

**Be mindful of the mindfulness interventions! Does mindfulness increase
leader moral action through unveiling organizational politics?**

by

Yasemin Paçacı

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Graduate School of Business

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Business Administration



KOÇ ÜNİVERSİTESİ

July 1, 2024

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Literature Review	7
Mindfulness, Psychological Well-Being, and Proactive Coping	8
Mindfulness and (Awareness of) Organizational Politics.....	14
Mindfulness and Leader Moral Action	16
Mindfulness, Organizational Politics (Awareness), and Moral Action	18
Mindfulness, Proactive Coping, Psychological Well-being, and Moral Action	20
Method	23
Sample and Procedure	23
Intervention	27
Measures.....	30
Mindfulness	30
Organizational politics (awareness).....	31
Psychological well-being.....	32
Proactive coping	32
Moral action.....	32
Control variables.....	34

Analyses	35
Results	36
Post-hoc Analyses	42
Discussion	49
Limitations and Future Research.....	57
Conclusion.....	64
References	66
Appendix.....	99

ABSTRACT

Distressing trends and the destructive effects of leadership are widespread, yet the revival of morality in leaders' behaviors remains poorly understood. This study, drawing on behavioral integrity and dynamic (managerial) capabilities theory, investigates how leaders' moral actions are activated through personal resources while tapping into contextual factors. More specifically, employing a quasi-experimental research design with a waitlist control group ($n = 30$ in total), the current study examines the effects of an 8-week Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) program on psychological well-being, proactive coping, awareness of organizational politics, and the subsequent enactment of moral actions among middle-level leaders from various multinational corporations in the service sector. The findings uncover a paradox: while mindfulness enhances psychological well-being, its translation into political awareness and moral action is complex. Increased personal resources do not directly result in improved political awareness or moral behavior among leaders, indicating a complex interplay between mindfulness and moral leader behavior. This study adds to the growing body of literature on mindfulness and leadership, advocating for further research into how mindfulness unveils morality in leadership while navigating the challenging dynamics of organizational politics.

ÖZET

Liderliğin endişe verici eğilimleri ve yıkıcı etkileri yaygın olmasına rağmen, lider davranışlarındaki ahlaklılığın nasıl canlanacağı hâlâ yeterince anlaşılmamıştır. Bu çalışma, davranışsal bütünlük ve dinamik yönetimsel yetenekler teorilerine dayanarak, liderlerin ahlaki eylemlerinin, kişisel kaynaklar ve bağlamsal faktörler aracılığıyla nasıl etkinleştirilebileceğini araştırıyor. Daha detaylı olarak, bu araştırma deney ve kontrol gruplarında toplamda 30 katılımcıyla yarı-deneysel bir tasarım kullanarak, 8 haftalık Farkındalık Temelli Stres Azaltma (MBSR) programının hizmet sektöründeki çeşitli çok uluslu kurumlardaki orta düzey liderlerin psikolojik iyi oluş, proaktif başa çıkma, örgütsel politika farkındalığı ve sonucunda ortaya çıkabilecek ahlaki eylemleri üzerindeki etkisini inceliyor. Bulgular bir paradoksu ortaya koyuyor: bilinçli farkındalık psikolojik iyi oluşu artırıyor, ancak bu durumun politik farkındalık ve ahlaki eyleme dönüşümünün karmaşık bir süreç olduğu görülüyor. Kişisel kaynaklardaki artışın, liderlerin politik farkındalığını veya ahlaki davranışlarını doğrudan etkilememesi, bilinçli farkındalık ve ahlaki lider davranışı arasındaki karmaşık etkileşimi gösteriyor. Bu doktora tezi, bilinçli farkındalık ve liderlik literatürüne katkıda bulunarak, bilinçli farkındalığın liderlikte ahlaki davranışları nasıl ortaya çıkardığına ve liderlerin örgütsel politikaların zorlu dinamiklerinde nasıl yol aldıklarına dair daha fazla araştırmanın gerekliliğini savunuyor.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to extend my deepest thanks to Prof. Dr. Zeynep Aycan, who has been much more than an advisor to me. I am grateful to her for teaching me how to learn, providing all kinds of resources to illuminate my path, believing in my potential, creating a space for me to pursue research that lies in my heart, and helping me get closer to my true self. I deeply appreciate her showing me how to work gracefully with joy, embrace change, and grow continuously, as naturally as breathing. I am filled with love and gratitude simply for having had the opportunity to witness such a wonderful human being up close.

I also would like to thank my thesis monitoring members, Prof. Dr. Mehmet Eskin and Asst. Dr. Mahdi Hashemian, who always supported me and devoted their time and effort unconditionally to improving my thesis. I also extend my gratitude to external jury members Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ceyda Maden-Eyiusta and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Andre Pekerti, who participated in my defense and generously offered their feedback and invaluable support.

I am immensely grateful to the members of the Leadership Lab and the extraordinary individuals Koç University has brought into my life (Bahar Moralıgil, Dilem Cinli, Muaz Özcan, Elif Karul, Fatemeh Zarebidaki, Pelin Sürmeli, Elmira Khodapanah, Noura Al Mursi, Başak Tavşanoğlu, Yasemin Can Gökdoğan) who have been closely involved in almost every stage of my Ph.D. journey. They have provided critical assistance and insights at crucial moments. I also extend my heartfelt thanks to the invisible heroes of my thesis, my dearest friends (Gizem Gülşen Taviş, Damla Saka İmamoğlu, Barış İmamoğlu, Elif Özer, Dilara Erşen), who have always believed in me and kept me motivated, and to every precious being who shared this passion with me. Your support turned this thesis into a collective adventure.

From the day I was born, my family, Mukadder Paçacı and Fahrettin Paçacı, have been there for me unconditionally. Without their existence and support, I wouldn't have even considered pursuing a Ph.D. I am grateful for their sacrifices, unconditional love, and for embracing me with compassion during my hardest moments, always believing in and trusting me. No words or deeds could ever fully express my gratitude and love toward you.

I am infinitely grateful to my role model and older brother, Anıl Paçacı, who introduced me to the concept of mindfulness and pushed me out of my comfort zone, making me believe that I could handle even the most challenging tasks gracefully. If you hadn't set such a fine example, and if you hadn't done everything in your power to lift me up every time I stumbled, I wouldn't have a job that brings me such joy and fulfillment.

I am deeply grateful to my fiancé, Baran Karakurt, who has listened to me endlessly with boundless openness and curiosity, who has experienced all my emotions alongside me, who has been more enthusiastic about my work than I am, and who has always been ready to help whenever I needed it. I thank you for being so happy and supportive of my achievements, and I am thankful for witnessing the presence of your generous and beautiful heart.

Finally, I would like to thank my chubby, grumpy, and cutest cat Lina and my lovely grandmother, Emine Anıl, for bringing joy, compassion, cure, innocence, and hope into my life.

I dedicate this study to this very moment, which is my entire life!

Introduction

“Clarity dictates our perspective, and our perspective dictates our experience”

(Puddicombe, n.d.).

Studies about mindfulness interventions for leaders have been steadily growing in the scholarly literature over the last few years (Donaldson-Feilder et al., 2019; Donaldson-Feilder et al., 2021; Nübold et al., 2020; Rupprecht et al., 2019; Schuh et al., 2019; Urrila, 2021) without much recognition of its mixed-blessing effect for organizations (Turel & Osatuyi, 2017; Wihler et al., 2022; Williams & Birtwell, 2018). To date, studies present several beneficial outcomes of leader-specific mindfulness interventions for both the organization and the leader. Urrila (2021), in her systematic review, classified intervention outcomes into four broad categories: personal well-being, work productivity, relationships, and inner growth. The manifested outcomes seem to justify the ever-mounting concentration on mindfulness intervention for all beneficiaries. Nevertheless, research on this topic needs more caution in displaying only the bright side of the story. If mindfulness entails seeing everything clearly as they are (Kabat-Zinn, 2015; Nyanaponika, 1971), wouldn't the undesirable and subtle elements that exist in every organization (Arefin et al., 2021) become more discernible in the eyes of mindful leaders?

If and when the subtle undesirable conditions in the organization surface due to the mindfulness intervention, how do leaders respond to what they now see more clearly? More specifically, as indicated in the quotation above, if clarity dictates leader perspectives on subtle organizational realities, how does this determine their response to that (i.e., experience)? The present study addresses this question through an experiment in which a group of leaders will

participate in a mindfulness intervention program from which they are expected to gain both desirable (well-being and coping) and undesirable outcomes (awareness of the existence of organizational politics and the discomfort it may create) compared to the no-intervention group. I then examine how leaders in the mindfulness-intervention group address the undesirability of organizational politics they become aware of (i.e., whether they take corrective moral action).

This study focuses on one of the undesirable conditions expected to be unveiled due to mindfulness intervention, namely, organizational politics. One of the most prevalent, ubiquitous, yet elusive elements of the organizational context is politics (Ferris et al., 2019; Hochwarter et al., 2020), which refers to informal, divisive, and unsanctioned individual or group behavior that aims to increase self-interest at the expense of the well-being of others (Ferris et al., 2002; Kacmar & Baron, 1999). Perceptions of organizational politics (POPs) concentrate on subjective evaluation of this concept (i.e., perceived politics), as objective evaluation is inherently unverifiable (Hochwarter et al., 2020). The majority of organizational politics literature is dominated by studies revealing the disruptive effect of politics on organizations and their members, such as higher levels of stress, exhaustion, perceived uncertainty, turnover intention, and counterproductive work behavior, whereas lower levels of justice, trust, relationship quality, innovative behavior, job satisfaction, and job commitment (Hochwarter et al., 2020). Although several studies have shown that the political environment poses a significant threat to organizations (Ferris & Kacmar, 1992), one of the shortcomings of current prescriptive literature is providing little to no information on whether and how leaders respond to organizational politics (Ferris et al., 2019; Kapoutsis & Thanos, 2018).

We need to know whether leaders take moral actions to intervene in the political context in organizations. The reason is that leaders are positioned as power holders and key change

agents in the organization who are expected to take action when necessary (Acton, 2021; Banks et al., 2018; Hannah et al., 2011; Moorman et al., 2013; Sanders et al., 2018; Sendjaya et al., 2016). A leader's awareness of the subtle nature of politics in the organization might be the first step to understanding their particular response (i.e., moral action) to that environment (Vich, 2015), which I will test in this study. A leader's moral action (i.e., behavioral response emerging from rational moral functioning) (Blasi, 1980) is one of the responses that might be triggered by the situational elements in the organization (Porter & McLaughlin, 2006). Leaders are less likely to intervene in the organization's political environment unless they have raised awareness about the situation's existence (or intensity) (Chmielewski et al., 2021; Molloy et al., 2019). This is where I argue that leader mindfulness should come into play as a necessary ingredient to increase leader awareness (Lewis & Ebbeck, 2014). To address the mentioned issues, the current study aims at investigating whether (1) mindfulness intervention increases the leaders' awareness of POPs, (2) the intervention increases the well-being and coping of leaders, and (3) whether those effects of the intervention result in leader moral action.

The importance of increasing our understanding of leaders' moral actions is twofold. First, we need to figure out ways to increase their moral action (Sendjaya et al., 2016), considering the ongoing distressing trends in leadership (e.g., corporate scandals, all-time low level of trust toward leaders, destructive leadership) (Bedi et al., 2016; Mackey et al., 2021). In parallel with this trend, extant literature positions leaders as either part of the political environment (Ellen et al., 2013; Munyon et al., 2021; Sheard et al., 2011) or significant agents to influence this environment and its outcomes (Durrani, 2014; Kacmar et al., 2013; Khattak et al., 2022). Therefore, the paucity of knowledge on moral leader behavior facing undesirable organizational contexts limits ways to achieve ethical leaders who take moral actions in required

circumstances (Kelemen et al., 2020). Second, we further need to light the connection between leader mindfulness and their moral action. The mentioned link can be one of the ways to activate leader corrective (moral) action rather than position them to be part of the political environment, as in previous studies. In line with this expectation, leaders (who especially embody ethical characteristics) may also feel obligated to react to the current demands of the situation (Banks et al., 2021). Keeping the strong connection between mindfulness and ethical behavior in mind (Guillén & Fontrodona, 2018; Kersemaekers et al., 2020; McGhee & Grant, 2015; Nguyen et al., 2020; Orazi et al., 2019; Sutamchai et al., 2020), the outcomes of mindfulness intervention in this study (i.e., awareness of POPs, well-being, and coping) hope to revive leaders' ethical qualities and create ways to activate their moral action.

The existence (and realization) of intriguing contextual factors in the organization (e.g., political environment) (Sharma, 2018) can be too challenging for leaders to respond effectively without developing essential coping skills and well-being levels (Kaluza et al., 2020; Li et al., 2018). The connection between ethics and well-being dates back to Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* (Ameriks & Clarke, 2000; Haybron, 2016; Witt & Mathesis Publications, 1985), arguing that experiencing eudaimonic (e.g., psychological) well-being and living ethically with moral excellence are attached to each other. On the other hand, proactive coping can be another essential ingredient to face moral issues effectively. The reason is that proactive coping creates resources and adaptability even before stress-related events (i.e., moral dilemmas) occur (Schwarzer & Taubert, 2002; Sharma et al., 2021). Therefore, leaders' psychological well-being and coping with difficulties proactively can play a crucial and complementary role in facilitating their moral actions. Studies present promising findings that leader-specific mindfulness interventions play a central role in heightening leader well-being and leadership capabilities

(Donaldson-Feilder et al., 2019; Donaldson-Feilder et al., 2021; Urrila, 2021). Accordingly, this study investigates leaders' psychological well-being and proactive coping that are expected to surface due to the mindfulness intervention. Consequently, leader well-being and coping are positioned as desirable outcomes and mechanisms to achieve leader moral action, along with the awareness of organizational politics.

I expect that a leader-specific mindfulness intervention will increase the well-being and coping of the intervention program participants compared to those who do not attend it. I also expect that mindfulness may trigger leaders' awareness of the elusive political environment by allowing them to see this environment more clearly, as it really is (Burmansah et al., 2019). I further aim at discovering whether the raised awareness of POPs stimulates any moral action of leaders to respond to it. In this way, I wish to present the mixed-blessing consequences of mindfulness intervention (well-being vs. POPs). Although increased well-being is one of the reported favorable effects of mindfulness (Decuyper et al., 2020; Lomas et al., 2017), it can also bring clarity and awareness of unpleasant organizational realities (i.e., organizational politics) that might create discomfort in leaders. Therefore, mindfulness intervention might create cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1962) for leaders, leading them to take actions to balance or reduce the discord they might have experienced.

The current study aims to make contributions both to academic research and practical applications in a variety of ways. To the best of my knowledge, this will be a pioneering study to explore the mechanism of change to investigate whether leader-specific mindfulness intervention can pave the way for ethical leader behavior (i.e., leader moral action). It also recognizes the highly overlooked (mixed-blessing) effect of mindfulness intervention by hoping to present both favorable (i.e., enhanced well-being and coping) and unfavorable (i.e., awareness of the

existence of organizational politics) outcomes that might lead to much-needed leader behavior (i.e., moral action). In this sense, this study also addresses the recent call by Choi et al. (2022) by tapping into “The Balance Framework” (Gruman et al., 2018) of mindfulness in the work context. The framework suggests that any positive phenomena incorporate nuanced features that might lead to both advantageous and detrimental experiences. Recognizing the nuanced nature of mindfulness also provides novel avenues for future research. Further, the proposed association between leader mindfulness and awareness of organizational politics clarifies the link between managerial cognition and a manager’s knowledge re-configuration. This way, the findings of this study will contribute to how mindfulness can serve as a micro-foundation of dynamic managerial capabilities (Gaertner, 2011; Helfat & Martin, 2015). Also, this study addresses the limited understanding of leader behavior (i.e., moral action) toward the political environment in the organization as well as the unconventional antecedent (i.e., leader awareness of organizational politics) of that behavior.

From a more practical standpoint, I intend to increase the understanding of the mixed-blessing consequences of the popularly addressed mindfulness intervention to guide organizational decision-makers. Although mindfulness helps leaders to release many beneficial outcomes (Urrila, 2021), it can also surface an undesirable and distressing element of the organization. Luckily, even those elements may turn into a process that pushes leaders to take moral actions, thanks to the power of intervention and its beneficial outcomes examined in this study (i.e., leader psychological well-being and proactive coping). Therefore, this research helps practitioners in recognizing the significance of leader mindfulness for the sake of the leader, the organization, and its members.

Literature Review

Mindfulness Interventions

Mindfulness refers to a conscious awareness that arises from paying attention to the present moment in an open and non-judgmental way (Bishop et al., 2004; Brown et al., 2007; J. Kabat-Zinn, 1990; Kabat-Zinn, 2015). It has both state and trait-wise tendencies. While state mindfulness describes within-person variations in present-focused awareness, trait mindfulness is associated with a person's overall tendency to sustain awareness at any given time (Brown & Ryan, 2003; Medvedev et al., 2017). Trait and state mindfulness are strongly correlated but distinct concepts (Brown & Ryan, 2003; Weinstein et al., 2009). Naturally, individuals possessing high levels of trait mindfulness tend to maintain a mindful state more frequently (Tanay & Bernstein, 2013).

Mindfulness interventions ultimately intend to foster trait mindfulness by cultivating mindful states with several exercises and practices. Several mindfulness interventions have been applied to various settings (e.g., school, workplace, military) and populations so far (Creswell, 2017). The intervention programs include but are not limited to well-known Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) (J. Kabat-Zinn, 1990), Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy (MBCT) (Teasdale et al., 2000), Mindfulness-Based Intuitive Eating Intervention (Bush et al., 2014), Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT) (Hayes et al., 2004), Mindfulness-Based Relationship Enhancement (MBRE) (Carson et al., 2004), Mindful Self-Compassion (MSC) (Germer & Neff, 2019), Dialectical Behavior Therapy (DBT) (Linehan, 1993a, 1993b), and many other targeted mindfulness training (Eby et al., 2019).

In recent years, research began to concentrate on leader-specific mindfulness interventions targeting several leader health and well-being outcomes, as well as leadership

development, such as fostering post-conventional leadership capabilities (Donaldson-Feilder et al., 2019). A recent review (including thirty articles) shows that the leader-specific mindfulness interventions have substantive implications for cultivating several essential (e.g., stress management, psychological well-being, creativity, information processing, etc.) and transformative (ethical, transformational, and authentic leadership behavior, self-awareness, spiritual growth, etc.) leadership capacities (Urrila, 2021). This study will also implement and test the effectiveness of a mindfulness intervention on a leader sample to investigate several outcomes (i.e., awareness of organizational politics) that are unexamined in the previous literature, to the best of our knowledge. Before proceeding, our initial hypothesis aims to investigate whether a mindfulness intervention, specifically the Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) program, administered to a sample of leaders for the purpose of this study, affects their levels of trait mindfulness. Existing studies overwhelmingly confirm the beneficial impact of mindfulness interventions on participants' mindfulness levels (Creswell, 2017; Urrila, 2021; Zhang et al., 2021). Building on this prior research, I formulate the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1: Leadership-specific mindfulness intervention positively impacts leaders' mindfulness.

Mindfulness, Psychological Well-Being, and Proactive Coping

Empirical literature provides abundant evidence presenting the link between mindfulness and well-being. Nevertheless, research studies on mindfulness interventions in the workplace mainly focused on the hedonic aspect (e.g., job or life satisfaction, positive or negative affect, perceived stress, etc.) of well-being as an outcome variable (Eby et al., 2019). The concentration on the eudaimonic part of well-being (also conceptualized as psychological well-being, including meaning, purpose, engagement, etc.) is less common.

The primary distinction between hedonic and eudaimonic well-being lies in that hedonic well-being focuses on the pursuit of pleasure and positive experiences derived from external circumstances, whereas eudaimonic well-being emphasizes positive internal functioning driven by intrinsic motivations like self-actualization, the search for meaning, and virtuous living (Ryff & Singer, 2006). Eudaimonic well-being extends beyond merely experiencing a pleasant life, highlighting a life well-lived. It is closely linked to the core principle of self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Deci et al., 2001), which is to fulfill three basic psychological needs (i.e., autonomy, competence, relatedness) for psychological health and well-being. The concept of eudaimonic well-being originates from Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, as noted by Haybron (2016). It emphasizes positive human functioning driven by intrinsic desires, including meaning, life purpose, self-actualization, flourishing, virtue, personal growth, and mastery over one's environment (Huta & Waterman, 2013).

Garland et al. (2015) proposed mindfulness-to-meaning theory (MMT), which can help us to understand the causal connection between mindfulness and eudaimonic well-being. The theory asserts that mindfulness promotes positive reappraisal of challenging life circumstances, thus allowing individuals to see those events as benign, meaningful, and growth-promoting. Individuals with heightened awareness (through mindfulness) are more likely to comprehend life experiences' purpose and meaning by decentering from stress appraisals. In this way, eudaimonic well-being arises from the cumulative impacts of those meaningful experiences without any support from external sources, as in hedonic well-being (Allen et al., 2021). Therefore, experiences of eudaimonic well-being have higher sustainability than hedonic well-being (Waterman, 2007). In fact, the opportunities to experience eudaimonia can be limitless because there are limitless challenges too. Waterman (2007) defines this notion as a "eudaimonic

staircase.” The broaden-and-build theory (Fredrickson, 2001; Huppert et al., 2004) supports this notion by describing an “upward spiral of positive emotions” (i.e., positive emotions create space for individuals to further develop personal resources by expanding attention and awareness).

Research studies presenting the positive link between trait mindfulness and psychological (the eudaimonic aspect of) well-being acknowledge that psychological well-being arises from the awareness and involvement of internal potential (Ryan & Deci, 2001). For example, Lam et al. (2022) find a direct and positive relationship between mindfulness and eudaimonic well-being. Similarly, Brown and Ryan (2003) reveal the link between mindfulness (with the measure that they developed called the Mindful Attention Awareness Scale) and various forms of psychological well-being (e.g., autonomy, competence, relatedness, vitality, and self-actualization) well in advance. Chang et al. (2014) wanted to understand the underlying psychological mechanism connecting mindfulness to eudaimonic well-being. They show the mediating role of three basic psychological need satisfactions (i.e., autonomy, relatedness, and competence) from the lens of self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Deci et al., 2001). Iani et al. (2016) demonstrate that several dimensions of mindfulness (e.g., describing, acting with awareness, and observing) relate to the core eudaimonic components of psychological well-being (i.e., growth, purpose, and autonomy). Many other studies (Howell et al., 2011; Jobbehdar Nourafkan et al., 2022; Klusman et al., 2020; Kong et al., 2016; Wolsko & Lindberg, 2013) provide evidence for the association between these two, but they fail to infer causality.

The extant literature also provides mindfulness-based interventions that can talk about their causal impact on psychological well-being (Boyle et al., 2019; Monzani et al., 2021; Tang et al., 2019). For example, Allen et al. (2021) provide a systematic review of mindfulness-based interventions targeting both hedonic and eudaimonic aspects of well-being. Although these

studies increase our understanding of the connection between mindfulness and psychological well-being, the current study focuses on leader-specific mindfulness interventions. Donaldson-Feilder et al. (2019) and Urrila (2021) come to the rescue on this matter with their review of leader-specific mindfulness interventions. These reviews reveal that only a handful of studies (Baron et al., 2018; Goldman-Schuyler et al., 2017) specifically targeted leader psychological well-being that connects with eudaimonia as an intervention outcome. From the perspective of mindfulness-to-meaning theory and relevant literature reviewed above, this study hopes to increase the understanding of the proposed relation and pose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2: Leadership-specific mindfulness intervention positively impacts leaders' psychological well-being.

Besides the link between mindfulness and well-being, studies also present persuasive findings regarding the relationship between mindfulness and coping with difficult circumstances. This link is not surprising considering mindfulness's well-established role in coping with stress, as reported in review studies (Eby et al., 2019; Janssen et al., 2018; Kriakous et al., 2020). As coping is a conscious or unconscious response to stress (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), mindful individuals are more likely to cope with challenges effectively. The underlying idea of this relation is also reported in Lazarus and Folkman's transactional model of stress and coping. This model suggests that the stress experienced by individuals primarily stems from their appraisal or perception of events, rather than from the actual outcomes of those events (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Therefore, an individual's capacity to cope with stress depends on their cognitive appraisal of the situation. Mindful individuals are more likely to engage in positive reappraisals about events (Stanisławski, 2019) due to the underlying mechanism of decentering (i.e., the ability to step out of the immediate experience, thus altering the nature of that experience)

(Safran & Segal, 1996). Hayes-Skelton and Graham (2013) also demonstrate that decentering is a shared mechanism between mindfulness and cognitive reappraisal, which can enhance our understanding of the connection between mindfulness and coping strategies.

Mindfulness interventions targeting several ways of coping remain relatively limited compared to correlational studies that consistently present a significant relationship between the two. Palmer and Rodger (2009) show that mindfulness correlates positively with problem-solving coping and negatively with avoidance and emotional coping. Weinstein et al. (2009) report that individuals with high mindfulness levels employ more frequent approach coping and less frequent avoidance coping. Their results indicate that mindfulness helps individuals to make more benign stress appraisals. Similarly, Donald and Atkins (2016) demonstrate that mindfulness is positively related to approach coping (e.g., active coping, acceptance, and positive reinterpretation) and negatively to avoidance coping (e.g., behavioral and mental disengagement). Mindful individuals are also reported to use adaptive coping strategies when handling stress (Pidgeon & Pickett, 2017; Wu & Buchanan, 2018). Similarly, Dillard and Meier (2021) show that individuals with higher trait mindfulness employ healthier coping strategies (e.g., acceptance, seeking support, planning, reframing, active coping) in dealing with coronavirus. Götmann and Bechtoldt (2021) also show that several facets of mindfulness are positively related to engagement coping and negatively related to disengagement coping styles in coping with coronavirus. Finkelstein-Fox et al. (2019) conclude that mindfulness relates to mindful emotion-focused coping, such as increased acceptance and decreased self-blame.

On the other hand, mindfulness interventions (such as training and practices) demonstrate a decreased concentration of coping outcomes. For instance, De Vibe et al. (2018) showed that mindfulness training is associated with increased adaptive coping (i.e., higher problem-focused

coping and lower avoidance-focused coping). Numerous mindfulness-based interventions have provided evidence supporting the positive effects of mindfulness on a variety of effective coping styles and strategies (e.g., active coping, positive reappraisal, self-talk, help for action) (de la Fuente et al., 2018; Han, 2021; Long et al., 2021).

This study concentrates on proactive coping as a leader-specific mindfulness intervention outcome among several coping styles and strategies. Proactive coping is one of the most effective coping techniques leaders need in the face of adverse events (Schwarzer & Taubert, 2002; Sharma et al., 2021), as it creates resources and adaptability even before stress-related events occur. It refers to readiness for demanding life circumstances through several dispositions such as obtaining (or creating) necessary skills and resources to make more adaptive meaning and anticipating potential demands and abstaining from dysfunctional meaning-making (Aspinwall & Taylor, 1997; Park & Folkman, 1997).

Leaders may be held accountable for problems when difficult circumstances arise (Williams, 2006). Consequently, they are expected to use their agency and take actions (Bowers et al., 2017; Panda & Gupta, 2001) in traditional organizational culture (i.e., one of the most prevalent types of cultures where the roles are clearly defined and separated) (Bellot, 2011; Bojadjev et al., 2015; Ismail Al-Alawi et al., 2007). Therefore, active participation and effective response to stressful events are less likely to be possible without proactive coping skills. Surprisingly, only a few studies (Dvořáková et al., 2019; Guo et al., 2022) presented a positive association between mindfulness and proactive coping. Therefore, we need to increase our understanding of ways to activate and enhance leader proactive coping. Drawing from the previous literature and the transactional stress framework, I pose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3: Leadership-specific mindfulness intervention positively impacts leaders' proactive coping.

Mindfulness and (Awareness of) Organizational Politics

Organizational politics has received tremendous attention among researchers as it is associated with numerous psychological (e.g., stress, burnout), perceptual (e.g., justice, trust, work control), attitudinal (e.g., job satisfaction, cynicism, turnover intention), and behavioral (e.g., withdrawal, task performance, political behavior) consequences for employees (Hochwarter et al., 2020). It refers to the “actions by individuals which are directed toward the goal of furthering their self-interests without regard for the well-being of others or their organization” (Kacmar & Baron, 1999, p. 4). Since scholars believe that the measurement of organizational politics is unverifiable, they focus on the perception of organizational politics (POPs) in the work environment (Hochwarter et al., 2020). POPs are defined as “an individual's subjective evaluation about the extent to which the work environment is characterized by coworkers and supervisors who demonstrate such self-serving behavior” (Ferris et al., 2000, p. 90). Researchers recognize that perceptions of organizational politics (POPs) can serve as a catalyst for studies exploring the causes and effects of political behavior in organizations (Meisler et al., 2017).

The research studies investigating the connection between mindfulness and the perception of organizational politics remain extremely limited. Two very recent studies address this gap even though they didn't present their direct relation. Chen et al. (2022) show that mindfulness moderates the relationship between POPs and knowledge-sharing hostility (directly) as well as innovative behavior (indirectly through knowledge-sharing hostility). Followingly, they advise managers to stick to clear regulations and policies and employ mindfulness

interventions to mitigate their POPs and their detrimental effects. On the other hand, Wan et al. (2020) examine how mindfulness and perceptions of organizational politics (POPs) interact to predict both destructive deviant behavior and unethical pro-organizational behavior, mediated by moral disengagement. Their results imply that mindfulness and POPs together substantially affect unethical behavior. Followingly, they suggest that organizations must simultaneously promote mindfulness and reduce politics.

The present study hopes to reveal how the leaders' awareness of POPs changes (i.e., increased awareness of the political environment) after a mindfulness intervention. In other words, subtle elements of politics in the environment are expected to be more visible in the eyes of a (mindful) leader. Therefore, this study unveils whether mindfulness brings clarity and visibility into already existing but elusive characteristics of the political context instead of presenting the relationship between mindfulness and POPs. The idea of this argument comes from the dynamic managerial capabilities framework. It defines how managers use their agency to create, extend, and alter organizational destinies to survive and earn their living (Helfat & Martin, 2015). Followingly, this framework helps us to understand the link between a broad range of dynamic managerial capabilities (e.g., managerial cognition, managerial social and human capital), strategic change (e.g., knowledge creation, strategic renewal, speed of action/response), and organizational performance (e.g., survival, growth, productivity).

This study draws from the dynamic managerial capabilities framework to explain the link between mindfulness (as a form of dynamic managerial capability) and changes in managers' awareness of politics (as a form of strategic change). Gaertner (2011) further supports this link by incorporating mindfulness as one of the micro-foundations of dynamic managerial capabilities. He suggests that mindfulness is a mechanism to clarify a manager's knowledge

creation and knowledge reconfiguration. Further, he indicates that mindfulness can contribute to sensing opportunities and threats.

Hochwarter et al. (2020), in their recent review regarding the POPs research, also support this suggested idea in this study. They posit that the perceptual accuracy of POPs depends on the depth of information processing followed by an event, aligning with the notion of event system theory (Morgeson et al., 2015). More specifically, individuals are less likely to rely on heuristics and implicit biases when they process information deliberately and effortfully (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986) (i.e., controlled information processing). In this way, individual perceptions can become more precise, as individuals are more inclined to evaluate situations considering the broader temporal, organizational, and social contexts in which they occur. Since mindfulness links to increased deliberative information processing (that can be adjusted to the current situation as a meta-cognitive process) (Kudesia, 2019), mindful individuals are more likely to perceive events accurately as they are. When these ideas are applied to this study, organizational leaders (from several different levels mentioned above) are expected to reconfigure their knowledge about the political environment (and sense this threat) thanks to (expected) increased awareness and clarity through mindfulness intervention, bringing this study to form the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 4: Leadership-specific mindfulness intervention positively impacts leader awareness of organizational politics.

Mindfulness and Leader Moral Action

The concerning trends observed in leadership, such as corporate scandals (e.g., Enron, WorldCom), a historically low level of trust in leaders, and the impacts of destructive leadership

(Bedi et al., 2016; Mackey et al., 2021; Schminke et al., 2005), have underscored the essential need for enhanced morality and ethics within workplace environments. In conventional organizational contexts, where leaders play pivotal roles as agents of change and decision-makers, there exists an increasing demand among organizational members for morally sound decision-making at the individual level (Vich, 2015). The scholarly examination of moral decision-making processes reveals that Rest (1986) proposed a four-step model consisting of moral awareness, moral judgment, the establishment of moral intent, and moral action. This framework suggests that the development and engagement in the latter three steps are predicated upon the elevation of moral awareness. Rest (1986) characterized moral awareness as the “person’s recognition that his/her potential decision or action could affect the interests, welfare, or expectations of the self or others in a fashion that may conflict with one or more ethical standards” (p. 982). Consequently, individuals possessing increased moral awareness are more prone to understand the impact of their actions on others, thereby facilitating more conscientious moral choices. Thus, mindfulness may emerge as a valuable resource for fostering moral development in individuals at each step of the moral decision-making process.

The recent literature supports the strong connection between mindfulness and ethics (Guillén & Fontrodona, 2018; Kersemaekers et al., 2020; McGhee & Grant, 2015; Nguyen et al., 2020; Orazi et al., 2019; Sutamchai et al., 2020), through the facilitating role of mindfulness on various insights (e.g., self-awareness, self-regulation, interconnectedness, moral reasoning, impermanence, compassion, responsibility, etc.). More broadly, mindful individuals are more likely to look beyond the provided frame and raise their awareness of the ethical attributes of any given issue (Dane, 2011). As Vich (2015) suggested, to make a moral judgment, one needs to

raise their moral awareness. Followingly, enhanced moral judgment (through awareness) is more likely to lead to enhanced moral action.

Similarly, mindfulness enhances ethical decision-making and behavior by fostering heightened awareness of one's immediate surroundings, ethical issues within that context, and oneself. This includes an increased understanding of one's biases, conditioned thoughts, and self-serving cognitions (Ruedy & Schweitzer, 2010). Even though the direct connection between mindfulness and moral action is overlooked in extant research, Ruedy and Schweitzer (2010) proposed a positive impact of mindfulness on individual moral actions. In line with this idea, this study suggests that mindful leaders (through intervention) can be more likely to engage in moral behaviors, especially when the situation calls for it (e.g., the existence and awareness of POPs). Based on the previous discussion, I form the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 5: Leadership-specific mindfulness intervention positively impacts leader moral action.

Mindfulness, Organizational Politics (Awareness), and Moral Action

The current study aims to reveal whether awareness of organizational politics through mindfulness activates leader moral action. The idea behind this relationship comes from behavioral integrity theory (Blasi, 1980; Simons, 2002), which explains the connection (and alignment) between a manager's reasoning (words) and action (deeds). The theory asserts that a manager's behavioral integrity comes from various behavioral antecedents such as poorly integrated policies and procedures, the manager's awareness of their own values, and the manager's personality traits. Drawing from this idea, the awareness of the political environment through enhanced mindfulness lays a foundation for managers to exhibit behavioral integrity. In

other words, if managers indicate higher visibility of politics thanks to their heightened level of awareness (reasoning), they are more likely to perform moral behaviors (action) to interfere with the situation. The reason is that leaders are positioned as power holders and key change agents in the organization who are expected to take action when necessary (Acton, 2021; Banks et al., 2018; Hannah et al., 2011; Moorman et al., 2013; Sanders et al., 2018). This process shows the alignment of the manager's words and deeds, corresponding with the behavioral integrity framework.

Behavioral ethics literature discusses a diverse but scarce set of antecedents for leaders to display ethical behaviors, although we know much about the outcomes of those behaviors (Lemoine et al., 2019). Therefore, factors making way for moral leader behavior have received insufficient attention (Kelemen et al., 2020). Other than the factors allowing leaders to inherently act morally (e.g., personality), contextual elements in the organization may lead them to elicit or withhold moral behaviors (Kalshoven et al., 2011; Ko et al., 2018; Mayer et al., 2012). For instance, Banks et al. (2021) argue that an ethical climate creates a convenient space for leaders to act morally. In contrast, an unethical climate may make them think their ethical signals may not be well-received. This argument is not surprising considering that ethical context signals social norms by which leaders should abide (Peterson, 2002). Moreover, this context creates an environment where leaders can learn and acquire ethically appropriate behaviors through observation. On the other hand, leaders' responses to unethical contextual elements in the organization are more complicated; we have a minimal understanding of this issue. Although leaders may think that ethical behaviors may not be welcomed and are futile in an unethical context, they may still perform those behaviors at personal expense. The rationale is that leaders who view their self-identity through a moral lens are more inclined to engage in ethical

behaviors, even when these actions come at a significant cost (Wang & Hackett, 2020). Therefore, I argue that (mindful) leaders (thanks to the mindfulness intervention) who tend to connect strongly to their moral identity (Basharpour & Ahmadi, 2021; Ruedy & Schweitzer, 2010; Xiao et al., 2020) are more likely to be motivated to take moral actions even (and especially) when they notice the unethical context in the organizational environment (i.e., politics). In this way, I draw from behavioral integrity and ethics theory and literature in general (Treviño et al., 2006) and propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 5a: Leadership-specific mindfulness intervention positively impacts leader moral action through (enhanced) awareness of organizational politics.

Mindfulness, Proactive Coping, Psychological Well-being, and Moral Action

The mentioned link between mindfulness and moral action may also actualize through developing essential coping skills and well-being levels, complementing the awareness of the organizational politics mechanism (Kaluza et al., 2020; Li et al., 2018). Nevertheless, research in this field remains limited in presenting the intermediary role of proactive coping on the relationship between challenging situations and behavioral outcomes. Searle and Lee (2015) are among the few to demonstrate the moderating effect of proactive coping on the relationship between challenge demands (as a form of stressors) and engagement as well as burnout. They conceptualize proactive coping as a personal resource (from the job demands-resources model) (Demerouti et al., 2001) and claim that proactive coping skills and behaviors bear the tremendous capacity to handle difficulties related to hindrances. Similarly, Altan-Atalay and Zeytun (2020) demonstrate the moderating effect of proactive coping on the relationship between negative urgency and depression. They argue that proactive copers are more likely to appraise

the threats as challenges, so their coping skills play a buffering role in the presented relation. Also, Stiglbauer and Batinic (2015) present the buffering effect of proactive coping on the association between job insecurity and subjective well-being. Polk et al. (2020), on the other hand, test the three-way interaction between daily stressor, daily mindfulness, and proactive coping in predicting daily negative affect. The results imply that individuals with high levels of proactive coping tend to react emotionally to stressors when they are low in mindfulness.

Heijden and Spurk (2019) suggest that proactive copers employ goal management strategies during difficult circumstances as they maintain a vision. They perceive difficulties as stimulating challenges to overcome (Greenglass, 2002). Therefore, they are more likely to be motivated to make the most of their job and strive for further development. Similarly, a recent study by Sharma et al. (2021) suggests that leader proactive coping skills are fundamental in today's unpredictable work environment that incorporates a diverse set of stressors and demands. They conclude that leaders can mitigate the negative impacts of stressors on both themselves and their organization by leveraging the benefits of proactive coping.

These studies show that proactive copers are more likely to ease the negative effect of difficult circumstances thanks to the effective application of coping skills. Moreover, individuals with high proactive coping skills also tend to be ready to capitalize on the possibility of gain that resides in such challenges. As proactive coping, by definition, creates resources and adaptability even before stress-related events occur (Schwarzer & Taubert, 2002; Sharma et al., 2021), this study suggests that leaders with high proactive coping skills are more prone to engage in moral behaviors when confronted with a moral dilemma.

Psychological well-being, along with proactive coping, may be another essential element determining the magnitude of effective leader response to adverse events. The reason is that psychological well-being itself can be positioned as a resource (aligning with the conservation of resources theory) (Hobfoll, 1989) that can create the capacity to deal with challenging circumstances and lead to constructive leadership behavior. Drawing from the conservation of resources framework, Byrne et al. (2014) show that leaders' lack of psychological well-being (as a form of depleted resource) undermines leadership behaviors such as reduced levels of transformational leadership and increased levels of abusive supervision. Kaluza et al. (2020) also present a reciprocal link between leader well-being and leadership behavior (both constructive and destructive), continuously feeding each other. Many other studies highlight the significant and direct impact of leader well-being on positive leadership behaviors (Barnes et al., 2015; Kouchaki & Desai, 2015; Lin et al., 2016; Tepper et al., 2006).

This study aims to bring a fresh look at this link by examining the complementary role of psychological well-being in the relationship between mindfulness and leader moral action. I suggest that the moral qualities which can be revived through enhanced mindfulness (Sevinc & Lazar, 2019) may allow individuals to experience psychological (i.e., eudaimonic) well-being in line with Aristotle's argument in *Nicomachean Ethics* (Ameriks & Clarke, 2000; Haybron, 2016; Witt & Mathesis Publications, 1985). More specifically, he argues that eudaimonic well-being, focusing on positive human functioning motivated by internal desires (Huta & Waterman, 2013), can be achieved through living ethically with moral excellence. Therefore, I suggest that eudaimonic well-being may have a stimulating role in activating individuals' moral behavior. Consequently, drawing from the previous literature and theory outlined above, I pose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 5b: Leadership-specific mindfulness intervention positively impacts leader moral action through (enhanced) psychological well-being and proactive coping.

Method

Sample and Procedure

The sample comprises white-collar employees holding managerial positions from several multinational organizations. I particularly approach entry and middle-level managers for several reasons. First, they can be consequential for organizations' destinies in terms of their total number (Dean et al., 2010). Second, they occupy the critical agentic role that can be the backbone of the organization, building a bridge between employees and top management (Floyd & Wooldridge, 2000; Mantere, 2008). Third, they are not just part of the everyday organizational environment but also responsible for managing the adversities that may reside in that environment (Van Rensburg et al., 2014). For the reasons above, this study focuses on the mentioned leader sample to understand whether they use their agency and take action to intervene in the unethical organizational context after the mindfulness intervention. Table 1 represents the remaining sample characteristics.

Table 1
Sample Characteristics

Group	Total Number	Age	Gender	Highest Level of Education	Total Work Experience
Experimental Group	21	4 of them are between 21-30	11 female 10 male	9 of them are master's degree	2 of them are between 1-5 years
		14 of them are between 31-40		12 of them are bachelor's degree	10 of them are between 6-10 years
		3 of them are between 41-50			6 of them are between 11-15 years
Control Group	9	5 of them are between 21-30	5 female	4 of them are master's degree	3 of them are beyond 16 years
		4 of them are between 31-40	4 male	5 of them are bachelor's degree	4 of them are between 1-5 years
					5 of them are between 6-10 years

Participants took part in a Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) program delivered by the author of this study. This setting was actualized in collaboration with the Koç University (KU) Graduate School of Business (GSB). GSB offers Master of Business Administration (MBA) and Executive MBA (EMBA) programs for organizational leaders. Thanks to our joint collaboration, GSB sent an announcement to their current MBA and EMBA students asking them to participate in an online MBSR program and measurement process (e.g., simulation, discussion, survey). After the initial one-to-one interview with potential program participants (aimed at determining whether they are suitable to take part in the MBSR and measurement process for data gathering), the author administered the MBSR program through online channels.

Participant suitability was assessed based on various factors: their readiness and willingness to commit time and effort to each session and measurement process, their occupational status, recent experiences of trauma (ineligible if present), and indications of the three dark triad traits: psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and narcissism (ineligible if present).

Despite lacking formal training in detecting dark triad traits, the author endeavored to identify any indicators of these traits through in-depth conversations with participants. This was facilitated by her intense theoretical background in the subject matter and practical training acquired during her formal mindfulness teacher training.

After conducting initial interviews with close to 40 participants, the pre-intervention experimental group comprised 30 individuals, primarily due to their inability to foresee allocating sufficient time ($n = 9$) and effort for the requirements of this study and the experience of a recent traumatic event ($n = 1$). During the initial weeks of the intervention, some individuals were unable to participate due to work commitments, resulting in a decrease in the number of participants included in the post-intervention experimental group to 21 for analyses.

An online setting is preferred to enhance participation and engagement and facilitate a more accessible environment for participants to engage comfortably from their homes or preferred places. Given that MBSR involves activities such as mindful movement and body scans that may necessitate participants to either lie down or engage in standing movements, requiring clothing and space conducive to such activities, traditional classroom settings may not adequately accommodate these needs. Based on previous findings (Aikens et al., 2014; Bazarko et al., 2013; Querstret et al., 2018; Rice et al., 2019), no significant differences are expected between online and in-person mindfulness training in terms of its effectiveness.

This study employed a pretest-posttest quasi-experimental research design, complemented by the inclusion of a wait-list control group. The control group participated in measurement processes without receiving any mindfulness intervention before or during the measurement process. In coordination with the Graduate School of Business (GSB), it was

acknowledged that there might have been hesitancy among MBA and EMBA students regarding participation in the control group. This view arose from the initial distribution of the Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) program announcement to all MBA and EMBA students. Most of these students might have perceived little to no benefit in participating solely in measurement activities and enduring a significant waiting period to get involved in the MBSR program. This was particularly relevant considering their schedules, which were often characterized by uncertainty, unpredictability, and high demands.

Consequently, an alternative approach was pursued to identify a control group with characteristics similar to the experimental group. The author, having previously provided mindfulness training to a multinational service firm, established a collaboration with the firm's administrative team. Subsequently, the author engaged with middle-level leaders across various departments who had not received the mindfulness intervention. Due to the daily demands and unpredictable schedules of the employees, the posttest was repeatedly rescheduled after being canceled numerous times, resulting in a reduction in the number of participants in the control group from twenty-four, who had completed the pretest, to nine individuals who ultimately participated in the posttest.

I obtained ethics approval from Koç University with confirmation number 2023.086.IRB3.030. Subsequently, I gathered the data through several means (i.e., survey, focus group discussion, and simulation) from the experimental group before and after the 8-week intervention by obtaining their consent, thus ensuring anonymity and confidentiality. The control group followed the same measurement procedure, except the time between the pretest and posttest exceeded 8 weeks due to numerous reschedules. The longitudinal design of this study

enabled the examination of the causal effects of mindfulness training on the variables under investigation, as well as the identification of possible mechanisms through which mindfulness interventions are connected to leaders' moral actions.

The participants' mindfulness, psychological well-being, and proactive coping values were collected with self-report measures. In terms of quantifying the awareness of organizational politics, they were provided with a written text about the organizational politics context. Then, they were asked to rate the organizational politics measure before and after the intervention. This approach allowed us to capture the extent of their awareness of organizational politics. A survey was used to collect control variables such as demographic information and social desirability. Finally, their moral action was evaluated in several ways, including a simulation and focus group discussion (Sendjaya et al., 2016). Multiple researchers conducted observations to reduce the potential bias that may occur in a single data source design.

Intervention

I (certified mindfulness teacher by Mindful Academy in Solterreno) initiated and led an 8-week Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) program (J. Kabat-Zinn, 1990) for a leader sample. Throughout the dissertation process, I undertook a multifaceted journey by receiving specialized training to achieve certification and qualification as a Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) teacher for the purpose of this study. The initial prerequisite for this journey was a minimum of five years of personal meditation experience, a criterion I had already fulfilled due to my longstanding practice in meditation.

Subsequently, I successfully completed an 8-week MBSR course, which I would later facilitate as the main part of this study. Following this, I engaged in the first level of teacher

training (TT1) at Mindful Academy Solterreno. This foundational course required at least 112 hours of preparatory study and 66 hours of direct training. The preparatory study encompassed reading two specified books, engaging in designated meditation practices, and undertaking personal and professional development through a detailed study guide. Conversely, the in-person training—often referred to as a retreat—included comprehensive discussions and explorations of the MBSR course curriculum, group exercises, and reflective practices on teaching methodologies, facilitated by experienced mindfulness instructors.

The third step in my specialized training involved participation in a 5-day silent retreat. During this period, I was required to maintain silence, engaging solely in teacher-led mindfulness practices, both formal and informal. This retreat aimed to deepen my experiential understanding of mindfulness practices.

The advancement in my training led to completing Teacher Training 2 (TT2) at Mindful Academy Solterreno, an advanced course demanding at least 132 hours of preparatory study and 66 hours of direct training. This phase of my preparation included intensive workshops that delved into the core intentions behind MBSR teaching methodologies, hands-on learning experiences of the 8-week MBSR course, practical teaching exercises, inquiry sessions, and receiving feedback on my teaching practices.

Furthermore, I documented my mindfulness teacher training journey and reflections in a 2500-word reflective journal, highlighting the challenges and insights gained through my teacher training experience. Additionally, I undertook a supervised teaching assignment, leading an 8-week MBSR course under the mentorship of an experienced teacher trainer to refine my teaching skills.

Prior to conducting the MBSR course for the current study, I also facilitated several four-week mindfulness training sessions for employees across various departments of a multinational corporation. This experience was aimed at further deepening my understanding and application of mindfulness training in organizational settings.

The MBSR program was developed by Jon Kabat-Zinn at the University of Massachusetts Medical School Research Center in 1979. MBSR is an experiential program consisting of several formal and informal mindfulness meditation practices, group discussions, home exercises and practices, and a full-day teacher-led silence retreat. Each weekly session spans 2.5 to 3 hours, with the duration varying based on the number of participants and the length of discussions. The formal mindfulness meditation practices included awareness of breath, body scan, mindful movement, open awareness, kindly awareness, awareness of emotions, breathing space, and turning toward difficulty, lasting from ten minutes to one hour. The instructor leads an inquiry after each formal practice providing a basis for participants to express their experiences and make reflections in an open and non-judgmental way. Participants are highly encouraged to continue their daily practices through home assignments, including 45-minute guided meditation practices, journaling, awareness of daily activities, etc. For this study, I used the term “leadership-specific mindfulness intervention” in hypotheses to describe a slightly modified MBSR program as I included an extra module focusing on raising awareness of organizational politics (POPs) and including a short session illustrating scientific studies that demonstrate the effects of mindfulness on individuals.

MBSR programs and their versions have spread worldwide and are employed in many contexts, such as hospitals, classrooms, workplaces, and public and private organizations. The

primary outcome of this program is to enhance state and trait mindfulness levels by facilitating participants to learn how to focus their attention on whatever the present moment presents, so that they can observe their thoughts, emotions, feelings, behaviors, sensations, and surroundings in a kind, open, and non-judgmental way. Followingly, participants are inspired to detach (not identify) from their internal and external environment and become aware of their automatic reactions and patterns in everyday life. This approach motivates individuals to move beyond their automatic-pilot mode, replacing unhelpful patterns with choices that are more beneficial and rational for themselves.

Measures

Below are the details of each measure utilized in this study. All questionnaires were administered in English, the original language in which they were created. Despite the participants being from Turkey, I anticipate no significant constraints in using English questionnaires, given that all participants possess an advanced level of English proficiency, a prerequisite for admission to the master's program at Koç University, where they are currently enrolled. The reliability and validity scores of the measures, derived from both existing literature and the data collected in this study, are presented in the results section.

Mindfulness

Leaders' mindfulness is measured with the Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire to capture the general level of (i.e., dispositional) mindfulness in life. A 24-item Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire short form is adapted from Bohlmeijer et al. (2011). A 5-item Likert-type scale is used where 1 indicates strong disagreement and 5 denotes strong agreement for the measurement of all items. Higher scores indicate higher levels of dispositional mindfulness. The scale consists of five dimensions: (a) act with awareness, e.g., I rush through activities without

being really attentive to them (reverse coded); (b) describing, e.g., I'm good at finding words to describe my feelings; (c) observing, e.g., I notice the smells and aromas of things; (d) non-judging, e.g., I tell myself that I shouldn't be feeling the way I'm feeling (reverse coded); (e) non-reacting, e.g., I watch my feelings without getting carried away by them (Baer et al., 2006).

Organizational politics (awareness)

The perceptions of organizational politics are measured using a 9-item scale adapted from Kacmar and Carlson (1997); Kacmar and Ferris (1991). A 5-item Likert-type scale is used where 1 indicates strong disagreement and 5 denotes strong agreement for the measurement of all items. Higher scores indicate higher levels of organizational politics perceptions. The scale consists of three dimensions: (a) general political behavior, e.g., People in this organization attempt to build themselves up by tearing others down; (b) go along to get ahead.

Since I intend to measure the awareness of organizational politics, I prepared a written script including subtle elements of organizational politics for participants to read before they rate the survey. The script included their unique role information in the simulation they play to create a well-framed and comparable political context that is also applicable to the simulation context. To make the text subtle and relatable to the simulation, I also incorporated a positive phenomenon that can simultaneously exist with POPs, called professional commitment (Chang & Choi, 2007). Followingly, I intended to capture how much they raise their awareness about the political context that I have presented in this written script after the intervention. An example of the written script can be found in the Appendix.

Psychological well-being

Psychological well-being is measured using a 21-item Eudaimonic Well-Being (QEWB) scale adapted from Waterman et al. (2010). A 5-item Likert-type scale is used where 1 indicates strong disagreement and 5 denotes strong agreement for the measurement of all items. Higher scores indicate higher levels of psychological well-being. The scale consists of three dimensions: (a) sense of purpose, e.g., I can say that I have found my purpose in life; (b) purposeful personal expressiveness, e.g., It is important to me that I feel fulfilled by the activities that I engage in; (c) effortful engagement, e.g., If something is really difficult, it probably isn't worth doing (reverse coded).

Proactive coping

Proactive coping is measured using the 14-item Proactive Coping Inventory adapted from Greenglass et al. (1999). A 5-item Likert-type scale is used where 1 indicates strong disagreement and 5 denotes strong agreement for the measurement of all items. Higher scores indicate higher levels of proactive coping. Examples of the items include: "I like challenges and beating the odds," and "I turn obstacles into positive experiences."

Moral action

To measure leaders' moral action potential, I utilized the procedure followed by Sendjaya et al. (2016). In line with their operationalization, I conducted a simulation and complementary focus group discussion to assess participants' moral action potential based on their reflection in this simulated environment and discussion on a provided case study. Then, these observations are used to rate (independent assessors rated the scale) a three-point scale where one indicates a below-average score, two indicates an average score, and three indicates an above-average score. A below-average score means that leaders in this category need extra improvement, whereas an

above-average score points to a relatively higher level of moral action where there could be minimal need for additional advancement of this feature. These scores are designated based on the observations during the simulation and discussion (e.g., participant's statements, reasonings, justifications, verbal and non-verbal behaviors such as tone of voice and facial expressions) when faced with a moral dilemma in several scenarios in different contexts. This way, we obtain individual scores of leaders' moral actions thanks to their verbal and non-verbal reactions in each of the exercises (explained below). A detailed explanation of the moral action measurement procedures and scale can be found in the supplementary documents.

Focus Group Discussion

I conducted a complementary focus group discussion built on questions reflecting 'The Parable of the Sadhu' case study (McCoy, 1997). In general, participants individually provided answers to the given ethical dilemmas that conflict between personal values and the vague ethical values provided by the organization. Participants were asked to reflect on "who they are becoming" when they compromise their core values for the sake of their job. When placed in a moral dilemma, they were required to justify the reasonings behind their responses. The facilitator probed comments and further questions (e.g., personalizing the situation by providing examples of dilemmas such as hiding the truth) and created a convenient space for leaders to communicate how they think and behave on moral issues. The facilitator also created an environment where they could provide their answers openly and comfortably. This setting ensured the clarity of the participants' moral positions.

Simulation

The participants' moral action is measured with Harvard Business School's leadership and team simulation in addition to focus-group discussions. The simulation is named after Everest, as the participants' (a group of five people) task is to climb the summit of Mount Everest. Each team member is designated to separate roles, such as a group leader, photographer, physician, marathoner, and environmentalist. The members face numerous challenges, requiring them to solve problems and make decisions during the expedition. They are provided with information (such as food supplies, weather, etc.) and instructions to proceed to successive camps effectively on their escalating way to the summit with time limitations. Participants are warranted to share information about their journey with other team members. At the beginning of the simulation, each team member is subject to a personal agenda manifested on their screen without informing other team members. Each member had a personal goal against their team's goal. In other words, the personal and team goals are pitted against each other, leaving participants with ethical dilemmas. For instance, they had to decide whether to hide critical information that may endanger others' capacity to survive to advance their personal interests. Two assessors (informed of the conflicting interests of team members and their diverse personal agendas) observed and rated participants' verbal and non-verbal behaviors, strategies, and reasonings as they made decisions and proceeded to subsequent camps in the simulation.

Control variables

In line with previous research, control variables are added to increase the validity as they might influence the variables of this study (Horley & Lavery, 1995; Klussman et al., 2020; Kong et al., 2016; Sendjaya et al., 2016; Witter et al., 1984). The first control variable, social

desirability bias, is measured using a 10-item scale adapted from Crowne and Marlowe (1960). A 5-item Likert-type scale is used where 1 indicates strong disagreement and 5 denotes strong agreement for the measurement of all items. Higher scores indicate higher levels of social desirability bias. The scale consists of two dimensions: (a) self-deception, e.g., When I don't know something, I don't at all mind admitting it (reverse coded); (b) impression management, e.g., I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget. Second, I recorded and included weekly participation in MBSR sessions (in terms of both being present and contributing to inquiries and discussions), engagement in home practices, as well as the level of resemblance of the simulation to their own workplace (in terms of communication patterns, level of competition, dedication to work, etc. in a team) as control variables. Thirdly, demographic variables such as age, gender, and tenure are included as the final control variables in this study.

Analyses

I obtained data from participants' pre- and post-assessment questionnaires and analyzed it using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 28. Initially, I applied descriptive statistics to compute the mean and standard deviation of the main variables. Then, I conducted non-parametric (i.e., Spearman) correlations to analyze the relationships among these variables. Next, I employed the Wilcoxon signed-rank test to measure the impact of mindfulness intervention on corporate leaders who participated in the study. By comparing the scores obtained before and after the intervention, along with the corresponding p-values, I could observe the effectiveness of the MBSR program in the participants' levels of trait mindfulness, psychological well-being, proactive coping, POPs awareness, and moral action.

Results

I examined the normality of data distribution given the composition of 21 (11 female and 10 male) participants in the experimental group and 9 (5 female and 4 male) in the control group. Initially, I assessed skewness and kurtosis scores to understand the distribution pattern. The absolute skewness values for perceptions of organizational politics, moral action, psychological well-being, mindfulness, and proactive coping were 1.08, 0.21, 0.13, 0.79, and 1.95, respectively. Correspondingly, the absolute kurtosis values for the same variables, in the same order, were 1.67, 0.03, 2.07, 0.25, and 7.09. Given that some of these values deviated from the anticipated range—less than 1 for skewness and less than 3 for kurtosis (Muthén & Kaplan, 1985)—I refrained from assuming a normal distribution and proceeded with non-parametric analyses.

Subsequently, I conducted the Shapiro-Wilk test (Razali & Wah, 2011) to further probe the distribution's nature as a supplementary analysis. While certain variables displayed significance (e.g., the p-value for perceptions of organizational politics was $0.004 < 0.05$, and for psychological well-being, it was $0.021 < 0.05$), the remaining results were insignificant (p-values for moral action, mindfulness, and proactive coping were 0.20, 0.20, and 0.13, respectively). Consequently, I refrained from assuming normality in the data distribution.

Additionally, a post hoc power analysis was conducted utilizing G*Power (Faul et al., 2007) to assess the adequacy of the study's sample size in achieving a desired level of statistical power, set at 0.80 (Cohen, 1992), thereby reducing the risk of committing a Type I error. The findings indicated that the power of this study was 0.70, characterized by a medium effect size of 0.5, with a sample size of 21 for the experimental group, and a significance level of $p < 0.05$.

Table 2 and Table 3 display the means, standard deviations, and correlations among the central variables belonging to the experimental group. Pre-intervention results (see Table 1) showed that mindfulness significantly correlated with psychological well-being ($r = 0.55$, $p < 0.05$) and proactive coping ($r = 0.61$, $p < 0.10$). Also, the correlation between psychological well-being and proactive coping was significant ($r = 0.54$, $p < 0.05$). The correlation between the remaining variables was insignificant. On the other hand, post-intervention results (see Table 3) demonstrated that the only significant relationship is the correlation between psychological well-being and proactive coping ($r = 0.70$, $p < 0.10$).

TABLE 2
Means, Standard Deviations, and Zero-Order Correlations, Pre-intervention Results

Variables	Mean	SD	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1) Mindfulness	3.00	0.52	1.00				
(2) Psychological well-being	3.47	0.36	.55** (0.01)	1.00			
(3) Proactive coping	3.71	0.47	.61** (0.00)	.54* (0.01)	1.00		
(4) Perception of organizational politics	2.98	0.40	-0.20 (0.37)	0.10 (0.64)	-0.11 (0.60)	1.00	
(5) Moral action	2.04	0.41	0.30 (0.17)	0.19 (0.40)	0.21 (0.36)	-0.35 (0.11)	1.00

Note. P-values are in parentheses. Non-parametric (i.e., spearman) correlations are presented.
* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

TABLE 3
Means, Standard Deviations, and Zero-Order Correlations, Post-intervention Results

Variables	Mean	SD	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1) Mindfulness	3.28	0.42	1.00				
(2) Psychological well-being	3.65	0.33	.24 (0.27)	1.00			
(3) Proactive coping	3.88	0.36	.25 (0.25)	.70** (0.00)	1.00		
(4) Perception of organizational politics	2.84	0.39	0.14 (0.52)	0.23 (0.30)	0.24 (0.28)	1.00	
(5) Moral action	1.95	0.27	-0.08 (0.70)	0.03 (0.89)	0.10 (0.66)	0.21 (0.34)	1.00

Note. P-values are in parentheses. Non-parametric (i.e., spearman) correlations are presented.
* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

The internal reliability of the mindfulness scale was calculated to be 0.71, which is consistent with previous literature (Bohlmeijer et al., 2011; Lam et al., 2022) and accords with a cut-off score of 0.70 (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). Conversely, the internal reliability of the perceptions of organizational politics scale yielded a coefficient of 0.53, despite its demonstrated reliability across diverse samples in previous studies (Arefin et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2022; Meisler & Vigoda-Gadot, 2014; Zibenberg, 2021). This lower score may potentially be attributable to the small sample size employed in the current study. Additionally, the internal reliability coefficients for the psychological well-being scale and the proactive coping scale were calculated as 0.75 and 0.76, respectively, again aligning with the established cut-off score of 0.70 (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011), and consistent with previous research (Altan-Atalay & Zeytun, 2020; Boyle et al., 2019; Chang et al., 2014; Greenglass et al., 1999; Guo et al., 2022; Zhou et al., 2013).

To assess the interrater reliability of the moral action measurement, Kendall's Tau was employed due to the ordinal nature of the ranking (Sen, 1968). For the experimental group, the pretest, posttest, and change scores yielded values of 0.13, -0.04, and 0.11, respectively. Conversely, the control group's scores were determined as 0.13, 0.18, and 0.00 for the pretest, posttest, and change, respectively. The interrater reliability between the two independent assessors for the moral action measurement fell well below the expected levels (<0.60) (Gisev et al., 2013). Consequently, our reliance on this measurement remains severely constrained. To mitigate this limitation, several post-hoc analyses were conducted, including post-interviews with program participants and the inclusion of additional survey measures such as the moral foundations questionnaire (Graham et al., 2011) to make sense of their moral stance, which are elaborated upon in the subsequent post-hoc analyses section.

The summary of the Wilcoxon signed-rank test results is reported in Table 4. I evaluated the impact of 8-week mindfulness training on participants using a nonparametric test due to the small sample size ($n = 21$ for the experiment group and $n = 9$ for the control group) and the results from previously reported analyses (e.g., Shapiro-Wilk test and skewness-kurtosis values). Given that the survey questions were structured on a Likert scale and the distribution of data did not conform to normality, I employed the Wilcoxon signed-rank test to assess the impact of the intervention on various aspects, including mindfulness, psychological well-being, proactive coping, awareness of POPs, and moral action. I analyzed and compared the participants' scores on the main variables before and after the intervention.

The findings indicated an increase in the average mindfulness score post-intervention ($M = 3.28$, $SD = 0.42$) from the initial assessment ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.52$), signifying a medium effect size (Cohen's $d = 0.53$, $p\text{-value} < 0.1$) for the experiment group, while no significant difference was observed in the results of the control group ($p\text{-value} = 0.31 > 0.05$). Similarly, there was a minor improvement in psychological well-being after the intervention ($M = 3.65$, $SD = 0.33$) compared to before ($M = 3.47$, $SD = 0.36$), also reflecting a medium effect size (Cohen's $d = 0.57$, $p\text{-value} < 0.1$) while no significant difference was observed in the control group ($p\text{-value} = 0.29 > 0.05$). These findings supported the initial two hypotheses (Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2).

Although the mean value of the proactive coping construct was higher for post-intervention results ($M = 3.88$, $SD = 0.36$) compared to pre-intervention ($M = 3.71$, $SD = 0.47$), this increase was not significant (Cohen's $d = 0.40$, $p\text{-value} > 0.05$). When I looked at the results of the POPs awareness construct, results were also not significant, and post-intervention scores

($M = 2.84$, $SD = 0.398$) were reported lower than pre-intervention scores ($M = 2.98$, $SD = 0.40$); (Cohen's $d = 0.23$, $p\text{-value} > 0.05$). Therefore, hypotheses 3 and 4 are not supported by the current dataset, although the control groups for the current study variables did not show significant differences after the intervention.

Regarding moral action, I first calculated the interrater reliability since the measurement of the participant's moral action was rated by two independent assessors. As previously indicated, the interrater reliability was extremely low (Kendall's Tau values 0.13, -0.04, and 0.11 for the experimental group's pretest, posttest, and change scores, respectively. Conversely, the control group's scores were determined as 0.13, 0.18, and 0.00 for the pretest, posttest, and change, respectively) between two raters, indicating very minimal to no agreement (Gisev et al., 2013). Although the results of this measure showed that the change in participants' moral action scores post-intervention ($M = 1.95$, $SD = 0.27$) was not significant compared to pre-intervention scores ($M = 2.04$, $SD = 0.41$) (Cohen's $d = 0.47$, $p\text{-value} > 0.05$), our reliance on this result remains severely constrained.

In examining the mediation hypotheses (Hypotheses 5a and 5b), our initial investigation focused on determining the presence of a significant association between the independent variable (mindfulness) and the dependent variable (moral action), as well as the relationships between the proposed mediators (POPs, psychological well-being, and proactive coping) and the dependent variable. However, as I could not meet the initial conditions necessary for testing the mediation effect (Judd et al., 2001; Mallinckrodt et al., 2006), I conclude that the available data does not support the inference of a mediation relationship among the variables. Consequently, Hypotheses 5a and 5b were not supported.

TABLE 4
Results of Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test, Cohen's d scores

Construct	Pre-assessment Mean (SD)	Post-assessment Mean (SD)	p-value	Cohen's d
Mindfulness	3.00 (0.52)	3.28 (0.42)	0.02	0.53
Psychological well-being	3.47 (0.36)	3.65 (0.33)	0.02	0.57
Proactive coping	3.71 (0.47)	3.88 (0.36)	0.16	0.40
Perception of organizational politics	2.98 (0.40)	2.84 (0.39)	0.35	0.23
Moral Action	2.04 (0.41)	1.95 (0.27)	0.73	0.47

Despite the non-parametric nature of the tests, which precluded the inclusion of several control variables in our analyses, an examination of participants' social desirability levels was conducted. The results indicate that the social desirability levels of both the experiment and control groups align closely with the midpoint of the 5-point scale (Mean = 3.15, Standard Deviation = 0.38), with scores ranging from a minimum of 2.5 to a maximum of 4.2. Given the study's existing underpowered status (falling below the desired level of statistical power, set at 0.80) (Cohen, 1992), participant exclusion was not pursued, and the analysis proceeded accordingly. I also examined the correlation between social desirability and the main variables in the study (i.e., psychological well-being, proactive coping, POPs awareness, and moral action) and found no significant relationships (*p-value* = 0.15, 0.41, 0.33, and 0.32 respectively). This lack of significant correlation further supports the conclusion that our results were not influenced by the social desirability levels of the participants.

The outcomes concerning the remaining control variables, including factors like participation in MBSR sessions, inquiries, and engagement in assigned homework, did not yield conclusive insights into their association with enhanced mindfulness post-treatment. More

specifically, a significant increase in mindfulness appears to occur regardless of the extent to which participants allocate time to home practices or actively participate in discussions during sessions.

Post-hoc Analyses

I undertook a series of additional post-hoc analyses (Curran-Everett & Milgrom, 2013), with the exclusive aim of deepening our understanding of the current data and findings for inclusion in the discussion section. This approach ensures that our analyses remain free from engaging in Hypothesizing After Results Are Known (HARKing), as cautioned against by Hollenbeck and Wright (2017).

First, I looked at the effect of mindfulness intervention on the participant's locus of control (Rotter, 1954; Spector, 1988), which is represented by internal and external loci. An internal locus of control is characterized by an individual's belief that their decisions and behaviors significantly influence life outcomes. Conversely, an external locus of control denotes an individual's belief that life outcomes are primarily determined by external factors, such as fate, luck, happenstance, or the influence of powerful others. I utilized the 16-item Work Locus of Control Scale by Spector (1988). Sample items include "getting the job you want is mostly a matter of luck" for the external locus of control, whereas "a job is what you make of it" represents the internal locus of control dimension. The internal reliability of the internal and external locus of control scales was calculated to be 0.71 and 0.83, respectively, which are consistent with previous literature (Chen et al., 2016; Karkoulian et al., 2016) and accord with a cut-off score of 0.70 (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011).

A few studies have documented the effects of mindfulness on locus of control across various contexts. For instance, Bidokhi et al. (2018) observed an increase in the internal health locus of control and a decrease in the external health locus of control among women. Similarly, Flinton (1997) reported increases in the internal locus of control within a prison environment. Furthermore, Bowen et al. (2006) identified an enhancement in alcohol-related internal locus of control. These findings collectively underscore the potential of mindfulness interventions to positively influence individuals' perceptions of control across different areas of their lives.

Despite the existing literature neglecting the connection between mindfulness and locus of control within the work life context, I asserted that mindfulness increases the internal locus of control and decreases the external locus of control by facilitating a perceptual shift in the mode of responding to whatever the present moment presents internally (e.g., thoughts, emotions, physical sensations) and externally (sounds, physical world, interactions with others, work environment, etc.) (Van Gordon et al., 2014). More specifically, mindfulness encourages the acceptance of any circumstance that the present moment may offer, while also highlighting the transient nature of all phenomena, including thoughts, emotions, external events, and so on. Consequently, individuals practicing mindfulness tend not to be carried away by anything that happens in the moment and realize their capacity to choose their responses to it. In other words, they are more likely to be aware of their agency and control in determining how they relate to the world and themselves (Goldman-Schuyler et al., 2017; Kabat-Zinn, 2015; Kudesia, 2019).

Due to the substantial limitations in measuring moral actions in this study, I aimed to investigate whether the locus of control among leaders moves towards a more internal perspective following the MBSR training. This shift could potentially enhance their moral

dispositions, influencing variables such as moral reasoning, moral judgment, and, ultimately, moral actions (Bachrach et al., 1977; Cherry & Fraedrich, 2000; Forte, 2005; Rest, 1986). This investigation is grounded in the understanding that individuals are more inclined to exhibit moral behaviors when they acknowledge that their actions have an impact on others and life outcomes, which is a central concept of an internal locus of control.

Subsequently, the analysis of the current data revealed that mindfulness intervention has a significant and positive effect on the internal locus of control, while concurrently exerting a significant and negative effect on the external locus of control. In other words, the findings indicated an increase in the average internal locus of control score post-intervention ($M = 3.80$, $SD = 0.42$) from the initial assessment ($M = 3.69$, $SD = 0.46$), signifying a small effect size (Cohen's $d = 0.24$, $p\text{-value} < 0.1$) for the experiment group while no significant difference was observed in the results of the control group ($p\text{-value} = 0.15 > 0.05$). In line with this notion, I found a decrease in the average external locus of control score post-intervention ($M = 2.58$, $SD = 0.60$) from the initial assessment ($M = 2.88$, $SD = 0.58$), signifying a medium effect size (Cohen's $d = -0.47$, $p\text{-value} < 0.1$) for the experiment group while no significant difference was observed in the results of the control group ($p\text{-value} = 0.15 > 0.02$).

In addition to examining the locus of control, I investigated the effects of MBSR on leaders' moral domain through secondary post-hoc analysis. The moral domain includes individuals' valuation and application of five moral foundations—Harm/Care, Fairness/Reciprocity, Ingroup/Loyalty, Authority/Respect, and Purity/Sanctity—in decision-making processes (Graham et al., 2011). Understanding how individuals make judgments on these foundations and their relevance is crucial, as it addresses the fundamental question of

“How can we measure moral concerns when people disagree about what ‘morality’ means?” (Graham et al., 2011, p. 2). Correspondingly, this study acknowledged the challenges in measuring moral action, highlighted by the extremely low agreement levels between two independent raters on our ratings. Thus, I aimed to explore whether MBSR induces changes in how leaders value a varied array of universally available moral intuitions. The moral foundations questionnaire’s (Graham et al., 2011) sample items include “whether or not someone suffered emotionally” from the harm/care dimension of moral relevance. Similarly, it includes “compassion for those who are suffering is the most crucial virtue” to assess the harm/care dimension of moral judgment. The internal reliability of the overall moral foundation scale was calculated to be 0.87, which is consistent with previous literature (e.g., Atari et al., 2023; Pagliaro et al., 2021) and accorded with a cut-off score of 0.70 (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011).

The results showed that the mindfulness intervention has a significant and positive effect on the Fairness/Reciprocity dimension of moral foundations. In other words, the findings indicated an increase in the average fairness score (both as moral judgment and moral relevance dimensions) post-intervention ($M = 4.37$, $SD = 0.50$) from the initial assessment ($M = 4.13$, $SD = 0.52$), signifying a medium effect size (Cohen’s $d = 0.48$, $p\text{-value} < 0.1$) for the experiment group while no significant difference was observed in the results of the control group ($p\text{-value} = 0.18 > 0.05$). Interestingly, none of the other moral foundations (i.e., Harm/Care, Ingroup/Loyalty, Authority/Respect, and Purity/Sanctity) showed significant differences after the intervention, indicating that participants placed much more emphasis on fairness among the five moral foundations when making decisions in life.

The final step of post-hoc investigation involved conducting post-interviews with participants of the Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) program to delve deeper into their experiences and understand the long-term impact of mindfulness on their professional lives. These interviews allowed participants to reflect on their mindfulness journey and contemplate its influence on their leadership within their work life. At the time of the interviews, almost a year had passed since the completion of the program. This time frame was significant as it offered a valuable opportunity to learn about the MBSR training's sustained effects from the participants' own perspectives.

I posed two questions to the participants: “Did you observe any changes in your leadership approaches/behaviors after the training?” and “Did you feel you adopted a more ethical/principled approach in your leadership position?” These questions were formulated based on recommendations from the thesis monitoring jury members. Given that the findings of the study did not allow us to make inferences beyond the individual level (e.g., significant increases in mindfulness, psychological well-being, internal locus of control, and emphasis on fairness, but insignificant findings on perception of POPs awareness and moral action after the intervention), the jury's suggestions enabled us to explore potential changes in leadership approaches.

I was able to interview nine out of the twenty-one participants due to their limited availability. Although I did not use any formal analyses or tools to derive themes, I recorded their responses and informally identified common themes based on my education and experience in the leadership domain.

Responses to the first question revealed a common theme among almost all participants. They reported an improvement in listening skills, which was highlighted as contributing to

improved communication with subordinates. Participants attributed this improvement to mindfulness, which facilitated their capacity to enhance communication and leadership effectiveness through acceptance and adaptation to others' working styles by increased receptivity to their viewpoints, ultimately fostering effective collaboration and team cohesion.

The second notable theme that emerged related to the adoption of a more empowering leadership style after the training. Several program participants reported a transition towards letting go of control and affording their team members greater autonomy in leading projects and expressing themselves. This change has been seen to increase the feeling of responsibility among team members.

The subsequent responses I present cover various aspects contributed by different participants, which do not form emerging interview themes. One participant articulated a development in their situational leadership approach, stating that they adjust their behaviors based on the demands of specific situations, factors, and dynamics they encounter. They perceive themselves as more adept at flexible adaptation. They also facilitate opportunities for others to engage in leadership experiences. This approach involves assuming responsibility for a defined period and subsequently transferring it to another individual, also reflecting shared leadership principles.

Finally, another participant noted a shift towards a softer approach in their leadership style, characterized by a reduction in aggression. They expressed that mindfulness has taught them not to strive to be a superhero figure for others. Previously, they tended to dictate and guide individuals, assuming their perspective to be the sole correct one. However, they now acknowledge the fallibility of their views and embrace a gentler leadership style. They state that

they still work collaboratively towards goals with others, perhaps at a swifter pace, but without the forcefulness previously employed.

Participants generally responded to the second question, “Did you feel you adopted a more ethical/principled approach in your leadership position?” by stating that they had already prioritized ethical and principled behavior in their professional life before the intervention and have continued to pursue these values. Additionally, a subset of responses diverged from the predominant theme, offering nuanced perspectives on the impact of mindfulness intervention on ethical behavior. One participant noted that as individuals learn to maintain calmness, their capacity to perceive positive aspects in situations increases, which is often challenging to perceive while in a hurry. This enhanced awareness of positive moments further motivates an increased ethical engagement. Another respondent highlighted a more ethical approach in their role through careful management of shared information to safeguard privacy, highlighting the significance of fair communication to honor all involved parties. Furthermore, a third participant reflected on becoming more receptive to feedback regarding transparency, indicating a shift towards openness and ethical responsiveness in the workplace. These varied responses illuminate the diverse ways in which mindfulness might influence and reinforce ethical behaviors within workplace settings.

Discussion

This study aimed to understand how leader-specific mindfulness intervention (i.e., MBSR) affects leaders, particularly in bringing out their moral action potential. The study also focused on both the positive (psychological well-being and proactive coping) and negative impacts (awareness of unpleasant organizational realities and the discomfort it might create) of

mindfulness that are expected to surface after the intervention. Results showed that while mindfulness intervention generally leads to improved mindfulness, psychological well-being, locus of control, and fairness perceptions, its impact on leader moral behavior and understanding of organizational politics awareness is complicated and needs further attention.

Consistent with earlier studies, our findings confirm the beneficial effects of mindfulness intervention on well-being and the positive relationship between mindfulness and coping (Boyle et al., 2019; Brown & Ryan, 2003; Dillard & Meier, 2021; Donald & Atkins, 2016; Lam et al., 2022; Monzani et al., 2021; Tang et al., 2019). However, the data from this study did not provide definitive conclusions regarding the influence of mindfulness on the awareness of organizational politics and moral action. While previous studies suggest that mindfulness enhances the awareness of environmental dynamics (Gaertner, 2011; Hochwarter et al., 2020; Kudesia, 2019), the relationship between these aspects and mindfulness showed insignificant results in our study.

In our novel effort to operationalize awareness of perceived organizational politics (POPs), the lack of significant results might reflect our measurement limitations. Initially, I prepared a script detailing participants' roles in a forthcoming simulation, incorporating subtle political dynamics. Participants were asked to assess this script using a validated POPs scale before and after the mindfulness intervention to determine any shifts in their recognition of the embedded politics. However, it's possible that in the post-intervention assessment, participants based their ratings more on the interpersonal dynamics and experiences from the simulation and the 8-week training, rather than the political nuances in the text. This tendency was suggested by informal interviews post-training, indicating that participants' real-time simulation experiences might have overshadowed the intended focus on the script's politics. Nevertheless, our novel attempt to operationalize the awareness of organizational politics, an unavoidable and often

unpleasant aspect present in every organization (Arefin et al., 2021), may hopefully facilitate future scholarly research into such phenomena.

Similarly, although we can talk about the theoretical link between mindfulness and ethical individual behavior (Basharpour & Ahmadi, 2021; Ruedy & Schweitzer, 2010; Vich, 2015; Xiao et al., 2020), the results of the current study demonstrated that there is no significant difference in leader moral action scores after mindfulness intervention compared to pre-intervention. Since I measured leader moral action potential through observations from simulation and complementary focus group discussions before and after the intervention, the results might be confounded by various factors (e.g., learning effect, familiarity effect, raters' judgments in observed behaviors, etc.). More importantly, since the interrater reliability between two independent assessors for the moral action measurement fell well below the anticipated and expected levels (<0.06) (Gisev et al., 2013), our reliance on this measurement remains severely constrained.

The protocol for measuring moral action may reveal various considerations. Firstly, it is acknowledged that moral behavior is inherently subjective, leading to challenges in reaching a consensus on its definition and observation, as noted by Graham et al. (2011). Secondly, the reliance on a limited number of assessors, specifically two, might be inadequate for achieving a comprehensive understanding and agreement when quantifying observations of moral behavior. Thirdly, the methodology, which includes simulations and focus group discussions, may have limitations in capturing the full spectrum of participants' potential for moral action, as this study does not incorporate role-playing exercises or any other observed behavior in a work context. Such exercises (i.e., role playing) were included in the study by Sendjaya et al. (2016), from which the moral action measurement was adapted, indicating a gap in the methodological

approach. Therefore, we need a more solid and nuanced measurement tool to understand the novel link between mindfulness and leader moral action.

Theoretical and Practical Contributions

The theoretical implications of this study are multifaceted. Firstly, it underscores the significance of mindfulness as a dynamic managerial capability framework, highlighting its role as a personal resource that enhances individual well-being and coping strategies. It presents the overlooked link between mindfulness and eudaimonic aspects of well-being, supporting the role of mindfulness in positive human functioning (Huta & Waterman, 2013). Additionally, the results signify that mindfulness is positively correlated with proactive coping techniques that are well-required in the face of adverse events (Schwarzer & Taubert, 2002; Sharma et al., 2021), as it creates resources and adaptability even before stress-related events occur. This connection seems counterintuitive, given that mindfulness, which fosters awareness of the present moment, is associated with a mechanism that helps cope with future challenges. Further, the link between leader mindfulness and awareness of organizational politics clarifies the link between managerial cognition and manager's knowledge re-configuration in the dynamic capabilities framework. In this way, the findings of this study contribute to how mindfulness can serve as a micro-foundation of dynamic managerial capabilities (Gaertner, 2011; Helfat & Martin, 2015).

This study also adds to “The Balance Framework” (Gruman et al., 2018) of mindfulness in the work context, which is a recent call by Choi et al. (2022), by testing both favorable (i.e., enhanced well-being and coping) and unfavorable (i.e., awareness of organizational politics existence) outcomes. The findings suggest that it's essential to consider individual resources and organizational factors (e.g., organizational politics) in understanding whether mindfulness training for leaders encourages their moral behavior. It also posits that the awareness of the

political environment, facilitated by mindfulness, does not automatically translate into moral action and may require a longer time period. This nuanced understanding adds a critical layer to the dynamic managerial capabilities framework, arguing for a more complex interplay between mindfulness, moral action, and organizational politics.

This study contributes to behavioral integrity theory and literature by examining the relationship between awareness of organizational politics through mindfulness intervention (as an unconventional predictor of leader moral behavior) and leader moral action. Behavioral integrity theory posits a connection and alignment between a manager's reasoning (words) and actions (deeds) (Blasi, 1980; Simons, 2002). While we hypothesized that enhanced mindfulness would increase awareness of the political environment and revive ethical characteristics, thereby providing a foundation for managers to exhibit behavioral integrity, the results suggest a more complex relationship. Specifically, increased awareness of politics through mindfulness (reasoning) did not directly translate into moral behaviors (actions) as indicated in the behavioral integrity theory. This finding draws lines to this theory by highlighting the nuanced interplay between awareness and behavioral outcomes. More specifically, this study demonstrates that enhanced mindfulness and awareness of unpleasant realities alone are insufficient to drive moral action, suggesting that other factors or mechanisms are influential in determining the nature of this relationship. This insight advances the literature on mindfulness and ethical leader behavior by pinpointing the gap between awareness and action, which is critical for developing more effective interventions aimed at fostering ethical behavior in organizational settings (discussed further in the future directions section).

The post-hoc analyses have also unveiled several critical relationships, key among them being the previously undervalued link between mindfulness and locus of control within a work-

life domain. Our findings demonstrate that mindfulness enhances the internal locus of control while diminishing the external locus of control among leaders in our sample. This outcome aligns with expectations, given the well-documented association between an internal locus of control and a variety of positive outcomes in both work and life, such as well-being, satisfaction, commitment, job motivation, self-efficacy, and career success—outcomes similarly associated with mindfulness (Eby et al., 2019; Ng et al., 2006). The mechanism explaining the association between mindfulness and a transition towards an internal locus of control might be attributed to heightened awareness of individual agency in life's events. Mindfulness fosters openness, acceptance, emotion regulation, and self-confidence, enabling individuals to recognize their capacity to influence their circumstances (Goldman-Schuyler et al., 2017; Kabat-Zinn, 2015; Kudesia, 2019). This recognition is crucial whether the situations are within their control or not, as it empowers them to choose their response to any situation, thereby reinforcing their sense of self-control in what happens in life as well as themselves.

The second significant contribution of our post-hoc analyses is identifying the positive influence of mindfulness on the fairness dimension within the moral domain (Graham et al., 2011). Given that the connection between mindfulness and fairness is a relatively novel area of inquiry about mindfulness and morality, our study enriches the expanding body of research on the impact of mindfulness on perceptions of justice (Long & Christian, 2015; Reb et al., 2019; Schuh et al., 2019). The unveiled relationship between mindfulness and the extent to which leaders prioritize fairness in their daily decision-making processes is extremely important. This relationship may serve as an indicator of a leader's moral judgments and intentions, potentially leading to the manifestation of the much-needed moral behavior in organizational settings (Li et al., 2020; Manstead, 2000; Reynolds & Ceranic, 2007; Wu & He, 2021).

Although these results (enhanced internal locus of control and how much they value fairness in decision-making) may signal an increased intention in moral considerations, I fail to observe (or make inferences about) any changes in actual moral behavior. In that sense, the current study's findings also confirm and contribute to the theory of planned behavior, highlighting the gap between intention and action (e.g., Conner & Norman, 2022; Gibson et al., 2021; Sultan et al., 2020). This theory refers to the idea that intentions to engage in different behaviors can be reliably predicted by individuals' attitudes, subjective norms, and their perceived level of control over the behavior (Ajzen, 1991; Conner & Armitage, 1998). These intentions and the sense of control significantly explain why people act the way they do. The theory also suggests that despite intentions, people often do not act as they plan, with research showing that intentions only explain a part of actual behavior (Sutton, 1998).

The final contribution of our post-hoc investigation emerges from informal post-interviews conducted with program participants. Gaining insight into their perceptions of their leadership behaviors and moral considerations is particularly crucial for understanding the sustainability of interventions. This significance is underscored by the timing of the interviews, which were conducted a year after the mindfulness intervention, providing a longitudinal perspective on its effects. A notable theme emerging from the interviews indicates that participants experienced enhanced listening skills and improved communication with subordinates, aligning with existing literature (e.g., Goh, 2012; Jones et al., 2019; Manusov et al., 2020). Additionally, they reported an increase in empowering leadership behavior, necessitating further investigation to clarify the mechanisms by which mindfulness promotes such behavior. This aspect is especially notable given the current literature's insufficient attention and exploration of the relationship between mindfulness and empowering leadership.

In terms of practical implications, this study offers guidance to organizational decision-makers on the nuanced effects of incorporating mindfulness interventions. Although our findings indicate that mindfulness interventions do not significantly affect awareness of organizational politics, they do highlight that mindfulness enhances clarity and visibility across all aspects of the present moment, encompassing the pleasant, unpleasant, and challenging elements due to the clarity it instills (Kabat-Zinn, 2015; Nyanaponika, 1971). Specifically, mindfulness promotes an understanding not only of pleasant realities but also of the less apparent, adverse aspects of the organizational environment that are inherent in every organization (Arefin et al., 2021), such as organizational politics. Therefore, organizations with unpleasant environments should consider addressing these toxic atmospheres (or stress-inducing factors) before implementing mindfulness interventions. Failing to do so may hinder the potential long-term benefits of such programs for the organization and its members.

Another practical implication of this study is the significant role mindfulness interventions can play in addressing distressing leadership trends, such as corporate scandals, historically low levels of trust in leaders, and destructive leadership behaviors (Bedi et al., 2016; Mackey et al., 2021). These interventions are particularly effective against the backdrop of unfair leadership practices and behaviors. This effectiveness is attributed to the significant positive impact of mindfulness on the Fairness/Reciprocity dimension of moral foundations, as demonstrated by the results of this study. Specifically, the leaders in our sample placed a heightened emphasis on fairness among the five moral foundations when making life decisions. Consequently, these leaders are more likely to make decisions that are well-considered and lead to higher levels of distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice within the organization (Colquitt, 2001). Such justice is a crucial resource for fostering favorable individual

and workplace outcomes, including job satisfaction, ethical decision-making, trust, performance, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior (Adamovic, 2023; Colquitt et al., 2001; Hadi et al., 2020).

Limitations and Future Research

This study's exploratory nature opens avenues for future research while acknowledging certain limitations. Firstly, the relatively small sample size of the waitlist control group ($n = 9$) in comparison to the experimental group ($n = 21$) limits the statistical power and comparability of the results between the two groups. The absence of a significant relationship between the experimental and control groups in the post-test results, despite significant changes within the experimental group from pre-test to post-test, can be attributed to the small sample size (thus weakness in power) of the control group.

The recruitment process, which involved sending announcements to university MBA and EMBA students inviting them to participate in an online MBSR program, inherently possesses a limitation due to the voluntary nature of participation. This voluntary aspect introduces a self-selection bias, as individuals who choose to join are likely already inclined towards self-improvement and open to training programs, making them more likely to benefit from the intervention. However, this study aimed to minimize this bias by incorporating a measure of locus of control. Locus of control assesses participants' beliefs regarding their control and agency over life events and their behavior. By including this measure, it is possible to argue against the presence of self-selection bias for several reasons.

Firstly, the pre-test analysis revealed no significant difference in locus of control between participants in the experimental and control groups. This indicates that, at the outset, both groups were comparable in terms of their beliefs about personal control and agency.

Secondly, the post-test analysis showed that the mindfulness intervention had a significant and positive effect on internal locus of control among participants in the experimental group, along with a significant negative effect on external locus of control. In contrast, the control group exhibited no significant changes in locus of control.

The absence of significant differences in pre-test locus of control scores between the experimental and control groups suggests that the participants in the experimental group were not inherently more motivated or predisposed to benefit from the intervention. Instead, the significant increase in internal locus of control observed in the experimental group post-intervention demonstrates that the mindfulness program itself facilitated this improvement.

Therefore, the results of the locus of control measures provide strong evidence that self-selection bias was minimized in this study. The initial similarity between groups and the differential improvement in locus of control attributable to the intervention support the conclusion that the observed benefits were due to the program rather than pre-existing participant characteristics.

Additionally, the time interval between the pre-test and post-test for the experimental group precisely spanned eight weeks, equal to the duration of the Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) program. In contrast, for the control group, the period between the pre-test and post-test exceeded eight weeks due to repeated postponements attributed to the participants' demanding work schedules. This discrepancy in the timing between the two groups potentially diminishes the feasibility of comparing the experimental and control groups without the confounding effects of external influences.

Moreover, the two-week intervals between the pre-test and post-test for participating in the simulation and undergoing the measurement process might prove too brief for participants, potentially leading them to feel overly familiar with the tasks. This familiarity could result in participants believing they already possess knowledge, subsequently reducing their level of attention during the tasks. This scenario mirrors the experience encountered during the measurement of POPs awareness, as discussed in subsequent paragraphs. This limitation underscores the importance of differentiating between genuine recollection and the perception of remembering. Nonetheless, efforts were made to mitigate this limitation proactively by altering the challenges participants faced during the second playthrough of the simulation, as well as by changing their assigned roles. Despite these efforts, future research could explore the use of alternative simulations and games, alongside longer intervals between pre- and post-assessments, to address this limitation more comprehensively.

Another limitation comes from the measurement of moral action and POPs awareness, which was confined to simulations and case study discussions. While valuable for controlled observations, they might not reflect the full spectrum of a leader's moral action potential in real-world and dynamic organizational contexts. Moreover, since we fail to account for any specific contextual information, our variables showing significant changes after the intervention (e.g., mindfulness, psychological well-being, emphasis on fairness, locus of control) also lack this essential information that may influence the results.

More importantly, our reliance on the measurement of moral action remains highly constrained due to the low levels of interrater reliability between two independent assessors that fell below the expected levels (<0.06) (Gisev et al., 2013). Additionally, the reliance on participants' self-reporting in measuring the perceived political environment might introduce

biases (which was also detailed in the discussion section), as individuals could rate the scale based on personal experiences of the simulation rather than the provided script containing their role information in the simulation.

Furthermore, our analyses fail to formally account for crucial control variables, such as participation in Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) sessions and inquiries (both in terms of physical and active presence), engagement in assigned homework, levels of social desirability, and the degree to which the simulation mirrored actual workplace dynamics (including communication patterns, competition levels, and work dedication), despite their documentation. This non-inclusion is attributable to our use of non-parametric tests, which, due to their inherent limitations, lack the capability to integrate and evaluate the impact of these control variables. Nevertheless, we could still draw limited inferences about some of those variables and understand their impact on the outcomes through the collected information at hand (e.g., social desirability, engagement with home practices and sessions, etc.), even without conducting a formal analysis, as presented at the end of the results section.

Moreover, another limitation of this study is the significant expense associated with implementing an 8-week mindfulness intervention within organizational settings, considering the investment in time, effort, and financial resources. An alternative approach for organizations could involve adopting more cost-effective interventions such as serious games, which are increasingly favored by professional trainers and educators for developing game-based learning in moral development and business ethics (Sholihin et al., 2020). For example, Tanner et al. (2022) investigated the effectiveness of a serious moral game, "uFin: The Challenge," designed to enhance moral sensitivity in business—a crucial aspect of ethical decision-making and behavior and a fundamental component of moral intelligence. Their research also explored the

impact of metacognitive prompting and prosocial nudges on learning effectiveness. Results from both questionnaire responses and game data showed that engagement with the game alone effectively promotes moral sensitivity. However, neither self-reflection nor exposure to prosocial nudges significantly improved learning effectiveness, which requires further investigation.

Finally, another limitation of this study is the potential existence of experimental bias. Despite my role as an MBSR teacher possibly introducing unintentional biases, I remained vigilant throughout the intervention and measurement processes to mitigate any influence on the outcomes. My involvement was strictly limited to providing the MBSR training, with no participation in other aspects of the study, particularly the measurement process.

To ensure objectivity, two independent assessors, who were blind to the study's hypotheses, conducted the moral action measurements. During the simulation, I provided clear instructions that I would not answer any questions or make comments throughout the session. Additionally, the remaining measures were based on established questionnaires, over which I had no influence. Nevertheless, the potential for unintentional biases due to my role cannot be entirely ruled out. Future experimental studies should consider having the training conducted by an independent instructor to further minimize this risk.

For future research, it is recommended to develop and utilize a broader array of measurement tools that are capable of accurately capturing the nuances of leader moral behavior and individuals' awareness of organizational politics in diverse real-world organizational settings. Currently, to our knowledge, there is no specific measurement tool designed to assess individuals' awareness of challenging organizational realities, such as organizational politics. Understanding how individuals become aware of such realities, their reactions/responses to this awareness, and the subsequent actions they take in response, remains an area for exploration.

Developing tools to measure these aspects can significantly contribute to our understanding of challenges in everyday organizational life and how to navigate them.

In the pursuit of establishing more definitive causal relationships and validating the intervention's effectiveness, future research should employ a control group that mirrors the experimental group in terms of sample size as well as participants' and their work environment's characteristics. Additionally, it is crucial to ensure that the time interval between the pretest and posttest in the control group aligns precisely with that of the experimental group. To further enhance the generalizability of the findings and the external validity of the study, increasing both the sample size and the diversity of participants (e.g., experience, occupation, culture, etc.) is recommended. Moreover, future studies could benefit from collecting survey data from larger samples to facilitate testing and a deeper understanding of the mechanisms through which mindfulness influences the intention and enactment behind leader moral behavior.

Future research should deepen our understanding of the processes (including moral awareness, moral values, moral intuition, moral intention, and moral judgment) that drive individual moral development and behavior (Rest, 1986; Vich, 2015), especially adding to the keen discussion about the relationship between moral intuition and moral judgment (Fehr et al., 2015; Gibbs, 2014; Haidt, 2001). In that sense, this study has unveiled numerous significant and broad-ranging questions for further study. Key among these is the duration required to observe shifts in moral dispositions and whether these shifts vary across cultures, contexts, upbringing, etc. Additionally, it is essential to explore further the various individual (e.g., mindfulness) and contextual factors (e.g., existence and intensity of organizational politics) that influence moral behavior to reach more precise conclusions. Further inquiry is also needed into the conditions and contingencies under which moral intentions may or may not lead to moral behavior (e.g.,

Leonard et al., 2004; Manstead, 2000; Sultan et al., 2020; Sutton, 1998; Vallerand et al., 1992), mainly through the framework provided by the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991; Conner & Armitage, 1998). Addressing these questions will enrich our understanding of the dynamics of moral behavior in diverse settings.

The relationship between awareness of organizational politics and moral action after (and before) the mindfulness intervention is a relatively novel area of inquiry that warrants further investigation. Our study found no significant relationship between these two variables, suggesting that the interaction may be influenced by the presence of several moderators. Future research should consider examining this relationship by incorporating various potential moderators. For instance, individuals may be highly aware of the political environment within their organization but choose not to engage in corrective actions. Alternatively, the nature of this relationship may depend on factors such as individual tolerance for organizational politics, intrinsic motivation towards their jobs, levels of organizational citizenship behavior, locus of control, and the organizational culture.

Individuals with high tolerance for organizational politics may see such behaviors as normal, reducing their likelihood of engaging in moral actions. Conversely, those with low tolerance find these behaviors unacceptable and feel more compelled to act morally. On the other hand, intrinsically motivated individuals are driven by internal rewards and personal satisfaction, adhering to ethical standards regardless of political awareness (Onu et al., 2019; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Those with low intrinsic motivation may be less inclined to act morally, especially if there is no personal benefit. Similarly, high levels of organizational citizenship behavior are linked to a greater willingness to address unethical behaviors, strengthening the relationship between political awareness and moral action. Low organizational citizenship behavior levels may

weaken this relationship, as individuals are less likely to act beyond their duties (Podsakoff et al., 2000; Ruiz-Palomino & Martínez-Cañas, 2014; Turnipseed, 2002). Moreover, individuals with an internal locus of control believe they can influence outcomes and are more likely to take moral actions when aware of organizational politics. Those with an external locus of control feel powerless to effect change, diminishing their likelihood of moral action (Ng et al., 2006). Finally, the organizational culture sets the tone for acceptable behavior (Banks et al., 2021; Porter & McLaughlin, 2006; Vilas-Boas, 2019). In a culture promoting ethical behavior and transparency, the relationship between political awareness and moral action might be stronger, as individuals feel supported in taking corrective actions. In contrast, a culture that rewards political maneuvering discourages moral actions, weakening this relationship.

By exploring these potential moderators, future studies can provide a more nuanced understanding of how awareness of organizational politics influences moral action and identify conditions under which this relationship may be strengthened or weakened.

Conclusion

In exploring the novel link between mindfulness and leader moral action, this study finds that while leader-specific mindfulness intervention enhances psychological well-being and relates with proactive coping, its relationship with moral action and awareness of organizational politics is complex, necessitating further research. Our results imply that mindfulness can enhance leaders' personal resources, including mindfulness itself, well-being, internal locus of control, and their appreciation for fairness, which are crucial in navigating ethical dilemmas (Hobfoll, 1989; Kaluza et al., 2020; Li et al., 2018). In that sense, these findings contribute to the burgeoning literature on the nuanced effects of mindfulness in organizational contexts.

This study establishes a foundation for future research to investigate the circumstances in which mindfulness interventions can most effectively foster moral leader behavior and drive positive organizational change. As organizations continue to deal with the complexities of organizational politics and leadership challenges, understanding the role of mindfulness in promoting contextual and moral awareness and action remains a critical but overlooked endeavor. For practice, our findings suggest that organizations considering mindfulness interventions should be mindful of their potential dual effects (enhanced personal resources vs. awareness of organizational politics existence and the discomfort it may create) and incorporate additional strategies to ensure that heightened awareness translates into ethical and proactive leadership (rather than alienation and withdrawal) in case of uncovering hidden and unpleasant organizational realities. This study, therefore, serves as a steppingstone for further research and a thoughtful application of mindfulness in leadership and organizational development.

References

- Acton, K. S. (2021). School leaders as change agents: Do principals have the tools they need? *Management in education*, 35(1), 43-51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0892020620927415>
- Adamovic, M. (2023). Organizational justice research: A review, synthesis, and research agenda. *European management review*, 20(4), 762-782. <https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12564>
- Aikens, K. A., Astin, J., Pelletier, K. R., Levanovich, K., Baase, C. M., Park, Y. Y., & Bodnar, C. M. (2014). Mindfulness goes to work: Impact of an online workplace intervention. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 56(7), 721-731. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000000209>
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179-211.
- Allen, J. G., Romate, J., & Rajkumar, E. (2021). Mindfulness-based positive psychology interventions: A systematic review. *BMC Psychology*, 9(1), 1-116. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-021-00618-2>
- Altan-Atalay, A., & Zeytun, D. (2020). The association of negative urgency with psychological distress: Moderating role of proactive coping strategies. *The Journal of Psychology*, 154(7), 487-498. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2020.1784824>
- Ameriks, K., & Clarke, D. M. (2000). *Aristotle: Nicomachean Ethics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Arefin, M. S., Alam, M. S., Li, S.-L., & Long, L. (2021). Spillover effects of organizational politics on family satisfaction: The role of work-to-family conflict and family support. *Personnel Review*, 50(5), 1426-1444. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-02-2020-0107>

- Aspinwall, L. G., & Taylor, S. E. (1997). A stitch in time: Self-regulation and proactive coping. *Psychological Bulletin*, 121(3), 417.
- Atari, M., Haidt, J., Graham, J., Koleva, S., Stevens, S. T., & Dehghani, M. (2023). Morality beyond the WEIRD: How the nomological network of morality varies across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.
- Bachrach, R., Huesmann, L. R., & Peterson, R. A. (1977). The Relation between Locus of Control and the Development of Moral Judgment. *Child Development*, 48(4), 1340-1352.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/1128492>
- Baer, R. A., Smith, G. T., Hopkins, J., Krietemeyer, J., & Toney, L. (2006). Using self-report assessment methods to explore facets of mindfulness. *Assessment (Odessa, Fla.)*, 13(1), 27-45. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191105283504>
- Banks, G. C., Fischer, T., Gooty, J., & Stock, G. (2021). Ethical leadership: Mapping the terrain for concept cleanup and a future research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 32(2).
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2020.101471>
- Banks, G. C., Gooty, J., Ross, R. L., Williams, C. E., & Harrington, N. T. (2018). Construct redundancy in leader behaviors: A review and agenda for the future. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(1). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.12.005>
- Barnes, C. M., Lucianetti, L., Bhave, D. P., & Christian, M. S. (2015). "You wouldn't like me when I'm sleepy": Leaders' sleep, daily abusive supervision, and work unit engagement. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(5), 1419-1437.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2013.1063>

- Baron, C., Baron, L., Grégoire, S., Cayer, M., & Brochu, F. (2018). Promoting mindfulness and post-conventional consciousness in organizational leaders. *Academy of Management Proceedings*,
- Basharpour, S., & Ahmadi, S. (2021). The pattern of structural relationships executive function, ego resilience, and moral identity in predicting self-efficacy for quitting people drug dependents: The mediating role of mindfulness. *Military Caring Sciences Journal*, 8(2), 169-182.
- Bazarko, D., Cate, R. A., Azocar, F., & Kreitzer, M. J. (2013). The impact of an innovative mindfulness-based stress reduction program on the health and well-being of nurses employed in a corporate setting. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health*, 28(2), 107-133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15555240.2013.779518>
- Bedi, A., Alpaslan, C. M., & Green, S. (2016). A meta-analytic review of ethical leadership outcomes and moderators. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 139(3), 517-536. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2625-1>
- Bellot, J. (2011). Defining and assessing organizational culture. *Nursing forum (Hillsdale)*, 46(1), 29-37. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6198.2010.00207.x>
- Bidokhi, M. B., Mousavi, A., Moshki, M., & Urban, M. P. (2018). Predicting Health Locus of Control in Women through Optimism and Mindfulness. *Pizhūhish/nāmah-i ravānshināsī-i musbat (Online)*, 3(4), 51-64. <https://doi.org/10.22108/ppls.2018.103456.1091>
- Bishop, S. R., Lau, M., Shapiro, S., Carlson, L., Anderson, N. D., Carmody, J., Segal, Z. V., Abbey, S., Specia, M., Velting, D., & Devins, G. (2004). Mindfulness: A proposed operational definition. *Clinical psychology (New York, N.Y.)*, 11(3), 230-241. <https://doi.org/10.1093/clipsy.bph077>

Blasi, A. (1980). Bridging moral cognition and moral action: A critical review of the literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 88(1).

Bohlmeijer, E. T., ten Klooster, P. M., Fledderus, M., Veehof, M. M., & Baer, R. (2011). Psychometric properties of the five facet mindfulness questionnaire in depressed adults and development of a short form. *Assessment (Odessa, Fla.)*, 18(3), 308-320.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191111408231>

Bojadjev, M., Kostovski, N., & Buldioska, K. (2015). Leadership styles in companies from Republic of Macedonia. *Ekonomski Razvoj*, 17(3), 211-222.
<https://go.exlibris.link/0tQvmLtX>

Bowen, S., Parks, G. A., & Coumar, A. (2006). Mindfulness meditation in the prevention and treatment of addictive behaviors. In D. K. Nauriyal, M. Drummond, & Y. B. Lal (Eds.), *Buddhist Thought and Applied Psychological Research* (pp. 429-449). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203098899-32>

Bowers, M. R., Hall, J. R., & Srinivasan, M. M. (2017). Organizational culture and leadership style: The missing combination for selecting the right leader for effective crisis management. *Business Horizons*, 60(4), 551-563.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2017.04.001>

Boyle, C. C., Cole, S. W., Dutcher, J. M., Eisenberger, N. I., & Bower, J. E. (2019). Changes in eudaimonic well-being and the conserved transcriptional response to adversity in younger breast cancer survivors. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 103, 173-179.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2019.01.024>

Brown, K. W., & Ryan, R. M. (2003). The benefits of being present: Mindfulness and its role in psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(4), 822-848.

- Brown, K. W., Ryan, R. M., & Creswell, J. D. (2007). Mindfulness: Theoretical foundations and evidence for its salutary effects. *Psychological Inquiry*, 18(4), 211-237.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10478400701598298>
- Burmansah, B., Rugaiyah, R., & Mukhtar, M. (2019). A case study of mindful leadership in an ability to develop focus, clarity, and creativity of the buddhist higher education institute leader. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 8(6), 57-69.
- Bush, H. E., Rossy, L., Mintz, L. B., & Schopp, L. (2014). Eat for life: A work site feasibility study of a novel mindfulness-based intuitive eating intervention. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 28(6), 380-388. <https://doi.org/10.4278/ajhp.120404-QUAN-186>
- Byrne, A., Dionisi, A. M., Barling, J., Akers, A., Robertson, J., Lys, R., Wylie, J., & Dupré, K. (2014). The depleted leader: The influence of leaders' diminished psychological resources on leadership behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(2), 344-357.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.09.003>
- Carson, J. W., Carson, K. M., Gil, K. M., & Baucom, D. H. (2004). Mindfulness-based relationship enhancement. *Behavior Therapy*, 35(3), 471-494.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7894\(04\)80028-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7894(04)80028-5)
- Chang, J.-H., Huang, C.-L., & Lin, Y.-C. (2014). Mindfulness, basic psychological needs fulfillment, and well-being. *Journal of happiness studies*, 16(5), 1149-1162.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-014-9551-2>
- Chang, J. Y., & Choi, J. N. (2007). The Dynamic Relation Between Organizational and Professional Commitment of Highly Educated Research and Development (R&D) Professionals. *The Journal of social psychology*, 147(3), 299-315.
<https://doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.147.3.299-315>

- Chen, L., Liu, Y., Hu, S., & Zhang, S. (2022). Perception of organizational politics and innovative behavior in the workplace: The roles of knowledge-sharing hostility and mindfulness. *Journal of Business Research*, 145, 268-276.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.03.006>
- Chen, T., Li, F., & Leung, K. (2016). When Does Supervisor Support Encourage Innovative Behavior? Opposite Moderating Effects of General Self-efficacy and Internal Locus of Control. *Personnel Psychology*, 69(1), 123-158. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12104>
- Cherry, J., & Fraedrich, J. (2000). An Empirical Investigation of Locus of Control and the Structure of Moral Reasoning: Examining the Ethical Decision-Making Processes of Sales Managers. *The Journal of personal selling & sales management*, 20(3), 173-188.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08853134.2000.10754237>
- Chmielewski, J., Los, K., Waszkiewicz, N., & Luczynski, W. (2021). Mindfulness is related to the situational awareness of medical students confronted with life-threatening emergency situations. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*, 10(9), 1955.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm10091955>
- Choi, E., Gruman, J. A., & Leonard, C. M. (2022). A balanced view of mindfulness at work. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 12(1), 35-72.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/20413866211036930>
- Cohen, J. (1992). Statistical Power Analysis. *Current directions in psychological science : a journal of the American Psychological Society*, 1(3), 98-101.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.ep10768783>

Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation of a Measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386-400.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386>

Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Yee Ng, K. (2001). Justice at the Millennium: A Meta-Analytic Review of 25 Years of Organizational Justice

Research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425-445. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425>

Conner, M., & Armitage, C. J. (1998). Extending the Theory of Planned Behavior: A Review and Avenues for Further Research. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28(15), 1429-1464. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1998.tb01685.x>

Conner, M., & Norman, P. (2022). Understanding the intention-behavior gap: The role of intention strength. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 923464-923464.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.923464>

Creswell, J. D. (2017). Mindfulness Interventions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 68(1), 491-516. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-042716-051139>

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24(4), 349-354.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/h0047358>

Curran-Everett, D., & Milgrom, H. (2013). Post-hoc data analysis: benefits and limitations.

Current Opinion in Allergy and Clinical Immunology, 13(3), 223-224.

<https://doi.org/10.1097/ACI.0b013e3283609831>

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>

de la Fuente, J., Mañas, I., Franco, C., Cangas, A. J., & Soriano, E. (2018). Differential effect of level of self-regulation and mindfulness training on coping strategies used by university students. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 15(10),

2230. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15102230>

De Vibe, M., Solhaug, I., Rosenvinge, J. H., Tyssen, R., Hanley, A., & Garland, E. (2018). Six-year positive effects of a mindfulness-based intervention on mindfulness, coping and well-being in medical and psychology students; Results from a randomized controlled trial. *PloS One*, 13(4), e0196053-e0196053.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0196053>

Dean, K. L., Beggs, J. M., & Keane, T. P. (2010). Mid-level managers, organizational context, and (un)ethical encounters. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 97(1), 51-69.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0495-0>

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.

https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M., Gagné, M., Leone, D. R., Usunov, J., & Kornazheva, B. P. (2001). eed satisfaction, motivation, and well-being in the work organizations of a former eastern bloc country: A cross-cultural study of self-determination. *Personality & Social*

Psychology Bulletin, 27(8), 930-942. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167201278002>

- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 499-512.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>
- Dillard, A. J., & Meier, B. P. (2021). Trait mindfulness is negatively associated with distress related to COVID-19. *Personality and Individual Differences, 179*, 110955-110955.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.110955>
- Donald, J. N., & Atkins, P. W. B. (2016). Mindfulness and coping with stress: Do levels of perceived stress matter? *Mindfulness, 7*(6), 1423-1436. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-016-0584-y>
- Donaldson-Feilder, E., Lewis, R., & Yarker, J. (2019). What outcomes have mindfulness and meditation interventions for managers and leaders achieved? A systematic review. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 28*(1), 11-29.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2018.1542379>
- Donaldson-Feilder, E., Lewis, R., Yarker, J., & Whiley, L. A. (2021). Interpersonal mindfulness in leadership development: A delphi study. *Journal of Management Education, 105*256292110671. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10525629211067183>
- Durrani, A. B. (2014). Understanding the relationship between organizational politics and leadership styles. *Journal of Business and Management, 16*(11), 62-67.
- Dvořáková, K., Greenberg, M. T., & Roeser, R. W. (2019). On the role of mindfulness and compassion skills in students' coping, well-being, and development across the transition to college: A conceptual analysis. *Stress and Health, 35*(2), 146-156.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.2850>

- Eby, L. T., Allen, T. D., Conley, K. M., Williamson, R. L., Henderson, T. G., & Mancini, V. S. (2019). Mindfulness-based training interventions for employees: A qualitative review of the literature. *Human Resource Management Review*, 29(2), 156-178.
- Ellen, B. P., Ferris, G. R., & Buckley, M. R. (2013). Leader political support: Reconsidering leader political behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(6), 842-857.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.10.007>
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G* Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 39(2), 175-191.
- Fehr, R., Yam, K. C., & Dang, C. (2015, 2015). Moralized Leadership: The Construction and Consequences of Ethical Leader Perceptions.
- Ferris, G. R., Adams, G., Kolodinsky, R. W., Hochwarter, W. A., & Ammeter, A. P. (2002). *Perceptions of organizational politics: Theory and research directions*. Oxford: JAI Press/Elsevier Science. [https://doi.org/doi: 10.1016/S1475-9144\(02\)01034-2](https://doi.org/doi: 10.1016/S1475-9144(02)01034-2)
- Ferris, G. R., Ellen, B. P., McAllister, C. P., & Maher, L. P. (2019). Reorganizing organizational politics research: A review of the literature and identification of future research directions. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 6(1), 299-323. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012218-015221>
- Ferris, G. R., Harrell-Cook, G., & Dulebohn, J. H. (2000). Organizational politics: The nature of the relationship between politics perceptions and political behavior. In *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Ferris, G. R., & Kacmar, K. M. (1992). Perceptions of organizational politics. *Journal of Management*, 18(1), 93-116. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639201800107>

- Finkelstein-Fox, L., Park, C. L., & Riley, K. E. (2019). Mindfulness' effects on stress, coping, and mood: A daily diary goodness-of-fit study. *Emotion (Washington, D.C.)*, 19(6), 1002-1013. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000495>
- Flinton, C. A. (1997). *The effects of meditation techniques on anxiety and locus of control in juvenile delinquents*. California Institute of Integral Studies.
- Floyd, S. W., & Wooldridge, B. (2000). *Building strategy from the middle: Reconceptualizing strategy process*. Sage.
- Forte, A. (2005). Locus of Control and the Moral Reasoning of Managers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 58(1/3), 65-77. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-005-1387-6>
- Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *The American Psychologist*, 56(3), 218-226. <https://go.exlibris.link/4bTHxdqH>
- Gaertner, C. (2011). Putting new wine into old bottles: Mindfulness as a micro-foundation of dynamic capabilities. *Management Decision*, 49(2), 253-269. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00251741111109142>
- Garland, E. L., Farb, N. A., Goldin, P. R., & Fredrickson, B. L. (2015). The mindfulness-to-meaning theory: Extensions, applications, and challenges at the attention–appraisal–emotion interface. *Psychological Inquiry*, 26(4), 377-387. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2015.1092493>
- Germer, C., & Neff, K. (2019). Mindful self-compassion (MSC). In *Handbook of mindfulness-based programmes* (pp. 357-367). Routledge.
- Gibbs, J. C. (2014). Toward an integration of Kohlberg's and Hoffman's theories of morality. In *Handbook of moral behavior and development* (pp. 183-222). Psychology Press.

- Gibson, L. P., Magnan, R. E., Kramer, E. B., & Bryan, A. D. (2021). Theory of Planned Behavior Analysis of Social Distancing During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Focusing on the Intention–Behavior Gap. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 55(8), 805-812.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/abm/kaab041>
- Gisev, N., Bell, J. S., & Chen, T. F. (2013). Interrater agreement and interrater reliability: key concepts, approaches, and applications. *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy*, 9(3), 330-338.
- Goh, E. C. L. (2012). Integrating Mindfulness and Reflection in the Teaching and Learning of Listening Skills for Undergraduate Social Work Students in Singapore. *Social work education*, 31(5), 587-604. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2011.579094>
- Goldman-Schuyler, K., Skjei, S., Sanzgiri, J., & Koskela, V. (2017). Moments of waking up: A doorway to mindfulness and presence. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 26(1), 86-100.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492616665171>
- Götmann, A., & Bechtoldt, M. N. (2021). Coping with COVID-19 – Longitudinal analysis of coping strategies and the role of trait mindfulness in mental well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 175, 110695-110695. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.110695>
- Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., & Ditto, P. H. (2011). Mapping the Moral Domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(2), 366-385.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021847>
- Greenglass, E., Schwarzer, R., Jakubiec, D., Fiksenbaum, L., & Taubert, S. (1999). The proactive coping inventory (PCI): A multidimensional research instrument. 20th international conference of the stress and anxiety research society (STAR), Cracow, Poland,

- Greenglass, E. R. (2002). Proactive coping and quality of life management. In *Beyond Coping: Meeting Goals, Visions, and Challenges* (Frydenberg, E. (Ed.) ed., pp. 37-62). Oxford University Press.
- Gruman, J. A., Lumley, M. N., & González-Morales, M. G. (2018). Incorporating balance: Challenges and opportunities for positive psychology. *Canadian Psychology = Psychologie Canadienne*, 59(1), 54-64. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cap0000109>
- Guillén, J. L., & Fontrodona, J. (2018). Mindfulness and its impact on ethical behavior in companies. In *Personal flourishing in organizations* (pp. 121-140). Springer.
- Guo, Y., Ji, M., Yang, Z., Wang, H., & You, X. (2022). Mindfulness and burnout among Chinese civil pilots: Mediation through fatigue and proactive coping. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 50(3).
- Hadi, S., Tjahjono, H. K., & Palupi, M. (2020). Study of organizational justice in smes and positive consequences: Systematic review. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(03), 4717-4730.
- Haidt, J. (2001). The Emotional Dog and Its Rational Tail: A Social Intuitionist Approach to Moral Judgment. *Psychological Review*, 108(4), 814-834. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.108.4.814>
- Han, A. (2021). Effects of mindfulness-and acceptance-based interventions on quality of life, coping, cognition, and mindfulness of people with multiple sclerosis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychology, Health & Medicine, ahead-of-print(ahead-of-print)*, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13548506.2021.1894345>

- Hannah, S. T., Avolio, B. J., & May, D. R. (2011). The impact of leader moral humility on follower moral self-efficacy and behavior. *The Academy of Management review*, 36(4), 663-685.
- Haybron, D. M. (2016). The philosophical basis of eudaimonic psychology. In *Handbook of eudaimonic well-being* (pp. 27-53). Springer.
- Hayes-Skelton, S., & Graham, J. (2013). Decentering as a common link among mindfulness, cognitive reappraisal, and social anxiety. *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 41(3), 317-328.
- Hayes, S. C., Strosahl, K. D., Bunting, K., Twohig, M., & Wilson, K. G. (2004). What is acceptance and commitment therapy? In *A practical guide to acceptance and commitment therapy* (pp. 3-29). Springer.
- Heijden, B. V. d., & Spurk, D. (2019). Moderating role of LMX and proactive coping in the relationship between learning value of the job and employability enhancement among academic staff employees. *Career Development International*, 24(2), 163-186.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-09-2018-0246>
- Helfat, C. E., & Martin, J. A. (2015). Dynamic managerial capabilities: Review and assessment of managerial impact on strategic change. In (Vol. 41, pp. 1281-1312). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *The American psychologist*, 44(3), 513-524. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513>
- Hochwarter, W. A., Rosen, C. C., Ferris, G. R., Ejaz, A., Maher, L. P., & Jordan, S. L. (2020). Perceptions of organizational politics research: Past, present, and future. *Journal of Management*, 46(6), 879-907. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206319898506>

- Hollenbeck, J. R., & Wright, P. M. (2017). Harking, Sharking, and Tharking: Making the Case for Post Hoc Analysis of Scientific Data. *Journal of Management*, 43(1), 5-18.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316679487>
- Horley, J., & Lavery, J. J. (1995). Subjective well-being and age. *Social Indicators Research*, 34(2), 275-282.
- Howell, A. J., Dopko, R. L., Passmore, H.-A., & Buro, K. (2011). Nature connectedness: Associations with well-being and mindfulness. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51(2), 166-171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.03.037>
- Huppert, F. A., Baylis, N., Keverne, B., & Fredrickson, B. L. (2004). The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *PHILOSOPHICAL TRANSACTIONS OF THE ROYAL SOCIETY B-BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES*, 359(1449), 1367-1377.
<https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2004.1512>
- Huta, V., & Waterman, A. S. (2013). Eudaimonia and Its Distinction from Hedonia: Developing a Classification and Terminology for Understanding Conceptual and Operational Definitions. *Journal of happiness studies*, 15(6), 1425-1456.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-013-9485-0>
- Iani, L., Lauriola, M., Cafaro, V., & Didonna, F. (2016). Dimensions of Mindfulness and Their Relations with Psychological Well-Being and Neuroticism. *Mindfulness*, 8(3), 664-676.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-016-0645-2>
- Ismail Al-Alawi, A., Yousif Al-Marzooqi, N., & Fraidoon Mohammed, Y. (2007). Organizational culture and knowledge sharing: critical success factors. *Journal of knowledge management*, 11(2), 22-42. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13673270710738898>

- Janssen, M., Heerkens, Y., Kuijer, W., Van Der Heijden, B., & Engels, J. (2018). Effects of mindfulness-based stress reduction on employees' mental health: A systematic review. *PloS One*, 13(1), e0191332-e0191332. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0191332>
- Jobbehdar Nourafkan, N., Tanova, C., & Gokmenoglu, K. K. (2022). Can Mindfulness Improve Organizational Citizenship and Innovative Behaviors Through its Impact on Well-Being Among Academics? *Psychological Reports*, 332941211069517-332941211069517. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00332941211069517>
- Jones, S. M., Bodie, G. D., & Hughes, S. D. (2019). The Impact of Mindfulness on Empathy, Active Listening, and Perceived Provisions of Emotional Support. *Communication research*, 46(6), 838-865. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650215626983>
- Judd, C. M., Kenny, D. A., & McClelland, G. H. (2001). Estimating and Testing Mediation and Moderation in Within-Subject Designs. *Psychological Methods*, 6(2), 115-134. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.6.2.115>
- Kabat-Zinn, J. (1990). *Full catastrophe living*. . Dell.
- Kabat-Zinn, J. (1990). *Full catastrophe living: Using the wisdom of your body and mind to face stress, pain, and illness*. Delacorte Press.
- Kabat-Zinn, J. (2015). Mindfulness. *Mindfulness*, 6(6), 1481-1483. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-015-0456-x>
- Kacmar, K., Andrews, M., Harris, K., & Tepper, B. (2013). Ethical Leadership and Subordinate Outcomes: The Mediating Role of Organizational Politics and the Moderating Role of Political Skill. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 115(1).
- Kacmar, K. M., & Baron, R. A. (1999). Organizational politics. *Research in human resources management*, 1, 1-39.

- Kacmar, K. M., & Carlson, D. S. (1997). Further Validation of the Perceptions of Politics Scale (Pops): A Multiple Sample Investigation. *Journal of Management*, 23(5), 627-658.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639702300502>
- Kacmar, K. M., & Ferris, G. R. (1991). Perceptions of organizational politics scale (POPS): Development and construct validation. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 51(1), 193-205.
- Kalshoven, K., den Hartog, D. N., & de Hoogh, A. H. B. (2011). Ethical leader behavior and big five factors of personality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 100(2), 349-366.
- Kaluza, A. J., Boer, D., Buengeler, C., & van Dick, R. (2020). Leadership behaviour and leader self-reported well-being: A review, integration and meta-analytic examination. *Work and Stress*, 34(1), 34-56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2019.1617369>
- Kapoutsis, I., & Thanos, I. C. (2018). Politics in organizations: Lessons, challenges and future directions. *European Management Journal*, 36(5), 589-592.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2018.10.001>
- Karkouliau, S., Srour, J., & Sinan, T. (2016). A gender perspective on work-life balance, perceived stress, and locus of control. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(11), 4918-4923.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.04.053>
- Kelemen, T. K., Matthews, S. H., & Breevaart, K. (2020). Leading day-to-day: A review of the daily causes and consequences of leadership behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 31(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2019.101344>
- Kersemaekers, W. M., Vreeling, K., Verweij, H., van der Drift, M., Cillessen, L., van Dierendonck, D., & Speckens, A. E. M. (2020). Effectiveness and feasibility of a mindful

- leadership course for medical specialists: a pilot study. *BMC Medical Education*, 20(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-020-1948-5>
- Khattak, M. N., O'Connor, P., & Muhammad, N. (2022). The buffering role of servant leadership on the relationship between organizational politics and employee task performance and citizenship behaviors. *Personnel Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-11-2020-0848>
- Klussman, K., Curtin, N., Langer, J., & Nichols, A. L. (2020). Examining the effect of mindfulness on well-being: self-connection as a mediator. *Journal of Pacific Rim psychology*, 14, e5. <https://doi.org/10.1017/prp.2019.29>
- Ko, C., Ma, J., Bartnik, R., Haney, M. H., & Kang, M. (2018). Ethical Leadership: An Integrative Review and Future Research Agenda. *Ethics & Behavior*, 28(2), 104-132.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2017.1318069>
- Kong, F., Wang, X., Song, Y., & Liu, J. (2016). Brain regions involved in dispositional mindfulness during resting state and their relation with well-being. *Social Neuroscience*, 11(4), 331-343. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470919.2015.1092469>
- Kouchaki, M., & Desai, S. D. (2015). Anxious, threatened, and also unethical: How anxiety makes individuals feel threatened and commit unethical acts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(2), 360-375. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037796>
- Kriakous, S. A., Elliott, K. A., Lamers, C., & Owen, R. (2020). The Effectiveness of Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction on the Psychological Functioning of Healthcare Professionals: a Systematic Review. *Mindfulness*, 12(1), 1-28.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-020-01500-9>
- Kudesia, R. S. (2019). Mindfulness as metacognitive practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 44(2), 405-423. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2015.0333>

- Lam, A. H. Y., Cheung, Y. T. D., Wong, K. H., Leung, S. F., & Chien, W. T. (2022). Dispositional Mindfulness and Psychotic Symptoms in Schizophrenia Spectrum Disorders: The Mediating Roles of Rumination and Negative Emotion. *Neuropsychiatric Disease and Treatment*, 18, 75-85. <https://doi.org/10.2147/NDT.S338133>
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer publishing company.
- Lemoine, G. J., Hartnell, C. A., & Leroy, H. (2019). Taking stock of moral approaches to leadership: An integrative review of ethical, authentic, and servant leadership. *Academy of Management Annals*, 13(1), 148-187.
- Leonard, L. N. K., Cronan, T. P., & Kreie, J. (2004). What influences IT ethical behavior intentions—planned behavior, reasoned action, perceived importance, or individual characteristics? *Information & management*, 42(1), 143-158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2003.12.008>
- Lewis, A. B., & Ebbeck, V. (2014). Mindful and self-compassionate leadership development: Preliminary discussions with wildland fire managers. *Journal of Forestry*, 112(2), 230-236. <https://doi.org/10.5849/jof.12-107>
- Li, C., Liang, J., & Farh, J. L. (2018). Speaking Up When Water Is Murky: An Uncertainty-Based Model Linking Perceived Organizational Politics to Employee Voice. *Journal of Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318798025>
- Li, J., Hou, W., Zhu, L., & Tomasello, M. (2020). The development of intent-based moral judgment and moral behavior in the context of indirect reciprocity: A cross-cultural study. *International journal of behavioral development*, 44(6), 525-533. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025420935636>

- Lin, S.-H., Ma, J., & Johnson, R. E. (2016). When ethical leader behavior breaks bad: How ethical leader behavior can turn abusive via ego depletion and moral licensing. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 101*(6), 815-830. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000098>
- Linehan, M. M. (1993a). *Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment of Borderline Personality Disorder*. (New York: Guilford)
- Linehan, M. M. (1993b). *Skills Training Manual For Treating Borderline Personality Disorder*. (New York: Guilford)
- Long, E. C., & Christian, M. S. (2015). Mindfulness Buffers Retaliatory Responses to Injustice: A Regulatory Approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*(5), 1409-1422. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000019>
- Long, R., Halvorson, M., & Lengua, L. J. (2021). A mindfulness-based promotive coping program improves well-being in college undergraduates. *Anxiety, stress, and coping, 34*(6), 690-703. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2021.1895986>
- Mackey, J. D., Parker Ellen, B., McAllister, C. P., & Alexander, K. C. (2021). The dark side of leadership: A systematic literature review and meta-analysis of destructive leadership research. *Journal of Business Research, 132*, 705-718. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.10.037>
- Mallinckrodt, B., Abraham, W. T., Wei, M., & Russell, D. W. (2006). Advances in Testing the Statistical Significance of Mediation Effects. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*(3), 372-378. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.53.3.372>
- Manstead, A. S. R. (2000). The Role of Moral Norm in the Attitude-Behavior Relation. In D. J. Terry & M. A. Hogg (Eds.), *Attitudes, Behavior, and Social Context* (pp. 11-30). Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410603210-2>

- Mantere, S. (2008). Role expectations and middle manager strategic agency. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45(2), 294-316. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2007.00744.x>
- Manusov, V., Stofleth, D., Harvey, J. A., & Crowley, J. P. (2020). Conditions and Consequences of Listening Well for Interpersonal Relationships: Modeling Active-Empathic Listening, Social-Emotional Skills, Trait Mindfulness, and Relational Quality. *International journal of listening*, 34(2), 110-126. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2018.1507745>
- Mayer, D. M., Aquino, K., Greenbaum, R. L., & Kuenzi, M. (2012). Who displays ethical leadership, and why does it matter? An examination of antecedents and consequences of ethical leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(1), 151-171.
- The parable of the Sadhu, Harvard Business Review 3-7 (1997).
- McGhee, P., & Grant, P. (2015). The influence of managers' spiritual mindfulness on ethical behaviour in organisations. *Journal of Spirituality, Leadership and Management*, 8(1), 12-33.
- Medvedev, O. N., Krägeloh, C. U., Narayanan, A., & Siegert, R. J. (2017). Measuring Mindfulness: Applying Generalizability Theory to Distinguish between State and Trait. *Mindfulness*, 8(4), 1036-1046. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-017-0679-0>
- Meisler, G., & Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2014). Perceived organizational politics, emotional intelligence and work outcomes. *Personnel Review*, 43(1), 116-135. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-02-2012-0040>
- Meisler, G., Vigoda-Gadot, E., & Drory, A. (2017). Stress, Psychological Strain, and Reduced Organizational Effectiveness: The Destructive Consequences of the Use of Intimidation and Pressure by Supervisors. In *Power, Politics, and Political Skill in Job Stress* (Vol. 15,

- pp. 51-80). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-355520170000015005>
- Molloy, M. A., Cunningham, R., Cleary, J., & Dial, M. (2019). Enhancing situational awareness by using mindfulness during simulation. *Nurse Educator*, 44(6), 307-307. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NNE.0000000000000669>
- Monzani, L., Escartín, J., Ceja, L., & Bakker, A. B. (2021). Blending mindfulness practices and character strengths increases employee well-being: A second-order meta-analysis and a follow-up field experiment. *Human resource management journal*, 31(4), 1025-1062. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12360>
- Moorman, R. H., Darnold, T. C., & Priesemuth, M. (2013). Perceived leader integrity: Supporting the construct validity and utility of a multi-dimensional measure in two samples. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(3), 427-444. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.02.003>
- Morgeson, F. P., Mitchell, T. R., & Liu, D. (2015). Event system theory: An event-oriented approach to the organizational sciences. *The Academy of Management review*, 40(4), 515-537. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2012.0099>
- Munyon, T. P., Houghton, J. D., Simarasl, N., Dawley, D. D., & Howe, M. (2021). Limits of authenticity: How organizational politics bound the positive effects of authentic leadership on follower satisfaction and performance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 51(6).
- Muthén, B., & Kaplan, D. (1985). A comparison of some methodologies for the factor analysis of non-normal Likert variables. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 38(2), 171-189.

- Ng, T. W. H., Sorensen, K. L., & Eby, L. T. (2006). Locus of control at work: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(8), 1057-1087. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.416>
- Nguyen, N. P., Wu, H., Evangelista, F., & Nguyen, T. N. Q. (2020). The effects of organizational mindfulness on ethical behaviour and firm performance: Empirical evidence from vietnam. *Asia Pacific business Review*, 26(3), 313-335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13602381.2020.1727649>
- Nübold, A., Van Quaquebeke, N., & Hülshager, U. R. (2020). Be(com)ing Real: a Multi-source and an Intervention Study on Mindfulness and Authentic Leadership. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 35(4).
- Nyanaponika, T. (1971). *The power of mindfulness*. Buddhist publication society.
- Onu, D., Oats, L., & Kirchler, E. (2019). The Dynamics of Internalised and Extrinsic Motivation in the Ethical Decision-Making of Small Business Owners. *Applied psychology*, 68(1), 177-201. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12151>
- Orazi, D. C., Chen, J., & Chan, E. Y. (2019). To erect temples to virtue: Effects of state mindfulness on other-focused ethical behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 169(4), 785-798. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04296-4>
- Pagliaro, S., Sacchi, S., Pacilli, M. G., Brambilla, M., Lionetti, F., Bettache, K., Bianchi, M., Biella, M., Bonnot, V., Boza, M., Butera, F., Ceylan-Batur, S., Chong, K., Chopova, T., Crimston, C. R., Álvarez, B., Cuadrado, I., Ellemers, N., Formanowicz, M., . . . Zubieta, E. (2021). Trust predicts COVID-19 prescribed and discretionary behavioral intentions in 23 countries. *PloS One*, 16(3), e0248334-e0248334. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248334>

- Palmer, A., & Rodger, S. (2009). Mindfulness, stress, and coping among university students. *Canadian Journal of Counselling and Psychotherapy*, 43(3).
- Panda, A., & Gupta, R. K. (2001). Understanding Organizational Culture: A Perspective on Roles for Leaders. *Vikalpa*, 26(4), 3-20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0256090920010402>
- Park, C. L., & Folkman, S. (1997). Meaning in the context of stress and coping. *Review of General Psychology*, 1(2), 115-144.
- Peterson, D. K. (2002). The Relationship between Unethical Behavior and the Dimensions of the Ethical Climate Questionnaire. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 41(4), 313-326. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021243117958>
- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. In *Advances in experimental social psychology* (L. Berkowitz (Ed.) ed., pp. 123-205). FL: Academic Press.
- Pidgeon, A. M., & Pickett, L. (2017). Examining the differences between university students' levels of resilience on mindfulness, psychological distress and coping strategies. *European Scientific Journal*(Special Edition), 103-113.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Critical Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature and Suggestions for Future Research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-563. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600307>
- Polk, M. G., Smith, E. L., Zhang, L.-R., & Neupert, S. D. (2020). Thinking ahead and staying in the present: Implications for reactivity to daily stressors. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 161. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.109971>

- Porter, L. W., & McLaughlin, G. B. (2006). Leadership and the organizational context: Like the weather? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 559-576.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.002>
- Puddicombe, A. (n.d.). 33 of the Best Meditation Quotes. headspace. Retrieved 19/06/2022 from <https://www.headspace.com/meditation/quotes>
- Querstet, D., Cropley, M., & Fife-Schaw, C. (2018). The effects of an online mindfulness intervention on perceived stress, depression and anxiety in a non-clinical sample: A randomised waitlist control trial. *Mindfulness*, 9(6), 1825-1836.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-018-0925-0>
- Razali, N. M., & Wah, Y. B. (2011). Power comparisons of shapiro-wilk, kolmogorov-smirnov, lilliefors and anderson-darling tests. *Journal of statistical modeling and analytics*, 2(1), 21-33.
- Reb, J., Chaturvedi, S., Narayanan, J., & Kudesia, R. S. (2019). Leader Mindfulness and Employee Performance: A Sequential Mediation Model of LMX Quality, Interpersonal Justice, and Employee Stress. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 160(3), 745-763.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3927-x>
- Rest, J. R. (1986). Moral development: Advances in research and theory.
- Reynolds, S. J., & Ceranic, T. L. (2007). The Effects of Moral Judgment and Moral Identity on Moral Behavior: An Empirical Examination of the Moral Individual. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 1610-1624. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1610>
- Rice, V. J., Liu, B., Allison, S. C., & Schroeder, P. J. (2019). Mindfulness training offered in-person and in a virtual World—Weekly self-reports of stress, energy, pain, and sleepiness

- among US military active duty and veteran personnel. *Mindfulness*, 10(9), 1815-1827.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-019-01129-3>
- Rotter, J. B. (1954). Social learning and clinical psychology.
- Ruedy, N. E., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2010). In the moment: The effect of mindfulness on ethical decision making. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95(Suppl 1), 73-87.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0796-y>
- Ruiz-Palomino, P., & Martínez-Cañas, R. (2014). Ethical Culture, Ethical Intent, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Moderating and Mediating Role of Person–Organization Fit. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 120(1), 95-108.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1650-1>
- Rupprecht, S., Falke, P., Kohls, N., Tamdjidi, C., Wittmann, M., & Kersemaekers, W. (2019). Mindful Leader Development: How Leaders Experience the Effects of Mindfulness Training on Leader Capabilities. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1081.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01081>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 54-67.
<https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1020>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 141-166.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.141>
- Ryff, C. D., & Singer, B. H. (2006). Know Thyself and Become What You Are: A Eudaimonic Approach to Psychological Well-Being. *Journal of happiness studies*, 9(1), 13-39.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-006-9019-0>

- Safran, J., & Segal, Z. V. (1996). *Interpersonal process in cognitive therapy*. Jason Aronson, Incorporated.
- Sanders, S., Wisse, B., Van Yperen, N. W., & Rus, D. (2018). On Ethically Solvent Leaders: The Roles of Pride and Moral Identity in Predicting Leader Ethical Behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 150(3), 631-645.
- Schminke, M., Ambrose, M. L., & Neubaum, D. O. (2005). The effect of leader moral development on ethical climate and employee attitudes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97(2), 135-151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.006>
- Schuh, S. C., Zheng, M. X., Xin, K. R., & Fernandez, J. A. (2019). The Interpersonal Benefits of Leader Mindfulness: A Serial Mediation Model Linking Leader Mindfulness, Leader Procedural Justice Enactment, and Employee Exhaustion and Performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 156(4), 1007-1025. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3610-7>
- Schwarzer, R., & Taubert, S. (2002). Tenacious goal pursuits and striving toward personal growth: Proactive coping. Beyond coping: Meeting goals, visions and challenges,
- Searle, B. J., & Lee, L. (2015). Proactive coping as a personal resource in the expanded job demands-resources model. *International journal of stress management*, 22(1), 46-69. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038439>
- Sen, P. K. (1968). Estimates of the regression coefficient based on Kendall's tau. *Journal of the American statistical association*, 63(324), 1379-1389.
- Sendjaya, S., Pekerti, A., Härtel, C., Hirst, G., & Butarbutar, I. (2016). Are Authentic Leaders Always Moral? The Role of Machiavellianism in the Relationship Between Authentic Leadership and Morality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 133(1), 125-139.

- Sevinc, G., & Lazar, S. W. (2019). How does mindfulness training improve moral cognition: A theoretical and experimental framework for the study of embodied ethics. *Current opinion in psychology*, 28, 268-272. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.02.006>
- Sharma, P. N. (2018). Moving beyond the employee: The role of the organizational context in leader workplace aggression. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(1), 203-217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.12.002>
- Sharma, P. N., Silvas, J. M., & Guadagnoli, M. (2021). Attention leaders: Are you losing the battle with stress? Arm yourself with proactive coping. *Organizational Dynamics*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2021.100845>
- Sheard, G., Kakabadse, A. P., & Kakabadse, N. K. (2011). Organisational politics: reconciling leadership's rational-emotional paradox. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 32(1), 78-97. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437731111099292>
- Sholihin, M., Sari, R. C., Yuniarti, N., & Ilyana, S. (2020). A new way of teaching business ethics: The evaluation of virtual reality-based learning media. *The international journal of management education*, 18(3), 100428-100428. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2020.100428>
- Simons, T. (2002). Behavioral Integrity: The Perceived Alignment Between Managers' Words and Deeds as a Research Focus. *Organization Science*, 13(1), 18-35.
- Spector, P. E. (1988). Development of the Work Locus of Control Scale. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 61(4), 335-340. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1988.tb00470.x>

- Stanisławski, K. (2019). The Coping Circumplex Model: An Integrative Model of the Structure of Coping With Stress. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 694.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00694>
- Stiglbauer, B., & Batinic, B. (2015). Proactive coping with job insecurity: Is it always beneficial to well-being? *Work and Stress*, 29(3), 264-285.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2015.1074956>
- Sultan, P., Tarafder, T., Pearson, D., & Henryks, J. (2020). Intention-behaviour gap and perceived behavioural control-behaviour gap in theory of planned behaviour: moderating roles of communication, satisfaction and trust in organic food consumption. *Food Quality and Preference*, 81, 103838. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2019.103838>
- Sutamchai, K., Rowlands, K. E., & Rees, C. J. (2020). The use of mindfulness to promote ethical decision making and behavior: Empirical evidence from the public sector in Thailand. *Public administration and development*, 40(3), 156-167. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.1872>
- Sutton, S. (1998). Predicting and Explaining Intentions and Behavior: How Well Are We Doing? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28(15), 1317-1338. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1998.tb01679.x>
- Tanay, G., & Bernstein, A. (2013). State Mindfulness Scale (SMS): Development and Initial Validation. *Psychological Assessment*, 25(4), 1286-1299.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034044>
- Tang, Y.-Y., Tang, R., & Gross, J. J. (2019). Promoting psychological well-being through an evidence-based mindfulness training program. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 13, 237-237. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2019.00237>

- Tanner, C., Schmocker, D., Katsarov, J., & Christen, M. (2022). Educating moral sensitivity in business: An experimental study to evaluate the effectiveness of a serious moral game. *Computers and education*, 178, 104381. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2021.104381>
- Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International journal of medical education*, 2, 53.
- Teasdale, J. D., Segal, Z. V., Williams, J. M. G., Ridgeway, V. A., Soulsby, J. M., & Lau, M. A. (2000). Prevention of Relapse/Recurrence in Major Depression by Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 68(4), 615-623. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.68.4.615>
- Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., Henle, C. A., & Lambert, L. S. (2006). Procedural injustice, victim precipitation, and abusive supervision. *Personnel Psychology*, 59(1), 101-123. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2006.00725.x>
- Treviño, L. K., Weaver, G. R., & Reynolds, S. J. (2006). Behavioral Ethics in Organizations: A Review. *Journal of Management*, 32(6), 951-990. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206306294258>
- Turel, O., & Osatuyi, B. (2017). A peer-influence perspective on compulsive social networking site use: Trait mindfulness as a double-edged sword. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 77, 47-53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.08.022>
- Turnipseed, D. L. (2002). Are good soldiers good?: Exploring the link between organization citizenship behavior and personal ethics. *Journal of Business Research*, 55(1), 1-15. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(01\)00217-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(01)00217-X)

- Urrila, L. I. (2021). From personal wellbeing to relationships: A systematic review on the impact of mindfulness interventions and practices on leaders. *Human Resource Management Review*, 32(3). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2021.100837>
- Vallerand, R. J., Deshaies, P., Cuerrier, J.-P., Pelletier, L. G., & Mongeau, C. (1992). Ajzen and Fishbein's Theory of Reasoned Action as Applied to Moral Behavior: A Confirmatory Analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62(1), 98-109. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.62.1.98>
- Van Gordon, W., Shonin, E., Zangeneh, M., & Griffiths, M. D. (2014). Work-Related Mental Health and Job Performance: Can Mindfulness Help? *International journal of mental health and addiction*, 12(2), 129-137. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-014-9484-3>
- Van Rensburg, M. J., Davis, A., & Venter, P. (2014). Making strategy work: The role of the middle manager. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 20(2), 165-186.
- Vich, M. (2015). The Emerging Role of Mindfulness Research in the Workplace and its Challenges. *Central European business review*, 4(3), 35-47. <https://doi.org/10.18267/j.cebr.131>
- Vilas-Boas, M. (2019). Relationship between the Perception of Organizational Culture and Ethical Climate and the Perception of Workplace Bullying. *Revista CES Psicología*, 12(2), 103-125. <https://doi.org/10.21615/cesp.12.2.8>
- Wan, M., Zivnuska, S., & Valle, M. (2020). Examining mindfulness and its relationship to unethical behaviors. *Management Research Review*, 43(12). <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-01-2020-0035>

- Wang, G., & Hackett, R. D. (2020). Virtues-centered moral identity: An identity-based explanation of the functioning of virtuous leadership. *The Leadership quarterly*, 31(5), 101421. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2020.101421>
- Waterman, A. S. (2007). On the Importance of Distinguishing Hedonia and Eudaimonia When Contemplating the Hedonic Treadmill. *The American psychologist*, 62(6), 612-613. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X62.6.612>
- Waterman, A. S., Schwartz, S. J., Zamboanga, B. L., Ravert, R. D., Williams, M. K., Bede Agocha, V., Yeong Kim, S., & Brent Donnellan, M. (2010). The questionnaire for eudaimonic well-being: Psychometric properties, demographic comparisons, and evidence of validity. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 5(1), 41-61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760903435208>
- Weinstein, N., Brown, K. W., & Ryan, R. M. (2009). A multi-method examination of the effects of mindfulness on stress attribution, coping, and emotional well-being. *Journal of research in personality*, 43(3), 374-385. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2008.12.008>
- Wihler, A., Hülshager, U. R., Reb, J., & Menges, J. I. (2022). It's so boring - or is it?: Examining the role of mindfulness for work performance and attitudes in monotonous jobs. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 95(1), 131-154.
- Williams, C. (2006). *Leadership accountability in a globalizing world*. Springer.
- Williams, K., & Birtwell, K. (2018). The double-edged sword of mindfulness: Maintaining integrity whilst increasing access. *Clinical Psychology Forum*(306).
- Witt, C., & Mathesis Publications, I. (1985). Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics. *Ancient philosophy (Pittsburgh, Pa.)*, 5(1), 113-116. <https://doi.org/10.5840/ancientphil19855136>

- Witter, R. A., Okun, M. A., Stock, W. A., & Haring, M. J. (1984). Education and subjective well-being: A meta-analysis. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 6(2), 165-173.
- Wolsko, C., & Lindberg, K. (2013). Experiencing connection with nature: The matrix of psychological well-being, mindfulness, and outdoor recreation. *Ecopsychology*, 5(2), 80-91.
- Wu, C., & He, X. (2021). Environmental Aesthetic Value Influences the Intention for Moral Behavior: Changes in Behavioral Moral Judgment. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(12), 6477.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18126477>
- Wu, I. H. C., & Buchanan, N. T. (2018). Pathways to Vitality: the Role of Mindfulness and Coping. *Mindfulness*, 10(3), 481-491. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-018-0989-x>
- Xiao, Q., Hu, C., & Wang, T. (2020). Mindfulness Practice Makes Moral People More Moral. *Mindfulness*, 11(11), 2639-2650. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-020-01478-4>
- Zhang, D., Lee, E. K. P., Mak, E. C. W., Ho, C. Y., & Wong, S. Y. S. (2021). Mindfulness-based interventions: an overall review. *British Medical Bulletin*, 138(1), 41-57.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/bmb/ldab005>
- Zhou, G., Gan, Y., Knoll, N., & Schwarzer, R. (2013). Proactive coping moderates the dietary intention–planning–behavior path. *Appetite*, 70, 127-133.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2013.06.097>
- Zibenberg, A. (2021). The Interaction between Personal Values and Perception of Organizational Politics in Predicting Stress Levels of Staff Members in Academic Institutions. *The Journal of psychology*, 155(5), 489-504. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2021.1906623>

Appendix

Example of Organizational Politics (Awareness) Measure

You will attempt to scale Mt. Everest with a team of five (i.e., a leader, physician, photographer, marathoner, and yourself, environmentalist). You are Italy's most accomplished mountaineer, who began your career scaling mountains in the Alps as a teenager. Your team has known each other for three years and has attended many other expeditions with several challenging yet fascinating experiences. During the past three years, there were many cases in which some team members needed to put themselves first to actualize their career goals set for themselves during expeditions. Each member thinks it is bliss to choose their profession over other jobs they had considered. The team has sub-groups that are more leading in decision-making, like every other team. Those decisions included putting others behind to reach the subsequent camps on time. Team members feel a strong sense of belonging to their profession. Each member usually has their agenda in addition to their mutual team goal (i.e., reaching the summit) as they all are pioneers in their occupation wanting to actualize respected career goals. Team members' willingness is very high in actualizing their ideas, although some are not always merit based. They would be happy to spend the rest of their career in their profession. They feel free to retaliate against those who speak up to oppose those ideas. Members proudly talk to others about what they do at work. Besides, some team members tend to become very agreeable not to offend powerful others. They feel emotionally attached to their profession. Finally, all team members always try to be there for one another and stay alert during this challenging journey to the top of Mount Everest.

Based on the information you have read; please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements regarding the context of this team environment. (Please answer the question

only based on the provided text instead of your experience of the simulation if you have played before.)

POPS Scale Items Adapted from Kacmar and Carlson (1997); Kacmar and Ferris (1991)
Factor 1: General Political Behavior
1. People in this team attempt to build themselves up by tearing others down.
2. There has always been an influential group in this team that no one ever crosses.
Factor 2: Go Along Get Ahead
1. Team members are encouraged to speak out frankly even when they are critical of well-established ideas.
2. There is no place for yes-men around here; good ideas are desired even if it means disagreeing with others.
3. Agreeing with powerful others is the best alternative in this team.
4. It is best not to rock the boat in this team.
5. Sometimes it is easier to remain quiet than to fight the system.
6. Telling others what they want to hear is sometimes better than telling the truth.
7. It is safer to think what you are told than to make up your own mind.

A 5-item Likert type scale is used where 1 indicates strong disagreement whereas 5 denotes strong agreement for the measurement of all items.

Moral Action Measurement Protocol

To measure leaders' moral action, we utilize the procedure followed by Sendjaya and colleagues (2016). We reached out to Dr. Andre Pekerti (a co-author of the article) to learn about

the details of their measurement process. We were able to obtain the necessary documents (e.g., the booklet, coding schema, case study) thanks to our personal communication with him. In line with their operationalization, we conducted a simulation and complementary focus group discussion to measure participants' moral action potential based on observations during the practices (e.g., participants' statements, reasonings, justifications, verbal and non-verbal behaviors) when confronted with a moral dilemma. We used these observations to rate a three-point moral action scale (which we also call the ethical action scorecard) that we developed based on the ethical action booklet (Darcia et al., 2001).

Participants (both the experiment group and the control group) engaged in simulation and focus group discussions twice, before (pretest) and after (posttest) the mindfulness intervention. Pretest scores were calculated based on average scores where one indicates a below-average score, two indicates an average score, and three indicates an above-average score. A below-average score means that leaders in this category need extra improvement, whereas an above-average score points to a relatively higher level of moral action where there could be minimal need for additional advancement. Posttest scores were calculated based on both the average score (how participants performed compared to others) and the difference score (how each participant performed compared to their own previous experience). The detailed explanation of the change score is as follows:

- Time 1 Rating (pre-test) – absolute score
- Time 2 Rating (post-test) – both the absolute score (i.e., the average score, just like in the pre-test measurement) and the difference score based on the 7-point scale below.

The difference score is not based on the mathematical differences between the pretest and posttest scores. Instead, it is based on the raters' judgment of participants' individual differences after the intervention (what raters have observed in comparison to how it was before). Raters will evaluate how each participant has altered their behavior (i.e., changes in their moral action) after the intervention.

The difference in the moral action scores of participants is captured through the scale below, which measures the magnitude of the difference.

-3 = large decrease in each ethical scorecard item (e.g., communicating well, resolving conflicts, etc.)

-2 = moderate decrease in each ethical scorecard item

-1 = small decrease in each ethical scorecard item

0 = no difference

1 = small increase in each ethical scorecard item

2 = moderate increase in each ethical scorecard item

3 = large increase in each ethical scorecard item

Harvard Business online simulation Everest

- The simulation will be played by 5 participants (referred to as players) taking on the roles of leader, marathoner, photographer, environmentalist, and physician. The author of the study conducts the simulation before and after the intervention.

- Each player undertakes the leadership role within their field and expertise. Therefore, the decision of whether to advance to the next camp is in the hands of the author instead of the leader in the simulation.
- The simulation is performed online and recorded via the Zoom platform.
- Two independent assessors (graduate students who are trained on the ethical action scorecard and briefed about the roles and conflicting interests of players) rate the players' ethical action scores based on the Ethical Action Scorecard.
- Raters watch the entire simulation to rate each participant's ethical action score. They rewatch the entire simulation each time to determine the ethical action score of each participant.
- The Ethical Action Scorecard is created based on the Ethical Action – Activity Booklet by Darcia Narvaez, Ruth Schiller, Jolynn Gardner, and Laura Staples (2001).

Ethical Action Scorecard items are analyzed (i.e., rated) based on the guide below.

Communicating Well

- **Subskill 1: Speaking & Listening** (e.g., posture, timing, eye contact, paying attention to non-verbal communication, clearly expressing oneself, active listening, listening instead of thinking about what to say next, getting feedback on being a good listener)
- **Subskill 2: Nonverbal and Alternative Communication** (e.g., being careful of movements that are culturally offensive, moving assertively, telling a joke or story, giving directions, solving problems, brainstorming, and being creative)

- **Subskill 3: Self-monitoring** (e.g., ensuring the message is getting across, being clear and concise, adjusting after feedback)

Resolving Conflicts and Problems

- **Subskill 1: Solving Interpersonal Problems** (e.g., resisting peer pressure, knowing the steps to solving a problem)
- **Subskill 2: Negotiation Skills** (e.g., changing the current position without compromising ethical ideals to reach an agreement)
- **Subskill 3: Anti-Violence Skills** (e.g., controlling temper during conflict, knowing the choices when feeling angry)

Identifying Needs and Acting Assertively

- **Subskill 1: Identifying Human Needs** (e.g., paying attention to what others are feeling and thinking, paying attention to what others want, being sensitive to balancing the needs of others and one's own)
- **Subskill 2: Building Communication Styles** (e.g., changing the communication style according to context, adjusting the communication style for different cultures)
- **Subskill 3: Building Assertiveness Skills** (e.g., questioning rules that seem unfair, handling peers that are teasing, asking for help when needed, not doing things only to impress others (reverse), learning from mistakes, not expecting oneself and others to act perfectly (reverse), not focusing on others' faults (reverse))

Taking Initiative as a Leader

- **Subskill 1: Learning Leadership Styles** (e.g., making a quick decision when needed, wanting to make the world a better place, ability to organize one's own work, finishing things by their due date, knowing the different styles of leadership to choose from)
- **Subskill 2: Taking Initiative for Others** (e.g., wanting to help others, helping other people solve problems, seeking fair treatment for all people, helping others receive fair treatment)
- **Subskill 3: Making Decisions for Groups** (e.g., finding out as much as they can about something before making a decision, considering several options before making a decision, helping the group to get the work done, pointing out things that need to be done)

Developing Courage

- **Subskill 1: Overcoming Fear** (e.g., not being afraid to try something new, admitting mistakes, not giving up when things go wrong)
- **Subskill 2: Standing Up Against the Crowd** (e.g., confronting others when they hurt someone, standing up for what they believe, even when others are against it, not doing the wrong things just to fit in when others do them)

Developing Perseverance

- **Subskill 1: Self-control** (e.g., not waiting until the last minute to do the work, not losing control when they are angry (reverse), controlling feelings of anger, resisting the impulse

to disobey rules, not doing what they want if it hurts others (reverse), resisting peer pressure to do harmful things)

- **Subskill 2: Overcoming Obstacles and Discouragement** (e.g., knowing how to encourage themselves when things get hard, not taking on more than they can handle, breaking tasks into smaller steps to complete them gradually)
- **Subskill 3: Pushing Oneself** (e.g., keeping at it until solving a problem, continuing to work even when things get hard, not giving up)

Working Hard

- **Subskill 1: Working for Excellence** (e.g., liking challenges and working hard to solve problems, figuring things out individually, enjoying tasks that are not easy to do)
- **Subskill 2: Setting Reachable Goals**
- **Subskill 3: Focusing** (e.g., knowing their own temptations that prevent them from working, knowing how to motivate themselves when they get tired, knowing how to "unbore" themselves when they are working, helping others "unbore" themselves while continuing to work)

Moral Action Scale (Ethical action scorecard)

Absolute Score

Name and Surname:			
Moral Action	Below Average	Average	Above Average
Communicating Well	1	2	3
Resolving Conflicts and Problems	1	2	3
Identifying Needs	1	2	3
Acting Assertively	1	2	3
Taking Initiative as a Leader	1	2	3
Developing Courage	1	2	3
Developing Perseverance	1	2	3
Working Hard	1	2	3
Moral Action Score (Avg.)			
Comments			

Difference Score

Name and Surname							
Ethical Action	Large Decrease	Moderate Decrease	Small Decrease	No Difference	Small Increase	Moderate Increase	Large Increase
Communicating Well	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
Resolving Conflicts and Problems	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
Identifying Needs	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
Acting Assertively	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
Taking Initiative as a Leader	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
Developing Courage	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
Developing Perseverance	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
Working Hard	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
Ethical Action Score							
Comments							

Focus Group Discussion

The author of this study conducts a focus group discussion based on questions that reflect 'The Parable of the Sadhu' case study (McCoy, 1997). In general, participants individually provide answers to ethical dilemmas that conflict between personal values and the vague ethical values provided by the organization. They are asked to reflect on “who they are becoming” when they compromise their core values for the sake of their job. When placed in a moral dilemma, they are expected to justify the reasoning behind their response. The facilitator probes comments and further questions (e.g., personalizing the situation by providing examples of dilemmas) and creates a convenient space for participants to provide their answers openly and comfortably. This setting ensures the clarity of the participants' moral positions. Participants' behaviors, reasoning,

and non-verbal cues are recorded and rated by two independent assessors using an ethical action scorecard created based on the ethical action booklet (Darcia et al., 2001).

Participants are asked to individually respond to the following question, building on 'The Parable of the Sadhu' case study:

“Research indicates that in the absence of clearly articulated organizational ethical values, individual ethical values play a prominent role in guiding us through ethical dilemmas. Often, we feel that our individual values are in conflict with the ambiguous ethical values that the organization espouses. In such a scenario, it is best for us not to compromise our sense of personal values. Granted, we cannot quit our jobs over every ethical dilemma, but if we knowingly violate our core values persistently, we would in the end wonder who is the person we are becoming. As such, rather than acting in the best interests of the organization in which we work, we should always be thinking more thoroughly and carefully about the situation at hand to reach the maximum benefit for the majority of the stakeholders involved, even if it means going against organizational values. Please explain the extent to which you agree or disagree with this statement and outline the reasons behind your response.”.