

Outcome Measure	Social Support Survey (SSS)
Sensitivity to Change	Not enough evidence
Population	Adult
Domain	Family Environment
Type of Measure	Self-report
ICF-Code/s	e3
Description	<p>The SSS (Sherbourne & Stewart, 1991) is a self-rating scale, designed to measure the perceived availability of functional social supports. It was initially developed for use in a longitudinal research study of patients with “chronic conditions” and has been used in people with stroke.</p> <p>The main focus of the SSS is the 19 items representing 5 dimensions of functional social support: (i) Emotional support (4 items), (ii) Informational support (4 items), (iii) Tangible support (4 items), (iv) Affectionate support (3 items), and (v) Positive social interactions (4 items). An additional 2 items provide contextual background.</p> <p>The structural support items (marital status and number of people in whom the person can confide) are not scored. Responses for the 19 functional items are made on a 5-point scale: 1 (none of the time), 2 (a little of the time), 3 (some of the time), 4 (most of the time), 5 (all of the time).</p>
Properties	<p>See Tate (2010) for further information.</p> <p>Sherbourne and Stewart (1991) examined the psychometric properties of the SSS in a large sample (n=2987) recruited from three sites in the USA. Mean age was 55 years and mean education was 13.3 years. Participants were drawn from a populations study which intentionally included people “who appeared to have one or more of four chronic diseases (hypertension diabetes, coronary heart disease and depression)”.</p> <p>Validity</p> <p><u>Construct</u>: Internal consistency: $\alpha = .97$ (dimension range: .92 - .96). Confirmatory factor analysis produced four factors (described above) and a single factor was extracted from PCA with loadings of each of the items ranging between .67 and .88.</p> <p><u>Convergent/divergent</u>: The authors found higher correlations between hypothesized similar constructs (e.g., total score with loneliness: $r = .67$, with family functioning: $r = .53$); and lower correlation with hypothesized dissimilar constructs (e.g., total score with physical functioning $r = .11$, with pain severity: $r = .19$).</p> <p>Reliability</p> <p><u>Test-retest</u>: The test was administered 1 year later: $r = .78$ (dimension range: .72-.76). Yu, Lee, and Woo (2004) reported an ICC of .84 after a 2</p>

	week interval using the Chinese version of the SSS.
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A carefully developed scale, with care taken to avoid overlapping constructs (e.g., family functioning) • Multidimensional (5 domains: emotional, informational, tangible, affectionate, positive) yet brief (19 items) • Easily completed; items have clear face validity • Focuses on function (i.e., resources provided by other people) rather than structure (i.e., quantitative aspects of social support such as size of social network) • In terms of a <u>head-to-head comparison</u>, an alternative is the Interpersonal Support Evaluation List (Cohen et al., 1985): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ISEL is also multidimensional (tangible, appraisal, self-esteem, belonging social support domains) - SSS is shorter than ISEL (19 vs 48 items) - ISEL has been used in TBI (McColl et al, 2001) - Both have adequate psychometric properties in general populations
Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being about functional social support, provides some (but limited) information on structural support (as intended – so not really a disadvantage, but rather a feature of the scale) • No clear indication about scoring procedures (but can get around this by using mean score, thereby anchoring it back to the response format) • Not widely used in clinical (and specifically ABI) populations – but this applies to many such scales. Hilari et al (2006) have used it in stroke
Additional Information	
Reviewers	Robyn Tate

References

- Sherbourne, C. D., & Stewart, A. L. (1991). The MOS social support survey. *Social Science & Medicine*, 32(6), 705-714. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536\(91\)90150-B](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536(91)90150-B)
- Tate, R. L. (2010). *A compendium of tests, scales, and questionnaires: The practitioner's guide to measuring outcomes after acquired brain impairment*: Psychology Press.
- Yu, D. S. F., Lee, D. T. F., & Woo, J. (2004). Psychometric testing of the Chinese version of the medical outcomes study social support survey (MOS-SSS-C). *Research in Nursing & Health*, 27(2), 135-143. doi: 10.1002/nur.20008