

# Perceived Social Isolation Makes Me Sad: 5-Year Cross-Lagged Analyses of Loneliness and Depressive Symptomatology in the Chicago Health, Aging, and Social Relations Study

John T. Cacioppo, Louise C. Hawkley, and Ronald A. Thisted  
University of Chicago

We present evidence from a 5-year longitudinal study for the prospective associations between loneliness and depressive symptoms in a population-based, ethnically diverse sample of 229 men and women who were 50–68 years old at study onset. Cross-lagged panel models were used in which the criterion variables were loneliness and depressive symptoms, considered simultaneously. We used variations on this model to evaluate the possible effects of gender, ethnicity, education, physical functioning, medications, social network size, neuroticism, stressful life events, perceived stress, and social support on the observed associations between loneliness and depressive symptoms. Cross-lagged analyses indicated that loneliness predicted subsequent changes in depressive symptomatology, but not vice versa, and that this temporal association was not attributable to demographic variables, objective social isolation, dispositional negativity, stress, or social support. The importance of distinguishing between loneliness and depressive symptoms and the implications for loneliness and depressive symptomatology in older adults are discussed.

*Keywords:* depressive symptoms, loneliness, social isolation, stress, social support

Loneliness and the feeling of being unwanted is the most terrible poverty.

—Mother Teresa

The word *solitude* expresses the glory of being alone, whereas the word *loneliness* expresses the pain of feeling alone (Tillich, 1959). Millions of people suffer daily from loneliness (Rubenstein & Shaver, 1982; Steffick, 2000), a debilitating psychological condition characterized by a deep sense of emptiness, worthlessness, lack of control, and personal threat (Booth, 2000; Cacioppo & Patrick, 2008; Weiss, 1973). Twin studies reveal that loneliness is temporally stable and heritable, with approximately equal parts attributable to heritable and nonshared environmental factors in adulthood (Boomsma, Willemsen, Dolan, Hawkley, & Cacioppo, 2005; Boomsma, Cacioppo, Muthén, Asparouhov, & Clark, 2007). People can feel lonely in a marriage or in a crowd (Cacioppo et al., 2000; Tornstam, 1992), but certain situational factors heighten the risk for increased loneliness. These include low socioeconomic status, poor marital quality, infrequent contact with friends and family, few social roles, lack of participation in voluntary organizations, physical health symptoms, and physical limitations (Hawkley et al., 2008; Savikko, Routasalo, Tilvis, Strandberg, & Pitkala, 2005).

Loneliness, in turn, is a risk factor for various physiological and health outcomes. Moreover, these outcomes are not adequately predicted by objective social isolation or social support, constructs that are often mistakenly equated with loneliness. Independent of objective social isolation or social support, loneliness has been associated with increased vascular resistance (Cacioppo, Hawkley, Crawford, et al., 2002), elevated blood pressure (Cacioppo, Hawkley, Crawford, et al., 2002; Hawkley, Masi, Berry, & Cacioppo, 2006), increased hypothalamic pituitary adrenocortical activity (Adam, Hawkley, Kudielka, & Cacioppo, 2006; Steptoe, Owen, Kunz-Ebrecht, & Brydon, 2004), underexpression of genes bearing anti-inflammatory glucocorticoid response elements and overexpression of genes bearing response elements for pro-inflammatory NF- $\kappa$ B/Rel transcription factors (Cole et al., 2007), impaired sleep (Cacioppo, Hawkley, Berntson, et al., 2002; Pressman et al., 2005), altered immunity (Kiecolt-Glaser et al., 1984; Pressman et al., 2005), alcoholism (Akerlind & Hornquist, 1992; Bell, 1956), progression of Alzheimer's disease (Wilson et al., 2007), obesity (Lauder, Mummery, Jones, & Caperchione, 2006), and poorer physical health (Caspi, Harrington, Moffitt, Milne, & Poulton, 2006; Cornwell & Waite, 2009; Lynch, 1977). Moreover, loneliness has been shown to prospectively predict admission to a nursing home (Russell, Cutrona, de la Mora, & Wallace, 1997). Finally, loneliness has been associated with psychiatric conditions such as personality disorders (Overholser, 1992; Richman & Sokolove, 1992), hypochondriasis (Brink & Niemeyer, 1993), schizophrenia (DeNiro, 1995; Neeleman & Power, 1994), suicidal ideation and behavior (Goldsmith, Pellmar, Kleinman, & Bunney, 2002; Wenz, 1977), and depression (Cacioppo, Hughes, Waite, Hawkley, & Thisted, 2006; Peplau, Russell, & Heim, 1979; Russell, 1982; Russell, Cutrona, Rose, & Yurko, 1984; Russell, Pep-

---

John T. Cacioppo and Louise C. Hawkley, Center for Cognitive and Social Neuroscience, University of Chicago; Ronald A. Thisted, Department of Health Studies, University of Chicago.

This research was supported by National Institute of Aging Program Project Grants PO1 AG18911 and RO1 AG034052-01.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Louise C. Hawkley, Social Neuroscience Laboratory, University of Chicago, 940 E. 57th St., Chicago, IL 60637. E-mail: hawkley@uchicago.edu

lau, & Ferguson, 1978; Segrin, 1998; Weeks, Michela, Peplau, & Bragg, 1980; Weiss, 1973).

The conceptual association between loneliness and depressive symptoms has led to items such as "I felt lonely" being included in putative measures of depressive symptomatology (Radloff, 1977). From a theoretical perspective, loneliness and depression are overlapping aversive, unpleasant states, but Weiss (1973) distinguished between them by characterizing loneliness as how people feel about their social connections in particular and depression as how people feel generally. Empirical studies designed to determine the relationship between loneliness and depressive symptoms have found them to be distinct conditions statistically (e.g., Bell, 1985; Cacioppo, Hawkley, et al., 2006; Cacioppo, Hughes, et al., 2006; Rook, 1987; Russell, 1996; Weeks et al., 1980) and functionally (e.g., Adam et al., 2006; Cole et al., 2007; Hawkley et al., 2006). Moreover, loneliness and depressive symptoms are only moderately correlated ( $r_s = .4-.6$ ) in middle-aged and older adults (Adams, Sanders, & Auth, 2004; Cacioppo, Hughes, et al., 2006). The existing longitudinal research further supports the distinction between loneliness and depressive symptomatology, and loneliness predicts increases in depressive symptomatology above and beyond what can be explained by initial levels of depressive symptomatology (e.g., Cacioppo, Hughes, et al., 2006; Green et al., 1992; Hagerty & Williams, 1999; Heikkinen & Kauppinen, 2004; Wei, Russell, & Zakalik, 2005; cf. Weeks et al., 1980).

Although the finding that loneliness predicts increases in depressive symptoms appears well established, there are several limitations in these longitudinal studies that we sought to address in the present research. First, investigators conducting longitudinal analyses have relied on regression or latent growth models in which depressive symptomatology served as the criterion measure. In the present study, we used cross-lagged panel models in which the criterion variables were loneliness and depressive symptoms, considered together, which made it possible to formally test for reciprocal predictive relationships.

Second, loneliness and depressive symptoms each have been found to be associated with other individual characteristics, including objective social isolation, general negativity, objective and perceived stress, and low social support (e.g., see Berscheid & Reis, 1998; Cacioppo, Hawkley, et al., 2006; Peplau & Goldston, 1984). The extent to which loneliness predicts depressive symptoms by the operation of one of these factors acting as a spurious third variable is not clear. In the present study, we performed a series of cross-lagged panel analyses to determine the extent to which any of these variables could account for any observed longitudinal associations between loneliness and depressive symptoms. Because each of these variables could change annually, they were modeled accordingly in our longitudinal analyses.

Third, most studies have not considered the possible effects of gender, ethnicity, education, psychiatric diagnosis, use of antidepressant medications, or physical functioning. We incorporated these factors into the cross-lagged panel analyses, and those variables that could change (e.g., psychiatric diagnosis, use of antidepressant medication, physical functioning) were modeled accordingly.

Finally, most prior longitudinal studies of loneliness and depressive symptoms cannot be generalized easily to our aging population. For instance, the investigators in most of these studies have relied on convenience samples. In the present study, we used a

population-based sample of middle-aged and older European American, African American, and Latino American women and men to permit generalization of the results to older American adults. In addition, the longitudinal analyses have been limited to one or two waves of measurement, typically across a year or less. The paucity of waves in these studies may constrain the varieties of life events to which middle-aged and older adults are exposed. In the present study, we report data from five 1-year waves of data collection to determine the relationship between loneliness and depressive symptoms in a sample of individuals born between 1935 and 1952.

## Method

### Participants

Data for this study were collected annually for 5 years, from 2002 to 2006, as part of the Chicago Health, Aging, and Social Relations Study (CHASRS; Cacioppo, Hughes, et al., 2006). CHASRS is a longitudinal, population-based study of non-Hispanic White, Black, and non-Black Latino Americans (hereafter referred to as Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics, respectively) born between 1935 and 1952, and living in Cook County, Illinois. The sample was selected with a multistage probability design, the first stage of which involved identification of a subset of households estimated to have high probability of containing at least one adult who was 50–65 years old (24% of the total frame). A stratified, equal-probability-of-selection sample was drawn from this subset. The three strata were (a) households from census tracts in which at least 80% of the residents were Black, (b) households for which the associated surname was identified by the U.S. Census Department (Word & Perkins, 1996) as "Hispanic," and (c) all remaining households. The second stage involved selecting one age-eligible individual per household and screening selected individuals to include only those who belonged to one of the three racial/ethnic groups of interest and who were sufficiently ambulatory to come to the university for a day-long visit to participate in the study. We used a quota sampling strategy at both the household and individual levels to achieve an approximately equal distribution of participants across the six gender by racial/ethnic group combinations. In the design of the sample selection, Blacks and Hispanics were oversampled, and gender equality was maintained. Response rates approached 45% overall, an impressive rate given that participation in our study required predominantly working adults to spend an entire day at the university.

The final sample in Year 1 of CHASRS consisted of 229 individuals who ranged in age from 50–68 years on the first testing occasion. Sample attrition over the course of the 5-year study averaged 7.2% annually, resulting in a sample size of 163 in Year 5. Sample attrition did not differ as a function of depressive symptoms ( $p = .08$ ) or loneliness ( $p = .15$ ). Participants were paid US\$126 each year for participating in the study.

### Procedures

Annual testing of participants occurred over the entire 12-month calendar year, and the testing interval averaged 11.6 months ( $SD = 1.1$ ). Participants arrived at the laboratory between 8:00 and 9:00 a.m. for a full day of testing that included standard psychological

and demographic surveys, health and medication interviews, anthropometric measurements, and a cardiovascular protocol. All psychological and demographic measures reported in this article were obtained in the first survey packet completed by participants. Participants were asked to bring their medications with them to the laboratory, and experimenters recorded drug name, dosage, and frequency for subsequent coding.

The University of California at Los Angeles Loneliness Scale-Revised (UCLA-R) has been shown to possess construct validity (Russell, 1996; Russell, Peplau, & Cutrona, 1980) as a measure of general loneliness and degree of satisfaction with one's social network. The UCLA-R captures a three-dimensional representation of loneliness that reflects inadequate intimate attachments as well as inadequate relational and collective attachments (Hawkey, Browne, & Cacioppo, 2005). Each of the 20 items is rated on a scale of 1 (*never*), 2 (*rarely*), 3 (*sometimes*), and 4 (*often*). Cronbach's alpha across all 20 items ranged from .90 to .92 across all 5 years of CHASRS ( $M = .91$ ). After reverse scoring appropriate items, we calculated loneliness scores by summing all items. The range of possible scores was 20 to 80, with higher scores signifying greater loneliness.

The Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) is a 20-item self-report questionnaire for the assessment of depressive feelings and behaviors experienced during the past week. Radloff (1977) reported good psychometric properties of this scale. In our sample, Cronbach's alpha across all 20 items ranged from .88 to .89 across all 5 years of CHASRS ( $M = .89$ ). Responses to each item were recorded using a 4-point Likert scale that ranged from 0 (*rarely or none of the time*) to 3 (*most or all of the time*). When calculating the total score, we did not include responses to one CES-D item concerning whether the respondent felt lonely to ensure any prediction of depressive symptoms by loneliness was not due to item overlap. We computed a depressive symptom score by summing the responses to the remaining 19 items, yielding a scale score range of 0 (*low depressive symptoms*) to 56 (*high depressive symptoms*). We refer to this total score as CES-DML (i.e., CES-D minus the loneliness item).

Demographic covariates included because of their known associations with depressive symptoms or loneliness were age at study outset, gender, years of education, and marital status (Pinquart & Sorenson, 2003), as well as race/ethnicity (George & Lynch, 2003). Time-varying covariates known to be associated with loneliness or depressive symptoms included use of antidepressant medications, psychiatric diagnosis (self-report), and physical functioning. We coded antidepressant medications using a standardized scheme available from the Multum website (Cerner Multum, n.d.). The Multum database permits coding of generic and brand name drugs by pharmacologic and therapeutic categories. Antidepressant medications include serotonin and norepinephrine reuptake inhibitors (SNRIs), selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs), monoamine oxidase (MAO) inhibitors, and phenylpiperazine, tetracyclic, and tricyclic antidepressants. A psychiatric diagnosis was recorded if, during a health interview, participants reported having had or having been told by a doctor that they had emotional, nervous, or psychiatric problems. Physical functioning was assessed using the corresponding subscale of the RAND 36-Item Short-Form Health Survey (Version 1.0; Ware & Sherbourne, 1992). Scores range from 0 to 100% and reflect the ability to engage in light (e.g., walking one block, dressing oneself), mod-

erate (e.g., pushing a vacuum cleaner), and vigorous (e.g., running, lifting heavy objects) activities.

In additional models, the Social Network Index, neuroticism, stressful life events, perceived stress, and social support were employed as covariates to assess whether reciprocal lagged relationships between loneliness and depressive symptoms were independent of the lagged effects of these related psychosocial variables.

The Social Network Index (SNI) was computed by following, as closely as possible, the procedure described by Berkman and Syme (1979). Four dichotomous variables were summed to generate a total SNI: being married or living with a partner, having close friends or relatives, belonging to a voluntary group or club, and attending church services at least twice a month. Scores could range from 0 (*no connections*) to 4 (*most connections*); in our sample, no one scored 0 and only 8% of the sample scored 1. Because the SNI incorporates marital status, we did not include marital status as a covariate when modeling the effect of SNI on the lagged relationships between loneliness and depressive symptoms. The Big 5 personality inventory (Goldberg, 1992) was used to measure emotional stability (the opposite of neuroticism), and in the reporting of results, we reversed the direction of the effects of emotional stability to correspond to the construct of neuroticism. Life events that had occurred in the prior 12 months were assessed using a 51-item checklist (based on the revised Social Readjustment Rating Scale (Hobson et al., 1998), and events were summed to represent exposure to significant life stress. Perceptions of stress were measured using the Perceived Stress Scale (Cohen, Kamarck, & Mermelstein, 1983). Social support was measured using the 12-item Interpersonal Support Evaluation List (Cohen & Hoberman, 1983; Cohen, Mermelstein, Kamarck, & Hoberman, 1985), and responses were averaged across the three subscales (i.e., tangible, appraisal, and belonging). The psychometric characteristics of these scales in the CHASRS study have been reported elsewhere (Hawkey et al., 2006).

## Data Analysis

Cross-lagged path analysis is widely used to infer causal associations in data from longitudinal research designs. Analyses were conducted using an autoregressive cross-lagged panel model approach (Curran, 2000) to simultaneously address reciprocal influences on loneliness and depressive symptoms. In a cross-lagged modeling technique, the pattern of effects is conceptually replicated at each time point. We report unstandardized regression coefficients ( $B$ ) and 95% confidence intervals throughout. The cross-lagged panel analyses were conducted with MPlus (Version 5; Muthén & Muthén, 2002). Missing data were not imputed; rather, available data from all 229 participants were used in analyses. We conducted all analyses using full information maximum likelihood estimation with robust standard errors. In the present study, covariance coverage values, which indicate the proportion of data present to estimate each pairwise relationship, ranged from 66% to 100%.

The degree of model fit was assessed with the chi-square goodness of fit statistic and the root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA; Browne & Cudeck, 1992). MacCallum, Browne, and Sugawara (1996) characterized a model with an RMSEA of .08 or less as an adequate fit; Hu & Bentler (1999) characterized

a model with an RMSEA of .05 or less as a good fit and .10 or more as a poor fit.

## Results

Table 1 provides sample characteristics of the CHASRS cohort. Table 2 lists means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for the CES-DML and UCLA-R Loneliness values at each annual assessment. The CES-DML and UCLA-R showed moderate temporal stability across years,  $r_s > 0.6$ . Intercorrelations between the CES-DML and UCLA-R when measured at the same point in time were also significant,  $r_s = .42-.68$ .

We specified cross-lagged panel models to examine reciprocal relationships between depressive symptoms and loneliness over a total of four 1-year intervals. Our theoretical model assumes that prospective relationships between variables are stable over time. We modeled these assumptions by applying equality constraints to the autoregressive and cross-lagged paths, thereby imposing "stationarity" on the relationships among variables in the model. In Figures 1–5, autoregressive effects are represented as single-headed arrows running from a given variable at one time point to the same variable at the next time point. The utility of depressive symptoms for prospectively predicting loneliness and of loneliness for prospectively predicting depressive symptoms over a 1-year interval (i.e., cross-lagged effects) is illustrated by diagonal single-headed arrows. We also assumed that the 1-year prospective effects of covariates (i.e., age, gender, race/ethnicity, years of education, marital or live-in partner status, use of antidepressant medication, psychiatric diagnosis, and physical functioning) on depressive symptoms and loneliness did not differ from year to year, and equality constraints were therefore applied to each of these covariates over the four 1-year intervals. The effects of

covariates are illustrated by diagonal single-headed arrows. Correlations between variables at a given time are illustrated by double-headed arrows.

The results for the model summarized in Figure 1 supported the stationary process assumption and fit the data adequately,  $\chi^2(225) = 476.332, p < .0001$ ; RMSEA = .070, 90% CI [0.061, 0.079]. The UCLA-R exhibited significant temporal stability ( $B = 0.79, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.66, 0.92]$ ), as did the CES-DML ( $B = 0.570, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.36, 0.71]$ ). In addition, the 1-year lagged effect of loneliness on depressive symptoms was significant ( $B = 0.18, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.09, 0.30]$ ). The 1-year lagged effect of depressive symptoms on loneliness did not achieve statistical significance ( $B = 0.10, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.05, 0.20]$ ). These pathways and estimates are displayed in Figure 1 and provide evidence that supports conceptual and empirical distinctions between loneliness and depressive symptoms.

Significant cross-sectional associations were evident among measures at baseline (Year 1; see Table 3). Loneliness levels and depressive symptoms were higher in those with a psychiatric diagnosis and with a greater degree of physical functional impairment and lower in those with higher levels of education. Depressive symptoms were also higher among Hispanics than Whites and higher in those on antidepressant medication. A psychiatric diagnosis was more likely to be present among the more educated and less likely among married individuals. Women were less likely to be married or have a live-in partner at baseline. Physical functioning was less impaired among women and more highly educated individuals and tended to be more impaired among older individuals. Hispanics were significantly younger than Whites. The only covariate with a significant lagged effect was age. With each additional year, loneliness decreased ( $B = -0.45, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.66, -0.32]$ ). This effect did not alter the influence of loneliness on depressive symptoms.

### Are the Relationships Between Loneliness and Depressive Symptoms Attributable to Differences in Social Isolation?

The next model examined whether the association between loneliness and depressive symptoms might be attributable to actual isolation. At baseline, social network size was found to be associated with loneliness ( $r = -.19, p < .05$ ) and depressive symptoms ( $r = -.17, p < .05$ ). Building on the model displayed in Figure 1, social network size was added as a covariate with 1-year lagged effects on loneliness and depressive symptoms. This model, depicted in Figure 2, fit the data adequately,  $\chi^2(334) = 649.970, p < .0001$ ; RMSEA = .064, 90% CI [0.057, 0.072]. The stationary lagged effect of social network size was not significant for loneliness ( $B = -0.02, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.65, 0.49]$ ) or depressive symptoms ( $B = 0.28, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.26, 0.91]$ ). Independent of neuroticism, the stationary cross-lagged effect of loneliness on depressive symptoms retained statistical significance ( $B = 0.18, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.08, 0.29]$ ), and the influence of depressive symptoms on loneliness remained nonsignificant ( $B = 0.09, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.07, 0.20]$ ).

### Are the Relationships Between Loneliness and Depressive Symptoms Reducible to General Negativity?

The next model examined whether the association between loneliness and depressive symptoms might be attributable to a

Table 1  
Characteristics of the CHASRS Sample ( $N = 229$ , Unless Otherwise Indicated)

Characteristic	No. or %	SD
Age (years)	57.4	4.5
Female (%)	52.4	
Ethnicity (%)		
White	35.8	
Black	35.4	
Hispanic <sup>a</sup>	28.8	
Education (years) ( $N = 223$ )	13.3	3.1
Married/living with partner (%)	61.6	
Antidepressant medications (%) ( $N = 228$ )	7.5	
Psychiatric diagnosis reported (%) ( $N = 226$ ) <sup>b</sup>	12.4	
Social Network Index ( $N = 225$ )	2.9	0.9
Physical functioning ( $N = 225$ )	80.4	24.2
Emotional stability ( $N = 213$ )	5.6	0.9
Life events ( $N = 228$ )	4.4	3.2
Perceived stress ( $N = 223$ )	13.3	6.4
Social support ( $N = 218$ )	12.9	2.2

Note. CHASRS = Chicago Health, Aging, and Social Relations Study.  
<sup>a</sup> The greatest majority of these individuals are Mexican (72%), with the remaining individuals representing a wide range of ethnicities (e.g., Puerto Rican, Cuban, Chilean, Colombian, Dominican, and so on). <sup>b</sup> A psychiatric diagnosis was recorded if, during a health interview, participants reported having had or having been told by a doctor that they had emotional, nervous, or psychiatric problems.

Table 2  
Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations Among CES-DML and UCLA Loneliness Scores

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	CES-DML					UCLA Loneliness				
			Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
CES-DML												
Year 1 ( <i>N</i> = 223)	9.8	8.5	—									
Year 2 ( <i>N</i> = 205)	10.2	8.7	.70**	—								
Year 3 ( <i>N</i> = 190)	9.0	8.0	.67**	.69**	—							
Year 4 ( <i>N</i> = 176)	8.9	8.0	.61**	.66**	.70**	—						
Year 5 ( <i>N</i> = 162)	8.7	7.9	.64**	.61**	.67**	.71**	—					
UCLA Loneliness												
Year 1 ( <i>N</i> = 225)	36.0	9.8	.57**	.51**	.46**	.50**	.42**	—				
Year 2 ( <i>N</i> = 206)	35.4	9.7	.54**	.68**	.58**	.61**	.54**	.76**	—			
Year 3 ( <i>N</i> = 191)	35.6	9.5	.54**	.55**	.61**	.60**	.55**	.74**	.84**	—		
Year 4 ( <i>N</i> = 177)	38.1	8.6	.54**	.53**	.60**	.67**	.55**	.65**	.75**	.79**	—	
Year 5 ( <i>N</i> = 162)	36.8	8.1	.48**	.53**	.58**	.61**	.57**	.63**	.78**	.79**	.83**	—

Note. CES-DML = Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale minus loneliness item; UCLA Loneliness = University of California at Los Angeles Loneliness Scale.

\*\*  $p < .01$ .

more general negativity factor. At baseline, neuroticism was found to be associated with loneliness ( $r = .26, p < .05$ ) and depressive symptoms ( $r = .39, p < .05$ ). Building on the model displayed in Figure 1, we added neuroticism as a covariate with 1-year lagged effects on loneliness and depressive symptoms. This model, depicted in Figure 3, fit the data adequately,  $\chi^2(332) = 722.891, p < .0001$ ; RMSEA = .072, 90% CI [0.065, 0.079]. The stationary lagged effect of neuroticism was not significant for loneliness ( $B = 0.44, 95\% \text{ CI} [-0.45, 1.26]$ ) or depressive symptoms ( $B = 0.03, 95\% \text{ CI} [-0.83, 0.88]$ ). Independent of neuroticism, the stationary cross-lagged effect of loneliness on depressive symptoms retained statistical significance ( $B = 0.15, 95\% \text{ CI} [0.04, 0.27]$ ), and the influence of depressive symptoms on loneliness remained nonsignificant ( $B = 0.08, 95\% \text{ CI} [-0.08, 0.18]$ ).

### Are the Relationships Between Loneliness and Depressive Symptoms Reducible to Exposure to Stressful Life Events?

The number of stressful life events was found to be associated with loneliness ( $r = .15, p < .05$ ) and depressive symptoms ( $r = .23, p < .05$ ). To examine whether the association between loneliness and depressive symptoms was attributable to stressful events influencing both loneliness and depressive symptoms, we added a life event count as a covariate with 1-year lagged effects on loneliness and depressive symptoms. The model, depicted in Figure 4, fit the data adequately,  $\chi^2(332) = 685.965, p < .0001$ ; RMSEA = .068, 90% CI [0.061, 0.075]. Although life events exhibited small cross-sectional correlations with loneliness and depressive symptoms in Year 1, the stationary lagged effects of life events on loneliness,  $B = -0.05$ , and depressive symptoms,  $B = -0.13$ , were nonsignificant,  $ps > .1$ . The stationary cross-lagged effect of loneliness on depressive symptoms retained statistical significance independent of life events ( $B = 0.19, p < .01$ ), and depressive symptoms had a significant influence on loneliness when life events were held constant ( $B = 0.13, 95\% \text{ CI} [0.01, 0.27]$ ). Thus, the cross-lagged association between loneliness and depressive symptoms does not appear to be attributable to stressful life events acting on both.

### Are the Relationships Between Loneliness and Depressive Symptoms Reducible to Perceived Stress?

Perceived stress was associated with loneliness ( $r = .49, p < .01$ ) and depressive symptoms ( $r = .72, p < .001$ ). To examine whether the temporal association between loneliness and depressive symptoms were attributable to the subjective experience of stress, we added perceived stress as a covariate to the base model with 1-year lagged effects on loneliness and depressive symptoms. This model, depicted in Figure 5, fit the data adequately,  $\chi^2(332) = 707.318, p < .0001$ ; RMSEA = .070, 90% CI [0.063, 0.077]. The stationary lagged effects of perceived stress were not significant for loneliness,  $B = -0.06$ , or depressive symptoms,  $B = 0.005, ps > .4$ . Independent of perceived stress, loneliness continued to exert a significant influence on depressive symptoms,  $B = 0.17, p < .01$ , but depressive symptoms did not exert a significant reciprocal effect on loneliness,  $B = 0.06, p > .4$ .

### Are the Relationships Between Loneliness and Depressive Symptoms Reducible to Social Support?

The final model examined whether the reciprocal influences between loneliness and depressive symptoms were attributable to perceptions of social support that might attenuate the effects of stress. As expected, social support was associated with loneliness ( $r = -.58, p < .01$ ) and depressive symptoms ( $r = -.41, p < .01$ ). This model, depicted in Figure 6, fit the data adequately,  $\chi^2(332) = 774.096, p < .0001$ ; RMSEA = .076, 90% CI [0.069, 0.083]. The stationary lagged effects of social support were significant for loneliness ( $B = -0.66, 95\% \text{ CI} [-1.09, -0.43]$ ) but not depressive symptoms,  $B = -0.10, p > .6$ . Independent of the effects of social support, loneliness continued to exert a significant influence on depressive symptoms,  $B = 0.13, p < .05$ , and depressive symptoms did not influence loneliness,  $B = 0.06, p > .3$ .




Figure 1. Cross-lagged panel model showing that loneliness predicts increases in depressive symptoms independent of covariates. Regression weights are unstandardized. Covariances (italicized) are standardized (i.e., equivalent to correlations). L = University of California at Los Angeles Loneliness Scale; D = Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale minus loneliness item (CES-DML); Psych = psychiatric diagnosis reported (participant reported having had or having been told by a doctor that he or she had emotional, nervous, or psychiatric problems); Antidepress = antidepressant medication; PhysFx = physical functioning. \*  $p < .01$ . \*\*  $p < .001$ .

**Discussion**

Much of the prior research on loneliness and depressive symptoms, particularly in the United States, has relied on convenience samples. Data from representative samples are needed if researchers are to understand loneliness as a risk factor for depressive symptomatology in middle-aged and older adults. The present study serves this purpose; adds to growing evidence for the conceptual, stochastic, and functional distinctions between loneliness and depressive symptoms; and provides evidence that loneliness predicts if not promotes increases in depressive symptomatology regardless of age, gender, or ethnicity. First, we found loneliness and depressive symptoms, as measured by the UCLA-R and CES-DML, to be statistically separable. Second, we found loneliness in year  $n - 1$  to predict changes in depressive symptoms in year  $n$  above and beyond what could be explained by depressive symptoms in year  $n - 1$ . Third, when demographic variables were considered in the models, the cross-lagged analyses revealed that loneliness in year  $n - 1$  still predicted changes in depressive symptoms in year  $n$  above and beyond what could be explained by depressive symptoms in year  $n - 1$ , but depressive symptomatology in year  $n - 1$  did not predict changes in loneliness in year  $n$ .

We constructed additional cross-lagged analytic models to test alternative interpretations for these findings. To determine whether the possible effect of loneliness on depressive symptoms reflected the effects of objective rather than perceived social isolation, we performed the cross-lagged model in which demographic factors and the time-varying factor of Social Network Index served as covariates. To determine whether the possible effect of loneliness on depressive symptoms reflected different manifestations of personality differences in general negativity, we constructed a cross-lagged model in which demographic factors and the time-covarying factor of neuroticism served as covariates. To determine whether the possible effect of loneliness on depressive symptoms reflected differences in exposure to stressful life events, we constructed a cross-lagged model in which demographic factors and the time-covarying factor of stressful life events served as covariates. To determine whether perceived stress was the important variable, we performed the cross-lagged model using perceived stress in the place of stressful life events. Finally, to determine whether the relationship between loneliness and depressive symptoms simply reflected the effects of social support, we constructed a cross-lagged analytic model in which demographic factors and

Table 3  
Intercorrelations Among Variables at Baseline (Year 1)

Variable	CES-DML	UCLA Loneliness	Psych	Antidepress	PhysFx	Age	Female	Black (vs. other)	Hispanic (vs. other)	Years of education	Married/live-in partner
CES-DML	—										
UCLA Loneliness	.58**	—									
Psych	.21*	.19*	—								
Antidepress	.35**	.13	.40**	—							
PhysFx	-.30**	-.22*	-.10	-.06	—						
Age	-.14	-.08	-.05	-.07	-.15	—					
Female	.08	-.12	.13	.15	-.22**	-.02	—				
Black (vs. other)	.11	.06	-.08	-.01	-.10	.14	.02	—			
Hispanic (vs. other)	.20*	.12	.12	.08	-.05	-.26**	-.00	-.47**	—		
Years of education	-.25**	-.15*	.16**	.01	.17*	-.02	.04	-.13	-.22**	—	
Married/live-in partner	-.10	-.11	-.15*	-.09	.10	-.01	-.30**	-.12	-.08	-.03	—

Note. Correlation coefficients are standardized regression coefficients obtained in the cross-lagged panel analysis depicted in Figure 1. CES-DML = Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale minus loneliness item; UCLA Loneliness = University of California at Los Angeles Loneliness Scale; Psych = psychiatric diagnosis reported (participants reported having had or having been told by a doctor that they had emotional, nervous, or psychiatric problems); Antidepress = antidepressant medication; PhysFx = physical functioning.  
\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

the time-covarying factor of social support served as covariates. In each case, we found that loneliness remained the significant predictor of changes in depressive symptomatology above and beyond what could be predicted by concurrent depressive symptomatology and the covariates. Thus, loneliness and its association with increases in depressive symptomatology cannot be reduced to demographic factors, objective social isolation, exposure to life stressors, perceived stress, negative affectivity, or social support.

Loneliness decreased over the course of the study, a finding that is consistent with prior research (Nolen-Hoeksema & Ahrens, 2002) showing that loneliness decreases from middle (45–55 years) to older (65–75 years) age. These results correspond to increasing emotional closeness in relationships as people age and place greater priority on a select few relationships (Carstensen, Isaacowitz, & Charles, 1999). Nevertheless, the cross-sectional association between loneliness and depressive symptoms remains

stable over the adult life span despite changes in loneliness (Nolen-Hoeksema & Ahrens, 2002), and our findings indicate that the prospective influence of loneliness on depressive symptoms is likewise independent of decreases in loneliness with age.

In addition, evidence was found to suggest why, in some prior studies, depressive symptomatology appeared to predict changes in loneliness. Specifically, when we performed the cross-lagged panel model in which exposure to life stressors served as a covariate, depressive symptoms emerged as a significant predictor of changes in loneliness. This latter effect was small and warrants replication, but it suggests that exposure to life stressors masks the effect of depressive symptoms on changes in loneliness. Notably, it was the objective exposure to stressors, and not the perception of stress, that masked the effect of depressive symptoms on changes in loneliness. It is important to note that exposure to life stressors did not alter or mask the effect of loneliness on subsequent




Figure 2. Cross-lagged panel model showing that loneliness predicts increases in depressive symptoms independent of social network size (and demographic, health, and medication covariates included in Figure 1, but not shown here). Marital status was dropped as a demographic covariate because it is included in the Social Network Index (SNI). Regression weights are unstandardized. Covariances (italicized) are standardized (i.e., equivalent to correlations). L = University of California at Los Angeles Loneliness Scale; D = Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale minus loneliness item (CES-DML). \*  $p < .01$ . \*\*  $p < .001$ .




Figure 3. Cross-lagged panel model showing that loneliness predicts increases in depressive symptoms independent of neuroticism (and demographic, health, and medication covariates included in Figure 1, but not shown here). Regression weights are unstandardized. Covariances (italicized) are standardized (i.e., equivalent to correlations). L = University of California at Los Angeles Loneliness Scale; D = Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale minus loneliness item (CES-DML); Neurot = neuroticism. †  $p < .05$ . \*  $p < .01$ . \*\*  $p < .001$ .

changes in depressive symptoms. We conducted ancillary analyses to explore the source of masking (i.e., statistical suppression) and identified the presence of a psychiatric diagnosis as an explanation for the impact of depressive symptoms on loneliness changes when the lagged effect of life events was held constant. Specifically, when we excluded participants with a psychiatric diagnosis at study outset ( $N = 28$ ), depressive symptoms no longer predicted changes in loneliness ( $B = 0.03$ ,  $SE = 0.08$ ,  $p > .6$ ) when life events were held constant. Loneliness, however, continued to predict changes in depressive symptoms ( $B = 0.19$ ,  $SE = 0.05$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The subset of the sample with a psychiatric diagnosis was too small to obtain reliable estimates in a parallel cross-lagged model, but we infer that the effect of depressive symptoms on changes in loneliness is greater in those with a psychiatric diag-

nosis than in those without such a diagnosis. Moreover, individuals with a self-reported psychiatric diagnosis also reported a greater number of stressful life events,  $r(226)_{\text{Year 1}} = .15$ ,  $p < .05$ , suggesting that the influence of depressive symptoms on increases in loneliness among these individuals may be explained by greater exposure to life-event stress. Additional research is needed to test this hypothesis.

In light of the possible role of loneliness in depressive symptoms, greater attention to loneliness may be important to maximize the likelihood people remain healthy and functional across the life span. The prior literature has tended to emphasize social support as the panacea. A literature search using PsycNet netted 2,904 articles in which the terms *social support* and *health* appeared in the abstract and the participants were middle aged or older. When




Figure 4. Cross-lagged panel model showing a reciprocal association between loneliness and depressive symptoms independent of life events (and demographic, health, and medication covariates included in Figure 1, but not shown here). Regression weights are unstandardized. Covariances (italicized) are standardized (i.e., equivalent to correlations). L = University of California at Los Angeles Loneliness Scale; D = Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale minus loneliness item (CES-DML); LEQ = life events. †  $p < .05$ . \*  $p < .01$ . \*\*  $p < .001$ .



assessments of depressive symptoms, and because the loneliness measure was similarly assessed by self-report, shared methodology may have confounded loneliness and depressive symptoms. On the other hand, our cross-lagged analytic models held constant the concurrent associations between loneliness and depressive symptoms, and the reciprocal lagged relationships between loneliness and depressive symptoms were retained when this potential confounding was statistically controlled. Moreover, to the extent that general negativity (i.e., neuroticism) captures shared method variance in values of loneliness and depressive symptoms, statistical control for general negativity did not alter the reciprocal lagged relationships between loneliness and depressive symptoms.

In sum, the human need for social connection does not fade away in middle-age and older adulthood. Five-year cross-lagged longitudinal analyses of data from an ethnically diverse representative sample show that loneliness predicts changes in depressive symptoms, and this temporal association is not attributable to objective social isolation, general negative affectivity, stress, or social support. Recognition of the importance of loneliness as a risk factor for changes in depressive symptoms may be important in mitigating its potentially deleterious effects on the quality of life of middle-aged and older adults.

## References

- Adam, E. K., Hawkley, L. C., Kudielka, B. M., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2006). Day-to-day dynamics of experience: Cortisol associations in a population-based sample of older adults. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science of the United States of America*, *103*, 17058–17063.
- Adams, K. B., Sanders, S., & Auth, E. A. (2004). Loneliness and depression in independent living retirement communities: Risk and resilience factors. *Ageing and Mental Health*, *8*, 475–485.
- Akerlind, I., & Hornquist, J. O. (1992). Loneliness and alcohol abuse: A review of evidences of an interplay. *Social Science and Medicine*, *34*, 405–414.
- Bell, R. A. (1985). Conversational involvement and loneliness. *Communication Monographs*, *52*, 218–235.
- Bell, R. G. (1956). Alcoholism and loneliness. *Journal of Social Therapy*, *2*, 171–181.
- Berkman, L. F., & Syme, S. L. (1979). Social networks, host resistance, and mortality: A nine-year follow-up study of Alameda County residents. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, *109*, 186–204.
- Berscheid, E., & Reis, H. T. (1998). Attraction and close relationships. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 193–281). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Boomsma, D., Willemsen, G., Dolan, C., Hawkley, L., & Cacioppo, J. (2005). Genetic and environmental contributions to loneliness in adults: The Netherlands Twin Register study. *Behavior Genetics*, *35*, 745–752.
- Boomsma, D. I., Cacioppo, J. T., Muthén, B., Asparouhov, T., & Clark, S. (2007). Longitudinal genetic analysis for loneliness in Dutch twins. *Twin Research and Human Genetics*, *10*, 267–273.
- Booth, R. (2000). Loneliness as a component of psychiatric disorders. *Medscape General Medicine*, *2*, 1–7.
- Brink, T. L., & Niemeyer, L. (1993). Hypochondriasis, loneliness, and social functioning. *Psychological Reports*, *72*(3 Pt 2), 1241–1242.
- Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1992). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. *Sociological Methods Research*, *21*, 230–258.
- Cacioppo, J. T., Ernst, J. M., Burleson, M. H., McClintock, M. K., Malarkey, W. B., Hawkley, L. C., . . . & Berntson, G. G. (2000). Lonely traits and concomitant physiological processes: The MacArthur social neuroscience studies. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, *35*(2–3), 143–154.
- Cacioppo, J. T., Hawkley, L. C., Berntson, G. G., Ernst, J. M., Gibbs, A. C., Stickgold, R., & Hobson, J. A. (2002). Do lonely days invade the nights? Potential social modulation of sleep efficiency. *Psychological Science*, *13*, 384–387.
- Cacioppo, J. T., Hawkley, L. C., Crawford, L. E., Ernst, J. M., Burleson, M. H., Kowalewski, R. B., . . . & Berntson, G. G. (2002). Loneliness and health: Potential mechanisms. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, *64*, 407–417.
- Cacioppo, J. T., Hawkley, L. C., Ernst, J. M., Burleson, M., Berntson, G. G., Nouriani, B., & Spiegel, D. (2006). Loneliness within a nomological net: An evolutionary perspective. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *40*, 1054–1085.
- Cacioppo, J. T., Hughes, M. E., Waite, L. J., Hawkley, L. C., & Thisted, R. A. (2006). Loneliness as a specific risk factor for depressive symptoms: Cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses. *Psychology and Aging*, *21*, 140–151.
- Cacioppo, J. T., & Patrick, B. (2008). *Loneliness: Human nature and the need for social connection*. New York: Norton.
- Carstensen, L. L., Isaacowitz, D. M., & Charles, S. T. (1999). Taking time seriously: A theory of socioemotional selectivity. *American Psychologist*, *54*, 165–181.
- Caspi, A., Harrington, H., Moffitt, T. E., Milne, B. J., & Poulton, R. (2006). Socially isolated children 20 years later: Risk of cardiovascular disease. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, *160*, 805–811.
- Cerner Multum. (n.d.) Multum Lexicon Plus [Database]. Retrieved from <http://www.multum.com>
- Cohen, S., & Hoberman, H. M. (1983). Positive events and social supports as buffers of life change stress. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *13*, 99–125.
- Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *24*, 385–396.
- Cohen, S., Mermelstein, R., Kamarck, T., & Hoberman, H. (1985). Measuring the functional components of social support. In B. R. Sarason & I. G. Sarason (Eds.), *Social support: Theory, research, and applications* (pp. 73–94). The Hague, the Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Cole, S. W., Hawkley, L. C., Arevalo, J. M., Sung, C. Y., Rose, R. M., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2007). Social regulation of gene expression in human leukocytes: Glucocorticoid resistance in the leukocyte transcriptome. *Genome Biology*, *8*, R189.1–R189.13.
- Cornwell, E. Y., & Waite, L. J. (2009). Social disconnectedness, perceived isolation, and health among older adults. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *50*, 31–48.
- Curran, P. J. (2000). A latent curve framework for the study of developmental trajectories in adolescent substance use. In J. S. Rose, L. Chassin, C. C. Presson, & S. J. Sherman (Eds.), *Multivariate applications in substance use research: New methods for new questions* (pp. 1–4). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- DeNiro, D. A. (1995). Perceived alienation in individuals with residual-type schizophrenia. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, *16*, 185–200.
- George, L. K., & Lynch, S. M. (2003). Race differences in depressive symptoms: A dynamic perspective on stress exposure and vulnerability. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *44*, 353–369.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment*, *4*, 26–42.
- Goldsmith, S. K., Pellmar, T. C., Kleinman, A. M., & Bunney, W. E. (2002). *Reducing suicide: A national imperative*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Green, B. H., Copeland, J. R., Dewey, M. E., Sharma, V., Saunders, P. A., Davidson, I. A., . . . & McWilliam, C. (1992). Risk factors for depression in elderly people: A prospective study. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, *86*, 213–217.
- Hagerty, B. M., & Williams, A. R. (1999). The effects of sense of belonging, social support, conflict, and loneliness on depression. *Nursing Research*, *48*, 215–219.
- Hawkley, L. C., Browne, M. W., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2005). How can I connect with thee? Let me count the ways. *Psychological Science*, *16*, 798–804.

- Hawkey, L. C., Hughes, M. E., Waite, L. J., Masi, C. M., Thisted, R. A., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2008). From social structural factors to perceptions of relationship quality and loneliness: The Chicago Health, Aging, and Social Relations Study. *Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *63*, S375–S384.
- Hawkey, L. C., Masi, C. M., Berry, J. D., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2006). Loneliness is a unique predictor of age-related differences in systolic blood pressure. *Psychology and Aging*, *21*, 152–164.
- Heikkinen, R.-L., & Kauppinen, M. (2004). Depressive symptoms in late life: A 10-year follow-up. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, *38*(3), 239–250.
- Heponiemi, T., Elovainio, M., Kivimäki, M., Pulkki, L., Puttonen, S., & Keltikangas-Jarvinen, L. (2006). The longitudinal effects of social support and hostility on depressive tendencies. *Social Science and Medicine*, *63*, 1374–1382.
- Hobson, C. J., Kamen, J., Szostek, J., Nethercut, C. M., Tiedmann, J. W., & Wojnarowicz, S. (1998). Stressful life events: A revision and update of the social readjustment rating scale. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *5*, 1–23.
- Hu, L.-T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *6*, 1–55.
- Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K., Garner, W., Speicher, C., Penn, G. M., Holliday, J., & Glaser, R. (1984). Psychosomatic modifiers of immunocompetence in medical students. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, *46*, 7–14.
- Lauder, W., Mummery, K., Jones, M., & Caperchione, C. (2006). A comparison of health behaviors in lonely and non-lonely populations. *Psychology, Health, & Medicine*, *11*, 233–245.
- Lynch, J. J. (1977). *The broken heart: The medical consequences of loneliness*. New York: Basic Books.
- MacCallum, R. C., Browne, M. W., & Sugawara, H. M. (1996). Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychological Methods*, *1*, 130–149.
- Muthén, B., & Muthén, L. (2002). *MPlus: The comprehensive modeling program for applied researchers*. Los Angeles: Muthén & Muthén.
- Neeleman, J., & Power, M. J. (1994). Social support and depression in three groups of psychiatric patients and a group of medical controls. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, *29*, 46–51.
- Nolen-Hoeksema, S., & Ahrens, C. (2002). Age differences and similarities in the correlates of depressive symptoms. *Psychology and Aging*, *17*, 116–124.
- Overholser, J. C. (1992). Sense of humor when coping with life stress. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *13*, 799–804.
- Peplau, L., Russell, D., & Heim, M. (1979). The experience of loneliness. In I. H. Frieze, D. Bar-Tal, & J. S. Carroll (Eds.), *New approaches to social problems: Applications of attribution theory* (pp. 53–78). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Peplau, L. A., & Goldston, S. E. (1984). *Preventing the harmful consequences of severe and persistent loneliness*. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Mental Health.
- Pinquart, M., & Sorenson, S. (2003). Risk factors for loneliness in adulthood and old age: A meta-analysis. In S. P. Shohov (Ed.), *Advances in psychology research* (Vol. 19, pp. 111–143). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science.
- Pressman, S. D., Cohen, S., Miller, G. E., Barkin, A., Rabin, B. S., & Treanor, J. J. (2005). Loneliness, social network size, and immune response to influenza vaccination in college freshmen. *Health Psychology*, *24*, 297–306.
- Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, *1*, 385–401.
- Richman, N. E., & Sokolove, R. L. (1992). The experience of aloneness, object representation, and evocative memory in borderline and neurotic patients. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, *9*, 77–91.
- Rook, K. S. (1987). Social support versus companionship: Effects on life stress, loneliness, and evaluations by others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *52*, 1132–1147.
- Rubenstein, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1982). The experience of loneliness. In L. A. Peplau & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Loneliness: A sourcebook of current theory, research, and therapy* (pp. 206–223). New York: Wiley.
- Russell, D. W. (1982). The measurement of loneliness. In L. A. Peplau & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Loneliness: A sourcebook of current theory, research, and therapy* (pp. 81–104). New York: Wiley.
- Russell, D. W. (1996). UCLA Loneliness Scale (Version 3): Reliability, validity, and factor structure. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *66*, 20–40.
- Russell, D. W., Cutrona, C. E., de la Mora, A., & Wallace, R. B. (1997). Loneliness and nursing home admission among rural older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, *12*, 574–589.
- Russell, D., Cutrona, C. E., Rose, J., & Yurko, K. (1984). Social and emotional loneliness: An examination of Weiss's typology of loneliness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *46*, 1313–1321.
- Russell, D. W., Peplau, L. A., & Cutrona, C. E. (1980). The revised UCLA Loneliness Scale: Concurrent and discriminant validity evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *39*, 472–480.
- Russell, D. W., Peplau, L. A., & Ferguson, M. L. (1978). Developing a measure of loneliness. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *42*, 290–294.
- Savikko, N., Routasalo, P., Tilvis, R. S., Strandberg, T. E., & Pitkala, K. H. (2005). Predictors and subjective causes of loneliness in an aged population. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, *41*, 223–233.
- Segrin, C. (1998). Interpersonal communication problems associated with depression and loneliness. In P. A. Andersen & L. A. Guerrero (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and emotion: Research, theory, applications, and contexts* (pp. 215–242). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Steffick, D. E. (2000). *Documentation on affective functioning measures in the Health and Retirement Study*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Survey Research Center.
- Stephoe, A., Owen, N., Kunz-Ebrecht, S. R., & Brydon, L. (2004). Loneliness and neuroendocrine, cardiovascular, and inflammatory stress responses in middle-aged men and women. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, *29*, 593–611.
- Tillich, P. (1959). The eternal now. In H. Feifel (Ed.), *The meaning of death* (pp. 30–38). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Tornstam, L. (1992). Loneliness in marriage. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *9*, 197–217.
- Ware, J. E., Jr., & Sherbourne, C. D. (1992). The MOS 36-Item Short-Form Health Survey (SF-36). I. Conceptual framework and item selection. *Medical Care*, *30*, 473–483.
- Weeks, D. G., Michela, J. L., Peplau, L. A., & Bragg, M. E. (1980). Relation between loneliness and depression: A structural equation analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *39*, 1238–1244.
- Wei, M., Russell, D. W., & Zakalik, R. A. (2005). Adult attachment, social self-efficacy, self-disclosure, loneliness, and subsequent depression for freshman college students: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *52*, 602–614.
- Weiss, R. S. (1973). *Loneliness: The experience of emotional and social isolation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wenz, F. V. (1977). Seasonal suicide attempts and forms of loneliness. *Psychological Reports*, *40*(3 Pt 2), 807–810.
- Wilson, R. S., Krueger, K. R., Arnold, S. E., Schneider, J. A., Kelly, J. F., Barnes, L. L., . . . & Bennett, D. A. (2007). Loneliness and risk of Alzheimer disease. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *64*, 234–240.
- Word, D. L., & Perkins, R. C. (1996). *Building a Spanish surname list for the 1990's: A new approach to an old problem*. (Technical Working Paper No. 13). Retrieved from U.S. Bureau of the Census, Population Division, website: <http://www.census.gov/population/documentation/twppo13.pdf>

Received April 15, 2009

Revision received July 6, 2009

Accepted July 20, 2009 ■