Mindfulness
https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-026-02920-9

RESEARCH

Workplace Mindfulness Scale: A Non-Western Adaptation

Zeynep Tunay Gül[1,2] · **Bülent Alcı**[3]

Received: 16 October 2025 / Accepted: 19 June 2026
© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature 2026

Abstract

Objectives This study adapted the Workplace Mindfulness Scale (Zheng et al., *Journal of Business and Psychology, 38*, 777–801, 2023) to Turkish and evaluated its structural validity and reliability among employees in a non-Western context, addressing the unique organizational conditions in Turkey and providing a reliable tool to assess mindfulness in professional settings.

Method A two-stage design was used. First, linguistic equivalence was established with 65 bilingual academics following standard cross-cultural adaptation procedures. Second, the Turkish WMS was administered online to 350 employees across public and private organizations. Analyses were conducted using SPSS and JASP. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) tested the original three-factor, 18-item structure. Reliability was evaluated through Cronbach's α, McDonald's ω, and item–total correlations.

Results Linguistic equivalence was confirmed ($r = 0.97$). CFA supported the three-factor model, and reliability was acceptable to high (overall $\alpha = 0.85$).

Conclusions Following adaptation, the Turkish version of the Workplace Mindfulness Scale (WMS) was obtained. The Turkish WMS demonstrated sound psychometric properties and can be used in research on workplace mindfulness and related outcomes.

Preregistrations This study is not preregistered.

Keywords Mindfulness · Occupational context · Scale adaptation · Psychometric properties

In modern life, the multitude of stimuli and the expectation of being fast and efficient can cause individuals to multitask in a relentless work pace, often without realizing it. In organizational settings shaped by efficiency imperatives, employees are required to work efficiently and present satisfactory performance. High performance demands not only present-moment attention, but also the ability to actively enact one's plans and intentions (Ajzen, 1991). At the same time, according to the happy and productive employees' hypothesis, higher levels of employee well-being are associated with better performance (Cropanzano & Wright, 2001), highlighting the increasing importance of psychological well-being in organizational settings.

Originated from Eastern meditation and defined as a way of focusing attention, mindfulness is the experience of attention and awareness in the present moment, and regulating attention to the present, focusing, orienting to experience, openness, and acceptance are its basic components (Kabat-Zinn, 2003). Inattention, in contrast, reflects the lack of awareness of habits, and automatic functions, which can be chronic for many individuals. There is a potential relationship between employee performance, absent-mindedness and awareness (Glomb et al., 2011). Research has shown that task performance is reduced by mind wandering (Smallwood & Schooler, 2015), whereas awareness empowers individuals to be more attuned to their surroundings, equipping them to navigate challenging and unpredictable situations more adeptly (Dane, 2011).

Among employees, mindfulness is positively associated with work engagement and job satisfaction (Leroy et al., 2013) and negatively associated with turnover intentions (Hülsheger et al., 2013) and emotional exhaustion/burnout (Dane & Brummel, 2014). In addition, mindfulness has been

✉ Zeynep Tunay Gül
zeynep.tunaygul@khas.edu.tr

Bülent Alcı
alci@yildiz.edu.tr

[1] Department of Common Courses, Kadir Has University, Istanbul, Turkey

[2] Curriculum and Instruction, Yıldız Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey

[3] Curriculum and Instruction, Yıldız Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey

Published online: 30 June 2026

shown to enhance executive functioning, including attentional control and cognitive flexibility (Moore & Malinowski, 2009), while also being associated with increased creativity and divergent thinking (Henriksen et al., 2020) in workplace contexts. Mindfulness-based exercises have been shown to strengthen interpersonal relationships (Dekeyser et al., 2008); reduce stress (Jensen et al., 2012); increase job performance (King & Haar, 2017); and increase professional commitment (Johnson et al., 2020). These findings underscore the value of mindfulness as a resource for both individual well-being and organizational effectiveness, while also highlighting the need for context-sensitive measurement tools that can accurately capture how mindfulness is experienced and enacted in organizational settings.

While the core principle of mindfulness remains consistent across settings, its manifestation varies depending on contextual characteristics, particularly in professional environments compared to non-work contexts (Dane & Brummel, 2014; Zivnuska et al., 2016). Employees in the workplace operate within task-driven processes, workflows, and employment relationships, which shape how mindfulness is experienced (Zivnuska et al., 2016). Therefore, mindfulness does not manifest in the same way in everyday life as it does in work settings. In this context, mindfulness has been recognized as a valuable tool for improving workplace functioning (Petchsawang & McLean, 2017).

Many mindfulness scales were originally developed for patients, students, or meditators (e.g., Chadwick et al., 2008; Haigh et al., 2011) or for individuals with meditation experience (Lau et al., 2006). Because workers may have different experiences from nonworker samples, this difference can affect the validity and applicability of existing scales. Zivnuska et al. (2016) proposed a unidimensional five-item workplace mindfulness scale; however, the Workplace Mindfulness Scale developed by Zheng et al. (2023) stands out as a more comprehensive and rigorously validated instrument as the authors proposed a multidimensional model of workplace mindfulness encompassing awareness, attention, and acceptance in professional contexts. Here, "workplace mindfulness" refers to employees' beliefs about their capacity to remain at present and attentive to their tasks, interactions and internal experiences within organizational settings.

This need is particularly salient in the Turkish context, where recent evidence points to comparatively low levels of well-being. According to Gallup's Global Emotions Report (2024), Turkey ranks among the countries with the lowest levels of positive emotional experiences. Furthermore, OECD data indicate that Turkey is among the countries with the longest working hours (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2023), reflecting the strain experienced by employees. These conditions highlight the importance of examining workplace mindfulness as a potential resource for enhancing employee well-being and performance. Measuring workplace mindfulness in the Turkish occupational context, where occupational stress and workload are notably high (Akdeniz et al., 2023; Palancı et al., 2021), can provide critical insights into employees' cognitive and emotional functioning at work and guide the development of interventions to enhance this capacity.

In response to this need, the present study aimed to adapt and psychometrically evaluate the Workplace Mindfulness Scale (Zheng et al., 2023) within the Turkish context. By providing a culturally sensitive measurement tool, this study sought to support future research on workplace mindfulness and its relationship with work-related outcomes and well-being.

Method

Participants

In the linguistic equivalence stage, 65 bilingual employees participated to assess the linguistic consistency of the Turkish and English versions of the scale. In the second stage, the final adapted scale was administered to 350 employees from public and private sectors in Turkey (66% female, 34% male). The sample size was considered adequate for confirmatory factor analysis based on recommended participant-to-item ratios (Kline, 2016). Participants represented diverse departments, including human resources, information technology, accounting, finance, marketing, research and development, education, medicine, and production. The samples used across the study stages are summarized in Table 1.

Procedure

The study was conducted in two stages. The first stage involved establishing the linguistic equivalence of the scale by administering both the original English and adapted Turkish versions to academics who were competent in both languages. This phase ensured that the Turkish form accurately reflected the content of the original instrument. The second stage tested the structural validity and reliability of the translated scale in a broader employee sample to determine whether it is an appropriate and psychometrically sound tool for use in the Turkish workplace context. Detailed information about the participants, original scale, and operations performed on the different samples is explained in detail below.

Linguistic Equivalence Testing

For this stage, five steps were performed by following the guidelines proposed by Beaton et al. (2000) grounded in certain procedures followed: translation, synthesis, back translation, experts' reviews and presenting (see Fig. 1).

Table 1 Samples across study stages

Stage	Purpose	Sample (*n*)	Sample characteristics
Linguistic Equivalence Testing	Linguistic equivalence (English-Turkish comparison)	65	Employees proficient in both English and Turkish
Scale Validation	Scale validation (structural validation and internal consistency)	350	Employees from public and private sectors; 66% female, 34% male; diverse departments including human resources, information technology, accounting, finance, marketing, research and development, education, medicine, and production



Fig. 1 Graphic representation of scale adaptation stages

The first step of this was *Translation*. For this purpose, field experts with a master's degree and minimum five-year experience of teaching English Language participated in the translation group. The Turkish translation was carried separately by three different experienced lecturers none of whom knew each other in a way to make sure that there was no interaction with each other. The second step, *Synthesis* was about collecting and comparing of different translations obtained from the language experts. For this reason, all the language experts came together with an online meeting platform to give shape to the Turkish form. After reaching an agreement on the disagreed items, the translation was presented to a Turkish language expert who is competent in both English and Turkish languages. After the recommendations given by the Turkish language expert for the scale, which was examined for spelling and grammar, minor adjustments to a few words were made without deviating from the meaning. In the third step—*Backward Translation*—the Turkish version of the scale to be translated back into English was sent to another group of three different English lecturers, who were not in the first translation stage. In this way, independent language experts had participated in these two translation processes. For the fourth step—*Expert Review*—the back-translated English version and the original form were compared by language experts and researchers, and no significant differences were identified between the two versions. Based on these evaluations, the Turkish form was finalized and deemed ready for pretesting. In the final step—*Pretesting*—linguistic equivalence was assessed by administering both the original English and Turkish versions to the same group of participants, using Pearson correlation and a paired-samples *t*-test to examine the association and differences between the two versions.

Scale Validation

After the linguistic equivalence phase, the scale was ready for main data collection, as the Pearson correlation between the Turkish and English versions was high and no significant differences were observed between the mean scores of the original English items and their Turkish equivalents. The final form of the scale (e.g., Online Resource 4) was sent online by using a Google Form to 350 employees in Turkey from different cities, companies, and departments. In the first part of the form, it was clearly stated that participation is voluntary, and the data obtained would only be used within the scope of scientific research.

Measures

The Workplace Mindfulness Scale (WMS), developed by Zheng et al. (2023), is an 18-item instrument comprising three dimensions: awareness, attention, and acceptance. The scale has demonstrated sound psychometric properties, with evidence supporting its factorial validity as a second-order construct. Reported internal consistency coefficients (Cronbach's α) were 0.89 for attention, 0.89 for awareness, 0.77 for acceptance, and 0.91 for the overall scale. Further evidence of convergent, discriminant, and predictive validity has also been established (Zheng et al., 2023).

Data Analyses

This section presents the data analyzing regarding the linguistic equivalence, structural validity, and internal consistency studies of the Workplace Mindfulness Scale. All data were analyzed via IBM SPSS 22 and Latent Variable Analysis (Lavaan) module in JASP software programs.

A pretesting study was conducted prior to the main analysis to establish the linguistic equivalence of the scale. Pearson correlation analysis was employed to examine the degree of association between the Turkish and English versions of the scale, and a paired-samples *t*-test was conducted to assess whether there were statistically significant differences between the corresponding items in the two language versions.

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using the DWLS estimator was conducted to test the three-factor structure of the scale. As the assumption of multiple normality between the items was not met, parameter estimation was performed with the Diagonally Weighted Least Squares (DWLS) method. A first-order three-factor model was tested, with correlations allowed among the latent factors. The values of the Normed Fit Index (NFI), Relative Fit Index (RFI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and Incremental Fit Index (IFI) are required to be greater than 0.90, and values approaching 1 indicate an excellent model fit. In addition, the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) values being below 0.05 also demonstrate a good model fit (Schumacker & Lomax, 2004). The internal consistency of the scale was evaluated through Cronbach's alpha (α) and McDonald's omega (ω).

Results

According to the results of the correlation analysis in the linguistic equivalence stage, it was found that there was a highly positive and significant relationship between the English and Turkish forms of the scale "$r = 0.97$, $p < 0.01$" (e.g., Online Resource 1). In addition, a paired-samples *t*-test was conducted to determine whether the Turkish and English versions of the items differed significantly, and the results showed no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the original English items and their Turkish counterparts "$t(64) = 0.82$, $p = 0.42$". The data presented herein indicates that the Workplace Mindfulness Scale satisfies the criteria for linguistic equivalence. Table 2 provides a comprehensive overview of the dependent samples *t*-test analysis.

The model demonstrated good fit (CFI = 0.95, IFI = 0.95, RMSEA = 0.05, SRMR = 0.04). The fact that the fit indices have good fit values indicates that the original scale model fits the data collected with the three-dimensional scale well and confirms the theoretical structure (e.g., Online Resource 2). Furthermore, it was observed that the standardized factor loadings of all items were above 0.40 except item 4. Although the factor loading of item 4 was below 0.40, the decision to retain the item was based on its satisfactory item–total correlation, its contribution to the overall internal consistency of the scale, and its conceptual relevance to the construct. It can be concluded that the scale items adequately represent the relevant factors as shown in Table 3.

To test the reliability of the scale, Cronbach's alpha (α) and McDonald's omega (ω) were calculated. The factors exhibited acceptable internal consistency, and the Cronbach's alpha values for attention, awareness, and acceptance were 0.76, 0.79, and 0.77, respectively, and the McDonald's omega values were 0.75, 0.79, and 0.77, respectively. In Factor 1, both reliability coefficients showed similar results. Factor 2 also had good reliability indicators and was found to have a strong internal consistency. Factor 3 was similarly found to have good reliability values. Overall, all three factors in the scale were found to have an acceptable internal consistency (e.g., Online Resource 3).

Item-total correlations ranged between 0.43 and 0.55 for the first factor, between 0.35 and 0.71 for the second factor, and between 0.43 and 0.55 for the third factor. In general, the items were found to have a strong relationship with the factor. The total Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the scale was calculated as 0.85. Item-total correlations, known as item validity coefficients, are shown in Table 4.

Discussion

Prior research has further shown that using a frame of reference (e.g., the workplace) strengthens the criterion-related validity of context-specific measures (Lievens et al., 2008). Consequently, when a mindfulness scale overlooks the specific context, situational differences may be neglected, which in turn can weaken both its explanatory power and predictive validity (Robie et al., 2000). Therefore, addressing this highly significant, multidimensional matter requires incorporating employees' self-assessment of workplace mindfulness, especially as situated within organizational contexts. With this purpose in mind, this study aimed to adapt the workplace mindfulness scale into the Turkish context.

The Turkish adaptation of the Workplace Mindfulness Scale retained the original three-factor, 18-item structure and demonstrated sound psychometric properties. Linguistic equivalence demonstrated a positive relationship between the original (English) and Turkish versions and no

Table 2 *t*-test results for dependent samples examining the relationship between Turkish and English scale ıtem

	n	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*t*	*p*
The original version (EN)	65	56.00	23.64	64	0.82	0.42
The adapted version (TR)		55.50	23.65			

Table 3 Standardized factor loadings

Factor No.		Item No.	Estimation	Std. error	*z*	*p*	CI (lower)	CI (upper)	Factor loading
Factor1	= ~	I1	1.00	0.00	11.98	< 0.001	1.00	1.00	0.57
Factor1	= ~	I2	0.84	0.07	11.69	< 0.001	0.70	0.98	0.62
Factor1	= ~	I3	1.10	0.09	8.79	< 0.001	0.92	1.29	0.61
Factor1	= ~	I4	0.59	0.07	11.77	< 0.001	0.46	0.72	0.34
Factor1	= ~	I5	0.93	0.08	12.22	< 0.001	0.78	1.09	0.60
Factor1	= ~	I6	1.15	0.09			0.97	1.34	0.72
Factor2	= ~	I7	1.00	0.00	13.62	< 0.001	1.00	1.00	0.63
Factor2	= ~	I8	1.29	0.10	11.34	< 0.001	1.11	1.48	0.68
Factor2	= ~	I9	1.08	0.10	14.10	< 0.001	0.89	1.27	0.44
Factor2	= ~	I10	1.64	0.12	13.52	< 0.001	1.41	1.87	0.78
Factor2	= ~	I11	1.44	0.11	13.17	< 0.001	1.23	1.65	0.71
Factor2	= ~	I12	1.59	0.12			1.32	1.78	0.61
Factor3	= ~	I13	1.00	0.00	10.35	< 0.001	1.00	1.00	0.72
Factor3	= ~	I14	0.65	0.06	12.21	< 0.001	0.53	0.78	0.42
Factor3	= ~	I15	0.89	0.07	12.49	< 0.001	0.74	1.03	0.64
Factor3	= ~	I16	1.01	0.08	11.66	< 0.001	0.85	1.16	0.65
Factor3	= ~	I17	0.86	0.07	11.37	< 0.001	0.71	1.00	0.54
Factor3	= ~	I18	0.86	0.08	11.98	< 0.001	0.71	1.01	0.52

Factor loadings for ıtems I6 and I12 were fixed to 1.00 for model identification; therefore, *z* and *p* values were not estimated

Table 4 Item-total correlations and total Cronbach's alpha coefficient

Factor No.	Item	Item-total correlation	Cronbach's alpha
Factor1	I1	0.43	0.85
	I2	0.49	
	I3	0.51	
	I4	0.55	
	I5	0.55	
	I6	0.53	
Factor2	I7	0.55	
	I8	0.66	
	I9	0.35	
	I10	0.71	
	I11	0.60	
	I12	0.49	
Factor3	I13	0.43	
	I14	0.49	
	I15	0.51	
	I16	0.55	
	I17	0.55	
	I18	0.53	

significant differences between them. The findings for scale validation stage indicated acceptable model fit and satisfactory internal consistency across the scale, supporting its use within the framework of Classical Test Theory.

In the first part (language equivalence validity) of the study, 65 academics from a private university took part in. The results showed that there was found to retain a statistically significant relationship between the original and Turkish forms in a positive direction. Moreover, the dependent sample *t*-test result demonstrated no statistically significant difference between both forms, which indicates that the scale provides the condition of linguistic equivalence.

The final version of the scale was tested on a group of 350 employees working in a variety of departments from public and private companies in Turkey. According to the results of the confirmatory factor analysis, the original version of the scale was retained as 18 items in total, with 3 factors (awareness, attention, and acceptance) as in the original form. While the Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient calculated for the first factor consisting of 6 items was found to be 0.76; the Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient calculated for the second factor consisting of 6 items was found to be 0.79 and the third factor with 6 items was found to be 0.77. This shows that the scale is highly reliable and has strong consistency. When the results of confirmatory factor analysis are examined, it is seen that the scale has acceptable fit indices. It was obtained as the Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the 18-item scale was 0.85. Therefore, the

reliability of the scale is high, and the internal consistency between the items is high, so it is as it is expected and desired in this study. To examine the psychometric structure of the adapted scale, item and test analyses were performed with the help of the Classical Test Theory (CTT), which is known to be widely applied, practical, and beneficial (Hambleton, 2002). Like the present study, Özdemir (2025) adapted the original Workplace Mindfulness Scale developed by Zheng et al. (2023). However, while they reduced the scale to 16 items due to low or cross-loadings, we retained all 18 items, prioritizing the original structure supported by acceptable CFA and reliability results.

In conclusion, the Turkish version of the Workplace Mindfulness Scale (WMS) preserves the original multidimensional structure and provides a practical tool for assessing awareness, attention, and acceptance in workplace settings. Acknowledging the profound impact of mindfulness within organizational settings, the Turkish version of the scale may facilitate future research on workplace mindfulness in Turkish samples, enable a deeper exploration of its associations with work-related outcomes, and contribute to a better understanding of mindfulness-related processes in organizational contexts.

Limitations and Future Directions

This study has some limitations. First, the scope of validity evidence was limited to structural validity, as convergent, discriminant, and criterion-related validity were not examined. Second, the use of self-report measures may have introduced common method bias. In addition, demographic covariates and prior mindfulness experience were not controlled, which may have acted as potential confounds. The study also did not account for working arrangements (e.g., in-office vs. remote) or employment status (e.g., part-time vs. full-time), which may influence workplace mindfulness. Furthermore, the sample size, although adequate, may limit generalizability. Future research should address these limitations by incorporating diverse samples, additional validity evidence, and relevant contextual variables.

Supplementary Information The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-026-02920-9.

Acknowledgements This study is based on the first author's doctoral dissertation.

Author Contributions The authors declare that they contributed equally to the conception, design, data collection, analysis, and writing of this manuscript.

Funding No funding was received for conducting this study.

Data Availability The raw data are available at https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20552568.

Declarations

Ethics Approval Ethical approval was obtained from the Social Sciences Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee of Yıldız Technical University (Turkey) (meeting no. 2024.06).

Informed Consent All participants received verbal and written information about the study's purpose, procedures, potential risks/benefits, confidentiality, and data handling. Prior to data collection, it was noted that participation was voluntary; participants could decline or withdraw at any time without penalty. Data were coded to protect anonymity and were not shared with third parties; only the research team had access. The study complied with the Declaration of Helsinki (1964) and relevant institutional/national ethical guidelines.

Competing interests The authors declare no competing interests.The authors declare no competing interests.

Declaration of Generative AI AI tools were used only for language polishing (proofreading and grammar). No AI was involved in the study design, data collection, analysis, or interpretation. The authors reviewed the final manuscript and take full responsibility for its content.

References

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50*(2), 179–211. https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T

Akdeniz, Ş, Çoban, M., Koç, O., Pekesen, M., Korkmaz Yaylagul, N., Sönmez, S., Yetiz, F., Başıbüyük, G. Ö., Efe, M., Ergun, A. D., Özgür, Ö., Vural, M., Akış, A. G., & Tufan, İ. (2023). Determination of workload, work stress and related factors in nursing home workers during the COVID-19 pandemic in Turkey. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 20*(1), 160. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20010160

Beaton, D. E., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F., & Ferraz, M. B. (2000). Guidelines for the process of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measures. *Spine, 25*(24), 3186–3191. https://doi.org/10.1097/00007632-200012150-00014

Chadwick, P., Hember, M., Symes, J., Peters, E., & Dagnan, D. (2008). Responding mindfully to unpleasant thoughts and images: Reliability and validity of the Southampton Mindfulness Questionnaire (SMQ). *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 47*(4), 451–455. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466508X314891

Cropanzano, R., & Wright, T. A. (2001). When a "happy" worker is really a "productive" worker: A review and further refinement of the happy-productive worker thesis. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 53*(3), 182–199. https://doi.org/10.1037/1061-4087.53.3.182

Dane, E. (2011). Paying attention to mindfulness and its effects on task performance in the workplace. *Journal of Management, 37*(4), 997–1018. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310367948

Dane, E., & Brummel, B. J. (2014). Examining workplace mindfulness and its relations to job performance and turnover intention. *Human Relations, 67*(1), 105–128. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726713487753

Dekeyser, M., Raes, F., Leijssen, M., Leysen, S., & Dewulf, D. (2008). Mindfulness skills and interpersonal behaviour. *Personality and Individual Differences, 44*(5), 1235–1245. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2007.11.018

Gallup. (2024). *Gallup global emotions report 2024*. Retrieved June 1, 2025, from https://www.gallup.com/analytics/349280/state-of-worlds-emotional-health.aspx

Glomb, T. M., Duffy, M. K., Bono, J. E., & Yang, T. (2011). Mindfulness at work. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 30*, 115–157. https://doi.org/10.1108/S0742-7301(2011)0000030005

Haigh, E. A., Moore, M. T., Kashdan, T. B., & Fresco, D. M. (2011). Examination of the factor structure and concurrent validity of the Langer mindfulness/mindlessness scale. *Assessment, 18*(1), 11–26. https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191110386342

Hambleton, R. K. (2002). Adapting achievement tests into multiple languages for international assessments. In A. C. Porter & A. Gamoran (Eds.), *Methodological advances in cross-national surveys of educational achievement* (pp. 58–79). The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/10322

Henriksen, D., Richardson, C., & Shack, K. (2020). Mindfulness and creativity: Implications for thinking and learning. *Thinking Skills and Creativity, 37*, Article 100689. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2020.100689

Hülsheger, U. R., Alberts, H. J. E. M., Feinholdt, A., & Lang, J. W. B. (2013). Benefits of mindfulness at work: The role of mindfulness in emotion regulation, emotional exhaustion, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 98*(2), 310–325. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031313

Jensen, C. G., Vangkilde, S., Frokjaer, V., & Hasselbalch, S. G. (2012). Mindfulness training affects attention—or is it attentional effort? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 141*(1), 106–123. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024931

Johnson, K. R., Park, S., & Chaudhuri, S. (2020). Mindfulness training in the workplace: Exploring its scope and outcomes. *European Journal of Training and Development, 44*(4–5), 341–361. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-09-2019-0156

Kabat-Zinn, J. (2003). Mindfulness-based interventions in context: Past, present, and future. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice, 10*(2), 144–156. https://doi.org/10.1093/clipsy.bpg016

King, E., & Haar, J. M. (2017). Mindfulness and job performance: A study of Australian leaders. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 55*(3), 298–319. https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-7941.12143

Kline, R. B. (2016). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (4th ed.). Guilford Press.

Lau, M. A., Bishop, S. R., Segal, Z. V., Buis, T., Anderson, N. D., Carlson, L., Shapiro, S., Carmody, J., Abbey, S., & Devins, G. (2006). The Toronto Mindfulness Scale: Development and validation. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 62*(12), 1445–1467. https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.20326

Leroy, H., Anseel, F., Dimitrova, N. G., & Sels, L. (2013). Mindfulness, authentic functioning, and work engagement: A growth modeling approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 82*(3), 238–247. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2013.01.012

Lievens, F., De Corte, W., & Schollaert, E. (2008). A closer look at the frame-of-reference effect in personality scale scores and validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(2), 268–279. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.2.268

Moore, A., & Malinowski, P. (2009). Meditation, mindfulness and cognitive flexibility. *Consciousness and Cognition, 18*(1), 176–186. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2008.12.008

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). *Hours worked (indicator)*. Retrieved May 2025, from https://www.oecd.org/en/data/indicators/hours-worked.html

Özdemir, K. (2025). İş yeri farkındalığı: Bir ölçek uyarlama çalışması. *İktisadi İdari ve Siyasal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 10*(27), 439–453. https://doi.org/10.25204/iktisad.1659134

Palancı, Y., Mengenci, C., Bayraktaroğlu, S., & Emhan, A. (2021). Analysis of workplace health and safety, job stress, interpersonal conflict, and turnover intention: A comparative study in the health sector. *Health Psychology Report, 9*(1), 76–86. https://doi.org/10.5114/hpr.2020.99971

Petchsawang, P., & McLean, G. N. (2017). Workplace spirituality, mindfulness meditation, and work engagement. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion, 14*(3), 216–244. https://doi.org/10.1080/14766086.2017.1291360

Robie, C., Schmit, M. J., Ryan, A. M., & Zickar, M. J. (2000). Effects of item context specificity on the measurement equivalence of a personality inventory. *Organizational Research Methods, 3*(4), 348–365. https://doi.org/10.1177/109442810034003

Schumacker, R. E., & Lomax, R. G. (2004). *A beginner's guide to structural equation modeling*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Smallwood, J., & Schooler, J. W. (2015). The science of mind wandering: Empirically navigating the stream of consciousness. *Annual Review of Psychology, 66*, 487–518. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010814-015331

Zheng, X., Ni, D., Liu, X., & Liang, L. H. (2023). Workplace mindfulness: Multidimensional model, scale development and validation. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 38*, 777–801. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-022-09814-2

Zivnuska, S., Kacmar, K. M., Ferguson, M., & Carlson, D. S. (2016). Mindfulness at work: Resource accumulation, well-being, and attitudes. *Career Development International, 21*(2), 106–124. https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-06-2015-0086

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Springer Nature or its licensor (e.g. a society or other partner) holds exclusive rights to this article under a publishing agreement with the author(s) or other rightsholder(s); author self-archiving of the accepted manuscript version of this article is solely governed by the terms of such publishing agreement and applicable law.