

SPECIFICS OF SELF-REGULATION IN LIFE DOMAINS WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF POSITIVE PSYCHOTHERAPY

Marine AYVAZYAN, *Armenian State Pedagogical University named after Khachatur Abovyan*
Department of Applied Psychology, Lecturer, PhD student

E-mail: marka.ayvazyan@gmail.com

ORCID:ID 0009-0005-4733-6374

DOI: 10.24234/miopap.v13i1.136

ABSTRACT

In modern society, the majority of psychological issues are linked to an imbalance among various life domains. In this context, positive psychotherapy offers a new approach—the "Balance Model"—as an effective means to regulate an individual's internal and external resources. The main objective of the study is to identify the impact of the nature of professional and educational activities (dynamic/uncertain, normative/controlled, and stable/regulated environments) on the distribution of psychological resources and the characteristics of self-regulation in individuals.

To achieve the defined goal, the following tasks were set: 1) to identify the levels of resource distribution across different professional groups according to the four domains of the balance model, 2) to determine the "vulnerable" (deficit) or imbalanced domains for each group, as well as the primary resources that compensate for them, 3) to analyze the interrelationship between the structural characteristics of psychological resources and environmental demands, 4) to test the Wiesbaden Inventory (WIPPF 2.0) in a work and organizational context as an innovative tool for revealing the resource balance of professional groups. The manifestations of resource distribution in various professional and educational environments were studied using testing methods (WIPPF 2.0) and psychological interviews. The results showed that life domains are more balanced among employees of the importing company, which can be explained by the stable, predictable nature of their professional environment and the active use of communicative-adaptive resources. Meanwhile, among working students, a sharp concentration of resources is observed in the domains of work, achievement, and the future, driven by the high dynamics, workload, and objective deficit of time resources in their educational and work environments. In the group of teachers, a concentration of resources is recorded around external, normative-role demands, accompanied by a noticeable depletion of semantic and emotional resources.

Keywords: *balance model, positive psychotherapy, regulation of life domains, psychological resilience, occupational stress, energy distribution.*

INTRODUCTION

The continuous progress of globalization requires individuals to possess a high level of psychological adaptability, which becomes not merely a skill, but a necessity. Only in the presence of effective self-regulation mechanisms can a person withstand the constantly changing world, filled with a continuous flow of information. Each new generation of psychological approaches strives to resolve the psychological problems characteristic of a given period, regardless of whether they have internal or external origins.

In this context, the growing complexity of modern professional environments further emphasizes the need for structural models that can explain how individuals maintain balance under pressure. Rapid changes, high demands, and increasing uncertainty often lead to an uneven distribution of psychological resources, as a result of which certain domains of life are overvalued, while others are neglected. This creates a necessity for integrative frameworks that not only describe these imbalances, but also offer practical ways for their restoration.

One such approach is the Balance Model of positive psychotherapy, developed by Nossrat Peseschkian. Positive psychotherapy utilizes the Balance Model to divide an individual's life into four separate yet interconnected domains. Each domain, possessing its own regulatory mechanisms, provides a unique perception of the entire system. In its application, it is not limited to the scope of being merely a tool for self-knowledge or therapeutic intervention, but serves as a theoretical basis for analyzing how individuals distribute their vital energy among different domains of life under various environmental conditions. It enables the identification of both adaptive patterns and potential imbalances, especially in contexts characterized either by stability or high uncertainty.

The Balance Model is not solely a tool for self-knowledge or internal reharmonization; it is also an approach for understanding and managing short-term to long-term goals and behaviors, as well as for the effective utilization of internal resources to achieve high productivity without harming other domains of life.

Although Nossrat Peseschkian's Balance Model is widely recognized in clinical and counseling psychology, its empirical application as an integrative framework for self-regulation across contrasting organizational environments remains underexplored. Existing empirical literature predominantly examines life-domain allocation within general population samples or static clinical settings, neglecting how domain priorities dynamically shift under specific occupational demands. Consequently, a critical scientific gap persists regarding how the structural constraints, operational intensity, and environmental pressures of different professional contexts moderate domain-specific self-regulatory behaviors and energy distribution.

Addressing this gap is crucial because professional environments act as primary moderators of individual coping and resource allocation. By comparing distinct organizational settings, this study diverges from previous research that treats life balance as a static or context-free trait. Instead, it conceptualizes domain balance as an active, context-dependent self-regulatory process. In line with

contextualized assessment paradigms in organizational psychology (e.g., Bing et al., 2004; Shaffer & Postlethwaite, 2012), this study introduces a contextualized measurement framework tailored specifically to evaluate domain-based self-regulation in workplace environments.

The primary scientific contribution of this work is threefold:

1. **Theoretical Integration:** Expanding Peseschkian's Balance Model from a clinical diagnostic framework into a dynamic model of organizational self-regulation.
2. **Empirical Evidence:** Demonstrating how occupational demands and structural environments directly shape life-domain prioritization and energy allocation.
3. **Methodological Advancement:** Developing and contextualizing the *Life Balance Questionnaire* to measure domain-specific self-regulatory capacity within professional cohorts.

INTRODUCTION

The Balance Model of Positive Psychotherapy was first introduced as a structural framework for understanding how individuals regulate their energy across four main domains of life (Peseschkian, 1977). These four domains - Body / Health, Performance / Achievements, Contacts / Relationships and Future / Meaning / Fantasy, function as regulatory mechanisms for mental and physical health.

Based on further research (Peseschkian, 1988; Remmers, 2020), a constant deficit in one area leads to a compensatory reaction in others, which becomes more prominent in environments with high stress levels.

In Positive Psychotherapy, symptoms are not viewed as pathology, but as a signal that indicates a violation of the balance between the main areas of life; therefore, a healthy mental state is determined by the integrated and balanced co-functioning of those areas.

According to Peseschkian (2000), the total human energy reserve - assuming it is 100%, is distributed among four areas of life; the ideal share of each domain for harmonious development and mental health should be approximately 25%.

N. Peseschkian (1998) distinguishes four main spheres of life activity, which are considered universal and independent units from culture.

1. **Body / Health.** This area includes behavioral patterns related to physical health, sensations related to the body, rest, nutrition, sleep, and somatic self-care. According to Peseschkian, neglect or overvaluation of this area can be expressed both in psychosomatic symptoms and increased vulnerability to stress. The physical area serves as a foundation for psychological resources, consequently, any violation in this area will directly affects others.
2. **Performance / Achievement.** At its core, this area includes professional activities, education, goal-setting, social roles, and achievement-oriented behavior. Peseschkian emphasizes that in modern societies, this area often becomes dominant, which can disrupt the overall balance of life. The dominance of this area is often accompanied by emotional burnout, weakened relationships, and various health problems.

3. **Contacts / Relationships.** This area refers to interpersonal relationships that include family, friendships, social support, and communication. According to Peseschkian's approach, this area performs an important function of emotional regulation, contributing to the reduction of stress and the formation of a sense of psychological security. Disruption of this area leads to social isolation, tension in communication, and a decrease in self-esteem.
4. **Fantasy / Meaning / Future.** The fourth area includes processes related to the meaning of life, values, beliefs, creative imagination, and plans for the future. Peseschkian gives special importance to this area, considering it as a source of psychological resilience and person's ontological stability. The absence of meaning can disrupt the functioning of all other spheres, even in the presence of favorable external conditions (Peseschkian, 1977, 2000).

The theoretical development of these models has deep roots within the broad context of psychological theories, which can be conditionally grouped around three main axes:

1. **Holistic, Existential, and Salutogenetic Foundations.** Alfred Adler (1933) was among the first to emphasize the interconnectedness of various life domains by highlighting the "three life tasks" (work, friendship, and love). According to the Adlerian approach, neglecting any of these domains impairs an individual's social interest and internal equilibrium. Expanding on the existential dimension, Viktor Frankl (1946) demonstrated that the search for meaning and the realization of values serve as a regulatory force, ensuring psychological stability even under crisis conditions. This perspective aligns with Aaron Antonovsky's (1987) salutogenetic model, in which the "sense of coherence" implies an individual's capacity to coordinate demands and resources arising from different life spheres. Peseschkian's model integrates this holistic tradition by viewing the "Meaning/Future" and "Contacts" domains as pillars of existential stability.
2. **Cognitive-Behavioral and Stress-Coping Mechanisms** An individual's resource mobilization and self-regulation are highly mediated by cognitive processes. Lazarus and Folkman (1984) define stress as an imbalance between environmental demands and the individual's available resources, indicating that psychological pressure arises when adaptive capacities are exceeded in a specific life domain. This cognitive appraisal is further deepened in Aaron Beck's (1976) framework, according to which dysfunctional schemas and automatic thoughts regarding work, relationships, or the future disrupt overall functional balance. Concurrently, Albert Bandura's (1997) self-efficacy theory explains how belief in one's capabilities influences effective energy allocation and resilience across various life domains. Peseschkian's Balance Model provides a spatial-contextual framework for these cognitive-behavioral mechanisms, demonstrating precisely in which domain dysfunctional beliefs cause energy "leaks." An individual's resource mobilization and self-regulation are highly mediated by cognitive processes. Lazarus and Folkman (1984) define stress as an imbalance between environmental demands and the individual's available resources, indicating that psychological pressure arises when adaptive capacities are exceeded in a specific life domain. This cognitive appraisal is further deepened in

Aaron Beck's (1976) framework, according to which dysfunctional schemas and automatic thoughts regarding work, relationships, or the future disrupt overall functional balance. Concurrently, Albert Bandura's (1997) self-efficacy theory explains how belief in one's capabilities influences effective energy allocation and resilience across various life domains. Peseschkian's Balance Model provides a spatial-contextual framework for these cognitive-behavioral mechanisms, demonstrating precisely in which domain dysfunctional beliefs cause energy "leaks."

- 3. Resource Conservation and Motivational Dynamics.** From a resource management perspective, Stevan Hobfoll's (1989) Conservation of Resources (COR) theory asserts that chronic stress and exhaustion result from a "loss spiral" when an individual fails to replenish vital and social resources. This is complemented by Edward Deci and Richard Ryan's (2000) Self-Determination Theory (SDT), which posits that well-being requires the satisfaction of basic psychological needs across all life domains. When professional or personal spheres fail to foster autonomy and competence, overall intrinsic motivation diminishes.

Thus, although the theoretical approaches of Adler, Frankl, Antonovsky, Bandura, Lazarus, Beck, Hobfoll, and Deci & Ryan illuminate distinct aspects of self-regulation and resource allocation, they often function in isolation. Nossrat Peseschkian's Balance Model serves as an integrative theoretical and practical framework that synthesizes these holistic, cognitive-behavioral, and motivational principles, providing a measurable and comprehensive picture of individual self-regulation across diverse organizational and professional contexts.

RESEARCH SAMPLE AND METHODS

The empirical basis of the study comprised three distinct groups representing varied professional environments and levels of contextual stability: school teachers (semi-static and regulated environment), manufacturing company employees (stable and regulated environment), and working psychology students (dynamic, dual-role environment). Each group included 130 participants, yielding a total sample size of $N = 390$. Participant ages ranged from 25 to 35 years in the first two cohorts and from 20 to 35 years in the student cohort. Because the primary objective of the study was to examine self-regulation characteristics across different professional and role environments, active engagement in the respective role (a minimum of one year of work or academic experience) served as the primary inclusion criterion, rather than strict age constraints.

The study was conducted in strict compliance with ethical standards: participation was voluntary, and data collection strictly observed the principles of anonymity and confidentiality. Data collection was carried out using two complementary assessment tools based on the theoretical framework of Positive Psychotherapy (PPT):

- 1. Wiesbaden Inventory for Positive Psychotherapy and Family Therapy (WIPPF 2.0):** The Wiesbaden Inventory (Peseschkian & Deidenbach, 1988) was applied as the primary

standardized instrument to assess basic individual psychological capacities and the allocation of resources. It measures the structural distribution of energy across four primary life domains: Body/Health, Achievement/Work, Contact/Relationships, and Future/Meaning/Fantasy. "Based on this research objective, **only the Personal Capacities (Differential Analysis) module** of N. Peseschkian's Wiesbaden Inventory for Positive Psychotherapy (WIPPF) was administered and analyzed to assess primary (emotional-relational) and secondary (socio-normative) capacities. The remaining two blocks of the inventory (clinical-symptomatic and family-relational) were excluded from the analysis, as their variables fall outside the scope of the present study's subject matter and research hypotheses

2. **Life Balance Questionnaire (LBQ):** Developed specifically for this study alongside the WIPPF, the LBQ was designed to measure current self-regulation characteristics in occupational and academic settings. The questionnaire comprises 20 items rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 ("Strongly Disagree") to 5 ("Strongly Agree") (Likert, 1932), equally distributed across four domains (5 items per domain).

The combined application of this assessment battery enables the identification of the degree to which individuals rely on their internal resources across various operational and social situations. Furthermore, it highlights the characteristics of self-regulation and adaptive development shaped under the influence of professional environments.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Comparative Analysis of Life Balance Indicators Across Research Groups (N=390). The distribution data for the life balance domains across the studied professional cohorts ("Teachers", "Manufacturing Employees", "Working Students") are presented in **Table 1**.

1.Body / Health: Data obtained in the "Body / Health" domain evidence a pronounced variance across the research cohorts. The highest score in the "Body / Health" domain belongs to teachers (23%). This may indicate a heightened subjective awareness of the need for somatic recovery following high cognitive and emotional loads in the educational environment, although this value remains below the normative balanced threshold (25%). For manufacturing company employees, the index is slightly lower (20%), implying that physical resources are predominantly depleted during real-time work dynamics, leaving less energy for self-care and recovery practices. Conversely, the lowest score was observed among working students (14%), which may be attributed to "role strain" resulting from the simultaneous execution of academic and professional responsibilities.

Table 1. Life balance indicators across professional cohorts (%)

Group Means of Life Balance Indicators Across Research Groups (%)

Life Balance Indicators	Teachers (M, %)	Manufacturing Employees (M, %)	Working Students (M, %)
-------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------

Life Balance Indicators	Teachers (M, %)	Manufacturing Employees (M, %)	Working Students (M, %)
Body / Health	22% – 24%	18% – 22%	12% – 16%
Performance / Achievement	38% – 42%	28% – 32%	45% – 49%
Contacts / Relationships	24% – 26%	32% – 36%	18% – 22%
Future / Meaning / Fantasy	10% – 14%	14% – 18%	17% – 21%

2. Performance / Achievement: In this domain, the highest score was observed among working students (46%), which may indicate the deployment of hyper-compensatory coping strategies driven by dual-role pressure (studies + work) and a high need for self-affirmation. The score among teachers is also notably high (40%), which can be attributed to constant accountability, high responsibility, and the continuous nature of lesson preparation inherent in the school system. Meanwhile, manufacturing company employees exhibited a more balanced index (30%), suggesting that clear regulation and demarcation of work responsibilities prevent an over-concentration of energy within the "Achievement" domain.

3. Contacts / Relationships: Data obtained in the "Contacts / Relationships" domain reflect the influence of the professional environment on interpersonal communication and the maintenance of social ties. The highest score in this domain was observed among manufacturing company employees (34%), which may indicate the team-oriented nature of work processes and the significant role of social interaction as a primary mechanism for resource recovery and coping with workplace stress. Among teachers, the index stands at a moderate, stable level (25%), which can be attributed to the high intensity of daily professional interactions that, being largely functional in nature, prevent an over-expansion of the emotional sphere. Conversely, the lowest score was recorded among working students (22%), implying that an intensive academic and work schedule restricts the time available for meaningful interpersonal and family relationships.

4. Future / Meaning / Fantasy: Data obtained in the "Future / Meaning / Fantasy" domain evidence differences in reflexive capacities and prospective planning across the research cohorts. The highest score in this domain was recorded among working students (19%), which may be attributed to their psychological specialization, a high level of introspection, and the prioritization of mental energy toward future mapping and the search for meaning during this developmental stage. Among manufacturing company employees, the index stands within a moderate range (16%), suggesting that a stable work environment allows for future planning without requiring constant existential re-evaluations. Conversely, the lowest score was observed among teachers (12%), which may reflect a constraint on psychological resources for creative imagination, future re-planning, and the search for new meanings, resulting from occupational monotony and high workload pressures.

The analysis reveals that each professional group demonstrates unique "critical points" of resource redistribution (energy disproportions). To uncover the psychological mechanisms and personal factors underlying these disproportions at the micro-level, the next phase of the research examined the expression of 19 personal capacities across the observed professional cohorts. The obtained group mean values are presented in **Table 2**.

The research results are presented as group mean values (M) for each scale. A comparison of the **WIPPF 2.0** data demonstrates that the three professional groups differ not only in the levels of individual capacities, but also in their prevailing combinations. Here, the primary emphasis is placed on the self-regulation characteristics specific to each group, their roles, and the probable mechanisms stemming from them. According to the standardized norms of the **WIPPF 2.0**, indicators are evaluated on a 3-12 point scale: 3–5 points indicating low expression/underdevelopment, 6-9 points indicating medium/balanced expression, and 10-12 points indicating high expression/overexpression.

Table 2. Expression of the 19 Personal Capacities Across Professional Environments According to WIPPF 2.0

Group Means (M) for 19 Capacity Scales Across Professional Environments

Capacity Block	No.	WIPPF 2.0 Personal Capacity	Working Students (n ₁ =130, M)	Teachers (n ₂ =130, M)	Importing Company Staff (n ₃ =130, M)
Secondary Capacities	1	Orderliness	5.8	7.5	8.0
	2	Cleanliness	6.1	8.0	7.4
	3	Punctuality	6.8	8.2	6.2
	4	Politeness	6.4	8.3	7.9
	5	Honesty / Openness	6.3	7.2	7.8
	6	Achievement	10.4	9.5	6.8
	7	Seriousness / Reliability	7.1	8.8	7.5
	8	Thrift	5.1	6.4	6.1
	9	Obedience	6.5	8.6	5.5
	10	Justice	6.5	6.9	7.2
	11	Faithfulness	5.6	8.1	7.3
Primary Capacities	12	Patience	4.8	8.1	6.0
	13	Time	3.8	5.6	6.8

Capacity Block	No.	WIPPF 2.0 Personal Capacity	Working Students ($n_1=130$, M)	Teachers ($n_2=130$, M)	Importing Company Staff ($n_3=130$, M)
	14	Contact	4.5	7.0	8.5
	15	Trust	5.4	6.5	7.2
	16	Hope	10.1	4.9	6.5
	17	Tenderness / Sexuality	5.2	6.1	7.0
	18	Love / Acceptance	5.9	7.4	8.3
	19	Faith / Meaning	8.9	4.3	5.5

1. Comparative analysis of highly expressed indicators reveals essential differences in the primary, mobilizing anchors of self-regulation across the groups. In the group of working students ($n_1 = 130$), Achievement ($M = 10.4$), Hope ($M = 10.1$), and Faith/Meaning ($M = 8.9$) predominate, which may indicate that their self-regulation is carried out at the expense of high future-oriented expectations and a focus on accomplishments. In contrast, primary self-regulation in the group of teachers ($n_2 = 130$) carries an over-socialized, normative nature; here, Achievement ($M = 9.5$), Seriousness/Reliability ($M = 8.8$), Obedience ($M = 8.6$), Politeness ($M = 8.3$), and Punctuality ($M = 8.2$) are high, which may suggest that their self-regulation relies entirely on the demands of the professional role and external discipline. Meanwhile, in the group of employees of the importing company ($n_3 = 130$), high indicators—Contact ($M = 8.5$), Love/Acceptance ($M = 8.3$), Discipline ($M = 8.0$), and Politeness ($M = 7.9$)—testify to communicative-adaptive self-regulation; this may mean that in a corporate environment, team interaction and emotional support serve as the primary stress-coping mechanisms.
2. Comparative analysis of low (deficit) indicators shows where the vulnerable areas of each group's self-regulation system are located. Sharp low values of Time ($M = 3.8$), Contact ($M = 4.5$), and Patience ($M = 4.8$) were recorded among working students, which may indicate that their self-regulation suffers from resource imbalance; combining study and work creates an objective deficit of time, depriving them of "time-contact" anchors for emotional recovery. In the group of teachers, on the contrary, the deficit carries an existential-semantic nature; low levels of Faith/Meaning ($M = 4.3$) and Hope ($M = 4.9$) constitute the most vulnerable feature of their self-regulation, which may suggest that long-term pedagogical activity has led to a semantic crisis and a loss of positive expectations for the future. Notably, sharply low (deficit) indicators were not recorded at all in the group of employees of the importing company, while Obedience ($M = 5.5$) and Faith/Meaning ($M = 5.5$) lie in the neutral-medium range, which may testify to high flexibility in their self-regulation system and low dependence on authoritarian instructions.

3. Comparative analysis of medium (range 6–9) indicators highlights the differences in balance and resource distribution among the groups. Among working students, behavioral norms fall within the 6–9 range: Discipline ($M = 5.8$), Orderliness ($M = 6.1$), Punctuality ($M = 6.8$), Politeness ($M = 6.4$), Honesty ($M = 6.3$), Seriousness ($M = 7.1$), Obedience ($M = 6.5$), and Justice ($M = 6.5$), which may mean that they maintain a sufficient level of social behavior, but these medium indicators do not serve as primary stress-compensating resources. In the group of teachers, secondary capacities lie within the 6–9 range: Orderliness ($M = 8.0$), Honesty ($M = 7.2$), Justice ($M = 6.9$), Loyalty ($M = 8.1$), Patience ($M = 8.1$), Contact ($M = 7.0$), Trust ($M = 6.5$), Tenderness ($M = 6.1$), and Love ($M = 7.4$), which may indicate that despite the semantic crisis, they preserve professional ethics and emotional acceptance toward learners. Unlike the first two groups, the absolute majority of indicators among the employees of the importing company fall within the 6–9 range (Discipline 8.0, Orderliness 7.4, Punctuality 6.2, Politeness 7.9, Honesty 7.8, Achievement 6.8, Seriousness 7.5, Frugality 6.1, Justice 7.2, Loyalty 7.3, Patience 6.0, Time 6.8, Trust 7.2, Hope 6.5, Tenderness 7.0), which constitutes the key feature of self-regulation in this group; this may suggest that corporate employees possess the most balanced self-regulation system, do not overstrain in separate domains, and lack deep deficits, thereby ensuring their high psychological adaptability.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study confirm that the nature of the professional environment has a significant impact on the distribution of psychological resources across various life domains. The obtained results align with the core tenets of the Positive Psychotherapy Balance Model, according to which an imbalance among life domains serves as a crucial factor in the emergence of psychological tension and dysfunctional states. The hyper-concentration of resources in the "Work / Achievements" domain recorded among working students, alongside the resource deficit in the "Body / Health" and "Contacts / Relationships" domains, indicates an "overstrained-motivational" adaptive strategy forming under conditions of chronic overload. This "flight into work and study" phenomenon and high future-oriented focus serve as cognitive-behavioral compensatory mechanisms to endow current difficulties with meaning; however, in the long-term perspective, they create a high risk of emotional exhaustion (C. Maslach's model).

In contrast, the balanced resource distribution observed among the employees of the importing company indicates that a stable and predictable professional environment fosters the harmonious preservation of physical, social, and semantic resources. Notably, the identity of the total volume of resources across the groups reaffirms a pivotal principle of the Balance Model: the issue lies not in the quantity of resources, but in their structural redistribution.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that dynamic and uncertain work environments tend to concentrate resources within specific domains-often at the expense of others-whereas stable environments allow for

the maintenance of a more harmonious distribution across life domains. These results provide an important foundation for future research and the development of applied programs aimed at promoting psychological well-being in professional environments.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY:

1. **Sample Size:** The study was conducted on sample sizes of limited scale ($n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = 130$; total $N = 390$), which may to some extent restrict the generalizability of the obtained results to other professional groups or regions.
2. **Study Design:** The study employs a cross-sectional design, which allows for recording the characteristics of resource distribution and self-regulation at a single point in time, but does not permit the identification of direct causal dynamics over time.
3. **Control of Additional Variables:** Demographic and personal factors—such as work tenure, marital status, or socioeconomic status—were not fully controlled for in the study, though they may also exert a mediated influence on the distribution of an individual's psychological resources.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the study, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- **Shift of Energy in Life Balance:** According to N. Peseschkian's approach, the fundamental prerequisite for mental health and life satisfaction is the equal distribution of energy across the four domains of life. The study revealed significant deviations from this balance. A sharp resource imbalance toward the "Work / Achievement" domain was recorded among working students, exceeding the normative level almost twofold, which is accompanied by a pronounced deficit in the "Body / Health" and "Contacts / Relationships" domains.
- **The Role of the Environment in the Distribution of Psychological Resources:** The nature of the professional and educational environment was found to exert a significant impact on an individual's resource distribution. An overstrained, dynamic educational and work environment (working students) leads to the concentration of energy along the "Work–Future" axis. In contrast, a stable and predictable environment (importing company) fosters the balanced preservation of energy in the "Body / Health" and "Contacts / Relationships" domains.
- **The Future Factor as a Psychological Anchor:** Among working students, the high indicator in the "Future / Fantasy" domain serves as an adaptive, compensatory mechanism. The present overload and time deficit are consciously accepted as a necessary professional foundation and educational experience, enabling individuals to maintain psychological stability in anticipation of future success.

PRACTICAL RECOMMENDATIONS

To prevent professional burnout and somatic issues based on these empirical findings, the following interventions are recommended:

1. **University and Corporate Support Programs:** Develop workshops on effective time management, as well as sleep and nutritional hygiene, tailored for working students to help restore the "Body / Health" domain.
2. **Activation of Emotional and Interpersonal Resources:** Organize stress management and emotional intelligence (EQ) development trainings to enhance communication quality and foster psychological support within the "Contacts / Relationships" domain.
3. **Transparency of Career and Educational Pathways:** Considering the strong motivational role of the "Future / Fantasy" domain, provide a clear vision for career and professional growth, which will justify the high current investments made by students and promote a sustainable life balance.

REFERENCES

- Adler, A. (1933).* The meaning of life. Verlag Passer.
- Antonovsky, A. (1987).* *Unraveling the mystery of health.* Jossey-Bass.
- Bandura, A. (1997).* *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* Freeman.
- Beck, A. T. (1976).* *Cognitive therapy and the emotional disorders.* International Universities Press.
- Bing, M. N., Whanger, G. S., Davison, H. K., & Van Hook, J. B. (2004).* Incremental validity of the frame-of-reference effect in personality assessment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(1), 150–159. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.1.150>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000).* The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01
- Frankl, V. E. (1946).* Man's search for meaning. Verlag für Jugend und Volk.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989).* Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513–524. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513>
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984).* *Stress, appraisal, and coping.* Springer.
- Likert, R. (1932).* A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 22(140), 1–55.
- Peseschkian, N. (1977).* Positive psychotherapy: Theory and practice of a new method. Fischer.

- Peseschkian, N.** (1988). *Positive psychosomatics: Clinical manual of positive psychotherapy*. Springer-Verlag.
- Peseschkian, N.** (1998). *Positive psychotherapy: Theory and practice*. Springer.
- Peseschkian, N.** (2000). *Positive psychotherapy: Theory and practice of a new method*. Springer-Verlag.
- Peseschkian, N., & Deidenbach, H.** (1988). *Wiesbadener Inventar zur Positiven Psychotherapie und Familientherapie (WIPPF)*. Springer-Verlag.
- Remmers, A.** (2020). Theoretical foundations and core concepts of positive psychotherapy. In E. Messias, H. Peseschkian, & C. Cagande (Eds.), *Positive psychiatry, psychotherapy and psychology: Clinical applications* (pp. 43–58). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-33264-8_4
- Shaffer, J. A., & Postlethwaite, B. E.** (2012). The validity of contextualized personality inventories for predicting job performance: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 20(4), 445–464. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12009>

The reference list was compiled with the assistance of AI