www.ijarp.com ISSN 2456-9992 Page: 01-10

International Journal Advanced Research Publications

Review Article

Volume: 02
Issue: 11

FROM CLEAR COMPREHENSION (SAMPAJAÑÑA) TO PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR: A TEXTUALLY GROUNDED MODEL FOR ETHICAL MINDFULNESS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

***Le Thi Xuan[1], Dr. Le Hong Linh[2], Le Thi Hong Oanh[3], Nguyen Thi Nhien Trang[4]**

[1]University of Education, Hue University.

[2]School of Buddhist Studies & Civilization, Gautam Buddha University.

[3]B.A. in Chinese Language, Hanoi Open University.

[4]Research scholar, Department of Buddhist Studies, Acharya Nagarjuna University.

Article Received: 13 October 2026, Article Revised: 02 November 2026, Published on: 21 November

***Corresponding Author: Le Thi Xuan**

University of Education, Hue University.

Doi: https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijarp.9898

ABSTRACT

A student observes the interruption of a classmate, and still believes it more important to complete a task than to give back the classmate's turn. What do students have to learn, so that awareness would guide their behavior in such moments? This conceptual article constructs a model of episode-level ethical mindfulness in higher education by engaging an analysis of three early Buddhist discourses against the background of literature on self-regulated learning, empathy, and transfer of learning. The Satipaṭṭhāna discourses locate straightforward understanding in everyday activity, including speech and silence. The Sedaka discourse offers a relational standard in its discussion of mutual defense. The proposed model separates noticing an impulse, the appraisal of the intention and probable consequences of a response, selecting an action that maintains a peer's agency, and modification of this action in response to feedback. A specific prediction of this model differentiates it from existing models of behavioral responses in scenarios where a seemingly generous intervention is at odds with the observed or expressed preference of the peer. A seminar practice, behavioral coding criteria, and a factorial design study provide a test of this prediction against models based on empathic concern, social expectations or rehearsal alone. Finally, the model identifies processes through which mindful attention may contribute to participation in learning groups at university, and in which restraint may better serve a peer, that require subsequent testing.

KEYWORDS: clear comprehension, ethical mindfulness, prosocial behavior, self-regulated learning, higher education.

The educational problem

During the group presentation, a student hesitates to recall a word in the language of the presentation. A fluent teammate gives it, completes the sentence and re -startS her speech. The group time is not yet up. The first speaker is not able to complete the argument. A second teammate could take the floor back, but that correction in public could also serve to gain unwelcome attention. The pedagogical problem is perfectly posed: what would a learner be able to notice at this moment, that would make the option more sensitive to the person concerned?

There is a rich body of literature in studies of university students on personal outcomes, like distress and well-being (Dawson et al., 2020). An intervention might influence outcomes without changing the amount of time spent speaking in a seminar. At this level, the basic unit of analysis is an interpersonal episode: a learner gets a cue, has some chance to respond and can see at least part of the effect. This choice offers two students in the same seminar the opportunity to experience the same intervention differently. It also reveals a cost that the learner's own account of satisfaction may overlook.

This is a problem well understood by self-regulated learning theory. Learners choose goals, monitor progress, adjust methods and interpret feedback (Panadero, 2017). So it's quite conceivable that a student who breaks into the presentation might be regulating performance quite well as the outcome timeline. The educational issue is: what's the task criterion regulating all that? What makes the years of time to contribute for a peer part of the task? An account of what a peer wants is needed.

In this article, we inquire, which aspects of clear understanding could bring a teachable response to such episodes, what psychological mechanisms might support learning and what evidence would do so. We suggest that the informed hypothesis makes the precise prediction that, when a changed preference in a recipient, a learned individual should be able to switch tracks without having to change the outwardly advantageous choice.

Textual method and interpretive limits

The test uses purposive textual reconstruction. Texts MN 10 and DN 22 were chosen because they report some similar things, clear comprehension while engaged in an action. Text SN 47.19 was chosen because it explicitly asks how taking care of oneself (attēna) parallels

taking care of others (atthi). For each text, I have described the practice and its end and the inference needed to transfer it to the classroom. Because the two Satipaṭṭhāna discourses share such extensive wording, they constitute multiple presentations of parallel method. I chose psychological evidence to compare competing causal explanations and outcome measures. This approach offers a hypothesis, but cannot assess its success or the proportions of trials that diverge.

While walking eating dressing, speaking, and silence. (MN 10, in Ñāṇamoli & Bodhi, 1995) in the long teaching, the activity context survives (DN 22, in Walshe, 1995). Silences make a difference. Silence implies a choice, either upon another's words or upon the uncertain demands to be self-responsible for a moment. The visible posture doesn't bridge the gap. Whether the many known accepted cases also help us think about awareness as we watch an activity unfold, other activities, is a further ethical question.

Sati evokes associations of keeping something in mind, while sampajañña points inquiry at what one takes as experience as it occurs (Bodhi, 2011). Theravāda explication develops purpose appropriateness domain and non-delusion (Anālayo, 2003). Appropriateness and purpose engage a classroom analogy: a worthwhile goal may be achieved in an inappropriate way. Domain and non-delusion have contemplative meanings that would be impaired by quantifying them as task focus or social reality accuracy. The educational analogy is engineered to exploit this interpretative tradition. Its proposed stages are ordered, emphatic, and explication are to is quite different.

In the Sedaka Sutta an apprentice discovers that unless an acrobat watches their balancing for them then both fall. The Sutta then accounts for the second (opposite) direction of protection in patience, harmlessness, goodwill, and sympathy (SN 47.19, in Bodhi, 2000). There are dissimilar accounts for the two directions. And, by denying the influence of personal attentiveness on helpful action, this makes the classroom reconstruction a more meaningful criterion: that students look at what their intervention makes the other person able to do. Asking the peer, which they prefer is an educational extension of that criterion.

Psychological mechanisms and competing accounts

Evidence exists for a route through empathic concern. In ostracism, Berry et al. (2018) asked whether concern for an ostracized stranger was linked to a change in attending mindfully, and then to helping. Ostracism is an accessible cue with a clear alternative remedy (deliberately exclude an inattentive tutorial participant, or sit quietly and compose a response or listen). Concern can induce concern-driven inquiry in all three scenarios. Concern alone cannot

determine the, which remedy would be preferred; this model predicts its key effect, the greatest potential influence of the clarify first step, will be when the initial interpretation is both appropriate and brain-ready for revision.

What 'mindfulness and prosociality' evidence is based on how you measure things. Donald et al. (2019) brought together the strength of associations and intervention evidence, for a range of measures. Kreplin et al. (2018) demonstrated how the strength of results and conclusions depend on which domain of prosocial behavior and the design features of meditation studies are included. A donation, a measure of compassion, and an edit to a shared document, all address different questions. Combining them might suggest a general association, without explaining how learning occurs. For teaching, the comparison is between two models of responding to a shared instruction.

Chen & Jordan (2020) compared ethical mindfulness, secular mindfulness and active control exercises across six days. Donors of the ethical condition gave more than donors in the secular condition (d = 0.24). Dispositional empathy moderated some of these outcomes. This takes an ethics condition that can be studied within an experiment, and the donation result allows this to be achieved. It remains unknown whether helpers respond to recipients who reject their offer. Poulin et al (2021) found the effects of a brief mindfulness induction on helping were moderated by independent and interdependent self-construal. One must because of this assess how helpers construe their duties rather than assume they do so from their nationalities or religious beliefs.

The proposed mechanisme is predicated on a policy that attention makes the exercise of onsets of impatience available to be moderated. Appraisal makes possible a subsequent task goalkeeping the other person engaged that is otherwise controlled by speed. Then, a brief query can supply the other side of an introspectively inaccessible equation. Feedback from the peer can influence these responses. Another hypothesis is that the instructor imparts a politeness script. Prediction on both lines of rational policy. There will be more offers of support immediately after instruction, but divergence occurs in refusal and in asking for additional support, with no instructor.

The model at the level of a learning episode

Think of a collaborative programming problem. One student attempts to grab the keyboard when a code partner fails. Seeing this motion triggers the next decision: the partner might want a hint, have time to look at the error or have someone else walk through the technique.

Correctness of the final program would be a weak measure if both students were not able to learn.

An indication of need. The learner finds a signal in the interaction and in an initial response: "I grabbed the mouse when the error flashed up." A retrospective report offers information on how the learner understood what was happening, with all the caveats of retrospective recall. Video can define the timing of a movement but cannot define the quality of awareness.

Assessment of purpose and probable impact. The learner differentiates the task completion by himself from guiding the partner through diagnosis. The achievement to be preserved is described in terms that enable the peer to rectify it. An open question about a choice of the form of help might be more revealing than imagining how one would feel.

Selecting a response that is proportionate. When a partner requests a hint, the learner indicates the error message and yields control of the keyboard to the partner. When requesting a demonstration directly, taking the keyboard will be a responsive response. The operational definition is the relationship between the cue and the options available to the peer's request.

Revising after feedback. The partner indicates that the hint revealed too much information. The learner can recognize this mismatch and inquire, which part the partner would prefer to attempt independently. In a subsequent exercise, delaying the offer of a hint would demonstrate evidence of transfer. Offering an immediate apology alone would only confirm that a feedback exchange took place.

These operations can be repeated, repeated, or broken off. Even if the student can change an interpretation before making a comment, another student can add a preference before an offer is made. Responsiveness is predicted when the choice between actions is open. The student who has no view of the shared screen has less access to its content than the presenter, and so must be predicted by recording what opportunities were available to each player.

Instruction and behavioral assessment

In a first-year tutorial, the teacher allocates 20 minutes to two versions of this group-work problem. The students initially note privately the impulse they feel whenever the partner pauses. They pause, type their first response or a word, or note the gesture. The teacher states that the exercise has a Buddhist origin and offers equal weight to both alternatives. The students' private thoughts and individual sentiments are not part of the assessment; the aim of learning is to see situations when more input from a fellow student would alter a response.

Next, students move through the roles of contributor, partner, and observer. In one version, the contributor is discreetly handed a card requesting assistance getting into the discussion. In the second version, the contributor is the type who would like some time to develop a thought and would rather not be embarrassingly identified as the contributor; the partner never reads the card. Meanwhile, the observer notes what information is present, if the partner asks for clarification and what takes place once the contributor's preference is understood. The two conversations are compared until the instructor reveals the paired design. One offer can be rated differently in the two instances.

The unaided coding rule is 0 when the response contradicts the preference, 1 when the response confirms the preference but does not change in the face of a possible alternative, and 2 when the learner acts in line with the preference or negotiates a negotiated alternative. A preference not known or a broken opportunity receives a coded missing/ineligible value. Silence after a request for time counts as 2 when a recording confirms that the learner held the turn. Silence after an ambiguous pause is not ineligible. Coders should write the cue and response observed and potential responses alongside scores so that disagreements can be analyzed.

Assessment should include an allowed refusal. For instance, a peer requests the student to do their individually assessed task instead. Responsiveness could include saying no and offering an acceptable alternative. Assessing if compliance is the test would incentivize behaving unfairly to other students. The cases for research should list acceptable, actionable alternatives and distinguish boundary disputes from preference matching. Students could be prompted to report what piece of information would cause a change of mind. A fluent defense does not contribute to the behavioral milestone without an observable choice.

A study capable of testing the model

A factorial trial (tutorial groups to be allocated between a 2×2 design with: brief guided noticing practice versus time-matched neutral observation and reciprocal-protection appraisal versus task efficiency appraisal) all 4 conditions would rehearse the same number of peer situations, have prompts of similar level of detail and rotate roles. Prompts would be pre-scripted, recording role and compliance, but not attempts to influence and avoiding foster tutor evaluation of their own group. Cluster allocation minimizes within-tutorial sharing of prompts. Trials across multiple sites would allow testing of variation between languages of teaching and seminar formats.

The main outcome measure would be the percentage of eligible decisions that follow a peer's stated preference in a subsequent collaborative task after 4 weeks. Use of active help and disclosure of requesting time (copyright) would be counterbalanced. The peer actor would reveal the preference at the same time in every scenario so that all participants have the same cue. A novel exploratory way of thinking would be used that takes asking to activate disclosure, because of this for separating seeking of available information from uptake. A blind recipient rating would provide a second measure of disclosure. Self-rated mindfulness, distress, and empathic concern will be administered as separate measures.

Three predictions emerge. First, the impaired delayed preference matching from explicit relational assessment may be greater than that from efficiency assessment, when a salient helping conflict defies the request. Second, noticing practice should boost detection of an emerging impulse on the separate, temporally earlier probe. Third, the combined manipulation should outperform assessment alone, under conditions of intermediate time pressure, if noticing assists learners in breaking out of a habitual response. Differences under adequate precision are of lesser value to the contemplative script and politeness accounts.

The primary analysis would be a mixed-effects logistic model for decisions nested within students and tutorials to cover multiple scenarios and site. Preregistration should specify the primary appraisal contrast, the interaction contrast, the smallest educationally meaningful difference, and how missing follow-up or unavailable opportunities will be treated. Power should be computed with pilot estimates of clustering and attrition. Double coding of a prespecified subset by independent coders masked to allocation and agreement expressed with uncertainty. Appraisal and concern judged before the transfer task could be explored as mediators with sensitivity for mediator–outcome confounding. Randomizing instruction alone does not define a causal mediation pathway.

DISCUSSION

Here is the contribution to educational psychology, to specify the target of regulation. A student regulating impatience to complete a task quickly may appear as relaxed as a student regulating impatience to save a peer's opportunity. Their behavior diverges when the peer requests more time. Combining otherwise similar circumstances renders that difference empirically detectable, and in doing so, supports an even more limited (although still ambitious) hypothesis than heightened altruism: that learners may learn heightened judgment about when and how to help, within the domain of a certain family of academic tasks.

Transfer remains a key challenge. A student might demonstrate the expected listening behavior during a seminar role-play but then take control of an online document this week. Barnett and Ceci (2002) identify several dimensions along, which training and assessment can vary. A helpful progression would first alter the content while keeping the partner and classroom constant, then change the partner and medium, and finally observe naturally occurring collaboration with consent. Changing all dimensions simultaneously would make it difficult to interpret any failure. Conversely, repeating the instructor's scenario immediately after rehearsal would provide little insight into use beyond the lesson.

What are the boundaries of recipient preference? Learners have often responded by deferring to more senior learners, following the leader publicly or requesting a unacknowledged cession. Anonymous feedback or abstaining from a session are valuable, but both leave a significant imbalance of power. Instructors might assess whether the course design itself is subject to a concentration of control over equipment, speaking time, or marks. Those conditions, if reproducible, can be addressed by mooting or rating rotation, but being patient is often not.

Textual limitations follow suit. The consensus derivation is based on three Pāli discourses and some Theravāda commentaries. I cannot claim that they encompass all Buddhist interpretations of mindfulness. Applying reciprocal protection within a pluralistic learning environment remains justifiable only as far as students can, within reason, consider the real-world consequences, contest the suggested response and be trustable, through varying attitudes, to make their own decision to participate. Future research should have students edit unclear scenarios and test whether the coding scheme performs equally well in different languages before merging scores.

CONCLUSION

The ultimate demonstration of such ethical attentiveness in a university classroom could well turn out to be a time when offering additional aid would interfere with a peer. The model suggested here details what a student would need to become aware of, whose feedback could have shifted a misjudgment, and how someone observing could have identified a beneficial correction. Whether contemplative noticing is educationally worthwhile apart from explicit relational training and practice is an empirically testable question.

REFERENCES

1. Anālayo. (2003). *Satipaṭṭhāna: The direct path to realization.* Windhorse Publications.
2. Barnett, S. M., & Ceci, S. J. (2002). When and where do we apply what we learn? A taxonomy for far transfer. *Psychological Bulletin, 128*(4), 612–637. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.128.4.612
3. Berry, D. R., Cairo, A. H., Goodman, R. J., Quaglia, J. T., Green, J. D., & Brown, K. W. (2018). Mindfulness increases prosocial responses toward ostracized strangers through empathic concern. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 147*(1), 93–112. https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000392
4. Bodhi, B. (Trans.). (2000). *The connected discourses of the Buddha: A translation of the Saṃyutta Nikāya.* Wisdom Publications.
5. Bodhi, B. (2011). What does mindfulness really mean? A canonical perspective. *Contemporary Buddhism, 12*(1), 19–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/14639947.2011.564813
6. Chen, S., & Jordan, C. H. (2020). Incorporating ethics into brief mindfulness practice: Effects on well-being and prosocial behavior. *Mindfulness, 11*(1), 18–29. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-018-0915-2
7. Dawson, A. F., Brown, W. W., Anderson, J., Datta, B., Donald, J. N., Hong, K., Allan, S., Mole, T. B., Jones, P. B., & Galante, J. (2020). Mindfulness-based interventions for university students: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being, 12*(2), 384–410. https://doi.org/10.1111/aphw.12188
8. Donald, J. N., Sahdra, B. K., Van Zanden, B., Duineveld, J. J., Atkins, P. W. B., Marshall, S. L., & Ciarrochi, J. (2019). Does your mindfulness benefit others? A systematic review and meta-analysis of the link between mindfulness and prosocial behaviour. *British Journal of Psychology, 110*(1), 101–125. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjop.12338
9. Kreplin, U., Farias, M., & Brazil, I. A. (2018). The limited prosocial effects of meditation: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Scientific Reports, 8*, Article 2403. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-20299-z
10. Ñāṇamoli, B., & Bodhi, B. (Trans.). (1995). *The middle length discourses of the Buddha: A translation of the Majjhima Nikāya.* Wisdom Publications.
11. Panadero, E. (2017). A review of self-regulated learning: Six models and four directions for research. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*, Article 422.

https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00422

12. Poulin, M. J., Ministero, L. M., Gabriel, S., Morrison, C. D., & Naidu, E. (2021). Minding your own business? Mindfulness decreases prosocial behavior for people with independent self-construals. *Psychological Science, 32*(11), 1699–1708. https://doi.org/10.1177/09567976211015184
13. Walshe, M. (Trans.). (1995). *The long discourses of the Buddha: A translation of the Dīgha Nikāya.* Wisdom Publications.