



Drs. Donaldson grant permission to use the Positive Functioning at Work Scale (PF-W) for any non-commercial purpose, including research, teaching, and student theses or dissertations. Please cite the original validation study:

Donaldson, S.I., Donaldson, S.I. The Positive Functioning at Work Scale: Psychometric Assessment, Validation, and Measurement Invariance. J well-being assess 4, 181–215 (2020). <https://doi-org.ccl.idm.oclc.org/10.1007/s41543-020-00033-1>

Permission is also granted to translate the scale for non-commercial research purposes. If you translate the PF-W, please include the copyright statement and provide attribution to the translator(s) and year of translation.

For commercial use, defined as using the scale in settings where a fee is charged or as part of a product, service, or training, please contact me at [scott.donaldson@rutgers.edu] to discuss licensing options.

Best wishes,

Scott I. Donaldson, PhD

Stewart I. Donaldson, PhD

Instructions: Please think about how well you have felt and functioned at work over the past two weeks. Respond to each statement by indicating the extent to which you agree, using the following scale:

POSITIVE FUNCTIONING AT WORK SCALE (PF-W)

Dimension	Sub-Dimension	Items	Label
Positive Emotions	Future-Oriented and Affective	I feel joy in a typical workday	P1
		Overall, I feel enthusiastic about my work	P2
		I love my job	P3
Engagement	Absorption	I typically become absorbed while I am working on something that challenges my abilities	E1
		I lose track of time while doing something I enjoy at work	E2
		When I am working on something I enjoy, I forget everything else around me	E3
Relationships	Giving	I can receive support from coworkers if I need it	R1
Relationships	Perceived	I feel appreciated by my coworkers	R2
Relationships	Shared Compassion	I trust my colleagues	R3
Relationships	Psychosocial	My colleagues bring out my best self	R4
Meaning	Transcendent	My work is meaningful	M1
Meaning	Meaning	I understand what makes my job meaningful	M2
Meaning	Greater Good	The work I do serves a greater purpose	M3
Accomplishment	Motivations		
		I set goals that help me achieve my career aspirations	A1
		I typically accomplish what I set out to do in my job	A2
Accomplishment	Prove (Performance Goal) Orientation	I am generally satisfied with my performance at work	A3
Physical Health	Biological	I typically feel physically healthy	H1
		I am rarely sick	H2
Physical Health	Functional	I can typically overcome sources of physical distress (e.g., insomnia, injuries, vision issues, etc.)	H3
Physical Health	Psychological	I feel in control of my physical health	H4
Mindset	Growth Mindset	I believe I can improve my job skills through hard work	MI1
Mindset	Prospection	I believe my job will allow me to develop in the future	MI2
Environment	Physical	I have a bright future at my current work organization	MI3
		My physical work environment (e.g., office space) allows me to focus on my work	EN1
		There is plenty of natural light in my workplace	EN2
		I can conveniently access nature in my work environment (e.g., parks, oceans, mountains, etc.)	EN3
Economic Security	Income	I am comfortable with my current income	ES1
Economic Security	Medical Spending	I could lose several months of pay due to serious illness, and still have my economic security	ES2

Note. Response set ranged from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree).

Scoring Instructions

To score the PF-W Scale:

- Each item is rated from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly Agree*).
- Subscale scores can be calculated by averaging responses within each subdimension.
- A total PF-W score can be computed as the average of all 29 items.
- No items require reverse scoring.

Dimension	Sub-Dimension	Item Labels
Positive Emotions	Joy, Enthusiasm, Love	P1, P2, P3
Engagement	Absorption	E1, E2, E3
Relationships	Giving, Appreciation, Trust, Psychosocial Safety	R1, R2, R3, R4
Meaning	Meaning, Purpose, Transcendence	M1, M2, M3
Accomplishment	Goals, Satisfaction	A1, A2, A3
Physical Health	Biological, Functional, Psychological	H1, H2, H3, H4
Mindset	Growth, Prospection	MI1, MI2, MI3
Environment	Workspace, Light, Nature Access	EN1, EN2, EN3
Economic Security	Income, Medical Safety Net, Savings	ES1, ES2, ES3

Score Significance and Interpretation

- Scores should be interpreted continuously, with higher values reflecting greater well-being and positive functioning.
- At present, there are no validated clinical cutoffs for the PF-W. Researchers and practitioners are encouraged to use mean scores, percentile ranks, and comparisons to relevant samples.
 - 5.5–7.0 → High positive functioning
 - 4.5–5.4 → Moderate functioning
 - <4.5 → Areas for growth

These thresholds are heuristic and should not be considered diagnostic. Future research will refine normative data and provide more precise benchmarks for interpreting scores across diverse populations.

Scale Development and Validity

The Positive Functioning at Work (PF-W) scale was developed to extend Seligman's PERMA model of well-being to the workplace by adding four additional building blocks: physical health, mindset, environment, and economic security. Scale development followed best practice recommendations (DeVellis, 2017), beginning with an 86-item pool content validated by subject matter experts. Exploratory factor analysis (Study 2; $N = 300$ full-time employees) supported a nine-factor solution. This resulted in a 29-item instrument with three to four items per factor. Reliability was excellent for the total scale (Cronbach's $\alpha = .94$) and acceptable to excellent for the subscales (α ranging from .76 to .93).

In a larger validation study (Study 3; $N = 727$), confirmatory factor analyses demonstrated that the nine-factor, higher-order, and bifactor models each provided good fit to the data (e.g., CFI = .951, RMSEA = .051). Internal consistency was supported across all subscales (McDonald's ω ranging from .69 to .93). Convergent validity was evidenced by large correlations with life satisfaction ($r = .74$) and psychological capital ($r = .71$), while discriminant validity was supported by moderate negative associations with job stress ($r = -.37$). Criterion and predictive validity were also demonstrated. PF-W scores were positively associated with job-related affective well-being, organizational citizenship behavior, and positive work role performance (all r 's $> .40$), and negatively associated with turnover intentions ($r = -.56$). Incremental validity analyses revealed that the four new building blocks (physical health, mindset, environment, and economic security) explained additional variance in outcomes beyond PERMA alone. For example, PF-W accounted for unique variance in turnover intentions and organizational proactivity above and beyond life satisfaction and psychological capital. Finally, multi-group measurement invariance analyses supported configural, metric, and scalar invariance across job functions (business, IT, administrative), indicating that the PFW scale operates equivalently across diverse occupational groups.

Analytic Approach for Validation and Translation

Researchers seeking to validate the scale in new populations or translations are encouraged to use CFA or bifactor structural equation modeling to confirm the factor structure. These approaches allow for assessment of both the multidimensional nature of the nine building blocks and the potential utility of a general factor. Cross-cultural validation is strongly recommended. The original validation demonstrated measurement invariance across job functions, but additional work is needed across different industries, cultural groups, and organizational contexts. Translations should undergo forward- and back-translation procedures, followed by CFA or bifactor modeling, to ensure the structural validity of the nine-factor framework.

Many researchers may choose to report both total and subscale scores. While the total score captures a general index of positive functioning at work, subscale scores allow for a more fine-grained understanding of strengths and challenges within specific domains (e.g., mindset,

economic security, environment). Future research will continue to refine cutoffs and normative benchmarks to aid applied interpretation.