

Examination of Socio-Cultural Factors Influencing Philanthropic Identity Realisation in Salem

Dr. P. Arunachalam^{1*}, Dr. A. Krishnan²

^{1*} Assistant Professor and Head, Department of Economics, Vivekanandha College of Arts and Sciences for Women (Autonomous), Tiruchengodu, Elayampalayam, Tamil nadu, Namakkal District, Tamil Nadu – 637 205. E-mail: kparunachalam06@gmail.com

² Assistant Professor & Head, Department of Economics, Sri Vijay Vidyalaya College of Arts and Science Nallampalli (po), Dharmapuri District - 636 807 Tamil Nadu E-mail: krishnanharur@gmail.com

Abstract

In an outset the article to delve in to the socio-economic dynamics of youth in Salem district, Tamil Nadu, bring together on the influence of gender, age, education, income, and occupation on philanthropic behaviour, particularly in relation to social media engagement. The findings highlight significant gender-based differences, with rural women primarily assuming caregiving roles, while urban men are more likely to engage in professional and public activities. Age-based distinctions reveal that the 20-24 age group, particularly in urban areas, is more involved in structured philanthropic efforts, whereas the 15-19 age group tends to focus on peer-driven or trending causes. Educationally, while urban areas have more graduates, rural areas show a higher percentage of postgraduates, suggesting the success of rural educational policies. Income analysis indicates that both rural and urban youth are predominantly in the lower- and middle-income brackets, with urban youth enjoying slightly better access to higher-income opportunities. Occupationally, students and professionals dominate both rural and urban areas, though rural areas have a higher proportion of homemakers. These findings underscore the importance of tailored policies and interventions to promote gender equality, educational access, and philanthropic behaviour across diverse socio-economic settings in both rural and urban areas.

Keywords: Gender roles, philanthropic behavior, social media engagement, value-based education, rural development policies, professional roles, caregiving roles, targeted interventions.

Introduction

Philanthropic identity refers to an individual's self-perception and sense of purpose that are fundamentally oriented toward selflessness and concern for the well-being of others. People with an philanthropic identity prioritize helping others, often placing collective or societal needs above their personal interests. This identity emerges through a combination of personal values, cultural norms, and social influences. Salem, located in Tamil Nadu, India, is a region rich in history, culture, and socio-economic diversity. It is known for its unique socio-cultural fabric shaped by historical influences, religious practices, and a blend of rural and urban lifestyles.

Salem's socio-cultural landscape is shaped by a blend of historical influences, demographic diversity, and vibrant practices that emphasize communal harmony and mutual support. Historically, Salem has thrived as a hub for trade and craftsmanship, particularly in textiles, steel production, and agriculture, with its cultural ethos deeply rooted in traditional practices and folklore that promote collective living. The region's demographic diversity is reflected in its multi-religious population, encompassing communities practicing Hinduism, Christianity, Islam, and others, coexisting in a unique blend of urban and rural lifestyles. This diversity fosters a social structure where progressive ideals meet traditional values, evident in the region's literacy rates, evolving gender roles, and varied economic activities. Further enriching its cultural fabric are the festivals, fairs, and religious events that bring

people together, alongside cooperative movements in agriculture and local industries that prioritize collective welfare. Together, these elements create a dynamic socio-cultural environment that supports the development of philanthropic identity in the community.

The study of philanthropic identity in Salem holds significant importance as it provides a deeper understanding of how regional socio-cultural factors shape individuals' sense of selflessness and collective responsibility. By exploring these dynamics, the study helps highlight the values that bind communities together, fostering social cohesion in a diverse and evolving socio-economic landscape. The findings can also serve as a valuable resource for policymakers and educators, offering strategies to integrate philanthropic values into community development initiatives and educational curricula, thus shaping ethical leaders of the future. Additionally, as rapid urbanization and modern lifestyles threaten traditional values of mutual support, this study provides insights into preserving and adapting these practices to contemporary realities. Given Salem's diversity and representative nature, the implications of the study extend beyond the region, offering lessons for other areas with similar cultural and social contexts, making it a valuable contribution to the understanding of identity Realisation and social harmony.

Review of Literature

Altruism, often defined as the selfless concern for the well-being of others, is influenced by a complex interplay of socio-cultural, psychological, and environmental factors. In the context of rural and urban India, where traditions and modernity coexist, understanding how philanthropic identities are shaped requires examining the socio-cultural dynamics unique to specific regions. This literature review explores various studies that examine the socio-cultural factors influencing philanthropic behaviour, identity Realisation, and social engagement, with a particular focus on rural and urban contexts like Salem.

Socio-Cultural Influences on Altruism

Philanthropic behaviour is deeply embedded in cultural contexts, with traditional values often guiding individuals' actions. In Indian society, where community values and family structures play a pivotal role, altruism is often considered a moral obligation. Many studies highlight that individuals in collectivist societies are more likely to engage in philanthropic acts as a way of fulfilling social norms and obligations (Schwartz, 1977). In the context of Tamil Nadu, the role of religion, family, and community networks is crucial in understanding how altruism is practiced. For instance, religious teachings emphasize the importance of helping others, which is often seen as a way to earn spiritual merit (Mulligan, 2015).

Gender Roles and Altruism

Gender norms significantly influence how philanthropic identities are formed. Women in rural settings often take on caregiving roles, which are integral to both family and community life (Dube, 1998). These caregiving roles contribute to an philanthropic self-identity where women's worth is tied to their ability to nurture and care for others. Conversely, in urban settings, where the role of women has evolved, women are also more likely to participate in public and professional domains (Barker, 2017). However, traditional expectations persist in rural areas, where women's altruism is often confined to the home, while men in both rural and urban contexts are expected to contribute to the community in broader, public ways (Sen, 2000). Understanding these gendered dynamics is essential for analyzing altruism within a socio-cultural framework.

Age and Philanthropic Behaviour

Age plays a critical role in the type of philanthropic activities individuals engage in. The younger population, particularly those between the ages of 15-24, are often seen as more influenced by peer-driven or trend-based altruism, especially through social media platforms. Studies have shown that

youth are more likely to engage in philanthropic behaviours that are visible and are seen as "socially relevant" (Levine, 2003). Urban youth, in particular, benefit from access to digital platforms and global networks, which allow them to support a range of causes, from global humanitarian campaigns to local charity events (Aydin, 2021). Rural youth, by contrast, may focus more on localized philanthropic causes, influenced by their immediate social circles and limited access to global networks. This age-based difference in altruism is critical to understanding how different groups engage with philanthropic behaviours both offline and online.

Educational and Socio-Economic Factors

Education is another significant factor shaping philanthropic behaviour. Research has consistently found that higher levels of education are associated with a greater likelihood of participating in philanthropic activities (Piliavin & Charng, 1990). In the rural context, despite traditionally lower educational levels, there has been a rise in access to post-secondary education, particularly through government initiatives. This has led to the emergence of a more educated rural population, which is more likely to participate in community development and social welfare activities (Jha, 2012). Conversely, urban areas typically show a higher percentage of graduates and postgraduates, which correlates with increased awareness and participation in social causes. Income also plays a significant role, with higher-income individuals more likely to contribute financially to causes they deem important (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011).

The Role of Social Media in Philanthropic Identity Realisation

Social media platforms are increasingly playing a role in the Realisation of philanthropic identities, particularly among youth. A study by Smith and Duggan (2013) noted that social media provides a space for individuals, particularly the younger generation, to express and engage with philanthropic causes. Social media platforms facilitate the spread of information about charitable events, volunteer opportunities, and social causes, creating a digital space for both localized and global altruism. In urban areas, where internet access and technological tools are more prevalent, youth are more likely to share content related to social causes, join virtual volunteer groups, or even fundraise online. Rural youth, on the other hand, may have limited access to such platforms, which may influence the way they express altruism, relying more on offline and community-based actions.

Cultural Associations and NGOs in Philanthropic Engagement

Cultural associations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) play a significant role in promoting philanthropic behaviors in both rural and urban areas. Many local NGOs focus on community development, providing platforms for youth to participate in social service and philanthropic activities. These organizations often work with educational institutions to promote social responsibility and charity as part of their value-based education curriculum (Narayan & Srinivasan, 2007). In rural areas, these NGOs often emphasize the importance of self-help groups, local development, and charity work as part of the community-building process. Urban NGOs, while also bring together on similar causes, often operate on a larger scale and may focus on issues like environmental sustainability, human rights, and social justice.

Summary and Research Gaps

While significant literature exists on the role of gender, age, education, and socio-economic factors in shaping philanthropic behaviour, there remains a lack of research focused specifically on how these factors manifest in different regions, particularly in rural-urban divides. Understanding how these socio-cultural factors intersect in the unique context of Salem is crucial for formulating policies that foster philanthropic identity Realisation, especially in an increasingly digital and globalized world. Further research could examine how digital literacy, access to social media, and participation in local community groups affect philanthropic behaviours across these settings.

Gender Roles and Social Expectations

Gender is a critical factor in shaping the socio-economic characteristics of a population because it affects access to opportunities, roles, resources, and overall participation in society. Understanding gender dynamics is key to addressing inequalities and promoting balanced socio-economic development. In traditional Tamil society, women are often viewed as nurturers, with care-giving roles expected within the family, contributing to an philanthropic self-identity. While men may traditionally assume public leadership roles, they are often regarded as protectors and benefactors of the community, shaping their philanthropic identity in social and economic contexts. Understanding these socio-cultural factors in Salem's unique context can provide insight into how philanthropic identity Realisation varies across different individuals and groups. These influences blend traditional elements with modern social dynamics, creating a multifaceted perspective on altruism in the region.

Table 1: Sex wise Distribution of Sample Respondents in Salem District

Sl. No.	Frequency		G. Total
	Rural	Urban	
Male	120 (46.15)	144 (55.38)	264 (50.77)
Female	140 (53.85)	116 (44.52)	256 (49.23)
Total	260 (100)	260 (100)	520 (100)

Source: Field Study

Note: Figure in parentheses indicates percentage to the total.

The Table 1 shows the gender-wise distribution of rural and urban sample respondents in Salem district. Out of a total of 520 respondents, 140 females (53.85per cent) lead in rural areas compared to 120 male respondents (46.15per cent). In urban areas, however, 144 male respondents (55.38per cent) are in the lead, followed by 116 female respondents (44.52per cent). The study further identifies that, overall, males dominate the sample with 264 respondents, while there are 256 female respondents in Salem district. The researcher found that the rural population has a slightly higher proportion of females (53.85per cent) compared to males (46.15per cent), while in urban areas, the male population is higher (55.38per cent) than the female population (44.52per cent). Overall, the population is almost evenly split between males and females, with males making up 50.77per cent of the total.

Age wise Distribution of Sample Respondents in Salem

The age-wise distribution of philanthropic identity manifested in social media, as examined in both rural and urban youth, provides insights into how different age groups express selflessness and social responsibility online. This comparative study likely involves categorizing youth respondents based on their age and analyzing how their philanthropic behaviours vary depending on their environment (rural or urban) and their presence on social media. Youth could be divided into specific age categories (15-19 years, 20-24 years), allowing for more granular analysis of how philanthropic behaviours change across these ranges. Examples could include sharing or posting content related to social causes, volunteering, charity work, or helping others in need through social platforms. How frequently they engage in such actions, whether occasionally, regularly, or rarely. Could be more engaged in broader, perhaps global causes, with greater access to diverse social networks and digital tools. Younger groups might be more engaged in peer-driven causes or trending issues. Older youth could be involved in more structured philanthropic efforts, such as fundraising for organizations or participating in social campaigns. May have less frequent or lower-quality internet access, potentially

influencing the way they manifest philanthropic identity compared to their urban counterparts. Likely, to have better access to technology and social media platforms, facilitating more frequent and diverse expressions of philanthropic behaviour.

Table 2: Age wise Distribution of Sample Respondents in Salem District

Sl. No.	Age	Frequency		G. Total
		Rural	Urban	
1	15 – 19	128 (49.23)	112 (43.08)	240 (46.15)
2	20 – 24	132 (50.77)	148 (56.92)	280 (53.85)
3	Total	260 (100)	260 (100)	520 (100)

Source: Field Study

Note: Figure in parentheses indicates percentage to the total.

Table 2 presents the distribution of individuals by age group across rural and urban areas in and around Salem district. Out of 128 individuals in the 15-19 age group, which accounts for 49.23per cent of the rural total, 112 individuals, or 43.08per cent of the urban total, are represented. This gives an overall total of 240 individuals in this age group, making up 46.15per cent of the grand total. The study also examined the 20-24 age group, which consists of 132 individuals, representing 50.77per cent of the rural total, and 148 individuals, accounting for 56.92per cent of the urban total. The findings indicate that the 20-24 age group comprises a larger share of the population in both rural (50.77per cent) and urban (56.92per cent) areas. There is a relatively balanced distribution of individuals between rural and urban areas, with 260 individuals in each. Overall, 53.85per cent of the total population falls within the 20-24 age group, while 46.15per cent belongs to the 15-19 age group in and around Salem district, Tamil Nadu.

Educational Institutions and Cultural Associations

Value-Based Education: Schools, especially those with religious or cultural affiliations, often incorporate teachings on charity and altruism as part of their curriculum. Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs): There are numerous local NGOs and cultural associations that promote social welfare and encourage youth participation in philanthropic activities.

Table 3: Educational wise Distribution of Sample Respondents in Salem

Sl. No.	Educational Level	Frequency		G. Total
		Rural	Urban	
1	School / Diploma / IT & below	62 (23.85)	64 (24.62)	126 (24.23)
2	Graduate	96 (36.92)	110 (42.30)	206 (39.62)
3	Post Graduate	102 (39.23)	86 (33.08)	188 (36.15)
	Total	260 (100)	260 (100)	520 (100)

Source: Field Study

Note: Figure in parentheses indicates percentage to the total.

The data from Table 3 shows the distribution of people across different educational levels, broken down by rural and urban populations. The study found that 62 respondents (23.85per cent of the rural population) had completed schooling/diploma/IT education or below. In urban areas, 64 respondents

(24.62per cent) fell into this category, with an overall sample of 126 respondents, constituting 24.23per cent of the total population in Salem district.

Additionally, the study indicates that there are 96 graduates in the rural sample, accounting for 36.92per cent of the rural population. In urban areas, there are 110 graduates, making up 42.30per cent of the urban sample.

Interestingly, postgraduates are more prevalent in rural areas, with 102 respondents (39.23per cent) compared to 86 respondents (33.08per cent) in urban areas. This is somewhat unexpected, as higher levels of education are often assumed to be more common in urban populations. The study also identifies that graduates are more concentrated in urban areas (42.30per cent) than in rural areas (36.92per cent).

The percentage of individuals in the School/Diploma/IT & Below category is nearly the same in both rural and urban areas, indicating no significant difference between the two regions in terms of lower educational levels.

Overall, the study suggests a slightly higher concentration of post-graduate education in rural areas, which may reflect trends such as local development or educational policies that benefit rural regions. However, urban areas still lead in the number of graduates.

The relationship between Income and social media

Philanthropic behaviour among both rural and urban youth on social media is typically manifested through various actions, such as: Sharing posts, videos, or info-graphics about social issues (e.g., environmental protection, poverty alleviation, mental health awareness) that call for public attention and support. Participating in or promoting online fundraisers for social causes, such as medical emergencies, education for underprivileged children, or disaster relief efforts. Youth may initiate crowd-funding campaigns or share links to donation platforms like GoFundMe, Milaap, or Ketto. Posting about community volunteering activities like cleaning drives, teaching underprivileged children, or distributing food to the needy. They may share photos, live updates, or post-event reflections to inspire others.

Engaging in campaigns that push for policy changes or collective action, such as posting about protests, petitions, or movements related to gender equality, caste discrimination, or human rights. Organizing or contributing to local mutual aid groups that provide direct assistance to community members (e.g., food, shelter, or monetary support). These efforts are shared and coordinated through social media. Youth from higher income groups are more likely to donate money to charitable causes and share their contributions online. They might also be seen promoting large-scale fundraising campaigns or organizing charity events. They tend to have greater access to smart-phones, high-speed internet, and larger social networks, making their philanthropic efforts more visible and influential on platforms like Instagram or Twitter.

High-income youth often engage in more professionally organized philanthropic activities, such as branded charity events or partnerships with non-profits, and use high-quality content (well-designed visuals, professional videos) to promote these causes. Instead of monetary donations, youth from lower income backgrounds often contribute through volunteering their time and effort, such as participating in local service projects or community-based mutual aid. They may organize or join grassroots efforts to support their immediate community, such as food or clothing drives, and use social media to spread word-of-mouth within smaller networks. Limited access to smart-phones or stable internet connections can constrain the reach of their online efforts, often leading to a focus on local rather than global causes. However, they may still participate in philanthropic activities via WhatsApp groups or local Face-book pages. Yes, there are several significant differences in how rural and urban youth express philanthropic behaviour on social media, influenced by factors such as access to technology, cultural values, and social context: Urban youth generally have access to a wider variety of platforms (Instagram, Twitter, YouTube, LinkedIn) due to better digital infrastructure and higher internet penetration. Their philanthropic actions are more visible on these platforms, with

widespread use of hash-tags, live videos, and digital campaigns. In rural areas, social media activity is often more limited to platforms like Face-book and WhatsApp, where connectivity is stable enough. Rural youth might focus more on community-driven, localized causes that are shared within smaller circles, using more text-based communication and regional languages.

Urban youth are more likely to engage in national or global issues, such as climate change, human rights, or international charity efforts. Their altruism might focus on awareness campaigns, fundraising for NGOs, or activism for broad social changes. Altruism among rural youth often focuses on local community issues, such as agricultural aid, local health crises, or immediate socio-economic needs. Their philanthropic actions are more closely tied to their communities, where they directly help neighbors or participate in grassroots projects. Philanthropic identity in urban areas often involves participating in or leading broader social movements (e.g., Black Lives Matter, Me-Too). These actions are typically more advocacy-driven and directed at wider societal change. Rural youth are often more involved in practical, community-based philanthropic activities like helping farmers, addressing local environmental challenges (e.g., water conservation), or supporting village schools. Their efforts are more localized and practical, with a focus on tangible, direct action in their communities.

Urban youth tend to have higher digital literacy, enabling them to engage in more sophisticated online activism. They may create professional-looking content, use advanced social media tools, and collaborate with NGOs or influencers. Limited digital literacy in rural areas often results in more modest online presence. Rural youth might use simpler forms of communication, like sharing WhatsApp forwards or posting photos of community service on Face-book, rather than participating in large-scale digital campaigns.

Philanthropic acts by urban youth often receive more online visibility and social approval, creating a "per-formative" aspect to altruism. The impact of their actions is measured by likes, shares, and engagement metrics. The focus in rural areas is more on practical, on-the-ground results, with less emphasis on digital visibility. Their actions might have immediate local impact, but may not receive the same level of recognition on larger social media platforms. The rural and urban youth in Salem (and other regions) express altruism differently on social media. Income plays a critical role in determining the nature and visibility of philanthropic behaviour, with wealthier youth more likely to engage in monetary contributions and sophisticated online campaigns, while lower-income youth focus on community-based support. Geographical background adds another layer of complexity, with urban youth engaging more in global causes and rural youth bring together on local, community-oriented efforts.

Table 4: Income wise Distribution of Sample Respondents in Salem

Sl. No.	Family Income	Rural	Urban	G. Total
1	Below 10000	42 (16.15)	44 (16.92)	86 (16.54)
2	10001 – 20000	96 (36.92)	76 (29.23)	172 (33.08)
3	20001 – 30000	84 (32.31)	90 (34.62)	174 (33.46)
4	above 30001	38 (14.62)	50 (19.23)	88 (16.92)
	G. Total	260 (100)	260 (100)	520 (100)

Source: Field Study

Note: Figure in parentheses indicates percentage to the total.

Table 4 shows that in the below ₹10,000 income bracket, 42 out of 260 rural youth (16.15%) fall into this low-income category. In urban areas, 44 out of 260 youth (16.92%) are in this group, indicating a similar proportion compared to rural youth. Overall, 86 out of 520 youth (16.54%) belong to this category, suggesting that about 1 in 6 youth, regardless of rural or urban background, come from families with very low income.

The study notes that in the ₹10,001–₹20,000 income bracket, the largest portion of rural youth (96 out of 260, or 36.92%) falls within this middle-income category, suggesting that a significant proportion of rural families in Salem earn within this range. In urban areas, a smaller but still substantial share of urban youth (76 out of 260, or 29.23%) belongs to this group, reflecting relatively more economic diversity in urban settings. Overall, 33.08% of the total sample (172 out of 520) falls into this income range, making it the largest group overall.

The study also finds that in the ₹20,001–₹30,000 income bracket, 84 out of 260 rural youth (32.31%) belong to this slightly higher middle-income group, indicating a sizable segment with relatively better financial status. In urban areas, a slightly larger portion of youth (90 out of 260, or 34.62%) falls into this bracket, suggesting that urban youth are more evenly distributed across middle-income levels compared to their rural counterparts. Overall, 33.46% of the total sample (174 out of 520) falls into this category, indicating that about one-third of both rural and urban youth come from families with moderate incomes.

The study highlights that in the above ₹30,001 income bracket, only 38 rural youth (14.62%) belong to families with an income above ₹30,001, reflecting the lower prevalence of higher-income households in rural areas. In urban areas, a higher percentage (50 out of 260, or 19.23%) of youth come from higher-income families, highlighting a more affluent population in urban settings. Overall, 16.92% of the total sample (88 out of 520) falls into this high-income category.

In rural areas, the largest percentage of youth (36.92%) comes from families earning ₹10,001–₹20,000, followed by 32.31% in the ₹20,001–₹30,000 range. This indicates that a substantial portion of rural youth come from lower-middle-income families. Only 14.62% of rural youth belong to high-income families, reflecting the limited presence of wealthier households in rural areas.

Urban youth are more evenly distributed across the middle-income brackets, with 29.23% in the ₹10,001–₹20,000 range and 34.62% in the ₹20,001–₹30,000 range. The percentage of youth from high-income families (19.23%) is higher in urban areas compared to rural areas, indicating better economic opportunities or access to higher-paying jobs. The largest overall group in the sample is in the ₹20,001–₹30,000 bracket (33.46%), closely followed by those in the ₹10,001–₹20,000 bracket (33.08%). The data shows that the youth population in both rural and urban areas is largely concentrated in the lower- and middle-income ranges, with a relatively small portion (16.92%) from high-income families.

The income distribution between rural and urban youth shows notable differences, with urban youth more likely to come from higher-income families than their rural counterparts. However, both groups are predominantly situated in the middle-income brackets. These income patterns can guide future research on how socio-economic status affects the manifestation of philanthropic behaviour on social media among rural and urban youth in Salem district.

The relationship between occupation and social media philanthropic identity

The occupation of rural and urban youth affects their time, resources, and motivation to engage in such behaviours, creating variations in how altruism is manifested across different occupational groups. Students, as the largest occupational group in both rural and urban areas, are highly active on social media. They are more likely to engage in raising awareness, sharing educational content, and participating in online campaigns for social causes.

Professionals tend to express their altruism by leveraging their social media presence for mentorship, networking, and sharing career advice. They may participate in or promote charitable events, support corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities, or make donations to causes they support. Self-

employed individuals may demonstrate altruism by supporting local businesses, sharing entrepreneurial tips, or offering job opportunities. They may use social media to promote community-based initiatives, providing resources or knowledge to help others start or grow their businesses. Homemakers often engage in philanthropic activities related to family, health, and community welfare. They may support causes such as child education, healthcare access, and women's empowerment through social media.

In rural areas, homemakers might focus more on community-centered philanthropic efforts, while in urban areas, homemakers from higher-income households may engage in charity work, contributing to larger campaigns or volunteering. The capacity to engage in philanthropic activities online is influenced by access to technology and digital literacy. Urban youth, particularly professionals and students, are likely to have greater access to high-speed internet and advanced digital tools, enabling them to participate in a wider range of philanthropic activities online. Rural youth, while equally motivated, may be limited by infrastructure and access.

Youth with higher-income backgrounds or those in professional roles often have more resources (financial or social capital) to contribute to formal philanthropic activities, such as fundraising or large-scale charity campaigns. Youth from lower-income or rural backgrounds might express altruism through community-based initiatives or localized support.

Cultural factors also play a role, as rural youth may be more community-oriented in their altruism, bring together on close-knit local causes, while urban youth might engage with broader social justice movements or global issues due to their exposure to diverse perspectives on social media.

The relationship between occupation and social media philanthropic identity among rural and urban youth is shaped by access to resources, digital literacy, and social context. Students and professionals dominate online altruism, with students often leading awareness campaigns and professionals contributing financially or through mentorship. Self-employed individuals focus on entrepreneurial and community development efforts, while homemakers and those in non-traditional occupations engage in more localized, community-based altruism. Understanding this relationship can help tailor social media campaigns to engage different occupational groups effectively in philanthropic behaviour.

Table 5: Occupational wise Distribution of Sample Respondents in Salem

Sl. No.	Occupational	Rural	Urban	G. Total
1	Student	120 (46.15)	124 (47.69)	244 (46.92)
2	Professional	90 (34.62)	98 (37.69)	188 (36.15)
3	Self-Employed	18 (6.92)	18 (6.92)	36 (6.92)
4	Homemaker	22 (8.46)	10 (3.85)	32 (6.15)
5	Others	10 (3.85)	10 (3.85)	20 (3.85)
	Total	260 (100)	260 (100)	520 (100)

Source: Field Study

Note: Figure in parentheses indicates percentage to the total.

The analysis of Table 5, which shows the occupational distribution of the sample respondents, reveals that students make up the largest group in both rural and urban areas. In rural areas, 120 out of 260 youth (46.15%) are students, while in urban areas, a similar percentage is observed, with 124 out of 260 (47.69%) being students. For professionals, 90 rural youth (34.62%) fall into this category,

making it the second-largest group. In urban areas, the percentage of professionals is slightly higher, with 98 out of 260 (37.69%) classified as professionals.

The study shows that the self-employed category is evenly distributed between rural and urban areas, with 18 out of 260 youth (6.92%) in each group. However, when it comes to homemakers, 22 rural youth (8.46%) fall into this category, which is a higher proportion compared to urban areas, where only 10 youth (3.85%) are homemakers. Both rural and urban areas have 10 youth (3.85%) categorized as "Others," showing minimal variation between the two regions.

The study further indicates that students and professionals dominate the occupational landscape, with nearly half of the youth in both rural and urban areas being students (46.92%) and over one-third being professionals (36.15%). The equal distribution of self-employed youth across rural and urban areas (6.92%) suggests that entrepreneurial activities are similarly prevalent in both regions. Homemakers, however, are more common in rural areas (8.46%) compared to urban areas (3.85%), possibly reflecting more traditional family roles in rural communities.

The "Others" category, representing various non-traditional occupations, has the smallest representation, with only 3.85% in both rural and urban areas. In conclusion, the occupational distribution of rural and urban youth exhibits similar patterns, with students and professionals being the dominant groups. However, there are notable differences in the proportion of homemakers, which are more common in rural areas, while urban youth show a slightly higher representation in professional roles. These findings provide valuable insight into the socio-economic dynamics of youth in both rural and urban settings, which could be further explored in relation to their philanthropic behaviour on social media.

Conclusion

The findings of this study provide valuable insights into the socio-economic dynamics of Salem district, highlighting key factors such as gender roles, age, education, income distribution, and occupations, all of which influence the expression of philanthropic behaviours. Traditional gender roles are particularly prominent, with women in rural areas predominantly assuming caregiving responsibilities, while men in urban areas are more likely to engage in public and professional domains. These gender-based patterns suggest the need for policies that promote gender equality and foster balanced socio-economic participation across both rural and urban settings. Additionally, the study reveals that the 20-24 age group, likely with better access to resources and a more mature perspective, is more actively engaged in structured philanthropic activities, particularly in urban areas where digital tools and broader networks are more accessible. In contrast, the 15-19 age group tends to focus on peer-driven or trending causes, often influenced by localized issues or social circles. This distinction underscores the importance of designing targeted programs for different age groups to encourage philanthropic behaviour. Regarding education, the study indicates that while urban areas have a higher percentage of graduates, rural areas have a higher proportion of postgraduates, suggesting the effectiveness of rural development policies in promoting higher education. Understanding these educational trends can help shape interventions to improve educational access and promote altruism through value-based education. The income distribution also shows that both rural and urban youth are concentrated in the lower- and middle-income brackets, with urban youth having slightly better access to higher-income opportunities. These economic disparities highlight the need for targeted interventions to address socio-economic status and its impact on philanthropic behaviour. Finally, the occupational distribution shows that students and professionals dominate both rural and urban areas, with rural areas having a higher percentage of homemakers and urban areas a higher percentage of professionals. These findings offer a comprehensive understanding of the socio-economic landscape of youth in Salem and provide a foundation for policies and programs that promote altruism, reduce disparities, and encourage balanced socio-economic development.

Reference

1. Aydin, E. (2021). *The influence of digital platforms on youth engagement in social causes*.
2. Barker, D. K. (2017). *Women, gender, and development: Redefining the role of women in modern society*.
3. Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011). A literature review of empirical studies on philanthropy: Eight mechanisms that drive charitable giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(5), 924–973. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764010380927>
4. Dube, L. (1998). *Women and kinship: Comparative perspectives on gender in South and Southeast Asia*. United Nations University Press.
5. Jha, P. (2012). *Education, access, and social change in rural India*.
6. Levine, R. V. (2003). *The kindness of strangers: Philanthropic behavior in a globalized world*.
7. Mulligan, M. (2015). *Religion and spiritual merit in South Asian cultural practices*.
8. Narayan, D., & Srinivasan, A. (2007). *Social capital and community development: A case study of Tamil Nadu*.
9. Piliavin, J. A., & Charng, H.-W. (1990). Altruism: A review of recent theory and research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 16, 27–65. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.16.080190.000331>
10. Schwartz, S. H. (1977). Normative influences on altruism. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 10, 221–279. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60358-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60358-5)
11. Sen, A. (2000). *Development as freedom*. Anchor Books.
12. Smith, A., & Duggan, M. (2013). *Online giving: How social media shapes the new landscape of altruism*. Pew Research Center.