CHAPTER- II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND FORMATION OF HYPOTHESIS
Psychologists have long been interested in the topic of loneliness (Fromm-Reichmann, 1959; Sullivan, 1953). The lack of adequate measures, and the considerable gap between theoretical conceptions of loneliness and its operational definitions, have seriously hampered research in this area. Only recently, however, loneliness has become the subject of substantial research. The flurry of research on loneliness in the last few years has been impressive. One impetus for the new interest is the realisation that loneliness is a serious and widespread problem, and the study of loneliness has much potential for helping to understand traditional topics such as need for affiliation and interpersonal attraction. Another reason is that only recently efforts have been made to develop objective scales for rating loneliness. One reason for the neglect of loneliness has been the lack of adequate measures. Recent work on scale development has produced several measures of loneliness that are reliable, valid and avoid social desirability problem (Loucks, 1980; Rubenstein & Shaver, 1980; Russell Peplau, & Cutrona, 1980; Russell, Peplau, & Ferguson, 1978). Peplau & Perlman (1982) suggest that loneliness is a meaningful psychological construct. A review of researches conducted in the recent past reveals that unidimensional as well as multi-dimensional explanations of loneliness have been advanced, though sufficient evidence is available in favour of unidimensional aspect of loneliness.
In recent years there has been a ground swell of interest by psychologists in the concept of loneliness. The phenomenon of loneliness in different populations has been investigated extensively by Woodward (1967). Since 1967, fifteen research projects have been conducted under the supervision of Woodward at the department of Human Development and the Family at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (cf. Woodward, 1990).

The population of these studies included divorced adults (Zabel, 1970), housewives (Visser, 1971), never-married young adults (Swanson, 1971), older persons (Woodward, 1971), freshman college students (Seevers, 1972), rural high class students (Otto, 1973) low income single parents (Joern, 1973), older adults in nursing homes (Wythers, 1974), low income single adolescent mothers (Bauermeister, 1978), elderly American Indians (Luck, 1979), older urban widows (Hornung, 1980), and alcoholic subjects in rehabilitation centres (Medora, 1983).

More recently, Medora & Woodward (1986) studied loneliness among adolescent college students at a Midwestern University. The study was descriptive and aimed at investigating the extent of loneliness experienced by the late adolescent college students, the relationship of loneliness to certain variables and the differences between this and other previously studied groups.

The first objective of the study was to investigate the extent of loneliness experienced by the late adolescent college students who were
enrolled in two human development courses at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. The second objective was to assess the loneliness scores in relation to the numerous variables: sex, socio-economic status, number of siblings, ordinal position in the family, number of close friends, ease in making friends, degree of happiness experienced during the past year, self-rated happiness experienced during childhood, and the subjects self-perception of how lonely they were. The third objective was to examine mean differences in the extent of loneliness in the sample under investigation and those in previous studies conducted by Woodward and his research group.

The sample comprised 92 white (34 males, 58 females), single, undergraduate college students enrolled in two separate human development courses offered at the university of Nebraska-Lincoln. The subjects were 18 to 23 years of age. Socio-economic status was determined according to father's occupation. The total sample was divided into four classifications: upper socio-economic group (n=23), upper middle (n=35), middle (n=76), and lower (n=18). With regard to religious beliefs, 44 subjects stated that they were Protestant, 28 were Catholic, and 20 were Jewish. 44 respondents indicated that they were born and raised in urban area; 48 respondents indicated that they were born and raised in a rural area.
A questionnaire was used to collect the data. It consisted of two parts; Part I comprised of background information items; and Part II consisted of the loneliness inventory constructed by Woodward (1967). The inventory contained 75 questions which asked the subjects to indicate whether they were (a) almost always lonely, (b) often lonely, (c) sometimes lonely, (d) rarely lonely, or (e) never lonely, under various conditions and circumstances.

The late adolescent subjects in this research study attained a mean loneliness score of 1.816. The higher loneliness score that could be attained was 4, and the lowest was 1. The loneliness questionnaire used in this study was also used by Woodward and his group to study thirteen other populations. The loneliness scores in these thirteen studies ranged from 0.78 to 2.06. The adolescents were the sixth most lonely group out of thirteen previously studied groups.

The obtained mean loneliness score of 1.816 in the study was somewhat lower than the one obtained by Seever’s (1972) freshman college students (mean = 1.90). Although not significant, the difference could be attributed to the fact that the adolescent group in this study was older than those in Seever’s study.

The mean loneliness scores for the various populations studied ranged from 0.78 to 2.06. The higher scores tended to center around the low-income single adolescent mothers, followed closely by the alcoholics,
the freshman college students, freshman and seniors in rural high schools, and adolescent college students. The lower loneliness scores are more apparent in studies focusing on the elderly i.e., the elderly had the lowest loneliness scores. These studies clearly emphasise that adolescents in comparison to older populations have higher loneliness scores (cf. Medora & Woodward, 1986).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population under consideration</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean loneliness score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Low-income single adolescent mother (Bauermeister, 1978)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alcoholic subjects</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Freshman college students (Seavers, 1972)</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Low-income single parents (John, 1973)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Freshman and Senior Class students in rural high schools (Otto, 1973)</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Adolescent college students (1984)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Undergraduate college students (Medora &amp; Woodward, 1986)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Divorced adults (Zabel, 1970)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Elderly American Indians (Luck, 1979)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Never-married young adults (Swenson, 1971) 103 1.26
11. Housewives (Visser, 1971) 102 1.21
12. Older urban widows (Hornung, 1980) 80 1.03
13. Elderly in homes for elderly (Wythers, 1974) 145 0.83
14. Elderly (Woodward, 1971) 390 0.78

Upmanyu, Upmanyu, & Dhingra (1993), Brennan (1982), & Rubenstein & Shaver (1980) have also found evidence for the fact that loneliness and depression are both characteristic problems of the adolescent period. There is evidence that there is more loneliness among adolescents than among any other age group.

Loneliness, Depression and Locus of Control

Recent years have seen a burgeoning interests in the psychological state of loneliness which has come to be recognised as one of the most common distress of the human experience (Peplau & Perlman, 1982; Gordon, 1976; Weiss, 1973). The flurry of research on loneliness in the last few years has been impressive. Researchers are divided on the etiological factors that determine loneliness. Some consider the phenomenological experience of loneliness to be the function of quantity of one's social interaction (Brennan, 1982; Russell,
Peplau, & Cutrona, 1980). Such studies have shown that individuals reporting feelings of loneliness tend to spend more time alone and to participate in fewer social activities than non lonely individuals. Other results suggest that lonely and non lonely people differ in terms of quality, rather than quantity of social interaction (Cutrona, 1981; Jones, 1981; Chelena, Sultan & Williams, 1980; McCormack & Kohn, 1980).

The characterological view offers still another etiological formulation of loneliness, one that focuses on personality and individual differences variables, rather than situational causes or environmental deficits. In this regard, loneliness has been associated with low self-esteem (Goswick & Jones, 1981), neuroticism (Stokes, 1985; Hojat, 1982) and feelings of helplessness and alienation (Horowitz & French, 1979).

Research during the last 20 years has documented positive correlation between loneliness and some personality characteristics (Jones, Carpenter, & Quintana, 1985; DeJong-Gierveld, 1984; Anderson Horowitz, & DeSales French, 1983; Solano, Batten, & Parish, 1982; Jones, 1982; Rubenstein & Shaver, 1982; Perlman & Pepalu, 1981) and between loneliness and people’s personal attributions of the causes of their loneliness feelings (Vian Tilburg & De Jong-Gierveld, 1984; Peplau, Russell, & Heim, 1979).
External locus of control, social anxiety, and self consciousness (Moore & Schultz, 1983; Jones, Freeman, & Goswick, 1981), low trust and altruism towards others, a sense of powerlessness, normlessness and social isolation, and a view of the world as unjust (Jones et al., 1981) have been found to be related to loneliness. Loneliness has also been linked to deficits in social skills (Jones, 1982), such as inappropriate self-disclosure (Solano, Batten, & Parish, 1982), although studies by Jones et al. (1981) suggest that negative perception of self and others may be more prominent among lonely individuals than are social skill deficits.

There is also some empirical evidence showing a correlation between extraversion and loneliness (Hojat, 1982; Russell et al., 1980) and between neuroticism and loneliness (Hojat, 1982; Goswick & Jones, 1981). Extraverts are outgoing, social types who seek out the company of others, introverts are quiet, retiring, introspective and reserved (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975). Extraversion intuitively seems related to loneliness. Jones, Hobbs, & Hockenbury (1982) suggested a relation between loneliness and a deficit in abilities to focus on other people. In general high-lonely subjects appear to interact with less awareness of a concern for others with less responsiveness, and in a more self-focused or self-absorbed manner.

Researches in the recent past have also shown that depression and loneliness are both characteristics problems of the adolescent
period. Epidemiological studies of psychiatric disorders have indicated that there is a sharp increase in the incidence of depression in the adolescent, compared to the childhood years (Brooks-Gunn & Petersen, 1991; Rutter, 1991; Kashani, Carlson, Beck, Hoeper, Corcoran, McAllister, Fallahi, Rosenberg & Reid, 1987). Loneliness is also widespread during this time, and there is evidence that there is more loneliness among adolescents than among any other age group (Brennan, 1982; Rubenstein & Shaver, 1980).

Although loneliness is a much more circumscribed phenomenon than depression (a clinical disorder characterised by disturbances in affect, cognition, motivation and physical functioning), the two concepts referring to loneliness and depression share a number of common features. According to Peplau & Perlman (1982), the three essential characteristics of loneliness are: (1) that it results from deficiencies in social relationships, (2) that it represents a subjective experience (that is, it is not necessarily synonymous with social isolation as one can be alone without feeling lonely or lonely when in a group of people), and (3) that it is unpleasant and emotionally distressing. Features two and three share obvious similarities with depression. Not only is depression unpleasant and uncomfortable but also is often related to the subjective, rather than objective, evaluation of one's circumstances. Although deficiencies in
social relationships are not included in the definition of depression, current conceptualisations of the etiology and maintenance of depression have placed a strong emphasis on the role of social skills deficits and dysfunctional interpersonal behaviours (e.g., Youngren & Lewinsohn, 1980; Coyne, 1976) as well as the protective features of social support (Cohn & Wills, 1985). Not surprisingly then, depression and loneliness have been found to be highly correlated across a number of studies (with r's ranging from .38 to .71; Young, 1982; Russell, Peplau, & Cutrona, 1980; Weeks, Michela, Peplau, & Bragg, 1980; Russell, Peplau, & Ferguson, 1978), including those studies using high school students (e.g., r=.66 between the Zung Depression Scale and the Revised UCLA Loneliness Scale; Moore & Schultz, 1983). Moreover, unlike other indices of psychopathology, the relationship between depression and loneliness remains strong, even when the effects of general emotional distress have been partialled out (Jackson & Cochran, 1991).

Research results on loneliness have clearly shown a positive relationship between the subjective experience of loneliness and impaired mental health (Quintana, 1985; Schmidt & Kurdek, 1985; Perlmen & Peplau, 1984; Rubenstein & Shaver, 1982; Young, 1982; Diamont & Windholz, 1981; Jones, Carpenter, & Loucks, 1980; Weeks, Michela, Peplau, & Bragg, 1980; Bragg, 1979), including neuroticism, low
self-esteem, depression, anxiety, psychosomatic concerns, aggression, and paranoia. One explanation for this observation is the possibility that both loneliness and general psychopathology are associated with interpersonal difficulties that result in a lack of rewarding social relationships. The other is that loneliness is a complex phenomenon where in the type of relationship deficits result in both generalised distress and specific negative emotional outcomes (Weiss, 1987).

Wiess (1987) suggested that the absence of connectedness to important attachment figures results in a separation distress and a perception of vulnerability to threat (or a lack of self-assurance). Russell, Cutrona, Rose, & Yurko (1984) found that depression was more strongly associated with emotional loneliness, whereas anxiety was related to social isolation. This link between emotional impairment and loneliness is most understandable when considering associations between loneliness and low self-esteem and/or depression, both of which are strongly related to perceptions of loss or inadequacy. Problematic social interactions may be associated with self blame and self-devaluative beliefs (Perlman & Peplau, 1984). Research results have also shown that depressed individuals engage in communication patterns that have a negative impact on their interpersonal relationships (Coyne, 1976) and that lonely individuals have more negative evaluations and expectations of social
interactions than do non lonely persons (Jones, Freeman, & Goswick, 1981).

Solano, Batten, & Parish (1982), examined the hypothesis that feeling lonely is related to a self-perceived lack of self-disclosure to significant others. Thirty seven male and 38 females undergraduates rated themselves on the UCLA loneliness Scale and the Self Disclosure Questionnaire. Analyses showed that for males and females, loneliness was significantly and linearly related to a self-perceived lack of intimate disclosure to opposite sex friends. For females, loneliness was also associated with a perceived lack of self-disclosure to same sex friends.

The second study investigated the relationship between loneliness and actual disclosure behaviour. Twenty-four lonely subjects and 23 non-lonely subjects were paired with non lonely partners in a structured acquaintanceship exercise. Both opposite sex pairs and same sex pairs were included in the design. Post-exercise ratings by partners indicated that lonely subjects were less effective than non lonely subjects in making themselves known. Analysis of the intimacy level in the conversations showed that lonely subjects had significantly different patterns of disclosure than non-lonely subjects.

Moore and Schultz (1983), conducted a research to determine how adolescents react to, interpret, and cope with their loneliness. Subjects
were 45 male and 54 female adolescents ranging in age from 14 to 19 years (M=17, S.D. = 0.98) recruited from a local high school.

The following measures were given to each subject in one of four randomly assigned orders: (1) the UCLA Loneliness Scale (Russell et al., 1980); (2) the Self-esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965); (3) the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (Speilberger et al., 1970); (4) a locus-of-control measure (Levenson, 1974); (5) a measure of self-consciousness (Feningstein et al., 1975); (6) the Zung Depression Scale (Zung, 1965); (7) Self-rating scale of attractiveness, liability, happiness, and life satisfaction; (8) eight items designed to measure social risk taking (Sermat, 1980); and (9) measures developed by the authors from a pilot study to assess the frequency, duration, characteristics, and perceived causes of loneliness, as well as coping strategies and reactions to loneliness.

The results revealed that lonelier the adolescent, the more likely he or she was to be anxious, depressed, show an external locus of control, have high levels of public self-consciousness and social anxiety, and exhibit low levels of happiness and life-satisfaction. In addition, loneliness was associated with a reluctance to take social risks. These characteristics serve to put the lonely adolescent in a vulnerable social position. As Peplau and Perlman (1979) point out, the likelihood of
loneliness is increased by personal characteristics that undermine either the initiation or maintenance of relationships (e.g., shyness and low levels of self-disclosure). The present results indicate that lonely adolescents have many characteristics that could interfere with the ability to initiate contacts with others, such as low social risk taking, low perceived likability, high social anxiety, and high public self-consciousness.

Conoley and Carber (1985) examined the effects of reframing in decreasing loneliness and depression in college students. Reframing was compared with a treatment consisting of self-control directives and a waiting list control. Subjects included 57 depressed and lonely college women who were randomly assigned to one of the three groups. The treatment groups met for two weekly half-hour interviews. Interviewer responses in the reframing group focused on ways to experience loneliness more positively, whereas self-control responses involved encouraging subjects to overcome loneliness. All three groups were administered a loneliness scale, depression inventory, and controllability measure at pre-treatment, post-treatment, and 2 week follow-up. Results indicated that subjects in the reframing group experienced a more significant reduction in depression than subjects in the self-control or control groups. All subjects became less lonely over time, but no treatment was more effective than another in reducing loneliness.
Jackson and Cochran (1990) examined associations between psychological symptoms, assessed by the symptoms check list - 90 (SCL-90; Derogatis, Lipman, & Covi, 1973) and loneliness as measured by the UCLA-R Loneliness Scale (Russell, Peplau, & Cutrona, 1980), in college students. Participants were 147 women and 146 men from working class backgrounds ranging in age from 17 to 26 years old (median age, 19 years) attending a large predominantly undergraduate teaching university in Southern California. Most were freshmen as sophomores. There was no significant difference between men and women in age or year in school.

Overall, self-reported psychiatric symptoms were strongly associated with perceptions of loneliness when zero order correlations were evaluated. Given the number of correlations being evaluated, a significance level of .01 was used for this and all further analyses.

When relationship between psychopathology and loneliness were examined separately for men and women, results indicated similar strong overall relationships between symptomatology and loneliness. Statistical comparisons of the strength of associations between responses given by men and women failed to reveal significant sex differences. In addition, men (M=37.9, S.D.=10.1) and women (M=36.4, S.D.=8.9) also reported equivalent levels of loneliness on the UCLA-R Loneliness Scale, $t(290) =$
1.27, p>0.10. The authors concluded: Results of the current study support previous findings that low self-esteem and depression are associated with the experience of loneliness in young adults (Jones et al., 1985; Young, 1982; Russell et al., 1980; Weeks et al., 1980; Bragg, 1979; Russell et al., 1978). In contrast, other psychiatric symptoms, including general and phobic anxiety, obsessive-compulsiveness, hostility, and paranoia did not appear to be related to loneliness when the confounding covariance of general psychological distress was removed.

**Social Support and Loneliness**

Social support can be defined as the interactive process in which emotional or tangible support is provided by a person's social network (Bowling & Farquhar, 1991). House (1981) integrated the ideas of previous social support researchers by distinguishing four basic types of support: emotional support (actions that convey esteem), appraisal support (feedback about one's views or behaviour), informational support (advice or information that facilitates problem solving), and instrumental support (tangible assistance). These or closely related distinctions have gained widespread acceptance among social support researchers (Barrera & Ainlay, 1983; Cohen & Hoberman, 1983; Leavy, 1983). Emotional support includes attachment, reassurance, and being able to rely on and confide in a person. Tangible support involves financial aid,
material resources, and needed services (Schaefer, Coyne, & Lazarus, 1981). Social network is the set of relationships of a particular person or a set of linkages among a set of persons.

Over the past 10-15 years, there has been virtual explosion of research demonstrating the role of social support in psychopathology. The breadth and consistency of the research on the beneficial effects of social support are impressive. Ranging from animal laboratory studies to large scale epidemiologic investigations of psychopathology, disease and mortality, the majority of the work documents that social support concepts, involving ties and transactions between individuals over time, represent a fundamental component of stress and disorder theory. Either through direct protective effects or by buffering the adverse consequences of life stresses, social support is associated with a decreased likelihood of development disorders. The presence of supportive people in one's life enhances both physical and emotional well-being.

Help provided by others (social support) is apt to be most useful in reducing threats to well-being by facilitating adaptation to stressful life events. Such events disrupts the individuals equilibrium and make salient the need for help (Cohen & Mckay, 1984). If psychological well-being can be conceptualised as having a true neutral point, then social support may
serve primarily to restore disrupted functioning to a neutral level. Companionship, in contrast, may be most valuable in providing positive inputs to well-being, such as recreation, humour, and affection. That is, pleasurable social interaction is important not so much for restoring the individual to a prior level of functioning as for elevating the current level of contentment. Weiss (1974, p.24) argued in this regard that friendships “offer a base for social events and happenings” and “in the absence of such ties life becomes dull, perhaps painfully so.” Other have similarly argued that emotional health requires more than the absence of psychiatric symptoms; it requires some degree of excitement and stimulation as well (e.g., Solano, 1986; Diener, 1984; Houton, 1978).

There is accumulating evidence that supportive personal relationships are associated with greater psychological adjustment (e.g. Cramer, 1991; Henderson & Brown, 1988). There is substantive evidence for a small negative association between psychological distress and variously defined indices of social support (e.g. Henderson & Brown, 1988; Biegel, McCardle, & Mendelson, 1985; Cohen & Syme, 1985). Although, most of this research has been cross-sectional in design, an increasing number of prospective studies suggest that prior social support is also negatively related to subsequent psychological distress (e.g. Karause, Liang, & Yotoni, 1989; Brown, Andrews, Harris, Adler, & Bridge, 1985).
1986; Monroe, Imhoff, Wise, & Harris, 1983) Since intervention experiments are difficult to conduct in this area, causal interpretation of the observed association is problematic (e.g. Monroe & Steiner, 1986). Although this relationship is usually taken to indicate that social support reduces psychological distress, it is equally compatible with the view that psychological distress decreases social support, or that the relationship between these two variables is either reciprocal or spurious. Because of the problems of realistically manipulating social support, most of the research in this area is of a non-experimental nature, consequently, the causal nature of the observed association is difficult to ascertain.

The relationship between social support and loneliness has been studied extensively. Most definitions of loneliness emphasise perceived deficits in social relationships that provide opportunities for emotional intimacy and companionship. These definitions imply that the characteristics of the social network of lonely and non lonely people may differ. There is some empirical evidence linking the characteristics of people's social networks of perceived loneliness.

Russell, Peplau, & Cutrona (1980) discovered that loneliness correlated with college students reports of the number of close friends. The authors found that loneliness correlated with college students' self-reports of time spent alone each day, number of times dinner was taken
alone, number of week and evenings spent alone, and number of close friends. Cutrona (1982) found a relation of loneliness to number of contacts with friends among college students, although the author also found that ratings of satisfaction with contacts explained a greater proportion of variance of loneliness scores than did objective measures of frequency. The amount of time spent with females was negatively related to loneliness for both males and females in a study by Wheeler, Reis, & Nezlek (1983). Jones (1981) did not find a significant difference in the amount of social contact between lonely and non lonely subjects; he did, however, find evidence relating loneliness to the diversity of social contacts. The interactions of lonely subjects occurred with more different people. Cutrona (1982) identified a relation of loneliness to the number of contacts with friends among college students. More recently, Stokes (1985) found that loneliness could be predicted from the number of confidents in a respondent’s social network and from the density or interconnectedness among members of the network. People with denser networks reported themselves to be less lonely.

There is considerable evidence for gender differences in the quality or nature of relationships and social interactions. One consistent finding from a number of studies of children’s play is that girls tend to interact more in small groups, particularly dyads, whereas boys tend to interact
more in larger groups (Waldrop & Halverson, 1975; Lever, 1974; Laosa & Brophy, 1972). Eder and Hallinan (1978) discovered that girls were more inclined than boys to form exclusive dyadic relationships with best friends and were less likely to include a third person. Bell (1981) also reported that women overwhelmingly form dyadic relationships, whereas men tend to include three or more people. Tiger (1969) used mainly anecdotal evidence to propose that an intense form of camaraderie and gregariousness develops among men but not among women.

When the quality as opposed to the quantity of social support has been assessed; the findings consistently support an inverse relationship between perceived social support and loneliness in samples of college students. Thus perceived social support should be inversely related to loneliness in early adolescents.

On the other hand, there is evidence that the social environment for the lonely is restricted. Jones (1981), using a self-monitoring procedure whereby college students kept a diary of their interactions, found no evidence for a relation between loneliness and number of interactions with others. There was, however, a relation between loneliness and diversity of social contacts, that is, lonely subjects had as many interactions with others as did non lonely subjects, but these interactions occurred with more people.
In brief review of this literature, Jones (1982) concluded that "there is little evidence to support the idea that lonely college students are socially isolated, and yet they act as if they are" (p.251). The authors also suggested that:

"The reasons for loneliness are not to be found so much in objective characteristics of the lonely person's social milieu (e.g., numbers of available friends or amount of social contact) as they are in the way in which lonely people perceive, evaluate, and respond to interpersonal reality" (p.244).

In several studies, loneliness has been investigated in relation to friendships, mostly using single item assessments of the quality or quantity of friendships. The quality of friendships has been found to be the stronger predictor of loneliness in adolescents and college students (Downey, 1984; Schmidt & Sermat, 1983; Russell, Peplau, & Cutrona, 1980). Using the construct of close friend solidarity, Nolan (1986) found that the lower the level of close friend solidarity (by virtue of higher scores), the higher the level of loneliness in a sample of adults.

Several studies have found inverse relationships between the perception of positive relations with mother or father and loneliness (Downey, 1984) and inverse relationships between maternal and paternal warmth and loneliness (Franzoi & Davis, 1985) in samples of high school
students. Egan (1986) found strong inverse correlations between perceived maternal expressiveness and loneliness, \( r = -0.56 \), and between perceived paternal expressiveness and loneliness, \( r = -0.56 \), in a sample of early adolescents.

Mahon and Yarcheski (1988) examined alternate explanations of loneliness in early adolescents. Two alternate explanations of loneliness by Weiss (1973), the situational theory and the characterological theory were tested in a sample of 112 boys and girls between the ages of 12 to 14. In addition to responding to the Revised UCLA Loneliness Scale, participants completed instruments measuring variables linked to either the situational or the characterological explanations of loneliness. Using hierarchical analysis of sets, the results indicated that the set of variables used to test the situational theory explained more variance in loneliness when entered first (62%) or second (34%) in the analyses than did the characterological set when entered first (33%) or second (5%) in the analysis. The findings suggested that the situational explanation played a more significant role than the characterological explanation in understanding loneliness in early adolescents.

Stokes and Levin (1986) examined relation of network density to loneliness. Network density is an index of the degree to which members of a social network have relationships with one another. In a network of
low density, most network members are unacquainted with one another. In a high density network, network members are highly interconnected. Because men's friendships are group oriented and focused on shared interests and activities, the authors predicted that friends of men would likely be friends of one another; that is, that male social networks would be denser than female social networks. Moreover, to the degree that being part of a group or "gang" is important in alleviating feelings of loneliness for men, the relation of network density to loneliness should be stronger for men than for women.

Two samples were used to explore gender differences. Sample 1 comprised 97 male and 82 female undergraduate students in an introductory psychology course who participated to help fulfil a course requirement. Most of these students were freshmen (58%) or sophomores (23%) who had never married (92%) and who lived at home with their families of origin (83%). Sample 2 was obtained in hopes that it would be more representative of the general population than were the college students in sample 1. Eighty percent of the sample 2 respondents attended evening classes at various community colleges; 20% were recruited from the same introductory psychology classes as sample 1, with the restriction that they be older than 25 years. This sample had a mean age of 29 and consisted of 82 women and 32 men. About half were
single, 33% were married, and 14% were divorced. Forty-three percent lived with a spouse or lover, 5% with a roommate, 35% with their family of origin, and 17% lived alone.

Respondents in both samples completed three instruments:

1. Social network list.
2. Inventory of socially supportive behaviour (ISSB; Barrera, Sandler, & Ramsay, 1981).
3. UCLA Loneliness Scale.

The results from these two studies indicate that social network characteristics are better predictors of perceived loneliness for men than they are for women. In each of three samples, the percentage of variance in loneliness that can be attributed to network characteristics was almost twice as great for men as it was for women. Although sex differences in any one sample were not overwhelming, the consistency of this finding across three independent samples attests to its reliability.

Density was more highly related to loneliness for men than for women in all three samples. This gender difference was not always large, but it was consistently present and was especially pronounced in sample 2 of study 1, after the effect of network size and the percentage of relatives had been controlled for statistically.
The authors concluded, "Men tend to be more group oriented in their friendships than women. Women, on the other hand, have a stronger interests in developing close, dyadic social ties. As a result, it is possible that men and women use different standards for evaluating satisfaction with their current relationships. Dense networks seem to provide a degree of social integration that the more group oriented men may use to evaluate whether he is lonely. Women may focus more on the nature of close, intimate one-to-one relationships when evaluating loneliness.

Rook (1987) studied the effects of social support versus companionship on life stress, loneliness, and evaluations by others. Five studies contrasted the roles of companionship and social support in buffering the effects of life stress, in influencing feelings of loneliness and social satisfaction, and in affecting others' judgement. Study 1 analysed data from a community survey and found that companionship had a main effect on psychological well-being and a buffering effect on minor life stress, whereas social support had only a buffering effect on major life stress. Studies 2,3 and 4 analysed data from two college student samples and a different community survey to evaluate how companionship and social support contributed to relationship satisfaction and feelings of loneliness. The results of these studies indicated that companionship was the strongest predictor of these dimensions of social satisfaction. Study 5 used an experimental design to test the hypothesis that a deficit of
companionship elicit more negative reactions from others than does a deficit of social support. The hypothesis received partial support. Considered together, the results of these studies suggest that companionship plays a more important and more varied role in sustaining emotional well-being than previous studies have acknowledged.

The hypotheses were tested with data from a survey of 1,050 northern California residents conducted in 1977-78 by Fischer (1982). Respondents were selected from 50 communities in countries east and north of San Francisco. Fischer provided evidence that this region is not so distinctive as to limit generalizability from this sample to other populations. The results of this study suggests that, as predicted, social support and companionship make somewhat different contributions to psychological well-being. In addition, the effects of social support appeared to be more complex and conditional than the effects of companionship. The results suggested that having access to others who can provide advice, assistance, and emotional reassurance is most important for people who are confronted by multiple major life stresses. The buffering effect of social support that was observed among the highly stressed respondents is consistent with theoretical perspectives that emphasize the role of social relationships in providing protection from external threats (e.g., Cohen & Mckay, 1984).
The positive association between social support and psychological distress among respondents who experienced lower than average levels of major life stress was unexpected although not unique to this study (Barrera, 1986). For example, a similar pattern was observed at the lowest levels of life stress in several analyses reported by Wilcox (1981). Three interpretations of this positive relation seem plausible. First, these respondents may have suffered from stressors that were not captured by the measure of major life stress and for which they were actively mobilizing support. As Barrera (1986) has noted, positive associations between support and emotional distress that reflect a process of support mobilization need not be viewed as contradicting stress-buffering models. A second possibility is that the psychologically distressed respondents who reported both few major stressful events and high levels of support may have been receiving support for the psychological distress itself. That is, individuals who are the most symptomatic may seek or receive the most social support (Barrera, 1986), regardless of the origins of their distress. A third possibility is that the support provided to these respondents was ineffective, perhaps because support providers were uncertain about how to be helpful (cf. Wortman and Lehman, 1985) or because they judged respondents needs for support to be illegitimate (cf. Gottlieb, 1984). These alternative explanations highlight the fact that
beneficial effects of social support may be contingent upon a variety of contextual factors.

Solomon, Mikulincer, & Hobfoll (1986) examined the effects of social support on loneliness on a sample of 382 Israeli soldiers who developed combat stress reactions (CSR) during the 1982 Israel-Lebanon war were compared with groups of carefully matched controls who did not develop CSR. Lack of social support from officers was found to be related to greater feelings of loneliness and greater likelihood of CSR in soldiers. Lack of social support from buddies was found to be related to greater loneliness. Intensity of battle was also found to be related to greater feelings of loneliness and increased likelihood of CSR.

This line of thinking suggests that poor troop cohesion may result in loneliness. The lonely individual feels socially isolated and lacks someone to turn to. Lonely soldiers feel cut off from the group. They might also feel that they lack the physical protection that a buddy might provide. In additional, their loneliness itself is experienced as stressful, compounding the stress they already feel from combat. This loneliness, in turn may further increase the likelihood of soldiers developing CSR. In contrast, those who feel good troop cohesion would be unlikely to feel lonely and to develop CSR (Dasberg, 1976).

Oskoo Kim (1999), examined mediation effect of social support between ethnic attachment and loneliness in older Korean immigrants.
The sample for this study was selected from a roster of 927 older Korean immigrants who were registered in the Korean American Senior Association (KASA) in a mid-western city. The mean age of the sample was 72.85 years (SD = 6.58) with a range of 60-87. The majority were female (n=110; 63.2%), married (n=103; 59.2%), and had a mean educational level of 7.32 years (SD = 5.12) with a range of 0-26. Residency duration in the United States ranged from 4-40 years (M=14.14, SD=5.33). The majority reported that they could not speak English at all (n=104; 59.8%), whereas only 15 (8.6%) could speak English very or pretty well.

Research instruments included the Revised UCLA Loneliness Scale (RULS), the Ethnic Attachment Questionnaire, and the Revised Social Support Questionnaire (RSSQ). Korean versions of the RULS and RSSQ were prepared using translation and back translation procedures (Chaman & Carter, 1979).

Ethnic attachment had both a direct and an indirect effect on loneliness through emotional and tangible social network size and satisfaction. As expected, older Korean who had stronger ethnic attachment had more emotional and tangible supporters, were more satisfied with their supports, and had a lower level of loneliness. It is possible that older Koreans who have a strong ethnic attachment tend to maintain and develop intimate relationships with Koreans, including
family and non-family members, and receive a greater amount of emotional and tangible support from them. This finding supports those of Dykstra (1990), who found that the greater the amount of emotional and tangible support and the larger the number of network members, the less lonely older adults tended to be. However, the findings regarding emotional network size do not support the previous studies by Keele-Card et al. (1993), who reported that emotional network size was not related to loneliness. The authors concluded: "Intervention studies for enhancing social support to reduce the level of loneliness also may be needed" (p.174).

Demir and Hurol (1999) investigated the relationship between loneliness and marital adjustment in Turkish couples. Some demographic correlates of loneliness and marital adjustment such as gender, age, duration of the marriage, type of marriage, and degree of acquaintance before marriage were also examined. The UCLA Loneliness Scale (Russell, Peplau, Cutrona, 1980) and the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976) were administered to 58 heterosexual married couples. The results showed that loneliness was significantly and negatively correlated with marital adjustment. For the demographic correlates, significant results were as follows: self-selected marriages resulted in lower loneliness scores and higher marital adjustment scores than the
arranged type of marriage, and marital adjustment increased parallel to an increase in the degree of acquaintance before marriage.

Gender Differences in Psychopathology

The focus of gender research has recently begun to shift from documenting the existence and extent of gender differences to exploring the origin of those differences (Eagly, 1995). Numerous theories have been advanced to explain the documented gender differences in emotion, motivation, cognition, and social behaviour. Prevalent in psychology are theories proposing that gender differences arise from and reflect status differences between men and women (e.g., Geis, 1993; Ridgeway & Diekema, 1992), arise from the different social roles that men and women have traditionally assumed (Eagly, 1987), and exist primarily in the context of social interaction (e.g., West & Zimmerman, 1991; Deau & Major, 1987). Indeed, many developmental psychologists argue that to some extent children grow up in gender-segregated separate cultures in which different norms exists for social behaviour. These different norms are than carried into adult social interaction (e.g., Maccoby, 1990; Tannen, 1990; Maltz & Borker, 1982; Hoffman, 1972).

Recently, Cross and Madson (1997) argued that many empirically demonstrated gender differences can be seen as reflecting fundamental differences in independence and interdependence. Specifically, it was
argued that whereas men are relatively more independent, women are relatively more interdependent. Independent and interdependent individuals differ in the extent to which the self is defined as separate from, versus connected to, others (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). "

Gender differences in socialisation have been detected from infancy onward (Shakin, Shakin, & Sternglanz, 1985; Culp, Cook, & Hourley, 1983; Bell & Carver, 1980). Not only are boys and girls socialised differently, but they are often socialised separately. Children begin to be segregated by gender at a very young age and continue to interact in gender-segregated environments for much of childhood (Maccoby, 1988). Indeed there is evidence that both parents and the public school systems encourage gender-typed activities and sex segregation (Lytton & Romney, 1991; Thorne, 1986).

A great deal of evidence supports the premise that girl's socialisation encourages them toward the interdependent tasks of forming and maintaining close relationships. For example, parents emphasise sensitivity to the feelings of others more with girls than with boys (Dunn, Bretherton, & Munn, 1987; Fivush, 1992). Girls social interactions are characterised more by cooperation, intimate friendships, and efforts to maintain interpersonal harmony, whereas boys' interactions are instead more likely to be characterised by demonstrations of dominance and competitiveness (Maccoby, 1990). Finally, girls are more likely to form
pair bonds and report intimacy as an important factor in forming relationships (Broderick & Beltz, 1996; Jones & Costin, 1995; Clark & Bittle, 1992). In sum, girls and boys are socialised differently and often separately; girls are encouraged to emphasise close relationships to a greater extent than boys. Furthermore, in their review of the literature, Cross and Madson (1997) presented a compelling argument that many gender differences in affect, motivation, and cognition may be a reflection of women's greater interdependence, defined by Cross and Madson as a heightened concern with close relationships. For example, in their review of the literature concerning gender differences in affect, they cited evidence that women described interpersonal problems as a source of distress more than did men (Pratt, Golding, Hunter, & Sampson, 1988; Walker, de Vries, & Trevethan, 1987). Linking hypothesised gender differences in interdependence to motivation, Cross and Madson (1997) argued that in comparison with men, women's behaviour was relatively more motivated by the goal of maintaining intimate relationships. They cited evidence that women were more likely to discuss less personal topics such as sports and politics (McFarland & Miller, 1990; Aries & Johnson, 1983; Fox, Gibbs, & Johnson & Dries, 1983; Caldwell & Peplau, 1982; Davidson & Duberman, 1982). Finally, in evaluating gender differences in cognition, Cross and Madson cited evidence that women attended to information related to relationships more than did men (Josephs, Markus, & Tafarodi,
and that men were more attuned to information related to social dominance (e.g., Sidanius, Pratto, & Bobo, 1994; Maccoby, 1990). 

Further, literature and in population culture, women are consistently identified as the more emotional sex (Grossman & Wood, 1993, p.1010). Psychological research on self-reports of emotions has corroborated this idea. Women report more intense experience of emotions than men, more intense expression, and greater comfort with and tendency to seek out emotional experiences (Larsen & Diener, 1987; Balswick & Avertt, 1977; Allen & Maccoun, 1976; Allen & Hamsher, 1974). Typical women are described as emotionally expressive, concerned with their own and other's feeling states, and emotionally labile (Ruble, 1983; Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972). Typical men, in contrast, are believed to be emotionally stable, stoic, and not excitable. Thus, women are attributed greater sensitivity to emotional events. Grossman and Wood's (1993), research provides strong support for the idea that sex differences in emotional intensity derive from sex-differentiated normative pressures that specify that women are more emotionally responsive than men. The sex difference in intensity of emotional experience has been found across the life span, in adolescents as well as middle aged adults (Diener, Sandvik, & Larsen, 1985).

Women's greater emotional responsiveness than men has also emerged in self-reports of specific emotions. For example, in the domain
of positive emotions, women report greater overall warmth, emotional expressiveness, and concern for others than do men (Spence & Helmreich, 1978) as well as higher levels of happiness and life satisfaction (Wood, Rhodes, & Whelan, 1989). With respect to negative emotions, women report higher levels of negative affect and depression than do men (Nolen-Hoeksema, 1987; Gove & Tudor, 1973; Gove, 1972, 1978) as well as greater fear and sadness (Scherer, Walbotlin, & Summerfield, 1986). Reports of anger, however, have not yielded consistent sex differences. Some studies find men report more frequent anger than women (Doyle & Biaggio, 1981; Biaggio, 1980), whereas others have failed to find significant sex differences (Wintre, Polivy, & Murray, 1990; Averill, 1982).

Research focusing on sex differences in loneliness at adolescence has been limited. Most studies of sex differences in loneliness have examined only quantitative differences in loneliness. Quantitative differences refer to sex differences in the magnitude of loneliness on various indices. Few studies have examined sex differences in the correlates of loneliness.

Several studies using somewhat different indices of loneliness, have addressed the issue of quantitative sex differences in loneliness among college students. Excellent reviews of sex differences in loneliness experience of college students have been given by Schultz & Moore (1986) and Borys & Perlman (1985).
With regard to studies using the UCLA Scale, Borys & Perlman (1985) after reviewing 28 studies emphasised that only a few (4 of 28) showed a statistically significant gender affect in all of these cases, however, males had higher loneliness scores. A number of studies, using various versions of the UCLA Loneliness Scale, reported no gender differences (Williams & Solano, 1983; Berg & Pepalu, 1982; Jones, Hobbs, & Hockenberg, 1982; Cheek & Busch, 1981; Hojat, 1981; Jones, Freeman, & Goswick, 1981; Maroldo, 1981; McCormack & Kahn, 1980; Perlman, Gerson, & Spinner, 1978; Russell, Peplau, & Ferguson, 1978).

Koenig, Isaacs, & Schwartz (1994) studied sex differences in adolescent depression and loneliness; why are boys lonelier if girls are more depressed? The author's concluded that depression and loneliness are two characteristics problems of adolescence. However, beginning in adolescence, girls experience depression at twice the rate of boys. Since depression and loneliness are highly correlated, it is surprising that girls are not also lonelier than boys. In fact, when gender differences do emerge, it is boys, not girls, who tend to be lonelier. The authors examined two possible explanations for this paradox: (1) a gender-specific response bias, characterised by a denial of emotional distress for boys that differentially affects reports of depression versus loneliness, and (2) gender differences in the relationship between depression and loneliness, whereby depression has a greater association with loneliness for boys than girls. Support was obtained for explanation two. Although
there were no gender differences in loneliness among the non-depressed or the highly depressed, mildly depressed boys were significantly lonelier than mildly depressed girls and just as lonely as highly depressed boys. This depression/loneliness distinction for mildly depressed girls may be magnified by the large number of female depressives (65% in this sample) who fall into the mildly depressed range. Girls were also more likely than boys to report turning to their friends when feeling depressed. The authors made an attempt to discuss these patterns in terms of coping processes that may subserve the distinction between depression and loneliness.

Schultz and Moore (1986) have emphasised that the revised UCLA Loneliness Scale has certain psychometric advantages over its predecessor which may augment its sensitivity to gender differences. On the revised UCLA Loneliness Scale, Russell, Peplau, & Cutrona (1980); Moore, Schultz, & Ellenberg (1982); Wheeler, Reis, & Nezlek (1983); and Dufton (1984) found males to be lonelier than females. Wheeler, Reis, & Nezlek (1983) found the mean loneliness score for 53 female and 43 male university students to be 41.7 and 45.8 (F:1, 94=3.0, p<.10). Russell et al. (1980) also found males to be more lonely (p<.001) in their study 1 but suspected a sampling bias because sex differences are not usually found. They considered their data from study 2, showing no sex differences, to be normative. Wheeler et al. (1983) concluded that the marginal sex difference is not inconsistent with previous results.
The purpose of another study (Williams, 1983) was to investigate the phenomenon of loneliness in delinquent adolescents with regard to types of delinquency offences committed, demographic characteristics, and personality characteristics in the areas of interpersonal needs for inclusion, control, and affection. The demographic variables examined were age, sex, race, family rank or birth order, family income level, religion, and geographic locale. A sample of 98 adolescents ranging in age from 12 to 18 was obtained from juvenile detention facilities in three metropolitan areas in United States. The types of delinquency offences were categorised as burglary, runaway, drugs, assault and incorrigible.

Subjects were asked to complete the loneliness questionnaire as a self reported measure of loneliness. The loneliness questionnaire consisted of 14 items and utilised a Likert-type scale for responses to 14 items. The score possibilities ranged from 14 to 84, with higher scores equated with high amounts of loneliness and lower scores with low amounts of loneliness. A Spearman rank - correlation coefficient of .87 was found between loneliness questionnaire and original UCLA Loneliness Scale when administered to 10 pilot study subjects ranging in age from 10 to 18 years. This was done to test the concurrent validity of the Loneliness Questionnaire. Subjects also completed the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation - Behaviour (FIRO-B) Questionnaire, which measured interpersonal needs for inclusion, control, and affection. The results revealed no significant differences in loneliness with regard to
any of the demographic variables when the effect of each (e.g., age, sex, income, birth order, religion) was considered alone. Sex and age in relationship to interpersonal needs for control, however, were associated with loneliness; for example males with medium needs to express control over others had higher mean scores on loneliness than the females with medium needs to express control over others.

A few studies also provide some evidence of sex differences among college students in the qualitative aspects of loneliness, that is, differences in the correlates of loneliness. Several studies suggest that there are sex differences in the generalizability of loneliness, in contributing factors to loneliness, and in the psychological consequences of contributing factors to loneliness, and in the psychological consequences of loneliness. Jones, Freeman, & Goswick (1981) found gender differences in the experience and effects of loneliness, with lonely men being particularly likely to perceive themselves negatively. Corty & Young (1981) found, for male undergraduates only, that loneliness and the amount of social contact were significantly correlated. Schill, Troves, & Ramaanaiah (1980) reported a gender by locus of control interaction with male external locus of control subjects being least affected, and male internal locus of control subjects being most affected by loneliness. Berg & Peplau (1982) found loneliness to be significantly and inversely related to self-disclosure for women, but not for men. Two studies, however, failed to find overall gender differences among college students.

Stokes & Levin (1986) examined gender differences in predicting loneliness from measures of social network structure and a measure of perceived social support. The results showed that social network characteristics, especially density, were consistently better predictors of perceived loneliness for men than for women. Study 1 used the traditional measure of network density in which the number of relationships among network members was determined. Study 2 used a newly developed index of density that assessed the extent of closeness of relationships between pairs of network members. Uniformly, male subjects with more highly interconnected, cohesive sets of friends reported themselves to be less lonely, whereas density had little relation to loneliness in female subjects. These results were discussed as possibly indicating that men and women use different standards in evaluating whether they are lonely. The authors suggested that men may use more group-oriented criteria in evaluating loneliness, whereas women focus more on the qualities of dyadic relationships.

The results from these two studies indicate that social network characteristics are better predictors of perceived loneliness for men than
they are for women. In each of three samples, the percentage of variance in loneliness that can be attributed to network characteristics was almost twice as great for men as it was for women. Although sex differences in any one sample were not overwhelming, the consistency of this finding across three independent samples attests to its reliability.

Men reported higher levels of loneliness than did women in all three samples, and in two samples the difference reached statistical significance. Where gender differences in scores on the UCLA Loneliness Scale have been found in previous research, male respondents have scored higher than female respondents (Borys & Perlman, 1985).

Density was more highly related to loneliness for men than for women in all three samples. This gender difference was not always large, but it was consistently present and was especially pronounced in Sample 2 of study 1, after the effects of network size and the percentage of relatives had been controlled for statistically.

Inderbitzen-Pisaruk, Clark, & Solano (1992) examined correlates of loneliness in mid adolescence. The purpose of the study was two fold. First, the study was designed to assess the predictive relationship between variables that have been previously related to adult loneliness (attributions, self-esteem, social anxiety, self-consciousness, fear of negative evaluation, and social skills) and adolescent perceptions of loneliness. It was hypothesised that the best set of predictors would include variables from each of the following three groups: cognitions (i.e., self-esteem, perceptions
of physical maturity and attributional style), social skills (i.e., self-perceptions and perceptions by a significant other), and social anxiety (i.e., interactional social anxiety, self consciousness, and fear of negative evaluation). Second, the study sought to determine if differential predictors of loneliness existed for males and females. Based on the different needs and structures of male and female friendships, it was hypothesised that the patterns of loneliness predictors for males and females would differ.

Subjects were 186 (107 males and 79 females) ninth-grade students. The mean age was 14.67 (SD=.69) with a range of 13-16. The students were recruited from a local high school in the south east. The revised UCLA Loneliness Scale (Russell et al., 1980; UCLA) was used to assess the student's level of loneliness. The Adolescent Attribution Assessment Scale was designed for this study to assess the attribution dimensions of control and stability.

The results from this study suggest that some factors commonly related to loneliness in adults are related to adolescent loneliness. Loneliness was significantly related to low self-esteem. Lonely adults are also more likely to report low self-esteem than non-lonely adults (Jones et al., 1981). Adolescent loneliness was also associated with high social anxiety, which is consistent with the finding that lonely adults experience more social anxiety than non-lonely adults and late adolescents (Jones et al., 1981). The self-report of social skills and the teacher's ratings of social skills were both significantly related to adolescent loneliness. Both social skills
scales were developed to assess the presence of communication skills, empathy, the ability to get along with others, and the ability to function within groups. Lonely adolescents were more likely to perceive themselves as lacking in these social skills and they were more likely to be perceived by teachers as having social skill deficits than adolescents who were not lonely. Researchers have found significant relationships between adults loneliness and social skills on both self-reported social skills measures (Jones et al., 1981; Peplau et al., 1979), and social skills ratings provided by others (Jones et al., 1981). Although loneliness was related to self-esteem, social skills, and social anxiety, there is still some question about the causal relationship between these variables, how self-esteem, poor social skills, and high social anxiety may be both antecedents and outcomes of loneliness?

The authors concluded that male and female adolescents do not report different levels of loneliness. Nevertheless, those factors that contribute to adolescent loneliness differ for males and females. Adolescents loneliness is related to a combination of cognitive and behavioural variables rather than any one single factor. This combination includes self-esteem, causal attributions, social skills, and social anxiety. Adolescent loneliness shares some characteristics associated with adults loneliness. Nevertheless, understanding loneliness in adolescents attending middle or high schools will necessitate incorporating information about their intimacy needs and changing social world.
Overview

The above mentioned review of the relevant researches in the recent past reveals the following important aspects concerning research in the area of loneliness:

1. Most researches of response patterns to loneliness have focused primarily on adults. Relatively fewer researchers have examined how younger subjects, especially adolescents, respond to loneliness, although it is important to study this group for several reasons. Moreover, the researches in the context of adolescent loneliness suffers from various methodological flaws. One of the most significant flaws is that the variables have been treated or examined in isolation to ascertain their relevance.

2. Although research indicates that loneliness among adolescence is a pervasive problem, it remains unclear as to what specific point in adolescence loneliness is greatest.

3. The researchers in the area of loneliness have failed to take cognizance of perceived stress, depression and anger as correlates of loneliness. Moreover, past research with adolescence, despite its merit, has resulted with conflicting findings concerning the role of locus of control.
4. It is possible that the one reason for pervasive loneliness in adolescence is due in part to the coping strategies they are using. Unfortunately, there is paucity of research on coping with loneliness in adolescence.

The resent study has been designed in two phases:

Phase I

The main objectives of phase I are:

1. To examine the relationship of loneliness with perceived stress.
2. To examine the relationship of loneliness with state and trait anger.
3. To examine the relationship of loneliness with social support.
4. To examine the relationship of loneliness with locus of control.
5. To examine the relationship of loneliness with depressive tendencies.

Hypotheses

On the basis of literature in different areas of psychopathology, the following hypothesis are formulated:

1. It is hypothesised that loneliness will be positively related to perceived stress.

2. It is hypothesised that loneliness will be more markedly related (positively) to trait anger than state anger.
3. It is hypothesised that loneliness would be negatively related to different indices of social support.

4. It is hypothesised that person's with external orientation will be more lonely than person's with internal orientation.

5. It is hypothesised that loneliness would be positively related to depressive tendencies.

**Phase II**

In the phase II of the present study, coping with loneliness would be examined in relation to important parameter's revealed by phase I of the study. The present study will not use any standardised questionnaire on coping. Instead, following Rubenstein & Shaver (1980) the 300 respondents would be asked to endorse as many responses as applicable to the statement, "when I am lonely I usually ......"

The subjects would be provided a list of 25 alternative ways of coping with loneliness. It is hypothesised that male and female adolescents would employ different coping strategies to deal with loneliness.