Scientific Studios on Social and Political Psychology

Journal homepage: https://sppstudios.com.ua/
***Scientific Studios on Social and Political Psychology*, 31(2), 6-14**

UDC 316.6:316.4
DOI: 10.61727/sssppj/2.2025.06

ISSN 2309-8287
E-ISSN 2706-9672

The relationship between social capital, digital well-being, and quality of life of Ukrainians: An empirical study

Illia Polityka
Undergraduate Student
Kyiv School of Economics
03113, 3 Mykoly Shpaka Str., Kyiv, Ukraine
https://orcid.org/0009-0005-7379-7211

Maryna Dvornyk-Kozachinska*
PhD in Social Psychology, Associate Professor
Kyiv School of Economics
03113, 3 Mykoly Shpaka Str., Kyiv, Ukraine
Senior Researcher
Institute of Social and Political Psychology of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine
04070, 15 Andriivska Str., Kyiv, Ukraine
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1505-0169

Abstract. The growing digitalisation of everyday life has transformed the role of social capital in shaping well-being, making it important to understand how traditional social ties operate in online contexts. The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between social capital, digital well-being, and quality of life in the Ukrainian population. An online survey was conducted among 91 participants (78% female), using three validated instruments: the KPIKS methodology for assessing social capital, the Digital Well-Being Scale, and the SF-36 v2 Health Survey for quality of life. Standardised data collection and statistical procedures ensured reliability of the results, while internal consistency analysis confirmed that the adapted scales demonstrated acceptable psychometric properties in the Ukrainian context. The results established that among several tested hypotheses, only one yielded a significant result: a moderate positive correlation between the total score of social capital and digital well-being ($r = 471$, $p < 0.001$). This indicated that individuals with broader and stronger social networks were more likely to experience balance, regulation, and emotional security in digital environments. At the same time, higher levels of digital competence and satisfaction were associated with greater opportunities for social fulfilment. Other hypothesised links, including those between social capital and overall quality of life or physical health indicators, were not statistically supported. These results contributed to the emerging literature on digital mental health by identifying social capital as a significant correlate of digital well-being, even when broader well-being indicators show weaker associations. The practical value of the study lies in its applicability for psychologists, educators, and digital health specialists who may use the results to design interventions that strengthen social networks and improve individuals' interaction with digital technologies

Keywords: digital literacy; psychological well-being; social support; civic engagement; solidarity; media consumption

Article's History: Received: 05.08.2025 Revised: 27.11.2025 Accepted: 30.12.2025 Published: 13.01.2026

Suggested Citation:
Polityka, I., & Dvornyk-Kozachinska, M. (2025). The relationship between social capital, digital well-being, and quality of life of Ukrainians: An empirical study. *Scientific Studios on Social and Political Psychology*, 31(2), 6-14. doi: 10.61727/sssppj/2.2025.06.

*Corresponding author

INTRODUCTION

Capital, as a concept, has long been integral to economic discourse, signifying both monetary and tangible resources that aid in the creation and growth of capital. The investigation of the capital has expanded to encompass interconnected domains beyond the economy, particularly the social realm, where elements such as social networks, trust, and collective norms play a crucial role in promoting cooperation and the sharing of resources among individuals and groups.

The exploration of social capital is, in fact, quite distinct from the in-depth analysis of its practical benefits and the various temporal contexts that play a crucial role in understanding its implications. J. Coleman (1990) viewed social capital as a resource that facilitates coordination and social mobility, while P. Bourdieu (1986) emphasised its role in reproducing social hierarchy and inequality. R. Putnam (2000) outlined the importance of social capital for civil society, showing that active participation in social ties strengthens democratic institutions. F. Fukuyama (2002) expanded this concept, emphasising its crucial role in shaping economic institutions and the level of trust in society. Thus, social capital is a multidimensional phenomenon that affects various aspects of social life, from education and politics to the economy and social structure.

Similar to economic capital, the presence of social capital significantly affects numerous dimensions of human life, notably concerning health and wellness. The literature in this area has pointed to the connection between social capital and quality of life in all human spheres: from childhood (Ramadan *et al.*, 2025) to assistance during man-made disasters (De Santis & Fantinelli, 2024). Within the micro-level framework, attention is directed toward the existing personal ties and their implications. Traditionally understood within offline, face-to-face interactions, social capital is increasingly being re-evaluated in the context of digital communication. Scientists, in particular M. Grottke *et al.* (2018) pointed to the difference in the mechanisms of social capital acquisition during the digital age, which indicates the importance of studying whether online connections can replace real ones. Digitalisation has also introduced many risks that can negatively impact health and well-being. Abuse of social media, dependence on phones, coupled with personalised content, can create isolation, an echo chamber bubble that can reduce cooperation and trust with people from other bubbles (Polishchuk *et al.*, 2024). M. Fahy & M. Barry (2024) found that computer-mediated communication that builds social capital improved individuals' well-being, especially for those experiencing loneliness, this further indicates the need to expand the study.

However, not only the digital environment itself is important, but also a balance called digital well-being, which was not implied in the social capital before. This experiential state is comprised of affective and cognitive appraisals of the integration of digital connectivity into ordinary life. People achieve digital wellbeing when experiencing maximal controlled pleasure and functional support, together with minimal loss of control and functional impairment (Razzante *et al.*, 2021). Also, D. Peters *et al.* (2018) pointed out that gadgets and digital interactions should support basic needs such as autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Thus, the distinction between digital social capital and conventional social capital is essential, as literature emphasises their different content and mechanisms of acquisition.

The study formulated several hypotheses. Hypothesis 1 (H_1) stated that there was a positive association between social capital and quality of life. Hypothesis 2 (H_2) proposed that digital well-being was positively associated with quality of life. Hypothesis 3 (H_3) suggested that private-sphere social capital was positively correlated with quality of life. Hypothesis 4 (H_4) indicated that higher levels of public-sphere social capital were associated with better physical health indicators. Hypothesis 5 (H_5) assumed that the presence of international social contacts was positively associated with overall well-being. The Hypothesis 6 (H_6) stated that there was a positive correlation between social capital and digital well-being. The primary objective of the present study was to explore the relationships among social capital, digital well-being, and various indicators of quality of life. To this end, six hypotheses were formulated and tested using nonparametric statistical methods, due to the non-normal distribution of the dependent variables.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In this study, a confirmatory research design was chosen to test the hypothesised relationships between all the phenomena under study, namely social capital, digital well-being, and quality of life. This design was based on the logic of the quantitative approach, which aims to develop and measure the statistical relationship between variables. The quantitative method provides the ability to collect standardised data and use validated scales, as well as a wide range of statistical methods. The definition of Social Capital used in this study is based on R. Styla (2009) KPIKS methodology (Individual Questionnaire for Measuring Social Capital, translated from Polish) as adapted by I. Semkiv (2015). The term defines an individual's access to social resources in the personal, public, and private spheres. The methodology included 64 statements related to the knowledge of a person who can help or support you at a given moment, and is assessed on a 4-point scale: 1 – "I don't know such a person", 2 – "I know such a person but poorly", 3 – "I know such a person well", 4 – "I know such a person very well". The questions were divided into productive indicators of skill, emotional, leisure, socio-professional, social institutions, international, and

private sphere resources. The resource index formed a general indicator – bonding social capital, which was defined as "the number of resources belonging to a person's social network that can become available to their as a result of the peculiarities of previous contacts (Semkiv, 2015). When using and transferring the methodology to Google Forms, some questions were updated to reflect the current context and universality. A complete list of these questions, along with the reasons for the changes, is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Modification of KPIKS methodology questions

№	Original version	Modified version	Modification Criteria	Ukrainian final version
26	Do you know anyone who could look after your **dog** while you're on vacation?	Do you know anyone who could look after your **pet** while you are on vacation?	Universality	Чи знаєш когось, хто міг би доглядати за твої домашнім улюбленцем під час твоєї відпустки?
47	Do you know anyone who would like to watch **TV** with you?	Do you know anyone who would like to watch a **media show/movie/series** with you?	Modernisation	Чи знаєш когось, хто може подивитися з тобою медіа-шоу/ фільм/ серіал?
48	Do you know anyone who is a **computer scientist**?	Do you know anyone who is an **IT (information technology)** specialist?	Modernisation	Чи знаєш когось, хто є фахівцем в IT (сфері інформаційних технологій)?
49	Do you know anyone who can help you if your **bike** breaks down?	Do you know anyone who can help you if your **small-sized vehicle (bicycle, etc.)** breaks down?	Universality	Чи знаєш когось, хто може допомогти тобі, якщо у тебе зламається негабаритний засіб пересування (велосипед тощо)?
53	Do you know anyone who is a **citizen of Russia**?	Do you know anyone who is a **citizen of the Czech Republic**?	Political context	Чи знаєш когось, хто є громадянином Чехії?

Source: developed by the authors

Digital Well-Being was operationalised through the digital well-being scale (DWBS) developed by V.B. Arslankara *et al.* (2022), which measures subjective well-being related to the use of digital technologies in everyday life. The scale consists of 12 statements organised into three subscales: (1) digital satisfaction, (2) safe and responsible behaviour, and (3) digital well-being. All items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale, from 1 – "not at all reflective of me" to 5 – "completely reflective of me". This methodology was translated into Ukrainian specifically for this research. The questionnaire did not require linguistic or cultural adaptation, as its items are formulated in a simple and universally comprehensible manner, ensuring clarity across diverse respondent groups. A direct translation was made from English into Ukrainian with corrections by a specialist in the field of philology Hanna Kniaz, a lecturer at the Kyiv School of Economics. The list of corrections can be found in Table 2.

Table 2. Translation of the digital well-being scale (DWBS) questions into Ukrainian

Factor	Original version	Ukrainian final version
Цифрове задоволення (Digital Satisfaction)	1. I can easily adapt to new technologies.	1. Я легко адаптуюся до нових технологій.
	2. I enjoy spending time with digital technologies.	2. Мені подобається проводити час з цифровими технологіями.
	3. I care about new digital experiences that can bring different experiences.	3. Мене цікавить новий цифровий досвід, що урізноманітнює враження.
	4. In digital skills, I feel in harmony with the people around me.	4. Мої цифрові навички допомагають почуватися в гармонії з людьми, які мене оточують.
Безпечна та відповідальна поведінка (Safe and Responsible Behavior)	5. I care about my digital reputation when using online platforms.	5. Я дбаю про свою цифрову репутацію під час використання онлайн-платформ.
	6. I take care not to exhibit behavior that disturbs other users on social media.	6. Я пильную, щоб не проявляти поведінку, яка заважає іншим користувачам у соціальних мережах.
	7. I use digital technology in purposeful meaningful ways.	7. Я використовую цифрові технології цілеспрямовано та осмислено.
	8. I always act cautiously against any harm that may come to me in the digital world.	8. Я завжди ставлюся з пересторогою до небезпеки, що може спіткати мене в цифровому світі.

Table 2, Continued

Factor	Original version	Ukrainian final version
Цифровий добробут (Digital Wellness)	9. I feel comfortable knowing that someone will see my social media posts.	9. Я почуваюся комфортно, знаючи, що хтось побачить мої дописи в соціальних мережах
	10. It makes me happy if the posts/stories/statuses I share are liked.	10. Мене тішить, якщо дописи/ історії/ статуси, якими я ділюся, є вподобаними
	11. A technological problem that I cannot solve makes me angry. (-)	11. Технологічна проблема, яку я не можу вирішити, злить мене (-)
	12. If I express myself freely on social media, I think that I will be ostracized by some people in my social networks (-)	12. Якщо я вільно проявлятимуся в соціальних медіа, думаю, що деякі люди з моїх соціальних мереж відкидатимуть мене (-).

Source: developed by the authors

The concept of Quality of Life was operationalised using the SF-36 v2 Health survey (Lopina, 2023), which was adapted and presented in medicine. Quality of Life is understood as an integrated assessment of a person's physical, psycho-emotional, social, and functional well-being, reflecting their ability to perform daily activities, maintain social relationships, cope with pain and stress, and maintain energy and vitality. The questionnaire included 36 items grouped into eight subscales: physical functioning, role functioning, bodily pain, general health, life activity, social functioning, emotional role functioning, and mental health. All responses were numerical and processed using the methodology of calculating a total score in the range of 0-100%, where higher values indicate a better quality of life. The target population of this study was the population of Ukraine, that is, individuals who permanently reside within the country and possess a sufficient level of digital literacy to participate in an online survey. This population included representatives of various social groups, such as school students, university students, employed individuals, the unemployed, and retirees, regardless of their region of residence, gender, or professional background. The selection of this population was driven by the aim of the study – to explore general patterns in the relationship between digital well-being, social capital, and quality of life among users of digital technologies in the context of contemporary Ukrainian society.

Sample formation was intentionally based on the guiding principle of random and convenient access. To maximise participation, the link to the questionnaire was effectively distributed through various social networking platforms, and participants were motivated to complete the questionnaire by their own interest as well as the idea of youth science support. Data was collected online using a structured digital questionnaire powered by Google Forms containing standardised scales: The DWBS (which was specially translated into Ukrainian as part of the research), the adapted KPIKS social capital questionnaire, and the Ukrainian version of the SF-36 scale for assessing quality of life. Data analysis was conducted using Jamovi statistical software version 2.6 (The Jamovi project, n.d.; R Core Team, 2024), and all procedures followed standard assumptions checking. Variables for DWBS, social capital (in both public and private spheres), and quality of life (QoL, as measured by the SF-36 v2) were computed by aggregating relevant item scores into total or subscale means. Where necessary, reverse-coded items were transformed before computation. Descriptive statistics were generated for each continuous variable, including means, standard deviations, skewness, and kurtosis. Normality of distributions was assessed using Shapiro-Wilk tests, revealing non-normality in key outcome variables (e.g., QoL). Consequently, Spearman's rank-order correlation was used for hypothesis testing involving ordinal or non-normal continuous data. To prevent ethical challenges, an informed consent form was presented at the beginning of the survey, including the purpose of the study, estimated time of completion, a reminder of the voluntary nature of participation, the possibility of withdrawal at any stage, and guarantees of confidentiality and anonymity of responses. At the end of the questionnaire, a debriefing was implemented in accordance with the ethical standards recommended by American Psychological Association (2017) and Standards of Ethical Practice (n.d.) It detailed the logic of the study, explained the choice of topic, provided contact information for withdrawal of participation within 48 hours, indicated the telephone number of the psychological support hotline, and offered links to the methods used in the questionnaire.

The sample comprised 91 respondents, with a pronounced preponderance of women (n = 71, 78.0%) relatively to men (n = 20, 22.0%). Age was classified into standard demographic categories (Under 18, 18-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65 and older). The largest age group was 18-24 y.o. (45/91, 49.5%), followed by 35-44 y.o. (16/91, 17.6%) and 45-54 y.o. (9/91, 9.9%). Twelve participants (13.2%) were under 18 y.o., seven (7.7%) were 25-34 y.o., two (2.2%) were 55-64 y.o., and no one was 65 or older. Subjective monthly income (self-rated on a 0-5 scale from low to high) was moderate on average (mean = 2.62, SD = 1.50; median = 3.0), with the full range of responses (0-5) represented. In other words, most respondents reported mid-range income adequacy, while fewer endorsed the lowest (0-1) or the highest (4-5) categories. So, a distinctive feature of the

sample was that the majority (49.5%) are people aged 18-24, who constitute a young segment of the population that should be in harmony with digital technologies, as evidenced by the obtained results.

Before testing the study hypotheses, descriptive statistics were computed to summarise the central tendencies and variability of the main variables: total social capital, general quality of life (QoL), digital well-being, and subjective income. These variables represented the core constructs of interest and were analysed across a sample of 91 participants. Means, medians, standard deviations, minimum and maximum values, skewness, kurtosis, and normality indicators (Shapiro-Wilk test) were examined. Also, before proceeding to hypothesis testing, it was essential to establish the internal consistency of the instruments used in the study. Reliability analysis ensured that the scales employed, particularly those that were adapted or translated, consistently measure the intended constructs. This was especially relevant when items have been modified or localised for a different cultural or linguistic context, as even minor changes may affect how respondents interpret and respond to the questions. Therefore, Cronbach's alpha and McDonald's omega were calculated to verify the reliability of the scales measuring social capital and digital well-being.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As shown in Table 3, social capital had a moderately low mean score (M = 1.67, SD = 0.46), while digital well-being was relatively higher (M = 2.48, SD = 0.59). The distribution of quality-of-life scores indicated moderate variability (M = 2.30, SD = 0.38), and subjective income had the largest spread (SD = 1.50). Shapiro-Wilk test results suggested that quality of life and income did not meet the assumptions of normality ($p < 0.5$), which was accounted for in the choice of nonparametric analyses.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics for main variables (N = 91)

Variable	M	Mdn	SD	Min	Max	Skew	Kurt	SW p
Social Capital	1.67	1.63	0.46	0.57	2.52	-0.23	-0.62	0.146
Quality of Life (SF-36)	2.30	2.41	0.38	1.32	3.28	-0.49	-0.15	0.005
Digital Well-Being	2.48	2.58	0.59	0.83	3.83	-0.19	0.25	0.308
Subjective Income	2.62	3.00	1.50	0.00	5.00	0.04	-0.71	<0.001

Source: developed by the authors

The internal consistency of the modified KPIKS scale was assessed using Cronbach's alpha ($\alpha = 9.48$) and McDonald's omega ($\omega = 9.52$), indicating excellent reliability. Although several items were modified (items 26, 47, 48, 49, and 53), most retained acceptable item-total correlations. One item (53) demonstrated a notably low item-rest correlation (13.05), suggesting the need for further revision or closer examination of its conceptual alignment with the overall construct. Several caveats should be noted. Due to the lack of social capital research in Ukraine that is not based on economic indicators, limited adapted methodologies for social capital were used. The KPIKS methodology was outdated and subject to change in several questions concerning Russian acquaintances or watching television. Also, the sample in this study does not represent the general population, as participants were recruited voluntarily through the distribution of invitations on social media (including personal pages and thematic communities), as well as through personal contacts of the researcher.

The reliability analysis of the Ukrainian adaptation of the DWBS demonstrated an acceptable level of internal consistency, with Cronbach's $\alpha = 7.47$ and McDonald's $\omega = 7.70$ for the full scale. These values indicate that the scale items are sufficiently interrelated to justify their aggregation into a total score. While most positively worded items showed strong item-total correlations ($DWBS_2 = 6.26$), reverse-coded items ($DWBS_{11} r = 2.46$) exhibited notably lower correlations, consistent with the original developers' caution regarding negatively phrased statements. Compared to the original Turkish validation study ($\alpha = 0.791$), the internal consistency remains within acceptable limits, although slightly reduced. These results suggest that the adapted scale maintains its psychometric integrity and is suitable for further use in assessing digital well-being in Ukrainian-speaking populations, particularly among younger adults engaged with digital technologies.

For Hypothesis 1, which posited a positive association between total social capital and overall quality of life, the results revealed a weak, non-significant correlation (Spearman's $r = 1.14$, $p = 2.84$). Therefore, H_1 should be accepted, indicating insufficient evidence of a linear relationship between the two constructs in this sample. Correspondingly, Hypothesis 2, which suggested that digital well-being would positively correlate with quality of life, was also not supported ($r = 0.21$, $p = 1.97$), resulting in retention of H_2. Regarding the specific domains of social capital, Hypothesis 3 predicted that private-sphere social capital would be positively associated with quality of life; however, the data again failed to support this claim ($r = 0.98$, $p = 3.56$), and H_3 was not accepted. In contrast, Hypothesis 4 addressed the role of public-sphere social capital and its association with physical health indicators (operationalised through the physical health component of the SF-36). Although conceptually plausible, this hypothesis did not find statistical support, as correlation coefficients

remained weak and non-significant (r = 4.71, p = 9.44), and H_4 was retained. Similarly, Hypothesis 5, which proposed that individuals with international social contacts would report higher levels of overall well-being, was not confirmed; correlation analyses revealed no significant difference between those with and without such contacts (r = 0.18, p = 8.68), thus supporting H_5. In the final hypothesis (H_6), a statistically significant moderate positive association was observed between social capital and digital well-being (r = 4.71, p < 0.01). This was the only hypothesis for which the null hypothesis (H_6) was rejected, thereby confirming that individuals with stronger social capital networks – whether private or public – tend to experience greater digital self-regulation, satisfaction, and emotional security in online environments. Based on H.G. De Zúñiga *et al.* (2016), it is worth emphasising that the mechanism of social capital in real and digital life differs, which may indicate that people who have good face-to-face communication relationships maintain them at the digital level as well digital well-being (DWB), social capital (SC), and quality of life (QoL) demonstrated complex interrelations in this sample. SC exhibited moderate levels, whereas DWB was relatively higher, suggesting that participants maintained digital engagement even when social networks were less pronounced. QoL and subjective income varied across participants, reflecting diverse economic perceptions and contextual influences on well-being.

The Ukrainian adaptation of the DWBS demonstrated acceptable internal consistency, with positively worded items correlating strongly with overall DWB, whereas reverse-coded items showed lower correlations, consistent with the original validation. These results confirm the reliability of the scale for assessing digital well-being among Ukrainian-speaking populations (Karabchuk & Shomotova, 2021). Analyses revealed that total SC and DWB were not directly associated with overall QoL. Specific domains of SC, including private and public social connections, as well as the presence of international contacts, did not predict differences in quality-of-life measures. These findings suggest that social networks and digital engagement alone may not translate into observable differences in general QoL, highlighting the role of contextual or mediating factors, such as digital literacy or social support quality, in shaping life satisfaction (Zhao *et al.*, 2024). In contrast, SC demonstrated a significant positive association with DWB, indicating that stronger social networks contribute to greater digital self-regulation, satisfaction, and emotional security online. This aligns with previous research showing that social capital reinforces adaptive digital engagement and supports psychosocial outcomes even when broader QoL measures remain unaffected (Judijanto & Nurwanto, 2024). The finding underscores that SC functions as an enabling factor for digital well-being, highlighting the need to consider indirect pathways linking social networks to online adaptive behaviours.

R. Calvo *et al.* (2011) highlighted the importance of having someone to rely on and count on in times of need. In contrast to this work, A.W. Taylor *et al.* (2017) focused on the state aspect, pointing out that developing resilience is an essential factor for enhancing well-being during disasters. Anyway, these aspects are directly influenced by economic indicators, which can play a role in either enhancing or degrading the significance of the bonds people create. For example, R. Calvo *et al.* (2011) pointed up the level of income in a country mediator which strongly influences the relationship between social capital and well-being, namely, the higher the level of income, the greater is the relationship. While D.P. Aldrich & M.A. Meyer (2014) noted that people who are isolated and have few social ties and therefore have no one to rely on are less likely to be rescued and receive help from others. With reference to the findings, the value of group activities and social initiatives that contributed to community cohesion can be emphasised.

The results also emphasised that traditional dimensions of SC may have a limited direct impact on physical health or overall life satisfaction. DWB appears to serve as a mechanism through which social networks influence subjective experiences of well-being, reinforcing the importance of distinguishing between online and offline domains when evaluating the effects of SC on quality of life (Danylova, 2021). Overall, these findings indicate that strategies aimed at enhancing well-being should focus on strengthening social networks to foster digital self-regulation and emotional security. Interventions could include digital literacy programs, peer-support initiatives, and structured online community engagement, reflecting the interdependence of social and digital dimensions in shaping individual well-being (Sewall *et al.*, 2020). The results indicate that overall social capital and digital well-being were not directly associated with general quality of life, physical health, or the presence of international contacts. However, the significant positive association between social capital and digital well-being suggests that stronger social networks contribute to greater digital self-regulation, satisfaction, and emotional security in online environments. This pattern highlighted the role of social capital as a supportive framework for adaptive digital engagement, even in the absence of direct effects on broader quality-of-life measures. Consequently, strategies aimed at enhancing well-being should focus on strengthening social networks to foster digital competence and emotional stability, emphasising the interdependence of social and digital dimensions in shaping individual well-being.

CONCLUSIONS

The study found a robust positive association between social capital and digital well-being (r = 0.471, p < 0.001), indicating that individuals with higher levels of social support and trust in their networks also tended to

report greater digital well-being. In line with it, although social capital may not directly predict general life satisfaction or physical health within this sample, it remains an important correlate of digital well-being, and may function as a foundational resource in navigating digital life. Documenting a clear positive relationship in a recent study added to the growing body of evidence that interpersonal and trust networks shape how people perceive the use of technology. Results also suggest that digital well-being frameworks should account for social context: the social environment of users (bonding and bridging ties) appears to influence digital stress and habits. In practical terms, the study implies that interventions aimed at improving digital well-being might benefit from fostering social capital (for example, by encouraging supportive online communities).

Future studies should take into account the diversity of the sample, involve closed online communities, or lonely people who spend most of their time in the digital environment. Given the ambiguous preliminary conclusions regarding hypotheses 1-5, it may be useful to use multi-item validated scales that will analyse the presented constructs in greater depth. Researchers could also test intermediaries or moderators: for example, whether loneliness weakens the positive impact of social capital on digital well-being. By addressing these questions, future research will enable better understanding of how social relationships and networks of trust contribute to positive outcomes in increasingly digital lives.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
None.

FUNDING
None.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST
None.

REFERENCES
[1] Aldrich, D.P., & Meyer, M.A. (2014). Social capital and community resilience. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 59(2), 254-269. doi: 10.1177/0002764214550299.
[2] American Psychological Association. (2017). *Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct*. Retrieved from https://www.apa.org/ethics/code.
[3] Arslankara, V.B., Demir, A., Öztaş, Ö., & Usta, E. (2022). Digital well-being scale validity and reliability study. *Journal of Teacher Education and Lifelong Learning*, 4(2), 263-274. doi: 10.51535/tell.1206193.
[4] Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J.G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood Press.
[5] Calvo, R., Zheng, Y., Kumar, S., Olgiati, A., & Berkman, L. (2012). Well-being and social capital on planet Earth: Cross-national evidence from 142 countries. *PLoS ONE*, 7(8), article number e42793. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0042793.
[6] Chen, Y., Liu, H., Lin, S., Wang, Y., Zhang, Q., & Feng, L. (2024). The impact of social capital on community resilience: A comparative study of seven flood-prone communities in Nanjing, China. *Land*, 13(8) article number 1145. doi: 10.3390/land13081145.
[7] Coleman, J.S. (1990). *Foundations of social theory*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
[8] Danylova, T., & Hoian, I. (2021). The influence of social networks on psychological functioning of an individual: Problem statement. *Humanities Studios: Pedagogy, Psychology, Philosophy*, 9(4), 118-125. doi: 10.31548/hspedagog2021.04.117.
[9] De Santis, A., & Fantinelli, S. (2024). Digital well-being as a new kind of adaptation to the new millennium needs: A state-of-the-art analysis. *Elementa. Intersections between Philosophy, Epistemology and Empirical Perspectives*, 3(1-2), 135-151. doi: 10.7358/elementa-2023-0102-safa.
[10] De Zúñiga, H.G., Barnidge, M., & Scherman, A. (2016). Social media social capital, offline social capital, and citizenship: Exploring asymmetrical social capital effects. *Political Communication*, 34(1), 44-68. doi: 10.1080/10584609.2016.1227000.
[11] Fahy, M., & Barry, M. (2024). Investigating the interplay of loneliness, computer-mediated communication, online social capital, and well-being: Insights from a COVID-19 lockdown study. *Frontiers in Digital Health*, 6, article number 1289451. doi: 10.3389/fdgth.2024.1289451.
[12] Fukuyama, F. (2002). Social capital and development: The coming agenda. *SAIS Review*, 22(1), 23-37. doi: 10.1353/sais.2002.0009.
[13] Grottke, M., Hacker, J.V., & Durst, C. (2018). Which factors determine our online social capital? An analysis based on structural equation modelling. *Australasian Journal of Information Systems*, 22. doi: 10.3127/ajis.v22i0.1656.
[14] Judijanto, L., & Nurwanto, N. (2024). The impact of technology access inequality and digital skill disparities on social integration and life satisfaction in Indonesia. *The Eastasouth Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 2(1), 89-101. doi: 10.58812/esssh.v2i01.346.
[15] Karabchuk, T., & Shomotova, A. (2021). Digitization, social capital, and subjective well-being across the globe. *First Monday*, 26(11). doi: 10.5210/fm.v26i11.12359.

[16] Lopina, N. (2023). *SF-36 v2 health survey*. Retrieved from https://clincasequest.academy/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2023/11/sf-36-v2-health-survey.pdf.
[17] Peters, D., Calvo, R.A., & Ryan, R.M. (2018). Designing for motivation, engagement and wellbeing in digital experience. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, article number 797. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00797.
[18] Polishchuk, O., Samchuk, Z., Dudchenko, V., Shtanagei, D., Storozhuk, I., Zhabenko, O., & Chervona, L. (2024). Digitization and globalization: Navigating the impact on social capital, natural resources, and environmental sustainability. *E3S Web of Conferences*, 541, article number 04007. doi: 10.1051/e3sconf/202454104007.
[19] Putnam, R.D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster. doi: 10.1145/358916.361990.
[20] R Core Team. (2024). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Retrieved from https://cran.r-project.org.
[21] Ramadan, E., Abdalla, S., Al Mamari, W., & Al Hosani, N. (2025). Building resilient communities: The impact of social capital on disaster recovery in Oman. *Community Development*. doi: 10.1080/15575330.2025.2525803.
[22] Razzante, R.J., Boylorn, R.M., & Orbe, M.P. (2021). Embracing intersectionality in co-cultural and dominant group theorizing: Implications for theory, research, and pedagogy. *Communication Theory*, 31(2), 228-249. doi: 10.1093/ct/qtab002.
[23] Semkiv, I.I. (2015). Psychometric indicators and adaptation of the KPIKS methodology. *Humanitarian Bulletin of the State Higher Educational Institution "Pereyaslav-Khmelnytskyi State Pedagogical University named after Hryhoriy Skovoroda": Psychology*, 37, 136-140.
[24] Sewall, C.J., Bear, T. M., Merranko, J., & Rosen, D. (2020). How psychosocial well-being and usage amount predict inaccuracies in retrospective estimates of digital technology use. *Mobile Media & Communication*, 8(3), 379-399. doi: 10.1177/2050157920902830.
[25] Standards of Ethical Practice. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://stgsapar.dsasites.tamu.edu/about/standards/.
[26] Styla, R. (2009). Questionnaire for the measurement of individual social capital (Polish abbreviation KPIKS) – a tentative proposal created on the basis of the idea of resource generator by Tom Snijders. *Social Psychological Bulletin*, 4(1-2), 67-77.
[27] Taylor, A.W., Kelly, G., Dal Grande, E., Kelly, D., Marin, T., Hey, N., Burke, K.J., & Licinio, J. (2017). Population levels of wellbeing and the association with social capital. *BMC Psychology*, 5, article number 23. doi: 10.1186/s40359-017-0193-0.
[28] The Jamovi project. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.jamovi.org.
[29] Zhao, J., *et al.* (2024). Association between social capital, mental health, and digital health literacy among university students in China: A multigroup analysis based on major difference. *BMC Public Health*, 24(1), article number 19672. doi: 10.1186/s12889-024-19672-7.

Взаємозв'язок між соціальним капіталом, цифровим добробутом та якістю життя українців: емпіричне дослідження

Ілля Політика

Студент
Київська школа економіки
03113, вул. Миколи Шпака, 3, м. Київ, Україна
https://orcid.org/0009-0005-7379-7211

Марина Дворник-Козачінська

Кандидат психологічних наук, доцент
Київська школа економіки
03113, вул. Миколи Шпака, 3, м. Київ, Україна
Старший науковий співробітник
Інститут соціальної та політичної психології Національної академії педагогічних наук України
04070, вул. Андріївська, 15, м. Київ, Україна
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1505-0169

Анотація. Зростаюча цифровізація повсякденного життя змінила роль соціального капіталу у формуванні добробуту, тому важливо зрозуміти, як традиційні соціальні зв'язки функціонують в онлайн-контексті. Метою цього дослідження було вивчити взаємозв'язок між соціальним капіталом, цифровим добробутом та якістю життя українського населення. Було проведено онлайн-опитування серед 91 учасника (78 % жінок) з використанням трьох перевірених інструментів: методології KPIKS для оцінки соціального капіталу, шкали цифрового благополуччя та опитування про якість життя SF-36 v2. Стандартизований збір даних та статистичні процедури забезпечили надійність результатів, а аналіз внутрішньої узгодженості підтвердив, що адаптовані шкали продемонстрували прийнятні психометричні властивості в українському контексті. Результати показали, що серед кількох перевірених гіпотез лише одна дала значущий результат: помірна позитивна кореляція між загальним балом соціального капіталу та цифровим благополуччям ($r = 471$, $p < 0{,}001$). Це свідчило про те, що особи з ширшими та міцнішими соціальними мережами частіше відчували рівновагу, стабільність та емоційну безпеку в цифровому середовищі. Водночас вищий рівень цифрової компетентності та задоволеності був пов'язаний з більшими можливостями для соціальної самореалізації. Інші гіпотетичні зв'язки, зокрема між соціальним капіталом та загальною якістю життя або показниками фізичного здоров'я, не були підтверджені статистично. Ці результати внесли свій вклад у нову літературу з цифрового психічного здоров'я, визначивши соціальний капітал як значущий корелят цифрового благополуччя, навіть коли більш широкі показники благополуччя демонструють слабкіші зв'язки. Практична цінність дослідження полягає в його застосовності для психологів, педагогів та фахівців з цифрового здоров'я, які можуть використовувати результати для розробки заходів, що зміцнюють соціальні мережі та покращують взаємодію людей з цифровими технологіями

Ключові слова: цифрова грамотність; психологічний добробут; соціальна підтримка; громадська активність; солідарність; медіаспоживання