

# DÜŞÜNEN ADAM

The Journal of Psychiatry and Neurological Sciences



## Author's Accepted Manuscript

The validity and reliability of the turkish brief version of the zimbardo time perspective inventory for adolescents

Ercan Kocayörük, Ömer Faruk Şimşek

To appear in: *Dusunen Adam The Journal of Psychiatry and Neurological Sciences*

DOI: 10.14744/DAJPNS.2019.00059

Cite this article as: Ercan Kocayörük, Ömer Faruk Şimşek. The validity and reliability of the turkish brief version of the zimbardo time perspective inventory for adolescents, *Dusunen Adam The Journal of Psychiatry and Neurological Sciences*, DOI: 10.14744/DAJPNS.2019.00059

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted by the *Dusunen Adam The Journal of Psychiatry and Neurological Sciences* editor for publication. As a service to our researchers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting galley proof before it is published in its final citable version. Please note that during the production process, typos or errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers pertaining to the manuscript.

Ercan Kocayörük<sup>1</sup>, Ömer Faruk Şimşek<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Çankkale Onsekiz Mart Univeristy, Department of Psychological Counseling and Guidance,  
Çanakkale, Turkey

<sup>2</sup>Rumeli University, Department of Psychology, İstanbul, Turkey

**Sorumlu Yazar:**

Ercan Kocayörük, Çankkale Onsekiz Mart Univeristy, Department of Psychological Counseling and  
Guidance, Çanakkale, Turkey

E-mail: kocayoruk@comu.edu.tr

Tel: +90 286 217 47 63

## Ergenlere için Zimbardo Zaman Algısı Envanterinin Türk kültürüne uyarlanması: Geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması

### Özet

**Amaç:** Bu çalışmanın amacı, örneklem olarak 17-24 yaş aralığında bulunan geç ergenlik dönemindeki bireyleri kullanarak, Zimbardo ve Boyd tarafından geliştirilen Zimbardo Zaman Algısı Envanteri (ZTPI)'nin psikometrik özelliklerini test etmektir.

**Yöntem:** Beş alt ölçek ve 15 maddeden oluşan ZTPI'nin kısaltılmış versiyonun Türkçe uyarlama için ne kadar uygun olduğunu belirlemek, ek olarak da ZTPI'nin yapıyı geçerliliğini test etmek amacıyla Açıklayıcı Faktör Analizi ve Doğrulamalı Faktör Analizi kullanılmıştır.

**Bulgular:** Ön doğrulamalı faktör analizinin sonuçları, ZTPI'nin 15 maddelik kısaltılmış versiyonunun özgün yapının, ergenlerin daha önceden ölçülmüş zaman algısı puanlarıyla örtüştüğünü belirtmektedir. Açıklayıcı faktör analizi, ZTPI'nin kısaltılmış versiyonu için beş yapı ortaya çıkartmıştır. Doğrulamalı faktör analizi de ZTPI'nin beş yapıyı ölçek boyutlarının sonuçlarını destekler yöndedir. Eş zamanlı geçerlilik çalışması da ölçeğin diğer akıl sağlığı göstergeleriyle orta düzeyde bir ilişki ortaya koymuştur.

**Sonuç:** Bu çalışmanın sonuçları, Türk kültürü için ZTPI uygulamalarının gelecekte de devam etmesini sağlayacak bir başlangıç olarak değerlendirilebilir. Geçmiş, şimdiki zaman ve gelecek algısı arasındaki uygun dengenin; başarı, akıl sağlığı ve kişisel mutluluk için bir öncül olduğu ileri sürülebilir. Çalışmanın sonuçları göz önünde bulundurularak; zaman algısı kavramının, klinik çalışmalarda psikoterapi uygulamalarında ele alınabileceği söylenebilir.

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** zaman algısı, ZTPI'nin psikometrik özellikleri, öznel iyi-oluş, ergenler

**The Validity and reliability of the Turkish brief version of the Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory for adolescents**

**Abstract**

**Objective:** The study aimed to examine the psychometric properties of the Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory (ZTPI) developed by Zimbardo and Boyd with a sample of subjects in late adolescence (aged between 17 and 24 years).

**Method:** In order to determine how well the identified model of the shortened version of the ZTPI (five sub-scale with 15 items) fits the Turkish adaptation, an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) were performed to understand the factor structure of ZTPI.

**Results:** The results of the initial confirmatory factor analyses suggested that the original factor structure of the ZPTI- shortened version with 15 items fit the data for adolescents' ratings of time perspective on the measures. The exploratory factor analyses revealed a five-factor structure for ZPTI with a shortened scale. Confirmatory factor analysis using competing models strategy also supported the five factor structure. Convergent validity study yielded moderate correlations with other mental health indicators.

**Conclusion:** The findings of the current study provided a good starting point for further ZTPI developments in the Turkish culture. It is proposed that a proper balance between the past, present, and future are now considered preconditions for success, mental health, and personal happiness. Considering the findings of current study, time perspective may be useful for evaluating the personality concerns and well-being of clients in counseling and therapy.

**Key Words:** time perspective, psychometric properties of ZPTI, subjective well-being, adolescents

## INTRODUCTION

Time perspective (1,2) is described as a continual flow of personal and social experiences whereby they are assigned to temporal categories, or time frames, that help to give order, coherence, and meaning to past, present and future events. As social and emotional experiences are influenced by one's TP, it is possible to say that TP has a dynamic influence on many important judgments, decisions, and actions. In fact, the concept of TP is very broad and encompasses a wide range of conscious and unconscious emotional, behavioral, and cognitive processes. According to Zimbardo and Boyd (1) TP is a result of the unconscious processes of assigning personal and social experiences into particular temporal categories to give meaning and coherence to these experiences. On the other hand, TP can emerge intentionally both through intentional individual endeavors and clinical and counseling interventions.

There has been an increase in the attention paid to research on "balanced time orientation" most adaptive for individuals that allows individuals to flexibly switch temporal frames among past, future, and present depending on situational demands, resource assessments, or personal and social appraisals (1). According to Holman and Silver (3), concerns in psychological and physical functioning are associated with getting stuck in any of the specific temporal zones. Thus, balanced time has been defined as "the mental ability to switch effectively among TPs depending on task features, situational considerations, and personal resources, rather than be biased towards a specific TP that is not adaptive across situations" (1). The behavior of those with such a time orientation would, on average, be determined by a compromise, or balancing among the contents of meta-schematic representations of past experiences, present desires, and future consequences.

Many research findings reveal that TP and a proper balance between the past, present, and future are associated with the preconditions for success, mental health, and personal happiness. For instance, van Beek et al. (4) demonstrated the relationship of TP to psychopathology such as depression and neuroticism. Similarly, TP has been found to be related with mental health (5,6) and significantly associate with subjective well-being (7). Moreover, Barnett et al. (8) documented connections among TP, substance use, and abuse while Sansone et al. (9) clarified the relationships between future orientation and smoking behavior. TP was used in many studies to explain or predict various forms of health behaviors, particularly dieting and exercising (10,11) and relevance to quit smoking (12). TP is also involved in diverse forms of psychosocial functioning (13), interpersonal relationships (14), and career decision-making (15).

The Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory (16, 1) is a well-known and comprehensively conceptualized tool for the assessment of TP. The conceptualization of TP by the ZTPI provides a measure of multiple time frames as individual temporal profiles, and assesses the five dimensions of TP: Past-Positive (PP), Past-Negative (PN), Present-Fatalistic (PF), Present-Hedonistic (PH), and Future (F). PP reflects a warm and embracing view of the past. PN reflects a negative, aversive view of the

past. PH reflects a hedonistic and risk-taking perspective, and an attitude toward pleasure, connected with little regard for future consequences. PF shows an orientation of a fatalistic, helpless, and hopeless attitude toward life and the future. F reflects a point of view regarding the future and thoughts concerning the future and weighs the consequences of one's actions. This dimension of TP assumes that behavior is dominated by a striving for future goals and rewards (17,18,7). Furthermore, the ZTPI has been shown to be a useful assessment tool in many different areas and numerous empirical studies have revealed that TP is a valuable predictor of various behaviors. For example, the findings of Zimbardo et al. (19) showed that risky driving is associated with a present time perspective. Similarly, Keough et al. (20) found that the reported use of alcohol, drugs, and tobacco is also associated with a present time perspective. In addition, the results of Apostolidis et al. (21) indicated that the reported use of cannabis is associated with a present time orientation. It is evident that the concept of TP has essential influence on many aspects of human behavior.

The validity and reliability of the ZTPI has been tested in many cultures, primarily in consulting and clinical applications and the ZTPI has been translated and validated in multiple languages. The currently available versions include the Italian (22), French (23), Spanish (24), Czech (25), Russian (26), Greek (5), Swedish (27), Lithuanian (28) and Portuguese versions (29). Some of these versions were tested on large representative samples such as Lithuanian (n=1529) and Czech versions (n=2030). Finally, the ZTPI was scrutinized by cross-cultural comparisons (30). In a comprehensive study, Sircova et al. (30) examined cross-cultural similarities and differences in time perspective involving samples from 24 countries. The findings of the study showed that similar views of the past, present, and future and important similarities across countries in time perspective. Furthermore, results also stated that five temporal orientations were invariant across many countries with diverse cultural traditions. The authors suggested a revised version of the ZTPI as the "gold standard" for further research on time perspective.

The validation studies showed that the translations of the ZTPI are useful tools in psychological practice and generally match the original factor structure. Recent studies frequently used the 15-item version of the ZTPI because of an apparent need for a short form of the ZTPI. A short form of the ZTPI was developed by Zhang et al. (7), consisting of 15 items in five scales. Similarly, Kostal et al. (31) focused on short versions (ZTPI-short), comprising 3 items for each scale, 15 items in total (18 when Future-Negative is added). The authors aimed to test the psychometric properties of the abbreviated ZTPI and the optional balancing of the Future scale with its negative counterpart. Seven items of Kostal et al. (31) inventories overlapped. The authors claimed that several items from Zhang's et al. (7) version appeared problematic when they were used in other studies or in other cultural contexts. In summary, although driven by a similar logic as the team of Zhang, their team opted for rigorous item selection from both the American and the international perspective and the usage of inventory in translations. Kostal et al. (31) tried to avoid items that appeared problematic in various national contexts. There was also a difference in the layout of the inventories. Zhang et al. (7) presented the items in consecutive

groups, according to each scale. Whereas Kostal et al. (31) liberated the items from the factor groupings in a similar way to how they are presented in the original the ZTPI (1) they also additionally rotated the items during administration to prevent any artifacts caused by the item location in the questionnaire.

In line with the tenets of time perspective studies, a number of studies have been made to modify or adapted an instrument for measuring time perspective in Turkish culture that is consistent with across culture. For instance, Şahin et.al. (32) examined the internal consistency, structural validity, and convergent validity of Turkish-ATI-TA scores. The authors concluded that 5 subscales (Past Positive, Past Negative, Present Positive Present Negative, and Future Positive) can be used with Turkish adolescents and that the Future Negative subscale needs to be revised and validated in this national context because of internal consistency estimates for Future Negative scores. To date existing instruments, the theoretically driven ZTPI is the most widely used and psychometrically sound instrument. One study investigated the relationships between undergraduate students' time perspectives and boredom coping strategies (33). The authors used the ZTPI with 39 item after Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CAF). They concluded that the five-factor solutions with 39 items was the best option when compared to other number of factor and also had acceptable fit to the data. A study with 178 students was to understand the extent to which individuals' perceptions of self and of interpersonal relationships used the ZTPI with 56 items was translated by Ergin Bilgic and her colleagues (unpublished data) using standard translate and back translate method (34). Consistent with the aim study, deviation from balanced time perspective (i.e., DBTP scores) was calculated by subtracting each participants' measured time perspective scale scores. To date, a number of attempts have been made to modify or validate the original time perspective instrument; however, there is no any specified form of time perspective instrument. In addition, researchers have been looking for shorter scales to make data collection more time-efficient in order to eliminate item redundancy and therefore reduces the fatigue, frustration, and boredom associated with answering highly similar questions repeatedly (35). Drawing from this stance, there are obvious advantages to a short measure, and its instrumental value is well accepted by many researchers as discussed above.

In conclusion, the ZTPI-short is a valid and reliable instrument for assessing TP and is recommended for further use. The aim of this study was to translate the short version of the ZTPI into Turkish and examine its reliability and validity in a relatively large sample. For this objective, Kostal et al. (31) short versions (ZTPI-short), comprising 3 items for each scale, 15 items in total was utilized.

**Study1: Factor Structure and Initial Reliability****Method*****Participants***

The university students in nominated classes were provided with an explanatory research statement and their consent and voluntarily involved was sought. An identical procedure was carried out in all studies. In study 1, the sample consisted of 353 undergraduate students studying at Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, which is a medium sized higher education institute in Turkey. Eight participants with missing data were removed from the analyses. Thus, the final sample included 345 participants. The sample ranged in age from 17 to 24 years ( $M = 20.74$ ,  $SD = 4.09$ ) and was composed of 112 boys (33%) and 233 girls (67%).

***Measure******Short Version of the Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory***

The ZTPI is the first comprehensive and theory-based operationalization of TP. The ZTPI, which was developed as an individual-differences metric, assesses the fundamental dimensions of the human condition related to time (1). The scale is composed of 56 items. After the exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses five distinct time perspective factors emerged: PN, PP, PF, PH and F. The analyses showed acceptable validity and internal, and test-retest reliability. In this current study the short version of the ZTPI has been utilized as a short-form by Košťál et al. (31) tested both in its five-scale and six-scale forms (with and without the Future-Negative scale). The authors suggested that the five-scale ZTPI-short form with 15 items had a slightly better model fit than the six-scale version, because the Future-Negative scale correlated strongly with the Past-Negative scale. Thus within this study, 15 items in the five-scale short form by Kostal, et. al. (without the Future-Negative scale) was translated into Turkish culture. The authors reported that the internal consistency of the scales measured by Cronbach's alpha varied from 0.65 to 0.78.

**Results*****Exploratory Factor Analysis***

The factor structure of the ZPTI-short version was explored using principal axis factor analysis with varimax rotation. In order to examine the factor structure of the ZPTI-short version with 15 items, a common factor analysis with varimax rotation was conducted. The data and sample size were adequate for factor analysis according to Bartlett's test of sphericity,  $X^2(105, N = 345) = 1092.92$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (0.761). An unrotated five factor with eigenvalue greater than 1.0 was obtained for the total sample, accounting for 62.29% of the variance. The first factor accounted for 20.17% of the variance (eigenvalue = 3.02) and the second factor accounted for 12.85% of the variance (eigenvalue=1.92). Subsequent factors added similar rate to the



explained variance (11.03%, eigenvalue= 1.65). The fourth factor accounted for 9.97% (eigenvalue = 1.49) and the last factor added 8.24% to the explained variance (eigenvalue =1.23). The results revealed that the factor solution for the 15 items were grouped into five factors. The basic psychometric properties of the ZTPI-short are listed in Table 1.

-----TABLE 1 HERE-----  
-----

In addition, the internal consistencies of the five factors were acceptable, ranging from  $\alpha = 0.65$  for the first factor,  $\alpha = 0.61$  for the second factor,  $\alpha = 0.64$  for the third factor,  $\alpha = 0.66$  for the fourth factor and  $\alpha = 0.79$  for the last factor. These Cronbach's alpha values are consistent with other ZPTI translations such as the Czech and Slovak study (from 0.65 to 0.78), the Lithuanian study (from 0.63 to 0.79), the Spanish (from 0.64 to 0.80), French (from 0.70 to 0.79), and the Swedish study (from 0.65 to 0.84) (31).

### **Study II Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)**

#### **Method**

##### *Strategy of Analysis*

Confirmatory factor analysis was implemented using competing models strategy and a series of first-order and higher-order CFA models were compared using both a chi-square difference test and information criterion indices such as Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) and Expected Cross Validation Index (ECVI). The following goodness-of-fit statistics were taken into consideration to evaluate the fit of the data to the models. An index of fit employed was the Goodness of Fit Index (36) with values greater than 0.90 indicating reasonable fit and greater than 0.95 indicating good fit, which is valid for Comparative fit Index (CFI). Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (37) was another statistic, with values less than 0.08 indicating reasonable fit of the model to the data whereas 0.05 indicating a good fit. The same criterion for reasonable fit is valid for the other goodness of fit statistics, namely Standardized Root Mean Square (SRMR).

##### *Participants*

Study 2 was conducted to confirm the factor structure of the ZTPI using confirmatory factor analyses. The sample consisted of 236 participants and ranged in age from 18 to 24 years (63.6% females, N = 150; 36.4% male, N = 86).

#### **Results**

Confirmatory factor analyses were conducted using the competing models strategy (38). The original five-factor model was compared with two alternative models, as shown in Figure 1.

-----FIGURE 1 HERE-----

Figure 1. Measurement models tested in the present study.

As can be seen from Figure 1, these models are the first-order one-factor model, first-order five-factor model, and higher-order one-factor model. Goodness of fit statistics calculated for these models are shown in Table 2.

-----TABLE 2 HERE-----  
-----

According to the results obtained, the first-order five-factor model produced better results than the other higher-order models. This model was better than the higher-order one-factor model as indicated by the chi-square difference test (19.22, 5;  $p < 0.01$ ). Smaller values of AIC, and ECVI for the first-order five-factor model also confirmed that this model was better than the other models. This model was also better than the higher-order one-factor model as indicated by the significant chi-square difference test (328.33, 10;  $p < 0.01$ ).

Intercorrelations among the factors of ZTPI-Short were shown in Table 3, indicating weak or moderate relationships. It is clear from the table that the only strong relationship was between future and present fatalistic factors, indicating that having a fatalistic opinions concerning the present has a strong relationship to have a negative outlook for future.

-----TABLE 3 HERE-----  
-----

### **Study III Test–retest reliability**

#### **Method**

##### ***Participants***

The test–retest reliability measures were produced by correlating scores from time 1 and time 2. The sample consisted of 149 university students ( $M = 20.28$ ;  $SD = 1.79$ ) 100 female, 49 male) randomly selected from the sample of Study 2. All students took part on a voluntary basis. The test–retest reliability was conducted over a 2-week interval. A meeting was held with the students for the retest procedure in which the scale was administrated collectively.

#### **Results**

The results of the Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient revealed that the test-retest reliability was moderate in the subscale. The results showed that the test–retest reliability was 0.55 for PN, 0.62 for PP, 0.57 for PH, 0.60 for PF and 0.69 for F.

### **Study IV Convergent Validity**

The aim of this study was to obtain evidence regarding the construct validity of the ZTPI by investigating its association with a number of scale scores related to personality traits and well-being. It was expected

that the positive dimensions of the ZTPI subscale scores (F, PH and PP) would correlate positively with subjective well-being such as flourishing and the positive factors of ontological well-being in addition to positive dimensions of trait personality as extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness. At the same time, the negative dimensions of ZTPI subscale scores (Past-Negative and Present-Fatalistic) were expected to negatively correlate with flourishing, the negative factors of ontological well-being, i.e., regret and nothingness, as well as negative dimensions of trait personality, namely neuroticism.

## **Method**

### ***Participants***

The study IV consisted of 267 undergraduate students from Çanakkale, Ankara and Istanbul. The sample ranged in age from 17 to 25 years ( $M = 20.42$ ,  $SD = 2.09$ ) and consisted of 72 boys (27%) and 195 girls (73%).

### ***Instruments***

#### *The Ontological Well-Being Scale (OWBS)*

The scale was developed to measure happiness and consisted of 24 items scored on a 5-point Likert-type scale (39). The OWBS is comprised of four subscales: regret, activation, nothingness, and hope. The Regret subscale (7 items) assesses participants' feelings regarding the completed part of their life projects (the past). The Nothingness (6 items) and Activation (5 items) subscales measure feelings toward ongoing life projects (the present). Lastly, the Hope subscale (6 items) taps into the feelings about one's future life projects (the future). The original scale had good internal consistencies ranging from 0.78 to 0.90, and the test-retest reliability of the OWBS, which was conducted over a 2-week interval, showed sufficient consistency of the scores over time (ranging from 0.72 to 0.92). In this current study, Cronbach's alpha values of OWBS varied from 0.61 to 0.73.

#### *The Big-Five Inventory (BFI)*

The 44-item Big-Five Inventory (40) was administered to assess five personality dimensions: Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness. Ratings are indicated on a scale from 1 (disagree strongly) to 5 (agree strongly) for each item. The scale was adapted by Sumer et al. (41) who only reported Cronbach's alpha reliabilities ranging from 0.64 to 0.77. The coefficients of alpha were 0.75, 0.82, 0.67, 0.51, and 0.80 respectively in the data set used in this study.

#### *Flourishing Scale (FS)*

FS is an 8-item scale that assesses the features of human functioning such as positive relationships, feelings of competence, meaning and purpose in life, and engagement with daily activities (42). The 7-point Likert-type scale was used to evaluate the items, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Higher scores on the scale indicate higher levels of well-being in important aspects of functioning

and flourishing. The scale was adapted into Turkish by Akın and Fidan (43) who reported strong Cronbach's alpha reliability ( $\alpha = 0.89$ ) for flourishing. The coefficients of alpha were 0.86 in the data set used in the present study.

### Results

Intercorrelations of the OWBS scores with scores on the measures of well-being, trait personality, and motivation are presented in Table 3. It is clear from Table 3 that five scales of ZPTI-short have relatively acceptable correlations with the OWBS-subscale scores and the current dimensions of flourishing and personality. Two factors, 'regret' and 'nothingness' were positively correlated with PN and PF, while 'activation' and 'hope' were correlated with PP and F. As expected, 'regret' and 'nothingness' were negatively correlated with PP and F, while 'activation' and 'hope' were negatively correlated with PN and PF. Interestingly, PH was only positively correlated with 'activation', 'hope' and 'flourishing'. On the other hand, F was only correlated with all personality types and openness did not correlate with TP, except for F.

-----TABLE 3 HERE-----

### Discussion

The findings of the confirmatory and exploratory factor analysis show that the five-factor structure of ZTPI (PN, PP, PF, PH and F) as a 15 item short form is validated with data from Turkish middle age adolescents. Based on the results it can be concluded that the ZTPI has an adequate validity, internal consistency and reliability. With respect to convergent validity, the scale has considerably higher correlations with other measures of personality, life projects and well-being. The results also show that the acceptable level of internal consistency is obtained for the five-factor structure and the findings are consistent with the theoretical framework with respect to convergent validity.

It has been increasing in the attention paid to develop a short version of the ZTPI. Many studies reported that (23) the original ZTPI with 56 items produced only an acceptable level of model fit, thus a short version of the ZTPI promises a significant improvement for TP studies. Similarly, a short version of the five-factor structure of ZTPI with 15 items (without the Future-Negative scale) was recently published by Zhang et al. (7) The short version of ZTPI in Zang's study suggested that 15 items in the five-factor structure (without the Future-Negative scale) had a good reliability, consistency and validity. Likely, in the present study results showed that the short version of the ZTPI has very good psychometric properties and meets the good fit criteria with regard to CFA in Turkish culture (see App.1).

In terms of the ZTPI's dimensionality, the concluding structure is closely related to studies which, in using the short form of ZTPI, have tended to derive factor structures containing five factors. For instance, Košťál et al.(31) tested both the five-scale and six-scale forms (with and without the Future-

Negative scale). The results indicated that the five-scale ZTPI–short had a better model fit in all indices than the six-scale ZTPI. Likewise, the number of significant factors obtained in the Swedish study conducted by Carelli et al. (27) concluded that the six-scale solution provided almost the same model fit as the original five-scale solution. Although goodness of fit statistics suggested a good or acceptable model fit, CFI values were quite low in the six-scale solution in their study. The authors claimed that correlations indicated strong relations among the Future-Negative and other negative scales, namely, the Past-Negative.

In addition, the present study provides consistent relationships between time perspectives and personality traits and well-being, which are consistent with previous studies reporting consistent relationships between time perspectives and personality traits, life satisfaction, and positive and negative effects (44-46). The relationships among the scales provide consistent evidence to validate a short version of the ZTPI with 15 items. However, unlike the original study (1), the present study was conducted with a sample of undergraduate students. This raises the question of whether the short version of the ZTPI with 15 items applies to a nonstudent sample of adults. A related issue is that our data were collected specifically from undergraduate psychological counseling students, where their specialized knowledge in psychology could play a role in influencing the outcome of the results. It is better to be replicated the short version of the ZTPI in a sample of adults.

Consequently, the short version of ZTPI could be suggested to assess the same multidimensional constructs in TP, proposed by Zimbardo and Boyd (1). The findings of the current study provided a good starting point for further ZTPI and Balanced Time Perspective (44, 47) developments in the Turkish culture. It is proposed that a proper balance between the past, present, and future are now considered preconditions for success, mental health, and personal happiness (17, 1). Beside, ZTPI with 56 items that make it too lengthy and time consuming to be used in research, therapy, and counseling settings, thus a more practical short version of the ZTPI that can be easily administered in such settings to save time and to reduce excessive burden on clients or research participants. Considering the findings of current study, time perspective may be useful for evaluating the personality concerns and well-being of clients in counseling and therapy.

The findings of the current study should be considered with several limitations. First, the study relied exclusively upon self-reported data from adolescents and students. Future analyses, therefore, should include informant reports from different age groups (i.e., adults, older) whereby a life-span point of view for time perspective is used as evidence of validity. Second, although correlation analyses were performed to evaluate the convergent and discriminant validity of the ZTPI-S with other psychological constructs, future analyses may also assess predictive validity by testing the potential causal effect of generalized expectancy on subsequent outcome variables that are theoretically linked to each of the temporal dimensions.

**References**

1. Zimbardo PG, Boyd J. Putting time in perspective: A valid, reliable, individual differences metric. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1999; 77:1271–1288.
2. Zimbardo PG, Boyd J. *The time paradox: The new psychology of time that can change your life*. New York Free Press, 2008.
3. Holman EA, Silver RC. Getting "stuck" in the past: temporal orientation and coping with trauma. *Journal of personality and social psychology* 1998; 74(5): 1146.
4. van Beek W, Berghuis H, Kerkhof A, Beekman A. Time perspective, personality and psychopathology: Zimbardo's time perspective inventory in psychiatry. *Time & Society* 2011; 20(3): 364–374.
5. Anagnostopoulos F, Griva F. Exploring time perspective in Greek young adults: Validation of the Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory and relationships with mental health indicators. *Social Indicators Research* 2012; 106(1): 41-59.
6. Gilbert SP, Sifers SK. Bouncing back from a breakup: Attachment, time perspective, mental health, and romantic loss. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy* 2011; 25(4): 295–310.
7. Zhang JW, Howell RT, Bowerman T. Validating a brief measure of the Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory *Time & Society* 2013; 22(3); 391-409.
8. Barnett E, Spruijt-Metz D, Unger J, Rohrbac LA, Sun P, Sussman S. Bidirectional associations between future time perspective and substance use among continuation high-school students. *Substance Use & Misuse* 2013; 48(8): 574–580. DOI: 10.3109/10826084.2013.787092.
9. Sansone G, Fong GT, Hall PA, Guignard R, Beck F, Mons U, Pötschke-Langer M, Yong, H-H, Thompson, EM, Omar M, Jiang Y. Time perspective as a predictor of smoking status: Findings from the International Tobacco Control (ITC) Surveys in Scotland, France, Germany, China, and Malaysia. *BMC Public Health* 2013; 13(1): 346.

10. Gellert P, Ziegelmann J, Lippke S, Schwarzer, R. Future time perspective and health behaviors: Temporal framing of self-regulatory processes in physical exercise and dietary behaviors. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine* 2012; 43(2): 208–218.
11. Guthrie LC, Lessl K, Ochi O, Ward MM. Time perspective and smoking, obesity, and exercise in a community sample. *American Journal of Health Behavior* 2013; 37(2): 171–180. DOI: 10.5993/AJHB.37.2.4.
12. Hall PA, Fong GT, Yong HH, Sanson, G, Borland R, Siahpush M. Do time perspective and sensationseeking predict quitting activity among smokers? Findings from the International Tobacco Control (ITC) Four Country Survey. *Addictive Behaviors* 2012; 37(12): 1307–1313. DOI: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2012.06.022.
13. Laghi F, Liga F, Baumgartner E, Baiocco R. Time perspective and psychosocial positive functioning among Italian adolescents who binge eat and drink. *Journal of Adolescence* 2012; 35: 1277–1284. DOI: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2012.04.014.
14. Bernstein MJ and Benield JA. Past perspective is related to present relationships: Past-positive and negative time perspectives differentially predict rejection sensitivity. *Psychological Record* (2013); 63(3): 615–628. DOI: 10.11133/j.tpr.2013.63.3.014.
15. Taber BJ. Time perspective and career decision-making difficulties in adults. *Journal of Career Assessment* 2013; 21(2): 200–209. DOI: 10.1177/1069072712466722.
16. Gonzales A, Zimbardo PG. Time in perspective: A Psychology Today survey report. *Psychology Today* 1985; 19: 21–26.
17. Boniwell I, Zimbardo PG. Balancing Time Perspective in Pursuit of Optimal Functioning. In: Linley PA and Joseph S (eds) *Positive Psychology in Practice*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, 2004; pp.165–178.
18. Stolarski M, Matthews G, Postek S, Zimbardo PG, Bitner J. How we feel is a matter of time: Relationships between time perspectives and mood. *Journal of Happiness Studies* (2014);15(4): 809-827.

19. Zimbardo PG, Keough KA, Boyd JN. Present time perspective as a predictor of risky driving. *Personality and Individual Differences* 1997; 23: 1007–1023.
20. Keough K.A, Zimbardo PG, Boyd JN. Who's smoking, drinking, and using drugs? Time perspective as a predictor of substance use. *Basic and applied social psychology* 1999; 21(2): 1: 49-164.
21. Apostolidis T, Fieulaine N, Soulé F. Future time perspective as predictor of cannabis use: Exploring the role of substance perception among French adolescents. *Addictive Behaviors* 2006; 31: 2339–2343.
22. D'Alessio M, Guarino A, De Pascalis V, Zimbardo PG. Testing Zimbardo's Stanford Time Perspective Inventory (STPI)—Short form: An Italian study. *Time and Society* 2003;12(2/3): 334–347.
23. Apostolidis T, Fieulaine N. Validation française de l'échelle de temporalité the Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory (ZTPI). *Revue Européenne de Psychologie Appliquée* 2004; 54(3): 207–217.
24. Diaz-Morales JF. Estructura factorial y fiabilidad del Inventario de Perspectiva Temporal de Zimbardo [Factorial structure and reliability of Zimbardo Time Perspective] *Psicothema* 2006; 18(3): 565-571.
25. Lukavská K, Klicperová-Baker M, Lukavský J, Zimbardo PG. ZTPI—Zimbardův dotazník časové perspektivy [Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory]. *Československá psychologie* 2011; 55: 356-373.
26. Sircova, A., Van De Vijver, F. J., Osin, E., Milfont, T. L., Fieulaine, N., Kislali-Erginbilgic, A., ... & Leite, U. D. R. (2014). A global look at time: A 24-country study of the equivalence of the Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory. *Sage Open*, 4(1), 2158244013515686.
27. Carelli MG, Wiberg B, Wiberg M. Development and construct validation of the Swedish Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment* 2011; 27: 220-227. doi:10.1027/1015-5759/a000076.



28. Liniauskaitė A, Kairys, A. The Lithuanian version of the Zimbardo time perspective inventory. *Psichologija* 2009; 40: 66-87.
29. Milfont TL, Andrade PR, Belo RP, Pessoa VS. Testing Zimbardo time perspective inventory in a Brazilian sample. *Interamerican Journal of Psychology* 2008; 42: 49-58.
30. Sircova, A, van de Vijver FJ, Osin E, Milfont TL, Fieulaine N, Kislali-Erginbilgic, A, ... and Leite UDR. A global look at time: A 24-country study of the equivalence of the Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory. *Sage Open* 2014; 4(1): 2158244013515686.
31. Košťál J, Klicperová-Baker M, Lukavská K, Lukavský J. Short version of the Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory (ZTPI-short) with and without the Future-Negative scale, verified on nationally representative samples. *Time & Society* 2016; 25(2): 169-192.
32. Şahin-Baltacı H, Tagay Ö, Worrell FC, Mello, ZR. Psychometric properties of Turkish Adolescent Time Inventory-Time Attitude (ATI-TA) scores. *International Perspectives in Psychology: Research, Practice, Consultation* 2017; 6(1): 47.
33. Eren A, Coşkun H. Time perspectives and boredom coping strategies of undergraduate students from Turkey. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice* 2015; 14: 53-75. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-014-9165-9>
34. Akirmak U. How is time perspective related to perceptions of self and of interpersonal relationships? *The Spanish Journal of Psychology* 2014; 17.
35. Robins RW, Fraley RC, Roberts BW, Trzesniewski KH. 2001 A longitudinal study of personality change in young adulthood. *Journal of Personality* 2001;69(4): 617-640.
36. Jöreskog, K. G., & Sörbom, D. (1993). *Lisrel 8: Structural equation modeling with the SIMPLIS command language*. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International.
37. Steiger, J. H. (1990). Structural model evaluation and modification: An interval estimation approach. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 25, 173-180.
38. MacCallum RC, Wegener DT, Uchino BN, Fabrigar LR. The problem of equivalent models in applications of covariance structure analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*; 1993; 114(1): 185.

- 39.Şimşek ÖF, Kocayörük E. Affective reactions to one's whole life: Preliminary development and validation of the ontological well-being scale. *Journal of Happiness Studies* 2013; 14(1): 309-343.
- 40.Benet-Martinez V, John OP. Los Cinco Grandes across cultures and ethnic groups: Multitrait-multimethod analyses of the Big Five in Spanish and English. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1998; 75(3): 729.
- 41.Sumer HC, Bilgic R, Sumer N, Erol T. Personality attributes as predictors of psychological well-being for NCOs. *The Journal of Psychology* 2005; 139(6): 529-544.
- 42.Diener E, Wirtz D, Tov, W, Kim-Priet, C, Choi DW, Oishi S, Biswas-Diener R. New well-being measures: Short scales to assess flourishing and positive and negative feelings. *Social Indicators Research* 2010; 97(2): 143-156.
- 43.Akın A, Fidan M. The validity and reliability of the Turkish version of the Flourishing Scale. In 3rd International Conference on New Trends in Education and their Implications (ICONTE-2012) 2012; April (pp. 26-28).
- 44.Boniwell I, Osin E, Alex LP, Ivanchenko GV. A question of balance: Time perspective and well-being in British and Russian samples. *Journal of Positive Psychology* 2010; 5(1): 24–40.
- 45.Dunkel CS, Weber JL. Using three levels of personality to predict time perspective. *Current Psychology* 2010; 29: 95–103.
- 46.Zhang JW, Howell RT. Do time perspectives predict unique variance in life satisfaction beyond personality traits? *Personality and Individual Differences* 2011; 50: 1261–1266.
- 47.Zhang JW, Howell RT, Stolarski M. Comparing three methods to measure a balanced time perspective: The relationship between a balanced time perspective and subjective well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies: An Interdisciplinary Forum on Subjective Well-Being* 2013; 14(1): 169-184.

Table 1

*Means, standard deviations and factor loadings for the items of the ZTPI-short*

Items	X	SD	PN	PP	PF	PH	FU
1	3.95	0.93	<b>0.73</b>				
2	2.94	1.14	<b>0.79</b>				
3	3.44	1.02	<b>0.73</b>				
4	4.12	0.99		<b>0.73</b>		0.40	
5	3.35	1.08		<b>0.71</b>			
6	4.14	0.85		<b>0.78</b>			
7	1.86	0.88			<b>0.81</b>		
8	1.61	0.85			<b>0.81</b>		
9	2.23	0.98			<b>0.61</b>		
10	4.06	0.72				<b>0.74</b>	
11	3.20	0.92	0.33			<b>0.85</b>	
12	3.02	0.94				<b>0.71</b>	
13	4.04	0.96			0.31		<b>0.81</b>
14	3.45	1.04	0.40				<b>0.85</b>
15	3.59	0.98		0.42			<b>0.83</b>

$n = 345$ ; principal axis factor analysis with Direct-Oblimin method was used in the analyses; the ZTPI item ratings range from 1 to 5. Likert scale anchors ranged from 1 = not at all true to 5 = extremely true. Factor loadings less than 0.30 are not represented; PN = Past-Negative, PP = Past-Positive, PF = Present-Fatalistic, PH = Present Hedonistic, FU = Future.

Table 2

*The Results of the Confirmatory Factor Analyses on the ZTPI-Short*

Indices	First-Order Five-Factor Model	Higher-Order One-Factor Model	First-Order One-Factor Model
$\chi^2$	134.54	153.76	462.87
df	80	85	90
GFI	0.93	0.92	0.79
CFI	0.93	0.91	0.54
SRMR	0.061	0.080	0.11
RMSEA	0.054	0.059	0.13
	(90% CI = 0.038-0.070)	(90% CI = 0.044-0.073)	(90% CI = 0.12-0.14)
AIC	215.54	223.76	522.87
ECVI	0.92	0.95	2.22

Notes.  $N = 236$ ; GFI = goodness-of-fit index; AGFI = adjusted goodness-of-fit index; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation; CFI = comparative fit index; CI = Confidence interval.

Table 3.

*Intercorrelations among the Factors of ZTPI-Short*

Factors	1	2	3	4
<b>1 Past Negative</b>	-			
<b>2 Past Positive</b>	-	-		
<b>3 Present Fatalistic</b>	0.33**	-0.19	-	

<b>4 Present Hedonistic</b>	-0.03	0.26	-0.09	-
<b>5 Future</b>	0.48**	-	0.76**	-0.11

Notes.  $N = 236$ ;

\*\* $p < .01$

\* $p < .05$

Table 4

*Intercorrelations among, ZTPI, OWBS, and the Big-Five personality dimensions*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
<b>1 PN</b>	-														
<b>2 PP</b>	0.13*	-													
<b>3 PF</b>	0.27**	0.24**	-												
<b>4 PH</b>	0.02	0.04	0.03	-											
<b>5 F</b>	0.15**	0.25**	0.17*	0.08	-										
<b>6 Extra</b>	0.22**	0.13*	0.16**	0.28**	0.16**	-									
<b>7 Agree</b>	0.08	0.14**	0.10*	0.01	0.21**	0.19**	-								
<b>8 Cons</b>	0.15**	0.22**	0.22**	0.12*	0.66**	0.16**	0.31**	-							
<b>9 Neuro</b>	0.37**	0.19**	0.21**	0.09	0.16*	0.25**	0.30**	0.20**	-						
<b>10 Open</b>	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.12*	0.13*	0.37**	0.03	0.12*	0.01	-					
<b>11 Reg</b>	0.53**	0.38**	0.32**	0.02	0.29**	0.30**	0.18**	0.35**	0.43*	0.06	-				
<b>12 Not</b>	0.32**	0.27**	0.29**	0.04	0.33**	0.24**	0.25**	0.39**	0.42*	0.05	0.53**	-			
<b>13 Hop</b>	0.29**	0.24**	0.30**	0.16**	0.45**	0.33**	0.23**	0.41**	0.26*	0.23**	0.48**	0.38**	-		

<b>14</b>	-	0.30	-	0.20	0.29	0.42	0.22	0.32	-	0.20	-	-	0.58	-
<b>Act</b>	0.31	**	0.29	**	**	**	**	**	0.35*	**	0.45	0.57	**	**
<b>15</b>	-	0.40	-	0.13	0.39	0.42	0.40	0.44	-	0.17	-	-	0.59	0.62
<b>Flour</b>	0.37	**	0.34	**	**	**	**	**	0.47*	**	0.54	0.51	**	**

N = 267, \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; PN= Past-Negative, PP= Past-Positive, PF= Present-Fatalistic, PH =Present Hedonistic, F= Future, Extra = Extraversion, Agree = Agreeableness, Neuro = Neuroticism, Open = Openness, Reg = Regret, Not = Nothingness, Hop = Hope, Act = Activation and Flour = Flourishing.

#### Appendix 1. Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory

Her maddeyi okuyunuz ve “bu benim için ne kadar doğru?” sorusunu yanıtlayınız.

Ölçek üzerinde uygun kutucuğu işaretleyiniz. Lütfen hiçbir maddeyi atlamayarak maddelerin tümünü işaretleyiniz.

(1) Benim için hiç doğru değil (2) Benim için doğru değil (3) Kararsızım (4) Benim için Doğru (5) Benim için çok doğru

1. Yaşamda neleri farklı yapmalıydım diye sık sık düşünürüm.
2. Yaşamımda hep kaçırdığım güzel şeyleri düşünürüm.
3. Geçmişte başıma gelen kötü şeyler hakkında düşünürüm.
4. Tanıdık çocukluk manzaraları, sesleri ve kokuları bir sürü harika anıyı geri getirir.
5. Geçmişim hakkında düşünmek beni mutlu eder.
6. Geçirdiğim iyi zamanların mutlu anıları hemen aklıma gelir.
7. Her şey olacağına varacağı için benim ne yaptığım pek de önemli değildir.
8. Nasıl olsa elimden bir şey gelmeyeceği için, gelecek hakkında kaygılanmanın bir anlamı yok.
9. Yaşamım, benim dışındaki şeyler tarafından kontrol ediliyor
10. Yaşamıma heyecan katmak çok önemlidir.
11. Yaşamıma heyecan katmak için risk alırım.
12. Anı yaşamının heyecanı ile sürüklenir giderim.
13. Bir şeyi başarmak istediğim zaman, hedefler koyar ve o hedeflere ulaşmanın yollarını belirlerim.
14. İstikrarlı şekilde ilerleyerek, işleri zamanında bitiririm.
15. Yapılması gereken işler varsa, beni yolumdan ayıracak şeylere karşı koyabilirim.