

Social and Family Validation as Predictors of Psychological Well-Being among Online Content Creators in India

Jincy K J¹, Dhruthi S Prasad²

¹USN No.: 241MSCD00325

Fourth Semester, MSc Psychology

²Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology – PG Studies, Centre for Distance Education and Online Education
JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), 2026

Abstract: *This study examined the relationships between social-validation, family-validation, and psychological well-being index scores among 50 online content creators in India. A descriptive, correlational, and predictive design was reported. The sample included creators using platforms such as YouTube, Instagram, and Facebook. Mean scores were 58.46 (SD = 9.58) for social validation, 58.67 (SD = 9.88) for family validation, and 58.17 (SD = 9.19) for psychological well-being. Social validation was positively correlated with psychological well-being, $r = .508$, $p < .001$; family validation was also positively correlated with psychological well-being, $r = .676$, $p < .001$. A two-predictor regression model was significant, $F(2, 47) = 29.321$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .555$, adjusted $R^2 = .536$. These are sample-specific associations and do not establish causation. The questionnaire appendix contains researcher-developed items rather than complete original versions of the published scales, and the reported statistics should be checked against the original response file and software output before submission.*

Keywords: social validation, family support, psychological well-being, online content creators, India

1. Introduction

Digital platforms enable individuals to publish creative work, build online identities, interact with audiences, and sometimes earn income. Content creators may receive visible feedback through likes, comments, shares, views, and follower counts. These indicators can be experienced as recognition, but they do not automatically represent meaningful validation or psychological health. Family relationships provide a different context through encouragement, emotional support, practical help, or concern about the stability and public exposure of content creation.

The study considers social validation and family validation as predictor variables and psychological well-being as the outcome. Ryff's framework defines well-being through self-acceptance, positive relations, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, and personal growth (Ryff, 1989). As the design is cross-sectional and correlational, statistical prediction must not be interpreted as proof of cause and effect.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

The study examines whether social-validation and family-validation index scores are associated with, and statistically predict, psychological well-being among online content creators in India.

1.2 Objectives

- To describe social-validation, family-validation, and psychological well-being scores among online content creators in India.

- To examine the relationships between each validation index and psychological well-being.
- To analyse social validation and family validation as joint statistical predictors of psychological well-being.

1.3 Hypotheses

- H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between social validation and psychological well-being.
- H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between family validation and psychological well-being.
- H₀₃: Social validation and family validation are not significant predictors of psychological well-being.

1.4 Variables and Operational Meaning

Predictors: social-validation index and family-validation index. Outcome: psychological well-being index. Demographic/ context variables listed in the study include age, gender, platform, duration of content-creation experience, follower count, and income status.

A key measurement distinction must be preserved. The Social Reward Questionnaire measures individual differences in the value placed on different kinds of social reward; it is not simply a count of likes or the amount of validation received. The measure associated with Procidano and Heller assesses perceived family support, which may not be identical to explicit family approval of content creation. Ryff's well-being scales have different versions and scoring procedures. The final report should identify the exact measures and scoring actually used.

2. Review of Literature

Foulkes et al. (2014) developed the Social Reward Questionnaire to assess several dimensions of social reward. Its relevance is conceptual, but the construct should not be relabelled as platform-specific validation without justification. Online feedback varies in type and meaning: positive comments may feel encouraging, while criticism, silence, or numerical comparisons may be experienced differently by different creators.

Procidano and Heller (1983) developed measures of perceived support from family and friends. Perceived support concerns an individual's belief that support is available or experienced; it is not simply family size or an objective rating of family behaviour. Family support may be relevant to well-being through emotional reassurance, belonging, and practical assistance, although cross-sectional data cannot establish direction of influence.

Ryff (1989) proposed a multidimensional, eudaimonic model of psychological well-being covering self-acceptance, positive relations, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, and personal growth. This framework extends beyond immediate happiness or the absence of distress. The literature suggests plausible links between social relationships and well-being, but results from general social-media users cannot automatically be generalised to content creators.

2.1 Research Gap and Rationale

The study addresses the proposed gap of examining audience-related social validation and perceived family validation together in a sample of Indian content creators. Its contribution is limited by the convenience sample, sample size, self-report design, and the degree to which the administered items represent the constructs named in the title.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Design

The study is described as descriptive, correlational, and predictive. It examines score distributions, bivariate associations, and the joint statistical contribution of two predictor indices to a psychological well-being index. The design does not establish causality.

3.2 Participants and Sampling

The report records 50 participant responses from online content creators in India. Convenience sampling is described. The population of interest includes creators using social media platforms such as YouTube, Instagram, and Facebook. Convenience sampling limits representativeness; the results should not be generalised to all Indian creators.

3.3 Measures

- Social validation/social reward: the synopsis refers to the Social Reward Questionnaire (Foulkes et al., 2014),

while the appendix describes researcher-developed questions about creator feedback. These are not interchangeable.

- Family validation/support: the synopsis refers to a perceived family support measure associated with Procidano and Heller (1983), while the appendix contains researcher-developed items.
- Psychological well-being: the synopsis refers to Ryff's Scales of Psychological Well-Being (Ryff, 1989); the exact version, item count, response options, and scoring method must be stated.

Because the appendix does not reproduce complete authorised versions of the named published scales, the indices should be described according to the items actually administered. The report should not claim that the original scales were administered in full unless supported by the study records.

3.4 Procedure and Ethics

The report indicates that responses were collected from 50 participants. The final submission should document the actual recruitment dates and method, eligibility criteria, consent process, approval status, survey settings, confidentiality safeguards, missing-data handling, and data-storage procedure from the original records. These details should not be guessed or retrospectively invented.

3.5 Statistical Analysis

The reported analyses include descriptive statistics, Pearson product-moment correlations, and multiple linear regression with psychological well-being as the outcome and both validation indices entered simultaneously. Before submission, verify scoring, valid case counts, assumptions, outliers, multicollinearity, residual behaviour, and all reported values against the original dataset and statistical software output.

3.6 Methodological Limitations

Important limitations are the small convenience sample ($N = 50$), self-report measurement, cross-sectional design, possible shared-method variance, and uncertainty about the alignment between the study-specific questionnaire items and the constructs named in the synopsis. These limitations reduce generalisability and prevent causal conclusions.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

The existing results tables report the following values for the three study-specific indices:

Index	Mean (SD)	Reported range
Social validation	58.46 (9.58)	40.8–83.1
Family validation	58.67 (9.88)	40.1–90.0
Psychological well-being	58.17 (9.19)	34.0–82.0

These values describe the scores reported for this sample. They should not be labelled low, moderate, or high without a

justified scoring framework and the exact instrument version.

4.2 Correlation Analysis

Social validation was positively correlated with psychological well-being, $r = .508$, $p < .001$. Family validation was also positively correlated with psychological well-being, $r = .676$, $p < .001$. Thus, both associations were statistically significant in the reported sample, with the family-validation association larger in magnitude.

4.3 Multiple Regression

The model containing both predictor indices was statistically significant, $F(2, 47) = 29.321$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .555$, adjusted $R^2 = .536$. The model accounted for 55.5% of the observed variance in the psychological well-being index in this sample.

Predictor	B	SE	p
Social validation	0.317	0.098	.002
Family validation	0.533	0.095	< .001

Both coefficients were positive and statistically significant when the other predictor was held constant. The reported confidence intervals were [0.119, 0.514] for social validation and [0.342, 0.725] for family validation.

4.4 Interpretation

The reported pattern indicates that higher scores on both validation indices were associated with higher psychological well-being scores among the 50 participants. Family validation had the stronger bivariate correlation in this sample. Possible explanations include the role of perceived encouragement and audience recognition, but these mechanisms were not directly tested. Correlation and regression do not show that validation causes well-being; reverse directionality and unmeasured factors remain possible.

Verification note: the participant-level response export and complete software output were not included in the materials used for this revision. The numerical results above are reproduced from the existing dissertation tables and have not been independently recalculated. They must be checked against the original records before submission.

4.5 Hypothesis Decisions

Based on the reported p-values, H_{01} and H_{02} were rejected because both bivariate correlations were statistically significant. H_{03} was rejected because the overall regression model was statistically significant; the reported coefficient tests also indicated significant unique associations for both predictors. These decisions apply only to the reported sample and depend on the accuracy of the existing statistical output.

5. Summary and Conclusion

5.1 Summary of the Study

The study examined the relationships between social-validation, family-validation, and psychological well-being indices among 50 online content creators in India. It used a descriptive, correlational, and predictive approach and reported descriptive statistics, Pearson correlations, and a two-predictor multiple regression model.

5.2 Conclusions by Objective

- Objective 1: Mean scores were 58.46 for social validation, 58.67 for family validation, and 58.17 for psychological well-being.
- Objective 2: Social validation was positively associated with psychological well-being ($r = .508$, $p < .001$), as was family validation ($r = .676$, $p < .001$).
- Objective 3: The regression model was significant, $F(2, 47) = 29.321$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .555$. Both social validation ($B = 0.317$, $p = .002$) and family validation ($B = 0.533$, $p < .001$) had positive coefficients.

5.3 Implications

The results suggest that audience-related feedback and perceived family support may be relevant correlates of well-being in the studied sample. The study also highlights the need to distinguish visible engagement metrics, sensitivity to social rewards, perceived family support, and explicit family approval of content creation. Practical recommendations should remain tentative because the design does not test interventions or causal mechanisms.

5.4 Limitations

The sample size and convenience sampling restrict generalisability. Self-report data may be affected by response style and shared-method variance. The cross-sectional design cannot establish temporal order or causation. A further limitation is that the appendix contains researcher-developed items rather than complete original versions of the published scales. Scoring procedures, reliability estimates, instrument versions, and regression diagnostics need to be documented from the actual study records.

5.5 Recommendations

- Confirm the exact instrument versions, scoring rules, and construct definitions with the supervisor.
- Cross-check every statistic against the original response file and software output; report only analyses actually conducted.
- Document recruitment, consent, ethics, eligibility, missing data, and confidentiality procedures accurately.
- Future studies should use larger and more diverse samples, validated and construct-aligned measures, and—where appropriate—longitudinal or qualitative methods.

6. Final Conclusion

The reported results show positive associations between both validation indices and psychological well-being among the 50 participants. They provide a sample-specific account, not proof that social or family validation causes higher well-being or that the findings represent all online content creators in India. Transparent measurement and independent verification of the reported statistics are essential before final submission.

References

- [1] Adeane, E., & Stasiak, K. (2025). Relatability versus responsibility: Social media influencers on their roles in youth mental health. *Digital Health*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20552076251382026>
- [2] Alwuqaysi, B. (2025). A systematic review and meta-analysis of social media's influence on mental health, family functioning, and visual content. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 12, Article 101793. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101793>
- [3] Ballara, N. B. (2023). The power of social validation: A literature review on how likes, comments, and shares shape user behavior on social media. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, 4(7), 3355–3367. <https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.4.723.51227>
- [4] Bray, I., Lerigo-Sampson, M., Morey, Y., & Williams, J. (2024). Mental health of social media influencers. *Journal of Occupational Health*, 66(1), Article uiae045. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jocuh/uiae045>
- [5] Foulkes, L., Viding, E., McCrory, E., & Neumann, C. S. (2014). Social Reward Questionnaire (SRQ): Development and validation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5, Article 201. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00201>
- [6] King, A. L. (2023). The real, ideal, and false me online: How authentic self-expression on social media platforms relates to personality, self-concept presentation and self-disclosure behaviours [Doctoral thesis, University of Sydney]. Repository URL requires verification.
- [7] Othman, L. M. (2026). Social media influencer engagement and mental health outcomes: The moderating analysis of family income differences. *Jurnal Ekonomi Kreatif dan Manajemen Bisnis Digital*, 4(3), 655–665. <https://doi.org/10.55047/jekombital.v4i3.1156>
- [8] Procidano, M. E., & Heller, K. (1983). Measures of perceived social support from friends and from family: Three validation studies. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 11(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00898416>
- [9] Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069–1081. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069>

developed social-validation and family-validation items, and a data-codebook template. For a concise six-page report, the full questionnaire and supplementary glossary/statistical templates have been omitted. They should be retained separately if required by the university or supervisor.

Before submission, confirm that the questionnaire actually administered matches the methods description. Do not describe researcher-developed items as the original published scales. Verify the statistical results against the original data and retain evidence of consent, approved procedures, scoring, and analysis.

Appendix: Essential Participant and Measurement Notes

The original document includes a participant information and consent section, demographic questions, researcher-