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Abstract

Background

There is a lack of methodologically strong measure to assess perceived social support among Arabic-speaking populations. Our main objective was therefore to examine the psychometric properties of an Arabic translation of the Multidimensional Social Support Scale (MSPSS) in a sample of Arabic-speaking Lebanese adults from the general population.

Methods

We adopted a cross-sectional design involving 387 non-clinical Lebanese adults aged 26.17 ± 11.47 years (58.4% females). The forward and backward translation method was applied to the MSPSS scale.

Results

The Arabic MSPSS and its subscales have a high internal consistency with McDonald’s ω values between 0.94 and 0.97. Confirmatory factor analysis indicated that fit of the three-factor model was acceptable. All indices suggested that configurational, metric, and scalar invariance was supported across gender. Both genders exhibited no significant difference in all MSPSS dimensions. Convergent validity was supported by showing that all three MSPSS sub-scores and total score correlated significantly and positively with resilience and posttraumatic growth scores.

Conclusion

Although further cross-cultural validations involving other Arab countries and communities are still needed, we preliminarily suggest that this scale is applicable to the broad Arabic-speaking people for the measurement of perceived social support in clinical and research contexts.

1. Introduction

Social support is a multifaceted and complex concept that refers to the amount of assistance an individual can get through interpersonal interactions [1, 2], including family, friends, peers, and members of a community [3]. As opposed to received social support (i.e., the actual support that one receives), perceived social support infers the beliefs and/or perceptions of the already-present support provided by the social network when needed [4–7]. Social support has an important role in human health [8]. Its adequate availability seems essential to provide a buffer for stressful physical and psychosocial events through greater resilience [9, 10], promote self-esteem [11], and mitigate the effects of psychological distress [12]. In this regard, perceived social support has been argued to have a more significant impact on health determinants compared to actual received social support [13, 14]. However, the existing literature on the effect of social support on physical, mental health and quality of life has led to mixed findings; which is partly due to the use of different measurement instruments [15].

A number of social support measures have been developed and tested in various groups and populations [16]. Out of these measures, the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS) is one of the most widely used worldwide [3, 6–8, 11, 12, 18]. The MSPSS is a 12-item brief, freely available, easy to administer, self-report scale designed by Zimet et al. to subjectively assess “the adequacy of received emotional social support” from three different sources (family, friends, and the significant other) ([17], p. 186). The original English version of the MSPSS consists of a three-factor construct which had high internal consistency and test-retest reliability, as well as moderate construct validity [17]. The scale has been translated in many languages (e.g., Italian [18], Swedish [19], Polish [20], Portuguese [21], Greek [22], South Korean [23], Turkish [24], Persian [25], Indian [26], Urdu [27], Thai [28], Hausa (Nigerian) [29], Ugandan [30], Malawi [31], Malay [32]) and countries (e.g., high-income [19, 21–23], middle-income [24, 25, 28, 32, 33], and low-income countries [29–31]) across the globe. The psychometric properties of the MSPSS have proven their appropriatenessness in individuals from a variety of cultural backgrounds, ages, and clinical profiles, i.e., Thai medical students and psychiatric patients [34], South Korean adolescent high school students [23], Korean breast cancer survivors [35], Indian [26], and Polish [20] university
students Malay medical students [32] and psychiatric outpatients [36], Pakistani antenatal women [27], Italian patients with chronic diseases [37], Ghananian [38] and Nigerian high-school adolescents [39], Greek oncology and mental health Nurses[40], UK family caregivers of people with dementia [41].

While there is evidence asserting the psychometric strength of the MSPSS across different contexts [42], literature has also documented a substantial impact of culture on social support access and sources [43–45]. For instance, collectivist cultures promote social cohesion and parenting/family relationships quality; therefore, individuals from such cultures expect extended family than other sources to supply them with any needed social support [46]. Despite these data, the largest amount of research on social support has emerged from the Western world. In addition, the original validation study and subsequent studies examining the MSPSS psychometric quality have been mostly performed in Western cultural backgrounds. This limits our knowledge about the pathways linking social support to mental health and prevents evidence-based policymaking in the under-researched contexts, including Arab countries and communities.

The Arab context

There are a total of 22 Arab countries geographically distributed over two continents (i.e., Africa and Asia), defined as lower-middle-income economies, traditional, religious and collectivist societies [47, 48], and having a current population estimated at greater than 450 million people [49]. Arabic is thus spoken by hundreds of millions of people in both Arab and non-Arab countries, and is ranked in the fourth position of most used languages of the Internet [50]. Over the last decades, Arab countries have faced a series of revolutions, armed conflicts, terrorist attacks, widespread violence, traumatic wars, and economic recessions, which have negatively affected their local communities’ mental health [51–53]. At the same time, Arab countries suffer a substantial lack of information, mental health legislation and policy [53]. One of the main factors that impede access to evidence-informed care and mental health research in Arab countries is the shortage of valid and reliable assessment tools [54]. As we specifically focus on perceived social support in the present study, we point to the little information available on this construct in Arab contexts. We could find only a few studies among Arab people using the MSPSS in specific populations (e.g., Arab American adolescents [55] and women [56], Arab immigrant women [57], refugees in Jordan [58], mothers of children with developmental disabilities [59]); which are far from being representative of the Arab general population. All these observations highlight the strong need for an Arabic valid tool to evaluate social support.

The present study

A systematic review published in 2018 by Dambi et al. [60] investigated the psychometric properties of the non-English translations of the MSPSS found only one Arabic version available (i.e., [33]). The authors described its methodology as “poor” on the basis of poor internal consistency and validity (no confirmatory factor analysis performed). Dambi et al. [60] also estimated that this version had “unknown evidence for construct validity” and provided “scanty details” for the adaptation process; which may in turn lead to the risk of misleading findings and negatively affect policy formulation. These potential methodological flaws encouraged our team to translate and validate the MSPSS to the Arabic language, in order to address the identified gaps of the previous Arabic version and provide a psychometrically sound social support scale for the Arabic-speaking researchers, clinicians, patients and the broad community. Our main objective was therefore to examine the psychometric properties of an Arabic translation of the MSPSS in a sample of Arabic-speaking Lebanese adults from the general population. We expect that the Arabic MSPSS will (1) replicate the original three-factor structure; and (2) yield good internal consistency, convergent validity (as evidenced by a positive correlation between MSPSS scores, resilience and posttraumatic growth), and measurement invariance across gender groups.

2. Methods

2.1. Participants

Three hundred eighty-seven participants participated in this study, with a mean age of 26.17 \pm 11.47 years and 58.4\% females. Other descriptive statistics of the sample can be found in Table 1.
2.2. Translation Procedure

The forward and backward translation method was applied to the resilience and post-traumatic growth scales. The English version was translated to Arabic by a Lebanese translator who was completely unrelated to the study. Afterwards, a Lebanese psychologist with a full working proficiency in English, translated the Arabic version back to English. The initial and translated English versions were compared to detect and later eliminate any inconsistencies by a committee composed of the research team and the two translators.

2.3. Measures

2.3.1. The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS): It is a succinct research instrument, gauging the degree of individual perceptions of social support that emanates from three distinct sources: Family, Friends and a Significant Other—measured by three subscales of four items each. Higher scores express stronger feelings of being socially supported [17]. We used the Arabic version already translated by Merhi and Kazarian [33].

2.3.2. The 10-item Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC-10). The CD-RISC-10 comprises 10 items [61, 62], each of which are scored on a 5-point scale ranging from 0 (not true at all) to 4 (true nearly all of the time). Examples of items include, “I am able to...
adapt when changes occur” and “I am not easily discouraged by failure.” Higher scores on the CD-RISC-10 indicate higher levels of resilience.

2.3.3. Post traumatic growth Inventory-Short Form (PTGI-SF). This scale measures favourable outcomes after a traumatic event, including 5 dimensions: relating to others, new possibilities, personal strength, spiritual change and appreciation of life. The 10-item scale was used in this study [63].

2.3.4. Demographics. Participants were asked to provide their demographic details consisting of age, sex, highest educational attainment, region of living, marital status and the Household Crowding Index (HCI); the latter reflecting the socioeconomic status of the family [64], is the ratio of the number of persons living in the house over the number of rooms in it (excluding the kitchen and the bathrooms).

2.4. Procedures

All data were collected via a Google Form link, between May and July 2022. The project was advertised on social media and included an estimated duration. Inclusion criteria for participation included being a resident and citizen of Lebanon of adult age. Excluded were those who refused to fill out the questionnaire. Internet protocol (IP) addresses were examined to ensure that no participant took the survey more than once. After providing digital informed consent, participants were asked to complete the instruments described above, which were presented in a pre-randomised order to control for order effects. The survey was anonymous and participants completed the survey voluntarily and without remuneration [65].

2.5. Analytic Strategy

2.5.1. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). There were no missing responses in the dataset. We used data from the total sample to conduct a CFA using the SPSS AMOS v.26 software. The minimum sample size to conduct a confirmatory factor analysis ranges from 3 to 20 times the number of the scale's variables [66]. Therefore, we assumed a minimum sample of 240 participants needed to have enough statistical power based on a ratio of 20 participants per one item of the scale, which was exceeded in our sample. Our intention was to test the original model of the MSPSS scores (i.e., three-factor model). Parameter estimates were obtained using the maximum likelihood method and fit indices. Additionally, evidence of convergent validity was assessed in this subsample using the Fornell-Larcker criterion, with average variance extracted (AVE) values of ≥ .50 considered adequate [67] and meaning that a latent variable is able to explain more than half of the variance of its indicators on average (i.e., items converge into a uniform construct).

2.5.2. Gender invariance. To examine gender invariance of MSPSS scores, we conducted multi-group CFA [68] using the total sample. Measurement invariance was assessed at the configural, metric, and scalar levels [69]. Configural invariance implies that the latent scales variable(s) and the pattern of loadings of the latent variable(s) on indicators are similar across gender (i.e., the unconstrained latent model should fit the data well in both groups). Metric invariance implies that the magnitude of the loadings is similar across gender; this is tested by comparing two nested models consisting of a baseline model and an invariance model. Lastly, scalar invariance implies that both the item loadings and item intercepts are similar across gender and is examined using the same nested-model comparison strategy as with metric invariance [68]. Following the recommendations of Cheung and Rensvold (2002) [70] and Chen (2007) [68], we accepted ΔCFI ≤ .010 and ΔRMSEA ≤ .015 or ΔSRMR ≤ .010 (.030 for factorial invariance) as evidence of invariance.

2.5.3. Further analyses. Composite reliability in both subsamples was assessed using McDonald's (1970) ω, with values greater than .70 reflecting adequate composite reliability [71]. McDonald’s ω was selected as a measure of composite reliability because of known problems with the use of Cronbach’s α (e.g., [72]). To assess convergent and criterion-related validity, we examined bivariate correlations between the MSPSS and the resilience and PTG scores. Based on Cohen (1992) [73], values ≤ .10 were considered weak, ~ .30 were considered moderate, and ~ .50 were considered strong correlations.

3. Results

3.1. Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the MSPSS scale
CFA indicated that fit of the three-factor model of the MSPSS scale was acceptable: $\chi^2/df = 246.45/51 = 4.83$, RMSEA = .100 (90% CI = .087, .112), SRMR = .034, CFI = .965, TLI = .954. When adding a correlation between residuals of items 4, 8 and 12, the fit indices improved as follows: $\chi^2/df = 192.10/49 = 3.92$, RMSEA = .087 (90% CI .074, .100), SRMR = .032, CFI = .974, TLI = .965. The standardised estimates of factor loadings were all adequate (see Table 2). The convergent validity for this model was borderline, as AVE = .81.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items of the multidimensional social perceived support scale in English and Factor Loadings Derived from the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) in the total sample.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.2. Gender Invariance**

As reported in Table 3, all indices suggested that configural, metric, and scalar invariance was supported across gender. Given these results, we computed an independent-samples t-test to examine gender differences in resilience scores. The results showed that there was no statistically significant difference between men and women in all MSPSS dimensions (Table 4).

**3.3. Composite reliability**

Composite reliability of scores was adequate in the total sample for the MSPSS total scale ($\omega = .97$), Significant others ($\omega = .95$), Family ($\omega = .94$) and Friends ($\omega = .95$) subscales.
Table 3
Measurement Invariance of the MSPSS Across Gender in the total sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>Model Comparison</th>
<th>Δχ²</th>
<th>ΔCFI</th>
<th>ΔRMSEA</th>
<th>ΔSRMR</th>
<th>Δdf</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Configural</td>
<td>268.21</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metric</td>
<td>277.76</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>Configural vs metric</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalar</td>
<td>280.97</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>Metric vs scalar</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CFI = Comparative fit index; RMSEA = Steiger-Lind root mean square error of approximation; SRMR = Standardised root mean square residual.

Table 4
Comparison between sexes in terms of the MSPSS total scale and subscales scores in the total sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSPSS total score</th>
<th>MSPSS: Significant others</th>
<th>MSPSS: Family</th>
<th>MSPSS: Friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>52.30 ± 18.24</td>
<td>17.29 ± 6.61</td>
<td>17.84 ± 6.31</td>
<td>17.17 ± 6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>52.47 ± 19.67</td>
<td>18.15 ± 7.38</td>
<td>17.73 ± 7.17</td>
<td>16.59 ± 6.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.932</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td>.397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5. Convergent and Criterion-Related Validity

To assess the validity of the scores, we examined bivariate correlations with all other measures included in the present study using the total sample. Higher MSPSS scores and subscores were significantly and positively correlated with higher resilience and PTG, but not with age (Table 5).

Table 5
Correlations of the MSPSS total scores and subscores with the other measures in the total sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. MSPSS total score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. MSPSS: Significant others</td>
<td>.94***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MSPSS: Family</td>
<td>.93***</td>
<td>.83***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. MSPSS: Friends</td>
<td>.91***</td>
<td>.78***</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Resilience</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Post-traumatic growth</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Age</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

4. Discussion

The purpose of the present study was to rigorously test the psychometric characteristics of the Arabic MSPSS in a non-clinical sample of Lebanese adults; more specifically, to fill the gaps of the first Arabic validation attempt by Merhi et al. [33, 60]. As hypothesized, the Arabic MSPSS maintained excellent psychometric properties in our sample in terms of factor structure, internal...
Our analyses indicated an adequate fit indices for the three-factor model which is in line with the original development study [17], and several other previous language adaptations in non-clinical samples [74–76]. Given that perceptions of social networks are shaped by culture [77–79], MSPSS may show inconsistent structural validity across many various cultural settings. For instance, certain previous validation studies, mainly in Asian countries, yielded a unidimensional factor structure (e.g., [27, 28, 34, 80–83]). Other psychometric studies reported a 2-factor structure, with either Family and Significant others [84] or Friends and Significant others [85] subscales merging into one factor. Hence the importance of performing CFA in addition to EFA which, when used alone, could result in inappropriate conclusions [86]. Beyond factor structure, our results demonstrated that the Arabic MSPSS and its subscales have a high internal consistency with McDonald’s ω values between 0.94 and 0.97 [87]. A good internal consistency of the MSPSS has been consistently supported through high Cronbach’s alphas coefficients in the original English [17] as well as other language versions [26, 27, 32, 36, 40]. While prior evidence has shown that Cronbach’s alpha is inappropriate in estimating the internal consistency of multidimensional instruments [88], and that McDonald’s ω is particularly more advantageous [88], very few studies used McDonald’s ω when assessing the internal consistency of MSPSS [39, 89].

Both genders exhibited no significant difference in all MSPSS dimensions. Our analyses also established measurement invariance across gender at the configural, metric, and scalar levels. These findings support the appropriateness of the MSPSS in measuring identical constructs with the same 3-factor structure across genders, and its usefulness in comparing the mean scores of the three social support subscales (Family, friends, and the significant other) between males and females. In the original validation by Zimet et al. [17], male undergraduates displayed lower perceived support from friends and the significant other, as well as lower total support than females. Other studies documented mixed patterns of gender differences (i.e., greater support in all dimensions among females [20], more support from family and friends among females [24], greater support from family among males [90], no gender difference [91]). These discrepancies may be explained by variations in socialized gender-roles across societies and cultures; which calls for further cross-cultural research on gender differences in perceived social support to confirm our assumptions. Finally, convergent validity was supported by showing that all three MSPSS sub-scores and total score correlated significantly and positively with resilience and PTG scores. These expected patterns of associations are in agreement with previous studies in which social support has consistently been found to be significantly related to both resilience [92] and PTG [93, 94] constructs. Resilience has been suggested to enable more positive perceptions of resources, which in turn acts as a stress buffer [95, 96]. Similarly, greater interpersonal resources were found to be amongst the positive changes undertaken by individuals after trauma [97].

Study limitations

First, our sample lacks diversity, comprised exclusively of Arabic-speaking Lebanese people. Future research should consider validating the MSPSS in other Arab countries and communities. Second, we adopted a cross-sectional design and a self-report method to collect our data. Longitudinal validation studies are still required to assess predictive validity. Third, some psychometric properties were not examined in the context of the present study, such as responsiveness and test-retest reliability, and should be subject of additional research to confirm temporal stability of the MSPSS.

5. Conclusion

We believe that this study will add to the body of literature on perceived social support by providing a psychometrically sound Arabic version of the MSPSS, with good factorial and convergent validity, as well as high internal consistency and gender invariance. Although further cross-cultural validations involving other Arab countries and communities are still needed, we preliminarily suggest that this scale is applicable to the broad Arabic-speaking people for the measurement of perceived social support in clinical and research contexts.
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