İstanbul Üniversitesi Kadın Araştırmaları Dergisi
Istanbul University Journal of Women's Studies
İUKAD 2024, 28 : 20–28
DOI: 10.26650/iukad.2023.1349157

RESEARCH ARTICLE / ARAŞTIRMA MAKALESİ

The Loneliness Paradox: Navigating the Challenges of Social Isolation

Yalnızlık Paradoksu: Toplumsal Yalnızlığın Zorluklarıyla Mücadele

Meltem İNCE YENİLMEZ[1], Eylül KABAKÇI GÜNAY[2]

[1]Prof.Dr., Izmir Democracy University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Economics, Izmir, Türkiye
[2]Associate Professor., Izmir Democracy University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Economics, Izmir, Türkiye

ABSTRACT

The growing concern surrounding social isolation and loneliness has become more prominent than ever. As we enter the fourth year of the COVID-19 pandemic, there is a looming apprehension about the potential long-term impacts of loneliness on individuals. This study investigates the intricate components and prevalence of social isolation and loneliness across Europe. Its goal is to gain a comprehensive understanding of the far-reaching impacts of loneliness, thereby providing a framework to guide interventions aimed at combating loneliness. The study's main focus is on elements of the loneliness theory, such as existential discomfort and involuntary components. To determine whether social capital confers resilience or if loneliness is made worse by social network threats connected to one's employment, the study examines how the epidemic affects vulnerable people. It emphasizes the importance of developing effective policies that address disparities in exposure to loneliness and lack of support based on socioeconomic status. The study addresses methodological issues in previous studies, including the limited pre-COVID-19 data. Significant geographical differences are revealed by this study's comparative research of social isolation and loneliness throughout Europe. The results highlight the necessity for all-encompassing approaches to deal with the pervasive impacts of loneliness on productivity and mental health.

ÖZ

Sosyal izolasyon ve yalnızlık her zamankinden daha fazla sorun yaratmaktadır. Yalnızlığın uzun vadeli etkilerinin, COVID-19 salgını dördünü yılına geldiğinde hissedileceğine dair endişeler artmaktadır. Bu çalışma, Avrupa genelinde sosyal izolasyon ve yalnızlığın yaygınlığını ve bileşenlerini incelemektedir. Bu çalışmada, yalnızlığın etkilerini, yalnızlık karşıtı önlemlere rehberlik etmek için kullanılabilecek geniş bir çerçeve içinde anlamayı amaçlamaktadır. Çalışmanın ana odak noktası, varoluşsal rahatsızlık ve istemsiz bileşenler gibi yalnızlık teorisinin unsurlarıdır. Sosyal sermayenin dayanıklılık durumu ve/veya yalnızlığın kişinin istihdamı ile bağlantılı sosyal ağlar tarafından nasıl sıradanlaştırıldığını belirlemek için çalışma, salgının savunmasız insanları nasıl etkilediğini incelemektedir. Yalnızlığa maruz kalma ve sosyoekonomik statüye dayalı destek eksikliğindeki eşitsizlikleri ele alan etkili politikalar geliştirmenin önemini vurgulamaktadır. Çalışma, sınırlı COVID-19 öncesi veriler de dahil olmak üzere önceki çalışmalardaki metodolojik sorunları ele almaktadır. Bu çalışmanın Avrupa genelinde sosyal izolasyon ve yalnızlık üzerine yaptığı karşılaştırmalı araştırma, önemli coğrafi farklılıkları ortaya koymaktadır. Sonuçlar, yalnızlığın üretkenlik ve ruh sağlığı üzerindeki yaygın etkileriyle başa çıkmak için her şeyi kapsayan yaklaşımların gerekliliğini vurgulamaktadır.

Keywords: Loneliness, Social Isolation, COVID-19 Pandemic

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yalnızlık, Sosyal İzolasyon, COVID-19

Introduction

In the fabric of modern existence, where technological advancements promise unmatched connectivity and the sharing of life experiences across global networks, a profound contradiction emerges: social isolation and loneliness pervade our hyperconnected society. As our lives become increasingly intertwined with technology, the very tools designed to bring us closer together appear to be fostering a silent epidemic of isolation, prompting a critical examination of the issues at hand. The introduction unequivocally demonstrates the dual reality of our technologically enriched civilization: the simultaneous growth of social isolation. It encapsulates the tension between individuals' physical isolation and the promise of digital contact connection, laying

Corresponding Author: Meltem İNCE YENİLMEZ **E-mail:** meltemince yenilmez@gmail.com
Submitted: 24.08.2023 • **Revision Requested:** 12.01.2024 • **Last Revision Received:** 21.02.2024 • **Accepted:** 22.02.2024

the foundation for a comprehensive investigation. This study adopts a multidisciplinary approach, examining the sociocultural, technical, and psychological aspects that underlie the loneliness paradox. The introduction presents social isolation as a complicated topic that requires careful attention by placing the debate within a larger social framework. As readers embark on this intellectual adventure, they are prompted to challenge established beliefs about modern connectivity. Rather than oversimplifying the discussion into a binary assessment of technology's merits, the exploration delves deep into how our digital existence intersects with our fundamental longing for genuine human bonds. By highlighting the key topics and concepts to be explored in depth, the introduction acts as a guide for readers, encouraging them to engage critically with the material. It underscores the urgency of addressing the loneliness paradox, highlighting its detrimental impact on both society at large and individual well-being. This approach not only draws readers into the discourse but also fosters a collective awareness of the challenges posed by contemporary social isolation. It challenges assumptions and invites active participation, setting the stage for a reflective and introspective exploration of the topic.

The subsequent sections of this article follow a structural approach: Section 2 delves into the literature review and clarifies various perspectives on living alone and loneliness, examining them through social and economic viewpoints. Section 3 elucidates the data utilized, providing clarity on the source and methods employed. Section 4 delineates the methodology and presents the analysis findings. Finally, Section 5 concludes by proposing initial policy implications drawn from the research and offering a concise summary of the key insights.

Literature Review

The COVID-19 pandemic introduced unprecedented measures such as "social distancing" to curb the virus's spread. These tactics, along with quarantine and isolation protocols, have become crucial tools in minimizing transmission among the public and those exposed to or infected with the virus. Even before the pandemic, a significant portion of the population grappled with social isolation, loneliness, or a combination of both (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2017). Loneliness, in essence, pertains to the subjective feeling of being alone or the disparities between the desired and actual level of connection. However, social isolation refers to the objective state of lacking companionship, having limited relationships, or experiencing few social interactions. While precise prevalence rates and temporal variations necessitate standardized global measurement and categorization, substantial data from national and international surveys highlight the trends. These assessments suggest a notable increase of 20%–30% in loneliness during the pandemic. Although loneliness can affect individuals regardless of age, income level, gender, or living arrangements, it appears to be more common among younger people, individuals with lower socioeconomic status, and those dealing with chronic health conditions (Bu et al., 2020).

Understandably, the pressing concerns brought about by a new virulent virus take precedence during a global epidemic. However, we cannot disregard the immediate and lasting health ramifications of social isolation and loneliness. The impact of these on issues like suicide or domestic violence can be profoundly acute, contrasting with their more protracted effects on disease-related mortality. Extensive global data, spanning over 3.4 million individuals, underscores a strong correlation between social isolation, loneliness, and a significantly heightened risk of mortality across all causes (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2015). Conversely, the presence of social support increases survival rates by 50% (Holt-Lunstad, et al., 2010).

Decades of research have accumulated compelling evidence suggesting that the mortality risk associated with social isolation and loneliness equals or surpasses that of other well-recognized public health concerns such as obesity and air pollution (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2017). Moreover, strong evidence indicates that loneliness and social isolation significantly increase morbidity, particularly in heart disease and stroke. Notably, loneliness and social isolation also influence unhealthy behaviors like substance abuse, inadequate sleep, and unhealthy eating patterns. The absence of meaningful social connections, especially with trustworthy individuals, can engender a heightened state of awareness, both centrally and peripherally. For individuals with preexisting conditions, such states may precipitate or exacerbate acute episodes through problematic behaviors and physiological changes (Uchino, 2006). Additionally, loneliness and social exclusion may increase vulnerability to COVID-19 infection. They are predictive of diminished mental well-being, and those dealing with mental illnesses are more prone to experiencing social isolation and loneliness (Cohen, 2021). This two-way relationship is particularly noteworthy, as evidenced by population-wide electronic health record analysis revealing that individuals with mental health diagnoses face a higher risk of contracting COVID-19 (Wang et al., 2021), hospitalization due to the virus, and possibly passing away afterward.

Social isolation and loneliness are distinct concepts; loneliness can strike anyone at any time, irrespective of their physical proximity to others. Both men and women can experience sustained loneliness (Cacioppo et al., 2015a, 2015b; de Jong Gierveld et al., 2018). Research underscores the profound impact of loneliness and social isolation on health and social outcomes, contributing to conditions such as anxiety (Shevlin et al., 2015), depression (Cacioppo and Patrick, 2008), dementia (Holwerda et al., 2014), stress (McHugh and Lawlor, 2013), sleep disturbance (Choi et al., 2015), coronary artery disease, and stroke (Hawkley et al., 2010; Valtorta et al., 2016). Furthermore, loneliness and social isolation are associated with unhealthy behaviors, including physical inactivity (Pels and Kleinert, 2016), increased mortality rates (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2015; Laugesen et al., 2018), compromised

immune system function (Cacioppo et al., 2015a, 2015b; Hackett et al., 2012), and increased healthcare costs (Cournane et al., 2015).

Loneliness is commonly defined as a distressing sensation or state that can persist for varying durations, emerging when an individual perceives a lack of something essential in their social network or connection (De Jong Gierveld, 1998). Conversely, the objective experience of having limited significant social connections and interacting less with others is termed social isolation (Prohaska et al., 2021). Various theories grounded in a complex interplay of social, cultural, psychological, and economic factors have been proposed to explain the phenomena of loneliness and social isolation (Hawkley and Cacioppo, 2010; Qualter et al., 2013).

While recent attention has predominantly focused on loneliness, social isolation also has a significant and detrimental impact on health, even with potential areas of overlap (Holt-Lunstad and Steptoe, 2021). This study, recognizing three primary forms of loneliness—social, emotional, and existential—concentrates on the whole idea of highlighting both risk factors and protective variables (Prohaska et al., 2020; Van Tilburg, 2020). Noteworthy components of loneliness, which constitute a substantial portion of related theory (Sadler and Weiss, 1975; Peplau and Perlman, 1982), and were relevant to our investigation included the involuntary dimension and the evaluation of existential distress. An important question emerges the following: how will the epidemic and ensuring lockdowns impact those who are already vulnerable, potentially intensifying feelings of loneliness? Does loneliness stem from threats to social networks offered by employment, or are individuals shielded from it by existing social capital such as community and religious ties? Moreover, do humans possess greater resilience than expected? If so, what factors contribute to this resilience? (Santini and Koyanagi, 2021; Shevlin et al., 2021).

Studies examining the impact of loneliness and/or social isolation in response to public health limitations have been conducted (Groarke et al., 2020; Li and Wang, 2020; Luchetti et al., 2020). These examinations have also examined the significance of specific risk factors such as gender, age, and mental health history. However, methodological challenges, including reliance on single scales or items (Losada-Baltar et al., 2020) and a focus on loneliness characteristics rather than social networks (Herrera et al., 2021; Müller et al., 2021), restrict a substantial portion of this study. Moreover, many studies are limited to surveys within a single nation (Teater et al., 2020), possess small sample sizes, and often lack pre-COVID-19 data collection (Barreto et al., 2020).

Hertz (2020) argues that these challenges can intensify prejudice and cynicism toward others, potentially paving the way for political measures that undermine community cohesion. Despite frequent discussions of loneliness in political discourse and the use of terms like "loneliness pandemic" in media, there has been limited cross-national research on the prevalence of loneliness. This study aims to address this gap by providing a comparative analysis of the occurrence and underlying causes of social isolation and loneliness across Europe. Approximately 9% of Europeans report spending most of their time alone, with loneliness affecting approximately one in ten individuals in countries like Hungary, the Czech Republic, Italy, Poland, Belgium, and Greece. Conversely, the Netherlands and Denmark boast the lowest rates of loneliness at 3% each, followed closely by Finland at 4% and Germany, Ireland, and Sweden at 5% each. Interestingly, social isolation is more prevalent than loneliness, affecting 21.8% of Europeans. This figure has seen a significant rise compared with subjective loneliness. Alarmingly, nearly 40% of individuals in Greece and Hungary have ceased communication with others for over a month, with figures in Poland, Lithuania, and Estonia hovering around 35%. Conversely, only 8% of individuals reside in the Netherlands, Denmark, or Sweden, where social isolation is the least common. Notably, these numbers may be inflated due to the widespread social stigma associated with loneliness. Overall, social isolation and loneliness have notable regional variations across Europe.

Western Europe is situated in Northern Europe, which has the lowest level of loneliness. In contrast, the largest concentration of lonely individuals in Europe is found in Southern Europe. Eastern Europe registered the largest percentage of socially isolated individuals, whereas Western and Southern Europe had the lowest rates of social isolation. A notable discrepancy can be observed in Southern Europe, where Greece demonstrates higher levels of social isolation at 43% compared with Portugal's 9% in relative terms of social isolation.

The dissonance between one's desired and actual level of social connections causes loneliness, a potent and deeply personal emotion. Loneliness stands apart from isolation, which is a more objective assessment of the quantity and quality of one's relationships. Loneliness can persist even among others or in situations with limited social interaction. Its self-reinforcing nature makes it challenging to break out of, hindering efforts to foster genuine connections. The origins and impact of loneliness vary significantly based on an individual's social, environmental, and personal context, making it inherently difficult to quantify due to its subjective nature. Loneliness extends beyond emotional distress; it impacts relationships, motivation, productivity, and overall well-being. Studies consistently highlight a strong correlation between social isolation, loneliness, and a heightened risk of heart disease, underscoring the broad-ranging effects of this pervasive socioeconomic challenge.

The workplace serves as a crucial arena for examining and addressing loneliness, reflecting broader societal dynamics. Socially isolated employees are prone to increased absenteeism and diminished performance, which pose challenges to individual productivity and overall group effectiveness. Recognizing these challenges, employers have introduced well-being programs that

incorporate health evaluations and preventative measures. However, a comprehensive approach is needed that transcends the narrow scope of physical health initiatives. This holistic strategy should include stress resilience, mental and emotional well-being, and overall job effectiveness.

The economic ramifications of absenteeism underscore the substantial impact of loneliness in the workplace. Research from the New Economics Foundation sheds light on the broader societal implications, establishing a direct correlation between employee satisfaction, productivity levels, and level of loneliness. Sweden's initiatives emphasize the importance of interventions prioritizing health and well-being, particularly for older individuals who are more prone to social isolation. However, a significant knowledge gap remains regarding the relationship between social isolation, loneliness, and mental health in other vulnerable individuals.

Loneliness is often likened to fundamental human needs such as hunger, thirst, and physical discomfort, as it plays a crucial role in maintaining and strengthening vital social bonds essential for life. While some individuals may experience temporary periods of loneliness due to life changes, a significant percentage of people experience chronic loneliness. Common assumptions associating social isolation and loneliness primarily with older individuals are challenged by the persistent prevalence of these conditions across various age groups, defying stereotypical beliefs. The complex interplay of behavior, demographics, and cultural factors further complicates the understanding of loneliness and isolation, adding layers of complexity to their definitions and manifestations.

In summary, loneliness represents a complex challenge requiring in depth investigation owing to its intricate subjectivity and societal implications. A comprehensive strategy that is mindful of individuals' physical, mental, and emotional well-being becomes essential in addressing loneliness, given its widespread effects on mental health and its impact on job productivity. The paradox of social isolation in a digitally interconnected era underscores the need for introspection at a personal level and concerted societal initiatives aimed at fostering inclusivity and genuine human relationships across diverse demographic groups.

Economic Impact of Loneliness and Social Isolation

How do these two forms of isolation—living alone and experiencing loneliness—affect economic activity and, consequently, growth potential? The capacity and motivation of an individual to work are influenced by whether they live independently or experience feelings of isolation. This, in turn, shapes their economic impact. Thus, the potential for growth in a given area may be influenced by the prevalence of single-person households and/or levels of loneliness. Regions with lower rates of loneliness tend to witness more interactions and interpersonal exchanges. Heightened social interactions and face-to-face interaction are critical factors for the exchange of ideas and the generation and spread of new information (Gertler, 2003; Maskell and Malmberg, 1999; Storper and Venables, 2004). Moreover, interpersonal relationships and trust foster connection and bridging, which creates social capital—a vital element for economic growth—according to Putnam (2000) and Rodriguez-Pose and Storper (2006). Conversely, inadequate social capital and a lack of contractions can lead to increased loneliness, adversely affecting an individual's mental health and well-being, as well as hindering societal progress overall (Simons et al., 2021). In a broader context, loneliness may impose a substantial cost on society as it is linked to numerous psychological and physical ailments that strain the healthcare system (Pretty et al., 2016). Additionally, loneliness reduces individuals' productivity and engagement in the economy, resulting in a talent drain and a reduced labor force (Bosma et al., 2015; Mielck et al., 2009).

The prevalence of single individuals in the developed world has consistently increased. Factors such as the significant entry of women into the workforce, extensive urbanization, and longer lifespans have facilitated this revolution (Klinenberg, 2012). Living independently has become increasingly feasible due to factors such as the communications revolution, the growing importance of employment, especially for women, and a greater desire for wide social networks over traditional martial ties. As noted by Klinenberg (2012), a significant number of single individuals lead more socially active lives than those living in larger households.

According to Bagheri et al. (2015), the rise in single-person households is driven by the modern urban lifestyle, where fostering social interactions and community ties may be more straightforward compared to traditional, larger residences. Moreover, living independently is often expensive, necessitating individuals who choose this lifestyle to possess significant financial resources to cover property expenses and rent (Vespa, 2017).

Finally, living alone can provide a sense of calm that aids in concentration, cognitive processes, and increased productivity, free from the interruptions and noise associated with larger family settings (Klinenberg, 2012). Nevertheless, living alone extends benefits beyond purely economic considerations. Prolonged periods of being alone within confined spaces can lead to health, social, and physical challenges (Sanders et al., 2004). Individuals residing alone have higher rates of suicide and self-harm incidents (Shaw et al., 2021).

Theoretical Background and Data

Our study utilizes a comprehensive dataset including measures of loneliness and living alone, alongside numerous factors influencing economic performance, to evaluate the correlation between these two distinct forms of isolation and regional economic

success in Europe. The dataset was compiled from various reputable sources, including the Quality of Government Institute (Dahlberg et al., 2020), the European Social Survey (ESS), the Statistics on Income and Living Conditions Survey, and EUROSTAT. Covering the years 2011–2022, the dataset comprises data from 140 regions across 15 European countries.

Measuring loneliness presents significant challenges. In the past, loneliness has often been measured using instruments like the UCLA Loneliness Scale (Russell et al., 1980). However, in our study, we focus on loneliness at the collective territorial level rather than at the individual microlevel, rendering the UCLA Loneliness Scale unsuitable. Instead, we assessed loneliness through indicators such as the frequency of social interactions with individuals outside the home and workplace, considering various temporal perspectives (Bosma et al., 2015; DeLeire and Kalil, 2010). This information is sourced from the ESS.

Loneliness-Related Metrics	Description and Applicability
Anthropocentric data	Anthropocentric data includes details on a person's age, gender, height, and weight. According to Badal et al. (2021), anthropocentric data might be effective in identifying numerous emotions, such as loneliness, melancholy, and fear, in both men and women.
Accelerometer data	The positioning sensors provide accelerometer data. Accelerometer data may be used to track a person's activity by extracting the x, y, and z components as well as the time and frequency domain components. Exercise levels, as described a few rows above, can be connected with loneliness levels and a lack of exercise can anticipate loneliness.
Sociability index	The variety of one's Sociability index (i.e., share of people living alone, level of participation, etc.) was found to be connected with feelings of loneliness and social isolation.
Sleep quality index	This indicator assesses sleep quality and patterns and has a direct correlation with reported loneliness. This index assesses sleep quality in seven subjective domains: sleep quality, sleep latency, sleep length, habitual sleep efficiency, sleep disruptions, usage of sleep medicine, and daytime dysfunction. A greater quality of sleep was shown to be positively connected with less loneliness.
Quality of Government	Define QoG in terms of economic performance; this is a reasonable definition considering that the inability of many developing nations to achieve sustainable economic growth served as the original impetus for the QoG discussion.
Population density	In this way, changes in density can provide insight into the natural history of the preferences and tolerances of individuals of the species; of course, if the species is regulated by density-dependent processes then the relationship of density with the attractiveness of the environment can be obscured. Even though the environment changes positively, there may be no increase in density. Population density is often used as a simple relative measure of how an organism responds to local conditions. If conditions are not good for the species, high density will be observed.

Methodology

Our chosen econometric technique is the Hausman-Taylor (HT) model, primarily due to the specific characteristics of certain variables in our dataset, such as "living alone" and the "fraction of old," which are only available for the year 2011.

The model is structured as follows:

$$Y_{it} = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 x_{1it} + \beta_2 x_{2it} + \delta_1 z_{1i} + p_t + \mu_i + \varepsilon_{it}$$

Here, i represents the country number ranging from 1 to 140, and time is denoted by t covering the period from 2011 to 2022. The vector x1it comprises time-variant regressors that are uncorrelated with μi, whereas x2it comprises variables associated with µi. Similarly, for time-invariant regressors, we used z_{1i} and x_{2i}. The HT model identifies x2it and z2i using information inherent in the model, thereby circumventing biases introduced by random effects estimators (Baltagi and Liu, 2016; McPherson and Trumbull, 2008).

The HT model was chosen over other options due to its ability to effectively address endogeneity issues. This approach accomplishes this by decomposing Xit and Zi as follows: X1it and Z1i are considered exogenous and are assumed to be uncorrelated with pt, μi, and εit, while X2it and Z2i are regarded as endogenous with regard to pt and μi, but not εit (Baltagi et al., 2003; Hausman and Taylor, 1981). The HT approach employs a random effects model that includes variables that are not correlated with other regressors, particularly our variables of interest: the sociability index and proportion of individuals living alone in a region, serving as endogenous factor instruments (Baltagi et al., 2003).

The HT approach combines fixed and random effect estimations by employing the within transformation of time-variant variables while also estimating coefficients for time-invariant variables. This unique feature allows HT estimates to achieve more precise model specifications (Baltagi et al. 2003). Moreover, they are more consistent and efficient compared with alternative methods, which use instrumental variables to address unobserved heterogeneity (Hausman and Taylor, 1981). Alternative approaches, such as panel data analysis with fixed effects and pooled ordinary least squares (pooled OLS), struggle with handling time-invariant

regressors or endogeneity challenges. For instance, fixed effect models cannot accommodate time-invariant variables, whereas pooled OLS tends to be biased and inconsistent. Random effects models also lack robustness when unobserved region-specific effects are linked with other independent variables, as in our study (Cameron and Trivedi, 2010; Hausman, 1978; Rodríguez-Pose and Ketterer, 2012). In contrast, the HT approach is preferable because it overcomes the limitations of pooled OLS, fixed effects, and random effects. It effectively addresses endogeneity concerns by considering the error component, making it a more robust and reliable method for estimating the relationships in our model.

Results

Table 1. Level of sociability and share of person's loneliness

Dependant variable: Growth of GDP per capita	1	2	3
Sociability index	0.078**		0.069**
	[0.002]		[0.002]
Share of individuals living alone		3.418***	3.873***
		[1.108]	[1.119]
Population density (ln)	-0.417***	-0.493***	-0.378***
	[0.072]	[0, not the same)	[0.087]
Quality of Government	0.003	0.003	0.003
	[0.003]	[0.004]	[0.003]
Sleep Quality Index	0.001	0.001	0.001
	[0.0009]	[0.0008]	[0.0008]
Elder people	-8.172***	-8.917***	-8.429***
	[2.117]	[2.219]	[2.197]
Observations	943	943	94314
Wald Chi-2	559.7	518.3	549.1
Prob> Chi2	0	0	0

Note: Clustered standard errors at the regional level are in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10.

Table 1 presents the results of a basic model applied to 140 covered regions where our loneliness index (the social index) and single-living index (the percentage of single-person homes) have been evaluated. The social index and the percentage of people living alone are shown in columns 1 and 2, respectively, and are totalled in column 3. First, areas with a high proportion of the social population expanded more quickly in the early study than those with a higher proportion of single men and women. Growing social networks appear to be the driving force behind economic activity and expansion. Higher costs of regional economic success are also correlated with the percentage of the population living alone. With a population coefficient of 1% and a social index coefficient of 5%, the coefficients are all excellent and very broad. These findings suggest that the vast majority of younger people remain single, but that socialization in the European region—as described by Klinenberg (2012) for the US—would promote economic development. Individuals who live alone are no longer alone in contributing to the economic prosperity of their neighbourhoods. The macroeconomic performance of the euro area in recent years has also been greatly influenced by several controllable variables. For instance, one of the main barriers to regional growth is an ageing population (Mund et al., 2020b). As predicted by New Economic Geography, economic agglomeration is associated with higher per capita economic growth. However, does the general state of loneliness impact economic growth? There are five categories within the social index. The perceived aim is higher when the social frequency of the local population is linked to GDP adjustment.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the investigation of the loneliness paradox in our hyperconnected culture highlights a fundamental inconsistency between the social isolation that permeates our society and the promises of technology-driven togetherness. The complex web of modern life, entwined with technological innovations, paradoxically promotes both unparalleled global connectedness and a persistent sense of loneliness.

By highlighting how urgent it is to confront the loneliness paradox, the introduction provides context for a thorough examination. The study challenges previous beliefs and invites readers to think about the intricacies of modern connection by using a multidisciplinary method to travel through socio-cultural, technological, and psychological factors.

The significance of having a comprehensive grasp of loneliness is underlined throughout the piece. This study aims to elicit empathy from a broad readership by fusing professional perspectives, direct stories, and academic knowledge. In addition to

offering a diagnostic study of the issue, it also issues a call to action, imploring readers to take proactive steps to build a society in which true relationships and fulfilment are valued.

The background material highlights the seriousness of the loneliness paradox by highlighting the dramatic increase in loneliness and social isolation, which has been made worse by the COVID-19 epidemic. The study examines the connections between mental health, physical health, and social structures, illuminating the profound effects of loneliness on healthcare expenses, illness, and death. An analysis of loneliness's economic effects reveals that it can hinder economic growth, hurt worker productivity, and put pressure on healthcare systems. The increase in single-person families is examined about the larger social and economic environment, with particular emphasis on the effects on social capital, economic growth, and general well-being.

The empirical inquiry, which uses a Hausman-Taylor econometric model to evaluate the association between loneliness measures and regional economic performance in Europe, is grounded in the theoretical background and methodological parts. The study is enhanced by the inclusion of a variety of loneliness-related measures, such as population density, quality of governance, sociability index, accelerometer data, anthropocentric data, and sleep quality index. The study's presentation of the data suggests that social connections and economic growth are positively correlated, implying that areas with higher social densities develop economically more quickly. Furthermore, there is a correlation between greater rates of regional economic success and the number of individuals living alone. The complex interactions between social dynamics and economic development are highlighted by these studies.

In conclusion, the study highlights the complexity of the loneliness paradox and calls on society to go past a dichotomous understanding of technology as a unifier or a divisive force. It promotes a sophisticated interpretation of loneliness by fusing human stories with academic rigour and by motivating group initiatives to create a more inclusive and connected environment. The report ends with a call to action that highlights the necessity of individual introspection as well as collective efforts to overcome the problems brought about by the loneliness paradox in our day of increased connectivity.

Ethics Committee Approval: Ethics committee approval is not required for the study.
Peer-review: Externally peer-reviewed.
Author Contributions: Conception/Design of Study- M.İ.Y., E.K.G.; Data Acquisition- M.İ.Y., E.K.G.; Data Analysis/Interpretation- M.İ.Y., E.K.G.; Drafting Manuscript- M.İ.Y., E.K.G.; Critical Revision of Manuscript- M.İ.Y., E.K.G.; Final Approval and Accountability- M.İ.Y., E.K.G.
Conflict of Interest: The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.
Grant Support: The author declared that this study has received no financial support.

REFERENCES

Bagheri, R., Sohrabi, Z., & Moradi, E. (2015). Psychometric properties of the Persian version of the multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ). *Medical Journal of the Islamic Republic of Iran, 29*(256), 2–9.

Baltagi, B. H., (2003). *Econometric Analysis of Panel Data*. Wiley and Sons, England.

Baltagi, B. H., and Liu, L. (2016). Random Effects, Fixed Effects and Hausman's Test for the Generalized Mixed Regressive Spatial Autoregressive Panel Data Model, *Econometric Reviews, Taylor & Francis Journals, 35*(4), 638-658.

Barreto, M., Victor, C., Hammond, C., Eccles, A., Richins, M.T., and Qualter, P. (2020). Loneliness around the world: Age, gender, and cultural differences in loneliness. *Pers. Individ. Differ. 169*, 110066.

Bosma, H., Jansen, M., Schefman, S., Hajema, K. J and Feron, F. (2015). Lonely at the Bottom: A cross-sectional study on being ill, poor, and lonely. *Public Health, 129*(2), 185–187.

Bu, F., Steptoe, A., and 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, 31-4.

Cacioppo, J.T. and Patrick, B. (2008). *Loneliness: Human nature and the need for social connection*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Cacioppo, J. T., Cacioppo, S., Capitanio, J. P., and Cole, S. W. (2015). The neuroendocrinology of social isolation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 66, 733-767.

Cacioppo, J. T., Cacioppo, S., Cole, S. W., Capitanio, J. P., Goossens, L., and Boomsma, D. I. (2015). Loneliness Across Phylogeny and a Call for Comparative Studies and Animal Models. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 10*(2), 202–212.

Cameron, C. and Trivedi, P.K. (2010). *Microeconometrics using Stata*. Stata Press, 706 pages.

Choi K, et al. (2015). Concerted and differential actions of two enzymatic domains underlie Rad5 contributions to DNA damage tolerance. *Nucleic Acids Res, 43*(5), 2666-77.

Cohen, S. (2021). Psychosocial Vulnerabilities to Upper Respiratory Infectious Illness: Implications for Susceptibility to Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 16*(1), 161 –174.

Cournane, S., Byrne, D.G., Conway, R.P., O'Riordan, D., Coveney, S., and Silke, B. (2015). Social deprivation and hospital admission rates, length of stay and readmissions in emergency medical admissions. *European Journal of Internal Medicine, 26*(10), 766-71.

Dahlberg, S, Holmberg, S., Rothstein, B., et al. (2020). Quality of Government Basic Dataset. Gothenburg.

De Jong Gierveld, J. (1998). A review of loneliness: Concept and definitions, determinants and consequences. *Rev. Clin. Gerontol. 8*, 73–80.

De Jong-Gierveld, J., Van Tilburg, T. G., and Dykstra, P. A. (2018). New ways of theorizing and conducting research in the field of loneliness and social isolation. In A. L. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Personal Relationships* (pp. 391–404). Cambridge University Press.

Gertler, M. S. (2003). Tacit knowledge and the economic geography of context, or the undefinable tacitness of being (there). *Journal of Economic Geography, 3*(1), 75-99.

Groarke, J.M., Berry, E., Graham-Wisener, L., McKenna-Plumley, P.E., McGlinchey, E., Armour, C. (2020). Loneliness in the UK during the COVID-19 pandemic: Cross-sectional results from the COVID-19 Psychological Wellbeing Study. *PLoS ONE, 15*, e0239698.

Hackett, D.A., Johnson, N.A., Halaki, M., and Chow, C.M. (2012). A novel scale to assess resistance-exercise effort. *J Sports Sci* 30, 1405–1413.

Hawkley, L.C., Thisted, R.A., Masi, C.M. and Cacioppo, J.T. (2010). Loneliness Predicts Increased Blood Pressure: 5-Year Cross-Lagged Analyses in Middle-Aged and Older Adults. *Psychology and Aging*, 25, 132-141.

Hawkley, L.C. and Cacioppo, J.T. (2010). Loneliness Matters: A Theoretical and Empirical Review of Consequences and Mechanisms. *Ann. Behav. Med., 40*, 218–227.

Herrera, M.S., Elgueta, R., Fernández, M.B., Giacoman, C., Leal, D., Marshall, P., Rubio, M. and Bustamante, F. (2021). A longitudinal study monitoring the quality of life in a national cohort of older adults in Chile before and during the COVID-19 outbreak. *BMC Geriatr. 21*, 1–12.

Hertz, N. (2020). The Lonely Century: Coming Together in a World That's Pulling Apart, Sceptre eds. 352 pages.

Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T.B. and Layton, J.B. (2010). Social Relationships and Mortality Risk: A Meta-analytic Review, *PLoS Med*, 7:e1000316

Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B., Baker, M., Harris, T., and Stephenson, D. (2015). Loneliness and social isolation as risk factors for mortality: a meta-analytic review. *Perspect*. Psychol. Sci. 10, 227–237.

Holt-Lunstad, J., Robles, T.F. and Sbarra, D.A. (2017). Advancing Social Connection as a Public Health Priority in the United States, *Am Psychol*, 72:517-30.

Holt-Lunstad, J. and Steptoe, A. (2021). Social isolation: An underappreciated determinant of physical health. *Curr. Opin. Psychol. 43*, 232–237.

Holwerda, T.J., Deeg, D.J., Beekman, A.T., van Tilburg, T.G., Stek, M.L., Jonker, C., and Schoevers, R.A. (2014). Feelings of loneliness, but not social isolation, predict dementia onset: results from the Amsterdam Study of the Elderly (AMSTEL). *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry, 85*(2), 135-42.

Hausman, J.A. (1978). Specification tests in econometrics, Econometrica. *Econometric Society, 46*(6), 1251-1271.

Hausman, J.A. and Taylor, W.E. (1981). Panel data and unobservable individual effects. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society, 49*(6), 1377–1398.

Klinenberg, E. (2012). *Going Solo: The Extraordinary Rise and Surprising Appeal of Living Alone*. New York: The Penguin Press.

Laugesen, K., Baggesen, L. M., Schmidt, S. A. J., Glymour, M. M., Lasgaard, M., Milstein, A., et al. (2018). Social isolation and all-cause mortality: a population-based cohort study in Denmark. *Sci. Rep*. 8:4731. doi: 10.1038/s41598-018-22963-w

Li, L.Z. and Wang, S. (2020). Prevalence and predictors of general psychiatric disorders and loneliness during COVID-19 in the United Kingdom. *Psychiatry Res., 291*, 113267.

Losada-Baltar, A., Jiménez-Gonzalo, L., Gallego-Alberto, L., Pedroso-Chaparro, M.d.S., Fernandes-Pires, J., Márquez-González, M. (2020). We're staying at home. Association of self-perceptions of ageing, personal and family resources and loneliness with psychological distress during the lock-down period of COVID-19. *J. Gerontol. Ser*. B, 76, e10–e16.

Luchetti, M., Lee, J.H., Aschwanden, D., Sesker, A., Strickhouser, J.E., Terracciano, A., Sutin, A.R. (2020). The trajectory of loneliness in response to COVID-19. *Am. Psychol, 75*, 897–908.

Maskell, P. and Malmberg, A. (1999). Localised learning and industrial competitiveness. *Cambridge Journal of Economics, 23*(2), 167-185.

McHugh, J.E. and Lawlor, B.A. (2013). Perceived stress mediates the relationship between emotional loneliness and sleep quality over time in older adults. *British Journal of Health Psychology, 18*(3), 546–555.

McPherson, M. Q. and Trumbull, W. N. (2008). Rescuing Observed Fixed Effects: Using the Hausman-Taylor Method for Out-of-Sample Trade Projections. *The International Trade Journal, 22*(3), 315-340.

Mielck A., Kiess R., Knesebeck O. V. D., Stirbu I. and Kunst A. E. (2009). Association between forgone care and household income among the elderly in five Western European countries analyses based on survey data from the SHARE-study. *BMC Health Services Research*, 9, 52.

Mund, M., Lüdtke, O. and Neyer, F.J. (2020b). Owner of a lonely heart: The stability of loneliness across the life span. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 119*(2) 497–516

Müller, F., Röhr, S., Reininghaus, U. and Riedel-Heller, S. (2021). Social Isolation and Loneliness during COVID-19 Lockdown: Associations with Depressive Symptoms in the German Old-Age Population. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health, 18*, 3615.

Pels, F., and Kleinert, J. (2016). Loneliness and physical activity: A systematic review. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 9*(1), 231–260.

Peplau, L.A. and Perlman, D. (1982). *Loneliness: A Sourcebook of Current Theory, Research and Therapy*; John Wiley & Sons Incorporated: Hoboken, NJ, USA.

Pretty, J., Barton, J., Bharucha, Z.P., Bragg, R., Pencheon, D., Wood, C., and Depledge. M.H. (2016). Improving health and well-being independently of GDP: dividends of greener and prosocial economies. *Int J Environ Health Res., 26*(1), 11-36.

Prohaska, T., Burholt, V., Burns, A., Golden, J., Hawkley, L., Lawlor, B., Leavey, G., Lubben, J., O'Sullivan, R., Perissinotto, C., et al. (2020). Consensus statement: Loneliness in older adults, the 21st-century social determinant of health? *BMJ Open, 10*, e034967.

Prohaska, T., O'Sullivan, R., Leavey, G., Burns, A. (2021). A public health approach to loneliness and isolation among older adults. In *The SAGE Handbook of Social Studies in Health and Medicine*, 2nd ed.; Scrimshaw, S.C., Lane, S.D., Rubinstein, R.A., Fisher, J., Eds.; Sage:

London, UK.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Qualter, P., Brown, S., Rotenberg, K., Vanhalst, J., Harris, R.A., Goossens, L., Bangee, M., and Munn, P. (2013). Trajectories of loneliness during childhood and adolescence: Predictors and health outcomes. *J. Adolesc. 36*, 1283–1293.

Rodríguez-Pose, A., and Storper, M. (2006). Better rules or stronger communities? On the social 30 foundations of institutional change and its economic effects. *Economic Geography, 82*(1), 1-25.

Rodríguez-Pose, A. and Ketterer, T.D. (2012). Do local amenities affect the appeal of regions in Europe for migrants? *Journal of Regional Science, 52*(4), 535–561.

Rossi A., Da Pozzo E., Menicagli D., Tremolanti C., Priami C., Sîrbu A., Clifton D.A., Martini C., Morelli D. (2020). A Public Dataset of 24-H Multi-Levels Psycho-Physiological Responses in Young Healthy Adults. *Data*. 5, 91.

Sadler, W.A. and Weiss, R.S. (1975). Loneliness: The Experience of Emotional and Social Isolation. *Contemp. Social. A J. Rev., 4*, 171.

Sanders, S., Bowie, S.L., and Bowie, Y.D. (2004). Lessons learned on the forced relocation of older adults: The impact of Hurricane Andrew on health, mental health, and social support of public housing residents. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work, 40*(4), 23–35.

Santini, Z.I. and Koyanagi, A. (2021). Loneliness and its association with depressed mood, anxiety symptoms, and sleep problems in Europe during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Acta Neuropsychiatr. 33*, 160–163.

Shevlin, M., Butter, S., McBride, O., Murphy, J., Gibson-Miller, J., Hartman, T.K., Levita, L., Mason, L., Martinez, A.P., McKay, R., et al. (2021). Refuting the myth of a 'tsunami' of mental ill-health in populations affected by COVID-19: Evidence that response to the pandemic is heterogeneous, not homogeneous. *Psychol. Med*. 1–9.

Simons, C., Martin, L.A., Balcombe, L., Dunn, P.K. and Clark, R.A. (2021). Mental health impact on at-risk high-level athletes during COVID-19 lockdown: A pre-, during and post-lockdown longitudinal cohort study of adjustment disorder. *J Sci Med Sport, 24*(4), 329-331.

Shevlin, M., Murphy, S., and Murphy, J. (2015). The latent structure of loneliness: testing competing factor models of the UCLA Loneliness Scale in a large adolescent sample. *Assessment, 22*(2), 208-15.

Shaw, R.J., Cullen, B.; Graham, N.; Lyall, D.M.; Mackay, D.; Okolie, C.; Pearsall, R.; Ward, J.; John, A. and Smith, D.A. (2021). Living Alone, Loneliness and Lack of Emotional Support as Predictors of Suicide and Self-Harm: A Nine-Year Follow up of the UK Biobank Cohort." *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 279, 316–23.

Storper, M. and Venables, A. J. (2004). Buzz: face-to-face contact and the urban economy. *Journal of Economic Geography, 4*(4), 351-370.

Teater, B., Chonody, J.M., Davis, N. (2020). Risk and Protective Factors of Loneliness among Older Adults: The Significance of Social Isolation and Quality and Type of Contact. *Soc. Work. Public Health, 36*, 128–141.

Uchino, B.N. (2006). Social Support and Health: A Review of Physiological Processes Potentially Underlying Links to Disease Outcomes, *J Behav Med*, 29, 377-87.

Valtorta, N.K., Kanaan, M., Gilbody, S., Ronzi, S. and Hanratty, B. (2016). Loneliness and social isolation as risk factors for coronary heart disease and stroke: systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal observational studies. *Heart., 102*(13), 1009–1016.

Van Tilburg, T.G. (2020). Social, emotional and existential loneliness: A test of the multidimensional concept. *Gerontologist, 61*, e335–e344.

Vespa, J. (2017). *The Changing Economics and Demographics of Young Adulthood: 1975–2016*. Washington, DC: US Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, US Census Bureau, pp. 1–23.

Wang, Q., Xu, R. and Volkow, N.D. (2021). Increased risk of COVID-19 infection and mortality in people with mental disorders: analysis from electronic health records in the United States, *World Psychiatry*, 20, 124-30.

How to Cite This Article / Atıf Biçimi

İnce Yenilmez, M., & Kabakçı Günay, E. (2024). The loneliness paradox: navigating the challenges of social isolation. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Kadın Araştırmaları Dergisi - Istanbul University Journal of Women's Studies, 28,* 20-28.