

理想與實際工時之契合及其與工作態度之關聯 — 跨國社會福利體制之比較

陸洛
台灣大學

論文編號：IJCS2014013

收稿 2014 年 3 月 6 日→第一次修正 2014 年 5 月 19 日→第二次修正 2014 年 9 月 3 日→第三次修正 2014 年 9 月 24 日
→正式接受 2014 年 9 月 26 日

目的：本研究之目的在於探討理想與實際工時的契合與員工工作態度之關聯，並聚焦於不同福利體制國家之跨國比較。

研究設計：本研究利用「國際社會調查計畫」(International Social Survey Program, 簡稱 ISSP) 的資料進行分析，涵蓋九個不同國家具代表性樣本的員工，分別代表四種類型的福利體制：社會民主型(丹麥、瑞典、挪威)、保守型(美國、澳洲)、自由型(法國、德國)、東亞發展型(南韓、台灣)，總樣本數為 8,525 人。

研究發現：我們發現理想和實際工時之契合，與員工工作滿意度和組織承諾間有正向關聯。我們藉由羅吉斯迴歸分析(Logistic Regression)發現，相較於東亞發展型福利體制的國家，社會民主型、保守型與自由型的福利制度較能預測員工理想和實際工時之「不契合」。更甚者，在控制了國家層次的勞動法規、福利體制及個人人口背景變項之影響後，個人財務需求(即「想賺少一點」)仍可預測理想與實際工時之不契合。我們更進一步以羅吉斯迴歸分析尋找兩種不同形式之「不契合」的預測因子，發現相較於東亞發展型福利體制，保守型社會福利制度及「想賺少一點」的個人財務需求，都能預測「目前工時多於期望工時」的不契合狀態；另相較於東亞發展型福利體制，社會民主型、保守型、自由型的社會福利制度、及「想賺多一點」的個人財務需求，都能預測「目前工時少於期望工時」的不契合狀態。

研究貢獻：本研究使用具代表性的多國樣本來檢視國家福利體制與實際與理想工時契合之間的關聯，這也是第一個跨國性的比較研究。基於本研究之結果，我們建議組織在工時管理的觀念與實務上，應將員工的需求與偏好納入考量，亦顧及本國之福利體制及勞動相關法規，提供員工適當的工作彈性，滿足員工的不同個人需求，俾利提升員工的工作態度。

關鍵字：理想工時、實際工時、福利體制、工作態度。

The Associations between the Fit of Desired and Actual Working Time and Work Attitudes: A Comparison between Different Social Welfare Regimes

Luo Lu
National Taiwan University

Paper No.: IJCS2014013

Received March 6, 2014→First Revised May 19, 2014→Second Revised September 3, 2014→Third Revised September 24, 2014→Accepted September 26, 2014

Purpose: *This study explores the association of the fit between desired and actual working hours, with work attitudes, focusing on the cross-national differences in terms of various types of welfare regimes.*

Design: *Secondary analysis was employed using data collected from the International Social Survey Program (ISSP). A total of 8,525 employees from nine different countries were selected to represent four types of welfare regimes: the social democratic welfare (Denmark, Sweden, and Norway), liberal welfare (United States and Australia), conservative corporatist welfare (France and Germany), and the East Asian welfare (Taiwan and South Korea).*

Findings: *We found that the fit between desired and actual working hours was associated with higher job satisfaction and organizational commitment. However, this association did vary across different social welfare regimes. Logistic regression further revealed that compared against the East Asian welfare regime, employees in countries with social democratic, conservative, and liberal welfare systems, were more likely to experience a fit between personal preferences and actual choices of working hours. Furthermore, after controlling for the macro-level social institutional factors and demographics, personal financial needs of "wanting to earn less" could still predict the state of misfit.*

Contribution: *This is the first study using multiple national representative samples to test the effect of social welfare regimes on the relationship between fit of working hours and work attitudes in a global context. Organizations are thus recommended to address the balance between individual preferences and available choices by supplying multiple options to employees.*

Key Words: *Ideal Working Time, Actual Working Time, Social Welfare Institution, Work Attitudes.*

Introduction

Fierce global competition and worldwide economic recession over the years have resulted in fundamental changes in the employment relationship, such as layoffs, early retirement, and temporary employment (Sparks et al., 2001; Worrall et al., 2013). Afraid of losing jobs, most employees work harder than before; however, more working time leads to increased strain (Lu, 2011). Hours of work have long been recognized to have a marked effect on the way an individual and his family lives (Dankert et al., 1965). Findings and theories from predominantly Western nations have suggested a clear link between working hours and health symptoms (Sparks et al., 1997). Long working hours have also been associated with both work- and non-work-related accidents (Kirkcaldy et al., 1997; Trimpop et al., 2000), job-related stress (Cooper et al., 1982), and job satisfaction (Trimpop et al., 2000). Despite the vast amount of literature concerning working hours and various strain outcomes, the majority of studies have been conducted in North American and European countries, as evident by the studies included in the comprehensive review on the topic (Sparks et al., 1997). Employees in Asia on average work longer hours (Taiwan: 41.6; South Korea: 44.2; Japan: 35.4) than do North Americans (United States: 33.9; Canada: 31.7) and Europeans (Germany: 34.2) (Directorate-General of Budget, 2012). Nevertheless, as "hardworking" is a socially sanctioned virtue in many East Asian cultures (Lu et al., 2011), little research has been conducted in this part of the world on the potential adverse effects of long working hours. Furthermore, one consistent finding in the past studies is that employees in different countries exhibit different responses to work stress dependent on the availability of social resources at the macro-level, such as social welfare institutions. For example, Spector et al. (2004) found a significant relationship between working hours and physical health for Chinese, but not for Anglo workers.

The purpose of this study is thus to extend the literature on working hours in the following ways. First, we examined the effects of *choice* or *fit*, rather than the mere length of working time on work attitudes.

Specifically, we took into account of personal preference of working hours, which has largely been overlooked in previous studies. Second, we explored whether the above effects varied in societies of different welfare regimes as a proxy of the availability of macro-level social resources. Specifically, we conducted a multi-national study comparing nine countries encompassing a comprehensive classification scheme of social welfare systems, which has never been done before in the literature on working hours. Finally, we tested the effects of personal drive (i.e., financial needs) on the choice of working hours, after controlling for societal resources. This is the first study combining individual and societal factors in explaining the choice of working hours across cultural borders.

The Ubiquity of the Benefit of Choice of Working Hours

Although the connection between working hours and strains (e.g., work-family conflict, job dissatisfaction, and ill-health) has been established, the effect size is uniformly small for Western employees (Bruck et al., 2002; Kirkcaldy et al., 2000; Sparks et al., 1997). This suggests that the mechanisms through which working hours produce strains remain largely unknown, and critical factors may have been overlooked. Barnett et al. (1999) argued that "fit" may be one such factor, namely whether an employee wants to dedicate these hours that he or she does to work. The congruence between personal needs and situation supplies correlates highly with job satisfaction and performance (Caldwell and O'Reilly, 1990), organizational identification, and intent to stay in the organization (Edwards and Cable, 2009). This suggests that the fit between desired and real working hours may be an important explanatory factor for different work outcomes observed in the literature. However, personal preferences were rarely considered in the relationship between working hours and strains. The construct of working hours as typically measured fails to capture employee motivation and/or desire to do so. This lacking may explain the weak correlations with strains. More importantly, a person's choice in time expenditure should be respected to enhance both personal well-being

and societal welfare. Although employment is widely seen to promote social inclusion and societal values, integration and stability in society are also facilitated by living according to the same norms and values as other members of society. The family is a major integrating structure protecting both the physical and mental well-being of people (Stack and Eshleman, 1998). The same holds true for other forms of social participation, such as voluntary associations and leisure activities (Argyle, 2001; Lu, 2012; Lu and Hu, 2005). Therefore, if people are allowed to choose between spending time on paid employment and on family living or other activities, a state of fit so achieved can enhance both role satisfaction in diverse life domains and general well-being.

The issue of *choice* can also be understood within the framework of the demand-discretion model (Karasek, 1979; Karasek and Theorell, 1990). According to this work stress model, strain is highest among those who endure high work demands (e.g., long working hours) and suffer from a lack of control over work (e.g., lack of autonomy regarding working hours). For those who endure high work demands but enjoy high decision latitude, work may represent more of a challenge than drudgery. A recent study based on a nationwide sample confirmed that autonomy in deciding working time was positively related to increased organizational commitment among Taiwanese employees (Lu et al., 2008). The issue of personal choice and control in relation to work schedule therefore merits further attention.

Applying the notion of personal choice and fit, Costa et al. (2006) compared the effects of two aspects of the flexible arrangement of working hours on health and well-being. They distinguished *variability*, which is subject to company control and decision, from *flexibility*, which is related to individual discretion and autonomy. Analyzing data from the Third European Survey on working conditions involving 21,505 workers, they concluded that the most favorable effects were associated with high flexibility and low variability. Furthermore, analyses of the impact of background variables such as demographics, working and social conditions revealed that flexibility is the most important factor influencing job satisfaction and the second important factor affecting family and social commitment. Therefore, suitable arrangements

for flexible working time, taking employees' needs and desires into account, appear to benefit employees' health, role satisfaction, and general well-being, with positive results too for the company and for the society.

Other studies have also produced evidence underlining the beneficial effects of personal choice. Literature on moonlighting (i.e., working at night) has produced two hypotheses: the "energetic/opportunity" hypothesis and the "deprivation/constraint" hypothesis (Jamal, 1986). The first hypothesis proposes that moonlighters are a special breed, having more energy and higher socioeconomic expectations than others. To satisfy their higher expectations, they voluntarily exert more energy and effort in their work than non-moonlighters. The "deprivation/constraint" hypothesis, in contrast, proposes that moonlighters are generally financially underprivileged and socially disadvantaged, and thus, resort to moonlighting as a solution. In a review of the literature, Baba and Jamal (1992) concluded that empirical evidence supports the energetic/opportunity hypothesis, thereby suggesting that moonlighters *choose* to work a second job or the nightshift to increase their income. Moonlighters may not suffer negative health consequences from working long/unusual hours because they have chosen to work extra hours/un-routine schedules. Therefore, compared to non-moonlighters, moonlighters were not subject to increased ill-health consequences.

In the work stress literature, person-environment fit (P-E Fit) theory emphasizes the interaction between the individual and the environment (Caplan, 1983; French et al., 1982). The core premise of P-E Fit theory is that stress arises not from the person or the environment alone, but rather from the fit between each another. People who work for the hours they want are in a state of fit, and thus, are satisfied and content. Conversely, people who work more or less hours than they would like represent a state of misfit, which is likely to cause strains and ill-being.

Applying the P-E Fit theory to *choice* and working hours, Hall and Savery (1986) found that employees' ability to control their hours of work influences perceived stress levels. Kirkcaldy et al. (2000) found that, for people with a Type A tendency (hard driving) and a stronger foci of internal locus of control, working long hours produced

positive results, presumably because they chose to work so hard. *Choice* may thus differentiate people on their manifest strains and well-being.

Although it is intuitive to infer that the fit of working hours should have beneficial effects on employees' work outcomes, previous studies have mostly focused on stress and strains as the dependent variables, rather than work-related attitudes. The importance of job satisfaction and organizational commitment as key work attitudes has been widely recognized in the organizational behavior research (Robbins and Judge, 2015). The former describes a positive feeling about a job, resulting from an evaluation of its characteristics (Robbins and Judge, 2015). The latter refers to a state in which an individual identifies with a particular organization and its goals and wishes to maintain membership in the organization (Meyer and Allen, 2001). In the work adjustment context, existing research has shown that both job satisfaction and organizational commitment correlate negatively with various work-related stressors, including long working hours (Jamal, 1990; Lu, 2011; Lu et al., 2008), and negatively with intention to leave (Cohen, 1993). Thus far, job satisfaction and organizational commitment have been established as salient psychological outcomes of work stressors. However, few researchers have examined the effects of "fit" of working hours on these work attitudes, let alone in non-Western countries (Lu, 2011, as an exception). Thus it is imperative to empirically test the ubiquity of the effects of fit in a large representative sample of employees across different nations, focusing on work attitudes. We hypothesized that:

H1: People who have a fit between desired and actual working hours experience higher job satisfaction and organizational commitment compared to those who experience a misfit in working hours, regardless of the countries they reside.

Social Welfare Institutions as Providers of Macro-level Resources

Cable and Edwards (2004) noted that P-E Fit is

a subjective experience which can be influenced by individual differences and elements found in the social environment (Cooper et al., 2001; Lazarus and Folkman, 1984). In a rare large-scale comparative cross-cultural study, Spector et al. (2004) found significant correlations between working hours and psychological health for both Anglo (Australia, Canada, England, New Zealand, and the United States) and Chinese employees (Hong Kong, the mainland China, and Taiwan). They also found a significant relationship between working hours and physical health for Chinese, but not for Anglo workers. These small and inconsistent effects ($r = 0.01 \sim -0.09$) suggest that people in diverse social environments may respond differently to the pressure of long working hours and/or the fit or misfit of P-E. Furthermore, research on the transactional stress model (Lazarus and Folkman, 1984) has already noted that avowed cultural values (cf. Hofstede, 1991) as individual-level psychosocial resources play an important role in employees' reactions to the work environments (Lu et al., 2011; Lu et al., 2010). Erlinghagen (2008) further stated that social systems (e.g., political, economic, tax, and social welfare regimes) as macro-level resources protecting and sustaining the lives of society members, also need to be considered in explaining cross-cultural differences in employees' work attitudes. Labor market regulations and state welfare provisions in particular influence people's work preferences and attitudes (Ginn and Fast, 2006; Lu, 2010). Erlinghagen (2008) proposed a fourfold typology of policy sets, typified by four welfare regimes (Aspalter, 2006; Esping-Andersen, 1999), based on a combination of labor market and social protection policies. We thus explore this specific dimension of the social environment, *social welfare*, as a proxy of the availability of macro-level resources.

Aspalter (2006) and Esping-Andersen (1999) proposed a four-fold scheme of welfare systems including social democratic, liberal welfare, conservative corporatist, and East Asian welfare. In *social democratic welfare* states, such as the Nordic countries, governments encourage people to work. For instance, governments implement policies and supply resources to care for young children and senior citizens, charge high taxes, and enhance job

retention and reemployment opportunities to maximize manpower. Every citizen has an equal right to apply for welfare payment if he/she becomes unemployed or disabled. *Liberal welfare* states such as the United States and Australia, as opposed to social democratic welfare states, regard work as a civil obligation and set liberal markets with minor governmental intervention. Welfare payment applies only to minority groups who have passed strict reviews by the government agencies. In *conservative corporatist* states such as Spain, France, and Germany, men are still the main providers of the family, and women often choose peripheral jobs or stay at home (Ginn and Fast, 2006). Since women are the major support providers to families, state welfare provision is typically limited and mainly available to men excluding unemployed women. Similar to conservative corporatist welfare states, East Asian countries such as Taiwan and South Korea, emphasize the value of family, and support is provided mainly by family members. Furthermore, contrary to Western concepts of social welfare, *East Asian welfare* is construed as a tool for developing a nation's economy, rather than protecting its citizens.

Based on the above description of the four welfare types, we believe that the social democratic welfare system provides the safest and most hopeful social environment for employees, reducing anxiety in the search for jobs and reemployment. Research has indeed shown that in social democratic welfare states, employees can afford to allocate more time to spend with families and friends compared to those in conservative corporatist and liberal welfare states (Ginn and Fast, 2006). A study by Anderson and Pontusson (2007) also confirmed the benefits of social security in reducing negative reactions to job threats. However, no study has yet included East Asian welfare countries in comparison alongside the three Western social welfare regimes. We hypothesized that:

H2: *The effects of fit of desired and actual working hours (P-E Fit) on work attitudes (work satisfaction and organizational commitment) vary across different welfare regimes, such that the positive effect in a social democratic welfare regime is stronger than those of the other three*

welfare systems.

In addition, we explored the effect of personal financial needs on the state of fit between desired and actual working hours, over and beyond that of the macro-level social security provision. Many employees work longer hours in the current competitive business world because of increased workloads, job insecurity, performance pressure, and the rising cost of living (pressure to earn more). Lu (2010; 2011) showed that the state of personal/family finance played an important role in employees' preferences regarding working hours. Driven by the needs of merchandise consumption and keeping up living standards in the global economic recession, people worked harder than ever before. Recent studies found that the increase in non-standard or contingent employment contracts, the decline of unions, and the widespread use of subcontracting all fueled financial strains and hardship (Green et al., 2000; Worrall et al., 2013). The financial needs to earn more or lack of it (to earn less) will be a proximal predictor of one's decision on working hours. We thus hypothesized that:

H3: *People who want to earn more or earn less will result in a state of misfit of desired and actual working hours, after controlling for the effects of social welfare regimes.*

Method

Data and Participants

Data were gathered from the International Social Survey Program (ISSP) with a theme on *work orientation*. The ISSP, which involves 40 countries worldwide, is an annual survey that uses a uniform questionnaire with a stratified random sample from each country, addressing a different theme each year. We selected for analysis only respondents claiming that they held full-time or part-time positions, identified by a particular question in the survey. Because of varying work demands across countries, identical indices of working hours for full-time jobs were unavailable. (However, within the ISSP framework, full-time employment is defined as a work week of 30

hours minimum, and part-time employment is defined as a 10-29-hour work week (Ginn and Fast, 2006). Using this type of grouping eliminates unwanted variations in working hours, and thus, avoids discrepancies between self-declared employment statuses and the actual time expenditure in paid positions. Consequently, the current representative national sample comprised 8,525 respondents from nine countries. Based on four-fold scheme of welfare systems, we classified these countries into four clusters: the *social democratic welfare* cluster ($n = 2,339$) including Denmark, Sweden, and Norway; the *liberal* welfare cluster ($n = 2,121$) consisting of the United States and Australia; the *conservative corporatist* welfare cluster ($n = 1,875$) including France and Germany; and the *East Asian* welfare cluster ($n = 2,190$) consisting of Taiwan and South Korea. The categorization of countries in terms of their welfare systems is the same as that of by Ginn and Fast (2006), though they did not include the *East Asian* welfare regime in their study.

Measures

As a member of ISSP, a rigorous procedure in questionnaire design, sampling, face-to-face home interview, data cleaning, and data dissemination has to be followed by each participating country, often represented by a prestige academic institute (cf. Ginn and Fast, 2006; Lu, 2010; 2011). Through ensuring the scientific rigor and the validity of its data, ISSP is now the largest and most trustworthy social survey series in the world (cf. Smith et al., 2006). The data analyzed in this study were derived mainly from the following parts of the ISSP survey.

Actual Working Hours and Personal Preference.

Two aspects of time expenditure were assessed: (a) *actual working hours* pertaining to the kind of job in present (full-time vs. part-time); and (b) *desired working hours* indicating by the personal preference to choose a full-time or part-time job without considering financial returns. Specifically, for the question "If you could choose your working hours, and if you had only one choice, which of the following would you choose?" participants were instructed to select one of the following options: (a) full time (work more than 30 hours) or (b) part time (work

10-29 hours). Note that both desired and actual working hours were assessed using the same discrete response options as above, not measured in the number of hours. The *fit* index in the present study was thus the congruence between the present employment status and the desired choice. Specifically, the following groups were identified:

Group A-fit: correspondence between desired and actual working hours, e.g., holding a full-time job and wanting a full-time job;

Group B-misfit-wanting More: preferring more working hours than he/she actually does, e.g., holding a part-time job but wanting a full-time job;

Group C-misfit-wanting Less: preferring less working hours than he/she actually does, e.g., holding a full-time job but wanting a part-time job.

Work Attitudes

In the survey, participants were asked to rate their (a) *job satisfaction* with the question "How satisfied are you with your job?" (1 = *completely dissatisfied* to 7 = *completely satisfied*); and (b) *organizational commitment* with three items deriving from a three-component model (i.e., affective, normative, and continuance commitment, Meyer and Allen, 2001). Five-point rating scales were used, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*), with high scores representing high levels of organizational commitment. The internal consistency of this three-item scale was 0.78 in the current sample. Established multi-item scales for these variables were not used because of space constraints for a large-scale social survey with an embedded international core module. However, these two measures showed good validity in previous studies using the ISSP data (Lu, 2011; Lu et al., 2008).

Personal Financial Needs

Personal financial needs were measured with the item "If you had only one of these three choices, which of the following would you prefer?" (1 = *work longer hours and earn more money*, 2 = *work the same number of hours and earn the same amount of money*, or 3 = *work fewer hours and earn less money*).

Control Variables

Information on gender (0 = *male*, 1 = *female*), age, seniority (tenure on the job), marital status (0 = *married*, 1 = *not married*), rank (0 = *manager*, 1 = *non-manager*), as well as the gross domestic product (GDP), unemployment rate, social security rate, and the legal working hours of these states were also collected. These control variables are customary in sociological studies involving work and employment (e.g., Ginn and Fast, 2006).

Results

To explore the relationship between P-E Fit and work attitudes and the variation of this relationship across different welfare systems, a series of ANOVAs was conducted, with the fit between desired and actual working hours as the independent variable, and job satisfaction and organizational commitment as the dependent variables (Table 1). The main effects of the fit between desired and actual working hours were significant on both job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Post hoc comparisons further revealed that employees with a fit between desired and actual working hours (Group A) had the highest job satisfaction

and organizational commitment, followed by those who wanted to work more hours (Group B) and those who wanted to work fewer hours (Group C). Across the board, the fit group (A) generally fared better than the two misfit groups (Groups B and C), fully supporting *Hypothesis 1*. The relationship between desired and actual working hours and work attitudes however, varied in different welfare regimes. In the social democratic and liberal welfare context, Groups A and C had the highest job satisfaction. For employees working in the conservative corporatist and East Asian welfare systems, Groups A and B had the highest job satisfaction. Mirroring the results on job satisfaction, in a social democratic welfare system, Groups A and C had the highest organizational commitment. In the conservative corporatist welfare system, employees in Groups A and B had the highest organizational commitment. However, employees in the social democratic welfare system did not show higher organizational commitment than the others. Therefore, *Hypothesis 2* was partially supported.

As a supplementary analysis, we computed the correlation matrix including all the research variables. Results are presented in Table 2. As can be seen in the table, compared against the East Asian welfare regime, the social democratic system and the liberal system

Table 1 ANOVA: Effects of Fit between Desired and Actual Working Hours on Work Attitudes

		1. fit (n = 5,463)		2. misfit-wanting more (n = 2,068)		3. misfit-wanting less (n = 994)		F	df	Post Hoc Scheffe Test
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD			
		All	JS	4.27	1.05	4.08	1.08			
	OC	10.10	2.44	9.79	2.43	9.27	2.70	47.03 ***	7,775	1 > 2 > 3
Social democratic	JS	4.36	0.99	4.11	1.03	4.52	1.05	19.73 ***	2,306	1 = 3 > 2
	OC	9.80	2.36	9.10	2.33	9.85	2.41	20.47 ***	2,073	1 = 3 > 2
Liberal	JS	4.43	1.07	4.16	1.23	4.30	1.16	9.35 ***	2,078	1 = 3 > 2
	OC	10.57	2.42	10.30	2.47	10.33	2.50	2.44	2,041	
Conservative corporatist	JS	4.30	1.04	4.14	1.20	4.04	1.10	9.94 ***	1,815	1 = 2 > 3
	OC	9.55	2.57	9.05	2.71	8.18	2.58	41.88 ***	1,649	1 = 2 > 3
East Asian	JS	3.93	1.04	3.99	1.00	3.73	1.07	5.25 ***	2,157	1 = 2 > 3
	OC	10.42	2.27	10.30	2.25	10.19	2.42	1.07	2,009	

註 : 1. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

2. JS = Job Satisfaction; OC = Organizational Commitment.

Table 2 Correlation among All Variables

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Unemployment Rates	11.67	12.79	1												
2. GDP	32635.18	11049.46	-.12***	1											
3. Social Security Rates	19.38	7.46	.67***	.36***	1										
4. Legal Work Hours	41.71	3.52	.94***	-.28***	.47***	1									
5. Social Democratic v.s. East Asian	.27	.45	-.28***	.49***	.44***	-.36***	1								
6. Liberal v.s. East Asian	.25	.43	-.31***	.41***	-.26***	-.45***	-.35***	1							
7. Conservative v.s. East Asian	.22	.41	.99***	-.12***	.61***	.95***	-.33***	-.31***	1						
8. Gender	.52	.50	-.03**	-.04***	-.07***	-.02*	-.03*	-.01	-.04**	1					
9. Age	42.01	11.84	-.04***	.10***	.03**	-.07***	.08***	.04***	-.04***	.05***	1				
10. Marital Status	.76	.43	-.05***	.04***	.03*	-.07***	.07***	.02*	-.05***	.01	.41***	1			
11. Job Position	.35	.48	.07***	.05***	.04**	.04**	-.06***	.07***	.07***	.17***	.06***	.08***	1		
12. Job Satisfaction	4.20	1.07	.02*	.15***	.09***	-.00	.05***	.09***	.01	.00	.07***	.06***	.11***	1	
13. Organizational Commitment	9.94	2.49	-.16***	.03*	-.22***	-.13***	-.09***	.14***	-.16***	.08***	.10***	.09***	.18***	.51***	1

註：1. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

2. Social Democratic v.s. East Asian: Social Democratic = 1, Else = 0; Liberal v.s. East Asian: Liberal = 1, Else = 0; Conservative v.s. East Asian: Conservative = 1, Else = 0; Gender: Female = 0, Male = 1; Marital Status: Single = 0, Married = 1; Job Position: Employee = 0, Supervisor = 1.

correlated positively with employees' job satisfaction. Again, compared against the East Asian welfare regime, the liberal system correlated positively, while the social democratic system and the conservative corporatist system correlated negatively with employees' organizational commitment. These results suggested that employees' work attitudes might vary in different social welfare regimes.

To test *Hypothesis 3*, we used logistic regression which allowed the criterion to be a categorical variable. Logistic regression also allowed the independent effects of personal financial needs on fit status to be assessed after controlling for legality and social welfare systems at the country-level, and demographics at the individual-level.

We used three steps to predict the fit status (0 = *fit*, 1 = *misfit*). First, we entered the country-level control variables for national differences (i.e., GDP, legal working hours, the unemployment rates, social security rates, and social welfare regimes). Second, we entered individual-level demographics as control variables (i.e.,

gender, age, number of dependent children, and marital status). Third, we entered personal financial needs as predictors. Table 3 presents a series of logit models. We found that employees wanting to earn less money had a higher tendency to experience a misfit between desired and actual working hours.

Repeating these procedures, we conducted an additional analysis to predict personal misfit status of "misfit-wanting more" (1 = *wanting more*, 0 = *else*) and "misfit-wanting less" (1 = *wanting less*, 0 = *else*) respectively. As displayed in the series of logit models in Table 4, people who wanted to earn more were more likely to experience the misfit state of working fewer hours than preferred (i.e. wanting to work more hours); oppositely, those who wanted to earn less were more likely to experience the misfit state of working more hours than preferred (i.e. wanting to work fewer hours). Therefore, *Hypothesis 3* was supported, that is personal financial needs contributed to a misfit between desired and actual working hours, after controlling for macro-level factors and demographics.

Table 3 Predicting the State of P-E Fit: Logistic Regression Results

	Misfit vs. Fit		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
	Beta	Beta	Beta
Constant	-1.60	-.40	-.60
Unemployment Rates	-.90 ***	-.85 ***	-.86 ***
GDP	.00	.00	.00
Social Security Rates	.10 ***	.11 ***	.11 ***
Legal Work Hours	.17 ***	.14 **	.14 *
Social Democratic vs. East Asian	4.20 ***	3.71 ***	3.55 ***
Liberal vs. East Asian	3.59 ***	3.17 ***	3.11 ***
Conservative vs. East Asian	26.21 ***	24.82 ***	24.78 ***
Gender		-.72 ***	-.72 ***
Age		.00	.00
Marital Status		.08	.06
Job Position		-.14 **	-.17 **
Wanting to Earn More			-.04
Wanting to Earn Less			1.02 ***

註 : 1. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

2. Misfit vs. Fit: Misfit = 1, Fit = 0; Social Democratic vs. East Asia: Social Democratic = 1, Else = 0; Liberal vs. East Asian: Liberal = 1, Else = 0; Conservative vs. East Asian: Conservative = 1, Else = 0; Gender: Female = 0, Male = 1; Marital Status: Single = 0, Married = 1; Job Position: Employee = 0, Supervisor = 1.

Table 4 Predicting the Type of P-E Misfit: Logistic Regression Results

	Misfit-wanting less			Misfit-wanting more		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	Beta	Beta	Beta	Beta	Beta	Beta
Constant	.90	1.40	1.96	-7.59 *	-5.88	-6.88
Unemployment Rates	-.44 ***	-.39 ***	-.36 ***	-1.25 ***	-1.22 ***	-1.26 ***
GDP	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
Social Security Rates	.06 *	.06 **	.07 **	.12 *	.12 *	.12 *
Legal Work Hours	.03	.02	.00	.32 **	.28 **	.30 **
Social Democratic vs. East Asian	2.27 **	1.87 *	1.38	4.85 **	4.43 *	4.91 **
Liberal vs. East Asian	1.49 *	1.13	.80	5.18 ***	4.87 ***	5.23 ***
Conservative vs. East Asian	11.40 ***	9.80 ***	8.79 **	37.56 ***	36.88 ***	38.00 ***
Gender		-.65 ***	-.64 ***		-.51 ***	-.55 ***
Age		.00	.00		.00	.01
Marital Status		.21 **	.18 *		-.16	-.16
Job Position		.05	.00		-.42 *	-.41 ***
Wanting to Earn More			.06			.54 ***
Wanting to Earn Less			.09 ***			-.02

註：1. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

2. Misfit-wanting less: Wanting Less = 1, Else = 0; Misfit-wanting More: Wanting More = 1, Else = 0; Social Democratic vs. East Asian: Social Democratic = 1, Else = 0; Liberal vs. East Asian: Liberal = 1, Else = 0; Conservative vs. East Asian: Conservative = 1, Else = 0; Gender: Female = 0, Male = 1; Marital Status: Single = 0, Married = 1; Job Position: Employee = 0, Supervisor = 1.

Discussion

Research Implication

In this study, we examined the fit between desired and actual working hours and its association with employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment in a world undergoing rapid social and economic changes, focusing on the comparison of various welfare regimes. We also explored the relationship between personal financial needs and the state of fit/misfit between personal preferences and actual working hours.

First, using the multinational samples in this study, we found that employees' work attitudes varied depending on the state of fit between desired and actual working hours. This finding resonated with the positive relationship between P-J Fit (person-job fit) and work attitudes found in a meta-analysis (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). The thrust of our research is to underline the fit of *working hours* as an important aspect of the generic concept of

P-E Fit, in addition to ability and needs. Furthermore, we extended the existing research to demonstrate that the importance of this particular aspect of P-E Fit is universal, regardless of culture and social infrastructures. Although researchers have identified fit as a mediator between working hours and burnout in Western countries (Barnett et al., 1999), the potential beneficial effects of personal choice and the resultant state of fit pertaining to working hours have rarely been empirically tested for non-Western countries. To remedy this shortcoming, we included two economically viable East Asian societies: South Korea and Taiwan in the present study. What we found involving a cross-nation sample of nine diverse countries are similar to those obtained by Lu (2011) among Taiwanese workers, showing that those who enjoyed a state of fit between desired and actual working hours generally had a better attitude toward work and lower strains, compared to those who were in a state of misfit, regardless of whether they wanted to work more or fewer hours. Together, these findings support the ubiquity

of the favorable effects of achieving the psychological state of fit in one's choice of working hours.

Second, we found that the relationship between desired/actual working hours and work attitudes did vary across different social welfare types. Contrary to our expectations, employees who experienced congruence between personal preference and actual supply did not report the highest positive attitudes toward work under the social democratic welfare system. The correlation analysis provided some additional proof, though these bi-variate results have to be interpreted in due caution. We can see in Table 2 that employees in the social democratic regime tended to report a higher level of job satisfaction than those in the East Asian regime. In contrast, employees in the East Asian regime tended to report a higher level of organizational commitment than those in the social democratic regime. One may argue that job satisfaction as a positive feeling towards job as-a-whole is a *personal* work attitude, while organizational commitment as a feeling of loyalty towards organization is a *social work* attitude. We noted that the welfare regimes seem to fall into two clusters, in terms of their influence on the association between the fit of working hours and work attitudes: social democratic and liberal welfare combined as one cluster, and the other cluster consisting of conservative corporatist and East Asian welfare. Esping-Andersen (1999) and Lee and Ku (2003) did point out that the conservative corporatist and East Asian systems shared some common characteristics, wherein men were the main providers of the family and women provided the majority of caretaking and home maintenance. More importantly, societies adopting both the conservative corporatist and East Asian welfare systems greatly emphasize the value of the family as a "social safety net", and discourage their citizens to rely on state welfare/security. Under the threat of economic recession and organizational restructuring, people feel the even greater need to be employed and work more hours, thus earning more money to support the family. Hardworking and monetary successes are traditionally regarded as top priorities in the East Asian life. In accordance with the Confucian cultural heritage, workers in Taiwan and South Korea work harder and longer to

provide their families a respectable living standard and to glorify their family names with career successes (Lu et al., 2011). It is conceivable that employees in East Asian and conservative corporatist systems may avow higher level of positive work attitudes, especially their loyalty to the company (organizational commitment), to increase their job opportunities.

Our findings corroborate the link between working hours and health consequences established for Western (Sparks et al., 1997) and Chinese (Lu, 2011; Spector et al., 2004) workers, thus the impact of long working hours on both the employee and his/her family deserves more research attention and managerial interventions. Considering the early warning by Dankert et al. (1965), that working hours affect not only the individual but also the family, any arrangements in working time should include both support for employees who are coping, as well as the needs and responsibilities of their family life. Despite the existence of daycare and nursing homes, as well as assistance and training for reemployment supplied by Nordic countries to assist workers, employees were still struggling to maintain a full-time job and at the same time spending more time to be with family and friends (Ginn and Fast, 2006).

Third, logistic regression was conducted to examine the association between personal financial needs and the state of fit between desired and actual working hours. As expected, we found that those with lower economic needs (i.e., wanting to earn less) had more chance of dropping into misfit of the desired and actual working hours. Supplementary analysis did confirm that some people wanting to earn more but had options to work less time than they desired. However, there may be critical factors other than financial needs contributing to the state of fit pertaining to work hours. Caplan (1987) proposed that an individual's ability and aspiration could be the most important factor influencing the fit between a person and the environment. Costa et al. (2006) also found that European workers considered individual autonomy in deciding working hours the most important factor affecting job satisfaction. These diverse human needs other than earning more money deserve more systematic examination in relation to working hours and well-being in future studies.

Managerial Implication

Considering the scarcity of cross-national probability samples and high-quality data collection in the field, our study makes a contribution by bridging certain knowledge gaps regarding the issue of working hours and work attitudes from a cross-national comparative perspective. Findings of this study also offer useful insights to inform management practices. We found that the fit between desired and actual working hours was associated with higher job satisfaction and organizational commitment. However, misfit exists and may hinder work attitudes. In fact, a substantial proportion of our sample (43.32%) wanted to work either more (29.32%) or fewer hours (14%). To respond to those who want to increase their monetary returns via working more hours, companies should review their compensation schemes to raise employees' tolerance to extended working hours. In addition, providing employees with a say in deciding their working hours can foster perceived organizational support and individual control at work, which can consequently promote job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work-family integration (Lu et al., 2008). To conclude, both working hours and personal choices should be considered when devising suitable working time schedules to maximize employees' well-being, organizational commitment, and societal integration. At the same time, societal macro-level provisions of support (e.g., social welfare system) need to be carefully designed and implemented to facilitate both economic growth and individual needs fulfillment.

Suggestion for Future Research

Certain methodological limitations exist in the present study, which point to directions for future research. First, our study was essentially an exercise in secondary data analysis, which has inherent limitations. For example, the true extent of the relationship between desired and actual working hours and work attitudes may be obscured by the use of single-item measure. Therefore, established theory-based multi-item measures of job satisfaction and organizational commitment should be adopted in future studies to better ensure the validity of

measurements for focal variables. Second, the missing variable bias may pose a threat to the generalizability of our findings. As mentioned above, certain factors other than financial needs should have been taken into account, but unfortunately was not included in the original design of the survey. Thus, in future studies, factors such as the individual's credential (ability), personal aspiration, and need for control (autonomy) as potential predictors of fit between a person and the environment. Last but not the least, in future studies, when a more comprehensive array of variables are included, more specific hypotheses can be formulated to predict the state of fit/misfit, and more sophisticated analysis (e.g., MANOVA) should then be run to test them.

References

- Anderson, C. J. and Pontusson, J., 2007. Workers, Worries and Welfare States: Social Protection and Job Insecurity in 15 OECD Countries, *European Journal of Political Research*, 46(2), 211-235.
- Argyle, M., 2001. *The Psychology of Happiness (2nd ed.)*, London, UK: Routledge.
- Aspalter, C., 2006. The East Asian Welfare Model, *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 15(4), 290-301.
- Baba, V. V. and Jamal, M., 1992. How Much Do We Really Know about Moonlighters? *Public Personnel Management*, 21(1), 65-73.
- Barnett, R. C., Gareis, K. C. and Brennan, R. T., 1999. Fit as a Mediator of the Relationship between Work Hours and Burnout, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 4(4), 307-317.
- Bruck, C. S., Allen, T. D. and Spector, P. E., 2002. The Relation between Work-family Conflict and Job Satisfaction: A Finer-grained Analysis, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 60(3), 336-353.
- Cable, D. M. and Edwards, J. R., 2004. Complementary and Supplementary Fit: A Theoretical and Empirical Integration, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 822-834.
- Caldwell, D. F. and O'Reilly, C. A., 1990. Measuring Person-job Fit with a Profile Comparison Process, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(6), 648-657.
- Caplan, R. D., 1983. Person-environment Fit: Past,

- Present and Future, in Cooper, C. L. (Ed.), *Stress Research*, New York, NY: Wiley, 35-78.
- Caplan, R. D., 1987. Person-environment Fit Theory and Organizations: Commensurate Dimensions, Time Perspectives and Mechanisms, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31(3), 248-267.
- Cohen, A., 1993. Organizational Commitment and Turnover: A Meta-analysis, *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(5), 1140-1157.
- Cooper, C. L., Davidson, M. J. and Robinson, P., 1982. Stress in the Police Service, *Journal of Occupational Medicine*, 24(1), 30-36.
- Cooper, C. L., Dewe, P. and O'Driscoll, M. P., 2001. *Organizational Stress: A Review and Critique of Theory, Research and Applications*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Costa, G., Sartori, S. and Akerstedt, T., 2006. Influence of Flexibility and Variability of Working Hours on Health and Well-being, *Chronobiology International*, 23(6), 1125-1137.
- Dankert, C. E., Mann, F. C. and Northrup, H. R., 1965. *Hours of Work*, New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Directorate-General of Budget, 2012. *Year Book of Manpower Statistic*, Taipei, Taiwan: Executive Yuan.
- Edwards, J. R. and Cable, D. M., 2009. The Value of Value Congruence, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(3), 654-677.
- Erlinghagen, M., 2008. Self-perceived Job Insecurity and Social Context: A Multi-level Analysis of 17 European Countries, *European Sociological Review*, 24(2), 183-197.
- Esping-Andersen, G., 1999. *Social Foundations of Postindustrial Economies*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- French, J. R. P., Jr., Caplan, R. D. and Harrison, R. V., 1982. *The Mechanism of Job Stress and Strain*, New York, NY: Wiley.
- Ginn, J. and Fast, J., 2006. Employment and Social Integration in Midlife: Preferred and Actual Time Use across Welfare Regime Types, *Research on Aging*, 28(6), 669-690.
- Green, F., Felstead, A. and Burchell, B., 2000. Job Insecurity and the Difficulty of Regaining Employment: An Empirical Study of Unemployment Expectations, *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 62(S1), 855-883.
- Hall, K. and Savery, L. K., 1986. Tight Rein, More Stress, *Harvard Business Review*, 64(1), 160-164.
- Hofstede, G., 1991. *Culture and Organizations: Software of the Mind*, London: McGraw-Hill.
- Jamal, M., 1986. Moonlighting: Personal, Social and Organizational Consequences, *Human Relations*, 39(11), 977-990.
- Jamal, M., 1990. Relationship of Job Stress and Type-A Behavior to Employees' Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, Psychosomatic Health Problems and Turnover Motivation, *Human Relations*, 43(8), 727-738.
- Karasek, R., 1979. Job Demands, Job Decision Latitude and Mental Strain: Implications for Job Redesign, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24(2), 285-308.
- Karasek, R. and Theorell, T., 1990. *Healthy Work*, New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Kirkcaldy, B., Levine, R. and Shephard, R. J., 2000. The Impact of Working Hours on Physical and Psychological Health of German Managers, *European Review of Applied Psychology*, 50(4), 443-449.
- Kirkcaldy, B. D., Trimpop, R. and Cooper, C. L., 1997. Working Hours, Job Stress, Work Satisfaction and Accident Rates among Medical Practitioners and Allied Personnel, *International Journal of Stress Management*, 4(2), 79-87.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D. and Johnson, E. C., 2005. Consequences of Individual's Fit at Work: A Meta-analysis of Person-job, Person-organization, Personal-group and Person-supervisor Fit, *Personnel Psychology*, 58(2), 281-342.
- Lazarus, R. and Folkman, S., 1984. *Stress, Appraisal and Coping*, New York, NY: Springer.
- Lee, Y. J. and Ku, Y. W., 2003. Another Welfare World? A Preliminary Examination of the Developmental Welfare Regime in East Asia, *Taiwanese Journal of Sociology*, 31, 189-241.
- Lu, L., 2010. Employment among Older Workers and Inequality of Gender and Education: Evidence from a Taiwanese National Survey, *The International Journal of Aging & Human Development*, 70(2), 145-162.
- Lu, L., 2011. Working Hours and Personal Preference among Taiwanese Employees, *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 4(3), 1-21.

- Lu, L., 2012. Aging and Quality of Life in Taiwan, *Journal of Alternative Medicine Research*, 4(3), 233-243.
- Lu, L. and Hu, C. H., 2005. Personality, Leisure Experiences and Happiness, *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 6(3), 325-342.
- Lu, L., Kao, S. F., Chang, T. T., Wu, H. P. and Cooper, C. L., 2008. Work/Family Demands, Work Flexibility, Work/Family Conflict and Their Consequences at Work: A National Probability Sample in Taiwan, *International Journal of Stress Management*, 15(1), 1-21.
- Lu, L., Kao, S. F., Siu, O. L. and Lu, C. Q., 2011. Work Stress, Chinese Work Values and Work Well-being in the Greater China, *Journal of Social Psychology*, 151(6), 767-783.
- Lu, L., Siu, O. L. and Lu, C. Q., 2010. Does Loyalty Protect Chinese Workers From Stress? The Role of Affective Organizational Commitment in the Greater China Region, *Stress & Health*, 26(2), 161-168.
- Meyer, J. P. and Allen, N. J., 2001. Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization: A Meta-analysis of Antecedents, Correlates and Consequences, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61(1), 20-52.
- Robbins, S. P. and Judge, T. A., 2015. *Organizational Behavior (16th ed.)*, Essex, UK: Pearson Education.
- Smith, T. W., Kim, J., Koch, A. and Park, A., 2006. Social Science Research and the General Social Surveys, *Comparative Sociology*, 5(1), 33-43.
- Sparks, K., Cooper, C., Fried, Y. and Shirom, A., 1997. The Effects of Hours of Work on Health: A Meta-analytic Review, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70(4), 391-408.
- Sparks, K., Faragher, B. and Cooper, C. L., 2001. Well-being and Occupational Health in the 21st Century Workplace, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74(4), 489-509.
- Spector, P. E., Cooper, C. L., Poelmans, S., Allen, T. D., O'Driscoll, M., Sanchez, J. I., Siu, O. L., Dewe, P., Hart, P. and Lu, L., 2004. A Cross-national Comparative Study of Work/Family Stressors, Working Hours and Well-being: China and Latin America vs. the Anglo World, *Personnel Psychology*, 57(1), 119-142.
- Stack, S. and Eshleman, J. R., 1998. Marital Status and Happiness: A 17-Nation Study, *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60(2), 527-536.
- Trimpop, R., Kirkcaldy, B., Athanasou, J. and Cooper, C. L., 2000. Individual Differences in Working Hours, Work Perceptions and Accident Rates in Veterinary Surgeries, *Work & Stress*, 14(2), 181-188.
- Worrall, L., Cooper, C. L. and Chang, Y.-Y., 2013. The Effect of the Recession on UK Managers: The Quality of Working Life 2007-2012, *Research in Applied Psychology*, 59, 23-48.



陸洛為國立台灣大學工商管理學系教授。英國牛津大學心理學博士。主要研究領域為「文化」與「自我」、主觀幸福感、壓力與調節、職場健康、及其他職場心理學相關的議題展開。曾獲國科會傑出研究獎，已發表中英文期刊論文 180 餘篇，學術論文曾發表於中華心理學刊、台大管理論叢、人力資源管理學報、本土心理學研究、中華心理衛生學刊、組織與管理 (以上皆為 TSSCI) ; Academy of Management Journal、Personnel Psychology、Journal of Organizational Behavior、Journal of Occupational Health Psychology、Work and Stress、Human Resource Management、European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology、British Journal of Psychology、Personality and Individual Differences (以上皆為 SSCI) 等期刊。

Luo Lu is a Professor in the Department of Business Administration, National Taiwan University. She received her Doctoral degree in Psychology from the University of Oxford, UK. Her main research areas include Culture and Self, Subjective Well-being, Stress and Adjustment, Occupational Health and other IO Psychological topics. She has been awarded the Distinguished Research Award by the Taiwanese Government. She has published over 180 referred papers in academic journals. Her research papers have been published in Chinese Journal of Psychology, NTU Management Review, Journal of Human Resource Management, Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies, Formosa Journal of Mental Health, Organization and Management (all above are listed in the TSSCI); Academy of Management Journal, Personnel Psychology, Journal of Organizational Behavior, Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, Work and Stress, Human Resource Management, European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, British Journal of Psychology, Personality and Individual Differences (all above are listed in the SSCI) and others.

