

Examining Students' Tendencies Towards Kindness; A Cross-Sectional Study

Mustafa Yüksel ERDOĞDU¹

¹ Department of Guidance and Psychological Counseling Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, Istanbul, Türkiye.

Email: myerdogdu@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
Received: 13 Mar 2025 Revised: 05 May 2025 Accepted: 15 May 2025	<p>The aim of this study is to examine students' kindness tendencies in terms of some demographic variables. The sample of the study consists of 558 secondary school students, 300 (54%) male and 258 (46%) female, living in Istanbul. In the study, the Student Kindness Scale was used to measure students' kindness tendencies. In the study, t-test was used to reveal the difference between two mean scores and one-way ANOVA was used to test the significance of the difference between more than two mean scores. Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficient was used to measure the relationship between two variables. In addition, independent categorical variables were turned into dummy variables and Stepwise regression analysis was applied to test the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable. According to the findings, empathy, communication kindness and total scale scores of the sub-dimensions of the student kindness scale were found to be significant in favor of girls. As the duration of internet use increased, respect, empathy, communication and school kindness scale scores decreased. Children who were treated with respect and fairness during childhood had higher kindness scale scores. Generally successful students were found to have more politeness behaviors. It is seen that children who are exposed to behaviors accepted as politeness at home and at school have more communicative kindness. The variables that have the most significant effect on student kindness are achievement, treating children fairly and respectfully, frequency of accessing the internet and gender, respectively.</p> <p>Keywords: Student Kindness, Respect, Empathy, Communication, School Kindness.</p>

INTRODUCTION

In addition to negative behaviors such as bullying, aggression and jealousy, students also have positive behaviors. These behaviors undoubtedly affect students' social relations. One of the most important factors determining students' social relations is their kind behavior, especially towards each other. Kindness is perceived by school students as exhibiting good behavior and it is stated that these behaviors support students' emotional and physical development (Binfet & Geatner, 2015). In particular, social emotional learning outcomes have important effects on the development of positive behaviors such as kindness (Durlak et al., 2011). In recent years, positive psychology, which aims to increase the resilience of individuals (Barry et al., 2019), is based on the happiness of individuals (Kobau et al., 2011) and sees supporting students' mental health as one of the main goals (Trew & Alden, 2015). In this context, kindness behaviors are seen as an important behavior in achieving the goals of positive psychology.

In general, kindness is defined as behaving well towards others, being willing to make people happy, and having useful behaviors for people (Kerr & et al., 2014; Park et al., 2004). This type of behavior expresses both a moral and characteristic state that refers to treating people with respect and thoughtfulness, being kind and empathetic (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Yavuzer, 2017). According to Carter (1998), kindness is defined as a virtuous behavior that includes being open to cooperation and engaging in positive and socially appropriate behaviors. In this context, kindness can be defined as understanding people's feelings and thoughts and exhibiting appropriate behaviors, supporting their psychological health, striving to increase their development, and being in respect-based behaviors.

Undoubtedly, one of the environments where individuals should acquire behaviors that will be accepted as kindness is the school environment. When kindness studies related to school and students are examined, it is seen that these studies are shaped by peer bullying and social emotional learning studies (Binfet & Gaertner, 2015; Binfet & et al., 2016). The fact that peer bullying is a negative behavior has pushed researchers to search for a behavior to be accepted as the opposite of this behavior (Binfet & Gaertner, 2015), and as a result, the concept of school kindness has emerged. School kindness is defined as creating a positive safe school environment, reducing negative behaviors such as bullying, and increasing students' social emotional development (Binfet & Gaertner 2015; Kaplan et al., 2016). In this context, school kindness is not only a form of behavior that concerns students, but also includes teachers, administrators and other school personnel.

While school politeness refers more to a social environment, student politeness encompasses individual behaviors. The tendency to investigate students' kindness behaviors has emerged as a result of studies to increase their social and emotional development (Ashdown & Bernard, 2012; Bear et al., 2015). Due to the limited number of studies on student politeness, no definition of student politeness has been found. However, in a study conducted by Binfet and Passmore (2019) on students and teachers, it was observed that student kindness behaviors included the concepts of being respectful, being helpful, and encouraging/defending. From this point of view, student kindness can be defined as students trying to understand each other, respecting each other and supporting each other's development.

Looking at the studies on kindness as a whole, it is seen that the well-being levels of students participating in the kindness program increase (Layous & et al., 2012), there is a positive relationship between kindness and well-being (Oğuz & Kaya, 2019), social emotional skills improve (Kaplan et al, 2016), there is a positive correlation between kindness tendencies and students' behavioral, cognitive, emotional school engagement (Datu & Park, 2019), this tendency increases school belonging (Lee & Huang, 2021), teacher kindness has positive effects on students' personality development (Poulou, 2021).

As can be seen in the findings of the research, kindness research shows that this behavior increases students' well-being levels, increases their level of commitment to school and improves students' social emotional skills. Undoubtedly, it is important to carry out these and similar studies in order to reveal the factors affecting student kindness and to increase awareness on this issue, especially because the researches on kindness tendencies are limited and more researches should be conducted on this subject. For this purpose, in this study;

1. Are there significant differences between the groups according to gender, duration of internet use, fair treatment of children and academic achievement scores of student kindness scale scores?
2. Are there significant relationships between student kindness scale scores and gender, duration of internet use, fair treatment of children, and academic achievement?
3. What is the level of independent categorical variables predicting student kindness? Answers to these questions were sought.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The aim of this study is to examine the kindness tendencies of students in terms of some demographic variables. Therefore, the research was conducted in the correlational model.

Population And Sample

The population of the study is the middle school students studying in Küçükçekmece district of Istanbul. Data were obtained from a total of 558 middle school students, 300 (%54) male and 258 (%46) female, who were willing to participate in the research from three schools determined by the cluster sampling method (Lower-Middle-Upper socio-economic level). The mean age of the students was measured as 13.81 (sd=1.96). 72 (%13) of the students use the internet for 1 hour or less, 342 (%61) for 2 hours, and 144 (%26) for 3 hours or more per day. 45 (8%) of the students have low, 206 (37%) have medium and 307 (55%) have high academic success perception.

Data Collection Tools

An information form was prepared by the researcher in order to determine the demographic characteristics of the students.

Student Kindness Scale: The Student Kindness Scale used in the study was developed by Erdoğan and Kütük in 2025 (Erdoğan and Kütük, 2025). As a result of the exploratory factor analysis, it was observed that the scale consisted of 4 sub-dimensions as "Respect, Empathy, School Kindness and Communication Kindness". These four factors explain 57.52% of the variance in the scale). The structure revealed by the exploratory factor analysis of the scale was supported by confirmatory factor analysis ($\chi^2 / df = .956$, GFI=0.98, CFI=0.99, AGFI=0.96, NFI=0.92, RMSEA=0.00). The discrimination of the scale items was obtained by comparing the upper and lower 27% groups and the differences between the groups were examined with the t-test and the differences between the groups were found to be significant. In this context, the scale items have the feature of distinguishing between those who have and do not have student kindness. The reliability values of the sub-dimensions of the scale were calculated with Cronbach's Alpha values. According to the values obtained, the reliability value of the respect sub-scale was measured as .66, for Empathy .71, for School Kindness .71, and for Communication Kindness .65. The Cronbach's Alpha value calculated for the entire scale was also found to be .84.

Process and Data Analysis:

Before data collection, consent documents were obtained from the families and necessary ethical permissions were obtained for the research. The data collected for the research were examined in detail and checked for incorrect answers. After the control, 558 data obtained from the personal information form and scales were transferred to the computer program. The transferred data was analyzed with the IBM SPSS 22 program. First, frequency and percentage analysis of the data obtained from the students included in the research was performed.

The skewness value of the student politeness scale used was measured as .193 and the kurtosis value as .124. George and Mallery (2010) state that the data has a normal distribution when the kurtosis and skewness values are between -2 and +2. Therefore, the scores obtained from the scales used in the research show a normal distribution. Therefore, parametric tests, which are quantitative research methods, were used in the research. In the research, t-test was applied for the significance of the difference between the mean scores of two groups, and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied for the significance of the difference between the mean scores of more than two groups. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to calculate the relationship between variables. Stepwise regression analysis was also used to reveal the predictive effect of independent categorical variables on the dependent variable. In the analysis, categorical variables were included in the analysis by turning them into a "dummy" variable produced by excluding one of the levels and minus one.

RESULT

This section includes the analysis of the scores obtained from the measurement tool used in the study. Do the sub-dimensions of the Student Kindness Scale (Respect, Empathy, School Kindness and Communication Kindness) and the total scale scores show significant differences according to the gender of the students?

Table 1: T-test results of the student kindness scale sub-dimensions (respect, empathy, school kindness and communication kindness) and total scale scores according to gender

Scales	Female (X \pm S) N=258	Male (X \pm S) N=300	t	p
Respect	13,11 \pm 2,22	12,80 \pm 2,48	1,42	,078
Empathy	10,65 \pm 1,31	10,10 \pm 1,87	3,67	.000*
School Kindness	6,94 \pm 1,16	6,80 \pm 1,25	1,24	,107
Communication Kindness	6,71 \pm 2,10	6,45 \pm 1,88	1,97	,025*
Total	37,43 \pm 4,11	36,17 \pm 4,45	3,02	,000*

As seen in Table 1, the respect subscale scores of girls and boys do not differ significantly according to gender variable [$t(478)=1,42$, $p>.05$]. Empathy subscale scores of girls and boys differ significantly according to gender variable [$t(478)=3,67$, $p<.05$]. According to the data obtained, girls' empathy scale scores ($\bar{x}=10,65$) are higher than boys' ($\bar{x}=10,10$). School kindness subscale scores of girls and boys do not differ significantly according to gender variable [$t(478)=1,24$, $p>.05$]. Communication kindness subscale scores of girls and boys show significant difference according

to gender variable [$t(478)=1,97, p<0,05$]. According to the data obtained, girls' communication kindness scale scores ($\bar{x}=6,7$) are higher than boys ($\bar{x}=6,45$). Total kindness scale scores of girls and boys show significant difference according to gender variable [$t(478)=3,02, p<0,01$]. According to the data obtained, girls' kindness scale scores ($\bar{x}=37,43$) are higher than boys ($\bar{x}=36,17$).

Do the student kindness scale sub-dimensions (Respect, Empathy, School kindness and Communication kindness) and total scale scores show significant differences according to the frequency of students using the internet?

Table 2: ANOVA test results of student kindness scale sub-dimensions (respect, empathy, school kindness and communication kindness) and total scale scores according to the frequency of using the internet

Scales	Frequency of Internet Use			F	Significant Difference
	A. 1 hour (72) $\bar{x}\pm S$	B. 2 hour (342) $\bar{x}\pm S$	C. 3 + hour (144) $\bar{x}\pm S$		
Respect	13,90 \pm 1,25	13,26 \pm 1,88	12,22 \pm 1,77	11,73*	A>C, B>C
Empathy	11,00 \pm 2,01	10,51 \pm 1,85	10,04 \pm 1,11	5,59*	B>C
School Kindness	6,80 \pm 0,82	7,03 \pm 1,00	6,54 \pm 1,25	8,40*	B>C
Com. Kindness	7,25 \pm 1,74	6,77 \pm 1,22	6,11 \pm 1,36	13,05*	A>C, B>C
Total	38,95 \pm 4,12	37,60 \pm 3,98	34,93 \pm 1,08	20,93*	A>C, B>C

Student Kindness Scale respect sub-dimension scale scores show significant differences according to the frequency of students' internet use [$F(2-475)=11,73, p<0,01$]. According to the obtained data, the kindness scores of those who use the internet for 2 hours or less are significantly higher than those who use the internet for 3 hours or more. Student Kindness Scale empathy sub-dimension scale scores show significant differences according to the frequency of students' internet use [$F(2-475)=5,59, p<0,01$]. According to the obtained data, the empathy scores of those who use the internet for 2 hours are significantly higher than those who use the internet for 3 hours or more. Student Kindness Scale school kindness sub-dimension scale scores show significant differences according to the frequency of students' internet use [$F(2-475)=8,40, p<0,01$]. According to the obtained data, the school kindness scores of those who use the internet for 2 hours are significantly higher than those who use the internet for 3 hours or more. Student Kindness Scale communication kindness sub-dimension scale scores show significant differences according to the frequency of students' internet access [$F(2-475)=13,05, p<0,01$]. According to the obtained data, communication kindness scores of those who use the internet for 2 hours or less are significantly higher than those who use the internet for 3 hours or more. Student kindness scale total scores show significant differences according to the frequency of students' internet access [$F(2-475)=20,93, p<0,01$]. According to the obtained data, communication kindness scale total scores of those who use the internet for 2 hours or less are significantly higher than those who use the internet for 3 hours or more.

Do the student kindness scale sub-dimensions (Respect, Empathy, School Kindness and Communication kindness) and total scale scores show significant differences according to the situation of students being treated fairly and respectfully?

Table 3: ANOVA test results for student kindness scale sub-dimensions (respect, empathy, school kindness and communication kindness) and total scale scores according to the fair and respectful treatment of students

Scales	Being Treated Fairly			F	Significant Difference
	A. Yes (293) $\bar{x}\pm S$	B. Sometimes (205) $\bar{x}\pm S$	C. No (60) $\bar{x}\pm S$		
Respect	13,32 \pm 2,12	12,63 \pm 2,85	12,22 \pm 2,77	6,81*	A>B, A>C
Empathy	10,42 \pm 1,85	10,38 \pm 2,01	10,07 \pm 1,77	,781	

School Kindness	6,94±1,88	6,88±1,62	6,50±1,88	2,30	
Com. Kindness	6,80±1,33	6,44±1,44	5,75±1,22	10,81*	A>B, A>C, B>C
Total	37,50±4,52	36,35±4,24	34,55±4,20	8,99*	A>B, A>C

The Student Kindness Scale respect sub-dimension scale scores show significant differences according to the students' perceptions of being treated fairly and respectfully [$F(2-474)=6.81, p<0.1$]. According to the obtained data, the respect scale scores of the students who answered "Yes" to the question of whether they were treated fairly and respectfully are significantly higher than those who answered "Sometimes" and "No".

The Student Kindness Scale empathy sub-dimension scale scores [$F(2-474)=.781, p>0.1$], school kindness scale scores [$F(2-474)=2.30, p>0.1$] do not show significant differences according to the students' perceptions of being treated fairly and respectfully.

The Student Kindness Scale communication courtesy sub-dimension scale scores show significant differences according to the students' perceptions of being treated fairly and respectfully [$F(2-474)=10.81, p<0.1$]. According to the obtained data, the communication kindness scale scores of the students who answered "Yes" and "Sometimes" to the question "Were they treated fairly and respectfully" are significantly higher than those who answered "No".

Student kindness total scale scores show significant differences according to the students' perceptions of being treated fairly and respectfully [$F(2-474)=8.99, p<0.1$]. According to the obtained data, the total scale scores of the students who answered "Yes" to the question "Were they treated fairly and respectfully" are significantly higher than those who answered "Sometimes" and "No".

Do the student kindness scale sub-dimensions (Respect, Empathy, School Kindness and Communication Kindness) and total scale scores show significant differences according to the students' perceptions of success?

Table 4: ANOVA test results of student kindness scale sub-dimensions (respect, empathy, school kindness and communication kindness) and total scale scores according to academic success level

Scales	Academic Achievement Level			F	Significant Difference
	A. Low (45) $\bar{x}\pm S$	B. Middle (206) $\bar{x}\pm S$	C. High (307) $\bar{x}\pm S$		
Respect	12,28±2,32	12,47±2,74	13,31±2,15	7,91*	C>B,
Empathy	9,72±2,01	10,13±1,52	10,59±1,45	6,95*	C>A, B>A
School Kindness	6,32±1,85	6,80±1,33	6,96±1,85	3,71*	C>A
Com. Kindness	5,84±1,65	6,15±1,52	6,91±1,54	19,60*	C>A, B>A
Total	34,16±4,52	35,56±4,65	37,79±4,02	18,11*	A>C, B>C

Student Kidness scale respect sub-dimension scale scores show significant differences according to students' perception of success [$F(2-472)=7.91, p<0.1$]. According to the data obtained, the respect subdimension scale scores of students with high achievement perception are significantly higher than those with medium achievement perception. Student Kindness scale empathy sub-dimension scale scores show significant differences according to students' perception of success [$F(2-472)=6.95, p<0.1$]. According to the data obtained, the empathy subdimension scale scores of students with high and medium achievement perception are significantly higher than those with low achievement perception. Student Kindness scale empathy sub-dimension scale scores show significant differences according to students' perception of success [$F(2-472)=6.95, p<0.1$]. According to the data obtained, the empathy subdimension scale scores of students with high and medium achievement perception are significantly higher than those with low achievement perception. Student Kindness scale school kindness subscale scale scores show significant differences according to students' perception of success [$F(2-472)=3.71, p<0.1$]. According to the data obtained, the school kidness subscale scores of students with high achievement perception are significantly higher than those with low achievement perception. The communication kindness subscale scores of the Student Kidness scale show significant differences according to students' perception of success [$F(2-472)=19.60, p<0.1$]. According to

the data obtained, the communication kindness subscale scores of students with high and medium achievement perception are significantly higher than those with low achievement perception.

The total scores of the kindness scale show significant differences according to the students' perception of success [$F(2-472)=18,11, p < 0.01$]. According to the data obtained, the total scores of the kindness scale of students with high and medium achievement perception are significantly higher than those with low achievement perception.

Table 5: Relationships between variables considered in the study

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
1. Politeness Scale	-				
2. Gender	-.137**	-			
3. Internet Access	-.280**	.099*	-		
4. Fair Treatment	-.189**	-.047	.156**	-	
5. Success	.265**	-.026	-.052	.158	-

As seen in Table 5, there are significant negative correlations between politeness scale scores and gender ($r = -.137, p < 0.01$), going online ($r = -.280, p < 0.01$), being treated fairly ($r = -.189, p < 0.01$), and significant positive correlations with achievement scores ($r = .268, p < 0.01$). The results of stepwise regression analysis of the predictors of student politeness scale scores are presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Stepwise regression analysis results of the predictors of student kindness scale scores

Model		B	Beta	t	Sig.	R	R ²	R ² Change ΔR^2
1	Constant	36,178	.137	122,642	.001	.137	.019	.017
	Gender (girl)	1,252		3,027	.003			
2	Constant	37,079	.109	114,284	.001	.290	.097	.080
	Gender (girl)	.992	-.257	2,463	.014			
	3 hours +	-2,561		-5,831	.001			
3	Constant	36,293	.123	88,818	.001	.320	.194	.097
	Gender (girl)	1,124	-.236	2,801	.005			
	3 hours +	-2,355	.137	-5,348	.001			
	Fair Treatment	1,256		3,116	.002			
4	Constant	35,159	.113	78,238	.001	.393	.341	.147
	Gender(girl)	1,033	-.227	2,647	.008			
	3 hours +	-2,265	.115	-5,291	.001			
	Fair Treatment	1,055	.229	2,682	.008			
	High Success	2,127		5,391	.001			

The analysis was completed in 4 steps. Gender (Female) contributed about 1% to student politeness and a positive correlation was observed between gender and school politeness. The variance increased to about 2% with the inclusion of going online for 3 hours or more in the second step, which contributed 1% to the variance. A negative correlation was observed between school kindness scores and going online for 3 hours or more. Treating students fairly, which contributed approximately 1% to the variance, was included in the analysis in the third step and the variance explained increased to 20%. There was a positive correlation between always treating students fairly and school kindness. In the last step, academic achievement (good), which contributed about 15%, was included in the analysis and the explained variance was 34%. There is a positive correlation between academic achievement (good) and student kindness scores.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The aim of this study is to examine the kindness levels of students in terms of some demographic variables. According to the findings, the total scores of empathy, communication kindness and kindness scale are higher in favor of girls. Although the researches generally reveal that women's empathy tendencies are higher than men's (Akgün; 2022; Baron-Cohen & Wheelwright, 2004; Ickes et al., 2000), significant differences are not observed in some studies (Deng, et al., 2023; Hepddeniz et al., 2023). It is possible to state that girls are generally more prone to empathy due to their personality traits and gender differences. The communication kindness scale and total kindness scale scores of females are higher than males. In Turkey, it is thought that girls' communication kindness is higher than boys' due to the expectations in this direction as girls are supported to speak more kindly and politely in their upbringing. When the research findings in the literature are examined, it is observed that although there is no finding revealing the differentiation of communication kindness according to gender, kindness scale scores show significant differences in favor of women (Binfet et al., 2016; Biswas (2006); Neto et al., 2014; Yıldız, 2022).

According to the findings obtained from the research, it is seen that as the frequency of students' access to the Internet increases, their respect, empathy, school and communication kindness scale scores decrease. It is thought that the frequency of accessing the Internet harms student politeness due to reasons such as the Internet environment encouraging cyberbullying, harmful software, negative models of addiction, and the use of the Internet for purposes other than learning. In the literature, there is no research finding on the relationship between the duration of internet access and politeness behaviors. However, it is observed that there are significant negative relationships between self-compassion, which includes positive emotions similar to kindness, and internet addiction (İskender, Akin, 2011; Moniri et al., 2022), this addiction reduces the sense of compassion in students (Akdamar, 2023), and internet addiction increases peer bullying (Gülbetekin & Gül, 2023; Nwanosike et al., 2022; Vessey et al., 2022). These research findings support the conclusion that as the frequency of students' access to the Internet increases, their politeness tendencies decrease. Reasons such as the internet environment causing lack of empathy, weakening social skills, and the widespread use of negative language eliminate politeness behaviors in students.

Respect, communication kindness and kindness total scale scores show significant differences according to students' perceptions of being treated fairly and respectfully. In other words, when students are treated fairly and respectfully, this also positively affects their kindness behaviors. It is assumed that when parents or teachers treat children with respect and fairness, it has a positive effect on their empathy development, contributes to the acquisition of positive and correct behaviors, and supports positive character development; accordingly, it is assumed that these children have more kindness tendencies. Similarly, it has been observed that children with positive parental behavior are more compassionate (Eker, Kaya, 2018), kindness training programs in schools increase kindness and similar positive behaviors in children (Kaplan et al. (2016), and there is a positive correlation between perceived social support and kindness behaviors (Yıldız, 2022).

Finally, students' perception of themselves as successful also increases their kindness behaviors. It is thought that successful students have more courteous behaviors in school due to reasons such as higher self-confidence, higher sense of responsibility, and more social skills. Research also reveals that those with high school achievement have higher perceptions of politeness (Özer, 2022), and that children who adopt the values presented by their families are more successful in high school (England & Lee, 1974). It is very important for students to have behaviors that will be accepted as courteous in school in terms of strengthening their social relations, empathy skills, and student-teacher interaction. In addition, the spread of kindness behaviors for school will reduce discipline problems in schools and improve learning environments. In this context, it is very important to reveal the factors determining kindness behaviors of students. According to the results obtained from the research findings, the reasons for the low kindness behaviors of male students and students with low academic achievement should be investigated and necessary measures should be taken. For these students, it is of great importance for schools to conduct awareness raising activities about the behaviors that will be accepted as kindness and the importance of this behavior. In addition to the negative effects of frequent use of the Internet and Internet addiction on children's personal, emotional and academic achievements, excessive Internet use negatively affects the development of children's kindness behaviors. In this context, it is important to provide educational and psychological support to students about using the internet consciously. The necessity of teaching behavioral patterns such as right and wrong to children at an early age

(Eisenberg, & Spinrad, 2014; Killen, Smetana, 2013) is also valid for teaching kindness behaviors. More precisely, polite behaviors in children are possible with parents being appropriate role models and informing their children correctly.

When the predictors of student kindness scale scores are analyzed, it is seen that the biggest effect on kindness is academic achievement. Especially as a result of academic success increasing self-confidence, it is thought that these students feel themselves valuable and accordingly, they are more willing to exhibit polite behaviors. Considering that those with academic success are generally considered to be role models for their peers, it is assumed that these students are willing to exhibit more polite behaviors to their peers and teachers. When the research findings are examined, it is observed that there is a positive correlation between emotional intelligence and academic achievement (Kiss et al., 2014) and subjective well-being increases academic achievement (Bücker et al., 2014), although there is no research on the relationship between politeness and academic achievement. According to the findings, the second variable that has the greatest effect on kindness is parents' fair and respectful behavior towards their children. Undoubtedly, the most important environment where children acquire positive and negative behaviors is family relationships. It is thought that children who are treated with respect and justice internalize these behaviors and as a result, these children exhibit more courteous behaviors. Studies have also revealed that family relationships have effects on politeness behaviors (Johnson et al., 2022; Majeed & Kamal, 2023). Increasing frequency of internet use has negative effects on politeness. It is thought that the politeness behaviors of students who use the internet are more damaged due to the anonymous communication of children in the internet environment and the negative effects of the internet environment on the development of empathy. The fact that children who frequently use the Internet have more bullying behaviors (Blinka et al, 2023; Gülbetekin and Gül, 2023) seems to support the research findings.

Based on the findings of the research, it is recommended that awareness raising activities should be carried out especially in schools about conscious internet use, and psychoeducation programs should be prepared for students with low academic achievement to gain kindness behaviors. In addition, it is considered important to conduct awareness raising activities for parents to gain positive behaviors in children. The fact that very few studies have been conducted on kindness behaviors in students and the reasons for this makes this study important. The weaknesses of this study are that the research was conducted in a cross-sectional model, the research was conducted on a limited sample, and the research did not provide in-depth findings on the causes of politeness behaviors. Generalization of the research findings is possible by conducting this and similar studies on different sample groups.

REFERENCES

- [1] Akdamar, B. 2023, *Investigation of the relationship between internet addiction and compassion level in adolescents* (Master's thesis) Necmettin Erbakan University, Turkey
- [2] Akgün, E. 2022, Examination of the relationships between multicultural competence perception, social empathy, classroom management skills and intercultural communication anxiety (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). *Hacettepe University, Ankara*.
- [3] Ashdown, D. M., & Bernard, M. E. 2012, Can explicit instruction in social and emotional learning skills benefit the social-emotional development, well-being, and academic achievement of young children? *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 39, 397-405.
- [4] Baron-Cohen, S., & Wheelwright, S. 2004, The empathy quotient: an investigation of adults with Asperger syndrome or high functioning autism, and normal sex differences. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 34, 163-175.
- [5] Barry, M. M., Clarke, A. M., Petersen, I., & Jenkins, R. 2019, *Implementing mental health promotion*. Springer Nature.
- [6] Bear, G. G., Whitcomb, S. A., Elias, M. J., & Blank, J. C. 2015, SEL and schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports. In J. Durlak, C. Domitrovich, R. Weissberg & T. Gullotta (Eds.), *Handbook of social and emotional learning* (pp. 453-467). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- [7] Beaton, D.E., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F., Ferraz, M. 2000, Guidelines for the process of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measures. *Spine*, 25(24), 3186-3191.
- [8] Binfet, J. T. & Gaertner, A. 2015, Children's conceptualizations of kindness at school. *Canadian Children*, 40(3), 27-3.

- [9] Binfet, J. T., & Passmore, H. A. 2019, The who, what, and where of school kindness: Exploring students' perspectives. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 34(1), 22-37.
- [10] Binfet, J. T., Gadermann, A. M., & Schonert-Reichl, K. A. 2016, Measuring kindness at school: Psychometric properties of a school kindness scale for children and adolescents. *Psychology in the Schools*, 53 (2), 111-126. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pits.21889>
- [11] Biswas-Diener, R. 2006, From the equator to the North Pole: A study of character strengths. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 7(3), 293-310. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10902-005-3646-8>
- [12] Blinka, L., Stašek, A., Šablatúrová, N., Ševčíková, A., & Husarova, D. 2023, Adolescents' problematic internet and smartphone use in (cyber) bullying experiences: A network analysis. *Child and Adolescent Mental Health*, 28(1), 60-66.
- [13] Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. 1987, *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage* (No. 4). Cambridge University press.
- [14] Bückner, S., Nuraydin, S., Simonsmeier, B. A., Schneider, M., & Luhmann, M. 2018, Subjective well-being and academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 74, 83-94.
- [15] Büyüköztürk, Ş. 2018, *Data Analysis Handbook for Social Sciences: Statistics, Research Design, SPSS Applications and Interpretation* (24th edition). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- [16] Carter, S. 1998, *Civility: Manners, Morals, and The Etiquette of Democracy*. Basic Books.
- [17] Crocker, L., & Algina, J. 1986, *Introduction to Classical and Modern Test Theory*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 6277 Sea Harbor Drive, Orlando, FL 32887.
- [18] Datu, J. A. D., & Park, N. 2019, Perceived school kindness and academic engagement: The mediational roles of achievement goal orientations. *School Psychology International*, 40(5), 456-473.
- [19] Deng, X., Chen, S., Li, X., Tan, C., Li, W., Zhong, C., ... & Ye, M. 2023, Gender differences in empathy, emotional intelligence and problem-solving ability among nursing students: A cross-sectional study. *Nurse Education Today*, 120, 105649.
- [20] Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. 2011, Enhancing students' social and emotional development promotes success in school: Results of a meta-analysis. *Child Development*, 82, 474-501
- [21] Eisenberg, N., & Spinrad, T. L. 2014, Multidimensionality of prosocial behavior. *Prosocial development: A multidimensional approach*, 13, 17-39.
- [22] Eker, H., & Kaya, M. 2018, Examining University Students' Self-Compassion and Compassionate Love Levels in Terms of Perceived Parental Attitudes. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 6(11), 49-56.
- [23] England, G. W., & Lee, R. 1974, The relationship between managerial values and managerial success in the United States, Japan, India, and Australia. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59(4), 411.
- [24] Gülbetekin, E., & Gül Can, F. 2023, The relationship between internet addiction and peer bullying level of sixth and seventh grade secondary school students. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Nursing*, 36(3), 248-255.
- [25] Hair, J.K., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J. and Anderson, R.E. 2014, *Multivariate Data Analysis*. 7th edition. Pearson Education Limited, Harlow, UK.
- [26] Hayton, J. C., Allen, D. G., & Scarpello, V. 2004, Factor retention decisions in exploratory factor analysis: A tutorial on parallel analysis. *Organizational Research Methods*, 7(2), 191-205. doi: 10.1177/1094428104263675
- [27] Hepdeniz, Ö. K., Temel, U. B., & Uğurlu, M. 2023, Evaluation of empathy levels of undergraduate students in a faculty of dentistry. *Medical Journal of Süleyman Demirel University*, 30(2), 235-244.
- [28] Ickes, W., Gesn, P. R., & Graham, T. 2000, Gender differences in empathic accuracy: Differential ability or differential motivation? *Personal Relationships*, 7, 95-109. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2000.tb00006.x>.
- [29] Iskender, M., & Akin, A. 2011, Self-compassion and Internet addiction. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, 10(3), 215-221.
- [30] Johnson, M. T., Fratantoni, J. M., Tate, K., & Moran, A. S. 2022, Parenting with a kind mind: exploring kindness as a potentiator for enhanced brain health. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 805748.

- [31] Kaplan, D. M., de Blois, M., Dominguez, V., & Walsh, M. E. 2016, Studying the teaching of kindness: A conceptual model for evaluating kindness education programs in schools. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 58, 160-170.
- [32] Kerr, S., L., O'Donovan, A. and Pepping, C. A. 2014, Can gratitude and kindness interventions enhance wellbeing in a clinical sample. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 16, 17- 36.
- [33] Killen, M., & Smetana, J. G. 2013, *Handbook of Moral Development*. Psychology Press.
- [34] Kiss, M., Kotsis, Á., & Kun, A. 2014, The relationship between intelligence, emotional intelligence, personality styles and academic achievement. *Business Education and Accreditation*, 6 (2), 23-34.
- [35] Kline, R. B. 2016, *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (4th ed). New York: The Guilford Press
- [36] Kobau, R., Seligman, M. E., Peterson, C., Diener, E., Zack, M. M., Chapman, D., & Thompson, W. 2011, Mental health promotion in public health: Perspectives and strategies from positive psychology. *American Journal of Public Health*, 101(8), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2010.300083>
- [37] Layous K., Nelson S.K., Oberle E., Schonert-Reichl K.A and Lyubomirsky S. 2012, Kindness Counts: Prompting Prosocial Behavior in Preadolescents Boosts Peer Acceptance and WellBeing. *PLoS ONE* 7(12), e51380. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0051380
- [38] Lee, C.-K. J., & Huang, J. 2021, The relations between students' sense of school belonging, perceptions of school kindness and character strength of kindness. *Journal of School Psychology*, 84, 95-108. doi: 10.1016/j.jsp.2020.12.001
- [39] Majeed, R., & Kamal, A. 2023, Impact of Gratitude and Kindness on Self-Esteem, Subjective Well-Being and Family Relationships among University Students. *Human Nature Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(1), 102-120.
- [40] Moniri, R., Pahlevani Nezhad, K., & Lavasani, F. F. 2022, Investigating anxiety and fear of COVID-19 as predictors of internet addiction with the mediating role of self-compassion and cognitive emotion regulation. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 13, 841870.
- [41] Neto, J.S., Neto, F., & Furnham, A. 2014, Gender and psychological correlates of self-rated strengths among youth. *Social Indicators Research*, 118 (1), 315-327. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11205-013-0417-5>
- [42] Nwanosike, C. L., Ujoatuonu, I. V., Kanu, G. C., Ike, O. O., & Okeke, T. J. 2022, Social bullying among undergraduates: the roles of internet gaming disorder, risk-taking behavior, and internet addiction. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 830794.
- [43] Oğuz- Duran, N. and Kaya- Memiş, A. 2019, Examining the relationship between school kindness perception and psychological and emotional well-being in elementary school students. *Elementary Education Online*, 18 (4), pp. 1671-1686. doi:10.17051/ilkonline.2019.632917
- [44] Özer, M. 2022, *School climate and kindness at school through the eyes of middle school students and teachers* (Master's thesis). Dokuz Eylül University, Turkey.
- [45] Park, N., Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. 2004, Strengths of character and wellbeing. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 23, 603-619. doi: 10.1521/jscp.23.5.603.50748.
- [46] Poulou, M. S. 2021, Perceptions of kindness in pre-service early childhood teachers. *Advances in Developmental and Educational Psychology*, 3(1), 90-96.
- [47] Simms, L. J. (2008). Classical and modern methods of psychological scale construction. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2(1), 414-433. doi: 10.1111/j.17519004.2007.00044.x
- [48] Stevens, J. P. 2009, *Applied Multivariate Statistics for The Social Sciences* (5th ed.). New York: Routledge.
- [49] Trew, J. L., & Alden, L. E. 2015, Kindness reduces avoidance goals in socially anxious individuals. *Motivation and Emotion*, 39(6), 892-907. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031015-9499-5>
- [50] Vessey, J. A., Difazio, R. L., Neil, L. K., & Dorste, A. 2022, Is there a relationship between youth bullying and internet addiction? An integrative review. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 1-25.
- [51] Worthington, R. L., & Whittaker, T. A. 2006, Scale development research: A content analysis and recommendations for best practices. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 34(6), 806-838.
- [52] Yavuzer, H. (2017). *Child Psychology* (34th edition). Istanbul: Remzi Bookstore.
- [53] Yildiz, M., & Eldeleklioglu, J. 2024, Relations between Perceived Social Support, Attachment and Kindness in High School Students. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 8(1), 120-142.