

Wilfrid Laurier University

## Scholars Commons @ Laurier

---

Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)

---

1982

# A study of the relationship between residential mobility and loneliness

Bruce Petelka  
Wilfrid Laurier University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd>



Part of the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Petelka, Bruce, "A study of the relationship between residential mobility and loneliness" (1982). *Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)*. 504.

<https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd/504>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive) by an authorized administrator of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact [scholarscommons@wlu.ca](mailto:scholarscommons@wlu.ca).

## CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

I.S.B.N.

## THESES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE



National Library of Canada  
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on  
Microfiche Service

Ottawa, Canada  
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada  
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes  
sur microfiche

### NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

**THIS DISSERTATION  
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED  
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED**

### AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un microfilm d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

**LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ  
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE  
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE**

A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP  
BETWEEN RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY AND LONELINESS



by

Bruce Petelka

B.Sc. University of Waterloo, 1979

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Master of Arts Degree  
Department of Psychology  
Wilfrid Laurier University

Waterloo, Ontario

Canada

1982

### Abstract

This research examined a number of ways in which residential mobility might be related to loneliness. It was hypothesized that high mobility separates one from one's support network of friends and family, thereby causing greater loneliness. This hypothesis and other related questions were tested with the UCLA Loneliness Scale and two questionnaires designed for this research: the Residential Mobility Questionnaire and the Petelka Support Network Scale. These questionnaires were mailed along with a cover letter to 500 Kitchener residents who had moved in the past year and 500 residents who had not moved in the past year. Of the 1000 questionnaires mailed out, 206 were completed and returned. Level of social support was found to be positively related to two measures of residential mobility; number of moves and average distance of move. However, level of social support was not related to loneliness at a statistically significant level. Also, none of the measures of residential mobility were found to be significantly related to loneliness except that, contrary to expectations, those moving in the past year were less lonely than those not moving in that time. Therefore, the present study does not provide support for the hypothesis that mobility causes a breakdown of social networks which results in greater loneliness.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
Abstract .....	i
Introduction .....	1
Method .....	13
Respondents	13
Measures	14
Procedure	16
Results .....	17
Sample Characteristics	17
Analyses of Hypotheses and Questions	21
Discussion .....	30
References .....	47
Appendix A	50
Appendix B	54
Appendix C	61

## List of Tables

	page
Table 1: Demographic variables .....	18,19
Table 2: Distubutions of Residential Mobility.....	20
Table 3: Multiple Regression Analyses of Age, Gender, Marital Status, and Education regressed on Residential Mobility .....	25
Table 4: Bivariate Regression Analyses between Loneliness and Four Sources of Support .....	28
Table 5: Bivariate Regression between Length of Occupancy and Four Sources of Social Support ...	29

## INTRODUCTION

The following research paper examines the multi-faceted relationship between loneliness and residential mobility. Residential mobility is used to refer to the degree to which an individual moves from place to place. Mobility involves both the frequency of moves and the distance of the moves. Although residential mobility appears to be a relatively simple concept it is probably related to numerous demographic variables which might be related to an emotional state. Demographic variables which may be important include age, gender, marital status and occupation.

Loneliness, being an internally-perceived emotional state, is much more difficult to objectively define. Lopata (1969) suggests that loneliness be defined as "a wish for a form or level of interaction different from the one presently experienced." Certainly this is a valid definition in many instances. However, it does not give adequate reference to the desolation and desperation of severe loneliness. Some authors have categorized types of loneliness in order to include more of the various experiences labelled loneliness in their definitions.

Hobson (1974) defines loneliness as "the pain of a felt inability to satisfy that urgent need for relation with other persons which is a basic characteristic of a human

being."(p.75) However he distinguishes between two types of loneliness; 'no-being' and 'cut-offness'. He describes 'no-being' as a "frozen isolation, empty silence, a being neither dead nor alive."(p.75) Although the feeling of no-being is impossible to describe or define clearly it is best conveyed by the paradoxical statement, "I am no-one." 'Cut-offness' refers to the unhappy physical, intellectual and/or emotional separation from others.

Francis (1976) refers to a different sort of categorization of loneliness. She distinguishes between primary and secondary loneliness. Secondary loneliness is used to refer to the "phenomenon experienced as the result of temporary separation (as compared with permanent separation by death) from persons and things to whom one is closely attached" (p.153) whereas primary loneliness is described as an omnipresent, universal human characteristic or a cosmic or existential loneliness. It is apparent that Hobson and Francis are not simply using different labels for their categories since 'cut-offness' can be experienced both as a result of temporary separation and as an omnipresent universal characteristic.

In Anatomy of Loneliness, Hartog (1980) defines loneliness in a manner that recognizes the differences between various experiences while portraying these



differences as quantitative rather than qualitative. For this reason Hartog's definition of loneliness is the most useful for the present study. Hartog defines loneliness as follows:

Two interrelated conditions form the skeletal frame of loneliness. Disconnectedness pertains to the physical and psychological states of being alone. Without longing however no disconnected condition qualifies as true loneliness. By longing I mean an anxious, painful, indescribable yearning for someone or something. . . Longing also relates to the sufferer who has no conscious object in mind. (p.2-3)

Such a definition of loneliness can be extrapolated easily to all lonely experiences including 'no-being' and 'out-offness' and primary and secondary loneliness. It also includes vague mid-category experiences of loneliness. Such a functional yet all-inclusive definition of loneliness would seem to be a wise starting point for future loneliness research.

The underlying hypothesis of this research is that to some extent loneliness is related to the lifestyles that we choose both at an individual and at a societal level. Ralph Keyes explores this hypothesis in We, the Lonely People. He argues that when one pursues mobility, convenience and privacy, one chooses to give up one's sense of community, thereby losing that which eases one's sense of loneliness. In his words,

We didn't lose community. We bought it off. And rediscovering community isn't a matter of finding the solution.' We know how to do it. It's a question of how much we're willing to trade in... (p.13)

Keyes never directly states, "mobility causes loneliness". However in his rambling fashion he suggests that we sacrifice a community of intimate friendship for mobility. This hypothesis has been extended slightly to the suggestion that we pay for our mobility in terms of loneliness. This study will focus on the mobility aspect of lifestyle and leave convenience and privacy to subsequent research.

Statistics Canada found in the 1976 Canadian census that we are indeed a nation of movers. Almost half of Canadians over 15 years of age have moved at least once in the past five years and of these movers over half had moved from outside of the municipality. Thus, if mobility affects us in the way Keyes suggests, it affects a substantial proportion of our society.

Bowman (1955) also sees a link between mobility and loneliness and discusses this relationship as follows,

Modern man has won a succession of battles for freedom but, looking back from the vantage point of the twentieth century, it appears that there were liabilities inherent in these victories. The freedom gained is "freedom from" rather than 'freedom to'. Men are lonely today because these emancipating triumphs severed the "primary ties" that united them with others in the pre-individualistic period... The kinship solidarity of a rural society where relatives live near each other and work together is undermined by the

movement of people from place to place... Frequent changes of residence prevent neighbors from becoming well acquainted in the personal sense characteristic of primary groups. Apartment dwellers may not know or care who lives on the same floor, communication being limited to formal courtesies... In addition to its disintegrating effects upon family and neighborhood there seems to be a pervasive emotional result: people who keep moving from place to place tend to develop a sense of detachment that is isolating. One can observe this attitude in the tourist who remains only a few days in one place. Highly mobile people seem to acquire a tourist state of mind as a permanent characteristic, participating in various group activities without feeling deeply that they belong. This rootlessness tends to destroy many of the emotional values implicit in group life, encouraging instead, a vicious circle where restless frustrations lead to further mobility which, in turn, breeds additional frustrations resulting from isolation." (p.195-197)

Certainly these ideas are consistent with those expressed by Fromm (1941) in Escape from Freedom:

...man, freed from the bonds of pre-individualistic society which simultaneously gave him security and limited him, has not gained freedom in the positive sense of realization of his individual self; that is, the expression of his intellectual emotional and sensuous potentialities. Freedom, though it has brought him independence and rationality has made him isolated and, thereby anxious and powerless. (p.viii)

One might also add that it has made him lonely.

Past theoretical and research publications present anything but a clear view of the loneliness-mobility relationship. One major problem is that the majority of writing concerning loneliness appears to be based on personal experience, conjecture and philosophy rather than

on any sort of systematic measurement of the relationship between the variables discussed. The following excerpt from Gordon's Lonely in America is an example of the type of broad unqualified generalizations made from the barest data;

Mobility has a great deal to do with this erosion of American life. People move with such astounding frequency (40 million Americans change their residence once a year and the average person will move 14 times in his or her lifetime) that they lose family ties, friends and themselves. There is a myth among the most highly mobile (corporate transients, academics and those in the armed services) that those who have met in the past will at one point or another meet again ... Mobility does more than affect close friendships; it changes the whole tone of a neighbourhood. When people lived in the same place for years, residents in a community knew one another. When someone moved onto the block you brought cake or candy. Today it is not unusual for people not to know their neighbours at all. Why should one make the effort of a welcome when the new arrivals will be leaving in a year? No sense wasting the energy.

(p.17-18)

Another problem common in the loneliness literature is that conflicting definitions and conflicting data are seldom discussed. Therefore it is necessary to examine each theory and piece of research carefully to determine to what extent it can be useful in developing an understanding of the loneliness-mobility relationship.

The most obvious theoretical link between loneliness and mobility is that moving from one residence to another separates one from a support network of friends and possibly

family. Portnoff's (1976) conclusions which were made after content analysing 68 experiences of loneliness, support this theory. He states: "loneliness was shown to be precipitated by lack of, or estrangement...from relationships of mutual caring." Thus if mobility is related to the breakdown of relationships, it is likely related to loneliness.

Two newspaper surveys done by Rubenstein and Shaver (1978) also support this hypothesis. Rubenstein and Shaver compared degree of loneliness with the number of times people moved in adulthood and in childhood and with the length of time they had resided in their present community. Loneliness was defined by the subject's response to eight direct questions concerning frequency and intensity of loneliness. Loneliness was not found to be related to adult or child mobility or the number of years one has resided in a community unless this was less than one year. These data suggest that loneliness is a problem when one moves only until one is able to garner a new support group.

The present study examined in more careful detail the relationship between loneliness and the length of time since the respondent's most recent move. In addition to obtaining information regarding the number of times people moved and the length of time they resided in their present neighbourhood, information relative to how many people moved

with the respondents, the distances of the moves, the reasons for moving and level of support from friends, family, coworkers and neighbours was also collected. Also loneliness was measured with a questionnaire with demonstrated validity and reliability.

If loneliness is related to mobility as a result of the dissolution of support networks, one might hypothesize that a number of secondary factors are involved. For example, the length of the move might affect the degree to which one is separated from friends and family and therefore the degree of loneliness may increase with length of move. Therefore, the effects of differences in the length of move have been examined in the present study.

A rival hypothesis suggesting a correlation between loneliness and mobility is that lonely people move from place to place in order to find someone or something that will ease their loneliness. Information concerning this question was obtained by asking respondents the reasons for their moves.

The type of relationship existing between loneliness and mobility has yet to be established. Moore (1974) attempted to relate loneliness to mobility (among five other factors) by comparing the degree of mobility (as measured by number of residence changes) in high and low lonely groups

(loneliness was measured with a 75-item questionnaire). There was no significant difference between the two groups in number of residence changes. Nevils (1978) also looked at a variety of possible causes of loneliness. He found that "high lonely subjects averaged having lived fewer years in a hometown and had greater difficulty in defining a hometown for themselves." Thus, his study suggests that mobility and loneliness are indeed related.

An alternate, possibly complementary, theory relating loneliness to mobility is that highly mobile people limit the depth of interpersonal relationships because they know that they will soon be moving on and that the shallowness of their relationships leads to loneliness. To the author's knowledge there has been no research which examines this theory. Therefore this question was explored in the present study. Respondants were asked if plans for moving in the near future makes it less likely that they will seek new friendships now. The relationship between these opinions and loneliness was investigated as will the relationship between moving plans and loneliness.

As mentioned earlier, loneliness may also be related to mobility as a result of underlying demographic variables. For example, non-married people may be lonelier than married people because they do not have a constant companion and

non-married people may also be more mobile than married people. If these two rather plausible hypotheses are true, a loneliness-mobility correlation may be nothing more than an indication of the marital-status-loneliness and the marital-status-mobility correlations. Hutchison (1975) provides evidence that married people are indeed less likely to be lonely than those who are widowed, separated or divorced. The degree of loneliness experienced in singles has not been explored extensively. However, there is evidence that at least in the elderly, singles do not perceive their isolation in terms of loneliness (Gubrium, 1975).

Hutchison also found that in low-income families, females report more loneliness than males thus suggesting gender as another possible link between loneliness and mobility. It should be noted, however, that this difference disappears when marital status is controlled. In other words, married women are no lonelier than married men and widows are no lonelier than widowers.

The last demographic variable that was examined in relation to loneliness and mobility was age. Little empirical data has been accumulated to examine the relationship between age and loneliness and the little evidence which does exist suggests that older people are



actually less lonely than other groups (Knipscheer, 1978; Rubenstein and Shaver, 1978)

The final variable examined in this study was neighbourhood mobility. If the separation from friends and family is what causes loneliness, one would expect loneliness to be more prevalent in transient neighbourhoods than in less mobile neighbourhoods. Therefore the respondents' perceptions of the mobility of their neighbourhoods was measured and the respondents were compared in terms of loneliness. The theory that the depth of interpersonal relationships is limited by expectations of future moves is also relevant in this context. Even though a family plans on remaining in an area for a long time, the knowledge that their neighbours will probably be moving soon may act consciously or subliminally to limit the depth of developing relationships.

In order to examine the general hypothesis that degree of loneliness is related to one's lifestyle, the present study began by examining the relationship between loneliness and residential mobility. The following hypotheses were used to understand how loneliness is related to residential mobility if indeed it is related:

- (1) Respondents moving in the past year are lonelier than

those who have not moved in that time.

(2) Loneliness is inversely related to length of occupancy.

(3) Loneliness is related to the distance of the most recent move such that people moving long distances are lonelier than those moving short distances.

(4) Loneliness is related to one's support system such that people with a high level of support are less lonely than those with a low level of support.

(5) One's level of support is related to length of occupancy such that people who have recently moved have a lower level of support than those who have not moved recently.

The following questions will also be researched in this study:

(1) Are individuals who have moved many times different in terms of loneliness from those who have seldom moved?

(2) Is number of moves related to level of support?

(3) Is number of moves related to whom an individual turns for support?

(4) Are loneliness, residential mobility, level of support and/or level of difficulty in making friends in present community related to marital status, level of education, age, and/or gender?

(5) Is the distance of the most recent move related to the difficulty of maintaining friendships such that people moving long distances have more difficulty maintaining friendships than people moving short distances?

- (6) Are plans for future moves related to present level of support and/or to loneliness?
- (7) What proportions of moves are made "to find friends" in comparison to other reasons for moving?
- (8) Does loneliness vary as a function of one's reason for moving?
- (9) Is perception of level of neighbourhood mobility related to level of support from neighbours and/or loneliness?
- (10) Is loneliness related to the source of social support (eg. family vs. coworkers)?
- (11) Do the categories of level of support differ in their relationship to length of occupancy?

#### METHOD

##### Respondents

Questionnaires were mailed to potential respondents in the city of Kitchener, a south-western Ontario city with a population of 139,000. One thousand respondents were selected randomly from Kitchener's Vernon Directory.

Questionnaires were mailed to 500 residents who have moved in the past year and to 500 residents who have not moved in the past year. Individuals moving to their present dwelling in the past year were identified by comparing the 1981 and 1982 directories. A questionnaire was also mailed to the next person listed in both directories in order to

obtain a control group at least roughly equivalent in geographic location and socio-economic status. It is assumed that such a sample would be representative of a larger portion of society than samples used in previous mobility-loneliness research. The majority of this past research has sampled undergraduate students, an unusual group in terms of mobility. Rubenstein and Shavers' study had a broader range of respondents with their newspaper questionnaire. However, the sample used in the Rubenstein and Shaver research was less representative than the one used in the present study because their sample was self-selecting. The fact that 80 per cent of the respondents in the Rubenstein and Shaver study were women is a clear indication of how self-selection affected the quality of sample used.

#### Measures

Each respondent completed the three questionnaires presented in Appendix A. The first is called the Residential Mobility Questionnaire and has been designed to collect demographic data as well as information concerning mobility. The second is called the Petelka Support Network Scale (PSNS). The PSNS measures level of support in terms of number of friends, neighbours, coworkers and close family and in terms of number of contacts with each of these

groups. The sum of the number of contacts with each group served as an 'overall level of support' score. These questionnaires were both designed for the present study.

Finally, each subject completed the revised UCLA Loneliness Scale. Russel, Peplau & Ferguson (1978) reported that their original measure has high internal consistency (all items had correlations of over .50 with total score) and reasonably good test-retest reliability ( $r=.73$  over a two month period). They also found correlations between the scale and self-reports of loneliness and related emotional states and between the scale and willingness to volunteer for a loneliness clinic, thus indicating adequate concurrent and construct validity. Russel et al. state that:

The correlation between the subjective self-report question about current loneliness and the loneliness scale score was highly significant ( $r(45)=.79, p<.001$ ). High scorers on the loneliness scale described themselves as more lonely than other people. Loneliness scores of people who were sufficiently troubled by loneliness to volunteer for a 3-week clinic/discussion program differed dramatically from scores of students in a comparison group who were tested concurrently. The mean loneliness scale score of clinic participants was 50.1 compared to a mean of 39.1 for the comparison sample ( $t(41)=5.09, p<.001$ ). Further validation is provided by evidence linking scores on the UCLA Loneliness Scale to other emotional states.... In the present study, scores on the UCLA Loneliness Scale correlated with participants' self-ratings of being "depressed" ( $r_{131}=.49, p<.001$ ) and "anxious" ( $r_{131}=.35, p<.001$ ). (p.292)

The UCLA Loneliness Scale was revised by Russel, Peplau & Cutrona (1980) in order to avoid the confounding effects of a response bias. Essentially this involved altering the wording so that some of the feelings stated negatively were stated positively. Evidence for the internal consistency and concurrent validity of the revised scale was also provided.

An important aspect of this scale is that there is good evidence that social desirability does not affect loneliness scores. Russel et al. also demonstrate that the scale discriminates between loneliness and related concepts while there is enough of a correlation to indicate concurrent validity. Russel et al (1980) found that,

Loneliness scores were significantly correlated with scores on the Beck Depression Inventory ( $r=.62$ ) and with the Costello-Comrey Anxiety ( $r=.32$ ) and Depression ( $r=.55$ ) scales. Loneliness scores were also significantly correlated (all  $r$ 's above .40) with feeling abandoned, depressed, empty, hopeless, isolated and self-enclosed and with not feeling sociable or satisfied. Loneliness scores were not significantly correlated with such conceptually unrelated affects as feeling creative, embarrassed, sensitive, surprised, or thoughtful. (p 475)

### Procedure

The questionnaires were distributed to the respondents by mail. A cover letter (Appendix A) was included to explain the purpose of the questionnaire and to assure the

respondent that all information received would remain confidential. A stamped self-addressed envelope was also included with the questionnaires.

## RESULTS

### Sample Characteristics

Of the 1000 questionnaires mailed to Kitchener residents, 206 were completed and returned. Also 36 questionnaire packages were returned unopened for a variety of reasons. Some of the people selected had recently moved or died while others were unknown to the residents at the addresses to which the questionnaires were mailed.

The respondents are described in terms of age, education, gender and marital status in Table 1. These statistics indicate that the sample is unrepresentative of the general population in several ways. A disproportionate number of respondents were male (77.2%), young (77.5% were under 45), married (71.6%) and well educated (76.9% had high school diploma or more).

Table 1  
Demographic Variable Results

Age	19-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	Over 64
Proportion of sample	13.8%	42.4	17.7	11.8	6.9	7.4
Proportion of population	18.8	25.4	16.9	15.8	11.1	11.9

Education	Less than Gr.9	Some High Sch.	High Sch. Dip.	Some U. or College	Bach. Degree	Post-Grad Degree
Proportion of sample	6.3%	17.5	19.4	28.2	23.3	5.3
Proportion of population	23.4	34.6	10.7	20.1	8.9	2.2

Gender	Male	Female
Proportion of sample	72.8%	27.2
Proportion of population	49.4	50.6



Marital Status	Single	Married	Divorced	Widowed
Proportion of sample	16.0%	71.8	8.3	3.9
Proportion of population	25.2	64.1	4.9	5.8

The second row of figures are comparable proportions of the Kitchener population. These percentages were calculated from the 1976 Canadian census. The figures for education and marital status represent proportions of Kitchener residents over 15 years of age in each category. The figures for age represent proportion of the population over 19 years of age.

Important measures of the sample's mobility are shown in Table 2. As one might expect, these percentages indicate that the distribution curves for number of moves and distance of last move are distinctly skewed.

Table 2

## Distributions of Residential Mobility Variables

Number of moves in last 10 yrs.	None	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-17
Proportion of sample	15.5%	35.9	21.8	17.5	9.2

Distance of last move*	1	2	3	4	5
Proportion of sample	13.0%	51.8	29.0	4.7	1.6

## \*Distance Code

1-within neighbourhood  
2-within city  
3-within province

4-within country  
5-outside country

## Moved in past year

	Moved	Did not Move
Proportion of sample	33.4	66.3

### Analyses of Hypotheses and Questions

The results of all ANOVA and regression analyses are shown in Appendix B.

A description of all analyses is provided in Appendix C. These results are discussed in terms of the hypotheses and questions outlined in the introduction. In the following discussion, the significance level has been set at .05 unless otherwise stated.

Hypothesis #1) Respondents moving in the past year are lonelier than those who have not moved in that time.

"Moved in past year" was regressed on loneliness. A relationship was found between loneliness and moving in the past year but was opposite to the one hypothesized,  $F(1,186) = 5.41, p < .05$ . In other words people who moved in the past year were not as lonely as those who had not moved.

Although the relationship between these two variables is statistically significant, the difference between the means of the two groups is small. The mean loneliness score for movers was 32.0 compared to a mean for non-movers of 35.1.

Hypothesis #2) Loneliness is inversely related to length of occupancy.

Length of occupancy was regressed on loneliness for respondents whose length of occupancy was greater than one year. For those not moving in the past year, loneliness was not related to length of occupancy at a statistically significant level,  $R = .12$ ,  $F(1,136) = 2.07$ .

Hypothesis #3) Loneliness is related to the distance of the respondents' most recent move.

Distance of last move was regressed on loneliness. Loneliness was not found to be related to distance of the most recent move at a statistically significant level,  $R = .01$ ,  $F(1,191) = 0.01$ .

Analysis of variance was used to test whether loneliness was related to distance of the respondents' most recent move for those moving in the past year. Distance of last move was not significantly related to loneliness at a for those moving in the past year.

Hypothesis #4) Loneliness is related to one's support system.

Level of social support was regressed on loneliness. Loneliness was not found to be linearly related to one's level of support at a statistically significant level,  $R = .16$ ,  $F(1,140) = 3.55$ . A scatterplot which plotted loneliness scores against PSNS showed that the majority of

respondents had both low loneliness and low PSNS scores. When the reciprocal of PSNS was regressed on loneliness, it was not related to loneliness at a statistically significant level,  $R = .15$ ,  $F(1,140) = 3.35$

Hypothesis #5) One's level of support is related to length of occupancy.

Length of occupancy was regressed on level of support. One's level of support was not found to be related to length of occupancy at a statistically significant level,  $R = .10$ ,  $F(1,143) = 1.56$ .

Question #1) Are individuals who have moved many times different in terms of loneliness than those who have seldom moved?

Number of moves was regressed on loneliness. The number of times an individual moved was found not to be significantly related to that person's loneliness score,  $R = .02$ ,  $F(1,197) = 0.13$ .

Question #2) Is number of moves related to level of support?

Number of moves was regressed on level of support.

These two variables were found to be positively related at a statistically significant level,  $R = .18$ ,  $F(1,143) = 4.98$ ,  $p < .05$ .

Question #3) Is number of moves related to whom an individual turns to for support?

Number of moves was regressed on the four categorized sources of support. Of the four sources of support, only the number of contacts with coworkers was significantly related to the number of times an individual moved,  $R = .22$ ,  $F(1,150)=7.97$ ,  $p<.01$ . This correlation indicated that as the number of moves an individual makes increases, the number of personal discussions he has with coworkers also increases.

Question #4) Are loneliness, residential mobility, level of support, and/or difficulty in making friends related to marital status, level of education, age and/or gender?

The four demographic variables were regressed on loneliness, level of support, number of moves, length of occupancy, distance of last move and "moved in past year". Table 3 shows the results of these analyses for the residential mobility variables. The demographic variables were found to be significantly related to all measures of residential mobility except distance of last move. The R-change values associated with age indicate that age is clearly the greatest contributor to the correlations between the measures of residential mobility and the demographic variables.

Loneliness, level of support and difficulty of making friends were not found to be significantly related to the demographic variables.

Table 3  
Multiple Regression Analyses of Age, Gender, Marital Status and Education regressed on Residential Mobility

Dependent Variable	I.V., Age Entered, R=	Overall R	F	Significance of F	n
Number of moves	.47	.49	12.11	$p < .01$	195
Length of occupancy	.56	.58	18.79	$p < .01$	191
Distance of last move	.20	.23	2.07	-	183
Moved in past year	.20	.26	2.62	$p < .05$	194

Question #5 Is the distance of the most recent move related to the difficulty of maintaining friendships formed in previous neighbourhoods?

The distance of last move was regressed on difficulty of maintaining past friendships. Difficulty of maintaining friendships did not vary significantly as a function of distance of most recent move,  $R = .00$ ,  $F(1,191) = 0.00$ .

Question #6) Are plans for future moves related to present level of support and/or to loneliness?

Analysis of variance was used to test for a relationship between "planned future moves" and loneliness and between "planned future moves" and level of support. Individuals planning to move in the near future did not differ significantly from those not planning to move in terms of level of support,  $F(2,130) = 0.53$ , or in terms of loneliness,  $F(2,164) = 0.88$ .

Question #7) What proportion of moves are made "to find friends" in comparison to other reasons for moving?

The 174 respondents who had moved listed 634 moves in all. Seven of the moves equalling 1.1% of the moves were made to "meet new people" and 8.4% were made "to be with family and friends."

Question #8) Does loneliness vary as a function of one's reason for moving?

Analysis of variance was used to examine how loneliness is related to one's reason for moving. Loneliness did not vary significantly as a function of one's reason for moving,  $F(5,180) = 0.95$ .



Question #9) Is perception of level of neighbourhood mobility related to level of support from neighbours and/or loneliness?

Level of neighbourhood mobility was regressed on level of support from neighbours and on loneliness. Perception of level of neighbourhood mobility (stability) was not significantly related to level of support from neighbours,  $R = .00$ ,  $F(1,177) = 0.00$ . Nor was perception of level of neighbourhood mobility related to loneliness at a statistically significant level,  $R = .09$ ,  $F(1,188) = 1.53$ .

Question #10) Is loneliness related to categories of level of support?

The number of contacts with neighbours, coworkers, friends, and family were each regressed on loneliness. The results of these analyses are shown in Table 4. The number of neighbour contacts was the only category of level of support found to be significantly related to loneliness. The variables were related negatively which means that individuals with little contact with neighbours were more likely to be lonely than those who regularly spoke with neighbours.

Table 4  
Bivariate Regression Analyses between Loneliness and  
Four Sources of Social Support

Source of Support	R	F	Significance of F	n
Neighbours	.27	11.60	$p < .01$	150
Coworkers	.01	0.02	-	150
Friends	.10	1.39	-	150
Family	.01	0.01	-	150

Question #11) Do the categories of level of support differ in their relationship to length of occupancy?

The number of contacts with neighbours, coworkers, friends and family were each regressed on length of occupancy. The results of these analyses are shown in Table 5. The number of coworker contacts was the only level of support category found to be significantly related to length of occupancy. The variables were related negatively which means that individuals who have moved recently were more likely to talk with coworkers about personal matters than those who have not moved recently.

Table 5  
Bivariate Regression Analyses between Length of  
Occupancy and Four sources of Social Support

Source of Support	R	F	Significance of F	n
Neighbours	.00	0.00	-	150
Coworkers	.17	4.44	$p < .05$	150
Friends	.05	0.32	-	150
Family	.11	1.68	-	150

To summarize the results, loneliness was not found to be significantly related to virtually all measures of residential mobility, level of social support or reason for last move. Positive relationships were found between number of moves and level of support and between number of moves and number of contacts with coworkers. Negative relationships were found between length of occupancy and number of moves and between loneliness and number of contacts with neighbours. When the effects of age, gender, marital status and education were examined, the only significant relationships found were between age and the various aspects of residential mobility.

## DISCUSSION

The purpose of this research was to examine the relationship between loneliness and residential mobility. Loneliness was not found to be related to number of moves, distance of last move or length of occupancy. These results are consistent with those of Rubenstein and Shaver (1978) and Moore (1975). The only relationship found between loneliness and mobility was that those who had moved in the past year were less likely to be lonely than those who had not moved.

It was hypothesized that level of loneliness would be related to mobility because moving from one residence to another separates one from a support network of friends and family. The present study does not provide support for this hypothesis since one's level of support was found to be related neither to whether one had moved in the past year nor to one's level of loneliness.

If mobility is related to loneliness due to a loss of social support, it follows that those living in mobile neighbourhoods would be lonelier than those living in stable neighbourhoods since they also suffer from loss of social support. However an individual's level of loneliness did not vary with how he perceived his neighbourhood in terms of mobility. Furthermore, the number of contacts an individual

had with neighbours was not found to be related to how mobile he perceived his neighbours to be. This also suggests that level of social support from neighbours is not related to the level of neighbourhood mobility. Thus, the results do not provide support for the hypothesis that loneliness and mobility are related due a loss of social support. These results are not consistent with those of the Rubenstein and Shaver study. Rubenstein and Shaver found that loneliness was related to number of hours spent socializing (r-squared values were between .10 and .30). The present study differs from the Rubenstein and Shaver study in a number of ways which might account for the differences in results. Rather than selecting a particular sample, Rubenstein and Shaver used respondents who completed a questionnaire published in a local newspaper. Another difference is that the majority of respondents in the present research were male whereas the majority of Rubenstien and Shavers' respondents were female. The differences in the results may be a result of the different methods used to measure loneliness and level of social support (or socializing). The present study used a well developed measure of loneliness whereas Rubenstein and Shaver relied on a few, very direct questions to measure loneliness. Level of social support was defined in the

present study as the total number of contacts made with neighbours, coworkers, friends and family in the past month whereas Rubenstein and Shaver measured number of groups to which the respondent belonged, number of friends, number of social events attended and number of phone calls. Therefore, it is clear that the two studies are measuring slightly different things. And finally, the differences may be explained by the larger sample used in the Rubenstein and Shaver research. It may be that R values close to the ones obtained in the present study reached statistical significance because of higher degrees of freedom.

The components of level of social support, namely number of contacts with each of neighbours, coworkers, friends and families were each compared with loneliness and the measures of residential mobility to explore the possibility of other relationships. The number of contacts with coworkers was related to both length of occupancy and number of moves. Thus it appears that mobile people are more likely to rely on coworkers for social support than less mobile individuals. It should be noted that length of occupancy and number of moves are strongly correlated in a negative direction,  $R = .48$ ,  $F = 59.46$ ,  $p < .01$ .

The only component of PSNS to be related to loneliness was the amount of contact with neighbours. This

relationship is quite unexpected, since one would suppose that friends and family generally provide more important social contact than neighbours. Possibly, the accessibility of neighbours accounts for the relationship between loneliness and the amount of contact with neighbours. However, the causes of this relationship clearly require more careful examination in future research.

Level of social support was related to two measures of residential mobility. The level of social support increased as the number of moves one made increased and as the average distance of moves in the past ten years increased. A possible explanation for these relationships is that high mobility provides an opportunity to develop the interpersonal skills necessary for meeting people after moving to a new neighbourhood. This appears to be an unlikely explanation as the results indicate that highly mobile generally find it more difficult to maintain friends from previous neighbourhoods and to make friends in their present neighbourhood. It may be that mobility is related to the total number of contacts simply because they have developed social networks in a number of areas and therefore have more friends with which to keep in touch.

Level of social support was also related to the cumulative distance an individual moved. This relationship

would be expected since cumulative distance is actually the number of moves multiplied by the average distance of move.

Thus, contrary to what was hypothesized, it appears that the highly mobile individual actually has more contact with friends and family than someone less mobile. In fact, if loneliness and residential mobility are related for some other reason, this relationship would be counteracted by the effect of level of support. The following discussion will examine some alternate explanations for a loneliness-mobility relationship and how the results can be interpreted with regard to these explanations.

A rival hypothesis that would explain a loneliness-mobility relationship is that lonely people move in order to find friends who would hopefully ease that loneliness. The respondents indicated that 1.1% of their moves were made to meet new people and that 8.4% of their moves were made to be closer to family and friends. This would suggest that loneliness is not a strong motivating force for mobility. However, when interpreting these data one must realize that there is probably more than one reason for any given move and that it would require a fairly intensive interviewing process and a good deal of introspection on the part of the participant to sort out these reasons. The present study relies on a relatively



superficial question for data on this issue since it is secondary to the main focus of the thesis.

This research also investigated a possible relationship between loneliness and the reason for one's last move. It was thought that people who moved for personal reasons might be less lonely than people who move because of their occupation or education. However these two variables were not found to be related.

Another way in which loneliness could be related to residential mobility is that highly mobile people limit the depth of interpersonal relationships because they know that they will soon be moving and that the shallowness of their relationships leads to loneliness. There was no support for this hypothesis since those planning to move in the next year were no different in terms of loneliness or level of social support than those not planning to move. Also, of the 17.5% of the respondents who were planning to move in the next year, only 18.9% (3.5% of the total population) felt that this made them less likely to seek new friends now. Thus, if mobility presents a problem as hypothesized here, it is a problem for a very small minority of the population.

It was suspected that relationships found between loneliness, level of social support and mobility might be a

result of the following underlying demographic variables: age, gender, marital status and education. However, no relationships were discovered between these variables and either loneliness or level of social support. The only significant relationships discovered were between age and the measures of residential mobility: Distance of last move and length of occupancy were positively related to age and number of moves was negatively related to age. In other words older people were more likely to have moved fewer times in the last ten years, to have moved a longer distance on their last move and to have lived in their present dwelling longer than younger people. Also older people were more likely not to have moved in the past year.

The present research tested for a relationship between distance of last move and ease of maintaining friendships with previous neighbours. Such a relationship would suggest a possible relationship between distance of last move and loneliness since loneliness was found to be related to ease of maintaining past friendships,  $F(1,188) = 19.17$ ,  $p < .01$ . However, results indicate that distance of last move is not related to ease of maintaining past friendships. Therefore the present study does not provide support for the hypothesis that distance of last move is related to loneliness as a result of an effect on ease of maintaining friendships with previous neighbours.

In conclusion, of all of the measures of residential mobility studied, only "moved in past year" was found to be related to loneliness at a statistically significant level. Thus, the present study does not provide support for the theories explored by Keyes (1973) and Bowman (1955).

Level of social support was found to be related to two measures of residential mobility in an opposite direction to that hypothesized. Therefore, it appears possible that level of social support actually counteracts a possible relationship between residential mobility and loneliness. The following possible links between these two variables were also investigated:

- (1) Lonely people move to find friends,
- (2) Future moves limit the depth of present interpersonal relationships,
- (3) A loneliness-mobility relationship is caused by common underlying demographic variables,
- (4) Long moves make it difficult to maintain friendships with previous neighbours and thus is related to loneliness.

The present study does not provide support for any of the above four statements. Therefore, of the measures of residential mobility examined in this study, only "moved in past year" appears to be related to loneliness.

While this research used respondents from the general population to increase the generalizability of the findings, it must be recognized that it suffers from the same problem that afflicts all research using volunteers in that it is not known how the respondents differ from non-respondents.

We know that the respondents are more often young, married, well-educated and male than the general population. This is likely due, at least in part, to how the potential respondents were selected. One might expect the respondents to be relatively young since half of those selected were to have moved recently and age was found to be related to mobility. The disproportionately large number of married, male respondents may be a result of the fact that a household is more likely to be listed in the Vernon's directory under the husband's name. Therefore the person filling out the questionnaire was likely the one to whom it was actually addressed (i.e. the husband and not the wife). Since more young, married males were selected one would expect the level of education to be higher than for the general population. This is not to say, however, that part of the differences in education level is not due to different interests of the potential respondents.

The demographic variables measured were not related to loneliness or level of social support and, therefore, do not

present a problem in interpreting these data. However, one must be careful in generalizing the results outside of the population of young, married, well-educated men.

It is difficult to determine whether the sample used in this research is representative in terms of level of social support. There is some evidence that people who complete mail-in questionnaires are more sociable than non-respondents (Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1975). This was found to be the case both when the questionnaire included items related to sociability (Tiffany et al, 1970; Lehman, 1965) and when the questionnaire focussed on issues unrelated to sociability (Kivlin, 1963; Reuss, 1943). Although some research in this area showed no difference in sociability between respondents and non-respondents (Bennett & Hill, 1964; Ebert, 1973; Poor, 1967) and one study indicated non-respondents are less sociable than respondents (Abeles et al, 1954) the majority of research found respondents to be more sociable than non-respondents. This would suggest that if the respondents in the present study are different in terms of level of social support that non-respondents, they have a greater level of social support. Since the few highly lonely respondents in the study reported a low level of social support, it is possible that the very lonely people are under-represented in this study. If

non-respondents are more lonely and have less social support than respondents the relationships found may have been dampened because of the relative dearth of lonely unsociable respondents.

The large number of respondents used in this study has made it possible for small R values to achieve statistical significance. For example, the R value for the loneliness-moved-in-past-year relationship is .18. This means that only 3% of the variation in the loneliness scores can be attributed to length of occupancy. Therefore it is obvious that there are other much larger contributors to the variation in the loneliness scores. Similarly level of social support is related to both number of moves and average distance of move at a .18 level. Clearly other sources of variation in these variables must be identified before sound conclusions can be made from the data. If a great deal of variation is due to measurement error, then one should attempt to reduce this error as much as possible. If other variables are more closely related to loneliness, research should focus on these factors to better understand and deal with the problem of loneliness.

The residential mobility questionnaire could better code the responses if the following changes were made. Two reasons often cited for moving is "marriage" and "to

purchase home." Therefore, these should be added to the list of reasons for moving. Also #7, "enjoy moving", should be deleted from this list since it only accounted for 0.6% of the moves.

The Petelka Social Network Scale would measure level of social support more accurately if the following changes were made. Firstly, what is meant by "personal friend" should be explained more elaborately so that the respondents include important social contacts but not casual acquaintances. Secondly, relatives and family members should be divided into two groups; those living with the respondent and those not living with the respondent. This would allow the researcher to identify the individual who has frequent social contact but whose only contacts are with his or her spouse and/or children. Finally, the respondents often avoided quantifying the number of social contacts by responding with "few" or "many". Therefore, the questions should be preceded by a request that the respondent use numbers to answer the questions even if the respondent needs to make a guess at the approximate number.

The UCLA Loneliness Scale would be improved if some of the items were altered to appear less ambiguous. It would be easier for a respondent to comment on whether he never, rarely, sometimes or often feels any given feeling if that

feeling is stated in positive terms. Therefore statements using negative terms such as not, no one, or no longer should be stated positively. For example, "I am no longer close to anyone" might be changed to "I feel distant from everyone."

Before selecting the sample used in this research, a great deal of time and effort was spent in searching for an appropriate subgroup of the general population to approach as respondents. It was assumed that clearer interpretations could be made from the responses of a more clearly defined and homogeneous sample.

The search began with insurance companies since it was thought that they might provide a large sample of relatively mobile people. But it was quickly determined that insurance salesmen must be stable in order to build a clientele and, therefore, are not as mobile as suspected.

The next step was to approach the major chartered banks with the research proposal. When it was possible, the researcher met with bank managers to whom he had been introduced by friends. It appeared that bank managers would provide a good sample of mobile people and the ones the researcher met were certainly enthusiastic about the project. However, all of the banks refused to cooperate in performing this research when the decision was put to the



person in charge of making such decisions. Some of the banks gave a flat "No" while others gave quite elaborate "No"'s. But most of them said that they were already performing similar research or had recently done so. When the researcher asked one personnel manager if he could look at the results he explained that they were confidential.

The researcher then approached a number of companies as well as the research branch of the armed forces with the proposal. It became increasingly clear that unless the researcher knew someone fairly high in the organization the proposal was not going to get serious consideration. When someone in a position of authority did give it serious consideration he refused to involve his organization because he was afraid that the questionnaire would cause unrest in employees who had been forced to move as a matter of policy.

Thus it became evident that it would be virtually impossible for the researcher to find a company that would be willing to research its policy of moving employees.

In the end, the research was accomplished by surveying the general population. In a pilot study volunteers, located in two local shopping malls completed the questionnaire. And then the questionnaire was mailed to randomly selected Kitchener residents.

The contribution of the present study to the understanding of loneliness is made clear when taken in the context of Peplau and Perlman's (1979) "Blueprint for a social psychological theory of loneliness." Peplau and Perlman consider four aspects of loneliness: (1) the definition of loneliness, (2) its manifestations and antecedents, (3) the role of attributions in loneliness and (4) ways of coping with loneliness. Antecedents of loneliness can be classified as either those which predispose one to loneliness or those which precipitate loneliness. Peplau and Perlman describe four ways in which loneliness can be precipitated: (1) the ending of a close emotional relationship, (2) physical separation from family and friends, (3) status changes such as promotion, unemployment or retirement and (4) reduced satisfaction in the quality of one's relationships. The present study contributes to the development of this framework by measuring the extent to which the precipitating factor, physical separation from family and friends, is related to various aspects of residential mobility. The results indicate that level of social support is not related to length of occupancy or number of moves in the past ten years such that individuals who move often have greater social support. The present study also supports Peplau and

Perlmans' position that frequency of interaction is not an accurate predictor of loneliness.

Further research in this area might be improved in a number of ways. The questionnaire used in the present study was limited in length so as to encourage potential respondents who had little motivation to participate in the research. Therefore, a subsequent study should begin with a more highly motivated sample. Perhaps this could be accomplished by offering the respondent some sort of material reward. Highly motivated respondents might put more effort into understanding the UCLA loneliness scale items. They would also enable the researcher to examine aspects of residential mobility and level of social support in greater detail. For example, a variable such as distance of a move could include a number of components other than the one measured in the present study. Other aspects of distance of a move which may be important in this context are the actual number of kilometers moved or the psychological distance between cultures.

Subsequent research in this area should also examine the positive relationship between level of social support and residential mobility and possible underlying factors. Moreover, measurement of level of social support might be expanded to include subjective measures of satisfaction regarding social support from various sources.

In conclusion, the results support few of the hypotheses proposed and do not provide the basis of conclusive statements regarding residential mobility and loneliness. Yet, this study is an important part of the growing body of research in this area in that it provides empirical data which one can use to put relatively subjective data in perspective. Informal interviews conducted during the course of the research and interviews conducted by Seidenburg (1973) indicate that for some individuals residential mobility does break up support networks, thereby causing loneliness. Therefore, empirical research is necessary to determine whether what affects these individuals occurs in the general population. On the basis of this research and other widely differing approaches to this question (Rubenstein and Shaver 1978; Moore, 1976), one can conclude, with caution, that residential mobility does not necessarily cause loneliness.

Since residential mobility does cause loneliness for a portion of our society the next step in studying this problem is to determine what other factors may interact with residential mobility to cause loneliness. Social skills, need for affiliation and personal interests are factors which should be considered in the future.

## REFERENCES

- Abeles, N., Iscoe I. & Brown, W.F. Some factors influencing the random sampling of college students. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1954, 18, 419-423.
- Bennett C.M. & Hill R.E., Jr. A comparison of selecte personality characteristics of responders and nonresponders to a mailed questionnaire study. Journal of Educational Research, 1964, 58, 178-180.
- Bowman, C.C. Loneliness and social change. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1955, 112, 194-198.
- Ebert, R.K. The Reliability and Validity of a Mailed Questionnaire for a Sample of Entering College Freshmen. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1973.
- Francis, G.M. Loneliness: Measuring the abstract. International Journal of Nursing studies, 1976, 13, 153-160.
- Fromm, E. Escape from Freedom. New York: Rinehart, 1941.
- Gordon, S. Lonely in America. New York: Simon & Shuster, 1976.
- Gubrium, J. F. Being single in old age. International Journal of Aging & Human Development, 1975, 6(1), 29-41.
- Hartog, J., Audy, J. R. & Cohen, Y.A. The Anatomy of Loneliness. New York: International Universities Press, 1980.
- Hutchison, I. W. The significance of marital status for morale and life satisfaction among the lower-income elderly. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1975, 37, 287-292.
- Keyes, R. We, the Lonely People. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.
- Kivlin, J.E. Contributions to the study of mail-back bias. Rural Sociology, 1965, 30, 322-326.
- Knipscheer, C.P. Social Integration: A problem for the elderly? Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Gerontologie, 1975, 6(3), 138-148.
- Lehman, E.C.Jr. Tests of significance and partial returns to mailed questionnaires. Rural Sociology, 1963, 28, 284-289.

- Mann, P. A. Residential mobility as an adaptive experience Journal of Clinical and Counselling Psychology, 1972, 39(1), 37-42.
- Moore, J. A. Loneliness: Self discrepancy and sociological variables. Canadian Counsellors, 1976, 10, 133-135.
- Nevils, R. S. A Study of Loneliness: Selected interpersonal, historical, situational and experiential aspects. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, 1978.
- Peplau, L.A. & Perlman, D. Blueprint for a social psychological theory of loneliness. In: Proceedings of the Swansea Conference on Love and Attraction, ed. G. Wilson. Oxford: Pergamon, 1979, 99-108.
- Poor, D. The Social Psychology of Questionnaires. Unpublished Bachelor's Thesis, Harvard College, 1967.
- Portnoff, G. The Experience of Loneliness. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, 1976.
- Reuss, C.F. Differences between persons responding and not responding to a mailed questionnaire. American Sociological Review, 1943, 8, 433-438.
- Roen, S. R. & Burnes, A. J. Community adaptation schedule. New York: Behavioural Publications, 1968.
- Rosenthal, R & Rosnow R.L., The Volunteer Subject. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1975.
- Rubenstein, C. M. & Shaver, P. Who are the Lonely? Telegram readers share their views. Worcester Sunday Telegram. July 2, 1978, 12-15.
- Russel, D., Peplau, L. A., & Ferguson, M. L. Developing a measure of loneliness. Journal of Personality Assessment. 1978, 42, 290-294.
- Russel, P., Peplau, L. A., & Cutrona, E. The revised UCLA Loneliness Scale: Concurrent and discriminant validity evidence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 1980, 39(3), 472-480.
- Seidenburg, R. Corporate Wives-Corporate Casualties. New York: Amacon, 1973.

Seidenburg, R. The lonely marriage in corporate America.(in Anatomy of Loneliness), 1980.

Tiffany, D.W., Cowan, J.r. & Blinn, E. Sample and personality biases of volunteer subjects. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 35, 38-43.

Statistics Canada. Supplementary bulletins: Geographic & Demographic. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services, 1978

Weiss, R. S. (Ed.) Loneliness: The experience of emotional and social isolation. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1973.

**Wilfrid Laurier University**



Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3C5. Telephone (519) 884-1970

Hello,

I am a graduate student of psychology at Wilfrid Laurier University. I am writing to ask you to help me explore the effects of residential mobility, that is the movement from one community to another, on the individual. You were selected because you have moved to your present location within the past year and a half.

All that I ask is that you fill out the following short questionnaire, and return it by mail. Naturally you are quite free to throw the questionnaire in your round filing cabinet, but the few minutes it will take you to go through it will likely be interesting and will certainly be appreciated. Also I would be glad to mail you a summary of the results when the study is completed. All information received will be completely confidential.

Thank you very much for your time and thought.

Sincerely Yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Bruce Petelka".

Bruce Petelka



Residential Mobility Questionnaire

51

Age \_\_\_\_\_

Occupation \_\_\_\_\_

Gender: Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female \_\_\_\_\_

TIGHT BINDING  
Reliure trop rigideMarital Status

Single \_\_\_\_\_

Separated/Divorced \_\_\_\_\_

Married \_\_\_\_\_

Widowed \_\_\_\_\_

Educational Level

Less than Grade 9 \_\_\_\_\_

Some University or College \_\_\_\_\_

Some High School \_\_\_\_\_

Bachelor Degree \_\_\_\_\_

High School Diploma \_\_\_\_\_

Post-graduate Degree \_\_\_\_\_

Please fill out the following chart for moves you have made in the past ten years, beginning with the most recent move.

	Date of Move Month, Year	Distance of move See Coding Below	Reason for move See Coding Below	No. of people moving with you
Most Recent				
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15		Please give date of last move if greater than 10 year		

Coding for Distance

A-within neighbourhood

B-within town/city

C-within county

D-within province

E-within country

F-outside country

Coding for Reason

1-Related to own employment

2-Related to spouse's employment

3-Education

4-To be with family &amp; friends

5-To be in a nicer area

6-To meet new people

7-Enjoy moving

8-Other-Please specify

1) Are you planning to move in the next year?

Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Do not know \_\_\_\_

2) If you are planning to move, do you believe that these plans make you less likely to seek new friends now?

Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Do not know \_\_\_\_

3) Generally speaking, how mobile are your neighbours?

/	/	/	/	/	/
Very Mobile	Mobile	Slightly Mobile	Slightly Stable	Stable	Very Stable

4) How easy was it to make new friends in your present neighbourhood?

/	/	/	/	/	/
Very Easy	Easy	Somewhat Easy	Somewhat Difficult	Difficult	Very Difficult

5) How difficult has it been to maintain friendships formed in previous neighbourhoods?

/	/	/	/	/	/
Very Difficult	Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Somewhat Easy	Easy	Very Easy

6) How many neighbours do you consider as personal friends?

\_\_\_\_ neighbours.

7) How many times in the past month did you stop and talk with one or another of these neighbours? \_\_\_\_ times.

8) How many coworkers do you consider as personal friends?

\_\_\_\_ coworkers.

9) How many times in the past month did you discuss personal matters with one or another of these coworkers? \_\_\_\_ times.

10) Outside of neighbours and coworkers, how many personal friends do you have? \_\_\_\_ friends.

11) How many times in the past month did you stop and talk with one or another of these friends? \_\_\_\_ times.

12) How many relatives and family members do you consider to be 'close' to you? \_\_\_\_ relatives and family members.

13) How many times in the past month did you stop and talk with one or another of these relatives or family members? \_\_\_\_ times.

Directions: Indicate how often you feel the way described in each of the following statements. Circle one number for each.

Statement	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
1. I feel in tune with people around me	1	2	3	4
2. I lack companionship	1	2	3	4
3. There is no one I can turn to	1	2	3	4
4. I do not feel alone	1	2	3	4
5. I feel part of a group of friends	1	2	3	4
6. I have a lot in common with the people around me	1	2	3	4
7. I am no longer close to anyone	1	2	3	4
8. My interests and ideas are not shared by those around me	1	2	3	4
9. I am an outgoing person	1	2	3	4
10. There are people I feel close to	1	2	3	4
11. I feel left out	1	2	3	4
12. My social relationships are superficial	1	2	3	4
13. No one really knows me well	1	2	3	4
14. I feel isolated from others	1	2	3	4
15. I can find companionship when I want it	1	2	3	4
16. There are people who really understand me	1	2	3	4
17. I am unhappy being so withdrawn	1	2	3	4
18. People are around me but not with me	1	2	3	4
19. There are people I can talk to	1	2	3	4
20. There are people I can turn to	1	2	3	4

If you would like a summary of the results please provide your name and address below.

---



---



---

## Appendix B

Table B-1) Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Range
Age	37.2	32.1	14.1	19-81
Number of moves	3.1	2.4	2.8	0-17
Length of occupancy	3.5	2.4	2.8	0-35.5
Distance of last move	2.3	-	5.5	1-5
Number of people moving with respondent on last move	1.9	1.6	1.4	1-6
Neighbourhood mobility	4.3	4.8	1.4	1-6
Difficulty of making friends	2.9	2.8	1.3	1-6
Ease of maintaining past friendships	3.7	3.8	1.5	1-6

Table B-2) Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Yes	No	Do not know	n
Plan to move in next year	17.5%	71.4	11.2	206
Will planning to move affect making friends at present	18.9	73.0	8.1	37

Table B-3) Analysis of Variance Results

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	n	F	Significance of F (p=)
Loneliness	Reason for last move	186	0.95	.45
Loneliness	Planned future moves	166	0.40	.53
PSNS	Planned future moves	132	0.02	.88
Number of neigh- contacts	Planned future moves	156	0.73	.39
Loneliness	Distance of last move	188	1.02	.40
Loneliness	Moved in last year	200	6.63	.01
Loneliness	Interaction variable*	201	3.17	.04
PSNS	Interaction variable	159	2.20	.11
Number of moves	Interaction variable	206	11.96	<.01
Difficulty making friends	Interaction variable	202	0.47	.63
Ease of maintain- ing past friends	Interaction variable	204	2.94	.05

\* "Interaction variable" is used to refer to the interaction between "moved in past year" and distance of last move. The respondents were divided into three groups; those not moving in the past year, those moving within the city in the past year and those moving from outside the city in the past year.

Table B-4) Bivariate Regression Analyses

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	R	F	Signif. of F	n
Loneliness	PSNS	.16	3.55	-	142
Loneliness	1/PSNS	.15	3.35	-	142
Loneliness	Number of neighbour contacts	.27	11.60	$p < .01$	150
Loneliness	Number of coworker contacts	.01	.02	-	150
Loneliness	Number of friend contacts	.10	1.39	-	150
Loneliness	Number of family contacts	.01	.01	-	150
Loneliness	Moved in past year	.18	6.41	$p < .05$	188
Loneliness	Length of occupancy	.12	2.07	-	138
Loneliness	Distance of last move	.01	.01	-	191
Loneliness	Number of moves	.02	.13	-	199
PSNS	Moved in past year	.14	2.79	-	145
Number of moves	Loneliness	.03	.14	-	188
Loneliness	Average distance of move	.05	.40	-	142
PSNS	Average distance of move	.18	4.87	$p < .05$	142
PSNS	Number of moves	.18	4.98	$p < .05$	145
PSNS	Length of occupancy	.10	1.56	-	145
PSNS	Distance of last move	.00	.00	-	145

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	R	F	Signif. of F	n
Loneliness	Cumulative distance	.04	.24	-	142
PSNS	Cumulative distance	.20	6.05	$p < .05$	142
Loneliness	Number of people moving with respondent on last move	.00	.00	-	184
Loneliness	Average number of people moving with respondent	.00	.00	-	184
Number of neighbour contacts	Number of moves	.02	.06	-	152
Number of neighbour contacts	1/Number of moves	.04	.26	-	186
Number of coworker contacts	Number of moves	.22	7.97	$p < .01$	152
Number of friend contacts	Number of moves	.05	.32	-	152
Number of family contacts	Number of moves	.07	.77	-	152
Difficulty of making friends	Number of moves	.18	6.82	$p < .01$	152
Ease of maintaining past friendships	Number of moves	.18	6.39	$p < .05$	193
Difficulty of making friends	Length of occupancy	.12	2.91	-	200
Ease of maintaining Past f	Distance of last move	.00	.00	-	193
Number of neighbour contacts	Stability of neighbours	.00	.00	-	179



Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	R	F	Signif. of F	n
Loneliness	Ease of maintaining past friendships	.30	19.17	$p < .01$	190
Loneliness	Stability of neighbours	.09	1.53	-	190
Loneliness	Difficulty of making friends	.41	38.37	$p < .01$	190
Number of neighbour contacts	Moved in past year	.06	.62	-	151
Number of coworker contacts	Moved in past year	.11	1.84	-	151
Number of friend contacts	Moved in past year	.02	.04	-	151
Number of family contacts	Moved in past year	.05	.43	-	151
Number of neighbour contacts	Length of occupancy	.00	.00	-	150
Number of coworker contacts	Length of occupancy	.17	4.44	$p < .05$	150
Number of friend contacts	Length of occupancy	.05	.32	-	150
Number of family contacts	Length of occupancy	.11	1.68	-	150
PSNS	1/Length of occupancy	.03	.17	-	154
PSNS	1/Age	.14	2.91	-	154
Number of moves	1/Age	.47	56.03	$p < .01$	203

Table B-5) Multivariate Regression Analyses

Dependent Variable	Independent Variables	R	F	Signif. of F	n
Loneliness	Residential mobility	.09	.54	-	188
Loneliness	Residential mobility & interactions	.24	1.15	-	146
PSNS	Residential mobility	.19	1.68	-	145
PSNS	Residential mobility & interactions	.26	1.41	-	145
Loneliness	Demographic variables	.09	.33	-	190
PSNS	Demographic variables	.25	2.02	-	151
Number of moves	Demographic variables	.49	12.10	p<.01	195
Length of occupancy	Demographic variables	.58	18.79	p<.01	192
Distance of last move	Demographic variables	.23	2.02	-	183
Moved in past year	Demographic variables	.25	2.62	p<.05	194
Ease of maintaining friendships	Demographic variables	.24	2.22	-	191

Note: Residential mobility variables include length of occupancy, distance of last move and number of moves.

Demographic variables include age, gender, marital status and education.

## Appendix C

Analysis

Frequency, mean, median, mode, standard deviation, variance and range were calculated for the following variables.

Age

Gender

Marital status

Level of education

Number of moves

"Moved in past year"

Length of occupancy

Distance of last move

Number of people moving with respondent on last move

Reason for last move

Planned future moves

Attitude regarding future move

Neighbourhood mobility

Ease of making friends

Ease of maintaining past friendships

Anova was used to test the relationships between the following variables. These relationships are expressed as 'Dependent variable by Independent variable'.

Loneliness by Reason for last move

Loneliness by Planned future moves

Loneliness by Distance of last move

PSNS by Planned future moves

Number of neighbour contacts by Planned future moves

ANOVA was also used to compare those not moving in the past year, those moving within Kitchener in the past year and those moving from outside Kitchener in the past year on the following variables.

Loneliness

PSNS

Number of moves

Ease of making friends

Ease of maintaining past friendships

Age

Gender

Marital status

Education

Note that the continuous variables considered to be the independent variables were analysed as if they were the

dependent variables so that information was not lost in categorizing continuous variables.

Bivariate regression analyses were used to test the relationships between the following variables. These relationships are expressed as 'Dependent variable with Independent variable'.

Loneliness with PSNS

Loneliness with "Moved in past year"

Loneliness with Length of occupancy

Loneliness with Number of moves

Loneliness with Distance of last move

PSNS with "Moved in past year"

Number of moves with Loneliness

Loneliness with Average distance of move

PSNS with Average distance of move

Loneliness with Cumulative distance

PSNS with Cumulative distance

Loneliness with Number of people moving with respondent on last move

Number of neighbour contacts with all Residential mobility measures

Number of coworker contacts with all Residential mobility measures

Number of friend contacts with all Residential mobility measures

Number of family contacts with all Residential mobility measures

Difficulty of making friends with Number of moves

Number of neighbour contacts with Mobility of neighbours

Loneliness with Ease of maintaining past friendships

Loneliness with Difficulty of making friends

Loneliness with Neighbourhood mobility

Loneliness with Number of neighbour contacts

Loneliness with Number of coworker contacts

Loneliness with Number of friend contacts

Loneliness with Number of family contacts

Ease of maintaining past friendships with Distance of last move

Ease of maintaining past friendships with Number of moves

Scatterplots were produced for all important sets of variables. After these plots were examined it appeared as though the dependent variable might be related to the reciprocal of the independent variable in the following sets of variables.

Loneliness with PSNS

PSNS with Length of occupancy

PSNS with Age

PSNS with Average number of People moving with respondent

Number of neighbour contacts with Number of moves

Number of moves with Age

The scatterplots also made evident the fact that on the measures of social support a few respondents scored values clearly outside of the normal range of distribution.

Therefore all analyses using PSNS or its component scores were recalculated excluding respondents whose level of social support was greater than three standard deviations from the mean. This was done under the assumption that those respondents outside the normal range of distribution interpreted the questions differently than the rest of the sample.

Multivariate regression was used to test the relationships between the following variables.

Loneliness with Length of occupancy, Distance of last move and Number of moves

PSNS with Length of Occupancy, Distance of last move and Number of moves

Length of occupancy, distance of last move and number of moves were regressed on loneliness after "moved in last year" was added to the regression equation to determine whether the measures of residential mobility were related to loneliness after variability due to "moved in past year" was taken into account.

Interactions between the measures of residential mobility were also examined in terms of how they related to loneliness and PSNS scores.

The measures of residential mobility were also regressed on PSNS scores separately because of the relatively large r-squared-change value associated with number of moves.

Demographic variables, age, gender, marital status and education were regressed on the following independent variables in multivariate regression analyses.

Loneliness

PSNS

Number of moves

Length of occupancy

"Moved last year"

Distance of last move

Ease of maintaining past friendships