Predicting Individual Preferences in Mindfulness Techniques Using Personality Traits

Rongxiang Tang

Todd Braver

Washington University in St. Louis

Abstract

The growing popularity of mindfulness-based interventions has prompted exciting scientific research regarding their beneficial effects on well-being and health. Most mindfulness programs are provided as multi-faceted packages encompassing a set of different mindfulness techniques, each with distinct focus and mechanisms. However, this approach overlooks potential individual differences which may arise in response to practicing various mindfulness techniques. The present study investigated preferences for four prototypical mindfulness techniques (focused attention, open monitoring, loving-kindness, and body scan) and identified factors that may contribute to individual differences in these preferences. Participants without prior mindfulness experiences were exposed to each technique through audio-guided instructions and were asked to rank their preferences at the end of all practices. Results indicated that preferences for loving-kindness were predicted by empathy, and that females tended to prefer loving-kindness more than males. Conversely, preferences for open monitoring were predicted by nonreactivity and nonjudgment of present moment experiences. Additionally, higher state mindfulness was detected for individuals' preferred technique relative to other alternatives. These findings suggest that individuals tend to prefer techniques compatible with their personalities, as the predictor variables encompass trait capacities specifically relevant to practicing these techniques. Together, our results suggest the possibility that assessing individual difference and then tailoring mindfulness-based interventions to individual needs could be a useful way to improve intervention effectiveness and subsequent outcomes.

Keywords: mindfulness, meditation, individual difference, personality, preferences

Introduction

Mindfulness-based interventions (MBIs) have gained traction over the past few decades among scientific and public communities for their promising effects in improving psychological well-being, cognition, physiology, and brain health, in both healthy and clinical populations (Black & Slavich, 2016; Chiesa, Calati, & Serretti, 2010; Gu, Strauss, Bond, & Cavanagh, 2015; Khoury, Sharma, Rush, & Fournier, 2015; Tang, Hölzel, & Posner, 2015). Cultivating and promoting mindfulness – the nonjudgmental and nonreactive attention and awareness of present moment experiences – is the one of the central themes of MBIs (Hölzel et al., 2011; Kabat-Zinn, 1990). Most MBIs, including two of the most popular variants – mindfulness-based stress reduction (MBSR) (Kabat-Zinn, 1990) and mindfulness-based cognitive behavioral therapy (MBCT) (Segal & Teasdale, 2018) – are provided as multi-faceted intervention packages encompassing a variety of mindfulness techniques that together achieve the goals of intervention. While these different techniques share the same goal of promoting mindfulness, studies have increasingly suggested that distinct cognitive and emotional processes are engaged in these mindfulness practices (Hölzel et al., 2011; Lutz, Slagter, Dunne, & Davidson, 2008; Vago & Silbersweig, 2012).

Indeed, mindfulness techniques not only differ considerably in terms of their object of attentional focus, but also vary in how attentional focus is directed toward the observed object. Focused attention (FA), one of the common mindfulness techniques taught in MBIs, involves directing and maintaining attentional focus and awareness on a specific object or sensation (e.g. breathing) throughout the duration of practice (Lutz et al., 2008). In contrast, open monitoring (OM), another prototypical mindfulness technique, emphasizes a non-specific or non-deliberate attentional focus, which involves openly observing and accepting any sensation, thoughts, or

emotion that arise at the present moment (Lutz et al., 2008). The former technique is concentrative and relies heavily on sustained attentional control to minimize mind wandering and distraction, while the latter technique is receptive and underscores a nonjudgmental monitoring of ongoing external and internal stimuli. Relatedly, loving-kindness, another common and popular mindfulness practice found in MBIs is vastly different from the previous two techniques. This practice involves cultivating positive emotions and feelings of kindness and love toward oneself and others through words and imagery, with the desire for all beings to be safe, happy, healthy, and free of suffering (Salzberg, 2011). This technique still requires individuals to be mindful during the practice but with a main emphasis on fostering positive emotions and compassion towards oneself and others (Fredrickson et al., 2008; Hutcherson, Seppala, & Gross, 2008). These apparent differences in styles of mindfulness practice have inspired growing investigations delineating the mechanisms of action by which individual technique work to differentially contribute to improvement in psychological and cognitive outcomes (Ainsworth, Eddershaw, Meron, Baldwin, & Garner, 2013; Britton et al., 2018; Hölzel et al., 2011; Lippelt, Hommel, & Colzato, 2014; Manna et al., 2010). Most importantly, these investigations do not assume different mindfulness techniques would have homogenous effects on relevant outcomes, even though they are often taught together in standardized MBIs.

Following this line of logic, it is improbable to assume that each individual would show similar responsiveness to every mindfulness technique. In fact, recent evidence has already indicated that individuals have preferences toward specific meditation techniques. In a study of 247 undergraduate students who were exposed to four different types of meditation (Zen, Vipassana, Qigong, and Mantra) over the course of 6-week training period, preferences were clearly demonstrated at the individual level, such that more students preferred Vipassana, a

mindfulness-based technique that focuses on breath observation, or Mantra, a practice that involves mental repetition of a sound or mantra, relative to the two other types of meditation - Qigong and Zen (Burke, 2012). Similarly, individual preferences or partiality toward specific modalities of attentional anchors (e.g. auditory, visual, somatosensory) commonly used in mindfulness techniques have been demonstrated in individuals exposed to 10-min of meditative practices (Anderson & Farb, 2018). These findings together corroborate the notion that individual differences can be found in response to various mindfulness techniques, while also highlighting MBI research to develop a better understanding of the potential moderating role of individual differences – a need that has previously been underscored by a number of researchers in the field (Davidson, 2010; Farias & Wikholm, 2016). Indeed, as concerns for potential adverse effects of MBIs are increasingly being noted (Farias & Wikholm, 2016; Van Dam et al., 2018), attending to individual preferences and differences in interventions could have important implications for clinical applications. Furthermore, matching individuals with appropriate mindfulness techniques or other suitable alternative based on their preferences would reduce the likelihood of attrition, facilitate adherence, and self-maintenance of practices, thereby enhancing intervention effectiveness and outcomes (Anderson & Farb, 2018; Swift, Callahan, & Vollmer, 2011).

However, there is currently a lack of knowledge of putative factors that may give rise to such individual difference in preferences, preventing us from making accurate predictions that would appropriately match individuals with techniques that they would likely find useful. Based on prior studies of individual difference in psychotherapy and MBIs, personality and dispositional traits are promising candidates that have been shown to influence standardized intervention effectiveness and outcomes (Chapman, Hampson, & Clarkin, 2014; de Vibe et al.,

2015; Nyklíček and Irrmischer, 2017). Yet, no study has investigated the feasibility of using these traits as potential predictors of individual preferences for mindfulness techniques. The present study examined and identified relevant personality and dispositional traits that may predict individual preferences for four prototypical mindfulness techniques found in most MBIs: focused attention, open monitoring, loving-kindness, and body scan. Furthermore, we explored whether preferences for specific mindfulness techniques would translate into differential level of state mindfulness during each meditative practice, demonstrating the practical implications of understanding and predicting individual preferences in MBIs.

Predictors of Individual Preferences for Mindfulness Techniques

To investigate whether personality and dispositional traits could be predictive of individual preferences, we specifically identified traits that contain critical capacities relevant for each mindfulness technique. The general hypothesis was that individuals would likely prefer techniques they can easily learn and practice without much difficulty or struggle. In other words, a mindfulness technique that heavily engages attentional control is likely to be preferred by individuals who feel skilled in the engagement of attentional control. Based on this hypothesis, below we described candidate predictors for each mindfulness technique, as well as related hypotheses.

Open Monitoring (OM)

This mindfulness technique does not have a designated object of attentional focus, instead it engages meta-awareness of arising and passing stimuli and emphasizes an equanimous monitoring and acceptance of these present moment experiences (Vago & Silbersweig, 2012). Therefore, we hypothesized that two facets of trait mindfulness, *nonreactivity to inner experience* and *nonjudging of inner experience*, should predict more preference for OM.

Additionally, we also hypothesized that *openness to experience*, a personality trait that involves open-mindedness, a sense of curiosity and attentiveness to inner feelings, should positively predict preferences for OM, as this trait should facilitate open awareness and acceptance of present moment experiences during the practice of OM.

Loving-kindness (LK)

Loving-kindness is another commonly practiced technique in MBIs, which involves fostering loving-kindness toward oneself and others through mental imagery or words (Salzberg, 2011). The standard technique begins with cultivating kindness toward oneself, then progresses onto a friend or loved one, someone who is “difficult” or unkind (i.e. enemy or disliked person), and finally expanding it to all people (Hofmann, Grossman, & Hinton, 2011). Given the emotional component of LK, we hypothesized that *empathy*, the ability to understand and adopt the psychological perspective of others and have feelings of sympathy for unfortunate others (Davis, 1983), should predict more preferences for LK. We also predicted that *self-compassion*, a dispositional trait that entails compassion and kindness toward oneself when encounter perceived failure and personal suffering (Neff, 2016) should predict more preferences for LK. Lastly, agreeableness, a personality trait characterized by similar qualities such as friendliness, warmth and cooperativeness (McCrae & Costa, 1991) should also predict more preferences for LK.

Focused Attention (FA)

The recruitment of attentional control is necessary for reducing distraction and maintaining attentional focus in this technique (Lutz et al., 2008). Thus, we hypothesized that individual’s capacity of *attentional focusing*, the ability to maintain attention while inhibiting distraction should positively predict preferences for FA. Furthermore, *conscientiousness*, a personality trait characterized by industriousness, persistence, and self-control (Sanderson and

Clarkin, 1994) should positively predict preferences for FA, as this trait has been shown to associate with inhibitory control and aspects of executive functions that support sustained attentional control (Hall & Fong, 2013; Vago & Silbersweig, 2012). Finally, *acting with awareness*, one facet of trait mindfulness that entails the ability to attend to present moment activities with awareness rather than behaving automatically, should predict preferences for FA.

Body Scan (BS)

Body scan is a technique that involves noticing and observing the physical sensation of individual body parts from top to bottom and sequentially shifting this attentional focus from one body part to the next (Dreeben, Marnberg, & Salmon, 2013). In particular, this technique has a cycle of directing, maintaining, disengaging, and shifting attention and awareness throughout the body. We hypothesized that *attentional shifting*, the ability to intentionally shift the attentional focus to desired object of focus, thereby avoiding unintentional focusing on other objects, should predict preferences for BS, since flexibly and constantly moving attentional focus is essential to this practice. Additionally, we hypothesized that *sensory processing sensitivity*, the tendency to engage in deeper cognitive processing of physical, emotional and social stimuli or to show heightened response to such stimuli (Aron & Aron, 1997) should predict less preference for BS, as individuals with high sensory processing sensitivity would likely have a difficult time disengaging from the current sensory experience or become too overwhelmed by the experience.

Covariates

Age and gender were included as standard covariates in all regression models. Additionally, we also included individual's recent perception of stress as measured by perceived stress scale (Cohen et al., 1988) as another covariate, in order to account for any potential influence of recent stress over preferences for mindfulness techniques. In addition, absorption, a

personality trait that describes the tendency to become fully engaged and devoted to sensory, imaginative, and self-altering experiences (perceptual, enactive, imaginative, and ideational) (Tellegen & Atkinson, 1974), was included as a covariate. Absorption has previously been shown to influence depth of meditative experiences, regardless of which meditation technique or tradition was practiced by the individual (Hölzel & Ott, 2006). Consequently, varying meditation depth could potentially bias individual preferences for mindfulness techniques. Therefore, we did not include absorption as a primary predictor (instead as a covariate), given that its general effect on meditation depth is not specific to any particular technique.

Methods

Participants

Participants without prior experiences in mindfulness and yoga practices were recruited for the study via the Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) on-line platform. The TurkPrime interface was used to post study descriptions to MTurk, manage recruitment and payment, send out reminder emails and handle all other communication with the participants. After reading a description of this multi-session study on MTurk, interested participants accessed a link which contained the consent form for them to review and sign electronically. After signing the consent, the web-link for the pre-screening questions was made available over MTurk. Data were collected across two separate testing waves held a few months apart, but the procedures for the tasks were identical across waves. Combining data from both waves, a total of 125 participants (79 males, 46 females) completed all study sessions, with age ranging from 22 to 67 years old ($M = 36.9$, $SD = 10.0$). Participants were compensated for a total of \$16 for completing all sessions. All protocols were approved by the Washington University Institutional Review Board.

Study Design and Procedure

The study included five sessions. Participants were asked to complete one session per day for five consecutive days. On each day, a new session was posted and participants were notified via emails. A brief screening questionnaire of prior mindfulness and yoga experiences occurred before the first session of the experiment. Eligible participants with no prior practice experiences were then presented with the web link to the first session of the experiment. This first session included a set of self-report questionnaires tapping into individual differences in personality and dispositional traits, as well as basic demographic information. To ensure all mindfulness-naïve participants had a basic understanding of mindfulness practices before the subsequent audio-guided practice sessions (Session 2 to 5), the first session also included a brief section with simple written descriptions that introduced participants to each of the four mindfulness techniques (Focused Attention, Open Monitoring, Loving-kindness, and Body Scan), followed by four probe questions that asked participants to briefly describe the differences among these techniques. Given the online nature of this study, these questions also served as an initial quality control step to exclude participants who clearly did not devote any effort into reading instructions or answering questions (e.g. filling out random or arbitrary answers) from later sessions.

The first session took 45 to 50 minutes to complete, whereas sessions 2-5 each took 15-20 minutes to complete. In sessions 2-5, participants practiced one of the four mindfulness techniques for ten minutes by following audio instructions recorded by a certified mindfulness-based stress reduction (MBSR) instructor. Before the start of the practice, participants were asked to find a quiet place and to practice without interruption. Otherwise, they were asked to find a different time to come back for the practice. The practice order of the four techniques

(sessions 2-5) was completely randomized for each participant. After the practice, participants were asked to take notes about their practice experiences, submitted them online, and saved their notes to a local computer. They were also informed that they would be using these notes in the last session for preference ranking of the four mindfulness techniques. Lastly, at the end of each session (2-5), participants completed the state mindfulness scale (SMS), based on the mindfulness practice experience they just had. In session 5, after completing the practice and SMS, participants were asked to copy and paste their previous practice notes into the textbox, review these notes, and then rank all four techniques from *most preferred* to *least preferred*.

Materials

Mindfulness Practices. For each of the four mindfulness techniques (Focused Attention, Open Monitoring, Loving-kindness, and Body Scan), a certified mindfulness-based stress reduction (MBSR) instructor recorded a 10-minute audio-guided practice with standard instructions. Participants were instructed to find a comfortable position to sit down and begin the practice. As a quality control step, participants were not able to move onto the subsequent portion of the session until the 10-minute audio instruction ended.

Preferences Ranking. Participants were asked to carefully review their practice notes from all 4 sessions to determine the preferences ranking of all 4 mindfulness techniques from 1 *most preferred* to 4 *least preferred*. As a validation step, participants were also asked to provide reasons for their rankings.

State Mindfulness. The State Mindfulness Scale (SMS) is a 21-item self-report questionnaire designed to measure mindfulness as a state-like phenomenon, rather than a stable trait. Scores for each item can range from 1 (Not at all) to 5 (Very well). The scale has been validated to be a reliable instrument (Cronbach's $\alpha = .85-.97$) for assessing the level of present

moment attention and awareness during a specific period of time (e.g. 10 minutes) and context (e.g. mindfulness practice) (Tanay & Bernstein, 2013). There are two subscales within this scale, one for assessing the level of mindfulness on bodily sensations, and the other for mental activities.

Trait Mindfulness. The Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire (FFMQ), a widely used questionnaire was utilized for assessing individual differences in trait mindfulness. The FFMQ contains 39 items that range from 1 (Never or very rarely true) to 5 (Very often or always true), measuring five different facets of mindfulness (Non-judging, Non-reactivity, Observing, Describing, and Acting with awareness). The FFMQ has also been widely used in previous studies and has good internal consistency with a Cronbach's α ranging from .80 to .91 (Baer et al., 2008).

Big Five Personality. The 60-item NEO-Five Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) is a well-validated, reliable and extensively used instrument by numerous studies in different populations for assessing five dimensions of personality, including neuroticism, extraversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and openness to experience (Costa & McCrae, 1989). Score for each item can range from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The inventory has been shown to have good reliability for all five dimensions (Cronbach's $\alpha = .75-.85$) (Sherry et al., 2007).

Self-Compassion. The Self-Compassion Scale (SCS) contains 26 items that measures one's tendency to be accepting, understanding, and caring towards oneself when facing failures, struggles, and negative emotions in life (Neff, 2003). Score for each item can range from 1 (Almost Never) to 5 (Almost Always). The SCS has been shown to have high test-retest reliability across all of its six subscales ($r > .80$) (Neff, 2003). The use of a total score has also

been found to be reliable and valid for tapping into self-compassion in five different populations (Neff, 2016).

Interpersonal Reactivity Index. The Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI) is 28-items self-report measure of individual differences in empathy and is scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “Does not describe me well” to “Describes me very well” (Davis, 1983). The measure has 4 subscales tapping into different aspects of empathy: Perspective Taking, Fantasy, Empathic Concern, and Personal Distress. The IRI is a valid and reliable measure of empathic tendencies with Cronbach’s alphas coefficients ranging from .75 to .80 and test-retest reliability (ICC) ranging from .61 to .81 (Davis, 1983; Baldner & McGinley, 2014).

Perceived Stress Scale. The Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) is a widely used measure for assessing individual’s recent perception of stress and the degree to which situations in one’s life are deemed stressful during the last month (Cohen & Mermelstein, 1994). The scale has 10 items and each item is scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “Never” to “Very often”. The PSS also has good reliability with a Cronbach’s alpha of .78 (Cohen & Mermelstein, 1994).

Highly Sensitive Person Scale. The Highly Sensitive Person (HSP) Scale is a 27-item measure of sensory processing sensitivity (Aron & Aron, 1997). Score of each item ranges from 1 (Not at all) to 7 (Extremely). The HSP has been shown to be a reliable measure of individual differences in sensory processing sensitivity in different populations with Cronbach’s alpha ranging from .85 to .87 across different samples (Benham, 2006).

Attentional Control Scale. The Attentional Control Scale (ACS) is a widely used self-report measure for assessing individual differences in attentional control. The ACS includes 20 items and two subscales on attention focusing and attention shifting. Score of each item ranges from 1 (Almost never) to 4 (Always). The ACS has shown good internal consistency for the full

scale ($\alpha = .84$), as well as for the attention focusing subscale ($\alpha = .87$) and the attention shifting subscale ($\alpha = .77$) (Derryberry & Reed, 2002; Judah et al., 2013).

Tellegen Absorption Scale. The Tellegen Absorption Scale (TAS) is a self-report measure of absorption, which refers to an individual's tendency to have their attention fully engaged and devoted to sensory and imaginative experiences (perceptual, enactive, imaginative, and ideational) (Tellegen & Atkinson, 1974). The TAS has 34 items and each item is scored on a dichotomous scale (True or False). The scale has shown good internal reliability ($r = .88$) and test-retest reliability ($r = .85-.91$).

Data Analysis

Additional quality control steps were taken before data analysis to ensure we only include participants who followed instructions and at least devoted effort to complete each session. Therefore, for each participant, the practice notes from all four sessions were reviewed and participants with irrelevant, short, or arbitrary responses (e.g. good, fine) in more than one session were excluded from subsequent analyses. A total of 5 participants were excluded for this reason.

To assess whether the hypothesized individual difference variables could predict individual preferences for mindfulness techniques, ordinal logistic regressions were first conducted using the *ordinal* and *rms* packages from R, since the rankings (*most preferred* to *least preferred*) were scored on an ordinal scale. Within each model, relevant personality traits and characteristics were used as predictors for preference rankings of each technique. Age, gender, absorption, and perceived stress were included in these regression models as covariates. For each predictor, a positive coefficient suggests an increased odd of ranking the technique in the more preferred categories and vice versa for negative coefficients. It should be noted that one

important assumption of ordinal logistic regression is the proportional odds (PO) assumption, which states that the predictors would have the same effects across different thresholds of the dependent variable (i.e. ranking levels). In other words, it assumes that the coefficients that describe the relationship between the least preferred category versus all other preferred categories are the same as those that describe the relationship between the third preferred category and all other higher preferred categories (i.e. 2nd Preferred and Most Preferred) and so on. Therefore, the coefficient of each predictor would be the same regardless of the threshold, but the intercept at each threshold would be different from one another. We specifically checked for this PO assumption through the Brant Test (Brant, 1990) using the *brant* package in R. This test showed that the PO assumption was violated by two different predictors (see below for details). Hence, multinomial logistic regressions (MNL) were also conducted as a follow-up, using the *multinom* package from R, whenever the PO assumption was violated by the predictors.

The logic behind MNL is different from ordinal logistic regression, in that MNL treats the dependent variable (i.e. rankings) as unordered but allows the coefficients of each predictor to differ across the thresholds, which partially mitigates the constraint imposed by the PO assumption. For MNL, a reference category is always set, to which all other categories (i.e. ranking levels) can be compared. For our MNL models, the reference category was set to “*Most Preferred*”, meaning that all other ranking levels (i.e. categories) would be compared relative to this base category. Specifically, the MNL model estimated three sets of binary logit models: 1) Most Preferred vs. 2nd Preferred, 2) Most Preferred vs. 3rd Preferred, and 3) Most Preferred vs. Least Preferred. Consequently, different estimates of coefficients for the predictors were obtained from the three models and positive coefficients entail an increase in the odds of ranking the technique in the present category (often the less preferred categories), compared to the

reference category (i.e. Most Preferred), and vice versa for negative coefficients. Because MNL does not constrain the predictors to have the same coefficients across all levels of the dependent variable, three different sets of coefficients would be obtained for each of the three binary logistic regressions. In the following section, we presented results from both ordinal logistic regression and MNL to illustrate the relationship between individual differences in personality traits and preferences for mindfulness techniques.

Results

Preferences Distribution

Preference rankings for the four mindfulness techniques were mostly evenly distributed as shown in Figure 1, indicating that we were able to capture a good range of variability with regard to individual preferences. Notably, participants did not exhibit systematic biases toward one technique or another. Interestingly, across the four techniques, loving-kindness was ranked as the most preferred technique by 29% of the participants and was also ranked as the least preferred technique by 35% of the participants. None of the other techniques, showed any bimodal trend.

Figure 1. Preferences Distribution of Mindfulness Techniques.

Loving-kindness

Perspective taking, empathic concern, and fantasy subscales from the interpersonal reactivity index (IRI) were summed into a composite score to represent empathy, as this approach would eliminate multicollinearity among these subscales of IRI. Personal distress, a subscale of IRI was not included in this composite because it shows a negative correlation with all other subscales, and does not load onto the empathy factor, in investigations of the hierarchical factor structure of IRI (Pulos, Elison, & Lennon, 2004). In addition to empathy, self-compassion (the total score) was also included as predictor in the model (Model 1). Although agreeableness was another predictor of interest, it was highly correlated with empathy ($r = .44$, $p < .001$). Thus, we ran a separate model (Model 2) with agreeableness and all the above variables except empathy. Table 1 shows the coefficients, standard errors and significance level for each predictor in each model. The AIC of each model is also shown.

Table 1. Ordinal Logistic Regression of Preferences for Loving-kindness.

	Model 1		Model 2	
Predictors	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>SE</i>
Empathy	0.055***	0.016	-	-
Agreeableness	-	-	0.062*	0.027
Self-Compassion	-0.310	0.293	-0.329	0.296
Age	-0.025	0.019	-0.021	0.019
Gender	0.985*	0.397	1.114***	0.393
Perceived Stress	-0.019	0.032	-0.013	0.032
Absorption	0.041	0.027	0.079***	0.026
Model Fit	281.83		288.66	
AIC				

* Indicates $p < 0.05$, ** indicates $p < 0.01$, and *** indicates $p < 0.005$.

Results showed that in Model 1, empathy significantly predicted preferences for LK, such that increase in empathy was associated with greater probability of ranking LK in more preferred categories. In other words, if we convert the coefficient of empathy to odds ratio, for one unit of increase in empathy, the odds of ranking LK as the most preferred technique versus all other categories increased by 5.7% ($e^{0.055}$) times, while controlling for other variables. Additionally, gender also showed significance, such that females were more likely to rank LK as their most preferred technique than males, and that the odds of doing so was 2.677 ($e^{0.985}$) times higher than that of males. For Model 2, agreeableness was a significant predictor, such that higher agreeableness was associated with greater likelihood of ranking LK as the most preferred technique. Gender also showed significance in this model, with females again showing more preferences for LK than males. Interestingly, one of the covariates, absorption, showed significance in Model 2 but not in Model 1. Specifically, for one unit increase in absorption, the tendency to become more absorbed and emotionally responsive to sensory or mental experiences, the odds of ranking LK as the most preferred technique increased by 8% ($e^{0.079}$) times. Comparing model fit, Model 1 had a higher AIC than Model 2, suggesting a better fit of this model, which includes empathy as the primary predictor. Finally, we added agreeableness to Model 1 in order to see if there would be any changes in the predictive power of empathy. In this new combined model, the significance of agreeableness went away, but empathy and gender remained to be significant predictors even after controlling for the effect of agreeableness.

Among all of the predictors, self-compassion was the only predictor that violated the PO assumption. Therefore, we also ran multinomial logistic regressions using predictors from Model 1 as follow up to ordinal logistic regressions. Not surprisingly, as shown in Table 2, empathy still positively and significantly predicted preferences for LK across all categories (i.e. 2nd Preferred,

3rd Preferred, and Least Preferred), such that individuals with higher empathy were more likely to rank LK as their most preferred technique above all other techniques. Surprisingly, self-compassion showed significance in MNL models, but in the opposite direction, as it *negatively* predicted preferences for LK. Yet, it was only significant as a predictor for two categories (i.e. 2nd Preferred, 3rd Preferred), so the result should be treated with caution. The pattern of findings suggested that people who scored high on self-compassion were more likely to rank LK as their 2nd preferred technique rather than the most preferred, or rank it as the 3rd preferred technique, rather than the most preferred. For covariates, gender was the only predictor that still showed significant predictability in the Least Preferred category, such that females were more likely to prefer LK than males and rank it as the most preferred technique, rather than the least preferred.

Table 2. Multinomial Logistic Regression of Preferences for Loving-kindness.

Predictors	2nd Preferred		3rd Preferred		Least Preferred	
	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>SE</i>
Empathy	-0.096***	0.031	-0.109***	0.034	-0.120***	0.031
Self-Compassion	1.181*	0.505	1.288*	0.558	0.751	0.474
Age	-0.013	0.032	0.010	0.034	0.027	0.029
Gender	-0.923	0.631	-1.090	0.721	-1.685**	0.612
Perceived Stress	0.040	0.052	0.046	0.058	0.041	0.047
Absorption	-0.007	0.045	-0.016	0.051	-0.053	0.044

* Indicates $p < 0.05$, ** indicates $p < 0.01$, and *** indicates $p < 0.005$.

Open Monitoring

Two facets of trait mindfulness from the FFMQ - non-judging of inner experiences and non-reactivity to inner experiences were included as predictors in the ordinal logistic regression model. In particular, the two facets were summed into one composite to eliminate

multicollinearity among the predictors. The observing facet was not included in this composite as prior literature has shown that this facet does not correlate well with other facets or load onto the overall mindfulness trait in non-meditating samples, and may in fact represent neutral attention, rather than mindful observing (Gu et al., 2016). Openness to experience was also included in the model as another predictor. Results indicated that both predictors had positive coefficients, such that higher levels of these traits were related to greater likelihood of ranking OM as the most preferred technique versus all other categories. However, the trait mindfulness composite was the only significant predictor as shown in Table 3. Specifically, for one unit of increase in mindfulness composite, the odds of ranking OM as the most preferred technique increased by 73% ($e^{0.551}$). Among the covariates, perceived stress was also a significant predictor of preferences for OM, such that for one unit of increase in perceived stress, the odds of ranking open monitoring as the most preferred technique increased by 5% ($e^{0.052}$).

Table 3. Ordinal Logistic Regression of Preferences for Open Monitoring.

Predictors	Coefficient	SE
Mindfulness Composite	0.551***	0.167
Openness to Experience	0.005	0.030
Age	-0.031	0.018
Gender	-0.221	0.372
Perceived Stress	0.052*	0.025
Absorption	-0.047	0.026

* Indicates $p < 0.05$, ** indicates $p < 0.01$, and *** indicates $p < 0.005$.

Given that gender was the only predictor that violates the PO assumption, we also ran multinomial logistic regression as a follow-up to ordinal logistic regression. Similarly, as shown in Table 4, the mindfulness composite was still significant for all three categories: 2nd Preferred,

3rd Preferred and Least Preferred. This suggested that people who have higher scores in these two facets of mindfulness tended to prefer OM more than other techniques and were more likely to rank it as their most preferred technique. Interestingly, absorption and perceived stress were two covariates that showed significance in two of the three categories. Specifically, significance was found in 2nd Preferred and Least Preferred for absorption, such that people with higher levels of absorption were less likely to rank OM as their most preferred technique, and were instead more likely to rank it as the 2nd preferred or as the least preferred technique. For perceived stress, significance was found in 3rd Preferred and Least Preferred, suggesting that people with higher level of perceived stress tend to rank OM technique as their most preferred technique rather than the 3rd preferred or the least preferred technique, which is consistent to the trend found in ordinal logistic regression.

Table 4. Multinomial Logistic Regression of Preferences for Open Monitoring.

Predictors	2nd Preferred		3rd Preferred		Least Preferred	
	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>SE</i>
Mindfulness Composite	-0.612*	0.298	-1.014**	0.316	-0.915**	0.318
Openness to Experience	-0.056	0.051	-0.031	0.053	-0.028	0.055
Age	0.026	0.032	0.047	0.033	0.043	0.034
Gender	-0.158	0.610	0.945	0.696	-0.759	0.644
Perceived Stress	-0.069	0.047	-0.101*	0.049	-0.113*	0.051
Absorption	0.094*	0.047	0.076	0.049	0.103*	0.050

* Indicates $p < 0.05$, ** indicates $p < 0.01$, and *** indicates $p < 0.005$.

Focused Attention

Attention focusing from attention control scale (ACS), acting with awareness from FFMQ, and conscientiousness from NEO-Five Factor Inventory were used as predictors for FA in the ordinal logistic regression model. These predictors were highly correlated with each other ($p < .001$) – focusing and acting with awareness ($r = .70$), focusing and conscientiousness ($r = .55$), acting with awareness and conscientiousness ($r = .62$). We ran separate models for each predictor, since given their conceptual distinctness, it was not deemed sensible to combine them into a composite. However, none of the predictors or covariates significantly predicted preferences for focused attention as shown in Table 5. Given the non-significant (null) effects of these predictors, strong speculation is not warranted. Nevertheless, it is potentially instructive to note the trends of predictors: attentional focusing showed positive relationship in both the full and separate models, such that higher scores in attentional focusing corresponded to greater probability of ranking focused attention as the most preferred technique versus all other categories; conversely, higher conscientiousness had a negative coefficient in both full and separate models, such that that higher conscientiousness was related to lower odds of ranking FA as the most preferred technique. Finally, acting with awareness had opposite signs for its coefficients in full and separate models, potentially due to the influence of multicollinearity. However, based on the coefficient from separate model without highly correlated predictors, higher acting with awareness was related to greater probability of ranking FA as the most preferred technique. Lastly, all predictors met the PO assumption, so multinomial logistic regression was not conducted.

Table 5. Ordinal Logistic Regression of Preferences for Focused Attention.

	Full Model		Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Predictors	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>SE</i>

Attention Focusing	0.455	0.345	0.264	0.269	-	-	-	-
Conscientiousness	-0.028	0.027	-	-	-0.016	0.023	-	-
Acting with Awareness	-0.080	0.305	-	-	-	-	0.012	0.219
Age	0.002	0.018	0.00	0.02	0.001	0.017	0.012	0.017
Gender	-0.637	0.367	-0.675	0.363	-0.633	0.365	-0.662	0.362
Perceived Stress	-0.003	0.022	0.003	0.021	-0.012	0.021	-0.005	0.021
Absorption	-0.021	0.022	-0.027	0.022	-0.021	0.022	-0.026	0.022

* Indicates $p < 0.05$, ** indicates $p < 0.01$, and *** indicates $p < 0.005$.

Body Scan

Attention shifting from ACS and sensory processing sensitivity as measured by the highly sensitive person scale (HSP) were included as predictors of preferences for body scan. Given that these two predictors were also highly correlated ($r = -.34$, $p < .001$), separate regression models with each predictor were conducted. However, none of the predictors showed significance in predicting BS; these null effects precluded strong interpretation. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that predictors had negative coefficients, indicating that people with higher attentional shift capacity and greater sensitivity to sensory stimuli and experiences were less likely to rank body scan as their most preferred technique. Additionally, none of the covariates showed significance in predicting BS. Table 6 shows estimates of coefficients and standard errors of all predictors. Given that the PO assumption was not violated by the predictors, multinomial logistic regression was not conducted.

Table 6. Ordinal Logistic Regression of Preferences for Body Scan.

Predictors	Full Model		Model 1		Model 2	
	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE

Attention Shifting	-0.052	0.313	-0.018	0.305	-	-
Sensory Processing Sensitivity	-0.108	0.236	-	-	-0.010	0.230
Age	0.034	0.018	0.034	0.018	0.034	0.018
Gender	-0.216	0.375	-0.261	0.362	-0.227	0.370
Perceived Stress	0.022	0.027	0.016	0.024	0.024	0.025
Absorption	0.006	0.025	0.001	0.022	0.005	0.023

** Indicates $p < 0.05$, ** indicates $p < 0.01$, and *** indicates $p < 0.005$.*

Dissociable Preferences

Based on the above results showing individual difference factors predicting preferences for open monitoring and loving-kindness, we further explored if these two mindfulness practices can be interpreted as truly dissociable in terms of the effects of individual difference predictors. For this analysis, the trait mindfulness composite was added as a predictor of loving-kindness, whereas empathy and self-compassion were added as predictors of open monitoring. All other variables in the original models remained the same, including the covariates and other non-significant predictors. Results indicated that even after adding in predictors of the other technique, both loving-kindness and open monitoring still had their original predictors showing significance. Moreover, these results demonstrate clear specificity in preferences for open monitoring and loving-kindness, since the added predictors showed non-significance in predicting the opposite technique. Figure 2 shows the dissociable preferences with coefficient estimates and 95% confidence interval of the primary predictors for each technique (note that the confidence intervals indicate which coefficients are reliably different from zero, but should not be used to compare across coefficients).

Figure 2. Dissociable Preferences with Primary Predictors of OM and LK.

Preferences and State Mindfulness

To investigate if there is a correspondence between preference rankings and individuals' evaluation of how well they were able to meditate with each of the techniques, we separately averaged the state mindfulness scores for each individual's most preferred technique, 2nd preferred technique, 3rd preferred technique, and least preferred technique. A One-way ANOVA was conducted to examine the mean differences in state mindfulness scores from the four different preference rankings. Results showed that there were significant mean differences in state mindfulness ($F(3, 472)=3.448, p=0.017$) across the four different rankings. Furthermore, Tukey's post-hoc tests indicated that the state mindfulness scores of the most preferred technique ($M=79.39, SD=15.74$) was significantly higher than that of the least preferred technique ($M=73.54, SD=17.33$), and that the state mindfulness scores of the second preferred technique ($M=78.87, SD=14.96$) was also significantly higher than that of the least preferred technique (shown in Figure 3). Although no significant differences were detected between other rankings, the means of state mindfulness scores, follow a clear ordinal pattern, decreasing as the rankings

go from most preferred to least preferred. This finding suggested that individuals had higher state mindfulness when they practiced their most and 2nd preferred techniques than their least preferred techniques.

Figure 3. Mean of State Mindfulness Scores Across Preferences Rankings.

Discussion

The present study investigated whether individual preferences for four prototypical mindfulness techniques in MBIs can be predicted by personality traits or other dispositional markers. Additionally, the study also explored whether preferences for different techniques have meaningful implications for how well individuals are able to get into the meditative state. The results indicated that preferences for two of the techniques – loving-kindness and open

monitoring were predicted by related traits; yet conversely, none of the hypothesized traits were significant predictors for focused attention or body scan. Nonetheless, there was a positive correspondence between preference rankings and level of state mindfulness, supporting the hypothesis that individual preferences could have an impact on meditative state.

Consistent with our hypothesis, preferences for loving-kindness were significantly predicted by empathy and agreeableness, when examined separately. Comparing empathy and agreeableness, the fit indices favored the model with empathy. Moreover, empathy remained to be a significant predictor even after controlling for the effect of agreeableness. This is not surprising because successfully cultivating loving-kindness toward others would rely on engaging empathic qualities such as perspective taking (i.e. putting oneself in other's shoes) and empathic concerns for others' suffering (Luberto et al., 2018). Relatedly, loving-kindness has been shown to improve empathy and related constructs such as pro-social behavior and compassion (Singer & Klimecki, 2014), which further suggested that empathy is an important ingredient in the practice of loving-kindness meditation. In contrast, agreeableness includes characteristics such as cooperativeness and adherence, which are qualities not explicitly involved in fostering loving-kindness. These may explain why agreeableness was a less robust predictor.

However, self-compassion showed an opposite, albeit less reliable trend, which was unexpected given that self-compassion should also facilitate loving-kindness practice, especially in the practice of generating kindness toward oneself. This perplexing result may be due to the fact that not all components of self-compassion scale are related to loving-kindness practice (i.e., it may be useful to examine subscales of self-compassion more closely, to determine whether those related to practicing loving-kindness are positive predictors). However, in this study we used the total score of self-compassion rather than individual subscales, as we did not have any *a*

priori hypotheses relating to subscales of self-compassion. Instead, we examined overall self-compassion capacity with respect to loving-kindness preferences. Finally, gender was a significant predictor of loving kindness, such that females preferred loving kindness more so than males. This sex differences in preferences were not part of our original hypotheses but were not surprising based on previous literature that showed reliable sex differences in empathy. Specifically, females in general do appear to be more empathic than males and exhibit higher emotional responsiveness in affective empathy than males (Christov-Moore et al., 2016), which may explain why females exhibited more preferences for a technique that involves empathic qualities.

Similarly, preferences for open monitoring were predicted by traits that have close associations with the actual practice (e.g. nonjudgment of internal experiences and nonreactivity to internal experiences). As described in introduction, being nonjudgmental and non-reactive to internal and external experiences are key components emphasized in open monitoring meditation. Therefore, individuals having high trait mindfulness in these two facets may experience a shallower learning curve when first exposed to open monitoring practices, thereby leading to more preferences for this particular technique. However, openness to experience did not significantly predict open monitoring as we expected. Nevertheless, the direction of association was in line with our hypothesis, that is, people with high openness to experience exhibited a tendency to prefer open monitoring relative to other techniques. Additionally, it was surprising to see that perceived stress was a covariate that showed significance in predicting preferences for open monitoring. Although it is unclear as to why a high level of perceived stress would predict more preferences for this technique, one plausible explanation may be that the emphasis of nonjudgment and nonreactivity toward present moment experiences in open

monitoring practice, including stressful thoughts, may actually serve to reduce stress to some extent, leading to a stronger preference for this type of practice. In fact, one recent study did show that brief mindfulness-based monitoring and acceptance training can induce reduction in physiological measures of stress reactivity (Lindsay, Young, Smyth, Brown, & Creswell, 2018). Nonetheless, this result suggests that perceived stress is worth investigating further as a primary predictor in future studies, since it did show specificity in predicting preferences for open monitoring, but not in the other three techniques.

Inconsistent with our hypotheses, focused attention and body scan were not significantly predicted by any of the hypothesized predictors in the present study. However, for focused attention, all predictors except conscientiousness, were in the expected directions, such that higher capacities in attentional focusing and acting with awareness was associated with a tendency to prefer for this technique. For the body scan, higher sensory processing sensitivity was weakly related to reduced preference for body scan, which was consistent with our hypotheses. However, attentional shifting, exhibited a weak negative relationship, which was opposite to our hypothesis.

These nonsignificant findings of hypothesized traits suggest two possible explanations. First, there could be other more sensitive and optimized predictors for these two techniques that were not included in the present study. Relatedly, it is also possible that self-report instruments used in this study did not adequately capture the traits or characteristics that were being evaluated. For instance, unlike conventional personality traits, individuals' self-reported capacity for attentional focusing and attentional shifting may be prone to various reporting biases. In contrast, objective cognitive tasks of attentional control may be able to accurately and reliably assess these attentional abilities. Second, despite our hypotheses postulating that preferences for

each technique should be predicted by individual variability in certain traits, it is still possible that there may be no meaningful variation to be predicted for these two techniques (FA and BS). In other words, focused attention and body scan may not be associated with systematic preferences that could be linked to trait characteristics. However, both explanations necessitate validation from future investigations that explore other promising predictors and sources of individual variability, given that the present study was only a first attempt to predict individual preferences for mindfulness techniques from personality and dispositional traits.

Finally, for the two techniques predicted by personality and other dispositional traits - loving-kindness and open monitoring, we were able to show the specificity effect of each predictor, in that each was selectively associated with only the theoretically-linked technique. This finding suggests that the predictive power of individual trait characteristics was not due to chance, and that dissociable preferences can be detected for these two techniques. Furthermore, we also demonstrated that individuals had higher state mindfulness when practicing their preferred techniques, relative to their less preferred techniques, illustrating the practical implications of assessing and predicting individual preferences. Notably, this finding speaks to the critical role of individual preferences in affecting how well individuals can meditate and progress into a meditative state. Previous studies have shown that improvement in state mindfulness over the course of MBIs is related to improvement in psychological outcomes at post-intervention (Gayner et al., 2012; Kiken, Garland, Bluth, Palsson, & Gaylord, 2015). Therefore, it is highly possible that assigning individuals to their preferred technique would likely increase their state mindfulness over the course of intervention, thereby resulting in greater improvement in targeted outcomes at the end of intervention.

Limitations and Future Directions

The present study does have several limitations that warrant further replication and investigations. First, we did not examine all putative predictors for each mindfulness technique, thus it is highly plausible that we missed meaningful variables that could otherwise be predictive of individual preferences. Given that this is the first study exploring this research question, it was not feasible to include a large set of different dispositional traits or other relevant individual characteristics in this investigation. Moreover, this would have reduced statistical power, by opening up the analysis to increased multiple comparisons and related concerns (i.e., those related to “fishing expeditions”). Nevertheless, additional studies are needed to examine other potential predictors of mindfulness preferences to determine whether there are potentially more sensitive sources of individual variability. Second, all traits were assessed based on self-report questionnaires in the present study, which could be prone to potential subjective biases, especially with regard to cognitive related abilities, such as attentional control. Future investigations would benefit from employing cognitive tasks and other objective measures of putative individual traits and characteristics. Third, our study was conducted online with multiple quality control steps built in place; nevertheless, it is possible that in-person instructions of mindfulness techniques may be different from listening to audio-guided instructions recorded by certified mindfulness instructor. Further replication of the present study with face-to-face mindfulness training would be necessary to validate these results. Lastly, an interesting future direction worth exploring is whether preferences for mindfulness techniques are fixed or malleable over the course of MBIs. In particular, the current study focused solely on individuals that were naïve to mindfulness, and did not track whether preferences changed upon further practice and exposure. Indeed, it is quite possible that preferences are dynamic and changeable

with practice. If such dynamic patterns can be observed, it would point to the need for understanding what factors can drive changes in preference. Such studies could be highly informative for intervention development and teaching, as we would be able to better design and apply our interventions to increase individuals' preferences and outcomes.

Conclusion

Understanding individual differences in response to standardized mindfulness-based interventions is critical for improving intervention effectiveness and outcomes. The present study provided a first step in tackling this individual difference question, by examining individual preferences for different mindfulness techniques commonly taught in mindfulness-based interventions. Our results illustrated that individuals not only have different preferences for individual mindfulness technique, which can be predicted by personality and dispositional traits, but also are more likely to prefer techniques compatible with their personality or dispositional traits. These findings provide support for personalizing mindfulness-based interventions to better meet individual needs, while also highlighting the need for future scientific investigations and clinical applications that consider these individual differences with respect to treatment planning and outcome evaluation.

References

- Ainsworth, B., Eddershaw, R., Meron, D., Baldwin, D. S., & Garner, M. (2013). The effect of focused attention and open monitoring meditation on attention network function in healthy volunteers. *Psychiatry research*, 210(3), 1226-1231.
- Aron, E. N., & Aron, A. (1997). Sensory-processing sensitivity and its relation to introversion and emotionality. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 73(2), 345.
- Baer, R. A., Smith, G. T., Lykins, E., Button, D., Krietemeyer, J., Sauer, S., ... & Williams, J. M. G. (2008). Construct validity of the five facet mindfulness questionnaire in meditating and nonmeditating samples. *Assessment*, 15(3), 329-342.
- Baldner, C., & McGinley, J. J. (2014). Correlational and exploratory factor analyses (EFA) of commonly used empathy questionnaires: New insights. *Motivation and Emotion*, 38(5), 727-744.
- Benham, G. (2006). The highly sensitive person: Stress and physical symptom reports. *Personality and individual differences*, 40(7), 1433-1440.
- Black, D. S., & Slavich, G. M. (2016). Mindfulness meditation and the immune system: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1373(1), 13.
- Brant, R. (1990). Assessing proportionality in the proportional odds model for ordinal logistic regression. *Biometrics*, 1171-1178.
- Britton, W. B., Davis, J. H., Loucks, E. B., Peterson, B., Cullen, B. H., Reuter, L., ... & Lindahl, J. R. (2018). Dismantling Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy: Creation and validation of 8-week focused attention and open monitoring interventions within a 3-armed randomized controlled trial. *Behaviour research and therapy*, 101, 92-107.

- Burke, A. (2012). Comparing individual preferences for four meditation techniques: Zen, Vipassana (Mindfulness), Qigong, and Mantra. *Explore*, 8(4), 237-242.
- Chapman, B. P., Hampson, S., & Clarkin, J. (2014). Personality-informed interventions for healthy aging: Conclusions from a National Institute on Aging work group. *Developmental psychology*, 50(5), 1426.
- Chiesa, A., Calati, R., & Serretti, A. (2011). Does mindfulness training improve cognitive abilities? A systematic review of neuropsychological findings. *Clinical psychology review*, 31(3), 449-464.
- Christov-Moore, L., Simpson, E. A., Coudé, G., Grigaityte, K., Iacoboni, M., & Ferrari, P. F. (2014). Empathy: gender effects in brain and behavior. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 46, 604-627.
- Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1994). Perceived stress scale. *Measuring stress: A guide for health and social scientists*, 10.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1989). NEO five-factor inventory (NEO-FFI). *Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources*, 3.
- Davidson, R. J. (2010). Empirical explorations of mindfulness: conceptual and methodological conundrums.
- Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 44(1), 113.
- Derryberry, D., & Reed, M. A. (2002). Anxiety-related attentional biases and their regulation by attentional control. *Journal of abnormal psychology*, 111(2), 225.

- de Vibe, M., Solhaug, I., Tyssen, R., Friberg, O., Rosenvinge, J. H., Sørbye, T., ... & Bjørndal, A. (2015). Does personality moderate the effects of mindfulness training for medical and psychology students?. *Mindfulness*, 6(2), 281-289.
- Dreeben, S. J., Marnberg, M. H., & Salmon, P. (2013). The MBSR body scan in clinical practice. *Mindfulness*, 4(4), 394-401.
- Farias, M., & Wikholm, C. (2016). Has the science of mindfulness lost its mind?. *BJPsych Bulletin*, 40(6), 329-332.
- Fredrickson, B. L., Cohn, M. A., Coffey, K. A., Pek, J., & Finkel, S. M. (2008). Open hearts build lives: positive emotions, induced through loving-kindness meditation, build consequential personal resources. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 95(5), 1045.
- Gayner, B., Esplen, M. J., DeRoche, P., Wong, J., Bishop, S., Kavanagh, L., & Butler, K. (2012). A randomized controlled trial of mindfulness-based stress reduction to manage affective symptoms and improve quality of life in gay men living with HIV. *Journal of behavioral medicine*, 35(3), 272-285.
- Gu, J., Strauss, C., Bond, R., & Cavanagh, K. (2015). How do mindfulness-based cognitive therapy and mindfulness-based stress reduction improve mental health and wellbeing? A systematic review and meta-analysis of mediation studies. *Clinical psychology review*, 37, 1-12.
- Gu, J., Strauss, C., Crane, C., Barnhofer, T., Karl, A., Cavanagh, K., & Kuyken, W. (2016). Examining the factor structure of the 39-item and 15-item versions of the Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire before and after mindfulness-based cognitive therapy for people with recurrent depression. *Psychological assessment*, 28(7), 791.

- Hall, P. A., & Fong, G. T. (2013). Conscientiousness versus executive function as predictors of health behaviors and health trajectories. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 45(3), 398-399.
- Hofmann, S. G., Grossman, P., & Hinton, D. E. (2011). Loving-kindness and compassion meditation: Potential for psychological interventions. *Clinical psychology review*, 31(7), 1126-1132.
- 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*, 6(6), 537-559.
- Hölzel, B., & Ott, U. (2006). Relationships between meditation depth, absorption, meditation practice, and mindfulness: A latent variable approach. *Journal of Transpersonal Psychology*, 38(2).
- Hutcherson, C. A., Seppala, E. M., & Gross, J. J. (2008). Loving-kindness meditation increases social connectedness. *Emotion*, 8(5), 720.
- Judah, M. R., Grant, D. M., Mills, A. C., & Lechner, W. V. (2014). Factor structure and validation of the attentional control scale. *Cognition & emotion*, 28(3), 433-451.
- Kabat-Zinn, J., & Hanh, T. N. (2009). *Full catastrophe living: Using the wisdom of your body and mind to face stress, pain, and illness*. Delta.
- 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.
- Kiken, L. G., Garland, E. L., Bluth, K., Palsson, O. S., & Gaylord, S. A. (2015). From a state to a trait: Trajectories of state mindfulness in meditation during intervention predict changes in trait mindfulness. *Personality and Individual differences*, 81, 41-46.

- Lindsay, E. K., Young, S., Smyth, J. M., Brown, K. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Acceptance lowers stress reactivity: Dismantling mindfulness training in a randomized controlled trial. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 87, 63-73.
- Lippelt, D. P., Hommel, B., & Colzato, L. S. (2014). Focused attention, open monitoring and loving kindness meditation: effects on attention, conflict monitoring, and creativity—A review. *Frontiers in psychology*, 5, 1083.
- Luberto, C. M., Shinday, N., Song, R., Philpotts, L. L., Park, E. R., Fricchione, G. L., & Yeh, G. Y. (2018). A systematic review and meta-analysis of the effects of meditation on empathy, compassion, and prosocial behaviors. *Mindfulness*, 9(3), 708-724.
- Lutz, A., Slagter, H. A., Dunne, J. D., & Davidson, R. J. (2008). Attention regulation and monitoring in meditation. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 12(4), 163-169.
- Manna, A., Raffone, A., Perrucci, M. G., Nardo, D., Ferretti, A., Tartaro, A., ... & Romani, G. L. (2010). Neural correlates of focused attention and cognitive monitoring in meditation. *Brain research bulletin*, 82(1-2), 46-56.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa Jr, P. T. (1991). The NEO Personality Inventory: Using the Five-Factor Model in Counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 69(4), 367-372.
- Neff, K. D. (2003). The development and validation of a scale to measure self-compassion. *Self and identity*, 2(3), 223-250.
- Neff, K. D. (2016). The self-compassion scale is a valid and theoretically coherent measure of self-compassion. *Mindfulness*, 7(1), 264-274.
- Nyklíček, I., & Irrmischer, M. (2017). For whom does mindfulness-based stress reduction work? Moderating effects of personality. *Mindfulness*, 8(4), 1106-1116.

- Pulos, S., Elison, J., & Lennon, R. (2004). The hierarchical structure of the Interpersonal Reactivity Index. *Social behavior and personality*, 32(4), 355-360.
- Salzberg, S. (2011). Mindfulness and loving-kindness. *Contemp. Buddhism* 12, 177–182.
- Sanderson, C., & Clarkin, J. F. (1994). Use of the NEO-PI personality dimensions in differential treatment planning.
- Segal, Z. V., & Teasdale, J. (2018). *Mindfulness-based cognitive therapy for depression*. Guilford Publications.
- Sherry, S. B., Hewitt, P. L., Flett, G. L., Lee-Baggley, D. L., & Hall, P. A. (2007). Trait perfectionism and perfectionistic self-presentation in personality pathology. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42(3), 477-490.
- Singer, T., & Klimecki, O. M. (2014). Empathy and compassion. *Current Biology*, 24(18), R875-R878.
- Swift, J. K., Callahan, J. L., & Vollmer, B. M. (2011). Preferences. *Journal of clinical psychology*, 67(2), 155-165.
- Tanay, G., & Bernstein, A. (2013). State Mindfulness Scale (SMS): development and initial validation. *Psychological assessment*, 25(4), 1286.
- Tang, Y. Y., Hölzel, B. K., & Posner, M. I. (2015). The neuroscience of mindfulness meditation. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 16(4), 213-225.
- Tellegen, A., & Atkinson, G. (1974). Openness to absorbing and self-altering experiences ("absorption"), a trait related to hypnotic susceptibility. *Journal of abnormal psychology*, 83(3), 268.

- Vago, D. R., & Silbersweig, D. A. (2012). Self-awareness, self-regulation, and self-transcendence (S-ART): a framework for understanding the neurobiological mechanisms of mindfulness. *Frontiers in human neuroscience*, 6, 296.
- Van Dam, N. T., van Vugt, M. K., Vago, D. R., Schmalzl, L., Saron, C. D., Olendzki, A., ... & Fox, K. C. (2018). Mind the hype: A critical evaluation and prescriptive agenda for research on mindfulness and meditation. *Perspectives on psychological science*, 13(1), 36-61.