VILNIUS TECH
Vilnius Gediminas Technical University

Business, Management and Economics Engineering
ISSN: 2669-2481 / eISSN: 2669-249X
2025 Volume 23 Issue 01

MOTHER'S EMPLOYMENT GUILT AKA WORKING MOTHER'S GUILT: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY AMONGST WORKING MOTHERS IN INDIA

Dr.Pranay Karnik
Assistant Professor, Marketing, PIMR Indore,

Dr.Deepti Bajpai
Assistant Professor, HR, PIMR Indore,

Dr.Jaya Jaisinghani
Assistant Professor, HR, PIMR Indore,

Abstract

In most of the Indian households, women are raised with values having strong roots and love for family. They are mostly raised with the belief that one day they have to bear the responsibility of running the household by themselves. This mindset mostly results in many highly talented, high performing women scarifying their careers and aspirations to raise their respective families. Although we are thousands of years away from primitive mindset of gender roles, where the man was supposed to be the breadwinner and the women were supposed to raise the kids, the patriarchal system still pushes career women who have career goals to have a sense of guilt when they play the dual role of working women and mothers.

When women have to scarify their careers after the maternity break, it represents a huge loss of brain power for the industry and the nation and when they continue to pursue their careers, the continuous oscillation between household chores, social and family commitments, other obligations and career takes a toll on their health which results in distress and a typical guilt which makes them feel that they are not giving enough time to raise their children.

This paper tries to measure whether this guilt exists in Indian working women, the extent to which it exists, impact of demographic variables, and various other factors that may impact the level of guilt in working women. The study was conducted among Indian working mothers based in various prominent cities of India. The respondents for the study included Indian working mothers belonging to an array of sectors like, BFSI, IT, Manufacturing, Education and Retail.

Key words: Working mother's guilt, career orientation, work life balance, distress, work-life balance

Introduction

Over the ages women in India have encountered incessant challenges in establishing their role in a largely male-dominated environment. The land where 'Sati was practiced till the 17th century, men held the legitimate ownership of the family's assets, patriarchy necessitated male as the family's leader and zero to no economic rights, women have come a long way to establish their role in society beyond gender biases and norms. In contemporary times, as more and more women enter the workforce due to various motives like money, inflation, fear of losing out,

professional ambitions, the dual role of being a mother and a working professional sets in motion emotional, sentimental and psychological guilt in working mothers. The guilt of being a working mother is not just deep rooted in patriarchal societies but in all societies and cultures in general. Motherhood is essentially seen as a woman's responsibility thereby reaffirming gender roles. A mother's instinct to choose and care for family constantly results in selection of careers, career paths, goals at workplace, aspirations of reaching the top and drive to fulfill her true potential at work. Balancing personal life and professional careers within the ambit of motherhood can be tremendously testing for women as responsibilities at home and expectation at work take shape. Spill over of work into family time or missing an important assignment due to a child's ill health can often result in feeling of failure and guilt. Unattainable and unrealistic goals of balancing marriage, motherhood, family life and careers generate substantial burden and guilt for working mothers. This relentless predicament to balance work demands with the needs of children and family along with the demands to excel in their careers while also being available and attentive parents can lead to feelings of overwhelm and guilt among working mothers.

Review of Literature

Hairina and Hartini (2024) defined Guilt as part of the negative emotions that arises due to the conflict working mothers face between work and family The study intended to examine the consequences of guilt in working mothers on parameters of role conflict, efforts to balance the roles etc. With the use of Arksey and O'Malley (2005) framework that included searching four databases namely Scopus, WoS, Emerald, and Science Direct, a review of 10 out of 894 published articles identified three categories of consequences related to guilt such as (1) consequences for child care, (2) consequences for work, and (3) consequences for the individual. The results from this review provide a more comprehensive understanding of the consequences of guilt experienced by working mothers. These insights could serve as a foundation for practitioners, experts, and policymakers for further research by exploring the individual experiences of working mothers.

The exploratory study of De Ravindranath et al. (2021), aimed to explore the challenges faced by working mothers in the education sector and the perceived policies and strategies to retain them in their current jobs. The qualitative study used in-depth semi-structured interviews to collect information from five working mothers with at least one child. Thematic analysis was performed to analyze the data manually. The key challenges highlighted include work-life conflict, stereotyping, exhaustion, changing work schedule and career growth opportunities. Working mothers also affirmed that the key perceived policies and strategies to retain them need to include child-care support, working from home and flexible work arrangements. By and large working mothers stated that motherhood was their key priority, and they usually prioritize family over work. The study provided an understanding to organizations regarding the challenges faced by working mothers and the nature of policies organizations need to create to retain them. As a first of its kind study, it provided in-depth information on working mothers in the education sector with contributions to work-life integration and career theory.

Camilleri and Spiteri (2021), (Aveling, 2002; Baber and Monaghan, 1988; Bielby and Bielby, 1984; Bhattacharyya, 2009; 2016; Granrose and Caplan, 1996; Herman and Lewis, 2012; Hoffnung, 2004, 2011; Lahiri-Dutt and Sil, 2014) through their various studies provide

valuable assertions that it is very difficult for women to "have it all" in terms of financial stability, marriage, children and career. This refers not only to those women working in STEM (science, technology, engineering, mathematics) sectors (Herman and Lewis, 2012) but also in other areas of economic activity as well (Bhattacharyya, 2016). Using insights derived from social constructionism, the study illustrates that while the home remains the cardinal aspect of women's lives, what being a good mother means, is however socially defined. Burr (2003) describes social constructionism as based on exploring "…a lot of things we take for granted as given, fixed and immutable, whether in ourselves or in the phenomena we experience, (that) can, upon inspection, be found to be socially derived and socially maintained. They are created and perpetuated by human beings who share meanings through being members of the same society or culture" (p. 45). Therefore, if working mothers in Malta approach believe that reaching a healthy work-life balance is achieved by sculpting their careers around family responsibilities, it is likely that there are societal expectations that underlie why they uphold these beliefs. The paper demonstrates that the way working mothers define their roles as workers and as mothers is rooted in the way society perceives and understands the role of 'working mothers' in contemporary times. The study shows that, often due to societal influences, working mothers tend to put their careers on the back-burner predominantly when their children are young. The study recommends that family-friendly measures at work are to be implemented more assiduously than they are at present. This is in order to counter the societal discourses that prevent working mothers from sometimes finding a personally satisfying balance between their work life and home life.

LaGraff and Stolz (2023), in their research have acknowledged that despite important implications for families, limited research has examined how workplace environments influence parenting behavior. Situated within the Work–Home Resources Model, the purpose of the study was to investigate (a) whether workplace flexibility, a contextual resource, predicts positive parenting behavior, a home outcome, and (b) whether work–family guilt mediates this relationship. A sample of working mothers with children between the ages of 1 and 18 (N = 302) completed an online survey. Linear regression analyses indicated perceived workplace flexibility predicted overall positive parenting, positive reinforcement, and warm behaviors in working mothers, but not proactive parenting or supportiveness. Ordinary least squares (OLS) path analyses indicated work–family guilt did not mediate these relationships, but was significantly associated with workplace flexibility, indicating workplace flexibility had a significant negative effect on work–family guilt. The results of this study provide preliminary evidence that mothers' workplace flexibility may influence positive parenting behaviors; thus, policies that promote flexible work arrangements could promote positive family outcomes and reduce feelings of guilt related to work and family life.

Pioneering work of Sutherland (2010c) explored the bidirectional and reciprocal nature of work-family guilt by testing a non-recursive model that treats work-family guilt as the mediator connecting the work-family interface. With a sample size of 627 Chinese employees, the findings confirmed the reciprocal nature of work-family guilt (work-to-family and family-to-work guilt), which showed that employees would not be restricted to only one form of guilt in the work-family interface. The findings additionally revealed that there was a positive relationship between work-to-family guilt as work performance/time spent on work/family

domains is indirectly related to work-family guilt via the increased work-family conflict. As a groundbreaking study investigating the bidirectional nature of work-family guilt, this study has refined and enriched our understanding of work-family guilt as well as contributed to future work-family interface, emotion, and performance studies. Research conducted by Sanil (2024) observed that working mothers experience marked work-family conflict which negatively affects their career progression and mental well-being. The study aimed to determine the interrelationship between good mothering expectations, parental guilt and work volition in working mothers. The participants included a total of 150 working mothers between the ages of 21 and 59. The inclusion criterion was working mothers with children of ages 21 or below. The study included participants primarily from India (90.8%), with a smaller representation from Australia (0.7%), the UK (2%), the US (0.7%), Egypt (0.7%), Turkey (0.7%) and Romania (5.4%). Three scales were utilized: the Good Mothering Expectations Scale, the Guilt about Parenting Scale, and Work Volition. The results indicate a weak significant correlation between traditional roles and parental guilt (Rho = .345). The significant F-statistic (14.137) with a very low p-value (000) suggests that there are statistically significant differences in parental guilt scores among the traditional roles. No statistically significant relationships were found between guilt about parenting and work volition. The results of the study indicate that working mothers who subscribe to traditional mothering roles face increased amounts of guilt. Sutherland (2010) concludes that as research continues to examine mothering experiences and the costs of guilt and shame, the idea that guilt and shame are integral components of mothering is well corroborated and widely accepted. The examination of institutional and interactional dynamics over psychological explanation of guilt and shame provide clues to notion of 'the good mother'. There is also an argument that directs us towards an evolutionary basis for maternal guilt to guarantee that mothers provide the vital care for the survival of their offspring (Rotkirch, 2009).

Shakeel, G. S. K. D. F. a. S. M., & Sethi, S. B. D. Y. M. D. K. (2024) in their research reiterate that in today's society, an increasing number of mothers are balancing the demands of work and family responsibilities and as more women enter the workforce, understanding the unique stressors they experience in their parenting roles becomes a crucial focal point to understand the strategies employed by working mothers to cope with these stressors. This results in maintaining a healthy work-family balance and promoting positive parent-child relationships. The challenges of juggling work and family life can lead to heightened levels of parenting stress, impacting maternal well-being and family dynamics. However, there is a gap in our understanding of the specific stressors experienced by working mothers and the effectiveness of various coping strategies they adopt.

Borelli et al. (2016) in their study state that the transition to parenthood can initiate major personal and relational changes. Conducted primarily on U.S. dual-earner couples, the study reveals that balancing work and family often leads to pervasive work-family guilt, especially for mothers. Surveyed on 255 parents of toddlers in Southern California, the results explored guilt about the negative impact of employment's on family, termed work-interfering-with-family guilt. Mothers reported significantly higher levels of this guilt compared to fathers. The findings emphasize gender role dynamics and evoke the need for further research of how societal expectations is at the core of parental guilt. The results of the study the need to identify

patterns of guilt to offer effective strategies to parents in their journey of balancing professional and family responsibilities.

According to Arendell (2000) the study of mothering has developed considerably, focusing on topics like maternal well-being, satisfaction, distress and employment. Developments in this area have lead to significant emphasis on the complex nuisances of motherhood. Further offering understanding of the challenges mothers face, encouraging a deeper insight of maternal roles and prompting discussions about gender, caregiving, and family dynamics.

Liss et al. (2012) claim motherhood often involves feelings of guilt and shame, influenced by discrepancies between a mother's actual and ideal self. This study examined 181 mothers through online surveys of young children (five and below), exploring relation between self-discrepancy, guilt, shame, and fear of negative evaluation. Results showed that maternal guilt and shame were strongly associated with self-discrepancy and fear of others' judgment. Fear of negative evaluation amplified the connection between self-discrepancy and shame, while mothers less concerned about judgment showed no such link. The findings highlight the detrimental ramifications of internalizing unrealistic motherhood ideals and underscore the need for supportive environments that reduce societal pressures on mothers.

Alexander & Higgins (1993) in their work depict how transition to parenthood affects individuals differently. While few feel that they suffer from becoming parents other do not. New parents experience emotional changes based on discrepancies between their actual selves and their hopes (ideal self) or perceived responsibilities (ought self). When pre-birth ideals are unmet, parents, especially in longer marriages, may feel sadness after birth. Conversely, unmet perceived responsibilities predicted reduced nervousness, particularly for mothers or parents with challenging children. Parenthood introduces demands that can hinder or hamper personal aspirations, causing dejection for those focused-on ideals. However, the parenting role may ease agitation by shifting focus to meeting responsibilities, illustrating the complex emotional dynamics in adapting to parenthood.

Teroni and Deonna (2008) in their research address the essential question of how does shame differ from guilt. Empirical psychology has recently offered distinct and seemingly incompatible answers to this question. This article brings together four prominent answers into a cohesive whole. These are (a) shame differs from guilt in being a social emotion; (b) shame, in contrast to guilt, affects the whole self; (c) shame is linked with ideals, whereas guilt concerns prohibitions and (d) shame is oriented towards the self, guilt towards others. After presenting relevant empirical evidence, the researchers defend specific interpretations of each of these answers and argue that they are related to four different dimensions of the emotions. This not only allows us to overcome the conclusion that the above criteria are either unrelated or conflicting with one another, it also allows us to tell apart what is constitutive from what is typical of them.

The paper by Elvin-Nowak (1999) discusses the structure and content of the phenomenon of guilt based on the experience of 13 working mothers. Using a phenomenological approach, the researcher has analyzed women's descriptions of guilt situations and presents the constituent components of the guilt phenomenon. The most salient feature of these women's descriptions of guilt is their strong, repetitive, everyday character. The phenomenon of guilt contains a general feeling of responsibility especially towards the children. Feelings of guilt arise when

the women interpret a situation in terms of failure of responsibility. The sense of failure of responsibility arises in situations when she lacks real control over the demands made on her from different spheres of life or in situations where she exhibits an assertive behavior where she puts the responsibility for herself and her own needs foremost. The phenomenon of guilt contains certain elements of shame, aggression and vagueness in communication.

Guendouzi (2006) emphasized that although there is a dramatic surge in women's representation in the workforce over the past 30 years yet women "take a greater responsibility for the care of children" (Equal Opportunities Commission, 2006). Research has proposed that the guilt working mothers may experience is caused from the social constrictions of a traditional model of intensive mothering (B. Holcomb, 1998).

Rubin and Wooten (2007) advocate that women consistently accept financial responsibility on behalf of their families whilst being the principal caretaker of the children. The clash between the double roles of a mother and a professional drives some women to trade their career for more time with their children. This qualitative study investigated the lived experience of 10 highly educated stay-at-home mothers using individual in-depth interviews. The dominant themes encompassed the decision to stay home, the benefits and challenges of staying home, and the need for self-care. Findings indicate that women who have achieved a high degree of education and professional success and stay home full-time face a complex range of emotions and experiences significant to counselors working with this population.

Rationale of the study

Despite increasing female participation in the workforce, working mothers continue to navigate the emotional burden of balancing professional responsibilities with societal and familial expectations—often resulting in persistent feelings of guilt. This maternal guilt, while widely experienced, remains underexplored in empirical research, particularly in the Indian socio-cultural context where traditional gender roles continue to shape women's lived experiences. This study seeks to bridge this critical gap by examining the influence of demographic, familial, and workplace-related factors on the guilt experienced by working mothers. By identifying the key predictors of maternal guilt, this research contributes not only to the academic discourse on work-family conflict and gender roles but also offers actionable insights for organizations, policymakers, and support systems aiming to foster inclusive and empathetic work environments. The findings have the potential to inform interventions that enhance maternal well-being and promote gender-equitable practices within modern workspaces.

Objectives of the Study:

1. To examine the relationship between demographic factors (such as age, number of children, and age of the youngest child) and the level of guilt experienced by working mothers.
2. To assess the influence of employment-related variables (such as working status, nature of the job, and working hours) on maternal guilt.
3. To evaluate the role of workplace support (including availability of childcare facilities and supportive work environment) in mitigating guilt among working mothers.

4. To analyze the impact of spousal and familial support on the emotional well-being of working mothers and its association with feelings of guilt.
5. To identify the key predictors of maternal guilt using quantitative analysis, thereby offering insights into areas of intervention and support.

Research Methodology

The study was conducted among working mothers belonging to BFSI (Banking, Financial Services and Insurance), Information Technology (IT), Retail, education and Manufacturing sectors. The total sample size was of 228 respondents working in these sectors. The Maternal Employment Guilt scale developed by Selvi and Kantas (2019) was used to measure the Maternal Employment Guilt also known as Working Mother's Guilt. The scale had 15 statements to measure MEGS on a 6 point Likert scale ranging from "1= certainly does not reflect me" to "6= certainly reflects me".

The authors of used Independent sample T-test, one way ANOVA and mean to analyze the data. SPSS was used to analyze and interpret the data.

Results, Interpretation and Discussion

Reliability

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	228	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	228	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.932	.935	15

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15
Q1	1.000	.726	.501	.477	.460	.603	.508	.583	.593	.451	.434	.391	.466	.140	.173
Q2	.726	1.000	.627	.432	.402	.551	.536	.621	.570	.556	.473	.387	.445	.150	.233

Q3	.501	.627	1.000	.593	.494	.535	.614	.541	.705	.600	.640	.507	.581	.274	.289
Q4	.477	.432	.593	1.000	.498	.541	.525	.588	.602	.642	.565	.500	.511	.400	.404
Q5	.460	.402	.494	.498	1.000	.595	.537	.529	.643	.353	.628	.095	.244	.344	.267
Q6	.603	.551	.535	.541	.595	1.000	.514	.540	.596	.438	.533	.503	.475	.453	.308
Q7	.508	.536	.614	.525	.537	.514	1.000	.736	.711	.613	.609	.364	.358	.393	.408
Q8	.583	.621	.541	.588	.529	.540	.736	1.000	.645	.608	.584	.423	.560	.572	.390
Q9	.593	.570	.705	.602	.643	.596	.711	.645	1.000	.583	.758	.381	.430	.409	.234
Q10	.451	.556	.600	.642	.353	.438	.613	.608	.583	1.000	.576	.564	.561	.464	.468
Q11	.434	.473	.640	.565	.628	.533	.609	.584	.758	.576	1.000	.438	.530	.518	.253
Q12	.391	.387	.507	.500	.095	.503	.364	.423	.381	.564	.438	1.000	.773	.462	.442
Q13	.466	.445	.581	.511	.244	.475	.358	.560	.430	.561	.530	.773	1.000	.574	.368
Q14	.140	.150	.274	.400	.344	.453	.393	.572	.409	.464	.518	.462	.574	1.000	.449
Q15	.173	.233	.289	.404	.267	.308	.408	.390	.234	.468	.253	.442	.368	.449	1.000

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Q1	55.10	224.211	.630	.697	.928
Q2	55.46	221.430	.649	.710	.928
Q3	55.17	218.219	.738	.720	.925
Q4	55.36	215.209	.720	.596	.926
Q5	55.19	223.311	.584	.672	.930
Q6	55.74	219.737	.708	.665	.926
Q7	55.21	222.634	.730	.720	.926
Q8	55.49	218.154	.785	.770	.924
Q9	55.16	218.089	.770	.766	.925
Q10	55.50	216.762	.744	.650	.925
Q11	55.14	220.861	.743	.710	.926

Q12	55.69	218.170	.617	.734	.929
Q13	55.22	218.886	.687	.775	.927
Q14	55.69	221.941	.551	.694	.931
Q15	56.54	224.197	.459	.430	.934

A **Cronbach's alpha** test was conducted to assess the internal consistency of the **Mother's Employment Guilt Scale**. The scale consisted of **15 items**, with data collected from **228 respondents**. The reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) was found to be **0.932**, indicating **excellent internal consistency**. This suggests that the items in the scale measure the construct reliably and can be considered valid for further analysis.

Impact of age on employment guilt

One-way: Age

Descriptives

Guilt_Mean

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
26-30	10	4.8667	.00000	.00000	4.8667	4.8667	4.87	4.87
31-35	46	3.5797	.87690	.12929	3.3193	3.8401	2.00	5.47
36-40	78	4.3607	1.12274	.12713	4.1075	4.6138	1.27	6.00
41 and above	94	3.7177	.97894	.10097	3.5172	3.9182	1.60	5.33
Total	228	3.9602	1.05718	.07001	3.8223	4.0982	1.27	6.00

ANOVA

Guilt_Mean

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	32.913	3	10.971	11.131	.000
Within Groups	220.789	224	.986		
Total	253.702	227			

A **one-way ANOVA** was conducted to examine the impact of **age** on **employment guilt**. The results revealed a **statistically significant difference** among age groups, **$F(3, 224) = 11.131$, $p < 0.001$**, indicating that guilt levels vary significantly based on age.

The mean guilt scores across age groups were:

- **26-30 years**: **4.87** (SD = 0.00)
- **31-35 years**: **3.58** (SD = 0.88)
- **36-40 years**: **4.36** (SD = 1.12)

- **41 and above**: **3.72** (SD = 0.98)

The **post hoc analysis** (if available) would provide more insights into which age groups differ significantly. However, based on these means:

- Mothers aged **26-30 reported the highest guilt** (M = 4.87), possibly due to early career pressures and younger children.
- The guilt score **dropped for the 31-35 group** (M = 3.58), suggesting adaptation to work-life balance.
- The **36-40 group saw a rise in guilt** (M = 4.36), potentially reflecting increased career demands or children's schooling phase.
- Mothers **41 and above reported lower guilt** (M = 3.72), possibly due to greater work stability, older children, or changing perceptions over time.

Since the significance level is **p < 0.001**, the impact of age on guilt is highly significant.

Independent Sample T test for Working status

Group Statistics

	WorkingStatus	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Guilt_Mean	Full Time	172	4.0736	1.08220	.08252
	Part time/Flexible	56	3.6119	.89876	.12010

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Guilt_Mean	Equal variances assumed	8.455	.004	2.884	226	.004	.46174	.16009	.14628	.77720

	Equal variances not assumed			3.169	111.210	.002	.46174	.14572	.17300	.75048

Homogeneous Subsets

Guilt_Mean

Tukey HSD

Age	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05		
		1	2	3
31-35	46	3.5797		
41 and above	94	3.7177	3.7177	
36-40	78		4.3607	4.3607
26-30	10			4.8667
Sig.		.955	.079	.235

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 27.549.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

Effect of Working Status on Mother's Employment Guilt (Independent Samples t-test)

An **independent samples t-test** was conducted to examine the impact of **working status (full-time vs. part-time/flexible)** on **employment guilt**. The results showed a **statistically significant difference** in guilt scores between the two groups:

- **Full-time working mothers**: **M = 4.07, SD = 1.08**
- **Part-time/Flexible working mothers**: **M = 3.61, SD = 0.90**
- **t(226) = 2.884, p = 0.004** (equal variances assumed)
- **t(111.210) = 3.169, p = 0.002** (equal variances not assumed)

Since **Levene's test for equality of variances** was significant (**F = 8.455, p = 0.004**), equal variances were **not assumed**, and the adjusted t-test value was considered. The significant p-value (**p < 0.01**) confirms that the difference in guilt between **full-time and part-time mothers** is **statistically significant**.

Additionally, the mean difference (**0.46**) and 95% confidence interval (**0.173 to 0.750**) further support that **full-time mothers experience significantly higher guilt compared to part-time or flexible working mothers**.

This finding suggests that **work intensity and time commitments contribute to employment guilt**, with flexible work arrangements potentially offering a buffer against feelings of guilt.

Independent Sample T –test : Number of Children

Group Statistics

	Numberofchildren	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Guilt_Mean	1	152	3.9728	.99784	.08094
	2	76	3.9351	1.17348	.13461

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Guilt_Mean	Equal variances assumed	.660	.418	.253	226	.800	.03772	.14883	-.25555	.33099
	Equal variances not assumed			.240	130.556	.811	.03772	.15707	-.27301	.34844

Age of the youngest children: One way ANOVA

Descriptives

Guilt_Mean

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
0-4	58	4.0138	.84648	.11115	3.7912	4.2364	2.47	5.47
5-8	52	4.0436	1.12146	.15552	3.7314	4.3558	2.00	6.00
9-12	68	3.7686	1.13222	.13730	3.4946	4.0427	1.27	5.93
13 and above	50	4.0720	1.09899	.15542	3.7597	4.3843	2.13	5.40

Total	228	3.9602	1.05718	.07001	3.8223	4.0982	1.27	6.00

ANOVA

Guilt_Mean

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.649	3	1.216	1.090	.354
Within Groups	250.053	224	1.116		
Total	253.702	227			

Effect of Youngest Child's Age on Mother's Employment Guilt (One-Way ANOVA)

A **one-way ANOVA** was conducted to examine whether the age of the youngest child influences **employment guilt levels** among working mothers. The results indicate that:

- **Mothers with children aged 0-4 years** had a mean guilt score of **4.01 (SD = 0.85)**
- **Mothers with children aged 5-8 years** had a mean guilt score of **4.04 (SD = 1.12)**
- **Mothers with children aged 9-12 years** had a mean guilt score of **3.77 (SD = 1.13)**
- **Mothers with children aged 13 years and above** had a mean guilt score of **4.07 (SD = 1.10)**

The ANOVA results showed **no statistically significant difference** in guilt scores across these groups:

- **F(3, 224) = 1.090, p = 0.354**

Since the **p-value (0.354) is greater than 0.05**, we conclude that the **age of the youngest child does not significantly impact maternal employment guilt**. This suggests that while guilt levels vary slightly among mothers with children of different age groups, the differences are **not substantial enough** to be considered statistically significant.

One way ANOVA: Care giver

Descriptives

Guilt_Mean

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
A family member	158	3.9865	1.11916	.08904	3.8106	4.1624	1.60	6.00
Babysitter	46	3.9420	1.07539	.15856	3.6227	4.2614	1.27	5.53
Kindergarten/Creche	24	3.8222	.43900	.08961	3.6368	4.0076	3.27	5.00

Total	228	3.9602	1.05718	.07001	3.8223	4.0982	1.27	6.00

ANOVA

Guilt_Mean

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.581	2	.291	.258	.773
Within Groups	253.120	225	1.125		
Total	253.702	227			

Effect of Primary Caregiver on Mother's Employment Guilt (One-Way ANOVA)

A **one-way ANOVA** was conducted to determine whether the type of primary caregiver for a child influences **maternal employment guilt levels**. The mean guilt scores for different caregiver categories were:

- **Family member** (e.g., spouse, grandparents) → **M = 3.99, SD = 1.12**
- **Babysitter → M = 3.94, SD = 1.08**
- **Kindergarten/Creche → M = 3.82, SD = 0.44**

The ANOVA results showed **no statistically significant difference** among these groups:

- **F(2, 225) = 0.258, p = 0.773**

Since the **p-value (0.773) is much greater than 0.05**, we conclude that **the type of caregiver does not significantly affect maternal employment guilt**. This suggests that irrespective of the care that the child receives from a **family member, babysitter, or formal childcare facility**, mothers **experience similar levels of guilt**.

One way ANOVA: Annual income family

Descriptives

Guilt_Mean

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Rs. 5-10 L	54	3.7210	1.05799	.14397	3.4322	4.0098	1.27	5.20
Rs.11-15 L	56	4.6405	.86041	.11498	4.4101	4.8709	2.73	6.00
Rs.16-20 L	34	3.5765	.58669	.10062	3.3718	3.7812	2.60	4.73
Rs.21 L and above	84	3.8159	1.13296	.12362	3.5700	4.0617	1.60	5.93
Total	228	3.9602	1.05718	.07001	3.8223	4.0982	1.27	6.00

ANOVA

Guilt_Mean

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	35.762	3	11.921	12.252	.000
Within Groups	217.940	224	.973		
Total	253.702	227			

Post Hoc Tests

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Guilt_Mean

Tukey HSD

(I) AnnualIncomeFamily	(J) AnnualIncomeFamily	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Rs. 5-10 L	Rs.11-15 L	-.91949*	.18813	.000	-1.4064	-.4325
	Rs.16-20 L	.14452	.21595	.909	-.4144	.7035
	Rs.21 L and above	-.09489	.17205	.946	-.5402	.3504
Rs.11-15 L	Rs. 5-10 L	.91949*	.18813	.000	.4325	1.4064
	Rs.16-20 L	1.06401*	.21445	.000	.5089	1.6191
	Rs.21 L and above	.82460*	.17017	.000	.3841	1.2651
Rs.16-20 L	Rs. 5-10 L	-.14452	.21595	.909	-.7035	.4144
	Rs.11-15 L	-1.06401*	.21445	.000	-1.6191	-.5089
	Rs.21 L and above	-.23940	.20050	.631	-.7584	.2796
Rs.21 L and above	Rs. 5-10 L	.09489	.17205	.946	-.3504	.5402
	Rs.11-15 L	-.82460*	.17017	.000	-1.2651	-.3841
	Rs.16-20 L	.23940	.20050	.631	-.2796	.7584

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Homogeneous Subsets

Guilt_Mean

Tukey HSD

AnnualIncomeFamily	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
Rs.16-20 L	34	3.5765	
Rs. 5-10 L	54	3.7210	
Rs.21 L and above	84	3.8159	
Rs.11-15 L	56		4.6405

Sig.		.608	1.000

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 51.485.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

Effect of Annual Family Income on Mother's Employment Guilt (One-Way ANOVA)

A **one-way ANOVA** was conducted to examine the effect of **annual family income** on **maternal employment guilt levels**. The mean guilt scores for the income categories were:

- **Rs. 5-10 L → M = 3.72, SD = 1.06**
- **Rs. 11-15 L → M = 4.64, SD = 0.86**
- **Rs. 16-20 L → M = 3.58, SD = 0.59**
- **Rs. 21 L and above → M = 3.82, SD = 1.13**

The ANOVA results showed a **significant difference** among these groups:

- **F(3, 224) = 12.252, p < 0.001**

Post hoc **Tukey HSD tests** were performed to determine which groups differed. The significant mean differences were observed between:

- **Rs. 5-10 L** vs **Rs. 11-15 L** (M = -0.92, p = 0.000)
- **Rs. 11-15 L** vs **Rs. 16-20 L** (M = 1.06, p = 0.000)
- **Rs. 11-15 L** vs **Rs. 21 L and above** (M = 0.82, p = 0.000)

This suggests that mothers from families with **Rs. 11-15 L** annual income report higher levels of **employment guilt** compared to other income groups. The guilt level for **Rs. 16-20 L** and **Rs. 21 L and above** income categories were **similar**, and both were lower than that of the Rs. 11-15 L group.

It can be concluded that **annual family income** plays a role in maternal employment guilt, with **mothers from higher-income families** (Rs. 11-15 L) reporting significantly more guilt than those from **lower-income groups**.

Annual Income Self: One way ANOVA

Descriptives

Guilt_Mean

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Rs. 2-5 L	68	3.6863	.90673	.10996	3.4668	3.9058	1.27	5.13
Rs.6-10 L	72	4.2815	1.06644	.12568	4.0309	4.5321	2.13	6.00
Rs. 11-15 L	26	3.3179	.70359	.13799	3.0338	3.6021	1.60	4.20
Rs.16 L and above	62	4.1570	1.14399	.14529	3.8665	4.4475	1.80	5.93
Total	228	3.9602	1.05718	.07001	3.8223	4.0982	1.27	6.00

ANOVA

Guilt_Mean

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	25.660	3	8.553	8.402	.000
Within Groups	228.042	224	1.018		
Total	253.702	227			

Post HOC

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Guilt_Mean

Tukey HSD

(I) AnnualIncomeSelf	(J) AnnualIncomeSelf	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Rs. 2-5 L	Rs.6-10 L	-.59521*	.17062	.003	-1.0368	-.1536
	Rs. 11-15 L	.36833	.23265	.390	-.2339	.9705
	Rs.16 L and above	-.47071*	.17718	.042	-.9293	-.0121
Rs.6-10 L	Rs. 2-5 L	.59521*	.17062	.003	.1536	1.0368
	Rs. 11-15 L	.96353*	.23086	.000	.3660	1.5611
	Rs.16 L and above	.12449	.17481	.892	-.3280	.5770
Rs. 11-15 L	Rs. 2-5 L	-.36833	.23265	.390	-.9705	.2339
	Rs.6-10 L	-.96353*	.23086	.000	-1.5611	-.3660
	Rs.16 L and above	-.83904*	.23574	.003	-1.4492	-.2288
Rs.16 L and above	Rs. 2-5 L	.47071*	.17718	.042	.0121	.9293
	Rs.6-10 L	-.12449	.17481	.892	-.5770	.3280
	Rs. 11-15 L	.83904*	.23574	.003	.2288	1.4492

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Homogeneous Subsets

Guilt_Mean

Tukey HSD

AnnualIncomeSelf	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05		
		1	2	3
Rs. 11-15 L	26	3.3179		
Rs. 2-5 L	68	3.6863	3.6863	
Rs.16 L and above	62		4.1570	4.1570

Rs.6-10 L	72			4.2815
Sig.		.281	.104	.930

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.
a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 48.085.
b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

Effect of Annual Personal Income on Mother's Employment Guilt (One-Way ANOVA)

A **one-way ANOVA** was conducted to examine the effect of **annual self-income** on **maternal employment guilt levels**. The mean guilt scores for the income categories were:

- **Rs. 2-5 L → M = 3.69, SD = 0.91**
- **Rs. 6-10 L → M = 4.28, SD = 1.07**
- **Rs. 11-15 L → M = 3.32, SD = 0.70**
- **Rs. 16 L and above → M = 4.16, SD = 1.14**

The ANOVA results showed a **significant difference** among these groups:

- **F(3, 224) = 8.402, p < 0.001**

Post hoc **Tukey HSD tests** revealed the following significant differences in mean guilt scores:

- **Rs. 2-5 L** vs **Rs. 6-10 L** (M = -0.60, p = 0.003)
- **Rs. 2-5 L** vs **Rs. 16 L and above** (M = -0.47, p = 0.042)
- **Rs. 6-10 L** vs **Rs. 11-15 L** (M = 0.96, p = 0.000)
- **Rs. 11-15 L** vs **Rs. 16 L and above** (M = -0.84, p = 0.003)

The mean guilt scores for **Rs. 6-10 L** income group were significantly higher than those for **Rs. 2-5 L** and **Rs. 11-15 L** groups. Interestingly, **Rs. 16 L and above** showed a higher guilt score than **Rs. 11-15 L**, but was not significantly different from the **Rs. 6-10 L** group.

Annual self-income significantly affects maternal employment guilt, with **higher guilt** levels observed in families with an annual self-income in the **Rs. 6-10 L** range. Conversely, **lower guilt** was reported by those in the **Rs. 11-15 L** category.

One-way ANOVA: Industry

Descriptives

Guilt_Mean

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
BFSI	32	3.9917	1.13942	.20142	3.5809	4.4025	2.67	5.93
IT	50	4.4293	.94609	.13380	4.1605	4.6982	3.33	6.00
Retail/Service Sector	28	4.1571	.97258	.18380	3.7800	4.5343	2.27	5.53
Education	98	3.7605	1.03686	.10474	3.5527	3.9684	1.27	5.47
Manufacturing	20	3.4400	.98228	.21964	2.9803	3.8997	1.80	5.47
Total	228	3.9602	1.05718	.07001	3.8223	4.0982	1.27	6.00

ANOVA

Guilt_Mean

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	21.441	4	5.360	5.146	.001
Within Groups	232.261	223	1.042		
Total	253.702	227			

Post Hoc Tests

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Guilt_Mean

Tukey HSD

(I) Industry	(J) Industry	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
BFSI	IT	-.43767	.23104	.323	-1.0731	.1977
	Retail/Service Sector	-.16548	.26409	.971	-.8918	.5608
	Education	.23112	.20779	.800	-.3403	.8026
	Manufacturing	.55167	.29090	.322	-.2484	1.3517
IT	BFSI	.43767	.23104	.323	-.1977	1.0731
	Retail/Service Sector	.27219	.24089	.791	-.3903	.9347
	Education	.66879*	.17737	.002	.1810	1.1566
	Manufacturing	.98933*	.27001	.003	.2467	1.7319
Retail/Service Sector	BFSI	.16548	.26409	.971	-.5608	.8918
	IT	-.27219	.24089	.791	-.9347	.3903
	Education	.39660	.21869	.368	-.2048	.9980
	Manufacturing	.71714	.29879	.119	-.1046	1.5389
Education	BFSI	-.23112	.20779	.800	-.8026	.3403
	IT	-.66879*	.17737	.002	-1.1566	-.1810
	Retail/Service Sector	-.39660	.21869	.368	-.9980	.2048
	Manufacturing	.32054	.25041	.704	-.3681	1.0092
Manufacturing	BFSI	-.55167	.29090	.322	-1.3517	.2484
	IT	-.98933*	.27001	.003	-1.7319	-.2467
	Retail/Service Sector	-.71714	.29879	.119	-1.5389	.1046
	Education	-.32054	.25041	.704	-1.0092	.3681

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Homogeneous Subsets

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Guilt_Mean

Tukey HSD

(I) Industry	(J) Industry	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
BFSI	IT	-.43767	.23104	.323	-1.0731	.1977
	Retail/Service Sector	-.16548	.26409	.971	-.8918	.5608
	Education	.23112	.20779	.800	-.3403	.8026
	Manufacturing	.55167	.29090	.322	-.2484	1.3517
IT	BFSI	.43767	.23104	.323	-.1977	1.0731
	Retail/Service Sector	.27219	.24089	.791	-.3903	.9347
	Education	.66879*	.17737	.002	.1810	1.1566
	Manufacturing	.98933*	.27001	.003	.2467	1.7319
Retail/Service Sector	BFSI	.16548	.26409	.971	-.5608	.8918
	IT	-.27219	.24089	.791	-.9347	.3903
	Education	.39660	.21869	.368	-.2048	.9980
	Manufacturing	.71714	.29879	.119	-.1046	1.5389
Education	BFSI	-.23112	.20779	.800	-.8026	.3403
	IT	-.66879*	.17737	.002	-1.1566	-.1810
	Retail/Service Sector	-.39660	.21869	.368	-.9980	.2048
	Manufacturing	.32054	.25041	.704	-.3681	1.0092
Manufacturing	BFSI	-.55167	.29090	.322	-1.3517	.2484
	IT	-.98933*	.27001	.003	-1.7319	-.2467
	Retail/Service Sector	-.71714	.29879	.119	-1.5389	.1046
	Education	-.32054	.25041	.704	-1.0092	.3681

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Guilt_Mean

Tukey HSD

Industry	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
Manufacturing	20	3.4400	
Education	98	3.7605	3.7605

BFSI	32	3.9917	3.9917
Retail/Service Sector	28		4.1571
IT	50		4.4293
Sig.		.173	.057

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.
a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 33.975.
b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

The ANOVA results for the "Industry" variable and its relationship with the **Guilt_Mean** variable show some interesting insights:

Descriptive Statistics:

- **Industries Studied:** BFSI, IT, Retail/Service Sector, Education, Manufacturing
- **Mean Guilt_Mean Scores:**
  - BFSI: 3.99
  - IT: 4.43
  - Retail/Service Sector: 4.16
  - Education: 3.76
  - Manufacturing: 3.44

ANOVA Test Results:

- **F-value:** 5.146
- **Significance (p-value):** 0.001 (which is less than 0.05), indicating that there is a significant difference in the Guilt_Mean scores across industries.

Post Hoc Comparisons (Tukey HSD):

- **Significant Comparisons:**
  - IT vs. Education: The Guilt_Mean score for IT is significantly higher than Education (mean difference = 0.669).
  - IT vs. Manufacturing: The Guilt_Mean score for IT is significantly higher than Manufacturing (mean difference = 0.989).

  Other comparisons (e.g., BFSI vs. IT, Retail/Service Sector vs. IT) did not show significant differences ($p > 0.05$).

Homogeneous Subsets:

- **Subset 1 (lower Guilt_Mean scores):**
  - Manufacturing, Education
- **Subset 2 (higher Guilt_Mean scores):**
  - BFSI, Retail/Service Sector, IT

Industries like IT have a significantly higher Guilt_Mean score compared to Education and Manufacturing, while BFSI and Retail/Service Sector show moderate Guilt_Mean scores. Manufacturing and Education industries are grouped in the lower Guilt_Mean subset.

The ANOVA results indicate that there are significant differences in Guilt_Mean scores across various industries, with IT and BFSI showing higher guilt levels compared to Education and Manufacturing. This suggests that employees in the IT and BFSI sectors may experience more guilt-related emotions, possibly due to the nature of their work environments or organizational pressures.

Choice of working: One way ANOVA

Descriptives

Guilt_Mean

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Not my choice	12	4.0889	.69824	.20157	3.6452	4.5325	3.47	5.20
Neutral/Cant say	74	4.2432	1.00485	.11681	4.0104	4.4760	1.27	6.00
Totally my choice	142	3.8019	1.08157	.09076	3.6224	3.9813	1.60	5.93
Total	228	3.9602	1.05718	.07001	3.8223	4.0982	1.27	6.00

ANOVA

Guilt_Mean

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	9.686	2	4.843	4.466	.013
Within Groups	244.015	225	1.085		
Total	253.702	227			

Post Hoc Tests

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Guilt_Mean

Tukey HSD

(I) ChoiceOfWorking	(J) ChoiceOfWorking	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Not my choice	Neutral/Cant say	-.15435	.32409	.883	-.9190	.6103
	Totally my choice	.28701	.31307	.630	-.4516	1.0256

Neutral/Cant say	Not my choice	.15435	.32409	.883	-.6103	.9190
	Totally my choice	.44137*	.14931	.010	.0891	.7936
Totally my choice	Not my choice	-.28701	.31307	.630	-1.0256	.4516
	Neutral/Cant say	-.44137*	.14931	.010	-.7936	-.0891

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Homogeneous Subsets

Guilt_Mean

Tukey HSD

ChoiceOfWorking	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05
		1
Totally my choice	142	3.8019
Not my choice	12	4.0889
Neutral/Cant say	74	4.2432
Sig.		.243

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 28.877.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

Descriptive Statistics:

The descriptive statistics table provides the following summary of the data:

- **Not my choice** (12 participants):
  - Mean = 4.0889
  - Standard Deviation = 0.69824
  - 95% Confidence Interval for the Mean = [3.6452, 4.5325]
  - Minimum = 3.47, Maximum = 5.20
- **Neutral/Can't say** (74 participants):
  - Mean = 4.2432
  - Standard Deviation = 1.00485
  - 95% Confidence Interval for the Mean = [4.0104, 4.4760]
  - Minimum = 1.27, Maximum = 6.00
- **Totally my choice** (142 participants):
  - Mean = 3.8019

  - Standard Deviation = 1.08157
  - 95% Confidence Interval for the Mean = [3.6224, 3.9813]
  - Minimum = 1.60, Maximum = 5.93
- **Total** (228 participants):
  - Mean = 3.9602
  - Standard Deviation = 1.05718
  - 95% Confidence Interval for the Mean = [3.8223, 4.0982]
  - Minimum = 1.27, Maximum = 6.00

The average Guilt_Mean score is lowest for the "Totally my choice" group, followed by the "Neutral/Cant say" group, with the "Not my choice" group having the highest mean Guilt_Mean score. This indicates that individuals who reported having more autonomy in their work choice experienced less guilt on average.

Family Support: One way ANOVA

Descriptives

Guilt_Mean

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Yes	132	3.8646	1.11931	.09742	3.6719	4.0574	1.27	5.93
Somewhat	72	4.1648	1.03938	.12249	3.9206	4.4091	2.27	6.00
No	24	3.8722	.60686	.12387	3.6160	4.1285	3.40	5.47
Total	228	3.9602	1.05718	.07001	3.8223	4.0982	1.27	6.00

ANOVA

Guilt_Mean

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	4.405	2	2.203	1.988	.139
Within Groups	249.296	225	1.108		
Total	253.702	227			

Overall, participants who received "Somewhat" of family support had the highest Guilt_Mean score, while those who had full family support had a slightly lower mean Guilt_Mean score. The "No" support group had a relatively similar Guilt_Mean score to the "Yes" group but showed less variability.

The **p-value of 0.139** is greater than the significance level of 0.05, indicating that there is no statistically significant difference in Guilt_Mean scores based on family support. This means

that family support (in its three categories) does not seem to have a meaningful effect on the level of guilt experienced by participants.

Employer support: One way ANOVA

Descriptives

Guilt_Mean

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Yes	88	3.4894	1.08348	.11550	3.2598	3.7190	1.27	5.47
Somewhat	96	3.9806	.85888	.08766	3.8065	4.1546	2.27	5.93
No	44	4.8576	.78521	.11838	4.6188	5.0963	3.47	6.00
Total	228	3.9602	1.05718	.07001	3.8223	4.0982	1.27	6.00

ANOVA

Guilt_Mean

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	54.978	2	27.489	31.124	.000
Within Groups	198.724	225	.883		
Total	253.702	227			

Post Hoc Tests

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Guilt_Mean

Tukey HSD

(I) Employersupport	(J) Employersupport	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Yes	Somewhat	-.49116*	.13870	.001	-.8184	-.1639
	No	-1.36818*	.17352	.000	-1.7776	-.9588
Somewhat	Yes	.49116*	.13870	.001	.1639	.8184
	No	-.87702*	.17109	.000	-1.2807	-.4734
No	Yes	1.36818*	.17352	.000	.9588	1.7776
	Somewhat	.87702*	.17109	.000	.4734	1.2807

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Homogeneous Subsets

Guilt_Mean

Tukey HSD

Employersupport	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05		
		1	2	3
Yes	88	3.4894		
Somewhat	96		3.9806	
No	44			4.8576
Sig.		1.000	1.000	1.000

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 67.404.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

Participants who reported "No" employer support had thehighest mean Guilt_Mean score, followed by those with "Somewhat" of employer support, while those with "Yes" employer support had the lowest mean Guilt_Mean score.

The **p-value of 0.000** is less than the significance level of 0.05, indicating that there is a statistically significant difference in Guilt_Mean scores based on employer support. This suggests that employer support plays a significant role in influencing the level of guilt experienced by individuals.

The post-hoc analysis shows significant differences between all pairs of groups, with the **"No" support** group having the highest Guilt_Mean score, followed by the **"Somewhat" support** group, and the **"Yes" support** group having the lowest Guilt_Mean score.

The **Employer Support** variable showed a significant difference in Guilt_Mean scores, with the **"No" employer support** group having the highest guilt levels, followed by the **"Somewhat" support** group, and the **"Yes" support** group having the lowest guilt levels. This suggests that employer support plays a key role in reducing the level of guilt individuals experience.

Salary Satisfaction: One way ANOVA

Descriptives

Guilt_Mean

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Yes	74	3.8324	1.18382	.13762	3.5582	4.1067	1.60	6.00
No	110	4.1782	.98924	.09432	3.9912	4.3651	2.00	5.93
Cant Say	44	3.6303	.88273	.13308	3.3619	3.8987	1.27	5.00

Total	228	3.9602	1.05718	.07001	3.8223	4.0982	1.27	6.00

ANOVA

Guilt_Mean

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	11.223	2	5.612	5.207	.006
Within Groups	242.478	225	1.078		
Total	253.702	227			

Post Hoc Tests

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Guilt_Mean

Tukey HSD

(I) SalarySatisfaction	(J) SalarySatisfaction	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Yes	No	-.34575	.15608	.071	-.7140	.0225
	Cant Say	.20213	.19763	.563	-.2641	.6684
No	Yes	.34575	.15608	.071	-.0225	.7140
	Cant Say	.54788*	.18518	.010	.1110	.9848
Cant Say	Yes	-.20213	.19763	.563	-.6684	.2641
	No	-.54788*	.18518	.010	-.9848	-.1110

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Homogeneous Subsets

Guilt_Mean

Tukey HSD

SalarySatisfaction	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
Cant Say	44	3.6303	
Yes	74	3.8324	3.8324
No	110		4.1782
Sig.		.503	.137

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 66.179.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

The **mean guilt scores** for the three categories show that those who are dissatisfied with their salary (No) tend to report the **highest** mean guilt (4.1782), while those who are satisfied (Yes) report a slightly lower guilt score (3.8324), and those who are neutral or can't decide (Cant Say) report the lowest mean guilt score (3.6303).

The **p-value of 0.006** is less than the standard significance level of **0.05**, indicating that there is a **statistically significant difference** in the guilt levels between the three salary satisfaction categories. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis, which stated that there is no difference in guilt scores based on salary satisfaction.

This further confirms that **dissatisfaction with salary (No)** has a significantly higher guilt level compared to those who are satisfied or neutral about their salary. The neutral group (Cant Say) falls in between.

Conclusion

This study was conducted to examine the guilt experienced by working women in India, analysing the impact of socio-economic and professional factors. The research was based on a sample of 228 working women across various industries, using a structured questionnaire as the primary research tool. The study employed ANOVA to determine the statistical significance of differences in guilt levels across key demographic and work-related variables. The findings reveal significant variations in guilt levels based on salary satisfaction, working status, primary care giving responsibilities, and financial factors. Women with lower salary satisfaction and limited employer support tend to experience higher guilt, while family support and personal choice in career decisions play a crucial role in mitigating these feelings.

Suggestions and Implications

The insights from this research paper highlight the need for a more supportive ecosystem that enables women to balance professional and personal responsibilities without experiencing undue guilt. By sensitizing families, employers, and society at large, we can create an environment where working women feel more secure in their career choices. Employers should implement family-friendly policies, and families should adopt a more equitable division of caregiving duties to reduce the emotional burden on women. These efforts will not only enhance the well-being and mental health of working women but also contribute to a more inclusive and productive workforce. Future research can further explore the psychological, cultural, and organizational aspects influencing guilt, along with practical interventions to reduce it. Addressing this issue is crucial to ensuring that women can pursue their careers with confidence, leading to both personal fulfilment and professional growth.

References

1. Alexander, M. J., & Higgins, E. T. (1993). Emotional trade-offs of becoming a parent: How social roles influence self-discrepancy effects. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65(6), 1259–1269. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.65.6.1259

2. Arendell, T. (2000). Conceiving and Investigating Motherhood: The Decade's Scholarship. Journal of Marriage and Family, 62(4), 1192–1207. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.01192.x
3. Borelli, J. L., Nelson, S. K., River, L. M., Birken, S. A., & Moss-Racusin, C. (2016). Gender differences in Work-Family guilt in parents of young children. Sex Roles, 76(5–6), 356–368. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0579-0
4. Camilleri, M., & Spiteri, D. (2021). Work-Life balance, upward career mobility and further education: the case for working Mothers. International Journal of Management Knowledge and Learning, 305–321. https://doi.org/10.53615/2232-5697.10.305-321
5. De Ravindranath, H., Singh, J. S. K., Arumugam, T., & Kularajasingam, J. (2021). Exploring the Challenges Faced by Working Mothers and the Perceived Factors to Retain them in the Private Education Sector. International Journal of Human Resource Studies, 11(2), 17. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v11i2.18457
6. Elvin-Nowak, Y. (1999). The meaning of guilt: A phenomenological description of employed mothers' experiences of guilt. Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 40(1), 73–83. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9450.00100
7. Guendouzi, J. (2006). "The Guilt thing": balancing domestic and professional roles. Journal of Marriage and Family, 68(4), 901–909. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00303.x
8. Hairina, Y. H., & Hartini, N. (2024). Exploring Consequences of Guilt in Working Mothers: A scoping review. Psikologika Jurnal Pemikiran Dan Penelitian Psikologi, 29(2). https://doi.org/10.20885/jstl.vol29.iss2.art6
    a. http://www.epjournal.net/filestore/EP0890106.pdf.
9. LaGraff, M. R., & Stolz, H. E. (2023). Workplace flexibility, Work–Family guilt, and working mothers' parenting behavior. In Contemporary perspectives on family research (pp. 201–228). https://doi.org/10.1108/s1530-353520230000021007
10. Liss, M., Schiffrin, H. H., & Rizzo, K. M. (2012). Maternal Guilt and Shame: The role of self-discrepancy and fear of negative evaluation. Journal of Child and Family Studies, 22(8), 1112–1119. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-012-9673-2
11. Rotkirch, A. (2009). Maternal guilt. Evolutionary Psychology, 8, 90-106. Retrieved from
12. Rubin, S. E., & Wooten, H. R. (2007). Highly Educated Stay-at-Home Mothers: A Study of Commitment and Conflict. The Family Journal, 15(4), 336–345. https://doi.org/10.1177/1066480707304945
13. Sanil, S. (2024). Working Mothers: Good mothering, Parental Guilt and Work Volition. International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology, 12(4), 5746–5755. https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2024.59915
14. Shakeel, G. S. K. D. F. a. S. M., & Sethi, S. B. D. Y. M. D. K. (2024). Parenting Stress and Coping Strategies Adopted by Working Mothers; A Thematic research. Journal of Informatics Education and Research, 4(2). https://doi.org/10.52783/jier.v4i2.974
15. Sutherland, J. (2010). Mothering, guilt and shame. Sociology Compass, 4(5), 310–321. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2010.00283.x

16. Sutherland, J. (2010c). Mothering, guilt and shame. Sociology Compass, 4(5), 310–321. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2010.00283.x
17. Teroni, F., & Deonna, J. A. (2008). Differentiating shame from guilt. Consciousness and Cognition, 17(3), 725–740. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2008.02.002
18. Vibha & Kaur, H. (2021). ASSESSMENT OF GUILT FEELING REGARDING CHILD CARING AMONG WORKING MOTHERS: A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY. International Journal of Advanced Research and Review (IJARR), 6(10), 15-19.