that foster a positive school environment (Marasca et al., 2022; Nakano, 2018; Souza & Murgo, 2024).

Educational institutions are viewed as privileged environments for promoting well-being, both within the school community and in society at large, due to their importance in society. By utilizing Positive Education, students and all members of the school community will not only be able to achieve academic success, but they will also be able to flourish personally, becoming full individuals and responsible citizens (Cintra & Guerra, 2017).

About the measurement instruments developed in Brazil, researchers have increasingly invested in the identification of positive variables in schooling processes to promote a more collaborative and positive learning environment (Marasca et al., 2022). Several examples can be provided in this regard.

To provide a comparison of national instruments, Segabnazi et al. (2012) developed the Scale of Positive and Negative Affects for Adolescents (EAPN-A) which consists of 28 items. It is designed for teenagers between the ages of 14 and 19. As part of the Tasks for Predicting Optimism in Children (TAPOC) developed by Bandeira et al. (2015), stories and colored drawings were used to assess optimism in children. Initial studies revealed positive correlations between positive affect and the variables of self-esteem and life satisfaction, as well as negative correlations between negative affect and these same variables.

The Positive and Negative Affect Scale for Children, developed by Giacomoni and Hutz (2006), is an instrument consisting of 34 items distributed across two subscales: 17 items measuring positive affect and 17 items measuring negative affect. Intended for children and adolescents aged 7 to 16, this scale was designed to capture the affective experiences of this population through self-reporting. The theoretical basis of the EAPNC is inspired by the original scale for adults, known as PANAS (Positive and Negative Affect Schedule), which is widely recognized for assessing emotional well-being. By adapting these concepts to the child and adolescent age groups, it becomes possible to understand more accurately the emotions that permeate the daily lives of children and adolescents, contributing to interventions that promote healthy emotional states.

The Subjective School Well-Being Scale (EBE-SE), created by Dias-Viana and Noronha (2021), consists of a 27-item instrument that aims to assess student well-being across three main dimensions: satisfaction with school, the presence of positive affect in the school environment, and the experience of negative affect. School satisfaction refers to the student's overall assessment of the school environment, while positive and negative affect refer to the frequency with which the student experiences positive or negative emotions throughout their schooling.

In line with the perspective of developing new instruments, Dametto and Noronha (2019) developed the Character Strengths Scale for Adolescents (CFS-A), which assesses five dimensions: interpersonal strengths, temperamental strengths, moral strengths, intellectual and leadership strengths, and open-mindedness strengths. A study presented by the authors revealed significant correlations between gratitude, hope, and vitality and Subjective Well-Being (SWB), suggesting that character strengths are related to aspects of SWB and indicating that they are important resources for promoting happiness.

The Brazilian Children's Self-Concept Scale measures four dimensions of self-concept: Personal Self-Concept (a child's perception of

themselves in terms of personal characteristics, such as personality traits, feelings, and values); Negative Self-Concept (addresses self-image and the negative aspects the child may associate with themselves, such as insecurities or self-criticism); Physical Self-Concept (evaluates how the child perceives and evaluates their physical appearance, considering factors such as self-esteem related to body image); and Self-Concept of Competence (a child's perception of their abilities and skills in different areas, such as academic, social, and recreational). Developed by Barboza (2022), this scale provides a comprehensive tool for understanding the various facets of children's self-concept, enabling more effective interventions in educational and psychological contexts. By assessing these dimensions, educators and mental health professionals can identify areas for strengthening and support needed to promote healthy development.

The Positive and Negative Affect Scale, developed and validated by Zanon et al. (2013), is a 20-item tool designed to assess both positive and negative affective experiences of respondents. This instrument allows for a comprehensive analysis of the emotions people experience in different contexts, making it useful for research exploring the relationships between affect and psychosocial variables.

Furthermore, Giacomoni and Hutz (2008) developed the Multidimensional Life Satisfaction Scale for Children (MSVC), which consists of 50 items. This scale was designed to assess life satisfaction in children aged seven to twelve, covering the child's perception of themselves and how this influences their overall satisfaction; how the child evaluates themselves in comparison to their peers and other significant references; the child's satisfaction with a violence-free environment that promotes safety and well-being; the child's perception of their family relationships and the support they receive; the quality of friendships and social relationships; and the child's satisfaction with the school environment, including relationships with teachers and peers.

The diversity of instruments, adapted, validated or developed for use with Brazilian children and adolescents, indicates that positive psychology concepts have been extensively investigated in the school environment, to promote healthy development in children at an early age.

Positive psychology and psychological assessment in organizational and work settings

This section is intended to demonstrate the relationship between PP and psychological assessment based on studies on work engagement, a construct that emerged in the field of positive organizational and work psychology and has influenced important advances in relation to the concept of burnout and other work variables. As a historical perspective of work engagement, Schaufeli and Taris (2005) report that its emergence in practice was influenced by a study conducted by Institute Gallup, an U.S. research organization, that assessed it by 12 items (Q12 instrument), in the 1990s, which focused primarily on leadership and job satisfaction. The authors argue that work engagement gained prominence at the beginning of the 21st century, primarily because of the increasing interest in human capital by businesses as a relevant factor for organizations, as well as the increasing interest of academics in positive psychology.

Academic interest in work engagement has resulted in a variety of approaches to define it and has brought together theoretical movement of positive psychology based on positive organizational behavior theories and positive organizational studies (Schaufeli, 2018; Vazquez, 2018). The initial focus on work engagement as an antithesis to burnout was the field in which psychological assessment played a vital role, driving studies influenced by positive psychology (Schaufeli & Salanova, 2011). A construct identified in practice and academia was clarified through this combination, and it led to advances in the development of a theoretical model that operationalized the most widely accepted definition of work engagement in scientific and professional circles due to the robustness of the evidence

provided (Shuck, 2011).

According to Altaf and Masrek (2021), the number of publications on work engagement increased 17 times between 2010 and 2020. According to the authors, research on this topic has matured and positioned itself consistently within the theoretical movement. This suggests that engagement at work is a central concept of applied positive psychology that has been consolidated in psychological assessment, showing that people with high levels of occupational health and well-being are engaged at work. Knowing how to organize personal and work lives in a healthy way, providing high performance and high quality in professional activities.

On the other hand, burnout research has evolved by questioning the early model that defined work engagement as a professional achievement as an inverse dimension of burnout. The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) traditionally identified three dimensions of burnout: exhaustion, depersonalization, and ineffectiveness in the workplace (Maslach et al., 1996). MBI has been consistently criticized for its conceptual, practical, and psychometric aspects, specifically because it assesses professional ineffectiveness, a negative state with positive items, and scientific findings sometimes point to it as a cause and sometimes as a consequence of burnout (Bresó et al., 2007; De Beer, Van der Vaart et al., 2020; Lheureux et al., 2017; Schaufeli & Taris, 2005; Sinval et al., 2022). Furthermore, De Beer, Schaufeli et al. (2024), in their systematic review and meta-analysis, draw attention to the fact that the evidence suggests that the energetic (exhaustion) and motivational (depersonalization) components may be central to the burnout construct. According to Schaufeli and Taris (2005), professional ineffectiveness is a distinct and singular construct that is not associated with burnout phenomena as its dimension.

As a result of critical questioning of burnout theory and the intuitive appeal of treating engagement as a dimension, which would be the expression of professional achievement, a set of research has emerged that robustly demonstrates that work engagement is a unique and distinct construct. It is associated with the Job Demand Resources (JDR) theoretical model, which is based on Tetrick's (2002) assumption that there are distinct processes to explain illness and health at work, which act in parallel in working life. It considers that the work context is shaped by concomitant stressors (demands) and motivational processes (resources), whose practical combination can have positive or negative effects (Mazzeti, 2023; Vazquez et al., 2025). Studies have demonstrated that work engagement plays a central and motivating role in the success of individuals at work and in their organizations, as well as being an important indicator of occupational health (Schaufeli, 2018; Schaufeli & Taris, 2005; Vazquez, 2018). In response to studies in this area, the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) was developed, which provided relevant findings for this debate (Schaufeli et al., 2002; Vazquez et al., 2015).

Additionally, critical questioning of conceptual, empirical, and psychometric aspects of burnout psychological assessment led to the development of a new theoretical model, supplemented by a specific instrument referred to as the Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT), allowing relevant discoveries to emerge (Schaufeli, Desarti, De White 2020a, 2020b; Sinval et al., 2022). With such robust data, scholars within applied positive psychology develop a new theory of burnout that allows significant advances in diagnosing patients and developing innovative treatments, such as rapid recovery and return to work at healthy levels and occupational well-being (Schaufeli, 2021, 2023; Schaufeli & De White, 2023; Vazquez et al., 2025). According to Bakker and Demerouti (2014), to the JD–R model, burnout is a result from an imbalance between job demands (aspects that require physical or mental effort and that, in the long term, can culminate in worker exhaustion) and job resources (motivational factors and strategies workers use to deal with their work demands).

Schaufeli, Desart and De White (2020a, 2020b) define burnout in this perspective with four central factors: exhaustion, mental distancing, decline in cognitive functions, and decline in

emotional functions. Based on Social Exchange Theory, the authors argue that the dynamics of the burnout phenomena occurs by the combination of a lack of vital energy that leads to extreme fatigue in work activities (i.e., exhaustion) and a lack of appetite for expending work effort that can turn into aversion to work itself (i.e., mental distancing) as a reactive process. In this process, the individual experiences a crescent decline in cognitive and emotional functions, inherent components of burnout. In addition to these four constituent dimensions, advances proposed in the study demonstrate that there are also secondary symptoms in the development of burnout. These are: depressive mood, psychological distress, and psychosomatic complaints.

Cross-cultural studies with countries from different continents have examined the psychometric properties of the Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT) (De Beer, Schaufeli et al., 2024; De Beer et al., 2020; Hadžibajramović et al., 2024; Vinueza-Solórzano et al., 2021). Its four dimensions were confirmed in international studies as primary symptoms and its other dimensions as secondary symptoms. Several advancements have been made since the development of the JDR theory along with motivational and stressor factors, resulting in positive and negative outcomes associated with work engagement and burnout, respectively. Here it is important to note that the search for conceptual accuracy and the collection of evidence through instruments with proven psychometric quality illustrate well the role of psychological assessment and positive psychology in this area.

A critical examination of psychological assessment instruments in positive psychology

Over the course of the first wave of PP, instruments were developed and validated internationally. It emphasizes the construction of measures to evaluate positive constructs in direct relation to psychological assessment (Oliveira & Nakano, 2023). As a result of this period, studies were conducted to investigate the psychometric qualities of psychological tests for the purpose of evaluating these constructs so that empirical support and refinement could be provided. A literature review conducted in Brazil by Scorsolini-Comin and Santos (2010) revealed that, at the time of the study, most of the scales had been adapted and translated without studies aimed at determining the validity of these scales, limiting them to evaluating subjective well-being aspects.

In a second moment, based on the expansion of psychological assessment methods and the examination of the relationships between positive constructs and other variables such as personality, variables associated with illness, outcomes and consequences of the presence and/or absence of positive behaviors, it was possible to advance in the understanding of the relationship between positive and negative in the human experience (Lomas & Ivtzan, 2015). Accordingly, Pureza et al. (2012) and Pires et al. (2015) indicate that there is growth in this field in both the number of instruments used in Brazil and the constructs addressed in them, even though translations of foreign instruments remain a significant part of the scenario. In the following years, Oliveira and Moreira (2024) noted that research related to the development of psychological measures was expanding to encompass a wider range of constructs.

Recently, PP has been expanded beyond the quantitative model that previously prevailed, to include other approaches, such as qualitative, longitudinal, large-scale and impact analyses of interventions, to enhance the objectivity and scientific standing required for the movement (Lomas et al., 2020). In other words, considering the growth and maturation of Positive Psychology, qualitative methods and techniques of Psychological Assessment became increasingly utilized as a means of collaborating on the understanding of positive expression and experience (Oliveira & Nakano, 2023), using a multi-method and multi-technique perspective. There has been significant growth in this area in Brazil, as evidenced by the increasing number of researchers, the availability of instruments, and

the increase in scientific production, especially in the last decade (Reppold et al., 2019).

Despite this growth, several criticisms are still raised regarding assessment instruments. Most of these tests are not on the approved list of SATEPSI tests, according to Oliveira and Nakano (2023), making it necessary for researchers to conduct studies to investigate their psychometric characteristics to strengthen PP as an evidence--based movement. A search conducted by the authors did not find any approved instruments for assessing PP's core constructs, such as optimism or subjective well-being, which are widely used. However, it is essential to highlight that other instruments not found on the list, adapted or developed in Brazil, have numerous studies aimed at investigating their psychometric qualities, and have been made available free of charge in books and articles by the authors (Hutz, 2016).

However, the same author emphasizes the importance of caring in choosing the tests to be used, since many of them, despite being widely used in practice, have not been extensively studied to investigate their psychometric qualities (Hutz, 2016). Thus, it is still common for authors to only make translations, reverse translations, and factor analyses, which does not suffice to attest to the safety and appropriateness of such measures. There are also preliminary criticisms regarding the subjective nature of the instruments, since they are primarily self-reporting instruments. Considering this nature, the influence of social desirability on the measures was questioned, and statistical advances have helped to resolve this issue (Barros et al., 2010). Considering this scenario, it is necessary to encourage the expansion of measures among Brazilian researchers and professionals to achieve the level of scientificity necessary (Oliveira & Moreira, 2024).

Conclusions

The growth of Positive Psychology is evident not only internationally but also in Brazil. Among the main contributions already achieved, it is worth highlighting the advances in the exploration of its constructs through the development of psychological assessment instruments and the structuring and implementation of intervention programs that promote the development of positive strengths in various contexts, particularly educational and organizational contexts. However, despite these advances, gaps in psychological assessment remain that limit the sufficiently comprehensive consideration of the positive aspects emphasized by Positive Psychology.

This highlights the need for further research to investigate how to effectively integrate these positive aspects into psychological assessment practices. Equally important is the recognition of the limitations of the present study, which presents a partial review of the literature and may not encompass all the nuances and complexities of the intersection between Positive Psychology and psychological assessment.

Future research could focus on developing and validating assessment instruments that more comprehensively measure positive psychological resources, as well as evaluating the effectiveness of Positive Psychology-based interventions in different contexts. Furthermore, it is crucial that the Positive Psychology movement continues to develop critically and reflectively, considering the ethical and cultural implications of its practices and seeking broader integration with other areas of psychology.

References

Ackerman, C. E., Warren, M. A., & Donaldson, S. I., (2018). Scaling the heights of positive psychology: A systematic review of measurement scales. *International Journal of Wellbeing, 8*(2), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v8i2.734.

Altaf, A., & Marsek, M. (2021). Visualizing the knowledge domain of Work Engagement through Bibliometric Analysis. *Library Philosophy and Practice, 5300*. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/5300

Associação Nacional de Pesquisa e Pós-Graduação em Psicologia [ANPEPP] (2025). *Diretório de GTs Thereza Mettel, Gt 06 - Avaliação em Psicologia Positiva e Criatividade*. https://www.cadastro.anpepp.org.br/grupotrabalho/view?ID_GRUPO_TRABALHO=41

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2014). Job Demands--Resources Theory. In P. Y. Chen, C. L. Cooper (Eds.), Wellbeing: a complete reference guide (pp. 37–64). John Wiley & Sons. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118539415.wbwell019.

Bandeira, C. M., Giacomoni, C. H., & Hutz, C. S. (2015). Tarefas Preditoras de Otimismo em Crianças (TAPOC): Construção e evidências de validade. *Avaliação Psicológica*, *14*(2), 199–206. https://doi.org/10.15689/ap.2015.1402.04.

Barboza, C. M. (2022). *Escala brasileira de autoconceito infantil: construção e investigação das qualidades psicométricas*. (Doctorate Thesis). Stricto Sensu Post-Graduation Program in Psychology, Pontifical Catholic University of Campinas, Campinas, São Paulo. https://repositorio.sis.puc-campinas.edu.br/handle/123456789/16668.

Barros, R. M. A., Martín, J. I. G., & Pinto, J. F. V. C. (2010). Investigação e prática em psicologia positiva. *Psicologia Ciência e Profissão, 30*(2), 318–327. https://doi.org/10.1590/S1414-98932010000200008

Bentivi, D. R. C., Bastos, A. V. B & Carneiro, L. L. (2021). Novas configurações no mundo do trabalho: desafios postos à psicologia positiva. In A. C. S. Vazquez & C. S. Hutz (Orgs.), Psicologia Positiva Organizacional e do Trabalho (pp. 71–104). Hogrefe.

Bohlmeijer, E., & Westerhof, G. (2021). The Model for Sustainable Mental Health: Future Directions for Integrating Positive Psychology into Mental Health Care. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.747999.

Bresó, E., Salanova, M., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2007). In Search of the "Third Dimension" of Burnout: Efficacy or Inefficacy? *Applied Psychology*, *56*, 460–478. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2007.00290.x

Bueno, J. M. H., & Ricarte, M. D. (2017). Aspectos históricos da testagem psicológica: contexto internacional e nacional. In M. R. C. Lins, & J. C. Borsa (Orgs.), *Avaliação psicológica: aspectos teóricos e práticos* (pp. 38–55). Vozes.

Carr, A., Cullen, K., Keeney, C., Canning, C., Mooney, O., Chinseallaigh, E., & O'Dowd, A. (2020). Effectiveness of positive psychology interventions: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *16*(6), 749–769. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2020.1818807.

Ciarrochi, J., Hayes, S. C., Oades, L. G., & Hofmman, S. G. (2022). Toward a Unified Framework for Positive Psychology Interventions: Evidence-Based Processes of Change in Coaching, Prevention, and Training. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.809362.

Cintra, C. L., & Guerra, V. M. (2017). Educação Positiva: A aplicação da Psicologia Positiva a instituições educacionais. *Psicologia Escolar e Educacional*, *21*(3), 505–514. https://doi.org/10.1590/2175-35392017021311191.

Costantini, A., De Beer, L. T., Klooster, P. M. T., Zonder-van-Zwijnenburg, M. A. J., Vera, M. & van Zyl, L. E. (2022). Positive Psychological Assessments: Modern Approaches, Methodologies, Models and Guidelines: Current perspectives. *Frontiers of Psychology, 13*, 1020653. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1020653.

Dametto, D. M., & Noronha, A. P. P. (2019). Construção e validação da escala de forças de caráter para adolescentes (EFC-A). *Paidéia, 29,* e2930. https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-4327e2930.

De Beer, L. T., Schaufeli, W. B., De Witte, H., Hakanen, J., Shimazu, A., Glaser, J., Seubert, C., Bosak, J., Sinval, J., & Rudnev, M. (2020). Measurement invariance of the Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT) across seven cross-national representative samples. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *17*, 4604. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17155604.

De Beer, L., Schaufeli, W. B., De Witte, H., Hakanen, J. J., Kaltiainen, J., Glaser, J., Seubert, C., Shimazu, A., Bosak, J., Procházka, J., Kajzar, A., & Christensen, M. (2024). Revisiting a global burnout score with the Burnout Assessment Tool across nine country samples. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*. https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000839.

De Beer, L., Van der Vaart, L., Escaffi-Schwarz, M., De Witte, H., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2024). Maslach Burnout Inventory – General Survey: A systematic review and meta-analysis of measurement properties. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, *40*(5), 360–375. https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000797.

Dias-Viana, J. L., & Noronha, A. P. P. (2021). Escala de Bem-Estar Subjetivo Escolar (EBESE): elaboração e validação de uma medida para avaliação educacional. *Ciencias Psicológicas*, *15*(1), e2349. https://doi.org/10.22235/cp.v15i1.2349.

Donaldson, S. I., Dollwet, M., & Rao, M. A. (2014). Happiness, excellence, and optimal human functioning revisited: Examining the peer-reviewed literature linked to positive psychology. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *10*(3), 185–195. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2014.943801.

Donaldson, S. I., Van Zyl, L. E., & Donaldson, S. I. (2021). PERMA+4: A framework for work-related wellbeing, performance and positive organizational psychology 2.0. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 817244. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.817244.

Giacomoni, C. H, & Hutz, C. S. (2008). Escala multidimensional de satisfação de vida para crianças: Estudos de construção e validação. *Estudos de Psicologia (Campinas), 25*(1), 23–35. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0103-166X2008000100003.

Giacomoni, C. H., & Hutz, C. S. (2006). Escala de afeto positivo e negativo para crianças: estudos de construção e validação. *Psicologia Escolar e Educacional, 10*(2), 232–245. https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-85572006000200007.

Hadžibajramović, E., Schaufeli, W., & De Witte, H. (2024). The ultra-short version of the Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT4) – Development, validation, and measurement invariance across countries, age and gender. *PLoSONE*, *19*(2), e0297843. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0297843.

Hutz, C. S. (2016). Introdução. In C. S. Hutz (Org.), *Avaliação em Psicologia Positiva: técnicas e medidas* (pp. 7–18). Hogrefe.

Hutz, C. S., Bandeira, D. R, Trentini, C. M. & Vazquez, A. C. S. (2020). *Avaliação psicológica no contexto organizacional.* Artmed.

Joshi, B. & Khan, T. (2024). Systematic Review Analysis on The Role of Positive Education in Promoting Well--Being. *BSSS Journal of Education, 13*(1), 16–39. https://doi.org/10.51767/je1302.

Kiptiony, G. J. (2024). Promoting a thriving school community: Investigating the effectiveness of positive psychology interventions for improved teacher-student and staff relationships-A critical review. *Journal of Education Management & Leadership (JEML)*, *3*(1), 26–40. https://doi.org/10.51317/jeml.v3i1.514.

Lheureux, F., Truchot, D., Borteyrou, X., & Rascle, N. (2017). The Maslach Burnout Inventory-Human Services Survey (MBI-HSS): Factor structure, wording effect and psychometric qualities of known problematic items. *Journal in Human Factors*, *80*, 161–186. https://doi.org/10.3917/th.802.0161

Lima, M. A., Silva, T. B., Luz, J. V., & Zanon, C. (2023). Avaliação psicológica positiva no Brasil: desenvolvimento e aplicação. In K. S. Oliveira, C. T. Reppold, E. M. Peixoto, & D. S. Zanini (Orgs.), *Avaliação em psicologia positiva: fundamentos e integração na prática profissional*. Ibap e Editora Vozes.

Linton, M., Dieppe, P., & Medina-Lara, A. (2016). Review of 99 self-report measures for assessing well-being in adults: exploring dimensions of well-being and developments over time. *BMJ Open, 6,* e010641. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2015-010641.

Lomas, T., & Ivtzan, I. (2016). Professionalizing positive psychology: Developing guidelines for training and regulation. *International Journal of Wellbeing, 6*(3), 96–112. http://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v6i3.4.

Lomas, T., Waters, L., Williams, P., Oades, L. G., & Kern, M. L. (2020). Third wave positive psychology: broadening towards complexity. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *16*(5), 660–674. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2020.1805501

Lopez, S. J & Snyder, C. R. (2004). *Positive Psychological Assessment:* A Handbook of Models and Measures. American Psychological Association.

Marasca, A. R., Oliveira, C. M., Giacomoni, C. H., & Bandeira, D. R. (2022). Avaliação de variáveis positivas no contexto escolar. In C. S. Hutz, D. R. Bandeira, C. M. Trentini, & J. P. Giordani (Orgs.), *Avaliação psicológica no contexto escolar e educacional* (pp. 229–242). Artmed.

Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (1996). *The Maslach Burnout Inventory — Test manual.* Consulting Psycologist Press.

Mazzetti, G., Robledo, E., Vignoli, M., Topa, G., Gugliemi, D., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2023). Work engagement: A meta-analysis using the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model. *Psychological Reports, 126*, 1069–1107. https://doi.org/10.1177/00332941211051988.

Moskowitz, J. T., Cheung, E. O., Freedman, M., Fernando, C., Zhang, M. W., Huffman, J. C., et al. (2021). Measuring positive emotion outcomes in positive psychology interventions: a literature review. *Emotion Review, 13*, 60–73. https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073920950811.

Nakano, C. T. (2018). *Psicologia positiva aplicada à educação*. Vetor Editora.

Nascimento, E. & Vasconcelos, A. G. (2016). O percurso da avaliação psicológica nos simpósios da ANPEPP. *Avaliação psicológica, 15*(1), 125–128. http://pepsic.bvsalud.org/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1677-04712016000100014&lng=pt&tlng=pt.

Oliveira, K. S., & Moreira, G. V. F. (2024). Aplicações da psicologia positiva para a avaliação psicológica. In C. H. Giacomoni & V. M. Guerra (Orgs.), *Psicologia Positiva:* introdução e aplicações. Vetor.

Oliveira, K. S., & Nakano, T. C. (2023). Desafios da avaliação psicológica na perspectiva das três ondas da psicologia positiva. In K. S. Oliveira, C. T. Reppold, E. M. Peixoto, & D. S. Zanini (Orgs.), *Avaliação em psicologia positiva: fundamentos e integração na prática profissional* (pp. 25–37). Ibap e Editora Vozes.

Owens, R. L., & Waters, L. (2020). What does positive psychology tell us about early intervention and prevention with children and adolescents? A review of positive psychological interventions with young people. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *15*(5), 588–597. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2020.1789706

Pires, J. G., Nunes, M. F. O., & Nunes, C. H. S. S. (2015). Instrumentos Baseados em Psicologia Positiva no Brasil: uma Revisão Sistemática. *Psico-USF, 20*(2), 287–295. https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-82712015200209.

Pureza, J. R., Kuhn, C. H. C., Castro, E. K., & Lisboa, C. S. M. (2012). Psicologia positiva no Brasil: uma revisão sistemática da literatura. *Revista Brasileira de Terapias Cognitivas, 8*(2), 109–117. https://pepsic.bvsalud.org/pdf/rbtc/v8n2/v8n2a06.pdf.

Reppold, C. T., D'Azevedo, L. S., Tocchetto, B. S., Diaz, G. B., Kato, S. K., & Hutz, C. S. (2019). Avanços da psicologia positiva no Brasil. *Revista Psicologia para América Latina, 32*, 133–141. https://pepsic.bvsalud.org/pdf/psilat/n32/a05n32.pdf

Reppold, C. T., & Hutz, C. S. (2021). *Intervenções em Psicologia Positiva no contexto escolar e educacional*. Vetor Editora.

Ryff, C. D. (2022). Positive psychology: Looking back and looking forward. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.840062.

Schaufeli, W. B. (2018). O que é engajamento? In A. C. S Vazquez & C. S. Hutz (Orgs.), *Aplicações da psicologia positiva:* Trabalho e organizações (pp. 33–62). Hogrefe.

Schaufeli, W. B. (2021). Engaging leadership. How to promote work engagement? *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 754556. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.754556.

Schaufeli, W. B. (2023). Burnout: Acritical overview. In L. M. Lapierre & C. Cooper (Eds.), *Cambridge companion to organizational stress and well-being* (pp. 214–259). Cambridge University Press.

Schaufeli, W. B., & De Witte, H. (2023). A fresh look at burnout: The Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT). In C. U. Krägeloh, M. Alyami, & O. N. Medvedev (Eds.), *International Handbook of Behavioral Health Assessment* (pp. 1–24). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-89738-3_54-1.Schaufeli, W. B., Desart, S., & De Witte, H. (2020a). De Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT) – Een nieuw instrument voor het meten van burn-out [The Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT) – A novel instrument to measure burn-out]. *Tijdschrift voor Klinische Psychologie, 50*, 267–283. https://www.wilmarschaufeli.nl/publications/Schaufeli/553.pdf.

Schaufeli, W. B., Desart, S., & De White, H. (2020b). The Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT) – Een nieuw instrument voor het meten van burn-out [The Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT) – a novel instrument to measure burnout]. *Tijdschrift voor Klinische Psychologie, 50,* 267–283. https://www.wilmarschaufeli.nl/publications/Schaufeli/553.pdf.

Schaufeli, W., & Salanova, M. (2011). Work engagement: On how to better catch a slippery concept. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 20*(1), 39–46. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2010.515981.

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzélez-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A confirmative analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 3*, 71–92. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326.

Scorsolini-Comin, F., & Santos, M. A. (2010). Psicologia positiva e os instrumentos de avaliação no contexto brasileiro. *Psicologia Reflexão e Crítica, 23*(3), 440–448. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-79722010000300004.

Segabnazi, J. D., Zortea, M., Zanon, C., Bandeira, D. R., Giacomoni, C. H., & Hutz, C. S. (2012). Escala de afetos positivos e negativos para adolescentes: adaptação, normatização e evidências de validade. *Avaliação Psicológica, 11*(1), 1–12. https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/3350/335027499002.pdf.

Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive Psychology: an introduction. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 5–14. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.5.

Shuck, B. (2011). Integrative Literature Review: Four Emerging Perspectives of Employee Engagement: An Integrative Literature Review. *Human Resource Development Review, 10*(3), 304–328. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484311410840.

Sinval, J., Vazquez, A. C., Hutz, C. S., Schaufeli, W. B., & Silva, S. (2022). Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT): Validity evidence for Brazil and Portugal. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *19,* 1344. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19031344.

Souza, L. S., & Murgo, C. S. (2024). Teacher Self-efficacy Scale for the use of active methodologies: validity based on external criteria. *Estudos de Psicologia (Campinas), 41*, e220098. https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-0275202441e220098

Tejada-Gallardo, C., Blasco-Belled, A., Torrelles-Nadal, C. *et al.* (2020). Effects of School-based Multicomponent Positive Psychology Interventions on Well-being and Distress in Adolescents: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, *49*, 1943–1960. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-020-01289-9.

Tetrick, L. E. (2002). Individual and organizational health. In D. Ganster & P. L. Perrewe (Eds.), *Research in organizational stress and well-being* (pp. 107–141). JAI Press.

van Zyl, L. E., & Rothmann, S. (2022). Grand Challenges for Positive Psychology: Future Perspectives and Opportunities. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.833057.

Vazquez, A. C. S. (2018). A psicologia positiva organizacional e do trabalho (PPOT): fundamentos e aplicações. In A. C. S. Vazquez, & C. S. Hutz (Orgs.), *Aplicações da Psicologia Positiva:* Trabalho e Organizações (pp. 5–32). Hogrefe.

Vazquez, A. C. S, Freitas, C. P. P., & Hutz, C. S. (2025). *Burnout hoje*: *o que sabemos e como podemos lidar com ele.* Vetor.

Vazquez, A. C. S, Magnan, E. S., Pacico, J. C., Hutz, C. S. & Schaufeli, W. B. (2015). Adaptation of the Brazilian version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale. *Psico-USF, 20*(2), 207–217. https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-82712015200202

Vázquez, C., Hervás, G., Rahona, J. J., & Gómez, D. (2009). Psychological well-being and health. Contributions of positive psychology. *Anuario de Psicología Clínica y de la Salud, 5*, 15–27. https://idus.us.es/server/api/core/bitstreams/60c6a5e4-860d-4a76-b87e-14332f402083/content.

Vinueza-Solórzano, A. M., Portalanza-Chavarria, C. A., Freitas, C. P. P, Schaufeli, W. B., De Witte, H., Vazquez, A. C. S, & Hutz, C. S. (2021). The Ecuadorian version of the Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT): Adaptation and validation. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18, 7171. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18137121.

Vo, D. T., & Allen, K. A. (2022). A systematic review of school-based positive psychology interventions to foster teacher wellbeing. *Teachers and Teaching*, *28*(8), 964–999. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2022.2137138.

Waters, L., Algoe, S. B., Dutton, J., Emmons, R., Fredrickson, B. L., Heaphy, E., … & Steger, M. (2021). Positive psychology in a pandemic: buffering, bolstering, and building mental health. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *17*(3), 303–323. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2021.1871945.

Wechsler, S. M., Hutz, C. S. & Primi, R. (2019). O desenvolvimento da avaliação psicológica no Brasil: Avanços históricos e desafios. *Avaliação Psicológica*, *18*(2), 121–128. http://dx.doi.org/10.15689/ap.2019.1802.15466.02.

Wissing, M. P. (2022). Beyond the "Third Wave of Positive Psychology": challenges and opportunities for future research. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.795067.

Yakushko, O., & Blodgett, E. (2021). Negative Reflections About Positive Psychology: On Constraining the Field to a Focus on Happiness and Personal Achievement. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 61*(1), 104–131. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022167818794551.

Zanini, D. S., Fernandes, I. A., & Noronha, A. P. P. (2023). Fundamentos da avaliação em psicologia positiva. In K. S. Oliveira, C. T. Reppold, E. M. Peixoto, & D. S. Zanini (Orgs.), *Avaliação em psicologia positiva: fundamentos e integração na prática profissional* (pp. 11–24). Ibap e Editora Vozes.

Zanon, C., Bastianello, M. R., Cerentini, J., & Hutz, C. S. (2013). Desenvolvimento e validação de uma escala de afetos positivos e negativos. *Psico-USF, 18*(2), 193–201. https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-82712013000200003.

Tatiana de Cassia Nakano

Doutora em Psicologia afiliada à Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Campinas.

Ana Cláudia Souza Vazquez

Doutora em Administração, com afiliação institucional na Universidade Federal de Ciências da Saúde de Porto Alegre.

Camélia Santina Murgo

Doutora em Psicologia vinculada à Universidade do Oeste Paulista.

Alexandra Cecília Portalanza-Chavarría

Doutora em Ciências da Administração, atua institucionalmente na Universidad Espíritu Santo, no Equador.

Claudia Hofheinz Giacomoni

Doutora em Psicologia afiliada à Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul.

Cláudio Simon Hutz

Doutor em Psicologia e professor na Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul.

Endereço para correspondência

Tatiana de Cassia Nakano

Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Campinas

Programa de Pós-Graduação em Psicologia

Avenida John Boyd Dunlop, s/n

Jardim Ipaussurama, 13060-904

Campinas, SP, Brasil

Ana Cláudia Souza Vazquez

Universidade Federal de Ciências da Saúde de Porto Alegre

Rua Sarmento Leite, 245

Centro Histórico, 90050-170

Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil

Camélia Santina Murgo

Universidade do Oeste Paulista

Campus II

Rodovia Raposo Tavares, km 572

Limoeiro, 19067-175

Presidente Prudente, SP, Brasil

Alexandra Cecília Portalanza-Chavarría

Universidad Espíritu Santo

Via Sanborondón, km 2,5

09-01-952

Sanborondón, Equador

Claudia Hofheinz Giacomoni

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul

Campus da Saúde

Instituto de Psicologia

Rua Ramiro Barcelos, 2600

Floresta, 90035-003

Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil

Cláudio Simon Hutz

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul

Campus da Saúde

Instituto de Psicologia

Rua Ramiro Barcelos, 2600

Floresta, 90035-003

Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil

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