

*Section: Preliminary studies in Positive Psychotherapy (PPT)***Primary and Secondary Capacities in Different Generations of the Greek Population****Aikaterini Flaka**

Psychotherapist, M.Sc. in Positive Psychotherapy,  
 Certified positive psychotherapist, private practice,  
 (Athens, Greece)

**Email:** [katerinaflak@yahoo.gr](mailto:katerinaflak@yahoo.gr)

**ORCID:** [0009-0007-8045-1985](https://orcid.org/0009-0007-8045-1985)

**Gabriela Hum**

Psy MA, Positive psychotherapist,  
 Master Trainer and Supervisor of Positive Psychotherapy  
 (Cluj-Napoca, Romania)

**Email:** [gabriela.hum@positum.ro](mailto:gabriela.hum@positum.ro)

**ORCID:** [0009-0000-8857-1948](https://orcid.org/0009-0000-8857-1948)

Received 30.10.2025

Accepted for publication 23.12.2025

Published 23.01.2026

**DOI:** [10.52982/lkj292](https://doi.org/10.52982/lkj292)

**Abstract**

This preliminary study explores the primary and secondary capacities described by Nossrat Peseschkian in Positive Psychotherapy theory across three generations of the Greek population. The study aims to examine whether primary capacities are more characteristic of Generations X and Y. In contrast, secondary capacities are more characteristic of Generation Z. Another aim is to investigate the influence of primary and secondary capacities on gender within each generation.

The sample comprised 119 participants from Greece aged 18 to 59. According to the findings, neither age nor gender appears to be a factor shaping an individual's association with primary or secondary capacities as defined in Positive Psychotherapy. This suggests that these capacities may be universal and not influenced by age or gender – at least within the Greek population studied.

**Keywords:** Positive Psychotherapy, primary capacities, secondary capacities, X, Y, Z generations

**Introduction**

The main objective of this research is to examine the primary and secondary capacities and their distinction, as articulated by Nossrat Peseschkian in his theory of Positive Psychotherapy.

In 1977, Nossrat Peseschkian formally introduced the notion of "basic and actual capacities" (Peseschkian, 1987). As he wrote at that time, each human being is born as a letter written with invisible ink. All of us are born with

all the capacities, but it depends on where the heat is applied; only those capacities will develop and will be visible. "The actual capacities have two functions: they offer categories for making descriptions, and provide an encompassing inventory of human behaviors", as Peseschkian says in his book "Positive Psychotherapy of Everyday Life" (2016). Actual capacities are derived from two basic capabilities shared by all human beings: the capacity to know and the capacity to love (Peseschkian, N., 1987).

The Primary capacities arise on the first day of a person's life through contact with other people (Peseschkian N., 1987), from the basic capacity to Love. The Primary capacities are expressed through resources such as Time, Patience, Contact, Love/acceptance, Tenderness/Sexuality, Trust, Doubt, Hope, Faith, Model, Unity/integrity, and Confidence. (Peseschkian N., 1987)

The Secondary capacities are linked with the transmission of knowledge and thus they developed from the basic capacity to Know. They reflect the values and norms of the social group and the individual's cultural environment. Secondary capacities are expressed through resources such as Punctuality, Cleanliness, Orderliness, Obedience, Courtesy, Honesty, Accuracy, Faithfulness, Justice, Diligence, Thrift, Reliability, and Conscientiousness. (Peseschkian H. & Remmers A., 2025).

A generation may be conceptualized as a cohort of individuals of comparable age who possess a shared historical and cultural framework. Experiences occurring within the same temporal context (Ryder, 1965) serve to distinguish one generation from another (Jurkiewicz & Brown, 1998), as these collective experiences significantly shape the attitudes, values, beliefs, and expectations inherent to generational cohorts (Inglehart & Norris, 2003). Each successive generation, succeeding its predecessor, emerges with distinctive characteristics and values (Bennett & Rademacher, 1997). The observed intergenerational variation can be explained by the premise that individuals born within a two-decade span share common characteristics shaped by the historical events of that period, prevailing economic conditions, and technological advancements (Reeves & Oh, 2008).

The term "Generation X" was popularized by the 1991 novel *Generation X: Tales for an Accelerated Culture* by Douglas Coupland, which explored the lives and attitudes of young adults in the early 1990s. The present study used the period 1965 to 1980 to represent Generation X. Representatives of this generation exhibit a profound sense of accountability for their professional obligations, even in the absence of direct supervision, and a strong work ethic (Wey & Sutton, 2002). A significant proportion of this generation comprises individuals who were raised in environments characterized by parental

oppression, which has a direct influence on their behavioural patterns and value systems (Eisner, 2005). During childhood, many of these individuals spent substantial periods of unsupervised time at home due to their parents' occupational commitments. Consequently, they developed an individualistic orientation, a pervasive scepticism towards the organizations employing them, a notable deficiency in organizational loyalty (Smola & Sutton, 2002), and an emphasis on achieving a harmonious work-life balance (Eisner, 2005), an aspiration for financial autonomy, and a propensity for entrepreneurial risk-taking (De Meuse, Bergman & Lester, 2001).

The designation "Generation Y" was originally introduced by scholars William Strauss and Neil Howe in their 1991 publication "Generations: The History of America's Future, 1584 to 2069." This study used the period 1981 to 1996 to represent Generation Y. This generation is referred to by various designations, including Gen-Me (Twenge et al., 2019), Next Generation, and Generation Y (Neubourne & Kerwin, 1999). This cohort represents the inaugural high-tech generation, having never experienced a time without mobile telecommunication devices, personal computing systems, and automated teller machines (Mitchell, 2002). The parents of this generation are characterized as "helicopter parents," who consistently hover over their offspring, exercising control and safeguarding them while catering to all their "desires." The implicit communication conveyed by these parents to their children is to "return home when faced with adversity", a sentiment that persists throughout their adulthood and exerts influence on their vocational trajectories. For this generation, familial connections are perceived as the fundamental source of happiness (Mitchell, 2002). It is a generation that makes decisions and acts based on its experiences (Bittner et al., 2013).

Generation Z, frequently referred to as the Children of the Internet, the Digital Generation, the Media Generation, or the Instant Online Generation (Levickaite, 2010), represents the inaugural generation that has been profoundly and comprehensively subjected to digital technologies, including social networking platforms and an abundance of hyper-information available online (Turner, 2015). This study used the period from 1997 to 2012 to represent Generation Y. The majority of

individuals in this cohort are from Generation X, which is characterized by notably higher educational attainment than previous generations (Swanbrow, 2012). Consequently, these guardians advocate for their children to engage deeply with technological innovations from the early stages of their developmental journey. For these youths, technology transcends its role as a mere instrument (which, if misapplied, may yield detrimental repercussions). "The Internet is to Generation Z like oxygen, without which they cannot even imagine their lives" (Oblinger & Oblinger, 2005). Their preoccupation with the digital realm, coupled with a deficiency in in-person interactions, has led to the assertion that this generation "is the first to have poor face-to-face interaction and is less likely to use brain logic in the thinking and decision-making process" (Salleh et al., 2017). Notwithstanding the lack of in-person social engagement, this cohort possesses the capacity to concurrently address multiple challenges (perennially facilitated by social media) (UPCEA, 2017), thereby establishing extensive interactive communities that enable direct communication with individuals whom they have not encountered in person (Riva et al., 2012).

The purpose of this paper is to add to the scientific community a study looking at the connection and influence that the Actual capacities (primary and secondary), as described in Positive Psychotherapy, may have on generations X, Y, Z, and the genders of each generation. In the research community, most generational studies are approached from perspectives quite different from the one used in this study. In addition, within the field of Positive Psychotherapy, existing studies on actual capacities typically involve different types of samples than those used here, as this study focuses specifically on generational groups in Greece.

**Methodology**

This research aims to examine whether there is a relationship between generations and genders in the use of primary and secondary capacities. The research hypotheses were developed as follows:

1. Generations X and Y are more oriented towards primary capacities, whereas

Generation Z is more oriented towards secondary capacities.

2. In Generations X and Y, women tend to show a stronger orientation toward primary capacities, while men tend to be more oriented toward secondary capacities.

This study collected 119 participants. All the participants were from Greece. They were adults aged 18-59 years. The survey sample included individuals from the three generations studied, and each generation was represented by both genders (Table 1). By generation, participation was 41.2% for Generation X, 48.7% for Generation Y, and 10.1% for Generation Z.

The WIPPF questionnaire (Wiesbaden Inventory for Positive Psychotherapy and Family Therapy) was developed by Peseschkian and Deidenbach (1988). The WIPPF-2 version adapted by A. Remmers in 1995 for international use assesses the Actual Capacities, both the Primary and Secondary. From the list of capacities described by Peseschkian, the WIPPF uses 11 secondary capacities and 8 primary capacities, presented in the table below:

**Table 1. List of primary and secondary capacities (Terminology and conceptual framework of Positive Psychotherapy, 2025)**

<i>Primary capacities from WIPPF</i>	<i>Secondary capacities from WIPPF</i>
<i>Patience</i>	Orderliness
<i>Time/Time awareness</i>	Cleanliness
<i>Contact/Social interaction</i>	Punctuality
<i>Trust</i>	Politeness/ Courtesy
<i>Hope</i>	Honesty/ Directness
<i>Tenderness/sexuality</i>	Achievement/ Diligence
<i>Love/acceptance</i>	Reliability/ Trustworthiness
<i>Faith/Believe/ World View</i>	Frugality/ Thriftiness
	Obedience
	Justice/ Fairness
	Fidelity/Loyalty

More specifically, the questionnaire comprises 88 items covering all actual capacities, both primary and secondary, conflict reactions, and model dimensions. We used 57 questions addressing the primary and secondary capacities

that were the focus of this study. The 57 items are rated on a four-point Likert scale (1 = "Fully disagree", 2 = "Partially disagree", 3 = "Partially agree", 4 = "Fully agree").

The WIPPF is a psychotherapeutic tool applicable across multiple languages and beneficial for purposes such as diagnosis, counseling, individual or family therapy, and quality assurance. It may be regarded as a transcultural approach to psychotherapy that transcends theoretical frameworks (Remmers, A., 1996)

The WIPPF has been used in a variety of studies by some researchers and therapists from different countries (Serdiuk, & Ottenko, (2021), Sinici, Sari, Maden Ö (2014), Latifi (2013), Prifti & Hum (2022), Ntarla, & Hum (2024).

## Results

Basic demographic characteristics were recorded for this study through frequency descriptive analysis per the gender of participants, as well as the generations represented in this study, as follows:

- per the sample's genders identified that out of 119 participants, 83 of them were females (69,7%) and 36 males (30,3%).
- per the generations represented, 49 individuals were born between 1965 and 1980 (41.2%) and belonged to Generation X, 58 individuals were born between 1981 and 1996 (48.7%). They belonged to Generation Y; 12 individuals (10.1%) were born between 1997 and 2012, and to Generation Z.

Table 2. Gender per generation crosstabulation, descriptive analysis results.

		Generation * Gender Crosstabulation		
		Count		Total
Generation		Male	Female	
			X (1965-1980)	13
	Y (1981-1996)	20	38	58 (48,7%)
	Z (1997-2012)	3	9	12 (10,1%)
	<b>Total</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>119</b>
		30,3%	69,7%	

The crosstabulation of frequencies showed that 13 males and 36 females belong to Generation X, 20 males and 38 females belong to Generation Y, and 3 males and 9 females belong to Generation Z.

Appropriate statistical tests for the WFFIP questionnaire were conducted to compare the use of primary and secondary capacities by gender and generation. The Shapiro-Wilk test was used to determine whether the generation and gender data were normally distributed. The test, when regarding the usage of primary capacities, produced a per generation statistic value of 0.967 for generation X with a p-value of 0.179, for generation Y with a statistic value of 0.982 and a p-value of 0.548, and generation Z with a statistic value of 0.863 and a p-value of 0.054, supporting the assumption of normality in data distribution.

With concerns of usage of secondary capacities, the same test introduced a per generation statistic value of 0.982 for generation X with a p-value of 0.643, for generation Y with a statistic value of 0.971 and a p-value of 0.183, and for generation Z with a statistic value of 0.891 and a p-value of 0.123, also supporting the assumption of normality (Table 2).

The same test was performed to produce a per gender statistic value 0.972 for male participants with a p-value of 0.473, and a statistic value of 0.979 for female participants with a p-value of 0.205 for usage of primary capacities, whilst a statistic value per gender of 0.964 for male participants with a p-value of 0.277, and a statistic value of 0.983 for female participants with a p-value of 0.355 for usage of secondary capacities, thus, supporting the assumption that the data were normally distributed (Table 3).

Table 3. Shapiro-Wilk test for normality per generation for primary and secondary capacities usage results

		Tests of Normality		
		Generation	Shapiro-Wilk	
			Statistic	Df Sig.
Primary	1965-1980	.967	49	<b>.179</b>
	1981-1996	.982	58	<b>.548</b>
	1997-2012	.863	12	<b>.054</b>
Secondary	1965-1980	.982	49	<b>.643</b>
	1981-1996	.971	58	<b>.183</b>
	1997-2012	.891	12	<b>.123</b>

Table 4. Shapiro-Wilk test for normality per gender for primary and secondary capacities usage results

		Tests of Normality		
		Sex	Shapiro-Wilk	
			Statistic	df Sig.
Primary	Male	.972	36	<b>.473</b>
	Female	.979	83	<b>.205</b>
Secondary	Male	.964	36	<b>.277</b>
	Female	.983	83	<b>.355</b>

A one-way ANOVA was performed to determine whether there is a relationship between generations and the use of primary and secondary skills. No statistically significant

difference was identified between different generations and the usage of primary ( $p = .320 > .05$ ) or secondary ( $p = .067 > .05$ ) capacities usage, as seen in the following table 4:

Table 4. One-way ANOVA test for the relationship between generations and the usage of capacities results

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Primary	Between Groups	.174	2	.087	1.149	<b>.320</b>
	Within Groups	8.781	116	.076		
	Total	8.955	118			
Secondary	Between Groups	.524	2	.262	2.766	<b>.067</b>
	Within Groups	10.977	116	.095		
	Total	11.501	118			

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to assess whether gender differences are associated with the use of primary and secondary capacities. No statistically significant

difference was identified between different genders and the usage of primary ( $p = .730 > .05$ ) or secondary ( $p = .217 > .05$ ) capacities usage, as seen in the following table:

Table 6. Independent Samples T-test for the relationship between genders and The usage of capacities results

		<i>t-test for Equality of Means</i>						
		<i>T</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>	<i>Std. Error Difference</i>	<i>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</i>	
							<i>Lower</i>	<i>Upper</i>
<i>primary</i>	Equal variances assumed	-.346	117	<b>.730</b>	-.01911	.05518	-.12839	.09018
	Equal variances not assumed	-.334	61.562	.739	-.01911	.05717	-.13340	.09519
<i>secondary</i>	Equal variances assumed	1.240	117	<b>.217</b>	.07710	.06216	-.04601	.20021
	Equal variances not assumed.	1.275	71.059	.206	.07710	.06046	-.04346	.19766

## Conclusion

The purpose of the present study was to examine the actual capacities described in Positive Psychotherapy by Peseschian across three generations (X, Y, and Z) in a Greek sample. Although prior literature highlights numerous distinct characteristics of these generations, research specifically linking generational identity to primary and secondary capacities remains limited. This study sought to examine whether Generations X and Y would exhibit a stronger orientation toward primary capacities, and whether Generation Z would exhibit a stronger orientation toward secondary capacities. A further exploratory aim was to investigate potential gender differences within Generations X and Y.

This research represents the first attempt in Greece to assess actual capacities in the general population using the WIPPF questionnaire. The sample comprised 119 individuals aged 18–59, with a higher proportion of women (69.7%). Generation Y comprised the largest proportion of the sample (48.7%), followed by Generation X (41.2%) and Generation Z (10.1%). Age and gender were the only demographic variables considered.

No statistically significant differences were found between generations in their orientation toward primary or secondary capacities. Similarly, no significant gender differences were

identified. These findings suggest that, within this sample, primary and secondary capacities may not be strongly associated with generational allegiance or gender. However, given the limited sample size - particularly for Generation Z - these results should be interpreted as preliminary rather than definitive.

It is also important to contextualize these findings within the broader cultural and social environments that have shaped each generation in Greece. Rapid societal changes, technological advancements, shifting family structures, and evolving sociopolitical values offer meaningful avenues for understanding the development of primary and secondary capacities. Additionally, the present study's design does not permit causal conclusions regarding the influence of these factors.

Overall, the findings contribute to an emerging discussion on whether the capacities defined in Positive Psychotherapy function as universal constructs rather than as gender - or generation-specific traits. Although the results did not reveal significant differences, they open pathways for further inquiries. Future research with larger, more diverse, and more balanced samples would provide a more robust basis for evaluating potential generational patterns.

Despite its exploratory nature, this study offers practical implications. If subsequent research supports the relative stability of primary and secondary capacities across

generations, this may inform the development of inclusive social policies and educational programs that emphasize shared competencies. Furthermore, such findings could support the design of intergenerational interventions that leverage common strengths rather than assumed generational divides, as well as therapeutic approaches that integrate both emotional and cognitive capacities across age groups.

### Study Limitations

The present study has several notable limitations related to sample size and generational distribution. The representation of

both generations and genders was uneven, with Generation Z being particularly underrepresented. This limited participation was likely due to difficulties accessing this age group and their lower willingness to engage through traditional recruitment methods. Future research should consider using social media platforms, which are more commonly used by Generation Z, as a more effective means of recruitment than traditional communication methods such as email. Future research should also aim to expand the sample size and employ more robust statistical methods, while also addressing the limitations of snowball sampling and its potential impact on the representativeness of the findings.

### References

- Bennett, L. & Rademacher, E. (1997). The age of indifference revisited: Patterns of political interest, media exposure, and knowledge among generation X. In: S. Craig & S. Bennett (Eds). *After the boom: the politics of generation X*.
- Bittner, A., & Baker, J. T. E. (2013). *Building an inclusive society: Post-secondary youth perspectives on immigration, multiculturalism, and racism in Newfoundland and Labrador*. Harris Centre Reports.
- Cesko E. (2018). Transcultural psychotherapy: new perspectives in clinical application. *Psychotherapie-Wissenschaft*. 8(2), 57–61. <https://doi.org/10.30820/8243.10>
- Coupland, D. (1991) *Generation X: Tales for an Accelerated Culture*. St. Martin's Griffin.
- De Meuse, K. P., Bergmann, T. J., & Lester, S. W. (2001). An investigation of the relational component of the psychological contract across time, generation, and employment status. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 13(1), 102–118.
- Eisner, S. P. (2005). Managing Generation Y. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 70(4), 4-15.
- Inglehart, R., & Norris, P. (2003). The true clash of civilizations. *Foreign policy*, 135, 63-70. <http://doi.org/10.2307/3183594>
- Jurkiewicz, C. L., & Brown, R. G. (1998). Generational comparisons of public employee motivation. *Review of public personnel administration*, 18(4), 18-37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X980180040>
- Latifi, A. (2013): Applicability of WIPPF at the group age of adolescents. Master's Thesis for PPT. Prishtina 2013.
- Levickaite, R. (2010). Generations X, Y, Z: How social networks form the concept of the world without borders (the case of Lithuania). *LIMES: Cultural Regionalistics*, 3(2), 170-183. <https://doi.org/10.3846/limes.2010.17>
- Luc, J.G.Y. et al (2020). Surgeon teachers and millennial learners: Bridging the generation gap. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*, 162(1), 334-341. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtcvs.2020.03.177>
- Meola, A. (2021). Generation Z News: Latest Characteristics, Research, and Facts. *Insider Intelligence*, <https://www.insiderintelligence.com/insights/generation-z-facts/>
- Mitchell, S. (2002). *American Generations: Who They Are, How They Live, What They Think*. New Strategist Pubns Inc.
- Neuborne, E., & Kerwin, K. (1999). Generation Y. *Business Week*, 144, 64.
- Ntarla, I., & Hum, G. (2024). Resilience of psychotherapists through the lens of the primary capacities of Nossrat Peseschkian's Positive Psychotherapy. Investigating the effect of a group Psychoeducation program on test anxiety: implementation of the balance model within the context of positive. *The Global Psychotherapist*, 4(1), 43-55. <http://doi.org/10.52982/lkj216>
- Oblinger, D. G., & Oblinger, J. L. (2005). *Educating the Net Generation*. Educase – Transforming Education Through Information Technologies.
- Peseschkian, H., Remmers, A. (2025). Positive Psychotherapy: An Introduction. In: Messias, E., Peseschkian, H. (eds) *Positive Psychiatry, Psychotherapy and Psychology*. Springer, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-94645-5\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-94645-5_2)
- Peseschkian, N. (1987). *Positive Psychotherapy. Theory and Practice of a New Method*. Springer-Verlag (Germany, USA).

19. Peseschkian, N. (2016). *Positive Family Therapy*. Bloomington, USA: AuthorHouse. 428 p. (first published in 1986, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg (Germany)).
20. Peseschkian, N., & Deidenbach, H. (1988). *Wiesbadener Inventar zur Positiven Psychotherapie und Familientherapie WIPPF* [Wiesbaden Inventory of Positive Psychotherapy and Family Therapy WIPPF]. Berlin: Springer-Verlag. [in German]
21. Prifti, A. O., & Hum, G. (2022). Approaches to conflict in the 5\* Hospitality industry in GREECE Through a Positive Psychotherapy Perspective. *The Global Psychotherapist*, 3(1), 60-64. <http://www.doi.org/10.52982/ikj181>
22. Reeves, T. C., & Oh, E. (2008). *Generational differences. Handbook of research on educational communications and technology*. Routledge.
23. Riva, G., Banos, R. M., Botella, C., Wiederhold, B. K., & Gaggioli, A. (2012). Positive technology: using interactive technologies to promote positive functioning. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 15(2), 69-77. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2011.0139>
24. Salleh, M. S. M., Mahbob, N. N., & Baharudin, N. S. (2017). Overview of the "GENERATION Z" Behavioral characteristic and its effect on hostel facilities. *International Journal of Real Estate Studies*, 11 (2), 59 - 67.
25. Serdiuk, L., & Ottekno, S. (2021). The Ukrainian language adaptation for the Wiesbaden Inventory for Positive Psychotherapy and Family Therapy (WIPPF). *The Global Psychotherapist*, 1(1), 11-14. <https://doi.org/10.52982/ikj135>
26. Sinici E, Sari, T. & Maden Ö (2014). Primary and Secondary Capacities in post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) Patients in terms of Positive Psychotherapy. *International Journal of Psychotherapy*, 18(3), 17-31.
27. Smola, K. W., & Sutton, C. D. (2002). Generational differences: Revisiting generational work values for the new millennium. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(Special Issue), 363–382. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.147>
28. Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (2000). *Millennials rising: The next great generation*. Vintage Books.
29. Swanbrow, D. (2012). *The Generation X Report: How many Gen Xers know their cosmic address?* Michigan News: University of Michigan.
30. Sweeney, R. (2006). *Millennial Behaviors & Demographics*. Newark: NJIT
31. Turner, A. (2015). Generation Z: Technology and social interest. *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, 71(2), 103-113. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jip.2015.0021>
32. Twenge J.M. (2019). *iGen: Η γενιά του Internet* [Gen: The Internet Generation]. Εκδόσεις Κλειδάριθμος . [in Greek]
33. UPCEA (2017). Generation Z, A New Cohort of Adult Learners. <https://upcea.edu/generation-z-new-cohort-adult-learners/>
34. Wey Smola, K., & Sutton, C. D. (2002). Generational differences: Revisiting generational work values for the new millennium. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 23(4), 363-382. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.147>
35. World Association for Positive and Transcultural Psychotherapy (2025). Terminology and conceptual framework of Positive Psychotherap. WAPP <https://www.positum.org/glossary/>
36. Реммерс, А. [Remmers, A.] (1996). Транскултурална обработка на психотерапевтичния въпросник WIPPF за международно приложение: теоретически и практически аспект [WIPPF 2.0 int. Transcultural Adaptation of the Psychotherapeutic Questionnaire WIPPF for International Use. Theoretical and Practical Aspects. WIPPF 2.0 int.]. *Journal Positum*, 13-28. [in Bulgarian]