Dark Future at Work:

Scale Adaptation and Validation

By

Ian Goulding

A Thesis Submitted to
Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Science in Applied Psychology.

August, 2024, Halifax, Nova Scotia

Approved: E. Kevin Kelloway, PhD
Supervisor

Approved: Eden-Raye Lukacik, PhD
Committee Member

Approved: Nicolas Roulin, PhD
Committee Member

Approved: Duygu Gulseren, PhD
External Examiner

Date: August 22, 2024

The Dark Future at Work
Scale Adaptation and Validation

By: Ian Goulding

Abstract

Research on Time Perspectives dates back over 70 years, playing an integral role in clinical psychology, encapsulating how the individual views and evaluates their life. Future Time Perspectives are a critical part of clinical psychology as how the individual evaluates their future can substantially affect individual mental health. Despite this, application of this topic to the workplace has been extremely limited with Occupational Future Time Perspectives (OFTP's) specifically being a sparsely studied topic. In an attempt to bridge this gap, I created an adapted version of The Dark Future scale (Zaleski et al., 2019), attempting to measure highly negative OFTP's through the "Dark Future at Work". Results show a 2-factor structure, comprising Future Job Anxiety, and Fear of Failure at work. Initial outcomes of the Dark Future at Work scale show positive relationships with measures of depression, State/Trait Hopelessness, Burnout, Turnover Intentions, and Work Neglect/Partial Absenteeism. Contrary to predictions, perceived organizational support did not moderate these associations. Finally, theoretical applications of the scale, as well as limitations and future research directions are discussed.

Date: August 22nd, 2024

Table of Contents

Introduction

The teacher who leaps at the opportunity to take early retirement because the educational system is getting worse and worse, or the nurse who leaves healthcare claiming that they simply "can't take it anymore" are all to frequent examples of "The Dark Future". Zaleski et al. (2019) suggest that the Dark Future arises when individuals examine their situation in a specific environment (such as work) and evaluate their future prospects in a fearful, negative, or overwhelmingly "dark" manner. This negative evaluation of the future is a form of future anxiety which, drawing on Time Perspective research, the authors define as "attitudes toward the future in which negative cognitive and emotional processes outweigh positive ones and in which fear is stronger than hope. It is a fear of future events and a feeling that dangerous or adverse changes may occur in the future" (Zaleski et al., 2019, p. 108). An important notion in this definition, is that Future Anxiety refers to perspectives regarding the fear of possible negative changes in a future situation. Zaleski et al. (2019) argue Future Anxiety is a cognitive process rather than emotional and/or physiological, responding to the future as a general concept, rather than responding to specific and present negative stimuli.

Although the notions of future anxiety or the Dark Future, have relevance for the workplace, there have been few, if any, empirical applications of the construct in organizations. Zacher and Frese (2009) examined Time Perspectives in an organizational setting (Occupational Future Time Perspectives), providing a guiding framework to study the Dark Future in the workplace. The Dark Future at Work represents a strongly negative Occupational Future Time Perspective one directs toward their current job and career path. Therefore, the purpose of my research is to:

[a] introduce the concept of the Dark Future at Work

And [b] to adapt the Dark Future scale (Zaleski et al., 2019) for an occupational setting and [c] evaluate the psychometric properties of a scale measuring the Dark Future at Work.

Theoretical Foundations

The notions of Future Anxiety and The Dark Future are grounded in the literature on Future Time Perspectives. The history of Time Perspectives can be dated back to Lewin's (1951) definition arguing that Time Perspectives involve "the totality of the individual's views of his psychological future and psychological past existing at a given time" (Lewin, 1951, p. 75). Zimbardo and Boyd (1999) expanded upon this by arguing Time Perspectives are a cognitive process that involves reconstructing past learned experiences. Additionally, Zimbardo and Boyd (1999) state that Time Perspectives are relatively stable in terms of how we view our past/present/future, and are reliant on individual differences as they are determined by multiple learned factors such as culture, religion, education, social status, and family modelling.

As a result of these individual differences, our Time Perspectives tend to be unique from person to person. Zimbardo et al. (2012) note that, as nobody is born with an idea of how to plan for the future, our Future Time Perspectives are built from these same unique differences. Future Time Perspectives are a construct introduced within Socioemotional Selectivity Theory, and it summarizes our perception of the time remaining in our lives (Cleveland et al., 2019). Carstensen et al. (1999) defines Future Time Perspectives in their most basic form as the individuals perception of the remaining time in their life, with our individually varying perspectives forming from the previously discussed unique individual differences we each hold as humans. As a result, Zimbardo et al. (2012) argue that Future Time Perspectives in their core may involve the cognitive process of reconstructing past learned experiences of situations so that

when combined with genetic dispositions (pessimism, optimism, openness etc.) we can create a biased prediction of how we expect similar future events to play out. Contrarily, General Anxiety can be defined as unspecified/unpleasant feelings of danger, these feelings are commonly linked with physiological changes in the person experiencing the anxiety (Eysenck, 2000). Comparing these two constructs, we see a more conscious and cognitive process involved in creating a Future Time Perspective through the individuals reconstruction. As a result individuals evaluate their future in specific situations differently based on a combination of genetic (e.g., genetic tendency to be more optimistic) and socially learned factors (ex: cultural teachings or mirroring family attitudes), and the reinforcement of past experiences.

With regard to the original definition of Future Time Perspectives, we know that those who have a positive Future Time Perspective (e.g., perceive their remaining time as full of opportunities and non-restrictive, generally optimistic) more commonly focus their energy on acquiring knowledge, personal growth, and developing social circles (Hai & Park, 2023). On the opposite side, individuals with a negative Future Time Perspective (e.g. perceive limited opportunities and holding generally restricted/pessimistic views) tend to prioritize things important to them individually such as finding someone to care for them (Hai & Park, 2023). Of these differences, it is important to note that whether the result is positive, negative, or somewhere in the middle, each individual is engaging in the same cognitive process of evaluating their time remaining in life.

Based on these findings, the original Dark Future scale validation article (Zaleski, 1996) as well as the shortened version (Zaleski et al., 2019) both hypothesized and provided evidence for the best fit deriving from a 1 factor solution. In addition, past work on time perspective measurement tools provides consistent evidence of a 1-factor structure, that factor being the

evaluation we make toward our future (Carstensen and Lang, 1996). While there are time perspective measures which found multiple factors such as the Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory (Zimbardo & Boyd, 1999), factor differences arise due to the authors manipulating the direction toward which participants are making their evaulations (i.e., past, present, or future specific evaluations). However, in these situations, the evaluations made toward a specific point in time mirror a 1-factor solution. Taking this information, combined with the present scale being an organizational adaptation of the original items from Zaleski et al. (2019), I hypothesize that:

H1: The Dark Future at Work Scale will demonstrate a 1-factor structure.

Furthermore, by drawing on the work by Zimbardo and Boyd (1999) regarding the stability of Future Time Perspectives, there is some evidence that the evaluations individuals make are rather consistent across different situations. For example, past research shows that individuals Future Time Perspectives can predict trust in government (Zhi et al., 2023), mental health outcomes and outlook on global pandemics such as the recent COVID-19 pandemic (Hytman et al., 2023), future opportunities at work (Zacher & Frese, 2009) and even partially mediating the relationship between interests and achievement in school age teenagers (Mohamed & Bendania, 2023).

One explanation for the relative stability of Future Time Perspectives across situations is the argument that personality and genetics play a role in how we view the world, and subsequently how we evaluate said world. Mohamed & Bendania (2023) found that individual open mindedness was predictive of how positive or negative of a Future Time Perspectives the individual held. While significant ($\beta = .23$; $p < .01$) these findings are considered a small effect size for Regression equations (Cohen, 1988). Additionally, Zaleski et al. (2019) provided evidence for stability over time as in their scale reduction study, the authors reported a one-

month test-retest reliability of $r = .68$ ($p < .001$). While there is some evidence showing stability across time and setting, these results do not answer the question of, what impact does our environment play on how we make these evaluations? This question is specifically important in the workplace where organizational factors such as strong leadership, perceptions of support, and job autonomy are known to impact how individuals view their jobs (Avey et al., 2011; Sparr & Sonnentag, 2008). As a result, it is important to consider context in organizational research studies such as this one.

By relying on the previously summarized research, we can infer evidence that Future Time Perspectives are generally consistent within the individual. While I believe there will be situational differences in a dynamic, ever-changing environment such as the workplace, evidence of Future Time Perspectives being predictive of attitudes both outside the workplace (Zhi et al., 2023), and within our working careers (Zacher & Frese, 2009). These findings allow for this study to use measures of Future Time Perspectives outside of work as a way to investigate these differences while establishing criterion-related validity for the Dark Future at Work scale. Therefore this study will maintain use of the Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory during the validity assessment as to mirror the work of the authors of the original Dark Future Scale (Zaleski, 1996), which in turn brings forth the following hypotheses:

H2a: The Dark Future at Work Scale will show evidence of convergent validity through positive correlations with the ZTPI past/negative and present/fatalistic subscales, and the future/negative component of the Future Time perspective scale.

H2b: The Dark Future at Work Scale will show evidence of discriminant validity through negative correlations with the ZTPI past/positive, present/hedonistic, future subscales, and the future/positive component of the Future Time Perspective Scale.

Occupational Future Time Perspectives

After identifying a gap in the literature, Zacher & Frese (2009) were some of the first to examine FTP's within an organizational setting where they later define Occupational Future Time Perspectives as the workers perception of both their time remaining and their future opportunities within their working careers. The authors found that, similar to general Future Time Perspectives, older employees tend to perceive less time remaining at work, and fewer opportunities for growth than their younger coworkers (Zacher & Frese, 2009). This makes sense however, as the authors argue, many working individuals aim to retire within a set range of a few years (for example, between the ages of 55 and 60). As these individuals approach the age span they hope to retire within, they also have a shift in perspectives toward their work now that there is a finish line in sight so to speak.

Beyond simply evaluating the time we have remaining in our jobs, Occupational Future Time Perspectives play a role in how we interpret job anxieties and their lasting effects on our day-to-day work. Lam et al. (2011) found that a strong positive Occupational Future Time Perspectives mediated the relationship between high job insecurity and increases in employee psychological distress. The authors found that when individuals hold a highly positive Occupational Future Time Perspectives, when they are faced with a stressor such as job insecurity, the stressor has less of a negative effect on the employees well-being. Comparatively, someone with a negative Occupational Future Time Perspectives may grow distraught in a similar situation (Lam et al., 2011). These findings are significant as they shine light on how Occupational Future Time Perspectives play a role in much more than evaluating our time remaining prior to retirement, but also are involved in how we evaluate work stressors, anxieties, and general changes in the work environment.

In their study shortening the Dark Future Scale, Zaleski et al. (2019) summarize some other early outcomes for individuals with high Future Anxiety such as pessimism toward future solutions, manipulative treatment of others, and a harder power strategy in subordinate/superior interaction. With Future Anxiety playing a role in our Future Time Perspectives, and the Dark Future being defined as a form of future oriented anxiety (Zaleski et al., 2019), when examining the Dark Future in an organizational setting, Job Anxiety is an important construct to be mindful of. As such, I will draw on the Job Anxiety and Occupational Future Time Perspective literature to formulate my remaining hypotheses for the Dark Future at Work Scale.

Negative Outcomes of Job Anxiety

Job anxiety is a long-studied construct with the organizational outcomes well known in the field of I/O Psychology (Asif et al., 2018). Job anxiety is related to decreased performance (Yin et al., 2022), strain (Richter et al., 2020), general anxiety and emotional exhaustion (Kinnunen et al., 2014), and job insecurity specifically can decrease perceptions of organizational fairness due to what employees feel is a breach of their psychological contract with their employer (Emberland & Rundmo, 2010). In addition, a significant outcome of job anxiety is depression. For example, Ganson et al. (2021) found evidence of increased Job Insecurity associated with increases in both Anxiety and Depression. Additionally, Andrea et al. (2009) found that high psychological task demand, and psychosocial work characteristics (e.g., lack of social support, high emotional demands etc.) were both related to increased depression symptoms. Regarding the Dark Future specifically, Bergman and Segel-Karpas (2018) found that a highly negative future time perspective (e.g., the Dark Future), was strongly related to depressive symptoms.

Perceptions of support within our workplaces seem to play an important role in minimizing job anxiety related turnover intentions as well. Raza et al. (2021) measured customer aggression and job anxiety among hotel employees, finding that organizational and co-worker support moderated the relationship between increases in job anxiety, and subsequent turnover intentions. Akgunduz and Eryilmaz (2018) found similar findings among restaurant workers, showing the presence of co-worker support can mediate turnover intentions when job-stressors and job anxiety is high. Much additional work has been completed in this area as well, as Leader-Member Exchange (Sparr & Sonnentag, 2008), high perceived locus of control (Näswall et al., 2005), high perceptions of job control (Elst et al., 2011) and high perceived organizational support (Mauno et al., 2005), were all found to impact the development of turnover intentions as a result of job insecurity and job anxiety. By drawing on the previously summarized work, as well as that from the shortened Dark Future Scale validation article by Zaleski et al. (2019), it is expected that higher scores on the Dark Future at Work scale will be strongly related to lower well-being among employees such that:

H3a: There will be a significant positive relationship between scores on the Dark Future at Work scale and Depression scores on the PHQ-9

H3b: Perceived Organizational Support will moderate the relationship between Dark future at Work scores and the PHQ-9

An important component of well-being (specifically depression) is that of hopelessness. While some research argues the two constructs are empirically distinct (Bussfeld et al., 2002), much work in this area acknowledges the crossover between the two constructs despite this empirical distinction (Beck et al., 1993). While Dunn et al. (2013) found hopelessness can be state or trait specific, this study focused on state related hopelessness as the current study was

focused on the presence of negative emotions and emotional states. As a result, in conjunction with the previously summarized work on well-being, I present the following hypotheses:

H4a: There will be a significant positive relationship between scores on the Dark Future at Work scale and scores on the State-Trait Hopelessness Scale

H4b: Perceived Organizational Support will moderate the relationship between Dark future at Work scores and scores on the State-Trait Hopelessness Scale

Unfortunately, not all organizations are lucky enough to have resources such as high organizational support or job control present, so what happens without them? An important finding in this area regarding occupational future time perspectives is from Richter et al. (2020) who found that the employees more commonly ruminating on their perceived job insecurity, more often scored higher on turnover intent, and even predicted actual turnover. Referring back to the work by Zaleski et al. (2019) who argue Future Anxiety is a cognitive process as we are aware of and consistently ruminating on these anxieties – we may be able to relate the two findings. If both authors are correct, it is fair to hypothesize that holding a more negative occupational future time perspectives may lead to higher levels of rumination on a potential negative future event, leading to increases in turnover intention and potentially actual turnover. As a result, this study will examine potential relationships between occupational future time perspectives and both turnover and retirement intentions at respondents current jobs, such that:

H5a: There will be a significant positive relationship between scores on the Dark Future at Work scale and Turnover/Retirement intentions.

H5b: Perceived Organizational Support will moderate the relationship between Dark future at Work scores and Turnover/Retirement intentions.

In addition to variables like depression and anxiety, a significant area of work surrounding job anxiety and overall negative work environments is burnout. As high burnout is known to illicit negative organizational and individual outcomes such as lower employee well-being (Koutsimani et al., 2019) and increased turnover intentions (Swider & Zimmerman, 2010), it is an important construct to examine when investigating the same outcomes as a result of highly negative occupational future time perspectives. In addition to these known outcomes, previous work by Lee & Ashforth (1996) tells us co-workers and supervisors play a large role in whether negative stimuli results in employees self-report burnout scores. As a result, I present the following hypotheses:

H6a: There will be a significant positive relationship between scores on the Dark Future at Work scale and Burnout.

H6b: Perceived Organizational Support will moderate the relationship between Dark future at Work scores and Burnout

Finally, given the nature of future time perspectives as a negative cognitive process, it is important to consider how "checked out" a person may be in their line of work. Much work on burnout shows a strong relationship with partial absenteeism and neglect of work tasks (Swider & Zimmerman, 2010). As such, a last variable I felt important to include in this initial analysis is neglect and partial absenteeism given the relationship these constructs are found to have with burnout (Swider & Zimmerman, 2010). Considering this relationship, I present the following hypotheses:

H7a: There will be a significant positive relationship between scores on the Dark Future at Work scale and Neglect/ Partial Absenteeism scores.

H7b: Perceived Organizational Support will moderate the relationship between Dark Future at Work scores and Neglect/ Partial Absenteeism scores.

The Present Study

Research on occupational future time perspectives is sparse, pointing to a gap in the I/O Psychology literature. For reference, a simple search of "occupational future time perspectives" on the PSYC info data base with no constraints or other key words yielded a mere 36 results with only one single article from 1964 until 2009 (Sattler, 1964). As with any research field, in order to examine effects of a construct, it is important to have a strong, valid, and reliable measure of said construct in order to allow for future research to progress. As a result, the focus of the current study was the development and assessment of a scale measuring the Dark Future at Work.

Methods

Participants

Participants were recruited through a Prolific sample (www.prolific.co), a website which pays individuals at a per hour rate to take surveys from research studies such as this one. Participants had to be of legal working age (18 years old), presently employed outside of the prolific website during the time of the study, and have held their current job for at least 1 year (to ensure novelty effects of a new job are no longer present as said novelty effects may skew participants to respond more positively regarding the outlook on their job).

As the adapted scale being used in this study contains 15 items, I recruited a sample of N = 300 to adhere to the recommendation made by Schwab (1980) of an item to response ratio of 1:10. A minimum sample of N = 300 allows this recommendation to remain true for both halves of the split sample (i.e. N = 150 for both samples). Initial responses yielded a sample of N = 315,

this data was cleaned removing individuals with over 50% missing data and/or failed attention check responses. Following this removal, I was left with a final sample size of $N = 303$, maintaining adherence to Schwab's (1980) recommendations.

Participant responses were then randomly split into 2 samples, one of which was used during the initial Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), while the other was used during the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and Validity assessment stages.

The first half of the split sample ($N = 151$), stayed within the recommendations by Schwab (1980) of an item to participant response ratio of 1:10 given the 15 items in the scale. The average age of participants was 33.5 years, with a standard deviation of 10.2 years. Participants identified primarily as Male (49%) and Female (49%) with 2% identifying as non-binary. The majority of the sample worked full time (77.5%), with 80.8% having completed community college or higher levels of education. Participants reported a mean of 4.72 years at their current job, and a standard deviation of 5.37 with job tenure ranging from 1 year to 24 years at their current job. Finally, participants reported a wide range of different fields of work such as Hospitality, Law, Healthcare, Physical Trades, Education, IT, and Engineering.

CFAs were conducted on the remaining half of the previously split data set, with a sample size of ($N = 152$). Participants in the CFA sample reported similar demographics to those in the EFA sample: Age ($M = 32.7$; $SD = 9.99$) and Gender (46.7% Male; 53.3% Female) was fairly evenly split. Additionally, the large majority of participants reported working full time (81.5%) compared to part time (18.5%). Moreover, the large majority of participants had completed community college or higher education levels (86.2% Community College or Higher). Finally, this sample had a wide range of reported occupational fields including Agriculture, Law,

Education, Healthcare, Sales, Computer Programming, Insurance/Real Estate, and Financial Banking.

Analysis

Following the process outlined by Hinkin (1998), after administration of the questionnaire, I next conducted the initial item reduction step using an EFA. Through this EFA, item loadings was examined with consistently low loading items [<.40 as per Ford et al. (1986)] being removed if said item is both a low loading item and deemed unnecessary through theory and available previous research. Additionally, at this stage an internal consistency assessment was conducted by examining the scales alpha level.

The next step outlined by Hinkin (1998) is conducting a CFA on the remaining items to analyze goodness of fit of the resulting factor structure following an EFA. As such, I followed the recommendations set by Hinkin (1998) by analyzing the variance-covariance matrix and examined fit indices from the chi-squared analysis. This stage of the validation process allows for an initial view of construct validity (Hinkin 1998) before proceeding to the Convergent/Discriminant Validity analysis in the next stage.

While there are 2 steps remaining in the recommendations made by Hinkin (1998), the final stage being replication – as previously mentioned, replication is outside of the scope of this project. As such, the final stage applied in the present study involves the convergent and discriminant validity analysis – scales used during this stage are listed in the upcoming "Materials" section. This step uses correlation matrices to examine relationships between The Dark Future at Work and similar constructs to examine the criterion-related validity of the newly developed scale.

To test Hypotheses 3A-7B, I used regression and moderated regression analyses. Specifically, Hypotheses 3A, 4A, 5A, 6A, and 7A, were each tested using individually calculated linear regression equations to determine relationships between the identified variable and Dark Future at Work scores. Secondly, Hypotheses 3B, 4B, 5B, 6B, and 7B were each tested using individually calculated moderated regression as to examine the impact perceived organizational support has on the original linear regression slopes. Within these moderation analyses, I examined direct and indirect effects to best understand if there is moderation present, and to what extent.

Measures

Including the newly adapted Dark Future at Work scale, a total of 9 scales were used during the data collection stage in this study (all available in Appendix A). All scales involved use either a likert-type response or a checklist, and are listed below with high scores on all scales indicating positive presence of the behavior being measured unless otherwise stated.

Dark Future at Work

The items for the newly created Dark Future at Work were adopted from the Zaleski et al. (2019) scale reduction study. 15 items from the Zaleski et al. (2019) Dark Future Scale reduction study were adapted with the goal of changing as few key words as possible, most often adding "at work" to the end of the item, attempting to only change where the individual is making their evaluation toward (i.e., changing from evaluating your future in general, to evaluating your future specifically at work). For example, an item taken from the original Dark Future scale reads "I am afraid that after several years I will evaluate my life as purposeless". When translating this item, the word "life" was changed to "career", for the new item used in this study to read "I am afraid that after several years I will evaluate my career as purposeless". This

process was followed for the entire adoption process of the Dark Future at Work scale, allowing for as minimal change of content as possible. Additionally, items were aimed to allow respondents to evaluate their future both within their current organization, as well as overall in their working careers. The Dark Future at Work scale asks participants "Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement". Participant responded using a 5-point Likert scale with response options ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree, to 5 = Strongly Agree.

While the shortened version contained 5 items (Zaleski et al., 2019), the present study tested 15 items. Of these 15 items, 5 of them are translated from the 5 items in the shortened scale. The other 10 come from a combination of strong loading items the authors left out while reducing the 29 items for the shortened version of the scale (Zaleski et al., 2019). During this stage, there was no "end goal" for a certain number of items to be tested in this study. Rather, I ended up with 15 items through consideration over covering enough content within the topic, while also considering the amount of item content that would need to be altered to have the new item accurately target workplace evaluations. For example, while one of the stronger loading items in their scale reduction study was "I fear the moment when I will have to account for the decisions and actions of my life" (Zaleski et al., 2019). This item would have been difficult to translate to a work setting without changing the item content drastically to make it both realistic and applicable to employees in a common workplace setting, and thus was not included in this study. Adapted items were reviewed by my thesis supervisor Dr. Kevin Kelloway for content accuracy and wording/grammar, and disagreements were discussed as needed to come to a final decision on item wording and inclusion.

Rationale for including more than just the 5 items from the Zaleski et al. (2019) scale reduction study is that due to the nature of changing a scales content even minimally, there is the chance that items will behave differently. With Zaleski et al. (2019) conducting an item reduction study on their original 29 item scale, there is no guarantee that the 5 best fitting items these authors found will also be the best 5 fitting items when the original 29 items are translated to an occupational setting. As a result, item removal was expected at the start of this study, however given I had changed the content of these items, it is important to examine other strong items to see if different variations of the scale provide better fit in an organizational context compared to the original 5 items found by Zaleski et al. (2019).

Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory (ZPTI)

The ZPTI (Zimbardo & Boyd, 1999) measures the individuals time perspective through 5 subscales, each focusing on a different potential way of evaluating the past, present, and future of the individual human experience. Past-Negative evaluates the extent the individual negatively evaluates their past. Past-Positive evaluates the extent the individual positively evaluates their past. Present-Hedonistic evaluates how we value the present and focus on the "here and now". Present-Fatalistic focuses on the extent individuals believe life is determined by fate. Lastly, the Future subscale investigates the extent to which individuals think about their future. The ZPTI uses a 5-point likert-type scale ranging from 1 = very uncharacteristic to 5 = very characteristic.

Future Time Perspectives

The Future Time Perspectives scale created by Carstensen and Lang (1996) is designed to measure the individuals future time perspectives both positively and negatively, helping gain a holistic view of the individuals disposition for evaluating their future. The scale contains both positively (ex: Many opportunities await me in the future) and negatively (ex: I have a sense time

is running out) framed items, where participants were asked to rate how true they feel the statement is of them. Responses are marked on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = Very Untrue to 7 = Very True. With the scale holding both positively and negatively framed items, the completed scale was split into 2 portions (positive items and negative items) following data collection with the positively framed items contributing to the discriminant, and negatively framed items contributing to the convergent validity portion of this projects validity analysis.

Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9)

The PHQ-9 survey is a self-report measure that has participants respond to a depression symptom checklist on a 4-point scale ranging from 0 = not at all to 3 = nearly every day. While past research has shown negative workplace attitudes such as job stress can be brought home, increasing conflict in our personal lives (Modaresnezhad et al., 2021), it is important not to ignore the potential impact individual differences in negative mental health symptoms may have on how employees evaluate their professional lives.

State-Trait Hopelessness Scale (Modified)

The State-Trait Hopelessness Scale (Dunn et al., 2013) is a measure of individual feelings of hopelessness as both temporary and chronic outlooks. The original article and scale found 2 factors of hopelessness, present and absent, however only items from the "Hopelessness Present" factor was included in this study due to the current research focus on the presence of these negative emotions/states. As a result, the scale used in this study contained 8 items such as "it is difficult for me to imagine my future" where participants were asked to respond on a 5-point Likert scale with responses ranging from 1= strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.

Perceived Organizational Support (POS)

To measure perceptions of organizational support, this study will use the Perceptions of Organizational Support measure first developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986), and later recommended by Eisenberger et al. (2020) as the best option in research practice. The 10 items used are all taken from the original article by Eisenberger et al. (1986) where respondents were asked to rate their agreement of items such as "The organization strongly considers my goals and values" on a scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. Given that high perceptions of organizational support has been shown to help minimize negative outcomes such as turnover intention and lower emotional distress (Raza et al., 2021), it is an important construct to consider when examining any potential outcomes related to mental health and turnover intentions.

Neglect and Partial Absenteeism

A combination of two tools will be used to measure employee's neglect of their work and partial absenteeism. First, a 3-item measure of neglect from Withey & Cooper (1989) which asked participants to recall their neglect of work over the last 2 months. An example item is, in the last 2 months I have been "Calling in sick and not dealing with what is happening". Respondents will rate their agreement on a 5-point Likert scale with responses ranging from 1 = strongly disagree, to 5 = strongly agree.

The second tool being used is a checklist of Partial Absenteeism taken from Hepburn & Barling (1996). This measure is a simple yes or no checklist where participants are asked to mark if they have or have not partaken in a specific behavior at work such as "Been late to work" or "Left work early" as a result of job-related stress and anxiety. Resulting scores allowed for comparison of the individuals evaluation of their job, and how that evaluation impacts their willingness to neglect work or engage in partial absenteeism.

Turnover and Retirement Intent Scales

Drawing on the work from Richter et al. (2020) on the impact rumination of job insecurity and job anxieties has on intent to leave our job, it is reasonable to expect some relationship between a highly negative occupational future time perspectives and the desire to leave as well given the cognitive and conscious process involved in future time perspectives as a whole (Zaleski et al., 2019). To measure Turnover intentions, a modified measure of Turnover intent from Kelloway et al. (1999) was used. The original scale was a 4-item measure of strictly turnover intentions including items such as "I am thinking about leaving this organization" where respondents marked their agreeance on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree.

Retirement Intentions were examined using 3 items created by slightly adaptation the Kelloway et al. (1999) turnover intentions scale. These items were scored using the same 5-point rating scale, with items such as "I plan to retire as soon as I qualify for a pension" and "I am actively planning for retirement in the near future", aiming to target at holistic perspective toward the different factors which may impact the individuals ability to retire.

Burnout

Participant burnout was measured using a slightly modified version of the Enzmann et al. (1998) Burnout Measure. The only modifications made were changing the prompt from having participants recall experience frequency of the last month, to asking for participants to recall experiences from the last 2 months, as all other measures in this study with time frame prompts used a 2-month window. Respondents were asked to rate how often in the last 2 months they have experienced symptoms of physical exhaustion (ex: being 'wiped out'), emotional exhaustion (ex: feeling depressed) and mental exhaustion (ex: feeling trapped).

Participants rate their experience frequency using a 5-point Likert scale with responses ranging from 1 = Never, to 5 = Always.

Results

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

All EFAs were conducted in Jamovi using maximum likelihood extraction with a promax rotation. An initial EFA using parallel analysis showed a 2-factor model fit with 58% explained variance, and unacceptable fit (χ^2= 176, p < .001; RMSEA = 0.09; TLI = .89). Additionally, 5 of the 15 items (items 3, 5, 7, 12, 13) had a cross loading above 0.3. As a result, these 5 items were removed for the next EFA. Upon reviewing the items loading onto the 2 initial factors, Factor 1 seemed to be related to anxiety about ones current work, while Factor 2 was more distant and related to the individual themselves and their own personal anxieties. Given future time perspectives are individually unique, this separation made theoretical sense. As a result, remaining EFAs were fixed to a 2-factor structure. Following removal of these items and rerunning the analysis with parameters set to a fixed 2-factor structure, cumulative variance increased slightly, now at 58.5%, and fit indices improved as the chi-squared statistic decreased (χ^2= 39.5, p < .05) and the TLI increased (TLI = 0.96).

Following the second EFA, item 11 was now beginning to cross load above 0.3 on both factors. When reviewing the remaining items in the scale, the content of item 11 (I am afraid that after several years I will evaluate my career as purposeless) was quite similar to item 15 (I am afraid that I won't be appreciated in my profession), both touching on fears toward how you will view your career and the thought of not having a purpose or legacy to be remembered by in your work. As such, I opted to remove item 11 as the fit increased following its removal, and item 15 had extremely strong loadings with no cross loadings through all EFAs conducted. I ran a final

EFA with item 11 removed and the resultant model provided an excellent fit to the data.(χ^2= 14.2, p = 0.77; RMSEA = 0.00; TLI = 1.0).

Item 8 also began cross-loading above 0.3 following the second EFA. However upon inspection, this item had a consistently low item uniqueness and upon removal, explained variance decreased from 58.5% to 48%, with no change noteworthy change in fit. Additionally, this item seemed to be unique in content, tapping into participants anxiety toward managing workplace stressors (I worry that I won't be able to deal with the problems in my workplace). As a result, item 8 was kept in the scale.

Following completion of the EFA process and item reduction stage, I was left with a 2 factor, 9 item scale, a summary of which including the final factor loadings can be found in Table 1. Factor 1 (Items 1, 2, 4, 6) are seemingly directly targeting future oriented job anxiety through a highly negative OFTP. For example, item 2 states "I don't think things are going to get any better in my job", thereby directly tapping into the individuals perspective on their future at work and how highly negative they expect their future to be. As such, Factor 1 was labelled "Future Job Anxiety". Interestingly, Factor 2 seemingly targets a sense of the fear of failure toward ones job, as well as career growth and goals. For example, item 15 states "I am afraid that I won't be appreciated in my profession", tapping into the individuals fear that when they finish their working career, they may not reach the heights they hope for, or may not have a left a meaningful reputation/contribution behind to be remembered and appreciated by. As such, this factor was be labelled "Fear of Failure".

Table 1

Dark Future at Work EFA Final Results

Item	Factor		Uniqueness
	Future Job Anxiety	Fear of Failure	
1. I am afraid the problems at work will continue for a long time	0.88	-0.16	0.38
2. I don't think that things are going to get any better in my job	0.80	-0.02	0.37
4. I am afraid that in the future my job will change for the worse	0.51	0.27	0.51
6. Things at work seem to be getting worse and worse	0.84	0.02	0.28
8. I worry that I won't be able to deal with the problems in my workplace	0.32	0.62	0.28
9. Even when things go well at work, I believe fate will turn against me	-0.15	0.82	0.45
10. I am afraid that in the future my co-workers will have a negative opinion of me	-0.08	0.73	0.53
14. I fear I will fail to overcome the mounting difficulties of my job	0.10	0.71	0.35
15. I am afraid that I won't be appreciated in my profession	0.01	0.70	0.50

A final part in the EFA and item reduction stage as outlined by Hinkin (1998) involves an internal consistency assessment. The 9-item Dark Future at Work scale achieved an internal consistency of $\alpha = 0.89$. Additionally, the Future Job Anxiety factor achieved an internal consistency of $\alpha = 0.84$, and the Fear of Failure factor showed slightly higher internal consistency at $\alpha = 0.85$.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

Fit indices used for both CFAs can be found in Table 2, with a one and two factor structure being compared at this stage. The one factor analysis showed less than satisfactory fit, with none of the indices meeting their respective recommended cut-offs, $\chi^2 = 128$, $p < .001$; TLI = 0.79, RMSEA = 0.16. The two-factor analysis showed stronger fit with improvement across all

indices, $\chi^2 = 67.8$, p < .001; TLI = 0.91, RMSEA = 0.10[1], as well as a significant chi-squared difference test [$\chi^2(df = 1) = 60.2$, $p < .01$] in favour of a two-factor structure. Results of this analysis show evidence against my original hypothesis of a 1 factor solution, therefore I reject Hypothesis 1.

Table 2

Dark Future at Work CFA Model Fit Indices

			RMSEA 90% CI			
Factors	TLI	RMSEA	Lower	Upper	AIC	BIC
1	0.79	0.16	0.13	0.18	3681	3762
2	0.91	0.10	0.07	0.13	3623	3707

Validity Assessment

At this stage of the analysis, the data set was re-combined in order to conduct the validity assessment and examine outcomes using the full sample size of N = 303. The full correlation matrix for all variables used in this analysis can be found in Table 3, showing results for the full validity assessment.

Convergent and Discriminant Validity

I found evidence of convergent validity with for each factor of the Dark Future at Work scale. For the Future Job Anxiety Factor, I found significantly positive correlations with ZTPI Past-Negative subscale ($r = 0.31$, $p < .001$), ZTPI Present-Fatalistic subscale ($r = 0.20$, $p < .001$), and FTPS Negative Component ($r = .27$, $p < .001$). Similarly, The Fear of Failure factor, showed significant positive correlations with ZTPI Past-Negative subscale ($r = 0.49$, $p < .001$), ZTPI

[1] RMSEA is influenced by sample size, lower sample sizes tend to be more prone to error (Kenny & McCoach, 2003), Considering this information with the lower end of the 90% CI being satisfactory (see Table 2), RMSEA being above the recommended threshold in this study may be a result of a relatively small CFA sample ($N = 152$)

Present-Fatalistic subscale ($r = 0.33$, $p < .001$), and FTPS Negative component ($r = .35$, $p < .01$). As a result, I concluded that Hypothesis 2A was supported.

My results provide mixed evidence in favour of discriminant validity as both factors within the Dark Future at Work scale showed non-significant near zero correlations with the ZTPI Past-Positive subscale (F1: $r = -0.03$, $p = 0.62$; F2: $r = 0.01$, $p = 0.841$), as well as the ZTPI Present-Hedonistic subscale (F1: $r = -0.06$, $p = 0.325$; F2: $r = 0.01$, $p = 0.803$). Additionally, both factors showed significant negative correlations with the ZTPI Future subscale (F1: $r = -0.13$, $p < 0.05$; F2: $r = -0.14$, $p < 0.05$), and FTPS Positive component (F1: $r = -0.34$, $p < .001$; F2: $r = -0.25$, $p < .001$) These results provide mixed evidence of discriminant validity, therefore I rejected Hypothesis 2B.

Criterion-Related Validity

As the results of exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses provided evidence for a two-factor structure, the following hypotheses were examined at the factor level. For Hypotheses 3A-7A, a correlation was used to examine the direct relationship between factors and outcomes, a summary of which can be found in Table 4.

As there were two subscales, in addition to correlations, post-hoc analyses were conducted to examine differences in variance explained by each factor. First, hierarchical linear regressions were conducted to examine the extent of the relationship with the outcomes in question. As the scale showed a 2-factor structure, I wanted to examine regression weights and identify if the factors showed any differences in importance regarding how they are related to the outcomes included in this study (e.g., is one factor carrying most of the weight of the relationship or not). Finally, as the Dark Future at Work factors were significantly correlated, relative weights analyses were conducted to examine how much variance is being accounted for by each factor.

Relative weights analyses was added to the data analysis after a two-factor solution was found to be the best fitting factor structure to help counter issues of collinearity as the two factors are highly correlated ($r = 0.60$), while also being able to best understand each individual factors influence on each outcome. Full compiled results of these analyses can be found in Table 5.

Table 3

Convergent and Discriminant Validity Analysis Correlation Matrix

	M	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Dark Future at Work	2.56	0.83	0.89												
2. Future Job Anxiety	2.73	0.93	0.88 ***	0.84											
3. Fear of Failure	2.42	0.92	0.90 ***	0.60 ***	0.85										
4. ZTPI Past-Pos	3.34	0.53	0.00	-0.03	0.01	0.60									
5. ZTPI Past-Neg	3.19	0.71	0.46 ***	0.31 ***	0.49 ***	0.08	0.82								

6. ZTPI Pres-Hedon	3.29	0.55	-0.02	-0.06	0.01	0.34***	0.10	0.80							
7. ZTPI Pres-Fatal	3.19	0.71	0.30***	0.20***	0.33***	0.22***	0.37***	0.37***	0.73						
8. ZTPI Future	3.59	0.43	-0.15**	-0.13*	-0.14*	0.41***	-0.01	0.13*	-0.09	0.63					
9. FTP Pos	5.18	1.18	-0.33***	-0.34***	-0.25***	0.26***	-0.11	0.41***	0.41***	0.35***	0.90				
10. FTP Neg	4.28	0.76	0.35***	0.27***	0.35***	0.06	0.34***	-0.02	0.33***	-0.06	-0.43***	0.76			
11. Perceived Organizational Support	3.34	0.93	-0.56***	-0.63***	-0.40***	0.169*	-0.22***	0.22***	-0.02	0.28***	0.44***	-0.22***	0.94		
12. Age	33.40	11.50	0.04	0.13*	-0.05	-0.02	-0.23***	-0.12*	-0.07	-0.07	-0.29***	0.09	-0.07	N/A	
13. Job Tenure	4.80	5.25	0.06	0.10	0.00	-0.02	-0.17**	-0.15*	-0.13*	-0.02	-0.21***	0.03	0.00	0.474***	N/A

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

ZTPI = Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory.

FTP = Future Time Perspective Scale.

Table 4

Criterion Related Validity Correlation Matrix

	M	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Dark Future at Work	2.56	0.83	0.89									
2. Future Job Anxiety	2.73	0.93	0.88***	0.84								
3. Fear of Failure	2.42	0.92	0.90***	0.60***	0.85							
4. Depression	2.26	0.93	0.46***	0.32***	0.50***	0.92						
5. Hopelessness	2.34	0.93	0.58***	0.43***	0.59***	0.69***	0.91					
6. Turnover Intentions	2.93	1.24	0.51***	0.57***	0.36***	0.28***	0.33***	0.93				
7. Retirement Intentions	2.12	0.96	0.25***	0.20***	0.22***	0.13*	0.14*	0.29***	0.68			
8. Burnout	2.63	0.79	0.62***	0.49***	0.60***	0.78***	0.74***	0.38***	0.11	0.96		
9. Neglect	1.70	0.85	0.47***	0.39***	0.46***	0.41***	0.42***	0.34***	0.22***	0.45***	0.78	
10. Partial Absenteeism	1.60	0.31	-0.29***	-0.25***	-0.29***	0.36***	-0.29***	-0.23***	-0.11	-0.38***	-0.45***	0.73

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 5

Regression and Relative Weights Analyses Results

		Predictor		R^2
		Future Job Anxiety	Fear of Failure	
Depression	β	0.037	0.481***	0.249
	RW	0.05 (21.37%)*	0.20(78.63%)*	
Hopelessness	β	0.128*	0.521***	0.359
	RW	0.10 (27.82%)*	0.26 (72.18%)*	
Turnover Intentions	β	0.751***	0.035	0.332
	RW	0.27 (80.16%)*	0.07 (19.84%)*	
Retirement Intentions	β	0.128	0.153	0.057
	RW	0.03 (46.67%)*	0.03 (53.33%)*	
Burnout	β	0.193***	0.417***	0.399
	RW	0.14 (35.46%)*	0.26 (64.54%)*	
Neglect	β	0.156**	0.333***	0.233
	RW	0.08 (36.11%)*	0.15 (63.89%)*	
Partial Absenteeism	β	0.038	-0.074**	0.092
	RW	0.03 (37.31%)*	0.06 (62.69%)*	

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.
Relative weights are denoted as RW and are reported as raw Relative Weight (Scaled Relative Weight)

PHQ-9

The Dark Future at Work scale ($r = 0.46$, $p < .001$), as well as both the Future Job Anxiety ($r = 0.32$, $p < .001$), and Fear of Failure factor ($r = 0.50$, $p < .001$) showed significantly positive correlations with depression scores. As a result, I accept Hypothesis 3A.

For the post-hoc analyses, the two factors explained 25% of variance in scores ($R^2 = 0.25$), with the Future Job Anxiety factor explaining 5% ($\beta = .04$, $p = .599$) and Fear of Failure accounting for 20% ($\beta = .48$, $p < .001$).

State-Trait Hopelessness

Results show significantly positive correlations with the Dark Future at Work scale ($r = 0.58$, $p < .001$), the Future Job Anxiety factor ($r = 0.43$, $p < .001$), and Fear of Failure factor ($r =$

0.59, $p < .001$). As such, I find evidence of the Dark Future at Work scales positive relationship with high State-Trait Hopelessness Scores, and accept Hypothesis 4A.

Results of the post-hoc analysis show the two factors accounting for 36% of variance in scores ($R^2 = 0.36$), with the Future Job Anxiety factor explaining 10% of variance ($\beta = .13$, $p < .05$), while the Fear of Failure factor accounted for 26% ($\beta = .52$, $p < .001$).

Turnover and Retirement Intentions

Starting with turnover intentions, results show significantly positive relationships with the Dark Future at Work scale ($r = 0.51$, $p < .001$), Future Job Anxiety factor ($r = 0.57$, $p < .001$), and Fear of Failure factor ($r = 0.36$, $p < .001$). For retirement intentions, I again found siginificantly positve relationships with the Dark Future at Work scale ($r = 0.25$, $p < .001$), the Future Job Anxiety factor ($r = 0.20$, $p < .001$), and the Fear of Failure factor ($r = 0.22$, $p < .001$). As a result, I accept Hypothesis 5A

Moving to the post-hoc analyses, beginning with turnover intentions, results show the two factors accounting for 33% of variance ($R^2 = 0.33$), with the Future Job Anxiety factor accounting for 27% of the variance ($\beta = .75$, $p < .001$), while the Fear of Failure factor accounted for the remaining 6% ($\beta = .035$, $p = 0.667$). As for retirement intentions, the two factors together explained 6% of variance, with both the Future Job Anxiety ($\beta = .13$, $p = 0.082$) and Fear of Failure ($\beta = .15$, $p < .05$) factors explaining approximately 3% of the variance.

Burnout

Results show a significantly positive correlation between burnot and the Dark Future at Work scale ($r = 0.62$, $p < .001$), the Future Job Anxiety factor ($r = 0.49$, $p < .001$), as well as the Fear of Failure factor ($r = 0.60$, $p < .001$). Echoing previous results, I find evidence in favor of

the Dark Future at work having a significantly positive relationship with Burnout and accept Hypothesis 6A.

Results of the post-hoc analysis show the two factors accounting for 40% of variance in Burnout scores. The Future Job Anxiety factor accounted for 14% of variance ($\beta = .19$, $p < .001$), and the Fear of Failure factor accounted for the remaining 26% of variance ($\beta = .42$, $p < .001$).

Neglect and Partial Absenteeism

Starting with neglect of work tasks, results show significantly positive correlations with the Dark Future at Work scale ($r = 0.47$, $p < .001$), Future Job Anxiety factor ($r = 0.39$, $p < .001$), and Fear of Failure Factor ($r = 0.46$, $p < .001$). Contrarily, for partial absenteeism results show significantly negative correlations with the Dark Future at Work scale ($r = -0.29$, $p < .001$), Future Job Anxiety factor ($r = -0.25$, $p < .001$), and Fear of Failure factor ($r = -0.29$, $p < .001$). As a result I conclude mixed evidence toward Hypothesis 7A.

Moving to the post-hoc analyses starting with Neglect of work tasks, the two factors combined for an explained variance of 23%. The Future Job Anxiety factor accounted for 8% of this variance ($\beta = .16$, $p < .01$), and the Fear of Failure factor accounted for 15% of the variance ($\beta = .33$, $p < .001$). For Partial Absenteeism, the two factors explained a combined 9% of variance in scores. The Future Job Anxiety factor accounted for 3% of variance ($\beta = -0.04$, $p = 0.104$), and the Fear of Failure factor accounted for the remaining 6% ($\beta = -0.07$, $p < .01$).

Moderation Analysis

Hypotheses 3B-7B examined the impact of Perceptions of Organizational Support as a moderator of these negative outcomes. As the scale holds 2 factors, moderations were conducted

on each individual factor to identify the impact perceptions of organizational support has on each factors relationship with each outcome.

Full results of this analysis can be found in Table 6, which as shown, Perceptions of Organizational Support was not found to moderate the relationship between either factor in the Dark Future at Work scale, and any of the associated outcomes with the exception of Retirement intentions. For Retirement Intentions, the interaction term explained a significant amount of variance for both the Future Job Anxiety factor ($R^2 = .02$, $p < .05$) and the Fear of Failure factor ($R^2 = .03$, $p < .01$). Simple Slopes Analysis showed Perceptions of Organizational Support scores had the largest impact on the relationship between each factor and Retirement Intentions at +1SD above the mean (F1: $\beta = 0.37$, $p < .001$; F2: $\beta = 0.38$, $p < .001$) when compared to at the mean (F1: $\beta = 0.24$, $p < .001$; F2: $\beta = 0.23$, $p < .001$), and -1SD (F1: $\beta = 0.11$, $p = 0.122$; F2: $\beta = 0.08$, $p = 0.315$). These results are contrary to expectations – suggesting that POS enhanced the effect of the Dark Future at Work on retirement intent. As a result, I reject Hypotheses 3B, 4B, 5B, 6B, and 7B.

Table 6
Moderation Analysis Results

		ΔR^2	p
Depression	Future Job Anxiety	0.002	0.41
	Fear of Failure	0.002	0.324
Hopelessness	Future Job Anxiety	0.001	0.486
	Fear of Failure	0.002	0.326
Turnover Intentions	Future Job Anxiety	0.008	0.059
	Fear of Failure	0.005	0.156
Retirement Intentions	**Future Job Anxiety**	**0.021***	**0.012**
	Fear of Failure	**0.027****	**0.004**
Burnout	Future Job Anxiety	0.000	0.831
	Fear of Failure	0.000	0.759
Neglect	Future Job Anxiety	0.011	0.057
	Fear of Failure	0.000	0.968
Partial Absenteeism	Future Job Anxiety	0.003	0.369
	Fear of Failure	0.01	0.071

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Discussion

The Dark Future at Work Scale

Results of both the EFA and CFA show evidence of a 2-factor solution of the Dark Future at Work scale, going against my initial Hypothesis of a 1 factor solution. This measurement, designed to tap into highly negative Occupational Future Time Perspectives, is the first of its kind to the best of my knowledge, and as such, opens many avenues for future research to address such a major gap in research knowledge. One caveat worth noting occurred during the discriminant validity portion of this analysis, with results showing mixed evidence in favor of the scales discriminant validity. When reviewing the scales used in this portion of the analysis, the ZTPI Past-Positive (the extent the individual positively evaluates their past) and Present-Hedonistic (how we value the present and focus on the "here and now") subscales are

seemingly less representative of a highly positive Future Time Perspective, the construct being used as evidence of discriminant validity given its opposing nature to a highly negative occupational future time perspective. However, the ZTPI Future subscale (the extent to which individuals think about their future) and FTPS Positive component (ex: Many opportunities await me in the future) are much more representative based on construct definitions provided by the authors and example items from the scales themselves. As such, while I cannot fully accept Hypothesis 2B, I argue there is mixed evidence in favor of discriminant validity given the differing nature of the non-significant and significant correlations

An interesting and unexpected finding from this study involved the factor structure itself. Past research in the realm of general future time perspectives tells us creating an evaluation of how future events may play out is a cognitive process involving genetic predispositions and past learned experiences in similar situations. As such, our evaluations tend to be the same in specific situation such as at work, at school, or towards hobbies (Zaleski, 1996; Zaleski et al., 2019; Zimbardo et al., 2012). In the case of the current study, this means we would expect evaluations towards work to follow a similar process, that individuals would simply undergo a process of evaluating the future of their working careers. However, we found Hypothesis 1 to be false as it was previously hypothesized the Dark Future at Work scale would hold a 1-factor structure, that being the attribution we make toward our future; the same findings as Zaleski (1996) and later Zaleski et al. (2019) in their scale reduction study for the original Dark Future scale.

With the present scale resulting in a 2-factor structure, it seems there is a separation in the kinds of evaluations being made regarding our future at work. The first factor, “Future Job Anxiety”, is seemingly an evaluation being made toward the current state of your work and direct anxieties related to how ones work environment might change. For example, Item 2 states

"I don't think that things are going to get any better in my job", tapping into the individuals anxiety toward the work they are currently conducting, as well as toward the long-term continuation of issues that are ongoing within their present job role. In this case, the evaluation is being made toward the potential future improvement of currently present job anxieties. However, the second factor "Fear of Failure" seems to be measuring how these anxieties as well as changes in our work environment will impact the employee both professionally (e.g., having to cope with job anxieties, task demand etc. in the future) and personally (e.g., the long-term mental toll that the continuation of high job anxieties may take on the employee). For example, item 9 states "Even when things go well at work, I believe fate will turn against me" investigating the individuals anxiety toward future issues, and examining fears of failure toward anxieties about ones work that may appear, and how said issue will impact the employee, as opposed to the continuation of what is occurring in the present "here and now".

A significant reason these findings are of interest, is that past research on general Future Time Perspectives argues there is a large role of genetics and personality involved in the creation of the evaluations we make regarding our future, leading to similar evaluations (i.e., commonly positive, or commonly negative) across the majority of situations in our life (Mohamed & Bendania, 2023). However, results of my analysis support the work conducted by Holtrop et al. (2014) who argue context specific measures have stronger predictive validity compared to general (in this case, Time Perspective) measures.

The Dark Future at Work scale provides further evidence to this finding, as the two-factor structure showed stronger fit than a one-factor model, outlining there is a different evaluation process occurring at work specifically. Comparatively, the original Dark Future article which found a one-factor structure fit best, with the factor simply being the evaluation we make toward

our future (Zaleski et al., 2019). In the case of the current study, the context of work seemingly plays a role in the process of how we evaluate our careers through individuals separating how our workplace might change (Future Job Anxiety factor), and how those changes might affect the employee (Fear of Failure) during their evaluation. As a result, this study tells us there is something specific to the workplace which leads to a different process occurring when evaluating our future at work versus outside of work. These findings illustrate the importance of the Dark Future at Work scale as a context specific Future Time Perspective measure, allowing researchers to gain a larger breadth of information about employee evaluations toward their jobs.

Outcomes of the Dark Future at Work

Results of this study provide evidence of the Dark Future at Work scale, as well as both factors, holding signiciant correlations with all outcomes tested, those being: depression, hopelessness, turnover/retirement intentions, burnout, job neglect, and partial absenteeism. Of particular interest are post-hoc analysis results where Regression and Relative Weights Analysis show relationships between the Dark Future at Work and those same outcomes. Specifically, the Fear of Failure factor had a significant relationship with PHQ-9, State/Trait Hopelessness, Retirement Intentions, Burnout, Neglect, and Partial Absenteeism. While the Future Job Anxiety factor had significant relationships with State/Trait Hopelessness, Turnover Intentions, Burnout, and Neglect, Relative Weights Analysis results show the Fear of Failure Factor explained greater amounts of variance than the Future Job Anxiety factor for all outcomes except Turnover Intentions. While the variance explained by each factor for Retirement Intentions and Partial Absenteeism was quite close (see Table 5 for a full summary), the differences in variance explained in PHQ-9, S/T Hopelessness, Burnout, and Job Neglect scores were vastly in favour of the Fear of Failure factor. These results show an interesting revelation as it seems the impact on

outcomes tends to arise from how employees evaluate "how will these changes in my workplace impact me" through the Fear of Failure factor. These findings shine an interesting light on how employees interpret change in the workplace, and the impact these changes have on us throughout our working careers. It appears the change itself is not what causes issues for employees as shown by the variance explained by the Future Job Anxiety factor which evaluates how our workplace may change. Rather, issues such as burnout, feelings of hopelessness, and job neglect seem to occur as the result of employees evaluating that said changes are going to impact them in a negative way long term as captured through the Fear of Failure factor.

Retirement Intentions

One of the unanticipated results of this study is the direction of the moderation occurring within retirement intentions for both factors. Simple slopes analyses show when perceptions of organizational support is average or high within an organization, individuals high on both the Future Job Anxiety factor, and Fear of Failure factor are more likely to retire. These results go against previous job anxiety literature which shows no relationship between high perceptions of organizational support and increased retirement intentions (Luccarella, 2016). However, I would speculate these findings are a result of the organization supporting the employee on the individual level. For example, if Employee A is a few years away from being able to retire, but their workplace is extremely overworked and task demand is high, perhaps the organization is able to work with the individual to retire early and be removed from such a stressful and difficult work setting. Contrarily, if Employee A is experiencing low levels of perceptions of organizational support in the same stressful work setting, they may not see early retirement as an option and accept that they must continue on or find work elsewhere until they are in a strong enough financial position to retire. While this is not the stereotypical way we think of

organizations supporting the individual, it still is a large showing of support for the mental well-being of an employee who is hoping to retire.

It is worth noting however, that the mean age within this study was quite low (M = 33.1), and it is not expected many participants will be thinking about retiring in the near future at age 33. However, at this age participants may simply be hoping to retire at an early age (e.g., 45-50 years old), which may potentially offer a different explanation for the unexpected results found during this portion of the analysis. This topic is expanded upon in the Future Research section of this paper.

Lack of Moderating Influence of Perceived Organizational Support

An unexpected result in this study involves the lack of moderating impact of perceptions of organizational support, specifically on neglect of work tasks and partial absenteeism. As shown in Table 3, both the Future Job Anxiety factor and Fear of Failure factor had strong significant negative correlations with perceptions of organizational support. Given the non-significant correlations this scale held with individual data such as age and job tenure, perceptions of support holding a highly negative relationship may shine light on how uniqiue and inidividualistic our occupational future time perspectives are. Perhaps the amount of support we as individuals are perceiving plays a role in how negatively we evaluate our future. However, finding no moderating impact on the dark future at work (a form of future oriented job anxiety) is notable due to the strong role perceptions of support is known to play in the job anxiety literature (Raza et al., 2021).

While there was no evidence of perceptions of organizational support significantly moderating the relationship between Dark Future at Work scores any of the outcomes measured in this study beyond retirement intentions, both sets of analysis showing near zero beta weights

and non-significant results for neglect and partial absenteeism was quite surprising. In addition to the relationship found between Dark Future at Work scores and both neglect/partial absenteeism, arguably the strongest relationship found involves a known antecedent to neglect of work tasks, that being burnout. It is worth noting, this lack of relationship may simply be due to range restriction on reported scores. As seen in Table 5, mean scores for both neglect and partial absenteeism are quite low, with partial absenteeism holding the smallest mean and standard deviation across the entire study. However, the given the size of this scales relationship with burnout, these lack of findings are still interesting and worth expansion.

Neglect and burnout are two intertwined constructs with past work showing higher levels of burnout can lead to increased neglect of work tasks (Swider & Zimmerman, 2010). Combining this information with past research showing the impact of perceptions of organizational support moderating the relationship between burnout levels and subsequent outcomes such as Neglect of work tasks (Luo et al., 2022), we would hypothetically expect some impact of perceptions of organizational support to appear in this context. However, not having the presence of perceptions of organizational support as a moderating provides us with further evidence that occupational future time perspectives and more broadly, general future time perspectives are indeed unique person to person, with many different factors such as our environment influencing how, where, and why they occur (Carstensen et al., 1999; Cleveland et al., 2019). When taking a step back however, we may be able to deduce some sort of rationale to explain these findings.

When thinking about individuals unique experiences, and considering how when creating future time perspectives previous work states these evaluations are created by consciously reconstructing our past learned experiences in relation with our genetic predispositions

(Zimbardo et al., 2012). Integrating these findings with the current results showing Perceptions of Organizational Support as a non-significant moderator in reducing job neglect and Partial Absenteeism, the heavy influence of individual differences may be playing a factor in the varying success high levels of perceptions of organizational support has on their outcomes as an employee. For example, if Employee A and Employee B both work for an understaffed organization where workload and job stress is high, both employees may have varying responses to their team leader providing high levels of support to them through a troubled time. Perhaps Employee A is highly optimistic and therefore trusts their leader in saying things will improve soon and that they are working to improve staffing and decrease workloads. With no past experience in this situation, high perceptions of organizational support may help improve Employee A's burnout and job neglect levels. However, if Employee B is highly pessimistic and in the same situation, they may think to their past where they have been in similar organizations and only heard empty promises. As a result, their team leaders support may not be as impactful due to differences in how Employee B is reconstructing their past negative experiences, whereas Employee A has not had these experience and therefore does not have a negative predisposed evaluation to re-construct. While this example creates issues for organizations regarding improving the workplace for individuals in Employee B's shoes, it shines light on the influence of the workplace context on how we evaluate our time remaining at work both short term and long-term. In the case of my example, scores on the Dark Future at Work scale may be able to shine light onto different reasons behind Employee B's increased negative workplace outcomes despite their team leader providing high levels of support.

Relationship with Partial Absenteeism

A final interesting revelation from this study involves the significantly negative relationship between Dark Future at Work scores, and Partial Absenteeism scores. Results of this study show a significantly negative relationship through correlation and regression coefficients between both factors and partial absenteeism. Previous work in this area shows when burnout is high, individuals can sometimes emotionally "check out" of their job, leading to increases in both job neglect, and partial absenteeism (Trivedi et al., 1981; Swider & Zimmerman, 2010), engaging in behaviors such as showing up late to work or taking an extended lunch break. A potential explanation may be found though the relative weights analysis as both factors explained ~9% of variance (R^2 = 0.0918), with the Fear of Failure factor carrying just under 6% of the total variance (RW = 0.0575). With this factor tapping into the individuals potential anxiety toward their larger overarching career as well as the individuals goals and aspirations within such trajectory, perhaps individuals who are keen on contributing to their field of work are more motivated to work harder when job anxiety is high due to their high career aspirations. A study conducted by Boon et al. (2014) may provide some support for this speculation as the authors found that an employee's positive perception of both high-performance work systems, and the work they were conducting was related to increases in allocated time and effort towards one's work. Summarizing this work can allow speculation regarding whether individuals who view their work as significant or in a positive light may put greater effort into tasks (i.e., the opposite of Partial Absenteeism) when they have a strongly negative score on the Fear of Failure factor.

Practical and Theoretical Implications

A significant implication of any scale development/adaptation study is the ability for future research to apply the scale and address gaps in knowledge. As mentioned throughout this paper, research on occupational future time perspectives is scarce. Part of this gap can be related

to a lack of effective measurement tools. Past work on occupational future time perspectives has had to rely on adapted scales made for the purpose of the authors studies (Zacher & Frese, 2009), rather than a scale such as the Dark Future at Work which was designed specifically to measure highly negative occupational future time perspectives. As a result, a major implication of this research project is providing researchers with a valid and reliable measurement tool to help shrink the gap in knowledge we hold within this area.

In addition to a new measurement tool, findings may provide future research with a guiding framework of initial outcomes pertaining to both the individual employee (such as depression and burnout), and the organization (such as turnover intentions and partial absenteeism). These findings are twofold; first, they provide researchers with an initial glimpse of areas to investigate such as antecedents of these negative evaluations. Second, these results showcase the importance of research regarding occupational future time persepctives due to evidence of the dark futures relationship with negative outcomes, and the lack of influence organizational support had on minimizing these outcomes.

Finally, a significant implication of these findings is the impact holding a highly negative occupational future time perspective may have on organizations. Results of this study found significant relationships and variance explained between the Dark Future at Work scores, and neglect, partial absenteeism, and turnover intentions. These are significant findings for professional organizations as employees engaging in neglect of work tasks and partial absenteeism behaviors are negatively related to performance (Guerrero & Chênevert, 2021). Additionally, voluntary turnover is an extremely costly issue for organizations (Darmon, 1990). Previously summarized work from Lam et al. (2011) showcases the benefit holding a highly positive occupational future time perspective can have for employees, while the current study

provides evidence of how problematic holding a highly negative occupational future time perspective can be. It is the hope that the results of this study may shine light on how important our occupational future time perspectives are for both the employee and the organization.

Limitations

As with any research study, there are limitations to the current project that need to be considered when interpreting results. First and foremost, this study relied on cross-sectional survey data. Such data causes issues in interpretation, as cross-sectional data does not allow for any inferences of causality between the Dark Future at Work scale and the outcomes examined in this study. Furthermore, cross-sectional survey data can result in issues of common method variance (Kock et al., 2021). As such, results of this study (particularly RWA) may be inflated due to this study relying on cross-sectional data. Additionally, past work on Future Time Perspectives shows evidence of the constructs stability over time (Zaleski et al., 2019). Cross-sectional data does not allow us to examine stability in any way, which is an important piece of evidence in confirming the Dark Future at Work as a context specific measure of Future Time Perspectives in an organizational setting. As a result, this scale should be examined using longitudinal data in order to confirm the findings from this study while managing potential issues such as that of common method variance.

Second, the sample size within this study cause some issues in fit interpretation, particularly with RMSEA as the statistic is naturally prone to inflation in smaller data sets. While our CFA sample of (N = 152) is sufficient for Schwab's (1980) item response ratio recommendations, given the RMSEA confidence interval ranges from acceptable to unacceptable fit (MacCallum et al., 1996), it may be beneficial to re-examine model fit with a larger sample

size to determine if this issue is simple due to small samples, or rather an issue with the scale itself.

In similar light, a third major limitation of this project involves the inability to conduct the final step of Hinkin's (1998) Factor Analysis guidelines, that being replication. Before applying this scale to any research projects or organizational interventions, it is important to replicate the results of the current paper through an independent sample and separate CFA. Work by Krzystofiak et al. (1988), later summarized by Hinkin (1998, p. 117) states "The factor analytical techniques that were used to develop the measures may result in factors that are sample specific and inclined toward high reliability". Given the low sample size and high internal consistency (alpha) levels of both the full scale, and each individual factor, a significant step in considering the Dark Future at Work scale to be reliable and applicable to researchers/organizations involves replicating the results of the present study.

In addition to replication studies, an important step in any scale development is examining stability over time as when applying a scale to a research or organizational setting, individuals potentially administering this scale need to be aware of how stable or prone to change participant scores may be. Keeping this in mind, past research on Future Time Perspectives show stability over time with Zaleski et al. (2019) reporting a correlation of $r = .681$ ($p < .001$) between scores over a one-month interval. Given the scale reduction study from Zaleski et al. (2019) is the basis for this scale adaptation study, mirroring this analysis and examining test-retest reliability is a significant step in validating the Dark Future at Work scale.

Future Research Directions

An exciting aspect of either creating a new scale or an adapted version such as the current study, is seemingly endless possibilities for future research studies with the Dark Future at Work

scale. As previously mentioned, work on occupational future time perspectives is extremely limited (Zacher and Frese, 2009), and having a valid measure tapping into occupational future time perspectives (specifically highly negative occupational future time perspectives in this instance), may allow for a plethora of future research in this area, with the hope that following replication, this scale may be able to help researchers dive into such a heavily underexamined area of work.

An interesting avenue for future research is antecedents to forming specific occupational future time perspectives (high or low). The current study presented insight into potential outcomes, and as environmental factors such as perceptions of organizational support do not seem to play a moderating role, a finding which goes against previous work on general job anxiety and negative outcomes (Mauno et al., 2005), there may be a separate underlying factor unique to the individual influencing the strength of these occupational future time perspectives despite potential environmental factors like perceptions of organizational support being present. Work from Zimbardo and Boyd (1999) tells us general future time perspective's (i.e., outside of work, relating to our life as a whole), can be influenced by things such as Religion, Culture, Education, Social Status, and Family Upbringing. Additional work from Zimbardo et al. (2012) builds on these findings, arguing future time perspectives involve cognitive reconstruction of ones past, combining our genetic attributes (i.e., personality, tendencies toward optimism vs pessimism etc.), with our learned experiences (i.e., cultural teachings, family experiences, previous experiences in similar situations) allowing us to create a prediction of how future events may play out. As such, potential antecedents such as personality and individual upbringing are significant to investigate in an attempt to mirror previous future time perspectives findings (Zimbardo and Boyd, 1999; Zimbardo et al., 2012) in an occupational setting.

For example, there may be differences in how one evaluates their job depending on the level the employee is at within their organization (e.g., entry level versus upper management) or the kind of work being conducted (e.g., high versus low occupational health and safety risks, or high versus low sense of meaning toward ones work). As a result, future research should examine both individual and organizational factors that may influence how employees evaluate their future at work.

Regarding the results of my moderation analysis for Retirement Intentions, given the unexpected direction of the moderation, an important area for future research to examine is the Dark Future at Work scales relationship with retirement intentions. However, future research should investigate a more targeted sample as the current study had a mean age of ~33 years old. As individuals at this age are not expected to be considering retiring in the near future, it is important for future research to re-examine the findings from this paper in a sample of older employees in an attempt to better understand the scales true impact on retirement intentions.

A final recommended avenue for future research, which may be of particular interest to organizations, would be examining the relationship between Dark Future at Work scores and job (specifically work task related) performance. An initial outcome found in this study involved a strong positive relationship between Dark Future at Work scores and both burnout and neglect of work tasks. With neglect of work tasks being a known outcome of high levels of burnout (Swider & Zimmerman, 2010), combined with past research showing evidence of perceptions of organizational support as a moderator in the relationship between these constructs (Luo et al., 2022), one would expect some sort of similar relationship to appear here. However, that was not the case as in this present study, perceptions of organizational support was not found to moderate any relationships between Dark Future at Work scores and the outcomes presented in this study,

that including burnout and neglect. As such, examining any potential relationships between performance and Dark Future at Work scores may prove beneficial to organizations if employee performance is dropping while organizational factors such as strong levels of perceptions of organizational support remain present. In a sense, it may provide organizations with other avenues to examine when best trying to understand changing levels of employee performance.

Conclusion

The goal of the current study was to adapt the Dark Future shortened scale created by Zaleski et al. (2019), and adapt the scale to a workplace setting by targeting highly negative occupational future time perspectives. Results of this study provide us with a 2-factor scale, showcasing strong internal consistency, as well as evidence of convergent and discriminant validity. Of the 2 factors, the first (Future Job Anxiety) targets evaluations of how current anxieties within one's job will play out over the near future. The second factor (Fear of Failure) targets a more broad and all-encompassing evaluation of the individuals career goals, whether that be at their current organization or not. Initial outcomes of this scale show significant positive relationships between Dark Future at Work scores, and variables such as Mental Health, State-Trait Hopelessness, Turnover intentions, Burnout, Neglect of work tasks, and Partial Absenteeism. As this study only found perceptions of organizational support to moderate retirement intentions, Future research should examine the influence of individual factors such as personality and its influence on the formation of an occupational future time erspective, as well as its influence on workplace outcomes.

References

Andrea, H., Bültmann, U., Van Amelsvoort, L. G. P. M., & Kant, Y. (2009). The incidence of anxiety and depression among employees-the role of psychosocial work characteristics. *Depression and Anxiety*, *26*(11), 1040–1048. https://doi.org/10.1002/da.20516

Asif, F., Javed, U., & Janjua, S. Y. (2018). The Job Demand-Control-Support Model and Employee Wellbeing: A Meta-Analysis of Previous Research. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, *33*(1), 203-.

Avey, J. B., Reichard, R. J., Luthans, F., & Mhatre, K. H. (2011). Meta-analysis of the impact of positive psychological capital on employee attitudes, behaviors, and performance. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *22*(2), 127–152. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.20070

Beck, A. T., Steer, R. A., Beck, J. S., & Newman, C. F. (1993). Hopelessness, Depression, Suicidal Ideation, and Clinical Diagnosis of Depression. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, *23*(2), 139–145. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1943-278X.1993.tb00378.x

Bergman, Y. S., & Segel-Karpas, D. (2018). Future time perspective, loneliness, and depressive symptoms among middle-aged adults: A mediation model. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *241*, 173–175. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2018.08.019

Boon, C., Belschak, F. D., Den Hartog, D. N., & Pijnenburg, M. (2014). Perceived Human Resource Management Practices: Their Effect on Employee Absenteeism and Time Allocation at Work. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, *13*(1), 21–33. https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000101

Bussfeld, P., Hegerl, U., Moller, H.-J., & Henkel, V. (2002). Cognitive-behavioural theories of helplessness/hopelessness: Valid models of depression? *European Archives of Psychiatry and Clinical Neuroscience*, *252*(5), 240–249. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00406-002-0389-y

Carstensen, L. L., Isaacowitz, D. M., & Charles, S. T. (1999). Taking time seriously: A theory of socioemotional selectivity. *American Psychologist*, *54*(3), 165–181. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.54.3.165

Cleveland, J. N., Huebner, L.-A., Anderson, K. J., & Agbeke, D. V. (2019). Lifespan Perspectives on Job Performance, Performance Appraisal/Management and Creative Performance. In *Work Across the Lifespan* (pp. 291–321). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-812756-8.00012-8

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203771587

Darmon, R. Y. (1990). Identifying Sources of Turnover Costs: A Segmental Approach. *Journal of Marketing*, *54*(2), 46–56. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299005400204

DP, S. (1980). Construct validity in organizational behavior. *Res Organ Behav*, *2*, 3–43.

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *71*(3), 500–507. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500

Eisenberger, R., Rhoades Shanock, L., & Wen, X. (2020). Perceived Organizational Support: Why Caring About Employees Counts. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *7*(1), 101–124. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012119-044917

Enzmann, D., Schaufeli, W., Janssen, P., & Rozeman, A. (1998). Dimensionality and validity of the Bumout Measure. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *71*, 331–351. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1998.tb00680.x

Eysenck, M. W. (2000). A cognitive approach to trait anxiety. *European Journal of Personality*, *14*(5), 463–476. https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-0984(200009/10)14:5<463::AID-PER393>3.0.CO;2-3

Ford, J. K., MacCallum, R. C., & Tait, M. (1986). The Application of Exploratory Factor Analysis in Applied Psychology: A Critical Review and Analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, *39*(2), 291–314. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1986.tb00583.x

Ganson, K. T., Tsai, A. C., Weiser, S. D., Benabou, S. E., & Nagata, J. M. (2021). Job Insecurity and Symptoms of Anxiety and Depression Among U.S. Young Adults During COVID-19. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *68*(1), 53–56. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2020.10.008

Guerrero, S., & Chênevert, D. (2021). Municipal Employees' Performance and Neglect: The Effects of Mission Valence. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, *41*(3), 447–465. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X19896013

Hai, S., & Park, I.-J. (2023). How and when does the career future time perspective motivate service performance? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2023.2266678

Henry, H., Zacher, H., & Desmette, D. (2017). Future Time Perspective in the Work Context: A Systematic Review of Quantitative Studies. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*, 413. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00413

Hepburn, C. G., & Barling, J. (1996). Eldercare responsibilities, interrole conflict, and employee absence: A daily study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *1*(3), 311–318. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.1.3.311

Hinkin, T. R. (1998). A Brief Tutorial on the Development of Measures for Use in Survey Questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods*, *1*(1), 104–121. https://doi.org/10.1177/109442819800100106

Ho, H. C. Y., & Yeung, D. Y. (2016). Effects of occupational future time perspective on managing stressful work situations. *International Journal of Psychology*, *51*(4), 261–268. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12144

Holtrop, D., Born, M. Ph., De Vries, A., & De Vries, R. E. (2014). A matter of context: A comparison of two types of contextualized personality measures. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *68*, 234–240. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.04.029

Hytman, L., Hemming, M., Newman, T., & Newton, N. J. (2023). Future Time Perspective and Psychological Well-Being for Older Canadian Women During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Adult Development*, *30*(4), 393–403. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10804-023-09445-8

Kelloway, E. K., Gottlieb, B. H., & Barham, L. (1999). The source, nature, and direction of work and family conflict: A longitudinal investigation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *4*(4), 337–346. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.4.4.337

Kenny, D. A., & McCoach, D. B. (2003). Effect of the Number of Variables on Measures of Fit in Structural Equation Modeling. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *10*(3), 333–351. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM1003_1

Kock, F., Berbekova, A., & Assaf, A. G. (2021). Understanding and managing the threat of common method bias: Detection, prevention and control. *Tourism Management*, *86*, 104330. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2021.104330

Koutsimani, P., Montgomery, A., & Georganta, K. (2019). The Relationship Between Burnout, Depression, and Anxiety: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*, 284. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00284

Krzystofiak, F., Cardy, R. L., & Newman, J. (1988). Implicit personality and performance appraisal: The influence of trait inferences on evaluations of behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *73*(3), 515–521. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.73.3.515

Lam, C. C.-C., Cheung, F., & Wu, A. M. S. (2019). Job Insecurity, Occupational Future Time Perspective, and Psychological Distress Among Casino Employees. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, *35*(4), 1177–1191. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-019-09855-y

Lee, R. T., & Ashforth, B. E. (1996). A meta-analytic examination of the correlates of the three dimensions of job burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81*(2), 123–133. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.2.123

Leiter, M. P., Jackson, N. J., & Shaughnessy, K. (2009). Contrasting burnout, turnover intention, control, value congruence and knowledge sharing between Baby Boomers and Generation X. *Journal of Nursing Management*, *17*(1), 100–109. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2834.2008.00884.x

Lewin, K. (1951). Field Theory in Social Science: Selected Theoretical Papers. *Social Research*, *18*(4). https://www.jstor.org/stable/40982341

Luccarella, M. (2016). *Organizational support and pre-retirement and retirement eligible workers' pursuit of flexible work arrangements: A quantitative study*. https://www.proquest.com/openview/c12bd5e72371d6ac8e8087a10f85ca9e/1?cbl=18750&parentSessionId=4rc4Buhg5eA2f0N6Qj5Z4bgEVAJ5P9uRiOLV8Q3b59g%3D&pq-origsite=gscholar&accountid=13908

Luo, D., Song, Y., Cai, X., Li, R., Bai, Y., Chen, B., & Liu, Y. (2022). Nurse managers' burnout and organizational support: The serial mediating role of leadership and resilience. *Journal of Nursing Management*, *30*(8), 4251–4261. https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.13852

MacCallum, R. C., Browne, M. W., & Sugawara, H. M. (1996). Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychological Methods*, *1*(2), 130–149. https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.1.2.130

Mohamed, T. N., & Bendania, A. (2023). Investigating the relationship of actively open-minded thinking in future time perspectives among Saudi undergraduate students. *Psychological Research*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00426-023-01851-7

Park, I.-J., Han, K., & Ryu, K. (2021). Development and Validation of a Career Future Time Perspective Scale. *Journal of Career Development*, *48*(5), 701–714. https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845319887810

Sattler, J. M. (1964). Counselor competence, interest and time perspective. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *11*(4), 357–360. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0044480

Sparr, J. L., & Sonnentag, S. (2008). Feedback environment and well-being at work: The mediating role of personal control and feelings of helplessness. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *17*(3), 388–412. https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320802077146

Swider, B. W., & Zimmerman, R. D. (2010). Born to burnout: A meta-analytic path model of personality, job burnout, and work outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *76*(3), 487–506. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.01.003

Trivedi, R. K., Srivastava, A. K., & Kumar, P. (1981). Interrelationship between job anxiety and absenteeism. *Indian Psychological Review*, *20*(3), 13–18.

Withey, M. J., & Cooper, W. H. (1989). Predicting Exit, Voice, Loyalty, and Neglect. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *34*(4), 521. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393565

Zacher, H., & Frese, M. (2009). Remaining time and opportunities at work: Relationships between age, work characteristics, and occupational future time perspective. *Psychology and Aging*, *24*(2), 487–493. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015425

Zaleski, Z. (1996). Future Anxiety: Concept, measurement, and preliminary research. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *21*(2), 165–174. https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(96)00070-0

Zaleski, Z., Sobol-Kwapinska, M., Przepiorka, A., & Meisner, M. (2019). Development and validation of the Dark Future scale. *Time & Society*, *28*(1), 107–123. https://doi.org/10.1177/0961463X16678257

Zhi, K., Yang, J., Chen, S., Chen, Y., Akebaijiang, N., Liu, M., & Xia, L. (2023). Future time perspective and trust in government: The mediation of the consideration of future consequences. *Current Psychology*, *42*(14), 12087–12095. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-02351-w

Zimbardo, P. G., & Boyd, J. N. (199 C.E.). Putting Time in Perspective: A Valid, Reliable Individual-Differences Metric. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*(6), 1271–1288. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-07368-2_2

Zimbardo, P., Sword, R., & Sword, R. (2012). *The Time Cure: Overcoming PTSD with the New Psychology of Time Perspective Therapy*. John Wiley & Sons.

Appendix A

The Dark Future at Work Scale (Adopted for the Workplace from Zaleski et al. (2019)

Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neutral 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

1. I am afraid the problems at work will continue for a long time
2. I don't think that things are going to get any better in my job
3. I am scared at the thought of facing a crisis or difficulty at work
4. I am afraid that in the future my job will change for the worse
5. I am afraid that future changes in economic or political situations will threaten my job
6. Things at work seem to be getting worse and worse
7. I worry that I won't be able to realize my professional goals.
8. I worry that I won't be able to deal with the problems in my workplace
9. Even when things go well at work, I believe fate will turn against me
10. I am afraid that in the future my co-workers will have a negative opinion of me
11. I am afraid that after several years I will evaluate my career as purposeless
12. I feel tense/uneasy when I think about my future at my current job
13. I fear the thought of what the next days/months/years at my job will bring
14. I feal I will fail to overcome the mounting difficulties of my job
15. I am afraid that I won't be appreciated in my profession

Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory Items (Zimbardo & Boyd, 1999)

Note: Respondents are asked to read each item and, as honestly as they can, answer the following question: "How characteristic or true is this of you?" (1 = very uncharacteristic, 2 = uncharacteristic, 3 = neutral, 4 = characteristic, 5 = very characteristic).

1. I believe that getting together with one's friends to party is one of life's important pleasures.
2. Familiar childhood sights, sounds, and smells often bring back a flood of wonderful memories.
3. Fate determines much in my life
4. I often think of what I should have done differently in my life.
5. My decisions are mostly influenced by people and things around me.
6. I believe that a person's day should be planned ahead each morning.
7. It gives me pleasure to think about my past.
8. I do things impulsively.
9. If things don't get done on time, I don't worry about it.
10. When I want to achieve something, I set goals and consider specific means for reaching those goals.
11. On balance, there is much more good to recall than bad in my past.
12. When listening to my favorite music, I often lose all track of time.
13. Meeting tomorrow's deadlines and doing other necessary work comes before tonight's play.

14. Since whatever will be will be, it doesn't really matter what I do.
15. I enjoy stories about how things used to be in the "good old times."
16. Painful past experiences keep being replayed in my mind.
17. I try to live my life as fully as possible, one day at a time.
18. It upsets me to be late for appointments.
19. Ideally, I would live each day as if it were my last.
20. Happy memories of good times spring readily to mind.
21. I meet my obligations to friends and authorities on time.
22. I've taken my share of abuse and rejection in the past.
23. I make decisions on the spur of the moment.
24. I take each day as it is rather than try to plan it out.
25. The past has too many unpleasant memories that I prefer not to think about.
26. It is important to put excitement in my life.
27. I've made mistakes in the past that I wish I could undo.
28. I feel that it's more important to enjoy what you're doing than to get work done on time.
29. I get nostalgic about my childhood.
30. Before making a decision, I weigh the costs against the benefits.
31. Taking risks keeps my life from becoming boring.
32. It is more important for me to enjoy life's journey than to focus only on the destination.
33. Things rarely work out as I expected.
34. It's hard for me to forget unpleasant images of my youth.
35. It takes joy out of the process and flow of my activities, if I have to think about goals, outcomes, and products.
36. Even when I am enjoying the present, I am drawn back to comparisons with similar past experiences.
37. You can't really plan for the future because things change so much.
38. My life path is controlled by forces I cannot influence.
39. It doesn't make sense to worry about the future, since there is nothing that I can do about it anyway.
40. I complete projects on time by making steady progress.
41. I find myself tuning out when family members talk about the way things used to be.
42. I take risks to put excitement in my life.
43. I make lists of things to do.
44. I often follow my heart more than my head.
45. I am able to resist temptations when I know that there is work to be done.
46. I find myself getting swept up in the excitement of the moment.
47. Life today is too complicated; I would prefer the simpler life of the past.
48. I prefer friends who are spontaneous rather than predictable.
49. I like family rituals and traditions that are regularly repeated.
50. I think about the bad things that have happened to me in the past.
51. I keep working at difficult, uninteresting tasks if they will help me get ahead.
52. Spending what I earn on pleasures today is better than saving for tomorrow's security.
53. Often luck pays off better than hard work.
54. I think about the good things that I have missed out on in my life.
55. I like my close relationships to be passionate.
56. There will always be time to catch up on my work.

Future Time Perspective Scale - Carstensen LL and Lang FR (1996) Future orientation scale. Unpublished manuscript. Stanford University.

Read each item and answer the questions: "How true is this of you?" Mark under the appropriate number on the scale, where 1 means the statement is very untrue for you and 7 means that the statement is very true for you.

Very Untrue Very True
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1. Many opportunities await me in the future.
2. I expect that I will set many new goals in the future.
3. My future is filled with possibilities.
4. Most of my life lies ahead of me.
5. My future seems infinite to me.
6. I could do anything I want in the future.
7. There is plenty of time left in my life to make new plans.
8. I have a sense time is running out.
9. There are only limited possibilities in my future
10. As I get older, I begin to experience time as limited.

Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9; Kroenke et al., 2001)

Over the last 2 months, how often have you been bothered by any of the following problems?
0 = Not at all; 1 = Several days; 2 = More than half the days; 3 = Nearly every day

1. Little interest or pleasure in doing things.
2. Feeling down, depressed, or hopeless.
3. Trouble falling or staying asleep or sleeping too much.
4. Feeling tired or having little energy
5. Poor appetite or overeating
6. Feeling bad about yourself - or that you are a failure or have let yourself or your family down.
7. Trouble concentrating on things, such as reading the newspaper or watching television.
8. Moving or speaking so slowly that other people could have noticed? Or the opposite - being so fidgety or restless that you have been moving around a lot more than usual.
9. Thoughts that you would be better off dead or of hurting yourself in some way

State and Trait Hopelessness Scales (Dunn et al., 2013) – Modified

Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neutral 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

In the past 2 months, I feel…

1. It is difficult for me to imagine my future.

2. I believe I cannot make a difference.
3. I believe I am powerless to change my future.
4. I see my future as gloomy.
5. I feel giving up would be easier.
6. Things do not work out as I would like.
7. Negative things seem to happen to me.
8. I doubt that anything is worthwhile.

Perceived Organizational Support – Eisenberger et al. (1986)

Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree)

1. The organization values my contribution to its well-being.
2. The organization strongly considers my goals and values.
3. Help is available from the organization when I have a problem.
4. The organization really cares about my well-being.
5. The organization wishes to give me the best possible job for which I am qualified.
6. The organization cares about my general satisfaction at work.
7. The organization takes pride in my accomplishments at work.
8. The organization would forgive an honest mistake on my part.
9. The organization is willing to extend itself to help me perform my job to the best of my ability.
10. The organization cares about my opinions.

Neglect Scale - Withey & Cooper (1989) and (Hepburn & Barling, 1996)

Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with the statement using the following rating scale:

1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neutral 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

In the past 2 months, at work I have been…

1. Calling in sick and not dealing with what is happening
2. Coming in late to avoid problems
3. Becoming less interested and making more errors

Please read the below statements and indicate whether or not you have engaged in the following behaviors as a result of high stress/anxiety at work:

In the past 2 months, due to Work Stress/Anxiety I have...

1. Been late to work (Yes) (No)
2. Left work early (Yes)(No)
3. Spent time on my phone (Yes)(No)
4. Taken an extended Break (Yes)(No)

5. Taken an extended Lunch (Yes)(No)
6. Been Distracted at Work (Yes)(No)

Turnover and Retirement Intent – (Kelloway et al., 1999) - Modified

Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neutral 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

1. I am thinking about leaving this organization
2. I am planning to look for a new job
3. I intend to ask people about new job opportunities
4. I don't plan to be in this organization much longer
5. I plan to retire as soon as I qualify for a pension
6. I am actively planning for retirement in the near future
7. I am thinking about retiring in the next year or so

Burnout Measure - Enzmann et al. (1998) (modified)

Please read the following items and rate how often you have had any of the following experiences in the last 2 months using the below rating scale.

1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Often 5 = Always

1. Being tired.
2. Feeling depressed.
3. Having a good day
4. Being physically exhausted.
5. Being emotionally exhausted.
6. Being happy.
7. Being ‘wiped out’.
8. Feeling ‘burned out’
9. Being unhappy.
10. Feeling rundown.
11. Feeling trapped.
12. Feeling worthless.
13. Being weary.
14. Being troubled.
15. Feeling disillusioned and resentful about
16. Feeling weak.
17. Feeling hopeless.
18. Feeling rejected.
19. Feeling optimistic.
20. Feeling Energetic
21. Feeling anxious.

Appendix B

The Dark Future at Work Scale [Adopted for the Workplace from Zaleski et al. (2019)]

Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement.

1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neutral 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

1. I am afraid the problems at work will continue for a long time
2. I don't think that things are going to get any better in my job
3. I am afraid that in the future my job will change for the worse
4. Things at work seem to be getting worse and worse
5. I worry that I won't be able to deal with the problems in my workplace
6. Even when things go well at work, I believe fate will turn against me
7. I am afraid that in the future my co-workers will have a negative opinion of me
8. I feal I will fail to overcome the mounting difficulties of my job
9. I am afraid that I won't be appreciated in my profession