Volume 4 Number 2 (2026)
July-December 2026
Page: 4201-4209

Journal of Creative Power and Ambition (JCPA)
https://edujavare.com/index.php/jcpa
E-ISSN: 3031-4054
DOI: 10.70610/jcpa.2241

The Effect of Social Support on Resilience Capacity of Female Inmates at the Women's Correctional Institution of Manado

Tracy Meloh[1], Roos Tuerah[2], Rachman Febrianto[3]
[123] Universitas Negeri Manado, Indonesia
* Correspondence e-mail: tracymeloh@gmail.com; roostuerah@unima.ac.id; rachmanfebrianto@unima.ac.id

Article history Submitted: 2026/11/01; Revised: 2026/11/06; Accepted: 2026/11/09

Abstract

This study examines the effect of social support on the resilience capacity of inmates at the Women's Correctional Institution of Manado. A causal associative quantitative approach was employed with 90 female inmates selected through saturated sampling. Data were collected using Likert-scale questionnaires: a 32-item Social Support Scale based on Sarafino and Smith (2017) (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.904) and the 25-item Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC-25) (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.905). Data were analyzed using simple linear regression with IBM SPSS Statistics 25. The normality test (Asymp. Sig. = 0.200) and linearity test (Deviation from Linearity = 0.491) indicated that the assumptions were met. The regression result was not statistically significant (B = 0.096, t = 1.572, p = 0.120), while social support explained 2.7% of the variance in resilience (R^2 = 0.027). These findings indicate that social support was not a significant predictor of resilience in this sample. Resilience may be more closely associated with internal psychological factors, including self-efficacy, emotional regulation, coping strategies, self-acceptance, spirituality, and rehabilitative experiences

Keywords Female Inmates; Resilience; Social Support; Women's Correctional Institution

© 2026 by the authors. This is an open-access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY SA) license, https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/.

INTRODUCTION

Correctional inmates are individuals undergoing a rehabilitative process in an environment characterized by restricted freedom, psychological distress, and social stigma from the broader community. This condition makes inmates vulnerable to various psychological problems throughout incarceration. Favril and van Ginneken (2024) found that individuals serving prison sentences experience high levels of psychological distress due to pressures in the prison environment, including loss of freedom, limited personal control, reduced decision-making autonomy, and changes in relationships with family and the external community.

An individual's capacity to cope with various pressures is important. Febrianto and Hartati (2020) found that adversity quotient affects an individual's level of anxiety. Individuals with an effective capacity to face difficulties tend to exhibit lower anxiety and better adaptive capabilities when confronted with challenging conditions. These findings indicate that the psychological capacity to endure and adapt is crucial, including for correctional inmates.

The phenomenon of low resilience among female inmates was also observed at the Women's Correctional Institution of Manado through initial interviews conducted by the researchers. Several inmates reported psychological distress during incarceration due to separation from family and the loss of freedom to carry out daily activities. Arfa et al. (2024) indicated that female inmates are at greater risk of loneliness, hopelessness, and suicidal ideation due to family separation, loss of social roles, and pressures during incarceration.

Social support is considered an important contributor to resilience. Cobb (1976), through Social Support Theory, explained that social support refers to an individual's perception of receiving affection, appreciation, and validation from social relationships, which can provide assistance and care when facing problems. Grashinta (2026) explained that social support can reduce isolation and helplessness and support more adaptive coping with stress. Similarly, Sengkey et al. (2025) demonstrated that support through attention, assistance, and positive reinforcement helps individuals manage stress and maintain psychological balance.

The relationship between social support and resilience is grounded in Masten's (2014) view that recovery and adaptation from difficult situations are influenced by protective factors, including positive and supportive social relationships. Previous research has shown that social support is associated with adaptive capacity among inmates. Raisa and Ediati (2016) found a significant positive correlation between social support and resilience among female inmates at the Class IIA Women's Correctional Institution in Semarang. This study therefore examines the extent to which social support influences the resilience capacity of inmates at the Women's Correctional Institution of Manado.

METHODS

This study employed a quantitative design with a causal associative approach to analyze the effect of social support on the resilience capacity of inmates at the Women's Correctional Institution of Manado. According to Sugiyono (2019), quantitative research is based on statistical hypothesis testing through data collected from a population or sample using research instruments.

The population consisted of 90 female inmates registered at the Women's Correctional Institution of Manado as of July 2026. The sample included all 90 inmates

through saturated sampling (total sampling), because the limited population size allowed all subjects to participate. Respondents were female inmates aged approximately 20–70 years who lived in the same correctional environment and underwent similar rehabilitative processes.

Data were collected using Likert-scale questionnaires. Social support was measured using a scale based on four aspects proposed by Sarafino and Smith (2017): emotional support, appraisal support, instrumental support, and informational support. After three rounds of validity testing using Pearson Product Moment correlation with SPSS version 25, 32 valid items were obtained (r-count > 0.207; df = 88; $\alpha = 0.05$). The instrument's Cronbach's Alpha was 0.904, indicating excellent reliability. Resilience was measured using the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC-25) developed by Connor and Davidson (2003), which measures five aspects. All 25 items were valid, with Cronbach's Alpha of 0.905. Data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 25 at a significance level of $p < 0.05$.

Research framework: Social Support (emotional, appraisal, instrumental, and informational support) → Resilience Capacity (five CD-RISC-25 aspects).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Variable Description

The analysis involved 90 female inmate respondents. Table 1 presents the hypothetical and empirical data for both research variables.

Table 1. Hypothetical and Empirical Data Description of Social Support and Resilience

Variable	Items	Min	Max	Range	Mean	Std. Deviation
Social Support (Hypothetical)	32	32	160	128	96.00	21.33
Social Support (Empirical)	32	98	160	62	133.91	15.07
Resilience (Hypothetical)	25	25	125	100	75.00	16.67
Resilience (Empirical)	25	92	125	33	110.43	8.75

The empirical mean of social support (133.91) is higher than the hypothetical mean (96.00), indicating that inmates generally tend to have high social support. Similarly, the empirical mean of resilience (110.43) exceeds the hypothetical mean (75.00), indicating that most respondents have an adequate capacity to cope with pressure and adapt positively.

Variable categorization using the Mean ± 1 SD formula showed that social support was high for 11 respondents (12.22%), moderate for 66 (73.33%), and low for 13 (14.44%). For resilience, 18 respondents (20.00%) were in the high category, 54 (60.00%) in the

moderate category, and 18 (20.00%) in the low category.

Table 2. Analysis Results of Social Support Variable Aspects

No.	Social Support Aspect	Empirical Score	Maximum Theoretical Score	Achievement (%)
1	Emotional Support	1,524	1,800	84.66
2	Appraisal Support	4,224	4,950	85.33
3	Instrumental Support	3,011	3,600	83.63
4	Informational Support	3,293	4,050	81.30

All aspects of social support fall into the very high category. Appraisal support ranks highest (85.33%), consistent with Sarafino and Smith's (2017) view that positive feedback and affirmation are important in constructing self-esteem and confidence. Emotional support ranks second (84.66%), followed by instrumental support (83.63%). Informational support records the lowest achievement (81.30%), indicating that inmates may still require more specific guidance during rehabilitation.

Table 3. Analysis Results of Resilience Variable Aspects

No.	Resilience Aspect	Empirical Score	Maximum Theoretical Score	Achievement (%)
1	Personal competence, high standards, and tenacity	3,188	3,600	88.55
2	Trust in one's instincts, tolerance of negative affect, and strengthening effects of stress	2,721	3,150	86.38
3	Positive acceptance of change and secure relationships	1,981	2,250	88.04
4	Control	1,214	1,350	89.92
5	Spiritual Influences	835	900	92.77

All resilience aspects fall into the very high category. Spiritual influences rank highest (92.77%), consistent with Connor and Davidson's (2003) view that belief in spiritual power, God, or destiny can provide inner peace and strength. Control ranks second (89.92%), followed by personal competence (88.55%), positive acceptance (88.04%), and trust in one's instincts (86.38%).

Analysis Assumption Testing

Table 4. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Normality Test

Measure	Value
N	90
Mean of residuals	0.0000000
Std. deviation	8.63372609
Absolute difference	0.063
Positive difference	0.063
Negative difference	-0.062
Test statistic	0.063
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.200

The One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test yielded an Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value of 0.200. Since this exceeds 0.05, the research residuals are normally distributed and the normality assumption is satisfied.

Table 5. Linearity Test Results

Component	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups (Combined)	2499.072	54	46.279	0.762	0.808
Linearity	185.459	1	185.459	3.054	0.085
Deviation from Linearity	2313.613	53	43.653	0.719	0.491
Within Groups	2129.817	35	60.852		
Total	4628.889	89			

The Test for Linearity yielded a Deviation from Linearity value of 0.491. Since this exceeds 0.05, the relationship between social support and resilience follows a linear pattern. The data therefore meet the linearity requirement for simple linear regression.

Hypothesis Testing

After the assumption tests were satisfied, hypothesis testing was conducted using simple linear regression. Table 6 presents the regression coefficients.

Table 6. Simple Linear Regression Analysis Results

Model	Predictor	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
1	Constant	97.584	7.001	13.939	0.000
1	Social Support	0.096	0.052	1.572	0.120

The constant is 97.584 and the regression coefficient for social support is 0.096, producing the equation Y = 97.584 + 0.096X. When social support (X) is zero, resilience (Y) is predicted to be 97.584. The positive coefficient indicates a positive direction; however, the t-test (t = 1.572; p = 0.120) is not statistically significant because p exceeds 0.05.

Table 7. Coefficient of Determination (R^2)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of Estimate
1	0.165	0.027	0.016	8.680

The R value of 0.165 indicates a very weak relationship between social support and

resilience. R^2 = 0.027 means that social support explains only 2.7% of the variance in resilience, while the remaining 97.3% is associated with variables outside the research model. The Adjusted R^2 of 0.016 further indicates low predictive power. Thus, H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected: social support does not have a statistically significant effect on resilience capacity in this sample.

The findings indicate that social support does not significantly affect the resilience capacity of inmates at the Women's Correctional Institution of Manado. Although the regression coefficient is positive (B = 0.096), the effect is very small and not statistically significant ($p = 0.120 > 0.05$). Social support is therefore not the primary predictor of resilience among the inmates in this study.

Resilience is likely shaped by a combination of internal and external factors. Richardson (2002) describes resilience as a dynamic process resulting from the integration of protective and risk factors originating in the individual and the surrounding environment. Connor and Davidson (2003) also explain that resilience involves personal characteristics such as mental toughness, self-confidence, adaptation to change, and the use of available resources. Tuerah's (2019) research similarly highlights the role of internal capacity development in psychological growth. Social support may function as one protective factor, but it is not the sole determinant.

The intensity of social support received by each inmate also varies. Some inmates face limitations related to distance, economic conditions, or disharmonious family relationships. These differences do not appear to directly distinguish respondents' resilience capacity. Resilience may develop more through personal adaptation and learning experiences during rehabilitative programs than through the amount of social support received alone.

Although regression results were not significant, descriptive analysis showed that all resilience aspects were in the very high category. Spiritual influences recorded the highest achievement (92.77%), suggesting that spiritual beliefs are an important source of strength in facing pressure. This points to the possible importance of internal factors, particularly spirituality and self-regulation, in shaping resilience.

These findings are consistent with Sari et al. (2022), who explained that inmate resilience is influenced not only by social support but also by spirituality, self-esteem, self-acceptance, and social adjustment. Nabilla and Ardelia (2025) found a positive relationship between self-acceptance and resilience among inmates, while Rahmah et al. (2022) emphasized the role of emotional regulation and perceived stigma. However, the present findings differ from Raisa and Ediati (2016) and Tunliu et al. (2019), who reported positive relationships between social support and resilience among inmates. Differences in respondent characteristics, measured support, psychological conditions, and correctional environments may help explain the discrepancy. Rehabilitation programs should therefore

develop inmates' internal psychological capacities while continuing to optimize social support.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the effect of social support on the resilience capacity of inmates at the Women's Correctional Institution of Manado. Simple linear regression did not show a statistically significant effect (B = 0.096, t = 1.572, p = 0.120), and social support explained only 2.7% of the variance in resilience ($R^2 = 0.027$). All resilience aspects were in the very high category, with spiritual influences recording the highest achievement (92.77%). Thus, H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected: social support has no significant effect on resilience capacity in this study.

These findings indicate that resilience should be understood more broadly than social environmental support alone. It may be more closely related to internal psychological factors such as self-acceptance, spirituality, self-efficacy, emotional regulation, and coping strategies. Correctional rehabilitation programs should comprehensively strengthen spirituality, emotional regulation, self-efficacy, and adaptive coping skills. Future research should use larger samples and examine additional internal psychological and contextual factors that may contribute to resilience among inmates.

REFERENCES

Arfa, W., Hasnida, & Tuapattinaja, J. M. R. (2024). Description of triggers for suicidal ideation in female inmates. J-CEKI: Jurnal Cendekia Ilmiah, 3(4), 6243–6253.

Azwar, S. (2018). Penyusunan Skala Psikologi (Edisi ke-2). Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Azwar, S. (2018). Reliability and Validity (4th ed.). Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Cobb, S. (1976). Social support as a moderator of life stress. Psychosomatic Medicine, 38(5), 300–314.

Connor, K. M., & Davidson, J. R. T. (2003). Development of a new resilience scale: The Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC). Depression and Anxiety, 18(2), 76–82.

Fanarraga, I., & Celinska, K. (2024). Gender-responsive classification of women in prison: A typology based on mental health symptoms and coping strategies. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology.

Favril, L., & van Ginneken, E. F. J. C. (2024). Individual and environmental contributors to psychological distress during imprisonment. European Journal of Criminology, 21(3), 350–369.

Febrianto, R., & Hartati, M. E. (2020). The influence of adversity quotient on anxiety in final year students of the Department of Architecture Engineering Sam Ratulangi University Manado. Proceedings of The ICECRS, 8.

Gorvine, B. J., Lyden, J., Spain, J. W., Boggess, T., & Belenko, S. (2021). A qualitative exploration of women's lives and resilience in recovery. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18(13), 7037.

Grashinta, A., Canny, S., Arsi, F., Safitri, D. A., Febrianto, R., Sarundayang, T. D., Arham, A., Hasmy, Z. A., Kamasi, V. J., Siregar, D. M., Veronika, T., & Salmon, A. G. (2026). Stress management for a calmer, more mindful, and balanced life. CV Widina Media Utama.

Harefa, N. M., Elita, V., & Dewi, A. P. (2023). Description of stress and coping mechanisms in female inmates at the Class IIA Women's Correctional Institution of Pekanbaru. Jurnal Ners Indonesia, 13(2), 223–232.

Hidayati, N. O., Suryani, S., Rahayuwati, L., & Widianti, E. (2023). Women behind bars: A scoping review of mental health needs in prison. Iranian Journal of Public Health, 52(2), 243–253.

Masten, A. S. (2014). Ordinary magic: Resilience in development. New York: Guilford Press.

Nabilla, J. N., & Ardelia, V. (2025). The relationship between self-acceptance and resilience in inmates. Jurnal Penelitian Psikologi, 12(3), 1170–1180.

Pamungkas, A. Y. F., Handayani, P. A., & Rudiyanto. (2023). Family support and coping strategies among female inmates: A cross-sectional study in penitentiaries. Healthcare in Low-Resource Settings.

Rahmah, C. D., Fitryasari, R., & Pradanie, R. (2022). Analysis factors related to prisoner's resiliency in Rutan Perempuan Kelas IIA Surabaya. Jurnal Ners, 17(2), 190–195.

Rahmayanti, F. (2023). The effect of psychological capital and social support on relapse tendency in drug abusers (Undergraduate Thesis, State Islamic University Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta).

Raisa, R., & Ediati, A. (2016). The relationship between social support and resilience in inmates at the Class IIA Women's Correctional Institution of Semarang. Jurnal Empati, 5(3), 537–542.

Reivich, K., & Shatté, A. (2002). The resilience factor: 7 essential skills for overcoming life's inevitable obstacles. New York: Broadway Books.

Richardson, G. E. (2002). The metatheory of resilience and resiliency. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 58(3), 307–321.

Rutter, M. (2012). Resilience as a dynamic concept. Development and Psychopathology.

Sarafino, E. P., & Smith, T. W. (2017). Health psychology: Biopsychosocial interactions. Wiley.

Sari, T. A., & Hurriyati, D. (2022). Social support and psychological adjustment in female inmates. Jurnal Psikologi: Jurnal Ilmiah Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Yudharta Pasuruan, 9(2), 261–270.

Sari, dkk. (2022). The role of social support and resilience in prison inmates: Literature study. Proceedings of 3rd International Conference on Psychological Studies (ICPsyche), 1(6), 387–395.

Sengkey, M. M., Sinaulan, N. L., Syahrin, N., Jamali, T. E., Sarungu', W. L., & Wisky, E. (2025). The role of social support in overcoming academic stress in university students. Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat dan Riset Pendidikan, 3(4), 5709–5712.

Sugiyono. (2019). Quantitative, Qualitative, and R&D Research Methods. Bandung:

Alfabeta.

Tuerah, R. M. S. (2019). The effect of a constructivist approach on student learning outcomes. Jurnal Pendidikan dan Psikologi, 6(2), 45–58.

Tunliu, S. K., Aipipidely, D., & Ratu, F. (2019). Family social support and resilience in inmates at the Class IIA Correctional Institution of Kupang. Journal of Health and Behavioral Science, 1(2), 68–82.

Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 22 of 2022 on Corrections.