



December 2023

Is Digital Altruism the Same as Offline Altruism?: An Exploration of Strength-Based Determinants Among Generation Z during COVID-19 Pandemic

Nair Shravya Sunil

Christ (Deemed to be University), Delhi NCR, shravyanair2408@gmail.com

Surekha Chukkali

Christ (Deemed to be University), Delhi NCR, Surekha.chukkali@christuniversity.in

Follow this and additional works at: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/ijahsp>



Part of the [Counselor Education Commons](#), and the [Other Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sunil N, Chukkali S. Is Digital Altruism the Same as Offline Altruism?: An Exploration of Strength-Based Determinants Among Generation Z during COVID-19 Pandemic. *The Internet Journal of Allied Health Sciences and Practice*. 2023 Dec 15;22(1), Article 26.

This Manuscript is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Health Care Sciences at NSUWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Internet Journal of Allied Health Sciences and Practice by an authorized editor of NSUWorks. For more information, please contact nsuworks@nova.edu.

Is Digital Altruism the Same as Offline Altruism?: An Exploration of Strength-Based Determinants Among Generation Z during COVID-19 Pandemic

Abstract

Digital altruism is a new form of altruism on social media platforms. Social media has been a vital tool for sharing and seeking information for day-to-day situations, enabling people to seek and render help. Engaging in helping behaviour could be purely out of altruism or can be traced back to their professional requirements. Social media platforms have brought out people's altruistic side on multiple occasions. The present study looked at the altruism levels of Indian Generation-Z social media users and how it is influenced by the users' strength-based determinants, i.e. empathy, compassion, social justice, optimism, social intelligence, and personality, compared to offline altruism. The altruism levels, both online and offline, and the strength-based determinants of 204 participants between the age group of 16-24 years were measured. A regression analysis was run to understand the nature of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. The results indicated that certain strength-based determinants impacted the levels of digital altruism.

Author Bio(s)

Nair Shravya Sunil, MSc Psychology (Counselling), is a student in the Department of Psychology at Christ (Deemed to be University), Delhi NCR campus.

Dr Surekha C is the Head of the Department of Psychology at Christ (Deemed to be University), Delhi NCR campus.



The Internet Journal of Allied Health Sciences and Practice

Dedicated to allied health professional practice and education

Vol. 22 No. 1 ISSN 1540-580X

Is Digital Altruism the Same as Offline Altruism? An Exploration of Strength-Based Determinants Among Generation Z during COVID-19 Pandemic

Nair Shravya Sunil

Surekha Chukkali

Christ (Deemed to be University)

India

ABSTRACT

Digital altruism is a new form of altruism on social media platforms. Social media has been a vital tool for sharing and seeking information for day-to-day situations, enabling people to seek and render help. Engaging in helping behaviour could be purely out of altruism or can be traced back to their professional requirements. Social media platforms have brought out people's altruistic side on multiple occasions. The present study looked at the altruism levels of Indian Generation-Z social media users and how it is influenced by the users' strength-based determinants, i.e., empathy, compassion, social justice, optimism, social intelligence, and personality, compared to offline altruism. The altruism levels, both online and offline, and the strength-based determinants of 204 participants between the age group of 16-24 years were measured. A regression analysis was run to understand the nature of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. The results indicated that certain strength-based determinants impacted the levels of digital altruism.

Keywords: Altruism, compassion, digital altruism, empathy, optimism, personality, social intelligence, social justice

INTRODUCTION

Social media, an online platform where people with similar professional or personal backgrounds and interests form connections and build networks has become an imperative part of our lives.¹ It is an empowering means of interaction where we inform and stay informed by sharing knowledge and also consuming information on what others share, making it an important source of news for people.² This unhindered flow of information and exchange of ideas on social media connects people by reducing the barriers of time and geographic location. Social media's role is pervasive across different aspects of our lives -- education, politics, culture, business etc. Social media has provided people with an open and equal platform where users have the freedom to share personal and professional information as well as information which is socially relevant and vital. In India, the number of social media users stands at more than 376 million³ and it is estimated to cross 450 million by the end of the year 2023.⁴

Social media has been used for communication during crises⁵ and is often used as a platform to disseminate information in times of need.⁶ On multiple occasions, social media proved to be a platform for acts of kindness. Due to the wide usage of a participatory medium like social media, governments across the globe use it to enhance public engagement in times of crisis.⁷ Such an engagement between the government and public has helped in managing crisis by understanding the nature of the crisis and taking effective actions.⁸ The Arab world's revolution in which Facebook was used as a weapon to overthrow the leaders they did not want in power,⁹ and Twitter was used as a secondary battle land to gather support and exchange information during the Russo-Ukrainian crisis¹⁰ are instances where social media has been used as a strong political weapon. During a social crisis like natural or manmade disasters, people rely on social media to communicate with their families and seek information regarding resources and other help.¹¹ When the lockdown due to the COVID-19 pandemic began in India, among the many strategies to deal with the crisis, online volunteerism became a significant step. Volunteers from across the country formed groups on social media sites and aimed to provide urgent care and support to those critically infected and their family members.¹² Social media's time-stamped exchange of information that is well-planned has helped in analysing assessing the spread of the COVID-19 disease.⁶

An action is said to be altruistic if it results from motivations directed towards the goal of improving others' interests and welfare. It is about wanting a beneficial outcome for others and not wanting it for self-serving purposes.¹³ It is also based on the recipient of altruistic behaviour.¹⁴ The altruistic approach is a contemporary theory of human motivation. It holds on to the meaning of "true" altruism. There are underlying motivations such as empathy, norms, judgements. There are similar motivations that affect one's actions on such digital platforms. Proponents of Altruism describe an altruist as one with high standards of justice, social responsibility, moral reasoning, more empathetic towards others.¹⁵ Social justice and social responsibility are a few of the guidelines of social media platforms that the users have to abide by. There are different types of altruism; Genetic Altruism, Reciprocal Altruism, Group-selected Altruism, Pure Altruism.¹⁶ Personality traits contribute to individual differences in altruism.

Conventionally, most of the altruistic acts were studied and considered in an online form. The advent of social media became a medium for a new form of altruism. Digital altruism is about using social media to support character strengths and virtues. It is about recognising the difference made in one's life based on the knowledge consumed and shared online.¹⁷ Digital altruism is different from offline altruism. Digital altruism can be in different forms -- sharing information or knowledge, sharing others' content for a wider reach, donating and supporting causes, signing petitions, and contributing to research. Social media platforms are a place with great potential for information exchange between a large number of people. People from different fields have largely moved to social media platforms and similar digital platforms, making it vital for their occupation and day-to-day lives. Understanding the altruistic behaviour online and its determinants among Generation-Z can be beneficial to strengthen and apply the same in other age groups as well.

A significant part of digital altruism is knowledge sharing; people post answers to academic questions, share educational and informative materials on websites, generate and share news, other users share these news pieces within their circle. Klisanin¹⁸ identifies three forms of digital altruism: everyday digital altruism, creative digital altruism, and co-creative digital altruism. Everyday digital altruism is the regular altruistic action that users of digital technology indulge in. It includes makers of donation campaigns to the users who click on these links. Creative digital altruism is when people go beyond the norms and be helpful in complex problems concerning human beings, using digital tools for the greater good. At the same time, co-creative altruism is about global cooperation and coordination with the help of digital tools to contribute to humanity and better global conditions. Many people engage in altruistic behaviour, and digital altruism is a growing phenomenon.¹⁷ As one tries to strengthen virtues related to altruism and make a difference in others' lives, choosing the medium for digital altruism is also essential. Since knowledge is person-bound,¹⁹ the level of comfort and motivation in sharing knowledge may vary across different social media platforms.

Altruism among students is one of the motivators for them to adopt technology for educational purposes,²⁰ which may lead to digital altruism. The integration of social media and education has pointed toward it being used for resource and material sharing.²¹ Digital altruism has a direct effect on connecting students to the community and influences their civic engagement. Despite talking about digital altruism at length and its importance, a digital altruist's characteristics have not been explored. The author has also mentioned this as a scope for further studies. Ma and Chan²² studied the relationship between social media users' altruism and knowledge-sharing behaviour. It was concluded that there is a direct, strong, and significant effect of altruism on knowledge sharing behaviour on social media. The concept of digital altruism is not considered here, but the researcher has bridged altruism with altruistic behaviour online. Research conducted to study the difference in the level of altruism

between cyberspace and real life showed that trust has an impact on the community factor of knowledge sharing in cyberspace as well as real life. On the other hand, social identification influences personal and community knowledge sharing factors in cyberspace but only community factors in real-life.²³ However, the comparison made in this study was not based on the strength-based determinants. The recipients of altruistic activities are often people known to the actor. When linked with digital altruism, the extensive use of social networking among college students can add more value to the present opportunities in campuses of educational institutions.²⁴ Online learning contributes to online knowledge sharing. When considering knowledge sharing among students as an altruistic act, factors of interaction, motivational factors, that is, perceived achievement and student's willingness, individual characteristics like student ability and degree of competence, and technological support positively affected knowledge sharing behaviour.²⁵

Studies have explored various motivational factors for sharing information online. Factors like enjoyment, self-efficacy, learning, personal gain, altruism, empathy, social engagement, community interest, reciprocity, and reputation act as motivation for sharing information on social media platforms.²⁶ However, the influence of these motivation factors differs across social media platforms. Altruism, reciprocity, and reputation also serve as motivators for social media communicators to share knowledge on social media.²⁷ Though all three strongly influenced sharing knowledge online, altruism was the strongest. Though the study looked at altruism as a motivation for knowledge sharing behaviour along with other two motivators, this study was conducted among people who were in the position of social media communicators, a newly developed role in organizations. For people in this position, knowledge sharing is a part of their job description, and cannot be considered as altruistic behaviour. Knowledge sharing behaviour is influenced by the characteristics of the user.²⁸ Using social media platforms and sharing information happens on professional fronts as well. Knowledge-sharing behaviour amongst employees on an intra-organizational social media platform is influenced directly by the feeling to help colleagues and to help the organization to achieve its goals.^{29(p.595)} This altruistic act is least influenced by financial rewards or individual advancement in career. This study was conducted among participants of a particular organization, restricting the extent of the study of knowledge sharing behaviour to colleagues.

Social media has ensured the smooth flow of work which was otherwise hindered by crises. It enabled people to help those in need from the comfort of their house as well as to get going with their academic or professional work. With a manmade or natural crisis happening in different parts of the world at different points of time, social media becomes an indispensable tool that binds this fast-paced world. The present study focuses on the role of empathy, compassion, social justice, optimism, social intelligence and personality of social media users, who are Indian and fall in the age group of Generation Z, in determining their levels of offline altruism and digital altruism. It studies how knowledge sharing on social media is altruistic in nature by investigating the strength-based determinants of Digital Altruism. The present study also investigates if there is any difference in the levels of altruism in an individual online and offline and if there is any difference in levels of altruism between male and female participants. The following are the hypotheses of the present study.

- H₁: Digital altruism will vary from offline altruism based on the strength-based determinants among Generation Z.
H₂: Age in Generation Z social media users does not determine digital altruism

The strength-based determinants considered here are empathy, compassion, social justice, optimism, social intelligence and personality, and these will be used as the bases to compare the variation in levels of offline altruism and digital altruism. It is hypothesised that the levels of these strength-based determinants will be different for both forms of altruism. Age is also considered a determinant and will be used to weigh the difference between offline altruism and digital altruism.

Understanding the role of these strength-based determinants in digital altruism can help strengthen it and encourage the culture of digital altruism. Digital altruism ensures loyalty and fosters a culture of interdependence among users. This is vital, as the world is shifting more towards digitalisation with every passing day.

METHODS

Sample

Two hundred four (204) Indian social media users between the age of 16 to 25 years were considered as participants for this study. The participants were called for this study through posts and messages on social media. The response of participants who had responded to the google form and fell in the age group of Generation Z were taken into consideration. The sample selected for this study were active users of social media sites. The exclusion criterion was those who are professionally related to social media usage, for example, social media communicators, content creators, marketers, bloggers etc. Another exclusion criterion was those who have been diagnosed and are undergoing treatment for any kind of mental health disorder.

Instruments

Altruism

In order to measure offline altruism, the Altruistic Personality Scale was used. It was introduced by Rushton, et al³⁰ in 1981. It is a 20 item, unidimensional, 5-point Likert scale ranging from Never (0) to Very Often (4).^(p. 297) The scale has good discriminant validity and significant interrater reliability. This scale gauges the frequency of altruistic acts one engages in.

Personality

The Big Five Inventory was used to measure personality. This was developed by John and Srivastava in 1999. This scale measures five personality factors which are Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness. It has 44 items and is measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from Disagree Strongly (1) to Agree Strongly (5).³¹

Empathy

The Toronto Empathy Questionnaire scale was developed by Spreng et al in 2009. This scale looks at empathy as a primary emotional process. It is a 16 item, unidimensional, 5-point Likert scale, ranging from Never to Always, that will be used in this study to measure empathy.^{32(p. 67)} The scale was found to have high test-retest reliability ($r = 0.81$) and strong convergent validity.

Optimism

To measure optimism in this study, the State Optimism Measure was used, introduced by Millstein et al,³³ in 2019. It is a 7-item, unidimensional scale. This 5-point Likert scale, Strongly disagree (1) to Strongly agree (5), was found to have high internal reliability and strong convergent validity (p. 86).

Compassion

Neff's Compassion Scale (Short-form) is a 12-item, multidimensional scale focusing on kindness, common humanity and mindfulness^{34(p.34)} developed by Pommier et al³⁵ in 2019. The scale is a 5-point Likert scale, Almost Never (1) to Almost Always (5), with good reliability ($r = 0.81$), divergent, convergent, and known-groups validity.

Social Intelligence

To measure social intelligence in the present study Tromsø Social Intelligence Scale was used, developed by Silvera et al,³⁶ in 2001. This scale is a 21-item, 4-point Likert scale focusing on three factors; social information processing, social skills and social awareness.^{37(p. 8)} The scale ranges from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (4). This scale was found to have good internal reliability and convergent validity.

Social Justice

The Basic Social Justice Orientations scale is an 8-item, multidimensional scale which focuses on equality, need, equity, and entitlement.^{39(p.669)}

Digital Altruism

The Online Prosocial Scale developed by Kinnunen et al,³⁹ was used to measure digital altruism. It is a 23-item scale with two dimensions; help giving and moral courage. The scale ranges from 1 to 7; 1 indicates "not at all", 6 indicates "describes very well", and 7 indicates "have not encountered this situation."

Demographic Datasheet

A demographic data sheet was used to collect information about the participants. The datasheet collected information regarding their age, gender, location, occupation, whether diagnosed for any mental health disorders, social media platforms used.

Procedure

Before beginning with the collection of data, the proposal of the present study was submitted to the Institutional Ethics Committee in order to get the Ethical Clearance Certificate. After getting the clearance from the board, a call for participants was made through social media platforms. The participants were informed about the purpose of the study and the role played by them. They were provided with the ethical guidelines and the instructions for the questionnaires. Following this, their consent to participate in the study was collected and their responses to the questionnaires were recorded. The participants were tested for altruism, digital altruism, optimism, compassion, empathy, social intelligence, social justice, and personality. The average time taken to fill in the questionnaire was 30 minutes. After the responses were collected the participants were debriefed about the study and the use of the data collected. The data used for this study was collected over a period of 2 months.

Data Analysis

In order to understand the data collected descriptive statistics were used. Normative tests were done to check if the data are normally distributed. In order to understand if there is a relationship between the determinants, optimism, empathy, compassion, social intelligence, social justice, personality, and digital altruism and offline altruism Pearson's Product Moment Correlation was used. Further, if a relationship was established

Regression analysis was used to understand the strength of the dependence of the dependent variable on the independent variable, that is, if these strength-based determinants predict altruism and digital altruism.

Correlation

Spearman Rank order correlation was run to examine the correlation between the strength-based determinants and altruism and digital altruism, the summary of which is presented in the table in Appendix I.

Correlation for Offline Altruism. The results showed a correlation between altruism and age, compassion, optimism, social information processing, social skill, social intelligence, agreeableness, openness and conscientiousness, extraversion and neuroticism.

Correlation for Digital Altruism. Digital altruism has a correlation with optimism, social information processing, social skill, extraversion and agreeableness.

Table 1. Depicts regression analysis of variables for offline altruism

Adjusted R Sq.	df			F
	Regression	Residual	Total	
0.280	15	188	203	6.264

Table 2. Regression coefficients and beta value

Predictors	B	β	t	p
(Constant)	-45.664		-2.626	.009
1.Age	2.954	.306	4.980	.000
2.Emathy	.095	.048	.497	.620
3.Compassion	-.421	-.220	-.972	.332
3.1.Mindfulness	.633	.100	.872	.384
3.2.Kindness	1.212	.196	1.539	.126
3.4.Indifference	.288	.066	.512	.609
4.Optimism	.026	0.11	.149	.882
5.Social Intelligence	-.291	-.304	-2.096	.037
5.1.Social Information Processing	.714	.271	3.060	.003
5.2.Social Skill				
6.1.Extraversion	.512	.295	2.091	.038
6.2.Agreeableness	.233	.110	1.242	.216
6.5.Conscientiousness	-.030	-.012	-.161	.872
6.3.Neuroticism	.115	.054	.783	.435
6.4.Openness	-.201	-.106	-1.368	.173
	.345	.136	2.007	.046

Table 3. Depicts regression analysis of variables for Online Altruism

Adjusted R Sq.	df			F
	Regression	Residual	Total	
0.126	6	197	203	5.865

Table 4: Regression coefficients and beta value

Predictors	B	β	t	p
(Constant)	29.393		.951	.343
1.Age	-.130	-.007	-.103	.918
4.Optimism	.230	.053	.730	.466
5.1.Social Information Processing	1.287	.252	3.704	.000
5.2.Social Skill	.348	.103	1.129	.260
6.1.Extraversion	.533	.130	1.455	.147
6.2.Agreeableness	-1.233	-.254	-3.614	.000

Regression Summary

From Table 1 it can be inferred that only 28% of the variance in altruism can be accounted for by the strength-based determinants. Table 2 indicates that age, social intelligence, social information processing, social skill and openness are significant predictors of altruism. Table 3 shows that 12.6% of the variance in digital altruism can be accounted for by the strength-based determinants. From Table 4, it can be concluded that social information processing and agreeableness significantly predict the value of digital altruism.

DISCUSSION

This study sought to investigate how age, optimism, empathy, compassion, social intelligence, personality, and social justice affect the levels of altruism and digital altruism in social media users. Age is a predictor of altruism; older adults tend to behave in a more altruistic way than younger adults.⁴⁰ Similar to this was the finding of the present study. However, the age range considered for the Generation Z population is lesser than that for adults as a whole. When aroused by any empathy-evoking event, empathic people engaged in help-giving behaviour.⁴¹ Consistent with this finding, the results indicate that empathy positively correlates with altruism, but a significant relationship is not established. A possible explanation for this is that altruistic acts offline demand more effort than online. Compassion is directly linked with altruism as altruistic action stirs altruistic emotions in people.⁴² However, it turns out to be insignificant. When one does not act on empathy itself, there are chances of not being compassionate. This could be because acting on feelings of empathy demands a set of requisites without which the action of help cannot be done. In contrast with the previous study by Hoffman et al,⁴³ the relationship between altruism and optimism is not significant. This could be because the study was conducted during the lockdown due to the COVID-19 pandemic in India. Due to the pandemic, which may have affected the optimism levels of the participants. Social intelligence and one of its dimensions, social information processing, were significantly positively correlated with altruism, similar to the results of previous studies by Sharma,⁴⁴ and Carreras et al.⁴⁵ Social information processing and altruism have a significant relationship. The ability to pick on social cues and adequately respond on time can be linked to understanding a situation that demands prosocial behaviour and engaging in it on time.

Of all the five traits of personality, we find that openness is a predictor of altruism, whereas agreeableness, neuroticism, conscientiousness, and extraversion are not. These results are similar to the findings of Oda et al¹⁴ and Ivcevic and Ambady.⁴⁶ Because people high on agreeableness focus on cooperativeness and polished social interactions, they may engage in actions that help others. These actions satisfy their need to maintain good social ties, defying the chance of these acts being altruistic in nature. Openness to new experiences may be linked directly with generating novel ideas by using existing knowledge to help others. Social anxiety with fear of social interaction and social withdrawal is linked with neuroticism. These affect how one interacts with people more physically, hindering the motivation to engage in altruistic behaviour. Those high on conscientiousness are generally organised and keep aside momentary gratification to achieve long-term success.⁴⁷ It makes them engage in altruistic behaviours but only in certain conditions. It was also found that social justice did not affect levels of altruism in social media users.

When looking at digital altruism, unlike offline altruism, age is not a predictor of it. This could be because the exposure to digital media is the same across Generation Z. Altruism online does not require any certain level of experience or learning from past experiences online. Everyone is equally free and has access to content created and shared online, irrespective of their age. Therefore, H₂ is accepted. All that one needs is the knowledge to navigate through creating and sharing content. The first strength-based determinant, empathy, is not a significant predictor of digital altruism or its dimensions. Social media users may empathise with those in need, but acting on it may depend on their ability and availability of resources. Moving further, no significant relationship is established between digital altruism and compassion. A possible explanation could be the lack of resources and the ability to offer help online, as compassion is the action part of empathy. Similarly, social justice does not have an impact on the levels of digital altruism. Social media has been a platform for social justice movements, posts, news and petitions for various social causes are circulated. Nevertheless, the presence of justice on social media among its users may not depend on their altruistic levels. This may be because what is right and wrong and the rights of social media users are often debated. Optimism on digital platforms includes steps taken towards greater digital innovation, which would benefit users of online technology.⁴⁸ However, optimism and digital altruism in social

media users do not share a significant relationship. The rationale for this is similar to that of the relationship between altruism and optimism. Due to the prevailing pandemic, the time spent on social media platforms has increased significantly.⁴⁹ During the COVID-19 pandemic, generation Z social media users have been worried about their health and that of their close ones, also about the impact of this on the economy.⁵⁰ Due to this constant worry, their level of optimism may have been low, giving us the results as discussed above. Social information processing and social skill, dimensions of social intelligence, are found to be predictors of digital altruism. Since social media is a platform where multiple viewpoints and aspects of information will be available, it enables the users to enhance the way the information is processed, further allowing them to provide help online.

When looking at the influence of personality, all the big five personality traits were considered. It was found that social media users who are on the higher end of extraversion tend to be more altruistic when considering online platforms. A person high on extraversion would be more socially engaging online and offline.⁴⁶ When a person is socially engaging online, they would form relationships and render help to the online connections whenever needed. However, it was not found to be a predictor of digital altruism. Agreeableness in people may be directly related to their cooperativeness, hence affecting their engagement in prosocial behaviour. A significant relationship is established between agreeableness and digital altruism. Similar to the results of Kinnunen et al,³⁹ the results obtained from the present study point toward neuroticism not being a significant predictor of digital altruism. Those on the higher end of neuroticism may have social anxiety with fear of social interaction and social withdrawal.⁵¹ The fact that others can view every action on social media may lead to constant self-scrutiny affecting their engagement in altruism on social media platforms. Openness and digital altruism were also found to have no significant relationship. This could be because most social media users circulate the existing information when asked for help, rather than always creating new content or looking for new opportunities to render help. The last personality factor, conscientiousness, was also found to have no significant relationship with digital altruism. This may be because those on conscientiousness are cautious. Hence, in times of crisis, those higher on conscientiousness may be cautious about the help being rendered based on the severity of the crisis.

Social intelligence is as vital for digital altruism as it is for offline altruism. The ability to understand others wisely to relate with them⁵² and to be susceptible to social stimuli⁵³ are equally important, be it in a physical space or on the internet. Since social media is a place where people have openly exhibited their support for and resistance against various issues, agreeableness comes into the picture as a predictor of digital altruism. Sharing on social media need not be purely because of the need to maintain polished relationships. However, it could be out of one's nature to cooperate and agree with people they are related to. Hypothesis 1 can be accepted as the results indicate that not all the strength-based determinants predict digital altruism and offline altruism. Except for social intelligence, different strength-based determinants predict the two types of altruisms considered in this study.

As of today, the world is only moving closer to technology, making social media a widely used medium for communication and a tool for professional and personal work. The findings from the present study will provide useful inputs to understanding the digital altruistic nature of the Generation Z population in specific settings. Similar studies can be conducted to look into the altruistic nature of people during day-to-day activities as the world is shifting online in the post-pandemic period. Studies can also look into the digital altruism of social media users during a manmade crisis or natural disaster, and the same can be explored in other generations as well. The limitation of the present study is its sample size. As this study was conducted during the peak of the COVID-19 pandemic in India, participation was limited.

Conclusion

Of all the strength-based determinants, social information processing and agreeableness are predictors of altruism on social media platforms. On the other hand, social information processing and openness are predictors of offline altruism.

References

1. Akram, W., & Kumar, R. (2017). A Study on Positive and Negative Effects of Social Media on Society. *International Journal of Computer Sciences and Engineering*, 5(10), 351–354. <https://doi.org/10.26438/ijcse/v5i10.351354>
2. Kaur, S., & Kaur, M. (2013). Impact of social media on politics. *Gian Jyoti E-Journal*, 3(4), 23-29.
3. Statista. (2020, October 16). Number of social network users India 2015-2023. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/278407/number-of-social-network-users-in-india/>
4. Keelery, S. (2021, August 2). Social media usage in India - statistics & facts. Statista. https://www.statista.com/topics/5113/social-media-usage-in-india/#topicHeader_wrapper
5. Schroeder, A., Pennington-Gray, L., Donohoe, H., & Kioussis, S. (2013). Using Social Media in Times of Crisis. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 30(1–2), 126–143. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2013.751271>
6. Goel, A., & Gupta, L. (2020). Social Media in the Times of COVID-19. *JCR: Journal of Clinical Rheumatology*, 26(6), 220–223. <https://doi.org/10.1097/rhu.0000000000001508>
7. Panagiotopoulos, P., Bigdeli, A. Z., & Sams, S. (2014). Citizen–government collaboration on social media: The case of Twitter in the 2011 riots in England. *Government Information Quarterly*, 31(3), 349–357. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2013.10.014>
8. Chen, Q., Min, C., Zhang, W., Wang, G., Ma, X., & Evans, R. (2020). Unpacking the black box: How to promote citizen engagement through government social media during the COVID-19 crisis. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 110, 106380. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106380>
9. Pritchard, T. (Director). (2011). *How Facebook Changed the World: The Arab Spring* [Film]. BBC.
10. Chen, E., & Ferrara, E. (2022). Tweets in Time of Conflict: A Public Dataset Tracking the Twitter Discourse on the War Between Ukraine and Russia. arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.07488.
11. Saroj, A., & Pal, S. (2020). Use of social media in crisis management: A survey. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* 48,101584. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2020.101584>
12. Roy, S., & Ayalon, L. (2020). “Goodness and Kindness”: Long-Distance Caregiving Through Volunteers During the COVID-19 Lockdown in India. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B*, . <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbaa187>
13. Clavien, C., & Chapuisat, M. (2013). Altruism across disciplines: one word, multiple meanings. *Biology & Philosophy*, 28(1), 125–140. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10539-012-9317-3>
14. Oda, R., Machii, W., Takagi, S., Kato, Y., Takeda, M., Kiyonari, T., Fukukawa, Y., & Hiraishi, K. (2014). Personality and altruism in daily life. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 56, 206–209. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.09.017>
15. Feigin, S., Owens, G., & Goodyear-Smith, F. (2014). Theories of human altruism: a systematic review. *Journal of Psychiatry and Brain Functions*, 1(1), 5. <https://doi.org/10.7243/2055-3447-1-5>
16. Cherry, K. (2023). Altruism: How to Cultivate Selfless Behavior. *Verywellmind*. <https://verywellmind.com/what-is-altruism-2794828>
17. Klisanin, D. (2012, February 4). Digital Altruism: Using Social Media to Support Well-being. *Psychology Today*. <https://www.psychologytoday.com/intl/blog/digital-altruism/201202/digital-altruism-using-social-media-support-well-being#:~:text=Digital%20altruism%20is%20about%20making,strengths%20and%20virtues%20for%20decades>
18. Klisanin, D. (2011). Is the Internet giving rise to new forms of altruism. *Media Psychology Review*, 3(1), 1-11.
19. Huber, G. (1991), “Organizational learning: the contributing processes and the literatures”, *Organization Science*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 88-115
20. Hinderliter, H. (2019). Altruism as a Motivational Factor in Student Technology Adoption. <https://halhinderliter.com/portfolio/altruism-as-a-motivational-factor-in-student-technology-adoption/>
21. Mazman, S. G., & Usluel, Y. K. (2010). Modeling educational usage of Facebook. *Computers & Education*, 55(2), 444-453
22. Ma, W. W. K., & Chan, A. (2014). Knowledge sharing and social media: Altruism, perceived online attachment motivation, and perceived online relationship commitment. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 39, 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.06.015>
23. Granda, K. (2012). The difference in the level of altruism between cyberspace and real life. (Master's thesis)
24. Kruger, K. (2013). The New Normal: Social Networking and Student Affairs. *Journal of College and Character*, 14(1), 31–38. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jcc-2013-0005>
25. Ghadirian, H., Fauzi Mohd Ayub, A., Daud Silong, A., Binti Abu Bakar, K., & Mohammad Hossein Zadeh, A. (2014). Knowledge Sharing Behaviour among Students in Learning Environments: A Review of Literature. *Asian Social Science*, 10(4), . <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v10n4p38>
26. Oh, S., & Syn, S. Y. (2015). Motivations for sharing information and social support in social media: A comparative analysis of Facebook, Twitter, Delicious, YouTube, and Flickr. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 66(10), 2045–2060. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23320>
27. Lertpratchya, A. P., & Carpenter, S. (2015). Social media communicators' motivations for professional engagement: A study of altruism, reciprocity, and reputation. *PRISM* 12(2):<http://www.prismjournal.org/homepage.html>
28. Shwartz-Asher, D., Chun, S., Adam, N. R., & Snider, K. L. G. (2020). Knowledge sharing behaviors in social media. *Technology in Society*, 63, 101426. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2020.101426>

29. Vuori, V., & Okkonen, J. (2012). Knowledge sharing motivational factors of using an intra-organizational social media platform. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 16(4), 592–603. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13673271211246167>
30. Rushton, J. P., Chrisjohn, R.D., & Fekken, G. C. (1981). The altruistic personality and the self-report altruism scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 1, 292-302.
31. John, O. P., Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin, & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 102–138). New York: Guilford Press.
32. Spreng, R. N., McKinnon, M. C., Mar, R. C., Levine, B. (2009). The Toronto Empathy Questionnaire: Scale Development and Initial Validation of a Factor-Analytic solution to multiple Empathy Measures. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 91(1), 62-71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223890802484381>
33. Millstein, R. A., Chung, W.-J., Hoepfner, B. B., Boehm, J. K., Legler, S. R., Mastromauro, C. A., & Huffman, J. C. (2019). Development of the State Optimism Measure. *General Hospital Psychiatry*, 58, 83–93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2019.04.002>
34. Pommier, E., Neff, K. D., & Tóth-Király, I. (2019b). The Development and Validation of the Compassion Scale. *Assessment*, 27(1), 21–39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191119874108>
35. Pommier, E., Neff, K. D., & Tóth-Király, I. (2019a). The Development and Validation of the Compassion Scale. *Assessment*, 27(1), 21–39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191119874108>
36. Silvera, D. H., Martinussen, M., Dahl, T. I. (2001). The Tromsø Social Intelligence Scale, a self-report measure of social intelligence. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 42, 313-319.
37. Grieve, R., & Mahar, D. (2013). Can social intelligence be measured? Psychometric properties of the Tromsø Social Intelligence Scale – English Version. *The Irish Journal of Psychology*, 34(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03033910.2012.737758>
38. Hulle, S., Liebig, S. May, M.J.(2017). Measuring Attitudes Toward Distributive Justice: The Basic Social Justice Orientations Scale. *Social Indicators Research*, 136(2), 663-692. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022167817690280>
39. Kinnunen, S. P., Lindeman, M., & Verkasalo, M. (2016). Help-giving and moral courage on the Internet. *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace*, 10(4). <https://doi.org/10.5817/cp2016-4-6>
40. Freund, A. M., & Blanchard-Fields, F. (2014). Age-related differences in altruism across adulthood: Making personal financial gain versus contributing to the public good. *Developmental Psychology*, 50(4), 1125–1136. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034491>
41. Oliner, P. M., & Oliner, S. P. (1990). THE ROOTS OF ALTRUISM. *Shofar*, 8(2), 16–34. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42941396>
42. DeSteno, D. (2015). Compassion and altruism: how our minds determine who is worthy of help. *Current Opinion IN Behavioral Sciences*, 3, 80–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2015.02.002>
43. Hoffman, E., Gonzalez-Mujica, J., Acosta-Orozco, C., & Compton, W. C. (2017). The Psychological Benefits of Receiving Real-Life Altruism. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 60(2), 187–204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022167817690280>
44. Sharma, A. (2016). Exploring the relationship between social intelligence and altruism and spiritual intelligence amongst youth. *Imperial Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 2, Issue12. ISSN: 2454-1362 Snyder, C., & Lopez, S. J. (2002). *Handbook of Positive Psychology*. (C. Snyder, & S. J. Lopez, Eds.) Oxford University Press.
45. Carreras, M. R., Braza, P., Muñoz, J. M., Braza, F., Azurmendi, A., Pascual-Sagastizabal, E., Cardas, J., & Sánchez-Martín, J. R. (2014). Aggression and prosocial behaviors in social conflicts mediating the influence of cold social intelligence and affective empathy on children's social preference. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 55(4), 371–379. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sjop.12126>
46. Ivcevic, Z., & Ambady, N. (2013). Face to (Face)Book: The Two Faces of Social Behavior? *Journal of Personality*, 81(3), 290–301. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2012.00804.x>
47. Understanding How Conscientiousness Affects Your Behavior. (2020, May 5). verywellmind. <https://www.verywellmind.com/how-conscientiousness-affects-your-behavior-4843763>
48. Althoff, J. (2021, September 9). Digital optimism: Customers drive cloud and industry innovation with Microsoft technology. The Official Microsoft Blog. <https://blogs.microsoft.com/blog/2021/07/26/digital-optimism-customers-drive-cloud-and-industry-innovation-with-microsoft-technology>.
49. Statista. (2021, May 19). Social media use during COVID-19 worldwide - statistics & facts. <https://www.statista.com/topics/7863/social-media-use-during-coronavirus-covid-19-worldwide/#dossierKeyfigures>
50. World Health Organization (2020). Social Media & COVID-19: A Global Study of Digital Crisis Interaction among Gen Z and Millennials.. Available online: <https://www.who.int/news-room/feature-stories/detail/social-media-covid-19-aglobal-study-of-digital-crisis-interaction-among-gen-z-and-millennials> (accessed on 14 June 2021)
51. Guo, Q., Sun, P., & Li, L. (2018). Why neurotic individuals are less prosocial? A multiple mediation analysis regarding related mechanisms. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 128, 55–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.02.026>
52. Thorndike, E. L. (1920). Intelligence and its use. *Harper's Magazine*, 140, 227–235.
53. Vernon, P. E. (1933). The biosocial nature of the personality trait. *Psychological Review*, 40(6), 533–548. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0072622>

Appendix A

Table: Correlations between Digital Altruism, Altruism, Empathy, Compassion, Optimism, Social Intelligence, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Neuroticism, Openness, Conscientiousness, Social justice

	1	2	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3	4	5.1	5.2	5.3	5	6.1	6.2	6.5	6.3	6.4	7.1	7.2	7.3	7.4	7	9	8.1	8.2	8	
1. Age	1.000																										
2. Empathy	.073	1.000																									
3.1 Mindfulness	-.021	.439**	1.000																								
3.2 Kindness	.077	.650**	.555**	1.000																							
3.3 Common Humanity	.012	.279**	.378**	.453**	1.000																						
3.4 Indifference	.016	.560**	.342**	.412**	.298**	1.000																					
3. Compassion	.034	.654**	.711**	.777**	.685**	.748**	1.000																				
4. Optimism	.091	-.027	.147*	.175*	.093	.050	.145*	1.000																			
5.1 Social Information Processing	-.075	.274**	.466**	.388**	.324**	.307**	.463**	.174*	1.000																		
5.2 Social Skill	.128	.262**	.185**	.217**	.125	.262**	.265**	.333**	.199**	1.000																	
5.3 Social Awareness	.076	.219**	.158*	.073	.034	.319**	.200**	-.048	.139*	.322**	1.000																
5. Social Intelligence	.078	.367**	.369**	.297**	.192**	.418**	.422**	.209**	.514**	.771**	.733**	1.000															
6.1 Extraversion	.070	.241**	.081	.177*	-.005	.073	.099	.308**	.080	.653**	.022	.382**	1.000														
6.2 Agreeableness	.123	.473**	.274**	.369**	.085	.376**	.369**	.106	.132	.341**	.342**	.424**	.272**	1.000													
6.5 Conscientiousness	-.010	.142*	.169*	.156*	-.029	.191**	.154*	.301**	.115	.279**	.242**	.309**	.299**	.284**	1.000												
6.3 Neuroticism	-.091	.145*	.033	.073	.011	.004	.029	-.478**	-.018	-.381**	-.193**	-.316**	-.316**	-.124	-.276**	1.000											

	1	2	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3	4	5.1	5.2	5.3	5	6.1	6.2	6.5	6.3	6.4	7.1	7.2	7.3	7.4	7	9	8.1	8.2	8	
1. Age	1.000																										
6.4 Openness	-.036	.348**	.365**	.282**	.239**	.336**	.424**	.114	.268**	.192**	.141*	.269**	.191**	.216**	.228**	-.003	1.000										
7.1 Equity	.021	-.100	.005	-.116	-.198**	-.179*	-.173*	.045	-.039	-.100	-.100	-.141*	-.023	-.063	-.083	.071	-.063	1.000									
7.2 Equality	-.080	-.071	.003	-.117	-.098	-.041	-.098	-.024	-.052	-.056	-.020	-.076	-.021	-.079	-.057	.051	-.021	.351**	1.000								
7.3 Entitlement	.060	-.054	-.001	.019	.060	.005	.037	.016	.085	.109	.041	.102	.062	-.037	-.024	-.008	-.001	-.284**	-.396**	1.000							
7.4 Need	-.060	-.052	-.011	-.060	-.141*	-.148*	-.136	.054	-.007	-.003	-.108	-.082	.076	-.094	-.029	.058	-.051	.620**	.548**	-.377**	1.000						
7. Social Justice	-.004	-.143*	-.015	-.138*	-.187**	-.182**	-.185**	.041	-.034	-.027	-.084	-.099	.028	-.115	-.087	.059	-.083	.790**	.669**	-.122	.831**	1.000					
9. AltTot	.317**	.240**	.229**	.300**	.116	.140*	.245**	.263**	.230**	.325**	.012	.263**	.352**	.163*	.195**	-.185**	.231**	.118	-.046	.023	.049	.066	1.000				
8.1 Help Giving	.034	.040	.088	.066	-.042	-.014	.016	.259**	.194**	.193**	-.094	.117	.188**	-.081	.127	-.144*	.046	.146*	-.065	.012	.068	.069	.572**	1.000			
8.2 Moral Courage	-.072	.124	.150*	.141*	.140*	-.025	.098	.015	.257**	.117	-.095	.097	.098	-.186**	-.086	.011	.127	.012	-.120	.111	-.010	-.025	.391**	.540**	1.000		
8. Online Altruism	-.009	.095	.124	.117	.049	-.027	.059	.163*	.245**	.179*	-.114	.116	.164*	-.150*	.024	-.078	.110	.088	-.103	.072	.038	.031	.558**	.875**	.873**	1.000	

Note: This table demonstrates the correlation between the independent variables and the dependent variables. ** indicates that the correlation is significant at the 0.01 level. * indicates that the correlation is significant at the 0.05 level