

УНИВЕРЗИТЕТ „СВ. КИРИЛ И МЕТОДИЈ“ – СКОПЈЕ  
ФИЛОЗОФСКИ ФАКУЛТЕТ

**ЗБОРНИК НА ТЕКСТОВИ ОД**  
**МЕЃУНАРОДНАТА КОНФЕРЕНЦИЈА**  
**ЗА ТЕОРИЈА И ПРАКТИКА ВО**  
**ПСИХОЛОГИЈАТА**

Скопје, 2016

**Назив на изданието:**

Меѓународна конференција за теорија и практика во психологијата  
30 октомври-1 ноември 2014, Филозофски факултет – Скопје

International conference on theory and practice in psychology  
30 October – 1 November 2014, Faculty of Philosophy –Skopje

**Број и годиште на изданието:**

број 1, година 1, декември 2015

**Главен и одговорен уредник:**

проф. д-р Виолета Арнаудова  
*претседателка на Организациониот  
одбор на конференцијата*

проф. д-р Елисавета Сарцоска  
*претседателка на Програмскиот  
одбор на конференцијата*

**УРЕДУВАЧКИ ОДБОР**

- проф. д-р Виолета Петроска Бешка, Институт за психологија, Филозофски факултет, Скопје
- проф. д-р Благоја Јанаков, Институт за психологија, Филозофски факултет, Скопје
- проф. д-р Михајло Поповски, Институт за психологија, Филозофски факултет, Скопје
- проф. д-р Елена Ачковска Лешковска, Институт за психологија, Филозофски факултет, Скопје
- проф. д-р Николина Кениг, Институт за психологија, Филозофски факултет, Скопје
- проф. д-р Чигдем Кагитчибаши, *Коч универзитет, Истанбул, Турција*
- проф. д-р Иван Фербежер, *Институт за развој на надареноста, Птуј, Словенија*
- проф. д-р Вивијана Лангер, *Универзитет Ла Сапиенца, Рим, Италија*
- проф. д-р Вилибалд Рух, *Универзитет во Цирих, Швајцарија*
- проф. д-р Мери Тадинац, *Универзитет во Загреб, Хрватска*
- проф. д-р Зорица Марковиќ, *Универзитет во Ниш, Србија*
- проф. д-р Пјотр Сороковски, *Универзитет во Вроцлав, Полска*
- проф. д-р Станислава Стојанова, *Универзитет Неофит Рилски, Благоевград, Бугарија*
- доц. д-р Панајотис Цакирпалоглу, *Палацки универзитет, Оломоуц, Чешка*
- доц. д-р Еуген Аврам, *Универзитет во Букурешт, Романија*
- доц. д-р Петар Чоловиќ, *Универзитет во Нови Сад, Србија*
- доц. д-р Ана Фрицханд, Институт за психологија, Филозофски факултет, Скопје
- доц. д-р Билјана Блажевска Стоилковска, Институт за психологија, Филозофски факултет, Скопје

- доц. д-р Орхидеја Шурбановска, Институт за психологија, Филозофски факултет, Скопје
- доц. д-р Огнен Спасовски, Институт за психологија, Филозофски факултет, Скопје
- доц. д-р Катерина Наумова, Институт за психологија, Филозофски факултет, Скопје
- асс. м-р Филип Сулејманов, Институт за психологија, Филозофски факултет, Скопје
- Даниела Неделкова, Филозофски факултет, Скопје
- Никола Демерциев, студент, Институт за психологија, Филозофски факултет, Скопје

**Секретар:**

м-р Филип Сулејманов

**Компјутерска подготовка:** МАР – САЖ, Скопје

**Печати:** МАР – САЖ, Скопје

**Тираж:** 150

CIP - Каталогизација во публикација  
 Национална и универзитетска библиотека "Св. Климент Охридски", Скопје  
 159.9(062)

МЕЃУНАРОДНА конференција за теорија и практика во психологијата (2014 ; Скопје)

Зборник на текстови од Меѓународната конференција за теорија и практика во психологијата / [Меѓународна конференција за теорија и практика во психологијата, 30 октомври-1 ноември 2014, Филозофски факултет-Скопје ; главен и одговорен уредник Виолета Арнаудова] / [International conference on theory and practice in psychology, 30 October- 1 November 2014, Faculty of Philosophy-Skopje ; editors in chief Violeta Arnaudova]. - Скопје : Филозофски факултет, 2016. - 796 стр. : табели, граф. прикази ; 23 см

Трудови на мак. и англ. јазик. - Библиографија кон трудовите

ISBN 978-608-238-109-1

I. International conference on theory and practice in psychology (2014 ; Скопје) види Меѓународна конференција за теорија и практика во психологијата (2014 ; Скопје)

а) Психологија - Собири

COBISS.MK-ID 101488138

**REVERSAL THEORY MEETS TIME PERSPECTIVES:  
EXAMINING THE RELATION BETWEEN PARATELIC  
DOMINANCE SCALE AND ZIMBARDO'S TIME PERSPECTIVES  
INVENTORY**

**Filip Sulejmanov<sup>1</sup>**

*Ss. "Cyril and Methodius" University, Skopje*

**Marija Shterjovska**

*MIT University, Skopje*

---

<sup>1</sup> Email: [fillip.sulejmanov@gmail.com](mailto:fillip.sulejmanov@gmail.com)

**REVERSAL THEORY MEETS TIME PERSPECTIVES:  
EXAMINING THE RELATION BETWEEN PARATELIC  
DOMINANCE SCALE AND ZIMBARDO'S TIME PERSPECTIVES  
INVENTORY**

**Abstract**

The aim of this article is to examine whether reversal theory measures are in relation with Zimbardo's Time Perspective factors. The Paratelic Dominance Scale (PDS) consist of three subscales (playfulness, spontaneity, arousal seeking) and a total score, while two subscales of ZTPI (Present Hedonistic – PH and Future - F) were used in this study. These measures were administered via Internet to a sample of 130 participants. Correlation method and linear regression analysis were applied as statistical procedures. The results showed theoretically consistent relations between the two constructs. All three subscales of PDS and the total score were in significant positive correlation with PH and in significant negative correlation with F. Further, arousal seeking was a significant predictor of PH and playfulness emerged as significant predictor of F. These findings support the construct validity of the reversal theory measures. The shortcomings of the study and recommendations for further research are discussed.

**Keywords:** *paratelic dominance, time perspective factors, present hedonistic, future*

## **Introduction**

Reversal theory is an integrative psychological theory of motivation, emotion and personality (Apter, 2013). It is concerned with explaining the structure of our experience, or the subjective meaning we assign to our actions and the various ways of experiencing the world and acting in it. The main postulates of the theory are that there are four pairs of opposite *metamotivational* states. Different ways of organizing or interpreting motivation is meant by the term metamotivation (Apter, 2007). The structure of our mental life is organized around the activation and switches or reversals between the following metamotivational states (Apter, 2003):

*Telic and paratelic* – The telic or serious state is focused on important goals, and planning ahead versus the paratelic (playful) state, focused on immediate enjoyment and acting spontaneously.

*Conformist and negativistic* – The conformist or conforming state is focused on obligations and maintenance of rules and routines versus the negativistic (challenging) state where the individual is focused on personal freedom.

*Mastery and sympathy* – In the mastery state, the focus is on power, control and dominance. The sympathy state primary concern is kindness, caring and harmony.

*Autic and alloic* – In the autic (self-oriented) state, the individual's primary consideration is one's own needs or well-being versus the alloic (other-orientated) state, where the focus is the needs of others.

Only one state from an opposite pair can be active in a given period of time. Reversal theory suggests that combinations of these states are likely, and different emotions are associated with different combinations of states. In that sense, we have to consider are mastery and sympathy states experienced in the autic or alloic state combination (Apter et al, 1998, according to Lafreniere and Cramer, 2006).

Another important reversal theory notion is that some individuals have an innate bias to spend relatively greater time in one

metamotivational state. This tendency is known as *dominance*. For example, a paratelic dominant individual is more in the paratelic state than in the opposite, telic state. However, it is expected that he would spend time in the telic state as well (Apter, 2007).

Research measuring dominance is primarily focused on the first metamotivational pair of states. The telic/paratelic dominance was related with numerous variables, like stress (Martin et al., 1987), delinquency (Bowers, 1988), psychopathy (Thomas-Peter, 1988), sexual risk taking (Skakoon-Sparling and Cramer, 2014), NEO personality dimensions and consideration of future consequences (Lafreniere and Cramer, 2006).

Instruments that measure telic/paratelic dominance are the Telic Dominance Scale (TDS; Murgatroyd et al., 1978) and Paratelic Dominance Scale (PDS; Cook and Gerkovich, 1993). The latter scale has better psychometric properties and evidence for validity in a number of contexts (Apter and Desseles, 2001, according to Lafreniere and Cramer, 2006). A more general instrument, which measures each of the metamotivational states proposed by reversal theory, is the Motivational Style Profile (MSP; Apter et al., 1998). This instrument allows measuring dominance, but also *salience* scores (the degree of importance the individual assigns to a particular pair of metamotivational states).

### *Zimbardo's Time Perspective Factors*

Generally, time perspective is defined as cognitive operation that implies both an emotional reaction to imagined time zones and a preference for locating action in past, present or future (Boniwell, 2009). It could become relatively stable personality trait when a particular temporal bias comes to predominate one's outlook and behavior. The time perspective construct, developed by Zimbardo & Boyd (1999), consist of five factors, which promotes different attitudes toward temporal frames: positive and negative toward past, hedonistic and fatalistic toward present and general orientation toward future.

The first factor of interest for this study, *Present-Hedonistic* (PH) is characterized by living in the moment, pleasure seeking, enjoying high intensity activities, seeking thrills and new sensations as well as openness to adventures. The other factor of interest, *Future* (F) refers to planning for the future followed by delaying gratification, avoiding time-wasting temptations and working for future goals and rewards, often at the expense of present enjoyment.

#### *Aim of the present study*

The present study examines how the PDS total score and its components, playfulness, spontaneity and arousal seeking are related with present hedonistic (PH), and future (F) time perspective factors. The time perspective factors are a theoretically relevant personality construct that hasn't been related to PDS. We hypothesized that the total score of the PDS and the three components will be positively related to PH, and negatively related to F. Further, we explore the predictive ability of the PDS subscales, while PH and F were criterion variables. In that sense, we will evaluate the construct validity of the PDS. There is still a need to examine reversal theory measures with other theoretically relevant variables, besides that the PDS was widely employed for some time (Lafreniere and Cramer, 2006). We focused on PH and F, since that these time perspective factors should be closely conceptually related with PDS. PH should be convergent with the subscales of PDS, and F should be discriminant. Additionally, time perspectives construct is an established personality measure and it's relation to PDS was not examined in previous studies.

### **Method**

#### *Participants and procedure*

The sample consisted of 130 subjects (39.2% male) aged between 16 and 45 years (median age of 26.00, SD = 6.00). The participants filled



in the questionnaires via internet. Snowball method was used to gather the data. We sent an email to students from Ss. "Cyril and Methodius" university from different departments (psychology, special education and rehabilitation, philosophy) who were interested to participate in the study a link containing the materials. They were asked to pass on the link to their friends and acquaintances. The link was also shared with friends of the authors. Gosling et al. (2004) showed that Internet-based studies are usually equally reliable and valid as paper-pencil based methods (more traditional strategies) and that samples collected via the Internet are usually more diverse than other samples (according to Ruch and Proyer, 2009).

### *Measures*

The *Paratelic Dominance Scale* (Cook and Gerkovich, 1993) consists of 30 items that measure telic/paratelic dominance using a true – false response format. Three subscales scores can be derived for playfulness/seriousness, spontaneity/planning ahead, and arousal-seeking/arousal-avoidance, as well as a total score. Each subscale consists of 10 items. A sample item for playfulness is *I usually make decisions based on the way I feel at the time*. Sixteen items need to be reverse coded in order to reflect the paratelic response. Higher scores indicate higher levels of paratelic dominance (in other words, lower scores indicate telic dominance). The validity and strong psychometric properties of the scale have been reported in previous studies (Apter and Desseles, 2001; Lafreniere and Cramer, 2006).

The *Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory* (Zimbardo and Boyd, 1999) consists of 56 items divided in 5 subscales measuring two factors of the past (Past Positive and Past Negative), two of the present (Present Hedonistic and Present Fatalistic) and one of the future. Two of these scales, Present Hedonistic and Future are used in this study and they consist of 15 and 13 items, respectively. A sample item for Present Hedonistic is *Taking risks keeps my life from becoming boring*, while the

one for Future is *I am able to resist temptations when I know that there is work to be done*. For both scales higher scores indicate higher level of the certain factor while lower scores indicate lower level of the certain factor. Psychometric properties of these scales have been examined in other studies and they are satisfactory (Zimbardo and Boyd, 1999, Drake, 2008).

## **Results**

### *Preliminary analysis*

There were relations with age for most of the variables that entered the study. Significant negative correlation was found with PDS total score ( $r = -.26, p < .01$ ), playfulness ( $r = -.30, p < .01$ ) and arousal-seeking ( $r = -.27, p < .01$ ). Also, participant's age was in significant negative correlation with PH ( $r = -.21, p < .05$ ). Sex did not correlate with any of the measures used. Therefore, it was decided to control for age in the subsequently conducted analysis.

### *Descriptive statistics and internal consistency of measures*

Descriptive statistics (Means, standard deviation, minimum and maximum) as well as reliability estimates (Cronbach's alpha) were computed for the PDS, PH and F. The results are given in Table 1.

**Table 1. Descriptive statistics for the PDS, PH and F**

	M	SD	Min.	Max.	Alpha
<i>Paratelic Dominance Scale</i>					
Playfulness	4.50	2.59	0	10	.72
Spontaneity	3.11	2.87	0	10	.84
Arousal Seeking	4.00	2.55	0	10	.73
PDS total	11.61	6.34	1	25	.86
<i>Zimbardo's Time Perspectives Inventory</i>					
Present Hedonistic	51.22	8.31	34	69	.78
Future	47.18	6.14	32	59	.67

Note:  $N = 130$

Table 1 shows that Cronbach's alpha was sufficiently high for each of the measures used. Additionally, none of the measures deviate from the normal distribution.

*Examination of the factor structure*

A principal component analysis (with Varimax rotation) was computed for the total of 30 items of the PDS (see Table 2). The KMO measure of sampling adequacy exceeds .7 (it was .782) and Bartlett's test of sphericity is significant. Examination of the scree plot indicated that a 3-component solution was appropriate. An oblimin rotation indicated that none of the components were correlated with each other greater than +/- .30, and so use of a varimax rotation of components is justified (Diekhnoff, 1992). Only items with high loadings on the main factor ( $\geq .40$ ), and loadings  $\leq .30$  on the other factors are given in Table 2. We didn't examine the factor structure of PH and F, since we only used these two subscales of the ZTPI.

**Table 2. Varimax rotated component matrix for the PDS**

Item	Item no. in the scale	Components		
		1	2	3
P2	2		.28	<b>.64</b>
P3	5	.21		<b>.73</b>
P6	15		.28	<b>.57</b>
P9	21	.13		<b>.58</b>
P10	26	.27		<b>.69</b>
S1	3	<b>.55</b>		.19
S2	4	<b>.73</b>		.14
S3	7	<b>.58</b>	.23	
S4	12	<b>.52</b>		.13
S7	22	<b>.71</b>	.14	.18
S9	27	<b>.65</b>		
S10	30	<b>.76</b>	.20	.16
AS1	6		<b>.54</b>	
AS2	8	.19	<b>.54</b>	
AS3	11		<b>.49</b>	-.22
AS4	13	.13	<b>.40</b>	.13
AS5	14		<b>.62</b>	.11
AS6	17	.23	<b>.68</b>	
AS7	23	.26	<b>.41</b>	.27
AS8	24		<b>.53</b>	.27
AS9	28	-.15	<b>.57</b>	
Eigenvalues		6.61	2.65	2.00
% of variance explained		14.69	13.53	9.30
Sum of variance explained =				
37.52%				

Note:  $N = 130$ ; P = Playfulness; S = Spontaneity; AS = Arousal-seeking  
 Absolute values less than .10 were suppressed.

*Intercorrelation*

Partial correlations (controlling for age) between the PDS (total score and its subscales), PH and F were computed. The results are summarized in Table 3.

**Table 3. Partial correlations (controlling for age) between PDS (total score and subscales), PH and F.**

	PH	F	PDS	P	S	AS
Present Hedonistic	1.00	-.18*	.47**	.34**	.24**	.55**
Future		1.00	-.44**	-.45**	-.35**	-.25**
PDS total			1.00	.82**	.81**	.73**
Playfulness				1.00	.52**	.44**
Spontaneity					1.00	.33**
Arousal-seeking						1.00

Note:  $N = 130$ ; P = Playfulness; S = Spontaneity; AS = Arousal-seeking; PH = Present Hedonistic; F = Future

Key: \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

Results in Table 3 confirm the hypothesized relationship between the paratelic dominance, PH and F. The paratelic dominance total score and subscales correlated positively with PH, and negatively with F.

*Multiple regression analyses: Predicting Present Hedonistic and Future time perspectives factors*

For the final evaluation of the relation between PDS components, PH and F, two multiple regression analyses were done.

In the first analysis PH was set as criterion variable, age and the subscales of PDS (playfulness, spontaneity and arousal seeking) were predictors. The multiple correlation coefficient of  $R^2 = .34$ ,  $F(4.125) = 16.07$ ,  $p < .01$ . It was found that only arousal-seeking was a significant predictor for PH ( $\beta = .50$ ,  $p < .01$ ).

In the second analysis F was a criterion variable with the same predictor variables. The multiple correlation coefficient of  $R^2 = .24$ ,

$F(4.125) = 9.65, p < .01$ . Here, playfulness was a significant predictor for  $F$  ( $\beta = -.37, p < .01$ ).

Multicollinearity was not a concern in both models. All VIF values were less than 10, and all tolerance values were higher than 0.1.

## **Discussion**

The findings of the present investigation support the construct validity of the paratelic dominance scale. The results show the predicted relations between paratelic dominance and both present hedonistic and future time perspective factors. Looking at the components of the paratelic dominance scale, arousal-seeking was a significant predictor for present hedonistic, while playfulness emerged as significant predictor for future time perspective. Participant's age was not a significant predictor for the criterion variables used.

The relationship between the arousal-seeking component and the present hedonistic time perspective is theoretically consistent. One of the characteristics of the individuals who are present hedonistic is that they want to take risks and experience excitement, and this is also what the arousal-seeking component is about. High arousal in the paratelic state is experienced as excitement rather than anxiety. Stimulations that increase arousal can be physical or intellectual. The danger of both arousal-seeking dominance and present hedonistic time perspective is the use of unhealthy stimulations such as drugs, alcohol, gambling and inappropriate risk taking. Also, we should mention that age was negatively correlated with both arousal-seeking and present hedonistic time perspective. This is consistent with previous findings that telic dominance increases with age (Murgatroyd, 1985; Tacon and Abner, 1993; according to Apter, 2007).

Regarding the association between paratelic dominance and future time perspective, the playfulness/seriousness component was mostly related with the future factor. One might expect that spontaneity/planning

orientation component should be a stronger predictor for this time perspective factor. Spontaneity is about taking things as they come, while on the other end is the planning orientation or planning ahead how to fulfil set up goals. Lafreniere and Cramer (2006) report substantial negative correlation between spontaneity and consideration for future consequences, a theoretically related variable to future time perspective. However, correlation coefficients between future time perspective and each of the components of paratelic dominance and the total score were similar (also, the components of paratelic dominance are intercorelated). The arousal seeking component was least related to future time perspective (see Table 3). Playfulness is discriminant to the future factor in a way that being at the present moment is opposite to serious-mindedness and thinking about important future goals. Individuals who score high on this component enjoy activities for their own sake without having any particular purpose to achieve.

The results from the PCA for the paratelic dominance scale should be carefully interpreted. This is a first analysis of the factor structure of the Macedonian version of the scale. The sample size in this study is small for an adequate examination of the factor structure. Nonetheless, the rotated solution showed a theoretically meaningful factor pattern. However, only half of the items from the playfulness subscale had high loadings on one factor, and low second loadings. The spontaneity subscale had seven "clean" items, and the arousal-seeking component had nine. Further studies should be done for an adequate examination of the scale.

It should be noted that reversal theory concept of dominance is fundamentally different from the personality trait construct, and even from state theories (see Apter, 2003a; Apter, 2013). The essence of reversal theory is that people are inherently inconsistent. Apter (2013) summarize that the advantage for researches is that dominance can be treated as a conventional trait, but standard psychometric tests miss the spirit of reversal theory, that is change. However, this does not mean that studies on dominance are not useful. There is a need for further research that

should examine reversal theory measures (including PDS) with other established personality constructs (Lafreniere and Cramer, 2006). An interesting study would be to include all of the subscales of ZTPI in relation to reversal theory measures. The telic/paratelic metamotivational pair accounts for a temporal orientation to present and future, but not for past. ZTPI makes a distinction between past negative and past positive time perspective.



### **Bibliography**

- Apter, M.J., Mallows, R. and Williams, S. (1998). The Development of the Motivational Style Profile. *Personality and Individual Differences*. 24:1, 7-18.
- Apter, M. J., & Desselles, M. (2001). Reversal theory measures. In M. J. Apter (Ed.), *Motivational styles in everyday life: A guide to reversal theory* (pp. 55–76). Washington, DC: APA Books.
- Apter, M. J. (2003). *Reversal theory society*. Retrived from <http://reversaltheory.net/org/about-the-theory/glossary/>
- Apter, M. J. (2003a). A certain kind of blindness in modern psychology. *The psychologist*. Vol.16. 9:474-475.
- Apter, M. J. (2007) *Reversal theory: The dynamics of Motivation, Emotion and Personality*. Oxford: Oneworld Publications.
- Apter, M. J. (2013). Developing reversal theory: Some suggestions for future research. *Journal of Motivation, Emotion and Personality*, 1(1), 1-8.
- Boniwell, I. (2009). Perspectives on time. In S. J. Lopez & C. R. Snyder (Eds.). *Oxford Handbook of Positive Psychology, 2nd ed.* (pp. 295-302). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bowers, A.J. (1988). Telic dominance and delinquency in adolescent boys. In M.J. Apter, J. Kerr & M. Cowles (Eds.), *Progress in reversal theory*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Press (Elsevier).
- Cook, M. R., & Gerkovich, M. M. (1993). The development of a Paratelic Dominance Scale. In J. H. Kerr, S. Murgatroyd, & M. J. Apter (Eds.), *Advances in reversal theory* (pp. 177-188). Amsterdam: Sweets & Zeitlinger B.V.
- Diekhoff, G. (1992). *Statistics for the Social and Behavioral Sciences: Univariate, Bivariate, Multivariate*. Dubuque, IA: Brown.

- Drake, L., Duncan, E., Sutherland, F., Abernethy, C. & Henry, C., (2008). Time Perspective and Correlates of Wellbeing, *Time & Society* 17 (1), 47-61.
- Lafreniere, K. D. & Cramer, K. M. (2006). Examining reversal theory measures in relation to NEO personality dimensions and consideration for future consequences. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 40, 1387-1397.
- Martin, R. A., Kupier, N. A., Olinger, L. J. (1988). Telic versus paratelic dominance as a moderator of stress. In Apter, M. J, Kerr, J. H., Cowles, M. (Eds.) *Progress in Reversal Theory*. Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Murgatroyd, S., Rushton, C., Apter, M.J., Ray, C. (1978). The development of the Telic Dominance Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 42(5), 519-528.
- Ruch, W., & Proyer, R. T. (2009). Extending the study of gelotophobia: On gelotophiles and katagelasticians. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 22, 183-212.
- Skakoon-Sparling, S. & Cramer, K. (2013). Paratelic/telic state, sexual arousal, and sexual-risk taking in university students. *Journal of Motivation, Emotion, and Personality*, 2, 32-37.
- Thomas-Peter, B.A. (1988). Psychopathy and telic dominance. In M.J. Apter, J. Kerr & M. Cowles (Eds.), *Progress in reversal theory*. Amsterdam: Nort-Holland Press (Elsevier).
- Zimbardo, P. & Boyd, J. (1999). Putting time in perspective: A Valid, Reliable Individual-difference Metric, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 77, 1271-1288.

Филип Сулејманов, Марија Штерјовска

**РЕВЕРЗИБИЛНАТА ТЕОРИЈА СЕ СРЕЌАВА СО  
ВРЕМЕНСКИТЕ ПЕРСПЕКТИВИ: ИСТРАЖУВАЊЕ НА  
ОДНОСОТ ПОМЕЃУ СКАЛАТА ЗА PARATELIC  
ДОМИНАНТНОСТ И ЗИМБАРДОВИОТ ИНВЕНТАР ЗА  
ВРЕМЕНСКА ПЕРСПЕКТИВА**

**Кратка содржина**

Целта на овој труд е да испита дали мерките на реверзибилната теорија се поврзани со факторите на временска перспектива на Зимбардо. *Скалата за paratelic доминантност* е составена од три субскали (разиграност, спонтаност и барање побудување) и вкупен скор, додека две од субскалите на *Зимбардовиот инвентар за временска перспектива* (хедонистичка сегашност – ХС и иднина – И) беа користени во ова истражување. Овие мерки беа заедени преку интернет на примерок од 130 испитаници. Корелацискиот метод и линеарна регресивна анализа беа користените статистички процедури. Резултатите покажаа теоретски конзистентни релации помеѓу двата конструкти. Сите три субскали на скалата за *paratelic* доминантност и вкупниот скор, значајно позитивно корелираа со ХС и значајно негативно корелираа со И. Понатаму, барањето побудување претставуваше значаен предиктор за ХС, додека разиграноста се покажа како значаен предиктор за И. Овие наоди ја потврдуваат конструкт валидноста на мерките на реверзибилната теорија. Дискутирани се недостатоците на овој труд и препораките за понатамошни истражувања.

**Клучни зборови:** *paratelic доминантност, фактори на временска перспектива, хедонистичка сегашност, иднина*

