Psihološka istraživanja, Vol. XXVIII (2) 2025.
141–158

UDK 159.923
TIP ČLANKA: Originalni naučni rad
DOI: 10.5937/psistra0-53630

Do Personality Traits Moderate the Relationship between Mindfulness and Satisfaction with Life?

Filip Biro[1] **(https://orcid.org/0009-0001-8886-2822)**
University Business Academy in Novi Sad, Faculty of Organizational Studies EDUKA in Belgrade, Department of Psychology.

Boris Popov (https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7124-6863)
University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Arts, Department of Psychology

The aim of this study is to investigate the relationship between mindfulness and life satisfaction, while also examining whether personality traits moderate this relationship. The sample consisted of 214 respondents (158 females and 56 males, the average age of 29). The instruments used in the research include the following: *Velikih pet + dva, skraćena verzija* (Big Five + Two, shortened version), *The Mindful Attention and Awareness Scale* (MAAS), and *Satisfaction with Life Scale* (SWLS). The results indicate that mindfulness significantly predicts satisfaction with life. In spite of the fact that almost all personality traits correlate with mindfulness, no significant moderating effect of personality traits has been obtained regarding the relationship between mindfulness and satisfaction with life.

Keywords: mindfulness, satisfaction with life, personality traits

Introduction

Mindfulness, traditionally defined as paying attention to the present moment with openness and non-judgment, has emerged as a valuable tool for promoting mental well-being (Carr, 2023). Mindfulness serves to nurture and develop an array of positive and constructive mental capabilities and skills that ultimately contribute significantly to enhancing and improving an individual's overall psychological well-being and mental health state (Spadaro & Provident, 2020). Research indicates that mindfulness practices can enhance focus and awareness, improve emotional regulation, and foster a greater sense of self-awareness, thus contributing to increased life satisfaction (Vago & Silbergweig, 2012).

1 filipbiro@live.com

Given these wide-ranging benefits, in recent decades, mindfulness has become an integral part of psychotherapy and a focal point of numerous research endeavours (Bajaj & Pande, 2016). A broader definition of mindfulness, put forth by Bishop, and the one that is more widely accepted in the literature, characterizes it as: "the capacity of an individual to direct attention to their mental processes and orient themselves to their experience with curiosity, in a non-judgmental manner, and with acceptance" (Bishop et al., 2004, p. 230).

Unlike previous authors, Brown and Ryan (2003) argue that acceptance does not belong to the definition of this concept. Their rationale is that acceptance directly follows from dedicating full attention to the present moment and, therefore, is redundant, which is a proposition supported by research findings (Feng et al., 2017). In line with this conceptualization, Brown and Ryan (2003) devised a unidimensional test *The Mindfulness Attention and Awareness Scale* (MAAS), used in this study as well.

The popularization of mindfulness within psychology is largely attributed to Kabat-Zinn's Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) programme. Initially designed as a technique to alleviate chronic pain, research has demonstrated that MBSR is highly effective in patients with psychological difficulties resulting from medical injuries or illnesses (Kabat-Zinn, 2003; Bishop et al., 2004). Research that evaluated the effects of MBSR indicates that mindfulness can significantly reduce distress (Drake et al., 2017), somatic consequences of stress (Grossman et al., 2004), anxiety, and hostility in cardiovascular patients (Kheyran-Alnesa et al., 2018), as well as depressive symptoms (Teasdale et al., 2000; Hofmann et al., 2010; Barnhofer et al., 2011).

More recently, mindfulness-based cognitive therapy (MBCT) has also shown promise, particularly in preventing depressive relapse (Galante et al., 2012). Neuroscientific research has complemented these findings by identifying the neurobiological markers associated with mindfulness (Taren et al., 2013), thus reinforcing the notion of mindfulness as both a psychological and physiological process for behavioural regulation.

The relationship between mindfulness and life satisfaction

While we can easily agree on the factors important for a fulfilling and happy life, such as health, a desired partner, or a successful career, not every individual will equally prioritize the same component. For some, family might hold greater significance than material possessions, whereas, for others, the reverse might be true. Another factor influencing people's satisfaction with their lives is their definition of success, where the standards for determining career success can significantly vary among individuals (Pavot & Diener, 2009). Diener and colleagues (Diener et al., 1985) advocate for the assessment

of individual's subjective definitions of success, since they influence their satisfaction level more than the satisfaction with specific life domains. To capture this subjective perspective, Diener et al. (1985) developed the *Satisfaction with Life Scale* (SWLS), used in this research as well.

Research that explored the relationship between mindfulness and life satisfaction has identified a significant connection between these two constructs. The individuals exhibiting greater mindfulness tend to report higher self-awareness, emotional regulation, and alignment between actions and personal values – the factors that enhance subjective well-being (Brown & Ryan, 2003a). These authors posit that mindfulness can enhance individual's well-being by helping them become aware of the activities they consider essential and aligned with their values and interests (Brown & Ryan, 2003a). Moreover, there is evidence that attention sensitivity to psychological and somatic cues, a crucial component of mindfulness, is essential for the functioning of healthy regulatory processes (Cash & Whittingham, 2010). Biofeedback studies have long reinforced the notion that attention is a key component in reducing unhealthy somatic conditions and disease symptoms (Brown & Ryan, 2003a).

Relationship of mindfulness with other personality traits

Researchers have also delved into the relationship between mindfulness and personality traits, often comparing their findings with the Big-Five model of personality. Meta-analyses conducted by Giluk (2009) and Hanley and Garland (2017), as well as the cross-cultural analysis from Roemer (2024), indicate that mindfulness significantly correlates with most personality traits in this model.

Neuroticism involves individuals who are more anxious, insecure, and tend to avoid unpleasant experiences. On the other hand, individuals with high scores in mindfulness exhibit a higher threshold for tolerating negative experiences, thoughts, and feelings. They may even willingly engage in such experiences and rarely avoid them. Based on this, it is not surprising that neuroticism is negatively correlated with mindfulness (Giluk, 2009).

Extraverted individuals are generally very open, warm, and assertive. Research has shown that there is a higher level of both subjective well-being and positive emotionality when talking about extraversion and mindfulness (McCrae & Costa, 2004). However, these two constructs differ in that the extraverted individuals have a need for activity, excitement, and a high level of stimuli, while mindfulness entails the complete opposite. Individuals with well-developed mindfulness are composed, not impulsive, and present in the current moment. This explains why some studies yield positive correlations between these two constructs, while others show negative correlations (Giluk, 2009).

Aggressiveness as a personality trait is manifested when an individual is uncooperative, selfish, prioritizes their interests over others, and generally shows disregard for other people. Mindfulness, on the other hand, entails a sense of empathy and compassion towards others (Neff & Germer, 2013; Kabat-Zinn, 1990). Additionally, aggressive individuals tend to be distrustful, believing that others are not well-intentioned, but always seeking the ways to deceive or harm them. This attitude contradicts the concept of the "beginner's mind" discussed by Kabat-Zinn (1990), which implies approaching people and events as *tabula rasa*, as if meeting a person or experiencing an event for the first time. Individuals with developed mindfulness are likely to approach even someone with whom they have had a negative experience, in the hope of building a new connection and experiencing a fresh, positive encounter. Therefore, it is expected that aggressiveness is negatively correlated with mindfulness, a relationship confirmed by previous research (Banfi & Randall, 2022; Giluk, 2009).

Conscientious individuals are reliable, responsible, rule-abiding, achievement-oriented, and self-disciplined. Self-discipline is a key aspect of both conscientiousness and mindfulness. Both concepts are characterized by thoughtfulness and effective responsiveness, rather than impulsivity or automatic actions, and research shows that both are positively associated with high levels of self-confidence (Roemer et al., 2024). Based on this, it is expected that conscientiousness and mindfulness will be positively correlated.

Openness to new experiences involves a person being creative, willing to try and experience new things. It also encompasses the thoughts and feelings a person has towards the experiences they encounter. Individuals characterized by openness are curious to learn more about the external world and to explore more about themselves. Mindfulness also implies that a person is curious and willing to re-examine their experiences. Shared elements of attention, curiosity, and receptivity suggest that openness to new experiences is positively related to mindfulness, as supported by previous research findings (Tan et al., 2021; Giluk, 2009).

Other personality traits outside the Big-Five model (included in the personality test applied in this study) also correlate with mindfulness. Negative valence characterizes the individuals who perceive themselves as manipulative, corrupt, disliked, and generally hold a negative self-image. Previous research indicates that individuals with developed mindfulness generally have positive self-perception, are inclined towards empathy, and aim to view themselves and their actions non-judgmentally. Based on this, it can be assumed that the correlation between these two concepts will be negative (Kabat-Zinn, 1990). On the other hand, positive valence implies that an individual sees themselves as superior, impressive, extraordinary, and the like. Individuals who exhibit greater mindfulness tend to hold a more

favourable self-view, and hence it is expected that these two constructs will be positively correlated (Kabat-Zinn, 1990).

The aim of the study

The positive relationship between mindfulness and life satisfaction is well-documented, with mindfulness consistently emerging as a significant predictor of psychological well-being (Brown & Ryan, 2003a; Pavot & Diener, 2009). Mindfulness, defined as a cultivable skill of present-moment awareness and non-judgmental acceptance, is understood to be a dynamic psychological process that enhances cognitive and emotional regulation (Nyklíček, 2011). This positions it as distinct from stable, enduring personality dispositions. While the direct effect of mindfulness on well-being is clear, the role of personality in this dynamic requires further exploration.

Previous research has often examined this interplay through the lens of mediation. For instance, studies have shown that resilience – a personality-related factor – mediates the impact of mindfulness on life satisfaction (Bajaj & Pande, 2016), and that neuroticism can also function within a mediating pathway (Wenzel et al., 2015). These findings suggest that personality traits can be a part of the pathway through which mindfulness improves well-being.

However, an alternative and less-explored theoretical model proposes that personality traits may function as moderators (Hopwood et al., 2013). Rather than being a pathway, stable personality traits may alter the strength or nature of the relationship between mindfulness and life satisfaction (Barnhofer et al., 2011). This perspective suggests that an individual's inherent personality profile could influence how effectively they engage with and benefit from mindfulness, ultimately shaping its impact on their life satisfaction (Nyklíček & Irrmischer, 2017). Despite the theoretical plausibility of this model, the studies that specifically test for moderation remain limited.

Therefore, this study has been designed to address this gap with two primary aims:

1. To confirm the direct, positive relationship between mindfulness and life satisfaction in a Serbian sample;
2. To investigate whether seven personality traits measured by the Big Five+2 questionnaire moderate the relationship between mindfulness and life satisfaction.

Based on this framework, we have established two main hypotheses. First, consistent with extensive prior research (e.g., Brown & Ryan, 2003a), we hypothesize that mindfulness (MAAS scores) will be a significant positive predictor of life satisfaction (SWLS scores). Second, based on our theoretical

model of moderation and prior work linking personality and mindfulness (Giluk, 2009; Hanley & Garland, 2017), we hypothesize that stable personality traits will significantly moderate the relationship between mindfulness and life satisfaction.

Method

Sample

A total of 214 participants from Serbia took part in the study, with 158 females and 56 males. The sample was convenient, implying that the participants were not randomly selected but chosen based on availability (i.e., readiness to fill in the online questionnaire). Participants' ages ranged from 18 to 76 years, with an average age of 29. Educational levels varied from having completed primary school to having obtained Doctoral and Master's degrees, with the majority (40%) having completed Bachelor studies.

Given the significant difference in the number of participants between genders, the significance of differences in the means of all variables based on gender was tested. In none of the cases were significant differences found, so the sample was treated as a whole.

Instruments

For the assessment of mindfulness, *The Mindful Attention and Awareness Scale* (MAAS; Brown & Ryan, 2003) was used. This scale represents a measure of the one-factor structure of mindfulness, consisting of 15 items describing the ways in which a person may exhibit a lack of full alertness, such as inattentiveness or engaging in automatic actions. Participants responded on a six-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (almost always) to 6 (almost never), where a higher score indicated a higher level of mindfulness. In the original study, the Cronbach's alpha showed good internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.89$), and, for this sample, it was $\alpha = 0.85$. Factor analysis in our research confirmed the one-factor structure of the questionnaire.

For assessing life satisfaction, the *Satisfaction with Life Scale* (SWLS; Diener et al., 1985), Serbian adaption (Vasić et al., 2011), was employed. This scale consists of only five items designed to measure the global cognitive judgment of one's life satisfaction. Participants responded using a five-point Likert scale, where 1 represented "Strongly Disagree" and 5 represented "Strongly Agree". The Cronbach's alpha for our sample is $\alpha = 0.82$, indicating good internal consistency.

The questionnaire used for assessing personality traits is the *Big Five + 2* (VP+2-70; Čolović, Smederevac & Mitrović, 2014). The *Big Five + 2* is a

test based on the lexical hypothesis, which was generated on the population of Serbia. It comprises 70 items categorized into seven scales measuring personality traits, with each scale consisting of 10 items. The scales include Neuroticism, Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Aggressiveness, Openness, Positive Valence, and Negative Valence. Participants responded using a five-point Likert scale, where 1 represented "Strongly Disagree" and 5 represented "Strongly Agree". A higher score on the scale indicates a stronger expression of the corresponding trait. The psychometric values are quite satisfactory based on previous research, with Cronbach's alpha values ranging from α=0.83 to α=0.92. In this study, for the whole test, Cronbach's alpha was α=0.83, while, for the specific scales, the values were the following: Neuroticism (α=0.84), Extraversion (α=0.85), Conscientiousness (α=0.79), Aggressiveness (α=0.84), Openness (α=0.80), Positive Valence (α=0.81), and Negative Valence (α=0.82).

Procedure

The research was conducted online, using the "Google Forms" platform. Before filling out the questionnaire, participants had the opportunity to read a consent form emphasizing that their data would remain anonymous and would be used solely for scientific purposes. They were also informed that they could withdraw from the study at any time. It took participants approximately 15 minutes to complete the questionnaires.

Results

Descriptive indicators

Table 1
Descriptive data

Variable	M	SD	Variance	Skewness	Kurtosis	Min.	Max.
MAAS	60.21	12.93	165.48	.17	-.50	28	89
Aggressiveness	26.28	7.22	48.37	.39	-.72	13	44
Extraversion	37.44	7.53	56.43	-.49	-.38	15	50
Neuroticism	24.41	9.46	83.63	.38	-.74	10	49
Negative Valence	16.92	6.30	28.74	1.67	1.14	10	36
Openness	38.90	4.90	23.62	-.82	.74	22	47
Positive Valence	31.58	7.74	59.31	-.21	-.13	11	49
Conscientiousness	34.00	7.25	50.13	-.43	-.19	14	49
SWLS	17.13	4.40	19.11	-.32	-.48	6	25

Note: M – Mean; SD – Standard deviation; MAAS – Mindful Attention and Awareness Scale; SWLS – Satisfaction with Life Scale.

Analysis of intercorrelations

Table 2
Intercorrelation matrix

Variable	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
MAAS	-							
Aggressiveness	-.33**	-						
Extraversion	.33**	–.14*	-					
Neuroticism	-.52**	.51**	-.55**	-				
5. Negative Valence	–.30**	.67**	–.15*	.46**	-			
6. Openness	.15*	–.07	.29**	–.18*	-.16*	-		
7. Positive Valence	.08	.17*	.50**	-.29**	.09	.41**	-	
8. Conscientiousness	.41**	–.13	.39**	-.42**	-.29**	.29**	.28**	-
9. SWLS	.34**	-.25**	.59**	-.66**	–.24**	.30**	.43*	.44**

Note: MAAS – Mindful Attention and Awareness Scale; SWLS – Satisfaction with Life Scale;
*Correlation is significant at the level 0.05; **Correlation is significant at the level 0.01.

The results of the intercorrelation analysis (Table 2) indicate that the *Mindful Attention and Awareness Scale* is significantly correlated with the *Satisfaction with Life Scale* (0.34). Mindfulness significantly correlates with all personality traits, except Positive Valence. It positively correlates with Conscientiousness (0.41), Extraversion (0.33), and Openness (0.15), and negatively with Neuroticism (-0.52), Aggressiveness (-0.33), and Negative Valence (-0.30). The *Satisfaction with Life Scale* is significantly correlated with all other variables.

Analysis of the moderating effect of personality traits on the relationship between mindfulness and life satisfaction

We conducted a Hierarchical Regression Analysis to analyse the moderating effect of personality traits on the relationship between mindfulness and life satisfaction. The analysis was performed using the Forward method.

In the first step, demographic variables (age, gender, education) were always included as control variables. The dependent variable was the *Satisfaction with Life Scale*. In the second step, one of the seven variables from the personality questionnaire (BF+2) and the *Mindful Attention and Awareness Scale* (MAAS) variable were included. In the final, third step, the interaction of the two variables from the second step was added.

For all analyses, the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) was calculated to check for potential multicollinearity during regression. In our analyses, none of the VIF values exceeded 1.5, indicating that the variance of the regression coefficients was not exaggerated due to multicollinearity.

Moderating effect of Aggressiveness

Table 3
Main and interactive effects of MAAS and Aggressiveness on SWLS

	R^2	β	R^2 Change	F coefficient
Step 1 Control variables	.024		.024	1.65
Step 2	.148**		.12	7.06**
Mindfulness		.289**		
Aggressiveness		-.139		
Step 3 Mindfulness x Aggressiveness	.148	.011	.00	5.86**

Note: β – Beta coefficient; F coefficient – coefficient Fisher test; ** significant at p <0.01; * significant at p <0.05;
Dependent variable SWLS – *Satisfaction with Life Scale*.

The variables Mindfulness and Aggressiveness explain 12% of the variance of the dependent variable. Mindfulness has a positive and significant beta value, indicating that it is a significant predictor of life satisfaction, while the beta value for the Aggressiveness variable is negative, but does not reach statistical significance. The interaction of these two variables was added to test the moderating effect, but it was not significant. Therefore, the results suggest that Aggressiveness does not have a significant moderating effect on the relationship between mindfulness and life satisfaction.

Moderating effect of Extraversion

Table 4
Main and interactive effects of MAAS and Extraversion on SWLS

	R^2	β	R^2 Change	F coefficient
Step 1	.024		.024	1.65
Control variables Step 2	.386**		.362	26.02**
Mindfulness		.152*		
Extraversion Step 3	.387	.538**	.001	21.65**
Mindfulness x Extraversion		.028		

Note: β – Beta coefficient; F coefficient – coefficient Fisher test; ** significant at p <0.01; * significant at p <0.05;
Dependent variable SWLS – Satisfaction with Life Scale.

The variables of Mindfulness and Extraversion explain 36.2% of the variance in the *Satisfaction with Life Scale*. The beta value for Mindfulness is positive and significant at the .05 level, while the beta value for Extraversion is positive and significant at the .01 level, indicating that both variables have a

significant positive effect on satisfaction with life. No significant moderation effect was obtained. Therefore, Extraversion also does not have a moderating effect on the relationship between mindfulness and life satisfaction.

Moderating effect of Neuroticism

Table 5
Main and interactive effects of MAAS and Neuroticism on SWLS

	R^2	β	R^2 Change	F coefficient
Step 1	.024		.024	1.65
Control variables Step 2	.445**		0.42	33.66**
Mindfulness		–.004		
Neuroticism Step 3	.446	–.658**	0.01	27.94**
Mindfulness x Neuroticism		-.022		

Note: β – Beta coefficient; F coefficient – coefficient Fisher test; ** significant at p <0.01; * significant at p <0.05;

Dependent variable SWLS – Satisfaction with Life Scale.

Mindfulness and Neuroticism explain a substantial 42.1% of the variance in the *Satisfaction with Life Scale*. The beta value for Neuroticism is negative and significant at the .01 level, while the beta value for Mindfulness is not significant. This indicates that Neuroticism significantly predicts a low score on the *Satisfaction with Life Scale*. Neuroticism does not have a moderating effect on the relationship between mindfulness and life satisfaction.

Moderating effect of Negative Valence

Table 6
Main and interactive effects of MAAS and Negative Valence on SWLS

	R^2	β	R^2 Change	F coefficient
Step 1	.024		.024	1.65
Control variables Step 2	.146**		.122	7.15**
Mindfulness		.297**		
Negative Valence Step 3	.147	-.136	.01	7.15**
Mindfulness x Negative Valence		.034		

Note: β – Beta coefficient; F coefficient – coefficient Fisher test; ** significant at p <0.01; * significant at p <0.05;

Dependent variable SWLS – Satisfaction with Life Scale.

Mindfulness and Negative valence explain 12.2% of the variance in the *Satisfaction with Life Scale*. The beta value for variable Mindfulness is positive and significant at the .01 level, while the beta value for Negative Valence is not significant. This means that Negative Valence is not a predictor of life satisfaction. Negative Valence does not have a moderating effect on the relationship between mindfulness and life satisfaction.

Moderating effect of Openness

Table 7
Main and interactive effects of MAAS and Openness on SWLS

	R^2	β	R^2 Change	F coefficient
Step 1	.024		.024	1.65
Control variables Step 2	.183**		.159	9.31**
Mindfulness		.297**		
Openness Step 3	.186	.237**	.03	7.94**
Mindfulness x Openness		–.063		

Note: β – Beta coefficient; F coefficient – coefficient Fisher test; ** significant at p <.01; * significant at p <.05;

Dependent variable SWLS – *Satisfaction with Life Scale*.

Mindfulness and Openness explain 15.9% of the variance in the *Satisfaction with Life Scale*. Beta values for Mindfulness and Openness are positive and significant at the .01 level, indicating that both variables significantly predict a positive score on the *Satisfaction with Life Scale*. Openness does not have moderating significance in the relationship between mindfulness and life satisfaction.

Moderating effect of Positive Valence

Table 8
Main and interactive effects of MAAS and Positive Valence on SWLS

	R^2	β	R^2 Change	F coefficient
Step 1	.024		.024	1.65
Control variables Step 2	.291**		.267	16.97**
Mindfulness		.290**		
Positive Valence		.406**		
Step 3	.292		.001	14.07**
Mindfulness x Positive Valence		-.011		

Note: β – Beta coefficient; F coefficient – coefficient Fisher test; ** ** significant at p <.01; * significant at p <.05;

Dependent variable SWLS – *Satisfaction with Life Scale*.

Variables of Mindfulness and Positive Valence explain 26.7% of the variance in the *Satisfaction with Life Scale*. Beta values for Mindfulness and Positive Valence are positive and significant at the .01 level, indicating that both variables are significant positive predictors of satisfaction with life. Positive Valence does not have moderating significance in the relationship between mindfulness and life satisfaction.

Moderating effect of Conscientiousness

Table 9

Main and interactive effects of MAAS and Conscientiousness on SWLS

	R^2	β	R^2 Change	F coefficient
Step 1	.024		.024	1.65
Control variables Step 2	.238**		.214	12.97**
Mindfulness		.195*		
Conscientiousness		.385**		
Step 3	.239		.001	10.78**
Mindfulness x Conscientiousness			-.019	

Note: β – Beta coefficient; F coefficient – coefficient Fisher test; ** ** significant at p <.01; * significant at p <.05;

Dependent variable SWLS – *Satisfaction with Life Scale*.

Variables of Mindfulness and Conscientiousness explain 21.4% of the variance in the *Satisfaction with Life Scale*. Beta value for Mindfulness is positive and significant at the .05 level, while Beta value for Conscientiousness is positive and significant at the .01 level, indicating that both variables significantly predict a positive score on the *Satisfaction with Life Scale*. Conscientiousness does not have moderating significance in the relationship between mindfulness and life satisfaction.

Discussion

The aim of this study was twofold: to explore the connection between mindfulness and life satisfaction and to investigate whether personality traits influence these connections.

The findings substantiate our initial hypothesis unequivocally: the notable correlation between mindfulness and life satisfaction, which indicates that mindfulness serves as one of the predictors of life satisfaction, implies that mindfulness plays a crucial role in enhancing the experience of life satisfaction. This outcome is consistent with prior studies that identified a significant relationship between these two constructs, suggesting that individuals exhibiting elevated levels of mindfulness reported a more

profound experience of life satisfaction or demonstrated a general increase in happiness (Brown & Ryan, 2003a). These authors contend that mindfulness helps individuals in recognizing the activities that they consider essential and congruent with their values and interests, consequently elevating their overall life satisfaction.

Our research builds on existing literature by validating the association in a fresh sample and context. Additionally, we demonstrate that the strength of this effect is significant. Moreover, experimental evidence underscores the practical importance of this link. A 12-week study which included mindfulness training for college students not only reduced stress and depression, but results also pointed to a significant improvement in life satisfaction (Alvarado-García et al. 2025). Together, these findings underscore that mindfulness reliably supports higher life satisfaction across diverse settings. The implications of these findings also suggest that mindfulness may function as an invaluable instrument in psychotherapy and mental health prevention.

On the other hand, the results from this study reject our second hypothesis: none of the seven examined personality traits exhibited a moderating influence on the correlation between mindfulness and life satisfaction. Specifically, none of these seven personality traits (neuroticism, extraversion, conscientiousness, openness, agreeableness, aggressiveness, or positive and valence) demonstrated a moderating effect on the relationship between mindfulness and life satisfaction.

Several personality traits showed significant correlations with both mindfulness and life satisfaction. Aggressiveness, neuroticism, and negative valence were negatively associated with both constructs, while openness, extraversion, and conscientiousness showed positive associations. Positive valence, however, was significantly related only to life satisfaction, not mindfulness. In our assessment, certain components within the Positive Valence scale may exhibit a characteristic of unexamined optimism, which stands in contrast to the principles of mindfulness, thus resulting in a lack of correlation.

Prior research (Angarita-Osorio, Escorihuela, & Cañete, 2024; Giluk, 2009; Hanley & Garland, 2017) has documented substantial correlations between personality traits and both mindfulness and well-being, but our data suggest that these correlations do not translate into conditional effects on life satisfaction.

Hanley and Garland (2017) found that mindfulness is strongly linked to traits related to emotional stability (low neuroticism/high conscientiousness/agreeableness), and also positively related to Plasticity traits (extraversion, openness). Our results align with these remarks. Extraversion, openness and conscientiousness were associated with higher mindfulness and satisfaction, which was also the case with Banfi and Randall's (2022) meta-analysis.

Importantly, however, no personality trait significantly moderated the positive mindfulness–life satisfaction link. In other words, the boost to life satisfaction associated with higher mindfulness was essentially the same, regardless of one's trait profile. This suggests that mindfulness enhances well-being via general self-regulatory processes rather than through any personality pathway. In other words, while individual traits set the baseline levels of satisfaction, the positive association between mindfulness and life satisfaction appears robust across the board, independent of any single personality trait.

In summary, our findings indicate that various personality traits independently correlate with both mindfulness and life satisfaction. The absence of a moderating effect, despite these strong correlations, suggests an additive rather than an interactive model. It appears that personality sets a baseline for individual's well-being, but mindfulness consistently provides an independent boost to life satisfaction across the personality spectrum. This implies that the mechanisms through which mindfulness enhances well-being may be universal and not contingent on pre-existing personality traits.

Nevertheless, based on our findings, there appears to be no substantial interaction effect between personality characteristics and mindfulness concerning life satisfaction. Therefore, it seems that this is another argument which shows that, irrespective of the dominant personality trait, individuals capable of attaining mindfulness tend to experience higher life satisfaction. With this, we aim to highlight the universality of these mechanisms: whether a person is naturally extroverted, high in neuroticism, or otherwise, mindful awareness can still engage these positive reappraisal and meaning-building processes that uplift satisfaction.

These findings offer encouraging insights from a clinical and health psychology standpoint. Our results imply that mindfulness-based interventions (MBIs) and practices can effectively boost life satisfaction for a wide range of individuals, as their impact does not appear to be contingent upon specific personality profiles. Such widespread applicability aligns with recent intervention research; for instance, Alvarado-García et al. (2025) found that a structured mindfulness programme notably improved students' life satisfaction, leading them to conclude that mindfulness meditation may be valuable for enhancing psychological well-being. In this program, individuals were trained to pay attention to present experiences and to nourish acceptance. In line with our results, these skills enhance life satisfaction regardless of personality. These findings suggest that mindfulness-based interventions can be effectively applied across diverse personality profiles.

Limitations of the study

One of the main limitations of this study is insufficient representativeness of the sample. Our reliance on convenience sampling implied that balancing

participant demographics, specifically gender, education, and age, was not possible. Encouragingly, our descriptive data showed no significant gender differences, which supports generalizing the obtained findings to both male and female populations. However, the online format of the study likely contributed to an average education level that was considerably higher, and an average age that was lower than one would typically anticipate in a representative sample.

A critical question arises regarding the potential dominance of highly educated individuals in the sample, and whether this might have impacted validity of the research. Considering the correlation between education and cognitive abilities, a logical question arises: how does mindfulness behave, and can it be adequately measured among individuals with lower education levels (Hyland, 2016)? Certain dimensions of mindfulness, including the capacity to identify and critically evaluate one's cognitive and emotional states, in addition to participation in meditative practices, may indeed present difficulties for individuals with lower educational attainment.

Scientific contribution of the Study

While mindfulness and life satisfaction have been widely studied, our research provides a unique contribution by testing whether stable personality traits – using the Big Five + Two model – moderate this relationship in a Serbian sample. This cultural and theoretical integration addresses a gap in the existing literature, where most studies examine direct or mediating effects but rarely explore moderation, especially in non-Western populations.

Giluk's (2009) meta-analysis highlighted strong associations between mindfulness and personality traits, but did not assess their role in moderating life satisfaction. Similarly, Jovanović and Joshanloo (2019) examined the predictors of life satisfaction in Serbia, excluding mindfulness and personality constructs. Our study thus extends generalizability by using a multidimensional personality framework and emphasizing mindfulness as a potentially universal predictor of life satisfaction, largely independent of individual dispositional traits.

References

Angarita-Osorio, N., Escorihuela, R. M., & Cañete, T. (2024). The relationship between neuroticism as a personality trait and mindfulness skills: a scoping review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *15*, 1401969.

Alvarado-García, P. A. A., Soto-Vásquez, M. R., Infantes Gomez, F. M., Guzman Rodriguez, N. M., & Castro-Paniagua, W. G. (2025). Effect of a mindfulness program on stress, anxiety, depression, sleep quality, social support, and life satisfaction: a quasi-experimental study in college students. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *16*,

1508934.Bajaj, B., & Pande, N. (2016). Mediating role of resilience in the impact of mindfulness on life satisfaction and affect as indices of subjective well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences, 93*, 63–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.09.005

Banfi, J. T., & Randall, J. G. (2022). A meta-analysis of trait mindfulness: Relationships with the big five personality traits, intelligence, and anxiety. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *101*, 104307.

Barnhofer, T., Duggan, D. S., & Griffith, J. W. (2011). Dispositional mindfulness moderates the relation between neuroticism and depressive symptoms. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *51*(8), 958–962. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.07.032

Bishop, S. R., Lau, M., Shapiro, S., Carlson, L., Anderson, N. D., Carmody, J., Segal, Z. V., Abbey, S., Speca, M., Velting, D., & Devins, G. (2004). Mindfulness: A proposed operational definition. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, *11*(3), 230–241.

Brown, K. W., & Ryan, R. M. (2003). Mindful Attention Awareness Scale. *PsycTESTS Dataset*. https://doi.org/10.1037/t04259-000

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

Carr, P. (2023). *The Roles of Mindfulness and Gratitude on Life Satisfaction* (Doctoral dissertation, Bellevue University).

Cash, M., & Whittingham, K. (2010). What facets of mindfulness contribute to psychological well– being and depressive, anxious, and stress-related symptomatology? *Mindfulness*, *1*(3), 177–182. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-010-0023-4

Čolović, P., Smederevac, S. i Mitrović, D. (2014). Velikih pet plus dva: validacija skraćene verzije. *Primenjena Psihologija*, *7*(1), 227–254. https://doi.org/10.19090/pp.2014.3-1.227-254

Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *49*(1), 71-75.https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901

Drake, M. M., Morris, D. M., & Davis, T. J. (2017). Neuroticism's susceptibility to distress: Moderated with mindfulness. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *106*, 248–252. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.10.060

Feng, X. J., Krägeloh, C. U., Billington, D. R., & Siegert, R. J. (2017). To what extent is mindfulness as presented in commonly used mindfulness questionnaires different from how it is conceptualized by senior ordained Buddhists? *Mindfulness*, *9*(2), 441–460. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-017-0788-9

Galante, J., Iribarren, S. J., & Pearce, P. F. (2012). Effects of mindfulness-based cognitive therapy on mental disorders: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *Journal of Research in Nursing, 18*(2), 133–155. https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987112466087

Giluk, T. L. (2009). Mindfulness, big five personality, and affect: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *47*(8), 805–811. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2009.06.026

Grossman, P., Niemann, L., Schmidt, S., & Walach, H. (2004). Mindfulness-based stress reduction and health benefits. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, *57*(1), 35–43. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-3999(03)00573-7

Hanley, A. W., & Garland, E. L. (2017). The mindful personality: A meta-analysis from a cybernetic perspective. *Mindfulness*, *8*(6), 14561470. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-017-0736-8

Hofmann, S. G., Sawyer, A. T., Witt, A. A., & Oh, D. (2010). The effect of mindfulness-based therapy on anxiety and depression: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *78*(2), 169–183. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018555

Hopwood, C. J., Morey, L. C., Donnellan, M. B., Samuel, D. B., Grilo, C. M., McGlashan, T. H., Shea, M. T., Zanarini, M. C., Gunderson, J. G., & Skodol, A. E. (2013). Ten-Year Rank-Order Stability of Personality Traits and Disorders in a Clinical Sample. *Journal of Personality*, *81*(3), 335–344. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1467-6494.2012.00801.X

https://doi.org/10.1093/clipsy.bph077

Hyland, T. (2016). The limits of mindfulness: Emerging issues for education. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 64*(1), 97–117. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00071005.2015.1051946

Kabat-Zinn, J. (1990). *Full Catastrophe Living: Using the Wisdom of Your Body and Mind to Face Stress, Pain and Illness.* Delacorte.

Kabat-Zinn, J. (2003). Mindfulness-based interventions in context: Past, present, and future. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, *10*(2), 144–156. https://doi.org/10.1093/clipsy.bpg016

Kheyran-Alnesa, M., Mirzaian, B., & Yar-Ali, D. (2018). The effectiveness of Acceptance and Commitment-Based Therapy on anger, anxiety and hostility for heart surgery patients. *Journal of Biochemical Technology*, *9*(4), 43. https://www.proquest.com/openview/ 1657b9f319b3f6b949718d425e4570c2/1?pqorigsite=gscholar&cbl=4425143

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (2004). Neo five-factor inventory – revised. *PsycTESTS Dataset*. https://doi.org/10.1037/t07553-000

Neff, K. D., & Germer, C. K. (2013). A pilot study and randomized controlled trial of the mindful self-compassion program. *Journal of clinical psychology*, *69*(1), 28–44.

Nyklíček, I. (2011). *Mindfulness, Emotion Regulation, and Well-Being* (pp. 101–118). Springer, New York, NY. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-6953-8_7

Nyklíček, I., & Irrmischer, M. (2017). For whom does mindfulness-based stress reduction work? Moderating effects of personality. *Mindfulness*, *8*(4), 1106–1116. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s12671-017-0687-0

Pavot, W., & Diener, E. (2009). Review of the satisfaction with life scale. *Assessing Well-Being*, 101–117. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-2354-4

Roemer, A., Cervin, M., Medvedeva, A., Bravo, A. J., & Medvedev, O. N. (2024). Big five of mindfulness and personality: Cross-cultural network analysis. *Mindfulness*, *15*(1), 37–47.

Spadaro, K. C., & Provident, I. M. (2020). Health benefits of mindful meditation. *Nutrition, Fitness, and Mindfulness: An Evidence-Based Guide for Clinicians*, 159–176.

Tan, C.-S., Mohd Hashim, I. H., Pheh, K. S., Pratt, C., Chung, M. H., & Setyowati, A. (2021). The mediating role of openness to experience and curiosity in the relati-

onship between mindfulness and meaning in life: evidence from four countries. *Current Psychology*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1007/S12144-021-01430-2

Taren, A. A., Creswell, J. D., & Gianaros, P. J. (2013). Dispositional mindfulness covaries with smaller amygdala and caudate volumes in community adults. PLoS ONE, 8 (5): e64574. https://doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0064574

Teasdale, J. D., Segal, Z. V., Williams, J. M., Ridgeway, V. A., Soulsby, J. M., & Lau, M. A. (2000). Prevention of relapse/recurrence in major depression by mindfulness-based cognitive therapy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *68*(4), 615–623. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006x.68.4.615

Vago, D. R., & Silbersweig, D. (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. https://doi.org/10.3389/FNHUM.2012.00296

Vasić, A., Šarčević, D. i Trogrlić, A. (2011). Zadovoljstvo životom u Srbiji. *Primenjena psihologija, 2*, 151–177. https://doi.org/10.19090/pp.2011.2.151-177

Wenzel, M., von Versen, C., Hirschmüller, S., & Kubiak, T. (2015). Curb your neuroticism – mindfulness mediates the link between neuroticism and subjective well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *80*, 68–75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.02.020

DATUM SLANJA: 2024/09/23 DATUM PRIHVATANJA: 2025/09/30

Da li osobine ličnosti imaju moderatorski efekat na punu svesnost i zadovoljstvo životom?

Filip Biro
Fakultet organizacionih studija EDUKA, Departman za psihologiju

Boris Popov
Univerzitet u Ljubljani, Filozofski fakultet, Departman za psihologiju

Cilj istraživanja je da prouči odnos između pune svesnosti i percepcije zadovoljstva životom, kao i da proveri da li su crte ličnosti moderatori tog odnosa. Uzorak se sastojao od 214 ispitanika iz Srbije (158 ženskih i 56 muških ispitanika, prosečnog uzrasta 29 godina). Korišćeni su sledeći instrumenti: *Velikih pet + 2 – 70*, *The Mindful Attention and Awareness Scale* (MAAS) i *Satisfaction with Life Scale* (SWLS). Dobijeni rezultati pokazuju da puna svesnost značajno predviđa percepciju zadovoljstva životom. Sa druge strane, nisu registrovani moderatorski efekti crta ličnosti na odnos između pune svesnosti i percepcije zadovoljstva životom.

Ključne reči: puna svesnost, zadovoljstvo životom, crte ličnosti