

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 various dimensions of social support.

Conceptual Organization

The instrument contains 24 items, four for each of the following: Attachment, Social Integration, Reassurance of Worth, Reliable Alliance, Guidance, and Opportunity for Nurturance. Half of the items describe the presence of a type of support and the others describe the absence of a type of support.

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

The non-copyrighted LONGSCAN version of the form is included in this manual. Also see Russell and Cutrona (1984).

Time Required

5 minutes

Administration Method

Interviewer-administered

Training

Minimal

Scoring

Score Types

The respondent indicates on 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 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, it has not been used with a low income, minority population.

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 study of approximately 300 school teachers, internal consistency estimates were all above .60 (Russell, Altwater, & Van Velzen, 1984).

Test-retest: Cutrona, Russell, and Rose (1984) report test-retest reliability coefficient ranging from .37 to .66.

Validity

Predictive: 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: 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 predicated 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 on the Social Provisions scale were associated with scores on the social support measure developed by House (1981).

Discriminant: Intercorrelations among the six provisions range from .10 to .51, with a mean intercorrelation of .27.

LONGSCAN Use

Data Points

Age 8

Respondent

Primary maternal caregiver

Mnemonic and Version

Age 8: SPA

Age 12: SSPB, SSPC. The C version is the ACASI-administered version.

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.

Administration and Scoring Notes

LONGSCAN adapted Cutrona and Russell's 24-item scale for use with our predominantly low income sample with limited reading skills. Items were shortened using simpler wording, and uncommon words were replaced with more commonly used words. For example, "I have close relationships that provide me with a sense of emotional security and well-being" was changed to "I have close relationships that make me feel good"; "If something went wrong, no one would come to my assistance." was changed to "If something went wrong, no one would help me."

Results

Table 1 displays the means and standard deviations for the Total Scale and each of the provisions by caregiver race and study site at the Age 8 interview. Overall, caregivers in the LONGSCAN sample report having a relatively high degree of social support. Black caregivers report a perception of lower social support than caregivers of other races, and caregivers at the SO site reported lower perceived support than those at other sites. Caregivers at the SO site also reported the lowest Social Integration and Reassurance of Worth scores. White caregivers and

caregivers of other races reported higher Reliable Alliance and Opportunity for Nurturance than other caregivers, and caregivers at the SW and NW sites reported the highest Reliable Alliance.

Table 1 about here

As can be seen in Table 2, total internal consistency reliability for the Social Provisions scales is excellent ($\alpha = .93$) with alpha coefficients for the total sample ranging from .59 (Opportunity for Nurturance) to .78 (Guidance) on the individual scales. Total scale alpha reliabilities are excellent when considered by caregiver race ($\alpha = .91$ to .95) and study site ($\alpha = .90$ to .93). Alpha coefficients were lower on Opportunity for Nurturance by caregiver race and study site and generally fell into the moderate range, while the majority of alpha coefficients on the other individual scales were in the acceptable to good range. It would appear that the Social Provisions Scale is a reliable measure for use with a low income, minority population.

Table 2 about here

References and Bibliography

Cutrona, C. E. (1982). Transition to college: Loneliness and the process of social adjustment. In L. A. Peplau and D. Perlman (Eds.), Loneliness: A sourcebook of current research, theory, and therapy (pp. 291-309). New York: Wiley Interscience.

Cutrona, C. E. (1984). Social support and stress in the transition to parenthood. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 93(4), 378-390.

Cutrona, C. E. and Russell, D. (1987). The provisions of social relationships and adaptation to stress. In W. H. Jones & D. Perlman (Eds.) Advances in personal relationships (Vol. 1, pp. 37-67). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Cutrona, C. E., Russell, D., & Rose, J. (1984). Psychosocial factors and physical and mental health among the elderly. Unpublished manuscript.

House, J. S. (1981). Work stress and social support. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Russell, D., Altwater, E., & Van Velzen, D. (1984). Job related stress, social support, and

burnout among teachers. Unpublished manuscript University of Iowa School of Medicine, Iowa City, Iowa.

Russell, D., Cutrona, C. E., Rose, J., & Yurko, K. (1984). Social and emotional loneliness: An examination of Weiss's typology of loneliness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 1313-1321.

Russell, D. & Cutrona, C. (1984, August). The provision of social relationships and adaptation to stress. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association, Toronto, ON, Canada.

Russell, D., Peplau, L. A., & Cutrona, C. E. (1980). The Revised UCLA Loneliness Scale: Concurrent and discriminant validity evidence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 472-480.

Weiss, R. S. (1974). The provisions of social relationships. In Z. Rubin (Ed.), Doing unto others (pp. 17-26). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

**Table 1. Mean Scores on the Social Provisions Scales by Caregiver Race and Study Site.
Age 8 Interview**

	N	Total Scale M (SD)	Attachment M (SD)	Social Integration M (SD)	Reassurance of Worth M (SD)	Reliable Alliance M (SD)	Guidance M (SD)	Opportunity for Nurturance M (SD)
Total	1036	78.85 (10.37)	13.25 (2.11)	12.53 (1.99)	12.77 (1.99)	13.67 (2.05)	13.40 (2.15)	13.40 (1.93)
Race								
White	283	81.91 (9.68)	13.90 (1.97)	13.05 (1.83)	13.10 (1.96)	14.16 (1.96)	13.84 (2.13)	13.99 (1.81)
Black	417	75.93 (9.70)	12.64 (2.05)	11.98 (1.89)	12.31 (1.95)	13.19 (2.08)	12.99 (2.10)	12.92 (1.87)
Hispanic	47	78.09 (10.75)	13.09 (2.23)	12.29 (2.11)	12.98 (1.94)	13.64 (2.12)	13.36 (2.11)	12.98 (1.91)
Multiracial	24	80.96 (10.83)	13.29 (2.37)	12.92 (2.00)	13.25 (1.98)	14.25 (1.82)	13.50 (2.50)	13.75 (1.96)
Other	17	84.12 (11.60)	13.94 (2.19)	13.88 (1.96)	13.41 (2.50)	14.29 (2.20)	14.59 (1.94)	14.00 (2.15)
Site								
EA	236	76.68 (10.20)	12.83 (2.02)	12.06 (1.87)	12.57 (1.89)	13.28 (2.14)	13.17 (2.00)	13.03 (1.84)
MW	126	75.25 (10.69)	12.47 (2.27)	12.04 (2.14)	12.36 (2.06)	13.19 (2.24)	12.66 (2.61)	12.70 (1.98)
SO	183	75.15 (8.52)	12.64 (1.75)	11.91 (1.57)	11.94 (1.67)	13.18 (1.80)	12.75 (1.74)	12.94 (1.61)
SW	270	82.16 (9.90)	13.90 (2.00)	13.05 (2.03)	13.32 (1.89)	14.20 (1.83)	13.96 (1.91)	13.87 (1.93)
NW	221	82.22 (10.07)	13.87 (2.13)	13.18 (1.95)	13.23 (2.09)	14.13 (2.06)	13.90 (2.31)	13.98 (1.91)

Source. Based on data received at the LONGSCAN Coordinating Center through 8/24/01.

Table 2. Cronbach's Alpha of the Social Provisions Scales by Caregiver Race and Study Site. Age 8 Interview

	Total Scale α	Attachment α	Social Integration α	Reassurance of Worth α	Reliable Alliance α	Guidance α	Opportunity for Nurturance α
Total	.93	.75	.68	.72	.74	.78	.59
Race							
White	.93	.79	.70	.76	.77	.82	.64
Black	.91	.70	.61	.66	.70	.73	.52
Hispanic	.94	.75	.67	.71	.73	.76	.53
Multiracial	.93	.77	.67	.70	.75	.74	.55
Other	.95	.64	.82	.78	.88	.87	.64
Site							
EA	.90	.71	.60	.58	.69	.71	.46
MW	.91	.67	.70	.68	.72	.81	.52
SO	.92	.76	.60	.75	.76	.74	.61
SW	.93	.77	.69	.71	.69	.74	.62
NW	.92	.75	.68	.76	.77	.82	.58

Source. Based on data received at the LONGSCAN Coordinating Center through 8/24/01.