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Abstract

Mindfulness can be defined as an awareness fostered by regulating one’s attention in a particular manner over time, on purpose, in the present moment, and in a non-judgmental manner (Kabat-Zinn, 2012). In attempting to identify some of the mechanisms of action through which mindfulness positively impacts well-being, recent literature has suggested the possible role that emotional intelligence (EI) might play (Schutte & Malouff, 2011; Wang & Kong, 2014). The present study attempted to empirically verify the proposed mechanism of action. In addition, the study conceptualized mindfulness as a multi-dimensional construct by adopting the five-facet model of mindfulness (Baer, Smith, Hopkins, Krietmeyer, & Toney, 2006). Specifically, the study identified which of the five facets of mindfulness were most predictive of subjective well-being (SWB) and EI, and determined if EI acted as a mediator in the relationship between each of the most predictive facets of mindfulness and SWB. One hundred and twenty-three Eastern Illinois University students participated in the study by completing an online questionnaire. The results of the study revealed that EI partially mediated the relationship between overall mindfulness and each of the SWB components of positive affect, negative affect, and life satisfaction. The mindfulness facets, ‘describing’ and ‘non-reactivity’, were most predictive of EI and SWB. Further, EI partially mediated the relationship between ‘describing’ and life satisfaction and positive affect, and the relationship between ‘non-reactivity’ and positive and negative affect. Clinical implications of the study, limitations, and suggestions for future research were addressed.
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Emotional Intelligence as a Mediator in the Relationship between Mindfulness and Subjective Well-Being

Mindfulness and emotional intelligence (EI) are two important areas of study in clinical psychology due to their positive influences on subjective well-being (SWB). Studies have also demonstrated a positive relationship between these two psychological constructs, leading one to ask in what manner mindfulness, EI, and SWB are related with each other. The purpose of the present study was to explore these relationships. Specifically, it tested whether mindfulness positively influences SWB by enhancing EI. In other words, does EI mediate the relationship between mindfulness and SWB? Given the multidimensional nature of mindfulness, the study also examined these relationships while taking into account the five facets of mindfulness.

First, the study identified which of the five facets of mindfulness was most predictive of SWB and EI. Second, the study investigated whether EI acts as a mediator in the relationship between mindfulness and SWB. Additionally, the study examined if EI acts as a mediator in the relationship between each of the most predictive facets of mindfulness and SWB. Results of the study increase our understanding of mindfulness and its influences on EI and SWB. More specifically, they have the potential to help researchers and therapists understand which facets of mindfulness influence EI. The facets can be interpreted as skills that can be developed. Thus, the study identified which mindfulness skills could be further tested by researchers and targeted by therapists in an attempt to increase EI and promote SWB.
Mindfulness

Conceptualizing mindfulness. Mindfulness is a concept rooted in Buddhist psychology, though incorporating elements of various philosophical areas, including Greek philosophy, phenomenology, existentialism, naturalism, transcendentalism, and humanism. It can be considered as central to the human experience, because of its roots in fundamental activities of consciousness and its inclusion in numerous philosophical and psychological traditions (Brown, Ryan & Creswell, 2007).

Researchers have defined and conceptualized mindfulness in a variety of different ways, attempting to explain the entirety of its nature. Kabat-Zinn (2012) defines mindfulness as an awareness that can be fostered by paying attention in a particular manner over time, on purpose, in the present moment, and in a non-judgmental manner. Brown et al. (2007) characterize mindfulness according to similar criteria by incorporating the following components: clarity of awareness, non-conceptual, nondiscriminatory awareness, flexibility of awareness and attention, an empirical stance toward reality, present-oriented consciousness, and stability or continuity of attention and awareness. Clarity of awareness is a clear awareness of one’s internal and external experience. Non-conceptual, nondiscriminatory awareness entails a mode of processing that does not compare, categorize, or evaluate. It does not contemplate, introspect, reflect, or ruminate about one’s memories and past experiences, but promotes an experience without interference, where one simply notices what is happening as it unfolds.

Flexibility of awareness and attention can be described as an ability to fluctuate between perspectives. It is also the capability to acquire a larger perspective on what is taking place. An empirical stance toward reality entails acquiring all of the facts in a situation,
refraining from judgment until carefully considering every piece of information. Present-oriented consciousness emphasizes one’s presence in an experience, and involves refraining from focusing on the past or fantasizing about the future. Stability or continuity of attention and awareness means maintaining and constantly demonstrating the previously mentioned qualities of attention and awareness.

The concept of mindfulness is abstract, but it may be easier to grasp its application. In mundane day-to-day activities, such as speaking with a friend or eating a meal, mindfulness can be practiced. While speaking with a friend, one can attend to the communication taking place, becoming sensitive to the emotional tone underlying the conversation, no matter how subtle. When eating a meal, one can attend to the taste of the food moment by moment, while also attending to the stomach and the decreasing level of hunger. In each example, consciousness is open, neither blunted nor restricted (Brown & Ryan, 2003).

On a spectrum where mindfulness is on one end, mindlessness is on the other. In the latter, a person’s thoughts, emotions, and behaviors are determined by “programmed” routines that have been developed through past experiences over time. Mindlessness is a result of drawing cognitive conclusions before completely evaluating a situation, applying previously formed mind-sets to present scenarios. As a result, mindlessness significantly reduces creativity and overall potential, locking individuals into a repetitive and restricted day to day life (Langer, 1989). Ruminating about the past and focusing on previously experienced events prevents a state of mindfulness. Fantasizing and worrying about the future can pull one away from what is taking place in the present moment as well (Brown & Ryan, 2003).
It is possible to assess mindfulness as either a trait or a state. Trait mindfulness, also referred to as dispositional mindfulness, is the level of mindfulness an individual possesses during daily activities. State mindfulness, on the other hand, refers to the level of mindfulness that can be achieved by engaging in mindfulness meditation exercises or other mindfulness training activities (Murphy, Mermelstein, Edwards, & Gidycz, 2012). In the present study, participants’ trait mindfulness was examined.

**Five facets of mindfulness.** Although there has been a lot of interest surrounding mindfulness over the years, researchers have struggled to agree upon its operational definition. One influential conceptualization of mindfulness described the phenomenon as focusing attention on the present experience in an open, curious, and accepting manner, without judging or reacting. This conceptualization incorporated two facets of mindfulness, which included self-regulated attention and orientation to experience. Self-regulated attention is defined as a sustained attention to the present moment. Orientation to experience is described as an open, curious, and accepting attitude (Tran, Glück, & Nader, 2013).

However, while these two components attempt to describe mindfulness, they may not adequately capture the phenomenon in its entirety. Mindfulness is an abstract concept that is multidimensional in nature. A newer, more complete model of mindfulness includes five facets, expanding on the two component conceptualization. The five facet model provides a more comprehensive conceptualization of mindfulness as experienced in daily life. Five facets of mindfulness have been identified and include the following: observing, describing, acting with awareness, being nonjudgmental, and nonreactivity (Baer, Smith, Hopkins, Krietmeyer, & Toney, 2006).
A study conducted by Baer et al. (2006) explored various mindfulness scales, examining the relationship between the different measures. These mindfulness scales were the Mindful Attention Awareness Scale (MAAS), the Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory (FMI), the Kentucky Inventory of Mindfulness Skills (KIMS), the Cognitive and Affective Mindfulness Scale (CAMS), and the Mindfulness Questionnaire (MQ). It was determined that each of the scales had good internal consistency and all scales were significantly correlated with one another. Further, the study concluded that meditation is likely to be connected to mindfulness. In addition to testing the relationship between the different mindfulness measures, the study examined the relationship between the mindfulness measures and various indices of well-being. The mindfulness scales positively correlated with openness to experience, EI, and self-compassion, with all but one scale being significantly correlated with such indices. All of the mindfulness scales demonstrated a significant negative correlation with psychological symptoms, neuroticism, and difficulties in emotion regulation, among other indices. When further examining the measures, it was found that different constructs affiliated with mindfulness differed significantly among the mindfulness scales. The KIMS had a 0.61 correlation with EI, yet MAAS only had a 0.22 correlation. Such findings suggested that the different mindfulness scales may be assessing different components of mindfulness.

In an attempt to isolate and identify different mindfulness facets, all of the mindfulness measures were combined and an exploratory factor analysis was conducted. The results showed 39 items that made up five different facets. Four of the five facets were taken from facets found on the KIMS, and an additional facet was based on the FMI and MQ. The five facets were observing, describing, acting with awareness, non-judging,
and non-reactivity. Baer et al. (2006) developed the 39-item Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire (FFMQ) upon completing the previously mentioned analysis.

The facet, observing, involves noticing and attending to internal stimuli, such as thoughts and feelings, and external perceptions (Baer et al., 2006). An individual who scores higher on the observing facet is more likely to notice internal and external stimuli and how it affects them, and is less inclined to extend or avoid their experience. Items that measure observing include statements such as, “I notice how foods and drinks affect my thoughts, bodily sensations, and emotions” or “I notice visual elements in art or nature, such as colors, shapes, textures, or patterns of light and shadow”. The observing items on the FFM-Q were derived from the KIMS (Baer et al., 2006).

Describing can be defined as an individual’s capacity to describe or label one’s internal experiences using words (Baer et al., 2006). Examples of this facet include statements such as “I can easily put my beliefs, opinions, and expectations into words” or “When I have a sensation in my body, it’s hard for me to describe it because I can’t find the right words”. The items on the FFM-Q that assess describing were taken from the KIMS and the CAMS (Baer et al., 2006).

Acting with awareness measures one’s capacity to attend to an activity in the moment, as opposed to merely going through the motions while attention is focused elsewhere (Baer et al., 2006). If an individual scores higher on acting with awareness, they are less likely to exhibit careless behavior when engaging in a task, such as spilling or breaking something, for example. Statements that assess this particular facet include, “I find it difficult to stay focused on what’s happening in the present” or “I rush through activities without being really attentive to them”, for example. The items on the FFM-Q
that measure ‘acting with awareness’ were derived from the MAAS, KIMS, and the CAMS (Baer et al., 2006).

Non-judging demonstrates a person’s ability to refrain from judging an experience, taking a non-evaluative stance towards inner thoughts and feelings (Baer et al., 2006). A person scoring higher on this particular facet would be less likely to become upset, frustrated, or angry with the self if experiencing certain thoughts or emotions. Items that assess for this facet include “I tell myself that I should not be feeling the way I’m feeling” or “I make judgments about whether my thoughts are good or bad”. The items that measure non-judging on the FFM-Q were taken from the KIMS and MQ (Baer et al., 2006).

The final facet, non-reactivity, assesses an individual’s ability to refrain from reacting to inner experiences. An individual who scores higher on non-reactivity may be more inclined to allow thoughts to pass through their mind without becoming caught up in or carried away by them. Items that measure non-reactivity include statements such as, “In difficult situations, I can pause without immediately reacting” or “Usually when I have distressing thoughts or images, I am able just to notice them without reacting”. Items included in the FFMQ that assess non-reactivity were taken from the FMI and MQ (Baer et al., 2006).

After running a confirmatory factor analysis, the researchers (Baer et al., 2006) asserted that four of the five facets describe a broad, hierarchical conceptualization of mindfulness, and that the facet, ‘observing’, is more applicable in studies where participants have experience with meditation. Upon comparing the individual facets of
mindfulness with indices of well-being, it was found that the facets strongly correlated
with nearly all of the well-being measures, in the directions previously observed with
overall mindfulness. Further, specific facets were shown to correlate more strongly with
particular well-being indices. The researchers examined whether the individual facets of
mindfulness could predict psychological symptoms. However, ‘observing’ was not
included, since results would have been affected by participants’ meditation experience.
After conducting a hierarchical regression analysis, “acting with awareness”, ‘non-judging’,
and ‘non-reactivity’ were found to be significant predictors of symptoms level.

**Emotional Intelligence (EI)**

Emotions are critical to everyday functioning, which has led researchers from
different perspectives to investigate how emotions can be most effectively managed,
according to Peña-Sarrionandia, Mikolajczak, and Gross (2015). Two relatively
independent research traditions have emerged to examine this issue. The emotion
regulation (ER) tradition has primarily focused on *how* people can adequately manage
their emotions, typically focusing on basic processes. The emotional intelligence (EI)
tradition, on the other hand, focuses on *who* exemplifies optimal emotional functioning,
looking at individual differences in EI (Peña-Sarrionandia et al., 2015). The present
study is predominantly focused on the basic processes of mindfulness, rather than
emotional functioning, and is not concerned with *how* people manage their emotions.
Rather, it is focused on how mindful individuals experience greater well-being. Thus, it
examines individual differences in emotional functioning, investigating *who*
demonstrates optimal emotional functioning, and if such differences are fostered through
mindfulness, which results in SWB. Therefore, the study measures EI rather than ER.
There is a clear link between mindfulness and EI that warrants further exploration of these variables. Salovey and Mayer (1990) acknowledged the similarities between these two constructs, explaining how both EI and mindfulness are meta-cognitive and meta-mood constructs, meaning they both involve people's abilities to perceive, understand, and regulate thoughts and emotions. According to Brown & Ryan (2003), more mindful individuals demonstrate greater adaptive emotional functioning, or EI. In addition, mindfulness meditation is capable of enhancing EI (Chu, 2010). Schutte and Malouff (2011) have speculated how key mindfulness components can potentially influence the development of EI capabilities, which include perceiving, understanding, managing and harnessing emotions in the self and others. Finally, though past research conducted by Schutte and Malouff (2011), Chu (2010), and Wang and Kong (2014) have explored the relationship between mindfulness and EI, further research is still necessary. Therefore, the study's focus on individual's differences in emotional functioning and the established connection between mindfulness and EI, as determined by past researchers, justifies a further investigation that includes such constructs.

EI stems from the notion that there are various kinds of intelligence. One of these types is social intelligence, which E.L. Thorndike differentiated from other types of intelligence, describing it as the capacity to understand men, women, boys, and girls, and to act intelligently when engaging in human interaction. Thorndike explained social intelligence as the ability to perceive the internal states, motives, and behaviors of oneself and of others, and to use such information to act more adaptively when interacting with others (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Gardner (1983) further developed the idea of multiple intelligences, incorporating interpersonal intelligence and intrapersonal intelligence.
Interpersonal intelligence is the capacity to comprehend intentions, motivations, and desires of other people. Intrapersonal intelligence is the ability to understand one's own feelings, fears, and motivations. Salovey & Mayer (1990) were the first to coin the term, emotional intelligence, conceptualizing it as a subset of Thorndike's social intelligence and Gardner's personal intelligences. It was defined as the ability to monitor feelings and emotions in oneself and in others, to discriminate among them, and to utilize such capacities for one's thinking and behavior. According to Daus (2006), the concept of EI was popularized in the public through the international best-seller, "Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More than IQ" (1995) by Daniel Goleman, a psychologist who previously reported for the New York Times. Goleman (1995) explained EI as a type of intelligence that anyone can possess, and involves abilities such as being able to motivate oneself and being persistent in the face of frustrations, controlling impulses and delaying gratification, regulating one's moods and preventing distress from debilitating one's ability to think, or having empathy and hope.

Upon being established as a construct, EI has been defined in a number of different ways. Salovey and Mayer (1997) define EI according to various abilities. It includes the ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion. Further, EI involves the ability to access and generate feelings to facilitate thought. In addition, it integrates the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge. Finally, EI indicates an ability to regulate emotions in order to promote emotional and intellectual growth (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). There are varying arguments regarding the concept, terminology, and operationalization of EI. It can be conceptualized as a set of abilities, a set of traits, or a mixed set of both abilities and traits.
When conceptualizing EI as an ability (AEI), it is understood to be a form of intelligence, characterized by a group of mental abilities. Ability testing is considered to be the primary method utilized in intelligence research, as intelligence references one’s capacity to successfully complete mental tasks, rather than one’s beliefs regarding such capacities (Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 2000).

The hierarchical four-branch model is the primary model for AEI. In the model, EI is characterized by four different information-processing abilities or skills. Perceiving and expressing emotions are abilities in the lower branches that lay the groundwork for higher, more integrated processes such as conscious regulation of emotions (Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

The first branch of the model, ‘Perception, Appraisal, and Expression of Emotion,’ refers to how accurately individuals can perceive emotions and emotional content. Individuals competent in this area can correctly identify and monitor their internal feelings. For example, a person who is staying up late at night may recognize that he is partially tired, partially filled with energy, and anxious about the clarity of his thinking. Such recognition of internal emotions can be applied to others in addition, as it is understood that an emotionally competent person is capable of accurately perceiving and evaluating emotion whenever it is expressed, whether in themselves, in others, or in art. A person who recognizes the link between experiencing stress and the resulting constricted posture in themselves could potentially identify anxious expression in other people and animals by perceiving their constricted postures. In addition to the identification and perception of emotions, branch 1 incorporates an ability to show
emotion through differing communication channels, such as facial expressions or voices (Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 2000; Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

The second branch of the model, ‘Emotional Facilitation of Thinking’, describes the capacity to utilize emotions and emotional events during intellectual processing. Further, it emphasizes the functional nature of emotions, describing how emotions shape and improve thinking by focusing one’s attention on pertinent emotional and cognitive changes. Additionally, branch 2 involves an ability to generate emotion on command. For example, if asked about how a character in a story feels in a given situation, a person capable of facilitating thinking with emotion would be able to generate the character’s feelings, placing themselves in the character’s shoes. He/she would also be able to anticipate the emotions associated with starting at a new school, beginning a new job, or being exposed to social criticism. Being capable of anticipating such emotions, that individual can more effectively plan ahead for these situations (Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 2000; Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

The third branch of the model, ‘Understanding and Analyzing Emotions’, involves an ability to understand emotions. From a young age, a person learns how to distinguish between different emotions, which emotions are linked to certain situations (for example, a child experiencing loss and sadness when their friend no longer plays with him/her), and how complex, contradictory emotions can be experienced in response to the same stimuli -- for example, a child learning to both love and hate the same individual (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). ‘Understanding and Analyzing Emotions’ also involves the ability to reason about the progression of emotions in interpersonal relationships, according to Mayer & Salovey (1997). This ability includes the
understanding that emotions tend to develop and change in a specific pattern. For example, an individual’s anger may develop into rage, and then change into satisfaction or guilt, depending on the situation.

The fourth and highest branch of the model, ‘Management of Emotions’, refers to the conscious regulation of emotions to stimulate both emotional and intellectual growth (Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 2000; Mayer & Salovey, 1997). A person managing their emotions is more open to their feelings, whether positive or negative, and can engage or distance themselves from emotions when necessary. For example, an individual feeling rage in response to an injustice may be an appropriate reaction. A person who is emotionally intelligent, however, is capable of disengaging from their rage and discussing the situation in a calm and collected manner. The person could later draw on their previously experienced rage to evoke others’ anger, in an attempt to oppose the injustice collectively through a course of action. Further, an emotionally intelligent individual is capable of progressing beyond solely experiencing the emotion. He/she is able to consciously reflect upon their emotional responses, known as meta-regulation, and regulate reflections of these emotional responses, known as meta-evaluation. One’s meta-evaluation of mood is dependent on how much attention an individual pays to their mood, which is required to reflect upon how typical, clear, acceptable, or influential one’s mood was. One’s meta-regulation involves regulating one’s mood in response to such reflections, promoting positive emotions, down-playing the exaggeration of negative emotions, or leaving one’s emotions as they are (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). One’s ability to internally regulate their emotions and to manipulate the environment to regulate one’s own and others’ emotions is highly dependent on the competencies of the other branches:
accurate perception, expression, generation, and understanding of emotions (MacCann, Matthews, Zeidner, & Roberts, 2004).

Petrides and Furnham (2001) proposed that EI can also be conceptualized as a trait (TEI), believing that a theoretical construct's name should be based upon what it is measures. Although performance-based measures of EI assess individuals' AEI, self-report or informant methods typically assess TEI, which is defined as behavioral dispositions and self-perceived abilities in reference to EI (Petrides & Furnham, 2001). Therefore, Petrides and Furnham (2001) differentiated between TEI and AEI, stating that TEI is assessed through self-report whereas AEI is assessed through performance measures.

TEI is primarily conceptualized according to a personality framework. Petrides & Furnham (2001) analyzed the existing peer-research regarding EI, concluding that many of the measured 'traits' on the self-report scales were understood to be personality traits (empathy, assertiveness, and optimism on Bar-On’s Emotional Quotient Inventory or empathy and assertiveness on Goleman’s Emotional Competence Inventory, for example).

When EI is conceptualized as a trait, an emotionally intelligent individual has the capacity for greater emotion appraisal, expression, management, and regulation. Further, he/she is competent in broader areas, such as in adaptability, assertiveness, self-esteem, and trait empathy. Thus, this approach to studying EI is completely different, as it is situated in the personality realm. Petrides and Furnham (2001) even proposed an alternative name for TEI: emotional self-efficacy. The authors decided to call it TEI, however, to draw the connection to past EI literature.
Mixed models integrate both mental abilities and personality characteristics (Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 2000). According to MacCann et al. (2004), mixed models treat EI as an extensive number of traits that are predictive of emotionally intelligent behavior, yet are not limited to intelligence or related forms of ability necessarily.

There are many different models of EI that are considered to be mixed, according to MacCann et al., 2004. One of the well-known models was proposed by Reuven Bar-On (2000), who describes emotional and social intelligences as a multifaceted spectrum of emotional, personal, and social competencies that influence our overall capability to actively and effectively manage the demands and pressures of our day to day lives.

The Bar-On Model, named after its creator, contains five dimensions of emotional and social competencies, and includes the intrapersonal, interpersonal, adaptation, stress management, and general mood dimensions. Such dimensions are made up of lower-order EI facets, including self-regard, emotional self-awareness, assertiveness, stress tolerance, impulse control, reality testing, flexibility, problem solving, empathy, and interpersonal relationship. Facilitators of these competencies are additionally incorporated and include optimism, self-actualization, happiness, independence, and social responsibility (Bar-On, 2000). According to the Bar-On model, an emotionally intelligent individual is emotionally self-aware, has high self-regard, and can tolerate stress. He/she is assertive yet flexible, empathic, capable of problem-solving, and successful inter-personally. Further, he/she is happy, optimistic, independent, and socially responsible.

The Bar-On model explains that EI develops over time and can be improved through practice, such as training or therapy. It is hypothesized that people with greater
than average EI generally find more success in meeting environmental demands and pressures, whereas people with less than average EI are less successful, and are more inclined to develop emotional problems, particularly if they have deficits in reality testing, problem solving, stress tolerance, and impulse control. The Bar-On model proposes that emotional and cognitive intelligence equally contribute to an individual's overall intelligence, indicating his/her potential to succeed in life (Bar-On, 2000).

In the present study, participants' TEI was examined. Their TEI was assessed using the Assessing Emotions Scale, which was a scale developed by Schutte et al. (1998, 2009) to specifically measure TEI. It was based on Salovey and Mayer's (1990) original model of emotional intelligence, which proposed that EI consists of appraisal of emotion in the self and others, expression of emotion, regulation of emotion in the self and others, and utilization of emotion in solving problems. In addition to overall TEI, the scale measures how participants identify, understand, regulate, and harness emotions in themselves and in others. Therefore, it can assess TEI unidimensionally, measuring participants' overall TEI, and it can also assess TEI multidimensionally, measuring participants' degrees of its varying components.

**Subjective Well-being**

Well-being is typically defined as optimal psychological functioning and experience. An individual's functioning and experience significantly contribute to his/her mental health. Well-being comes up in everyday conversation, when people ask one another, "How are you?", yet has been critically examined in research and considered by theorists to be complex and controversial. It has long been debated what determines optimal experience and what it means to live "the good life" (Ryan & Deci, 2001). There
are three prominent perspectives on well-being and they include SWB, psychological well-being, and social well-being. SWB is rooted in the concept that well-being is determined by one's subjective experience of happiness, satisfaction, and an absence of negative feelings or judgments. Psychological well-being, also described as "eudaimonic" well-being, is founded upon Aristotle's idea of *eudaimon*, which means "true self." With that being said, it is based on many theories of self-actualization, and incorporates one's subjective experience of the meaning in life, sense of purpose, and drive toward individuality, authenticity, or self-expression. Social well-being involves an individual's interaction with society, examining one's perception of how they fit into society, where society is heading, and how his/her goals and values align with the larger social framework they are a part of (Ryan & Deci, 2001). In the present study, participants' SWB was examined.

SWB can be defined as individuals' evaluations of their lives (Xu & Xue, 2014). It was the first well-being perspective to be conceptualized in psychological literature after being proposed by Ed Diener (1984) in a review of philosophical and psychological happiness theories. The concept has only been slightly modified across time. SWB is considered to be a "hedonic" form of well-being, since it involves the personal assessment of one's pursuit for experiencing pleasure and avoiding pain. According to Christopher (1999), there are two general components that make up SWB: life satisfaction and affective balance. Judgments about life satisfaction are based on subjective cognitive appraisals. The individual evaluates their life, comparing it to their perception of "the good life", which is based on their own personal criteria. Affective balance evaluates how someone's degree of positive affect compares to their degree of
negative affect experienced in life. This component conceptualizes well-being according to the popular usage of the word, "happiness" since it is an evaluation that is affectively oriented, with positive affect outweighing negative affect (Christopher, 1999). The present study utilized the Positive Affect Negative Affect Scale (PANAS), developed by Watson, Clark, and Tellegen (1988), and the Satisfaction with Life Scale, developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin (1985), to measure participants' SWB.

The Relationships between Mindfulness, EI, and SWB

Mindfulness and SWB. There have been a multitude of past studies illustrating the efficacy of mindfulness in reducing negative mental health outcomes and a wide variety of mental and physical health symptoms (Mandal, Arya, & Pandey, 2012). Mindfulness-based stress reduction (MBSR), a program which focuses on empowerment, non-judgmental interpretation of events, and acceptance of the present situation by utilizing mindfulness meditation practices and gentle stretching (Bazzano et al., 2013), has been found to reduce mood disturbances and stress symptoms in patients with various cancer diagnoses. Further, MBSR has revealed itself to be capable of reducing symptoms related to physical, psychosomatic, and psychiatric disorders. Previous research has additionally shown that trait mindfulness is correlated with a reduction of symptoms pertaining to chronic pain, generalized anxiety, panic disorder, fibromyalgia, and cancer. Causal studies that have utilized training programs that incorporate mindfulness have elicited a reduction of symptoms pertaining to chronic pain, generalized anxiety, panic disorder, fibromyalgia, and cancer as well (Mandal et al., 2012). Trait mindfulness has been found to negatively correlate with symptoms and distress and positively correlate with positive mental health, positive affect and life satisfaction. Similarly, causal studies
that involve practices incorporating mindfulness have been found to reduce symptoms and distress as well, and have also been shown to increase positive mental health, positive affect, and life satisfaction. (Mandal et al., 2012). As can be seen, mindfulness has the capacity to decrease negative health indices, and has the potential to increase positive health indices as well, which could lead to greater SWB.

Empirical evidence supports the role of mindfulness in enhancing subjective and eudaimonic well-being. If one’s level of mindfulness in day-to-day activities increases as a result of interventions, such as practicing meditation, SWB tends to increase as well (Schutte & Malouff, 2011). According to Brown et al. (2007), past research demonstrates that trait mindfulness significantly correlates with various cognitive and affective indices of mental health and well-being, including lower levels of emotional disturbance, higher levels of eudaimonic well-being, and higher levels of SWB. Lower levels of emotional disturbance are characterized by fewer depressive symptoms, lower anxiety, and lower stress. Higher levels of eudaimonic well-being are indicated by a greater degree of vitality and self-actualization. The two general components that determine SWB are affective balance and life satisfaction, as previously mentioned. Thus, the positive correlation between mindfulness and SWB is demonstrated by significantly more positive affect, less negative affect, and greater life satisfaction (Brown et al., 2007). Research has demonstrated that mindfulness is capable of promoting a variety of different cognitive and affective indices of mental health and well-being, including SWB.

**EI and SWB.** EI has attracted a considerable amount of attention in well-being research (Koydemir, Simsek, Schutz, & Tipandjan, 2013). Similar to mindfulness, EI is capable of eliciting a variety of positive outcomes (Krishnaveni & Deepa, 2013). For
one, when compared to individuals with lower EI, individuals with higher EI are more likely to experience greater psychological well-being. Further, empirical evidence supports a connection between high EI and emotional well-being. Research additionally suggests EI is associated with mental health, psychosomatic health, and physical health. Finally, EI is affiliated with positive moods, self-esteem, stress tolerance, and life satisfaction (Krishnaveni & Deepa, 2013). The past research has demonstrated that EI is correlated with an array of positive outcomes that promote a more positive evaluation of life and greater SWB.

Although EI has been found to influence numerous positive outcomes, past research has also indicated a direct connection between EI and SWB. Individuals who possess strong emotional abilities are believed to better perceive, use, understand, and manage their emotions, resulting in greater SWB (Zhao, Kong, & Wang, 2013). Higher levels of AEI and TEI have both been found to be connected to positive outcomes, particularly indices of SWB, which includes life satisfaction and affective balance (Schutte & Malouff, 2011).

Though the connection between EI, life satisfaction, and affective balance is not completely understood, one explanation describes how people with high EI can more accurately perceive and manage emotions, resulting in lower reported levels of distress and negative affect. In addition, their capacity to perceive and regulate emotions can lead to experiencing positive affect. Previous research has drawn similar conclusions, acknowledging that adaptive emotional functioning is affiliated with experiencing pleasant emotions (Koydemir et al., 2013).
Theorists have determined that emotional abilities are integral to social competency as well, which results in more fulfilling social relationships, leading to well-being. A person who possesses emotional abilities is going to have more positive interactions and less negative interactions with their friends. Individuals reporting high levels of EI feel they have more social support and more satisfactory relationships. As a result of strong social support and strong social networks, people are able to achieve stable mental health and more positive affect (Koydemir et al., 2013). In conclusion, EI can potentially lead to more positive affective states and greater social rewards, which results in greater life satisfaction.

**Mindfulness and EI.** It is clear there is also a link between mindfulness and EI. Higher levels of mindfulness are affiliated with more adaptive emotional functioning, operationalized as EI, according to preliminary evidence (Brown & Ryan, 2003). Mindfulness meditation has been found to be beneficial in controlling emotions and is capable of enhancing EI (Chu, 2010). Further, it is understood that mindfulness practice improves one’s ability to manage emotion (Hill & Updegraff, 2012). Research has revealed that MBSR positively affects how the brain processes complex emotions when distressed, resulting in an activation shift in the prefrontal cortex, from right-sided activation to left-sided activation. A shift in this direction leads to a greater emotional balance (Kabat-Zinn, 2012). There have been recently developed psychotherapies that incorporate components of mindfulness in order to improve emotional well-being, illustrating the utilization of mindfulness for the promotion of higher emotional functioning. One intervention that integrates mindfulness, dialectical behavior therapy, has been found to decrease emotional distress, resulting in less depression, anger, and
anxiety (Hill & Updegraff, 2012). As can be seen through past research, mindfulness is capable of promoting more adaptive emotional functioning.

When examining the core components of mindfulness, one can further understand its connection to the abilities and competencies of EI. According to Brown et al. (2007), mindfulness adds clarity to experience, encourages greater sensory awareness, and promotes self-regulated functioning, characterized by continually attending to psychological, somatic, and environmental cues. In addition, mindfulness is capable of promoting the development of emotional regulation (Koole, 2009). Key mindfulness components could potentially influence the development of EI capabilities, according to Schutte & Malouff (2011). By practicing mindfulness, individuals are encouraged to more accurately and effectively perceive and regulate emotions. Further, there is a non-evaluative component of mindfulness which enables individuals to acquire a more accurate understanding of emotions in themselves and in others. One component of mindfulness addresses self-regulated functioning, which parallels emotion management, another key characteristic of EI. Finally, mindfulness can contribute to a greater awareness of current emotions, which could facilitate a critical aspect of EI, harnessing of emotions (Schutte & Malouff, 2011).

**Mindfulness, EI, and SWB.** Previous studies have examined the relationships between the three constructs of mindfulness, EI, and SWB. Research conducted by Chu (2010) investigated the beneficial effects of meditation experience on EI, perceived stress, and negative mental health by utilizing cross-sectional and experimental studies. Meditation experience was defined as having at least 20 minutes of regular daily practice of either concentrative, mindfulness or integrated meditation. There was an open-ended
single item which questioned how many years the participants had been meditating before receiving the questionnaire. EI was assessed by using the Emotional Intelligence Scale (Schutte et al., 1998), a self-report measure for assessing the various components of EI. Perceived stress was assessed by using the Perceived Stress Scale (Cohen et al., 1983), a self-report measure designed to assess the degree to which people appraise situations in their lives as stressful. Negative mental health was assessed by utilizing the General Health Questionnaire-28 Scale (Goldberg & Hillier, 1979), which is a measure that asks respondents about recently experienced symptoms or behaviors such as somatic symptoms, anxiety, insomnia, social dysfunction, and severe depression. Participants of the study completed each measure. The study involved 351 full-time working adults with varying degrees of meditation experience. It was hypothesized that differences in meditation experience would influence differences in EI, perceived stress, and negative mental health. The study revealed that participants with greater meditation experience displayed higher EI, less perceived stress, and less negative mental health than individuals who meditate less or who do not meditate. Later in the study, 20 graduate students with no meditation experience were divided into a mindfulness meditation group \((n = 10)\) and a control group \((n = 10)\). The researchers measured the students’ EI, perceived stress, and negative mental health pre-treatment and post-treatment. When assessing if meditation training improves people’s state according to these constructs, the researchers discovered that students who completed the mindfulness meditation training significantly improved their states compared to the control group.

The first part of the study carried out by Chu (2010) demonstrated that meditation experience promoted EI while also decreasing perceived stress and negative mental
health. Mindfulness is considered to be similar to other forms of meditation, since it engages the individual in regulating attention and energy. Further, mindfulness is capable of influencing and transforming the quality of an experience, as is the case with other forms of meditation (Chu, 2010). Therefore, these common characteristics could have induced greater EI and reduced perceived stress and negative mental health. The second part of the study mirrored the conclusions drawn in the first part of the study, showing that mindfulness meditation was capable of increasing EI and decreasing perceived stress and negative mental health. The present study expanded on these findings, assessing mindfulness as a trait rather than a state. In other words, the study examined the level of mindfulness individuals possess during daily activities, rather than observing the level of mindfulness that can be achieved by engaging in mindfulness meditation exercises. The study by Chu (2010) examined the influence of mindfulness on EI, perceived stress, and negative mental health simultaneously. The present study, on the other hand, investigated if mindfulness influences SWB by enhancing EI. In other words, the mediating role of EI was tested. While the Chu (2010) study observed the impact of mindfulness on stress and negative health, the present study considered its impact on two other indices of well-being, affective balance and life satisfaction. Furthermore, by incorporating trait mindfulness, rather than state mindfulness, observing alternative indices of well-being, and testing the mediating role of EI, the current study provided a greater understanding of the three constructs and how they impact each other.

Research by Wang and Kong (2014) assessed the role of EI as a mediator between mindfulness and two indicators of subjective well-being: life satisfaction and mental distress. In the study, three hundred and twenty-one participants completed a battery of
assessment measures, including the Mindful Attention Awareness Scale (Brown & Ryan, 2003), the Wong Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (Wong & Law, 2002), the Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener et al., 1985), and the General Health Questionnaire-12 (Lai and Chan, 2002). The researchers utilized a sample of Chinese adults that was divided into four different groups consisting of males, females, students, and non-students. The results revealed that EI partially mediated the impact of mindfulness on life satisfaction and mental distress. While the gender of the participant did not influence the results, it was found that non-students with high levels of mindfulness are more likely to perceive greater life satisfaction than students.

Wang and Kong’s (2014) findings support the critical role of EI in the relationship between mindfulness and positive outcomes. The present study further explored these findings by drawing from a sample based in the United States rather than China, attempting to determine if the role of EI as a mediator between mindfulness and positive outcomes is a universal phenomenon. The study assessed participants’ life satisfaction and affective balance, yet did not measure mental distress, addressing alternative well-being outcomes.

Schutte and Malouff (2011) conducted a study to determine whether EI mediates the relationship between mindfulness and SWB. The participants were required to complete measures of trait mindfulness and EI, in addition to measures of SWB, which included positive affect, negative affect, and life satisfaction. The researchers found that higher levels of mindfulness correlated with greater EI, positive affect, lower negative affect, and life satisfaction. Further, high levels of EI correlated with greater positive affect, lower negative affect, and life satisfaction. In the study, EI partially mediated the
positive relationship between mindfulness and positive affect, while EI fully mediated the inverse relationship between mindfulness and negative affect. Further, EI partially mediated the positive relationship between mindfulness and life satisfaction. The findings suggest an explanation for why mindfulness is capable of inducing positive life outcomes.

Schutte and Malouff (2011) assessed mindfulness by employing the short form of the Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory (Kohls, Sauer, & Walach, 2009; Walach, Buchheld, Buttenmuller, Kleinknecht, & Schmidt, 2006), a scale which assesses the extent to which individuals focus on the present in a non-evaluative manner. The current study assessed mindfulness by utilizing the five facet approach, determining which of the five facets of mindfulness are most predictive of EI and SWB. While the study by Schutte and Malouff (2011) demonstrates the mediating role of EI, the present study further tested this process on a mindfulness facet level, determining which facets of mindfulness are most predictive of EI and SWB, and whether EI does in fact mediate the relationship between individual mindfulness facets and SWB.

Goals of the Present Study

Both mindfulness and EI have been found to be positively correlated with SWB. In addition, higher levels of mindfulness are positively correlated with greater EI. Although the relationship between mindfulness, EI, and SWB has been established, the process in which the three variables influence each other is not completely understood. Schutte and Malouff (2011) speculate that one of the processes of mindfulness involves facilitating the growth of EI, which contributes to desirable outcomes, including
promoting SWB. It is possible that mindfulness facilitates the ability to more accurately perceive emotions and to more effectively regulate emotions in the self and in others, promoting the development of emotional abilities and competencies, resulting in greater well-being (Wang & Kong, 2014). Therefore, the present study hypothesized that mindfulness promotes the development of greater EI, and EI leads to greater SWB. In other words, EI mediates the relationship between mindfulness and SWB (Schutte & Malouff, 2011).

In relation to EI and SWB, past research, however, has only assessed overall mindfulness. The present research examined mindfulness on a facet level. The five facet model (Baer et al., 2006) has been recently developed and treats mindfulness in a comprehensive manner, more adequately capturing its complex and multidimensional nature.

The first goal of the current study was to identify which of the five facets of mindfulness is most predictive of EI and SWB. By doing so, the study can help researchers and therapists comprehend which particular facets of mindfulness increase EI and promote greater SWB. As previously stated, these facets can be interpreted as skills that can be learned. With that being said, the study revealed which mindfulness skills should be further examined by researchers and incorporated into interventions by therapists in an effort to achieve greater EI, and ultimately greater SWB. The second goal of the current study was to assess EI as a mediator of the relationship between mindfulness and SWB, strengthening the literature that has explored the relationship between the three variables. On a facet level, the study investigated whether EI acts as a mediator in the relationship between specific facets of mindfulness and SWB.
Study Questions and Hypotheses

The following were the research questions and hypotheses of the present study:

Study Question 1: What is the relationship between overall mindfulness and SWB? Which facets of mindfulness are most predictive of SWB?

Hypothesis 1: It was hypothesized that there will be a significant positive correlation between overall mindfulness and SWB. Individuals who possess greater levels of mindfulness will also possess greater SWB. Past research has demonstrated that mindfulness is capable of reducing negative mental health outcomes, in addition to various mental and physical health symptoms (Mandal, Arya, & Pandey, 2012). Further, mindfulness has also been found to increase positive mental health, positive affect, and life satisfaction (Mandal et al., 2012). Thus, mindfulness can decrease negative health indices and increase positive health indices, which could potentially increase SWB. However, empirical evidence directly supports the role of mindfulness in promoting SWB as well. When increasing one’s level of mindfulness in everyday activities through interventions, such as meditation, SWB increases (Schutte & Malouff, 2011). Previous research has illustrated there is a significant correlation between trait mindfulness and various cognitive and affective indices of mental health and well-being, which includes SWB. The various components of SWB are impacted as a result, leading to significantly more positive affect, less negative affect, and greater life satisfaction (Brown et al., 2007).

Although it is understood that mindfulness can potentially increase SWB, the current research further determined which of the five facets of mindfulness are most
critical to SWB. Past research has yet to look into which facets of mindfulness are most influential of SWB. It was hypothesized that the facets ‘non-reactivity’ and ‘acting with awareness’ would be most predictive of SWB. ‘Non-reactivity’ is an individual’s ability to refrain from reacting to inner experiences (Baer et al., 2006) and would seem to be critical to the SWB measure, affective balance. A person capable of demonstrating ‘non-reactivity’ would be less likely to become caught up or carried away by negative thoughts. Thus, they would experience less negative affect and be more affectively balanced. ‘Acting with awareness’ is one’s capacity to attend to an activity in the moment (Baer et al., 2006) and would seem to be most indicative of the other SWB measure, life satisfaction. An individual who acts with awareness would seem to have greater life satisfaction since engaged in their life, fully experiencing each event or activity in the moment.

Study Question 2: What is the relationship between overall mindfulness and EI? Which facets of mindfulness are most predictive of EI?

Hypothesis 2: It was hypothesized there will be a significant positive correlation between overall mindfulness and EI. Individuals who possess greater mindfulness will also possess greater EI. Past research indicates a positive correlation between mindfulness and EI. According to preliminary evidence, higher levels of mindfulness are associated with more adaptive emotional functioning, operationalized as EI (Brown & Ryan, 2003). Mindfulness meditation is capable of influencing one’s ability to control their emotions, promoting EI (Chu, 2010). Practicing mindfulness improves emotion regulation, which parallels the EI ability, managing emotion (Hill & Updegraff, 2012). MBSR positively impacts how the brain processes complex emotions when under stress,
which results in an activation shift in the prefrontal cortex from the right side to the left side, promoting emotional balance (Kabat-Zinn, 2012). In conclusion, past literature has revealed that mindfulness can positively impact EI and its affiliated components.

While it is known that mindfulness is capable of promoting EI, the present study dug deeper into the relationship between the two variables, determining which of the five facets of mindfulness are most influential of EI. It is apparent that each of the five facets of mindfulness could influence the development of various abilities and competencies related to EI. Past research has not investigated which facets of mindfulness are most critical to this development, however. Upon exploring the five facets of mindfulness, one can better see how the mindfulness facets can initiate the development of EI components.

Salovey and Mayer (1990) explained that mindfulness and EI are similar in that both emphasize people’s abilities to perceive, understand, and regulate their thoughts and emotions. Through the mindfulness facets of ‘observing’ and ‘acting with awareness’, individuals experience greater clarity in their day to day experiences. They are more aware of their internal and external experiences in the present moment and act with full attention and presence (Baer et al., 2006). Both facets promote greater sensory awareness and self-regulated functioning, which increases attention to psychological, somatic, and environmental cues (Schutte & Malouff, 2011). When observing and acting with awareness more adequately, individuals could more accurately and effectively perceive and manage their emotions. The mindfulness facet, “being “nonjudgmental” could enable individuals to acquire a more accurate understanding of emotions in themselves and in others (Schutte & Malouff, 2011), as they do not judge their thoughts and feelings as bad or criticize themselves for having negative thoughts and feelings (Baer et al.,
The mindfulness facet, “nonreactivity”, involves the capacity to be aware of thoughts and feelings without acting on them or becoming entangled with them (Baer et al., 2006). This particular facet could further enhance self-regulated functioning (Schutte & Malouff, 2011) and parallels the EI competency, “managing emotion”. Finally, the mindfulness facet ‘describing’ promotes an awareness of current emotions through an individual’s ability to identify and describe thoughts, feelings, and sensations. He/she is articulating inner experiences into words (Baer et al., 2006). This could facilitate the EI competency, “harnessing of emotions” (Schutte & Malouff, 2011). As can be seen, each of the five facets of mindfulness could potentially result in the development of various abilities and competencies related to EI. However, research has not explored yet which particular facets of mindfulness are most predictive of EI.

Study Question 3: What is the relationship between EI and SWB?

Hypothesis 3: It was hypothesized that there will be a significant positive correlation between EI and SWB. More specifically, it was predicted that there will be a positive correlation between EI and life satisfaction, as well as between EI and positive affect. On the other hand, it was expected that EI will be inversely correlated with negative affect. High levels of EI have been connected to greater psychological and emotional well-being, and have been affiliated with mental health, psychosomatic health, and physical health. Further, past research has drawn a link between EI and positive moods, self-esteem, stress tolerance, and life satisfaction (Krishnaveni & Deepa, 2013). Such positive outcomes could move a person to evaluate their life in a more positive light, increasing their SWB. In addition, research has found a direct connection between EI and SWB. People with strong emotional competences are understood to better
perceive, use, understand, and manage their emotions, which leads to greater SWB. Both AEI and TEI have been found to be associated with numerous positive outcomes, especially SWB indices, including life satisfaction and affective balance (Schutte & Malouff, 2011).

Study Question 4: Does EI mediate the relationship between overall mindfulness and SWB? Does EI mediate the relationship between a specific facet of mindfulness and SWB?

Hypothesis 4: It was hypothesized EI will mediate the relationship between overall mindfulness and SWB. Mindfulness will foster greater EI, which will promote greater SWB. Both mindfulness and EI have been shown to be positively correlated with SWB. Further, higher levels of mindfulness are associated with greater EI. Schutte and Malouff (2011) speculate that mindfulness fosters the growth of EI, which leads to the desirable outcomes that occur. It has been proposed that mindfulness enables individuals to more accurately perceive emotions and to more effectively regulate emotions in themselves and in others, leading to the development of EI, which results in greater well-being (Wang & Kong, 2014). Thus, it has been suggested that mindfulness promotes the development of greater EI, and EI leads to greater SWB. In other words, EI mediates the relationship between mindfulness and SWB (Schutte & Malouff, 2011). Upon determining which of the five facets of mindfulness are most predictive of EI and SWB, the study further investigated the mediation process by testing if EI mediates the relationship between such facets and SWB.
Method

Participants

The present study involved one-hundred and thirty-five Eastern Illinois University students enrolled in undergraduate psychology courses during the Spring 2015 and Summer 2015 semesters. However, seven participants were excluded from the study for failing to complete the items on the online packet of questionnaires. Five more participants were excluded from the study for either completing the study too quickly (taking less than five minutes) or taking too much time (finishing in over an hour). Most participants took around 10 to 30 minutes to finish. No participants were removed as outliers upon utilizing the box-plot approach, or when using standardized residuals, Mahalanobis distances, and Cook’s distances. All of the proposed analyses involved conducting multiple regressions with a maximum number of five predictors. To perform these multiple regressions tests with a desired power of .95 and an anticipated medium effect size at an alpha level of .05, at least 138 students were needed. Though the desired number of participants was not collected for the study, the final sample size of 123 students was close to the goal.

Of the participants included in the study, 39 were male (31.7%), while 84 were female (68.3%). The ages of the students ranged from 18 to 60 (\( M = 24.23, Mdn. = 21.00 \)). In regard to their ethnicity, 96 were White/Caucasian (78.0%), 22 were Black/African American (17.9%), 4 were Hispanic (3.3%), and 1 was Multi-ethnic (0.8%). When considering the participants’ year in school, 31 were freshman (25.2%), 16 were sophomores (13.0%), 22 were juniors (17.9%), 53 were seniors (43.1%), and 1 was a graduate student (0.8%).
Procedure

Participants completed the FFMQ, The Assessing Emotions Scale, The PANAS, and The Satisfaction with Life Scale online, through Qualtrics, an online survey system. The participants were initially given a statement of informed consent, followed by a demographic questionnaire. After being presented with the statement of informed consent and the demographic questionnaire, the participants completed a battery of measures comprised of the previously mentioned scales. In order to control for order effects, the scales were counterbalanced. Upon completing the battery of measures, the participants were debriefed and thanked for their participation in the study.

Materials

The Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire (FFMQ). Mindfulness was assessed using the FFMQ, a scale designed by Baer et al. (2006). The questionnaire includes 39 items which address the five facets of mindfulness: ‘observing’, ‘describing’, ‘acting with awareness’, “being nonjudgmental”, and “nonreactivity”. An example of an ‘observing’ item would be, “I notice how foods and drinks affect my thoughts, bodily sensations, and emotions”. The statement, “I find it difficult to stay focused on what’s happening in the present”, is an example of an ‘acting with awareness’ item. An example of the facet, ‘describing’, would be “I can easily put my beliefs, opinions, and expectations into words”. One of the ‘non-judging’ facet items states “I tell myself that I should not be feeling the way I’m feeling”. Finally, an example of the ‘non-reactivity’ facet would be “In difficult situations, I can pause without immediately reacting”. The items are scored on a Likert scale, ranging from 1 (never or very rarely true) to 5 (very often or always true). Research has demonstrated that the FFMQ has good internal
consistency, with alpha coefficients ranging from .75 to .91. Alpha coefficients for each of the facets are as follows: non-reactivity = .75, observing = .83, acting with awareness = .87, describing = .91, and non-judging = .87. All five facet scales demonstrate adequate to good internal consistency. For the purposes of the present study, mindfulness was measured as a one-dimensional and multi-dimensional construct. For each participant, an overall mindfulness score was obtained in addition to individual facet scores. Overall scores range from 39-195, with higher scores on the FFMQ suggesting higher levels of overall mindfulness. Each individual facet is represented by either seven or eight items, with scores ranging from 7-35 or 8-40. See Appendix B for the full scale.

**The Assessing Emotions Scale.** The Assessing Emotions Scale was developed by Schutte et al. (1998, 2009) and is used to measure TEI. More specifically, the scale assesses how effectively participants perceive, manage, regulate, and harness emotions in themselves and in others. One of the “perception of emotion” items includes, “I am aware of my emotions as I experience them”. An example of a “managing own emotions” item would be, “When I am faced with obstacles, I remember times I faced similar obstacles and overcame them”. A “managing others’ emotions” item example is “I know when to speak about my personal problems to others”. Finally, an example of a “harnessing emotion” item is “Some of the major events of my life have led me to re-evaluate what is important and not important”. The measure contains 33 items and utilizes a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Total TEI is calculated by reverse coding items 5, 28, and 33, and then obtaining the sum of all items. Scores can range from 33 to 165, with higher scores suggesting greater TEI. There are 10 “perception of emotion” items, 9 “managing own emotions” items, 8
“managing others’ emotions” items, and 6 “utilization of emotion” items, with scores ranging from 10-50, 9-45, 8-40, and 6-30, respectively. Each of the 33 items represents one of the EI competencies. Past research has shown that the scale has good internal consistency, with alpha coefficients between 0.87 and 0.90. Drawing on responses from adolescents and university students respectively, reported internal consistency for subscales were as follows: Perception of Emotion, .76, .80; Managing Own Emotions, .63, .78; Managing Others’ Emotions, .66, .66; and Utilization of Emotion, .55. Further, the scale has been found to have a two-week test-retest reliability of 0.78. Additionally, there is evidence that the measure has construct validity due to its association with related constructs, including other measures of emotional intelligence. See Appendix C for the full scale.

The Positive and Negative Affect Scales (PANAS). The PANAS is a 20-item measure of an individual’s level of positive and negative affect, developed by Watson, Clark, & Tellegen (1988). The measure utilizes a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely). There are 10 positive affect items, which include “interested,” “alert,” and “attentive,” and 10 negative affect items, which include “hostile,” “guilty,” and “upset.” Participants received separate scores for positive and negative affect, ranging from 10 to 50. Higher scores suggest greater positive or negative affect. Internal consistency has been shown to be good for positive affect items (α = .88) and negative affect items (α = .87). See Appendix D for the full scale.

The Satisfaction with Life Scale. The Satisfaction with Life scale is a 5-item measure of global life satisfaction developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin (1985). Participants report their level of agreement with the statements using a 7-point
Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The scale includes statements such as “In most ways my life is close to my ideal” and “The conditions of my life are excellent”. High scores suggest higher levels of life satisfaction, with scores ranging from 5 to 35. Past research shows that the internal consistency of the scale is good, ranging from 0.82 to 0.87. Further, the scale showed evidence of construct validity through associations with theoretically related constructs, including other aspects of subjective well-being. See Appendix E for the full scale.

Results

Internal Consistency Analyses of the Measures

Prior to conducting the analyses, Cronbach’s alphas were obtained for each measure. In regard to the FFMQ, the internal consistency for the individual mindfulness facets, ‘observing’, ‘describing’, ‘acting with awareness’, and ‘non-judging’, were found to be good, while the individual mindfulness facet, ‘non-reactivity’, was found to be acceptable. Further, overall mindfulness had good internal consistency. The Assessing Emotions Scale, the PANAS’ positive and negative affect scales, and The Satisfaction with Life Scale were additionally had good internal consistency.
Table 1

Internal Consistency of the Measures \((N = 123)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFMQ - Observing</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFMQ - Describing</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFMQ - Acting with awareness</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFMQ - Non-judging</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFMQ - Non-reactivity</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFMQ - Overall Mindfulness</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Assessing Emotions Scale</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS - Positive Affect</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS – Negative Affect</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Satisfaction with Life Scale</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Cronbach's alphas for 'observing', 'acting with awareness', and 'non-judging' were .80, .85, and .86, respectively. These were similar to the good internal consistency values obtained by Baer et al. (2006) when constructing the scale, which were .83, .87, and .87. The mindfulness facet, 'non-reactivity' had a Cronbach's alpha of .74, resembling the acceptable internal consistency value found by Baer et al. (2006), which was .75. However, the mindfulness facet, 'describing', had a Cronbach's alpha of .82, which is weaker than the excellent internal consistency value found by Baer et al. (2006), which was .91. The internal consistency for overall mindfulness was .87, which falls between the FFMQ's range of alpha coefficients established by Baer et al. (2006),
spanning from .75 to .91. The Assessing Emotions Scale had an internal consistency of .89, which matches past research conducted by Schutte et al. (1998, 2009), who showed that the scale has good internal consistency, with alpha coefficients ranging from .87 to .90. The positive affect measure on the PANAS had a Cronbach’s alpha of .86, whereas the negative affect measure had a value of .85. Similarly, when developing the PANAS, Watson, Clark, & Tellegen (1988) found both positive affect (α = .88) and negative affect (α = .87) items to demonstrate good internal consistency. Finally, the Cronbach’s alpha of The Satisfaction with Life Scale was .87, which resembles the good internal consistency obtained in past research, which suggested Cronbach’s alpha ranged from 0.82 to 0.87 (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985).

**Descriptive Statistics**

Mindfulness was scored as both a one-dimensional construct and multi-dimensional construct, through the administration of the FFMQ. Thus, both overall mindfulness and individual facets of mindfulness were measured. Affective balance, which was measured by the PANAS, was divided into positive and negative affect subscales. EI and satisfaction with life, on the other hand, were scored only as one-dimensional constructs, using The Assessing Emotions Scale and The Satisfaction with Life Scale, respectively. Mean scores and standard deviations of each measure are found in Table 2.
Table 2
Means and Standardized Deviations (N = 123)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Possible Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFMQ - Observing</td>
<td>26.83</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>8 - 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFMQ - Describing</td>
<td>27.46</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>8 - 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFMQ - Acting with Awareness</td>
<td>23.86</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>8 - 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFMQ - Non-judging</td>
<td>24.68</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>8 - 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFMQ - Non-reactivity</td>
<td>22.08</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>7 - 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFMQ - Overall mindfulness</td>
<td>124.92</td>
<td>15.58</td>
<td>39 - 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Assessing Emotions Scale</td>
<td>123.55</td>
<td>14.27</td>
<td>33 - 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS - Positive Affect</td>
<td>35.93</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>10 - 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANAS - Negative Affect</td>
<td>22.62</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>10 - 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Satisfaction with Life Scale</td>
<td>23.82</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>5 - 35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores on each of the facet scales of the FFMQ, which included observing (M = 26.83, SD = 5.26), describing (M = 27.46, SD = 5.12), acting with awareness (M = 23.86, SD = 5.28), non-judging (M = 24.68, SD = 5.88), and non-reactivity (M = 22.08, SD = 3.85), resembled those found by Williams, Dalgleish, Karl, and Kuyken (2014) in community and clinical samples (Observing: M = 26.47, SD = 5.29; Describing: M = 26.43, SD = 6.60; Acting with Awareness: M = 23.64, SD = 5.95; Non-judging: M = 23.62, SD = 7.38; Non-reactivity: M = 20.35, SD = 4.73). Each of the facet scale mean
scores in the present study were markedly above the mid-point, indicating that the students reported demonstrating a more mindful state of being in each of the five facet areas.

In a study that utilized a similar sample of Eastern Illinois University students, Lafferty (2013) obtained overall mindfulness scores on the FFMQ (M = 125.69, SD = 16.95) that resembled those found in the present study (M = 124.92, SD = 15.58). Similarly, Creamean (2012) utilized Eastern Illinois University students for his study, obtaining comparable overall mindfulness scores when administering the FFMQ (M = 123.17, SD = 16.53). The participants in the present study scored above the scale’s midpoint for overall mindfulness, signifying that they reported their thinking and behavior to generally reflect a more mindful state.

Upon gathering data from responses to The Assessing Emotions Scale, participants scores (M = 123.55, SD = 14.27) mirrored those found by Brackett and Mayer (2003) (M = 123.42, SD = 14.52), who collected data from a similar sample, as their study involved University of New Hampshire students. Since the mean score in the present study is well above the midpoint (99), participants generally agreed with many of the statements included on the scale, believing themselves to possess emotional intelligence.

Participants’ scores on the PANAS, which measured positive affect (M = 35.93) and negative affect (M = 22.62), were similar to those found by Deku (2012), who also measured positive affect (M = 36.50) and negative affect (M = 21.90) in Eastern Illinois University students. Such scores were above the scale’s mid-point for positive affect
(30), yet below the mid-point for negative affect (30), signifying more prominent affective states. Watson (1988) determined that the normal population will report a mean positive affect score of 29.7 and a mean negative affect score of 14.8. Thus, when comparing the present study participants’ mean score to Watson’s estimations, they appear to be higher in regard to both positive and negative affect.

Scores from The Satisfaction with Life Scale in the present research ($M = 23.82, SD = 6.35$) were similar to the scores found in the Whisman and Judd (2015) study when utilizing an American adult sample ($M = 24.58, SD = 6.37$). If the mean of participants’ life satisfaction scores in the present study was equal to 20, this would have indicated that the students were neither satisfied nor unsatisfied with their lives. However, the mean score was greater than 20, indicating that students were generally more satisfied with their lives.

**Correlations between Mindfulness, EI, and SWB**

Prior to investigating whether EI mediates the relationship between mindfulness and SWB, correlations between the variables were observed. Many of the correlations were found to be highly significant. See Table 3 below.
### Table 3

**Correlations between Variables (N = 123)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>AWA</th>
<th>NJ</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>Overall Mindfulness</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>LS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observing</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describing</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting with Awareness</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-judging</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reactivity</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mindfulness</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive affect</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative affect</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01

Among the subjective well-being constructs, overall mindfulness was positively correlated with positive affect and life satisfaction, and negatively correlated with negative affect, as was expected. Overall mindfulness was additionally found to be positively correlated with EI, as was predicted. Similarly, the individual facets were positively correlated with positive affect and life satisfaction, and negatively correlated with negative affect. Further, each mindfulness facet was positively correlated with EI. When examining the correlations between EI and the SWB components, EI was
positively correlated with positive affect and life satisfaction, and negatively correlated with negative affect, as was also predicted. Therefore, greater overall mindfulness and individual facet mindfulness were affiliated with greater EI, and greater EI was associated with greater positive affect and life satisfaction, and lower negative affect. These initial findings lay the foundation for the subsequently conducted tests of mediation. It can also be noted that the SWB components of positive affect, negative affect, and life satisfaction were significantly correlated with one another in the anticipated directions (See Table 3 above).

**Relationship between Mindfulness and SWB (Study Question 1)**

What is the relationship between overall mindfulness and SWB? As was previously indicated, overall mindfulness was positively correlated with positive affect and life satisfaction, and negatively correlated with negative affect. Which facets of mindfulness are most predictive of SWB? To explore this question, multiple regressions were conducted, with five facets as predictors and the three SWB components as criterion variables.

In reference to positive affect, results of the multiple regression indicate that only the facets, ‘describing’ and ‘non-reactivity’ were predictive. Though the mindfulness facet, ‘observing’, was associated with positive affect in the correlations presented in Table 3, it was not found to be predictive in this multiple regression. In other words, ‘observing’ did not uniquely predict positive affect or have a unique contribution to this particular SWB component, as did ‘describing’ and ‘non-reactivity’ (see Table 4).
Table 4

Summary of the Multiple Regression Analysis for the Five Mindfulness Facets Predicting Positive Affect (N = 123)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observing</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describing</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.29 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting with Awareness</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-judging</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reactivity</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.26 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R^2 = .20$; adjusted $R^2 = .16$;  
**$p < .01$

When predicting negative affect, results of the multiple regression indicated that only ‘non-judging’ and ‘non-reactivity’ were predictive. Though ‘describing’ and acting with awareness were also predictive when considering the correlations (Table 3), they were not uniquely predictive of negative affect in the multiple regression (see Table 5).
Table 5

*Summary of the Multiple Regression Analysis for the Five Mindfulness Facets Predicting Negative Affect (N = 123)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observing</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describing</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting with Awareness</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-judging</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.36 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reactivity</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.28 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $R^2 = .29$; adjusted $R^2 = .26$,

***$p < .001$***

Finally, in the multiple regression that involved the five facets and life satisfaction, only ‘describing’ was predictive. The facets, ‘acting with awareness’, ‘non-judging’, and ‘non-reactivity’ were associated with life satisfaction according to the correlation results (Table 3), yet did not uniquely contribute in predicting life satisfaction in the multiple regression (see Table 6).
Table 6

Summary of the Multiple Regression Analysis for the Five Mindfulness Facets Predicting Life Satisfaction (N = 123)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observing</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describing</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.19  *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting with Awareness</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-judging</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reactivity</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R^2 = .16$; adjusted $R^2 = .12$.

* $p < .05$

Relationship between Mindfulness and EI (Study Question 2)

What is the relationship between overall mindfulness and EI? As was previously reported, overall mindfulness was found to be positively correlated with EI. Which facets of mindfulness are most predictive of EI? A multiple regression was conducted with the five facets as predictors and EI as the criterion variable. Results showed that only ‘describing’ and ‘non-reactivity’ were uniquely predictive of EI. Although ‘observing’ was also predictive in the correlations, it did not have unique predictive value (see Table 7).
Table 7

Summary of the Multiple Regression Analysis for the Five Mindfulness Facets Predicting Emotional Intelligence (N = 123)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observing</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describing</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.36 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting with Awareness</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-judging</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reactivity</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.35 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R^2 = .40$; adjusted $R^2 = .38$.

*** $p < .001$

Relationship between EI and SWB (Study Question 3)

What is the relationship between EI and SWB? As shown in Table 3, correlations between EI and each of the three SWB variables indicated that EI was positively correlated with positive affect and life satisfaction, and negatively correlated with negative affect.
Emotional Intelligence as a Mediator in the Relationship between Overall Mindfulness and Positive Affect (Study Question 4)

Does EI mediate the relationship between overall mindfulness and SWB, particularly in regard to positive affect? Step 1 of the Baron and Kenny (2014) procedure for testing mediation requires that the proposed causal variable (overall mindfulness) be correlated with the outcome variable (positive affect). The study demonstrated that as overall mindfulness levels increased, positive affect increased as well, $\beta = .35, p < .001$. Step 2 tested to see if there was a correlation between the proposed causal variable and the potential mediator (EI). It was found that as overall mindfulness levels increased, EI increased also, $\beta = .51, p < .001$. Step 3 explored whether there was a correlation between the potential mediator and the outcome variable, while controlling for the causal variable. Step 4 of the Baron and Kenny (2014) procedure is the final step, testing whether the relationship between the causal variable and the outcome variable is zero, while controlling for the potential mediator. According to the more recent Baron and Kenny (2014) test of mediation guidelines, if is the beta value at Step 4 is zero, mediation is deemed complete or full. If it is not zero, it is a partial mediation. The results demonstrate that the relationship between overall mindfulness and positive affect, while controlling for EI, was not significant, $\beta = .10, p > .05$ (see Table 8). EI partially mediated the relationship between overall mindfulness and positive affect, as beta was not zero (See Figure 1 below). When considering the amount of mediation that took place, $\beta_{\text{Indirect Effect}} = .25$. According to a Sobel's test, this partially mediated effect was statistically significant ($z = 6.12, p < .001$).
Table 8

Summary of the Multiple Regression Analysis for Overall Mindfulness and Emotional Intelligence Predicting Positive Affect (N = 123)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mindfulness</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.50**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R^2 = .30$; adjusted $R^2 = .29$,

**$p < .001$

\[
\beta_{\text{total effect}} = .35**
\]
\[
\beta_{\text{direct effect}} = .10
\]
\[
\beta_{\text{indirect effect}} = .25**
\]

Figure 1. Relationship between Overall Mindfulness and Positive Affect as partially mediated by Emotional Intelligence.

** $p < .001$
Emotional Intelligence as a Mediator in the Relationship between Overall Mindfulness and Negative Affect (Study Question 4)

Does EI mediate the relationship between overall mindfulness negative affect?

Step 1 of the Baron and Kenny (2014) mediation demonstrated that when overall mindfulness increased, negative affect decreased, $\beta = -.44, p < .001$. Step 2 showed that as overall mindfulness levels increased, EI increased also, $\beta = .51, p < .001$. Step 3 indicated that the negative correlation between EI and negative affect, while controlling for overall mindfulness, was statistically significant, $\beta = -.27, p < .01$ (See Table 9 below). Step 4 was the final step, testing whether the relationship between the causal variable and the outcome variable was zero, while controlling for the potential mediator. The results demonstrated that the relationship between overall mindfulness and negative affect, while controlling for EI, was significant, $\beta = -.30, p = .001$. As beta was not zero, EI partially mediated the relationship between overall mindfulness and negative affect (See Figure 2 below). When looking at the amount of mediation that took place, $\beta_{Indirect Effect} = -.14$. According to Sobel’s test, this partially mediated effect was statistically significant ($z = -4.65, p < .001$).
Table 9

Summary of the Multiple Regression Analysis for Overall Mindfulness and Emotional Intelligence Predicting Negative Affect (N = 123)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mindfulness</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R^2 = .25$; adjusted $R^2 = .24$, $p < .01$

$\beta_{\text{Total Effect}} = -.44^{**}$

$\beta_{\text{Direct Effect}} = -.30^*$

$\beta_{\text{Indirect Effect}} = -.14^{**}$

Figure 2. Relationship between Overall Mindfulness and Negative Affect as partially mediated by Emotional Intelligence.

* $p < .01$, ** $p < .001$
Emotional Intelligence as a Mediator in the Relationship between Overall Mindfulness and Life Satisfaction (Study Question 4)

Does EI mediate the relationship between overall mindfulness and life satisfaction? Step 1 of the Baron and Kenny (2014) test for mediation revealed that when overall mindfulness increased, life satisfaction increased as well, $\beta = .37$, $p < .001$. Step 2 showed that as overall mindfulness levels increased, EI increased also, $\beta = .51$, $p < .001$. Step 3 indicated that there was a statistically significant positive correlation between EI and life satisfaction, while controlling for overall mindfulness, $\beta = .28$, $p < .01$ (See Table 10 below). Step 4 results showed that the relationship between overall mindfulness and life satisfaction, while controlling for EI, was significant, $\beta = .22$, $p < .05$. Beta was not zero. Therefore, EI partially mediated the relationship between overall mindfulness and life satisfaction (See Figure 3 below). Upon observing the amount of mediation that took place, $\beta_{Indirect \, Effect} = .15$. According to Sobel’s test, this partially mediated effect was statistically significant ($z = 4.90$, $p < .001$).
Table 10

Summary of the Multiple Regression Analysis for Overall Mindfulness and Emotional Intelligence Predicting Life Satisfaction (N = 123)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mindfulness</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.28**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. R² = .19; adjusted R² = .18,
*p < .05, **p < .01

\[ \beta_{\text{Total Effect}} = .37^{***} \]
\[ \beta_{\text{Direct Effect}} = .22^{*} \]
\[ \beta_{\text{Indirect Effect}} = .15^{***} \]

![Diagram showing the relationship between Overall Mindfulness and Life Satisfaction as partially mediated by Emotional Intelligence.]

* \( p < .05, \) ** \( p < .01, \) *** \( p < .001 \)

Figure 3. Relationship between Overall Mindfulness and Life Satisfaction as partially mediated by Emotional Intelligence.
Emotional Intelligence as a Mediator in the Relationship between Individual Mindfulness Facets and Positive Affect (Study Question 4)

Does EI mediate the relationship between individual mindfulness facets and SWB, particularly in regard to positive affect? In the previously presented multiple regressions for Study Question 1, only ‘describing’ and ‘non-reactivity’ uniquely predicted positive affect. Similarly, only ‘describing’ and ‘non-reactivity’ uniquely predicted EI. Thus, tests of mediation were conducted using only these two facets.

Emotional Intelligence as a mediator in the relationship between ‘Describing’ and Positive Affect. Step 1 of the Baron and Kenny (2014) procedure indicated that the facet, ‘describing’ ($\beta = .35, p < .001$) was predictive of positive affect. Step 2 revealed that as the levels of ‘describing’ increased, EI increased also, $\beta = .46, p < .001$. Step 3 indicated that the relationship between EI and positive affect, while controlling for ‘describing’ was significant, $\beta = .49, p < .001$ (See Table 11 below). Step 4 showed that the correlation between ‘describing’ and positive affect, while controlling for EI, was no longer significant, $\beta = .12, p > .05$. As beta does not equal zero, EI only partially mediated the relationship between the mindfulness facet, ‘describing’, and positive affect (See Figure 4 below). Upon observing the amount of mediation that took place, $\beta_{\text{indirect effect}} = .23$ for ‘describing’. According to Sobel’s test, this partially mediated effect was statistically significant ($z = 2.03, p < .05$).
Table 11

Summary of the Multiple Regression Analysis for ‘Describing’ and Emotional Intelligence Predicting Positive Affect (N = 123)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describing</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.49**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R^2 = .31$; adjusted $R^2 = .30$

**$p < .001$

$\beta_{\text{Total Effect}} = .35^{**}$

$\beta_{\text{Direct Effect}} = .12$

$\beta_{\text{Indirect Effect}} = .23^*$

Figure 4. Relationship between ‘Describing’, and Positive Affect as partially mediated by Emotional Intelligence.

*$p < .05$, **$p < .001$
Emotional Intelligence as a mediator in the relationship between 'Non-reactivity' and Positive Affect. Step 1 of the Baron and Kenny (2014) procedure determined that the proposed causal variable, ‘non-reactivity’, was correlated with the outcome variable, positive affect ($\beta = .34, p < .001$). Step 2 showed that as the levels of ‘non-reactivity’ increased, EI increased as well, $\beta = .49, p < .001$. Step 3 indicated that the relationship between EI and positive affect, while controlling for ‘non-reactivity’, was significant, $\beta = .23, p < .001$ (See Table 12 below). Step 4 demonstrated that the correlation between ‘non-reactivity’ and positive affect, while controlling for EI, was no longer significant, $\beta = .09, p > .05$. As beta did not equal zero, EI only partially mediated the relationship between the mindfulness facet, ‘non-reactivity’, and positive affect (See Figure 5 below). Upon observing the amount of mediation that took place, $\beta_{\text{Indirect Effect}} = .25$ for ‘non-reactivity’. According to Sobel’s test, this partially mediated effect was statistically significant for ‘non-reactivity’ ($z = 1.66, p < .05$).

Table 12

Summary of the Multiple Regression Analysis Non-reactivity and Emotional Intelligence Predicting Positive Affect ($N = 123$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-reactivity</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.50**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R^2 = .30$; adjusted $R^2 = .29$,

**$p < .001$**
\[ \beta_{\text{Total Effect}} = .34^{**} \]
\[ \beta_{\text{Direct Effect}} = .09 \]
\[ \beta_{\text{Indirect Effect}} = .25^{*} \]

**Figure 5.** Relationship between ‘Non-reactivity’, and Positive Affect as partially mediated by Emotional Intelligence.

\[ \beta = .49^{**} \]
\[ \beta = .50^{**} \]

*\( p < .05 \), **\( p < .001 \)

**Emotional Intelligence as a Mediator in the Relationship between Individual Mindfulness Facets and Negative Affect (Study Question 4)**

Does EI mediate the relationship between individual mindfulness facets and SWB, specifically in regard to negative affect? In the previously presented multiple regressions for Study Question 1, only the mindfulness facets, ‘acting with awareness’ and ‘non-reactivity’, uniquely predicted negative affect. Only the facets, ‘describing’ and ‘non-reactivity’, uniquely predicted EI. However, of these facets, only ‘non-reactivity’ was uniquely predictive of both negative affect and EI. Thus, a test of mediation was carried out using the facet, ‘non-reactivity’.
Emotional Intelligence as a mediator in the relationship between 'Non-reactivity' and Negative Affect. Step 1 of the Baron and Kenny (2014) mediation test confirmed that 'non-reactivity' was correlated with the outcome variable of negative affect. When 'non-reactivity' increased, negative affect decreased, $\beta = -.34, p < .001$. Step 2 showed that as 'non-reactivity' increased, EI increased as well, $\beta = .49, p < .001$. Step 3 indicated that the negatively correlated relationship between EI and negative affect, while controlling for 'non-reactivity', was statistically significant, $\beta = -.33, p < .001$ (See Table 13 below). Step 4 revealed that the relationship between 'non-reactivity' and negative affect, while controlling for EI, was no longer significant, $\beta = -.18, p > .05$. As the beta value was not zero, the mediation is partial (See Figure 6 below). If considering the degree of mediation that took place, $\beta_{\text{Indirect Effect}} = -.13$. According to Sobel's test, this partially mediated effect was statistically significant, $z = -1.64, p < .05$ (one-tailed).
### Table 13

*Summary of the Multiple Regression Analysis for Non-reactivity’ and Emotional Intelligence Predicting Negative Affect (N = 123)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-reactivity</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.34*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. \( R^2 = .20 \); adjusted \( R^2 = .19 \),

\[ \beta_{\text{Total Effect}} = -.31^{**} \]

\[ \beta_{\text{Direct Effect}} = -.18 \]

\[ \beta_{\text{Indirect Effect}} = -.13^{*} \]

*\( p < .001 \)

---

**Figure 6.** Relationship between ‘Non-reactivity’ and Negative Affect as partially mediated by Emotional Intelligence.

\*\( p < .05 \), \**\( p < .001 \)
Emotional Intelligence as a Mediator in the Relationship between Individual Mindfulness Facets and Life Satisfaction (Study Question 4)

Does EI mediate the relationship between individual mindfulness facets and life satisfaction? As was seen in the multiple regressions (Study Question 1), only 'describing' uniquely predicted life satisfaction. Similarly, only 'describing' uniquely predicted EI. Since 'describing' was uniquely predictive of both life satisfaction and EI, a test of mediation was conducted using this facet.

Emotional Intelligence as a mediator in the relationship between 'Describing' and Life Satisfaction. Step 1 of the Baron and Kenny (2014) mediation test demonstrated that when 'describing' increased, life satisfaction additionally increased, \( \beta = .30, p = .001 \). Step 2 found that as 'describing' increased, EI increased as well, \( \beta = .46, p < .001 \). Step 3 showed that the positive correlation between EI and life satisfaction, while controlling for 'describing', was statistically significant, \( \beta = .33, p = .001 \) (See Table 14 below). Step 4 indicated that the correlation between 'describing' and life satisfaction, while controlling for EI, was no longer significant, \( \beta = .15, p > .05 \). This is a partial mediation, as the beta value does not equal zero (See Figure 7 below). If considering the degree of mediation that took place, \( \beta_{\text{Indirect Effect}} = .15 \). According to Sobel's test, this partially mediated effect was statistically significant, \( z = 1.99, p < .05 \) (one-tailed).
Table 14

Summary of the Multiple Regression Analysis for ‘Describing’ and Emotional Intelligence Predicting Life Satisfaction (N = 123)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describing</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R^2 = .18$; adjusted $R^2 = .16$

*p = .001

$\beta_{total \ effect} = .30^{**}$

$\beta_{direct \ effect} = .15$

$\beta_{indirect \ effect} = .15^{*}$

*Figure 7. Relationship between ‘Describing’ and Life Satisfaction as partially mediated by Emotional Intelligence.

* $p < .05$, ** $p = .001$, *** $p < .001$
Discussion

The present research investigated emotional intelligence as a potential mediator in the relationship between mindfulness and three components of subjective well-being, which included positive affect, negative affect, and life satisfaction. Previously conducted correlational and causal research has demonstrated that practicing mindfulness decreases negative health indices (Bazzano et al., 2013; Mandal et al., 2012) and promoting positive health indices (Mandal et al., 2012). More specifically, mindfulness has been found to enhance SWB, as supported by experimental evidence (Schutte & Malouff, 2011) and correlational studies (Brown et al., 2007), signifying an increase in positive affect and life satisfaction, and a decrease in negative affect. EI has additionally been found to elicit a variety of positive health outcomes, according to experimental and correlational evidence (Krishnaveni & Deepa, 2013). In fact, past research has indicated a direct connection between EI and SWB (Zhao et al., 2013), resulting in greater affective balance and life satisfaction (Koydemir et al., 2013; Schutte & Malouff, 2011). A link between mindfulness and EI has also been observed in previous studies as well, through experimental (Chu, 2010; Hill & Updegraff, 2012, Kabat-Zinn, 2012) and correlational research (Broan & Ryan, 2003), as key mindfulness components can potentially facilitate the development of EI capabilities (Koole, 2009; Schutte & Malouff, 2011).

The previously examined relationships between mindfulness, EI, and SWB have opened up the door for studies that investigate whether EI is a mechanism of action through which mindfulness influences SWB. Could mindfulness foster an increase in EI, which, in turn, could positively influence SWB, promoting positive affect and life satisfaction, and reducing negative affect? Further, could particular facets of mindfulness
induce this phenomenon more significantly than others? It was hypothesized that EI would mediate the relationship between overall mindfulness and SWB components. In addition, it was hypothesized that EI would mediate the relationship between individual facets of mindfulness and SWB components, though it was difficult to predict which facets would be most predictive, as each one is capable of enhancing EI competencies.

Results of the present study revealed that EI partially mediated the relationship between overall mindfulness each of three SWB components of life satisfaction, positive affect, and negative affect. When examining the individual mindfulness facets, EI partially mediated the relationship between ‘describing’ and life satisfaction, in addition to positive affect. EI partially mediated the relationship between ‘non-reactivity’ and positive affect as well as negative affect.

The present study is the third to date to establish EI as playing a mediating role in the impact of mindfulness on SWB components. It goes beyond the research conducted by Schutte and Malouff (2011) and Wang and Kong (2014), however, when it treated mindfulness according to the five facet model. Similar to the research conducted by Schutte and Malouff (2011), the present study concluded that EI mediates the relationship between overall mindfulness and positive affect, negative affect, and life satisfaction. The present study found a partial mediation between overall mindfulness and negative affect, rather than a full mediation. However, the present study found a partial mediation between overall mindfulness and positive affect, mirroring the findings of Schutte and Malouff (2011). In addition, both studies showed that EI partially mediated the relationship between overall mindfulness and life satisfaction. The results of the present study resembled those found by Wang and Kong (2014), as EI partially mediated the
relationship between overall mindfulness and life satisfaction. The partial mediations imply that an aspect of mindfulness still directly influences the SWB components. When promoting positive outcomes, such as positive affect and life satisfaction, mindfulness does so by initially fostering EI, yet also plays a direct role in the process. Likewise, when reducing negative outcomes, such as negative affect, mindfulness has direct and indirect (through EI) influences.

In sum, the present study has demonstrated that EI acts as a mediator in the relationship between overall mindfulness and SWB, shedding light on the process through which mindfulness promotes positive life outcomes. According to Chu (2010), when practicing mindfulness, an individual engages in regulating attention and energy. Additionally, a mindful individual has the capacity to influence and transform the nature of their perception. Such common mindfulness traits have the potential to induce greater EI, which could ultimately promote SWB.

Beyond establishing EI as a mediator in the relationship between overall mindfulness and SWB, the present study attempted to determine which specific facets of mindfulness lead to the development of EI, ultimately promoting greater SWB. EI partially mediated the relationship between the individual mindfulness facet, 'describing', and the SWB components, positive affect and life satisfaction. 'Describing' is a person's capacity to describe or articulate his/her internal experiences through words (Baer et al., 2006). Therefore, if a mindful individual is developing a proficiency for communicating internal experiences by using words, that person will be fostering EI competencies as well, which will ultimately result in greater positive affect and life satisfaction. Since EI
partially mediates the relationship, however, ‘describing’ also impacts positive affect and life satisfaction directly.

EI also partially mediated the relationship between the facet, ‘non-reactivity’ and the SWB components, positive affect and negative affect. ‘Non-reactivity’ is defined as the capacity of an individual to resist reacting to inner experiences, allowing thoughts to pass through his/her mind without becoming entangled and carried away by them (Baer et al., 2006). Thus, a mindful person who persistently refrains from reacting to inner experiences would develop EI competencies that would promote positive affect and reduce negative affect. Since EI also partially mediates these relationships, ‘non-reactivity’ influences positive affect and negative affect in a direct manner as well.

The mindfulness facets, ‘observing’ and ‘acting with awareness’ were not correlated with EI or any of the SWB components. Though correlations between these two facets and EI and the SWB components were found to be significant, such facets did not have unique predictive value when considering the multiple regressions. ‘Observing’ is characterized by noticing and attending to internal stimuli, including one’s thoughts and feelings, and one’s external perceptions (Baer et al., 2006). ‘Acting with awareness’ is a person’s capacity to attend to an activity in the moment, rather than going through the motions while attention is focused elsewhere (Baer et al., 2006). Such mindful behaviors are predictive of EI and SWB components, only when supplemented with other individual mindfulness facets. Therefore, there is something characteristic about the ‘observing’ and ‘acting with awareness’ capacities that is not sufficient enough to elicit significant change in one’s EI or SWB, when applied individually.
Such results from the present study provide greater insight into the mediated relationship between mindfulness, EI, and SWB, since describing which particular aspects of mindfulness are most influential on SWB, and the significance of EI as a mediator.

**Clinical Implications**

The findings of the study would seem to be applicable to a wide range of individuals seeking mental health services. Regardless of a client’s disorder, it would seem that he/she could benefit from experiencing greater affective balance and satisfaction with life, as this would increase his/her SWB. However, the development of such skills would be especially useful for individuals who experience either a considerable deprivation of positive affect, an excess of negative affect, or a significant dissatisfaction with life. Such an experience appears to resemble depression, a common psychological symptom characterized by a markedly diminished interest or pleasure in activities, a depressed mood, feelings of worthlessness, and suicidal ideation (American Psychiatric Association, 2013).

In identifying which of the five facets of mindfulness are most predictive of EI and SWB, therapists are better able to understand how to promote change in clients. Such facets can be interpreted as skills that can be learned, and, therefore, should be incorporated into interventions by therapists in an attempt to enhance clients’ EI, and ultimately their SWB. With that being said, therapists should target the facets, ‘describing’, ‘non-judging’, and ‘non-reactivity’. Even if the intervention was not
initially intended to be mindfulness-based, incorporating elements of these three facets would prove to be useful in therapy.

According to the present study, ‘describing’ was shown to lead to greater positive affect and life satisfaction upon being mediated by EI. Thus, by introducing concepts in therapy that promote a client’s ability to describe or articulate his/her internal experiences through words, he/she could achieve greater SWB through EI, by improving his/her positive affect and life satisfaction. ‘Non-reactivity’ was found to increase positive affect and decrease negative affect by initially fostering EI. Therefore, by incorporating elements into therapy that strengthen an individual’s capacity to refrain from reacting to inner experiences, allowing thoughts to pass through the mind without becoming carried away by them, he/she would achieve greater affective balance, increasing his/her positive affect and decreasing his/her negative affect. ‘Non-judging’ was found to be directly influential on reducing negative affect. By integrating this idea into therapy, encouraging individuals to resist judging an experience, they could improve their affective balance, since reducing their negative affect. Such facets could be taught to clients through psychoeducation or assigning readings for homework. Further, if engaging clients in exercises where they could practice honing skills related to the mindfulness facets, ‘describing’, ‘non-reactivity’, and ‘non-judging’, in therapy and in the outside world, they would be able to develop a greater SWB.
Limitations of the Study / Future Research

As is the case with any study, there were some noteworthy limitations. For one, the study was correlational, rather than causal. Instead of introducing an intervention that would develop mindfulness, the research measured mindfulness as a trait. With that being said, if a study investigated the same variables, yet incorporated direct mindfulness training instead, how would EI and SWB be impacted? In the future, research could explore causal relationship between mindfulness, EI, and SWB, utilizing an experimental design. Participants would be randomly assigned to either an experimental or a control group, with some participants completing mindfulness training and others not. The participants’ levels of mindfulness would be measured, and the differences in mindfulness between the experimental and the control group would be correlated with EI and SWB upon completing the training. Such a study would allow researchers to examine if mindfulness training positively influences EI, which then leads to greater SWB.

Another limitation of the study was the utilization of the Baron and Kenny (1986, 2015) procedure for testing mediation, which was accompanied by Sobel tests. Both the Baron and Kenny test and the Sobel test have been criticized for lacking power in testing mediation effects, and therefore, requiring large sample sizes (Fritz & MacKinnon, 2007). However, the current study had a sample size of 123 participants, which exceeds the recommended 100 participants necessary to achieve a medium effect size in tests of mediation, as established by MacKinnon et al. (2002). Further, all of the Sobel tests conducted were found to be statistically significant.
The characteristics of the study sample were an additional limitation of the study. As mentioned earlier, all of the proposed analyses involved conducting multiple regressions with a maximum number of five predictors. In order to perform such multiple regression tests with a desired power of .95 and an anticipated medium effect size at an alpha level of .05, 138 students were needed. However, the desired number of participants was not collected for the study, as only 123 students were included. In addition, the majority of participants were White/Caucasian, female, college-aged students. Therefore, as this sample is not representative of the general population, it is difficult to generalize such findings to a more diverse demographic. If conducting a similar study in the future, it would be necessary to use a sample that reflected more diversity.

In order to assess the numerous variables involved in the research, the study involved self-report measures. However, when utilizing self-report measures, the responses are subjective in nature and may be influenced by the participants' biases. Further, participants' answers could be influenced by their desire to appear socially acceptable. Thus, future studies would benefit from involving more objective methods of testing.

Conclusion

The present research contributes to the literature surrounding mindfulness and its influence on well-being. The study has demonstrated how EI acts as a mechanism of action in the relationship between mindfulness and components of SWB, conceptualizing mindfulness as an overall construct, and as a multi-faceted variable. However, there are
limitations to the study that warrant future research, as it would be useful to investigate similar variables using causal studies that utilize more objective measures and involve a more diverse sample. Results of the study have clinical implications, as the findings would be applicable to a wide range of individuals seeking mental health services. Mindfulness facets can be interpreted as skills that can be learned, and the facets most indicative of promoting EI and SWB should be incorporated into interventions by therapists in an effort to promote individuals’ psychological health. In conclusion, though the current study is not completely conclusive or exhaustive in nature, such research contributes to the emerging and extensive literature investigating the positive influence of mindfulness.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Demographic Information

Demographics Questionnaire

Instructions: Please provide a response to the following statements.

1. Age: __________

2. Gender: Male or Female

3. Ethnicity:
   __ White/Caucasian
   __ Black/African-American
   __ Hispanic
   __ Native American
   __ Asian American
   __ Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
   __ Multi-ethnic
   __ Other

4. Year in School
   __________ Freshman
   __________ Sophomore
   __________ Junior
   __________ Senior
   __________ Graduate

5. Academic Major: __________________
Appendix B: Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire

Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire

Instructions: Please rate each of the following statements using the scale provided.

Write the number in the blank that best describes your own opinion of what is generally true for you.

1 2 3 4 5
Never or very rarely true Rarely true Sometimes true Often true Very often or always true

1. When I'm walking, I deliberately notice the sensations of my body moving.
2. I'm good at finding words to describe my feelings.
3. I criticize myself for having irrational or inappropriate emotions.
4. I perceive my feelings and emotions without having to react to them.
5. When I do things, my mind wanders off and I'm easily distracted.
6. When I take a shower or bath, I stay alert to the sensations of water on my body.
7. I can easily put my beliefs, opinions, and expectations into words.
8. I don't pay attention to what I'm doing because I'm daydreaming, worrying, or otherwise distracted.
9. I watch my feelings without getting lost in them.
10. I tell myself I shouldn't be feeling the way I'm feeling.
11. I notice how foods and drinks affect my thoughts, bodily sensations, and emotions.
12. It's hard for me to find the words to describe what I'm thinking.
13. I am easily distracted.
14. I believe some of my thoughts are abnormal or bad and I shouldn’t think that way.

15. I pay attention to sensations, such as the wind in my hair or sun on my face.

16. I have trouble thinking of the right words to express how I feel about things.

17. I make judgments about whether my thoughts are good or bad.

18. I find it difficult to stay focused on what’s happening in the present.

19. When I have distressing thoughts or images, I “step back” and am aware of the thought or image without getting taken over by it.

20. I pay attention to sounds, such as clocks ticking, birds chirping, or cars passing.

21. In difficult situations, I can pause without immediately reacting.

22. When I have a sensation in my body, it’s difficult for me to describe it because I can’t find the right words.

23. It seems I am “running on automatic” without much awareness of what I’m doing.

24. When I have distressing thoughts or images, I feel calm soon after.

25. I tell myself that I shouldn’t be thinking the way I’m thinking.

26. I notice the smells and aromas of things.

27. Even when I’m feeling terribly upset, I can find a way to put it into words.

28. I rush through activities without being really attentive to them.

29. When I have distressing thoughts or images I am able just to notice them without reacting.
30. I think some of my emotions are bad or inappropriate and I shouldn't feel them.

31. I notice visual elements in art or nature, such as colors, shapes, textures, or patterns of light and shadow.

32. My natural tendency is to put my experiences into words.

33. When I have distressing thoughts or images, I just notice them and let them go.

34. I do jobs or tasks automatically without being aware of what I'm doing.

35. When I have distressing thoughts or images, I judge myself as good or bad, depending what the thought/image is about.

36. I pay attention to how my emotions affect my thoughts and behavior.

37. I can usually describe how I feel at the moment in considerable detail.

38. I find myself doing things without paying attention.

39. I disapprove of myself when I have irrational ideas.
Appendix C: The Assessing Emotions Scale

The Assessing Emotions Scale

Directions: Each of the following items asks you about your emotions or reactions associated with emotions. After deciding whether a statement is generally true for you, use the 5-point scale to respond to the statement. Please circle the “1” if you strongly disagree that this is like you, the “2” if you somewhat disagree that this is like you, “3” if you neither agree nor disagree that this like you, the “4” if you somewhat agree that this is like you, and the “5” if you strongly agree that this is like you.

There are no right or wrong answers. Please give the response that best describes you.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = somewhat disagree
3 = neither agree nor disagree
4 = somewhat agree
5 = strongly agree

1. I know when to speak about my personal problems to others
2. When I am faced with obstacles, I remember times I faced similar obstacles and overcame them.
3. I expect that I will do well on most things I try.
4. Other people find it easy to confide in me.
5. I find it hard to understand the non-verbal messages of other people.
6. Some of the major events of my life have led me to re-evaluate what is important and not important.
7. When my mood changes, I see new possibilities.
8. Emotions are one of the things that make my life worth living.
9. I am aware of my emotions as I experience them.
10. I expect good things to happen.
11. I like to share my emotions with others.
12. When I experience positive emotion, I know how to make it last.
13. I arrange events others enjoy.
14. I seek out activities that make me happy.
15. I am aware of the non-verbal messages I send to others.
16. I present myself in a way that makes a good impression on others.
17. When I am in a positive mood, solving problems is easy for me.
18. By looking at their facial expressions, I recognize the emotions people are experiencing.
19. I know why my emotions change.
20. When I am in a positive mood, I am able to come up with new ideas.
21. I have control over my emotions.
22. I easily recognize my emotions as I experience them.
23. I motivate myself by imagining a good outcome to tasks I take on.
24. I compliment others when they have done something well.
25. I am aware of the non-verbal messages other people send.
26. When another person tells me about an important event in his or her life, I almost feel as though I experienced this event myself.
27. When I feel a change in emotions, I tend to come up with new ideas.
28. When I am faced with a challenge, I give up because I believe I will fail.
29. I know what other people are feeling just by looking at them.
30. I help other people feel better when they are down.
31. I use good moods to help myself keep trying in the face of obstacles.
32. I can tell how people are feeling by listening to the tone of their voice.
33. It is difficult for me to understand why people feel the way they do.
Appendix D: Positive and Negative Affect Scale

Positive and Negative Affect Scale

Instructions: This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to that word. Indicate to what extent you generally feel this way, that is, how you feel on average. Use the following scale to record your answers:

1 Very slightly or not at all 1. Interested 11. Irritable
2 A little 2. Distressed 12. Alert
3 Moderately 3. Excited 13. Ashamed
5 Extremely 5. Strong 15. Nervous
7 7. Scared 17. Attentive
8 Hostile 8. Hostile 18. Jittery
9 Enthusiastic 9. Enthusiastic 19. Active
Appendix E: The Satisfaction with Life Scale

The Satisfaction with Life Scale

By Ed Diener, Ph.D.

DIRECTIONS: Below are five statements with which you may agree or disagree. Using the 1 – 7 scale below, indicate your agreement with each item by placing the appropriate number in the line preceding that item. Please be open and honest in your responding.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Slightly Disagree
4 = Neither Agree or Disagree
5 = Slightly Agree
6 = Agree
7 = Strongly Agree

______ 1. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.

______ 2. The conditions of my life are excellent.

______ 3. I am satisfied with life.

______ 4. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.

______ 5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.