International Journal of Environmental Sciences
ISSN: 2229-7359
Vol. 11 No. 22s, 2025
https://www.theaspd.com/ijes.php

Development and Preliminary Validation of the Comprehensive Mindfulness Scale among Working Professionals in India

Ramneet Kaur Khurana[1*], Dr. Farhat Jahan[2]
[1*]Research Scholar, SGT University, Gurugram, Psychologist and Coach Email: kramneet73712@gmail.com, ORCID: 0009-0002-5239-8578
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology,Faculty of Behavioural Sciences, Shree Guru Gobind Singh Tricentenary University,Gurugram, Haryana, India Email: scholar.farhat@gmail.com, ORCID:0000-0001-7264-6298

Abstract
Mindfulness has gained prominence in workplace psychology due to its impact on emotional regulation and well-being. The current study aimed to develop and validate the Comprehensive Mindfulness Scale tailored for Indian working professionals. Based on theoretical underpinnings from Kabat-Zinn (2003) and Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR), a 40-item pool was generated and reviewed by nine experts. Items were deleted on the basis of inter-item correlation, and exploratory factor analysis (EFA), respectively, which led to a 21-item unidimensional scale. Results indicated high internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = .913) and adequate construct and convergent validity (r = .144 with Indian Mindfulness Inventory). The scale addresses contextual gaps in existing measures and supports practical mindfulness assessments in organizational settings.
Keywords *- Mindfulness, Attention, comprehensive, scale development, preliminary validation, present–moment awareness*

INTRODUCTION

Mindfulness has emerged as a vital construct in psychology, especially in the fields of organizational and positive psychology, recognized for its contribution to emotional regulation, resilience, and well-being in professional environments. Recently, empirical studies have indicated that mindfulness at the workplace supports not only individual outcomes such as reduced stress and improved focus but also broader organizational goals, including better communication, ethical leadership, and crisis responsiveness (Bartlett et al., 2023; Montani et al., 2023). Mindfulness is a concept deeply rooted in Buddhist philosophy that has gained significant importance in organizational settings. Scholars have developed various definitions that focus on different domains of mindfulness, thereby enhancing our understanding of this multifaceted construct. Scales like the Mindful Attention Awareness Scale (MAAS) (Brown & Ryan, 2003), the Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire (FFMQ) (Baer et al., 2006), and the Cognitive and Affective Mindfulness Scale - Revised (CAMS-R) (Feldman et al., 2007) are widely used. Various other prominent global scales that contributed to the conceptual foundation of this study include the Toronto Mindfulness Scale (TMS) (Lau et al., 2006), Kentucky Inventory of Mindfulness Skills (KIMS) (Baer et al., 2004), Philadelphia Mindfulness Scale (PHLMS) (Cardaciotto et al., 2008), Southampton Mindfulness Questionnaire (SMQ) (Chadwick et al., 2008), (Williams et al., 2014), Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory (FMI) (Walach et al., 2006), Langer Mindfulness Scale (LMS) (Bodner & Langer, 2001), and the Workplace Mindfulness Scale (WMS) (Reb et al., 2015). Mindful working professionals would cultivate greater consciousness, be more attentive to, and aware of what is happening in the present moment in the workplace, characterized by an open and non-judgmental orientation. (Reb, et.al., 2015). It is observed that, despite this increasing interest, existing measures of mindfulness have been developed for various population groups and specific organizational sectors, including clinical, but not for the general working population. These measures are also primarily based in Western countries, with limited relevance to the understanding of the Indian working population. The developed tools have explored intrapersonal awareness and emotional states without accounting for the interactive and socially embedded nature of modern work contexts. While offering valuable dimensions and structures, none have been developed specifically for Indian populations or the nuanced demands of Indian professionals' lives.A few studies have tried to include mindfulness assessment in workplaces. For example, Reb et al. (2015) proposed an integrative framework for workplace mindfulness, and Good et al. (2021) emphasized its role in shaping interpersonal interactions at work. However, these studies have relied mainly on adapted versions of existing scales or on unidimensional constructs, which may overlook the complexity of professional life realities (Karanika-Murray et al., 2022). Constructs such as awareness, attention, and presence in these scales are often measured in isolation from the organizational culture, social dynamics, or job roles.

Jon-Kabat-Zinn (2003) explains mindfulness as “the consciousness that arises by paying attention on purpose, in the given moment, and nonjudgmentally to the flow of experience moment by moment” (Lomas et. al., 2017, p.

133). The main traits of mindfulness include a 'pre-conceptual awareness' and 'acceptance' of one's practices; flexible control of attention; a detached or impartial openness to experience; and an orientation to be 'here-and-now' (Brown et. al., 2007a; Howell, 2008, p. 773). Mindfulness has been studied with regard to leadership and safety practices, such as in the case of ethical leadership and nurse well-being (Kim et al., 2022), perceived organizational support during crises (Yadav et al., 2023), and relational behaviors like compassionate communication and responsiveness (Montani et al., 2023). Such findings suggest that mindfulness for working professionals should not only include self-awareness but also be sensitive to interpersonal cues, task relevance, and role-specific demands. The present study addresses this conceptual and contextual gap by developing a Comprehensive Multidimensional Mindfulness Scale specifically tailored for the working population in India. This instrument is grounded in cognitive, positive, and organizational psychology. The scale also reflects dimensions that are relevant to occupational functioning, such as task-focused attention, emotional composure under pressure, awareness of interpersonal dynamics, and adaptive responding. Will contribute to both research and interventions for adults of all ages in their working years. The investigators understand that as working professionals, individuals tend to develop tendencies and behavioral attributes, which may or may not be unhealthy for their mental well-being, and that these tendencies can either enhance or decline their work-life balance, satisfaction rates, procrastination rates, and overall sense of well-being. If emphasis is laid on understanding the mindfulness levels, a lot can also be understood about their memory, attention, and awareness of the self and others.

Mindfulness is held to be leading to enhanced levels of well-being; specifically, it is believed to be improving well-being by making any experience more splendid and fuller.

Mindfulness can indirectly endorse well-being by improving healthy self-regulation, including a sharp, focused attention to openness and acceptance of one's wants or principles and an improved ability to act with them (Brown & Ryan, 2003; Brown et al., 2007a), in (Howell et al, 2008, p. 773). Siegel (2014) noted that mindfulness comprises three key factors: awareness, present experience, and acceptance. As also supported by Carbera (2016), Mindfulness enhances the ability to perform better and be in the present moment. Paying attention is not only vital for improved performance but also for the sense of psychological well-being. Low levels of attention can also lead to feeling more anxious as our wandering thoughts worry about the impending. The assessment of Mindfulness will therefore help working professionals and organizations incorporate practices that benefit themselves and their workplaces. Mindfulness trains the mind to broaden our focus on what is appearing now in the present, with open-minded interest and approval (Kabat-Zinn 1996, in Weare, 2014, p.4). The following components were considered as a part of the theory and research literature to create the item pool: *Mind Body Aware* – Statements relating to attention to bodily sensations, physical states, and the embodied experience of mindfulness have been incorporated. Individuals with this trait are usually aware of feelings within their own selves and are aware of bodily sensations and know better about their body in a certain situation. *Introspects and Describes* – Items capturing internal reflection, emotional labeling, and descriptive awareness of thoughts and feelings. Individuals with this trait are aware of their emotions and feelings and can articulate them effectively. They are not confused about the reasons a certain emotion or situation exists on an intrapersonal level. *Act with Insight* – Items emphasizing intentional, present-focused behavior as opposed to automatic or distracted actions. Individuals with this trait will be acting on situations with clear awareness about their occurrence and be more present minded than responding immediately without knowledge and attention. Individuals pay more attention to themselves and those around them, leading to increased awareness and more effective action. *Conscious and Alert* – Items reflecting the individual's capacity to neutrally observe experiences within themselves as well as those around them, while understanding their implications. Individuals with this quality have a composed mind, allowing events to unfold at their own pace. Their attention is commendable, as they observe and remain alert while being mindful. These findings are foundational in MBSR. *Nonjudgmental Acceptance* – Statements denoting openness, tolerance, and acceptance of the thoughts without any judgment of the emotions being negative or positive, such as guilt and excitement, on any given situation in daily life. The statements denote the qualities of individuals who can accept everything as they are in the present. It does not indicate an unwilling acceptance, but rather a recognition of one's experiences with awareness and non-judgmental understanding. In a developing country like India, a psychometric scale like this could be effectively utilized, as individuals strive to achieve financial independence, multitask, manage household responsibilities, and juggle the demands of entrepreneurship alongside their studies, all while navigating various life situations. While work life also comes with multi-tasking, individuals often burn out mentally and physically due to overthinking of "what went wrong", "what could have been better", "what and how to do next", ultimately leading to an absence of attention,

awareness, and non-judgmental acceptance of the present moment without judging. The present scale of Mindfulness, when administered to the working population, will be able to benefit individuals as well as organizations through a structured understanding of their attributes, which may further allow them to learn to enhance mindfulness levels through simple practices that can be adopted daily in life. As simple as breathing mindfully, walking mindfully, eating mindfully, or drinking their favorite beverage mindfully in the middle of the day, and gradually as a continuous process. Hence, the present research aims at the development of a scale for measuring Mindfulness among Working Professionals in India. The scale will also be translated into the union language of India, Hindi, which is most widely spoken in the country. This will become a medium for a broader population to understand and respond to our scale, even if they are not well-versed in English. The study of translation will be conducted and published later.

METHOD

Participants

The participants of the research were working professionals, including all adult individuals aged 18 years and above. Any working professional who was willing and gave consent for the study was considered for the research survey conducted using questionnaires. The sample was collected using a purposive sampling method. The individuals were professionals from corporate organizations, including banks, colleges, schools, and hospitals in the Delhi–NCR region in India.

Procedure

Design and Development

The development of the Comprehensive Mindfulness Scale was initiated through a theoretically informed and empirically driven multi-phase process. It includes item pool creation, Expert review and finalization, Item analysis, reliability and validity testing, and analyzing the factor structure. Item analysis uses statistics and expert opinion to assess experiments grounded on the excellence of discrete items, item sets, and total sets of items, as well as the association of each item with other items. It "examines the performance of items measured separately, whichever in kin to some exterior measure or in kin to the remaining items on the test" (Thompson & Levitov, 1985, p. 163).

In the first phase, an initial pool of 40 items was generated based on an extensive review of existing mindfulness frameworks, theory and validated instruments, as mentioned in the introduction section. The goal was to capture a wide range of mindfulness-related traits that are relevant to working professionals. The initial pool included items covering aspects of mindfulness, such as attention, present-moment awareness, self-awareness, mind–body connection, and non-judgmental acceptance.

Administration for Pilot Testing A sample of 200 individuals from working professionals in Delhi NCR was collected for the process of pilot testing. The survey was filled out on a 5-point Likert scale by all the participants, which did not take more than fifteen minutes of time. This pool consisted of the items of the Comprehensive Scale, as well as a set of 100 professionals filled in two more scales, i.e., Indian Mindfulness Inventory by Peter, et.al. (2019), and General Procrastination Scale (Lodha, et.al., 2019). The set of 100 participants was collected for the process of Convergent Validity. The sample of this data was collected from working professionals by personally visiting them at their workplaces. The process and purpose of the survey were introduced to the individuals, and Informed Consent was taken before they gave their responses to the questionnaires. The Survey questionnaires were all filled out physically using the pen and paper format to increase the reliability of the responses and avoid reader bias. The administering author was present with the participant to ensure that any query, during the process, is answered and resolved for a smooth process of the survey. The participants were instructed to respond to the questionnaire by selecting responses that came to their mind immediately, without thinking a lot about one statement, to capture their natural and habitual tendencies toward mindfulness. After the data collection through hard copies of the questionnaires, Scoring was done manually and electronically to create a database in SPSS.

Data Analyses

Statistical analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS 30. The validation process involved assessing internal consistency, construct validity, Exploratory Factor Analysis, and convergent validity.

Content Validity

To ensure content relevance and item clarity, an external panel of nine subject-matter experts, including psychologists, psychometricians, and practitioners, was invited to review the pool of 40 items. Experts were

provided with a detailed definition of the mindfulness construct as operationalized in this study, with relevance to the author's perspective and goal behind the study. They were requested to evaluate each item based on its relevance and concept alignment. Feedback was gathered using both qualitative comments and quantitative ratings. This process of content validity index was applied, which resulted in the refinement of the item pool. Some items were modified while considering their relevance and requirement, while others remained the same.

Internal Consistency Reliability

The reliability was analyzed using Pearson's correlation. Pre-deletion, the 40-item pool yielded Cronbach's α = .895(α_standardized = .895). As represented in Table 1, Cronbach's alpha was better but inter-item correlations presented that some items did not have a strong correlation with the others (i.e., below .30); therefore, they were chosen to be deleted (Table 1). The correlation matrix was reviewed to assess inter-item relationships. Seventeen items in the original 40-item pool demonstrated weak corrected item-total correlations (< .30) and have been removed as per the cutoff value considered for the process of Exploratory Factor analysis. The 23-item version was used for Exploratory factor analysis using the Principal Axis Factoring. During the EFA process, items 4 and 7 resulted in communality below 0.30, and they were therefore removed from the scale, resulting in a final scale of 21 items as mentioned in Table 3, with a Cronbach's α = .895(α_standardized = .913) as mentioned in Table 3. The list of items retained has been shared after the deletion of 17 + 2 items out of the 40-item scale at the start (Table 4).

Construct Validity To establish the construct validity of the mindfulness scale, Exploratory Factor Analysis and convergent validity were measured.

Exploratory Factor Analysis The analysis was performed using IBM SPSS 30 to discover the latent constructs by employing maximum likelihood estimation. Before performing EFA, preliminary checks were conducted to assess sampling adequacy and factorability of the data. An important step was to consider analyzing the overall implications of the correlation matrix through Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, which provides a value for the statistical probability indicating that the correlation matrix has significant correlations among some of its factors. The results were significant, $x2(n = 200) = 1617.710(p < 0.001)$, indicating its suitability for factor analysis. The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) measure yielded a value of .900, well above the acceptable threshold of 0.50, indicating sufficient shared variance among items, confirming that the correlation matrix was not an identity matrix and that the data were suitable for factor analysis as depicted in Table 5. EFA was computed using the principal axis factoring method and Direct Oblimin rotation. The minimum factor loading criteria were set to 0.50 as a rule of thumb rule for scale development. The communalities of the scale, which indicate the amount of variance in each domain, were assessed to ensure adequate levels of justification (Table 6). The findings prove that all communalities were over 0.50.

As presented in Table 7, Principal Axis Factoring (PAF) analyzed the structural validity and resulted in a unidimensional factor structure of the 21-item comprehensive mindfulness scale retained after pilot testing, item refinement, and exploratory factor analysis. As a result, just one dominant factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1, which validates the retention using Kaiser's criterion, was obtained. The absence of secondary factor clusters indicated that the item pool reflected a cohesive latent trait in the scale. The factor loadings of each factor appeared greater than 0.30, implying strong correlations between the items and the respective constructions (Table 8). The extracted communalities range between moderate to high .30 to .50. This is an indicator of the fact that the variance of most of the items is accounted for by a single factor, reinforcing the inter-consistency of the model. All the eigenvalues were more than 1 as represented in Table 9. The unidimensional factor determines a significant proportion of the variance.

Convergent Validity Convergent validity ensures that the items of two different scales statistically relate to the same construct. Convergent validity of the Comprehensive Mindfulness Scale was established using a sample of 100 individuals who were assessed on the scale under development and the Indian Mindfulness Inventory developed by Peter. A (2019), as both these scales assess Mindfulness. Pearson's correlation was 144, which is a remarkable result considering the size of the sample used for preliminary validation (Table 10)

DISCUSSION

The preliminary study established the unidimensional construct validity and reliability of the Comprehensive Mindfulness Scale for working professionals in India, fulfilling the purpose of the study. The study was conducted on a sample of working professionals from organizations in Delhi-NCR. The mindfulness scale developed in the present study aims to understand the specific challenges faced by Indian working populations. By capturing context-relevant attributes of mindfulness, the scale can serve as both a diagnostic and

developmental tool, especially for the occupational sector. For individuals, it provides structured feedback and opportunities for self-reflection. For organizations, it provides insight into the mental well-being of their workforce and opens pathways for implementing mindfulness-based interventions (MBIs) in workplace settings. Literature supports that even brief mindfulness practices, when performed consistently, can yield substantial benefits in emotional regulation, focus, and stress reduction (Creswell, 2017). On an assessment of individuals in organizations, when the scale is used can help inculcate simple practices of mindfulness in daily life such as mindful eating, mindful drinking, mindful walking, mindful reading, and simply breathing with more awareness. Thus, the present research contributes to both theoretical and applied domains by proposing a unidimensional psychometric tool specifically tailored to Indian work-life dynamics, also offering an ease of language by providing the Hindi version alongside. It holds potential not only for improving individual quality of life but also for fostering mindful organizational cultures.

Limitations and Future Scope

The study is presently in its preliminary stage and thus at present may only be suitable for the Indian continent, while it can in the future be globally used as a scale for Mindfulness assessments at the workplace. The scale can also be generalized to non-working populations in the future. The sample size, due to its pilot nature, is also limited, which will be increased in future studies of this scale. Mindfulness-based scales demonstrate broad applicability across various workplace settings, including healthcare, education, corporate organizations, the military, and high-stress environments such as emergency services. The Comprehensive Mindfulness Scale can be used to analyze and understand the Mindfulness levels of working professionals in any given sector, as it allows understanding the individual mind and functioning while training them to be mindful in situations of adversity and discomfort. The scope encompasses organizational interventions, employee support programs, and research in industrial health psychology, encompassing the assessments in the workplace globally. The Hindi version of the scale will also broaden the scope and applicability of the scale to the various population sectors in India not versed with the English language.

REFERENCES

1. Baer, R. A., Smith, G. T., Hopkins, J., Krietemeyer, J., & Toney, L. (2006). Using self-report assessment methods to explore facets of mindfulness. *Assessment, 13*(1), 27–45. https://doi.org/10.1177/ 1073191105283504
2. Bartlett, L., Martin, A., Neil, A. L., Memish, K., Otahal, P., Kilpatrick, M., & Sanderson, K. (2023). Mindfulness-based and mindfulness-informed interventions at the workplace: A systematic review and meta-regression analysis of RCTs. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 28*(1), 15–32. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000341
3. Belden, K. (2022). *The relationship between trait mindfulness and memory performance* (Unpublished master's thesis). Assumption University. https://core.ac.uk/download/567768133.pdf
4. Bodner, T., & Langer, E. J. (2001). Individual differences in mindfulness: The Mindfulness/Mindlessness Scale. In J. A. Masling & R. F. Bornstein (Eds.), *Empirical perspectives on the self* (Vol. 5, pp. 115–140). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/10420-005
5. 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. https://doi.org/10.1037/ 0022-3514.84.4.822
6. Brown, K. W., Ryan, R. M., & Creswell, J. D. (2007). Mindfulness: Theoretical foundations and evidence for its salutary effects. *Psychological Inquiry, 18*, 211–237. https://doi.org/10.1080/10478400701598298
7. Cabrera, B. (2016, June). Women need mindfulness even more than men do. *Harvard Business Review.* https://hbr.org/2016/06/women-need-mindfulness-even-more-than-men-do
8. Cardaciotto, L., Herbert, J. D., Forman, E. M., Moitra, E., & Farrow, V. (2008). The assessment of present-moment awareness and acceptance: The Philadelphia Mindfulness Scale. *Assessment, 15*(2), 204–223. https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191107311467
9. Chen, Y., Feng, X., & Zulnaidi, H. (2025). Assessment of positive psychological functioning among Chinese university students: Revision and psychometric properties of a psychological capital scale. *PLoS ONE, 20*(6), e0323731. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0323731
10. Chadwick, P., Hember, M., Mead, S., Lilley, B., & Dagnan, D. (2008). Responding mindfully to unpleasant thoughts and images: Reliability and validity of the Southampton Mindfulness Questionnaire (SMQ). *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 47*(4), 451–455. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466508X314891
11. Creswell, J. D. (2016). Mindfulness interventions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 68*(1), 491–516. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-042716-051139
12. Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods, 4*(3), 272–299. https://doi.org/10.1037/ 1082-989X.4.3.272
13. Feldman, G., Hayes, A., Kumar, S., Greeson, J., & Laurenceau, J.-P. (2007). Mindfulness and emotion regulation: The development and initial validation of the Cognitive and Affective Mindfulness Scale–Revised (CAMS-R). *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 29*(3), 177–190. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10862-006-9035-8
14. Field, A. P. (2017). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

15. Good, D. J., Lyddy, C. J., Glomb, T. M., Bono, J. E., Brown, K. W., Duffy, M. K., & Lazar, S. W. (2021). Implementing mindfulness in the workplace: A new strategy for enhancing both individual and organizational effectiveness. *Organizational Dynamics, 50*(2), Article 100756. https://doi.org/10.1016 /j.orgdyn.2020.100756
16. Howell, A. J., Digdon, N. L., Buro, K., & Kabat-Sheptycki, A. R. (2008). Relations among mindfulness, well-being, and sleep. *Personality and Individual Differences, 45*, 773–777. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2008.08.005
17. Hossain, A., Arefin, A., & Sutradhar, P. (2022). A prospective longitudinal study with treated hypertensive patients in Northern Bangladesh (PREDIcT-HTN) to understand uncontrolled hypertension and adverse clinical events: A protocol for 5-years follow-up. *PLoS ONE, 17*(5), e0269240. https://doi.org/10.1371/ journal.pone.0269240
18. Kabat-Zinn, J. (1996). *Full catastrophe living.* Piakus Books.
19. Karanika-Murray, M., Michaelides, G., & Wood, S. J. (2022). Sign of the times: Workplace mindfulness as an empty signifier. *Human Relations, 75*(6), 1033–1060. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508417740643
20. Kim, Y., Lee, H., & Kim, S. (2022). The relationship between ethical leadership and nurse well-being: The mediating role of workplace mindfulness. *Journal of Nursing Management, 30*(2), 519–527. https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.13528
21. Lau, M. A., Bishop, S. R., Segal, Z. V., Buis, T., Anderson, N. D., Carlson, L., ... & Devins, G. (2006). The Toronto Mindfulness Scale: Development and validation. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 62*(12), 1445–1467. https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.20326
22. Lord, B., Sanguinetti, J. L., Ruiz, L., Miskovic, V., Segre, J., Young, S., Fini, M. E., & Allen, J. J. B. (2024). Transcranial focused ultrasound to the posterior cingulate cortex modulates default mode network and subjective experience: An fMRI pilot study. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 18*, Article 1392199. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2024.1392199
23. Montani, F., Courcy, F., & Giorgi, G. (2023). Your presence is requested: Mindfulness infusion in workplace interactions and relationships. *Organizational Psychology Review, 13*(1), 32–51.
24. Peter, A., Pundeer, A., Srivastava, R., Srivastava, A., & Sheikh, I. (2019). Development and validation of Indian mindfulness inventory. *International Journal of Advance and Innovative Research, 6*(2), 15–22. https://iaraedu.com/pdf/ijair-volume-6-issue-2-xxxvii-april%E2%80%93june-2019.pdf
25. Reb, J., Narayanan, J., & Ho, Z. W. (2015). Workplace mindfulness: An integrative review of antecedents, mediators, and moderators. *Journal of Management, 41*(3), 825–846. https://doi.org/10.1177 /0149206312472285
26. Thompson, B., & Levitov, J. E. (1985). Using microcomputers to score and evaluate test items. *Collegiate Microcomputer, 3*, 163–168.
27. Walach, H., Buchheld, N., Buttenmüller, V., Kleinknecht, N., & Schmidt, S. (2006). Measuring mindfulness—the Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory (FMI). *Personality and Individual Differences, 40*(8), 1543–1555. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2005.11.025
28. Weare, K. (2014). *Evidence for mindfulness: Impacts on the wellbeing and performance of school staff.* Mindfulness in Schools Project, University of Exeter.
29. Williams, M. J., Dalgleish, T., Karl, A., & Kuyken, W. (2014). Examining the factor structures of the Five-Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire and the Self-Compassion Scale. *Psychological Assessment, 26*(2), 407–418. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035566
30. Yadav, R. K., Singh, S., & Mahapatra, M. (2023). The role of perceived workplace safety practices and mindfulness in maintaining calm in employees during times of crisis. *Safety Science, 157*, Article 105900. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2022.105900

Informed Consent

Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Consent for Publication

Not applicable.

Declaration of Conflicting Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Funding Statement

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Table 1 *Correlation for Initial 40 item Scale*

Item	Correlation	p-value	Retention Status
S1	.417	***	Retained
S2	.417	***	Retained
S3R	.034		Not Retained
S4	.304	***	Retained
S5	.359	***	Retained
S6	.421	***	Retained
S7	.120		Not Retained

Item	Correlation	p-value	Retention Status
S8	.212	***	Retained
S9	.325	***	Retained
S10	.043		Not Retained
S11	.420	***	Retained
S12	.469	***	Retained
S13	.284	***	Retained
S14R	.148		Not Retained
S15	.406	***	Retained
S16	.335	***	Retained
S17	.438	***	Retained
S18R	.028		Not Retained
S19R	–.107		Not Retained
S20R	.073		Not Retained
S21	.247	***	Retained
S22	.159	.024	Not Retained
S23	.192	***	Retained
S24	.249	***	Retained
S25	.400	***	Retained
S26	.359	***	Retained
S27	.361	***	Retained
S28	.362	***	Retained
S29R	–.072		Not Retained
S30R	.116		Not Retained
S31	.299	***	Retained
S32	.321	***	Retained
S33	.323	***	Retained
S34	.275	***	Retained
S35	.198	***	Retained
S36	.253	***	Retained
S37	.424	***	Retained
S38	.364	***	Retained
S39	.483	***	Retained
S40	.237	***	Retained

Note. All correlation values marked *** are statistically significant (2-tailed, N = 200), at p<.001. Items were retained if they demonstrated both theoretical relevance and statistically meaningful correlation ($r \geq .30$). Reverse-coded items are denoted with an "R". Based on the correlation values 17 items removed.

Table 2 *Initial and Extracted Communalities for 23 items scale*

	Initial	Extraction
S1	.509	.519
S2	.438	.362
S5	.450	.545
S6	.375	.545
S9	.408	.402

S11	.403	.432
S12	.562	.581
S13	.493	.561
S15	.521	.465
S16	.544	.728
S17	.385	.408
S25	.529	.702
S26	.405	.445
S27	.419	.395
S28	.433	.446
S32	.476	.511
S33	.483	.599
S36	.357	.337
S37	.513	.568
S38	.373	.381
S39	.375	.401
S7*	.281	.267
S4*	.079	.073

Note. Initial and extraction communalities are presented for 23 items. Extraction method: Principal Axis Factoring. * Less than .30 communality, hence items removed.

Table 3 *Internal Consistency Reliability Statistics for final 21 items Scale*

Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Items
.914	21

Table 4 *Correlation Matrix for final 21 items scale*

Item	**Correlation**	**p-value**
S1	.456	***
S2	.456	***
S5	.361	***
S6	.424	***
S9	.389	***
S11	.339	***
S12	.492	***
S13	.353	***
S15	.449	***
S16	.317	***
S17	.421	***
S25	.400	***
S26	.406	***
S27	.337	***
S28	.378	***
S32	.330	***
S33	.355	***
S36	.352	***
S37	.506	***
S38	.335	***

Item	Correlation	p-value
S39	.432	***

Note. Statements with correlation coefficient of 0.30 and above were retained (***p <.001).

Table 5 *Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity for EFA Assumptions for final 21 items scale*

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.900 1617.710
	df	210
	Sig.	<.001

Note. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy is reported as .900. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is significant with χ^2 = 1617.710, df = 210, p< .001.

Table 6 *Initial and Extracted Communalities of Final 21 Items*

Communalities		
	Initial	Extraction
S1	.498	.490
S2	.431	.386
S5	.444	.450
S6	.373	.318
S9	.392	.324
S11	.396	.351
S12	.560	.609
S13	.488	.436
S15	.513	.488
S16	.536	.779
S17	.366	.362
S25	.528	.479
S26	.398	.338
S27	.417	.357
S28	.380	.357
S32	.472	.489
S33	.480	.606
S36	.357	.350
S37	.513	.582
S38	.364	.363
S39	.356	.355

Note. Initial and extraction communalities are reported for 21 items. Extraction method: Principal Axis Factoring.

Table 7 *Factor Matrix for final 21scale*

	Factor			
	1	2	3	4
S12	.705			
S37	.682			
S1	.677			
S15	.654			
S25	.635			
S13	.626			
S16	.605	.553		
S33	.596			
S39	.587			
S27	.581			
S5	.568			

S17	.565	
S9	.559	
S26	.557	
S11	.554	
S2	.547	
S32	.538	.440
S28	.522	
S38	.521	
S36	.488	
S6	.487	

Note. Factor loadings are reported for 21 items across four extracted factors. Extraction method: Principal Axis Factoring.

Table 8 *Structure Matrix After Oblimin Rotation for final 21scale*

	Factor			
	1	2	3	4
S25	.669			-.564
S1	.661			-.595
S37	.644		-.558	-.596
S2	.597			
S36	.585			-.405
S6	.562			-.414
S26	.557			-.466
S17	.538			-.536
S16		.875		-.473
S5	.483	.618		-.417
S32		.602	-.532	-.415
S33			-.753	-.469
S38			-.548	-.448
S12	.524			-.778
S15	.511			-.694
S13	.483			-.654
S11	.456			-.582
S27	.432		-.411	-.564
S28			-.424	-.562
S39	.516			-.561
S9	.476	.409		-.512

Note. Structure coefficients are presented for 21 items across four factors. Extraction method: Principal Axis Factoring. Rotation method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.

Table 9 *Total Variance Explained for final 21scale*

Total Variance Explained						
	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
Factor	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	7.777	37.033	37.033	7.231	34.435	34.435
2	1.413	6.730	43.763	.938	4.465	38.900
3	1.115	5.309	49.072	.605	2.880	41.780
4	1.042	4.961	54.033	.494	2.353	44.133
5	.998	4.754	58.787			
6	.935	4.451	63.238			
7	.843	4.013	67.251			
8	.772	3.677	70.928			
9	.729	3.472	74.399			
10	.641	3.051	77.450			

11	.633	3.012	80.462
12	.599	2.854	83.316
13	.553	2.635	85.951
14	.497	2.367	88.318
15	.432	2.058	90.376
16	.420	1.999	92.374
17	.401	1.907	94.282
18	.379	1.804	96.085
19	.295	1.406	97.492
20	.286	1.360	98.851
21	.241	1.149	100.000

Note. This table presents the initial eigenvalues and extraction sums of squared loadings for the Comprehensive Mindfulness Scale based on principal axis factoring. The first factor explains the largest proportion of variance. Factors with eigenvalues greater than 1 were considered for retention.

Table10 *Pearson Correlation Between COMPREHENSIVE MINDFULNESS SCALE and INDIAN MINDFULNESS INVENTORY (N=100)*

	INDIAN MINDFULNESS INVENTORY
COMPREHENSIVE MINDFULNESS SCALE	.144