Gender-ethnicity intersectional variation in work–family dynamics: Family interference with work, guilt, and job satisfaction
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Abstract
Although guilt is often considered the most prevalent emotional outcome of work–family conflict (WFC), most work–family research focuses on family-related guilt stemming from work interference with family, rather than job-related guilt stemming from family interference with work (FIW). In addition, there is little understanding of how different employee social groups experience the implications of FIW in their daily lives. To address these research gaps, this study explores the relationship between daily FIW and job-related guilt, and its subsequent impact on job satisfaction. It also investigates variation in these relationships by (1) gender and (2) the intersection of gender and ethnicity. Bayesian multilevel structural equation modeling using data from 5-day diary surveys from 210 solicitors in Britain shows daily FIW is associated with higher job-related guilt and subsequently lower job satisfaction. The relationship is stronger for women than men in general, but is also stronger for South Asian women than white British women (and men), and for South Asian men than white British men. This suggests that studies focusing on single social group characteristics (e.g., gender) are likely to obscure intersectional effects that might produce significant within-group variation. The findings also highlight the importance of integrating workplace inequality arguments into theorization of WFC.
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1 | INTRODUCTION

Work–family conflict (WFC) has become entrenched in many employees' daily lives in recent decades (e.g., Allen et al., 2020; Michel et al., 2011; Wayne et al., 2020). This has had significant implications for their work-, family-, and life-related outcomes concerning, for example, job/family attitudes (Bruck et al., 2002; Kallath et al., 2017), health and well-being (Grzywacz et al., 2007; Nohe et al., 2015), and emotional states (Greenhaus et al., 2006; Judge et al., 2006; Livingston & Judge, 2008).

One of the key individual-level outcomes on which the work–family literature has focused is family-related guilt stemming from work interference with family (WIF) (e.g., Korabik, 2015; Shockley et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2019). This is often portrayed as a highly
relevant discrete emotional response to WFC in the popular press, public discourse, and the management literature. However, few studies have explored job-related guilt stemming from family interference with work (FIW) (Aamtzen et al., 2019; Judge et al., 2006; Livingston & Judge, 2008). This is nevertheless a matter worthy of attention, since where FIW results in job-related guilt, this may have significant deleterious implications. For example, it might impact job satisfaction negatively, given research showing job satisfaction has an affective component that can be influenced by emotional states (such as guilt) experienced at the time of evaluation (Fisher, 2000).

Additionally, researchers have raised the possibility that the implications of WFC (both FIW and WIF) may vary between different employee groups, although there is significant debate over the direction and magnitude of this variation. For example, gender role theory (Eagly, 1987; Gutek et al., 1991) argues that men and women encounter different expectations regarding their societal roles, with men facing greater pressure to focus on the job domain, and women on the family domain. Thus, FIW might be expected to have greater negative implications for men than for women, while the opposite might apply regarding WIF (Duxbury & Higgins, 1991; Powell & Greenhaus, 2010). Yet it is also possible that WFC will have equally, or even greater, negative implications for women than for men due to the gender-related disadvantage they often encounter in the workplace, which may exacerbate the difficulties they face in navigating inter-role conflict (Allen et al., 2000; Dolson & Deemer, 2022). Given these competing arguments, it is perhaps unsurprising that empirical research on the impact of WFC on job and family satisfaction (two of the most frequently studied outcomes of the work–family interface) has yielded inconsistent or non-significant differences by gender (e.g., Cloninger et al., 2015; Grandey et al., 2005; Kinnunen & Mauno, 1998; Yoo, 2022).

Regarding the impact of WFC on guilt, while some prior research has shown that women experience greater family-related guilt than men as a result of WIF (e.g., Aamtzen et al., 2023; Borelli et al., 2017), there is to our knowledge no empirical research on gender variation in the relationship between FIW and job-related guilt.

The implications of WFC might also vary by ethnicity, given potential within-country differences in cultural norms and values regarding work and family between ethnic minority and dominant communities (Guerrero & Schober, 2021; Wang, 2019). Moreover, similar to women, ethnic minority employees often face significant workplace discrimination, which serves as a workplace stressor (Ashe et al., 2019; Trade Union Congress, 2022) that potentially exacerbates the negative implications of WFC. However, little work–family research has explored this matter, with most studies adopting a white-focused or ethnicity-neutral approach that either draws on samples consisting predominantly of white majority men and women, or not proactively considering intra-societal ethnic group difference (for exceptions, see Beutell & Schnier, 2014; Grzywacz et al., 2007).

Beyond this, the implications of the intersection of multiple social identities have rarely been considered in the work–family literature (Frevert et al., 2015; Powell et al., 2019). Most studies treat social identities as independent of each other, exploring differences by one form of identity (usually gender) at a time (for exceptions, see: Ammons et al., 2017; Roehling et al., 2005). However, single-axis approaches of this nature have been challenged by the intersectionality perspective (Crenshaw, 1991), which first emerged in the late 20th century in response to ethnicity/race-blind mainstream feminist theorizing. This perspective argues that individuals do not experience social identities (e.g., gender and ethnicity) separately; instead, they interact with each other, concurrently determining the form and extent of privilege/disadvantage the individual encounters (Acker, 2006; Cho et al., 2013). Therefore, studies focusing on single, seemingly homogeneous identities (e.g., gender) risk obscuring significant within-group variation between, for example, ethnic minority women and white majority women, given the unique forms and greater levels of oppression the former encounter arising from the double jeopardy of ethnicity and gender disadvantage (Browne & Misra, 2003; Collins, 2002). While early intersectionality theorizing took an “intra-categorical complexity” approach that focused largely on heterogeneity among women, this has been augmented in recent years by “inter-categorical complexity” theorizing, which highlights variation within and between all social groups of interest, for example not just between ethnic minority and white majority women, but also between ethnic minority women and both white majority and ethnic minority men, or between white majority men and ethnic minority men (McCay, 2005).

Therefore, drawing on unique data from the United Kingdom, we take an inter-categorical complexity approach to explore gender and gender-ethnicity intersectional variation in the implications of WFC, focusing specifically on the effect of FIW on guilt and job satisfaction. We first develop a baseline model regarding the relationship between FIW and job satisfaction through job-related guilt. We then conduct a novel analysis of whether this relationship varies by gender and the intersection of gender and ethnicity. This allows us to identify whether the previously established relationship between FIW and job satisfaction (typically from an identity-insensitive or a single-axis perspective based on gender, e.g., Amstad et al., 2011; Cloninger et al., 2015; Premeaux et al., 2007), and also the often speculated but rarely empirically demonstrated relationship between FIW and job-related guilt (e.g., Judge et al., 2006; Livingston & Judge, 2008), can be generalized beyond the white majority to other social groups, thus offering a step forward in understanding the gendered and intersectional nature of work–family dynamics. Although we acknowledge the importance of other social identity dimensions, our study focuses on gender and ethnicity given this corresponds with classic intersectionality studies that centered primarily on within-gender ethnic differences, and also given prior research from a single-axis perspective demonstrating variation in employment-related experiences along these dimensions (e.g., Kenny & Briner, 2007; Triana et al., 2021). Among the several ethnic minority groups represented in the United Kingdom, we focus on South Asians (people of Indian, Pakistani, and Bangladeshi ethnic origin) as they are the largest minority group, comprising approximately 5% of the UK labor market (Office for National Statistics, 2022). Our intersectional analysis therefore comprises four social groups—white British men (WBM), South Asian men (SAM), white British women (WBW), and South Asian women (SAW), residing in the United Kingdom.
In addressing these matters, we employ a daily diary (i.e., experience sampling) method (Fisher & To, 2012). This is important given the nature of guilt as a short-lived and momentary state means it is best studied using a research design that allows for measurement at the point of occurrence (i.e., the day-level) rather than retrospectively (Goote et al., 2009). Our method also accounts for the daily fluctuating nature of FIW and job satisfaction (Judge et al., 2006; Judge & Ilies, 2004).

Our study makes several novel contributions to the literature. First, by focusing on job-related guilt and its mediating effects on the relationship between FIW and job satisfaction, we contribute to nascent arguments in the literature that the current debates on work-family guilt, which concentrate predominantly on family-related guilt (e.g., “mummy” or “daddy” guilt) stemming from WIF, need to be broadened to also consider job-related guilt stemming from FIW (Aarnitzen et al., 2019; Livingston & Judge, 2008).

Second, by exploring the effects of multiple social identities (gender and ethnicity) on the implications of FIW, our study provides one of the few systematic intersectional analyses of the work-family interface in general (see also Ammons et al., 2017; Roehling et al., 2005), and the only intersectional analysis of the implications of FIW. We thus offer important new insights into the effects of WFC in today's increasingly diverse workforce (Özbilgin et al., 2011).

Third, we develop novel theorizing regarding inter-group differences in the experience of WFC. While previous research has relied overwhelmingly on gender role theory, which assumes stronger work role orientation among men and stronger family orientation among women, we argue from a workplace inequality perspective (Ollier-Malaterre & Fournel, 2017) that the structural disadvantage minority groups encounter in organizations also affects outcomes from WFC (Allen et al., 2000; Murphy et al., 2021). As such, our theorizing responds to calls for the development of more integrative theories of work-family dynamics (Powell et al., 2019; Shen & Shockley, 2021; Shockley et al., 2017).

2 | LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

2.1 | Daily FIW, guilt, and job satisfaction

For our baseline model, we first develop a hypothesis regarding the relationship between FIW, job-related guilt, and job satisfaction. We view guilt as “an agitation-based emotion or painful feeling of regret that is aroused when the actor actually causes, anticipates causing, or is associated with an aversive event” (Ferguson & Stegge, 1998, p. 20) resulting from the violation of either social expectations and personally valued goals (Baumester et al., 1994; Bernsden et al., 2004). Regarding social expectations, employees are typically expected by their organization to adhere to “ideal worker” norms, which prescribe that family demands should not interfere with work performance (Gambles et al., 2006). Regarding personally valued goals (which are often heavily influenced by social expectations; see, Lazarus, 1991), employees may consider their work to be important in attaining not just economic resources but also self-fulfillment and life meaningfulness (Rosso et al., 2010); hence, they will view performing their job to the best of their abilities as personally important. When an individual perceives their social expectations and/or personally valued goals to have been violated by their failure to fulfill daily work tasks due to family obligations (i.e., FIW), this is likely to trigger significant feelings of job-related guilt (Aarnitzen et al., 2019; Judge et al., 2006; Livingston & Judge, 2008).

In turn, job-related guilt, as a negative affective response, would be expected to reduce job satisfaction. This has traditionally been understood as a relatively stable job attitude determined mainly by an individual’s cognitive assessment or belief about specific features of their job (e.g., job tasks, autonomy, pay, relationships with coworkers or supervisors; Weiss, 2002). However, more recent studies suggest it also has affective components, determined by the individual’s immediate affective assessment of their general job situation (e.g., “I currently feel bad and negative about my job and therefore I feel less satisfied with it”, see: Fisher, 2000; Judge & Ilies, 2004). Hence, on days when individuals experience greater job-related guilt as an emotional outcome of the struggle or failure to satisfy work-related goals and expectations, they are likely to evaluate their job situation negatively, and thus experience reduced job satisfaction.

While the relationship between daily FIW and job-related guilt (Aarnitzen et al., 2019; Judge et al., 2006 & Livingston & Judge, 2008), and also the relationship between FIW and job satisfaction (Amstad et al., 2011; Premexau et al., 2007) has been demonstrated previously, we extend this previous research by exploring in our baseline model the role of job-related guilt in mediating the daily FIW-JOB satisfaction relationship.

Hypothesis (H1). The relationship between daily FIW and job satisfaction is mediated by job-related guilt, such that daily FIW is positively related to job-related guilt, which in turn is negatively related to job satisfaction.

2.2 | Social identities and the implications of FIW

As suggested earlier, the above relationship might not hold for all social groups equally. For example, regarding gender differences, gender role theory argues from a sociocultural perspective that men are traditionally expected to adopt a breadwinner role, and women a caregiver role (Eagly, 1987). These expectations are then internalized into individuals’ gender role orientations (Gutek et al., 1991; Livingston & Judge, 2008) through gender socialization processes and social sanctioning (Peck, 1977; Powell & Greenhaus, 2010), resulting in men viewing the job domain, and women the family domain, as particularly salient. FIW may thus invoke stronger job-related guilt among men than among women, as they will view it as violating their more salient job-related domain (Cinamon & Rich, 2002; Duxbury & Higgins, 1991). Also, the satisfaction women derive from fulfilling their more salient family domain may help buffer the perceived negative implications of FIW, further reducing their perceptions of job-related guilt (Bagger et al., 2008).
Gender role theory (Eagly, 1987) also suggests the relationship between FIW and job satisfaction through guilt will vary by gender-ethnicity intersectional group. In South Asian communities, gender roles have traditionally been strongly demarcated, with family orientation being particularly high (and work orientation particularly low) for SAW, given their primary caregiver role (Dale et al., 2002; Kamenou, 2008). Conversely, work orientation is generally considered to be particularly high (and family orientation particularly low) for SAM, given their primary breadwinner role and responsibility for extended family members' financial well-being (Wang, 2019; Zucotti, 2018). This in turn suggests the implications of FIW might be especially pronounced for SAM, but especially weak for SAW. By contrast, in white British communities, while imbalances in the household division of labor remain (Scott & Clery, 2013), traditional gender role orientations are arguably less pronounced than in South Asian communities (Dale & Ahmed, 2011; Khoudja & Platt, 2018). Hence, although WBW may continue to bear greater caregiving responsibilities than WBM, they may nevertheless have greater desire and latitude than SAW to focus on the work domain, and will therefore view this domain as more salient (Kan & Laurie, 2018). Thus, the implications of FIW for job satisfaction through guilt would be expected to be more pronounced for WBW (as well as WBM) than for SAW, as they may perceive it as a more serious contradiction of their personal goals and societal expectations.

However, there are reasons to question this traditional gender role orientation-based theorizing. Particularly debatable is whether the job domain continues to be less salient (and the family domain more salient) for women than for men. There is growing evidence that gender role identity is converging, with both men and women expressing less support for traditional gendered divisions of labor (Knight & Brinton, 2017; Taylor & Scott, 2018), and expressing increasingly egalitarian attitudes within which both work and family domains are viewed as important (Hochschild & Machung, 2012). Recent meta-analysis (Shockley et al., 2017) shows only weak differences in work orientation by gender, and no gender differences in family orientation, with men becoming more involved in family-based nurturing roles under newly defined notions of “manhood” (e.g., “involved fathering”); Gatrell et al., 2022; Scott & Clery, 2013). As such, if the work domain has become more important for women (and the family domain for men) than implied by gender role theory, both genders will see FIW as a significant violation of their valued goals; hence, the relationship between FIW and job satisfaction through job-related guilt may be no weaker for women than for men.

This may hold within British South Asian communities as well as white British communities. Within the former, although gender norms may remain generally more patriarchal, the social pressure on SAW to prioritize family obligations over work roles is easing (Li, 2018), with their identity no longer tied exclusively to family roles. Reflecting this, the number of British SAW attending university has grown rapidly in recent years (Bagguley & Hussain, 2016), in part attributable to their growing career ambitions (Bradley & Healy, 2008; Kamenou & Fearfull, 2006) as well as parental support for these ambitions (Khattab, 2018). There is also evidence that SAM are embracing more egalitarian gender role orientations. For example, Gill (2020) found that SAM are increasingly engaged in caregiving responsibilities, suggesting “caring masculinities” are becoming more central to their identity.

Given these changing social attitudes, the traditional gender role orientation prediction that the job domain is significantly less salient, and family roles significantly more salient, for women (SAW in particular) than for men (SAM in particular) may be increasingly debatable. This in turn questions whether the relationship between FIW and job satisfaction through job-related guilt will indeed be stronger for men (especially SAM) than women (especially SAW). However, the first step in exploring this matter is to assess whether, and how far, gender role orientations vary across social groups. The above arguments suggest variation may be limited at most, with egalitarian gender role orientations being apparent across both genders, and also across all gender-ethnicity intersectional groups. Therefore, we hypothesize:

Hypothesis (H2). Gender role orientation does not vary significantly between men and women (H2a), or between each of the gender-ethnicity intersectional groups (H2b), with all groups showing high levels of egalitarian gender role orientation.

Support for (H2) would imply that the relationship between FIW and job satisfaction through job-related guilt will be equivalent across gender and gender-ethnicity intersectional groups. However, rather than simply being equivalent, it is possible that the relationship will be stronger for women (especially SAW) than for men (especially WBM). Regarding this, gender role theory points to several sources of disadvantage concerning the perceptions and treatment of women within the workplace, with gender role stereotypes typically resulting in them being cast as a lower status group (Hull & Nelson, 2000). For instance, congruent with perceptions of women as primary caregivers, they are often labeled as overly emotional and passive. In contrast to the ambitious, independent, and agentic characteristics associated with the masculine image of the ideal worker (Heilman, 2001). Hence, they are stereotyped as less valuable employees than men, and less suited to more senior organizational roles (Schein, 2001). Such stereotyping might persist despite recent increases in gender-role egalitarianism at the individual level (as argued above) given ongoing homosociality and in-group favoritism within organizations, reflected in the frequent exclusion of women (especially SAW) from informal but powerful social networks by virtue of the “old boys” club (Bushell et al., 2020; Ibarra, 1993), which in turn results in the continued protection of coveted positions traditionally occupied by (white) male organizational members (Phillips et al., 2022). Where this leads to a lack of gender diversity at senior organizational levels, this may further signal (erroneously) that women lack career ambition and are less work-oriented than men, thereby perpetuating negative gender stereotypes and underpinning women's lower social status at work.

This in turn gives rise to a “workplace inequality perspective” concerning the implications of FIW for gender and gender-ethnicity intersected groups. Double standards theory (Auspurg et al., 2017; Foschi, 2000) argues that given their lower social status, women are
usually viewed as less competent than men (the high-status group), even if their objective competence is no different. Therefore, to prove their organizational credibility and value, they are required to work harder and longer, and deliver better work performance, than their male colleagues (Pinnington & Sandberg, 2013; Walsh, 2012). As such, where women experience FIW, they may view this as a particularly significant threat to their ability to meet the (higher) performance standards expected of them, and will thereby experience considerable job-related guilt and subsequently lower job satisfaction in response to it. By contrast, as the high-status group, men may not have to demonstrate such high performance standards to prove their organizational value. Accordingly, even if FIW prevents them from fulfilling their job responsibilities, this will impact less on their perceptions of how far they have violated organizational performance expectations, or on whether others view them as having done so. Thus, their feelings of job-related guilt will be less pronounced, and their job satisfaction will be impacted less severely.

However, while prior research (Cloninger et al., 2015; Yoo, 2022) shows a stronger relationship between FIW and job satisfaction among women than men, studies have not explored gender variation in the relationship between daily FIW and job-related guilt, or the indirect relationship between daily FIW and job satisfaction through job-related guilt. In addressing this matter, we hypothesize:

**Hypothesis (H3).** The relationship between daily FIW and job-related guilt, and also the indirect relationship between daily FIW and job satisfaction through job-related guilt, is stronger for women than for men.

These dynamics might be even more pronounced for SAW. Intersectional studies suggest that as layers of minority identity are added, workplace inequalities worsen, with multi-disadvantaged groups facing multiple jeopardy effects (e.g., Berdahl & Moore, 2006; Derous et al., 2012; Woodhams et al., 2015). SAW are therefore likely to encounter negative gender stereotypes beyond those attached to WBW, such as being too obedient, family-oriented, dependent on others, and lacking career ambition (Anitha et al., 2012; Frevert et al., 2015). Also, given the dual effects of gender- and ethnicity-based homophily, SAW may face greater exclusion from both formal and informal networks and mentoring opportunities (Kamenou & Fearfull, 2006), further casting them as a particularly low status group within the workplace.

This in turn might have significant implications for their emotional reactions to FIW. Double standards theory (Auspurg et al., 2017; Foschi, 2000) suggests that SAW, as a particularly low status group, may be required to meet performance standards to demonstrate their organizational credibility and value that are higher than not only those of their male (SAM and WBW) colleagues, but also their WBW colleagues (Holvin, 2010; Kenny & Briner, 2010). Consequently, where they experience FIW, they may view this as seriously compromising their ability to meet these performance standards. Thus, the relationship between FIW and job satisfaction through job-related guilt may be stronger for SAW than not only for men (both WBW and SAM) but also for WBW, for whom the required performance expectations will be relatively lower. Therefore, we hypothesize:

**Hypothesis (H4).** The relationship between daily FIW and job-related guilt, and also the indirect relationship between daily FIW and job satisfaction through job-related guilt, is stronger for SAW than for the other gender-ethnicity intersectional groups.

Reflecting the aforementioned “inter-categorical complexity” approach to intersectionality theorizing, the workplace inequality perspective also posits differences in responses to FIW between SAM and WBW. Given lasting negative colonial stereotypes (Banerjee, 2012; Chopra et al., 2004), SAM are often treated as a lower status group than WBW within the workplace, reflected in negative stereotyping and exclusion from networking, mentoring or training opportunities (Phills et al., 2018; Tomlinson et al., 2013). Consistent with double standards theory (Foschi, 2000), this suggests SAM will have to meet higher performance standards than WBW to prove their organizational credibility and value (Wyatt & Silvester, 2015). Hence, SAM may view FIW as a greater violation of the performance standards required of them than will WBW and thus experience stronger job-related guilt and lower job satisfaction in response to it.

However, the workplace inequality perspective suggests that the implications of FIW for job-related guilt and job satisfaction might be no different for SAM than for WBW. Both groups are likely to experience (dis)advantage along a single dimension, with SAM experiencing ethnicity disadvantage but benefitting from sharing the dominant group’s gender, and WBW experiencing gender disadvantage but benefitting from sharing the dominant group’s ethnicity (Holvin, 2010). Given their partly privileged and partly disadvantaged status, SAM and WBW may have to meet similar performance levels to prove their organizational credibility and value (Foschi, 2000), and therefore FIW will have similar implications concerning how far they perceive it as violating required performance standards. This will result in similar responses from SAM and WBW regarding job-related guilt and job satisfaction. Therefore, we hypothesize:

**Hypothesis (H5).** The relationship between daily FIW and job-related guilt, and also the indirect relationship between daily FIW and job satisfaction through job-related guilt, is stronger for SAM than WBW.

**Hypothesis (H6).** There is no difference in the strength of either the relationship between daily FIW and job-related guilt, or the indirect relationship between daily FIW and job satisfaction through job-related guilt, for SAM and WBW.

3 | METHODS

3.1 | Participants and procedures

To test the hypotheses, we employed a daily diary method, involving surveys of solicitors in the private sector in the Greater London area...
of the United Kingdom in 2016–2017. The study was designed purposely to test the paper’s hypotheses rather than drawing on a dataset originally collected for a different purpose. There are three reasons why solicitors were chosen as the study population. First, the legal profession is characterized by strong “ideal worker” norms, which dictate that work should be prioritized and unencumbered by nonwork (e.g., family) responsibilities (Pringle et al., 2017). Thus, solicitors are likely to view FIW as a direct contravention of these norms and, as a result, be sensitive to it (Ackroyd & Muzlo, 2007). Second, the gendered and racialized structure of law firms (Hull & Nelson, 2000; Kay & Gorman, 2008; Tomlinson et al., 2013) provides an appropriate setting in which to examine how gender- and ethnicity-based disadvantage influences work–family dynamics. Third, the legal profession provides a controlled setting regarding solicitors’ educational level, its organizational systems, and the nature of the job (Mahbutra et al., 2010). This relative homogeneity facilitates an examination of gender and the gender-ethnicity intersection while holding other potentially confounding factors constant.

Participants were recruited through personal networks and snowball sampling. We also contacted solicitors listed in the member directory on the Law Society website (the professional body of the legal profession in England and Wales) directly by email. Once potential participants signed the research consent form, they received a background information survey, which included questions regarding their gender role orientation, job, family, and the time they usually finish work. One week after completion of this survey, daily diary surveys were distributed for five consecutive working days, each containing questions regarding levels of FIW, job-related guilt, and job satisfaction. Across the 5 days, daily surveys were sent two hours before the end of each participant’s working day, and the participants were instructed to complete them as close to the end of their working day as possible. The study was reviewed by the ethics committee at the authors’ university and was judged to be in accordance with ethical and legal guidelines, and thus exempt from further review.

Initially, 297 participants agreed to participate in the research and received the background information survey, of whom 273 responded. However, 28 participants were excluded from the sample as they did not satisfy the participant criteria (i.e., private sector solicitors of South Asian or white British ethnic origin in the Greater London area). Prior to the distribution of the daily surveys, eight participants informed the researchers that they were unable to continue their participation for family- and/or job-related reasons. The remaining 237 participants were sent daily diary surveys across five working days. Of these, seven did not respond despite reminders. Data points from 20 participants were also removed as they completed fewer than 3 days’ worth of the daily surveys, and thus provided insufficient data to assess variation across the observation days. This resulted in a final sample of 949 daily surveys collected from 210 participants (69 SAW, 62 WBW, 31 SAM, and 48 WBM).

The participants in the final sample completed on average 4.5 daily surveys out of five. Their practice areas varied from commercial and banking to wills and charity law/philanthropy. 23% of participants (49 participants) were at partner level. Around 16% (33 participants) worked part-time, all of whom were women (either of South Asian or white British origins) except for one WBM. 170 participants (81%) were married or in a long-term and cohabiting relationship, and more than half (106 participants) had children, among whom 64% (68 participants) had more than one child, and 59% (63 participants) had a child under the age of 5 years. In addition, 23 participants reported having caring responsibilities for disabled or elderly relatives.

3.2 | Measures

3.2.1 | Daily FIW

To assess daily FIW, we drew on the five-item scale developed by Netemeyer et al. (1996), reformatted to suit the assessment of daily experiences. For example, “I have to put off doing things at work because of demands on my time at home” was reformatted as “Today, I had to put off doing things at work because of demands on my time at home.” Participants were asked to indicate their agreement/disagreement with each item using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The average Cronbach’s alpha across days was 0.93. 58% of WBM (28 participants), 66% of WBW (41 participants), 71% of SAM (22 participants), and 75% of SAW (52 participants) reported 4 or above on at least one of the five FIW items. This suggests FIW was deeply ingrained in our study participants’ daily lives and therefore confirms the suitability of solicitors as a sample on which to explore the implications of FIW.

3.2.2 | Daily job-related guilt

Job-related guilt was measured using the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule—Expanded Form (Watson & Clark, 1999). To reduce the time burden on participants, we shortened the original six-item scale into a four-item scale. The two items removed were “ashamed” and “disgusted with self,” as shame and guilt are conceptually distinct (Tangney, 1999), and disgust with self is likely to be of limited relevance to daily FIW. The four remaining items were “guilty,” “blameworthy,” “angry at self” and “dissatisfied with self.” Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they experienced each of these feelings toward their job during the day using a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 (very slightly or not at all) to 5 (very strongly). The average Cronbach’s alpha across days was 0.91.

3.2.3 | Daily job satisfaction

To assess daily job satisfaction, we adapted Cammann et al.’s (1979) three-item scale (e.g., “All in all, I am satisfied with my job”) became “Today, I was satisfied with my job”). The other items were: “Today, I liked working here”; and “Today, I did not like my job” (reverse coded), measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly
isfaction through job-related guilt (H4)–(H6), we constructed four dummy variables for each gender-ethnicity intersectional group, with WBM set as the reference group. Dummies were coded “1” if the individual is a member of the group, or “0” otherwise.

3.2.6 | Control variables

Control variables at the between-individual level were included in testing (H1) and (H3)–(H6) as follows. First, a dummy variable was included for whether the respondent held partnership status (1 = partner; 0 = otherwise). As partners have already established their professional status and reputation, they may face fewer performance expectations to prove their competence and value than more junior solicitors, and hence experience less guilt in response to FIW. Second, controls were included for hours worked per week (continuous variable), number of children (continuous variable), hours spent on caring for elderly or disabled family members per week (continuous variable), and marital status (1 = married or in a long-term and cohabiting relationship; 0 = otherwise). These controls were included to hold constant the confounding effects of work and family demands, given these are likely to increase FIW (Boyar et al., 2008; Kossek et al., 2001) and reduce job satisfaction (Lee et al., 2001; Stack & Eshleman, 1998). Although we report the models below with controls, the results did not differ when run without controls.

3.3 | Analysis procedure

Given the multilevel structure of the data, in which days were nested within individuals, multilevel modeling was undertaken to analyze (H1) and (H3)–(H6), utilizing Mplus 8 (Muthén & Muthén, 2017). The intraclass correlation coefficients in null models for day-level variables were: 0.359 for FIW, 0.546 for job-related guilt, and 0.502 for job satisfaction. This indicates that daily variance explains a substantial proportion of the total variance of each daily variable (between 45 and 64%). As a preliminary analysis, we conducted a multilevel confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to establish the construct validity of the day-level variables. Measurement invariance was also tested between the four intersectional groups to determine whether they interpreted and rated the measures equivalently (Vandenberg & Lance, 2000).

To test (H1) and (H3)–(H6), we used multilevel structural equation modeling (MSEM) techniques with latent variables. These techniques have the benefit of enabling simultaneous tests of multilevel models. They also automatically partition all Level-1 (i.e., day-level) variables into latent within- and between-level components with no centering of observed variables required, thus producing unconfounded and unbiased estimates (Preacher et al., 2010). In estimating the MSEM models, we used Bayesian estimation (iterations up to 200,000; medians as point estimators) due to its unique strengths relative to maximum-likelihood (ML) estimation (Muthén, 2010; Zyphur & Oswald, 2015). Specifically, it accommodates non-normally distributed data more effectively, which is important in mediation analysis given the distribution of mediation effects is often non-normal (Yuan & MacKinnon, 2009). Furthermore, Wang and Preacher (2015) show that, in testing conditional indirect effects, Bayesian methods produce unbiased estimates with higher power than traditional ML methods.

Since our research model involves both mediation and conditional indirect effects, the Bayesian approach offers a superior estimation method.

In all MSEM models, we set informative priors on the slopes of the relationships between FIW and job guilt (path aw) and between FIW and job satisfaction (path cw), taken from Judge et al. (2006). For slope aw, the prior has a mean of 0.23 and a variance of 0.014, while for slope cw, the prior has a mean of −0.05 and a variance of 0.004. The prior variances were set four times larger than those found in Judge et al. (2006) to allow for potential differences between the studies (Muthén, 2010). To test the effects of gender (H3) and the intersection of gender and ethnicity (H4)–(H6) on the mediated relationship between daily FIW and job satisfaction through job-related guilt, we included dummy variables for the demographic categories in our model—gender for (H3), and SAW, SAM, and WBW for (H4)–(H6)—and interacted them with FIW as cross-level moderators. The significance of the interaction term coefficients thus shows whether the impact of FIW on job-related guilt for the group of interest is...
TABLE 1 Descriptive statistics of the study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-0.54**</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.29**</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAW</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-0.29**</td>
<td>-0.58**</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.18**</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAM</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.37**</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.23**</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBW</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.16*</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRO</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.16*</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.15**</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work hours</td>
<td>45.68</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>-0.18**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.26**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability/elderly care</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily FiW</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily job guilt</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily job satisfaction</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SAW = South Asian women, SAM = South Asian men, WBW = White British women, WBM = White British men, GRO = Gender role orientation. Married = being married or in a long-term and cohabiting relationship. Disability/elderly care = hours spent on caring for disabled/elderly relatives per week. Between-individual correlations are shown above the diagonal and within-individual (i.e., day-level) correlations are shown below the diagonal. For between-individual correlations, within-individual variables were averaged across the 5 days. Between-individual n = 210, within-individual n = 949. *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01.
larger or smaller than for the reference group (men for the gender analysis and WBM for the intersectional analysis).

(H2) (social group differences in gender role orientation) was tested in a separate model, using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). In testing gender differences (H2a), the assumption of homogeneity of variance was met, and therefore F-test was utilized, while Welch’s F-test was administered for the test of intersectional differences (H2b) since the assumption was violated with Levene’s test being significant (F(3206) = 7.479, p = 0.000).

4 | RESULTS

Table 1 displays the descriptive statistics and correlations of the study variables.

4.1 | Preliminary analyses

4.1.1 | Multilevel CFA

The fit indices for the suggested three-factor model comprising daily FIW, job guilt, and job satisfaction in a multilevel CFA were $\chi^2$ (103) = 366.644, $p = 0.000$, CFI = 0.948, RMSEA = 0.052. All standardized factor loadings were statistically significant. When this model was compared with alternative lower factor models (i.e., one or two factor models), it had a consistently better fit (from $\Delta\chi^2 = 711.634$, $\Delta df = 3$, $p = 0.000$ to $\Delta\chi^2 = 1627.720$, $\Delta df = 5$, $p < 0.001$, all MLR corrected; CFI = 0.629–0.809; RMSEA = 0.098–0.136). This demonstrates our main study variables are sufficiently distinct from each other.

4.1.2 | Measurement invariance test

Two sets of measurement invariance tests were conducted across SAW, SAM, WBB, and WBM (Kim et al., 2017): configural invariance, in which the same factor structure is present across the groups; and metric invariance, in which the same factor loadings are present across the groups. The configural invariance results showed adequate fit indices, indicating that the factor structures of the day-level study variables are consistent across the four social groups: $\chi^2$ (204) = 550.436, $p = 0.000$, CFI = 0.935, RMSEA = 0.085. The results for metric invariance were: $\chi^2$ (231) = 592.332, $p = 0.000$, CFI = 0.932, RMSEA = 0.081. CFI differences ($\Delta$CFI) between the configural and metric invariance models were 0.003, which is considerably lower than the threshold of 0.01 suggested by Cheung and Rensvold (2002). Therefore, metric invariance was also confirmed.

4.2 | Main analysis

In testing (H1) and (H3)–(H6), model estimation was conducted by determining whether the credibility interval (CI)—the Bayesian counterpart to a confidence interval in ML—for the parameter of interest included zero or otherwise (Zyphur & Oswald, 2015). We used the criterion of a 90% CI, as advocated by Preacher et al. (2010).

(H1) predicts that the relationship between daily FIW and job satisfaction is mediated by job-related guilt, such that daily FIW is positively related to job-related guilt, which in turn is negatively related to job satisfaction. To test this hypothesis, we specified all the day-level effects as random slopes and allowed them to covary (Preacher et al., 2010). We then examined whether the product of the path $aw$ (i.e., the relationship between daily FIW and job-related guilt) and the path $bw$ (i.e., the relationship between daily job-related guilt and job satisfaction), plus the covariance between $aw$ and $bw$, was significantly different from zero (Bauer et al., 2006). The results, reported in Table 2, show that daily FIW was positively associated with job-related guilt ($\beta = 0.505$, posterior SD = 0.066, $p = 0.000$, 90% CI [0.396, 0.614]). Further, job-related guilt was negatively associated with job satisfaction ($\beta = -0.401$, posterior SD = 0.078, $p = 0.000$, 90% CI [-0.534, -0.278]). The estimate for the indirect effect of daily FIW on job satisfaction through job-related guilt was also significant ($\beta = -0.212$, posterior SD = 0.060, $p = 0.000$, 90% CI [-0.309, -0.113]). (H1) was therefore supported.

(H2) predicts that gender role orientation does not vary significantly between men and women (H2a), and between each of the gender-ethnicity intersectional groups (H2b), with all groups showing high levels of egalitarian gender role orientation. Supporting (H2a),
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**TABLE 2** Mediation effect of job-related guilt on the relationship between daily FIW and job satisfaction (H1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect type</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$p$-Value</th>
<th>90% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Path $aw$: Daily FIW</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>[0.396, 0.614]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Daily job-related guilt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path $bw$: Daily job-related guilt</td>
<td>-0.401</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>[-0.534, -0.278]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Daily job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path $cw$: Daily FIW</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>[-0.143, 0.016]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Daily job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effect</td>
<td>-0.212</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>[-0.309, -0.113]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Estimates are unstandardized coefficients. SD = standard deviation of the posterior distribution in lieu of standard errors. CI = credibility intervals in lieu of confidence interval. Values in bold type show where the 90% CI excludes zero. Controls include partnership status, hours worked per week, number of children, marital status, and hours spent on caring for elderly or disabled family members per week. Between-individual $n = 210$, within-individual $n = 949$. 
ANOVA results showed that gender role orientation did not vary between genders, with both men ($M = 4.428, SD = 0.654$) and women ($M = 4.411, SD = 0.732$) showing highly egalitarian gender role orientations ($F[1, 208] = 0.029, p = 0.864$). Also supporting (H2b), a Welch's F-test revealed no significant differences between the intersectional groups (Welch's $F[3, 93.115] = 2.524, p = 0.062$), with all four groups reporting high levels of egalitarian gender role orientation ($M = 4.558, SD = 0.456$ for WBM; $M = 4.532, SD = 0.486$ for WBW; $M = 4.226, SD = 0.847$ for SAM; $M = 4.301, SD = 0.888$ for SAW). Therefore, (H2) was fully supported.

(H3) predicts that the relationship between daily FIW and job-related guilt, and also the indirect relationship between daily FIW and job satisfaction through job-related guilt, is stronger for women than men. We first examined the interaction effect of daily FIW and gender on job-related guilt. As Table 3 shows, the interaction term was positive and significant ($β = 0.428$, posterior SD = 0.133, $p = 0.000$, $90\%$ CI [0.212, 0.648]), suggesting that women are more prone to job-related guilt as a result of daily FIW than men. A simple slope analysis also confirmed this: the slope for women was 0.756 (posterior SD = 0.107, $p = 0.000$, $90\%$ CI [0.583, 0.933]), while the slope for men was 0.328 (posterior SD = 0.085, $p = 0.000$, $90\%$ CI [0.188, 0.469]). Regarding whether the strength of the indirect relationship between daily FIW and job satisfaction through job-related guilt varies by gender, the relationship was significant both for women (conditional indirect effect = 0.287, posterior SD = 0.072, $p = 0.000$, $90\%$ CI [−0.407, −0.171]), and for men (conditional indirect effect = −0.119, posterior SD = 0.062, $p = 0.024$, $90\%$ CI [−0.219, −0.018]). However, the CI for the difference in the effects did not contain zero (difference = −0.166, posterior SD = 0.060, $p = 0.000$, $90\%$ CI [−0.267, −0.073]), suggesting the indirect effect of daily FIW on job satisfaction through job-related guilt is stronger for women than men. (H3) was therefore supported.

(H4) predicts that the relationship between daily FIW and job-related guilt, and also the indirect relationship between daily FIW and job satisfaction through job-related guilt, is stronger for SAW than for the other gender-ethnicity intersectional groups. To evaluate this, we first computed a slope of the daily FIW-guilt relationship for each group and then examined slope differences between each pair of groups to identify whether the CI included zero (Table 4). The relationship for SAW (effect = 0.939, posterior SD = 0.146, $p = 0.000,$

### TABLE 3 Cross-level moderating effect of gender (H3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect of daily FIW on daily job-related guilt</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>90% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among women</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>[0.583, 0.933]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among men</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>[0.188, 0.469]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (gender × daily FIW)</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>[0.212, 0.648]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Estimates are unstandardized coefficients. Gender: 1 = women; 0 = men. CI = credibility intervals in lieu of confidence interval. Values in bold type show where the 90% CI excludes zero. Controls include partnership status, hours worked per week, number of children, marital status, and hours spent on caring for elderly or disabled family members per week. Between-individual $n = 210$, within-individual $n = 949$.

### TABLE 4 Intersectional effect of gender and ethnicity (H4–H6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects among each demographic group</th>
<th>Effect of daily FIW on daily job-related guilt</th>
<th>90% CI</th>
<th>Conditional indirect effect of daily FIW on daily job satisfaction through daily job-related guilt</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>90% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) SAW</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>[0.703, 1.181]</td>
<td>−0.363</td>
<td>−0.508</td>
<td>[−0.220]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) SAM</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>[0.345, 0.967]</td>
<td>−0.252</td>
<td>−0.413</td>
<td>[−0.102]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) WBW</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>[0.341, 0.812]</td>
<td>−0.222</td>
<td>−0.350</td>
<td>[−0.104]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) WBM</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>[0.089, 0.401]</td>
<td>−0.093</td>
<td>−0.194</td>
<td>[0.008]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between demographic groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) and (2)</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>[−0.088, 0.653]</td>
<td>−0.109</td>
<td>−0.263</td>
<td>[0.040]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) and (3)</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>[0.042, 0.674]</td>
<td>−0.138</td>
<td>−0.273</td>
<td>[−0.099]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) and (4)</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>[0.414, 0.971]</td>
<td>−0.268</td>
<td>−0.406</td>
<td>[−0.141]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) and (3)</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>[−0.287, 0.467]</td>
<td>−0.029</td>
<td>−0.180</td>
<td>[0.119]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) and (4)</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>[0.066, 0.756]</td>
<td>−0.158</td>
<td>−0.302</td>
<td>[−0.023]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) and (4)</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>[0.051, 0.611]</td>
<td>−0.128</td>
<td>−0.245</td>
<td>[−0.016]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Estimates are unstandardized coefficients. SAW = South Asian women. SAM = South Asian men. WBW = White British women. WBM = White British men. SAW, SAM, and WBW included as dummy variables with WBM as the reference group. CI = credibility intervals in lieu of confidence interval. Values in bold type show where the 90% CI excludes zero. Controls include partnership status, hours worked per week, number of children, marital status, and hours spent on caring for elderly or disabled family members per week. Between-individual $n = 210$, within-individual $n = 949$. "Temperature of use; "OAI articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License."
90% CI [0.703, 1.181]) was stronger than for WBW (effect = 0.579, posterior SD = 0.143, p = 0.000, 90% CI [0.341, 0.812]; difference = 0.360, posterior SD = 0.193, p = 0.028, 90% CI [0.042, 0.674]) and WBM (effect = 0.245, posterior SD = 0.095, p = 0.005, 90% CI [0.089, 0.401]; difference = 0.695, posterior SD = 0.170, p = 0.000, 90% CI [0.414, 0.971]). However, the strength of the relationship for SAM and SAM (effect = 0.657, posterior SD = 0.189, p = 0.000, 90% CI [0.345, 0.967]) did not differ (difference = 0.282, posterior SD = 0.226, p = 0.103, 90% CI [−0.088, 0.653]).

Regarding the conditional indirect effect of daily FIW on job satisfaction through job-related guilt, this was stronger for SAM than for WBW (conditional indirect effect = −0.363, posterior SD = 0.088, p = 0.000, 90% CI [−0.508, −0.220]) than for both WBW (conditional indirect effect = −0.222, posterior SD = 0.075, p = 0.001, 90% CI [−0.350, −0.104]) and WBM (conditional indirect effect = −0.093, posterior SD = 0.062, p = 0.063, 90% CI [−0.194, 0.008]), with the CIs for the effect differences excluding zero (difference between SAW and WBW = −0.138, posterior SD = 0.082, p = 0.028, 90% CI [−0.273, −0.009]; difference between SAW and WBM = −0.268, posterior SD = 0.082, p = 0.000, 90% CI [−0.406, −0.141]). However, no significant difference in the conditional indirect effect was found between SAW and SAM (conditional indirect effect = −0.052, posterior SD = 0.096, p = 0.003, 90% CI [−0.413, −0.102]; difference between SAW and SAM = −0.099, posterior SD = 0.093, p = 0.103, 90% CI [−0.263, 0.040]). Therefore, (H4) was partially supported.

(H5) predicts that the relationship between daily FIW and job-related guilt, and the indirect effect of daily FIW on job satisfaction through job-related guilt, is stronger for SAM than WBW. The results show that the daily FIW-guilt relationship was indeed stronger among SAM than WBW (difference = 0.412, posterior SD = 0.210, p = 0.023, 90% CI [0.066, 0.756]). Similarly, the conditional indirect effect of daily FIW on job satisfaction through job-related guilt was significantly stronger among SAM than WBW (difference = −0.158, posterior SD = 0.086, p = 0.023, 90% CI [−0.302, −0.023]). (H5) was therefore supported.

(H6) predicts that there is no difference in the strength of either the relationship between daily FIW and job-related guilt, or the indirect relationship between daily FIW and job satisfaction through job-related guilt, for SAM and WBW. Neither the daily FIW-guilt slopes nor the conditional indirect effects of daily FIW varied significantly between SAM and WBW (difference in slopes = 0.077, posterior SD = 0.230, p = 0.368, 90% CI [−0.287, 0.467]; difference in conditional indirect effects = −0.029, posterior SD = 0.092, p = 0.368, 90% CI [−0.180, 0.119]). (H6) was therefore supported.

5 | DISCUSSION

Drawing on the intersectionality perspective (Crenshaw, 1991), this study explored variation in the impact of FIW on job satisfaction through job-related guilt by gender and gender-ethnicity intersectional groups.

Supporting prior studies (Aarntzen et al., 2019; Judge et al., 2006; Livingston & Judge, 2008), we found a significant relationship between FIW and job-related guilt. We extended this research by demonstrating that job-related guilt mediates the relationship between FIW and job satisfaction. We then showed, largely in line with our hypotheses, that these relationships are moderated by both gender and the intersection of gender and ethnicity, with the relationships being stronger for women than for men, and stronger for SAW than for WBW and WBM. The relationships were also stronger for SAM than for WBW but no different between SAM and WBM (also as predicted).

However, a notable (and unexpected) finding is that we did not find support for our hypothesis that the relationship between daily FIW and job-related guilt, and also the indirect relationship between daily FIW and job satisfaction through job-related guilt, would be stronger for SAW than SAM, with the relationships being equally strong for both groups. One possible explanation for this is the ethnically imbalanced nature of hierarchies within the UK legal profession, which may result in ethnicity being a particularly salient identity marker. Reflecting this, while around 35% of white European solicitors attain partnership positions, only 25% of South Asian solicitors do so, and in the top 50 UK law firms, white European solicitors are almost twice as likely as ethnic minority solicitors to attain partnerships (Hinde et al., 2020; The Law Society, 2020). This indicates that ethnic minority solicitors in general may encounter high levels of workplace disadvantage, regardless of their other demographic identities (e.g., gender). Thus, even though SAW may experience multiple jeopardy effects due to their double minority identities (Woodhams et al., 2015), their experience of workplace inequality might not be significantly different from that of SAM. This concurs with previous research showing that in multiple identity situations, certain identities can act as significant identity markers that exert a greater influence than others (Hall et al., 2019; Kulik et al., 2007).

Overall, our study makes three important contributions to the work–family literature. The first is its development and testing of discrete emotion-centered models of FIW focusing on job-related guilt. As discussed earlier, guilt is considered one of the most prevalent and significant emotional outcomes of WFC (Aarntzen et al., 2019; Shockley et al., 2022), yet much of the prior research has focused on family-related guilt resulting from WIF (e.g., Korabik, 2015; Zhang et al., 2019) rather than job-related guilt stemming from FIW. This is despite mounting evidence, especially during the Covid-19 pandemic, of increasing job-related guilt due to frequent interruptions from domestic responsibilities (Leroy et al., 2021; Tayal & Mehta, 2022). Given this, our analysis adds to the nascent research (Aarntzen et al., 2019; Judge et al., 2006; Livingston & Judge, 2008) showing that job-related guilt is a notable outcome of WFC that is deserving of greater attention in analyses of inter-role conflict. Our finding that job-related guilt mediates the relationship between FIW and job satisfaction underlines this argument.

Second, our study advances empirical understanding of identity-sensitive and intersectionality-based explanations of the work–family interface (Frevert et al., 2015; Özbilgin et al., 2011). As outlined
earlier, while some prior studies have explored gender variation in the relationship between WIF and family-related guilt (Aamtzen et al., 2023; Borelli et al., 2017), gender variation in the relationship between FIW and job-related guilt has not been examined. Our finding that FIW has more severe implications for job-related guilt (and job satisfaction through guilt) for women than for men thus offers an important and novel contribution to the WFC literature. Also, few prior studies have examined intersectional variation in WFC dynamics (e.g., Ammons et al., 2017; Roehling et al., 2005), and none have explored intersectional variation in the implications of FIW; hence our analysis of this matter might be considered particularly novel. Notwithstanding the possibility (as discussed above) that ethnicity might be an especially salient identity marker in the legal profession for both genders, the differences we identify—especially by ethnicity within each gender category (i.e., SAW vs. WBW; SAM vs. WBM)—support the central intersectionality argument that single-axis perspectives exploring individual social identities such as gender (e.g., Powell & Greenhaus, 2010; Shockley et al., 2017) potentially mask significant variation within seemingly homogenous social groups (Collins, 2002; Crenshaw, 1991). Our study thus highlights the need for more nuanced studies of the work–family interface that account for individuals’ multiple social identities (Frevert et al., 2015; Özbilgin et al., 2011).

Third, our analysis offers several important observations on the competing theoretical positions regarding the implications of FIW for different social groups. Particularly notable is that our results contradict traditional gender role orientation arguments that given their weaker work orientation (Gutek et al., 1991; Pleck, 1977), the indirect effects of FIW on job satisfaction through job-related guilt will be weaker for women (SAW in particular) than for men. Instead, consistent with evidence regarding changing gender roles in British society (Li, 2018; Taylor & Scott, 2018), we find that work role orientation does not vary significantly between gender and gender-ethnicity intersectional groups, and that the relationship between FIW and job satisfaction through guilt is stronger (not weaker) for women (SAW in particular) than for men (WBM in particular). Our findings therefore accord with the workplace inequality perspective that WFC poses greater challenges to minority than majority employees (Allen et al., 2000). This in turn supports Grünberg and Matei’s (2020, p. 305) argument that work–family theorizing should “depart from a traditional understanding of gender roles” (which Shockley et al., 2017, p. 1614 also describe as a “false assumption”), and become “more firmly anchored in the new gendered realities of the 21st century.” Integrating workplace inequality arguments into theorizing on the work–family interface may thus be significantly more important than hitherto recognized (Ollier-Malaterre & Foucreault, 2017).

Nonetheless, our findings do not deny the likely continued importance of the gender role orientation perspective in theorizing on the work–family interface more widely (Hochschild & Machung, 2012). Gendered social expectations are deeply rooted in many national contexts (Knight & Brinton, 2017; Scarborough et al., 2019); hence, gender role orientations consistent with gender role theory are likely to be more prevalent in some countries than others. Also, gender role orientations (and hence the relevance of gender role theory) might vary by occupation. In our study context (the legal profession), individuals need to undergo a very demanding training period, which requires significant investments in time, effort, and financial resources. Thus, they will only consider entering the profession if the work domain is highly salient to their identity. Subsequent socialization and professional training is likely to strengthen their work identities further (Pratt et al., 2006). Therefore, the lack of evidence of traditional gender role orientations, and of high (and equivalent) work orientation across all the gender-ethnicity intersectional groups, is perhaps to be expected. However, in other less professionalized contexts, patterns of work orientation might be more consistent with traditional gender role theory, with women (especially SAW) displaying lower work orientation than men, and the relationship between FIW and guilt among women (SAW in particular) being weaker than found in our study. Indeed, as Livingston and Judge (2008) show, women possessing more traditional gender role orientations are less likely to experience guilt in response to FIW than women with more egalitarian orientations (see also Bagger et al., 2008).

Nevertheless, in societies where gender role attitudes are changing (as in Britain) or in highly professionalized contexts (as in the legal profession), our analysis suggests it should not be assumed that work orientation remains lower for women (especially SAW) than for men. Instead, theorization of the work–family interface needs to recognize that in certain contexts, both genders may have an equal desire to commit to work and family domains, and in such contexts their work–family dynamics may be significantly influenced by the workplace inequality they encounter. Our nascent theorization from the workplace inequality perspective provides a basis on which future analysis of the implications of WFC for different social groups might draw.

5.1 Practical implications

Our study has several practical implications for employers. First, it highlights the importance that diversity training reflects the workplace inequality perspective (rather than the gender role orientation perspective) in considering the implications of FIW. This might involve countering the gender role stereotype that women’s (SAW in particular) work orientation is inherently lower than that of men, especially in professionalized work contexts. It might also involve countering assumptions that the implications of FIW will be less pronounced for women (especially SAW), and instead may be significantly more pronounced. Diversity training should also emphasize that while the implications of FIW may be generally more severe for women than for men, this is not an issue for women alone, given our findings suggesting it also has implications for men (SAM in particular).

Second, our findings point to the importance of enacting organizational efforts to tackle the stereotyping and homophily/in-group favoritism that cast women and ethnic minorities as lower status groups, given the potential for this to explain their more negative experiences of FIW. Such efforts might include leadership programs...
to aid the progression of women and ethnic minorities into senior management roles, thus challenging perceptions that they are less suited to leadership positions or are less career-oriented than men (Ely et al., 2011). Also imperative might be diversity training that seeks to address stereotyping and prejudice, while also developing diversity-friendly behavioral skills (Bezrukova et al., 2016; Devine & Ash, 2022). Organizations might also highlight the importance of such measures in helping hire and retain diverse employees, especially in a context of labor market shortages (Piszczek, 2020; Wayne & Casper, 2012). If these measures help raise the status of women and ethnic minority employees within the organization, this in turn might reduce the disproportionate performance pressure within the organization, thus facilitating the process of job-related guilt when FIW occurs.

Third, provision of family-friendly practices in many British workplaces is extremely limited (Budd & Mumford, 2006; van Wanrooy et al., 2013). Our findings emphasize the need to extend the adoption of such practices, given their potential to reduce WFC and mitigate its negative effects (Ali et al., 2015; Bainbridge & Townsend, 2020; Li, 2018). Certain practices including generous leave arrangements (e.g., short breaks, parental leave, and flexible annual leave) or child/elder care services (e.g., childcare and breastfeeding facilities in the workplace) have been identified as particularly beneficial to women (Fritz & van Knippenberg, 2018; Kalysh et al., 2016). However, it is important that they are made available to all employees to avoid the negative stereotyping that might emerge if targeted at specific groups. If implemented on an organization-wide basis, they may well help reduce the occurrence and negative implications of WFC across social groups.

5.2 | Limitations and future research

Our study has several limitations, and also highlights a number of avenues for future research. First, our day-level variables were measured concurrently, which renders the findings susceptible to common method bias (CMB) and reverse causality. An alternative approach that would avoid these problems would be to require participants to complete daily surveys at multiple time points per day. However, as our study population (i.e., solicitors) already faced very busy work schedules and significant job demands, this approach was considered too intrusive. Nevertheless, potential CMB problems in our analysis regarding same-source measurement are partially alleviated given the analytical technique used (i.e., MSEM), which removes the effect of between-individual variance when examining the relationships among within-individual (i.e., day-level) variables (Preacher et al., 2010). Also, CMB is unlikely to affect interaction effects (McClelland & Judd, 1993), hence it is unlikely to explain the moderating roles of gender and ethnicity observed in the analysis. Moreover, following Podsakoff et al. (2003), we took several procedural steps to control for CMB—for instance, ensuring privacy protection and anonymity, and a 1-week time lapse between the background information survey and the daily diary surveys.

Beyond this, however, we conducted several supplementary analyses to further help address concerns regarding potential reverse causality. First, we re-ran the mediation model with the previous day’s guilt and job satisfaction included as control variables. This helps reduce ambiguity in causality by allowing the results to be understood as change in guilt and job satisfaction from the previous day. Including these controls did not alter the pattern found in the main analysis, with the 90% CI of the indirect effect still not including zero (effect = −0.100, posterior SD = 0.022, p = 0.000, 90% CI [−0.136, −0.064]). Second, we tested a lagged indirect effect of daily FIW (Day t) on the next day’s job satisfaction (Day t + 1) through the next day’s job-related guilt (Day t + 1), controlling for same-day job-related guilt (Day t) and job satisfaction (Day t). We found the indirect effect remained significant (effect = −0.028, posterior SD = 0.014, p = 0.015, 90% CI [−0.053, −0.006]), confirming that FIW precedes job-related guilt and job satisfaction. These supplementary analyses provide indirect, yet meaningful, evidence that the relationships between the study variables are consistent with our theorization. Nonetheless, future research would benefit from temporal separation between measurements to address reverse causality and CMB more directly. This might involve research on less time-poor populations that can more easily accommodate multiple data collection points per day.

A second limitation is that caution is needed in interpreting our results regarding (H2), given respondents may report an egalitarian gender role orientation but not actually enact it in their daily lives (Daminger, 2020). Nevertheless, even if there is a discrepancy between reported and actual gender role orientation, this may be insufficiently large to discredit our results, as our SEM models ((H3)–(H6)) also support workplace inequality rather than (traditional) gender role orientation-based predictions, thus further supporting our conclusions regarding (H2).

Third, although our findings generally align with the workplace inequality perspective (Foschi, 2000; Woodhams et al., 2015), our analysis did not directly test underpinning causal mechanisms; hence, we are unable to demonstrate whether the causes of the gender and intersectional group differences we identified accord with this perspective. Such an analysis would require exploration of respondents’ perceptions of their social status in the workplace and the performance standards they have to meet to demonstrate their credibility and value to their organization. Future research on this matter is warranted.

Fourth, our data were collected in 2016–2017 prior to the Covid-19 pandemic, and it is possible that the dynamics we report in our analysis will have been affected by this. For example, the relationship between FIW and job-related guilt may have weakened during the pandemic, given that much FIW at the time may have stemmed from the urgent need for employees to care for severely ill family members or for children due to school and nursery closures. The widespread awareness of the health effects and care demands of Covid-19 may have also increased employers’ understanding of and hence their social support for the pressures faced by employees who experience FIW. Should this endure into the future, the relationship between
FIW and job-related guilt (and hence job satisfaction), and the variance in the impact of FIW between social groups, may weaken.

However, it is also possible that the relationship between FIW and guilt may have strengthened for certain social groups following the pandemic. Many dual-earner couples fell back on more traditional work–family patterns during the pandemic, with women performing the bulk of housework and childcare and men prioritizing work roles (Hjálmsdóttir & Bjarnadóttir, 2021; Shockley et al., 2021). This might have been particularly apparent among South Asian communities given their pre-pandemic gender role norms were arguably already more patriarchal. The pandemic may therefore have reversed recent social change regarding gender role attitudes. This suggests, from a traditional gender role orientation perspective, that the relationship between FIW and job-related guilt may have weakened among women (especially SAW), but strengthened among men (especially SAM). That said, the workplace inequality perspective would suggest that the re-traditionalization of gender roles may have reinforced organizational stereotypes of women as more family-oriented and lacking in career ambition than men, thus entrenching the view of women (especially SAW) as a lower status group. The growth of hybrid working following the pandemic may have exacerbated this tendency, given managers may take the view that women (SAW in particular) will inevitably be drawn into caring responsibilities should they spend significant time working from home. This implies a potential strengthening in the relationship between FIW and job-related guilt for women (both WBW and SAW). We can, however, only speculate on these dynamics; hence, further research is needed.

A fifth caveat is that our intersectional analysis focuses on gender and ethnicity only. Despite the novelty of this in the context of work–family studies, future research might expand the intersectional lens we advocate here to include other social identities, including disability, sexual orientation, age, marital status, and religion and belief (Özbilgin et al., 2011; Powell et al., 2019). The intersectionality-based theorization we develop may offer a departure point in exploring the implications of WFC for these social identities.

Finally, our research design does not enable us to explore whether the gender-ethnicity intersectional effects we identify vary between different generations within ethnic minority communities. It is possible that second/third generation British Asians adhere less to traditional gender norms than their first generation counterparts given their greater exposure to British society’s relatively more egalitarian culture (Kan & Laurie, 2018; Wang & Coulter, 2019). Hence, from a gender role orientation perspective, the gendered implications of FIW might also be weaker for more recent generations. However, the workplace inequality perspective suggests that since more recent generation ethnic minorities continue to encounter considerable workplace discrimination (Tarj & Syed, 2018; Wood et al., 2009), their work–family dynamics might not be significantly different from those of first generation migrants. Future research might usefully investigate this matter.

6 | CONCLUSION

The increase in workforce diversity in many countries has coincided with a growing awareness of, and preference for, work–family balance among recent generations of employees. Therefore, seeking ways to manage the WFC experienced by different employee social groups has become an increasingly pressing organizational matter. Based on the experiences of solicitors in the United Kingdom, our analysis demonstrated empirically that daily FIW increases job-related guilt, which subsequently reduces job satisfaction. It also demonstrated that this relationship varies not only by gender but also by the intersection of gender and ethnicity, with minority employees experiencing greater job-related guilt (and therefore lower job satisfaction) in response to FIW. Our analysis contributes to the work–family literature by demonstrating, from an intersectionality perspective, the importance of taking into account an individual’s multiple social identities in understanding the implications of FIW dynamics. In addition, it questions traditional gender role orientation-based predictions regarding gender and intersectional variation in the implications of FIW. Instead, it suggests the workplace inequality perspective sheds important light on work–family dynamics, especially in societal or professional contexts in which gender role norms are becoming more egalitarian.
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ENDNOTES

1 Cross-cultural studies comparing the implications of WFC in Western and non-Western societies (see, e.g., Lu et al., 2010) might help illuminate this matter. However, the transferability of these studies is arguably limited given sociocultural norms regarding work and family roles are likely to differ for ethnic minority people in the resident country than in the country of their heritage (see Olson et al., 2013; Shang et al., 2018). Also, their family support structures (which can help reduce the incidence and the implications of WFC) in the host country may be less well-developed given they are likely to be geographically distanced from much of their extended family (Khokhar & Beaucourt, 2014).

2 We excluded the “within-White” comparison (WBW vs. WBM) from our intersectional theorization since it would be highly similar to that used in predicting gender differences (H3). We nevertheless empirically tested the difference between WBW and WBM. The results (Table 4) were consistent with the workplace inequality-based prediction (a stronger indirect effect of FIW on job satisfaction through job-related guilt among WBW than WBM).
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