

The Resilience, Adaptation and Well-Being Project



Social Support Index

SSI

SSI:

Social Support Index

Overview

The Social Support Index (SSI) was developed by Hamilton McCubbin, Joan Patterson, and Thomas Glynn (1982) as part of several national studies with the goal of recording the degree to which families find support in their communities. Community based social support is viewed as an important dimension and factor in family resiliency. Past studies have emphasized the importance of social support as a buffer against family crisis factors, a resiliency factor in promoting family recovery, and as a mediator of family distress.

Development of SSI

By drawing from past studies which emphasize the emotional, esteem and network support from the community, items were selected to measure each of the domains of support. The pool of items were reduced through item analysis and tests of internal consistency. The resulting 17 items were selected for the final scale.

Conceptual Organization

The SSI is a 17-item instrument which uses a 5-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree, to record the degree to which families are integrated into the community, view the community as a source of support and feel that the community can provide emotional, esteem, and network support. Versions of the Social Support Index with 22 and 25 items have been used in the past but the additional items consist of social desirability items and are not used in scoring or analysis and so were not included in this chapter.

Reliability

The internal reliability (Cronbach's alpha) of the SSI measure is .82.

Validity

The SSI was found to have a .40 validity coefficient with the criterion of family well-being, and it was found that community/social support varied across stages of the family life cycle, reaching its lowest point at the School Age stage; and its highest at the Empty Nest stage.

In a study of 1000 families in Western Europe faced with the threat of war, community/social support was positively correlated with the family's sense of fit within the community; this fit was significantly related to successful family adaptation in the foreign environment (Lavee, H.I. McCubbin, & Patterson, 1985). The sense of community/social support was also directly related to family adaptation in a foreign country. When family life cycle stage is taken into account, community/social support was positively correlated with family adaptation at the Couple and Adolescent stage of the family life cycle. In a LISREL analysis, community/ social support was significantly related the family's sense of coherence and indirectly related to family adaptation through coherence. Additionally, community/social support was inversely related to family stress and appeared to serve as buffer to the relocation strains impacting negatively upon family adaptation.

In studies of families of rural bank employees faced with the downturn of the farm economy, the Social Support Index was also used (H.I. McCubbin & A.I. Thompson, 1988). The study of 500 families

revealed that community/social support was a critical predictor of family resiliency and positively related to the family's confidence in coping with the situation.

When applied to the study of families with different ethnic backgrounds (Asian, Native Hawaiian, Caucasian, and those of mixed races), community/social support was negatively correlated with family distress in Native Hawaiian families (H.I. McCubbin, M.A. McCubbin, A.I. Thompson, & E.A. Thompson, 1995). The path analysis revealed that community/social support was an indirect predictor of family distress, operating through family schema and family problem solving communication. Additionally, community/social support was also indirectly related to family distress through family hardiness and family problem solving communication. Community/social support was also positively correlated with family well-being for Caucasian, Asian, Native Hawaiian, and mixed race ethnic families.

Test-Retest Reliability

The test-retest reliability is .83.

Additional Validity Checks

No additional validity information is available at this time.

Scoring Procedures

The total score for SSI is obtained by simply summing the number circled by the respondent (i.e., 0 = Strongly Disagree, 1 = Disagree, 2 = Not Sure, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree) for all 117 items. However, 6 of the items (7, 9, 10, 13, 14, and 17) must be reversed before scoring (i.e., 4 = Strongly Disagree, 3 = Disagree, 2 = Not Sure, 1 = Agree, 0 = Strongly Agree) in order to ensure that all items are scored in the same positive direction for analysis and interpretation.

Norms and/or Comparative Data

Comparative data are available for farm families, Native Hawaiian families, military families, families of investment executives, and families of rural bank employees. These are presented as percentiles and standard scores, means and standard deviations in Tables 12.1 through 12.11.

Instrument Utilization for Research

The SSI instrument is currently being tested within the Family Stress, Coping and Health Project and by other investigators. To facilitate the review of research involving the use of SSI a summary table of related publications is provided. This table includes the authors, subjects, reliabilities, and notations on findings. The results of our review of SSI are presented in Table 12.12.

Notes

1. The availability of additional psychometrics and bibliographies of other users is limited at the date of publication. Upon publication of this material, wider usage is expected, and as subsequent publications become available they will be added to our database. If you would like to inquire about more recent studies, please write to us at the Center for Excellence in Family Studies, Family Stress, Coping and Health Project, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1300 Linden Drive, Madison, WI 53706 or send email to manual@macc.wisc.edu. There will be a charge for these additional materials.
2. When referencing this instrument, the proper citation is: McCubbin, H.I., Patterson, J., & Glynn, T. (1982). Social Support Index (SSI). In H.I. McCubbin, A.I. Thompson, & M.A. McCubbin (1996). *Family Assessment: Resiliency, coping and adaptation-Inventories for research and practice*. (pp. 357-389). Madison: University of Wisconsin System.

Table 12.1
Midwestern Farm Families Social Support Index (N=423)

| Raw Scores | Standard Scores | Cumulative Percentiles |
|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 0-21 | -3.1 | .2 |
| 22 | -3.0 | .5 |
| 23 | -2.8 | .9 |
| 24-25 | -2.6 | 1.7 |
| 26 | -2.5 | 1.9 |
| 27-28 | -2.2 | 2.1 |
| 29 | -2.1 | 2.6 |
| 30 | -2.0 | 4.0 |
| 31 | -1.9 | 4.7 |
| 32 | -1.7 | 5.9 |
| 33 | -1.6 | 6.9 |
| 34 | -1.5 | 9.0 |
| 35 | -1.4 | 10.4 |
| 36 | -1.3 | 12.8 |
| 37 | -1.1 | 15.4 |
| 38 | -1.0 | 18.0 |
| 39 | -0.9 | 19.6 |
| 40 | -0.8 | 22.0 |
| 41 | -0.7 | 25.3 |
| 42 | -0.5 | 28.4 |
| 43 | -0.4 | 32.6 |
| 44 | -0.3 | 35.2 |
| 45 | -0.2 | 42.1 |
| 46 | 0.0 | 47.3 |
| 47 | +0.1 | 51.3 |
| 48 | +0.2 | 57.7 |
| 49 | +0.3 | 64.3 |
| 50 | +0.4 | 68.3 |
| 51 | +0.6 | 74.9 |
| 52 | +0.7 | 78.3 |
| 53 | +0.8 | 81.3 |
| 54 | +0.9 | 86.1 |
| 55 | +1.0 | 87.9 |
| 56 | +1.2 | 88.7 |
| 57 | +1.3 | 90.5 |
| 58 | +1.4 | 92.4 |
| 59 | +1.5 | 95.0 |
| 60 | +1.7 | 96.2 |
| 61 | +1.8 | 97.6 |
| 62 | +1.9 | 99.1 |
| 63 | +2.0 | 99.5 |
| 64-68 | +2.3 | 100.0 |

Mean = 46.390
SD = 8.241
Range = 44
Kurtosis = .077
Skewness = -.375

Mode = 45.0

Table 12.2
Families of Native Hawaiian Ancestry Social Support Index (N=188)

| Raw Scores | Standard Scores | Cumulative Percentiles |
|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 0-20 | -3.1 | .5 |
| 21-23 | -2.7 | 1.1 |
| 24-25 | -2.4 | 1.6 |
| 26-28 | -2.0 | 2.1 |
| 29-30 | -1.8 | 3.2 |
| 31 | -1.7 | 4.3 |
| 32 | -1.5 | 6.4 |
| 33 | -1.4 | 8.5 |
| 34 | -1.3 | 10.1 |
| 35 | -1.1 | 12.2 |
| 36 | -1.0 | 17.0 |
| 37 | -0.9 | 22.9 |
| 38 | -0.8 | 25.5 |
| 39 | -0.6 | 30.3 |
| 40 | -0.5 | 33.5 |
| 41 | -0.4 | 38.8 |
| 42 | -0.2 | 44.1 |
| 43 | -0.1 | 49.5 |
| 44 | 0.0 | 52.7 |
| 45 | +0.1 | 56.9 |
| 46 | +0.3 | 63.8 |
| 47 | +0.4 | 69.1 |
| 48 | +0.5 | 70.7 |
| 49 | +0.7 | 75.5 |
| 50 | +0.8 | 79.3 |
| 51 | +0.9 | 83.0 |
| 52 | +1.0 | 86.7 |
| 53 | +1.2 | 89.4 |
| 54 | +1.3 | 93.1 |
| 55-56 | +1.6 | 95.7 |
| 57-58 | +1.8 | 96.3 |
| 59 | +1.9 | 97.9 |
| 60-61 | +2.2 | 98.4 |
| 62 | +2.3 | 98.9 |
| 63 | +2.5 | 99.5 |
| 64-68 | +2.6 | 100.0 |

Mean = 43.872

SD = 7.786

Range = 44

Kurtosis = .057

Skewness = -.024

Mode = 46.0

Table 12.3
Military Families Social Support Index Overall Males (N=913)

| Raw Scores | Standard Scores | Cumulative Percentiles |
|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 0-12 | -3.7 | .2 |
| 13-18 | -3.0 | .3 |
| 19-20 | -2.7 | .8 |
| 21 | -2.6 | .9 |
| 22 | -2.5 | 1.0 |
| 23 | -2.4 | 1.5 |
| 24 | -2.2 | 1.6 |
| 25 | -2.1 | 2.4 |
| 26 | -2.0 | 3.0 |
| 27 | -1.9 | 3.4 |
| 28 | -1.8 | 4.3 |
| 29 | -1.6 | 6.0 |
| 30 | -1.5 | 7.8 |
| 31 | -1.4 | 9.5 |
| 32 | -1.3 | 12.0 |
| 33 | -1.1 | 14.0 |
| 34 | -1.0 | 16.9 |
| 35 | -0.9 | 20.6 |
| 36 | -0.8 | 24.4 |
| 37 | -0.6 | 27.6 |
| 38 | -0.5 | 32.5 |
| 39 | -0.4 | 36.3 |
| 40 | -0.3 | 40.5 |
| 41 | -0.2 | 45.9 |
| 42 | 0.0 | 49.6 |
| 43 | +0.1 | 54.2 |
| 44 | +0.2 | 58.7 |
| 45 | +0.3 | 63.5 |
| 46 | +0.5 | 67.6 |
| 47 | +0.6 | 72.5 |
| 48 | +0.7 | 77.2 |
| 49 | +0.8 | 81.7 |
| 50 | +1.0 | 85.4 |
| 51 | +1.1 | 88.6 |
| 52 | +1.2 | 91.2 |
| 53 | +1.3 | 93.9 |
| 54 | +1.5 | 95.0 |
| 55 | +1.6 | 95.7 |
| 56 | +1.7 | 96.8 |
| 57 | +1.8 | 97.6 |
| 58 | +1.9 | 97.9 |
| 59 | +2.1 | 98.0 |
| 60 | +2.2 | 98.6 |
| 61 | +2.3 | 99.0 |
| 62 | +2.4 | 99.6 |
| 63 | +2.6 | 99.8 |
| 64-68 | +2.7 | 100.0 |

Mean = 42.229

SD = 8.117

Range = 52

Kurtosis = .137

Skewness = -.196

Mode = 41.0

Table 12.4
Military Families Social Support Index Caucasian Males (N=620)

| Raw Scores | Standard Scores | Cumulative Percentiles |
|------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| 0-12 | -3.7 | .2 |
| 13-18 | -3.0 | .3 |
| 19-20 | -2.7 | .8 |
| 21 | -2.6 | 1.0 |
| 22-23 | -2.4 | 1.8 |
| 24 | -2.2 | 1.9 |
| 25 | -2.1 | 2.7 |
| 26 | -2.0 | 3.2 |
| 27 | -1.9 | 3.5 |
| 28 | -1.8 | 4.5 |
| 29 | -1.6 | 6.5 |
| 30 | -1.5 | 7.9 |
| 31 | -1.4 | 9.8 |
| 32 | -1.3 | 11.9 |
| 33 | -1.2 | 14.2 |
| 34 | -1.0 | 16.8 |
| 35 | -0.9 | 20.3 |
| 36 | -0.8 | 23.1 |
| 37 | -0.7 | 26.9 |
| 38 | -0.6 | 31.8 |
| 39 | -0.4 | 34.7 |
| 40 | -0.3 | 38.1 |
| 41 | -0.2 | 43.9 |
| 42 | -0.1 | 47.3 |
| 43 | 0.0 | 51.3 |
| 44 | +0.2 | 56.8 |
| 45 | +0.3 | 60.5 |
| 46 | +0.4 | 64.5 |
| 47 | +0.5 | 69.0 |
| 48 | +0.6 | 74.0 |
| 49 | +0.8 | 78.7 |
| 50 | +0.9 | 82.7 |
| 51 | +1.0 | 86.6 |
| 52 | +1.1 | 90.0 |
| 53 | +1.2 | 93.2 |
| 54 | +1.4 | 94.5 |
| 55 | +1.5 | 95.2 |
| 56 | +1.6 | 96.5 |
| 57 | +1.7 | 97.3 |
| 58 | +1.8 | 97.7 |
| 59 | +2.0 | 97.9 |
| 60 | +2.1 | 98.4 |
| 61 | +2.2 | 99.0 |
| 62 | +2.3 | 99.4 |
| 63 | +2.4 | 99.7 |
| 64-68 | +2.6 | 100.0 |

Mean = 42.619

SD =8.344

Range = 52

Kurtosis = .009

Skewness = -.247

Mode = 41.0

Table 12.5
Military Families Social Support Index African-American Males (N=171)

| Raw Scores | Standard Scores | Cumulative Percentiles |
|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 0-12 | -3.7 | .6 |
| 13-20 | -2.7 | 1.2 |
| 21-25 | -2.1 | 1.8 |
| 26 | -1.9 | 2.9 |
| 27 | -1.8 | 3.5 |
| 28 | -1.7 | 4.7 |
| 29 | -1.5 | 6.4 |
| 30 | -1.4 | 8.2 |
| 31 | -1.3 | 9.9 |
| 32 | -1.2 | 13.5 |
| 33 | -1.0 | 14.6 |
| 34 | -0.9 | 19.3 |
| 35 | -0.8 | 23.4 |
| 36 | -0.6 | 29.2 |
| 37 | -0.5 | 31.0 |
| 38 | -0.4 | 35.1 |
| 39 | -0.2 | 40.9 |
| 40 | -0.1 | 47.4 |
| 41 | 0.0 | 53.8 |
| 42 | +0.1 | 58.5 |
| 43 | +0.3 | 63.7 |
| 44 | +0.4 | 66.1 |
| 45 | +0.5 | 74.3 |
| 46 | +0.7 | 77.8 |
| 47 | +0.8 | 83.0 |
| 48 | +0.9 | 86.5 |
| 49 | +1.1 | 91.2 |
| 50 | +1.2 | 93.0 |
| 51-52 | +1.4 | 93.6 |
| 53 | +1.6 | 94.7 |
| 54 | +1.7 | 95.9 |
| 55 | +1.8 | 96.5 |
| 56 | +2.0 | 97.1 |
| 57 | +2.1 | 97.7 |
| 58-60 | +2.5 | 98.8 |
| 61-68 | +2.7 | 100.0 |

Mean = 40.883

SD = 7.723

Range = 50

Kurtosis = 1.028

Skewness: -.102

Mode = 45.0

Table 12.6
Military Famines Social Support Index Overall Females (N=861)

| Raw Scores | Standard Scores | Cumulative Percentiles |
|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 0-13 | -3.9 | .1 |
| 14-21 | -2.9 | .2 |
| 22 | -2.7 | .6 |
| 23 | -2.6 | .8 |
| 24 | -2.5 | 1.3 |
| 25 | -2.4 | 1.5 |
| 26 | -2.2 | 2.6 |
| 27 | -2.1 | 2.8 |
| 28 | -2.0 | 3.5 |
| 29 | -1.8 | 5.1 |
| 30 | -1.7 | 6.0 |
| 31 | -1.6 | 8.0 |
| 32 | -1.5 | 9.1 |
| 33 | -1.3 | 11.4 |
| 34 | -1.2 | 13.0 |
| 35 | -1.1 | 15.4 |
| 36 | -0.9 | 18.1 |
| 37 | -0.8 | 21.7 |
| 38 | -0.7 | 25.4 |
| 39 | -0.6 | 30.1 |
| 40 | -0.4 | 33.7 |
| 41 | -0.3 | 38.1 |
| 42 | -0.2 | 42.5 |
| 43 | 0.0 | 47.0 |
| 44 | +0.1 | 63.4 |
| 45 | +0.2 | 68.2 |
| 46 | +0.3 | 64.3 |
| 47 | +0.5 | 69.5 |
| 48 | +0.6 | 74.7 |
| 49 | +0.7 | 79.9 |
| 50 | +0.8 | 83.0 |
| 51 | +1.0 | 85.7 |
| 52 | +1.1 | 88.9 |
| 53 | +1.2 | 91.4 |
| 54 | +1.4 | 93.3 |
| 55 | +1.5 | 94.9 |
| 56 | +1.6 | 96.6 |
| 57 | +1.7 | 97.2 |
| 58 | +1.9 | 97.4 |
| 59 | +2.0 | 98.4 |
| 60 | +2.1 | 99.0 |
| 61 | +2.3 | 99.5 |
| 62-63 | +2.5 | 99.7 |
| 64-65 | +2.8 | 99.9 |
| 66-68 | +2.9 | 100.0 |

Mean = 43.370
SD = 7.810
Range = 63
Kurtosis = .140
Skewness = -.251
Mode = 44.0

Table 12.7
Military Families Social Support Index Caucasian Females (N=596)

| Raw Score | Standard Score | Cumulative Percentiles |
|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| 0-13 | -4.0 | .2 |
| 14-21 | -3.0 | .3 |
| 22 | -2.8 | .5 |
| 23-24 | -2.6 | 1.0 |
| 25 | -2.4 | 1.2 |
| 26 | -2.3 | 1.8 |
| 27-28 | -2.1 | 2.3 |
| 29 | -1.9 | 4.0 |
| 30 | -1.5 | 4.5 |
| 31 | -1.7 | 6.5 |
| 32 | -1.6 | 7.0 |
| 33 | -1.4 | 9.4 |
| 34 | -1.3 | 10.7 |
| 35 | -1.2 | 13.4 |
| 36 | -1.1 | 16.3 |
| 37 | -0.9 | 20.0 |
| 38 | -0.5 | 23.3 |
| 39 | -0.7 | 27.3 |
| 40 | -0.5 | 31.5 |
| 41 | -0.4 | 34.9 |
| 42 | -0.3 | 37.6 |
| 43 | -0.2 | 41.8 |
| 44 | 0.0 | 45.3 |
| 45 | +0.1 | 53.2 |
| 46 | +0.2 | 59.6 |
| 47 | +0.3 | 64.6 |
| 48 | +0.5 | 70.1 |
| 49 | +0.6 | 75.2 |
| 50 | +0.7 | 78.9 |
| 51 | +0.9 | 82.0 |
| 52 | +1.0 | 86.2 |
| 53 | +1.1 | 88.6 |
| 54 | +1.2 | 91.1 |
| 55 | +1.4 | 93.5 |
| 56 | +1.5 | 95.6 |
| 57 | +1.6 | 96.1 |
| 58 | +1.7 | 96.5 |
| 59 | +1.9 | 97.8 |
| 60 | +2.0 | 98.7 |
| 61 | +2.1 | 99.3 |
| 62-63 | +2.4 | 99.5 |
| 64-65 | +2.6 | 99.8 |
| 66-68 | +2.8 | 100.0 |

Mean = 44.272

SD = 7.876

Range = 53

Kurtosis = .171

Skewness = -.256

Mode = 44.0

Table 12.8
Military Families Social Support Index African-American Females (N=130)

| Raw Scores | Standard Scores | Cumulative Percentiles |
|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 0-22 | -2.6 | .8 |
| 23 | -2.4 | 2.3 |
| 24 | -2.3 | 3.1 |
| 25 | -2.2 | 3.8 |
| 26 | -2.0 | 6.2 |
| 27 | -1.9 | 7.7 |
| 28 | -1.7 | 9.2 |
| 29 | -1.6 | 10.8 |
| 30 | -1.5 | 11.5 |
| 31 | -1.3 | 13.1 |
| 32 | -1.2 | 14.6 |
| 33 | -1.1 | 16.2 |
| 34 | -0.9 | 18.5 |
| 35 | -0.8 | 20.0 |
| 36 | -0.7 | 22.3 |
| 37 | -0.5 | 23.8 |
| 38 | -0.4 | 28.5 |
| 39 | -0.3 | 33.8 |
| 40 | -0.1 | 36.9 |
| 41 | 0.0 | 43.8 |
| 42 | +0.1 | 55.4 |
| 43 | +0.3 | 61.5 |
| 44 | +0.4 | 67.7 |
| 45 | +0.5 | 70.8 |
| 46 | +0.7 | 75.4 |
| 47 | +0.8 | 80.8 |
| 48 | +0.9 | 85.4 |
| 49 | +1.1 | 91.5 |
| 50 | +1.2 | 93.1 |
| 51 | +1.3 | 94.6 |
| 52 | +1.5 | 95.4 |
| 53 | +1.6 | 98.5 |
| 54-56 | +2.0 | 99.2 |
| 57-68 | +2.1 | 100.0 |

Mean = 41.069
SD= 7.471
Range = 85
Kurtosis = .064
Skewness = -.611
Mode = 42.0

Table 12.9
Investment Executives Social Support Index (N=288)

| Raw Scores | Standard Scores | Cumulative Percentiles |
|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 0-25 | -2.9 | .7 |
| 26 | -2.7 | 1.4 |
| 27 | -2.5 | 2.1 |
| 28 | -2.3 | 2.8 |
| 29 | -2.1 | 3.8 |
| 30 | -1.8 | 4.9 |
| 31 | -1.6 | 7.3 |
| 32 | -1.4 | 10.4 |
| 33 | -1.2 | 12.2 |
| 34 | -1.0 | 18.4 |
| 35 | -0.8 | 23.3 |
| 36 | -0.6 | 28.8 |
| 37 | -0.4 | 35.8 |
| 38 | -0.2 | 44.1 |
| 39 | 0.0 | 52.8 |
| 40 | +0.2 | 63.5 |
| 41 | +0.5 | 70.5 |
| 42 | +0.7 | 77.1 |
| 43 | +0.9 | 84.4 |
| 44 | +1.1 | 87.2 |
| 45 | +1.3 | 93.4 |
| 46 | +1.5 | 95.5 |
| 47 | +1.7 | 97.6 |
| 48 | +1.9 | 99.0 |
| 49-68 | +2.1 | 100.0 |

Mean = 38.833
SD = 4.779
Range = 24
Kurtosis = .037
Skewness = -.368
Mode = 40.0

Table 12.10
Spouses of Investment Executives Social Support Index (N=228)

| Raw Scores | Standard Scores | Cumulative Percentiles |
|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 0-26 | -3.5 | .4 |
| 27-29 | -2.8 | 1.8 |
| 30-31 | -2.3 | 2.6 |
| 32 | -2.1 | 3.9 |
| 33 | -1.8 | 4.4 |
| 34 | -1.6 | 6.6 |
| 35 | -1.4 | 8.8 |
| 36 | -1.1 | 15.4 |
| 37 | -0.9 | 18.4 |
| 38 | -0.6 | 26.8 |
| 39 | -0.4 | 37.7 |
| 40 | -0.2 | 47.4 |
| 41 | +0.1 | 58.3 |
| 42 | +0.3 | 68.4 |
| 43 | +0.6 | 75.0 |
| 44 | +0.8 | 83.8 |
| 45 | +1.0 | 87.7 |
| 46 | +1.3 | 93.0 |
| 47 | +1.5 | 96.1 |
| 48 | +1.7 | 97.8 |
| 49 | +2.0 | 98.2 |
| 50 | +2.2 | 98.7 |
| 51 | +2.5 | 99.1 |
| 52 | +2.7 | 99.6 |
| 53-68 | +2.9 | 100.0 |

Mean = 40.675
SD = 4.203
Range = 27
Kurtosis = .824
Skewness = -.255
Mode = 39.0

Table 12.11
Rural Bank Employees Social Support Index (N=720)

| Raw Score | Standard Score | Cumulative Percentiles |
|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| 0 | -4.6 | 1.0 |
| 1 | -4.4 | 1.1 |
| 2 | -4.3 | 1.3 |
| 3 | -4.2 | 1.4 |
| 4 | -4.1 | 1.5 |
| 5-6 | -3.8 | 1.8 |
| 7 | -3.7 | 1.9 |
| 8-10 | -3.3 | 2.4 |
| 11 | -3.2 | 2.5 |
| 12 | -3.0 | 2.6 |
| 13 | -2.9 | 2.8 |
| 14 | -2.8 | 2.9 |
| 15 | -2.7 | 3.2 |
| 16-17 | -2.4 | 3.3 |
| 18-19 | -2.1 | 3.6 |
| 20 | -2.0 | 4.0 |
| 21 | -1.9 | 4.7 |
| 22 | -1.8 | 4.9 |
| 23-24 | -1.5 | 5.4 |
| 25 | -1.4 | 6.5 |
| 26 | -1.3 | 7.5 |
| 27 | -1.1 | 8.5 |
| 28 | -1.0 | 9.6 |
| 29 | -0.9 | 11.4 |
| 30 | -0.7 | 14.4 |
| 31 | -0.6 | 17.8 |
| 32 | -0.5 | 22.1 |
| 33 | -0.4 | 26.7 |
| 34 | -0.2 | 33.5 |
| 35 | -0.1 | 40.0 |
| 36 | 0.0 | 46.9 |
| 37 | +0.1 | 55.0 |
| 38 | +0.3 | 63.5 |
| 39 | +0.4 | 70.8 |
| 40 | +0.5 | 77.1 |
| 41 | +0.7 | 82.8 |
| 42 | +0.8 | 87.9 |
| 43 | +0.9 | 91.4 |
| 44 | +1.0 | 93.9 |
| 45 | +1.2 | 95.0 |
| 46 | +1.3 | 96.7 |
| 47 | +1.4 | 97.1 |
| 48 | +1.5 | 98.1 |
| 49 | +1.7 | 98.5 |
| 50 | +1.8 | 99.0 |
| 51 | +1.9 | 99.3 |
| 52 | +2.1 | 99.4 |
| 53 | +2.2 | 99.6 |
| 54-56 | +2.6 | 99.7 |
| 57-58 | +2.8 | 99.9 |
| 59-68 | +4.1 | 100.0 |

Mean = 35.838

SD = 7.856
Range =68
Kurtosis = 6.374
Skewness =-.1.729
Mode =38.0

Table 12.12
Social Support Index (SSI): Select Published Reports

| Author(s) | Sample | N Count | Alpha Reliability | Validity Notes |
|---|---|------------|----------------------|---|
| Beach, E.K., Maloney, B.H., Plocica, A.R., Sherry, S.E., Weaver, M., Luthringer, L., & Utz, S. (1992) | Married couples in which one of the pair experienced an acute myocardial infarction | 17 | .80 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No significant relationship was found between social support & recovery. |
| Carty, L. (1989) | Adolescents who received peer counseling compared to control groups to examine impact of peer counseling program on stress & social support | 340 | N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adolescents in peer support group: higher social support corresponded to lower stress levels |
| Duong, D. (1994) | N/A | N/A | N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doctoral Dissertation |
| Harvey, L. (1993) | N/A | N/A | N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doctoral Dissertation |
| Lee, Y. (1995) | N/A | N/A | N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doctoral Dissertation |
| Magill-Evans, J.E., & Restall, G. (1991) | Men & women with cerebral palsy matched with non-disabled persons | 44 | N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No differences found between cerebral palsy & non-disabled groups on social support. • Self-esteem was significantly related to social support. |
| Malia, J. (1993) | N/A | N/A | N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Masters Thesis |
| McCubbin, H.I., McCubbin, M.A., Thompson, A.I. & Thompson, E.A. (1995) | Native Hawaiian families | 155 | N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structural equation analysis revealed a significant (positive) direct relationship between social support & family hardiness & an indirect (negative) relationship to family dysfunction via family hardiness & family problem solving communication. |
| McCubbin, H.I., & Thompson, A.I. (1992) | Multiracial families | 200 | .71 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social support was significantly related to family well-being for all ethnic groups (Caucasian, Asian, Hawaiian, & mixed race). |

Table 12.12 (continued)
Social Support Index (SSI): Select Published Reports

| Author(s) | Sample | N Count | Alpha Reliability | Validity Notes |
|---|---|--------------------|------------------------------|--|
| McCubbin , H.I., Thompson, A.I., Thompson, E.A., Elver, K., & McCubbin, M.A. (1994) | Native Hawaiian families | 155 | .82 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSI was significantly related to family schema & family hardiness. Community social support was indirectly related (through schema & hardiness) to problem solving communication & inversely to family dysfunction. |
| Newby, N.M. (1995) | N/A | N/A | N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doctoral Dissertation |
| Patterson, J.M., Jernell, J., Leonard, B.J., & Titus, J.C. (1994) | Home caregiving by parents of medically fragile children | 48 | .64-.82 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support from community was inversely related to strain with home care providers. |
| Reddon, J.E., McDonald, L., & Kysela, G.M. (1992) | Families raising preschoolers with developmental disabilities | 16 | N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mothers received more support from friends & professionals than did fathers; fathers more support from co-workers; parents in general reported moderate levels of emotional support. • Both total life experiences & parental stress were positively related to social support from professionals, community groups & special groups. |
| Teague, B.R., Fleming, J.W., Castle, A., Kiernan, B.S., Lobo, M.L., Riggs, S., & Wolfe, J.G. (1993) | Caregivers of chronically ill, technology dependent children | 73 | N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social support inversely related to illness & family care strains: relationship statistically significant |
| Thompson, E.A., McCubbin, H.I., Thompson, A.I., & Elver, K. (1995) | Native Hawaiian families representing two-parent households (N = 83) & single-parent households | 197 | .82 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community social support has already been correlated with family well-being & is a significant predictor (negative) of family distress for both two-parent & single-parent households. |

SSI

SOCIAL SUPPORT INDEX

Xhosa Version

SSI

Nceda ukhethe ezi nkcazelo zilandelayo ngokusetyenziswa kwazo kusapho lwakho.

| Eyeofisi | Strongly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Neutral | Moderately Agree | Strongly Agree |
|--|--------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Xa ndinento engxamileyo, nabantu endingabaziyo apha ekuhlaleni bakubanomdla wokundinceda | | | | | |
| 2. Ndiva mnandi ngam xa ndincama ndinikele ngexesha namandla kumalungu osapho lwam | | | | | |
| 3. Izinto endizenzela amalungu osapho lwam nandenzela zona zindenza ndizive ndiyinxalenye yeli qela libalulekileyo | | | | | |
| 4. Abantu kule ndawo bangalufumana uncedo ekuhlaleni xa besengxakini | | | | | |
| 5. Ndinabahlobo abandazisayo ukuba bandixabisile lo mntu ndinguye nendinokukwenza | | | | | |
| 6. Abantu bangaxhomekeka omnye komnye kule ndawo | | | | | |
| 7. Amalungu osapho lwam awafane aziphulaphule iingxaki okanye iimbono zam; ndisoloko ndiziva ndigxekwa | | | | | |
| 8. Uncedo oluvela kubahlobo bam apha ekuhlaleni luyinxalenye yezinto ezenzeka imihla ngemihla kum | | | | | |
| 9. Kukho amaxesha apho amalungu osapho enza izinto ezenza amanye amalungu angonwabi | | | | | |
| 10. Kufuneka ndiyilumkele kakhulu indlela endenza ngayo ebahlobeni bam kuba bayandivuyelela | | | | | |
| 11. Ukuhlala apha kule ndawo kundenza ndizive ndikhuselekile | | | | | |
| 12. Amalungu osapho lwam ayazama ukubonisa uthando nenceba yabo kum | | | | | |
| 13. Kukho apha ekuhlaleni into yokuba abantu mabangahlobani kakhulu nabanye | | | | | |
| 14. Le asiyondawo ilungileyo ongakhulisela kuyo abantwana | | | | | |
| 15. Ndiziva ndiqinisekile ukuba ndibaluleke kubahlobo bam njengoko benjalo kum | | | | | |
| 16. Ndinabahlobo abasenyongweni kakhulu kum abangaphandle kosapho lwam endibaziyo ukuba bandikhathalele ngokwenyani yaye bayandithanda | | | | | |
| 17. Amalungu osapho lwam akhangeleka engandiqondi; ndiziva ndithathwa nje | | | | | |