

The association between mental status, personality traits, and discrepancy in social isolation and perceived loneliness among community dwellers

Kumi Watanabe-Miura^{1,2}, Takuya Sekiguchi², Mihoko Otake-Matsuura^{2*}

¹ Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS), Kojimachi, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 102-0083, Japan

² RIKEN Center for Advanced Intelligence Project, Nihonbashi, Tokyo 103-0027, Japan

Address for correspondence:

Mihoko Otake-Matsuura, PhD, Team leader,

RIKEN Center for Advanced Intelligence Project, Nihonbashi, Tokyo 103-0027, Japan

E-mail: mihoko.otake@riken.jp

Abstract

Objectives

To examine the factors associated with social asymmetry, which refers to the discrepancy between actual social isolation and perceived loneliness, focusing on an individual's mental status and personality traits.

Methods

This study introduced a cross-sectional study design that was utilizing the data from the University of Michigan Health and Retirement Study (HRS) from waves during 2014 and 2016. The participants were community dwellers aged 50 years and older. The outcome measurement, social asymmetry, was defined as the discrepancy between social isolation according to six criteria and loneliness as assessed by the three-item version of the Revised UCLA Loneliness Scale. Multinomial logistic regression models were conducted to examine the factors associated with social asymmetry.

Results

Fewer depressive symptoms and higher extraversion were consistently associated with social asymmetry, compared with both isolation and loneliness. Participants with higher neuroticism were likely to be lonely even in the absence of isolation, whereas those with lower neuroticism were likely to not be lonely even with social isolation. In addition, participants with fewer depressive symptoms, lower neuroticism, and higher extraversion were more likely to be not lonely even with social isolation, compared with lonely even in the absence of isolation.

Conclusions

Mental status and personality traits may closely relate to social asymmetry. This study suggests that incorporating social, mental, and psychological factors may be essential for interventions in social isolation and loneliness.

Keywords

Social isolation; loneliness, social asymmetry; personality traits; depressive symptoms

Highlights

Social asymmetry is a phenomenon reflecting the discrepancy between actual social isolation and perceived loneliness. This gap between situation and emotion may be associated with health risks. However, little information is available on social asymmetry, and its related factors remain poorly understood. Thus, we examined the factors associated with social asymmetry using data from the University of Michigan Health and Retirement Study (HRS). We hypothesized that both mental status and personality traits play a role in social asymmetry due to their effect on individuals' perceptions.

As a result, depressive symptoms, neuroticism, and extraversion, as well as demographic and socioeconomic status were consistently associated with both social asymmetry outcomes: 1) only social isolation (without loneliness) and 2) only loneliness (without social isolation). This result implies that mental and psychological factors were associated with social asymmetry in a complex manner and that incorporating social, mental, and psychotherapeutic aspects in social interventions may be essential for future intervention strategies for social isolation and loneliness.

1. Introduction

Social isolation is a serious public concern. A National Health and Aging Trends Study found that 7.7 million older adults living in the community (24%) were socially isolated in the United States.¹ Although the number of people with social isolation or loneliness is further increasing during the COVID-19 pandemic,²⁻⁶ there is a great deal of concern about the physical and mental health

implications of social isolation and loneliness.^{2,7-10}

Numerous empirical studies have revealed that social isolation and loneliness affect our health. Previous studies have reported the link to several health outcomes, such as depression and anxiety,¹¹⁻¹³ mortality,¹⁴⁻¹⁵ and the onset of dementia.¹⁶⁻¹⁷ These studies are based on a variety of definitions and measurements of social isolation and loneliness. Social isolation often refers to objective isolation, which is a limited social relationship in structural (social networks) or functional (social support) facets.¹⁴ On the other hand, loneliness is generally assessed as subjective isolation that refers to situations in which an individual feels uncomfortable or has an unacceptable lack of social connectivity.¹⁸ Although social isolation and loneliness can co-occur, these are different concepts. Some people may not feel loneliness even during social isolation or may feel loneliness in the absence of social isolation. These discrepancies between social isolation and loneliness have been termed social asymmetry.¹⁹

There is a paucity of studies on social asymmetry. Victor et al. classified social groups into four types of combination of social isolation and loneliness using data of the 1950s–1960s.²⁰ However, the characteristics and factors associated with the classification of discrepancy have not been discussed. Other prior studies have reported relationships between the social asymmetry types and health outcomes. A study using the Irish Longitudinal Study on Ageing (TILDA) and the English Longitudinal Study of Aging (ELSA) categorized social asymmetry into “Concordantly Lonely & Isolated,” “Discordant: Robust to Loneliness,” and “Discordant: Susceptible to Loneliness.”¹⁹ The “Discordant:

Robust to Loneliness” group that felt less lonely in the face of social isolation outperformed the “Discordant: Susceptible to Loneliness” group in all cognitive function tests. Moreover, a study from the ELSA classified six types based on living arrangement, loneliness, and social isolation using cluster analysis.²¹ Groups with either social isolation or loneliness were associated with health outcomes, including activities of daily living, subjective health status, chronic illness, and mental health. Another study using data from the Canadian Longitudinal Study of Aging clarified the four categories of combinations of social isolation and loneliness and found relationships with social support and psychological stress.²²

To summarize, some prior studies have suggested that the social asymmetry types, as well as social isolation and loneliness alone, may be key factors for various health risks. Although there is still limited literature on social asymmetry, more evidence is required to be accumulated for the development of the intervention in social isolation and loneliness. Specifically, understanding the factors associated with social asymmetry has clinical usefulness because these factors possibly buffer the effects of interventions or may be effective in intervening themselves on social isolation and loneliness. We hypothesized that mental status and personality traits are associated with social asymmetry due to their effect on individuals’ perceptions, which create gaps in their actual situation of social isolation and perception of loneliness. While little is available on social asymmetry, especially the role of personality traits, our study may provide new empirical knowledge and is expected to offer new insight into mental health and social activity interventions.

Therefore, this study aimed to examine the comprehensive factors associated with social asymmetry, especially focusing on mental status and personality traits.

2. Materials and methods

2.1 Study design and setting

This study introduced a cross-sectional study design that utilized data from the University of Michigan Health and Retirement Study (HRS), which is a biennial longitudinal study with a nationally representative sample. The HRS includes noninstitutionalized adults over the age of 50 and their spouses selected via multistage probability sampling.

We analyzed the RAND HRS Longitudinal File²³ and linked RAND files with HRS Leave Behind Questionnaires (LBQ)²⁴ which include our interest variables, such as loneliness and social isolation. The LBQ introduced a rotating random subsample of the longitudinal panel. A random subsample of 50% of the HRS participants (Subsample A) responded in the relevant year, and the other 50% (Subsample B) responded in the next survey. Thus, we combined the 2014 (Subsample A) and 2016 (Subsample B) waves to obtain the whole sample. Information about educational attainment and institutionalized status was obtained from the Cross-Wave Tracker File.

The participants aged 50 and older, noninstitutionalized adults, and those who answered the items related to demographics (age, sex, educational attainment, and race) were included in the analysis. Participants who were missing all indicators on the LBQ, including loneliness, social isolation indicators,

and personality traits, were excluded. First, 18,899 participants who were aged over 50 and answered the LBQ (who were provided LBQ weight) during the 2014 or 2016 waves were initially enrolled. After participants were excluded due to institutionalization, we had 17,948 total participants, and ultimately, 13,094 participants with no missing values regarding demographics were included in the final analysis.

2.2 Measurement

2.2.1 Social isolation

Although a variety of definitions and measurements for social isolation exist with no golden standard, we used criteria with reference to previous research in the ELSA and the HRS.²⁵⁻²⁸ We assigned one point for each of six criteria: (i) lived alone, (ii) unmarried, (iii)-(v) had less than monthly contact with family, children, and friend, and (vi) had less than monthly participation in any social groups or organizations. The score ranged from 0–6, and a higher rating corresponded to severe isolation. Given the prevalence of social isolation,¹ the top quartile of the scores (score ≥ 3) was treated as socially isolated.

2.2.2 Loneliness

Loneliness was measured using a three-item version of the Revised UCLA Loneliness Scale.²⁹ This scale assesses the frequency of feeling loneliness: (i) lacking companionship, (ii) feeling left out, and (iii) being isolated from others. Each question has three options, including “never or hardly ever,” “some of the time,” or “often,” with 1–3 points given for these responses. The total score

ranged from 3–9 by summing the scores for each item. A high score corresponds to severe loneliness. Considering the prevalence of loneliness,³⁰ the top quartile of the scores (score ≥ 6) was treated as loneliness.

2.2.3 Social asymmetry

The social asymmetry, which is our main interest, were represented by a matrix between social isolation and loneliness. Based on the categorization of social isolation and loneliness divided into quintiles as described earlier, we classified the combination of social isolation and loneliness into four categories: (i) No social isolation and loneliness (No SL), (ii) Only social isolation (Only S), (iii) Only loneliness (Only L), and (vi) Social isolation and loneliness (SL). In those groups, we defined “Only S” and “Only L,” which show the discrepancy between social isolation and loneliness, as social asymmetry

2.3 Independent variables

2.3.1 Demographics

Age was treated as a continuous variable. Sex was categorized as female and male. Education was dichotomized into high school or less and college or above. Race was divided into White/Caucasian, Black or African American, and other. Household income, which is the sum of the income of respondents and their spouses or partners, was treated as continuous (\$1000/unit). Medical conditions were divided into yes (has) or no (does not have) for each disease status: diabetes, stroke, cancer (excluding skin cancer), and heart disease. IADL was measured by five items assessing any difficulty with preparing a meal, making phone calls,

taking medications, paying the bills and keeping track of expenses, and shopping. Each question has several response options, including “yes,” “no,” “can’t do,” and “don’t do.” Participants who reported difficulties with at least one item (i.e., answered “yes” or “can’t do”) were defined as dependent.

2.3.2 Mental and psychological status

Mental health status was measured by the eight-item short version of the Center for Epidemiologic Studies-Depression Scale (CES-D-8).³¹ This scale consists of eight items that assess experiencing depressive symptoms for much of the time during the past week (e.g., felt depressed, felt everything was an effort, and felt sleep was restless). Each item was recorded as yes or no and the total score ranged from 0–8, with high scores indicating severe depressive symptoms. The traditional broadly used cut-off for the CES-D 8 was a score of ≥ 3 . However, previous work has suggested using a more conservative cut-off for the CES-D in the older population,³² and data in the HRS showed that a cut-off of ≥ 4 for the CES-D-8 may be equivalent to a cut-off of 16 for the original CES-D (20-item).³³ Thus, we introduced a cut-off of ≥ 4 and dichotomized scores into cases of depression syndrome (≥ 4) or no depression syndrome. Neuroticism and extroversion from among the Big 5 Personality traits were measured by the items of the Midlife Development Inventory Personality Scales.³⁴ Considering the multicollinearity that shows strong correlations with medium or large correlation coefficients among personality domains in these data, this study introduced the neuroticism and extraversion domains that were related to social isolation and loneliness in a previous study³⁵ as personality factors. Neuroticism is the

personality trait that describes negative affect, such as nervousness, moodiness, and temperament.³⁶ Extraversion is a personality trait that describes active people with sociable, talkative, and assertive natures.³⁷

2.4 Analysis

This study examined the comprehensive factors associated with social asymmetry, with a particular focus on mental status and personality traits.

First, participants were assigned to one of the four groups based on the classification of social isolation and loneliness. Then, a multinomial logistic regression model was utilized to determine the factors related to the social asymmetry groups; “Only S” (do not feel lonely even in social isolation) and “Only L” (feel lonely in the absence of social isolation) compared with “SL” (social isolation and loneliness). Subsequently, we examined the differences between “Only S” and “Only L” in the model with “Only L” set as the reference.

As a supplementary analysis, we applied a multinomial logistic regression model utilizing a top-10%tile cut-off threshold for social isolation and loneliness in relation to social asymmetry, meaning a greater focus on severe social isolation and loneliness.

Missing data in the multinomial logistic regression model were imputed by multiple imputations with the fully conditional specification method. We created five imputed datasets and integrated each result of the analysis.

The level of significance was set at 0.05. All statistical tests were performed using SAS version 9.4.

Results

Table 1 shows the participants' demographic characteristics by the social isolation and loneliness categories. The results showed that the groups with social isolation ("Only S" and "SL") involved older participants compared with those without isolation. The groups with social isolation, loneliness, or both had higher proportions of females than the "No SL" group. The "SL" group had the highest prevalence of depressive symptoms and IADL dependence.

Table 2 describes the results of multinomial logistic regression analysis for the combination of social isolation and loneliness, with the "SL" group set as the reference. Depressive symptoms and personality traits were closely associated with all three groups. Participants with a less depressive tendency and higher extraversion were more likely to be in social asymmetry groups than "SL." Neuroticism was associated with social asymmetry as well; however, the direction of the association differed. While higher neuroticism was likely to be "Only L," lower neuroticism was likely to be "Only S."

Demographic factors, including age and higher household income, were also consistently related to social asymmetry. While being younger was more likely to be "Only L," being older was more likely to be "Only S" than "SL." In addition, lower educational attainment had a higher likelihood of being "Only S," and history of cancer had a higher likelihood of being "Only L."

Table 3 describes the results of multinomial logistic regression analysis with the "Only L" group set as the reference to determine the differences in characteristics among the "Only S" and "Only L" groups. Participants with being older, being female, lower educational attainment, lower income, lower

depressive symptoms, lower neuroticism, and higher extraversion were more likely to be “Only S” than “Only L.”

Supplementary Tables 1 and 2 describe the models, focusing on severe social isolation and loneliness utilizing top 10%tile cut off. In the model with the “SL” group set as the reference (Supplementary Table 1), the significance of depressive tendency and neuroticism remained for the “Only S” group, consistent with Table 2; however, an association between personality traits and “Only L” was not observed. In the model with the “Only L” group set as the reference (Supplementary Table 2), participants with lower depressive tendency and lower neuroticism were still likely to be “Only S” than “Only L” while extraversion was not associated with.

4. Discussion

Although social isolation and loneliness are important and urgent public health issues, the factors associated with social asymmetry, which refers to the gap between the actual situation of social isolation and feeling lonely, have remained unknown. To the best of our knowledge, the current study is the first to examine comprehensive factors related to social asymmetry with a focus on the roles of mental status and personality traits using large-scale data. While previous studies have reported the factors associated with social isolation and loneliness alone^{1, 38-40} our findings may add new knowledge and insight into social isolation and loneliness prevention by directing a spotlight on social symmetry as follows:

First, depressive symptoms and personality traits were consistently associated with both social asymmetry groups. While social isolation may closely

be related to situational loneliness caused by environmental factors, internal loneliness—the perception of being alone that makes a person lonely—is influenced by psychological factors such as mental distress and personality traits.⁴¹ Although the association between mental health and social isolation and loneliness is well established,^{11-13, 42} our work added that mental health is associated with social asymmetry, as are loneliness and social isolation individually. Further, the result showed that the personality traits, including neuroticism and extraversion, were related to social asymmetry.

To summarize the results regarding personality traits, higher extraversion was associated with two social asymmetry groups: “Only S” and “Only L.” Given that the extraversion is a personality trait that elicits individuals’ activeness in terms of a sociable, talkative, and assertive nature,³⁷ the groups with either social isolation or loneliness may tend to be more extroverted than the combination social isolation–loneliness group.

Interestingly, the direction of the association between neuroticism and the two social asymmetry groups differed; higher neuroticism was associated with “Only L,” and lower neuroticism was associated with “Only S.” Furthermore, our model with set “Only L” as reference suggested that “Only S” had significantly higher extraversion compared with “Only L” even though “Only S” has limited social interaction.

Neuroticism and extraversion are personality traits that may be closely associated with stress reactivity and resilience in daily life. A prior study suggested that people with higher neuroticism may experience more event-related distress and have greater stress-reactivity than those with lower

neuroticism.⁴³ Another study reported that higher neuroticism and lower extraversion were related to worse adaptation to the COVID-19 lockdown,⁴⁴ which is a situation similar to social isolation. Considering those reports, our result implies that the “Only S” group, which does not feel lonely in an isolated situation, may feel less loneliness because of lower stress-reactivity via lower neuroticism, while for the “Only L” group, the situation is reversed. In addition, people with higher extraversion may be resistant to stressful situations.⁴⁵ Significantly higher extraversion in the “Only S” group compared with the “Only L” group might help these individuals cope with loneliness by facilitating their resistance to stressful situations, such as social isolation in this case. In summary, one possible hypothesis is that personality may be associated with one’s perception of isolation via resistance and stress reactivity and may sometimes create a discrepancy between the actual situation and perception of isolation.

It should also be noted that our supplementary analysis focusing on severe social isolation and loneliness showed that personality traits were not significantly associated with “Only L,” which is the group with severe loneliness despite the absence of severe isolation. Rather than personality traits, gender, household income, depressive symptoms, and cancer history were associated with “Only L,” although neuroticism was consistently associated with “Only S.” This result implies that socio-demographic factors, physical and mental health status rather than personality traits may be closely related to “Only L” in the case of severe loneliness without severe social isolation.

In addition to mental status and personality traits, demographic and socio-economic factors, including age, educational attainment, household income, and

history of disease were also associated with social asymmetry. In those results, “Only S” which is without loneliness tended to be older and had lower educational attainment compared with “SL” which is a combination of high risk of social isolation and loneliness. This result seems to be in the opposite direction of the association with the prior studies which reported that being older and having lower educational attainment were risk factors for loneliness alone.⁴⁶ However, the work by Schoenmakers et al, which examined the ways of coping in various situations where loneliness occurs, suggested that the regulative coping for loneliness—a coping path by lowering expectations about their relationships—may be more often in people who are older and with low educational attainment.⁴⁷ Given this report, our result can be explained as follows: people who are older and have lower educational attainment might adjust their aspirations even during social isolation, whereas other people tend to try to remove the stressor by increasing social contacts. Future studies are needed to accumulate evidence on the direction of the association between demographic and socio-economic factors, including age and educational attainment, and social asymmetry.

From the perspective of social intervention, this study has strong implications for isolation and loneliness prevention. In recent years, much attention has been focused on interventions for social isolation and loneliness. According to comprehensive reviews,⁴⁸⁻⁵⁰ many trials have emphasized social contacts, and most of them have intervened in a single way (e.g., increase social contact, social skill training). Considering our results, social involvement intervention may help improve individuals’ social isolation and situational

loneliness; however, intervention in a single way could not address social asymmetry, which was associated with mental status and personality traits in a complex manner. Thus, this study implies that incorporating social, mental, and psychotherapeutic aspects in social interventions, such as a combination of social involvement and cognitive-behavioral interventions, may be essential for future intervention strategies.

The strength of the current study included examining the factors related to social asymmetry using large-scale data with comprehensive variables including mental health and personality traits, as the strengths of the HRS implied introducing various indicators, including socio-economic, physical, mental, and psychological factors. The limitations of this study should also be noted. First, our results could not address the causal relationship between variables and longitudinal changes. The factors related to social asymmetry in this study, such as depressive symptoms, can be bidirectionally linked to social isolation and loneliness. Second, the results were based on self-administered questionnaires. Self-reported bias, such as feelings of loneliness being influenced by the emotions at the time of completing the questionnaire, cannot be ruled out. Third, differences in evaluation between the clinical evaluation and self-reported indicators are possible in terms of the mental and psychological factors, including depressive symptoms, loneliness, and personality traits. Based on these limitations, future studies are expected to accumulate more evidence on social asymmetry.

5. Conclusions

The current study examined the association between mental status, personality traits, and social asymmetry among community-dwellers using the HRS dataset. As we hypothesized, depressive symptoms and personality traits were consistently associated with social asymmetry. The results indicated the possibility that mental status and personality traits are closely involved in creating gaps between social isolation and perceived loneliness. Our findings provided implications for social interventions, indicating that social, mental, and psychotherapeutic aspects may be essential for intervention. As this study has its set of limitations, future studies are expected to delve deeper into the mechanism of social asymmetry.

Reference

1. Cudjoe, T., Roth, D. L., Szanton, S. L., Wolff, J. L., Boyd, C. M., & Thorpe, R. J. (2020). The Epidemiology of Social Isolation: National Health and Aging Trends Study. *The journals of gerontology. Series B, Psychological sciences and social sciences*, 75(1), 107–113. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gby037>
2. Murayama, H., Okubo, R., & Tabuchi, T. (2021). Increase in Social Isolation during the COVID-19 Pandemic and Its Association with Mental Health: Findings from the JACSIS 2020 Study. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 18(16), 8238. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18168238>
3. O'Sullivan, R., Burns, A., Leavey, G., Leroi, I., Burholt, V., Lubben, J., Holt-Lunstad, J., Victor, C., Lawlor, B., Vilar-Compte, M., Perissinotto, C. M., Tully, M. A., Sullivan, M. P., Rosato, M., Power, J. M., Tiilikainen, E., &

- Prohaska, T. R. (2021). Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Loneliness and Social Isolation: A Multi-Country Study. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 18(19), 9982. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18199982>
4. Bu, F., Steptoe, A., & Fancourt, D. (2020). Who is lonely in lockdown? Cross-cohort analyses of predictors of loneliness before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Public health*, 186, 31–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2020.06.036>
5. Elran-Barak, R., & Mozeikov, M. (2020). One Month into the Reinforcement of Social Distancing due to the COVID-19 Outbreak: Subjective Health, Health Behaviors, and Loneliness among People with Chronic Medical Conditions. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 17(15), 5403. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17155403>
6. Ausín, B., González-Sanguino, C., Castellanos, M. Á., & Muñoz, M. (2021). Gender-related differences in the psychological impact of confinement as a consequence of COVID-19 in Spain. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 30(1), 29-38.
7. Sepúlveda-Loyola, W., Rodríguez-Sánchez, I., Pérez-Rodríguez, P., Ganz, F., Torralba, R., Oliveira, D. V., & Rodríguez-Mañas, L. (2020). Impact of Social Isolation Due to COVID-19 on Health in Older People: Mental and Physical Effects and Recommendations. *The journal of nutrition, health & aging*, 24(9), 938–947. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12603-020-1469-2>
8. Pancani, L., Marinucci, M., Aureli, N., & Riva, P. (2021). Forced Social Isolation and Mental Health: A Study on 1,006 Italians Under COVID-19 Lockdown. *Frontiers in psychology*, 12, 663799.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.663799>

9. Kim, H. H., & Jung, J. H. (2021). Social Isolation and Psychological Distress During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Cross-National Analysis. *The Gerontologist*, 61(1), 103–113. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gnaa168>
10. Robb, C. E., De Jager, C. A., Ahmadi-Abhari, S., Giannakopoulou, P., Udeh-Momoh, C., McKeand, J., ... & Middleton, L. (2020). Associations of social isolation with anxiety and depression during the early COVID-19 pandemic: a survey of older adults in London, UK. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 991.
11. Taylor, H. O., Taylor, R. J., Nguyen, A. W., & Chatters, L. (2018). Social isolation, depression, and psychological distress among older adults. *Journal of aging and health*, 30(2), 229-246.
12. Domènech-Abella, J., Lara, E., Rubio-Valera, M., Olaya, B., Moneta, M. V., Rico-Uribe, L. A., ... & Haro, J. M. (2017). Loneliness and depression in the elderly: the role of social network. *Social psychiatry and psychiatric epidemiology*, 52(4), 381-390.
13. Beutel, M. E., Klein, E. M., Brähler, E., Reiner, I., Jünger, C., Michal, M., ... & Tibubos, A. N. (2017). Loneliness in the general population: prevalence, determinants and relations to mental health. *BMC psychiatry*, 17(1), 1-7.
14. Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B., & Layton, J. B. (2010). Social relationships and mortality risk: a meta-analytic review. *PLoS medicine*, 7(7), e1000316.
15. Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B., Baker, M., Harris, T., & Stephenson, D. (2015). Loneliness and social isolation as risk factors for mortality: a meta-analytic review. *Perspectives on psychological science*, 10(2), 227-237.
16. Fratiglioni, L., Paillard-Borg, S., & Winblad, B. (2004). An active and socially

integrated lifestyle in late life might protect against dementia. *The Lancet Neurology*, 3(6), 343-353.

17. 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(2), 234-240.
18. Gierveld, J. (1998). A review of loneliness: Concept and definitions, determinants and consequences. *Reviews in Clinical Gerontology*, 8(1), 73-80. doi:10.1017/S0959259898008090
19. McHugh, J. E., Kenny, R. A., Lawlor, B. A., Steptoe, A., & Kee, F. (2017). The discrepancy between social isolation and loneliness as a clinically meaningful metric: findings from the Irish and English longitudinal studies of ageing (TILDA and ELSA). *International journal of geriatric psychiatry*, 32(6), 664–674. <https://doi.org/10.1002/gps.4509>
20. Victor, C., Scambler, S., & Bond, J. (2008). *The social world of older people: Understanding loneliness and social isolation in later life: Understanding loneliness and social isolation in later life*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
21. Smith, K., & Victor, C. (2019). Typologies of loneliness, living alone and social isolation, and their associations with physical and mental health. *Ageing and Society*, 39(8), 1709-1730. doi:10.1017/S0144686X18000132
22. Menec VH, Newall NE, Mackenzie CS, Shooshtari S, Nowicki S (2020) Examining social isolation and loneliness in combination in relation to social support and psychological distress using Canadian Longitudinal Study of Aging (CLSA) data. *PLoS ONE* 15(3): e0230673. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0230673>

23. Bugliari, D., Campbell, N., Chan, C., Hayden, O., Hayes, J., Hurd, M., ... & St Clair, P. (2019). RAND HRS longitudinal file 2016 (V1) documentation. RAND Center for the Study of Aging, Santa Monica, CA.
24. Smith, J., Fisher, G., Ryan, L., Clarke, P., House, J., & Weir, D. (2013). Psychosocial and lifestyle questionnaire. Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research.
25. Shankar, A., McMunn, A., Demakakos, P., Hamer, M., & Steptoe, A. (2017). Social isolation and loneliness: Prospective associations with functional status in older adults. *Health psychology*, 36(2), 179.
26. Gale, C. R., Westbury, L., & Cooper, C. (2018). Social isolation and loneliness as risk factors for the progression of frailty: the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing. *Age and ageing*, 47(3), 392-397.
27. Steptoe, A., Shankar, A., Demakakos, P., & Wardle, J. (2013). Social isolation, loneliness, and all-cause mortality in older men and women. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 110(15), 5797–5801. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1219686110>
28. Crowe, C. L., Domingue, B. W., Graf, G. H., Keyes, K. M., Kwon, D., & Belsky, D. W. (2021). Associations of Loneliness and Social Isolation With Health Span and Life Span in the U.S. Health and Retirement Study. *The journals of gerontology. Series A, Biological sciences and medical sciences*, 76(11), 1997–2006. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glab128>
29. Hughes, M. E., Waite, L. J., Hawkey, L. C., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2004). A Short Scale for Measuring Loneliness in Large Surveys: Results From Two Population-Based Studies. *Research on aging*, 26(6), 655–672.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0164027504268574>

30. Chawla, K., Kunonga, T. P., Stow, D., Barker, R., Craig, D., & Hanratty, B. (2021). Prevalence of loneliness amongst older people in high-income countries: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PloS one*, 16(7), e0255088. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0255088>
31. Karim, J., Weisz, R., & Bibi, Z. (2015). Validation of the eight-item center for epidemiologic studies depression scale (CES-D) among older adults. *Current Psychology*, 34(4), 681-692.
32. Dozeman, E., van Schaik, D. J., van Marwijk, H. W., Stek, M. L., van der Horst, H. E., & Beekman, A. T. (2011). The center for epidemiological studies depression scale (CES-D) is an adequate screening instrument for depressive and anxiety disorders in a very old population living in residential homes. *International journal of geriatric psychiatry*, 26(3), 239–246. <https://doi.org/10.1002/gps.2519>
33. Steffick, D. (2000). Documentation of affective functioning measures in the Health and Retirement Study. Institute for Social Research, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan. doi:10.7826/ISR-UM.06.585031.001.05.0005.2000
34. Lachman, M. E., & Weaver, S. L. (1997). Midlife Development Inventory (MIDI) personality scales: Scale construction and scoring (Unpublished Technical Report). Brandeis University, Waltham, MA. Retrieved from <http://www.brandeis.edu/projects/lifespan/scales.html>
35. Yang, J., & Moorman, S. M. (2021). Beyond the Individual: Evidence Linking Neighborhood Trust and Social Isolation Among Community-Dwelling Older Adults. *International journal of aging & human development*, 92(1), 22–39.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0091415019871201>

36. Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist*, 48(1), 26–34. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.48.1.26>
37. McCabe, K. O., & Fleeson, W. (2012). What is extraversion for? Integrating trait and motivational perspectives and identifying the purpose of extraversion. *Psychological science*, 23(12), 1498–1505. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612444904>
38. Donovan, N. J., & Blazer, D. (2020). Social Isolation and Loneliness in Older Adults: Review and Commentary of a National Academies Report. *The American journal of geriatric psychiatry : official journal of the American Association for Geriatric Psychiatry*, 28(12), 1233–1244. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jagp.2020.08.005>
39. Buecker, S., Maes, M., Denissen, J. J., & Luhmann, M. (2020). Loneliness and the Big Five personality traits: A meta-analysis. *European Journal of Personality*, 34(1), 8-28.
40. Ormstad, H., Eilertsen, G., Heir, T., & Sandvik, L. (2020). Personality traits and the risk of becoming lonely in old age: A 5-year follow-up study. *Health and quality of life outcomes*, 18(1), 47. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-020-01303-5>
41. Tiwari, S. C. (2013). Loneliness: A disease?. *Indian journal of psychiatry*, 55(4), 320–322. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0019-5545.120536>
42. Santini, Z. I., Jose, P. E., York Cornwell, E., Koyanagi, A., Nielsen, L., Hinrichsen, C., Meilstrup, C., Madsen, K. R., & Koushede, V. (2020). Social

- disconnectedness, perceived isolation, and symptoms of depression and anxiety among older Americans (NSHAP): a longitudinal mediation analysis. *The Lancet. Public health*, 5(1), e62–e70. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(19\)30230-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(19)30230-0)
43. Bolger, N., & Schilling, E. A. (1991). Personality and the problems of everyday life: the role of neuroticism in exposure and reactivity to daily stressors. *Journal of personality*, 59(3), 355–386. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1991.tb00253.x>
 44. Morales-Vives, F., Dueñas, J. M., Vigil-Colet, A., & Camarero-Figuerola, M. (2020). Psychological Variables Related to Adaptation to the COVID-19 Lockdown in Spain. *Frontiers in psychology*, 11, 565634. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.565634>
 45. Sahi, M., & Raghavi, M. (2016). A study of personality in relation to resilience and stress. *International Journal for Innovation Education and Research*, 4(2), 10-18.
 46. Dahlberg, L., McKee, K. J., Frank, A., & Naseer, M. (2022). A systematic review of longitudinal risk factors for loneliness in older adults. *Aging & mental health*, 26(2), 225–249. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13607863.2021.1876638>
 47. Schoenmakers, E. C., van Tilburg, T. G., & Fokkema, T. (2012). Coping with loneliness: what do older adults suggest?. *Aging & Mental Health*, 16(3), 353-360.
 48. Fakoya, O. A., McCorry, N. K., & Donnelly, M. (2020). Loneliness and social isolation interventions for older adults: a scoping review of reviews. *BMC*

public health, 20(1), 129. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-8251-6>

49. Gardiner, C., Geldenhuys, G., & Gott, M. (2018). Interventions to reduce social isolation and loneliness among older people: an integrative review. Health & social care in the community, 26(2), 147–157. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hsc.12367>
50. Williams, C., Townson, A. T., Kapur, M., Ferreira, A. F., Nunn, R., Galante, J., Phillips, V., Gentry, S., & Usher-Smith, J. A. (2021). Interventions to reduce social isolation and loneliness during COVID-19 physical distancing measures: A rapid systematic review. PloS one, 16(2), e0247139. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0247139>

Table 1. Demographic statistics of independent variables by social isolation and loneliness categories

		Only loneliness		Only social isolation		Social isolation and loneliness		No social isolation and no loneliness	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Age	Mean (\pm SD)	66.64	(\pm 9.94)	71.79	(\pm 10.67)	69.38	(\pm 11.02)	67.95	(\pm 9.74)
Sex	Male	517	36.56	439	34.08	230	32.9	2478	43.22
	Female	897	63.44	849	65.92	469	67.1	3256	56.78
Educational attainment	High school or less	981	69.38	1012	78.57	546	78.11	3704	64.6
	College or above	433	30.62	276	21.43	153	21.89	2030	35.4
Race	White	1037	73.34	903	70.11	491	70.24	4435	77.35
	Black	255	18.03	294	22.83	164	23.46	863	15.05
	Other	122	8.63	91	7.07	44	6.29	436	7.6
Household income	Mean (\pm SD)	76167.1	(\pm 124234.41)	46027.18	(\pm 86830.84)	35746.06	(\pm 49716.73)	87569.61	(\pm 113769.58)
Chronic disease	Diabetes	366	25.9	342	26.59	227	32.47	1325	23.12
	Stroke	111	7.86	98	7.61	79	11.32	349	6.09
	Cancer	247	17.47	222	17.25	115	16.52	929	16.21
	Heart disease	363	25.69	377	29.29	221	31.62	1357	23.68
IADL	Independent	1144	80.96	1099	85.53	510	73.07	5256	91.71
	Dependent	269	19.04	186	14.47	188	26.93	475	8.29
Depressive symptoms	Yes	367	26.61	141	11.16	250	36.76	330	5.86
	No	1012	73.39	1122	88.84	430	63.24	5305	94.14
Personality traits	Neuroticism: Mean (\pm SD)	2.30	(\pm 0.62)	1.83	(\pm 0.56)	2.28	(\pm 0.64)	1.85	(\pm 0.55)
	Extraversion: Mean (\pm SD)	3.02	(\pm 0.59)	3.20	(\pm 0.55)	2.93	(\pm 0.60)	3.30	(\pm 0.52)

Table 2. Multinomial logistic regression analysis for the combination of social isolation and loneliness with SL set as the reference

		OR	95% CI		
No isolation and loneliness (No SL)	Age (Continuous)	0.990*	0.981	-	0.998
	Sex (ref. Male)	0.804**	0.691	-	0.937
	Educational attainment (ref. College or above)	1.127	0.929	-	1.369
	Race: Black (ref. White)	0.621***	0.503	-	0.767
	Race: Other (ref. White)	1.325	0.990	-	1.772
	Household income (Continuous)	1.010***	1.007	-	1.012
	Depressive symptoms (ref. No depression)	0.215***	0.180	-	0.256
	IADL (ref. Independent)	0.708***	0.594	-	0.844
	Diabetes (ref. No)	0.944	0.804	-	1.108
	Stroke (ref. No)	0.788	0.598	-	1.037
	Cancer (ref. No)	1.208	0.990	-	1.472
	Heart disease (ref. No)	0.983	0.828	-	1.166
	Neuroticism (Continuous)	0.463***	0.407	-	0.528
	Extraversion (Continuous)	2.227***	1.881	-	2.635
Only social isolation (Only S)	Age (Continuous)	1.021***	1.010	-	1.032
	Sex (ref. Male)	1.113	0.928	-	1.333
	Educational attainment (ref. College or above)	1.469***	1.186	-	1.819
	Race: Black (ref. White)	0.999	0.790	-	1.263
	Race: Other (ref. White)	1.512*	1.028	-	2.225
	Household income (Continuous)	1.004***	1.002	-	1.007
	Depressive symptoms (ref. No depression)	0.381***	0.305	-	0.476
	IADL (ref. Independent)	0.912	0.721	-	1.153
	Diabetes (ref. No)	0.956	0.781	-	1.170
	Stroke (ref. No)	0.756	0.548	-	1.043
	Cancer (ref. No)	1.090	0.847	-	1.402
	Heart disease (ref. No)	1.032	0.835	-	1.275
	Neuroticism (Continuous)	0.398***	0.341	-	0.463
	Extraversion (Continuous)	1.571***	1.299	-	1.901
Only loneliness (Only L)	Age (Continuous)	0.982**	0.971	-	0.992
	Sex (ref. Male)	0.913	0.767	-	1.088
	Educational attainment (ref. College or above)	1.102	0.884	-	1.375
	Race: Black (ref. White)	0.867	0.662	-	1.136
	Race: Other (ref. White)	1.257	0.899	-	1.758
	Household income (Continuous)	1.010***	1.007	-	1.012
	Depressive symptoms (ref. No depression)	0.564***	0.467	-	0.682
	IADL (ref. Independent)	0.832	0.683	-	1.013
	Diabetes (ref. No)	0.948	0.787	-	1.141
	Stroke (ref. No)	0.826	0.582	-	1.173
	Cancer (ref. No)	1.273*	1.017	-	1.594
	Heart disease (ref. No)	0.982	0.798	-	1.207
	Neuroticism (Continuous)	1.192*	1.021	-	1.391
	Extraversion (Continuous)	1.222*	1.012	-	1.477

Ref: Social isolation and Loneliness (SL)

*P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01; *** P < 0.001

OR: odds ratio; IC: confidence interval

Table 3. Multinomial logistic regression analysis for the combination of social isolation and loneliness with Only L set as the reference

		OR	95% CI		
No isolation and loneliness (No SL)	Age (Continuous)	1.008**	1.002	-	1.014
	Sex (ref. Male)	0.881*	0.786	-	0.988
	Educational attainment (ref. College or above)	1.023	0.908	-	1.152
	Race: Black (ref. White)	0.717***	0.613	-	0.838
	Race: Other (ref. White)	1.053	0.860	-	1.290
	Household income (Continuous)	1.000	1.000	-	1.001
	Depressive symptoms (ref. No depression)	0.381***	0.326	-	0.445
	IADL (ref. Independent)	0.851*	0.727	-	0.996
	Diabetes (ref. No)	0.996	0.872	-	1.138
	Stroke (ref. No)	0.953	0.762	-	1.192
	Cancer (ref. No)	0.948	0.817	-	1.101
	Heart disease (ref. No)	1.001	0.878	-	1.141
	Neuroticism (Continuous)	0.389***	0.353	-	0.428
	Extraversion (Continuous)	1.821***	1.641	-	2.022
Only social isolation (Only S)	Age (Continuous)	1.040***	1.031	-	1.049
	Sex (ref. Male)	1.218*	1.045	-	1.420
	Educational attainment (ref. College or above)	1.332**	1.118	-	1.588
	Race: Black (ref. White)	1.152	0.939	-	1.412
	Race: Other (ref. White)	1.203	0.912	-	1.587
	Household income (Continuous)	0.995***	0.993	-	0.996
	Depressive symptoms (ref. No depression)	0.675***	0.548	-	0.830
	IADL (ref. Independent)	1.096	0.884	-	1.359
	Diabetes (ref. No)	1.009	0.855	-	1.190
	Stroke (ref. No)	0.915	0.667	-	1.256
	Cancer (ref. No)	0.856	0.707	-	1.037
	Heart disease (ref. No)	1.051	0.898	-	1.230
	Neuroticism (Continuous)	0.334***	0.293	-	0.380
	Extraversion (Continuous)	1.286***	1.126	-	1.468
Social isolation and Loneliness (SL)	Age (Continuous)	1.019**	1.008	-	1.029
	Sex (ref. Male)	1.095	0.919	-	1.304
	Educational attainment (ref. College or above)	0.907	0.728	-	1.131
	Race: Black (ref. White)	1.153	0.880	-	1.511
	Race: Other (ref. White)	0.795	0.569	-	1.112
	Household income (Continuous)	0.991***	0.988	-	0.993
	Depressive symptoms (ref. No depression)	1.772***	1.467	-	2.139
	IADL (ref. Independent)	1.202	0.987	-	1.463
	Diabetes (ref. No)	1.055	0.876	-	1.271
	Stroke (ref. No)	1.210	0.853	-	1.717
	Cancer (ref. No)	0.785*	0.627	-	0.983
	Heart disease (ref. No)	1.019	0.829	-	1.253
	Neuroticism (Continuous)	0.839*	0.719	-	0.979
	Extraversion (Continuous)	0.818*	0.677	-	0.988

Ref: Only loneliness (Only L)

*P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01; *** P < 0.001

OR: odds ratio; IC: confidence interval

Supplement 1. Multinomial logistic regression analysis for the combination of severe social isolation and loneliness with SL set as the reference

		OR	95% CI
No isolation and loneliness (No SL)	Age (Continuous)	1.012	0.995 - 1.029
	Sex (ref. Male)	1.320*	1.003 - 1.737
	Educational attainment (ref. College or above)	1.076	0.789 - 1.466
	Race: Black (ref. White)	0.706*	0.500 - 0.997
	Race: Other (ref. White)	1.454	0.865 - 2.443
	Household income (Continuous)	1.007**	1.002 - 1.012
	Depressive symptoms (ref. No depression)	0.143***	0.101 - 0.202
	IADL (ref. Independent)	0.628**	0.465 - 0.847
	Diabetes (ref. No)	1.043	0.788 - 1.380
	Stroke (ref. No)	0.751	0.471 - 1.197
	Cancer (ref. No)	1.371	0.935 - 2.010
	Heart disease (ref. No)	0.870	0.586 - 1.294
	Neuroticism (Continuous)	0.404***	0.284 - 0.574
	Extraversion (Continuous)	1.805***	1.338 - 2.436
Only social isolation (Only S)	Age (Continuous)	1.035**	1.013 - 1.058
	Sex (ref. Male)	0.939	0.660 - 1.335
	Educational attainment (ref. College or above)	1.245	0.831 - 1.867
	Race: Black (ref. White)	0.950	0.648 - 1.395
	Race: Other (ref. White)	1.724	0.911 - 3.262
	Household income (Continuous)	0.998	0.993 - 1.004
	Depressive symptoms (ref. No depression)	0.319***	0.193 - 0.526
	IADL (ref. Independent)	1.040	0.698 - 1.551
	Diabetes (ref. No)	0.930	0.656 - 1.320
	Stroke (ref. No)	0.512*	0.294 - 0.892
	Cancer (ref. No)	1.140	0.697 - 1.864
	Heart disease (ref. No)	0.786	0.528 - 1.171
	Neuroticism (Continuous)	0.365***	0.250 - 0.532
	Extraversion (Continuous)	1.359	0.989 - 1.867
Only loneliness (Only L)	Age (Continuous)	1.005	0.986 - 1.024
	Sex (ref. Male)	1.688***	1.246 - 2.286
	Educational attainment (ref. College or above)	1.051	0.755 - 1.465
	Race: Black (ref. White)	0.886	0.596 - 1.316
	Race: Other (ref. White)	1.185	0.642 - 2.187
	Household income (Continuous)	1.006*	1.001 - 1.012
	Depressive symptoms (ref. No depression)	0.486**	0.325 - 0.726
	IADL (ref. Independent)	0.717	0.511 - 1.006
	Diabetes (ref. No)	1.093	0.805 - 1.482
	Stroke (ref. No)	0.836	0.483 - 1.449
	Cancer (ref. No)	1.536*	1.021 - 2.311
	Heart disease (ref. No)	0.896	0.576 - 1.392
	Neuroticism (Continuous)	0.866	0.576 - 1.301
	Extraversion (Continuous)	1.080	0.799 - 1.461

Ref: Social isolation and loneliness (SL)

*P < 0.05; ** P< 0.01; *** P < 0.001

OR: odds ratio; IC: confidence interval

Supplement 2. Multinomial logistic regression analysis for the combination of severe social isolation and loneliness with Only L set as the reference

		Odds	95% CI	
No isolation and loneliness (No SL)	Age (Continuous)	1.007*	1.000	1.014
	Sex (ref. Male)	0.782**	0.676	0.904
	Educational attainment (ref. College or above)	1.023	0.879	1.191
	Race: Black (ref. White)	0.797*	0.665	0.955
	Race: Other (ref. White)	1.227	0.934	1.612
	Household income (Continuous)	1.001	1.000	1.002
	Depressive symptoms (ref. No depression)	0.294***	0.249	0.346
	IADL (ref. Independent)	0.876	0.732	1.047
	Diabetes (ref. No)	0.955	0.823	1.108
	Stroke (ref. No)	0.898	0.703	1.146
	Cancer (ref. No)	0.892	0.746	1.067
	Heart disease (ref. No)	0.972	0.829	1.139
	Neuroticism (Continuous)	0.466***	0.413	0.526
	Extraversion (Continuous)	1.672***	1.486	1.881
Only social isolation (Only S)	Age (Continuous)	1.031***	1.019	1.042
	Sex (ref. Male)	0.556***	0.425	0.729
	Educational attainment (ref. College or above)	1.184	0.875	1.604
	Race: Black (ref. White)	1.073	0.793	1.454
	Race: Other (ref. White)	1.455	0.969	2.184
	Household income (Continuous)	0.992***	0.989	0.995
	Depressive symptoms (ref. No depression)	0.655**	0.481	0.893
	IADL (ref. Independent)	1.451*	1.081	1.948
	Diabetes (ref. No)	0.851	0.640	1.134
	Stroke (ref. No)	0.613	0.364	1.031
	Cancer (ref. No)	0.742	0.524	1.050
	Heart disease (ref. No)	0.878	0.629	1.225
	Neuroticism (Continuous)	0.421***	0.342	0.517
	Extraversion (Continuous)	1.258	0.954	1.660
Social isolation and loneliness (SL)	Age (Continuous)	0.995	0.977	1.015
	Sex (ref. Male)	0.592***	0.437	0.803
	Educational attainment (ref. College or above)	0.951	0.682	1.325
	Race: Black (ref. White)	1.129	0.760	1.678
	Race: Other (ref. White)	0.844	0.457	1.558
	Household income (Continuous)	0.994*	0.989	0.999
	Depressive symptoms (ref. No depression)	2.057**	1.377	3.073
	IADL (ref. Independent)	1.395	0.994	1.958
	Diabetes (ref. No)	0.915	0.675	1.242
	Stroke (ref. No)	1.196	0.690	2.072
	Cancer (ref. No)	0.651*	0.433	0.979
	Heart disease (ref. No)	1.117	0.719	1.735
	Neuroticism (Continuous)	1.155	0.768	1.735
	Extraversion (Continuous)	0.926	0.685	1.252

Ref: Only loneliness (Only L)

*P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01; *** P < 0.001

OR: odds ratio; IC: confidence interval