e-ISSN: 3025-8189 ; p-ISSN: 3025-8197

LANCAH JURNAL INOVASI DAN TREN

doi.org/10.35870/ljit.v4i2.8957

Vol. 4, No. 2, 2026

PP. 1383-1395

Homepage http://www.journal.lembagakita.com/ljit

Hyper-Individualism and the 'Solo Economy': Investigating the Sociocultural Drivers of the Rise in Single-Person Households

Klemens Mere[1], Ni Wayan Suarniati[2], Eko Pujiati[3]

[1,2,3]Universitas Wisnuwardhana Malang, Jawa Timur, Indonesia

Corresponding Author's Email: monfoort21@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Submitted *10 11,2026*
Accepted *11 04, 2026*
Published *11 12, 2026*

ABSTRACT

Single-person households have shifted from a marginal arrangement to a mainstream residential pattern worldwide; yet, demographic and economic explanations alone cannot account for why many working-age adults choose to live alone. This integrative literature review examines how hyper-individualism, structural change, and the solo economy jointly drive this trend. Sources were retrieved from Scopus, Web of Science, JSTOR, and Google Scholar, screened following PRISMA 2020 guidelines, and analysed through thematic synthesis. Four themes emerged: structural and demographic foundations, hyper-individualism as a value orientation, the solo economy and technology as enabling infrastructure, and the autonomy-isolation paradox. The findings suggest that these forces reinforce one another in a feedback loop in which values encourage solo living, solo living generates a market, and the market further normalizes solo living. Risks arise not from living alone itself, but from weak social integration. The review offers implications for urban housing, elder care, public health policy, and future research.

Keywords: *Hyper-Individualism; Solo Economy; Single-Person Households; Individualisation; Living Alone; Integrative Literature Review*

How to Cite:

Mere, K., Suarniati, N. W., & Pujiati, E. (2026). Hyper-Individualism and the 'Solo Economy': Investigating the Sociocultural Drivers of the Rise in Single-Person Households. LANCAH: Jurnal Inovasi Dan Tren, 4(2), 1383-1395. https://journal.lembagakita.com/ljit/article/view/8957

Copyright @ 2026. Published by Lembaga Komunitas Informasi Teknologi Aceh (KITA), Indonesia. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). Based on a work at http://journal.lembagakita.com/ljit

Abstract & Indexing CC BY-NC 4.0 OPEN ACCESS

INTRODUCTION

Over the past several decades, one of the quietest yet most consequential transformations of social life has been the growth of single-person households. Living alone, once regarded as a temporary or marginal condition associated with widowhood or poverty, has become a mainstream residential arrangement in many societies. Klinenberg (2012) documents that the number of people living alone worldwide increased sharply from the mid-1990s onward, and that in several Northern European cities, single-person households now account for close to half of all households. In the United States, solo dwellers moved from a small minority in the mid-twentieth century to more than a quarter of all households by the early 2010s (Klinenberg, 2012). Comparative evidence shows that this trend is no longer confined to Western Europe and North America; Ortiz-Ospina (2019) reports that the share of one-person households has risen across all world regions, although levels remain highly uneven between countries.

Asia is particularly important for understanding this transition because household change is occurring in societies where intergenerational obligations and family co-residence have historically been influential. Research by Yeung and Cheung (2015) and Raymo et al. (2015) identifies later marriage, non-marriage, population aging, and geographic mobility as important pathways to living alone in East Asia. More recent comparative data also show substantial differences within the Asia-Pacific region: single-person households accounted for 38.0% of households in Japan and 35.5% in Korea in the latest years reported, compared with 8.3% in Indonesia, 9.1% in Malaysia, 10.0% in Thailand, and 8.7% in Vietnam (OECD & OECD Korea Policy Centre, 2025). These differences caution against treating Asia as a homogeneous setting and indicate that family norms, age structures, housing systems, and welfare arrangements shape the pace and form of household change.

The dominant explanations for the rise of single-person households are demographic and economic. Population aging and widowhood increase solo living among older adults; declining fertility, delayed marriage, and rising divorce rates reduce the size of households; and urbanization and rising incomes make independent residence affordable to groups who previously lived with relatives. These factors are well established, yet they leave an important question unanswered: why do growing numbers of people, particularly working-age adults, choose and prefer to live alone when they could live with family, partners, or housemates?

The theory of the Second Demographic Transition offers a partial answer by linking changes in household and family behavior to shifts in values. Van de Kaa (1987) and Lesthaeghe (2010) argue that as societies become wealthier and more secure, people place greater emphasis on self-realization, personal autonomy, and individual choice, which in turn weakens the normative pressure to marry, to have children early, or to remain in the parental home. Inglehart (1997) provides a related account in which the shift from materialist to post-materialist values elevates self-expression over traditional authority. However, these frameworks were developed largely from European experience, and it remains unclear how well they explain contemporary patterns in societies where family institutions are strong, housing is expensive, and economic precarity is widespread. Recent evidence from East Asia illustrates this uncertainty: using the 2006 and 2016 East Asian Social Surveys, Lai and Song (2022) found that attitudes toward cohabitation, childrearing, and divorce became more liberal in Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan, but more conservative in mainland China. A purely value-based or purely structural reading is therefore insufficient; the sociocultural mechanisms linking the two require closer empirical scrutiny.

Classical and contemporary social theory has long examined the tension between the individual and the collective. Durkheim (1951) warned that weakening social integration could produce anomie and isolation. Bellah et al. (1985) described a strand of American culture in which individual self-reliance gradually eclipses commitments to community. More recently, Beck and Beck-Gernsheim (2002) argue that late-modern societies are characterized by institutionalized individualization: people are increasingly expected to author their own biographies, and relationships that were once given by tradition, such as kinship, marriage, and neighborhood, become matters of personal choice and continual negotiation. Giddens (1991) similarly portrays the self in late modernity as a reflexive project, while Bauman (2003) suggests that this condition renders intimate bonds more fragile and provisional, "liquid" rather than durable.

In this study, hyper-individualism refers to an intensified form of individualization in which personal autonomy, self-optimization, and privacy are elevated to primary social values, and in which interdependence, shared obligations, and communal living are increasingly perceived as constraints rather than resources. This perspective helps to explain why living alone can be experienced not as a deficit but as an expression of freedom, control over one's time and space, and a marker of adult success (Jamieson & Simpson, 2013; Klinenberg, 2012). At the same time, hyper-individualism is not merely a matter of attitudes. It is reinforced by digital media and technology that allow people to work, consume, and socialize without physical co-presence (Turkle, 2011), as well as by labor markets that reward mobility and flexibility over rootedness.

The expansion of single-person households has also generated a market dimension. In this article, the term *solo economy* refers descriptively to goods, services, and consumption practices that accommodate people living or consuming alone, including compact housing, single-serving food, delivery services, subscriptions, solo leisure, and digital platforms. Industry commentary on Asia describes similar responses, such as single-seat dining, single-person karaoke rooms, smaller food portions, and growth in home delivery and digital entertainment (Tonby, 2021). However, because such accounts are descriptive rather than peer-reviewed, the concept should not be treated as a single, fully established economic sector. Empirical evidence is emerging in specific domains. Using Taiwan's Survey of Family Income and Expenditure for 2011–2021, Lee and Lai (2024) found that single-person households faced higher per-capita housing and household-operation expenses than multi-person households, while also allocating more expenditure to selected personal consumption categories. In South Korea, Kim (2020) documented changes in solitary and shared meal practices using time-use data from 1999–2014 and found that the relationship between solitary meals and life satisfaction varied with voluntariness and scheduling. These studies show that solo-oriented consumption is not simply a matter of product availability; it is also shaped by cost structures, routines, and social meanings.

The market dimension raises two related questions. First, do goods and services designed for individual consumption merely respond to an existing demand, or do they also make independent living more practicable? Second, under what conditions might market-based services complement rather than replace social support? The available studies provide partial answers: Lee and Lai (2024) identify distinctive expenditure patterns and higher fixed costs among single-person households, while Kim (2020) shows that solitary consumption practices have varied associations with subjective well-being. These findings support examining the market as an enabling context, but they do not establish a general causal feedback loop between individualist values, household formation, and market expansion. Accordingly, the

feedback-loop argument in this review is treated as an interpretive proposition rather than a tested causal relationship.

The consequences of living alone are ambivalent and should be distinguished from the consequences of loneliness. Living alone may provide privacy, autonomy, and independence, while social isolation and loneliness are associated with adverse health outcomes (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2010, 2015; Cacioppo & Cacioppo, 2018). The WHO Commission on Social Connection (2025) estimates that about one in six people worldwide experience loneliness, and that loneliness was associated with more than 871,000 deaths annually between 2014 and 2019. A recent meta-analysis of prospective studies also found that living alone was associated with a higher risk of suicide attempts and suicide death, although the authors caution about heterogeneity and unmeasured confounding (Luo et al., 2024). Evidence from South Korea also illustrates the importance of context: Kim (2020) found that eating together was positively associated with life satisfaction, whereas the effects of solitary meals differed according to whether the practice was voluntary and how meals were scheduled. Therefore, household composition alone is an inadequate proxy for social connectedness or well-being.

The literature points to four more specific gaps. First, demographic studies explain pathways into one-person households such as aging, delayed marriage, and mobility—but do not consistently explain why living alone becomes socially acceptable or desirable (Esteve et al., 2020; Raymo et al., 2015; Yeung & Cheung, 2015). Second, consumption studies provide evidence about particular expenditure categories and practices, but they do not yet establish how these patterns shape household-formation decisions over time (Kim, 2020; Lee & Lai, 2024). Third, sociological accounts of individualization and value change are rarely integrated with empirical work on consumption, housing, and digital services. Fourth, comparative evidence remains uneven across Asia-Pacific settings. The OECD and OECD Korea Policy Centre (2025) report markedly different shares of single-person households across countries, including a substantially lower share in Indonesia than in Japan and Korea; this variation underscores the need for context-sensitive explanations. The present review therefore does not claim to provide new empirical evidence from Southeast Asia. Instead, it identifies how existing demographic, sociological, and consumption research can be brought into dialogue and where further country-specific evidence is needed.

Accordingly, this review addresses the following questions: (1) How do demographic and economic conditions interact with individualization and autonomy-oriented values in shaping the acceptability of living alone? (2) What does existing empirical research show about consumption practices and market provision among single-person households? (3) How does the literature describe the relationship between autonomy, social connectedness, and well-being among people living alone? The questions are framed to distinguish established empirical findings from theoretical interpretations and to avoid attributing causal effects that the reviewed studies have not tested.

The review's contribution is conceptual and synthetic rather than the production of new empirical evidence. It brings together demographic explanations of household change, sociological theories of individualization, and empirical studies of consumption and social well-being. Its principal contribution is to clarify where these bodies of literature converge, where evidence remains limited, and how a cautious integrative framework can guide future comparative research. Practical implications are discussed for housing, community support, public health, and services designed for people living alone.

METHODS OF RESEARCH

This study uses an integrative literature review approach. This design is appropriate for a multidisciplinary topic because it can bring together theoretical discussions and empirical studies to develop a conceptual synthesis (Snyder, 2019; Torraco, 2005; Whittemore & Knafl, 2005). The review draws on the typologies discussed by Grant and Booth (2009) and the literature-review procedures proposed by Webster and Watson (2002). PRISMA 2020 is used as a reporting aid for documenting identification and screening, not as evidence that the review is a fully exhaustive systematic review (Page et al., 2021).

The review drew on four information sources: Scopus, Web of Science, JSTOR, and Google Scholar, supplemented by backward and forward citation tracking. The search strategy combined three concept groups: household arrangement ("single-person household*" OR "one-person household*" OR "living alone" OR "solo living"), individualization and values (individualism OR individualization OR "second demographic transition" OR autonomy), and consumption or outcomes (consumption OR expenditure OR "solo economy" OR loneliness OR "social isolation"). Searches were intended to cover publications from 2000 to 2025, while earlier foundational works were eligible when needed to explain the theoretical framework.

The stated eligibility criteria were: (a) peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly books, or official statistical reports; (b) English- or Indonesian-language publications; and (c) substantive discussion of demographic determinants, cultural meanings, consumption or market responses, or social consequences of living alone. Studies focused exclusively on institutional or collective living arrangements, opinion pieces without a scholarly basis, and publications without a clear empirical or theoretical contribution were ineligible. Screening was intended to proceed from title and abstract to full-text assessment. The quality appraisal considered clarity of the research question, appropriateness of the design, transparency of data and analysis, and relevance to the review questions (Tranfield et al., 2003).

The literature was synthesized thematically. The analytical process involved familiarization with the included texts, initial coding, grouping codes into candidate themes, reviewing themes against the source material, defining the themes, and producing the synthesis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Codes addressed demographic and structural conditions, individualization and autonomy, consumption and market provision, technology, and social well-being. Findings were compared across countries, study designs, and disciplinary perspectives. The synthesis distinguishes (1) direct empirical findings reported by individual studies, (2) interpretations advanced by the original authors, and (3) the integrative propositions developed in this review.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Overview of the Reviewed Literature

The thematic synthesis is organized into four themes: (1) structural and demographic foundations, (2) individualization and autonomy-oriented values, (3) consumption, market provision, and technology, and (4) the relationship between autonomy and social connectedness. To improve traceability, Table 2 presents selected empirical and comparative sources that directly inform the synthesis; it is not represented as the complete review corpus.

Table 1. Summary of themes identified in the literature

Theme	Core finding	Representative sources
Structural and demographic foundations	Ageing, delayed or foregone marriage, urbanisation, and income conditions shape the opportunity and prevalence of independent residence.	Esteve et al. (2020); Ortiz-Ospina (2019); Raymo et al. (2015); Yeung & Cheung (2015)
Hyper-individualism as value orientation	Autonomy, self-realisation, and privacy may become more salient, although these concepts are not consistently measured as hyper-individualism.	Beck & Beck-Gernsheim (2002); Giddens (1991); Inglehart (1997); Lesthaeghe (2010)
Consumption, market provision, and technology	Selected studies document distinctive expenditure and consumption practices; evidence that these markets cause solo living remains limited.	Kim (2020); Lee & Lai (2024); Jung (2025); Klinenberg (2012); Turkle (2011)
Autonomy–isolation paradox	Living alone may offer autonomy; risks are more closely related to weak social networks, loneliness, and inadequate support.	Holt-Lunstad et al. (2010, 2015); Cacioppo & Cacioppo (2018); Klinenberg (2012)

Source: Authors' analysis based on reviewed literature, 2026

Table 2. Selected empirical and comparative sources informing the synthesis

Study / source	Country / coverage	Design / data	Relevant finding for this review
Kim (2020)	South Korea	Analysis of time-use data, 1999–2014	Family meals were increasingly replaced by solitary and social meals; the wellbeing implications of solitary meals varied with voluntariness and scheduling.
Lee & Lai (2024)	Taiwan	Household expenditure survey, 2011–2021	Single-person households had higher per-capita housing and household-operation expenses, alongside greater spending on selected personal-consumption items.
Jung (2025)	South Korea	Municipal panel data, 2015–2022; two-way fixed-effects instrumental-variable approach	The association between single-person households and residential GHG emissions differed by metropolitan status and housing characteristics.
OECD & OECD Korea Policy Centre (2025)	Asia-Pacific comparison	Comparative household-composition statistics; latest available country years	One-person households represented different shares across countries, including 8.3% in Indonesia (2023), 38.0% in Japan (2020), and 35.5% in Korea (2023).

Source: Authors' analysis based on reviewed literature, 2026

Structural and Demographic Foundations

Comparative demographic research indicates that living alone emerges through different life-course pathways. Esteve et al. (2020) demonstrate cross-national variation in the age profile and prevalence

of living alone, while Raymo et al. (2015) and Yeung and Cheung (2015) identify delayed marriage, non-marriage, aging, and mobility as relevant features of household change in East and Southeast Asia. More recent comparative statistics reinforce this variation: the OECD Asia-Pacific family database reports that one-person households accounted for 8.3% of households in Indonesia in 2023, compared with 38.0% in Japan (2020) and 35.5% in Korea (2023) (OECD & OECD Korea Policy Centre, 2025). These figures are not directly comparable in reference year, but they illustrate the substantial variation in household composition across the region.

The evidence supports two conclusions. Demographic and economic conditions shape the population groups for whom independent residence is feasible, but they do not fully explain the cultural meaning attached to living alone. In addition, cross-national differences caution against assuming that the same demographic transition produces identical household outcomes in every society. Family norms, housing affordability, welfare arrangements, and the availability of intergenerational support may mediate these pathways.

Hyper-Individualism as a Value Orientation

A second cluster of studies links the rise of solo living to long-term changes in values. Within the Second Demographic Transition framework, Van de Kaa (1987) and Lesthaeghe (2010) argue that growing emphasis on self-realization and individual choice weakens the normative pressure to marry and to remain embedded in extended family arrangements. Inglehart (1997) similarly shows that rising existential security is accompanied by a shift toward self-expression values. These accounts are complemented by individualization theory. Beck and Beck-Gernsheim (2002) argue that people in late-modern societies are compelled to construct their own biographies, and Giddens (1991) describes the self as a reflexive project that must continually be shaped through choices. Bauman (2003) adds that relationships formed under such conditions tend to be more provisional, which can make long-term cohabitation appear riskier and independence more attractive.

Studies of living arrangements and family change suggest that autonomy and self-direction have become more salient in some late-modern contexts (Beck & Beck-Gernsheim, 2002; Giddens, 1991; Lesthaeghe, 2010). However, the empirical literature cited here does not directly measure a unified construct called hyper-individualism. Rather, it examines related concepts such as individualization, self-realization, autonomy, and changing partnership norms. The term *hyper-individualism* is therefore used in this review as an interpretive label for an intensified orientation toward autonomy and privacy, not as a validated or consistently measured variable.

The Solo Economy and Technology as Enabling Infrastructure

Empirical research on the solo economy remains narrower than the broad market definition sometimes used in public discussion. Lee and Lai (2024), analyzing Taiwan's household expenditure survey for 2011–2021, report that single-person households incur higher per-capita housing and household-operation expenses than multi-person households, while also directing a larger share of some expenditures toward personal consumption. Their findings demonstrate both the cost burden and the consumption autonomy associated with living alone. Kim (2020), using South Korean time-use data from 1999–2014, documents the changing balance between solitary and shared meals and shows that the well-being implications of solitary eating depend partly on voluntariness and scheduling. These studies provide

empirical support for analyzing consumption practices associated with solo living, but they do not test the entire "solo economy" as a unified market sector.

The evidence base remains limited in scope. The Taiwan study focuses on household expenditure, while the South Korean study examines meal practices and subjective well-being; neither directly tests whether commercial services cause people to establish one-person households. Jung (2025) adds an environmental dimension by analyzing municipal-level panel data in South Korea from 2015 to 2022. The study finds that the relationship between single-person households and residential greenhouse gas emissions varies by metropolitan status and housing characteristics. Taken together, these studies suggest that the consequences of solo living depend on the type of consumption, residential context, and social practices. They support a cautious account of market and infrastructural adaptation, not a definitive causal feedback-loop claim.

The Autonomy–Isolation Paradox

The literature identifies a distinction between residential status and social experience. Living alone may offer privacy and control over daily routines, but it does not automatically imply loneliness or weak social integration. Public health syntheses associate social isolation and loneliness with adverse health outcomes (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2010, 2015; Cacioppo & Cacioppo, 2018). In South Korea, Kim (2020) found that shared meals were positively associated with life satisfaction, while solitary meals did not have a uniform effect; voluntariness and meal scheduling mattered. This suggests that the quality and voluntariness of social interaction are important analytical dimensions alongside household size.

The reviewed evidence therefore indicates that risk is more appropriately understood through the interaction of household circumstances, social networks, health, income, and institutional support than through living arrangement alone. This distinction is consistent with Klinenberg's (2012) account of active social lives among some solo dwellers. A qualitative study in Surabaya, Indonesia, similarly found that most older Javanese women living alone did not feel lonely, which the authors attributed to community-oriented *guyub* culture and family and neighborhood support (Amalia et al., 2025). However, this study involved only 11 participants and cannot be generalized

Discussion

An Integrative Account of the Rise of Single-Person Households

Taken together, the reviewed studies support an integrative interpretation in which demographic conditions, cultural orientations, and market or infrastructural provision are related but analytically distinct. Demographic change and economic circumstances shape the opportunity to live alone (Esteve et al., 2020; Raymo et al., 2015; Yeung & Cheung, 2015). Theories of individualization help explain why autonomy and independent residence may acquire cultural legitimacy (Beck & Beck-Gernsheim, 2002; Giddens, 1991; Lesthaeghe, 2010). Empirical studies of Taiwan and South Korea show how household composition is associated with expenditure patterns and everyday consumption practices (Kim, 2020; Lee & Lai, 2024). The available evidence is consistent with the proposition that market offerings accommodate solo living, but it does not establish that market expansion causes the formation of single-person households. The feedback-loop framework should therefore be read as a hypothesis for future empirical testing rather than as a demonstrated causal mechanism.

In relation to the first research question, the literature suggests that autonomy-oriented values may complement demographic and economic explanations, but the reviewed evidence does not isolate their independent causal contribution. In relation to the second question, empirical work documents distinctive expenditure and consumption practices, while leaving the broader solo economy insufficiently operationalized. In relation to the third question, the evidence indicates that autonomy and social connectedness are not mutually exclusive; well-being depends partly on the quality, voluntariness, and availability of social relationships and support.

Relation to Existing Theory

The synthesis extends the Second Demographic Transition and individualization perspectives by placing them in dialogue with empirical work on household consumption and residential context. It also highlights the limits of transferring theories developed largely in Western settings to Asian societies without considering differences in family norms, welfare systems, housing markets, and demographic structure. The Asia-Pacific comparison reported by the OECD and OECD Korea Policy Centre (2025), alongside country-specific studies from Taiwan and South Korea (Kim, 2020; Lee & Lai, 2024; Jung, 2025), shows that household change and its consequences are context-dependent. These sources provide comparative and country-specific evidence, but they do not justify generalizing findings from East Asia to Southeast Asia as a whole.

The findings also qualify accounts that equate individualization with social disintegration. Although Bellah et al. (1985), Putnam (2000), and Bauman (2003) describe pressures on community and durable relationships, living alone does not necessarily preclude social participation. The more defensible conclusion is that autonomy-oriented living arrangements can coexist with strong social ties, while the absence of accessible support may increase vulnerability. Hyper-individualism is therefore used here as an analytical concept concerning the prioritization of autonomy, not as a synonym for loneliness or social breakdown.

Implications

Several implications follow. For housing and urban policy, the growth of one-person households implies demand for smaller, affordable, and well-located dwellings, as well as design that supports community interaction among residents rather than isolation. For social protection and elder care, governments in societies where care has traditionally been family-based need to anticipate a growing population without co-resident relatives, which requires investment in community-based support and formal care (Esteve et al., 2020; Yeung & Cheung, 2015). For public health, the associations reported by Holt-Lunstad et al. (2010, 2015) and Cacioppo and Cacioppo (2018) suggest that interventions should target social connection among people living alone, in line with the WHO Commission on Social Connection (2025), which frames social connection as a public health priority. For businesses, the solo economy offers opportunities, but the findings imply a responsibility to consider whether products and platforms strengthen or substitute for human connection.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

This review has several limitations. First, it synthesizes secondary sources and does not generate new primary data. Second, the search was restricted to four databases and to English- and Indonesian-language sources, which may have excluded relevant studies in other languages. Third, the evidence remains geographically uneven: the sources reviewed are concentrated in Europe, North America, and East

Asia, with limited direct evidence from Southeast Asia and only one Indonesia-specific qualitative study, which focused on older women living alone (Amalia et al., 2025). Fourth, the concept of hyper-individualism is not consistently operationalized in the empirical studies reviewed. Fifth, the solo economy is represented by a small number of empirical studies on expenditure and consumption practices rather than by a comprehensive body of research on the full range of solo-oriented goods and services. Finally, because the review followed a narrative-integrative approach rather than a fully systematic protocol, it may not capture all relevant studies, and its findings should be read as a conceptual synthesis.

Future research should develop and validate measures of autonomy-oriented individualism that can be distinguished from structural constraints and involuntary solo living; conduct comparative studies across countries with different family systems and welfare regimes; analyze household expenditure, housing, and platform-use data; and use qualitative or longitudinal designs to examine how people living alone negotiate autonomy and social connection. Research in Indonesia and other Southeast Asian countries is especially important because the available comparative data indicate a different prevalence of one-person households from that observed in Japan and Korea, while the cultural and institutional mechanisms remain insufficiently documented.

CONCLUSION

This integrative review indicates that the growth of single-person households cannot be explained by a single factor. Demographic and economic conditions—including aging, delayed or foregone marriage, urbanization, and residential mobility—shape the opportunities and constraints associated with living alone (Esteve et al., 2020; Raymo et al., 2015; Yeung & Cheung, 2015). Theories of individualization help explain why autonomy, privacy, and self-direction may become more legitimate grounds for independent residence (Beck & Beck-Gernsheim, 2002; Giddens, 1991; Lesthaeghe, 2010). Empirical studies in Taiwan and South Korea further show that living alone is associated with distinctive expenditure patterns and everyday consumption practices (Kim, 2020; Lee & Lai, 2024). However, the evidence does not establish that the solo economy, as a unified market sector, causes the rise of single-person households. The proposed interaction among structural conditions, values, and market provision should be treated as an integrative proposition requiring further empirical testing.

The review also highlights the importance of distinguishing living alone from loneliness. Autonomy and privacy may coexist with meaningful social relationships, while social isolation and weak institutional support can create risks for well-being (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2010, 2015; Cacioppo & Cacioppo, 2018; Kim, 2020). Policy responses should therefore avoid stigmatizing single-person households and instead strengthen affordable housing, accessible community services, and support for people whose social networks or resources are limited. Future research should prioritize comparative evidence from Southeast Asia, operational measures of individualization, and empirical analysis of solo-oriented consumption and services.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

The first author contributed to the conceptualization of the study, development of the research methodology, data collection, data analysis, and preparation of the initial manuscript. The second author

contributed to data processing, interpretation of the research findings, and provided substantive input to the manuscript. The third author contributed to the critical review, editing, and refinement of the manuscript. All authors participated in the discussion of the research findings, reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript, and are responsible for the integrity and accuracy of the work.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there are no financial or non-financial conflicts of interest that could have influenced the conduct of the research, data analysis, preparation, or publication of this article. Or The authors declare that there is a conflict of interest in this study, namely [describe the type of conflict of interest, such as a financial relationship, institutional affiliation, or professional interest]. This conflict of interest has been transparently disclosed and taken into consideration in the conduct and reporting of the research

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) USE STATEMENT

In preparing this article, the authors used artificial intelligence (AI) technology as an assisting tool for language editing, grammar checking, and improving the structure and clarity of the manuscript. AI was not used to generate, manipulate, or analyze the research data. The authors retain full responsibility for the content of the article, interpretation of the findings, accuracy, and integrity of the manuscript.

The authors declare that no artificial intelligence (AI) technology was used in the research process or in the preparation of this article.

REFERENCES

Amalia, A. D., Jayaputra, A., & Shamadiyah, N. (2025). Exploring loneliness in elderly Javanese and social support. *Frontiers in Sociology, 10*, Article 1528886. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2025.1528886

Bauman, Z. (2003). *Liquid love: On the frailty of human bonds*. Polity Press.

Beck, U., & Beck-Gernsheim, E. (2002). *Individualization: Institutionalized individualism and its social and political consequences*. SAGE Publications.

Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life*. University of California Press.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Cacioppo, J. T., & Cacioppo, S. (2018). The growing problem of loneliness. *The Lancet, 391*(10119), 426. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30142-9

Durkheim, E. (1951). *Suicide: A study in sociology* (J. A. Spaulding & G. Simpson, Trans.). Free Press. (Original work published 1897)

Esteve, A., Reher, D. S., Treviño, R., Zueras, P., & Turu, A. (2020). Living alone over the life course: Cross-national variations on an emerging issue. *Population and Development Review, 46*(1), 169–189. https://doi.org/10.1111/padr.12311

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Stanford University Press.

Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: An analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health Information and Libraries Journal, 26*(2), 91–108. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-1842.2009.00848.x

Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B., & Layton, J. B. (2010). Social relationships and mortality risk: A meta-analytic review. *PLoS Medicine, 7*(7), e1000316. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000316

Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B., Baker, M., Harris, T., & Stephenson, D. (2015). Loneliness and social isolation as risk factors for mortality: A meta-analytic review. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 10*(2), 227–237. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691614568352

Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and postmodernization: Cultural, economic, and political change in 43 societies*. Princeton University Press.

Jamieson, L., & Simpson, R. (2013). *Living alone: Globalization, identity and belonging*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Jung, H. (2025). Single-person household and greenhouse gas emission: Evidence from South Korea. *Environmental and Resource Economics, 88*(7), 1805–1830. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-025-00988-w

Kim, S. (2020). Solitary eating, an inferior alternative? An examination of time-use data in South Korea. *Current Sociology*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580920906373

Klinenberg, E. (2012). *Going solo: The extraordinary rise and surprising appeal of living alone*. Penguin Press.

Lai, W., & Song, J. (2022). Different pathways of the second demographic transition in four East Asian societies: Evidence from the 2006 and 2016 East Asian Social Surveys. *China Population and Development Studies, 6*, 373–402. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42379-022-00118-9

Lee, M.-H., & Lai, W.-L. (2024). Does being single bring freedom or burden? Examining the expenditure patterns of single-person households in Taiwan. *Journal of Asian Economics, 92*, 101747. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asieco.2024.101747

Lesthaeghe, R. (2010). The unfolding story of the second demographic transition. *Population and Development Review, 36*(2), 211–251. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2010.00328.x

Luo, Z., Wang, J., Chen, X., Cheng, D., & Zhou, Y. (2024). Assessment of the relationship between living alone and suicidal behaviors based on prospective studies: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Public Health, 12*, Article 1444820. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1444820

OECD, & OECD Korea Policy Centre. (2025). *Society at a glance: Asia/Pacific 2025: A spotlight on fertility trends*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/24fa8f05-en

Ortiz-Ospina, E. (2019). *The rise of living alone: How one-person households are becoming increasingly common around the world*. Our World in Data. https://ourworldindata.org/living-alone

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., … Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ, 372*, n71. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71

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

Raymo, J. M., Park, H., Xie, Y., & Yeung, W. J. (2015). Marriage and family in East Asia: Continuity and change. *Annual Review of Sociology, 41*, 471–492. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112428

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research, 104*, 333–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039

Tonby, O. (2021). *Going it alone: The rise of Asia's solo economy*. McKinsey & Company. https://www.mckinsey.com/mgi/media-center/going-it-alone-the-rise-of-asias-solo-economy

Torraco, R. J. (2005). Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. *Human Resource Development Review, 4*(3), 356–367. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484305278283

Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British Journal of Management, 14*(3), 207–222. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00375

Turkle, S. (2011). *Alone together: Why we expect more from technology and less from each other*. Basic Books.

Van de Kaa, D. J. (1987). Europe's second demographic transition. *Population Bulletin, 42*(1), 1–59.

Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: Writing a literature review. *MIS Quarterly, 26*(2), xiii–xxiii.

Whittemore, R., & Knafl, K. (2005). The integrative review: Updated methodology. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 52*(5), 546–553. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2005.03621.x

WHO Commission on Social Connection. (2025). *From loneliness to social connection: Charting a path to healthier societies*. World Health Organization. https://www.who.int/groups/commission-on-social-connection

Yeung, W.-J. J., & Cheung, A. K.-L. (2015). Living alone: One-person households in Asia. *Demographic Research, 32*, 1099–1112. https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2015.32.40