

Chau-kiu Cheung

Production Dynamics for Life Quality in the Incipient 21st Century

 Springer

Production Dynamics for Life Quality in the Incipient 21st Century

Chau-kiu Cheung

Production Dynamics
for Life Quality
in the Incipient 21st Century

 Springer

Chau-kiu Cheung
Department of Social and Behavioural
Sciences
City University of Hong Kong
Hong Kong, China

ISBN 978-981-19-3826-9 ISBN 978-981-19-3827-6 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-3827-6>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd. 2022

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors, and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd.
The registered company address is: 152 Beach Road, #21-01/04 Gateway East, Singapore 189721, Singapore

Contents

1 Introduction	1
Study Needs	7
Study Plan	10
2 Life Quality, Experiences, and Practices: Identification	15
Life Quality Feelings	16
Social Experiences	24
Practices	27
Feelings, Experiences, and Practices	44
Summary	45
3 Life Quality Production: Theory	47
Functionalist Explanation for Life Quality	53
Voluntaristic Mechanism of Realization	54
Voluntaristic Mechanism of Optimization	57
Voluntaristic Mechanism of Conformity	59
Voluntaristic Mechanism of Consistency	61
Deterministic Mechanism	63
Predictors of Life Quality	66
Sociodemographic Characteristics	69
Experiences	82
Practices	84
Life Quality	89
National Indicators	90
Time	100
4 Life Quality Production: Findings	105
Statistical Analysis of Life Quality	105
Predicting Health	107
Predicting Life Satisfaction	110
Predicting Delight	114
Predicting Worry	121

Summary	123
Implications	133
5 Life Experience Production: Theory	135
Functionalist Explanation for Social Experiences	135
Explaining Social Experiences	136
Economic Hardship	137
Neighborhood Nuisance	139
Victimization	140
Security	146
Family Saving	148
Stress	150
Predictors of Social Experiences	151
Age	151
Mid-age	152
Gender	153
Immigration	155
Education	156
Employment	158
Creative Work	159
Independent Work	160
Religiousness	161
Summary	186
6 Life Experience Production: Findings	189
Findings	189
Economic Hardship	189
Neighborhood Nuisance	190
Victimization	193
Security	196
Family Saving	199
Discussion	201
Education Effects	205
Family Income Effects	208
Student Status Effects	209
Nonprofit Organization Effects	210
Creative Work Effects	211
Independent Work Effects	211
National Population Effects	212
National Bank Credit Effects	213
National Technology Effects	214
Summary	220

- 7 Life Practice Production: Theory** 223
 - Functionalist Explanation for Practices 223
 - Explaining Practices 226
 - E-activity 226
 - Learning 229
 - Spiritual Activity 230
 - Risk Aversion 232
 - Organizational Participation 233
 - Appealing 234
 - Strike participation 240
 - Voting 241
 - Green Demonstrating and Donation 244
 - Predictors of Practices 247
 - Age 248
 - Mid-Age 249
 - Gender 250
 - Immigration 252
 - Education 252
 - Employment 254
 - Creative Work 255
 - Independent Work 255
 - Religiousness 256
 - Marital Status 258
 - Parenthood 259
 - Family Income 259
 - Population Size 261
 - Population Density 262
 - Talent 262
 - Technology 263
 - Financialization 263
 - Prosperity 264
 - Inequality 265
 - Liberty 266
 - Democracy 267
 - Government Effectiveness 268
 - Emission 269
 - Human Development 270
 - Time 271
 - Summary 273
- 8 Life Practice Production: Findings** 281
 - Findings 281
 - Discussion 293
 - Personal Influences 293
 - National Influences 300

Time Influences	313
Summary	314
9 Conclusions	323
Statics	324
Dynamics	329
Summary	331
References	333

Chapter 1

Introduction



Statics and dynamics for producing life quality in the general person in the world during 2004–2012 connect to the tracking and predicting life quality. In this work, quality refers to a person's life quality in living and comprises the maintenance of health, satisfaction, avoidance of worry, and delight, including happiness, autonomy, and financial adequacy. This quality depends on production, which uses resources acquired or experienced (Lindenberg 2001; van Bruggen 2000). Specifically, life quality is a current or recent feeling or state resulting from experiences, practices, and personal and environmental background characteristics that existed or formed in the past. The processes thus proceed successively from background characteristics to experiences and practices and finally to life quality. These production processes unfold the statics or structural mechanisms of influence, which are changeable over time to reflect influence dynamics. Statics represent general influences regardless of time, whereas dynamics reveal changes in the influences across time.

To show the statics and dynamics of life quality production, this study employed Waves 5 and 6 of the World Values Survey conducted from 2005 to 2012. In addition, the study incorporated national data from the World Bank and the Quality of Government Basic Dataset (Dahlberg et al. 2018) and the Standardized World Income Inequality Database (Solt 2016) to reveal life quality production at the personal level. The national data of 2004 and 2009 preceded Wave 5 and Wave 6 personal data, respectively. To represent any person in the world generally, the study applied weighting to the data to make them representative of the world population. The statics of the production concern successive effects from personal and national background characteristics to personal life experiences, personal life practices, and personal life quality appraisals. Personal background characteristics include age, gender, marriage, education, and social class. National indicators include population size, economic development per capita, technology export per capita, income inequality, globalization, democracy, liberty, human development, and carbon dioxide (CO₂) emission. Personal life experiences include economic hardship, victimization, security, and neighborhood nuisance. Personal practices comprise private and public ones. Private practices include e-activity, learning, risk aversion, spiritual activity, and

weapon carrying. Public practices include appealing, civic organizational participation, strike participation, political voting, and green activism. Life quality appraisals include health, life satisfaction, happiness, autonomy, and worry. Meanwhile, the dynamics of the production concern the main and interaction effects of time (Wave 6 vs. Wave 5) on personal life experiences, practices, and quality appraisals. The interaction effects mean the time effects on the influences of personal and national characteristics and personal experiences and practices. Essentially, the dynamics concern the strengthening or weakening of the statics.

Concern about the dynamics of production processes leading to life quality stems from a broader concern about the dynamics of social and environmental changes, such as modernization, postmodernization, individualization, globalization, and denaturalization or humanization. The most notable among these concerns is the conservation or volatility of the static, structural mechanism over time (Fein 2015). The conservative view emphasizes the stasis of the mechanism because of the crystallization of norms, stratification, decentralization, and other structures in society. Notably, decentralization or differentiation suggests the erosion of a central institution to enforce concerted and pervasive changes. By contrast, the liberal and populist views expect changes or even revolutions in the structural mechanism over time (Fein 2015). These views posit the importance of individuals in shaping changes collectively according to a centralized or bureaucratic institution to counter the stasis imposed by established norms or structures. That is, people are capable of mustering collective power to overthrow structures through democratic or populist means. This notion is compatible with a broader, generalist view that people and their creations and structures are flexible (Fein 2015). These differing views expose the need to clarify dynamics in the production of life quality during the inception of the twenty-first century.

The twenty-first century is clearly of imminent concern for research and clarification. The inception of the century has been noteworthy for spawning many changes in life, technology, work, politics, and the world (Hicks et al. 2008; Jang 2016; Lou et al. 2011). For instance, it has generated new skills in information communication technology, interpersonal relationships, and applications in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (Jang 2016; Mainemelis et al. 2002; Markauskaite 2007). As such, the skills trigger changes in communication, information processing, socializing, cooperation, management, and problem-solving. These changes are germane to education and other ways to prepare for future life (Lou et al. 2011). Such education notably emphasizes innovation to cater to changes toward decentralization, transparency, interoperability or orchestration with multiple devices, and so on (Flogie et al. 2018). Innovation has also been prominent in robotics, satellite applications, networking, leisure activity, and income generation (Lou et al. 2011; Nugent et al. 2010; Suzuki and Best 2003). The spate of innovation necessarily demands attention and research to harness it to benefit life quality.

This innovation exemplifies social and environmental changes that are the focus of dynamics. These changes include modernization, postmodernization, individualization, globalization, and denaturalization or humanization to leave the required human footprint in the natural environment. Modernization has its primal characteristic in industrialization and Westernization, which means a change to resemble Western,

industrialized, or advanced society (Harper and Leicht 2011). The other basic characteristics of modernization include diversifying occupation and social life to increase social complexity and heightening productivity by using inanimate energy to raise income. As a further advanced, and probably revolutionary form of modernization, postmodernization features the multiplication of ideas, voices, and forms in society (Adams 2007). Nevertheless, the “post” condition in postmodernization raises questions about the significance of modernization elements, such as industrialization. Meanwhile, individualization and globalization connect to both modernization and postmodernization. On the one hand, individualization principally means progress toward disintegration from or downplaying of classes, roles, and other conventional statuses that group people (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002). On the other hand, globalization means the increasing flow of people, materials, and information worldwide (Harper and Leicht 2011). Accordingly, globalization implies denationalization to reduce the legitimacy of the national state. Moreover, denaturalization or humanization registers the environmental change due to the increasing presence of people and their deeds. This change can be detrimental to the environment and/or people, such as increasing environmental degradation, destruction, and deforestation (Black et al. 2011; Hengeveld 2012; Jorgenson et al. 2009). Nevertheless, the change can happen by improving the environment or at least making it more suitable for people. Given these changes, the critical question concerns their impacts on life quality and its formation. The latter is especially crucial because of its uncertainty. This uncertainty is the topic of dynamics that this research needs to address.

Research on the statics and dynamics of life quality builds on the grand theoretical framework of analytical functionalism (Lackey 1987; Munch 1987, 1988; Parsons 1968; Savage 1981; Schwinn 1998; Turner 2013). Within this framework, the orienting idea is the need to elaborate the functions required to sustain the whole system. These functions are analytically the products of just two dimensions: internal versus external and instrumental versus consummatory functioning. Internal functioning deals with concerns inside, whereas external functioning deals with interaction with the outside. Meanwhile, instrumental functioning is about the means to achieve goals, whereas consummatory functioning is about the satisfaction of goals. Four functions evolve from the combination of the two dimensions: goal attainment of the fulfilling function of external and consummatory functioning, adaptation function of external and instrumental functioning, integration function of internal and consummatory functioning, and latency function of internal and instrumental functioning. These four functions further buttress four mechanisms: those concerning power realization for the fulfilling function, utility optimization for the adaptation function, norm conformity for the integration function, and idea consistency for the latency function (Munch 1987). Specifically, the realization mechanism emphasizes the driving force of power, the optimization mechanism emphasizes the attractive force of gain, the conformity mechanism emphasizes the assimilating force of the norm, and the consistency mechanism emphasizes the exhibiting or rationalizing force of ideology. The realization mechanism encompasses conflict

or power theory and psychoanalytic theory; the optimization mechanism encompasses rational choice and exchange theories; the conformity mechanism encompasses social learning, norm, and cultural theories; and the consistency mechanism encompasses symbolic-interactionist and cognitive consistency theories. The mechanisms of the analytical-functionalist framework already cover materialist theory, structuration theory, and idealist theory. The analytical-functionalist framework likewise differentiates between voluntaristic and deterministic levels in applying the mechanisms. Whereas the voluntaristic level focuses on the mechanisms of internal forces, the deterministic level focuses on the mechanisms of external forces. In applying to the person, voluntaristic mechanisms emphasize the forces of personal power, gain (expected), norm exposure, and idea. By contrast, deterministic mechanisms emphasize forces external to the person, including those from the polity or authority, economy or market, community or social network, and culture or religion. These forces arise from society when it functions well. Apart from being influential through their impacts on voluntaristic forces, deterministic forces are influential directly on the person through coercing, shaping, channeling, and even providing and substituting, which means acting for the person.

Voluntaristic and deterministic forces are engaged in personal and national factors, respectively, when the framework elaborates statics in the production process, including experiences, practices, and life quality. Reflecting the power realization mechanism, voluntaristic forces include personal resources, ability, education, income, marriage, access to resources from family and other sources, and resource deficiency in terms of age, divorce, widowhood, and immigration. Representing the utility optimization mechanism, voluntaristic forces include personal gains expected from employment, work quality, security, and saving, and losses expected from unemployment, hardship, nuisance, and victimization. Registering the norm conformity mechanism, voluntaristic forces include personal exposure to norms from employing organizations and the media. Revealing the idea consistency mechanism, voluntaristic forces include personal ideas or religious beliefs and their manifestations in actions and habits. In addition, deterministic forces include the basic national conditions of PISTOL (i.e., population, information, space, technology, organization, and life standards) (Bailey 1994). These forces also include the modernization factors of economic development, globalization, government effectiveness, democracy, liberty, human development, and human capital (Dahlberg et al. 2018). Modernization factors include the side effect factors of income inequality and CO₂ emission. These national factors provide external forces, including resources and conflicts, to determine the production process.

The dynamics of the production process involving experiences, practices, and life quality center on time impacts. Concerning the World Values Survey, the impacts refer to changes from 2004 to 2012 or from Waves 5 and 6 of the survey. Theoretically, the passage of time indicates social and environmental changes in modernization, postmodernization, individualization, globalization, and denaturalization. The World Values Survey indicated tremendous and statistically significant increases in the national indicators of population (*partial r* = 0.798, controlling for countries), bank credit to the private sector (*partial r* = 0.757), gross domestic product

(GDP, *partial r* = 0.790), globalization (*partial r* = 0.784), government effectiveness (*partial r* = 0.575), human development (*partial r* = 0.932), and human capital (*partial r* = 0.920). Meanwhile, land per capita greatly decreased (*partial r* = -0.528). At the personal level, increases were substantial and significant in independent work (*partial r* = 0.315), public employment (*partial r* = 0.255), and e-activity (*partial r* = 0.224). Meanwhile, full-time employment evidenced a substantial and significant decrease (*partial r* = -0.345), demonstrating modernization, postmodernization, globalization, individualization, and denaturalization. Specifically, increases in bank credit, prosperity (i.e., GDP), globalization, government effectiveness, human development, and human capital indicate modernization. Globalization and e-activity reflect both postmodernization and modernization. The increase in independent work and the decrease in full-time employment illustrate individualization. Meanwhile, the increase in population and the decrease in land per capita manifest denaturalization or humanization.

Precisely, the dynamics of the production processes depict the effects of time on the production of life experiences, practices, and quality. Such dynamics reasonably reflect modernization, postmodernization (including globalization), and individualization. In brief, the dynamics of modernization highlight the increasing influence of rationality, thus strengthening the effects of personal adaptation (or utility optimization) and latency (or idea consistency), which entail instrumental and substantive rationality, respectively. Conversely, the dynamics of modernization suggest the diminishing influences of resources and social factors, including personal power realization, norm conformity, and external determination. By contrast, the dynamics of postmodernization emphasize the increasing unpredictability of personal experiences, practices, and quality. These dynamics thus champion blanket declines in the effects of any factor. Alternatively, the dynamics of individualization stress the increasing influences of personal factors and the declining influences of non-personal factors.

The dynamics of modernization that indicate rationality factors increase their influences with time, whereas non-rationality factors reduce their influences with time register rationalization in modernization. Accordingly, rationalization is a characterizing component of modernization (Brand 1999; Gibbins and Reimer 1999; Heaphy 2007; Venkatesh 1999) and refers to the elevation of instrumental reasoning and purposive reasoning (Heaphy 2007; Venkatesh 1999). Reasoning involves personal calculation and expectation of optimizing utility, gain, or the achievement of valued goals and the consistency maintained among ideas, values, beliefs, and attitudes. Consequently, reasoning means upholding instrumental and substantive rationality. Conversely, rationalization means disenchantment and the dispelling of tradition or external demand or norms (Heaphy 2007). For instance, religious affiliation would reduce its influence in the face of modernization. This condition indicates the impact of secularization, which is a feature of modernization (Gibbins and Reimer 1999; Inglehart 1999; Inglehart and Baker 2000; Martinelli 2005). A source of secularization in modernization is expanding education or enlightenment, which would demystify and downplay superstitious and religious influences (Best and Kellner 2001; Martinelli 2005). This process relates to the increasing favor for

humanism in modernization (Best and Kellner 2001). Such an increase underlies the increasing reliance on science and technology in modernization (Best and Kellner 2001; Martinelli 2005; Zhen and Wu 1996) and facilitates industrialization as another critical feature of modernization (Heaphy 2007; Martinelli 2005). Industrialization, in turn, expedites socioeconomic development, notably prosperity or progress visible in the economy (Gibbins and Reimer 1999; Inglehart and Welzel 2005; Martinelli 2005; Mouzelis 1999). This development enables rationalization, notably the increase in self-reflection or reflexivity (Beck et al. 1994; Han and Shim 2010). Reflexivity builds on the personal awareness about information, which is increasingly available in modernization (Beck et al. 1994; Diolae and Seda 2001). In all, rationalization hinges on secularization, educational expansion, scientific and technological development, socioeconomic development, and popularization of information, all of which characterize modernization.

The dynamics of postmodernization emphasize the unpredictability of personal experience, practice, quality, and other aspects. Unpredictability is a defining characteristic of postmodernization and the central proposition of postmodern theory or postmodernism (Gibbins and Reimer 1999). Moreover, unpredictability connects to indeterminacy, ambiguity, contingency, and chaos arising in postmodernization (Boje 1995; Heaphy 2007; Tester 2004). Essentially, postmodern theory rejects determinism (Heaphy 2007). These features stem from change, volatility, fluidity, and liquidity, as emphasized in postmodernization (Blackshaw 2005; Gibbins and Reimer 1999; Heaphy 2007; Martinelli 2005). The emphasis champions constant search and reconstruction (Gibbins and Reimer 1999; Goulding 2000). Postmodern fads and catchwords are short-lived, instant, unstable, and insecure (Blackshaw 2005; Gibbins and Reimer 1999; Martinelli 2005; Pilisuk et al. 1996) because of the liberal, permissive, and tolerant orientation treasured in postmodernization (Martinelli 2005; Peritore and Karina 2000). Postmodern fads are intricate, bricolaged, ambivalent, and variegated (Blackshaw 2005; Heaphy 2007; Jacques 1998). Adding to unpredictability are the arational and anti-scientific features of postmodernization, such that it is unintelligible, illogical, and independent of rationality and knowledge (Crook et al. 1992; Gibbins 1998; Ritzer 1997). Postmodern incidents, such as buying and playing, are whimsical, impromptu, situational, and ephemeral (Martinelli 2005), all of which characterize the transient self in postmodernization (Jacques 1998). Moreover, arationality happens in incoherence or inconsistency among ideas, values, orientations, and other mental concepts (Geser 1999). Alternatively, it represents perversity to obstruct predictability (Gibbins and Reimer 1999). Unpredictability also arises from diversification, decenteredness, discontinuation, and mixing or dedifferentiation in postmodernization (Brand 1999; Gartman 1998; Gibbins and Reimer 1999; Rojek 1995; Scambler 2002). Specifically, the gist of the postmodern object is unidentifiable. This idea connects to fragmentation or the loss of an identifiable whole in postmodernization (Gibbins and Reimer 1999; Martinelli 2005; Venkatesh 1999). For example, the postmodern self can play many conflicting roles simultaneously, just like in a drama (Blackshaw 2005). This ability stems from nihilism prevailing in postmodernization to deny anything central or essential (Gibbins and Reimer 1999; Scambler 2002). It also results from the multiplicity, multidimensionality, plurality, or

perspectivism or acceptance of multiple perspectives emphasized in postmodernization (Boje 1995; Gibbins and Reimer 1999; Heaphy 2007; Peritore and Karina 2000). This emphasis underlies the debate and negotiation to defy common understandings in postmodernization (Alvarado 1996), resulting in noisiness which impedes understanding and predictability (Blackshaw 2005). Another source of unpredictability is experimentation and risking or the lack of intention, planning, and solid knowledge in postmodernization (Blackshaw 2005; Heaphy 2007). Furthermore, the emphasis on particularism, idiosyncrasies, and uniqueness impedes predictability in postmodernization (Gibbins and Reimer 1999; Inglehart 2000; Leonard 1997; Venkakesh 1999). This outcome means upholding personal images instead of objective reality in postmodernization, thus dampening predictability (Gibbins and Reimer 1999; Heaphy 2007; Sampson 1999).

The dynamics of individualization hold the increasing influences of individual-based or internal factors and dwindling social or external influences over time because of the growing importance of personal agency (Beck et al. 1994; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002). Such agency transpires in personal awareness, choice, autonomy, self-culture, self-orientation, self-determination, self-reference, self-reflection, and self-influence (Bauman 2001; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002; Beck et al. 1994; Burgess 2018; Heinz 2002; Sorensen and Christiansen 2013). Remarkably, the agency tends to engage in applying science or technology (Elliott 2003). The application also stems from liberation, disembeddedness, disengagement, separation, and disintegration from groups such as classes (Bauman 2001; Beck et al. 1994; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002). Institutional influence also declines with individualization (Burgess 2018). Consequently, habit, attachment, commitment, and obligation to tradition and other social establishments lose their influences with individualization (Bauman 2001; Burgess 2018; Gibbins and Reimer 1999).

Study Needs

Statics and dynamics in sustaining or producing life quality in the average person in the contemporary world of the incipient twenty-first century require theoretical and empirical elucidation. Such production involves inputs from national and personal backgrounds through the throughputs of life experiences and practices to engender the output of life quality appraisal. All these factors are prominent and essential. Life quality, well-being, or the good life is of crucial concern, associated with civilization, morality, and policy (Diener et al. 2009; Ng et al. 2003; Veenhoven 1984). Pursuing personal life quality is the lifelong goal of ethics and politics (Helliwell and Putnam 2005; Lane 2000; Marks and Shah 2005). This personal aspect necessarily respects the person rather than the collective. As each person counts, personal life quality is noteworthy rather than collective national life quality, though collective life quality is also valuable. Importantly, life quality, experiences, practices, and the production processes apply to the average adult in the world, not to the American, Chinese, Brazilian, Nigerian, or other specific nationality. As in most other studies, the current

study needs to understand the average person rather than the Westerner. National boundaries are unnecessary for general understanding, especially in the globalized world (Smith 2004; Sorensen and Christiansen 2013). Hence, national identity is a factor rather than a delimitation or filter for this study to avoid Eurocentrism or Sinocentrism.

In the average contemporary adult, both the statics and dynamics of life quality production, comprising their influential input and throughput factors, are obscure. Most available knowledge about the statics and dynamics comes from national or Western studies of individuals or cross-national studies of nations. This knowledge tends to be Eurocentric (i.e., centered on the West, including Europe, North America, and their descents). Moreover, the knowledge is commonly devoid of a comprehensive theoretical framework for understanding. Hence, it can be atheoretical, short-term, and even whimsical (Ryff 1989; Veenhoven 2008). Knowing the universal truth is crucial and required, particularly regarding life quality production (Nevarez 2011; Veenhoven 2000). This knowledge appeals to human nature or interest in curiosity, authenticity, and truth-seeking (D'Raven and Pasha-Zaidi 2016; Huta 2017; MacLeod 2015; Maslow 1999; Seligman 2002; Veenhoven 2014; Waterman 2008). People also have a strong desire to tackle their problems concerning life quality (Cummins et al. 2009). This desire tends to hold because of the prevalence of personal and collective melancholy, dysfunction, and crisis in the contemporary world (Cummins et al. 2009; Lane 2000). Life quality in the new millennium is under challenge (Lyubomirsky 2001). Meanwhile, people are long-lived and perfectionistic, thus desiring more knowledge about life quality production (Phillips 2006; Veenhoven 2008).

The comprehensive theoretical framework underlying the statics and dynamics of life quality production has not engaged enough theorizing and empirical work. On the one hand, a promising theorizing work builds on analytical functionalism to incorporate both voluntaristic and deterministic mechanisms that thoroughly cover personal and impersonal or collective factors. Theorizing the mechanisms and factors of life quality production has not been pervasive and systematic. Therefore, theorizing is necessary to enhance people's understanding and meet their need for a complete explanation or cognitive closure (Kruglanski et al. 2002). It also needs to address atheoretical work on life quality production (Ryff 1989; Veehoven 2008). On the other hand, demonstrating empirical findings about the effects of the theoretically plausible factors is necessary to meet people's need for truth (Maslow 1999; Salagame 2014). These findings are always necessary for understanding life quality production (Megone 1990). They need to indicate general knowledge about the average adult globally based on statistical analysis (Sachs 2003). Hence, the knowledge is objective and representative. Crucially, such knowledge highlights statistically and practically significant static and dynamic factors in life quality production.

Especially for the voluntaristic mechanism of power realization, statistical analysis reveals significant resources, strengths, and drives that power the production, such as education, income, and marriage. Regarding the voluntaristic mechanism of utility optimization, the analysis is to probe significant gains that attract life quality production, such as from security, self-employment, and independent work.

Regarding the voluntaristic mechanism of norm conformity, the analysis is to screen norms and social experiences that assimilate with the production. For the voluntaristic mechanism of idea consistency, the analysis is to identify beliefs, roles, and behaviors that rationalize the production. Moreover, to clarify the deterministic mechanism, the analysis identifies national factors that enable personal life quality production, including population size, economic development or living standards, and democracy. These deterministic factors, which incorporate social and material resources, will push, coerce, empower, channel, put, and/or even replace one in the production. Replacing means that a person obtains life quality or related experiences because other people act for the person's life quality production. An example is an adult behaving just like a child to receive feeding from other people.

In addition to improving the understanding of the functionalist mechanisms and their factors, this study needs to clarify the dynamics of social and natural changes, including modernization, postmodernization, globalization, individualization, and denaturalization, diminishing natural properties due to human intervention. The clarification appeals to human interest in understanding and predicting changes and the future (Hassenzahl et al. 2015; Prenda and Lachman 2001). That is, understanding the dynamics enables the prediction of the future. Of vital concern for the understanding and prediction is change, improvement, or deterioration in life quality production (Brockmann et al. 2009; Phillips 2006). This concern is necessary for planning, preparing, and/or coping with the change in the production (Baylis 2005; Gattino et al. 2015; Navarez 2011; Prenda and Lachman 2001). Nevertheless, understanding and planning are presently uncertain in the face of diverse views about social and natural changes and their dynamics. These views include the changes as challenging, colonizing, conflicting, unequalizing, fragmenting, evolutionary, revolutionary, and teleological or planned (Adams 2007; Cole 2003; Fararo 2001; Fein 2015; Harper and Leicht 2011; Schmidt 2010; Turner 2003). Specifically, controversy is raging over the dynamics of modernization, postmodernization, globalization, individualization, and denaturalization concerning life quality (Munck 2018; Nederveen Pieterse 2010; Rabbani 2011), raising issues about progress, risk, crisis, limitation, sustainability, indeterminacy, and nihilism (Johnson 2009; Schroeder 2013). The diverse views entail different responses in adaptation, conformity, competition, migration, social movements, and anxiety (Adams 2007; Fein 2015; Harper and Leicht 2011; Turner 2003). Thus, clarification of the diverse views is necessary.

Specifically, the dynamics of modernization, postmodernization, globalization, individualization, and denaturalization for life quality production require clarification because, while the dynamics tend to be real and prevailing, their impacts on life quality production are obscure. Accordingly, modernization, characterized by rationalization and industrialization, has engendered peace, autonomy, and stress (Delhey 2010; Dioake and Seda 2001). Postmodernization, which maintains discontinuity, volatility, uncertainty, and unpredictability in society, has raised consumption and fear (Haller 2002; Tester 2004). Globalization, which underlies postmodernization, has enlarged revenue, stress, and resistance (Arnett 2002; Brady et al. 2007; Tsai 2006). Individualization, which springs from both modernization and postmodernization, has sustained liberation and peace and risks, anomie, insecurity, and anxiety

(Bauman 2001; Beck et al. 1994; Burgess 2018; Castells 2000; Frank and Meyer 2002; Turner 2010). The effects of dynamics on static influences on life quality production have likewise remained uncharted. Specifically, how the influences of personal and national determinants of life quality production transform over the incipient twenty-first century remain unclear. These influences can reflect increasing rationality in modernization, increasing unpredictability in postmodernization, and personal influence in individualization. All these possible changes require empirical scrutiny.

Study Plan

Following the above introduction, the study unfolds its theory and findings in seven subsequent chapters before arriving at conclusions. Individually, the chapters concern identification of life quality appraisals, experiences, and practices (Chap. 2); theory about life quality production (Chap. 3); findings on life quality production (Chap. 4); theory about life experience production (Chap. 5); findings on life experience production (Chap. 6); theory about life practice production (Chap. 7); findings on life experience production (Chap. 8); and conclusions (Chap. 9).

Chapter 2 is about identifying life quality appraisals, experiences, and practices. It displays findings from the statistical analysis of World Values Survey data in the twenty-first century concerning the factor structure and reliability of the appraisals, experiences, and practices. All the analyses involved person-level data weighted to represent the average adult in the world. For current life quality appraisal, factor analysis identified two factors to represent worry and delight: happiness, autonomy, and financial satisfaction. Concerning recent life quality, factor analysis showed that health and life satisfaction were separate factors. Regarding experiences, factor analysis identified four factors pertaining to economic hardship, neighborhood nuisance, victimization, and security. In addition, the analysis found family saving to be a stand-alone experience (i.e., not falling into any factor). For private practice or activity, factor analysis identified five factors about e-activity, learning, spiritual activity, risk aversion, and television watching. Factor analysis also found weapon carrying to be a stand-alone private practice. For public practice or activity, factor analysis identified four factors about civic organizational participation, appealing, strike, and voting. In addition, factor analysis showed that participation in green demonstrations and green donation were stand-alone public practices. The identified factors were all reliable. Partial correlation analysis then showed relationships among personal factors, national factors, and time while controlling for indicators of the nation (i.e., Brazil, China, Egypt, and so on). The analysis indicated significant and relatively large increases in e-activity, public employment, and independent work over time in the early twenty-first century. By contrast, the analysis revealed significant and relatively large decreases in learning, civic organizational participation, spiritual activity, full-time employment, and private business employment with time. Moreover, the analysis displayed very strong increases in population, bank credit,

economic development, globalization, human development, and human capital with time. These changes demonstrate modernization, globalization, and individualization in the world.

Chapter 3 is about the theory of life quality production and details the conceptualization and explanation of life quality. Life quality in terms of health, happiness, life satisfaction, financial satisfaction, and no worry primarily identify the hedonist good life, whereas life quality in terms of autonomy reflects the eudemonic or humanist good life. In any form, life quality is explicable with the voluntaristic mechanisms of power realization, utility optimization, norm conformity, and idea consistency and the deterministic mechanism of external force within the analytical-functionalist framework. This framework incorporates explanations predicated on resources, exchange, comparison, temperament, and others. Life quality appraisal involving health maintenance, satisfaction, feeling happy, independence, and worry-free is both a voluntaristic action and a deterministic response. At the personal level, sociodemographic characteristics, experiences, and practices produce life quality according to the voluntaristic mechanism. Recent life quality likewise produces current life quality considering the voluntaristic mechanism of consistency. Furthermore, national factors such as population and economic development produce life quality initially and directly through the deterministic mechanism and indirectly through the voluntaristic mechanism. The deterministic mechanism holds that a person's life quality results from other people's production efforts. For instance, national human development in terms of education, life expectancy, and income provides people with increased capability to help one another sustain life quality. Due to modernization, postmodernization, globalization, individualization, and denaturalization, life quality can also change with time. Additionally, the effects of personal and national factors on life quality can change with time. The dynamics of effects or time or zeitgeist are explicable with the deterministic mechanism.

Chapter 4 is about findings concerning life quality production and primarily exhibits the main and interaction effects of personal and national factors on the life quality of health, life satisfaction, delight, and worry. Among the significant main effects, the most pervasive was the positive effects of education and family saving and the negative effects of economic hardship and neighborhood nuisance. In addition, independent work and national human development displayed positive effects, while national land per capita exhibited negative effects. The effects are explicable with the voluntaristic and deterministic mechanisms of the functionalist framework. Among voluntaristic mechanisms, power realization and utility optimization are particularly applicable. The significant interaction effects with time manifest the modernization, postmodernization, and individualization dynamics. That is, non-rational factors decreased their influences in line with modernization dynamics. Similarly, influences became weaker, or life quality became more unpredictable, thus supporting postmodernization dynamics. In addition, social factors decreased their influences, and individual-based factors increased their influences in support of individualization dynamics. Notably, modernization, postmodernization, individualization, and their dynamics prevail simultaneously and are not mutually exclusive.

Chapter 5 is about the theory regarding the production of life experiences as precursors to life quality appraisals. These experiences consist of the adversities of economic hardship, neighborhood nuisance, victimization, and the benefits of security and family saving. They also represent the objective or experiential indicators of life quality. Their production reflects the voluntaristic and deterministic mechanisms of the functionalist framework. On the one hand, life experiences, including economic hardship and neighborhood nuisance, can be voluntaristic in that they involve personal selection, awareness, perception, and interpretation. Thus, these talents enable one to encounter favorable experiences according to the voluntaristic mechanism of power realization. Alternatively, favorable expectations, norms, and beliefs can induce favorable perceptions and experiences according to the voluntaristic mechanisms of optimization, conformity, and consistency. On the other hand, life experiences can be involuntary responses to deterministic factors external to the person. Static national and dynamic factors conveyed through modernization, postmodernization, and others can determine personal life experiences.

Chapter 6 exhibits findings on the production of life experiences. The findings primarily show the main and interaction effects of personal sociodemographic and national factors on the experiences. The main effects indicate the statics about the production, whereas the interaction effects gauge the dynamics or change due to the time about the production. The interaction effects particularly manifested individualization dynamics such that individual-based factors became more influential on life experiences with time. The individual is increasingly responsible for his or her life experiences.

Chapter 7 discusses the theory concerning the production of life practices, which produce life quality. These practices consist of the private activities of e-activity, learning, risk aversion, and weapon carrying and the public activities of civic organizational participation, appealing, strike, voting, green demonstrations, green donation, and spiritual activity. They also count as the objective or behavioral indicators of life quality. Their production reflects the voluntaristic and deterministic mechanisms of the functionalist framework. The voluntaristic mechanisms involve personal, sociodemographic factors, whereas the deterministic mechanisms hinge on national factors. National factors such as national technology and organization would shape or require the person to do something, such as e-activity, when the deterministic mechanisms operate. These mechanisms also identify the statics and dynamics in producing life practices. The dynamics, which underlie changes over time, reflect modernization, postmodernization, individualization, and others.

Chapter 8 concerns findings on the production of life practices. The findings primarily show the main and interaction effects of personal sociodemographic and national factors on the practices. The main effects illustrate the statics about the production, whereas the interaction effects unfold the dynamics of the production. The interaction effects showed that the practices were increasingly predictable with time, thus refuting postmodernization dynamics.

Chapter 9 concludes the findings on statics and dynamics in producing life quality, including its subjective dimensions of appraisal and objective indicators of life experiences and practices. Both statics and dynamics rest principally on the analytical-functional framework, encompassing voluntaristic and deterministic mechanisms engaging personal and national factors. The statics highlight the importance of the voluntaristic mechanism of power realization, which hinges on resources or various kinds of capital. At the same time, the statics reveal the deterministic mechanism, which builds on national factors. This mechanism suggests that national factors can directly influence life quality production through external provision, coercion, and/or channeling. The dynamics reflect the deterministic mechanisms of time or social change in terms of modernization, postmodernization, globalization, individualization, and denaturalization. Such dynamics consist of the main effect of time and its interaction with personal and national factors. The interaction effects particularly illustrate that modernization, postmodernization, and individualization underlie the dynamics in producing life quality.

Chapter 2

Life Quality, Experiences, and Practices: Identification



Life quality or its appraisals or feelings generally is the end for predication by such predictors as experiences and practices. The feelings include current worry and delight and existing health and life satisfaction. Delight includes satisfaction, happiness, and a sense of autonomy. The experiences include those of economic hardship, neighborhood nuisance, victimization, security, and family saving. Meanwhile, practices include such private activities as e-activity, learning, spiritual activity, risk aversion, weapon carrying, and public activities such as active organizational participation, appealing, joining strikes, voting, and environmentalist involvement.

Life feelings, experiences, and practices are crucial because they are functional or dysfunctional to bolster and materialize the social system. On the one hand, the bolstering rests on practices and their underlying dispositions and attitudes, typically prosocial. Such bolstering emanates from the voluntaristic functions of goal attainment, adaptation, integration, and latency, or their respective mechanisms of power realization, utility optimization, norm conformity, and idea consistency. Accordingly, personal feelings, experiences, and practices engender personal practices relevant, functional or dysfunctional, to the social system. Those functional ones would be sustainable, famous, or prominent, whereas those dysfunctional ones would be unsustainable, unpopular, and marginal. On the other hand, the materialization happens when personal feelings, experiences, and practices exemplify discourses, such as conservatism, liberalism, and socialism prevailing in the social system. The materialization or exemplification engages the latency function of idea consistency or rationalization. Those materializing discourses in the social system would be functional and sustainable, whereas those contradicting discourses in the social system would be dysfunctional and unsustainable. Herein, such discourses are functional to the social system with the latency function of rationalization. In other words, discourses are the superstructure or spiritual pillars of the system.

Life Quality Feelings

Life quality resides in one's appraisal or feeling about life (Huta 2017). Feeling means a conscious, subjective psychological state (Reber 2016). It is crucial for acting, such as problem-solving, maintaining homeostasis, and retaining and rejecting memories (Heller 2009; Reber 2016). That is, feeling good retains memories of something good. The contributions of feeling to action and homeostasis reflect the functions of adaptation and goal attainment in the analytical-functionalist framework. Accordingly, feeling provides the guide for action in achieving adaptation and sets the goal for homeostatic attainment. In addition, feeling is justifiable or of concern through some discourses. Empiricist discourse posits that feeling is factual, real, and experienceable (Ratcliffe 2008). By contrast, phenomenological discourse maintains that feeling is a reflection as opposed to a display of dogmatism (Ratcliffe 2008). Hence, feeling is active or lively. Feeling is also vital as a kind of romance, which is treasurable in romanticism (Heller 2009; Reber 2016). Moreover, feeling is a basis for virtue, guiding virtuous action (Reber 2016). For instance, feeling bad drives virtuous action to redress something terrible. Feeling is crucial in Confucian and stoic ethics or virtues (Reber 2016). Whereas Confucian ethics emphasizes associating feeling with music, ritual, and reading moral maxims, stoic ethics advocates the deprivation of longing from feeling.

Life quality feeling is noteworthy in positive psychology (Cowen and Kilmer 2002; D'raven and Pasha-Zaidi 2016). This approach casts doubt on the objective treatment of life quality in medicine, neglecting the positive aspect of life. The positivist approach thus emphasizes personal strengths, including appreciation, gratitude, hope, humor, love, spirituality, and vitality, which also characterize life quality or well-being. In the approach, feeling well broadens and builds one's repertoire and its enactment, which are constructive and productive (Diener et al. 2009; Fredrickson 2008). They can contribute to one's employment, health, income, relatedness, resources, solidarity, trust, and upward social mobility (Diener et al. 2009; Fredrickson 2008; Oishi and Koo 2008; Veenhoven 2008). In a broader view, feeling well induces longevity as opposed to pathology and dysfunction (Cummins et al. 2009; Veenhoven 2008). Such individual achievement follows and accords with individualization (McKenzie 2016). Individualization is a social trend to connect individual well-being to societal functioning (Cummins 2016). Feeling well is the ultimate motivator for personal and societal development action (Lai et al. 2007). Considering the analytical-functionalist framework, such motivation illustrates the goal-attainment function of feeling well as energy or resource.

Life quality feeling is justifiable or essential in humanist, individualist, neoliberal, utilitarian, and other discourses. Humanist discourse maintains that the feeling is necessary to fulfill needs, such as for fairness, parity, and worth in life (Burnett 2012). Individualist, egocentric, person-oriented, or Western discourse posits that feeling well is necessary for agency, autonomy, self-actualization, self-development, and self-fulfillment (Barrow 2019; Burnett 2012; Ganesh and McAllum 2010). Utilitarian

discourse asserts that feeling well is essential for capitalism, characterized by competitiveness and productivity, freedom, individualism, and market operation (Burnett 2012; Duncan 2014). The good feeling evolves from and contributes to leisure and work. This contribution is helpful to generate maximum utility in a maximum number of people. Essentially, feeling well is the core of utility. Standing on individualism and utilitarianism, neoliberal discourse similarly treasures the role of feeling well in capitalism, consumerism, economic growth, and rationality (Cabanas 2016; Daraei and Mohajery 2013). That is, feeling well plays a vital role in consumption, economic activity, and thus capitalism. Rationality is relevant for the person to optimize the good feeling. Hence, feeling well is adaptive, representing a requisite function in the analytical-functionalist framework. According to World Values Survey data, the feeling or appraisal can take the forms of happiness, satisfaction with life and finance, particularly autonomy, health, and having no worry.

Worry, as a negative form of good or life quality feeling, is a dysfunction in need of minimization (Bouton et al. 2001; McNally 1990). Such a dysfunction is indicative of danger and threat, which are stable and intrusive (Flinkfeldt 2020; Zeidner and Matthews 2011). Moreover, worry is an irrational, problematic arousal reflecting feeling about uncertainty in need of vigilance (Frink et al. 2004; Zeidner and Matthews 2011). Worry tends to be a feminine characteristic associated with emotionality, inferiority, and vulnerability as opposed to choosing, control, and reasoning (Nelson 2015). Nevertheless, worry is prevalent because of its susceptible to social construction, including that in the media and social atmosphere (Hubbard 2003). The prevalence is visible in worry about terrorist attack, unemployment, war and civil war particularly, and wiretapping or the lack of privacy.

Terrorism or terrorist attack is violence against civilians or non-combatants in clandestine ways to arouse worry (Orr 2012; Taylor 2018). The attack thus inflicts damage, insecurity, intimidation, and even war (Morin 2016; Orr 2012; Taylor 2018). Moreover, terrorism aims to provoke publicity because of its exceptional adversity (Morin 2016; Orr 2012). Terrorism can transpire in extortion, extremism, killing, and paralysis, as well as an attack (Bjorgo 2016; Dugan and Chenoweth 2012; Neumayer and Plumper 2009; Onursal and Kirkpatrick 2021). Based on the clash of civilization and media circulation and amplification, terrorism becomes prevalent (KhosraviNik and Amer 2022; Morin 2016). The clash registers unresolvable entrenched cultural or ideological conflict fueling terrorism. Terrorism is blameworthy according to discourses about care, consequentialism or utilitarianism, contractualism, and deontology. Care discourse wrongs terrorism for its harm, violence, and worrying (Held 2008). Instead, the discourse embraces empathy, equality, fraternity, mutuality, and relatedness. This discourse rests on the premise of interrelated conditions in society. Consequentialist or utilitarian discourse faults terrorism for undermining peace and utility (Held 2008; Taylor 2018). Contractualist discourse criticizes terrorism for violating the law, liberty, and rationality or reasoning (Taylor 2018). Deontological discourse condemns terrorism for its violation of rights (Held 2008). In addition, terrorism is objectionable because of its barbarism, evilness, extremism, fanaticism, scapegoating, tyranny, victimization, and provocation of war (Bhatia 2009; Blain 2015; Fragon 2019; Jackson and Hall 2016).

Unemployment is a worrisome problem concomitant to such social changes as labor deregulation and technologization (Francesconi and Golsch 2005; Schellenberg 1996). Such deregulation originates from globalization or global employment and an associated decline in unionism. Globalization also capitalizes on technologization to replace labor with technology. Consequently, unemployment signifies disqualification and stigmatization imposed on unemployed people (Gallie and Paugam 2000; Paugam and Russell 2000). Unemployment is also blameworthy for income inequality and poverty (Francesconi and Golsch 2005). All these register the risk society characterized by insecurity and vulnerability (Tam and Ip 2017). Furthermore, unemployment is problematic, considering discourse on agency, which treasures personal control, growth, and independence (Dooley and Prause 2004). The lack of agency introduces stress to the person (Dooley and Prause 2004). In addition, unemployment is symptomatic of skill mismatch, reflecting problems in education to suit the job market (Adely et al. 2021). Unemployment is worrisome because it provokes economic hardship, homelessness, hospitalization, and victimization (Lelli 2008; Kaukinen 2004; Muhlau 2014). That is, unemployment jeopardizes one's health and wealth (Lelli 2008; Reeskens and Vandecasteele 2017). Conversely, unemployment has eroded one's social capital (Manturuk et al. 2010; Webber and Huxley 2007). As such, unemployment indicates dysfunction in goal attainment or fulfillment in the analytical-functionalist perspective.

War is worrying, as is politically institutionalized lethal violence (Olsson and Maleevi 2018). It operates collectively and solidly through fighters of either side (Malesevic 2010). Its worry is understandable with the discourses of consequentialism, feminism, pacifism, and virtue. Consequentialist discourse problematizes war that results in disadvantage and misrule (Gorman 2010; Graham 2008). Feminist discourse condemns war for its origin in patriarchy, particularly unfair to women (Owens 2010). Based on consequentialist, deontological, and teleological ethics, pacifism castigates war for harm to pleasure, happiness, welfare, dutifulness, and virtues such as charity, faith, hope, justice, love, and moderation (Orend 2006; Owens 2010). Furthermore, virtue discourse accuses war for undermining such additional virtues as charity, dignity, fortitude, freedom, prudence, and temperance (Gorman 2010). War is unjust when it is arbitrary, clandestine, invasive, illegal, irresponsible, sudden, unreasonable, and violating human rights (Orend 2006).

Civil war, as a kind of war involving opposing parties within a country, is worrying because of its domestic havoc (Bentrovato and Nissanka 2018). Such war commonly comes with rebellion, revolution, resistance, and subversive struggles for power (Meis 2017). Civil war is disharmonizing and upsetting peace (Bentrovato and Nissanka 2018). Often, civic war involves different ethnic parties in a country, thus registering ethnic conflict or struggle (Corstange and York 2018). Civil war can arise from democracy, which appeals to the pursuit of freedom and rights, which becomes a cause of civic war (Bentrovato and Nissanka 2018). Such war is worrying or unjustifiable with collectivist, counter-terrorist, evil or irrationality, and security discourses (Bentrovato and Nissanka 2018; Seoighe 2016; Sorial 2012; Whiting 2012). Accordingly, civil war undermines national collectivity, solidarity, and security, especially

when it foments terrorism which is evil and irrational. Civil war is justifiable, pardonable, or common according to discourses on defense, history, humanitarianism, liberation, loyalty, pragmatism, self-determination, separatism, terrorism, traitors, and victimization (Nackers 2015; Seoighe 2016). Accordingly, civil war is a necessary defense for certain parties, including separatists, to uphold their liberty and rights practically or effectively, rather than being victims of misrule. Hence, destruction through terrorism or civic war is acceptable. In addition, civil war just follows some historical tradition to declare loyalty to a specific party in a country. Moreover, when a party betrays the country with treason, civil war erupts to safeguard national interests.

Wiretapping is worrying as an intrusion into personal privacy (Hampton 2016). Privacy emphasizes autonomy and opposes being in public (Connor and Doan 2021). In justifying privacy, privatism encompasses self-interest and familialism or family orientation as opposed to being civic or public and privileging helpfulness, social order, and the state (Cook 2001; Dowling et al. 2010; Hampton 2016; Pospech 2020). Privacy or privatism arises from depoliticization, desire, marketing, and technology, notably concerning information and communication (Cook 2001; Hampton 2016). These factors register the basis for self-interest and self-sufficiency, hence privacy or privatism. Notably, depoliticization means that one does not need to care about politics, as the emphasis is on the market, which rests on self-interest. Privacy or privatism, in turn, stands on liberal, neoliberal, and right discourses. Liberal discourse favors the market (Huber 2012; Tapper and Kobayashi 2018). In addition to favoring the market, neoliberal discourse treasures commerce, competition, deregulation, and the privatization of public services, as opposed to state planning and welfare (Dowling et al. 2010; Huber 2012; Tapper and Kobayashi 2018). In addition, rights discourse privileges personal rights (Lokot 2020). By contrast, privacy or privatism is questionable according to formal or rationalist, order, and theological discourses. Formalist or rationalist discourse, stemming from enlightenment, advocates transcendence or going beyond the person (Dell'Oro 2002). Discourse order favors order and its conformity (Fritz et al. 2022). In addition, theological discourse upholds sharing and commonality and demeans privacy or privatism, and it regards people as the common subjects of God (Dell'Oro 2002).

Education as a kind of human capital and a way of learning is noteworthy for worrying (Dolton et al. 2004; Nordin 2011). Thus, education embodies the functions of human capital, rationalization, and social control that are common everywhere (Munk 2003; Nordin 2011; Papastephanon 2015). Education has nurtured such ideologies as capitalism, communitarianism, conservatism, environmentalism, expressivism, humanism, individualism, liberalism, meritocracy, moralism, multiculturalism, neoliberalism, postmaterialism, postmodernism, populism, progressivism, relativism, socialism, and traditionalism (Derks 2004; Engels and Jacobson 2007; Evans et al. 2010; Gilberbloom and Markham 1995; Hood and Deopere 2002; Hrabá et al. 2001; McCright and Dunlop 2008; Norris and Inglehart 2009; Pichler 2009; Sotirovic 2000; Sharp and Josyla 2008; Tranter and Western 2009; Wernet et al. 2005; Yuchtman-Yaar 2002; Welzel 2013). Meanwhile, education has eroded such ideologies as authoritarianism, Buddhism, egalitarianism, familism, humanitarianism, leftism, nationalism, patriotism, pronatalism, and racism (Achterberg and

Houtman 2009; Barker and Tinnick 2006; Billiet et al. 2003; Jones and Brayfield 1997; Norris and Inglehart 2009; Rossi 2001; Tang 2001; Vernby and Finseraas 2010; Wodtke 2012), Moreover, education has raised the values of autonomy, childrearing, conformity, imagination, independence, need, reasoning, voting, and work (Armon and Dawson 2003; Gelissen 2002; Fjellvang 2011; James and Luo 1999; Ulbig 2002; Weimann and Brosius 1994; Wu and Macneill 2003; Xiao 2000). Conversely, education has discounted the values of ascription, conservation, evaluation, obedience, and survival (Datler et al. 2013; Fjellvang 2011; Forgas et al. 1995). All these effects reflect the integration or norm conforming function of education through its varied contents. Alternatively, education has enhanced civic skill, conscientiousness, intelligence, knowledge, memory, morality, openness, physical functioning, susceptibility, and verbal ability (Norris and Inglehart 2009; Opp 1989; Pratt et al. 1996; Rossi 2001; Shin 2012; Stevens et al. 2001; Straughn and Andriot 2011; Verba et al. 1995). These contributions indicate the functions of goal attainment and integration through learning and conformity. Conversely, education has diminished the need for help, religiosity, and vulnerability (Immerzeel and van Tubergen 2013; Lessler et al. 2000; Langenderfer and Shimp 2001). These effects illustrate the goal attainment function of learning and empowerment. For practice, education has raised civic engagement, civility, cultural activity, distancing from others, environmental protection, exercising, health behavior, impeachment, media use, musical lifestyle, online activity, persistence, political discussion and participation, prevention, protest participation, social participation, traveling, visiting, and voting (Bull et al. 2004; Djupe and Lewis 2015; Flavin and Keane 2011; Grzywacz 2000; Guillen et al. 2011; Grasso 2014; Kerrissey and Schofer 2013; Lelli 2008; Mirowsky and Ross 2001; Norris 2011; Norris and Inglehart 2009; McCabe 2014; Papadakis 2000; Pratt et al. 2010; Tsai 2006; Van Eijck 2001; Weisberg 2005; Welzel 2013). These activating effects reflect the functions of goal attainment and integration through learning and conforming. Conversely, education has discouraged birth, deviance, discrimination, housework, intergenerational association, natural lifestyle, personal care, prostitution, recourse, resistance, and returning from migration (Backman and Nilsson 2011; Gershuny 2000; Katz-Gerro 1999; Korinek et al. 2005; Lubbers et al. 2006; Su and Feng 2013; Swader and Vorobeva 2015; Torche 2011). These effects again reflect the functions of goal attainment and integration through learning and conforming. Eventually, education has escalated social class, earnings, insurance coverage, organizational membership, wealth, and social status (Cerin and Leslie 2008; Knab et al. 2008; Pettigrew 2002; Schnittker and Behrman 2012; Straughn and Andriot 2011; Whyte and Gao 2009). Education is functional to capital acquisition and is valuable and desirable to pursue. Having inadequate education is thus worrisome.

As the core of life quality feeling, happiness typically highlights the contemporary affective aspect of the Feeling (Lydon-Staley et al. 2019; Wadsworth 2014). It is acute, discrete, and intense in drawing and demonstrating psychic energy (Cropanzano et al. 2011; TenHouten 2007). Such energy is functional to sustain attention, humor, and resilience to stress in exploration, optimism, and relaxation (Fredrickson and Losada 2005). The exploration can facilitate information processing, proactivity, and resource acquisition (Cropanzano et al. 2011; Fredrickson 2001). Such acquired

resources can foster creativity, health, optimism, and relational quality (Waugh 2014). Hence, happiness performs the function of goal attainment or fulfillment to establish the self, identity, character, and social relationships (Conway et al. 2014; Kaplan 2006; Stets and Trettevik 2014). In addition, happiness has contributed to justice, judgment, patriotism, and even fighting for the country (Cropanzano et al. 2011; Turner and Stets 2005). These contributions represent the function of adaptation, which concerns the fair exchange in returning the favor. That is, feeling happy in a place generates support for the place.

Satisfaction registers the retrospective, cognitive aspect of life quality feeling (Hagerty 2003). It manifests such qualities as homeostasis and stability (Cummins et al. 2003; Heidemeier and Staudinger 2012). Homeostasis means that fluctuation in satisfaction is temporary. Satisfaction with life is a popular indicator of utility, particularly in the democracy (Ateca-Amestoy et al. 2014; Radcliff 2001; Stavrova 2014). Life involved in life satisfaction comprises 11 facets of education, employment, family, finance, friendship, health, housing, partnership, recreation, religion, and transportation (Mallard et al. 1997). Income and safety are particularly noteworthy (Burchardt 2005; Nielsen and Smyth 2008). Life satisfaction has contributed to intelligence, job commitment, marriage, political participation, social cohesion, social networking, volunteering, and voting (Chan 2014; Flavin and Keane 2011; Luhmann et al. 2013; Schaie 2013; Yoo and Jeong 2017). As such, life satisfaction demonstrates the enabling effect of the goal attainment function for social involvement. Life satisfaction has also strengthened support and trust for society and polity, such as democracy (Chan 2014; Chen and Zhong 1998). This strengthening reflects the adaptation function of fair exchange involving the society or polity.

Financial or economic satisfaction is a vital indicator of utility (Vera-Toscano et al. 2006; Yu and Chiu 2016). This satisfaction appears to be the most important to represent life satisfaction (Wan 1992). Income satisfaction is particularly crucial (Obucina 2013; Zagorski 2011). Financial satisfaction has facilitated budgeting and self-control (Sahi 2017). This facilitation manifests the goal attainment function of enabling and facilitating. Moreover, financial satisfaction has fostered political participation (Lee and Lee 2019). This influence reflects the adaptation function of returning the favor and the goal attainment function of enabling. Accordingly, financial satisfaction based on a polity contributes to support for the polity.

Autonomy or having a free choice and control over life is a crucial life quality feeling emphasized by discourses on capability, existentialism, liberalism, neoliberalism, and postmodernism. Capability discourse regards autonomy as essential for the capability to uphold democracy and well-being (Laruffa 2020). Alternatively, autonomy is an ideal in existentialism (Ryan and Deci 2006). Accordingly, existentialism idealizes autonomy because of godlessness and mortality and thus the absence of destiny and supernatural domination (Cox 2012). Similarly, liberalism and its humanist basis maintain autonomy as relevant and functional for enlightenment in the anthropocentric stance (Zimran 2020). They thus liken autonomy to humanity. Furthermore, neoliberalism highlights the relevance of autonomy to capitalism, its competitiveness, flexibility, individualism, and privatization as opposed to regulation and organization (McLean 2015). In addition, postmodernism emphasizes

autonomy in terms of independence and self-help to sustain optimism because others are not trustworthy (McLean 2015). Autonomy also reflects the value of recreation to avert external pressure and alienation (Walker et al. 2001). Eventually, autonomy has contributed to effectiveness and performance in work, participation, and relatedness (Gagne and Deci 2005; Weinstein and Ryan 2010). As such, autonomy is a strength underpinning the function of goal attainment in facilitating work and social life.

Health can be a central life quality feeling covering exercising, fitness, safety, vitality, and the absence of disease, impairment, obesity, physical functioning, sleepiness, symptoms, and the risk of mortality (Baker et al. 2009; Cutler and Lleras-Muney 2008; Hagquist and Andrich 2004; Headey et al. 2001; Thiede and Traub 1997). The importance of health rests on its indication of capability conducive to achievement or functioning (Lelli 2008). Moreover, health is favorable according to discourses on healthism, capitalism, modernization, neoliberalism, pragmatism, social democracy, and utilitarianism (Albrecht 2005; Njoh 2009; Petersen 1996; Tink et al. 2020; Zweifei and Breyer 1997). Healthism treasures or yearns for bodily balance, beauty, consumption, control, fitness, flexibility, and nutrition, as opposed to risk (Arguedas 2020; Halasz 2018; Wiest et al. 2015). To achieve health, healthism advocates personal choice, control, dieting, discipline, management, moderation, and responsibility as opposed to fun and pleasure (Brown 2018; Jaye et al. 2018; MacGregor et al. 2021). Healthism also upholds individualism as opposed to hedonism (Lavrence and Lozanski 2014). Healthism moralizes health and its technology (Arguedas 2020; Brown 2018; Wiest et al. 2015). Healthism arises from anxiety about health, insecurity, risk, medicalization, and decline in religion and particularly salvation (Arguedas 2020; Brown 2018; Harrington and Fullagar 2013; Jaye et al. 2018). Accordingly, medicalization is the social force facilitating and thus raising the concern for health and healthism. Meanwhile, the decline in religion and thus salvation in the afterlife heightens personal responsibility for health. In addition, insecurity and risk uplift personal control and responsibility (Jaye et al. 2018). Healthism thus represents ethics, morality, religion, and even fear of death (Brown 2018; Kristensen et al. 2016; Pelters and Wijma 2016). What is more, healthism also rests on neoliberalism (Luna 2019; MacGregor et al. 2021). Essentially, healthism builds on such neoliberal emphases as activism, calculation, capitalism, choice, consumption, docility, individualism, management, rationality in terms of cost-benefit analysis, self-care, self-control, self-discipline, self-governing, and surveillance (Jaye et al. 2018; Lavrence and Lozanski 2014; Luna 2019; MacGregor et al. 2021; Wiest et al. 2015). The emphases require personal monitoring of health. They also champion the value of health generally (Tink et al. 2020). Relevant neoliberal tenets are accountability, activism, individualization, responsibility, self-care, self-examination, self-governance, self-improvement, and self-management (Inthorn and Boyce 2010; Petersen 1996; Tink et al. 2020). Accordingly, personal care for the personal asset or resource of health is paramount (Ashcroft 2015). In addition, health is a significant modern concern for leisure, recreation, and sport (Njoh 2009; Young et al. 2021). Health is also amenable to and compatible with modern practice, policy, and technological advancement (Albrecht 2005). Furthermore, health is valuable for production according to utilitarian discourse (Zweifei and Breyer 1997). Health has

contributed to social cohesion, coping, cultural activity, environmentalist activity, financial transfer, spiritual activity, role diversification, search for meaning, self-enhancement, social activity, volunteering, and voting (Adeola 2000; Ben-Zur 2002; Mitrut and Wolff 2011; Goerres 2007; Immerzeel and van Tubergen 2013; Kazarian and Martin 2006; Scherger 2009; Stalker 2008; Tomich and Helgeson 2002). Hence, health demonstrates the function of goal attainment for activating various personal and social activities.

Analysis of World Values Survey data illustrated that current life quality feelings identified two factors, worry, and delight. Worry consisted of that about the terrorist attack, civil war, war, government wiretapping, inability to give children a good education, losing or job, or not finding a job. Worrying about the terrorist attack was the central one, relating most highly with other worries. Meanwhile, delight consisted of financial satisfaction, autonomy, and happiness. In addition, health and life satisfaction were recent life quality feelings temporally separate from the current life quality feelings.

Among the items of the worry factor, worry about education was the highest ($M = 69.0$, on the 0–100 scale). Other worries with a similarly moderate level were those about losing or not finding a job ($M = 64.4$), terrorist attacks ($M = 61.0$), and war ($M = 60.3$). Lower worry happened to civil war ($M = 55.0$) and government wiretapping ($M = 45.6$). In all, worry was substantial, reflecting various social risks.

Happiness was moderately high and highest among life quality feeling items ($M = 69.6$). Autonomy, life satisfaction, and health were the next highest ($M = 62.3–67.7$). They tended to be functional. In addition, financial satisfaction was somewhat lower at the modest level ($M = 56.4$). Life quality feelings were generally moderately high despite the equally high level of worry (Table 2.1).

Table 2.1 Means, standard deviation, and factor loadings on well-being

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Worry	Delight	
Worrying about terrorist attack	61.0	34.0	0.866	0.087	Q184
Worrying about civil war	55.0	35.4	0.857	0.072	Q185
Worrying about war involving my country	60.3	33.7	0.844	0.057	Q183
Worrying about government wire-tapping or reading my mail or email	45.6	35.8	0.563	0.057	Q186
Worrying about not being able to give my children a good education	69.0	32.9	0.475	−0.070	Q182
Worrying about losing my job or not finding a job	64.4	35.1	0.453	−0.089	Q181
Being satisfied with the household financial situation	56.4	25.8	−0.054	0.675	Q59
Having free choice and control over life	67.7	25.2	0.022	0.525	Q55
Being happy	69.6	24.0	0.029	0.507	Q10
Health	62.3	29.1			Health
Life satisfaction	63.5	25.6			Satis

Note % variance explained = 56.4