E-ISSN: 3031-8629
P-ISSN: 3032-325
Halaman 65-79
Volume 2 Nomor 1 Tahun 2025

Social Support, Self-Confidence, and English Achievement among Junior Secondary Learners

Putri Solehatul Fadilah[1], Siti Syafiatul Qomariyah[2], Baiq Sumarni[3]
English Language Education Department, FBMB, Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika
Jl. Pemuda No. 59 A, Mataram, Indonesia 83125
e-mail: putrisf85@gmail.com

Abstrak

Penelitian ini mengkaji hubungan dukungan sosial dan kepercayaan diri dengan prestasi bahasa Inggris siswa sekolah menengah pertama. Penelitian menggunakan desain korelasional kuantitatif dengan melibatkan 30 siswa kelas IX SMPN 5 Pringgabaya yang dipilih melalui simple random sampling. Dukungan sosial dan kepercayaan diri diukur menggunakan angket terstruktur, sedangkan prestasi bahasa Inggris direpresentasikan oleh nilai rapor. Sebelum regresi berganda, variabel prestasi ditransformasikan menggunakan inverse normal transformation sebagaimana dilaporkan dalam penelitian sumber. Model secara keseluruhan signifikan ($p = .019$) dan menjelaskan 25,6% variasi pada hasil yang dimodelkan ($R^2 = .256$). Namun, kontribusi unik dukungan sosial ($p = .084$) dan kepercayaan diri ($p = .093$) tidak signifikan pada taraf .05. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa signifikansi model bersama tidak dapat disamakan dengan signifikansi masing-masing prediktor. Pembahasan menempatkan hasil tersebut dalam literatur psikososial pembelajaran bahasa Inggris, termasuk penelitian dosen Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris UNDIKMA mengenai self-confidence, self-efficacy, anxiety, motivation, dan classroom support. Penelitian menyimpulkan bahwa dukungan sosial dan kepercayaan diri layak diperhatikan secara terpadu, tetapi arah hubungan, kontribusi unik prediktor, dan kestabilan estimasi memerlukan penelitian dengan sampel lebih besar dan desain longitudinal.

Kata kunci: social support; self-confidence; English achievement; multiple regression; junior secondary education

Abstract

This study examined the association of social support and self-confidence with English achievement among junior secondary learners. A quantitative correlational design involved 30 ninth-grade students at SMPN 5 Pringgabaya selected through simple random sampling. Structured questionnaires represented perceived social support and self-confidence, while

school report scores represented English achievement. As reported in the source study, an inverse normal transformation was applied to the achievement outcome before multiple regression. The overall model was statistically significant ($p = .019$) and explained 25.6% of the variation in the modeled outcome ($R^2 = .256$). However, the unique contribution of social support ($p = .084$) and self-confidence ($p = .093$) did not reach the .05 significance level. The findings therefore require a distinction between the significance of the joint model and the significance of individual predictors. The discussion situates this pattern within psychosocial research on English learning, including UNDIKMA scholarship on self-confidence, self-efficacy, anxiety, motivation, and supportive learning conditions. The study concludes that social support and self-confidence merit integrated educational attention, while causal direction, predictor-specific contributions, and estimate stability require larger and preferably longitudinal investigations.
Keywords: social support; self-confidence; English achievement; multiple regression; junior secondary education

INTRODUCTION

English achievement is not produced by linguistic knowledge alone. Students encounter instruction through social relationships, feedback, expectations, prior experiences of success and failure, and beliefs about whether they can participate successfully. Social support and self-confidence therefore represent two different but potentially connected psychosocial conditions. Social support concerns perceived access to emotional, informational, and practical assistance from significant others, whereas self-confidence concerns learners' judgments that they can act successfully in a learning situation. Neither construct is equivalent to achievement itself, and neither should be treated as a substitute for demonstrated language performance (Zimet et al., 1988; MacIntyre et al., 1998).

The distinction is particularly important in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings. Language learning requires repeated public and private responses, and learners may interpret mistakes as evidence about their competence. A supportive teacher or peer can make help-seeking safer, while prior success can strengthen confidence and willingness to communicate. At the same time, the relationships may run in the opposite direction: students who already achieve well may become more

confident and may elicit more positive support from teachers, peers, and family members. Cross-sectional correlational data therefore identify patterns of association but cannot determine a single causal direction (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994; Fredricks et al., 2004).

Social support is educationally relevant because assistance is not limited to encouragement. It can involve clarification of assignments, access to learning materials, feedback on errors, emotional reassurance, or the presence of someone who takes a learner's effort seriously. Research on teacher-student relationships and engagement indicates that supportive relational conditions can be connected with students' participation and achievement, but the mechanisms depend on the quality and function of the support provided (Roorda et al., 2011; Martin & Dowson, 2009). Consequently, a broad social-support score should be interpreted as a perception of the social learning environment rather than a direct measure of a specific instructional treatment.

Self-confidence likewise needs conceptual boundaries. In language learning, confidence can be task-specific and situational. A learner may feel confident answering a familiar written exercise but hesitant when speaking spontaneously in front of peers. This is related to, but not identical with, self-efficacy, anxiety, motivation, self-concept, or willingness to communicate. Self-efficacy is usually defined in relation to perceived capability for a particular task, whereas broader confidence measures may capture a more general judgment. Treating these constructs as interchangeable can obscure why they relate differently to specific English outcomes (Horwitz et al., 1986; Multon et al., 1991; Pajares, 2003; MacIntyre et al., 1998).

Research from Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika (UNDIKMA) provides a useful local comparison because several studies have examined affective and social dimensions of English learning in West Nusa Tenggara. Farosy et al. (2019), involving 44 junior secondary learners, reported a multiple relationship between anxiety, learning motivation, and speaking skill. Sumarsono and Amin (2019) examined contextual teaching and students' self-confidence and found descriptive improvement in confidence without a statistically significant effect. These two studies illustrate that

affective variables can be educationally salient while producing different statistical patterns depending on the construct, outcome, and design (Tahir, et. al, 2024).

Other UNDIKMA studies reinforce the importance of distinguishing learning conditions from learner beliefs. Qomariyah and Utama (2021) found that problem-based learning influenced students' English learning interest, showing that classroom design can shape an affective response without making interest equivalent to confidence or achievement. Jupri et al. (2022) documented improved speaking performance through Two Stay Two Stray in a classroom-action context where foreign language anxiety was relevant, while Sumarsono et al. (2022) showed that remote learning could be experienced as either motivating or demotivating and that some students perceived increased independence and confidence. These findings indicate that psychosocial responses emerge within particular instructional arrangements rather than functioning as fixed learner traits.

A particularly close local comparison is provided by Setianingsih et al. (2024), who examined self-efficacy and speaking skills among 30 senior high school students in Mataram. They reported a strong positive correlation between self-efficacy and speaking performance. That result is relevant to the present investigation because it demonstrates a local association between a capability belief and an English skill. Nevertheless, it cannot be treated as direct confirmation of the present model: self-efficacy is not identical to general self-confidence, speaking is a specific productive skill rather than a broad report-card outcome, the school level differs, and the present study simultaneously models social support and confidence. The comparison is strongest when these differences are retained.

The present study addresses a narrower statistical question. It examines whether social support and self-confidence, considered together, are associated with English achievement among ninth-grade students at SMPN 5 Pringgabaya, and it distinguishes the overall regression model from the unique contribution of each predictor. This distinction matters because a model can be statistically informative as a set even when individual coefficients do not meet a conventional significance threshold.

The study therefore aims to interpret the reported joint association proportionately, identify what the individual tests do and do not show, and connect the pattern with pedagogically relevant literature without converting prediction into causation.

METHOD

The study employed a quantitative correlational design involving 30 ninth-grade students at SMPN 5 Pringgabaya. The source study describes the participants as selected through simple random sampling from the relevant school population. Social support and self-confidence were measured using structured questionnaires, while English achievement was represented by students' academic report scores. No experimental manipulation of support or confidence was conducted; the design therefore examined statistical relationships among measured variables.

The two questionnaire variables were treated as predictors and English achievement as the outcome. The source study applied an inverse normal transformation to the achievement scores before fitting the multiple regression model. The inferential results reported in this article consequently concern variation on the transformed achievement scale. Because a transformed score does not retain the same metric as the original report-card score, regression interpretation should not be translated directly into a specific number of raw grade points without a justified back-transformation procedure.

The analysis focused on four reported results: the coefficient of determination (R^2), the probability value for the overall regression model, and the probability values associated with the social-support and self-confidence coefficients. Statistical significance was interpreted using the .05 criterion stated in the source study. The overall model test and the individual coefficient tests were treated as different inferential questions. A nonsignificant individual p value was not interpreted as proof that the corresponding association was exactly zero, and the model's explained variance was not interpreted as a causal percentage attributable to the predictors.

The small sample and observational design require restrained interpretation. With 30 participants and two predictors, coefficient estimates can be sensitive to

sampling variation, while overlap between predictors can reduce the precision of their unique effects. The available source does not report variance inflation factors, confidence intervals, or standardized coefficients; therefore, no claim of multicollinearity, effect magnitude, or predictor ranking is added here. The article retains only the statistics documented in the study and discusses possible explanations as hypotheses for future research rather than as findings (Lakens, 2013; Babyak, 2004).

Only aggregate results are reported. Students' names and individual report-card records are not reproduced. No additional ethics approval number, consent procedure, reliability coefficient, or new data-collection event is introduced because these details are not documented in the supplied source. The present manuscript is an expanded journal adaptation of the recorded study, with additional theoretical comparison and methodological clarification rather than a new analysis of undisclosed raw data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The reported multiple-regression model was statistically significant at $p = .019$. The coefficient of determination was $R^2 = .256$, indicating that social support and self-confidence jointly accounted for 25.6% of the variation in the transformed English-achievement outcome within this sample. This is a model-level description: it does not mean that 25.6% of each student's achievement was caused by the two predictors, nor does it identify how much of the explained variance belongs uniquely to either predictor.

Table 1. Summary and interpretation of the reported regression results

Statistical component	Reported result	Interpretive meaning
Overall multiple-regression model	$p = .019$	The predictors are jointly associated with the transformed achievement outcome at the .05 level.
Coefficient of determination	$R^2 = .256$	The fitted model accounts for 25.6% of sample variation in the modeled outcome; this is not a causal percentage.

Statistical component	Reported result	Interpretive meaning
Social support	p = .084	The unique coefficient does not reach the .05 significance criterion when self-confidence is included in the model.
Self-confidence	p = .093	The unique coefficient does not reach the .05 significance criterion when social support is included in the model.
Outcome metric	Inverse-normal transformed achievement	The inferential model is not expressed directly in original report-card points.

The individual social-support coefficient had a reported p value of .084, while the self-confidence coefficient had a reported p value of .093. Neither met the .05 criterion when evaluated as a unique contribution in the joint model. This pattern does not contradict the significant overall model because the tests answer different questions. The overall test evaluates whether the set of predictors provides information about the outcome, whereas an individual coefficient evaluates the association that remains for one predictor after statistical adjustment for the other.

One plausible explanation for the pattern is shared statistical information between social support and self-confidence. Supportive experiences can contribute to learners' perceptions of competence, and confident learners may seek or perceive support differently. If the predictors overlap, the model may capture their combined association more clearly than it separates their unique contributions. However, the source study does not report predictor correlations or collinearity diagnostics, so overlap should be treated as a theoretical possibility rather than a confirmed statistical diagnosis. A second possibility is limited precision from the small sample, which can leave individual coefficients uncertain even when the overall set of predictors is informative (Babyak, 2004).

The distinction between joint and unique association has direct educational meaning. Students do not experience social support and confidence as isolated

classroom variables. A learner who can obtain clarification from a teacher may approach the next task with greater confidence, while successful performance can make help-seeking easier and elicit further encouragement. These reciprocal pathways are compatible with the result but are not identified by the cross-sectional regression. The appropriate interpretation is therefore an integrated psychosocial pattern rather than a causal sequence in which one predictor has been proven to produce achievement.

The result is broadly consistent with local UNDIKMA scholarship showing that affective conditions often operate in combination with classroom experiences. Farosy et al. (2019) reported that anxiety and learning motivation were jointly related to junior secondary students' speaking skill. Although their predictors and outcome differ from those used here, the study supports the broader proposition that language performance can be associated with more than one psychosocial factor at the same time. It also illustrates why a multivariable result should not be reduced to a single emotional explanation.

Setianingsih et al. (2024) provide an especially important comparison because their study involved 30 learners and reported a strong correlation between self-efficacy and speaking skill. That result strengthens the case for examining learner beliefs in local EFL contexts, but it should not be used to override the present nonsignificant self-confidence coefficient. Self-efficacy is more explicitly capability-focused, their outcome was speaking performance, and their analysis did not ask for the unique contribution of confidence after controlling for social support. The different statistical result may therefore reflect differences in construct alignment, outcome specificity, and model specification rather than a contradiction between studies.

The contrast with Sumarsono and Amin (2019) is also informative. Their contextual-teaching study reported an improvement in students' self-confidence but did not find a statistically significant effect on confidence. This local evidence demonstrates that theoretically desirable changes in confidence do not automatically produce a clear inferential result. In the present study, the $p = .093$ value likewise requires a restrained conclusion: self-confidence remains educationally relevant as a construct, but the

available regression does not establish an independent association at the specified significance level after adjustment for social support.

Social support should be interpreted with similar caution. The p = .084 result is not statistically significant at .05, but neither should it be described as proof that support has no relationship with English learning. A general support score may combine emotional reassurance, practical help, informational guidance, and perceptions of belonging. These functions may relate differently to achievement. International research on teacher-student relationships shows that supportive relationships can be associated with engagement and achievement, particularly when the support is connected to learning opportunities and students' participation (Roorda et al., 2011; Martin & Dowson, 2009). A more differentiated measure could clarify which type of support is most relevant to English learning.

The local work of Qomariyah and Utama (2021) helps interpret this mechanism without equating constructs. Their problem-based learning study found a significant effect on students' English learning interest. Interest is not social support, but the finding demonstrates that the organization of classroom activity can shape an affective response to English learning. Similarly, Jupri et al. (2022) reported improved speaking performance within a collaborative Two Stay Two Stray arrangement where foreign language anxiety formed part of the instructional problem. Together, these studies suggest that affective and social conditions should be examined in relation to concrete classroom practices rather than only as stable questionnaire traits.

Sumarsono et al. (2022) further showed that learning conditions can create mixed psychosocial responses. During remote learning, students reported obstacles such as internet problems and reduced interaction, while some also described greater independence, curiosity, and confidence. This is relevant to the present social-support construct because perceived support is partly shaped by whether learners can access explanations, interaction, and assistance when difficulties occur. The implication is not that remote learning explains the present regression, but that contextual access to interaction can influence how support and confidence are experienced.

The model's R^2 of .256 indicates that most variation in the modeled achievement outcome was not accounted for by the two predictors. The remaining 74.4% should not be labeled as a measured set of specific causes. Prior achievement, vocabulary knowledge, attendance, task difficulty, instructional quality, assessment practices, anxiety, motivation, family resources, and many other factors could be relevant, but their contributions were not estimated in this model. The responsible conclusion is therefore that the two predictors provide a partial description of achievement variation in this sample, not a comprehensive theory of English achievement.

The use of report-card scores also affects interpretation. A school grade can aggregate several forms of performance, such as assignments, tests, participation, and teacher judgments, depending on local assessment practice. A broad achievement measure may therefore be less tightly matched to a confidence questionnaire than a specific speaking, reading, or writing task would be. This may help explain why task-specific self-efficacy studies sometimes show stronger relationships with performance than broad confidence measures, although the present dataset does not allow that explanation to be tested directly (Multon et al., 1991; Pajares, 2003).

The inverse normal transformation creates an additional interpretive boundary. The model was fitted to a transformed achievement outcome, so its inferential scale is not the original report-card metric. Transformation can be useful for analytical reasons, but it reduces the directness of substantive interpretation if the original distribution and coefficients are not reported alongside the transformed analysis. Accordingly, this article does not claim that a one-unit rise in support or confidence produces a particular increase in school grades. Such a statement would require coefficient information and a justified interpretation on the original scale that are not available in the supplied study.

A further methodological issue is statistical precision. With a sample of 30, p values can change noticeably with modest sampling variation, and a binary significant/nonsignificant label conveys less information than effect estimates and confidence intervals. Those statistics are not available in the source document, so they cannot be reconstructed here without raw data. Future studies should report

unstandardized and standardized coefficients, confidence intervals, predictor correlations, and collinearity diagnostics. Such reporting would make it possible to distinguish a genuinely small unique relationship from an imprecisely estimated one (Lakens, 2013).

Directionality is equally unresolved. Social support may facilitate engagement and practice; confidence may make students more willing to attempt difficult English tasks; and successful achievement may subsequently increase confidence and improve learners' perceptions of support. A one-time regression cannot establish which process occurred first. Longitudinal measurement would allow prior achievement to be controlled and would show whether earlier support or confidence predicts later achievement beyond baseline performance. An intervention study would be needed for stronger claims about whether deliberately changing support or confidence causes achievement improvement.

The pedagogical implication should therefore be framed as a low-risk educational response rather than a causal prescription. Teachers can make academic help easier to access, provide clear criteria for success, respond to errors without public humiliation, and give feedback that identifies a feasible next step. These practices are consistent with supportive instruction and can provide students with evidence from which realistic confidence may develop. Formative-assessment research similarly emphasizes that feedback is most useful when it helps learners understand where they are, what the goal is, and what action should follow (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Confidence-building should not be reduced to generic praise. Indiscriminate reassurance may temporarily improve feelings without increasing learners' understanding of what they can actually do. More educationally useful confidence is calibrated to performance: students can identify a task they can complete, the strategy that supported success, and the next challenge that remains. This distinction is especially important because the present study does not show an independent statistical effect of confidence. The goal is not to maximize self-reported confidence

regardless of evidence, but to create repeated opportunities for successful, accurately interpreted performance.

Support should also be made specific. A learner who does not understand an instruction may need clarification; a learner who lacks materials may need practical assistance; a learner who understands the task but fears embarrassment may need a safer participation structure. These different needs would all be obscured by a recommendation simply to 'increase support.' Future research could separate teacher, peer, and family support and distinguish emotional, informational, and instrumental functions. This would improve both statistical interpretation and the usefulness of recommendations derived from the findings (Zimet et al., 1988).

The present results also caution against labeling individual students as 'unsupported' or 'unconfident' on the basis of a single questionnaire score. Perceptions can vary across teachers, tasks, peer groups, and recent experiences. A student who reports low confidence in oral interaction may still perform well in written work, and a student who feels generally supported may still need targeted academic help. Teachers should therefore interpret psychosocial information together with work samples, classroom observation, and task-specific performance rather than treating survey scores as complete diagnoses.

Taken together, the study contributes a bounded local finding: social support and self-confidence were jointly associated with transformed English achievement, but neither predictor showed a statistically significant unique coefficient at the .05 level in the reported model. The result is neither a simple confirmation nor a rejection of the local literature. Instead, it refines the discussion by showing that relationships seen in single-construct or skill-specific studies may become less clear when two related psychosocial predictors are modeled simultaneously against a broad achievement outcome. This distinction is the main analytical value of the present study.

CONCLUSION

Social support and self-confidence were jointly associated with transformed English achievement in the reported regression model ($p = .019$; $R^2 = .256$), while

neither predictor showed a statistically significant unique coefficient at the .05 level. The findings support integrated attention to supportive learning conditions and learner confidence without establishing causal direction or independent intervention effects. Teachers should provide accessible academic assistance and performance-linked feedback. Future studies should use larger, longitudinal samples and report coefficients, confidence intervals, predictor correlations, and interpretable achievement metrics.

REFERENCES

Babyak, M. A. (2004). What you see may not be what you get: A brief, nontechnical introduction to overfitting in regression-type models. Psychosomatic Medicine, 66(3), 411-421. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.psy.0000127692.23278.a9

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 5(1), 7-74. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102

Farosy, A. H., Sumarsono, D., & Sumarni, B. (2019). The correlation between students' anxiety and learning motivation towards students' speaking skill. Cordova Journal Language and Culture Studies, 9(1), 146-156. https://doi.org/10.20414/cordova.v9i1.1815

Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. Review of Educational Research, 74(1), 59-109. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 81-112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. The Modern Language Journal, 70(2), 125-132. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb05256.x

Jupri, J., Mismardiana, Muslim, & Haerazi, H. (2022). Teaching English using Two Stay Two Stray in improving students' English speaking skills integrated with foreign language anxiety. Journal of Language and Literature Studies, 2(1), 33-42. https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v2i1.719

Lakens, D. (2013). Calculating and reporting effect sizes to facilitate cumulative science: A practical primer for t-tests and ANOVAs. Frontiers in Psychology, 4, 863. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00863

MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. Language Learning, 44(2), 283-305. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1994.tb01103.x

MacIntyre, P. D., Clement, R., Dornyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. The Modern Language Journal, 82(4), 545-562. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb05543.x

Martin, A. J., & Dowson, M. (2009). Interpersonal relationships, motivation, engagement, and achievement: Yields for theory, current issues, and educational practice. Review of Educational Research, 79(1), 327-365. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308325583

Multon, K. D., Brown, S. D., & Lent, R. W. (1991). Relation of self-efficacy beliefs to academic outcomes: A meta-analytic investigation. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38(1), 30-38. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.38.1.30

Pajares, F. (2003). Self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and achievement in writing: A review of the literature. Reading & Writing Quarterly, 19(2), 139-158. https://doi.org/10.1080/10573560308222

Qomariyah, S. S., & Utama, I. M. P. (2021). Problem-based learning on students' English learning interests. International Journal of Language Teaching and Education, 5(2), 55-61. https://doi.org/10.22437/ijolte.v5i2.15881

Roorda, D. L., Koomen, H. M. Y., Spilt, J. L., & Oort, F. J. (2011). The influence of affective teacher-student relationships on students' school engagement and achievement: A meta-analytic approach. Review of Educational Research, 81(4), 493-529. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311421793

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. American Psychologist, 55(1), 68-78. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68

Setianingsih, T., Nafisah, B. Z., Sumarni, B., & Kamarudin, K. (2024). Investigating EFL students' speaking skills viewed from self-efficacy: Instructional experiences learned from seniors high schools. Journal of Language and Literature Studies, 4(4), 883-894. https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v4i4.2249

Sumarsono, D., & Amin, S. (2019). Contextual Teaching Learning (CTL) approach towards students' self confidence in learning English: Does it have any effect? Cordova Journal Language and Culture Studies, 9(2), 207-218. https://doi.org/10.20414/cordova.v9i2.1576

Sumarsono, D., Suadiyatno, T., & Bagis, A. K. (2022). Remote learning in the crisis of Covid-19: Motivating or demotivating the EFL students to learn? Jo-ELT (Journal of English Language Teaching), 9(1), 61-71. https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v9i1.5257

Tahir, S. Z. B., Sakkir, G., & Iye, R. (2024). Buru Language Learning Management Model in Ecotourism-Based Embedded-Multilingual: Teachers' Need Analysis. Idarah (Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kependidikan), 8(1), 15-30.

Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, S. G., & Farley, G. K. (1988). The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support. Journal of Personality Assessment, 52(1), 30-41. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa5201_2