

## The Status of and Relationship between Loneliness and Internet Addiction Among College Students

BY

Yongmei Hou<sup>1\*</sup> Li Chumeng<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Department of Psychology, School of Humanities and Management, Guangdong Medical University, Dongguan, Guangdong, China



### Article History

Received: 01/03/2023

Accepted: 11/03/2023

Published: 13/03/2023

Corresponding author:

Yongmei Hou

### Abstract

**Objective** To explore the status of college students' Internet addiction and loneliness, and explore the impact of loneliness on Internet addiction. **Methods** 1229 undergraduates are selected by stratified random sampling method, and they are investigated with the Young Internet Addiction Impact Index (IAII) and the Revised UCLALS3 Loneliness Scale-Version 3 (UCLALS3). **Results:** (1) The scores of IAII and UCLALS3 of this group are  $(50.66 \pm 12.83)$  and  $(43.63 \pm 8.16)$  respectively. (2) The incidence of Internet addiction in this group is 75.25%; The incidences of low, medium and high loneliness are 22.17%, 33.64% and 44.19%, respectively; (3) There are significant differences in the incidences of Internet addiction and loneliness between boys and girls at all levels ( $\chi^2=31.492, 43.256; All P < .001$ ). (4) The result of linear regression analysis shows that the total score of UCLALS3 positively predicts the total score of IAII ( $\beta=.368, P < .001$ ). **Conclusion** Internet addiction is a common behavior problem of college students, and loneliness may be one of the main influencing factors of college students' Internet addiction.

**Key words:** Internet Addiction, Loneliness, Influencing Factors, Linear Regression Analysis

### 1. Introduction

Loneliness is a painful experience that an individual undergoes when his/her actual social relation is obviously inferior to the expected status, and meanwhile, he/she feels not accepted due to isolation from others or lack of contact [1-2]. The young college students experience high-level loneliness universally. Almost every college student feels lonely, among them, the rate of medium or serious loneliness is 61.4~95.5% [3-6]. The loneliness could predict forwards the psychological and behavioral problems of college students such as smartphone addiction [3,7-8], distress in romantic relationships and sex [5], depression [9], and suicidal ideation [6]; and predict negatively mental health status [10] and subjective well-being [11]; loneliness could reduce sleep quality [8,12-13], and increase morbidity and mortality rates of multiple diseases [12-13].

Network technology has broadened people's horizons, facilitated people's lives, and made great contributions to the progress of society, but there are also drawbacks, among which the harm caused by Internet addiction is huge. Internet Addiction Disorder (IAD) refers to the phenomenon of obvious social and

psychological damage caused by excessive use of the Internet [14]. College students have become a high-incidence group of Internet addiction [15]. Internet addiction can cause extensive physical and psychological harm to individuals, such as affecting individuals' sleep quality [16], causing cognitive decline [17], producing emotional disorders such as depression and anxiety [18], and even social dysfunction [19]. There are many reasons for Internet addiction, one of which is bad mood. The ACE model established by Young points out that the three characteristics of the network itself, namely, concealment, convenience, and remoteness from reality, will lead to excessive Internet access. Concealment refers to the fact that individuals can hide their names in the network and freely vent their emotions without feeling uneasy; Convenience means that individuals can meet their various needs through the network without leaving home; Being away from reality means that when encountering various difficulties in life, individuals can seek comfort and stimulation through the Internet [14]. It can be seen that the root cause of Internet addiction is that the Internet can meet all kinds of needs, even those that addicts cannot meet in the real world, such as emotional needs. That is to say, addicts have

great emotional deficiency in the real world. So, do the Internet addicts have a higher loneliness than general population? How does loneliness affect Internet addiction? This paper aims to answer these questions.

## 2. Objects and Methods

### 2.1 Objects

The stratified random sampling method is adopted to select a total of 1300 undergraduates from 7 universities including Guangdong Pharmaceutical University, Jinan University, Guangzhou Academy of Fine Arts, Guangdong University of Technology, Xinghai Conservatory of Music, Guangdong Institute of Physical Education and Guangdong Institute of Finance. 1299 valid questionnaires are collected, and the effective rate is 94.5%. There are 717 boys and 582 girls; 1002 only-children and 297 non-only-children; 741 urban students and 558 rural students; 343 freshmen, 310 sophomores, 269 juniors, 251 seniors, and 126 fifth-year students. The age ranged from 17 to 24 years old, with an average of  $(19.54 \pm 1.38)$  years old.

### 2.2 Tools

#### 2.2.1 Revised UCLA Loneliness Scale-Version 3 (UCLALS3) [20]

Compiled by Russell, et al. (1978) [20] and revised by Liu Ping [21] into the Chinese version. UCLALS3 contains 20 items, with a single dimension. The Likert 4-point scoring method is adopted to score from 1 to 4 points corresponding to “never” to “always”. The higher the total score, the serious the loneliness. Those with total score  $>44$  are highly lonely,  $<28$  are lowly lonely, while  $28 \leq$  total score  $\leq 44$  are medium lonely. In this study, the Cronbach’s a coefficient of the scale is 0.889.

#### 2.2.2 Internet Addiction Impairment Index (IAII)[22]

Compiled by Young KS (1999)[22], University of Pittsburgh, USA. A total of 20 items are divided into 4 dimensions, namely tolerance (TO), compulsion and withdrawal reaction (CW), time management (TM), interpersonal and health problems (IH). The Likert 5-point scoring method is used to score from 1 to 5 points corresponding to “almost not” to “always”. The higher the total score, the higher the degree of addiction. 0-30 points are non-Internet addicts, 31-49 points are mild Internet addicts or Internet addicts, 50-79 points are moderate Internet addicts, 80-100 points are serious or severe Internet addicts. In this study, the Cronbach’s a coefficient of the total table is 0.873, and the Cronbach’s a coefficients of each dimension is 0.751-0.822.

### 2.3 Data Processing

SPSS 20.0 is used for statistical analysis. Descriptive statistics is used to calculated the mean scores and standard deviations; Pearson product difference correlation is used to explore the

correlation among variables; Linear regression is used to analyze the influences of loneliness on Internet addiction.

## 3. Results

### 3.1 Common Method Deviation Test

Since the data are all from the questionnaire (self-report of the subjects), there may be common bias. Harman single factor test [23] is used to test the common method deviation. The results showed that there are 17 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1, and the first factor explains 24.34% of the total variation, which is less than the critical criterion of 40%. Therefore, the influence of common method bias on the results of this study can be excluded.

### 3.2 The level of college students’ Internet addiction and loneliness

The IAII total score is  $(50.66 \pm 12.83)$ , and the UCLALS3 total score is  $(43.63 \pm 8.16)$ .

### 3.3 Incidence of Internet addiction among college students

#### 3.3.1 Overall incidences

984 students in this group score more than 40 in IAII, accounting for 75.25% of the sample. Among them, 869 are mild Internet addicts, accounting for 66.90% of the sample; 79 are moderate Internet addicts, accounting for 6.08% of the sample; 36 are severe Internet addicts, accounting for 2.77% of the sample.

#### 3.3.2 Comparison of the incidences of Internet addiction at various levels between boys and girls

It can be seen from Table 1 that there are significant differences in the incidences of Internet addiction at various level between boys and girls ( $\chi^2=31.492, P<.001$ ).

Table 1 Differences in the incidences of Internet addiction at various levels between boys and girls  $n(\%)$

Addition level	Gender	Boys	Girls
	$\chi^2$	$P$	
Non-internet addiction (NonA)	133 (18.55)	182 (31.27)	31.492 <.001
Mild internet addiction (MiA)	508 (70.85)	361 (62.03)	
Moderate internet addiction (MoA)	50 (6.97)	29 (4.98)	
Severe internet addiction (SvA)	26 (3.63)	10 (1.72)	

#### 3.3.3 Comparison of Incidences of Internet addiction among 5 grades

It can be seen from Table 2 that there are no statistical differences in the incidences of Internet addiction at various levels among 5 grades ( $\chi^2=7.712, P=.807$ ).

Table 2 Differences in the incidences of Internet addiction at various levels among 5 grades  $n(\%)$

Addition level	Grade	Freshmen	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Fifth-year students	$\chi^2$	$P$

NonA	82 (23.91)	78 (25.18)	68 (25.32)	60 (23.92)	27 (21.43)	7.712	.807
MiA	224 (65.29)	204 (65.81)	181 (67.29)	175 (69.69)	85 (67.51)		
MoA	23 (6.71)	20 (6.49)	14 (5.21)	13 (5.22)	9 (7.08)		
SvA	14 (4.09)	8 (2.52)	6 (2.18)	3 (1.17)	5 (3.98)		

**3.4 The incidences of loneliness among college students**

**2.4.1 Overall incidences**

There are 288, 437, and 574 students with low, medium, and high loneliness, accounting for 22.17%, 33.64%, and 44.19% of the sample respectively.

**3.4.2 Comparison of the incidences of loneliness between boys and girls**

It can be seen from Table 3 that there are significant differences in the incidences of loneliness at various levels between boys and girls ( $\chi^2=43.256, P<.001$ ).

Table 3 Differences in the incidences of loneliness at various levels between boys and girls n(%)

Gender		Boys	Girls	$\chi^2$	P
Mild loneliness	246 (34.29)	105 (18.02)	43.256	<.001	
Moderate loneliness	183 (25.50)	191 (32.79)			
Severe loneliness	288 (40.21)	286 (49.19)			

**2.4.3 Comparison of the incidences of loneliness in various grades**

It can be seen from Table 4 that there is no statistical difference in the incidences of loneliness at different levels in various grades ( $\chi^2=6.070, P=.639$ ).

Table 4 Differences in the incidences of loneliness at different levels in various grades n (%)

Loneliness level	Grade					$\chi^2$	P
	Freshmen	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Fifth-year		
Mild loneliness	88 (25.71)	86 (27.69)	67 (24.92)	74 (29.49)	33 (26.18)	6.070	.639
Moderate loneliness	112 (32.72)	93 (30.30)	102 (37.89)	85 (33.91)	44 (34.92)		
Severe loneliness	143 (41.57)	131 (72.31)	100 (37.19)	92(36.60)	49 (38.90)		

**2.5 Correlation analysis of Internet addiction and loneliness among college students**

It can be seen from Table 5 that the total score of IAI and all dimensions have significant positive correlation with the total score of UCLALS3 (r=.368 to .668, all P < .001).

Table 5 Correlation Analysis of IAI and UCLALS33 scores

Dimension	M±SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. TO	11.23±3.09						
2. CW	12.76±3.28	.648**					
3. TM	12.23±3.54	.764**	.827**				
4. IH	10.43±4.19	.584**	.619**	.465**			
5. IAI	46.66±12.83	.770**	.725**	.663**	.627**		
6. UCLALS3	43.63±8.16	.564**	.453**	.157**	.688**	.368**	

**2.6 Linear regression analysis of the predictive effect of UCLALS3 score on IAI total score**

Taking the total score of IAI as the dependent variable and the total score of UCLALS3 as the independent variable, the linear regression is carried out within the 95% confidence interval, and the result is shown in Table 6.

It can be seen from Table 6 that UCLALS3 total score positively predicts the total score of IAI ( $\beta=.368, P<.001$ ).

Table 6 Linear regression analysis of the impact of UCLALS3 total score on IAI total score.

Dependent	Independent	B	SE	$\beta$	t	P	R <sup>2</sup>	R <sub>adj</sub> <sup>2</sup>
-----------	-------------	---	----	---------	---	---	----------------	-------------------------------

variable variable

IAII	UCLALS3	.186	.023	.368	7.099	<.001	.179	.175
------	---------	------	------	------	-------	-------	------	------

#### 4. Discussion

The total scores of IAI and UCLALS3 of this group are (46.66 ± 12.83) and (43.63 ± 8.16), respectively. 75.25% of college students have the tendency of Internet addiction. The IAI total score, UCLALS3 total score, the incidence of Internet addiction, and the incidences of moderate and severe loneliness are significantly higher than the results of previous studies [2, 4, 9, 24-26]. It suggests that college students' behavior problems such as Internet addiction and loneliness are becoming more and more serious with the passing of time.

This study finds that the incidence and severity of Internet addiction of boys are higher than those of girls, while the level of loneliness and the incidence of moderate and severe loneliness of girls are higher than those of boys, consistent with the results of previous studies [2, 4, 9, 24-26], suggesting that Internet addiction and loneliness are common psychological and behavioral problems for boys and girls, while boys and girls have different susceptibility to these two problems.

This study finds that there is no significant grade difference in Internet addiction and loneliness at all levels, which is consistent with the results of previous studies [2, 4, 9, 24-26]. It is suggested that the university stage is not the key period for the development of Internet addiction and loneliness.

This study finds that loneliness is a positive independent predictor of Internet addiction. The reason may be driven by individual needs. Self-determination theory points out that [27-28], the lack of psychological needs will increase the individual's fear of the lack of needed objects. Individuals with high loneliness have a lack of social needs, and they also lack information and resources from the real social environment, which makes them afraid of the lack of interpersonal relationships, and also worry about missing some valuable information and resources [29], and then rely on online media to meet social needs, obtain relevant information and resources, which is more likely to lead to Internet addiction.

#### References

1. Cacioppo JT, Patrick W. Loneliness: Human nature and the need for social connection [J]. *Library Journal*, 2008, 19(3): 71-89.
2. Pinquart M, Sörensen S. Risk factors for loneliness in adulthood and old age--- a meta-analysis [J]. *Advances in Psychology Research*, 2003, 19(15): 111-143.
3. Zhang Yan, Zhou Yangen, Pei Tao. Mediating effect of loneliness on relationship between interpersonal adaptation and mobile phone addiction in college students [J]. *Chinese Journal of Mental Health*, 2015, 29(10): 774-779.
4. Zhou Li, Yu Shigang. Study on the loneliness of college students [J]. *Chinese Journal of Science of Social Psychology*, 2015, 30(11): 28-33.

5. Xie Hua, Peng Mingfang, Zhao Xue. Research into the loneliness in college students between their Love and sex [J]. *Journal of Ankang University*, 2015, 27(5): 107- 110.
6. Zhang Haixia. Relationship between stress life events, loneliness, and suicidal ideation among university students [J]. *Chinese Journal of Occupation and Health*, 2016, 32(14): 1976-1979.
7. Li Yange. Study on communication alienation and gregarious loneliness of college students [J]. *Journal of Wuhan Textile University*, 2015, 28(1): 75-79.
8. Li Li, Mei Songli, Niu Zhimin, et al.. Loneliness and sleep quality in university students: Mediator of smartphone addiction and moderator of gender [J]. *Chinese Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 2016, 24(2): 345- 349.
9. Dai Ge, Guo Wei, Wang Zhigang, et al. The effect of college students' sense of loneliness on depression [J]. *Chinese Journal of Health Psychology*, 2017, 25(2): 297-299.
10. Yan Ming, Xu Ya, Zhao Dongwei. Relationship between family environment and mental health: Chain mediating effects of neuroticism and loneliness [J]. *Chinese Journal of Occupation and Health*, 2015, 31(13): 1821-1824.
11. Zhang Zhitao, Wang Jingqun, Liu Fen. Relationship between parenting styles, perceived social support, loneliness, and subjective well-being of undergraduates [J]. *Chinese Journal of Health Psychology*, 2012, 20(7): 1050-1082.
12. Cacioppo JT, Hawkley LC, Crawford LE, et al. Loneliness and health: Potential mechanisms [J]. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 2002, 64(3): 407-417.
13. Kurina LM, Knutson KL, Hawkley LC, et al. Loneliness is associated with sleep fragmentation in a communal society [J]. *Sleep*, 2011, 34(11): 1519-1526.
14. Young, Kimberly S. Internet addiction: The emergence of a new clinical disorder [J]. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 1998, 7(3): 237-244.
15. Sun Lunxuan, Sun Dongmei. A bibliometric analysis of Internet addiction among Chinese college students [J]. *Chinese Journal of Social and Psychological Sciences*, 2010, (1): 63-67.
16. Li Jian, Liu Huan, Zhang Ming, etc. The status quo of Internet and mobile phone addiction among medical students and its impact on sleep quality [J]. *Journal of Shenyang Medical College*, 2019, (1): 43-47
17. Luo Qinghua, Meng Huaqing, Fu Yixiao, et al. A case-control study on cognitive function of Internet addicts [J]. *Chinese Journal of Mental Health*, 2007, (4): 237-239
18. Wang Dongmei, Zhang Lixin, Zhang Zhen. Longitudinal study on the relationship between problematic Internet use and happiness, social anxiety, and depression [J]. *Chinese Journal of Psychology and Behavior Research*,

- 2017, (4): 569-576
19. Gao Feng, Yang Dongfeng, Yang Chunjing, etc The relationship between post-95 college students' Internet addiction, interpersonal communication and academic burnout [J]. Journal of Mudanjiang Normal University: Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition, 2017, (1): 129-134.
  20. Russell D, Peplau LA, Ferguson ML. Developing a measure of loneliness [J]. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1978, 42: 290-294.
  21. Wang Xiangdong, Wang Xilin, Ma Hong. Rating Scales for Mental Health (Expanded Edition) [M]. Beijing: Chinese Journal of Mental Health, 1993: 284-287.
  22. Young KS. Cyber—Disorders : The Mental Health Concern for the New Millennium [J]. Cyber Psychology & Behavior, 1999, 2(5): 475-479.
  23. Harrison DA, McLaughlin ME, Coalter TM. Context, Cognition, and common method variance: psychometric and verbal protocol evidence [J]. Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 1996, 68 (3): 246- 261.
  24. Xia Mengtian, Yang Manxin. The use of college students' social networks and its impact on social ability [J]. Higher Medical Education in China, 2014, (6): 9-10.
  25. Jiang Minmin, Wang Yanqiu, Zhao Ying, et al. The intermediary effect of college students' sleep quality between Internet addiction and depression and anxiety [J]. Journal of Wannan Medical College, 2021,40 (3): 272-275.
  26. Xia Yanyu, Jin Zheng, Hui Qiuping, et al. The impact of Eisenck's personality traits and interpersonal problems on college students' Internet addiction [J]. Journal of Mudanjiang Normal University (Social Sciences Education), 2022, (1): 57-64.
  27. Deci E, Ryan RM. Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior [M]. New York: Plenum Press, 1985: 9-11.
  28. Ryan RM, Deci EL. Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being [J]. The American Psychologist, 2000, 55(1): 68-78.
  29. Cheng Peng. The relationship between loneliness and fear of loss in teenagers: the intermediary role of social media use intensity [J]. Chinese Journal of Clinical Psychology, 2021, 29(1): 187-190.