Duke-UNC Functional Social Support Questionnaire
1988

Description of Measure

Purpose
To measure an individual’s perception of the amount and type of personal social support they receive.

Conceptual Organization
The original instrument included 14 items, grouped into 4 subscales: Quantity of Support, Confidant Support, Affective Support, and Instrumental Support.

Item Origin/Selection Process
The 14 items were derived from a larger questionnaire developed from a review of the literature for content validity and pretested for reliability (Broadhead, Gehlbach, DeGruy, & Kaplan, 1988; 1989).

Materials
See Broadhead, Gehlbach, DeGruy, & Kaplan, 1988.

Time Required
5 minutes

LONGSCAN Administration Method
A-CASI administered

Training
Minimal

Scoring
Score Types
The item response options are on a 5-point scale ranging from ‘1=much less than I would like’ to ‘5=as much as I would like’. Items 1-10 can be summed for an overall caregiver social support score.

Score Interpretation
Higher scores reflect greater perceived social support.

Norms and/or Comparative Data
The Duke-UNC Functional Social Support Questionnaire (FSSQ) was developed and tested on 401 randomly selected patients attending a family medical clinic in Durham, NC. The population was primarily white, female, and of high SES. Mean item scores on the 14-item instrument for this group ranged from 3.54 to 4.34 on a 5-point scale (Broadhead, Gehlbach, DeGruy, & Kaplan, 1988).
Psychometric Support

Reliability

Test-retest reliability was evaluated over a 2-week time period, and a correlation coefficient of .66 was found. Item-remainder correlations were used to assess internal consistency and ranged from .50 for useful advice, to .85 for help around the house (Broadhead, Gehlbach, DeGruy, & Kaplan, 1989). The Instrumental Support items had the poorest internal consistency. Factor analysis supported the cohesiveness of the a priori scales describing Confidant Support and Affective Support, while Instrumental Support items did not load together on a single factor. “Help when I’m sick in bed” loaded with the Affective Support items. To improve instrument reliability the original 14-item scale was reduced to eight items.

Validity

Construct validity was demonstrated by significant correlations of individual items with measures of symptom status and emotional function. These measures have been shown to relate to social support. Concurrent validity was supported by significant correlations with 3 out of 4 activities measures (Broadhead et al., 1983).

Reliability and validity of the scale are supported by a study in Spain (N = 656) (Bellon Saameno, Delgado Sanchez, Luna del Castillo, & Lardilli, 1996). Factor analysis replicated the results of Broadhead and colleagues in yielding two factors Confidant Support and Affective Support. Low social support was significantly related to living alone, worse subjective health, greater chronic morbidity, mental health disorder, and poorer family functioning (measured by Family APGAR).

In another study using the Duke-UNC Functional Social Support Questionnaire (Williams, Williams & Griggs, 1990), social support was again shown to be strongly correlated with family functioning (measured in this instance by FACES and FCOPES).

LONGSCAN Use

Data Points
Ages 4, 6, and 16

Respondent
Caregiver

Mnemonic and Version
SSQB: Ages 4 and 6
SSCC: Age 16

Rationale
Social support received by caregivers may be an important protective factor for children at risk for maltreatment. The measure was selected because it is brief, simple to administer, and has acceptable reliability and validity.

Administration and Scoring Notes
LONGSCAN used a slightly modified version of the FSSQ, comprised of 10 items and 3 a priori scales: Confidant Support, Affective Support, and Instrumental Support. Seven items are from the
original scale and were selected because of their demonstrated reliability and validity by the author. The other three items were developed by LONGSCAN in an attempt to enhance measurement of instrumental support. These items are:

- Help when I need transportation
- Help with cooking and housework
- Help taking care of my children

Results

Descriptive Statistics

For descriptive statistics of the age 4 and 6 Caregiver Social Support scores, please refer to the 1st and 2nd volumes of the measures manuals (Hunter et al., 2003). Table 1 provides descriptive statistics for the age 16 Caregiver Social Support scores by sample demographics.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Age 16 Caregiver Social Support Score by Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caregiver Social Support Sum Score</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>40.4 (8.1)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>40.2 (8.3)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>40.6 (7.8)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>42.1 (8.1)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>39.8 (8.1)</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>41.8 (6.4)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>40.2 (8.1)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>38.6 (8.5)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source. Based on data received at the Coordinating Center through February ‘10.

Reliability

Internal consistency for the Caregiver Social Support Score sample was excellent (Cronbach Alpha = .88).
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