

Exploring Acts of Kindness and Predispositions that Predict Their Use and
Engagement in Communication Savoring

Tiana Case

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

University of Washington

2024

Committee:

Valerie Manusov

Carmen Gonzalez

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

Communication

©Copyright 2024

Tiana Case

University of Washington

Abstract

Exploring Acts of Kindness and Predispositions that Predict Their Use and
Engagement in Communication Savoring

Tiana Case

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:

Valerie Manusov

Department of Communication

This thesis explored the positive communication and psychological processes of prosociality, kindness, and savoring by applying a multi-level analytic framework using a macro, meso, and micro perspective. With the intention of clarifying interpersonal kindness behaviors, this thesis assessed and coded experienced kindness narratives into a typology of five categories. By evaluating prosocial dispositions (beneficence, humanity-esteem, mindfulness, and capacity to savor) that predict engagement in savoring, this thesis also clarified the intrapersonal features involved in the micro level of communication savoring of kindness engagement. The salient findings from this study promote the prosocial disposition of beneficence as particularly important for savoring, with mindfulness as a distal consideration. The preferred kindness typology grounds kindness research concretely to behavior.

Exploring Acts of Kindness and Predispositions that Predict Their Use and Engagement in Communication Savoring

The term “prosociality” captures an array of interrelated cognitive constructs, such as favorability and helpfulness, all of which relate to an other-oriented perspective that maintains and expands the social fabric (Bryant, 2021; Caprara et al., 2012). Prosociality may manifest in prosocial behaviors, and these are likely to result in positive outcomes such as enhanced life satisfaction, positive affect, and subjective well-being (Jiao et al., 2021; Knafo & Israel, 2012) for both the provider and recipient of the behavior (Martela & Ryan, 2016). One form of prosociality is kindness, which is recognized as incorporating various intrapersonal dispositions (i.e., virtues) and interpersonal behaviors that benefit others (Curry et al., 2018). Kindness, like sociality more generally, promotes social welfare, relying on close attention to sensitivities of people and contexts (Hart & Hart, 2023).

As with many positive experiences, people may want to extend the duration of the effects of prosocial interactions, including feelings and acts of kindness, by savoring the sensations that accompany them (Bryant, 2021). Whereas the concept of savoring is often applied to food and its pleasurable consumption, communication researchers have also begun exploring savoring of interactional experiences. This process, known as *communication savoring*, refers to thinking back on positive interactions to amplify the pleasure derived from them (Pitts, 2019). Such savoring is particularly likely to occur when an experience is evaluated as high in effort, intention, and authenticity (Binfet et al., 2022; Cotney & Banarjee, 2019). Given these conditions, it is likely that people may savor moments of kindness they experienced, both as the recipient *and the enactor* of kind behavior.

The constructs of prosociality, kindness, and savoring are part of what researchers term the “bright side” of communication, in that they emphasize the presence of positive, constructive, and facilitative interactions that are typically mindful and intentional (Pitts & Socha, 2013), all of which tend to increase personal and social welfare. These three concepts can also be integrated based on their multidimensional nature, and doing so can help explain the form and conditions under which their blending will occur. Specifically, they can be understood as involving various levels: macro, meso, and micro (Penner et al., 2005). The *macro level* relates to large-scale contexts and norms within them such as communities, organizations, corporations, and even nations; the *meso level* centers *interpersonal* interactions and the enactment of behavior (e.g., helping and volunteering); and the *micro level* refers to *intrapersonal* processes (i.e., dispositions and tendencies) that predict prosocial tendencies.

In an effort to clarify the processes within and between people surrounding these positive communication functions, the present study explores narratives of kindness and quantitatively assesses prosocial predispositions likely to predict them through an online survey. Applying this framework to savoring kindness communication, this thesis seeks to better understand and predict their relationship by articulating types of interpersonal kindness (meso-level) and evaluating intrapersonal predispositions that encourage prosocial behavior (micro-level), all housed in an understanding that kindness is recognized as being and feeling good (macro-level).

As extant categorizations of enacted kindness (meso-level) have been conceived through broad generalizations rather than concrete experiences, and existing typologies are not entirely congruent, this thesis first assesses the types of kindness in which people report having engaged to better determine common forms. A more grounded delineation of the types of kindness behavior in which people have engaged can inform theoretical perspectives on kindness and tie

them more concretely to communication savoring. Discerning specific types of kindness may also work as a blueprint for their use in educational and healthcare settings. Suggestions of supportive gestures for various circumstances promotes actual implementation of that behavior (Crowe & McDowell, 2017). For example, a tangible understanding of giving thanks as a type of kindness can prove useful in contexts such as marriage counseling, conflict resolution, or relational maintenance.

This thesis also identifies personal prosocial characteristics (micro-level) that should make individuals more likely to engage in the communication savoring of kindness. By examining the connection between prosocial dispositions and savoring acts of kindness, researchers and practitioners can better understand the ways in which pleasure amplification can be activated and nurtured. For example, recognizing an individual's inclinations toward others can inform specific strategies to help people engage in communication savoring and reap its benefits. This is important, as such cognitive engagement can be useful in the promotion of well-being, particularly in the area of mental health (i.e., savoring can enhance one's state of mind) (Jiao et al., 2021).

Importantly, the micro- and meso-levels of the prosocial processes of enacted kindness and savoring are housed in the macro-level that frames prosociality, kindness, and savoring as part of communication's bright side. Understanding further the connection between micro- and meso-level processes can illuminate the larger cultural narratives in which those processes are based and explain the reason why they are considered to be "good." To better explain these within and between levels and connections, I review relevant literature, grounded within prosociality to understand prosocial behavior and four factors likely to predict it, followed by descriptions of the psychological and communicative foundations of kindness, and finally I

venture into the concept of savoring to explore the features of kindness and delineate states of mind that may predict its communication savoring.

Prosociality

Prosociality is the enduring tendency to enact other-orientedness (i.e., consciously valuing others), including care, empathy, helping, and sharing (Caprara et al., 2012), and it is often considered to be a stable aspect of personality (Knafo & Israel, 2012). Bailey et al. (2021) intentionally define prosociality through a broad lens, viewing it as “a set of behavioral, motivational, cognitive, affective, and social processes that contribute to, and/or are focused on, the welfare of others” (p. 1). Although this conceptualization includes behavioral components, the incorporation of the other four factors distinguishes prosociality *as an overall orientation* that conditions people to engage in ways that tend to have positive outcomes. Hart and Hart (2023) likewise describe organizational prosociality, a term that encompasses prosocial motives, impacts, and behaviors.

As Hart and Hart’s definition suggests, people vary in their reasons for being prosocial. Gebauer et al. (2008) explain two motives that underlie a prosocial orientation to help others: pleasure and pressure. Whereas pressure is an extrinsic motivation informed by cultural politeness norms, pleasure is an intrinsically driven motivation to help others in an effort to receive pleasure for themselves (Gebauer et al., 2008). These motivations parallel the related communication constructs of emotional and reflexive intentions for communication (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Being internally motivated for emotional gain or to reap interpersonal benefits offer different intentions for acting prosocially.

The pleasure-based motivation may serve as a more salient predictor for engaging in prosocial behavior, driven by the good feelings elicited from acting in a way that benefits others.

Prosocial impact in this discussion does not signify the satisfaction of an outcome but, rather, the individual's perspective of themselves as accomplishing something good. Consistent with the goals of the present study, impact is defined as “the experience of making a positive difference in the lives of others” (Bolino & Grant, 2016, p. 602). This positive other-oriented thread continues to narrow as the next section of this thesis elaborates on concrete conceptualizations and examples of prosocial behavior.

Prosocial Behavior

In its broadest sense, prosocial behavior can be understood as any voluntary behavior enacted with the intent to benefit another (Eisenberg et al., 2006). Conceptualizations of prosocial behavior (e.g., Dovidio, 1984; Eisenberg & Miller, 1987; Penner et al., 2005) range in their emphasis on intentions, consequences, and societal context, however. Pfattheicher et al. (2022) identified a common core across several definitions, which revealed three key dimensions of prosocial behavior: (a) intentions and motives, (b) costs and benefits, and (c) societal context. Examples of such behavior include cooperating, comforting, helping others, and sharing (Penner et al., 2005). According to Bolino and Grant (2016), for example, prosocial behaviors are any acts that “promote or protect the welfare of individuals, groups, or organizations” (p. 602). Importantly, in addition to their positive effects on others, *prosocial behaviors can benefit the person who engages in them* (Mikolajewski et al., 2014). Among other outcomes, engagement in prosocial behavior helps shield individuals from negative emotions by, for instance, encouraging the formation of relationships with others.

Prosocial Dispositions

Prosociality includes specific tendencies that lend themselves to encouraging pro-other behaviors. These include emotional stability, empathy, moral reasoning, and perspective taking,

among others (Carlo et al., 2010; Hoffman, 2000; Tur-Porcar et al., 2018). Selections of such tendencies serve as trait-like stable characteristics, mapping out part of an individual's personality. Personality researchers often emphasize the importance of considering a multitude of factors to achieve a holistic assessment of tendencies (e.g., Epstein, 1994). As such, a prosocial orientation should likewise not be assessed via one disposition as doing so could not capture the breadth of the concept and be reliable indicator of it (McGinley et al., 2022). As such, when investigating communication savoring of kindness, multiple predictors should be examined.

Several prosocial dispositions exist in the literature as possible predictors of communication savoring. Three of these dispositions are the focus of this study: beneficence, humanity-esteem, and mindfulness. Beneficence and humanity-esteem are more clearly associated with being prosocial than is mindfulness. For example, beneficence, acknowledging oneself as an active citizen, may bring about greater social change than recognizing that people vary in their attendance to civil duties. Similarly, perceiving humankind in a positive light, humanity-esteem, could encourage stronger engagement in volunteerism compared to someone with a demoralized conviction of humanity.

The proclivity to be mindful does not necessarily involve the prosocial expectation of benefitting others, however. It is included in this thesis to reflect the premise that greater awareness of oneself invites greater awareness of others. Heightened attunement to one's own surroundings illuminates extant need for that of others, further revealing remaining shortages of other-oriented support (Cook-Cottone, 2017). Such a sensitivity to internal and external experiences fosters deficit awareness and encourages prosocial reaction. This thesis specifically evaluates beneficence and humanity-esteem as overt (i.e., explanatory) dispositions. Whereas mindfulness is not overtly prosocial, it still can more covertly factor into the predictive qualities

of someone engaging in behaviors that promote positivity. Each of these predispositions is discussed more fully next.

Beneficence. Beneficence refers to how much individuals perceive themselves as prosocial agents. Beneficial and benevolent, closely related terms, support beneficence as an assessment of how giving people are to others. According to Martela and Ryan (2016), beneficence is a form of predisposition defined as “the subjective feeling or evaluation about the actor’s personal sense of having done good things to others,” and further “the simple pleasure in having contributed to others” (p. 751). It is an affective and motivational construct derived from recognizing one’s positive impact on others, typically emerging during engagement in prosocial behavior (Martela & Ryan, 2019).

In parallel to how self-esteem empowers people to be confident, beneficence empowers people to act prosocially. High global self-esteem is generally associated with greater confidence in abilities and related competence in self-regulation, such as coping (Brown et al., 1988). This more specific beneficence self-esteem ought to operate similarly in encouraging prosocial engagement. Recent investigations of beneficence have evaluated the capacity for it to serve as an additional basic psychological need per Ryan and Deci’s (2000) Self-Determination Theory (SDT) (Martela & Ryan, 2019). SDT posits that the core needs of autonomy, competence, and relatedness must be satisfied in order to achieve a fulfilling life (Ryan & Deci, 2000). As such, this feeling of being good to others – beneficence – motivates further contributions to prosociality and engagement in prosocial behavior.

Beneficence can help increase self-efficacy as people perceive that their actions have a unique and significant social contribution (Keyes, 2013). Feeling good about oneself encourages behaviors that benefit beyond the individual to spread the wealth of positivity and reinforces

personal sense of beneficence. Beneficence *satisfaction*, the degree to which one is content with their level of prosocial good, influences participation in further prosocial engagement (Martela & Ryan, 2016). Moreover, it helps to explain why helping another can be pleasurable for the helper.

Humanity-esteem. The prosocial quality of helping others can expand beyond the benefit to one individual. Beyond thinking of oneself as doing good things for others, how someone views humans at large can impact their worldview and actions. Humanity-esteem is defined as a “general favorable or unfavorable evaluation of humanity” (Luke & Maio, 2009, p. 592). It involves a global evaluation of others, in contrast to *self-esteem*’s global evaluation of oneself (Luke et al., 2004). The humanity-esteem concept is a unidimensional summary attitude that reflects beliefs about humans and the nature of humanity, and it expands previous understandings about humanity beliefs by focusing largely on generosity, goodness, and trustworthiness of others (Wrightsman, 1992).

Distinct from self-esteem, this more global *humanity-esteem* serves as an assessment for overall favorability to others at large. Within the realm of attachment and assessments of attachment styles emerged the models for self and other (Bartholomew & Shaver, 1998). These models tap into evaluations of some subject, predicting overall attitudes and feeling toward them (Fraley et al., 2000). Whereas self-esteem is predicted by the attachment self-model, humanity-esteem is reliably predicted by the attachment other-model (Luke et al., 2004). Luke and Maio (2009) argue that a high humanity-esteem or favorable perception of humanity fosters prosocial tendencies and concern for larger humanitarian issues such as volunteerism and helping others. Positive humanity-esteem promotes additional other-oriented tendencies including empathy and moral reasoning (McFarland et al., 2012).

A key implication of humanity-esteem in relation to prosocial behavior is the consequential increase in helping other humans broadly, not just based on individual liking and similarity (Luke & Maio, 2009). Overall, viewing humanity as good encourages prosocial engagement in part because helping others helps oneself, when considering that the self is reflected in the positive scope of humanity.

Mindfulness. To be mindful of a moment is to experience it through an open, conscious, and reflective approach. Mindfulness is a multifaceted construct that includes acting with awareness, mindful describing, nonjudgment, nonreactivity, and mindful observing (Baer et al., 2006; Kabat-Zinn, 2015). Brown and Ryan (2004) explained mindfulness as involving attention, awareness, and acceptance of something that takes place in a present moment. A mindful person observes from a neutral perspective, one that does not judge others or incorporate personal assessments of a matter (Killingsworth & Gilbert, 2010). Mindfulness serves as both a state and trait (Schindler & Friese, 2022). As a state, people may be mindful in some moments and not in others (e.g., after exercising but not while grocery shopping). Reflecting a more stable personal state, some individuals are more mindful than others across contexts.

Being sensitive to one person's needs can relate to general tendencies of attending to lives of others in mindful ways. The argument that mindfulness encourages prosocial engagement is not new (Condon & DeSteno, 2011; Ostafin et al., 2015; Pfattheicher & Keller., 2015) and is based largely on the understanding that mindfulness is linked to greater self-regulation and higher empathic concern (Schindler & Friese, 2022). Mindfulness improves executive functioning, because it increases attention to and awareness of others while making it more manageable to inhibit negative feelings. Most importantly, Schindler and Friese's (2022) recent meta-analyses are consistent with the claim that enhanced mindfulness increases prosocial

behavior, a claim found by others (Berry et al., 2020; Donald et al., 2019), though their findings in relation to sustained effects and ranges of prosocial behavior are limited. Assessing another's needs and desires mindfully, then, should enhance people's likelihood of engaging in prosocial behavior, as sensitivity to others is a continuous practice.

Kindness

As noted, one distinct form of prosocial behavior, a meso-level characteristic, is kindness. Although there are many conceptualizations of kindness, each draws from a foundation of benefitting others (Cotney & Banarjee, 2019). Kindness is a subset characteristic of prosociality, one that operates on a smaller scale with amplified attunement to others. Following Penner et al.'s (2005) typology of prosocial behavior, kindness operates at the meso- and micro-levels. It encapsulates the meso-level, interpersonal contexts with enacted kindness and the micro-level, cognitive intrapersonal kindness. Some conceptualizations highlight the feeling of or a disposition toward kindness, which speaks to the intrapersonal, psychological aspect of kindness. This dispositional kindness is often perceived as developmental in nature and relates to temperament and maturity (Cotney & Banarjee, 2019).

A broader view of kindness, however, considers it as involving emotional, motivational, and behavioral components (Kerr et al., 2015). Knafo and Israel (2012), for instance, defined kindness as a "constellation of positive attitudes, behaviors, and feelings toward others" (pp. 168). These definitions proffer a network of kindness-related concepts that includes altruism, empathy, generosity, and prosociality, identifying altruism and empathy as particularly central in their relation to kindness. Further, Malti (2021) related three components to the experience of kindness: being, doing, and feeling, paralleling the meso- and micro-levels noted above. At the micro level, people conceptualize kindness through their individual perspectives and

experiences. Binfet et al. (2022), for instance, found that young people believed kindness involves being self-aware and acting selfless, with the latter part centering on the behavioral and performative (i.e., the interpersonal) features of kindness.

Kindness Communication

For communication scholars, the focus on kindness-as-behavior is paramount because it centers on the encoding and decoding processes integral to the discipline. That is, it goes beyond what occurs internally to behaviors that connect people to one another. In line with work centering on kindness as enacted in behavior, Hamrick (2002) defined kindness as “purposeful, voluntary action undertaken with sensitivity to the needs or desires of another person and actively directed toward fostering their well-being or flourishing” (as cited in Doty, 2014, section 3). In doing so, Hamrick (2002) aligned kindness-as-behavior as a form of prosocial action. In his definition, Hamrick elaborates on the core sensitivity to another’s experiences of kindness, which relates to mindful awareness and implies decoding communicative messages.

To clarify the behavioral enactment of kindness, this thesis uses the term *kindness communication* to center on acts of kindness toward others. Researchers have already determined that kindness may be communicated in a variety of ways. Binfet et al. (2022), for example, assessed university students’ understanding of kindness with these resulting themes, each of which had several subcategories: helping, giving, being nice/friendly, improving someone’s day, communication, care and concern, being polite, being respectful, having a positive attitude, and other. Likewise, Cotney and Banarjee (2019) evaluated adolescents’ conceptualizations of kindness to explore the relationship of those perspectives to well-being, and found the following categories: emotional support, proactive support, social inclusion, positive sociality (positive behaviors in everyday contexts), complimenting, helping, expressing forgiveness, honesty,

generosity, and formal kindness (i.e., collective premeditated acts of kindness and charitability, such as fundraising).

Whereas these two studies show some consensus on salient themes (i.e., helping and giving), overall, the categories from each study are inconsistent. Moreover, both typologies were derived from studies asking for kindness in the abstract (i.e., people's conceptualizations of what kindness entails) rather than capturing actual communicated kindness. As such, more research is needed to better determine what people count as kindness behavior that is grounded in experienced kind interactions. Doing so can aid in the clarification of kindness and kindness communication to better describe and test it as a beneficial communicative form. A first step in this thesis therefore is to explore the types of kindness in which people report engaging.

RQ₁: What types of kindness do individuals recall enacting?

Savoring

Much of the research on prosocial behavior in general, and kindness communication in particular, has focused on the receiver. Being the recipient of acts of kindness can increase self-esteem, empathy, compassion, mood, health, and well-being (Binfet et al., 2022; Cotney & Banarjee, 2019; Otake et al., 2006). Communicated kindness is not only beneficial for the recipient, however, it can also have positive effects on the giver (Cotney & Banarjee, 2019). Research on other prosocial behaviors provides grounding for this assertion. Most notably, studies have found that people who were affectionate to another (i.e., affection providers) experienced positive effects on their health and well-being (Floyd, 2018; Floyd et al., 2005). Similarly, Taylor's (2012) tend and befriend theory explains that providing nurturing behaviors to another benefits the nurtured and the nurturer through physiological internal reward pathways

(Taylor et al., 2000). This thesis posits that affiliation in kindness communication should operate similarly (Floyd et al., 2005).

Given its potentially positive effect for the giver, people may choose to reminisce upon an act of kindness they performed after its occurrence. That is, kindness communication can be savored. Psychological or social savoring emerged from the realm of positive psychology and was defined initially the “perceived ability to savor positive outcomes” (Bryant, 1989, p. 775). Bryant (1989) detailed several ways in which people savor social moments that reflect these stages: (a) cognitively amplifying or prolonging the enjoyment of positive events, (b) anticipating future positive outcomes in ways to promote pleasure in the present moment, (c) recalling past positive events to enhance present well-being (which is the focus of this thesis), and (d) marshalling friends or relatives to help an individual enjoy positive. With time, the definition of social savoring has evolved to be “the capacity to attend to, appreciate, and enhance the positive experiences in one’s life” (Bryant & Veroff, 2007, p. 87). As such, savoring is a form “emotional capitalization” with ties to increased positive affect (Pitts, 2019).

Bryant and Veroff (2007) detailed key savoring terms (experiences, responses, and strategies) within their conceptualization. A *savoring experience* represents the entirety of an individual’s perceptions, sensations, emotions, and behaviors during their attendance to and appreciation of a positive experience. A *savoring response* or strategy is a particular cognition or behavior that impacts the savoring process such as luxuriating or laughing. A *savoring process* refers to the cognitive or behavioral exercise of recognizing a positive experience then transitioning to attending to it, savoring it, and experiencing positive affect. These discrete definitions enable greater acuity in delineating the complex systems of savoring. Savoring as infused with communication is detailed in the next section.

Communication Savoring

Although social savoring originated in positive psychology, savoring-related applications have spanned into other realms such as clinical and health psychology, education, marketing, neuropsychology, and importantly, communication (Bryant, 2021). Communication savoring is a process intended to “enhance, prolong, and build positive experiences by attending to the social and relational dimensions of savoring” (Pitts et al., 2018, p. 98) and has been found to generate immediate and gradual positive affect as well as promote resource collection for future savoring practices (Pitts, 2019). These findings are consistent with Frederickson’s (1998) broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions: Positive emotions have a “broadening” effect on individuals’ affective state and can help build personal resources for the future.

Pitts (2019) identified seven distinct types of communication experiences that people savor: aesthetic communication, communication presence, nonverbal communication, recognition and acknowledgement, relational communication, extraordinary communication, and implicitly shared communication. Consistent with Bryant’s (2021) temporal considerations for savoring (i.e., savoring in anticipation, in the moment, and in reminiscence of an experience), Pitts denoted three themes that represent the phenomenological experience of savoring: (a) present-moment awareness, (b) savoring with future intent, and (c) retrospection. Each emphasizes social interaction and meaning-making within the savoring experience.

Savoring Communicated Kindness

In exploring the connections between kindness and savoring, it is helpful to consider overlap across communicated kindness and communication savoring to disentangle the unique elements of each and refine their relationship. Descriptions within Pitts’ (2019) communication savoring typology vary, though some may uniquely relate to the communication of kindness.

After collecting narratives about savoring experiences from an online questionnaire completed by undergraduate students, Pitts coded the data following field normative processes including open-coding and later second-cycle coding (Charmaz, 2014; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Pitts constructed a typology for the seven types of communication savoring that emerged in her data, each listed with a working definition. Her goal was to substantiate more complex and nuanced understandings of savoring, which she considers a “pillar for quality of life” (Pitts, 2019, p. 251). For example, communication presence is defined as “pleasure derived from mutually, genuinely, and wholly attending to the communicative moment, often resulting in the lack of awareness of time, pressures, or the presence of others, and feelings of intense connectivity” (Pitts, 2019, p. 244).

This “present” type of communication savoring was identified with the key terms of “real,” “entirely honest,” and “genuine.” Participants mentioned “feeling as if nobody else in the world mattered” due to a thoroughly engaged presence in the interaction (Pitts, 2019, p. 245). This is way of thinking about savoring consistent with other research that, more broadly, has found that mindfully appreciating pleasurable experiences results in more positive outcomes for health and wellness (Bryant, 2021). Noting that kindness could be savored, one participant identified that they savored “all acts of kindness towards one another [that] were genuine and not forced” (Pitts, 2019, p. 245). Attentiveness, being the sole focus, and mutual recognition were common descriptors of communication presence.

In summary, prosociality involves multiple levels of understanding: a macro level of societal norms and expectations that promote and request other-oriented engagement, a meso level of interpersonal enacted prosocial behaviors, and a micro level involving the cognitive processes that frame a prosocial personality. At the micro level, two overt prosocial dispositions

include beneficence and humanity-esteem, evaluating the self and human society as agents of good. These are expected to predict both individual capacity to savor – an additional prosocial disposition – and engagement in the communication savoring of prosocial behavior. Another prosocial disposition, mindfulness, is similarly expected to predict both outcomes through its greater overall sensitivity to social engagement. This set of presumptions leads to this study's first two hypotheses:

H₁: The prosocial dispositions of (a) beneficence and humanity-esteem will (a) predict the capacity to savor prosocial behavior and (b) engagement in the communication savoring of prosocial behavior.

H₂: Dispositional mindfulness will predict (a) capacity to savor prosocial behavior and (b) engagement in the communication savoring of prosocial behavior.

Bryant and Veroff (2007) explain that savoring and pleasure are intimately related. That said, there are some recognized “triggers” for savoring: social and education activities, time work, and aesthetics (Bryant & Veroff, 2007). Social and educational activities inspire interaction with others that, when positive, are valued interpersonal moments wherein the positive experience can be prolonged. Temporal and aesthetic management also elicit savoring behaviors (Bryant & Veroff, 2007). Time work allows one to savor more with a greater capacity to manage temporal experience elements, with the ability to plans things arrives the opportunity to savor and prolong feelings further. Correspondingly, feeling moved by some visual or aural art lingers beyond the initial encounter.

It makes sense to expect that additional forms of interaction are likely to be savored more than others. For example, in Pitts' (2019) typology, the communication savoring form reported most frequently was extraordinary communication. Given that acting kind to others may emerge

in people's minds as out of the ordinary, and the general premise that savoring happens to different degrees for different behaviors, this thesis asks a second research question:

RQ₂: Of the enacted kindness moments that individuals report, which type is savored more than others, if any?

Capacity to Savor

Smith and Bryant (2016) argued that social savoring's core feature centers primarily on the conscious awareness of experiencing events rather than the concrete surroundings of the events themselves. An individual's introspective acknowledgement of savoring is unique; simply demonstrating awareness of people, places, and things within a setting may suggest mindfulness but is distinct from savoring. Not only is savoring a psychological process in which people can engage; it is also linked to a stable personality trait – the capacity to savor – defined as one's tendency to immerse in, mindfully appreciate, and prolong positive outcomes (Bryant et al., 2011). An individual's ability to derive pleasure related to their past, present, and future encounters serves as the basis for this inquiry in predictors of savoring behaviors.

Bryant (2003) highlighted the capacity of an individual to regulate, manipulate, and sustain pleasure as key factors of savoring. The greater people's capacity to savor, the more likely they can prolong and revisit those pleasurable experiences. One's capacity to savor, however, is likely influenced by features of a prosocial orientation like humanity-esteem (Luke & Maio, 2009). As a consecutive prosocial disposition, one's capacity to savor is expected to predict engagement in the communication savoring of prosocial behavior. Although capacity to savor does not necessarily comment on the *likelihood* to savor an experience, a greater capacity enables a different relative threshold to cross for engagement in savoring.

Acknowledging a quantitative assessment of one's ability to appreciate positive experiences allows different management and maintenance functions (Bryant, 2021). A greater ability to enjoy and hold onto pleasurable moments enables awareness of and tools to promote swifter uptake in the process of savoring. A lower capacity may permit individuals to savor only landmark occasions rather than smaller moments. Given that engaging in communicated kindness is typically a rewarding and pleasurable experience, the ability to amplify such pleasure should factor into engagement in kindness communication, leading to this study's final hypothesis:

H₃: Capacity to savor will predict reported frequency of engagement in the communication savoring of prosocial behavior.

Data and Methods

Data were collected via an online survey in 2023. Following IRB approval (STUDY00017794), students over the age of 18 were recruited from undergraduate Communication courses at the University of Washington to engage in a two-part study. To recruit, I announced the study in several large introductory Communication courses, offering context to the study, an overview of questions asked, and mention of potential harms and benefits. Online fliers were also distributed, consistent with the information above. For the first part of the study, participants completed an online survey with an open-ended narrative style questionnaire and self-report measures. Individuals who fully responded to both parts the study were compensated \$10 via online Tango gift cards. Compensation was financed by a grant from the University of Washington's Department of Communication. A total of 327 people took the survey for part one, but 127 were omitted due to incomplete responses, failure to correctly follow attention check questions, and/or poor data quality.

Participants

Of the final sample ($N = 200$), 75.5% of participants identified as a woman, 20.5% as a man, 2% as nonbinary, and 1% as transgender. In terms of participant ethnicity, 44.5% identified as White, 22% as Asian, 17.5% as Asian American, 9% as Hispanic/Latiné, 5% as Black/African American, and <1% as American Indian/Alaskan Native, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander. Further, 25% of the individuals reported identifying as having a disability, which varied across physical, mental, visual, hearing, and emotional or cognitive forms. Their average age was 20.3 years ($SD = 3.90$).

Procedure

Participants received the link to an online Qualtrics questionnaire in which they first provided their informed consent and, following this, were asked to provide quantitative and qualitative data. They inputted demographic information and the measures for this study, detailed later. Respondents were then asked if they could recall having acted kind toward another person. If they did, they were prompted to describe in detail the experience when they communicated kindness to another person. After data collection was complete, two coders individually engaged in thematic analysis of the types of kindness participants described (Charmaz, 2014; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). They then met to discuss the themes and finalize the number and descriptors of those themes. Following this, both coders applied the codes to the full data set. Intercoder reliability was 90.9% consistent, with Cohen's *kappa* demonstrating strong agreement ($\kappa = .87$). The two coders then discussed the instances where they disagreed upon themes until they agreed on the best categorization.

Measures

In the questionnaire, the predictor scales were presented first, followed by demographic information prompts, with narrative kindness recollections and savoring engagement last. The savoring beliefs inventory was presented first, followed by beneficence scale, five-factor mindfulness questionnaire, and humanity-esteem scale. As the measure lengths varied from one to 24 items, I arranged the measures in a way to provide the most efficient and effective audience responsiveness. The longer measures were broken up into chunks of six items per online viewing page to not overwhelm the participants.

Beneficence Scale

Martela and Ryan's (2016) Beneficence Scale is a 4-item measure that assesses individuals' sense of their prosocial impact. Participants were asked to respond to the following items on a seven-point scale from "not at all true" to "very true": "I feel that my actions have a positive impact on the people around me," "the things I do contribute to the betterment of society," "I have been able to improve the welfare of other people," and "in general, my influence in the lives of other people is positive." Scores for each item were summed into one overall beneficence score. The reported *alpha* was .81, and the *alpha* in the present study was .85. This scale has demonstrated convergent validity, as beneficence was moderately related to agreeableness, empathy, prosocial aspirations, vitality, self-esteem, and subjective well-being (Martela & Ryan, 2016).

Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire

Baer et al. (2006) constructed the Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire, a 39-item measure of the following five facets of mindfulness: observation, description, aware reactions, nonjudgmental responses, and nonreactivity. A condensed version containing 15-items was used

for this study, with three items per facet, as it is a valid and reliable evaluation of the five aspects of mindfulness (Baer et al., 2012). Gu et al. (2016) assessed psychometric differences between the 39-item and 15-item versions in which the factor structures and correlations were consistent. The reported *alpha* for the composite measure was .80, and the *alpha* in the present study was .75 (Gu et al., 2016). Each of the 15 items were summed into one score for analysis.

Humanity-Esteem Scale

Luke and Maio's (2009) Humanity-Esteem Scale is a 10-item adapted version of the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965) geared toward assessing individual beliefs and perceptions of humanity. The items range from "I feel that human beings have a number of very good qualities" to "at times I think that human beings are no good at all." All items were rated on a seven-point scale ("strongly disagree" to "strongly agree"). Items were appropriately reverse-scored and summed into scores for humanity-esteem. The reported *alpha* was .77, and the *alpha* in the present study was .81. Additional studies assessed the construct, convergent, and discriminant validity of this scale (Luke & Maio, 2009).

Engagement in Communication Savoring

Engagement in the communication savoring of kindness was assessed using a one-item measure of five-point scale from never to very often. Participants were asked "how often have you thought about that kindness act since you did it? This can include thinking or reminiscing about it and/or rekindling feelings from it." Further, participants were prompted to indicate the time passed since their identified kindness moment on a four-point scale (within the last month, year, two to five years, or greater than five years).

Savoring Beliefs Inventory

Bryant's (2003) Savoring Beliefs Inventory is a valid and reliable 24-item measure of individual's perceived capacity to savor positive experiences. The SBI reported alphas provide a global total score ($\alpha = .84$) and three subscales for the temporal distinctions: anticipating ($\alpha = .80$), savoring the moment ($\alpha = .88$), and reminiscing ($\alpha = .85$). The *alpha* in the present study overall was .91. Of the 24 items, 12 are positively worded statements and 12 are negatively worded statements, and each temporal domain is represented by eight items. The items were summed into one score for overall capacity to savor.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Means, standard deviations, and zero-order correlations among all variables are in Table 1. Each of the predictors (beneficence, humanity-esteem, mindfulness, and capacity to savor) were positively correlated with one other, though only the correlations between beneficence and capacity to savor along with humanity-esteem and mindfulness were significant. The strongest and one of few significant correlations demonstrated a moderate relationship between beneficence and capacity to savor. Preliminary analyses were conducted to check skewness and kurtosis values and to identify missing data. The skewness and kurtosis values for all variables fell into acceptable ranges except for engagement in communication savoring (± 2 for skewness and kurtosis; George & Mallery, 2010). To address the skewness, a log-transformation of the outcome variable was executed, leveling the skew to an acceptable range. Less than 1% of data were missing across the sample. The few responses with missing data were removed and not included in the final sample.

RQ1: Kindness Communication Types

Examination of the open-ended survey data revealed five types of coded kindness communication and their frequencies, listed in Table 2. In response to RQ1, the observed types of kindness communication reported by participants include the following five categories: task assistance, gifting, emotional support, companionship/inclusion, and expressed appreciation. Each type is described with exemplars in the section below. Task assistance and gifting were the most commonly reported types, making up nearly 70% of the total sample (35.5% and 34% respectively). Only a few responses did not fit into any of the five categories or did not clarify a specific form of communicated kindness.

Task Assistance. This category centered on helping behaviors, and they ranged in size and scope. Some were smaller customary tasks that afforded little cost, whereas others involved higher stakes and effort. Additionally, tasks varied in being physical, tangible, or informational. For example, physical task assistance is offering to hold the door for someone or another lifting or motion behavior. One participant noted that they “helped an older person lift the grocery cart onto the sidewalk.” Task assistance was also informational: “I am a medical student and helped a patient understand their kidney disease”.

Gifting. This category encapsulates the transfer of a gift or other tangible product from one person to another. Many times, small gifts were mentioned, such as coffee or lunch: “I bought my friend a coffee”; “I took soup for my friend when he was sick.” On several occasions, the gift involved what appeared to be thoughtfulness and attention to an individual that reflected close relational ties. One such moment was mentioned here: “I picked up a favorite snack for my roommate while I was grocery shopping.” Whereas food was incorporated in these kind acts often, items or experiences were also gifted (e.g., “I gave my friend a ring she's been wanting”;

“I threw an extravagant birthday celebration for my friend when she was in town and away from the rest of her friends.”).

Emotional Support. This category broadly reflects caring behaviors when someone reported that they listened to and comforted another, typically with the understanding that there was a need for support because the receiver was facing something difficult in their lives. For instance, “my friend was having a bad day, so I...spent time with her and tried to be there for her in whatever way she needed.” Similarly, “I helped my friend during a rough time in a relationship, giving her advice that helped her cope and move on.”

Companionship/inclusion. For this category, two terms best suited the feeling of including someone and offering company and togetherness. This ranged from short moments of inclusion with a stranger or classmate to fuller invitations of fellowship. Examples include the following: “I went out with a friend even though I was tired and didn’t want to”; “Yesterday, I was on a difficult hike with my friends, and waited for my friend when she had to tie her shoe (though the others went ahead).” Further, the inclusion of strangers mentioned “I noticed a girl who was at an event by herself, so I sat next to her,” and “I wrote kind ‘hope you have a great week’ letters and slipped them under the doors of random people in my dorm building.”

Expressed Appreciation. The final category reflects instances of complimenting and appreciating behaviors, often verbal or written. These expressions were not exclusive to people in close relationships but also to people in their work roles and to strangers. One participant mentioned “I wrote my older sister a letter telling her how grateful I am for her and I called her and read it to her.” Another noted that as an exercise coach, “I teach spin and wrote a rider a sweet note.” Compliments to strangers or classmates were common, for instance, “I complimented someone on their hair because it was a really cool color.”

H₁: Beneficence and Humanity-Esteem as Prosocial Dispositions

Hypothesis 1a stated that the prosocial dispositions of beneficence and humanity-esteem would predict the capacity to savor prosocial behavior. For all of the analyses, gender and time since kindness communication served as covariates due the potential impacts that gender stereotypes and time may have on ability and likelihood to savor. Gender norms perpetuate the notion that women are expected to be feminine, caring, and nurturing individuals more inclined to be and act prosocially. Thus, gender was used in this study as a covariate to not skew engagement in the prosocial behavior of savoring kindness. The specific examination of time since the kindness moment was also used as a covariate here to account for any differences in savoring based on time since its occurrence.

In response to H_{1a}, a multiple linear regression with standard predictor entry was used to predict the capacity to savor prosocial behavior. Model results showed that the set of predictors for H_{1a} (beneficence and humanity-esteem) together explained a total of 26% of the variance in the outcome when controlling for gender and the time since kindness communication, which was significantly different from zero: $R^2 = .26$ ($Adj R^2 = .25$), $F(4,195) = 17.28$, $p < .001$. Results also showed that only the coefficient for beneficence score was significantly different from zero: $SE = .28$, $t(195) = 7.85$, $p < .001$. Hypothesis 1a received partial support.

Hypothesis 1b posited that that the prosocial dispositions of beneficence and humanity-esteem would predict engagement in the communication savoring of prosocial behavior. A parallel process was followed for H_{1b}: A multiple linear regression with standard predictor entry was used to predict the engagement in the communication savoring of prosocial behavior. Model results showed that the set of predictors for H_{1b}, (beneficence and humanity-esteem) together explained a total of 6.8% of the variance in the outcome when controlling for gender identity and

the time since kindness communication, which was significantly different from zero: $R^2 = .07$ ($Adj R^2 = .05$), $F(4,195) = 3.55$, $p < .001$. Again, only the coefficient for total beneficence score was significantly different from zero: $SE = .02$, $t(195) = 2.95$, $p < .005$. Hypothesis 1b therefore also received partial support.

H2: Mindfulness as a Prosocial Disposition

Hypothesis 2a asserted that the prosocial disposition of mindfulness would predict the capacity to savor prosocial behavior. To assess H_{2a}, a multiple linear regression with standard predictor entry was used to predict the capacity to savor prosocial behavior. Model results mindfulness scores explained a total of 4% of the variance in the outcome when controlling for gender and time since kindness communication, which was significantly different from zero, $R^2 = .04$ ($Adj R^2 = .03$, $F(4,195) = 2.87$, $p < .05$). Hypothesis 2a received support.

Hypothesis 2b posited that the prosocial disposition of mindfulness would predict engagement in the communication savoring of prosocial behavior. Again, to address H_{2b}, a multiple linear regression with standard predictor entry was used to predict engagement in communication savoring of prosocial behavior. Results of the model displayed that mindfulness explained a total of 3.2% of the variance in the outcome when controlling for gender identity and the time since kindness communication, which was not significantly different from zero, $R^2 = .03$ ($Adj R^2 = .17$, $F(4,195) = 2.16$, $p = .094$). Hypothesis 2b was not supported.

RQ2: Evaluation of Communication Savoring for the Kindness Types

In an effort to understand whether different types of kindness communication are savored more than others, a one-way ANOVA was conducted. Comparisons were made across the five types of kindness: task assistance, gifting, emotional support, companionship/inclusion, and expressed appreciation. There was not a significant difference in communication savoring

frequency among the five types of kindness communication: $F(4,195) = 1.67, p = .159$. The mean frequencies of communication savoring for the five kindness categories are as follows: task assistance ($M = 2.49$), gifting ($M = 2.42$), emotional support ($M = 2.44$), companionship/inclusion ($M = 2.67$), and expressed appreciation ($M = 3.17$). Although there were no significant differences across the means, expressed appreciation was notably highest, suggesting that individuals may savor moments involving expressions of appreciation more often than other types of kindness.

H3: Capacity to Savor as a Predictor of Communication Savoring

Hypothesis 3 stated that an individual's capacity to savor would predict their frequency of engagement in the communication savoring of prosocial behavior. To evaluate H3, a multiple linear regression with standard predictor entry was used to predict the engagement in the communication savoring of prosocial behavior. Model results showed that the predictor for H3, capacity to savor, explained a total of 3.8% of the variance in the outcome when controlling for gender identity and the time since kindness communication, which was not significantly different from zero, $R^2 = .04$ ($Adj R^2 = .02$), $F(3,196) = 2.61, p = .053$). Hypothesis 3 was not supported.

Discussion

Intending to further connections between and examination of within (micro) and between (meso) processes of kindness and savoring, this thesis delineates what forms kindness communication can take and examines the relationship between kindness communication and savoring as forms of prosociality. Based on the premise that prosociality – and its various forms – can be understood at the macro, meso, and micro levels, and with a particular concern for the interconnectedness between the meso and micro levels of communication savoring, my primary goals were as follows: a) to create a typology of communicated kindness based on what kinds of

kindness people recalled enacting and b) to assess possible prosocial predispositions that predict engagement in communication savoring of kindness communication. Grounded within the macro level perspective that prosociality in general, and prosocial behavior in particular, is good for people, this discussion details important takeaways about the meso and micro levels of engaging in and savoring acts of kindness.

Meso Findings: Enacted Interpersonal Kindness

One output of this study was the clarified categories of kind acts. Previous studies were based on asking about abstract conceptualizations of kindness (i.e., “what do you think kindness involves?”) (Binfet et al., 2022; Cotney & Banarjee, 2019). In this study, however, people were asked to recall a specific act of kindness in which they had engaged. All of the 200 participants recalled acting kind. Five types of kindness emerged from their narratives: task assistance, gifting, emotional support, companionship/inclusion, and expressed appreciation. Task assistance and gifting were the most frequently cited categories, though expressed appreciation was the most frequently savored. This may be in part due to the relative size and impact perceived by the different kind acts. Descriptions for task assistance typically cited door holding, direction giving, and resource sharing. Gifting routinely mentioned surprising another with an experiential, consumable, or monetary item. Having concise terms and clear qualitative support for each form offers a more clarified baseline moving forward for studying kindness as a communicative act.

As kindness is recognized widely to result in positive outcomes for both the provider and recipient – such as life satisfaction and enhanced subjective well-being – learning more about the forms that such kindness takes not only provides more clarification into what kindness communication may include; it also helps establish more precise, tailored advice for building and practicing healthy relational maintenance habits and social behavior. A greater ability to respond

to calls for kindness is now accessible: Many organizations, public figures, and citizens advocate to “treat people with kindness;” this typology now offers clear actionable ways to engage in such kindness. With greater ability to understand and perceive kind moments in society, individuals are further equipped to spread kindness to others. These categories can also contribute to the development and implementation of kindness interventions, including the role of savoring as contributing to well-being.

Micro Findings: Prosocial Predispositions/Predictors of Savoring Kindness

Overall, hypotheses 1a, 1b, and 2a received support. In these instances, the regression model itself was significantly different from zero. This demonstrates that the grouped variables for each hypothesis predicted the outcome as a whole set, though the strength of the variables’ predictive ability varied. Beneficence and humanity-esteem, the set of overt prosocial dispositions, exhibited the greatest predictive ability, as 26% of variance in the outcome, capacity to savor, was explained by them (H_{1a}). Only the unique relationship between beneficence and capacity to savor was significant in H_{1a} , however, with 34% of the variance in capacity to savor being uniquely explained by beneficence ($sr^2 = .34$).

Humanity-esteem did not uniquely predict the variance in the outcome despite it doing so in the regression model in conjunction with beneficence and the covariates. Although the coefficients did not display significant unique predictive relationships with the given outcome variable consistently, the models for hypotheses 1a, 1b, and 2a were significantly different from zero. The models for H_{1b} and H_{2a} predicted smaller effects, as 6.8% and 4% of the variance in the outcome was explained by the variable set, respectively. Although these hypotheses received support in that their regression models were significant, the only salient individual predictor was beneficence for the capacity to savor and engagement in savoring outcomes.

Overall, then, beneficence demonstrated the strongest predictive effects for capacity to savor and engagement in savoring. As noted, this construct refers to recognizing the positive impact that individuals can have on others and valuing it favorably (Martela & Ryan, 2019). It may be uniquely related to savoring due to their shared basis of self-reflection. Both constructs require one's internal self-assessment to discern individual abilities to savor positive experiences and recognize oneself as prosocial. The emphasized reflective element here draws attention to benevolent giving and the recognition of it being promotive of well-being (Martela & Ryan, 2016). Martela and Ryan found additional support that beneficence mediated the relationship between prosocial behavior and well-being.

Whereas beneficence appears particularly important to savoring processes, mindfulness also had some predictive value, though the effect size was small ($R^2 = .04$). The incorporation of mindfulness, a tendency to experience moments through open, conscious, and reflective approaches, in this study factors into the capacity to assess oneself as holistically, which does play a role in perceiving the self as able and open to savoring (Brown & Ryan, 2004). As mindfulness can be thought of as moment-to-moment, non-judgmental awareness, cultivated by paying attention in a specific way, a mindful person may give greater space to attending to the potential prosocial idiosyncrasies in the self, like beneficence or capacity to savor (Kabat-Zinn, 2015). These results suggest that beneficence and mindfulness are involved in the intrapersonal cognitive savoring processes at the micro-level. This constellation of intrapersonal (micro), interpersonal (meso), and societal factors (macro) inform how these variables impact the likelihood of engaging in communication savoring, elaborating on how people conceptualize and enact communication savoring of kindness.

Limitations and Future Directions

Although this thesis provides a useful step into deciphering kindness communication and the prosocial systems of kindness and savoring, there were several limitations to this study. The scope of the survey and sample were limited by accessible resources related to time, recruitment capacity, and financial incentivization. Recruitment only occurred in UW's introductory-level Communication courses, which implicate the findings' generalizability in that the sample was not representative of either the entire university or the more general public. The financial incentive to take the surveys was modest, which may have deterred participation from a more diverse population.

Moreover, this study included one-item measures to capture the essence of two key outcome variables: engagement in kindness and communication savoring. Both variables were significantly skewed, and kindness engagement was a nearly constant variable (i.e., almost everyone recalled enacting kindness), which impacted its utilization in my models. Both were also rated on five-point Likert scales, which may be less rich than the seven-point system (Finstad, 2010). As multifaceted concepts, more inclusive measures should be used in future studies. Moving forward, it would also be critical to measure the likelihood of engaging in communication savoring and generally more robust assessments for savoring and kindness.

Focused elaboration on kindness communication as a distinct concept requires more research to yield empirical information and claims. This could include macros assessments that help place kindness into a social/cultural frame (i.e., how and why it is valued). The proffered typology of kindness in this thesis, and larger cultural grounding in which it is based, should therefore be applied to more research inquiries around kindness, including my personal research agenda around savoring kindness. Additional quantitative and qualitative investigation around

these categories will help confirm and potentially expand this typology and its applications. Further investigation should also focus on more comprehensive assessments of savoring communicative behavior and how it connects to wider applications of the revealed kindness categories.

Conclusion

This thesis explored the positive communication and psychological factors of prosociality, kindness, and savoring. I applied a multi-level analysis framework to evaluate these concepts through a macro, meso, and micro perspective of savoring kindness. In an effort to elaborate on recognized acts of kindness and predict engagement in savoring them, the study findings provide a typology of enacted kindness and reflect the particular importance of beneficence as a prosocial disposition that predicts their savoring. Whereas there is insufficient empirical support to suggest that certain prosocial predispositions predict engagement in communication savoring, there is room to investigate savoring further with more refined measurement and analytical tools. The categories of kindness emergent from this thesis serve as a strong basis for assessing core recognized acts of kindness, and beneficence emerged as a particularly important theoretical predictor.

The potential positive implications of this work are vast across health and interpersonal contexts. Clinical psychologists may recommend savoring kindness as a productive aid when facing mental health challenges, perhaps as a way to counter rumination. Further, relationship counselors or advice columns could advise savoring kind moments that a partner or spouse shared during turbulent moments to curb turmoil. Importantly, graduate students like myself can continue to refine understandings and implementations of these positive processes for further beneficial societal impact.

References

- Baer, R. A., Carmody, J., & Hunsinger, M. (2012). Weekly change in mindfulness and perceived stress in a mindfulness-based stress reduction program. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 68*(7), 755–765. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.21865>
- Baer, R. A., Smith, G. T., Hopkins, J., Krietemeyer, J., & Toney, L. (2006). Using self-report assessment methods to explore facets of mindfulness. *Assessment, 13*(1), 27–45. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191105283504>
- Bailey, P. E., Ebner, N. C., & Stine-Morrow, E. A. L. (2021). Introduction to the special issue on prosociality in adult development and aging: Advancing theory within a multilevel framework. *Psychology and Aging, 36*(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000598>
- Bartholomew, K., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Methods of assessing adult attachment: Do they converge? In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 25–45). The Guilford Press.
- Berry, D. R., Hoerr, J. P., Cesko, S., Alayoubi, A., Carpio, K., Zirzow, H., Walters, W., Scram, G., Rodriguez, K., & Beaver, V. (2020). Does mindfulness training without explicit ethics-based instruction promote prosocial behaviors? A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 46*(8), 1247–1269. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167219900418>
- Binfet, J.-T., Willis-Stewart, S., Lauze, A., Green, F. L. L., Draper, Z. A., & Calibaba, B. (2022). Understanding university students' conceptualizations and perceptions of kindness: A mixed methods study. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 46*(4), 441–460. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2021.1967895>
- Bolino, M. C., & Grant, A. M. (2016). The bright side of being prosocial at work, and the dark side, too: A review and agenda for research on other-oriented motives, behavior, and

- impact in organizations. *Academy of Management Annals*, 10(1), 599–670.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2016.1153260>
- Brown, J. D., Collins, R. L., & Schmidt, G. W. (1988). Self-esteem and direct versus indirect forms of self-enhancement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55(3), 445–453. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.55.3.445>
- Brown, K. W., & Ryan, R. M. (2004). Perils and promise in defining and measuring mindfulness: Observations from experience. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 11(3), 242–248. <https://doi.org/10.1093/clipsy.bph078>
- Bryant, F. B. (2003). Savoring beliefs inventory (SBI): A scale for measuring beliefs about savouring. *Journal of Mental Health*, 12(2), 175–196.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0963823031000103489>
- Bryant, F. B. (1989). A four-factor model of perceived control: Avoiding, coping, obtaining, and savoring. *Journal of Personality*, 57(4), 773–797. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1989.tb00494.x>
- Bryant, F. B. (2021). Current progress and future directions for theory and research on savoring. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.771698>
- Bryant, F. B., Chadwick, E. D., & Kluwe, K. (2011). Understanding the processes that regulate positive emotional experience: Unsolved problems and future directions for theory and research on savoring. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 1(1), 107–126,
<https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v1i1.18>
- Bryant, F. B., & Veroff, J. (2007). *Savoring: A new model of positive experience*. Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315088426>

- Caprara, G. V., Alessandri, G., & Eisenberg, N. (2012). Prosociality: The contribution of traits, values, and self-efficacy beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 102*, 1289–1303. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025626>
- Carlo, G., Mestre, M. V., Samper, P., Tur, A., & Armenta, B. E. (2010). Feelings or cognitions? Moral cognitions and emotions as longitudinal predictors of prosocial and aggressive behaviors. *Personality and Individual Differences, 48*(8), 872–877. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.02.010>
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). SAGE.
- Condon, P., & DeSteno, D. (2011). Compassion for one reduces punishment for another. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 47*(3), 698–701. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.11.016>
- Cook-Cottone, C. P. (2017). *Mindfulness and yoga in schools: A guide for teachers and practitioners*. Springer Publishing Co.
- Cotney, J. L., & Banerjee, R. (2019). Adolescents' conceptualizations of kindness and its links with well-being: A focus group study. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 36*(2), 599–617. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407517738584>
- Crowe, K., & McDowell, E. (2017). *There is no good card for this: What to say and do when life is scary, awful, and unfair to people you love*. Harper Collins.
- Curry, O. S., Rowland, L. A., Van Lissa, C. J., Zlotowitz, S., McAlaney, J., & Whitehouse, H. (2018). Happy to help? A systematic review and meta-analysis of the effects of performing acts of kindness on the well-being of the actor. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 76*, 320–329. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2018.02.014>

- Donald, J. N., Sahdra, B. K., Van Zanden, B., Duineveld, J. J., Atkins, P. W. B., Marshall, S. L., & Ciarrochi, J. (2019). Does your mindfulness benefit others? A systematic review and meta-analysis of the link between mindfulness and prosocial behaviour. *British Journal of Psychology, 110*(1), 101–125. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjop.12338>
- Doty, J. (2014, November 16). The healing power of kindness. *HuffPost Life*.
https://www.huffpost.com/entry/the-healing-power-of-kindness_b_6136272
- Dovidio, J. F. (1984). Helping behavior and altruism: An empirical and conceptual overview. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 17, pp. 361–427). Academic Press. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60123-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60123-9)
- Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., & Spinrad, T. L. (2006). Prosocial development. In N. Eisenberg, W. Damon, & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development* (6th ed., pp. 646–718). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Eisenberg, N., & Miller, P. A. (1987). The relation of empathy to prosocial and related behaviors. *Psychological Bulletin, 101*(1), 91–119. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.101.1.91>
- Epstein, S. (1994). Integration of the cognitive and the psychodynamic unconscious. *The American Psychologist, 49*(8), 709–724. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0003-066x.49.8.709>
- Finstad, K. (2010). The usability metric for user experience. *Interacting with Computers, 22*(5), 323–327. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intcom.2010.04.004>
- Floyd, K. (2018). *Affectionate communication in close relationships*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108653510>
- Floyd, K., Hess, J. A., Miczo, L. A., Halone, K. K., Mikkelsen, A. C., & Tusing, K. J. (2005). Human affection exchange: VIII. Further evidence of the benefits of expressed affection. *Communication Quarterly, 53*(3), 285–303. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463370500101071>

- Fraley, R. C., Waller, N. G., & Brennan, K. A. (2000). An item response theory analysis of self-report measures of adult attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(2), 350–365. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.78.2.350>
- Fredrickson, B. L. (1998). What good are positive emotions? *Review of General Psychology*, 2(3), 300–319. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.2.3.300>
- Gebauer, J. E., Riketta, M., Broemer, P., & Maio, G. R. (2008). Pleasure and pressure based prosocial motivation: Divergent relations to subjective well-being. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42(2), 399–420. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2007.07.002>
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2010). *Spss for windows step by step: A simple guide and reference, 17.0 update*. Allyn & Bacon.
- 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), 791–802. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000263>
- Hamrick, W. S. (2002). *Kindness and the good society: Connections of the heart*. SUNY Press.
- Hart, R., & Hart, D. (2023). Untying the text: Organizational prosociality and kindness. *Behavioral Sciences*, 13(2), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13020186>
- Hoffman, M. L. (2000). *Empathy and moral development: Implications for caring and justice*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511805851>
- Jiao, J., Kim, S., & Pitts, M. J. (2021). Promoting subjective well-being through communication savoring. *Communication Quarterly*, 69(2), 152–171. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2021.1901758>

- Kabat-Zinn, J. (2015). Mindfulness. *Mindfulness*, 6(6), 1481–1483.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-015-0456-x>
- Kerr, S. L., O'Donovan, A., & Pepping, C. A. (2015). Can gratitude and kindness interventions enhance well-being in a clinical sample? *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 16(1), 17–36.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-013-9492-1>
- Keyes, C. L. M. (2013). Promoting and protecting positive mental health: Early and often throughout the lifespan. In C. L. M. Keyes (Ed.), *Mental well-being: International contributions to the study of positive mental health* (pp. 3–28). Springer Netherlands.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-5195-8_1
- Killingsworth, M. A., & Gilbert, D. T. (2010). A wandering mind is an unhappy mind. *Science* (New York, N.Y.), 330(6006), 932. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1192439>
- Knafo, A., & Israel, S. (2012). Empathy, prosocial behavior, and other aspects of kindness. In M. Zentner & R. L. Shiner (Eds.), *Handbook of temperament* (pp. 168–179). The Guilford Press.
- Luke, M. A., & Maio, G. R. (2009). Oh the humanity! Humanity-esteem and its social importance. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43(4), 586–601.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2009.03.001>
- Luke, M. A., Maio, G. R., & Carnelley, K. B. (2004). Attachment models of the self and others: Relations with self-esteem, humanity-esteem, and parental treatment. *Personal Relationships*, 11(3), 281–303. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2004.00083.x>
- Malti, T. (2021). Kindness: A perspective from developmental psychology. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 18(5), 629–657.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2020.1837617>

- Martela, F., & Ryan, R. M. (2016). The benefits of benevolence: Basic psychological needs, beneficence, and the enhancement of well-being. *Journal of Personality, 84*(6), 750–764. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12215>
- Martela, F., & Ryan, R. M. (2019). Distinguishing between basic psychological needs and basic wellness enhancers: The case of beneficence as a candidate psychological need. *Motivation and Emotion, 44*(1), 116–133. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-019-09800-x>
- McFarland, S., Webb, M., & Brown, D. (2012). All humanity is my ingroup: A measure and studies of identification with all humanity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 103*, 830–853. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028724>
- McGinley, M., Pierotti, S. L., & Carlo, G. (2022). Latent profiles of multidimensional prosocial behaviors: An examination of prosocial personality groups. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 162*(2), 245–261. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2021.1881031>
- Mikolajewski, A. J., Chavarria, J., Moltisanti, A., Hart, S. A., & Taylor, J. (2014). Examining the factor structure and etiology of prosociality. *Psychological Assessment, 26*(4), 1259–1267. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037132>
- Ostafin, B. D., Robinson, M. D., & Meier, B. P. (Eds.). (2015). *Handbook of mindfulness and self-regulation*. Springer Science + Business Media. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-2263-5>
- Otake, K., Shimai, S., Tanaka-Matsumi, J., Otsui, K., & Fredrickson, B. L. (2006). Happy people become happier through kindness: A counting kindnesses intervention. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 7*(3), 361–375. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-005-3650-z>

Penner, L. A., Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., & Schroeder, D. A. (2005). Prosocial behavior: Multilevel perspectives. *Annual Review of Psychology, 56*(1), 365–392.

<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070141>

Pfattheicher, S., & Keller, J. (2015). The watching eyes phenomenon: The role of a sense of being seen and public self-awareness. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 45*(5), 560–566. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2122>

Pfattheicher, S., Nielsen, Y. A., & Thielmann, I. (2022). Prosocial behavior and altruism: A review of concepts and definitions. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 44*, 124–129.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2021.08.021>

Pitts, M. J. (2019). The language and social psychology of savoring: Advancing the communication savoring model. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 38*(2), 237–259. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X18821404>

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X18821404>

Pitts, M. J., Kim, S., Meyerhoffer, H., & Jiao, J. (2018). Communication savoring as positive interpersonal communication. In J.A. Muñiz-Velázquez & C.M. Pulido (Eds.). *The Routledge handbook of positive communication*. (pp. 95–105). Routledge.

Pitts, M. J., & Socha, T. J. (Eds.). (2013). *Positive communication in health and wellness*. Peter Lang Publishing.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES). [Database record]. *APA PsycTests*.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/t01038-000>

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*, 68–78.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68>

- Schindler, S., & Friese, M. (2022). The relation of mindfulness and prosocial behavior: What do we (not) know? *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *44*, 151–156.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2021.09.010>
- Smith, J. L., & Bryant, F. B. (2016). The benefits of savoring life: Savoring as a moderator of the relationship between health and life satisfaction in older adults. *The International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, *84*(1), 3–23.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0091415016669146>
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. SAGE.
- Taylor, S. E. (2012). Tend and befriend theory. In P.A.M Van Lange, A.W. Kruglanski, & E.T. Higgins (Eds.). *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology* (pp. 32–49). SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446249215>
- Taylor, S. E., Klein, L. C., Lewis, B. P., Gruenewald, T. L., Gurung, R. A., & Updegraff, J. A. (2000). Biobehavioral responses to stress in females: Tend-and-befriend, not fight-or-flight. *Psychological Review*, *107*(3), 411–429. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.107.3.411>
- Tur-Porcar, A., Doménech, A., & Mestre, V. (2018). Family linkages and social inclusion: Predictors of prosocial behavior in childhood. *Anales de Psicología*, *34*, 340–348.
<https://doi.org/10.6018/analesps.34.2.308151>
- Wrightsmann, L. (1992). *Assumptions about human nature: Implications for researchers and practitioners* (2nd ed.). SAGE. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483325934>

Tables

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Zero-Order Correlations

Variable	<i>M</i>	(<i>SD</i>)	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
<i>Outcome</i>								
1. Engagement in the Communication								
Savoring of Kindness	2.50	(0.97)	--					
<i>Predictors</i>								
2. Beneficence	21.11	(3.96)	.20	--				
3. Humanity-Esteem	4.55	(4.74)	-.01	.05	--			
4. Mindfulness	46.30	(4.93)	.08	.09	.20	--		
5. Capacity to Savor	30.98	(18.03)	.09	.50	.00	-.10	--	
6. Time Since Kindness	1.30	(0.55)	.08	-.13	-.06	-.22	-.15	--

Note. Pearson's *r* reported. Boldfaced correlations are those that are significantly different from zero ($p < .05$, 2-tailed).

Table 2

Typology of Kindness Behaviors

Category	Description	Coding Frequency
Task Assistance	help with physical, tangible, or information services	68
Giftng	offering goods or experiences	71
Emotional Support	caring, comforting, or listening	34
Companionship/Inclusion	inclusion, company, fellowship, togetherness	15
Expressed Appreciation	complimenting and appreciating behaviors	12
		200