There Are Four Kinds of Loneliness. Two of Them Affect Your Health

9 MIN READ

MAR. 24, 2026

BY HEATHER HURLOCK

A new study names the gap between your social life and your sense of connection.

Maybe you know the feeling. Your calendar is full. There are people who love you. The group chat is chatting. And still, somewhere underneath all of it, there's a quiet ache. Not loneliness, exactly, at least not the kind you're supposed to have. You're not isolated. You're not alone. So what is this?

Researchers at University College London have a name for it now: social asymmetry. And a study tracking nearly 8,000 people across 13 years just found that this gap, the discrepancy between how socially connected you appear to be and how connected you actually *feel*, is a meaningful and measurable health risk.

The Problem With How We've Been Thinking About Loneliness

For decades, researchers have studied loneliness and social isolation as if they were roughly the same thing. More contact meant less lonely. Less contact meant more at risk. It was tidy, if incomplete.

The problem is that we humans are not that tidy.

- Isolation is objective: It's the count of people you actually see, talk to, belong to.
- Loneliness is subjective: It's whether any of it lands.

And those two things, it turns out, aren't always in balance together.

A 2016 systematic review in the journal *Heart* had already established that poor social relationships were associated with **a 29% higher risk of coronary heart disease and a 32% higher risk of stroke**. The question researchers hadn't fully answered: which kind of social deficit is driving that risk? The outer circumstances or the inner experience?

The new UCL study, published in *JAMA Network Open* in February 2026, finally starts to answer it. Researchers analyzed data from the English Longitudinal Study of Aging, which is 7,845 adults, average age 65, followed through death records and hospital data up to 2024. They measured both objective social contact (frequency of interaction with children, relatives, friends; group membership) and subjective loneliness (using the validated **UCLA 3-item Loneliness Scale**), then calculated the gap between them.

They called that gap social asymmetry.

Your Body Registers Social Asymmetry, Not Your Mind

The results were clarifying. People who were "socially vulnerable," meaning they felt lonelier than their social circumstances would predict, had a 13% higher risk of all-cause mortality and a 16% higher risk of cardiovascular disease over 13 years, compared to those who were socially resilient. That held after controlling for age, wealth, physical activity, smoking, BMI, and existing health conditions.

But here's the finding that should make you sit up: the elevated risk wasn't limited to the obviously isolated. When the researchers divided people into four groups based on the pattern of their loneliness and isolation, two very different profiles showed increased cardiovascular and mortality risk:

The concordant high lonely: people with both high isolation and high loneliness. That one tracks intuitively.

The discordant susceptible: people with relatively good social connections who still felt deeply lonely.

That one is the surprise. People with full lives, by most external measures, whose bodies were registering something their calendars didn't show.

So what is the body actually picking up on? Not the number of people in your life. Not whether your weekend looked social. Something closer to: Do these connections feel like mine? Am I known here, or just present?

Your nervous system, it turns out, is not impressed by a full contact list.

Alone, But Not Lonely

The fourth group in the study is worth a moment. Researchers called them the discordant robust: people with genuinely limited social contact, objectively isolated, who nonetheless did not feel lonely.

This group showed no elevated risk of mortality or cardiovascular disease. None.

Which means the body isn't just counting your social interactions. It's reading your experience of them. Someone living quietly, intentionally, with few people but deep enough peace in that, their nervous system, apparently, knows the difference.

Julianne Holt-Lunstad, PhD, a leading social health researcher at Brigham Young University whose work is cited throughout this literature, has argued that social connection should be treated as a public health priority on par with diet and exercise. A 2022 piece in the *Annual Review of Public Health* she authored **frames social connectedness as a core determinant of health**, not a lifestyle factor but a biological one. The UCL study adds important nuance: it's not connection by the numbers that appears to protect us. It's connection that registers.

The Four Social Profiles: Which One Are You?

The research defines four distinct patterns. See if you recognize yourself.

1. 1 **Socially Connected (Concordant low lonely)** Low loneliness. Low isolation. Your connections are real, and they feel real. You're the reference point, the lowest risk group in the study. Not because your life is perfect, but because your inside and outside are roughly matched.
2. 2 **Sparsely Connected (Concordant high lonely)** High isolation. High loneliness. Your social life is genuinely sparse, and you feel it. The research is clearest about this group: the risk is elevated, the mechanism makes sense, and the intervention is also clearest, more connection, more depth.
3. 3 **Social But Lonely (Discordant susceptible)** Here's the one. You're present at everything. Your phone buzzes. People depend on you. And yet something isn't landing. You feel lonelier than your life on paper would suggest you should. This group showed elevated cardiovascular and mortality risk in the study despite their relatively full social lives. The gap between seen-and-known versus simply *seen* appears to register in the body.
4. 4 **Content Solitary (Discordant robust)** Limited contact. No ache. You've made a life with fewer people, and it fits you. The research found no elevated mortality or cardiovascular risk here. Solitude, it turns out, is not the same as loneliness, and the body seems to know the difference.

Try This: The UCLA Loneliness Scale

The three questions are adapted from the UCLA 3-Item Loneliness Scale, the same one used in the study, and one of the most widely used loneliness assessments in research. It measures three dimensions: whether you feel you lack companionship, whether you feel left out, and whether you feel isolated from others.

Answer each one honestly, thinking about your life as it generally is, not your best week, not your worst one.

For each question, choose: Hardly ever (1) · Some of the time (2) · Often (3)

1. How often do you feel that you lack companionship?

2. How often do you feel left out?

3. How often do you feel isolated from others?

Add your scores.

3–5: Most of the time, your felt sense of connection is holding. That doesn't mean every relationship is nourishing, but the overall reading is relatively low loneliness.

6–7: You're in the middle range. Something may be off-balance, either the quantity of connection, the quality of it, or both. Worth sitting with.

8–9: Your subjective experience of disconnection is high. That's important information, not a judgment, and not permanent. But it's the range the research flags as clinically meaningful.

One thing to hold alongside your score: this scale measures how lonely you *feel*, not how socially active you are. If you scored in the higher range while having what looks like a full social life, that gap between your circumstances and your experience is exactly what this research is about. You may be in the discordant susceptible group. Your body may already know it.

So What Do You Do With This?

The research doesn't yet have a clear prescription. Social asymmetry is a newly named concept, and the intervention science hasn't caught up with the observational data. But what the evidence points toward is less about adding connections and more

about going deeper.

Quantity is not the issue. The discordant susceptible group already had the contacts. What they may have lacked, though the study can't prove this, is the quality of felt connection within them.

The ache is data, not ingratitude. Recognizing that you can be surrounded by people and still feel disconnected is clarifying rather than shameful. Your nervous system isn't confused. It's communicating.

One relationship where you feel fully known may do more than ten where you feel present but not seen. The research on social health consistently finds that depth, not breadth, is the protective factor.

Solitude is allowed. If you're a person who prefers fewer, quieter connections and genuinely feels at peace in that, the research actually supports you. The goal isn't to fill your calendar. It's to close the gap between the life you have and the life that feels like yours.

Social asymmetry is a newly named and newly measured construct. We know it's associated with health risk. We don't yet have strong evidence about which specific interventions reduce it. What the evidence does consistently point toward across the broader loneliness literature is that depth of connection matters more than breadth.

*The information provided in this article is for educational and informational purposes only and is not intended as health, medical, or financial advice. Do not use this information to diagnose or treat any health condition. Always consult a qualified healthcare provider regarding any questions you may have about a medical condition or health objectives.**Read our disclaimers**.*

WRITTEN BY:



Heather Hurlock