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ABSTRACT

Working-hours mismatches occur when people want to spend less or more time at work. Conventionally, undermatches are considered a consequence of under-employment and precarious jobs, and overmatches are interpreted as symptomatic of overwork among professionals. In the current study, we examine culture as another reason for mismatches. We posit that Asians and Whites answer survey questions about mismatch differently because work has different meanings across collectivistic and individualistic groups. In collectivistic groups, the desire for more work time, though partially symptomatic of deprivation, can also represent a commitment to one’s family and an acknowledgment that time spent at work will be interpreted positively rather than negatively by family members. Using data from a large New Zealand survey (N = 3,854), we found that Asians were approximately twice as likely as Whites to express the desire for more time at work, even after controlling for working hours, perceived deprivation, and other potential confounds. Furthermore, having a family diminishes the desire for more work time among Whites, but marginally increases the desire for more work time among Asians.
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INTRODUCTION

The discrepancy between desired and actual working time is commonly termed ‘mismatch’. Mismatch trends, particularly undermatch trends involving the desire for more work time, have interested researchers who study precarious jobs, where workers have short hours and inadequate income and thus desire more working hours. For such workers, it is assumed that the fiscal benefits of more working hours will outweigh the cost of reduced leisure time. While this explanation has merit, it underplays the role of culture, which can drive people to state that they want more time at work, regardless of inadequate earnings. This article examines the effect of culture by comparing how Asians and Whites in New Zealand respond to a work-time mismatch question in a survey.

The study of working-hours mismatch follows from a line of sociological research that began with interest in mean working hours. Further research revealed that the most significant change was not in the mean, but the variance. In an influential study, Jacobs and Gerson (2004) documented an increase from 1970 to 2000 in the proportion of workers who worked less than or more than 40 hours per week. Similar increases in working-time variability were documented in Australia and New Zealand (Callister 2005; Wooden and Drago 2007), and the U.K. (Green 2001). A set of under-employed people now have short working hours and insufficient earnings, while a set of highly educated people have long working hours and generous earnings (Bluestone and Rose 1998; Coleman and Pencavel 1993a, 1993b; Jacobs and Gerson 2004; Kalleberg 2013).

Because of rising interest in working-hours mismatch, questions about mismatch have been introduced into surveys. Recent studies on mismatch have used data from the European Social Survey (Başlevent and Kirmanoğlu 2014), the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS) (Angrave and Charlwood 2015), and the International Social Survey Program Survey on Work Orientation (Stier and Lewin-Epstein 2003). One stream of research is concerned with the effect of mismatches on human welfare. Studies focus on the association between mismatches and the well-being of individuals and families, probing how the association is moderated by the national unemployment rate, gender, the mismatch valence, and other factors (Angrave and Charlwood 2015; De Moortel et al. 2017; Wooden, Warren, and Drago 2009; Wunder and Heineck 2013). Some scholars have also questioned whether time mismatch has a weaker impact on well-being than other temporal factors like schedule control (Lyness et al. 2012).

The second stream, to which the current study belongs, has focused on the interpretation of answers to survey questions about mismatch. Answers vary depending on whether working-time questions are asked baldly, or whether a phrase in the question tells respondents to account for the impact on income and family time (see Campbell and van Wanrooy 2013). Mismatch questions also demonstrate unreliability, with answers from the same individuals varying from year to year, even when working hours are constant (Reynolds and Aletraris 2006, 2010). Although such changes can be attributed to life events or real changes in appraisal, the variation suggests that the question might be problematic. In a qualitative study, long-hours workers who changed answers across survey waves were interviewed about their rationale. Their answers belied an ambivalence about whether an hours reduction was actually feasible, even if personally desirable, given their local work culture (Campbell and van Wanrooy 2013).

These answers suggest that culture matters for people who express a preference for less time at work. Culture may also drive people to express a preference for more time at work, regardless of financial need. As Weber (1958) documented, Protestantism changed the work culture of many European nations because Calvinism and similar doctrines preached that a person’s work ethic signified whether God had predestined their eternal salvation. This development ramped up the propensity to be industrious and entrepreneurial, one factor in the emergence of capitalism. As an industrialized economy took hold, a Fordist ideology of efficiency determined the start and end of the working day, but in recent decades, a post-Fordist ideology has emerged. This ideology encourages employers to grant autonomy to their workers, but also requires employers to reward “motivated” workers who visibly prioritize work over other commitments, thereby promoting a culture of over-work (van Echtelt, Glebbeek, and Lindenberg 2006).

Cross-cultural differences also affect work-related attitudes. In this article, I contrast Asian and White (European) workers in New Zealand because these workers lie at different points on the collectivism–individualism spectrum. This cultural dimension, one of five documented by Hofstede (1980) has been central in cross-cultural research (Brewer and Chen 2007). In collectivist cultures, people must fulfill their duties toward a wider ingroup, often their household, prioritizing those duties over autonomous desires. In individualistic cultures, people are expected to independently shape their own lives based on distinctive, autonomously chosen life goals. Although social scientists have argued that the concepts of individualism and collectivism need refinement, there is consensus around the usefulness of differentiating cultures on this basis. Individualism is high in Western cultures, and highest in the Anglosphere (Hofstede 1980). It is lower in Asia and Latin American. India and Japan are more individualistic than other Asian nations—but no Asian nation is comparable to the Anglosphere. These cross-cultural differences have been consistent over time (Beugelsdijk, Maseland, and van Hoorn 2015). Within the Anglosphere, people of European ancestry are more individualistic than people of Asian and other ancestries (Benet-Martínez and Karakitapoglu-Aygün 2003; Podsiadlowski and Fox 2011).

Collectivism affects how people appraise their work situation (Aycan 2008). In a collectivist frame, work is a means of fulfilling one’s financial obligation to one’s family (Powell, Francesco, and Ling 2009). Collectivists also perceive that family members who work long hours are dedicated to the family’s well-being, whereas individualists interpret such behavior as inconsiderate (Yang et al. 2000). When individualists consider potential benefits of longer working hours, they must also consider the subsequent home conflicts to a greater degree than collectivists. Cross-cultural studies have found accordingly that work demands are a better predictor of work-family conflict in individualistic than collectivist cultures (Lu et al. 2006; Spector et al. 2004, 2007). Thus, increases in working hours and income adequacy, among individualists, should induce a desire for fewer hours, not more hours.

In addition, employees from individualistic countries perceive themselves as bearing a heavier workload than counterparts in collectivistic countries, net of working hours (Lu et al. 2006; Yang et al. 2012). Distinct appraisals may arise from different models of psychological resources (Job and Walton 2017). On average, Americans believe that exerting willpower is depleting, whereas Asian Indians believe that exerting willpower is energizing (Savani and Job 2017). One cross-cultural study on work-family balance examined how collectivism and individualism moderate the association between work-family balance and well-being (Haar et al. 2014). Workers from collectivist cultures (i.e., Malaysians, Chinese, New Zealand Maori) and individualistic cultures (i.e., Spanish, French, Italian, New Zealand Europeans) were compared, and, as hypothesized, a lack of work-family balance reduced well-being only in individualistic groups. This study is pertinent because of the New Zealand context, where White residents are more individualistic than non-Whites (Podsiadlowski and Fox 2011).

A secondary reason to expect an Asian–White difference is that Asian parents in Western nations instill a work ethic in children that emphasizes superior performance. This cultural mindset, found across working- and upper-class Asian immigrants, has been well documented, and is one reason for the exceptional performance of Asian children (Kao and Tienda 1998; Lee and Zhou 2015; Liu and Xie 2016; Qian and Blair 1999; Sakamoto, Goyette, and Kim 2009). For a New Zealand study of this phenomenon, see Guo (2014). Researchers have not yet examined whether this mindset persists through adulthood, so this explanation is tenuous.

In the current study, we build on earlier studies by examining time mismatch in the New Zealand context. Asian immigration to New Zealand has followed a pattern similar to that in Canada and Australia—a whites-only policy was replaced by a human-capital oriented policy in the late twentieth century (Akbari and MacDonald 2014). Asians mostly immigrated after the 1960s, when the government changed the focus toward recruiting semi- and unskilled labor from abroad (Spoonley and Bedford 2012). Starting in 1991, New Zealand instituted a points system to grade potential immigrants on fit with the domestic labor market. The points system sparked a large inflow from Asia, with sizable proportions from Hong Kong, Korea, and Taiwan in the early 1990s, and from India and China after 2000 (Bedford and Spoonley 2014). Although U.S. immigration policy is somewhat different, the steep rise in the Asian immigration rate is similar across New Zealand and the U.S (Akbari and MacDonald 2014; Barnes and Bennette 2002; Hoeffel, Elizabeth et al. 2012).

The hypothesis of this study is that Asians are more likely than Whites to express a desire for more time at work, net of factors that also influence mismatches. The analytic plan is to use a multinomial logit model, where the three categorical outcomes are desiring less time, about the same time, or more time at work. In the initial model, race is the only predictor. Under-employment mismatches typically occur when people have low working hours and inadequate income. In the second model we include working hours, income adequacy, and a three-way interaction between race, working hours, and income adequacy. The desire for more time at work should diminish when people are married and have children (Otterbach 2010; Reynolds and Aletraris 2010). In Model 3, we adjust for household configuration. As noted earlier, Whites should be more sensitive than Asians to this effect, so we also enter an interaction term. In Model 4, we add gender, income, occupational class, and age. Involuntary long hours are more common among men, and employees whose jobs have high prestige (van Echtelt et al. 2006). Involuntarily short hours are more common among women (De Moortel et al. 2017; Puig-Barrachina et al. 2014). People at different life stages have distinct priorities, and, given immigration trends, younger Asians may be over-represented.

Mismatches also ensue from low work-life balance and job satisfaction (Başlevent and Kirmanoğlu 2014; Lyness et al. 2012). Model 5 includes these two covariates. Asians and Whites may differentially occupy sectors where objective factors improve work-life balance and satisfaction, but high work-life balance and job satisfaction can also be manifestations of the same latent attitude that drives up the preference for work time, so Model 5 should be interpreted cautiously.

METHODS

*Sample*

Data are from Wave 1 of the Sovereign New Zealand Wellbeing Index (SNZWI), a study conducted by the Human Potential Center at Auckland University of Technology. The SNZWI data are from a diverse and representative sample of New Zealand adults; pegged to the New Zealand census based on age and gender. An international market research company recruited prospective participants from SmileCity, the largest commercial survey panel in New Zealand, open to individuals 18 and older. Its users volunteer to take online surveys, and receive cash or gift cards as compensation. Email invitations were sent to 38,439 individuals over three waves. The return rate, which includes partial responses, was 32%. The complete response rate of 26% was within the typical range (20-39%) for online surveys (Cook, Heath, and Thompson 2000). The sample may be biased because web-survey respondents tend to be higher in conscientiousness and other traits than the general population (Marcus and Schutz 2005). Employed respondents ages 18-65, who self-identified as exclusively White or Asian, and provided sufficient data were included in analyses (N = 3,854).

Demographic characteristics in aggregate and by race are in Table 1.

Table 1 here

Asians, as anticipated from immigration trends, were younger than White participants, on average, but a reasonable proportion of Asians (19%) were in the 45-65 age bracket. Marital status and household type were comparable, although more Asians were married and fewer were single parents. Asian educational attainment was quite high with 76% of Asians vs. 30% of Whites holding a bachelor’s degree. Asians were also less likely to be in the working class. Almost twice as many Asians—51% vs. 26%—stated a desire for more time at work, which aligns with the study hypothesis. For a closer examination of occupational class, we compared the proportion of Asians in each occupation to their proportion (13%) in the estimation sample, using 95% confidence intervals. Asians were over-represented in four professional fields: business, human resources, and marketing (25%); design, engineering, science and transport (28%); health (20%); and information and communications technology (27%). Asians were under-represented in professionals–education (6%), technician and trade workers (8%), and community and personal service workers (4%).

*Measures*

Race was measured by asking participants to select one or more of these categories: "New Zealand European / Pakeha," "New Zealand Maori," "Samoan," "Cook Island Maori," "Tongan," "Niuean," "Other Pacific," "Chinese," "Korean," "Indian," "Other Asian (e.g., Filipino, Japanese)," "British / European," "Australian," "South African," or "Other (please specify)". These categories were collapsed into Asian: Chinese, Korean, Indian, and Other Asian. These categories were collapsed into European: New Zealand European / Pakeha, British European, Australian, and South African. Participants who exclusively selected European or Asian were coded as White or Asian respectively and only their data was analyzed.

Because the association between age and mismatch was unlikely to be linear or quadratic, we divided age into three categories, 18-24, 24-44, and 45-65. For robustness, we also tested a model with numerical age and age2, and a four-category coding scheme, finding no meaningful changes.

Marital status was measured with a question with four options: single and never married, married or living with a partner, permanently separated or divorced, and widowed. Household composition was measured with a series of questions, asking participants to record the gender, age, and relationship of all household members. Combining this information with marital status, we created a four-category variable encoding household type: (1) single, no child (henceforth *single*), (2) married, no child, (3) child, not married, and (4) married with child (henceforth *family*).

Occupational class was derived by recoding a 14-option question about occupation into a dummy variable coded for working class vs. professional. Working class occupations were machinery operator or driver, laborer, technical or trade worker; community or personal service worker, clerical or administrative worker, and sales worker. Professional occupations were manager or any of 7 subtypes of professionals. Ordinarily, laborers and machinery operators would be separated from clerical workers, but due to the small proportion of Asians in those fields, we used a dichotomous variable.

Participants were asked to select their highest academic qualification on a six-point scale: 1 (finished primary school), 2 (finished secondary school), 3 (University entrance/bursary/scholarship [or equivalent]), 4 (apprenticeship, diploma, trade certificate), 5 (bachelor degree or higher), and 6 (postgraduate diploma/degree or higher). We recoded answers to create a three-category variable: primary/secondary; university entrance/diploma; and bachelor’s or higher.

Income inadequacy was measured by asking how participants felt about their household income nowadays. The options ranged from 1 (living comfortable on present income) to 4 (finding it very difficult on present income). Both job satisfaction and work-life-balance were measured on a scale from 0 (extremely dissatisfied) to 10 (extremely satisfied). Participants were asked how satisfied they were with their present job, and “the balance between the time you spend on your paid work and the time you spend on other aspects of your life.”

Household income was measured with a single question: “What is the total combined income that your household got from all sources, before tax or anything was taken out of it, in the last 12 months?” Respondents answered on a 16-point scale. Items 1–3 were “zero or negative,” “ ≤ $5,000,” and “$5,001–$10,000” respectively. Items 4–13 were intervals spanning $10,000. Items 14–16 were “$100,001–$150,000,” “$150,001–-$200,000,” and “≥ $200,001.” Median household income in New Zealand was $57,820 at the time of survey administration (Statistics New Zealand 2012).

Working hours were measured by asking participants how many weekly hours they spent in paid employment. Answer options ranged from 1 (less than 5) to 15 (more than 70 hours). Working-hours mismatch was measured using the question, “Compared with now, how much TIME WOULD YOU LIKE to spend on each these aspects?” on a scale from 0 (a lot less time) to 10 (a lot more time).” The midpoint was 5 (about the same amount of time). Ten life domains were presented, one of which was ‘work’. Wanting less time is not the polar opposite of wanting more time (Angrave and Charlwood 2015; De Moortel et al. 2017), so this variable is not ordinal. We recoded 1-4 as less time, 5 as same time, and 6-10 as more time. More information and technical reports on the Sovereign New Zealand Wellbeing Index Wave 1 questions can be accessed from the study website (www.mywellbeing.co.nz).

*Analytic Plan*

Multinomial logistic regression was used to analyze the outcome, working time mismatch. To obtain robust standard errors, we used the Huber/White/sandwich estimator of variance (Hayes and Cai 2007). The coefficients in multinomial logistic regression can be exponentiated to obtain relative risk ratios, as in logistic regression, but interpretation is problematic given many possible outcomes. Marginal probabilities must be estimated, for which we used SPost13 (Long and Freese 2014). For continuous factors, we used standardized variables so that intercepts and coefficients would be meaningful and comparable. For the same reason, we used the middle category of age and education as reference values.

RESULTS

The distribution of working hours mismatch by race is displayed in Figure 1.

Insert figure 1 here

Table 2 displays the means and standard deviations of work-related variables, in aggregate and by race. The standardized White–Asian difference is in the last column.

Insets table 2 here

Table 3 displays correlations between key variables.

Insert table 3 here

Asian and White household incomes are comparable despite the Asian advantage in education and occupational class. Greater job seniority among Whites may explain this equality. In job satisfaction, *d* = -.03, and working hours, *d* = .11, Whites and Asians are reasonably similar, but Whites are more likely to perceive their income an inadequate, *d* = .30. The correlation between household income and income inadequacy is moderate, at .40, and working hours positively correlates with income, but negatively correlates with income inadequacy. These facts support the primacy of income adequacy over household income in predicting mismatches.

Table 4 displays the results of the first three multinomial logistic models.

Insert table 4 here

Coefficients in the model are relative risk ratios, with ‘same time’ as the reference outcome. Model 1 shows that Asians are more likely to want more time at work, and less likely to want less time at work. In Model 2, as anticipated, the interaction between inadequate income and short hours was predictive of wanting more time. At .08, the *p* value for the three-way interaction with race was marginally significant, but the statistical power to detect three-way interactions is low, so we retained it. We probed the interaction by computing the desire for more time at low (-1 SD) and high (1 SD) values of income inadequacy and working hours, by race (Table 5).

Insert table 5 here

Although both Asians and White are affected by deprivation, the effect is much stronger for Whites. The probability of wanting more time for a White worker short on income and hours was .35, and but only .21 if the worker has adequate income and long working hours, *z* = 6.088, *p* < .001. For Asians, however, the corresponding probabilities were .52 and .46, a negligible difference, *z* = 0.620, *p* =.54.

In Model 3, we include household type and its interaction with race. Although there appeared to be no effects for wanting more time, there was an interaction effect for wanting less time. For White workers, the probability of wanting less time increased as household size increased. Specifically, the probability was .39 if single and .43 with a family, *z* = 1.620, *p* = .11. Though weak, this change suggests a desire for family time. For Asians, however, the probability of wanting less time was .33 if single, but dropped to .14 with a family, *z* = -3.749, *p* < .001, suggesting an aspiration to serve one’s family better through earnings.

Table 6 displays models 4 and 5.

Insert table 6 here

In model 4, occupational class, education, gender, and age were added to the model. Workers in the 45-65 age bracket were less likely than younger workers to want a time reduction. It may be the case that parents in this age bracket have older children who are not at home, or have job seniority providing autonomy and job satisfaction. Being highly educated and holding a professional occupation had contrary effects. Given the correlation between education and class with each other and other covariates, it is difficult to interpret these effects. However, both education and class effects were weaker in Model 5, where job satisfaction and work-life balance are included. People who report satisfaction with work and work-life balance do not feel overworked, and the effects of education and occupational class are likely mediated through these two forms of satisfaction, which are strong predictors—the pseudo R2 increases substantially in Model 5.

In both Models 4 and 5, the Asian coefficient is stronger than earlier, indicating further suppression effects. The probabilities of wanting more and less working time for Asians and Whites at particular levels of working hours, household type, and income inadequacy are in Figure 2, a forest plot in an order descending from deprived individuals (insufficient income and short hours) to over-satiated individuals (sufficient income and long hours).

Insert figure 2 here

In both the upper and lower plot, Whites follow the canonical pattern. Deprived Whites are less likely to want time reductions and more likely to want time increases, relative to the average White participant. Also, Whites with families were more interested in time reductions than single Whites. Deprived Asian workers were less inclined to want time reductions, and non-deprived Asian workers were roughly twice as likely as Whites to want time increases. Asians consistently express this desire, across levels of income inadequacy and working hours.

In the upper plot, there is a zigzag pattern—Asians and Whites are close in odd (single) rows and far apart in even (family) rows, which represents the interaction effect of household type discussed earlier. When they have a family, Asians become less interested in time reductions, whereas Whites become more interested in time reductions. This zigzag pattern also appears to a weaker degree in the last six rows of the lower plot. This pattern suggests that Asian workers may lack a strong target for their collectivistic duties until they have family. When single, perhaps they appraise work as a thief of leisure time, as Whites do. Once within a family, however, Asians and Whites evaluate time differently. Whites want time reductions, which create more family time. Asians, having a target for collectivistic duties, do not want time reductions, comporting with the tendency of collectivistic individuals to appraise paid work as a family-serving duty.

DISCUSSION

The results here are consistent with the thesis that under-employment and low earnings are predictive of subjective under-employment, but they also reveal a racial contrast in time mismatches. Even after accounting for differences in subjective deprivation, household income, work satisfaction, and work-life balance, Asians are much more likely than comparable Whites to desire more time at work. Although we could not directly test individualism and collectivism as mediators, this racial contrast is consistent with the cultural hypothesis. Moreover, the interaction between household type and desire for more time fits the theoretical prediction that collectivism determines how people appraise their work time and work-life balance.

Hypothetically, time-mismatch questions could assess whether people foresee a net time gain from reducing working time, or a net income gain from expanding working time. White workers answer in this fashion, consistently wanting more time given short hours and insufficient earnings, and less time given long hours, sufficient earnings, and a reason to spend time at home. On average, an Asian individual with short hours and insufficient earnings, like a White individual, desires more work time. In other respects, the Asian responding pattern deviates from the White pattern. Asians’ desire for more work time is surprisingly high by absolute standards, even under conditions of high income and long working hours. This effect is not mitigated by having a spouse and child.

These results indicate that Asians may not solely be appraising work time through the lens of net gains and losses. Rather, they seemingly consider not just perceived deprivation but also role-based identity. Among Asians who are married parents, a collectivistic value orientation seems to motivate an answer to the mismatch question that verifies their identity as a family-oriented breadwinner (Stryker 2003). Even single Asians desire more work time than comparable Whites, so family-based orientations cannot be the sole explanation. It may be the case that the perfectionistic Asian school ethic persists as a work ethic. Alternatively, collectivism may motivate the interpretation of diligent work as duty fulfilment toward parents and younger siblings. Fear of discrimination should also not be ruled out, however. Given that even professional Asians with substantial earnings state a preference for more work hours, fears of downward mobility may be salient (Zeng 2011), motivating compensatory efforts.

This study has a number of limitations. Firstly, there was a lack of more specific representative sampling by work type. Although the sample was diverse and pegged to the New Zealand census based on age and gender ensuring broad representativeness, some occupations may be disproportionally represented within particular demographic categories. Asians may also be concentrated in occupations where the workplace culture emphasizes overwork (e.g., law), and the Asian–White contrast may weaken after accounting for this fact. A second limitation is that the nationality and immigration status of respondents is unknown. It is quite possible that workers who are non-citizens may possess a stronger work ethic because of insecurity about their immigration prospects. This is supported by research that shows that immigrants who enter a country on temporary work visas or student/trainee visas outperform native colleges graduates in wages, patenting, commercializing, licensing patents, exceptional contributions to STEM fields, and authoring book papers for publication or presentation at major conferences, whereas immigrants who arrived as legal residents (via family unification) perform similarly to natives (Hunt 2011; Kerr 2013).Thirdly, New Zealand’s immigration policy resembles that of Australia and Canada. As such these results may not be generalizable to the U.S. or U.K, or to other less Anglo-Saxon countries. A final limitation is that we could not ascertain if collectivism was a mediator because it was not measured.

The study does not imply that only Whites answer the mismatch correctly. Rather, it implies that both Whites and Asians bring cultural lenses to bear on their perceptions of wanting to spend less or more time at work. Motivating Asians and Whites to interpret the question similarly may be challenging. Even if phrased to emphasize the impact of hours on income, the question may elicit contrasting answers from collectivists and individualists. Over-employment can be indexed through questions about work-life balance, so the challenge is indexing under-employment. If researchers seek to measure deprivation, surveys may be improved by assessing precisely what the respondent cannot afford, and whether longer working hours would address that problem. Alternatively, a survey question could be framed around whether the employer allots fixed hours and, if so, how many hours. A larger concern is that all questions are filtered through a cultural lens. Given how Asian immigrants have changed workforce composition, sociologists must consider whether a longitudinal change in work-related attitudes derives from compositional change. Furthermore, culture not only varies by race and nationality, but also cohort and period, and all cultural changes can affect appraisals.
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TABLES

Table 1. Summary of Demographic Characteristics and Work Mismatch, Aggregate and By Race

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | All | White | Asian |
| Gender |  |  |  |
| Male | 50.0 | 48.4 | 61.1 |
| Female | 50.0 | 51.7 | 38.9 |
| Age |  |  |  |
| 18-24 | 10.0 | 9.9 | 11.0 |
| 24-44 | 49.0 | 45.9 | 69.7 |
| 45-65 | 41.0 | 44.2 | 19.3 |
| Race |  |  |  |
| White | 87.2 |  |  |
| Asian | 12.8 |  |  |
| Marital Status |  |  |  |
| Single | 23.2 | 22.0 | 31.7 |
| Married | 66.2 | 66.5 | 64.1 |
| Separated/Divorced | 9.5 | 10.3 | 4.0 |
| Widowed | 1.1 | 1.2 | 0.2 |
| Household Type |  |  |  |
| Not Married, No Child | 26.9 | 26.3 | 31.4 |
| Married, No Child | 31.1 | 31.8 | 25.9 |
| Not Married, Child | 6.2 | 6.7 | 2.9 |
| Married, Child | 35.8 | 35.2 | 39.8 |
| Education |  |  |  |
| Primary/Secondary | 26.8 | 30.0 | 5.9 |
| Diploma/ Univ. Entrance | 36.9 | 39.9 | 17.3 |
| College | 36.2 | 30.2 | 76.8 |
| Occupational Class |  |  |  |
| Working | 51.87 | 53.79 | 39.10 |
| Professional | 48.13 | 46.21 | 60.90 |
| Work Time Preference |  |  |  |
| Less | 38.0 | 40.3 | 22.0 |
| Same | 32.9 | 33.8 | 27.0 |
| More | 29.1 | 25.9 | 50.9 |
| N | 3746 | 3265 | 481 |

Includes information for individuals with non-missing data for work-time preference and race, sufficient for inclusion in Model 1. Missing data is < 3% for all variables except household type (14.2%) and occupational class (9.3%).

Table 2. Means, Standard Deviations, and Cohen’s *d* of Continuous Demographic and Social Psychological Variables

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   |   |   | All |   |   | White |   |   | Asian |   |   | Cohen's *d* (95%CI) |
| Variable | Range |   | Mean | SD |   | Mean | SD |   | Mean | SD |   |   |
| Working Hours1 | 1-15 |  | 7.73 | 2.31 |  | 7.7 | 2.35 |  | 7.96 | 1.98 |  | 0.11 (0.02, 0.21) |
| Household Income2 | 1-15 |  | 9.84 | 3 |  | 9.86 | 2.97 |  | 9.72 | 3.14 |  | -0.05 (-0.15, 0.06) |
| Income Inadequacy | 1-4 |  | 2.01 | 0.88 |  | 2.04 | 0.88 |  | 1.79 | 0.84 |  | -0.30 (-0.40, -0.20) |
| Job Satisfaction | 0-10 |  | 6.29 | 2.42 |  | 6.3 | 2.45 |  | 6.23 | 2.23 |  | -0.03 (-0.13, 0.07) |
| Work-Life Balance | 0-10 |   | 6.01 | 2.31 |   | 5.97 | 2.33 |   | 6.26 | 2.18 |   | 0.13 (0.03, 0.22) |
| N |   |   | 3746 |   |   | 3265 |   |   | 481 |   |   |   |

1Working hours were measured on an interval scale where 7 = 31-35 hours, and 8 = 36-40 hours

2 Household income was measured on an ordinal scale where 9 = $60,001-70,000, and 10 = $70,001-80,000.

Table 3. Pairwise Correlations Between Variables Used in Regression Models

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Female | Asian | Age (yrs.) | Education | Working Hrs. | Household Inc. | Professional Class |
| Female | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian | -0.09\*\*\* | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age (yrs.) | -0.08\*\*\* | -0.19\*\*\* | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Education | -0.01 | 0.30\*\*\* | -0.17\*\*\* | 1 |  |  |  |
| Working Hrs. | -0.29\*\*\* | 0.04\* | 0.03 | 0.08\*\*\* | 1 |  |  |
| Household Inc. | -0.13\*\*\* | -0.02 | -0.03 | 0.23\*\*\* | 0.28\*\*\* | 1 |  |
| Professional  | -0.01 | 0.10\*\*\* | <.01 | 0.43\*\*\* | 0.15\*\*\* | 0.31\*\*\* | 1 |
| Income Inadeq. | 0.02 | -0.10\*\*\* | 0.07\*\*\* | -0.17\*\*\* | -0.11\*\*\* | -0.40\*\*\* | -0.17\*\*\* |
| Job Sat. | 0.05\*\* | -0.01 | 0.09\*\*\* | <.01 | 0.02 | 0.08\*\*\* | 0.14\*\*\* |
| Work-Life Balance | 0.04\* | 0.04\* | 0.04\* | 0.04\* | -0.20\*\*\* | 0.07\*\*\* | 0.07\*\*\* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | Income Inadeq. | Job Sat. |
| Income Inadeq. | 1 |  |
| Job Sat. | -0.24\*\*\* | 1 |
| Work-Life Balance | -0.27\*\*\* | 0.59\*\*\* |

In regression models, age is treated as categorical, but the continuous form is used here. \**p* < .05 \*\**p* < .01 \*\*\**p* < .001 (two-tailed tests).

Table 4. Multinomial Logistic Models 1-3 Predicting Desire for Less or More Time Relative to Same Time at Work

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Model 1 |   |   | Model 2 |   |   | Model 3 |   |
|   | less | more |  | less | more |  | less | more |
|   | RRR/SE | RRR/SE |   | RRR/SE | RRR/SE |   | RRR/SE | RRR/SE |
| White  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian  | 0.691\*\* | 2.450\*\*\* | 0.667\* | 2.638\*\*\* | 1.428 | 2.823\*\*\* |
|   | (0.095) | (0.288) |  | (0.108) | (0.365) |  | (0.390) | (0.732) |
| Income Inadeq.(z)  |  |  |  | 1.151\*\* | 1.214\*\*\* | 1.144\*\* | 1.192\*\* |
|   |  |  |  | (0.054) | (0.065) |  | (0.058) | (0.069) |
| Asian X Income Inadeq.(z)  |  |  |  | 0.947 | 0.887 |  | 0.959 | 0.876 |
|   |  |  |  | (0.151) | (0.125) |  | (0.163) | (0.136) |
| Working Hrs.(z)  |  |  |  | 1.324\*\*\* | 0.924 |  | 1.295\*\*\* | 0.926 |
|   |  |  |  | (0.058) | (0.046) |  | (0.061) | (0.050) |
| Asian X Working Hrs.(z)  |  |  |  | 1.247 | 1.257 |  | 1.371 | 1.224 |
|   |  |  |  | (0.243) | (0.198) |  | (0.288) | (0.202) |
| Income Inadeq.(z) X Working Hrs.(z)  |  |  |  | 0.954 | 0.851\*\* |  | 0.943 | 0.854\*\* |
|   |  |  |  | (0.045) | (0.044) |  | (0.047) | (0.047) |
| Asian X Income Inadeq.(z) X Working Hrs.(z) |  |  |  | 1.151 | 1.328 |  | 1.407 | 1.423\* |
|   |  |  |  | (0.235) | (0.215) |  | (0.297) | (0.238) |
| Single No Child  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Married No Child  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.089 | 0.946 |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.133) | (0.127) |
| Child Not Married  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.925 | 0.794 |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.185) | (0.175) |
| Married Has Child  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.100 | 0.846 |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.130) | (0.112) |
| White X Single No Child  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian X Married No Child  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.350\* | 0.856 |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.143) | (0.312) |
| Asian X Child Not Married  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.231 | 0.283 |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.191) | (0.221) |
| Asian X Married Has Child  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.260\*\*\* | 1.010 |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   | (0.101) | (0.330) |
| Pseudo R2   | 0.015 |  |  | 0.031 |  |  | 0.034 |  |
| N  | 3854 |   |   | 3520 |   |   | 3037 |   |

RRR = relative risk ratio. Pseudo R2 is McFadden’s R2. \**p* < .05 \*\**p* < .01 \*\*\**p* < .001 (two-tailed tests)

Table 5. Predicted Probability of Wanting More Work Time by Race, Working Hours, and Income Inadequacy

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Race | Working Hours | Income | *p* | 95% | CI |
|   |   |   |   | LL | UL |
| White | Short hours | Inadequate | 0.35 | 0.32 | 0.39 |
|  | Short hours | Adequate | 0.24 | 0.21 | 0.27 |
|  | Long hours | Inadequate | 0.20 | 0.17 | 0.24 |
|  | Long hours | Adequate | 0.21 | 0.18 | 0.24 |
| Asian | Short hours | Inadequate | 0.52 | 0.38 | 0.66 |
|  | Short hours | Adequate | 0.54 | 0.45 | 0.63 |
|  | Long hours | Inadequate | 0.51 | 0.37 | 0.65 |
|  | Long hours | Adequate | 0.47 | 0.39 | 0.54 |

Table 6. Multinomial Logistics Models 4-5 Predicting Desire for Less or More Time Relative to Same Time at Work

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Model 4 |   |   | Model 5 |   |
|   | less | more |  | less | more |
|   | RRR/SE | RRR/SE |   | RRR/SE | RRR/SE |
| White  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian  | 1.437 | 4.582\*\*\* | 1.325 | 4.623\*\*\* |
|   | (0.458) | (1.432) |  | (0.465) | (1.463) |
| Income Inadeq.(z)  | 1.163\* | 1.072 |  | 0.864\* | 1.075 |
|   | (0.073) | (0.075) |  | (0.060) | (0.078) |
| Asian X Income Inadeq.(z)  | 1.063 | 1.027 |  | 1.009 | 1.037 |
|   | (0.209) | (0.193) |  | (0.220) | (0.195) |
| Working Hrs.(z)  | 1.305\*\*\* | 0.962 |  | 1.142\* | 0.929 |
|   | (0.076) | (0.063) |  | (0.072) | (0.063) |
| Asian X Working Hrs.(z)  | 1.358 | 1.315 |  | 1.231 | 1.321 |
|   | (0.363) | (0.274) |  | (0.345) | (0.287) |
| Income Inadeq.(z) X Working Hrs.(z)  | 0.935 | 0.821\*\* |  | 0.953 | 0.824\*\* |
|   | (0.054) | (0.051) |  | (0.060) | (0.050) |
| Asian X Income Inadeq.(z) X Working Hrs.(z) | 1.555 | 1.530\* |  | 1.419 | 1.544\* |
|   | (0.404) | (0.311) |  | (0.383) | (0.328) |
| Single No Child  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Married No Child  | 1.103 | 1.066 |  | 1.249 | 1.049 |
|   | (0.158) | (0.174) |  | (0.191) | (0.171) |
| Child Not Married  | 0.937 | 0.872 |  | 0.951 | 0.869 |
|   | (0.212) | (0.215) |  | (0.231) | (0.214) |
| Married Has Child  | 1.127 | 1.016 |  | 1.266 | 0.979 |
|   | (0.160) | (0.167) |  | (0.192) | (0.160) |
| Household Type X Race |  |  |  |  |  |
| White X Single No Child  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian X Married No Child  | 0.334\* | 0.746 |  | 0.394 | 0.745 |
|   | (0.157) | (0.316) |  | (0.194) | (0.318) |
| Asian X Child Not Married  | 0.255 | 0.201 |  | 0.261 | 0.205 |
|   | (0.226) | (0.190) |  | (0.251) | (0.193) |
| Asian X Married Has Child  | 0.267\*\* | 0.630 |  | 0.266\*\* | 0.651 |
|   | (0.113) | (0.237) |  | (0.123) | (0.246) |
| Household Inc.(z)  | 1.073 | 0.856\* |  | 1.056 | 0.867 |
|   | (0.074) | (0.064) |  | (0.077) | (0.065) |
| Occupational Class |  |  |  |  |  |
| Working  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Professional  | 0.667\*\*\* | 0.926 |  | 0.769\* | 0.889 |
|   | (0.074) | (0.114) |  | (0.091) | (0.112) |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary/Sec.  | 0.985 | 1.147 |  | 0.988 | 1.118 |
|   | (0.126) | (0.160) |  | (0.134) | (0.156) |
| Univ ent./Dipl.  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Coll./Grad Sch.  | 1.285\* | 0.892 |  | 1.200 | 0.911 |
|   | (0.159) | (0.126) |  | (0.157) | (0.130) |
| Female  | 1.012 | 0.880 |  | 0.978 | 0.859 |
|   | (0.106) | (0.101) |  | (0.107) | (0.100) |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18-24  | 1.174 | 1.359 |  | 1.229 | 1.308 |
|   | (0.229) | (0.291) |  | (0.251) | (0.281) |
| 25-44  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-65  | 0.762\*\* | 1.281\* |  | 0.764\* | 1.253 |
|   | (0.080) | (0.151) |  | (0.084) | (0.148) |
| Job Satisfaction (z)  |  |  |  | 0.702\*\*\* | 1.185\* |
|   |  |  |  | (0.044) | (0.086) |
| Work-Life Balance (z)  |  |  |  | 0.520\*\*\* | 0.886 |
|   |   |   |   | (0.034) | (0.065) |
| Pseudo R2  | 0.045 |  |  | 0.108 |   |
| N  | 2458 |   |   | 2457 |   |

RRR = relative risk ratio. Pseudo R2 is McFadden’s R2. SEs in parentheses. \**p* < .05 \*\**p* < .01 \*\*\**p* < .001 (two-tailed tests)
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Figure 1. Distribution of Working Time Mismatches for White (N = 3,265) and Asian (N = 481) Workers



Figure 2. Adjusted Probability of Wanting More and Less Work Time for White and Asian Workers, Ages 18-65. Error bars denote 95% confidence intervals. Hrs = working hours. Insuff. = insufficient. Suff. = sufficient. Single = not married or cohabiting, no child at home. Family = married or cohabiting with 1+ child at home.