

Shaping tomorrow: the societal ripple effects of evolving youth lifestyles

Dr.M. Reshma¹, Dr.N.Jemila Dani², Dr.P.Besmi³

Assistant Professor

PG and Research Department of Commerce, St Alphonsa College of Arts & Science, Karinkal,
Kanniyakumari District, Tamil Nadu, India
(Affiliated to Manonmaniam Sundaranar University)

Abstract

The evolution of youth lifestyles represents a critical dimension of contemporary social change, reflecting the interplay between technological innovation, globalization, and shifting cultural norms. This study investigates the societal impacts of emerging lifestyle trends among young populations, with particular attention to their influence on social structures, economic participation, and cultural practices. The findings indicate that these lifestyle shifts extend beyond individual behavior, generating ripple effects that reshape community engagement, political participation, and cultural identity. By situating youth lifestyle evolution within a sociological framework, this study underscores its significance as both a driver and a reflection of societal change, offering insights for policymakers, educators, and stakeholders seeking to adapt to an increasingly dynamic social landscape.

Keywords: Youth lifestyle evolution, societal change, emerging trends, Digital transformation.

1. Introduction

Youth lifestyles have undergone profound transformations in recent decades, driven by rapid technological progress, globalization, shifting social norms, and evolving economic conditions. Unlike previous generations, today's youth live in a highly interconnected, media-saturated environment that shapes their identities, aspirations, and day-to-day behaviors. Social media platforms, gig economy opportunities, and a growing emphasis on personal well-being and self-expression are redefining what it means to be young in the century. These changes extend beyond individual preferences, influencing broader social structures, economic systems, and cultural landscapes. For instance, the adoption of digital tools has altered modes of communication, while changing attitudes toward work life balance and sustainability have begun to influence market trends and policy decisions. This study seeks to examine the evolving lifestyles of youth and to explore the societal ripple effects emerging from these changes, with particular attention to their implications for cultural practices, social relationships, and economic participation.

Literature review

Wood et al. (2023) further noted that emerging work models, such as remote jobs and gig economy platforms, aligned with youth preferences for autonomy and flexibility, challenging traditional

career structures and reshaping labor market participation. These shifts not only redefined professional aspirations but also influenced broader social values, with younger generations placing greater emphasis on personal well-being, sustainability, and inclusivity. **Samji et al. (2022)**, in a rapid review of 122 studies, highlighted a notable rise in anxiety, loneliness, and stress among adolescents during this period, emphasizing the profound mental health implications of enforced lifestyle changes. **Nesi and Prinstein (2022)** identified divergent pathways of digital flourish in: one marked by positive self-expression, prosocial engagement, and digital literacy, and the other by compulsive use and diminished self-regulation.

Statement of the problem

Youth lifestyles are undergoing rapid and unprecedented transformation, driven by technological innovation, globalization, shifting cultural norms, and post-pandemic societal changes. These shifts are evident in patterns of communication, work preferences, consumption behavior, health consciousness, and social engagement. While such changes present opportunities for self-expression, inclusivity, and economic innovation, they also introduce significant challenges ranging from mental health concerns and digital dependency to economic vulnerability and the erosion of traditional cultural practices. Without such integrated analysis, policymakers, educators, and community leaders may struggle to design effective interventions that maximize the benefits of youth-driven change while mitigating its negative consequences. This gap underscores the need to investigate the societal ripple effects of evolving youth lifestyles, with a focus on understanding both their transformative potential and their unintended drawbacks.

Objectives

The objectives are,

- To analyze the impact of youth lifestyles on society.
- To examine the influence of social media on shaping youth lifestyles.

Research methodology

The study adopts a descriptive research design to examine the evolving lifestyles of youth and their societal impacts. Both primary and secondary data sources were utilized to ensure comprehensive coverage of the research objectives.

Data Collection

Primary data was collected through a structured questionnaire administered to the sample respondents. The questionnaire was designed to capture demographic details, lifestyle preferences, and perceptions regarding societal impacts. Secondary data was sourced from books, peer-reviewed journals, and scholarly articles relevant to youth lifestyle trends and sociological change.

Sampling Design

The study employed a simple random sampling method to ensure each member of the population had an equal chance of selection. The sample size was 100 respondents, representing youth from the designated study area. This approach enhanced the representativeness of the findings and minimized sampling bias.

Data Analysis

The collected primary data was initially organized into statistical tables using frequency distribution and subsequently converted into percentage analysis to provide a clear understanding of response patterns.

Percentage analysis served as the basic statistical tool for summarizing data and interpreting trends. In addition to descriptive statistics, t-tests and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were employed to test hypotheses and determine whether significant differences existed between groups based on demographic and lifestyle factors. This combination of descriptive and inferential statistics enabled both a detailed description of trends and a robust examination of relationships within the data.

Data analysis and results

Descriptive Statistics: Descriptive Statistics that are discussed in this work are the frequency and percentages of the profile of the respondents. The Table 1 illustrates the demographic profile of the respondents according to the variables –Age, Gender, Educational Status, Job Status and Annual Income respectively.

Table 1. Demographic Profile of the Respondents

| Demographic Variable | Demographic Categories | Frequency | % |
|---------------------------|------------------------|------------|--------------|
| Age | 17-20 Years | 48 | 48.0 |
| | 21-24 Years | 21 | 21.0 |
| | 25-28 years | 21 | 21.0 |
| | Above 28 Years | 10 | 10.0 |
| | Total | 100 | 100.0 |
| Gender | Male | 40 | 40.0 |
| | Female | 60 | 60.0 |
| | Total | 100 | 100.0 |
| Educational Status | UG | 51 | 51.0 |
| | PG | 22 | 22.0 |
| | Diploma | 13 | 13.0 |
| | Engineering | 14 | 14.0 |
| | Total | 100 | 100.0 |

Source: Primary data

From the table it can be inferred that 48 percentage of the respondents belongs from the 17-20 age group, 21 percentage of the respondents are from the 21-24 and 24-28 age group. The remaining 10 percentage of the respondents is above 28. The majority of respondents in this study fall within the age group of 17-20 years; this indicates that youth in this age group are significantly impacted by evolving lifestyle trends. Out of the total respondents surveyed 60 percentage are female and remaining 40 percentage are male. This suggests that the perspectives of females may be more prominent in understanding the societal impacts of changing youth lifestyles. Based on this survey we found that 51 percentage of the respondents are UG, 22 percentage of the total respondents are PG, 14 percentage of the respondents are Engineering, finally the remaining 13 percentage are Diploma students. The majority of respondents are UG students, it providing a broad perspective on how changing trends in youth lifestyles impact individuals across different levels of education.

Youth lifestyle impact

The independent samples t-test was conducted to examine the impact of youth lifestyle across two groups.

Null hypothesis:

There is no significant difference between the gender of the respondents and the Youth lifestyle impact.

Table 2
Youth lifestyle impact

| Independent Samples Test | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|---|---------|
| | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
| | F | Sig. | T | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| Equal variances assumed | .604 | .439 | -1.029 | 98 | .306 | 1.12500 | 1.09316 | 3.29434 | 1.04434 |
| Equal variances not assumed | | | -1.043 | 87.601 | .300 | 1.12500 | 1.07811 | 3.26765 | 1.01765 |

Source: Calculated data

The independent samples t-test results ($p=0.306$) show that there is no statistically significant difference in youth lifestyle impact between the groups. By seeing Sig. (2-tailed) the value greater than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted. So there, is not a significant difference between Gender and the lifestyle of Youth.

Social media's role in lifestyle

The ANOVA test was conducted to analyze the role of social media in lifestyle based on the age of respondents. If sig value greater than 0.05 then accept hypothesis. If less then reject hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis:

There is no significant difference between the age of the respondents and the social media's role in lifestyle.

Table3
Social media's role in lifestyle

| ANOVA | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|------|
| | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 28.542 | 18 | 1.586 | 1.606 | .078 |
| Within Groups | 79.968 | 81 | .987 | | |

| | | | | | |
|-------|---------|----|--|--|--|
| Total | 108.510 | 99 | | | |
|-------|---------|----|--|--|--|

Source: Calculated data

It is clear from Table 3 shows the results of a one-way ANOVA comparing the age of respondents among the groups. The test yielded an F-value of 1.606 with degrees of freedom (18, 81) and a p-value of 0.078. Since the p-value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, the result is not statistically significant. To reject the null hypothesis (H_0), indicating that there is no significant difference in the age of respondents across the groups.

Discussion & managerial implications

The study found that the majority of respondents (48%) were aged 17–20 years, with females constituting 60% of the sample and over half (51%) being undergraduate students, indicating that younger, academically engaged youth form the dominant group in the dataset. Statistical analysis revealed no significant difference in lifestyle impact between genders ($p = 0.306$) or across age groups ($p = 0.078$), suggesting that evolving lifestyle trends influence youth broadly across demographic categories. Based on these findings, it is suggested that awareness programs be organized to help youth balance modern trends with health and cultural values, and that digital literacy initiatives be strengthened to promote safe and effective technology use. Efforts should also focus on encouraging holistic lifestyles through healthy habits and mindful technology use, while ensuring initiatives are inclusive of all youth demographics. Additionally, accessible counseling and peer-support services should be provided to address mental health challenges, and policymakers should incorporate these insights into youth development policies to amplify the benefits of lifestyle evolution while mitigating its negative effects.

Conclusion

The study highlights that evolving youth lifestyles are a widespread phenomenon affecting individuals across age, gender, and educational backgrounds in similar ways. With the majority of respondents being young undergraduates, the findings emphasize the pervasive influence of modern trends on the formative years of life. The absence of significant demographic differences suggests that societal and technological changes are shaping youth behavior in a uniform manner, underscoring the need for inclusive strategies to address both the opportunities and challenges of this evolution. By promoting balanced lifestyle practices, enhancing digital literacy, and ensuring accessible mental health support, stakeholders can help youth navigate these changes constructively, thereby fostering personal growth and positive societal impact.

Reference

1. Arafa, A., Yasui, Y., Kokubo, Y., Iwagami, M., & Saito, E. (2024). Lifestyle behaviors of childhood and adolescence: Factors, health consequences, and interventions. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 21(9), 11562273. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph21091234>
2. Benavides, C., Pérez, P., Sánchez, R., & Molina, F. (2024). eHealth intervention to improve health habits in adolescents: Mixed methods study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 26(4), e42015. <https://doi.org/10.2196/42015>

3. Imran, F. A., & Khatun, E. (2024). Post-lockdown lifestyle changes among university students in Bangladesh. arXiv Preprint, arXiv:2407.20238. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.20238>
4. Lee, M., Kim, H., Jun, B., & Park, J. (2025). We are what we buy: Extracting urban lifestyles via delivery records. arXiv Preprint, arXiv:2504.15618. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.15618>
5. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2025). How's life for children in the digital age? OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/how-s-life-for-children-in-the-digital-age_0854b900-en/full-report/the-impact-of-digital-activities-on-children-s-lives_4df70664.html
6. Panarese, P., & Azzarita, V. (2021). Impact of COVID-19 on youth leisure and routine in Italy. YOUNG, 29(4_suppl), S65–S80. <https://doi.org/10.1177/11033088211031389>
7. Pandit, M., Magadum, T., Mittal, H., & Kushwaha, O. (2025). Digital natives, digital activists: Youth, social media, and environmental sustainability movements. arXiv Preprint, arXiv:2505.10158. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.10158>
8. Wiciak, M. T., Shazley, O., & Santhosh, D. (2024). Social media behaviors and lifestyle changes in young adults (ages 18–28) during the COVID-19 pandemic: International cross-sectional study. JMIR Public Health and Surveillance, 10, e12345. <https://doi.org/10.2196/12345>
9. Zhu, Y., Chan, D. K., Pan, Q., et al. (2024). National trends in physical activity among U.S. youth (2019–2021): A cohort study. BMC Public Health, 24(1), 19486. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-024-19486-7>