Social Provisions Scale
Cutrona, C. E. and Russell, D.
1987

Description of Measure

Purpose
To examine the degree to which respondent’s social relationships provide social support.

Conceptual Organization
The instrument contains 24 items, four for each of the following dimensions of social support: Attachment, Social Integration, Reassurance of Worth, Reliable Alliance, Guidance, and Opportunity for Nurturance. Half of the items describe the presence of one of the dimensions of social support, and the others describe the absence of a dimension of social support. For additional information about the Social Provisions Scale, see Hunter et al., 2003.

Item Origin/Selection Process
The items were based on the six social provisions identified by Weiss (1974). Individual item selection for each provision was based on factor analyses (Russell & Cutrona, 1984).

Materials
A-CASI delivery system

Time Required
5 minutes

Administration Method
A-CASI

Training
Minimal training is required because the measure is delivered in an A-CASI format.

Scoring

Score Types
The respondent indicates (using a 4-point scale) the extent to which each statement describes her current social network. Responses range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). After reversal of negatively worded items (indicated by an “R” below) a total score may be computed by summing all items. Subscale scores may be computed by summing items as follows:

• Attachment: Items 2R, 11, 17, and 21R
• Social Integration: Items 5, 8, 14R, and 22R
• Reassurance of Worth: 6R, 9R, 13, and 20
• Reliable Alliance: Items 1, 10R, 18R, and 23
• Guidance: Items 3R, 12, 16, and 19R
• Opportunity for Nurturance: 4, 7, 15R, and 24R

Scores Interpretation
A high score indicates a greater degree of perceived social support.
Norms and/or Comparative Data
This scale has been used with a variety of samples (Cutrona, Russell, & Rose, 1984; Russell, Altwater, & Van Velzen, 1984; Russell, Cutrona, Rose, & Yurko, 1984); however, prior to LONGSCAN use, it had not been used with a low income, minority population. For additional information about the Social Provisions Scale, see Hunter et al., 2003.

Psychometric Support

Reliability

*Internal consistency:* Overall, the internal consistency of this scale is acceptable. Russell et al. (1984) administered a 12-item version of the scale, with two items measuring each support dimension, to 505 college students. Each pair of items contained one item that was worded positively and one that was worded negatively. The correlations between the two items for each provision ranged from $r = -.33$ (Reassurance of Worth) to $r = -.56$ (Reliable Alliance) (Russell, Cutrona, Rose, & Yurko, 1984). Cutrona, Russell, and Rose’s (1984) study of approximately 100 elderly subjects revealed internal consistency figures across all provisions to be above .70. In a 474 study of approximately 300 school teachers, internal consistency estimates were all above .60 (Russell, Altwater, & Van Velzen, 1984).


Validity

*Predictive Validity:* In a study of first-time mothers, Cutrona (1984) found that the provisions of Reliable Alliance, Reassurance of Worth, Social Integration, and Guidance were predictive of postpartum depression. Women without these provisions were more likely to become depressed after their pregnancy. Social provision scores were also found to be predictive of loneliness, depression, and health status among teachers (Russell, Altwater, & Van Velzen, 1984).

*Convergent Validity:* In Cutrona’s 1982 study of college freshmen the Social Integration, Reassurance of Worth, and Guidance provisions were found to be significantly related to scores on the UCLA Loneliness Scale (Russell, Peplau, & Cutrona, 1980). Deficits in these provisions explained 66% of the variance in the UCLA loneliness scores. Among the elderly, the total score correlated from .28 to .31 ($p < .05$) with life satisfaction, loneliness, and depression (Cutrona et al., 1984). Individual provisions have also been shown to correlate significantly and differentially with ratings of different relationship categories, as predicted by Weiss (1974). For example, among college students, Social Integration correlated with relationship ratings most highly of all of the provisions. Attachment correlated most highly with satisfying romantic or marital relations ($r = .53$, Russell et al., 1984).

Additionally, scores on the Social Provisions scale were found to correlate with measures of social networks (i.e., number of relationships and frequency of contact) and satisfaction with different types of social relationships among the elderly (Cutrona, Russell, & Rose, 1984). Scores on the Social Provisions scale were associated with scores on the social support measure developed by House (1981). For additional information about the Social Provisions Scale, see Hunter et al., 2003.

*Discriminant Validity:* Inter-correlations among the six provisions range from .10 to .51, with a mean inter-correlation of .27.
LONGSCAN Use

Data Points
Ages 8, 12, 14

Respondent
Caregiver

Mnemonic and Version
SPA: Age 8
SSP: Ages 12 (item level data)
SPSS: Ages 8 and 12 (scored data)

Rationale
Social support is well established as a protective factor. The Social Provisions Scale was chosen because it is based in theory, has good psychometric properties, contains simply worded questions, and is relatively brief.

Results

Descriptive Statistics
For descriptive statistics of the age 8 Social Provisions Scores, please refer to the 2nd volume of the measures manuals (Hunter et al., 2003). Tables 1 and 2 provide descriptive statistics for scores from the age 12 and age 14 Social Provisions Measure overall, and by sample demographics. At both age 12 and 14, caregivers report having a relatively high degree of social support. Caregivers at the SW and NW sites report the highest levels of support across all of the scores.

| Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for the Age 12 Social Provisions Scores by Demographics |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Overall | 918 | 13.2 (2.2) | 13.4 (2.2) | 13.2 (2.0) | 13.0 (2.1) | 13.6 (2.2) |
|  | Child’s Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 461 | 13.3 (2.1) | 13.5 (2.1) | 13.3 (1.9) | 13.1 (2.1) | 13.8 (2.1) | 12.8 (2.0) |
| Female | 459 | 13.1 (2.3) | 13.2 (2.3) | 13.1 (2.0) | 12.9 (2.1) | 13.5 (2.2) | 12.5 (2.0) |
| Study Site |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EA | 182 | 12.8 (2.1) | 13.1 (2.1) | 12.7 (2.1) | 12.8 (2.1) | 13.3 (2.1) | 12.4 (1.9) |
| MW | 160 | 12.5 (2.3) | 12.7 (2.5) | 12.7 (1.9) | 12.7 (2.1) | 12.9 (2.5) | 12.0 (2.1) |
| SO | 172 | 12.6 (2.0) | 12.8 (2.1) | 13.2 (1.7) | 12.2 (1.8) | 13.2 (2.0) | 12.2 (1.9) |
| SW | 218 | 13.9 (2.1) | 13.9 (2.1) | 13.6 (1.9) | 13.6 (2.1) | 14.2 (2.1) | 13.1 (1.9) |
| NW | 187 | 13.8 (2.2) | 14.0 (2.0) | 13.7 (1.9) | 13.4 (2.2) | 14.3 (1.9) | 13.3 (1.5) |

Notes. Based on data received at the Coordinating Center through March ’08.
Sample Ns differ slightly across scores due to missing data.
Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for the Age 14 Social Provisions Scores by Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Attachement M (SD)</th>
<th>Guidance M (SD)</th>
<th>Opportunity for Nurturing M (SD)</th>
<th>Reassurance of Worth M (SD)</th>
<th>Reliable Alliance M (SD)</th>
<th>Social Integration M (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>13.3 (2.2)</td>
<td>13.5 (2.2)</td>
<td>13.3 (1.9)</td>
<td>13.2 (2.1)</td>
<td>13.7 (2.1)</td>
<td>12.8 (2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>13.3 (2.3)</td>
<td>13.5 (2.2)</td>
<td>13.4 (1.9)</td>
<td>13.1 (2.1)</td>
<td>13.7 (2.1)</td>
<td>12.9 (2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>13.2 (2.2)</td>
<td>13.5 (2.2)</td>
<td>13.3 (2.0)</td>
<td>13.2 (2.1)</td>
<td>13.8 (2.1)</td>
<td>12.7 (2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>13.2 (2.3)</td>
<td>13.3 (2.2)</td>
<td>12.9 (2.1)</td>
<td>13.1 (2.1)</td>
<td>13.5 (2.2)</td>
<td>12.6 (2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>12.6 (2.1)</td>
<td>12.9 (2.2)</td>
<td>12.7 (2.0)</td>
<td>12.9 (1.9)</td>
<td>13.2 (2.0)</td>
<td>12.3 (2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>13.0 (2.1)</td>
<td>13.4 (2.2)</td>
<td>13.4 (1.9)</td>
<td>12.9 (2.0)</td>
<td>13.6 (2.1)</td>
<td>12.7 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>13.8 (2.0)</td>
<td>14.0 (2.1)</td>
<td>13.8 (1.7)</td>
<td>13.7 (2.0)</td>
<td>14.2 (1.9)</td>
<td>13.3 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>13.6 (2.4)</td>
<td>13.7 (2.4)</td>
<td>13.8 (1.8)</td>
<td>13.3 (2.2)</td>
<td>14.0 (2.2)</td>
<td>13.1 (2.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Based on data received at the Coordinating Center through March ’08. Sample Ns differ slightly across scores due to missing data.

Reliability
For reliability of the age 8 Social Provisions Scores, please refer to the 2nd volume of the measures manuals (Hunter et al., 2003). As can be seen in Table 3, at age 12 alpha coefficients for the total sample range from .59 (Opportunity for Nurturance) to .78 (Guidance) on the individual scales, with nearly identical alphas for age 14 scoring.

Table 3. Cronbach Alpha’s for the Social Provisions Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th>Guidance</th>
<th>Opportunity for Nurturing</th>
<th>Reassurance of Worth</th>
<th>Reliable Alliance</th>
<th>Social Integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 12</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 14</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Based on data received at the Coordinating Center through March ’08.
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