Volume 3, Issue 6, 2020 (pp. 47-54)



AVAILABILITY OF SOCIAL SUPPORT AMONG INMATES OF MAXIMUM-SECURITY PRISONS, SOUTHWEST NIGERIA

Omitogun Ezekiel Olusola¹, Ogunfowokan Rukayat Temitope² and Omitogun Omolola M.³

¹School of Psychiatric Nursing, Aro Abeokuta, Nigeria ²Department of Nursing, Olabisi-Onabanjo University, Sagamu Campus, Ogun State ³Federal Medical Centre, Abeokuta Nigeria

ABSTRACT: Social support in the prison system is an essential aspect of rehabilitation programme for the incarcerated individuals who have no control over decisions being made as regard their daily living during the period of incarceration. This study assessed the social supports available to the inmates of Maximum-Security Prisons in Southwest Nigeria. Descriptive survey design was employed for the study and the target population were the inmates Maximum Security Prisons in Southwest Nigeria. Three hundred and forty (340) participants from the maximum prisons were used for the study. An adapted questionnaire of multidimensional scale of perceived social support was used to collect data from the participants. Data were analyzed using descriptive tools and results presented in tables depicting frequencies and percentages. The findings show that 71% were males and 29% were females; 124 (36.9%) were below 25 years of age and 122 (35.8%) were between 26 and 35 years; 151 (45%) were married, 152 (45%) single and 37 (11%) were separated. Social support was low from family and friends with mean score of 2.84 and 2.49 respectively while NGOs and correctional officers' support were 3.45 and 4.34 respectively. The study concluded that respondents' social support were inadequate from their family and friends whereas, correctional officers and non-governmental organizations were supportive in spite of social stigma in the society.

KEYWORDS: Correctional Officers, Incarceration, Inmates, Social Support, Nigeria

INTRODUCTION

Background

Social support is essential aspect of human community as it promotes communication, survival and adaptation to an individual, small groups or in an organization such as inmates who found themselves in the maximum-security prisons by reason of any culpable act. Imprisonment in actual sense is a serious problem for the victims of crime as well as their families and friends due to attributed social stigma during the period of incarceration and thereafter leading to withdraw of their support to the person and subsequent diminishing level of health and general relationship. Inmates' adaptation to prison life depends on numerous factors such as developing personal coping skills, conforming with rules and regulations and so on (Leban, Cardwell, Copes & Brezina, 2015) in which families, friends and other social organizations in the society play some vital roles (Shamrva, Santiago, Kubiak, Cumings, & Johnson, 2018).

Volume 3, Issue 6, 2020 (pp. 47-54)



Jamadar and Patil, (2017) postualte social support as a multi-dimensional construct that deals with subjective and objective needs and feelings of an individual in adapting to the environment and coping with challenges of daily living. Availability of social support and its perception might be beneficial to both family and state in reduction of recidivism rate among the exconvicts (Dadi, Dachew, Tahiru, Habitu & Demissie, 2019). Wallace, Fahmy, Cotton, Jimmons, McKay, Stoffer and Syed, (2016) examined relationship between inmates' mental health and their social support thus, reported that inmates who have stronger connections or have a sense of closeness with their families during incaceration were reported to have experienced positive mental health.

In a prison system, social support can be viewed as an essential aspect of rehabilitation programme for the incarcerated indviduals who also have no control over decision being made as regards their daily experince while still in this environment. Though, adequate social support might not be available in many prisons due to differences in policies that guides the prison administration. Amongst variables regarded as social support, Novek, (2017) identified strong connection with the families and friends, members of religious organization, roles of non-governmental organizations as social support to the inamates while correctional officers, medical personnel also serve important needs of the inmates.

Pettus-Davis, Veeh, Davis and Tripodi, (2017) equally opinned that availability of social support is a major contributory factor in promoting optimal health of inmates during incarceration and upon release into the society since the prison settings globally tend to experience steady increase in population with increase of 20% in the last fifteen years and the proportion of people incarcerated yearly taking different dimensions around the world. The United State of America has 666 prisoners per 100,000 of the population (over 2.3million with 1.35millions in state prisons and 34, 000 in juvenile centres currently in prison (Novek, 2017), 146 per 100,000 in Western Europe, England and Wales compare with 103 in France, 94 in Belgium and 77 in Germany (Turner, 2018). In Nigeria, congestion, inadequate welfare and rehabilitation pose negative effect to the inmates' available social support (Ayuk, Emeka & Omono, 2013).

Maximum security prison may be noisy and crowded (Novek, 2017), yet at same time profoundly isolating cutting away inmates from family and friends who might seldom visit or not at all due to social stigma (Antonio, 2018) and institutional policies (Ayuk *et al*, 2013) leaving the incarcerated to harsh condition of the prison that stifles hope, triggers violence and teaches cyanism, suspicion and negative personality development for the sake of survival. These latter consequences also lead to vulnerability of inmates to poor physical health, psychological distress, negative social influences and gross decrease in their overall health (Leban *et al*, 2015; Novek, 2017). The prisoners have to cope with so many problems in the course of their jail term among which absence of families and loved ones, change in the social status, financial incapacitation, lack of autonomy and sometimes ill-health are major (Combalbert, Pennequin, Ferrand, Armand, Anselme, & Geffray, 2018).

Statement of the Problem

Social support from families, friends, non-governmental organizations and the kind gesture of correctional officers have been described as a panacea for emotional distress during incarceration of inmates owing to its effective communication components. Moreover, normal adaptation of prisoners requires adjustment to the environment and optimal utilization of

Volume 3, Issue 6, 2020 (pp. 47-54)



available resources which is proportional to the estimated value and standard permitted by prison authority. It must also correspond with the objectives of the prison, rehabilitation of the prisoners and provision of necessary support while in jail (Besadre et al, 2017).

The official weekly report of Nigerian Prisons Service, total inmates as at 16th April, 2018 was 72,277 while total male was 70,865 and total female was 1,412 (1.95%); 49,229 (66%) out of 72,277 total inmates fell into awaiting trial category (Nigerian Prisons Service, 2018) which implies that there would be over utilization of resources, congestion, numerous health problems (Ayuk *et al*, 2013) and poor rehabilitation programme. Thus, there is negative effect on prisoners' social adjustment and re-integration to the society upon release (Ayuk *et al*, 2013). Subsequently, from the researchers' observation and interactions with inmates in some prisons in South-West Nigeria, there appears to be a wide gap between inmates' satisfaction and the social resources available at prison environment in Nigeria. This paper focused on assessing available social support to the inmates as a way of promoting their rehabilitation and building healthier environment.

Objectives of the Study

This paper assessed the social support available to the inmates of maximum-security prisons in Southwest Nigeria as means to promote their rehabilitation programme

Scope of the Study

This study was limited to the two maximum prisons in Southwest Nigeria; Abeokuta and Kirikiri Maximum Security Prison, Ogun and Lagos State respectively.

Justification for the Study

Despite the fact that the primary objective of prison is to maintain security of the prisoners and rehabilitate them, series of health problems were being reported among them causing government huge amounts of money yearly (Ayuk *et al*, 2013; Basu, 2004). Many of the inmates developed different preventable mental, physical and social problems. The inmates are equally reported to be under perpetual loneliness in a noisy maximum-security prison due to disconnection from family and loved ones (Novek, 2017). Although, several reports maintained that social support has been helpful in sustaining inmates' optimal health in developed countries (Costanza, Fisher, Ali, Beer, Bond, Boumans & Snapp, 2007; Besadre, *et al.* 2017; Shamrva, *et al.* 2018), the situation in Nigeria is incongruous with the finding (Ayuk *et al.* 2013; Omitogun, 2014). The study identifies the need to examine the availability of social support to this population.

Research Design: The study adopted a cross-sectional descriptive design in assessing the social support available to the respondent.

Study Setting: Southwest a Yoruba tribe dominated geo-political zones in Nigeria with two maximum security prisons; Old Abeokuta Prison in Ogun State and Kirikiri Maximum Prison in Apapa area of Lagos State. Both centres were under Zone-A Zonal Headquarters (Lagos) being headed by Deputy Controller who in turn report directly to the Controller General at nation's capital. Similarly, there is regular transfer of both staff and inmates between the two centres especially whenever there is security challenge. Abeokuta Maximum Prison was founded in 1900 with official capacity of 510 inmates but due to persistent congestion, the total

Volume 3, Issue 6, 2020 (pp. 47-54)



inmates accommodated ranges from about 765 to over 1200 inmates. It has provision for all categories of offenders in respect to the level of their dangerousness with facilities for female offenders and gallows to execute condemned prisoner. Kirikiri Maximum Prison was founded in 1955 by the colonial masters with the official capacity of 1056. This prison is notable among others prison in Nigeria due to the nature of the offenders that are being kept there and for its congestion.

Sampling Size and Sampling Technique

The study adopted a simple random sampling technique to select all male respondents while total enumeration technique was used to capture the entire 98 female participants to meet up with male sample size. A calculated sample size using modified formula of W. G. Cochran (Glenn, 2009; GfK Plonia, 2013) was used to determined sample size for male respondents

$$n = \frac{\frac{Z^2 p (1-p)}{e^2}}{1 + (\frac{Z^2 p (1-p)}{e^2 N})}$$

Where

N = Population of males

e = Margin error (0.05)

Z = Confidence Interval (z-score) = 1.96

p = Expected Prevalence (in decimal) = 0.5 (Pourhoseingholi, Vahedi, Rahimzadeh, 2013)

n = Sample size

A total of 349 male participants were calculated from the formula hence, 349 males + 98 females on total enumeration = 447 inmates were recruited for the study.

Instrument and Data Collection

The researcher adapted a multidimensional scale of perceived social support from Zimet, Dahem, Zimet & Farley (1988) on the rating scale of 1-5 (1 = Neutral, 2 = Strongly Disagreed, 3 = Disagreed, 4 = Agreed and 5 = Strongly Agreed). The questionnaire was divided into two (2) sections; Section (A) - Socio-demographic data and Section (B): Satisfaction on Perceived Social Support.

Data collection was through administering questionnaires within the space of six weeks. Prior to the administration of the questionnaire, permission was sought from the prisons' authority and thorough explanation of the purpose was given to the respondents followed by signing of the consent form. Completed questionnaires were collected immediately to prevent alteration.

Method of Data Analysis

Data collected were subjected to proper sorting, invalid questionnaire were eliminated leaving 340 questionnaires that were computed and analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences version 23. Descriptive statistics was used to assess socio-demographic



characteristics and social support variables while findings were presented using frequency tables and percentages.

Ethical Consideration

Approval of institutional Ethics Committee was taken before initiation of the study. Security protocols were followed all through the period of data collection. A proper written informed consent was taken from all the participants of the study. The privacy of the participants was ensured through anonymity. The chance to participate was also equitably distributed.

FINDINGS

Table 1: Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Items		Results		
		Freq.	%	
Gender	Male	242	71	
	Female	98	29	
	Total	340	100	
Age	Below 25	124	36.9	
	26-35	122	35.8	
	36 above	94	27.3	
	Total	340	100	
Marital	Single	152	45	
Status	Married	151	44	
	Separated/Divorced	37	11	
	Total	340	100	
Religion	Christianity	201	59.1	
	Islam	134	39.4	
	Indigenous	5	1.5	
	Total	340	100	
Education	No Formal	68	20.0	
	Education			
	Up to Secondary	225	66.2	
	Beyond Secondary	47	13.8	
	Total	340	100	
Length of	≤2yrs	209	61.5	
Incarceration	2-5yrs	73	21.5	
	>5yrs	58	17.0	
	Total	340	100	
Occupation	Unemployed	50	14.7	
	Artisans	132	38.8	
	Public-Servant	33	9.7	
	Trading	101	29.7	
	Farming	24	7.1	
	Total	340	100	

Volume 3, Issue 6, 2020 (pp. 47-54)



Table 2: Social Support Available for the Respondents

Someone do help me when in need	2a). Family Support Available	Disagree	Agree	Mean	Std.	Ave.
Can share joys and sorrows with someone. 170		F (%)	F (%)		dev.	Mean
Tean share joys and sorrows with someone. 170 170 3.05 1.58	Someone do help me when in need			2.92	1.61	
Someone. (50.0) (50.0)		(51.8)	(48.2)			
Pamily really tries to help.	I can share joys and sorrows with	170	170	3.05	1.58	
Can talk about my problems with my family. Can talk about my family. Can	someone.	(50.0)	(50.0)			
Receives emotional support from family. 261	Family really tries to help.	192	148	2.88	1.71	
Thave someone who is a real source of comfort. 190		(56.5)	(43.5)			
Thave someone who is a real source of comfort. 190	Receives emotional support from family.	261	79 (23.2)	2.14	1.39	2 94
comfort. (55.9) (44.1)	-	(76.8)				2.04
Can talk about my problems with my family. 130 (38.2) (61.8) 3.25 (61.8) 1.57 (61.8) Family is willing to help me to make decisions. 188 (52.3) (44.7) 2.78 (44.7) 1.58 (52.3) 2b). Support from Friends (52.3) (44.7) 2.01 (1.36 (77.4) 1.36 (77.4) Can count on friends when things go wrong. (77.4) (77.4) 2.01 (1.38 (68.2) (31.8) 2.49 Share joys and sorrows with friends. 232 (68.2) (31.8) (31.8) 1.59 (56.8) (43.2) 1.59 (56.8) (43.2) Friends cares about my feelings. 193 (43.2) (38.2) 1.59 (56.8) (38.2) 1.58 (61.8) Family and friends contribute to my wellness. (61.8) (38.2) 2.65 (1.58 (69.4) (30.6) (69.4) 1.55 (69.4) (30.6) (69.4) NGOs (e.g. religious body) are helpful (30.6) (69.4) 104 (30.6) (69.4) (69.4) (69.4) 2.434 (34.2) (43.4) (34.2) Correctional officers are supportive. 21 (6.2) (31.9) (31.9) (4.34 (87) (4.34) (87) (4.34) (87) (4.34) (4.3	I have someone who is a real source of	190	150	2.83	1.59	
family. (38.2) (61.8) 1.58 Family is willing to help me to make decisions. 188 152 2.78 1.58 2b). Support from Friends (52.3) (44.7) 2.01 1.36 Can count on friends when things go wrong. (77.4) 2.01 1.36 Share joys and sorrows with friends. 232 108 2.51 1.38 (68.2) (31.8) 2.80 1.59 (56.8) (43.2) 2.80 1.59 Family and friends contribute to my wellness. (61.8) (38.2) 1.58 2c). Support from Religious Organization 104 236 3.45 1.55 NGOs (e.g. religious body) are helpful 104 236 3.45 1.55 2d). Support from other sources 21 (6.2) 319 4.34 .87 4.34	comfort.	(55.9)	(44.1)			
Samily is willing to help me to make decisions.	Can talk about my problems with my	130	210	3.25	1.57	
decisions. (52.3) (44.7)	family.	(38.2)	(61.8)			
decisions. (52.3) (44.7)	Family is willing to help me to make	188	152	2.78	1.58	
Can count on friends when things go wrong. 263 (77.4) 77 (22.6) 2.01 1.36 (2.49) Share joys and sorrows with friends. 232 (68.2) 108 (2.51 1.38) 1.38 (2.49) Friends cares about my feelings. 193 (43.2) 147 (22.6) 2.80 1.59 (2.65) 1.59 (2.65) Family and friends contribute to my wellness. (61.8) (38.2) 1.58 (2.65) 1.58 (2.65) 1.58 (2.65) Value of the properties of the prope		(52.3)	(44.7)			
Can count on friends when things go wrong. 263 (77.4) 77 (22.6) 2.01 1.36 (2.49) Share joys and sorrows with friends. 232 (68.2) 108 (2.51 1.38) 1.38 (2.49) Friends cares about my feelings. 193 (43.2) 147 (22.6) 2.80 1.59 (2.65) 1.59 (2.65) Family and friends contribute to my wellness. (61.8) (38.2) 1.58 (2.65) 1.58 (2.65) 1.58 (2.65) Value of the properties of the prope	2b). Support from Friends					
Share joys and sorrows with friends. 232 108 2.51 1.38 Friends cares about my feelings. 193 147 2.80 1.59 Family and friends contribute to my wellness. 210 130 2.65 1.58 Vec). Support from Religious Organization 104 236 3.45 1.55 3.45 NGOs (e.g. religious body) are helpful 104 236 3.45 1.55 3.45 2d). Support from other sources 21 (6.2) 319 4.34 .87 4.34		263	77 (22.6)	2.01	1.36	
Share joys and sorrows with friends. 232 108 (2.51 1.38 (68.2) (31.8)	wrong.	(77.4)				2.40
Friends cares about my feelings. 193 (56.8) (43.2) 147 (43.2) 2.80 (43.2) 1.59 (56.8) 1.59 (43.2) 1.58 (43.2) 1.58 (61.8) 1.58 (38.2) 1.58 (61.8) 1.58 (38.2) 1.58 (38.2) 1.58 (38.2) 1.55 (69.4) 1.55 (69.4) 1.55 (69.4) 3.45 (69.4) 3.45 (1.55 (29.4)) 3.45 (29.4)	Share joys and sorrows with friends.	232	108	2.51	1.38	2.49
Family and friends contribute to my wellness. (56.8) (43.2) 1.58		(68.2)	(31.8)			
Family and friends contribute to my wellness. 210 (61.8) (38.2) 1.30 (38.2) 2.65 1.58 2c). Support from Religious Organization NGOs (e.g. religious body) are helpful (30.6) 104 (30.6) (69.4) 236 (69.4) 3.45 (69.4) 1.55 (3.45) 3.45 2d). Support from other sources 21 (6.2) 319 (4.34) 87 (4.34) 4.34	Friends cares about my feelings.	193	147	2.80	1.59	
wellness. (61.8) (38.2) 2c). Support from Religious Organization NGOs (e.g. religious body) are helpful (30.6) 104 (69.4) 236 (69.4) 3.45 (69.4) 2d). Support from other sources Correctional officers are supportive. 21 (6.2) 319 4.34 .87 4.34		(56.8)	(43.2)			
2c). Support from Religious Organization NGOs (e.g. religious body) are helpful 104 (30.6) 236 (69.4) 3.45 1.55 3.45 2d). Support from other sources Correctional officers are supportive. 21 (6.2) 319 4.34 .87 4.34	Family and friends contribute to my	210	130	2.65	1.58	
NGOs (e.g. religious body) are helpful 104 (30.6) 236 (69.4) 3.45 1.55 3.45 2d). Support from other sources 21 (6.2) 319 4.34 .87 4.34	wellness.	(61.8)	(38.2)			
NGOs (e.g. religious body) are helpful 104 (30.6) 236 (69.4) 3.45 1.55 3.45 2d). Support from other sources 21 (6.2) 319 4.34 .87 4.34	2c). Support from Religious Organization	on				
2d). Support from other sources (30.6) (69.4) 3.45 Correctional officers are supportive. 21 (6.2) 319 4.34 .87 4.34			236	3.45	1.55	2.45
Correctional officers are supportive. 21 (6.2) 319 4.34 .87		(30.6)	(69.4)			3.43
Correctional officers are supportive. 21 (6.2) 319 4.34 .87	2d). Support from other sources					
		21 (6.2)	319	4.34	.87	121
(93.8)			(93.8)			4.34

DISCUSSION

Four basic categories of social support identified were; family, friends, non-governmental organization (e.g. religious bodies, human right organization and voluntary groups like National Youth Service Corps advocacy group) and correctional officers' support. In contrast to Dadi, Dachew Tariku, Habitu and Demissie (2019) who reported good social support from friends, families and significant others in their study conducted among inmates in Ethiopia. The outcome of this study revealed that support from family and friends were inadequate to the respondents. The result showed that inmates don't receive adequate support from their immediate family as well as their close friends during the period of their jail term. This might be manifesting in the reduction of number of times been visited, failure to show up in the court during court proceedings and break in communication from home. The study was in line with Minnesota Department of Corrections (DOC-USA), (2011) report that over 40% of the

Volume 3, Issue 6, 2020 (pp. 47-54)



offenders were never visited during jail term. The possibility that social relationship is a significant part of life and sense of love and belonging is very key to value which an individual place on self especially from people that are very close them.

Similar to the report of Ngu (2016) that social support entails an individual perception whether he/she is loved and cared for, valued and esteemed and having the sense of belonging to a network of communication that has a set of mutual obligations. Though, Dadi et al (2019) attributed social ties from co-inmates as friendship from where they can derive some level of support; this was not so in this study possibly due to congestion where available resources might not be sufficient and due to frequent transfer of inmates across different centres for security reasons (Ayuk et al, 2013) thus, cutting away individuals that might want to place an obligation on self to render minimal support to them while in jail. The possibility of inmates developing emotional distress with direct impact on their mental health was equally attributed to lack of social support (Jamadar & Patil, 2017) during period of incarceration. Anxiety or psycholoical distress are problems of the mind and require that a sufferer finds a companion or close person to share the burden with at given period of time thus, promoting easy adaptation and coping to their given environment.

CONCLUSION

Social support was seen to be of significant importance for effective co-habitation and interaction in any society which might be inform of gifts or other items to the one in need, encouragement, empathy, love and affection to the sufferer however, inmates do not enjoy these adequately from their family and friends might lead to social stigma upon their release and associated anxiety disorder or distress, mental illnesses and high rate of recividivism.

The main social supports available to the inmates in this study were support from non-governmental organization and correctional officers including nurses and other health personnel. Though, they had potential for family and friends' support, in the absence of these, inmates turned to correctional officers. The disconnection from family and significant others possesses mental health challenge and decrease in optimal physical health to the inmates during their jail term (Wallace et al, 2016; Pettus-Davis et al, 2017). Availability of correctional officers, series of rehabilitation programmes as well as counselling and spiritual session were part of support enjoyed by the inmates from correctional officers however, increase workload is inevitable in the absence of continuous lack of social support from inmates' relatives and friends.

REFERENCES

Antonio, P. D. (2018). Who are the prisoners? *Revista Critica Penal y Poder*, 113-128. Retrieved April 16th, 2018

Ayuk, A. A, Emeka, J. O. & Omono, C. E. (2013). The impact of prison reforms on the welfare of the inmates: A case study of Afokang Prison, Calabar. *Nigeria Journal of Human Social Science (CD)*, Vol. XIII Issue II.



- Dadi, A.F., Dachew, B.A., Tahiru, A., Habitu, Y.A. & Demissie, G.D. (2019). Status of perceived social support and its associated factors among inmate prisoners in Northwest Amhara, Ethiopia. *BMC Res Notes*, *12*(660). Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-019-4696-z
- Jamadar, C. and Patil, V. (2017). Social support and mental health among male and female prison inmates. Retrieved December 8th, 2017, from www.academia.edu: https://maccwm.academia.edu
- Nga, M. N. (2016, March). The importance of social support. *The Parkinsonian*, 19(1). Retrieved September 15th, 2017, from www.parkinsonians.org.nz
- Nigerian Prisons Service. (2018, April 17th). Retrieved from https://www.prisons.gov.ng/statistics.
- Novek, E. M. (2017). Jail pedagogies: Teaching and trust in a maximum security men's prison. *Dialogues in Social Justice*, 2(2). Retrieved April 18th, 2018
- Omitogun, E. O. (2014). Assessment of health status of Inmates in Ogun State Prison Command. *Unpublished research work presented to Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria*.
- Pettus-Davis, C., Veeh, C. A., Davis, M. & Tripodi, S. (2017). Gender Differences in Experiences of Social Support Among Men and Women Releasing from Prison. *Institute for Advancing Justice Research and Innovation*. Retrieved January 28th, 2018
- Pourhoseingholi, M.A., Vahedi, M., Rahimzadeh, M. (2013). Sample Size Calculation in Medical Studies. *Gastroenterol Hepatol Bed Bench*, 6(1), 14-17. Retrieved December 12th, 2017
- Shamrva, D., Santiago, O., Kubiak, S., Cumings, C. & Johnson, J. (2018). Gender Differences in Factors Associated with PTSD Among the Incarcerated: Victimization, Social Support and Prison Climate. *Society for Social Work and research*. Retrieved February 1st, 2018, from sswr.confex.com/sswr/2018/webprogram/paper32053
- Turner, M. (2018). The growing need for palliative care in prisons. *Palliative Medicine*, 32(1), 4-5. doi:10.1177/0269216317746302
- Wallace, D., Fahmy, C., Cotton, L., Jimmons, C. McKay, R., Stoffer, S. & Syed, S. (2016). Examining the role of familial support during prison and after release on post-incarceration mental health. *Int'l Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 60(1), 3-20. doi:10.1177/0306624X14548023
- 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*, 30-41.

Copyright © 2020 The Author(s). This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0), which permits anyone to share, use, reproduce and redistribute in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.