Check for updates

Journal of Organizational Behavior

WILEY

Journal of Organizational Behavior

POINT-COUNTERPOINT

Contextualizing Mindfulness at Work: Strengthening the Scientific Evidence

Darren J. Good[1] | Christopher J. Lyddy[2] | Kirk Warren Brown[3]

[1]Pepperdine Graziadio Business School, Pepperdine University, Malibu, California, USA | [2]School of Business, Providence College, Providence, Rhode Island, USA | [3]Department of Psychology, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

Correspondence: Darren J. Good (darren.good@pepperdine.edu) | Christopher J. Lyddy (clyddy1@providence.edu)

Received: 31 October 2025 | **Revised:** 4 June 2026 | **Accepted:** 16 June 2026

ABSTRACT

Are there benefits to mindfulness in the workplace? The answer is clear. In this Counterpoint to Sajons and Antonakis (in press), we consider the research evidence showing that mindfulness contributes to enhanced workplace well-being, healthy social dynamics, and job performance. This interdisciplinary mindfulness literature is notable for its rigor and breadth, which bolsters confidence in the workplace value of mindfulness. We propose advancing discourse on the topic by contextualizing mindfulness within organizational scholarship. This important inquiry involves integrating mindfulness with models of organizational cognition and clarifying its workplace antecedents, moderators, and boundary conditions. These additions should narrow the gap between sanguine and skeptical perspectives on mindfulness at work. Taken together, we argue that mindfulness is beneficial, benign, and worthy of sustained scholarly and organizational investment.

1 | Introduction

Interest in workplace mindfulness has grown dramatically, fueled by studies suggesting benefits for employee well-being, performance, and social dynamics. In their focal article, Sajons and Antonakis (In press) raise a timely challenge to this trend, warning that "mindfulness" risks becoming a corporate buzzword outpacing its scientific support. We applaud these authors for sparking dialogue about excessive hype and ensuring that organizational mindfulness research and initiatives rest on solid evidence. We share their concern that enthusiasm for mindfulness in the workplace should not race ahead of what empirical science can justify. At the same time, we find that many of their critiques miss the mark by mischaracterizing the current state of mindfulness research in organizational behavior (OB). In this counterpoint, we contend that the focal article's methodological criticisms—though important in principle—are often overly general or unrealistically stringent and are applied in a way that overlooks the considerable rigor found in the mindfulness literature. Furthermore, by focusing on a narrow slice of studies and offering little theoretical analysis, the critique paints an incomplete picture.

Drawing on our expertise as mindfulness scholars, we respond in two parts. First, we address the methodological concerns, showing that mindfulness research at work is more robust and well-founded than the focal article implies. We illustrate how the critique's demands for evidence, while laudable in theory, are disconnected from both standard OB research practices and the rich multidisciplinary evidence base on mindfulness. Second, we advance the theoretical conversation largely sidestepped by the focal article, calling for greater contextualization of mindfulness at work. In our view, a deeper theoretical inquiry—what we have begun to frame as *contemplative management theory* (CMT)—is essential for understanding *when* and *how* mindfulness adds value in organizations (Good et al. 2016; Lyddy and Good 2025). By addressing both methodology and theory, we aim to enrich this debate and chart a forward-looking agenda for mindfulness at work grounded in rigorous science and practical wisdom.

Darren J. Good and Christopher J. Lyddy share equal responsibility for the manuscript.

© 2026 John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

2 | Setting the Debate on Mindfulness at Work

Responding to critiques of mindfulness involves first clarifying the nature of this oft-confused construct. Rooted in Buddhism, mindfulness can be defined in different ways according to translation from source material and historical and contemporary cultural tradition (e.g., Brown and Grossman 2025). For simplicity, we describe its primary feature as a sustained, receptive attention to and awareness of current experiences or events (e.g., Brown and Ryan 2003). This construct, whether theorized and operationalized as a state of mind or dispositional propensity, contrasts with the common experiences of mind-wandering, distraction, and automatic functioning. Fortunately, mindfulness can be reliably augmented through mindfulness practices (like meditation) and training interventions (Creswell 2017).

3 | Methodological Critiques and the Evidence Base for Mindfulness

3.1 | Scope of Evidence and Disciplinary Boundaries

The focal article's concerns about the support for mindfulness (Sajons and Antonakis In press) are partly shaped by imprecise inclusion and exclusion of literature. A core critique is that empirical support for workplace mindfulness is weak, resting on correlational studies that lack causal direction. To build claims about the weakness of the literature, Sajons and Antonakis (in press, 8) draw from "a random set" of micro-OB studies found in a handful of top management and applied psychology journals.[1] This narrow scope is problematic. By design, it excludes the vast majority of mindfulness research emerging from psychology, neuroscience, and medicine—fields that have long examined mindfulness with rigorous methods. Micro-OB as a discipline has always advanced by drawing from basic research in psychology and related areas (Heath and Sitkin 2001), and the study of mindfulness is no exception. Imposing an artificial boundary around only management journals not only ignores OB's interdisciplinary nature but also acts as a blinder to some of the strongest evidence on mindfulness.

Confusion also stems from including research that is not actually about mindfulness as defined in this discourse (present moment attention and awareness). Indeed, the focal authors' analysis inadvertently illustrates this issue by erroneously including a paper on "social mindfulness" (Song et al. 2018) that uses the term *mindfulness* in a very different sense (attention to others' needs). This apples-to-oranges inclusion underscores the focal article's imprecision about the construct and reinforces the need for clear boundaries and definitions in future discourse.

In sum, sweeping claims that only weak evidence exists in support of mindfulness' workplace benefits ignore a wealth of high-quality evidence outside the focal article's self-imposed scope. When one steps back and considers the full body of work, mindfulness shows very real and replicable effects on many basic human processes relevant to work.

3.2 | Methodological Standards in Context

The focal article calls for unusually stringent study designs—drawn primarily from economics methods—as the preferable approach for researching mindfulness. For example, the authors lament the lack of studies that randomly manipulate mediators or implement certain quasi-experimental techniques seldom seen in micro-OB. We agree that stronger causal designs are desirable; however, singling out mindfulness research for not meeting atypical methodological standards is misguided. By the focal authors' own admission, the proposed methods are virtually unused across micro-OB, so their critiques should address broader disciplinary norms, not specifically mindfulness studies. Furthermore, it is curious to castigate mindfulness research for methodological approaches commonly used in micro-OB.

If anything, many mindfulness-at-work studies reflect or even exceed typical OB standards. For instance, randomized field experiments are increasingly used to assess effects of mindfulness interventions (Hafenbrack et al. 2020; Sawyer et al. 2022), as RCT methodologies avoid many of the focal article's concerns about endogeneity. More broadly, the reproducibility of mindfulness findings is actually a bright spot: associations between trait or state mindfulness and outcomes like burnout, engagement, and performance have been demonstrated by multiple independent teams using diverse methods. Multiple studies show that mindfulness and mindfulness practices predict greater work engagement and reduced surface acting and burnout (Hülsheger et al. 2013; Leroy et al. 2013; Lyddy et al. 2025; Radin et al. 2025). Replication across methods, samples, settings, and independent research teams suggests these relationships are reliable, helping to allay concerns that workplace mindfulness findings might be driven by unmeasured variables or headed towards a "replication crisis" (Köhler and Cortina 2021).

Crucially, when one looks beyond the micro-OB silo, mindfulness research boasts a rigor and breadth atypical for organizational phenomena. As of 2021, there were over 16 000 papers on mindfulness (Baminiwatta and Solangaarachchi 2021), including hundreds of randomized controlled trials and neuroscience experiments (Goldberg et al. 2022; Michaelsen et al. 2023; Tang et al. 2015). To illustrate, consider a pair of studies by Tang and colleagues that meet a high bar for causal inference. In one study (Tang et al. 2007), healthy volunteers were randomly assigned to short-term mindfulness training or an active relaxation control condition; those in the mindfulness condition showed significantly better attention on objective tasks, lower levels of stress hormones, and changes in brain activity in self-regulation regions. In a follow-up study (Tang et al. 2013), a brief mindfulness intervention led to reduced smoking behavior among participants without even explicitly targeting smoking cessation. These findings address the kind of "third variable" and causality issues the focal article frets over—demonstrating that mindfulness practice causally leads to improvements in attentional performance, stress reactivity, and self-control. Likewise, other rigorous designs have compared long-term mindfulness experts to novices, revealing dose–response relationships; for example, monks with thousands of hours of meditation experience show measurably more efficient neural processing of distractions than novices (Brefczynski-Lewis et al. 2007). While such designs are unconventional in organizational research, they

10991379, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/job.70112 by Ku Leuven, Wiley Online Library on [20/07/2026]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

provide compelling evidence that mindfulness training causally produces enduring changes in basic capacities like attention and emotion regulation—capacities that are inherently relevant in work settings. In short, contrary to the focal article's implication, the link between mindfulness and "basic functioning" is backed by robust science. This gives us confidence that applying mindfulness in organizations is not a blind leap of faith, but a translational step building on well-established effects in the mind and body.

The focal article also criticizes mindfulness studies for not always including active control conditions or for failing to compare mindfulness against alternative interventions. Once again, this critique, if applied uniformly, would indict most of applied psychology research, not just that which concerns mindfulness. Few workplace intervention studies routinely pit multiple interventions head-to-head or employ active placebo controls. However, on this front, mindfulness research is actually ahead of the curve. In clinical, health, and social psychology, it is now common to include active control conditions in mindfulness trials (e.g., comparing mindfulness training to coping or health education training; Lindsay et al. 2018; MacCoon et al. 2012), and these methodologies are increasingly seen in organizational contexts too. For example, several mindfulness-at-work studies have used active control conditions in both experimental (Hafenbrack et al. 2013; Liang et al. 2018; Long and Christian 2015) and intervention studies (Bartlett et al. 2019; Choi, Leroy, et al. 2022; Levy et al. 2012). One notable meta-analysis in the medical literature found that mindfulness interventions were as effective as established treatments (like antidepressant medication, physical exercise, or psychotherapy) for reducing depression and anxiety (Goyal et al. 2014). Rather than seeing this as a null result, we concur with its investigators who note that mindfulness interventions working as well as gold-standard treatments—often with fewer side effects and with added benefits like improved self-awareness—is a remarkable testament to its potency. In organizational research, hardly any other psychosocial intervention has been tested so rigorously or comparatively. Tellingly, when we surveyed top OB journals over 13 years,[2] we found only 11 articles that substantively mentioned "active control" or "comparative efficacy," and three of those were mindfulness-at-work papers (Choi, Leroy, et al. 2022; Kay and Skarlicki 2020; Shaffakat et al. 2022). This again underlines that mindfulness researchers have been pushing methodological frontiers.

The focal articles' specific complaints (e.g., including only "motivated" participants in mindfulness trainings) are similarly impractical. Participants in mindfulness programs are often self-selected, but workplace interventions cannot easily force research participation on randomly-chosen employees—and doing so would be unethical and undesirable, since unmotivated participants could undermine the training atmosphere and outcomes. The real-world constraints and norms of field research must temper idealized methodological prescriptions. Nonetheless mindfulness researchers routinely mitigate risks of selection effects, by using active or waitlist control designs or by measuring participants' baseline characteristics to statistically account for differences.

We agree with Sajons and Antonakis that future work should strive for more experimental and longitudinal designs to bolster causal claims (Good et al. 2016). However, dismissing the extant mindfulness literature for not meeting atypical standards in micro-OB research ignores the considerable methodological rigor it *does* possess. By conventional criteria of science—replication, theoretical coherence, triangulation of methods—the mindfulness-at-work knowledge base is on solid ground and steadily maturing. The focal article's conclusion that organizations should hold off on mindfulness programs until stronger evidence emerges strikes us as unduly stringent and even counterproductive, potentially withholding a helpful intervention with substantial empirical support (Creswell 2017).

Instead, we envision organizational science and mindfulness practice as co-evolving. Organizations routinely invest in interventions (leadership training, team development, employee wellness, etc.) despite imperfect science. Mindfulness practices have already met criteria for adoption in many high-stakes contexts. For instance, variants of mindfulness training are offered by major corporations, academic medical centers (Wolever et al. 2012), national health systems (e.g., the UK's National Health Service), and militaries (Jha et al. 2010) because a critical mass of research supports their efficacy. If such institutions deem mindfulness interventions worthwhile for organizationally-relevant variables like stress reduction and cognitive functioning, it seems overly cautious to deem mindfulness insufficiently validated for organizational use. Of course, as scientists we advocate for ongoing rigorous evaluation, and for tailoring programs to each organizational context and population. However, given the generally positive evidence accumulated (and little indication of serious harm in workplace settings), mindfulness-based programs can be ethically and judiciously implemented while research continues. The question then becomes not just *whether* mindfulness works at all, but *why* and *when* it works best in organizational contexts. This is precisely the conversation that a broader and better-informed perspective enables, moving past the focal article's narrow skepticism toward a more constructive agenda for future research and practice.

4 | Contextualizing Mindfulness at Work

The evidence detailed above supports theoretical views that mindfulness predicts and promotes diverse and largely beneficial outcomes at work. Despite these different views, we do align with the focal article regarding the need to better understand mindfulness specifically in the context of work. With so much knowledge about mindfulness drawn from other disciplines, addressing this translational challenge could yield greater understanding because the work context differs markedly from some contexts of mindfulness research (e.g., neuroscientific studies and therapeutic interventions). Without understanding mindfulness specifically *at work*, skepticism about the causal and statistical relationships between mindfulness and workplace outcomes, and the efficacy and consistency of mindfulness practices in organizations, will persist. Researchers should therefore devote greater effort towards contextualizing mindfulness at work. Such a process is consistent with organizational science's historical development by importing constructs from basic disciplines like psychology (Heath and Sitkin 2001).

10991379, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/job.70112 by Ku Leuven, Wiley Online Library on [20/07/2026]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

We see at least two major research questions that should be addressed to enhance the contextual understanding of mindfulness at work. First, mindfulness has not yet been well-integrated into extant models of cognition in organizations (Hodgkinson and Healey 2008; J. P. Walsh 1995), likely in part because it is a very different mental mode to that commonly describing how individuals think at work. Clarifying how mindfulness influences typical cognition in organizations is an essential step towards increasing theoretical insight (Lyddy and Good 2017). Second, while we have an increasingly clear picture of the outcomes of mindfulness at work, we still know very little about the antecedents, mechanisms, and moderators that shape mindfulness at work. Addressing these questions should reduce the uncertainty about mindfulness at work raised in the focal article, and advance a dialogue between mindfulness skeptics and proponents.

4.1 | Gap 1: Integrating Mindfulness and Organizational Cognition

Organizational life is continuously shaped by cognitive and emotional processes. While mindfulness influences both domains, its relatively straightforward impacts on emotional processes at work have been better researched (e.g., on reducing negative effects and stress; Bartlett et al. 2019; Hülsheger et al. 2013). The effect of mindfulness on organizational cognition has been less explored, as it differs markedly from common understandings about how individuals think at work in multiple respects, like meta-cognition, appraisal, temporality, attention, identity, self-regulation, conceptual processing, and more. This integration represents an important research frontier.

Explaining how mindfulness offers distinctive cognitive resources that synergistically combine with cognition would advance theories about the workplace benefits of mindfulness. For example, mindfulness predicts reduced temporal focus on the past, a mediating mechanism explaining reduced susceptibility to sunk-cost bias (Hafenbrack et al. 2013). Another example is around receiving critical feedback, which typically provokes defensive responses that divert attention from information key for self-development (Kluger and DeNisi 1996). Mindfulness may foster acceptance of such critiques without engaging in harsh evaluation of oneself or others, permitting more receptive attention to the critique and hence learning and growth (Lyddy et al. 2022).

However, mindfulness' properties might also act as liabilities that antagonistically impede cognitive processes in organizations, and these potential costs might limit or even reverse mindfulness' benefits, at least in specific contexts. For example, Hafenbrack and Vohs (2018) presented results from laboratory experiments showing that inducing mindfulness prior to routine tasks predicted decrements in motivation to perform those tasks. However, other research has shown that mindfulness conduces to autonomous choice (e.g., Beloborodova and Brown 2023; Brown and Ryan 2003), which may be reflected in reduced motivation to perform routine tasks.

Similar questions arise regarding the relationship of mindfulness and attention. Mindfulness correlates in neurological studies with enhanced attention (Good et al. 2016), an essential resource in organizational cognition (Lord et al. 2010; March and Simon 1958; Ocasio 1997). In contrast with the vast majority of extant literature, several studies show that under certain circumstances, mindful attention can lead to decrements in workplace well-being, job performance, and social relationships. Specifically, mindfulness has been shown to magnify relationships between aversive variables (abusive supervision, surface acting, and situational anxiety) and undesirable outcomes (ill-being, self-control depletion, loneliness, and low job performance; Good et al. 2025; Lyddy et al. 2021a; M. M. Walsh and Arnold 2020). Formally theorizing and investigating the cognitive resources and liabilities that emerge from mindfulness will contribute to a better understanding of *why* and *when* mindfulness benefits organizational outcomes.

4.2 | Gap 2: Contextualizing Mindfulness at Work

With increasing rigor, research shows the changes in basic functioning and workplace outcomes associated with mindfulness, but important contextual questions remain. A major gap is a lack of understanding of the antecedents of mindfulness at work, including both intervention practices and organizational factors. Furthermore, while the workplace is rife with many contextual factors that could influence mindfulness, little research has considered these formally. Such factors might act as predictors of mindfulness but also seem likely to moderate the relationships between mindfulness and its antecedents and outcomes. Contextualizing mindfulness at work in these respects would help to address the questions raised in the focal article.

The simplest path for managing mindfulness at work is designing and validating workplace-friendly mindfulness practices, yet which intervention components maximize (or limit) efficacy in modern workplaces is unclear. Technology is increasingly shaping the ability of organizations to bolster mindfulness, with mobile and online platforms making different types of mindfulness meditation readily accessible and scalable across even large organizations (Creswell and Goldberg 2025). A recent large randomized trial served to validate this approach: Employees assigned to use a popular meditation app briefly each day showed significant reductions in stress, burnout, and anxiety, along with improved engagement, relative to waitlist controls (Radin et al. 2025). Notably, these improvements remained four months later, indicating that digital delivery can produce enduring benefits for employee focus and well-being. One critique of mindfulness programs has been their cost and logistical burden (bringing in trainers, scheduling classes, etc.), but digital technology creates practical, low-cost alternatives that ensure standardized instruction quality and create opportunities for personalized user experience (e.g., adapting difficulty or focus areas based on user feedback; Radin et al. 2025). Future research could explore how to best integrate these digital interventions into the workday.

While organizational factors are also likely important antecedents of mindfulness (Ashforth and Fried 1988; Good et al. 2016; Shahbaz and Parker 2022; Sutcliffe et al. 2016; Weick and Putnam 2006), limited empirical research has directly addressed this topic (Lyddy and Good 2017; Reb et al. 2015). Organizational contexts include at least three basic dimensions—task, social, and

10991379, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/job.70112 by Ku Leuven, Wiley Online Library on [20/07/2026]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

physical (Johns 2006) — that could directly impact mindfulness. Consistent with this, initial studies have shown that antecedent factors like workload (Hülsheger et al. 2018), supervisor support (Reb et al. 2015), and job control (Lawrie et al. 2018) may predict mindfulness; yet other contextual aspects have received little or no investigation. While organizational culture ubiquitously influences individual psychology and behavior at work, research has not considered if and how different cultural dimensions may inhibit or promote mindfulness. For example, organizations that emphasize cognitive properties distinct from mindfulness, like evaluations of favorability/unfavorability, may predict lower employee mindfulness than organizational cultures that emphasize openness and equanimity.

Another gap is clarification of which aspects of the organizational context interact with practical and organizational antecedents of mindfulness at work. Here too, organizational culture might be important, potentially moderating the relationship between practical factors (e.g., type and dose of mindfulness intervention) and outcomes. For example, a mindful breathing exercise might be embraced in one company but ridiculed in another, making such practices more effective in the former environment. This effect was seen in a randomized intervention study of police officers, as perceived social norms favoring the training predicted greater increases in mindfulness (Krick and Felfe 2020).

Task context may also be important (Choi, Gruman, and Leonard 2022; Lyddy and Good 2017), potentially interacting with mindfulness in unexplored ways with important consequences. For example, in a study of nuclear power plant workers, task complexity moderated the relationship between mindfulness and task performance (Zhang et al. 2013). For employees with low task complexity roles (field workers), mindfulness was not a significant predictor of task performance, but among employees with high task complexity roles (control room operators), mindfulness significantly predicted superior task performance. Another example of task context that may moderate between mindfulness and outcomes is having strong norms for positive emotional displays, such as in customer service roles. Being mindful can amplify the self-regulatory and job performance costs of displaying inauthentic emotions (e.g., surface acting; Lyddy et al. 2021a). Therefore, highly mindful individuals in jobs with strong emotional display norms may exhibit less favorable or even inferior outcomes (Lyddy et al. 2021b).

In sum, little is known about *when* mindfulness may yield beneficial or detrimental outcomes. Considering boundary conditions permits more refined questions, rather than accepting or rejecting the importance of mindfulness outright. By identifying such contingencies, we address critics' concerns that the effects of mindfulness are unreliable, showing that such variation can be systematically investigated through empirical research. Developing this contextualized understanding would reflect a more nuanced understanding of mindfulness at work.

5 | Debating Mindfulness at Work: Organizational Responses Despite Imperfect Science

The emerging body of research can be used to support both favorable and skeptical views on mindfulness at work, as articulated in this Point-Counterpoint exchange. However, imperfect information should not induce paralysis; it should do the opposite, eliciting greater curiosity. As with most topics in social science, the ambiguity considered in this debate is likely to persist for some time. Therefore, the investigation and investment merited by mindfulness in the workplace should depend upon its expected benefits and costs.

We take a sanguine view, as evidence shows that the benefits of mindfulness interventions likely outweigh the costs, potentially to a substantial degree. Mindfulness interventions can be justified solely by the ample evidence documenting that they benefit well-being (Aikens et al. 2014; Bartlett et al. 2019; Brown et al. 2007; Creswell 2017; Eberth and Sedlmeier 2012; Janssen et al. 2018; Radin et al. 2025; Wolever et al. 2012), and workplace wellness interventions can offer very favorable benefit/cost ratios (Baicker et al. 2010). What makes mindfulness particularly intriguing is the growing evidence suggesting it also contributes to job performance (Lyddy et al. 2021a) and workplace interpersonal relationships (Beach et al. 2013; Reb et al. 2014). Even a modest expectation of benefit in these domains suggests mindfulness interventions and related research on mindfulness offer laudable value. By acting as a single "parsimonious intervention" with diverse impacts (Good et al. 2016, 134), organizations may realize these benefits with limited costs.

The skepticism about mindfulness at work evinced by Sajons and Antonakis (In press) will likely yield opportunity costs. In the over 16,000 studies published on mindfulness (Baminiwatta and Solangaarachchi 2021), unfavorable evidence is quite scarce. Only select studies document adverse effects from mindfulness training, often when considering more intensive interventions than typical workplace training (Britton 2019). While it is true that workplace research shows mindfulness and mindfulness interventions can exhibit null effects (Bartlett et al. 2019) or even limited costs (Good et al. 2025; Lyddy et al. 2021a), the preponderance of evidence in this field suggests that mindfulness offers an array of significant, durable, and beneficial impacts. Some small fraction of this evidence is found throughout this article, and more can be found in the many reviews (e.g., Brown et al. 2007; Chiesa and Serretti 2011; Creswell 2017; Eby et al. 2019; Good et al. 2016; Hölzel et al. 2011; Kriakous et al. 2021; Sutcliffe et al. 2016; Tang et al. 2015) and meta-analyses (e.g., Bartlett et al. 2019; Eberth and Sedlmeier 2012; Galante et al. 2021, 2023; Goldberg et al. 2022; Goyal et al. 2014; Janssen et al. 2018; Khoury et al. 2015; Michaelsen et al. 2023; Vonderlin et al. 2020) published on mindfulness among working and general populations. Consequently the case against mindfulness centers around uncertainty, which is best reduced through careful investment and investigation.

6 | Conclusion

The exchange initiated by Sajons and Antonakis (In press) has been invaluable in prompting reflection on mindfulness research and practice in organizations. While they argue that the "benefits of mindfulness at the workplace … [are] unclear" (p. 1), our response has aimed to demonstrate the opposite: the science of workplace mindfulness reveals great promise through rigorous interdisciplinary research spanning psychology, neuroscience,

10991379, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/job.70112 by Ku Leuven, Wiley Online Library on [20/07/2026]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

and organizational studies. It is neither as insubstantial as skeptics suggest nor as straightforward as cheerleaders might wish. This debate shows ample room to sharpen theories, improve methodologies, and deepen our understanding of *when* and *why* mindfulness is beneficial. The emerging picture is of a field coming into its own: one that acknowledges complexity and is supported by a broad base of evidence from multiple disciplines. Moving forward, we encourage scholars to build on this foundation by embracing more rigorous research designs, by engaging seriously with the integration challenges and contextualization of mindfulness at work, and by exploring new horizons such as antecedents of mindfulness like training, technology, and culture. When approached with scientific rigor and applied with discernment, mindfulness holds significant potential to enrich employees' lives and enhance organizational functioning. Rather than being considered a fad or a cure-all, it merits the sustained and rigorous inquiry that advances *contemplative management theory* (Good et al. 2016; Lyddy and Good 2025). With open dialogue between skeptics and proponents centered around evidence-based practice, we can ensure that mindfulness in the workplace evolves from a promising idea into a mature field of knowledge that benefits individuals, organizations, and society at large.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Thomas Ptashnik for the helpful feedback on the manuscript.

Data Availability Statement

Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

Endnotes

[1] https://osf.io/hnmdv?view_only=78b4bcc0e2fd4d9cac3e8e5e29f72512.

[2] For the period from 2010 to 2023, reflecting the focal article's search criteria, we searched JOB, AMJ, JAP, OBHDP, JOHP, JOM, Org Sci, PPsych, JVB, and LQ.

References

Aikens, K. A., J. Astin, K. R. Pelletier, et al. 2014. "Mindfulness Goes to Work: Impact of an Online Workplace Intervention." *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine* 56, no. 7: 721–731. https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000000209.

Ashforth, B. E., and Y. Fried. 1988. "The Mindlessness of Organizational Behaviors." *Human Relations* 41, no. 4: 305–329. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872678804100403.

Baicker, K., D. Cutler, and Z. Song. 2010. "Workplace Wellness Programs Can Generate Savings." *Health Affairs* 29, no. 2: 304–311. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2009.0626.

Baminiwatta, A., and I. Solangaarachchi. 2021. "Trends and Developments in Mindfulness Research Over 55 Years: A Bibliometric Analysis of Publications Indexed in Web of Science." *Mindfulness* 12, no. 9: 2099–2116. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-021-01681-x.

Bartlett, L., A. Martin, A. L. Neil, et al. 2019. "A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Workplace Mindfulness Training Randomized Controlled Trials." *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 24, no. 1: 108–126. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000146.

Beach, M. C., D. Roter, P. T. Korthuis, et al. 2013. "A Multicenter Study of Physician Mindfulness and Health Care Quality." *Annals of Family Medicine* 11, no. 5: 421–428. https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.1507.

Beloborodova, P., and K. W. Brown. 2023. "The Mismeasurement of Mindfulness: Evidence From Network Analysis of a Jangle Fallacy in Popular Mindfulness Scales." *PsyArXiv*. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/b9yjz.

Brefczynski-Lewis, J. A., A. Lutz, H. S. Schaefer, D. B. Levinson, and R. J. Davidson. 2007. "Neural Correlates of Attentional Expertise in Long-Term Meditation Practitioners." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 104, no. 27: 11483–11488. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0606552104.

Britton, W. B. 2019. "Can Mindfulness Be Too Much of a Good Thing? The Value of a Middle Way." *Current Opinion in Psychology* 28: 159–165. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2018.12.011.

Brown, K. W., and P. Grossman. 2025. "Conceptualization and Operationalization of Mindfulness in Contemporary Contemplative Science." In *Handbook of Mindfulness: Theory, Research, and Practice*, edited by K. W. Brown, J. D. Creswell, and R. M. Ryan, 2nd ed. p. 28. Guilford. https://books.google.com/books%3Fhl%3Den&lr%3D&id%3DRwxIEQAAQBAJ&oi%3Dfnd&pg%3DPA28&dq%3Dkirk%2Bwarren%2Bbrown%2Bpaul%2Bgrossman&ots%3DeiH9IrcoYR&sig%3DKFioCx5TAwD2iuR6nN-Ub02IESPg.

Brown, K. W., and R. M. Ryan. 2003. "The Benefits of Being Present: Mindfulness and Its Role in Psychological Well-Being." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 84, no. 4: 822–848. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.4.822.

Brown, K. W., R. M. Ryan, and J. D. Creswell. 2007. "Mindfulness: Theoretical Foundations and Evidence for Its Salutary Effects." *Psychological Inquiry* 18, no. 4: 211–237. https://doi.org/10.1080/10478400701598298.

Chiesa, A., R. Calati, and A. Serretti. 2011. "Does Mindfulness Training Improve Cognitive Abilities? A Systematic Review of Neuropsychological Findings." *Clinical Psychology Review* 31, no. 3: 449–464. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2010.11.003.

Choi, E., J. A. Gruman, and C. M. Leonard. 2022. "A Balanced View of Mindfulness at Work." *Organizational Psychology Review* 12, no. 1: 35–72. https://doi.org/10.1177/20413866211036930.

Choi, E., H. Leroy, A. Johnson, and H. Nguyen. 2022. "Flaws and All: How Mindfulness Reduces Error Hiding by Enhancing Authentic Functioning." *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 27, no. 5: 451–469. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000327.

Creswell, J. D. 2017. "Mindfulness Interventions." *Annual Review of Psychology* 68: 491–516. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-042716-051139.

Creswell, J. D., and S. B. Goldberg. 2025. "The Meditation App Revolution." *American Psychologist*. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0001576.

Eberth, J., and P. Sedlmeier. 2012. "The Effects of Mindfulness Meditation: A Meta-Analysis." *Mindfulness* 3, no. 3: 174–189. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-012-0101-x.

Eby, L. T., T. D. Allen, K. M. Conley, R. L. Williamson, T. G. Henderson, and V. S. Mancini. 2019. "Mindfulness-Based Training Interventions for Employees: A Qualitative Review of the Literature." *Human Resource Management Review* 29, no. 2: 156–178. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.03.004.

Galante, J., C. Friedrich, T. Dalgleish, P. B. Jones, and I. R. White. 2023. "Systematic Review and Individual Participant Data Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials Assessing Mindfulness-Based Programs for Mental Health Promotion." *Nature Mental Health* 1, no. 7: 462–476. https://doi.org/10.1038/s44220-023-00081-5.

10991379, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/job.70112 by Ku Leuven, Wiley Online Library on [20/07/2026]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

Galante, J., C. Friedrich, A. F. Dawson, et al. 2021. "Mindfulness-Based Programmes for Mental Health Promotion in Adults in Nonclinical Settings: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomised Controlled Trials." *PLoS Medicine* 18, no. 1: e1003481. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003481.

Goldberg, S. B., K. M. Riordan, S. Sun, and R. J. Davidson. 2022. "The Empirical Status of Mindfulness-Based Interventions: A Systematic Review of 44 Meta-Analyses of Randomized Controlled Trials." *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 17, no. 1: 108–130. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620968771.

Good, D. J., C. J. Lyddy, T. M. Glomb, et al. 2016. "Contemplating Mindfulness at Work: An Integrative Review." *Journal of Management* 42, no. 1: 114–142. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315617003.

Good, D. J., C. J. Lyddy, P. S. Thompson, and W. J. Becker. 2025. "The Costs of Mindfulness During a Crisis: The Moderating Effects of Mindfulness on the Relationship Between Situational Anxiety, Loneliness, and Job Performance." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 61, no. 3: 435–467. https://doi.org/10.1177/00218863241261071.

Goyal, M., S. Singh, E. M. S. Sibinga, et al. 2014. "Meditation Programs for Psychological Stress and Well-Being: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis." *JAMA Internal Medicine* 174, no. 3: 357–368. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2013.13018.

Hafenbrack, A. C., L. D. Cameron, G. M. Spreitzer, C. Zhang, L. J. Noval, and S. Shaffakat. 2020. "Helping People by Being in the Present: Mindfulness Increases Prosocial Behavior." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 159: 21–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2019.08.005.

Hafenbrack, A. C., Z. Kinias, and S. G. Barsade. 2013. "Debiasing the Mind Through Meditation: Mindfulness and the Sunk-Cost Bias." *Psychological Science* 25, no. 2: 369–376. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613503853.

Hafenbrack, A. C., and K. D. Vohs. 2018. "Mindfulness Meditation Impairs Task Motivation but Not Performance." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 147: 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2018.05.001.

Heath, C., and S. B. Sitkin. 2001. "Big-B Versus Big-O: What Is Organizational About Organizational Behavior?" *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 22, no. 1: 43–58. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.77.

Hodgkinson, G. P., and M. P. Healey. 2008. "Cognition in Organizations." *Annual Review of Psychology* 59: 387–417. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.59.103006.093612.

Hölzel, B. K., S. W. Lazar, T. Gard, Z. Schuman-Olivier, D. R. Vago, and U. Ott. 2011. "How Does Mindfulness Meditation Work? Proposing Mechanisms of Action From a Conceptual and Neural Perspective" *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 6, no. 6: 537–559. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691611419671.

Hülsheger, U. R., H. J. E. M. Alberts, A. Feinholdt, and J. W. B. Lang. 2013. "Benefits of Mindfulness at Work: The Role of Mindfulness in Emotion Regulation, Emotional Exhaustion, and Job Satisfaction." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 98, no. 2: 310–325. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031313.

Hülsheger, U. R., A. Walkowiak, and M. S. Thommes. 2018. "How Can Mindfulness Be Promoted? Workload and Recovery Experiences as Antecedents of Daily Fluctuations in Mindfulness." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 91, no. 2: 261–284. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12206.

Janssen, M., Y. Heerkens, W. Kuijer, B. van der Heijden, and J. Engels. 2018. "Effects of Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction on Employees' Mental Health: A Systematic Review." *PLoS ONE* 13, no. 1: e0191332. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0191332.

Jha, A. P., E. A. Stanley, A. Kiyonaga, L. Wong, and L. Gelfand. 2010. "Examining the Protective Effects of Mindfulness Training on Working Memory Capacity and Affective Experience." *Emotion* 10, no. 1: 54–64.

Johns, G. 2006. "The Essential Impact of Context on Organizational Behavior." *Academy of Management Review* 31, no. 2: 386–408.

Kay, A. A., and D. P. Skarlicki. 2020. "Cultivating a Conflict-Positive Workplace: How Mindfulness Facilitates Constructive Conflict Management." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 159: 8–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2020.02.005.

Khoury, B., M. Sharma, S. E. Rush, and C. Fournier. 2015. "Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction for Healthy Individuals: A Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Psychosomatic Research* 78, no. 6: 519–528. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2015.03.009.

Kluger, A. N., and A. DeNisi. 1996. "The Effects of Feedback Interventions on Performance: A Historical Review, a Meta-Analysis, and a Preliminary Feedback Intervention Theory." *Psychological Bulletin* 119, no. 2: 254–284. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.119.2.254.

Köhler, T., and J. M. Cortina. 2021. "Play It Again, Sam! An Analysis of Constructive Replication in the Organizational Sciences." *Journal of Management* 47, no. 2: 488–518. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206319843985.

Kriakous, S. A., K. A. Elliott, C. Lamers, and R. Owen. 2021. "The Effectiveness of Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction on the Psychological Functioning of Healthcare Professionals: A Systematic Review." *Mindfulness* 12, no. 1: 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-020-01500-9.

Krick, A., and J. Felfe. 2020. "Who Benefits From Mindfulness? The Moderating Role of Personality and Social Norms for the Effectiveness on Psychological and Physiological Outcomes Among Police Officers." *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 25, no. 2: 99–112. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000159.

Lawrie, E. J., M. R. Tuckey, and M. F. Dollard. 2018. "Job Design for Mindful Work: The Boosting Effect of Psychosocial Safety Climate." *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 23, no. 4: 483–495. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000102.

Leroy, H., F. Anseel, N. G. Dimitrova, and L. Sels. 2013. "Mindfulness, Authentic Functioning, and Work Engagement: A Growth Modeling Approach." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 82, no. 3: 238–247. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2013.01.012.

Levy, D. M., J. O. Wobbrock, A. W. Kaszniak, and M. Ostergren. 2012. "The Effects of Mindfulness Meditation Training on Multitasking in a High-Stress Information Environment." In *Proceedings of Graphics Interface*, 45–52. Canadian Information Processing Society.

Liang, L. H., D. J. Brown, D. L. Ferris, S. Hanig, H. Lian, and L. M. Keeping. 2018. "The Dimensions and Mechanisms of Mindfulness in Regulating Aggressive Behaviors." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 103, no. 3: 281–299. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000283.

Lindsay, E. K., S. Young, J. M. Smyth, K. W. Brown, and J. D. Creswell. 2018. "Acceptance Lowers Stress Reactivity: Dismantling Mindfulness Training in a Randomized Controlled Trial." *Psychoneuroendocrinology* 87: 63–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2017.09.015.

Long, E. C., and M. S. Christian. 2015. "Mindfulness Buffers Retaliatory Responses to Injustice: A Regulatory Approach." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 100, no. 5: 1409–1422. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000019.

Lord, R. G., J. M. Diefendorff, A. M. Schmidt, and R. J. Hall. 2010. "Self-Regulation at Work." *Annual Review of Psychology* 61: 543–568.

Lyddy, C. J., and D. J. Good. 2017. "Being While Doing: An Inductive Model of Mindfulness at Work." *Frontiers in Psychology* 7: 2060. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.02060.

Lyddy, C. J., and D. J. Good. 2025. "Contemplative Management: Theory and Practice of an Emerging Discipline." In *Handbook of Mindfulness: Theory, Research, and Practice*, edited by K. W. Brown, J. D. Creswell, and R. M. Ryan, 2nd ed. Guilford Press.

10991379, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/job.70112 by Ku Leuven, Wiley Online Library on [20/07/2026]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License

Lyddy, C. J., D. J. Good, M. C. Bolino, P. S. Thompson, and J. P. Stephens. 2021a. "The Costs of Mindfulness at Work: The Moderating Role of Mindfulness in Surface Acting, Self-Control Depletion, and Performance Outcomes." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 106, no. 12: 1921–1938. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000863.

Lyddy, C. J., D. J. Good, M. C. Bolino, P. S. Thompson, and J. P. Stephens. 2021b. "Where Mindfulness Falls Short." *Harvard Business Review*. https://hbr.org/2021/03/where-mindfulness-falls-short.

Lyddy, C. J., D. J. Good, T. D. Kriz, and J. P. Stephens. 2022. "Contemplating Critique: Mindfulness Attenuates Self-Esteem and Self-Regulatory Impacts of Negative Feedback." *Mindfulness* 13, no. 6: 1521–1531. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-022-01894-8.

Lyddy, C. J., D. J. Good, S. Yuan, E. J. Michel, C. Ahlvik-Garrison, and J. Reb. 2025. "Reperceiving Personal Resources Within JD-R: Mindfulness Influences Burnout and Work Engagement by Shaping Perceptions of Job Demands and Job Resources." *Journal of Business Research* 193: 115307. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2025.115307.

MacCoon, D. G., Z. E. Imel, M. A. Rosenkranz, et al. 2012. "The Validation of an Active Control Intervention for Mindfulness Based Stress Reduction (MBSR)." *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 50, no. 1: 3–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2011.10.011.

March, J. G., and H. A. Simon. 1958. *Organizations*. Wiley.

Michaelsen, M. M., J. Graser, M. Onescheit, et al. 2023. "Mindfulness-Based and Mindfulness-Informed Interventions at the Workplace: A Systematic Review and Meta-Regression Analysis of RCTs." *Mindfulness* 14, no. 6: 1271–1304. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-023-02130-7.

Ocasio, W. 1997. "Towards an Attention-Based View of the Firm." *Strategic Management Journal* 18: 187–206.

Radin, R. M., J. Vacarro, E. Fromer, et al. 2025. "Digital Meditation to Target Employee Stress: A Randomized Clinical Trial." *JAMA Network Open* 8, no. 1: e2454435. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.54435.

Reb, J., J. Narayanan, and S. Chaturvedi. 2014. "Leading Mindfully: Two Studies on the Influence of Supervisor Trait Mindfulness on Employee Well-Being and Performance." *Mindfulness* 5, no. 1: 36–45. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-012-0144-z.

Reb, J., J. Narayanan, and Z. W. Ho. 2015. "Mindfulness at Work: Antecedents and Consequences of Employee Awareness and Absent-Mindedness." *Mindfulness* 6, no. 1: 111–122. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-013-0236-4.

Sajons, G. B., and J. Antonakis. In press. "Mindfulness in the Workplace: How Strong Is the Scientific Evidence?" *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.

Sawyer, K. B., C. N. Thoroughgood, E. E. Stillwell, M. K. Duffy, K. L. Scott, and E. A. Adair. 2022. "Being Present and Thankful: A Multi-Study Investigation of Mindfulness, Gratitude, and Employee Helping Behavior." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 107, no. 2: 240–262. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000903.

Shaffakat, S., L. Otaye-Ebede, J. Reb, R. Chandwani, and P. Vongswasdi. 2022. "Mindfulness Attenuates Both Emotional and Behavioral Reactions Following Psychological Contract Breach: A Two-Stage Moderated Mediation Model." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 107, no. 3: 425–443. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000878.

Shahbaz, W., and J. Parker. 2022. "Workplace Mindfulness: An Integrative Review of Antecedents, Mediators, and Moderators." *Human Resource Management Review* 32, no. 3: 100849. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2021.100849.

Song, Y., Y. Liu, M. Wang, K. Lanaj, R. E. Johnson, and J. Shi. 2018. "A Social Mindfulness Approach to Understanding Experienced Customer Mistreatment: A Within-Person Field Experiment." *Academy of Management Journal* 61, no. 3: 994–1020. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2016.0448.

Sutcliffe, K. M., T. J. Vogus, and E. Dane. 2016. "Mindfulness in Organizations: A Cross-Level Review." *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior* 3, no. 1: 55–81. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-041015-062531.

Tang, Y.-Y., B. K. Hölzel, and M. I. Posner. 2015. "The Neuroscience of Mindfulness Meditation." *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 16, no. 4: 213–225. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3916.

Tang, Y.-Y., Y. Ma, J. Wang, et al. 2007. "Short-Term Meditation Training Improves Attention and Self-Regulation." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 104, no. 43: 17152–17156. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0707678104.

Tang, Y.-Y., R. Tang, and M. I. Posner. 2013. "Brief Meditation Training Induces Smoking Reduction." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110, no. 34: 13971–13975. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1311887110.

Vonderlin, R., M. Biermann, M. Bohus, and L. Lyssenko. 2020. "Mindfulness-Based Programs in the Workplace: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials." *Mindfulness* 11, no. 7: 1579–1598. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-020-01328-3.

Walsh, J. P. 1995. "Managerial and Organizational Cognition: Notes From a Trip Down Memory Lane." *Organization Science* 6, no. 3: 280–321. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.6.3.280.

Walsh, M. M., and K. A. Arnold. 2020. "The Bright and Dark Sides of Employee Mindfulness: Leadership Style and Employee Well-Being." *Stress and Health* 36, no. 3: 287–298. https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.2926.

Weick, K. E., and T. Putnam. 2006. "Organizing for Mindfulness: Eastern Wisdom and Western Knowledge." *Journal of Management Inquiry* 15, no. 3: 275–287. https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492606291202.

Wolever, R. Q., K. J. Bobinet, K. McCabe, et al. 2012. "Effective and Viable Mind-Body Stress Reduction in the Workplace: A Randomized Controlled Trial." *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 17, no. 2: 246–258. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027278.

Zhang, J., W. Ding, Y. Li, and C. Wu. 2013. "Task Complexity Matters: The Influence of Trait Mindfulness on Task and Safety Performance of Nuclear Power Plant Operators." *Personality and Individual Differences* 55, no. 4: 433–439. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.04.004.

10991379, 0, Downloaded from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/job.70112 by Ku Leuven, Wiley Online Library on [20/07/2026]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/terms-and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License