

1 ‘Kindness By Post’: A Mixed-Methods Evaluation of A 2 Participatory Public Mental Health Project

3
4 Congxiyu Wang¹, Eiluned Pearce², Rebecca Jones², Brynmor Lloyd-Evans^{2*}

5
6 1: Department of Psychiatry, University of Oxford, Warneford Hospital, Warneford Ln, Headington,
7 Oxford OX3 7JX, United Kingdom

8 2: Division of Psychiatry, Faculty of Brain Sciences, University College London, Maple House, 149
9 Tottenham Court Rd, London W1T 7BN, United Kingdom

10 * Correspondence: Brynmor Lloyd-Evans
11 b.lloyd-evans@ucl.ac.uk

12 Abstract

13
14 **Background:** Random acts of kindness can improve wellbeing. However, less is known about the
15 impacts of giving and receiving acts of kindness with strangers on wellbeing and loneliness. Therefore,
16 this study’s objectives were to evaluate a participatory public mental health project involving sending
17 and receiving a card with goodwill messages, to understand how such acts of kindness influence
18 wellbeing and loneliness, and to investigate the potential mechanisms underlying the project’s impacts.

19
20 **Materials and methods:** This study was a secondary analysis of anonymised service evaluation data
21 collected in the ‘Kindness by Post’ (KBP) project in 2020. It used a mixed-methods single-group
22 design and data from 289 participants. Changes in wellbeing, loneliness, sense of belonging and hope
23 from baseline to follow-up were analysed using linear or multinomial logistic regression. Regression
24 models also examined the associations between changes in wellbeing and baseline loneliness or
25 participation level. Free text responses about experiences and suggestions for the project were analysed
26 using thematic analysis.

27
28 **Results:** Participants had a small, but statistically significant improvement, in wellbeing equating to
29 0.21 standard deviations (SD) (95% CI: 0.12 to 0.30) after taking part in the project, as well as
30 improvements in loneliness, sense of belonging and hope. How lonely a participant was at baseline
31 and whether participants both sent and received a kindness card were not associated with
32 improvements in wellbeing. In the qualitative analysis, a desire to help others emerged as the main
33 motivator to take part in the card exchange. Participants reported enhanced personal fulfilment, leading
34 to improvements in wellbeing. Receiving a card could make people feel special and cherished, which
35 was reported to establish a sense of connection with others, with potential benefits for reducing
36 loneliness.

37
38 **Conclusions:** This study provided preliminary evidence that the KBP project might improve wellbeing,
39 loneliness, sense of belonging and hope. Sending a kindness card in this project played a predominant
40 role in wellbeing enhancement, and receiving a kindness card could reduce loneliness. This study
41 suggests that the KBP project can be replicated in more contexts in the future, and might improve

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

42 wellbeing and loneliness in large communities.

43

44 **Keywords**

45 Kindness, Wellbeing, Loneliness, Belongingness, Public Health

46

47 **1. Introduction**

48 This paper reports a mixed methods evaluation of an innovative participatory public health programme:
49 the Kindness By Post (KBP) project, in which participants send and receive cards with a message of
50 kindness from another participant. KBP aims to enhance wellbeing and social connection and reduce
51 feelings of loneliness for those taking part.

52

53 Wellbeing typically consists of two components: 1) subjective wellbeing, which emphasises positive
54 affective experiences, including life satisfaction, positive emotion and absence of negative mood (Ryan
55 and Deci, 2001, p143, 144) and 2) psychological wellbeing, which relates to positive psychological
56 functioning, comprising self-acceptance, autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive
57 relationships and life purpose (Ryff, 1989, p1077). Wellbeing plays an essential role in quality of life.
58 For example, a low level of wellbeing is a risk factor in developing depression (Wood and Joseph,
59 2010), whereas a high level of wellbeing can be a protective factor to reduce the risks for various
60 mental illnesses and physical diseases (Ryff, 2014). Apart from health, positive wellbeing may create
61 many necessary characteristics and resources that lead to successful outcomes in work and romantic
62 relationships (Lyubomirsky et al., 2005a, p39). Therefore, growing evidence demonstrates that it is
63 worthwhile enhancing wellbeing because it brings desirable benefits to people's lives.

64

65 Loneliness is a subjective negative emotional state that arises when people perceive a discrepancy
66 between a desired and actual social network (de Jong Giervel, 1998; Perlman and Peplau, 1981, p39;
67 Valtorta and Hanratty, 1981, p518). Loneliness is conceptualised as multi-dimensional, consisting of
68 intimate, relational and collective dimensions (Cacioppo et al., 2015). Consequently, loneliness refers
69 to not only an absence of a desired interpersonal affection and intimacy with a significant love, friends
70 and family, but also a lack of connection to a broader community. For the general population,
71 experiencing loneliness is quite common. Approximately 10–15% of people in Europe and 20–30% of
72 people in the UK reported experiencing loneliness frequently or most of the time (Jopling and
73 Sserwanja, 2016). For people with worse wellbeing, feeling lonely is even more common (Kearns et
74 al., 2015). Loneliness has negative impacts on physical health. For instance, feeling lonely weakens
75 ongoing anabolic processes (Cacioppo and Hawkley, 2003) and has negative impacts on the immune
76 and cardiovascular system, which increases heart disease and mortality risk (Murberg,
77 2004). Loneliness is also linked to increased risk of and poorer recovery from a range of mental health
78 problems (Hawkley and Cacioppo, 2010, p219; Wang et al., 2018, p11). Loneliness may make people
79 perceive that they have poor social skills and lead to low self-esteem (Cacioppo et al., 2000), which
80 may consequently decrease wellbeing (Apaolaza et al., 2013, p5). Additionally, people feeling
81 chronically lonely may become more pessimistic and encounter emotional dysphoria (Cacioppo et al.,
82 2000), and loneliness has been found to increase the risk of later depression (Lee et al., 2021). Given
83 the negative impacts of loneliness on physical and mental health, it is critical to prevent or reduce
84 loneliness for individuals, which may reduce the burden on public health.

85

86 Various psychological interventions can improve wellbeing. For instance, a positive emotion focused
87 wellbeing therapy can improve wellbeing and self-acceptance (Ruini et al., 2006). Loving-kindness
88 meditation in which participants direct their feelings of love and compassion toward an imaginary
89 stranger can also increase the acceptance to the self and social connectedness to others, promoting
90 participants' wellbeing (Hutcherson et al., 2008). Although psychological interventions can improve
91 wellbeing with a moderate effect size (Weiss et al., 2016), most interventions require support from
92 expert clinicians, which is expensive and might not be accessible to all people. Apart from professional
93 interventions, people can improve wellbeing through their own activities, either achieved
94 independently or facilitated by organised non-clinical support. The evidence based 'Five ways to
95 mental wellbeing' model, promoted widely in UK helping agencies, encourages connecting with others,
96 being physically active, learning new skills, acts of giving and kindness and mindfulness to improve
97 wellbeing (Aked et al., 2008).

98

99 Performing kind acts has been found to improve wellbeing (Curry et al., 2018, p4; Layous et al., 2017;
100 Layous et al., 2013, p1299; Otake et al., 2006; Kaffke, in press). Such kindness may include holding
101 a door for another, greeting strangers or helping others with academic work (Ouwennel et al., 2014).
102 It is suggested that kind behaviours that are courteous or altruistic may make people realise their
103 abilities to help others, which cultivates positive feelings to themselves (Lyubomirsky et al., 2005b).
104 Consequently, positive experiences may promote positive emotions in the long term, leading to a
105 higher level of wellbeing (Pressman et al., 2015). As well as the person performing the kind act, people
106 who receive kindness could also have improved wellbeing. People who received kindness have been
107 found to show higher levels of smiling expressions, which reflected more sincere joy, compared to
108 those who did not interact with people performing kind acts (Pressman et al., 2015). A thematic
109 analysis found that receiving kindness could increase wellbeing beyond experiencing pleasure but also
110 self-confidence, self-actualisation and sense of mastery (Filep et al., 2017). In addition to enhancing
111 wellbeing, acts of kindness may also connect the giver and receiver because the receiver may feel
112 acknowledged and valued by the giver. Furthermore, engaging in something new such as doing
113 creative work is also encouraged as a way to improve wellbeing. Conner et al (2018) demonstrated
114 that people who had done more creative activities (e.g., artistic ones) or developed original ideas
115 reported a higher level of daily flourishing. Therefore, creative acts may help to achieve a positive
116 mood and improve wellbeing, particularly if these acts also provide an opportunity to give and receive
117 kindness.

118

119 If kind acts can enhance people's wellbeing, it is worthwhile organising such kindness activities into
120 more extensive and comprehensive programmes in the general population (Sin and Lyubomirsky,
121 2009). Previous research has only demonstrated an overall small positive effect size of kindness acts
122 on primarily the actors (Curry et al., 2018, p19), and there is limited evidence showing the
123 psychological impacts on receiving kindness from strangers. There is a lack of evidence regarding the
124 effects of kindness programmes where people both perform kind acts to strangers and receive kindness
125 from strangers, and whether this mutuality leads to bigger impacts on wellbeing and loneliness than
126 only giving or receiving kindness. Importantly too, although there is growing evidence suggesting that
127 kindness to strangers leads to wellbeing promotion (Dunn et al., 2008), there is still insufficient
128 understanding about the potential mechanisms underlying the relationships between kind acts towards

129 strangers and enhancement of people’s wellbeing. Therefore, it is essential to further investigate the
130 experiences of kind acts for improving wellbeing. Furthermore, kindness behaviours can provide social
131 support in which people encounter social interactions. Cacioppo et al (2015) noted that actions that
132 provide mutual social support and increase social interactions with others could reduce loneliness.
133 Concerning the strong associations between loneliness and wellbeing (Emerson et al., 2020; Houghton
134 et al., 2016), it is also worth determining whether simple kindness behaviours could build
135 connectedness between individuals, which may be an effective means to reduce loneliness.

136
137 This study will add to the developing evidence base regarding acts of kindness to and from strangers
138 in promoting wellbeing and reducing loneliness. It aims to examine the effectiveness of a brief, self-
139 administrated kindness programme that was organised among the general population. The public
140 health programme ‘Kindness by Post’ (KBP) is run nationally online across the UK by the Mental
141 Health Collective (MHC), a non-profit community interest company. In the KBP project, participants
142 send a handmade or bought card that includes kind messages to a randomly allocated stranger, and
143 receive a similar card from a different randomly allocated stranger, who is likely to be a different
144 person. It has been used in a variety of social contexts, including for new students at university, for the
145 public during the Covid-19 lockdown, and for people observing Ramadan. This study used data
146 collected in a card exchange for Valentine’s Day in 2020—the ‘Great British Valentine’ (GBV). The
147 exchange sought to help participants at a time which may be difficult for many, as people without a
148 partner or in a troubled romantic relationship may experience low mood or loneliness during the
149 Valentine’s Day period (Otnes et al., 1994). The KBP project mobilises several mechanisms for
150 improving wellbeing, discussed above. First, it involves an act of kindness to a stranger, which has an
151 established evidence base for improving wellbeing. Second, in contrast to most random acts of
152 kindness projects, KBP also has a reciprocal element of giving and receiving, which may increase
153 connections with others. Third, the creative element of card-making and kind message-writing in KBP
154 may also be helpful for wellbeing promotion. As an inexpensive, potentially highly scalable
155 programme, it is therefore of substantial interest to evaluate the KBP project and understand how it is
156 experienced by participants.

157
158 Mixed methods, combining quantitative and qualitative approaches, were used to evaluate the KBP
159 project. There are two main research questions in the quantitative analysis: (1) What are the impacts
160 of taking part in the KBP project on participants’ wellbeing, loneliness, hope and sense of
161 belongingness; and (2) whether baseline loneliness and the extent of participation in the card exchange
162 relate to wellbeing changes? Our primary hypothesis is that participants would have an increase in
163 wellbeing, measured by the Short Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale (SWEMWBS)
164 (Stewart-Brown et al., 2009), from baseline to follow-up after taking part in the KBP project.
165 Regarding secondary outcomes, we hypothesise that participants’ scores on measures of loneliness,
166 hope and belongingness will improve from baseline to follow-up following the card exchange.
167 Additionally, it is hypothesised that people with lower baseline loneliness scores would have more
168 improvements in wellbeing at follow-up. It is also predicted that people who both sent and received a
169 card would have more improvements in wellbeing compared to those who partially took part in the
170 programme (who only gave or only received a card).

171
172 We will use qualitative analysis of participants’ free texts online comments to explore their experience

173 of this programme, its perceived benefits and the potential mechanisms by which any perceived effects
174 may have been achieved.

175

176 **2. Materials and methods**

177 *2.1 Study design and setting*

178 The current study is a secondary analysis based on the existing data collected by the KBP programme
179 organisers in the 2020 Great British Valentine (GBV) card exchange. The research comprises a cohort
180 study, employing a within-subject design.

181

182 *2.2 Participants*

183 All participants in GBV who completed pre- and post-outcome measures were included in this study.
184 To take part in GBV, people had to be aged 16 years or above with a postal address in the UK; there
185 were no other exclusion criteria. Participants were required to sign up for GBV online. Consistent with
186 our ethical approval, the current study only used the data from the adult participants, aged 18 or above.

187

188 *2.3 Ethical approvals*

189 The study was approved by the UCL Research Ethics Committee on 9th July 2020 (REC reference
190 18307/001).

191

192 *2.4 Procedure*

193 The GBV card exchange was broadly advertised in newspapers, broadcast and social media. People
194 who were interested in this project could sign up on the MHC website. Participants registered to take
195 part were first invited to complete the 'Before questionnaire' online. They were informed that the data
196 could be shared with external organisations anonymously for research purposes. People gave their
197 consent to this by proceeding with the questionnaire. The baseline data collection was conducted from
198 the 12th of January to the 14th of February 2020. One week before Valentine's Day, each participant
199 was asked to send a homemade card or letter with goodwill messages to a stranger who was randomly
200 allocated by a computer algorithm. The stranger's postal address and instructions regarding how to
201 send a card were sent to the participant's account. In return, each participant would receive a card from
202 another stranger during the week of Valentine's Day. If participants had not received a card, there was
203 a back-up system that allowed participants to ask the programme organisers to arrange for a
204 'replacement' card from a volunteer. Participants were informed that there was no guarantee of
205 receiving a card because the sending process from the stranger was completely voluntary, and not
206 receiving a card was nothing personal. Participants could withdraw from the project at any time they
207 wished. After the card exchange, participants were contacted again by email on the 26th February and
208 invited to complete the online 'After Questionnaire'. They were reminded again about their
209 anonymised data being shared and that they could give their consent by completing the questionnaire.
210 Participants were sent a second reminder by email if they did not respond to the questionnaires. The
211 follow-up data collection was closed on the 2nd March 2020. Participants responding outside the data
212 collection windows were excluded from the analysis.

213

214 *2.5 Measures*

215 At baseline and follow-up, participants completed online self-report measures of:

- 216 • Wellbeing, using the 7-item Short Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale (SWEMWBS)
217 (Stewart-Brown et al., 2009);
- 218 • Loneliness, using the 3-item University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) Loneliness Scale
219 version-3 (Russell, 1996);
- 220 • Belongingness, using four items drawn from the General Belongingness Scale (GBS) (Malone
221 et al., 2012);
- 222 • Hope, using a single item from the Beck Depression Inventory (Beck et al., 1996).

223
224 Participants reported their gender, ethnicity and age group at baseline. They reported whether or not
225 they had sent and had received a card and provided brief free-text feedback about their experiences of
226 the project at follow-up. There were four questions covering the specific sending or receiving
227 experiences as well as their overall impressions and suggestions for the project. Further information
228 regarding the study measures and how they were scored is provided in supplementary material 1.

229
230 All data were downloaded into a Microsoft Excel file by KBP staff. Free-text data were checked to
231 remove any personally identifying information, such as names. Multiple and duplicate responses from
232 the same person were identified by checking the sources such as email addresses of the responses. For
233 participants who completed the measures more than once at the same timepoint in either before- or
234 after-questionnaires, all their responses were removed, unless the responses at the same timepoint were
235 identical, then one of the responses was saved. An anonymised dataset was thus produced, containing
236 no personal identifiers or codes that could be used to link the data back to identifiable individuals. This
237 anonymised dataset was then shared with the researcher at UCL through the secure UCL Dropbox
238 system.

239 240 *2.6 Quantitative analysis*

241 We summarise demographic characteristics of the sample as well as baseline and follow up measures
242 of wellbeing, loneliness, sense of belonging and hope using descriptive statistics. To explore how
243 representative our sample was of GBV participants, we compared participants who had completed
244 both before and after questionnaires with those who had only completed the before questionnaire
245 using linear regression and chi squared tests.

246
247 We calculated standardised scores for wellbeing, loneliness and sense of belonging at baseline and
248 follow up, standardised by the mean and standard deviation of the measure at baseline. For each
249 participant, we calculated changes in wellbeing, loneliness and sense of belonging from baseline to
250 follow up for scores on both original and standardised scales as outcomes for the analysis. Change in
251 hope was recategorised into three groups (negative change, no change and positive change). A new
252 binary variable was generated based on the sending and receiving experiences of the participant to
253 represent the level of participation in the programme (full vs partial; see supplementary material 1).

254
255 We estimated change in wellbeing, loneliness and sense of belonging from baseline to follow up
256 using separate linear regression models. Results are presented on both the original measurement
257 scale and as standardised effect sizes. We used multinomial logistic regression to examine whether
258 there was any improvement in hope after taking part in the programme. We assessed whether the
259 four outcome measures are distinct from each other at baseline using Pearson correlation coefficients

260 for the continuous measures and Spearman correlation coefficients for comparisons involving the
261 ordinal measure of hope.

262

263 To explore whether the programme's effectiveness was associated with either baseline loneliness or
264 full vs partial participation, we fitted separate univariable linear regression models with change in
265 wellbeing as the outcome and baseline loneliness and participation level respectively as the single
266 explanatory variable. We checked the assumptions of regression models through the construction of
267 appropriate histograms and normal quantile plots. All analyses were performed using Stata v16.

268

269 *2.7 Qualitative analysis*

270 The current study uses the standards for reporting qualitative research (SRQR) to report the qualitative
271 analysis (O'Brien et al., 2014). This study used a thematic analysis to capture the pattern of the
272 meaning of the experiences and feedback reflected by the participants. The qualitative analysis
273 processes were guided by the thematic approach developed by Braun and Clarke (2012). There were
274 388 participants who completed the after-questionnaire, which contained the free-text responses, and
275 the current analysis used the transcripts of the 289 participants who completed both before- and after-
276 questionnaires (see Figure 1). However, the other 99 transcripts were also checked once a coding frame
277 had been developed to determine whether there were any additional novel and distinctive codes
278 generated. The qualitative transcripts were analysed using NVivo software version 12.

279

280 *2.7.1 Unit of analysis*

281 All free-text comments to the four questions were merged as an individual transcript for each
282 participant. All 289 participant transcripts were analysed.

283

284 *2.7.2 Researcher characteristics and reflexivity*

285 The lead researcher (CW), who had the main role in coding the transcripts, has an academic psychology
286 background. Her personal experience of loneliness and lack of belongingness during time living abroad
287 alone for several years made her interested in determining whether the KBP project made people feel
288 more connected to another. The other two researchers involved in analysis of qualitative data are
289 academic researchers with anthropology (EP) and social work (BLE) backgrounds and are the
290 Coordinator and a Co-investigator of the UKRI-funded Loneliness and Social Isolation in Mental
291 Health Research Network, respectively. They were involved in the discussion regarding the coding
292 framework and brought their perspectives from their own personal, professional and academic
293 experiences to the analysis. All the researchers had participated in KBP, which helped them better
294 understand what people reflected in the transcripts.

295

296 *2.7.3 Data analysis*

297 The current study utilised both inductive and deductive approaches. Regarding the inductive analysis,
298 the lead researcher first read through all the transcripts to become intimately familiar with the data sets'
299 contents and made some preliminary notes on the initial insights relevant to the research questions.
300 For deductive analysis, there were some preliminary concepts (supplementary material 2) regarding
301 the potential impacts of the KBP project proposed by the key stakeholder, the MHC. The preliminary
302 concepts were considered as codes while analysing the qualitative data.

303

304 Codes relevant to the research questions were generated inductively and deductively based on the
305 semantic meaning of the responses and the latent meaning or the interpretation of the contents. The
306 codes could be modified iteratively throughout the coding process to accommodate new ideas. After
307 the codes were created, a cluster of codes sharing unifying features were combined into a higher-level
308 subtheme or theme depending on how well it described a coherent and meaningful pattern in the data.
309 The codes arising from the transcripts and the theme framework were discussed with other researchers
310 to achieve a consensus, which would enhance the trustworthiness and credibility of the results. Themes
311 concerning the research questions were reviewed and adjusted to capture better the overall tone of the
312 entire dataset. Finally, the patterns and relationships of the themes were interpreted. The participation
313 level (full or partial) was also added as an attribute of classification to the participants. Commonalities
314 and variations of the themes were compared between participants in different participation groups.
315

316 **3 Results**

317 318 *3.1 Quantitative results*

319 There were 1239 participants who registered online to take part in the KBP card exchange, of which
320 709 had valid baseline measures, and 289 had both valid baseline and follow-up measures. Details
321 regarding the number of individuals at each stage of the project are provided in Figure 1.
322

323 [Figure 1 about here](#)

324 325 *3.1.1 Descriptive characteristics*

326 For the participants in our study who completed both questionnaires, most people (N=254, 88%) were
327 aged between 18–60 years, with equal numbers (44%) in the 19-40 and 41-60 categories. Most
328 participants were female (N=271, 94%) and white (N=278, 96%). The mean wellbeing score for these
329 participants was 20.7 (SD=3.48) at baseline and was 21.5 (SD=3.86) at follow-up. Eighty one percent
330 (N=229) of participants sent and received a card, and 19% (N=54) only sent but did not receive one.
331 Hardly anybody (N=6) received a card but did not send one. Compared to the people who only
332 completed the before-questionnaire, participants completing both questionnaires were generally older
333 and had a lower baseline sense of belonging. There was also weak evidence that more completers were
334 female. There was no evidence of any other differences between completers and non-completers. Table
335 1 shows participants' descriptive statistics summarised according to completer status.
336

337 [Table 1 about here](#)

338 339 *3.1.2 Analysis for research question 1*

340 A simple linear regression provided strong evidence that participants had greater wellbeing after taking
341 part in the programme (estimated change from baseline to follow-up: 0.77; 95% CI: 0.44 to 1.10;
342 $p < 0.001$; standardised effect size=0.21). For the secondary outcomes, the Pearson and Spearman's rank
343 correlation tests showed that the baseline measures of wellbeing, loneliness, sense of belonging and
344 hope were not collinear to each other ($|r| < 0.7$, see Table 2, Dormann et al., 2013). There was strong
345 evidence that loneliness scores decreased from baseline to follow-up (estimated change: -0.28; 95%
346 CI: -0.43 to -0.13; $p < 0.001$; standardised effect size=0.15), and sense of belonging also improved

347 (estimated change: 1.98; 95% CI:1.44 to 2.52; $p<0.001$; standardised effect size=0.37). There was
348 strong evidence that the risk to have no change in hope was more than three time the risk to have
349 positive change (relative risk ratio for no change vs positive change=3.12, 95% CI: 2.36 to 4.13,
350 $p<0.001$). However, although a large majority (N=203, 70%) reported no change in hope, there was
351 strong evidence that participants in the KBP programme were three times more likely to experience an
352 increase in hope than a decrease (RR for negative vs positive change: 0.32; 95% CI: 0.20 to 0.53;
353 $p<0.001$). Table 3 provides further details.

354

355 [Table 2 about here](#)

356

357 *3.1.3 Analysis for research question 2*

358 There was no evidence that baseline loneliness was associated with wellbeing improvements ($p=0.732$)
359 or that level of participation in the project was related to wellbeing changes ($p=0.556$). Please see Table
360 3 for further details.

361

362 [Table 3 about here](#)

363

364 *3.2 Qualitative results*

365 Four overarching themes were identified with the 289 transcripts: motivators, potential mechanisms,
366 project impacts, evaluations and suggestions for improvements. There were no additional codes or
367 themes added after checking the other 99 transcripts.

368

369 [Table 4 about here](#)

370

371 *Theme 1. Motivators*

372 The first theme captures the reasons why participants decided to take part in the project.

373

374 *Sub-theme 1a. Altruism*

375 Participants perceived that the KBP project could help others, which motivated them to initiate the
376 kindness behaviours and take part. They considered that their kindness of sending a card would benefit
377 others; for example, *'It is a brilliant way to show kindness and help uplift a stranger (ID32)'*. Some
378 participants also noted that taking part in the project gave them an opportunity to show care towards
379 others, *'I hoped the recipient knew someone was thinking about them (ID41)'*.

380

381 *Sub-theme 1b. Anticipate receiving*

382 Participants stated that taking part in this exchange programme enabled them to look forward to
383 receiving a handmade card from a strange. Responders wrote that *'I looked forward to receiving the
384 card all week and checked the post more often than I normally would (ID206)'*.

385

386 *Sub-theme 1c. Difficult time*

387 Some participants reflected that they faced mental difficulties, stress or low mood when the project
388 was advertised. Therefore, they hoped to take part in this positive project with an expectation of feeling

389 more encouraged. One responder commented that *'Valentine's Day was a sad day for me this year*
390 *(ID187)'*. Participants also felt lonely during Valentine's Day, making them more willing to connect to
391 the world, *'As a single person, I guess I can feel a little left out on Valentine's day (ID179)'*.

392

393 Theme 2. Potential mechanisms

394 Participants described four potential mechanisms that may influence their experience of the
395 programme.

396

397 *Sub-theme 2a. Pleasure in making a card*

398 Many participants mentioned that they enjoyed the processes of making a card because they could
399 slow down and spend time being creative and making artistic items. This process promoted self-care.
400 Participants wrote that *'I loved making the card & being creative (ID72); It made me think what would*
401 *make me happy (ID164)'*.

402

403 *Sub-theme 2b. Pleasure in sending a card*

404 Some people stated that they enjoyed giving something that others might find helpful, *'I sent two cards,*
405 *and both individually handmade by me, and if it brightened someone's day, then I'm delighted (ID28)'*.

406

407 *Sub-theme 2c. Individual fulfilment*

408 Participants obtained personal fulfilment by taking part in such a meaningful and national-wide project.
409 The sending experiences made them feel proud of themselves, *'Sending someone a card of good wishes*
410 *made me feel useful (ID35)'*.

411

412 *Sub-theme 2d. Appreciate other's thoughts and behaviours*

413 A substantial number of participants commented that it was really nice to receive a card from a stranger,
414 and they appreciated others making beautiful handmade cards with thoughtful messages; they felt
415 cared for by others, *'Really appreciated the words and effort (ID84)'*.

416

417 Theme 3. Project impacts

418 This theme captures the perceived project impacts.

419

420 *Sub-theme 3a. Positive affective impacts*

421 Participants had positive changes in their mood by taking part in the project. They felt joyful, excited,
422 warmed and inspired after the card-exchange, *'It gave me a lovely warm feeling for days afterwards*
423 *(ID144)'*.

424

425 *Sub-theme 3b. Feel the self is special and valued*

426 Receiving a card and performing a highly meaningful task that benefited others made people feel
427 valued and special to themselves and others, '*Receiving it made me feel very special (ID88)*'.

428

429 *Sub-theme 3c. Connection*

430 Participants reflected that the exchange programme provided an opportunity to connect to others
431 despite being strangers. Hence, they felt less lonely: '*I feel connected to my 'senders', even though I*
432 *don't know them (ID200); It made me feel less lonely in the world (ID12)*'. Participants also found that
433 the project restored their faith in humanity: '*Restored some faith in the kindness of people (ID162)*'.

434

435 *Sub-theme 3d. Negative experiences*

436 There were only few negative experiences compared to positive impacts reported in the responses.
437 Some people felt sad when they did not receive a card, '*I found it hard not receiving a card. Felt*
438 *disappointed and sad (ID136)*'. Others felt disappointed getting an inappropriate card, '*upon opening*
439 *I got a little disheartened as the person clearly hadn't put as much effort in (ID54)*'. Additionally, the
440 stress felt when attempting to make a good card was also a negative experience for some, '*I felt quite*
441 *pressured to create something worthy of sending (ID68)*'.

442

443 *Theme 4. Evaluations and suggestions for improvements*

444 This theme describes participants' appraisal of the project and participants' advice for improving it in
445 the future.

446

447 *Sub-theme 4a. Positive project evaluations*

448 Participants commented that they loved the idea of the project, which was relatively simple in its
449 procedures but was highly positive and spread kindness, '*I love the idea of random acts of kindness*
450 *(ID53); 'Such a great movement (ID185)*'.

451

452 *Sub-theme 4b. Unpredictable*

453 Participants noted many uncertainties in the project. For example, they were unsure about the
454 recipient's responses when receiving the card, '*Weird to not know how they were received (ID3)*'.
455 Moreover, participants understood that there was no guarantee of receiving a card, which may be a
456 risk for those who were vulnerable and did not receive a card, '*It could devastate someone who is very*
457 *lonely and depressed if they did not get one (ID72)*'.

458

459 *Sub-theme 4c. Suggestions for improvements*

460 Participants provided some suggestions for improving the project. For example, they considered that
461 improving the project's publicity and providing participants with confirmation that their card had been

462 received, and that they would receive a back-up card if they requested one, could be useful. They
463 suggested that the back-up system would raise a second expectation of receiving a card, but it might
464 even be hurtful if the additional card was not received; thus, this back-up system should be further
465 developed. Further details about the stranger, such as their age or more personalised information, might
466 be helpful when making the cards.

467

468 Overall, few substantial differences were observed in participants' programme experiences with
469 different participation levels (sent and received/sent but not received/not sent but received). However,
470 among the six participants who did not send but did receive a card, none of them identified the project
471 could be an altruistic action, and this group exclusively reported the code of guilt (see supplementary
472 material 3). Moreover, compared to the others, participants who sent but did not receive a card
473 responded more about the disappointment of not receiving a card and had less positive affective
474 emotions. People who sent and received a card reported more individual fulfilments compared to the
475 other two groups. Further details about the themes and codes can be found in supplementary material
476 3.

477

478 **4. Discussion**

479

480 *4.1 Main findings and interpretations*

481 The current study evaluated a nationwide participatory public mental health project and has provided
482 preliminary indications that the KBP project may help improve people's wellbeing, loneliness and
483 sense of belonging. The 0.77-point increase on the SWEMWBS measure for the KBP only has a small
484 standardised effect size just above 0.2; however, this meets established thresholds for a meaningful,
485 non-negligible change (Shah et al., 2018). The results also suggest that, although this project might not
486 affect any change in hope for most people, taking part in the project is more likely to result in increased
487 hope for the future than a loss of hope. Contrary to the hypotheses, the results provided no evidence
488 that the level of loneliness at baseline affected the impacts of GBV on participants' wellbeing. There
489 was also no evidence of differences in wellbeing outcomes between people who sent and received a
490 card and those who only gave or only received a card.

491

492 Although there was, on average, a small change in wellbeing and loneliness found in the quantitative
493 results, the experiences shared in the qualitative results suggested that the experience of taking part in
494 the project could be joyous and warm, which had quite large and sustained affective impacts for some.
495 Qualitative and quantitative results both suggested that sending the kindness cards in this project could
496 improve wellbeing, which further supported the evidence in the previous literature that performing
497 acts of kindness promotes wellbeing and affective emotions (Curry et al., 2018, p4). Furthermore, the
498 qualitative results indicated that the process of making and sending was highly positive for people,
499 with engaging in a creative act and helping others both being important to many participants. These
500 observations may help explain the quantitative finding that improvements in wellbeing were not
501 different for those who only gave a card from those who also received one.

502

503 The qualitative results also revealed some potential mechanisms explaining how the KBP project may
504 have helped people improve wellbeing and loneliness. First, the participants perceived the project to
505 be an altruistic action benefiting others, which motivated them to send cards to strangers. Participants

506 could increase personal fulfilment by thinking that they were performing a significantly meaningful
507 task to help others, increasing their self-esteem and happiness. This finding aligns with the previous
508 literature noting that people could derive satisfaction and gain more resources from the kindness
509 behaviours that help others, which makes them happy (Curry et al., 2018, p11).

510
511 The findings also illustrated that enjoyment in making cards allowed people respite from the pressures
512 of life and spend time being creative, which promoted self-care and made them feel joyful. This
513 observation agrees with some studies proposing that engaging in creative activities may enhance
514 positive mood and make people flourish (Dunn et al., 2008; Forgeard and Eichner, 2014). The card-
515 making processes enabled people to search for positive quotes, poems and goodwill messages to write
516 kind words, and it also allowed them to make an artistic card creatively. Lomas (2016) suggested that
517 art and literature integrate the essence of humanity, and such artistic expression and appreciation helps
518 people make sense of their lives and enriches their experiences, both of which can substantially
519 improve wellbeing. Ryan and Deci (2000) also proposed that engaging in creative activities could
520 satisfy the need for autonomy, which may boost wellbeing. Creatively developing good ideas offers a
521 sense that one could master a piece of work. This self-sufficiency might evoke the positive emotions
522 of pleasure and pride (Amabile et al., 2005, p369), which are the key components in wellbeing
523 enhancement.

524
525 Gratitude for others' efforts for the kind messages and handmade cards was also shown to not only
526 make people feel excited and warmed while receiving, but it also enabled them to feel special and
527 cherished. Consequently, participants could establish a close connection with the sender and the world
528 because they felt cared for and loved by others. The benefits of receiving kindness that have been
529 evidenced were mainly about the positive affective impacts (Pressman et al., 2015, Lyubomirsky and
530 Layous, 2013; Nadler, 2017) or one's self-efficacy, feeling of fulfilment and closeness in intimate
531 relationships (Gleason et al., 2003, p1042). The qualitative results in this study suggested that receiving
532 kindness from the KBP could improve wellbeing, and it could also help with the collective aspects of
533 loneliness that people felt more included in society. However, due to the positive impacts of receiving
534 kindness, the experiences of not receiving a card might be a potential barrier to the project's benefits
535 for some people.

536 537 *4.2 Strengths and limitations*

538 This study is novel in utilising a mixed-methods design to understand how kindness acts in a public
539 mental health project improve wellbeing and reduce loneliness for both the giver and the receiver. It
540 provides insight into the potential mechanisms explaining which components in the kind acts could
541 enhance wellbeing and reduce loneliness. It also has the significant advantage of using nationwide data
542 to explore the effectiveness of a public programme involving acts of kindness for promoting general
543 wellbeing and social connection in a large social community.

544
545 Despite these strengths, there are still some limitations identified in this study. First, there was no
546 control group in this pre-post study. As a result, it is not possible to draw strong inferences about the
547 effectiveness of the KBP intervention (Fitz-Gibbon and Morris, 1987), i.e., it is unclear whether the
548 improvements in wellbeing and loneliness were entirely attributed to the impacts of taking part in KBP,
549 or people merely felt better after Valentine's Day – for instance, because Valentine's Day was over, or

550 with the flourish of spring.

551

552 Regarding the study measures: to maintain a good response rate, the questionnaire was designed to be
553 sufficiently brief to capture the four individual outcomes (Edwards et al., 2002). Thus, there were a
554 limited number of questions extracted from the structured measures for belongingness and hope, which
555 might potentially reduce the measures' reliability (Goodman et al., 2015). This brief-measure issue
556 was particularly prominent when analysing hope. Merely including a single item made it less sensitive
557 for discriminating the change in hope over time, which might explain why most participants reported
558 no change in hope. Moreover, this study only used brief online free-text responses for the qualitative
559 analysis. The content in these materials was not always clear or in-depth; hence, it might be difficult
560 to capture a full understanding of the experiences of the project.

561

562 Regarding the participants of KBP, participants in the current datasets were mostly white and female,
563 potentially because the project was called 'Great British Valentines', which failed to attract some ethnic
564 minority groups from distinct cultures or religions that do not celebrate Valentine's Day. Therefore, the
565 results might not generalise to ethnic minorities or to men. In addition, the insufficient number of
566 people from non-White British ethnic groups does not allow us to explore whether this cultural
567 homogeneity may enhance the programme's effects, if a card is received from someone with some
568 shared cultural experience and perspectives, or conversely whether exchanges with people different
569 from oneself are even more connecting and powerful. Furthermore, we lacked data about other
570 characteristics of interest for participants, for instance their socio-economic or marital/partnership
571 status, with which to describe our sample or explore potential moderators of the programme's effects.
572 Regarding the data available to the researchers, participants who continued to complete the
573 questionnaire at follow-up were generally older and had a lower level of belongingness than those who
574 only completed the baseline measures. Therefore, there might be an attrition bias in the study data.
575 Additionally, there were only six people who did not send but received a card. Therefore, this study
576 might miss the experiences shared by this group, and whether the KBP helped them was unclear.
577 Finally, the collection date for the 'After questionnaire' was only one week after the intervention. This
578 study does not tell us whether the enhancement in wellbeing and decrease in loneliness due to this
579 project would be maintained over the longer term.

580

581 *4.3 Implications*

582

583 *4.3.1 Implications for practice*

584 The current study has shown that the KPB project has the potential to enhance wellbeing and reduce
585 loneliness for the general population. This supports providing more KBP card exchanges in more
586 contexts in the future, particularly during periods when people are vulnerable to mental or physical
587 difficulties due to social isolation or natural disasters (Emerson et al., 2020), although sufficiently
588 powered randomised controlled trials are required to provide more robust evidence on efficacy. It could
589 be an inexpensive intervention to improve public wellbeing and reduce loneliness worldwide for
590 people under the current social isolation orders due to the Covid-19 pandemic (Clair et al., 2021;
591 Grover et al., 2020). However, our study suggests it may be helpful to strengthen some procedures to
592 maximise benefits and mitigate any negative experiences of the KBP project. First, our qualitative
593 findings suggest that not receiving a card may reduce the likelihood of project benefits. Therefore,

594 strengthening the back-up system to provide an additional card may be helpful, to ensure that everyone
595 could receive a card. It may also be helpful to set up a way for participants to confirm online that they
596 have sent a card; otherwise, they could receive a reminder. Additionally, it might be helpful for
597 participants to know whether their card was received by the recipient in a direct or indirect feedback
598 system. People may derive satisfaction from their kindness behaviours that are appreciated by others,
599 potentially enhancing the project's effectiveness (Curry et al., 2018, p11; Ouweneel et al., 2014).

600

601 *4.3.2 Implications for research*

602 Most importantly, it is desirable to utilise a more robust design in future evaluations, such as
603 randomised control trials that introduce a comparison group to obtain more robust evidence of the
604 project's effectiveness. To explore the generalisability of our results, further research could recruit
605 more participants with various demographic characteristics and cultural backgrounds in other KBP
606 projects (such as currently planned MHC projects aimed at Pentecostal Christian churches over Easter,
607 a new trial of Ramadan KBP or one for elderly people in care homes) to obtain more evidence across
608 a broader population. Comparisons between demographic subgroups could potentially explore the
609 influence of cultural homogeneity on the effectiveness of the KBP. It is also of interest for future
610 evaluations to include a wider range of measures including not only wellbeing, loneliness but also
611 fulfilment, self-esteem and the positive affective emotions that were the project's impacts as reported
612 in the current qualitative results. More in-depth qualitative interviews with participants are also
613 necessary to help understand the mechanisms and experiences better.

614

615 Another intriguing direction for future research would be to analyse how long the positive outcomes
616 are maintained after the kindness interventions. The creative processes in the kindness acts that
617 promote wellbeing and affective emotions might last no more than two days (Conner et al., 2018;
618 Amabile et al., 2005). Ouweneel and colleagues (2014) suggested that the effects of kindness acts
619 could lessen as time progresses, whereas Seligman et al. (2005) argued that such effects could last for
620 several months. Therefore, future research could potentially involve a longitudinal study tracking the
621 KBP project's impacts. Additionally, the positive outcomes of this project were achieved with
622 participants whose average wellbeing scores were nearly three quarters of a standard deviation below
623 the population norm (Ng Fat et al., 2017). Therefore, future studies could investigate whether the KBP
624 might also work well specifically for people with depression. Finally, researchers could also perform
625 a cost-effectiveness study for the KBP project to determine whether the modest gains in wellbeing and
626 loneliness found in this study represent good value for money.

627

628 **5. Conclusion**

629 This study showed preliminary evidence that the KBP project may enhance wellbeing and reduce
630 loneliness. The sending process seems to play a crucial role in the main positive impacts of the project.
631 Qualitative reports suggests that altruism motivates people to initiate kindness behaviours, through
632 which people may obtain personal fulfilment, and this could potentially enhance wellbeing. Moreover,
633 receiving kindness enhances self-esteem and enables participants to perceive a connection with the
634 sender who provides kindness, even though they are a stranger and there is no ongoing contact. Thus,
635 the social connection might reduce participants' loneliness. Therefore, this study supports providing
636 future KBP projects, as a new initiative that is not only simple and cheap but may also be powerful for
637 wellbeing promotion and loneliness prevention in the community.

638

639 **List of abbreviations**

640 KBP: Kindness by Post

641 GBV: Great British Valentines

642 SWEMWBS: Short Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale

643 UCLA: University of California at Los Angeles

644 GBS: General Belongingness Scale

645 UCL: University College London

646

647 **Competing interests:** The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

648

649 **Consent for publication:** Not applicable

650

651 **Ethics approval and consent to participate:** The study received ethical approval from UCL
652 [reference number: 18307 001]. Participation in the study was voluntary and all participants whose
653 data was analysed consented by proceeding the questionnaires to take part.

654

655 **Funding:** EP and BLE are supported by funding from UK Research and Innovation, through the
656 Loneliness and Social Isolation in Mental Health Research Network (Grant number: ES/S004440/1).
657 The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of UKRI.

658

659 **Availability of data and materials:** The datasets generated and/or analysed during the current study
660 are not publicly available due the protection of the confidentiality of research participants, but are
661 available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

662

663 **Authors' contributions:** CW performed the data analysis, drafted the ethical application forms and
664 the research report. BL and EP helped proceed the ethical approval, revised the qualitative coding
665 framework and provided feedback to the report to improve the writing-up. RJ helped with the
666 quantitative data analysis. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

667

668 **References**

669

670 Aked, J., Marks, N., Cordon, C. & Thompson, S. (2008). Five Ways to Wellbeing: A report presented
671 to the Foresight Project on communicating the evidence base for improving people's well-being.
672 London: New Economics Foundation.

673 Amabile, T. M., Barsade, S. G., Mueller, J. S., and Staw, B. M. (2005). Affect and creativity at work.
674 *Administrative science quarterly*, 50(3), 367-403. doi:10.2189/asqu.2005.50.3.367

675 Apaolaza, V., Hartmann, P., Medina, E., Barrutia, J.M., and Echebarria, C. (2013). The relationship
676 between socializing on the Spanish online networking site Tuenti and teenagers' subjective wellbeing:
677 *The roles of self-esteem and loneliness. Computers in Human Behavior* 29(4), 1282-1289. doi:
678 10.1016/j.chb.2013.01.002

679 Baumeister, R. F., and Leary, M. R. (1995). The Need to Belong: Desire for Interpersonal Attachments
680 as a Fundamental Human Motivation. *Psychological Bulletin* 117, 497-529. doi:10.1037/0033-
681 2909.117.3.497.

- 682 Beck, A.T., Steer, R.A., and Brown, G.K. (1996). Beck depression inventory (BDI-II). Pearson.
- 683 Braun, V., and Clarke, V. (2012). Thematic analysis. *APA handbook of research methods in psychology,*
684 *Vol 2: Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological.*, 57–71.
685 doi:10.1037/13620-004.
- 686 Cacioppo, J. T., Ernst, J. M., Burleson, M. H., McClintock, M. K., Malarkey, W. B., Hawkley, L. C.,
687 et al. (2000). Lonely traits and concomitant physiological processes: the MacArthur social
688 neuroscience studies. *International journal of psychophysiology: official journal of the*
689 *International Organization of Psychophysiology* 35, 143–154. doi:10.1016/S0167-
690 8760(99)00049-5.
- 691 Cacioppo, J.T., and Hawkley, L.C. (2003). Social isolation and health, with an emphasis on underlying
692 mechanisms. *Perspect Biol Med* 46(3 Suppl), S39-52.
- 693 Cacioppo, S., Grippo, A.J., London, S., Goossens, L., and Cacioppo, J.T. (2015). Loneliness: clinical
694 import and interventions. *Perspect Psychol Sci* 10(2), 238-249. doi: 10.1177/1745691615570616.
- 695 Clair, R., Gordon, M., Kroon, M., and Reilly, C. (2021). The effects of social isolation on well-being
696 and life satisfaction during pandemic. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications* 2021 8:1
697 8, 1–6. doi:10.1057/s41599-021-00710-3.
- 698 Conner, T. S., DeYoung, C. G., and Silvia, P. J. (2018). Everyday creative activity as a path to
699 flourishing. *Journal of Positive Psychology* 13, 181–189. doi:10.1080/17439760.2016.1257049.
- 700 Curry, O. S., Rowland, L. A., Van Lissa, C. J., Zlotowitz, S., McAlaney, J., & Whitehouse, H. (2018).
701 Happy to help? A systematic review and meta-analysis of the effects of performing acts of
702 kindness on the well-being of the actor. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 76, 320–329.
703 doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2018.02.014.
- 704 de Jong-Gierveld, J. (1998). A review of loneliness: Concepts and definitions, determinants and
705 consequences. *Reviews in Clinical Gerontology*, (8), 73-80. doi:10.1017/S0959259898008090.
- 706 Dormann, C. F., Elith, J., Bacher, S., Buchmann, C., Carl, G., Carré, G., et al. (2013). Collinearity: a
707 review of methods to deal with it and a simulation study evaluating their performance. *Ecography*
708 36, 27–46. doi:10.1111/J.1600-0587.2012.07348.X.
- 709 Dunn, E.W., Aknin, L.B., and Norton, M.I. (2008). Spending money on others promotes happiness.
710 *Science* 319(5870), 1687-1688. doi:10.1126/science.1150952.
- 711 Edwards, P., Roberts, I., Clarke, M., DiGiuseppi, C., Pratap, S., Wentz, R., and Kwan, I. (2002).
712 Increasing response rates to postal questionnaires: systematic review. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*,
713 324(7347), 1183. doi:10.1136/bmj.324.7347.1183.
- 714 Emerson, E., Fortune, N., Aitken, Z., Hatton, C., Stancliffe, R., and Llewellyn, G. (2020). The
715 wellbeing of working-age adults with and without disability in the UK: Associations with age,
716 gender, ethnicity, partnership status, educational attainment and employment status. *Disabil*
717 *Health J* 13(3), 100889. doi: 10.1016/j.dhjo.2020.100889.
- 718 Filep, S., Macnaughton, J., Glover, T., Filep, S., Macnaughton, J., and Glover, T. (2017). Tourism and
719 gratitude: Valuing acts of kindness. *Annals of Tourism Research* 66, 26–36.
720 doi:10.1016/J.ANNALS.2017.05.015.
- 721 Fitz-Gibbon, C. T. and Morris L. L. (1978). How To Design a Program Evaluation. Program Evaluation
722 Kit, 3.
- 723 Forgeard, M. J. C., and Eichner, K. v. (2014). Creativity as a Target and Tool for Positive Interventions.
724 *The Wiley Blackwell Handbook of Positive Psychological Interventions*, 135–154.
725 doi:10.1002/9781118315927.CH7.

- 726 Gleason, M. E., Iida, M., Bolger, N., and Shrout, P. E. (2003). Daily supportive equity in close
727 relationships. *Personality & social psychology bulletin*, 29(8), 1036–1045.
728 doi:10.1177/0146167203253473.
- 729 Goodman, A., Wrigley, J., Silversides, K., and Venus-Balgobin, N. (2015). Measuring your impact on
730 loneliness in later life. London UK: Campaign to End Loneliness.
- 731 Grover, S., Sahoo, S., Mehra, A., Avasthi, A., Tripathi, A., Subramanyan, et al. (2020). Psychological
732 impact of COVID-19 lockdown: An online survey from India. *Indian journal of psychiatry*, 62(4),
733 354–362. doi:10.4103/psychiatry.IndianJPsychiatry_427_20
- 734 Hawkey, L. C., and Cacioppo, J. T. (2010). Loneliness matters: a theoretical and empirical review of
735 consequences and mechanisms. *Annals of behavioral medicine : a publication of the Society of*
736 *Behavioral Medicine*, 40(2), 218–227. doi:10.1007/s12160-010-9210-8.
- 737 Houghton, S., Hattie, J., Carroll, A., Wood, L., and Baffour, B. (2016). It Hurts To Be Lonely!
738 Loneliness and Positive Mental Wellbeing in Australian Rural and Urban Adolescents. *Journal of*
739 *Psychologists and Counsellors in Schools* 26, 52–67. doi:10.1017/JGC.2016.1.
- 740 Hutcherson, C.A., Seppala, E.M., and Gross, J.J. (2008). Loving-kindness meditation increases social
741 connectedness. *Emotion* 8(5), 720-724. doi: 10.1037/a0013237.
- 742 Jopling, K., & Sserwanja, I. (2016). Loneliness across the life course: a rapid review of the evidence.
743 Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, UK Branch.
- 744 Kaffke, L. (2018). Can “Acts of Kindness “enhance mental well-being and flourishing in individuals
745 from the general Dutch population? , University of Twente.
- 746 Kearns, A., Whitley, E., Tannahill, C., and Ellaway, A. (2015). Loneliness, social relations and health
747 and well-being in deprived communities. *Psychology, health & medicine* 20, 332–344.
748 doi:10.1080/13548506.2014.940354.
- 749 Layous, K., Lee, H., Choi, I., and Lyubomirsky, S. (2013). Culture matters when designing a successful
750 happiness-increasing activity: A comparison of the United States and South Korea. *Journal of*
751 *Cross-Cultural Psychology* 44(8), 1294-1303. doi:10.1177/0022022113487591.
- 752 Layous, K., Nelson, S.K., Kurtz, J.L., and Lyubomirsky, S. (2017). What triggers prosocial effort? A
753 positive feedback loop between positive activities, kindness, and well-being. *The Journal of*
754 *Positive Psychology* 12(4), 385-398. doi:10.1080/17439760.2016.1198924.
- 755 Lee, S. L., Pearce, E., Ajnakina, O., Johnson, S., Lewis, G., Mann, F., et al. (2021). The association
756 between loneliness and depressive symptoms among adults aged 50 years and older: a 12-year
757 population-based cohort study. *The Lancet Psychiatry* 8, 48–57. doi:10.1016/S2215-
758 0366(20)30383-7.
- 759 Lomas, T. (2016). Positive art: Artistic expression and appreciation as an exemplary vehicle for
760 flourishing. *Review of General Psychology*, 20(2), 171-182. doi:10.1037/gpr0000073.
- 761 Lyubomirsky, S., and Layous, K. (2013). How do simple positive activities increase well-being?.
762 *Current directions in psychological science*, 22(1), 57-62. doi: 10.1177/0963721412469809.
- 763 Lyubomirsky, S., King, L., and Diener, E. (2005a). The benefits of frequent positive affect: does
764 happiness lead to success? *Psychol Bull* 131(6), 803-855. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.131.6.803.
- 765 Lyubomirsky, S., Sheldon, K. M., and Schkade, D. (2005b). Pursuing happiness: The architecture of
766 sustainable change. *Review of General Psychology* 9, 111–131. doi:10.1037/1089-2680.9.2.111.
- 767 Malone, G.P., Pillow, D.R., and Osman, A. (2012). The general belongingness scale (GBS): Assessing
768 achieved belongingness. *Personality and individual differences* 52(3), 311-316. doi:
769 10.1016/j.paid.2011.10.027.

- 770 Murberg, T.A. (2004). Long-term effect of social relationships on mortality in patients with congestive
771 heart failure. *Int J Psychiatry Med* 34(3), 207-217. doi: 10.2190/gkj2-p8bd-v59x-mjnj.
- 772 Nadler, A. (2017). The human essence in helping relations: Belongingness, independence, and status.
773 The Oxford handbook of the human essence, 1, 123-134.
- 774 Ng Fat, L., Scholes, S., Boniface, S., Mindell, J., and Stewart-Brown, S. (2017). Evaluating and
775 establishing national norms for mental wellbeing using the short Warwick-Edinburgh Mental
776 Well-being Scale (SWEMWBS): findings from the Health Survey for England. *Quality of life
777 research : an international journal of quality of life aspects of treatment, care and rehabilitation*,
778 26(5), 1129–1144. doi:10.1007/s11136-016-1454-8.
- 779 O'Brien, B.C., Harris, I.B., Beckman, T.J., Reed, D.A., and Cook, D.A. (2014). Standards for reporting
780 qualitative research: a synthesis of recommendations. *Acad Med* 89(9), 1245-1251. doi:
781 10.1097/acm.0000000000000388.
- 782 Otake, K., Shimai, S., Tanaka-Matsumi, J., Otsui, K., and Fredrickson, B.L. (2006). HAPPY PEOPLE
783 BECOME HAPPIER THROUGH KINDNESS: A COUNTING KINDNESSES
784 INTERVENTION. *J Happiness Stud* 7(3), 361-375. doi: 10.1007/s10902-005-3650-z.
- 785 Otnes, C., Ruth, J.A., and Milbourne, C.C. (1994). The pleasure and pain of being close: Men's mixed
786 feelings about participation in Valentine's Day gift exchange. *ACR North American Advances*.
- 787 Ouweneel, E., Le Blanc, P.M., and Schaufeli, W.B. (2014). On being grateful and kind: results of two
788 randomized controlled trials on study-related emotions and academic engagement. *J Psychol*
789 148(1), 37-60. doi: 10.1080/00223980.2012.742854.
- 790 Perlman, D., & Peplau, L. A. (1981). "Personal Relationships: 3. Relationships in Disorder," in the
791 *Toward a Social Psychology of Loneliness*, ed. R. Gilmour, & S. Duck (London: Academic Press),
792 31-56.
- 793 Pressman, S.D., Kraft, T.L., and Cross, M.P. (2015). It's good to do good and receive good: The impact
794 of a 'pay it forward' style kindness intervention on giver and receiver well-being. *The Journal of
795 Positive Psychology* 10(4), 293-302. doi: 10.1080/17439760.2014.965269.
- 796 Ruini, C., Belaise, C., Brombin, C., Caffo, E., and Fava, G.A. (2006). Well-being therapy in school
797 settings: a pilot study. *Psychother Psychosom* 75(6), 331-336. doi: 10.1159/000095438.
- 798 Russell, D.W. (1996). UCLA Loneliness Scale (Version 3): reliability, validity, and factor structure. *J
799 Pers Assess* 66(1), 20-40. doi: 10.1207/s15327752jpa6601_2.
- 800 Ryan, R. M., and Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic
801 motivation, social development, and well-being. *The American psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78. doi:
802 0.1037//0003-066x.55.1.68.
- 803 Ryan, R.M., and Deci, E.L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: a review of research on
804 hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annu Rev Psychol* 52, 141-166. doi:
805 10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.141.
- 806 Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological
807 well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069–1081. doi:0.1037/0022-
808 3514.57.6.1069.
- 809 Ryff, C.D. (2014). Psychological well-being revisited: advances in the science and practice of
810 eudaimonia. *Psychother Psychosom* 83(1), 10-28. doi: 10.1159/000353263.
- 811 Seligman, M. E., Steen, T. A., Park, N., and Peterson, C. (2005). Positive psychology progress:
812 empirical validation of interventions. *The American psychologist*, 60(5), 410–421. doi:
813 10.1037/0003-066X.60.5.410.

- 814 Shah, N., Cader, M., Andrews, W.P., Wijesekera, D., and Stewart-Brown, S.L. (2018). Responsiveness
815 of the Short Warwick Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale (SWEMWBS): evaluation a clinical
816 sample. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 16(1), 239. doi: 10.1186/s12955-018-1060-2.
- 817 Sin, N.L., and Lyubomirsky, S. (2009). Enhancing well-being and alleviating depressive symptoms
818 with positive psychology interventions: a practice-friendly meta-analysis. *J Clin Psychol* 65(5),
819 467-487. doi: 10.1002/jclp.20593.
- 820 Stewart-Brown, S., Tennant, A., Tennant, R., Platt, S., Parkinson, J., and Weich, S. (2009). Internal
821 construct validity of the Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS): a Rasch
822 analysis using data from the Scottish Health Education Population Survey. *Health Qual Life*
823 *Outcomes* 7, 15. doi:10.1186/1477-7525-7-15.
- 824 Valtorta, N., and Hanratty, B. (2012). Loneliness, isolation and the health of older adults: do we need
825 a new research agenda? *J R Soc Med* 105(12), 518-522. doi:10.1258/jrsm.2012.120128.
- 826 Wang, J., Mann, F., Lloyd-Evans, B., Ma, R., and Johnson, S. (2018). Associations between loneliness
827 and perceived social support and outcomes of mental health problems: a systematic review. *BMC*
828 *psychiatry*, 18(1), 156. doi:10.1186/s12888-018-1736-5.
- 829 Weiss, L. A., Westerhof, G. J., and Bohlmeijer, E. T. (2016). Can We Increase Psychological Well-
830 Being? The Effects of Interventions on Psychological Well-Being: A Meta-Analysis of
831 Randomized Controlled Trials. *PloS one* 11. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0158092.
- 832 Wood, A.M., and Joseph, S. (2010). The absence of positive psychological (eudemonic) well-being as
833 a risk factor for depression: a ten year cohort study. *J Affect Disord* 122(3), 213-217. doi:
834 10.1016/j.jad.2009.06.032.

835

836 **Acknowledgements:**

837 We thank Dr Amy Pollard, the Director of the Mental Health Collective and organiser of the ‘Kindness
838 by Post’ project, for her support for this study, for providing access to the study data and for
839 contributing to development of themes for the qualitative analysis.

840 We also extend thanks to the participants for contributing their data to the current research.

Table 1: Demographic characteristics and baseline measures of participants.

		Non-completers: (N=420)	Completers: (N=289)	Difference between non-completers vs completers	
Demographic characteristics					
		N(%)	N(%)	*P value	
Age (years)	19–40	32(55%)	127(44%)	0.007	
	41–60	156(37%)	127(44%)		
	Over 60	32(8%)	35(12%)		
Gender	Female	372(89%)	271(94%)	0.061	
	Male	41(10%)	16(6%)		
	Non-binary, prefer not to say	7(2%)	2(1%)		
Ethnicity	White	384(91%)	278(96%)	0.090	
	Black	6(1%)	0(0%)		
	Asian	16(4%)	5(2%)		
	Mixed	10(2%)	4(1%)		
	Other	4(1%)	2(1%)		
Baseline measures					
		Mean(SD)	Mean(SD)	Estimated difference (95%CI)	#P value
Wellbeing		20.4(3.61)	20.7(3.48)	0.41(-0.24 to 0.83)	0.283
Loneliness		6.02 (1.87)	5.99(1.83)	-0.63(0.30 to 0.25)	0.848
Sense of belonging		18.9 (5.42)	17.8(5.34)	-0.95(-1.92 to -0.31)	0.007
Hope		N(%)	N(%)	*P value	
	0	17(4%)	9(3%)	0.726	
	1	54(13%)	34(12%)		
	2	129(31%)	83(29%)		
	3	220(52%)	163(56%)		

*Notes: Non-completers=Participants completing only before-questionnaire. Completers=Participants completing both before- and after-questionnaires. N=number. %=percentage. SD= standard deviation. * Pearson Chi-squared test. # Linear regression model. Responses for hope were coded as 0, 1, 2 and 3, and greater score means higher level of hope.*

Table 2: Correlations between baseline wellbeing, loneliness, sense of belonging and hope

	Wellbeing	Loneliness	Sense of belonging	Hope
Wellbeing	1			
Loneliness	$ r =0.566$	1		
Sense of belonging	$ r =0.662$	$ r =0.618$	1	
Hope	$ r_s =0.567$	$ r_s =0.469$	$ r_s =0.502$	1

Notes: $|r|$ =Pearson correlation coefficient. $|r_s|$ =Spearman's rank correlation coefficient.
 $p<0.001$ for all correlations.

Table 3: Estimated change in wellbeing, loneliness, belonging and hope and associations with change in wellbeing

Change from baseline to follow up					
	Baseline Mean (SD)	Follow up Mean (SD)	Estimated change (95% CI)	P value	Standardised effect size (95% CI)
Wellbeing	20.7 (3.48)	21.5 (3.86)	0.77 (0.44 to 1.10)	<0.001	0.21 (0.12 to 0.30)
Loneliness	5.99 (1.83)	5.71 (1.81)	-0.28 (-0.43 to -0.13)	<0.001	0.15 (0.07 to 0.23)
Sense of belonging	17.8 (5.34)	19.8 (5.52)	1.98 (1.44 to 2.52)	<0.001	0.37 (0.27 to 0.46)
	Change in hope N (%)		Relative risk ratio (95% CI)	P value	–
Hope					
Positive change	65 (22%)		–	–	–
No change	203 (70%)		3.12 (2.36 to 4.13)	<0.001	–
Negative change	21 (7%)		0.32 (0.20 to 0.53)	<0.001	–
Association with change in wellbeing					
	Change in wellbeing Mean (SD)	Estimated difference / association (95% CI)		P value	–
Loneliness at baseline	–	-0.03 (-0.21 to 0.15)		0.732	–
Participation level					
Full (N = 229)	0.82 (2.70)		–	–	–
Partial (N = 60)	0.59 (3.30)		-0.24 (-1.06 to 0.57)	0.556	–

Notes: SD = standard deviation. CI = confidence interval. N = number. % = percentage. Standardised scores for baseline and follow up were calculated using the mean and SD of the baseline measure.

Table 4: Themes generated regarding how KBP was experienced by participants and how KBP achieved the benefits.

Overarching theme	Sub-theme
1. Motivators	1a. Altruism
	1b. Anticipate receiving
	1c. Difficult time
2. Potential Mechanisms	2a. Pleasure in making a card
	2b. Pleasure in sending a card
	2c. Individual fulfilment
	2d. Appreciate other's thoughts and behaviours
3. Project impacts	3a. Positive affective impacts
	3b. Feel the self is special and valued
	3c. Connection
	3d. Negative experiences
4. Evaluations and suggestions for improvements	4a. Positive project evaluations
	4b. Unpredictable
	4c. Suggestions for improvements

Figure 1: Participants included in the Kindness By Post analyses



