JGSB: Jurnal Gerakan Semangat Buddhayana
Vol. 4, No.2, October 2026, Page. 104-122
DOI: https://doi.org/10.60046/jgsb.v4i2.354
E-ISSN: 3031-1985
https://ejournal.stiab-jinarakkhita.ac.id/index.php/jgsb/index

Mindfulness and Employee Locus of Control: A Buddhist Perspective through the *Ādhipateyya Sutta*

Duong Tran Quang Hoang*[1], Widi Astuti[2]

[1]International Institute Department, Ho Chi Minh City University of Economics and Finance, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam
[2]Buddhist Business and Management Department, Jinarakkhita Buddhist College of Lampung, Indonesia
*Corresponding Author: duonghtq@uef.edu.vn

(Received: 15 October 2026, Accepted: 28 October 2026, Published: 30 October 2026)

Keywords:
Mindfulness; Locus of Control; Ādhipateyya Sutta; Buddhist Teachings; Employees.

Copyright © 2026 Authors
This is an open access article under CC-BY-NC 4.0 license.

Abstract

Mindfulness plays an important role in shaping individuals' awareness, self-regulation, and perceptions of personal control. From a Buddhist perspective, mindfulness (sati) is closely associated with conscious reflection and ethical self-discipline, as reflected in the Ādhipateyya Sutta, which introduces three guiding principles: self-authority (attādhipateyya), worldly authority (lokādhipateyya), and Dhamma authority (dhammādhipateyya). Drawing on this Buddhist framework, this study examines the relationship between mindfulness and employees' locus of control, particularly their tendency toward an internal locus of control. Using a quantitative approach, data were collected through questionnaires administered to employees from various organizations. The findings indicate a positive relationship between mindfulness and internal locus of control, suggesting that employees with higher levels of mindfulness tend to perceive greater personal control over their actions and work-related outcomes. Interpreted through the Ādhipateyya Sutta, these findings highlight a conceptual connection between mindfulness, reflective self-governance, and personal responsibility, while recognizing the distinction between Buddhist ethical principles and psychological beliefs about control. The study contributes to the dialogue between Buddhist teachings and organizational psychology by offering a Buddhist interpretive perspective on the relationship between mindfulness and locus of control. Practically, the findings suggest that mindfulness-based employee development initiatives may support self-awareness and personal responsibility in the workplace, although their effectiveness requires further empirical investigation.

Introduction

Personality is an important factor in understanding individual behavior and responses to various challenges in the workplace. One significant aspect of employee personality is locus of control (Halim et al., 2026; Rotter, 1966; Spector 1982). This construct refers to individuals' beliefs about the extent to which they can exercise control over their careers and occupational success. Locus of control is generally classified into two orientations: internal locus of control and external locus of control (Rotter, 1966; Spector, 1982).

JGSB: Jurnal Gerakan Semangat Buddhayana
Vol. 4, No.2, October 2026, Page. 104-122
DOI: https://doi.org/10.60046/jgsb.v4i2.354
E-ISSN: 3031-1985
https://ejournal.stiab-jinarakkhita.ac.id/index.php/jgsb/index

Since Rotter (1966) introduced the construct, locus of control has been extensively examined as a generalized expectancy concerning whether outcomes depend on individuals' own actions or external forces, such as luck, fate, and powerful others. Within organizational settings, this construct has important practical implications. A meta-analysis conducted by Ng et al. (2006) demonstrated that employees with a stronger internal locus of control tend to report higher job satisfaction, greater motivation, better job performance, and lower levels of stress and psychological distress. Research conducted in Indonesia has revealed a similar tendency, indicating that locus of control, together with motivation, contributes to employees' work achievement (Ginawati, 2019). Given that locus of control influences how employees interpret failure, accept responsibility, and sustain their efforts, organizations have a substantial interest in understanding the psychological resources that may strengthen employees' perceptions of personal control.

According to Dane (2011), mindfulness practices, including meditation and self-awareness, have received increasing scholarly attention in relation to employees' careers and productivity. Mindfulness involves the capacity to intentionally direct attention, without judgment, toward tasks and experiences occurring in the workplace. Previous research suggests that mindfulness practices may provide various benefits, including reducing stress, enhancing productivity, and improving interpersonal relationships among colleagues (Good et al., 2016). Nevertheless, an important question remains: how does mindfulness influence employees' locus of control? More specifically, can mindfulness practices facilitate a shift from an external toward an internal locus of control, thereby strengthening employees' sense of responsibility and personal agency in achieving workplace success?

Mindfulness is commonly defined as the capacity to pay attention in a particular way: intentionally, in the present moment, and nonjudgmentally (Kabat-Zinn, 1990). Brown & Ryan (2003) conceptualized mindfulness as receptive awareness of and attention to ongoing experiences and demon strated its association with self-regulation and psychological well-being. Shapiro et al. (2006) proposed that intention, attention, and attitude operate together to facilitate a shift in perspective that subsequently supports self-regulation and clarity of values. In organizational research, (Good et al., 2016), through an integrative review, concluded that mindfulness is associated with attention, cognition, emotion, behavior, and job performance. Similarly, Hülsheger et al. (2013) found that mindfulness was associated with improved emotional regulation, lower levels of emotional exhaustion, and greater job satisfaction.

From a theoretical perspective, there are compelling reasons to expect an association between mindfulness and locus of control. Individuals who can observe their thoughts and emotions without judgment may be less inclined to respond automatically to events. They may also develop greater awareness of the relationship between their choices and the consequences of those choices. Such awareness may reduce the tendency to attribute outcomes to luck or other individuals while strengthening the belief that personal actions can influence subsequent outcomes. This belief represents a central characteristic of an internal locus of control. Conversely, employees who pay limited attention to ongoing experiences or respond impulsively under pressure may be more likely to perceive events as beyond their control. Accordingly, mindfulness may function as an internal psychological resource that supports employees' perceptions of control in the workplace.

JGSB: Jurnal Gerakan Semangat Buddhayana
Vol. 4, No.2, October 2026, Page. 104-122
DOI: https://doi.org/10.60046/jgsb.v4i2.354
E-ISSN: 3031-1985
https://ejournal.stiab-jinarakkhita.ac.id/index.php/jgsb/index

From a Buddhist perspective, the relationship between mindfulness and personal control can be further understood through the *Ādhipateyya Sutta* (*Aṅguttara Nikāya 3.40*), which describes three guiding principles of ethical conduct: self-authority (*attādhipateyya*), world-authority (*lokādhipateyya*), and Dhamma-authority (*dhammādhipateyya*) (Bodhi, 2012). These principles emphasize different foundations for evaluating and regulating individual behavior, including personal reflection, awareness of moral responsibility toward others, and commitment to the Dhamma. The sutta explicitly associates these principles with the cultivation of sustained effort, the establishment of mindfulness (*sati*), bodily tranquility, and mental concentration. In particular, *attādhipateyya* emphasizes the capacity for self-direction through reflection, enabling individuals to recognize their responsibility to abandon unwholesome conduct and cultivate wholesome qualities. This teaching provides a Buddhist conceptual foundation for understanding how mindfulness may support self-awareness, intentional action, and personal responsibility, which are relevant to psychological perspectives on perceived control (Bodhi, 2012, AN 3.40).

The principles presented in the *Ādhipateyya Sutta* offer a complementary perspective for interpreting the relationship between mindfulness and employees' locus of control. An internal locus of control refers to individuals' beliefs that outcomes are influenced by their own actions, whereas self-authority in Buddhist teachings emphasizes mindful reflection and ethical responsibility in directing behavior (Brown et al., 2011). These concepts converge in their recognition of individuals' capacity to act intentionally and guide their own conduct, although they differ in their theoretical foundations and ultimate purposes. Furthermore, *lokādhipateyya* and *dhammādhipateyya* demonstrate that the Buddhist understanding of personal responsibility extends beyond individual control to encompass social responsibility and ethical guidance. Thus, the sutta does not equate personal responsibility with complete control over external circumstances; rather, it emphasizes awareness and responsible action amid continually changing conditions . Integrating this Buddhist perspective provides a conceptual basis for interpreting the relationship between mindfulness and employees' internal locus of control without conflating psychological constructs with Buddhist principles of authority.

The significance of this issue extends to both academic and practical domains. Academically, clarifying the relationship between mindfulness and locus of control may contribute to integrating two areas of research that have generally been examined separately: contemplative practices and personality within organizational settings. Practically, organizations that understand this relationship may develop employee development programs aimed not only at reducing stress but also at strengthening initiative, responsibility, and employees' confidence in their ability to influence work-related outcomes. For higher education institutions whose daily activities are closely associated (Shapiro et al., 2011) with contemplative values, empirical evidence concerning this relationship may also assist management in determining how mindfulness can be more systematically integrated into human resource management practices.

Despite these theoretical foundations, empirical evidence directly examining the relationship between mindfulness and employees' locus of control remains limited, particularly in Indonesia and within institutions where contemplative practices form part of everyday organizational life. Much of the existing research has investigated mindfulness in relation to stress, well-being, or performance, whereas locus of control has more frequently been treated as a background variable rather than as a primary outcome of investigation. A

JGSB: Jurnal Gerakan Semangat Buddhayana
Vol. 4, No.2, October 2026, Page. 104-122
DOI: https://doi.org/10.60046/jgsb.v4i2.354
E-ISSN: 3031-1985
https://ejournal.stiab-jinarakkhita.ac.id/index.php/jgsb/index

private Buddhist higher education institution in Indonesia, where employees may already be familiar with meditation practices, therefore provides a relevant context for examining this relationship.

Although mindfulness and locus of control have been extensively examined in organizational psychology, research directly investigating the relationship between these constructs within Buddhist organizational contexts remains limited. Previous studies have primarily emphasized the relationships between mindfulness, emotional regulation, psychological well-being, and workplace performance, while locus of control has frequently been examined as an individual characteristic associated with occupational outcomes. Consequently, the relationship between mindfulness and employees' perceptions of personal control requires further empirical investigation. Moreover, the integration of psychological findings with the ethical principles of the *Ādhipateyya Sutta* remains insufficiently explored. Addressing this gap, the present study examines the statistical relationship between mindfulness and employees' locus of control while offering a Buddhist interpretative framework emphasizing self-awareness, reflective responsibility, and ethical self-regulation.

Based on these considerations, the present study examines the influence of mindfulness on employees' locus of control at a private Buddhist higher education institution in Indonesia. Employing a quantitative approach and simple linear regression analysis, the study tests the alternative hypothesis that mindfulness has a positive and statistically significant effect on locus of control (H_a), against the null hypothesis that mindfulness has no effect on locus of control (H_0). The findings are expected to contribute to the literature on workplace mindfulness within the Indonesian context and provide insights into how mindfulness practices may be utilized to strengthen employees' self-regulation and occupational success (Dane & Brummel, 2014; Wang et al., 2010). A deeper understanding of the relationship between mindfulness and locus of control may enable organizations and individuals to provide more effective support for employees in developing their potential within an increasingly competitive work environment.

Method

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative approach using a cross-sectional survey design to examine the relationship between mindfulness and employees' locus of control. Mindfulness was designated as the independent variable, while locus of control was treated as the dependent variable. Simple linear regression analysis was employed to determine the direction of the relationship, its statistical significance, and the proportion of variance in locus of control explained by mindfulness. This design enabled the examination of relationships between variables using quantitative data collected at a single point in time, without experimental manipulation or intervention.

Population and Sample

The study was conducted among employees of a private Buddhist higher education institution in Indonesia. The institution's identity was withheld to maintain the confidentiality of the research setting. The study population comprised 50 employees, and a total sampling technique was applied, whereby all members of the defined population were included as respondents. Accordingly, the final sample consisted of 50 employees. This

JGSB: Jurnal Gerakan Semangat Buddhayana
Vol. 4, No.2, October 2026, Page. 104-122
DOI: https://doi.org/10.60046/jgsb.v4i2.354
E-ISSN: 3031-1985
https://ejournal.stiab-jinarakkhita.ac.id/index.php/jgsb/index

sampling technique was classified as a non-probability sampling approach because the respondents were drawn from a single, predefined institutional population. Data were collected through an online questionnaire administered via Google Forms.

Instruments

The research instrument consisted of a structured questionnaire designed to measure two primary variables: mindfulness and locus of control. Mindfulness was conceptualized as an individual's capacity to maintain receptive attention to and awareness of experiences occurring in the present moment, consistent with the conceptualization proposed by (Brown & Ryan, 2003). In this study, mindfulness was operationalized through three dimensions: awareness, attention, and meditation practice. Awareness and attention were used to represent the psychological characteristics of mindfulness, whereas meditation practice was incorporated as an additional aspect associated with its cultivation and development. The initial mindfulness instrument comprised 60 items. This instrument was not treated as the original version of the Mindful Attention Awareness Scale (MAAS); rather, its operationalization required clarification regarding the theoretical sources and item development procedures employed in the study.

Locus of control was defined as an individual's belief regarding the extent to which experienced outcomes are influenced by personal actions or external factors, consistent with (Rotter, 1966) theoretical conceptualization. The initial instrument consisted of 48 items encompassing internal locus of control, external locus of control, proactive personality, and perceived control in the workplace. The first two dimensions were directly associated with locus-of-control orientations, whereas proactive personality and perceived workplace control represented related constructs incorporated into the study's operationalization. (Liang et al., 2023) was cited as a reference concerning the relationships between locus of control and various psychological and organizational outcomes, rather than as the source of a four-dimensional measurement instrument. Therefore, the interpretation of the composite score should account for the conceptual distinctions among these dimensions and the coding direction of individual items. The research instruments were developed to measure mindfulness and locus of control as distinct psychological constructs. Mindfulness was operationalized through awareness, attention, and meditation practice, with an initial pool of 60 items. Locus of control was assessed using 48 initial items covering internal locus of control, external locus of control, proactive personality, and perceived workplace control. Following item validity screening, 56 mindfulness items and 46 locus of control items were retained. Although these dimensions were incorporated into the operational definitions adopted in this study, meditation practice, proactive personality, and perceived workplace control should be distinguished conceptually from the core psychological constructs. Consequently, interpretation of the composite scores requires consideration of the measurement structure, item coding, and the distinction between internal and external control orientations.

Data Collection Procedures

The study was conducted in several stages, including a preliminary study, instrument development, questionnaire review, pilot testing, data collection, and statistical analysis. A preliminary survey was conducted to obtain an initial understanding of the research setting. Subsequently, the research instrument was reviewed by subject-matter and language experts to evaluate its content relevance and the clarity of item wording. A limited pilot test

JGSB: Jurnal Gerakan Semangat Buddhayana
Vol. 4, No.2, October 2026, Page. 104-122
DOI: https://doi.org/10.60046/jgsb.v4i2.354
E-ISSN: 3031-1985
https://ejournal.stiab-jinarakkhita.ac.id/index.php/jgsb/index

was conducted among employees of the institution where the study took place.

Item validity was assessed using correlation coefficients, with a critical value of 0.361 at a significance level of 0.05. The results indicated that 56 of the 60 mindfulness items met the specified validity criterion, whereas four items (Items 13, 33, 35, and 49) failed to meet the criterion. For the locus of control variable, 46 of the 48 items satisfied the validity criterion, while two items (Items 4 and 44) did not. Consequently, 102 items were retained for subsequent analysis, comprising 56 mindfulness items and 46 locus of control items. However, the sample size used for the validity assessment and the justification for adopting the critical value of 0.361 require confirmation based on the actual instrument-testing data.

Instrument reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient in IBM SPSS Statistics version 27. The reliability analysis of the combined 102 items yielded a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.914. This value indicated internal consistency across the analyzed set of items; however, it was insufficient to establish the reliability of each variable independently. Therefore, separate reliability assessments for each construct are necessary to provide a more accurate evaluation of the measurement quality of mindfulness and locus of control.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 26. The initial stage involved descriptive statistical analysis to examine the distributional characteristics of the research scores, including the number of respondents, minimum and maximum values, means, standard deviations, and variances. Subsequently, normality was assessed using the one-sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov test at a significance level of 0.05. This test was applied to the mindfulness and locus of control scores. Additionally, Levene's test was employed to examine differences in variances. However, this test was not used as the sole basis for evaluating the homoscedasticity assumption in linear regression.

Hypothesis testing was performed using simple linear regression analysis, expressed by the following equation:

$$Y = \alpha + \beta X + \varepsilon$$

In this equation, represents the locus of control score, denotes the mindfulness score, is the intercept, represents the regression coefficient, and denotes the error term. The statistical significance of the regression coefficient was evaluated using the t-test, whereas the overall significance of the regression model was assessed using the F-test. All statistical tests were conducted at a significance level of 0.05. The correlation coefficient (R) was used to describe the strength of the relationship between the two variables, while the coefficient of determination (R^2) was used to estimate the proportion of variance in locus of control scores explained by mindfulness within the regression model.

This study drew upon the *Ādhipateyya Sutta* (*Aṅguttara Nikāya 3.40*) as a Buddhist conceptual framework for interpreting the relationship between employees' mindfulness and locus of control. The discourse outlines three principles of authority: *attādhipateyya* (self-authority), *lokādhipateyya* (worldly authority), and *dhammādhipateyya* (Dhamma authority). These principles were employed to examine reflective awareness, behavioral self-regulation, and individual ethical responsibility in responding to different circumstances. The *Ādhipateyya Sutta* was incorporated into the interpretation and discussion of the empirical findings rather than treated as an additional variable in the statistical model. Accordingly, the Buddhist-informed analysis connected the quantitative

JGSB: Jurnal Gerakan Semangat Buddhayana
Vol. 4, No.2, October 2026, Page. 104-122
DOI: https://doi.org/10.60046/jgsb.v4i2.354
E-ISSN: 3031-1985
https://ejournal.stiab-jinarakkhita.ac.id/index.php/jgsb/index

findings concerning mindfulness and locus of control with Buddhist principles of awareness, self-authority, and ethical responsibility. This interpretive approach was intended to enrich the conceptual understanding of the empirical results without equating the psychological construct of locus of control with the principles of authority articulated in the Buddhist tradition.

Result and Discussion

Result

This section presents the results of the data analysis examining the relationship between mindfulness and locus of control among 50 employees who participated in the study. The findings are presented beginning with descriptive statistics to characterize the distribution of variable scores, followed by the results of instrument validity and reliability assessments, normality testing, and the examination of equality of variances. Subsequently, hypothesis testing results are reported using simple linear regression analysis to determine the direction and statistical significance of the relationship between mindfulness and locus of control, as well as the proportion of variance in locus of control explained by the research model.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistical analysis was conducted to examine the characteristics of mindfulness and locus of control scores among the 50 employees who participated in the study. The analysis included the mean, minimum and maximum scores, range, standard deviation, and variance.

Table 1. Validity Test

Descriptive Statistics								
	N	Range	Min.	Max.	Mean		Std. Dev.	Var.
	Stat	Stat.	Stat.	Stat.	Stat.	Std. Error	Stat.	Stat.
locus of control	50	65	129	194	151.12	1.691	11.958	143.006
Valid N (listwise)	50							

Source: Output SPSS 2027

Based on Table 1, the descriptive statistical analysis of locus of control indicated that the study involved 50 respondents, with a minimum score of 129 and a maximum score of 194. The difference between these scores yielded a range of 65, indicating variability in locus of control scores among respondents. The mean score of 151.12 represented the central tendency of the locus of control score distribution among the employees surveyed. Meanwhile, the standard deviation of 11.958 and variance of 143.006 reflected the dispersion of respondents' scores around the mean. The standard deviation, equivalent to approximately 7.9% of the mean, suggested relatively limited score dispersion in relation to the mean value. Furthermore, the standard error of the mean of 1.691 indicated the precision of the estimated sample mean. Overall, these findings demonstrated that locus of control scores varied among respondents but tended to cluster around the mean. Nevertheless, the mean score of 151.12 alone was insufficient to determine whether employees exhibited low, moderate, or high levels of locus of control without additional

JGSB: Jurnal Gerakan Semangat Buddhayana
Vol. 4, No.2, October 2026, Page. 104-122
DOI: https://doi.org/10.60046/jgsb.v4i2.354
E-ISSN: 3031-1985
https://ejournal.stiab-jinarakkhita.ac.id/index.php/jgsb/index

information regarding the theoretical score range, scoring procedures, and classification criteria of the instrument employed.

Table 2. Statistical Reliability

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.914	102

Based on Table 2, the reliability analysis using Cronbach's alpha yielded a coefficient of 0.914 for the 102 questionnaire items analyzed. This value exceeded the commonly accepted minimum reliability threshold of 0.70 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994), indicating a high degree of internal consistency across the analyzed item set. The 102 items comprised 56 items measuring mindfulness and 46 items measuring locus of control, all of which had satisfied the criteria established during the preceding item validity assessment. Nevertheless, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.914 was obtained by combining two sets of items designed to measure distinct constructs. Therefore, this result cannot be considered sufficient evidence that each variable independently demonstrates adequate reliability. Separate reliability assessments for each construct are still required to establish the internal consistency of the mindfulness and locus of control instruments. Thus, these findings provide preliminary information regarding the internal consistency of the combined item set but do not conclusively establish the reliability of the individual research instruments.

Table 3. Normality Test

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test			
		Mindfulness	locus of control
N		50	50
Normal Parameter	Mean	184.90	151.12
	Std. Deviation	18.644	11.958
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.123	.125
	Positive	.121	.125
	Negative	-.123	-.076
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.869	.883
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.437	.417

a. Test distribution is Normal.

Based on Table 3, the normality assessment using the One-Sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov Test involving 50 respondents yielded a Kolmogorov–Smirnov Z statistic of 0.869 with a significance value of 0.437 for mindfulness. Meanwhile, locus of control yielded a Kolmogorov–Smirnov Z statistic of 0.883 with a significance value of 0.417. Both significance values indicating that the null hypothesis of normality could not be rejected. These results suggest that there was insufficient statistical evidence to conclude that the score distributions of either variable deviated significantly from a normal distribution. Accordingly, the mindfulness and locus of control scores were considered to satisfy the normality criterion based on the statistical tests performed. However, testing individual variable scores does not establish whether the regression residuals satisfy the normality assumption.

JGSB: Jurnal Gerakan Semangat Buddhayana
Vol. 4, No.2, October 2026, Page. 104-122
DOI: https://doi.org/10.60046/jgsb.v4i2.354
E-ISSN: 3031-1985
https://ejournal.stiab-jinarakkhita.ac.id/index.php/jgsb/index

Table 4. Homogeneity Test

Test of Homogeneity of Variances			
Minfulness			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
5.451	1	98	.022

Based on Table 4, the results of the homogeneity of variance test using Levene's test yielded a Levene statistic of 5.451, with degrees of freedom of df1 = 1 and df2 = 98, and a significance value of 0.022. Since the significance value was below the 0.05 threshold ($p < 0.05$), the null hypothesis of equal variances was rejected. This finding indicates a statistically significant difference in variances between the groups of scores compared in the analysis. Nevertheless, the results of Levene's test cannot be directly used to determine whether the homoscedasticity assumption in simple linear regression has been satisfied or violated. This is because homoscedasticity refers to the constancy of residual variance across different levels of predicted values, rather than merely the equality of variances between groups. Therefore, these findings are reported as evidence of differences in variances, while further examination of the regression residuals is required to assess whether the homoscedasticity assumption of the regression model is satisfied.

Table 5. Statistical Hypothesis Test

Coefficient						
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Type		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	44.782	7.617		5.879	.000
	mindfulness	.575	.041	.897	14.030	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Locus of Control						

Based on Table 5, the results of hypothesis testing using simple linear regression analysis revealed that mindfulness had an unstandardized regression coefficient (B) of 0.575, with a standard error of 0.041. The standardized regression coefficient ($\beta = 0.897$) indicated a very strong positive relationship between mindfulness and employees' locus of control. The regression coefficient was statistically significant ($t = 14.030$, $p < 0.001$), with the p-value falling below the significance threshold of 0.05. Accordingly, the null hypothesis (H0), which stated that the regression coefficient for mindfulness was equal to zero, was rejected, while the alternative hypothesis (Ha), proposing a positive relationship between mindfulness and locus of control, was supported by the empirical data. The positive regression coefficient indicated that each one-point increase in mindfulness scores was associated with a predicted increase of 0.575 points in locus of control scores. Meanwhile, the intercept of 44.782 represented the predicted locus of control score when the mindfulness score was zero. Overall, these findings suggest that higher mindfulness scores were associated with higher locus of control scores, as predicted by the regression model. However, this association should not be interpreted as evidence of a causal relationship, given the observational and cross-sectional nature of the study.

JGSB: Jurnal Gerakan Semangat Buddhayana
Vol. 4, No.2, October 2026, Page. 104-122
DOI: https://doi.org/10.60046/jgsb.v4i2.354
E-ISSN: 3031-1985
https://ejournal.stiab-jinarakkhita.ac.id/index.php/jgsb/index

Table 6. Simple Linear Analysis

ANOVA					
Type	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	5633.570	1	5633.570	196.847	.000a
Residuals	1373.710	48	28.619		
Total	7007.280	49			

a. Predictors: (Constant), mindfulness
b. Dependent Variable: locus of control

Based on Table 6, the analysis of variance (ANOVA) for the simple linear regression model yielded an F-statistic of 196.847, with degrees of freedom of F (1, 48) and a significance level of $p < 0.001$. Since the p-value was below the significance threshold of 0.05, the regression model was considered statistically significant. This finding indicates that the model incorporating mindfulness as a predictor accounted for significantly more variance in locus of control scores than an intercept-only model. Furthermore, the regression sum of squares and the residual indicated that the variance in locus of control scores explained by the model exceeded the unexplained variance. These findings were consistent with the preceding regression coefficient analysis, which demonstrated a positive and statistically significant relationship between mindfulness and employees' locus of control. Accordingly, mindfulness emerged as a statistically significant predictor of locus of control scores within the specified regression model. Nevertheless, the statistical significance of the model does not establish a causal relationship, given the observational and cross-sectional nature of the study.

Table 7. R-square Coefficient of Determination Value (Model Summary)

Model Summary				
Type	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.897	.804	.800	5.34967

a. Predictors: (Constant), mindfulness

Based on Table 7, the results of the simple linear regression analysis yielded a correlation coefficient (R) of 0.897, indicating a very strong positive relationship between mindfulness and employees' locus of control. The coefficient of determination (R^2) of 0.804 indicated that mindfulness, as the predictor variable, accounted for 80.4% of the variance in locus of control scores within the research model, while the remaining 19.6% of the variance was not explained by the model. Furthermore, the adjusted R^2 value of 0.800 indicated that, after accounting for the number of predictors and sample size, the model continued to explain approximately 80.0% of the variance in locus of control scores. Meanwhile, the standard error of the estimate of 5.34967 represented the estimated standard deviation of the regression residuals when predicting locus of control scores. Overall, these findings demonstrated that mindfulness was strongly associated with employees' locus of control and accounted for a substantial proportion of the variance in locus of control scores within the study sample. Nevertheless, the relatively high coefficient of determination should not be interpreted as evidence that mindfulness causally determines 80.4% of the changes in locus of control, given the observational and cross-sectional design of the study.

JGSB: Jurnal Gerakan Semangat Buddhayana
Vol. 4, No.2, October 2026, Page. 104-122
DOI: https://doi.org/10.60046/jgsb.v4i2.354
E-ISSN: 3031-1985
https://ejournal.stiab-jinarakkhita.ac.id/index.php/jgsb/index

Discussion

Relationship Between Mindfulness and Employees' Locus of Control

The findings revealed a positive and statistically significant relationship between mindfulness and employees' locus of control, as indicated by a standardized regression coefficient of $\beta = 0.897$, a t-value of 14.030 ($p < 0.001$), and a coefficient of determination of $R^2 = 0.804$. These findings suggest that employees with higher mindfulness scores tended to exhibit higher locus of control scores. The coefficient of determination indicates that mindfulness accounted for 80.4% of the variance in locus of control scores within the research model. This relationship demonstrates a strong empirical association between awareness of personal experiences and individuals' beliefs regarding control in their working lives. Nevertheless, these findings should be interpreted as evidence of a statistical association rather than proof that mindfulness directly causes changes in locus of control, given the cross-sectional research design.

These findings can be understood through the characteristics of mindfulness, which enable individuals to intentionally direct their attention toward present-moment experiences. (Brown & Ryan, 2003) explained that mindfulness involves receptive attention to ongoing experiences and supports self-regulation. (Hölzel et al., 2011) also identified several psychological mechanisms that may explain how mindfulness meditation operates, including attentional regulation, body awareness, emotion regulation, and changes in self-perspective. In the workplace, the ability to recognize thoughts, feelings, and emotional reactions may help employees consider their responses before taking action. Such awareness may strengthen their understanding of the relationships among decisions, effort, and work-related consequences. However, these psychological mechanisms represent theoretical explanations that were not directly examined in the present study.

The relationship between mindfulness and locus of control can also be understood through Rotter, (1966) theory, which distinguishes between internal and external control orientations based on individuals' beliefs regarding the sources of control over experienced outcomes. Employees with an internal locus of control tend to believe that their personal actions play an important role in determining outcomes, whereas those with an external locus of control place greater emphasis on the influence of luck, fate, or other external agents. A meta-analysis by Ng et al. (2006) demonstrated that locus of control was associated with various aspects of work experiences, including job satisfaction, motivation, and performance. From this perspective, mindfulness can be understood as a psychological resource potentially associated with individuals' beliefs about their own roles in responding to workplace demands. However, because the instrument used in the present study employed a composite score encompassing internal locus of control, external locus of control, proactive personality, and perceived workplace control, the findings cannot establish a specific shift from an external toward an internal control orientation.

This explanation is consistent with (Shapiro et al., 2011), who proposed that mindfulness may facilitate a shift in perspective through the interaction of intention, attention, and attitude. Such a shift enables individuals to observe their experiences without immediately engaging in automatic reactions. In workplace settings, employees who can reflectively recognize pressure or failure may be better positioned to evaluate alternative courses of action more rationally. This interpretation is also consistent with the findings of Hülsheger et al. (2013), which highlight associations between mindfulness and attention, emotion

JGSB: Jurnal Gerakan Semangat Buddhayana
Vol. 4, No.2, October 2026, Page. 104-122
DOI: https://doi.org/10.60046/jgsb.v4i2.354
E-ISSN: 3031-1985
https://ejournal.stiab-jinarakkhita.ac.id/index.php/jgsb/index

regulation, well-being, and various work-related outcomes. Accordingly, the present findings extend the discussion of mindfulness beyond well-being and emotional regulation to encompass beliefs concerning personal control within organizational settings.

Mindfulness and Self-Authority in the *Ādhipateyya Sutta*

From a Buddhist perspective, the relationship between mindfulness and self-direction can be interpreted through the *Ādhipateyya Sutta* (*Aṅguttara Nikāya 3.40*). This discourse outlines three principles of authority: *attādhipateyya* (taking oneself as an authority), *lokādhipateyya* (taking the world as an authority), and *dhammādhipateyya* (taking the Dhamma as an authority). These principles are presented within the context of a Buddhist monk's spiritual training, in which the practitioner reflects on the purpose of the renunciant life and arouses effort to abandon unwholesome mental qualities while cultivating wholesome ones. Within each principle, mindfulness (*sati*) is associated with the arousal of effort, bodily tranquility, and mental concentration. Thus, the discourse situates mindfulness within a process of mental cultivation involving reflection, perseverance, and ethical responsibility (*Ādhipateyya Sutta, AN 3.40*).

The principle of *attādhipateyya* provides the perspective most closely related to the issue of self-direction examined in this study. Taking oneself as an authority does not imply that individuals possess absolute control over all circumstances. Rather, it suggests that individuals use reflection on their goals and actions as a foundation for cultivating appropriate behavior. In the discourse, practitioners recognize the purpose of their spiritual lives and subsequently arouse effort to avoid actions that contradict that purpose. Self-awareness becomes part of an evaluative process through which individuals identify inconsistencies between their intentions and behavior. When applied to workplace settings, this principle can be interpreted as emphasizing employees' ability to reflect on personal responsibilities, recognize mistakes, and determine appropriate responses to the challenges they encounter.

The conceptual connection between *attādhipateyya* and the research findings lies in the role of reflective awareness in behavioral self-direction. Employees with higher levels of mindfulness may be better able to recognize their mental states and consider their actions before responding to workplace demands. This capacity shares conceptual similarities with the principle of self-authority, particularly regarding reflection and personal responsibility. However, a fundamental conceptual distinction remains. Internal locus of control refers to an individual's belief about the extent to which outcomes are influenced by personal actions, whereas *attādhipateyya* represents an ethical and spiritual principle concerning the basis for directing one's actions. Therefore, the positive relationship between mindfulness and locus of control cannot be regarded as empirical evidence that respondents have developed *attādhipateyya*. Instead, this connection is interpretative and illustrates the potential for conceptual dialogue between psychological theory and Buddhist teachings.

Lokādhipateyya and *Dhammādhipateyya*: Social and Ethical Dimensions of Self-Regulation

The principle of *lokādhipateyya* broadens the understanding of behavioral self-direction by positioning the world as a basis for moral consideration. In the *Ādhipateyya Sutta*, reflection on the world is not intended to surrender personal control to external circumstances but to reinforce the awareness that individual actions are inseparable from broader moral considerations. Within organizational settings, this principle can provide an interpretative

JGSB: Jurnal Gerakan Semangat Buddhayana
Vol. 4, No.2, October 2026, Page. 104-122
DOI: https://doi.org/10.60046/jgsb.v4i2.354
E-ISSN: 3031-1985
https://ejournal.stiab-jinarakkhita.ac.id/index.php/jgsb/index

perspective on the importance of considering the social consequences of one's actions. Employees do not operate as individuals isolated from their social environments; rather, they maintain relationships with colleagues, supervisors, and other stakeholders who may be affected by their decisions and behavior. Accordingly, mindfulness can be conceptually associated with the capacity to consider the interests of others and the social consequences of one's actions.

This distinction is essential for differentiating *lokādhipateyya* from external locus of control. Although both concepts involve reference to factors beyond the individual, their conceptual meanings differ. External locus of control refers to the belief that outcomes are largely determined by external factors, whereas *lokādhipateyya* concerns the use of the world as a basis for moral reflection. Consequently, *lokādhipateyya* should not be treated as the Buddhist equivalent of external locus of control. This distinction demonstrates that integrating Buddhist teachings with organizational psychology requires conceptual precision to avoid interpreting similarities in terminology or attentional orientation as evidence of construct equivalence.

Meanwhile, *dhammādhipateyya* provides a normative foundation for understanding that self-direction should be accompanied by ethical consideration. In the discourse, the Dhamma serves as an authority that guides individuals in abandoning negligence, arousing effort, and cultivating wholesome mental qualities. This principle suggests that self-direction in Buddhism concerns not only the capacity to achieve desired outcomes but also the alignment of one's actions with the Dhamma. Within workplace settings, this interpretation is relevant to discussions of integrity, professional responsibility, and awareness of the consequences of one's actions. Employees who strongly believe in their ability to influence work outcomes may not necessarily exercise that ability for ethical purposes. Thus, *dhammādhipateyya* introduces an evaluative dimension that is not directly encompassed by the psychological construct of locus of control.

Together, these three principles of authority demonstrate that behavioral self-direction from a Buddhist perspective encompasses personal, social, and normative dimensions. *Attādhipateyya* emphasizes reflection on personal responsibility, *lokādhipateyya* situates actions within considerations of the world and their moral consequences, and *dhammādhipateyya* establishes the Dhamma as a guide for behavioral development. The relationship between mindfulness and locus of control identified in the present study can be interpreted through this framework, although the findings cannot establish the direct involvement of these three principles of authority. The contribution of the discourse lies in its capacity to extend the interpretation of awareness and self-direction beyond psychological control toward ethical responsibility.

Integration of Empirical Findings and the *Ādhipateyya Sutta* Perspective

Integrating the empirical findings with the *Ādhipateyya Sutta* suggests that mindfulness can be understood through two complementary but conceptually distinct perspectives. From the perspective of organizational psychology, mindfulness is associated with attention, awareness of experience, and the regulation of individual responses. From a Buddhist perspective, however, sati constitutes an element of mental cultivation associated with effort, concentration, and ethical consideration. The conceptual convergence between these perspectives lies in their emphasis on awareness of experiences and actions, whereas their differences concern the scope of their objectives and the normative frameworks within

JGSB: Jurnal Gerakan Semangat Buddhayana
Vol. 4, No.2, October 2026, Page. 104-122
DOI: https://doi.org/10.60046/jgsb.v4i2.354
E-ISSN: 3031-1985
https://ejournal.stiab-jinarakkhita.ac.id/index.php/jgsb/index

which they operate. Mindfulness in organizational psychology is frequently examined in relation to well-being and work effectiveness, whereas sati within the context of the *Ādhipateyya Sutta* is directed toward the cultivation of wholesome mental qualities and the ultimate goal of liberation from suffering.

As summarized in Table 8, the findings provide empirical evidence of a positive relationship between mindfulness and locus of control, while the three Buddhist principles of authority offer perspectives for interpreting reflective awareness, social responsibility, and ethical orientation. The high coefficient of determination indicates that the model possesses substantial statistical explanatory power within the study sample. However, it does not establish that attentional processes, self-reflection, or moral responsibility mediate the relationship between the two variables. Accordingly, the connection between the quantitative findings and Buddhist teachings is positioned as a conceptual integration rather than an empirical examination of the principles articulated in the discourse.

This interpretation further demonstrates that internal locus of control cannot be directly regarded as a measure of an individual's spiritual qualities. Individuals who believe that their work outcomes depend on personal effort do not necessarily possess adequate ethical reflection. Conversely, individuals who recognize the limitations of their control over external circumstances may still exercise personal responsibility wisely. From a Buddhist perspective, the capacity to direct one's actions requires consideration of the relationship among effort, prevailing conditions, and the moral quality of decisions. Therefore, the theoretical contribution of this study does not lie in equating mindfulness with sati or locus of control with *attādhipateyya*, but rather in identifying areas of conceptual convergence between psychological awareness and self-direction informed by Buddhist principles.

The findings have practical implications for human resource development, particularly in designing activities that support self-awareness and the capacity to respond reflectively to workplace demands. Previous research has demonstrated that mindfulness practices are associated with stress reduction and improved emotion regulation, providing a potential basis for organizations to consider employee well-being programs (Hülsheger et al., 2013; Khoury et al., 2015). In the context of the present study, the positive association between mindfulness and locus of control suggests the relevance of considering self-reflection activities, attentional training, and meditation as components of employee development. However, the effectiveness of such programs in changing locus of control has not been directly examined, and their implementation therefore requires further evaluation.
The perspective offered by the *Ādhipateyya Sutta* may enrich these developmental initiatives by providing an orientation extending beyond productivity enhancement alone. The principle of *attādhipateyya* can serve as a foundation for reflecting on personal responsibility and individual choices; *lokādhipateyya* can be contextualized to cultivate awareness of the social consequences of actions; and *dhammādhipateyya* can provide a foundation for ethical considerations in decision-making. Employee development initiatives integrating these three principles may position mindfulness not merely as a stress-management technique but also as a means of reflecting on the quality of one's actions and professional responsibilities. Their implementation should nevertheless respect voluntary participation, diversity of beliefs, and relevance to the organizational context.

The research setting, a private Buddhist higher education institution, provides a relevant context for examining mindfulness in relation to contemplative practices. Nevertheless, the institution's affiliation with Buddhist values does not justify assuming that all respondents

JGSB: Jurnal Gerakan Semangat Buddhayana
Vol. 4, No.2, October 2026, Page. 104-122
DOI: https://doi.org/10.60046/jgsb.v4i2.354
E-ISSN: 3031-1985
https://ejournal.stiab-jinarakkhita.ac.id/index.php/jgsb/index

regularly practice meditation or understand the principles of the *Ādhipateyya Sutta*. Accordingly, the institutional characteristics are treated as contextual features rather than evidence that Buddhist practices influenced the relationship between mindfulness and locus of control. Future research should independently assess meditation experience, participation in contemplative activities, and understanding of Buddhist values if the contributions of these factors are to be empirically examined.

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings. First, the study employed a cross-sectional design involving 50 respondents from a single institution, which precludes causal inference and limits the generalizability of the results. Second, both variables were measured using self-report questionnaires administered during the same period, introducing the possibility of common method variance, as discussed by (Podsakoff et al., 2003) . Third, the exceptionally strong association warrants further examination of potential conceptual overlap among mindfulness, proactive personality, and perceived workplace control. Fourth, the reported instrument reliability was calculated using a combined set of 102 items measuring both variables, thereby providing insufficient information regarding the internal consistency of each construct independently. Furthermore, the available results did not include direct assessments of residual normality and homoscedasticity in the regression model.

Additional limitations concern the operationalization of mindfulness and locus of control. The study incorporated awareness, attention, and meditation practice into the measurement of mindfulness, although meditation does not constitute a separate dimension of the Mindful Attention Awareness Scale developed by (Brown & Ryan, 2003). Similarly, the locus of control variable included proactive personality and perceived workplace control, which are not conceptually identical to the internal and external control orientations proposed by (Rotter, 1966). Therefore, future studies should employ instruments with clearer theoretical foundations and stronger evidence of construct validity while examining these dimensions separately. This approach is necessary to determine whether the observed relationship genuinely reflects an association between mindfulness and locus of control or a broader orientation toward self-direction.

From the perspective of Buddhist studies, the present investigation was limited to employing the *Ādhipateyya Sutta* as a conceptual interpretative framework. The study did not measure respondents' application of *attādhipateyya*, *lokādhipateyya*, or *dhammādhipateyya*, nor did it conduct a systematic textual analysis of multiple canonical sources. Future research could adopt a mixed-methods approach combining quantitative surveys, in-depth interviews, and Buddhist textual analysis to investigate how employees understand mindfulness, personal responsibility, and ethical considerations within workplace settings. Longitudinal or experimental designs are also necessary to examine whether mindfulness practices are associated with changes in locus of control over time. Other variables, including self-efficacy, occupational stress, organizational tenure, leadership style, and organizational culture, may be considered additional factors worthy of investigation.

Overall, the study demonstrated a positive and statistically significant relationship between mindfulness and employees' locus of control scores. Through the perspective of the *Ādhipateyya Sutta*, this relationship can be understood within a broader conceptual context encompassing reflective awareness, behavioral self-direction, social responsibility, and ethical consideration. Thus, the study's contribution lies not only in its empirical findings

JGSB: Jurnal Gerakan Semangat Buddhayana
Vol. 4, No.2, October 2026, Page. 104-122
DOI: https://doi.org/10.60046/jgsb.v4i2.354
E-ISSN: 3031-1985
https://ejournal.stiab-jinarakkhita.ac.id/index.php/jgsb/index

concerning the association between the two variables but also in fostering conceptual dialogue between organizational psychology and Buddhist teachings. Nevertheless, the Buddhist interpretation must remain distinct from the statistical findings and should be regarded as a foundation for future research integrating textual scholarship with more comprehensive empirical investigation.

To clarify the relationship between the empirical findings and Buddhist perspectives, Table 8 presents an interpretative synthesis based on the principles outlined in the *Ādhipateyya Sutta* (AN 3.40). This integration illustrates how the relationship between mindfulness and locus of control may be understood through the dimensions of self-reflection (*attādhipateyya*), social responsibility (*lokādhipateyya*), and behavioral guidance based on the Dhamma (*dhammādhipateyya*). Nevertheless, these connections represent conceptual interpretations of the research findings rather than relationships directly examined within the statistical model.

Tabel 8. Integration of Empirical Findings and Buddhist Perspectives from the *Ādhipateyya Sutta*

Research Findings	**Buddhist Perspectives**	**Conceptual Connections and Interpretations**
Positive relationship between mindfulness and locus of control (β = 0.897; $p < 0.001$)	*Attādhipateyya* (self-authority)	Reflective awareness can be understood as a foundation for behavioral self-direction and personal responsibility.
Mindfulness explains 80.4% of the variance in locus of control scores (R^2 = 0.804)	*Sati* and the cultivation of effort (*viriya*)	The empirical findings demonstrate a strong association, while the sutta offers a perspective on mindfulness and intentional effort without empirically establishing these mechanisms.
Attention and awareness as components of mindfulness	Cultivation of *sati*	The ability to recognize experiences and consider appropriate responses shares conceptual similarities with mindfulness in Buddhist practice.
Meditation practice as part of the operationalization of the independent variable (X)	Bodily tranquility and mental concentration	Meditation can be understood as a practice supporting mental cultivation, although its independent contribution was not examined.
Behavioral self-direction in the workplace	*Lokādhipateyya* (worldly authority)	Personal responsibility can be extended to consideration of social consequences and accountability toward others.
Relationship between awareness and responsibility	*Dhammādhipateyya* (Dhamma authority)	Awareness and personal control should be considered alongside the ethical quality of individual goals and actions.
Very strong relationship observed among 50 respondents	Three principles of *ādhipateyya*	The Buddhist framework enriches the interpretation of the findings but does not eliminate limitations related to construct validity, method bias, and generalizability.

Source: Research findings (N = 50) and the authors' conceptual interpretation based on the *Ādhipateyya Sutta* (AN 3.40). The Buddhist principles presented in this table were not included as empirically tested variables.

As presented in Table 8, the perspective of the *Ādhipateyya Sutta* broadens the interpretation of the relationship between mindfulness and locus of control beyond

JGSB: Jurnal Gerakan Semangat Buddhayana
Vol. 4, No.2, October 2026, Page. 104-122
DOI: https://doi.org/10.60046/jgsb.v4i2.354
E-ISSN: 3031-1985
https://ejournal.stiab-jinarakkhita.ac.id/index.php/jgsb/index

psychological aspects to encompass ethical dimensions and personal responsibility. However, these Buddhist principles should not be directly equated with the psychological construct of locus of control. Therefore, the contribution of this integration lies in enriching the conceptual and interpretative framework rather than providing empirical validation of the principles articulated in the sutta.

Conclussion

This study demonstrated a positive and statistically significant relationship between mindfulness and employees' locus of control, with substantial explanatory power in the regression model ($\beta = 0.897$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.804$). These findings indicate that mindfulness is strongly associated with individuals' perceptions of control in the workplace. From the perspective of the *Ādhipateyya Sutta* (AN 3.40), this relationship acquires broader conceptual significance through three Buddhist principles of authority: *attādhipateyya*, which emphasizes self-reflection and personal responsibility; *lokādhipateyya*, which concerns moral considerations within the social environment; and *dhammādhipateyya*, which establishes the Dhamma as an ethical foundation for guiding individual actions. This integration suggests that mindfulness can be understood not only in relation to perceptions of personal control but also through reflective awareness and ethical responsibility. The primary contribution of this study lies in advancing a conceptual dialogue between organizational psychology and Buddhist teachings while maintaining a clear distinction between the psychological construct of locus of control and the principles of authority articulated in the Buddhist tradition. From a practical perspective, these findings provide a basis for organizations to consider developing mindfulness-based activities that support self-reflection, behavioral self-regulation, and professional responsibility. However, the interpretation of the findings is constrained by the cross-sectional research design, the sample drawn from a single institution, and the use of a locus of control instrument incorporating several related constructs. Future research should therefore strengthen measurement validity, employ longitudinal or experimental designs, and examine more diverse organizational contexts. Further empirical investigation is also needed to explore how the principles outlined in the *Ādhipateyya Sutta* can be conceptually and methodologically operationalized in research on mindfulness, self-direction, and ethical responsibility in the workplace.

References

Brown, K. W., & Ryan, R. M. (2003). The benefits of being present: Mindfulness and its role in psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *84*(4), 822–848. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.4.822

Bodhi, B. (2012). *The Numerical Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Aṅguttara Nikāya*. Wisdom Publications. https://suttacentral.net/an3.40/en/bodhi

Cahyaningrum, K., Widah Faridah, B., Alif Pratama, A., Syah, R., & Ubaidillah Solihin, H. (2024). Efektivitas Pelatihan Mindfulness untuk Mengurangi Stres Kerja pada Pegawai. *Jurnal Psikologi Talenta Mahasiswa*, *3*(3). https://dx.doi.org/10.26858/jtm.v3i3.50320

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

https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726713487753

Ginawati, M. (2019). Pengaruh Locus of Control dan Motivasi Terhadap Prestasi Kerja Karyawan (Suatu Studi Pada PT. Bineatama Kayone Lestari Tasikmalaya). *Jurnal Business Management and Entrepreneurship*, *1*(2). https://jurnal.unigal.ac.id/bmej/article/view/2308

Good, D. J., Lyddy, C. J., Glomb, T. M., Bono, J. E., Brown, K. W., Duffy, M. K., Baer, R. A., Brewer, J. A., & Lazar, S. W. (2016). Contemplating mindfulness at work: An integrative review. *Journal of Management*, *42*(1), 114–142. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315617003

Halim, E. N., Paramarta, V., & Mariati Asnar, E. S. (2026). An Analysis of the Effects of Competence, Internal Locus of Control, and Work Culture on Employee Organizational Commitment: A Case Study at Kraton Regional General Hospital, Pekalongan Regency. *Eduvest - Journal of Universal Studies*, *6*(5), 5302–5320. https://doi.org/10.59188/eduvest.v6i5.53085

Hölzel, B. K., Lazar, S. W., Gard, T., Schuman-Olivier, Z., Vago, D. R., & Ott, U. (2011). How Does Mindfulness Meditation Work? Proposing Mechanisms of Action From a Conceptual and Neural Perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science : A Journal of the Association for Psychological Science*, *6*(6), 537–559. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691611419671

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

Kabat-Zinn, J. (1990). *Full catastrophe living: Using the wisdom of your body and mind to face stress, pain, and illness*. Delacorte.

Khoury, B., Sharma, M., Rush, S. E., & Fournier, C. (2015). Mindfulness-based stress reduction for healthy individuals: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, *78*(6), 519–528. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2015.03.009

Ng, T. W. H., Sorensen, K. L., & Eby, L. T. (2006). Locus of control at work: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *27*(8), 1057–1087. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.416

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill. https://opac.ensign.edu.gh/bib/339

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(5), 879–903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, *80*(1), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0092976

Schultz, P. P., Ryan, R. M., Niemiec, C. P., Legate, N., & Williams, G. C. (2015). Mindfulness, Work Climate, and Psychological Need Satisfaction in Employee Well-being.

Mindfulness, *6*(5), 971–985. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-014-0338-7

Shapiro, S. L., Carlson, L. E., Astin, J. A., & Freedman, B. (2006). Mechanisms of mindfulness. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *62*(3), 373–386. https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.20237

Spector, P. E. (1982). Behavior in organizations as a function of employees' locus of control. *Psychological Bulletin*, *91*(3), 482–497. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.91.3.482

Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode Penelitian: Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta. https://inlislite.ipdn.ac.id/opac/detail-opac?id=2723

Ṭhānissaro Bhikkhu. (1998). Ādhipateyya Sutta: Governing principles (AN 3.40). Access to Insight. https://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/an/an03/an03.040.than.html

Wang, Q., Bowling, N. A., & Eschleman, K. J. (2010). A meta-analytic examination of work and general locus of control. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *95*(4), 761–768. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017707