



Uncertainty and flexibility of fertility intentions

LSE Research Online URL for this paper: <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/123027/>

Version: Published Version


Article:

Barker, Ross and Buber-Ennser, Isabella (2024) Uncertainty and flexibility of fertility intentions. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 61. ISSN 1569-4909

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2024.100618>

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence. This licence allows you to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the work, even commercially, as long as you credit the authors for the original work. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>



Uncertainty and flexibility of fertility intentions

Ross Barker^{a,b,*}, Isabella Buber-Ennsner^b

^a Department of Methodology, The London School of Economics and Political Science, Columbia House, Aldwych, WC2A 2AE, London, UK

^b Vienna Institute of Demography, Austrian Academy of Sciences (OeAW), Dr. Ignaz Seipel-Platz 2, 1010 Vienna, Austria

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Fertility intentions
Europe
Uncertainty of fertility intentions
Revision of fertility intentions
Generations and Gender Survey (GGS)
Sankey diagrams

ABSTRACT

Large-scale survey data is widely used to study the intention to have a(nother) child. However, there are further opportunities to understand how these intentions are revised over the life course and the uncertainty surrounding them. We aim to further outline the importance of simultaneously considering change and uncertainty in fertility decision-making. Specifically, we identify uncertainty in the “probably not” and “probably yes” responses to questions on whether an individual intends to have a(nother) child, and compare the differences in individuals’ stated intention between survey waves. Using panel data from the Generations and Gender Survey (GGS) for Austria, France, Hungary, Italy, and Poland, we study short-term followed by long-term (overall) fertility intentions. First, descriptive analyses compare and visualise the prevalence of uncertainty intentions at first and second wave using Sankey diagrams. Next, multivariate analyses on transitions in intentions focus on partnership and employment context. The results reveal that for both short-term and overall intentions, four in ten respondents are uncertain about intending a (further) child. Further, one in two report a different intention between waves, with changes mainly occurring from one “probably” response to another (e.g., “probably not” to “probably yes”) or through a shift in increasing or lessening certainty (e.g., “probably yes” to “definitely yes”). The childless exhibit by far the greatest uncertainty and revision. Multivariate analyses show that partnership and employment are associated with gradual transitions and larger changes in intentions. Our results also show that fertility intentions form to a large extent along a spectrum of certainty—from “definitely not,” to “probably not,” to “probably yes,” to “definitely yes,” and finally to the birth of a child.

1. Introduction

Different dimensions of fertility intentions are captured in surveys, varying by timeframe, certainty, and whether the question relates to time-specific or quantity-specific intentions for (further) children. These aspects are important for how researchers construct, interpret, and communicate their work. Fertility research often examines the timing of childbearing, the intended number of children, and changes in individuals’ intentions for (further) children (e.g., Jones, 2017; Kuhnt et al., 2021; Ní Bhrolcháin & Beaujouan, 2015).

A short-term fertility intention is generally considered as a plan of action to have a child in the near future, with the underlying rationale that an intention will be indicative of subsequent behaviour, considering the perceived costs and benefits of having children (Ajzen & Klobas, 2013; Raybould & Sear, 2021). The literature uses different definitions of uncertainty in fertility intentions (Kuhnt et al., 2021) and previous research has demonstrated the importance of uncertainty and change in

overall intentions (e.g., Jones, 2017; Kuhnt et al., 2021). Scholars have emphasised that the presence of uncertainty in fertility intentions is genuine and that it is problematic to group “probably” and “definitely” intentions into either “yes” or “no” (Ní Bhrolcháin & Beaujouan, 2015). We take direction from Ní Bhrolcháin and Beaujouan (2019), who argue that fertility may be a discovery rather than a goal, and that the uncertainty expressed in intentions captures part of the decision-making process. Therefore, it may be logical to consider that shifts between neighbouring intentions, such as ‘probably no and ‘probably yes’, occur more frequently than shifts from opposing intentions, such as from ‘definitely yes’ to ‘definitely no’. By grouping positive and negative intentions and disregarding uncertainty, we may fail to capture a substantial population who, for various reasons, are not certain about intending to have or not have children. This issue becomes even more problematic when studying the change or revision of fertility intentions over the life course, as we may overlook transitions into or out of certainty.

* Corresponding author at: Department of Methodology, The London School of Economics and Political Science, Columbia House, Aldwych, WC2A 2AE, London, UK.

E-mail addresses: r.barker1@lse.ac.uk (R. Barker), isabella.buber-ennser@oeaw.ac.at (I. Buber-Ennsner).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2024.100618>

Received 26 October 2023; Received in revised form 1 March 2024; Accepted 8 May 2024

Available online 13 May 2024

1569-4909/© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

When individuals change their intention to have a child, they may also change from uncertainty to certainty (or vice versa). To the best of our knowledge, literature on the movement between certain and uncertain fertility intentions, such as from “probably yes” to “definitely yes,” has not yet been studied in detail. Our aim is to gain further insight into the uncertainty in fertility intentions associated with events in life domains, such as changes in partnership or employment. In our paper, we define uncertainty as “probably yes/no,” in contrast to certainty as “definitely yes/no.” We view uncertainty as dynamic in that its extent changes throughout the life course. We identify patterns that may reflect a sequential progression of fertility intentions from “definitely not” intending to “definitely” intending a child. Therefore, we focus on changes alongside certainly not intending a child, probably not intending a child, probably intending a child, and certainly intending a child. We analyse both short-term and overall fertility intentions using two waves of the Generations and Gender Survey (GGS), where the time interval between the two observations is three to four years. We apply the life-course approach to fertility (Elder, 1994; Huinink & Kohli, 2014), considering the general uncertainty of life and the interdependency of life domains such as employment, partnership, and family. In the first step, we describe the prevalence of uncertainty and transitions between two observations, with a focus on age and parity. We then estimate the associations of life course events with the revisions and changes to fertility intentions. We add to the literature on the change in overall intentions by including the dynamics of “probably yes” and “probably no” responses. Further, we contribute to the literature on short-term intentions by simultaneously considering uncertainty and revision.

This paper is structured as follows: First, we provide an overview of the background of uncertainty. Next, we present our framework, followed by a chapter on data and methods. The subsequent analysis is divided into short-term and overall fertility intentions, with both descriptive and multivariate analyses. Finally, we discuss our results and the challenges associated with longitudinal studies of fertility.

2. Previous research

The first studies on the uncertainty of fertility intentions focused on those who responded “don’t know” when asked about their family plans (Morgan, 1981, 1982). Since then, there has been a growth in the literature on this topic, often using the British General Household Survey (GHS), the German Family Panel (Pairfam), or the GGS (Brzowska & Beaujouan, 2021; Kuhnt et al., 2021; Ní Bhrolcháin & Beaujouan, 2011). These studies measured uncertainty in different ways, depending on how the underlying data was coded. Some studies defined fertility intentions as uncertain if individuals answered “I am not sure” when asked about the number of (further) intended children (Jones, 2017; Kuhnt et al., 2021). Others defined fertility intentions as uncertain if individuals answered with “probably yes,” “probably no,” “don’t know,” or gave no response when asked about having any (more) children (Ní Bhrolcháin & Beaujouan, 2011). A slightly narrower definition included only those answering with “probably yes” or “probably no” (Brzowska & Beaujouan, 2021). In an alternative approach, Buhr and Huinink (2017) distinguished between individuals considering having children, persons giving up on having children, those permanently not considering having children, and those switching. They define “considering having children” for certainly intending a child, but also for being uncertain about future childbearing plans or not having thought about having (further) children. Applying a qualitative approach, Bernardi et al. (2015) emphasise different types of uncertainty. For example, they identify temporary indifference towards having a child, where some individuals take the approach of “if it happens, it happens.” Based on their interpretation of the interviews, they identify six categories; namely, “definitely no,” “definitely yes,” and four levels of uncertainty (named “contingent intention,” “far intention,” “indifferent intention,” and “ambivalent intention”). However, the authors state that it is not the

degree of uncertainty they identify, but that uncertainty is broad—relating to timing, quantum, or difficult-to-measure variables such as personality type. Due to difficulties in pinpointing the meaning and scale of uncertainty, demographers have advocated for new ways to conceptualise and measure childbearing intentions, particularly in response to uncertainty (Guzzo & Hayford, 2020; Ní Bhrolcháin & Beaujouan, 2019).

Research on the uncertainty of fertility intentions has primarily focused on overall fertility, with fewer studies concerned about the level of uncertainty in short-term intentions. This is justified by short-term intentions already being difficult to interpret (e.g., Beaujouan, 2013). Two general and often separate approaches have been applied. First, a cross-sectional one that compares the proportions of individuals uncertain about (further) childbearing (e.g., Ní Bhrolcháin & Beaujouan, 2011); second, a longitudinal approach researches the change in uncertainty of overall intentions over the life course or within a certain period of time (e.g., Jones, 2017; Kuhnt et al., 2021). Most research has applied a cross-sectional approach to understand the prevalence of “probably yes/no” or “don’t know” responses in short-term intentions (e.g., Beaujouan, 2013), while longitudinal studies have focused on understanding the prevalence of being “unsure” or “uncertain” about having any (more) children (e.g., Bernardi et al., 2015; Berrington & Pattaro, 2014; Ní Bhrolcháin et al., 2010). Thus, the patterns and processes regarding revisions of short-term intentions, when considering different levels of certainty, remains unclear. By showing the proportions of revisions, and the drivers of these revisions, the role of uncertainties on fertility intentions and outcomes can be better understood.

The proportion of the population considered uncertain of fertility intentions varies widely, depending not only on the country, but also on the definition or measurement of uncertainty (e.g., Beaujouan, 2013; Kuhnt et al., 2021; Morgan, 1981). According to the Austrian GGS, four in ten persons aged 18 to 45 years were uncertain about having (further) children, with 28% responding “probably yes” and 14% responding “probably no” (Buber-Ennser et al., 2014). Ní Bhrolcháin and Beaujouan (2019) identified over 30% of the population aged 18 to 44 in the UK as unsure of whether they will have any (more) children by combining “probably yes/no,” “don’t know,” and “no answer” responses. Using three survey waves of women aged 18 to 39 in the US over the course of one year, Jones (2017) found that 39% of individuals were not sure of whether they would have any (more) children in at least one interview. Jones (2017) also stressed that uncertainty in fertility intentions is a temporary state, as demonstrated by widespread changes in just one year, as only nine percent were uncertain of their fertility intentions in each wave. Similarly, Kuhnt et al. (2021) examined the flexibility between negative, uncertain, and positive overall intentions in Germany. They found a remarkable level of volatility in fertility plans, as 51% of individuals had changed their overall fertility intentions over the course of 11 years.

Uncertainty in overall fertility intentions has been associated with various life domains, like partnership, employment and economic situation, and family background (Berrington & Pattaro, 2014; Kuhnt et al., 2021). Additionally, age and parity have been related to uncertainty in having (further) children. Berrington and Pattaro (2014) found that educational level, employment status, partnership status, and number of siblings were associated with uncertain overall fertility intentions in the UK. Using multinomial logistic regression, they showed that economic uncertainty (being unemployed or economically inactive) was associated with greater uncertainty in intentions, and that fertility intention uncertainty was highest in those who were never married and without a partner. Several studies stress that parity can help predict the level of uncertainty in overall intentions (e.g., Berrington & Pattaro, 2014; Kuhnt et al., 2021; Ní Bhrolcháin & Beaujouan, 2019). Similarly, Jones (2017) found that having one or more children, being aged above 30, and perceiving a partner’s intentions as uncertain were associated with uncertainty in fertility intentions.




Fig. 1. Example of uncertainty in individuals' short-term and overall fertility intentions across stages of the life course.

In general, changes in expected overall fertility have been associated with age, family formation, partnership status, young age at first birth, and background factors such as growing up with both parents or having more siblings (Buhr & Huinink, 2017; Gray et al., 2013; Hayford, 2009; Heiland et al., 2008). Further, an individual's ability to revise the intended number of children is related to uncertainty in life domains such as employment and relationships (Trinitapoli & Yeatman, 2018). Due to the significance of employment on the intention to have a child, we may expect that changes in employment status, such as entering employment after being a student, will be associated with changes and revisions in both short-term and overall fertility intentions. Given the evidence that uncertain intentions appear to be transitory, we might expect that the variables associated with changes in the number of intended children are also significant for changes in the level of certainty. In fact, changes in uncertainty in intentions have been associated with getting older, separating from a partner, the number of children, and being male (Buber-Ennser et al., 2014; Kuhnt et al., 2021).

Research on short-term fertility intentions has revealed that the proportion of women and men definitely and probably intending a child in the near future changes over the life course, with both groups being of similar size. A substantial share of persons in their late twenties, which are the prime years of family formation, certainly want to have a(nother) child in the near future (Brzozowska & Beaujouan, 2021). As expected, those who certainly wanted a child within the next three years fulfilled this concrete plan much more often than those who answered the question about having a child within three years with "probably yes" (Brzozowska & Beaujouan, 2021; Buber-Ennser et al., 2014). Similar studies such as Beaujouan (2013) and Bernardi et al. (2015) identify broad meanings of uncertain intentions (such as ambivalence or

ambiguity towards the timing of having children) and large proportions who pass through or express uncertainty. To the best of our knowledge, there is a lack of literature regarding transitions within uncertain short-term intentions.

3. Theoretical framework and hypotheses

We apply a life-course approach that enables simultaneously examining various interdependent changes in individual trajectories (Udry, 1983). This approach does not conceptualise fertility intentions as independent, but rather dependent on other areas of life and changing over time. Individuals have agency and construct their life course based on opportunities and constraints, such as the beginning of a new partnership or change in employment (Testa & Bolano, 2021). The life-course approach has been applied to cases where individuals revise and adapt their fertility desires throughout the life course (Gray et al., 2013; Kuhnt et al., 2021). Such studies use the approach to identify how changes in intentions are related to changes in life domains. Further examination of fertility plans stress the importance of fertility intention formation amidst broader life developments and the changing meaning and depth of such plans across various life stages (Bachrach & Morgan, 2013). Bachrach and Morgan (2013) urge for reconciling the importance of fertility intentions and their conceptualisation in demographic research. They revisit intentions through the lens of cognitive and macro social theory, and similarly to our perspective have comparisons to uncertainty literature such as Ní Bhrolcháin and Beaujouan (2012), by conceptualising that intention formation may be a stage in a developmental process, which we reaffirm in this study. This theory frames intentions in early life a largely shaped by norms and schemas acquired

during adolescence, and intentions can become less salient throughout life, often dependent on their proximity to actions. According to this theory, intentions are a part of a myriad of other concepts of what life entails, such as the concept of family more broadly, and wider relevance to changes in life domains such as employment and relationships.

Following the approach by [Kuhnt et al. \(2021\)](#), we assume a sequential pattern of fertility intentions, with uncertainty at its centre as a transitional phase between positive and negative intentions. [Fig. 1](#) illustrates the potential sequences of fertility intentions throughout life along a spectrum of certainty. Within this framework, intentions can move up or down a spectrum of certainty and may be influenced by changes in life domains. This process begins in early adulthood and fluctuates throughout life. Starting cohabitation with a partner may lead to a reduction in uncertainty and increasingly positive intentions, while becoming unemployed may increase the intention to not have children in the near future. After the birth of a child, fertility intentions may be revised, especially short-term intentions.

The aim of this research is to provide insights on the prevalence of fertility intention uncertainty alongside the change or revision of fertility intentions over time. We propose the following hypotheses:

H1: Changes and revisions of short-term and overall fertility intentions occur to a larger extent gradually—between certainly yes, probably yes, probably no, and certainly no.

H2: For both short-term and overall intentions, changes to uncertain intentions are more frequent than changes to certain intentions.

H3: Changes in partnership are associated with changes and revisions of fertility intentions.

H4: Changes in employment are associated with revisions of short-term fertility intentions.

H5: Life events are correlated with short-term intentions to a higher degree than with overall intentions.

Our study includes several European countries and we assume that the dynamics in fertility intentions are similar in all countries.

4. Data and methods

4.1. Data

This study is based on the Generations and Gender Survey (GGS) and uses data from waves 1 and 2 (DOIs: 10.17026/dans-z5z-xn8g, 10.17026/dans-xm6-a262). We refer to [Gauthier et al. \(2018\)](#) or to the GGP website (<https://www.ggp-i.org/>) for methodological details. The GGS—a leading source for studying fertility intentions in Europe—provides individual-level data that is available longitudinally via two waves with a three- or four-year interval. We have selected five European countries based on data availability, similar timeframes, and similarity in questionnaire structure; namely, Austria, France, Hungary, Italy, and Poland.

Questions on fertility intentions were asked to women and men below age 50 years as well as men above 50 years whose female partner was below age 50. The module on fertility intentions started with the question (1) “Do you yourself want to have a/nother baby now?” and in France, “Are you trying to have a baby now?” Possible responses were “yes,” “no,” and “maybe, do not know yet.” The question about short-term intentions was framed as: (2) “Do you intend to have a(nother) child within the next three years?” The response options were “definitely yes,” “probably yes,” “probably not,” and “definitely not.” Persons who were expecting a child at the time of the interview were not asked about their short-term intentions. France and Hungary had an option for “don’t know” for the intention questions. Overall fertility intentions were asked to persons who responded negatively to the short-term intentions question (either definitely not or probably not intending a child in the next three years) with an additional question: (3) “Supposing you do not have a/another child during the next three years, do you intend to have any (more) children at all?” The same response options were provided as for the short-term intentions question.

Table 1

Sample size.

	Wave 1	Wave 2	Sample for short-term intentions	Sample for overall intentions
Austria	2008/ 2009	2012/ 2013	3030	2986
France	2005	2008	2516	2449
Hungary	2008/ 2009	2012/ 2013	2606	
Italy	2003/ 2004	2007	3000	2921
Poland	2010/ 2011	2014/ 2015	4217	4174
Total			15,369	12,530

Source: GGS, individuals aged 18 to 45 years (Austria, France, Poland, and Italy) and aged 24 to 45 years (Hungary) at wave 1.

For individuals who expressed wanting to have a child or actively trying to have a child at the time of the interview, both their short-term intentions and overall intentions were coded as “definitely yes.” As persons who were definitely or probably intending to have a child in the near future were not further asked about their overall fertility intentions, we recoded their overall fertility intentions to match their short-term intentions.

In selecting the sample, we excluded individuals with missing information on fertility intentions in wave 1 due to the above-mentioned age restrictions or pregnancy, as well as infecundity (i.e., individuals who physically—according to their provided information—were definitely not able to have (further) children at wave 1 or wave 2). As Austria limited the survey to persons aged 18 to 45 years and as persons above age 46 had reached age 50 by wave 2 and were thus no longer asked about fertility intentions, we restricted our analyses for all countries to persons aged 18 to 45 years at the time of wave 1. Moreover, we dropped a few Hungarian records with “don’t know” responses for short-term intentions at wave 1.¹ Further, individuals with missing fertility intentions at wave 2 were excluded, except for those expecting a child at the time of wave 2.

Our final sample included individuals aged 18 to 45 years who participated in both waves, totalling to 15,369 persons across the five countries ([Table 1](#)). As the Hungarian questionnaire did not include uncertain responses to overall fertility questions, the country was excluded from analyses on overall fertility intentions. Moreover, we dropped 233 respondents with missing long-term intentions at wave 1 or 2, which reduced the sample size for analysing overall intentions and changes therein to 12,530 persons. In our study, data were weighted with post-stratification country weights, and weights were applied to ensure that each country in the sample was equally represented.

The attrition rates between waves 1 and 2 varied among the countries in our sample. Overall, the attrition rate amounted to 38% in Poland ([Kotowska et al., 2016](#)), 35% in France ([Régnier-Loilier, 2017](#)), and 28% in Austria ([Buber-Ennser, 2014](#)). Between wave 2 and wave 3 of the Hungarian GGS, which we use in this analysis, attrition was low (18%). However, over the long term—from the first wave in 2001/2002 to the third wave—attrition amounted to 51%. Italy did not conduct the GGS survey similarly to other countries, but used data from the *Famiglia e Soggetti Sociali* (FSS) for wave 1, and a subsample thereof for wave 2 ([Régnier-Loilier & Vignoli, 2011](#)). We calculated attrition in the Italian sample based on the 24,551 individuals aged 18 to 45 years at wave 1, physically able to have a child, and with information on short-term

¹ As mentioned above, respondents in Hungary and France had the option of “don’t know” for short-term intentions. After excluding individuals with missing information on fertility intentions in wave 1 due to the above-mentioned age restrictions, infecundity, or current pregnancy, the Hungarian dataset contained 1.5% “don’t know” responses, whereas zero cases were counted in France.

Table 2a

Model specifications for gradual transitions.

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3			Model 4			
Wave 1	Definitely no		Probably no		Probably yes			Definitely yes			
Wave 2	Def. no	Prob. no	Def. no	Prob. no	Prob. yes	Prob. no	Prob. yes	Def. yes	Prob. yes	Def. yes	Had or expected a child

Table 2b

Model specifications for larger changes.

	Model 5			Model 6			Model 7		Model 8	
	Larger changes upwards from definitely no			Larger changes upwards from probably no			Larger changes downwards from probably yes		Larger changes downwards from definitely yes	
Wave 1	Definitely no			Probably no			Probably yes		Definitely yes	
Wave 2	Def. no	Prob. yes; def. yes; had or expected a child		Prob. no	Def. yes; had or expected a child		Prob. yes	Def. no	Def. yes	Def. no; prob. no

fertility intention at wave 1 (Table A1). Therein, attrition amounted 34%, which was highest in Poland (45%) and lowest in Austria (23%). Further, it must be noted that attrition varied by short-term intentions stated at wave 1: Persons who “probably” intended a(nother) child at wave 1 dropped out of the panel to a greater extent (39%) than those with certain (positive or negative) intentions (33%). Women and men who were “probably not” intending a child in the near future also had a higher attrition rate than certain respondents, namely 35%. In all countries considered in our analyses, respondents providing uncertain fertility intentions more often dropped out of the survey as compared to those with certain intentions. Variation in attrition might lead to somewhat biased results regarding uncertainty and dynamics therein.

4.2. Methods

Three research questions underlie the current study. What is the proportion of the surveyed population reporting uncertainty in fertility intentions? What is the share of persons reporting different short-term and overall fertility intentions from one wave to the next? Which life course events are associated with the revision or change of individuals’ intentions over time? Throughout the paper, we distinguished individuals’ fertility intentions into four groups: (1) Definitely no, (2) probably no, (3) probably yes, and (4) definitely yes.

Short-term fertility intentions and overall fertility intentions were studied separately, following a similar structure: First, we examined the prevalence of uncertainty at wave 1 and at wave 2, differentiated by age. This was followed by visualising transitions and changes in individuals’ fertility intentions between wave 1 and wave 2 using Sankey diagrams. For the latter, we further differentiated by parity and provide separate analyses for the childless, persons with one child, as well as persons with two and more children. Second, we performed regressions to identify factors associated with changes and transitions in fertility intentions. Importantly, the term “change” is not always appropriate and that “transition” or “revision” might better capture the process and the dynamic of fertility intentions, especially those for the near future. We are aware that we do not fully capture a change or revision of short-term intentions, as these intentions refer to the following three years. This is because the intention questioning is specific to the time when an individual is interviewed. For example, a person who does not intend to have a child during the next three years at wave 1, but within a period of five or six years, and whose plans remain the same over time, would—in our conceptualisation—change from not intending a child to intending a child. Such a situation is better described as a transition. Therein, we

want to point out that—especially for short-term intentions—the term “transition” is more appropriate, whereas for long-term intentions the notation of “change” is applicable.

We used a set of binary and multinomial logistic regression models to estimate the likelihood of transitions (or realisation) of fertility intentions between waves. Following the path outlined in Fig. 1, we focus on gradual transitions with step-by-step progressions from “definitely no,” to “definitely yes,” and to the birth of a child (Table 2a). Moreover, we study larger changes in intentions, as outlined in Table 2b (see also Table A2).

Results are presented as average marginal effects (AME). They represent the average effect of a variable on the probability of changing fertility intentions, when holding all other effects constant, therefore isolating the effect of the variable of interest. AMEs allow for the direct comparison of effect sizes between different models (Best & Wolf, 2012; Mize, 2019). Positive AMEs indicate that a group changed or revised fertility intentions more often than the reference group, while negative AMEs indicate that a group did so less often.

To explain our strategy, we provided detailed descriptions of three models for transitions in short-term intentions: Model 1 included persons “definitely not” intending a child within the next three years. In the binary regression, the outcome was 0 if the person gave the same answer in the next wave, and 1 if the respondent answered with “probably no” at wave 2. Model 2 included persons “probably not” intending a child within the next three years. We applied a multinomial regression and differentiated for the outcome between answering “definitely no,” “probably no,” and “probably yes” at wave 2. Model 5 includes respondents definitely not intending a child at wave 1. In binary regression the outcome was 0 if the person gave the same answer in the next wave, and 1 if the respondent probably or definitely intended a child at wave 2 or had/expected a newborn at wave 2.

Our main explanatory variables were age and parity as well as changes in two life-course domains that occurred between waves; namely, partnership and employment status. Regarding partnership, we differentiated between seven categories: (1) cohabiting at both waves, (2) living apart together (LAT) at both waves, (3) no partner at both waves, (4) partner at wave 1 (either cohabiting or LAT) and no partner at wave 2, (5) no cohabiting partner or LAT at wave 1 and cohabiting with a partner at wave 2, (6) no partner at wave 1 (neither cohabiting nor LAT) and LAT at wave 2, and (7) cohabiting at wave 1 and LAT at wave 2. For employment status, we distinguished between eight categories: (1) employed at both waves, (2) unemployed at both waves, (3) student at both waves, (4) unemployed or student at wave 1 and employed at




Fig. 2. Short-term fertility intentions at wave 1 and wave 2. Source: GGS, 15,369 individuals aged 18 to 45 years at wave 1, Austria, France, Hungary, Italy, Poland. Weighted data.




Fig. 3. Comparison of short-term fertility intentions between wave 1 and wave 2. Source: GGS, 15,369 individuals aged 18 to 45 years at wave 1, of which 6067 were childless, 3154 had one child, and 6148 had two or more children at wave 1. Austria, France, Hungary, Italy, Poland. Weighted data.

wave 2, (5) employed at wave 1 and unemployed at wave 2, (6) on parental leave or homemaker at both waves, (7) employed at wave 1 and on parental leave or homemaker at wave 2, and (8) others.² We acknowledge that changes in employment and partnership are based on the comparison between waves 1 and wave 2, and we were unable to capture further changes occurring between the waves (such as being employed at wave 1, experiencing unemployment, and being employed again at wave 2). Further, we controlled for sex and country. As employment status was not coded in the Italian wave 2, we excluded Italy from regressions that included changes in employment status.

Respondents were on average 33 years at wave 1. Four out of ten were childless, two out of ten had one child, two out of ten had two children and the remaining group (roughly 10%) had three or more

² Employment includes self-employment and the group “helping family member in family business.” The category “unemployment” includes few respondents whose employment status was “ill or disabled for a long time.” The category “student” includes respondents whose employment status was “military service or social service.” The other category includes all other transitions that occur infrequently within the dataset, namely: unemployed – student; unemployed-leave/homemaker; student – unemployed; student – employed; student – leave/homemaker; employed – student; leave/homemaker – unemployed, leave/homemaker – student; leave/homemaker – employed.

children (Table A3). The majority was cohabiting at both waves or had no partner at both points in time. About two in ten reported a different partnership status at both waves. Regarding employment situation, 64% were employed at both points in time, while 14% were unemployed at wave 1 and employed at wave 2. The remaining categories, described above, comprised less than five percent.

5. Results

5.1. Short-term fertility intentions

Uncertainty in short-term fertility intentions was substantial. In the first wave, four in ten were somewhat uncertain regarding having a (nother) child in the near future (i.e., in the next three years): 17% answered with “probably yes” and 23% with “probably no” (Fig. 2a). Overall, the largest group comprised those definitely not planning a child in the near future (roughly one half), whereas about one in eight had very concrete plans and “definitely” intended a child within the next three years.

The distribution of short-term fertility intentions by age showed a U-shaped pattern in terms of certainty, with the highest levels of certainty found at the youngest and highest ages. As expected, especially in very early adulthood and at late reproductive age, women and men did not

Table 3
Estimated Average Marginal Effects for gradual transitions in short-term fertility intentions between wave 1 and 2, persons childless at wave 1.

Wave 1	Model 1	Model 2			Model 3			Model 4		
	Definitely no	Probably no	Probably no	Probably yes	Probably no	Probably yes	Definitely yes	Probably yes	Definitely yes	Had or expected a child
Wave 2	Probably no	Definitely no	Probably no	Probably yes	Probably no	Probably yes	Definitely yes	Probably yes	Definitely yes	Had or expected a child
Age (wave 1) (ref.=30–34)										
18–29	-0.08	-0.06*	0.01	0.05	-0.03	-0.02	0.06	-0.03	0.00	0.03
35–39	-0.24***	0.13**	-0.02	-0.11**	0.05	-0.03	-0.03	0.07	0.07	-0.14**
40–45	-0.34***	0.23***	0.01	-0.24***	0.19**	0.04	-0.23***	0.06	0.12	-0.18**
Partnership status at wave 1 and wave 2 (ref.=cohabiting – cohabiting)										
LAT – LAT	0.09	0.00	0.02	-0.02	0.01	0.10	-0.11	0.07	0.37***	-0.44***
No partner – no partner	0.12*	-0.01	0.16***	-0.15***	0.17***	0.12**	-0.29***	0.56***	-0.00	-0.55***
(Cohabiting) partner – no partner	0.18**	0.02	0.18***	-0.20***	0.09*	0.10	-0.20***	0.38***	0.01	-0.40***
No (cohabiting) partner – cohabiting	0.29***	-0.13**	0.02	0.11*	-0.05	-0.06	0.11**	0.02	0.04	-0.06
No partner – LAT	0.18*	0.01	0.03	-0.03	0.11	0.14*	-0.25***	0.32**	0.19	-0.51***
Cohabiting – LAT	0.11	0.25*	0.04	-0.29***	0.06	0.27*	-0.33***	0.31**	0.25	-0.56***
Country (ref.=Austria)										
France	-0.22***	0.17***	-0.10*	-0.07	-0.08	-0.08	0.17***	-0.04	-0.15***	0.19***
Hungary	-0.06	0.08*	-0.16***	0.08	-0.07	-0.10*	0.17***	0.01	-0.04	0.02
Italy	-0.24***	0.24***	-0.28***	0.05	-0.17***	0.01	0.16***	0.02	-0.11**	0.10*
Poland	0.04	0.01	-0.04	0.03	0.09**	-0.02	-0.06*	0.03	-0.11**	0.07
Sex (ref.=female)										
Male	0.05 ⁺	-0.02	0.05*	-0.03	0.02	0.02	-0.04	0.02	-0.09***	0.07**
Pseudo R ²	0.1264	0.0866			0.1193			0.1236		
Observations	1447	1396			941			887		

Note:
⁺ p < 0.1.
 * p < 0.05.
 ** p < 0.01.
 *** p < 0.001.

Source: GGS, individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1, Austria, France, Hungary, Italy, and Poland.

intend to have children in the near future. The highest levels of uncertainty occurred in the mid and late 20s (Fig. 2a), reaching values between 50% and 60%. Uncertain positive answers were pronounced in late 20s and early 30s, when roughly three in ten answered the question on intending a child within the next three years with “probably yes.” We found that at almost all ages, the group of persons with uncertain positive intentions was larger than that with certain positive intentions. The share of those “probably not” intending a child in the near future remained rather stable until the late 30s (around 25%) and declined thereafter.

When asked again about short-term intentions in the second wave, roughly one in four gave an uncertain response (12% “probably yes;” 16% “probably no”), while 15% either had a child between waves or were expecting one. As the cohorts aged, there was an increasing proportion of individuals who “definitely” did not intend to have a child within the next three years at higher ages (Fig. 2b).

Comparing short-term fertility intentions at both waves clearly revealed that the largest group (37%) comprised those who “definitely” did not intend a child in the near future at both waves (Fig. 3a). Individuals realising strong short-term fertility intentions (i.e., “definitely” intending a child at wave 1 and reporting a newborn or pregnancy at wave 2) comprised six percent of the surveyed population. Of smaller size were those “probably” intending a child at wave 1 and reporting a newborn or pregnancy in the second interview (four percent). Further, some respondents “definitely” or “probably” not intending a child in the near future at wave 1 also had a newborn or were expecting one at wave 2. It is not possible to deduce to what extent these pregnancies were unintended or intended when conceived, as individuals might have changed previous negative intentions between the two interviews.

One in two surveyed persons (49%) reported the same short-term

fertility intentions at both waves and one in ten realised certain or uncertain short-term intentions. Therein, four in ten gave different answers for short-term intentions at both points in time. Gradual transitions between “certainly yes,” “probably yes,” “probably no,” and “certainly no” were frequent (26%) as compared to more pronounced shifts (14%). Transitions between the two extremes (“definitely no” and “definitely yes”) were negligible, whereas transitions between “probably yes” and “definitely no” were somewhat more frequent (2–3 percent). Our results thus confirm hypothesis H1 that changes and revisions of fertility intentions occur to a larger extent gradually. Overall, the sources of differences in individuals’ intentions between waves primarily came from the uncertain responses. Almost two thirds who answered “probably no” in wave 1 reported a different short-term intention three or four years later; further, nine percent became the parent of a newborn or expected one meanwhile. Additionally, transitions were especially frequent among those who initially answered with “probably yes” in wave 1, as one in two reported a different intention in the following wave and a substantial share (26%) had a newborn child or expected one at wave 2. These findings confirm our hypothesis H2 that changes of uncertain intentions are more frequent than changes of certain intentions. Our descriptive results thus indicate that “probably” intending a child within the next three years especially appears to be a transitory stage.

When separating by parity, the childless turned out to have the most transitory short-term fertility intentions (Fig. 3b), with almost one in two reporting different short-term intentions at waves 1 and 2, as compared one third among parents with one child, and one fourth at parity two and higher. Therein, stability in short-term intentions increases with parity, mostly due to individuals who “definitely” did not intend to have another child in the near future at the time of both interviews (Figs. 3c and 3d). Further, parents with one child at wave 1

Table 4
Estimated Average Marginal Effects for larger changes in short-term fertility intentions between wave 1 and 2, persons childless at wave 1.

	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8
	Larger changes upwards from		Larger changes downwards from	
	... definitely no	... probably no	... probably yes	... definitely yes
Age (wave 1) (ref.=30–34)				
18–29	-0.05	-0.03	0.01	0.00
35–39	-0.17**	-0.20**	0.20**	0.13 ⁺
40–45	0.33***	-0.34**	0.24**	0.27*
Partnership status at wave 1 and wave 2 (ref.= cohabiting – cohabiting)				
LAT – LAT	-0.01	-0.19**	0.01	0.21*
No partner – no partner (Cohabiting) partner – no partner	-0.16**	-0.47***	-0.04	0.31***
No (cohabiting) partner – cohabiting	0.24***	-0.00	-0.19*	0.02
No partner – LAT Cohabiting – LAT	-0.03 -0.28 ⁺	-0.23*** -0.31*	-0.00 -0.30	0.33*** 0.18
Country (ref.= Austria)				
France	-0.04	0.08	0.13*	-0.03
Hungary	0.13**	0.14**	0.05	-0.01
Italy	0.04	0.25***	0.14*	0.03
Poland	0.19***	0.10**	-0.11	0.03
Sex (ref.=female)				
Male	-0.01	-0.06*	-0.01	0.07
Pseudo R ²	0.2355	0.3547	0.0912	0.2380
Observations	1436	859	564	370

Note:
⁺ p < 0.1.
 * p < 0.05.
 ** p < 0.01.
 *** p < 0.001.

Source: GGS, individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1. Austria, France, Hungary, Italy and Poland.

frequently enlarged their family, with one quarter having or expecting another child at the time of wave 2, which was much less often the case among parents with two or more children (seven percent having or expecting another child at wave 2). Respondents “probably” intending a child in the near future somewhat differ across parities: Childless tended to give the same answer once more, parents with one child rather frequently realised their previously uncertain intentions, and a non-negligible share of parents transitioned to “definitely no.” A further differentiation between parents with two children and parents with three or more children reveals that revisions in intentions are similar, with a higher share of those definitely not planning further children in the near future at parity 3+ (Figure A1). Moreover, dynamics are similar among women and men, and across parities (Figure A2).

Country-specific analyses revealed that uncertain short-term fertility intentions were mentioned less often in France than in the remaining four countries included in our study (Figures A3 and A4). This was especially true for the group “probably not” intending a child in the near future, which was comparably small (wave 1: about 10%, as compared to roughly 20 to 30% in Austria, Hungary, Italy, and Poland). Further, uncertainty in short-term intentions was less pronounced in France from the mid-30s onwards, as most respondents aged 35 to 49 years gave

“definitely yes” or “definitely no” answers. Changes or transitions in short-term fertility intentions varied across countries, ranging from 26% in France to 42% in Austria and Italy, with Hungary and Poland falling in between (Figure A5). Childbearing between the two waves was frequent in France, where almost two in ten reported a newborn child or a pregnancy at wave 2—especially French parents with one child who had or expected a second one at wave 2 (about one in three). Transitions from “probably no” to “definitely no” were substantial in Italy. In all countries, transitions were related to parity and were more frequent among the childless than among parents. Childless Austrians, Italians, Poles, and Hungarians reported higher rates of change (around 50%) than their French peers (about 42%). For those with two or more children, “definitely not” intending another child in the near future was the most common answer in all countries, followed by the group “probably not” intending to enlarge one’s family. Among parents with two or more children, a substantial group intended further children at wave 1 in France (13%) and by wave 2, while almost 10% of parents with two or more children had or expected another child at wave 2. Further childbearing at these parities was rare in Italy. The uncertain categories appeared more transitory in some countries than others. Among persons “probably not” intending a child in the near future, transitions to different answers on short-term intentions were frequently observed in Italy (75%) and less often in Poland (55%), with Hungary, France, and Austria ranging in between. However, differences in answers at wave 2 were less pronounced for those “probably” intending a child in the near future.

In multivariate analyses, we focused on childless persons, as changes were most pronounced in these groups, and provide results for parents in the Appendix (Tables A4 and A5). Results show that age and partnership context were significantly associated with gradual as well as larger transitions in short-term fertility intentions (Tables 3 and 4, respectively). With increasing age, gradual revisions or changes in short-term intentions towards an increasingly positive direction became less likely (Table 3). For example, a childless woman aged 35 to 39 years, living in Austria, cohabiting with a partner at both waves, and “probably not” intending a child within the next three years, was less likely to provide a “probably yes”-answer at wave 2 than a peer aged 30 to 34 years (11% points; model 2). Among respondents in their early 40s at wave 1, the difference amounted to 24% points. Further, transitions from “probably yes” to “definitely yes” and from “definitely no” to “probably no” were reported significantly less often among persons in their early 40s at the time of the first interview (Model 3). Further, with increasing age, larger changes upwards became less frequent and larger changes downwards more frequent (Table 4, Models 5–6 and Models 7–8, respectively).

Regarding partnership context, increasingly positive intentions in the sense of transitions from “probably no” to “probably yes” or from “probably yes” to “definitely yes” were mainly mentioned if living together with a partner at both waves, and significantly more often if entering a cohabitation with a partner (model 1 and model 3). Moreover, finding a partner and moving in together with a partner was associated with the transition from “definitely not” to “probably not.” By contrast, separations were associated with increasingly negative intentions in the sense of transitioning from “probably yes” to “probably no,” which was also the case for individuals who had no partner at wave 1 or wave 2 (model 3). Notably, the small group of LAT respondents definitively wanting a child at wave 1 were all in union if they had a child. The large negative AME for realising their intention reflects that the decisions to have a child and to live together were likely taken together. Larger changes upwards from “definitely no” were associated with entering a cohabitation (Table 4, model 5), while larger changes downwards from “definitely yes” were related with breaking up with the partner (Table 5, model 8). Our multivariate analyses confirm hypotheses H3 that changes in partnership are associated with changes and revisions of fertility intentions.

Further, employment status and changes therein between waves were associated with transitions in short-term intentions, supporting

Table 5

Estimated Average Marginal Effects for gradual transitions in short-term fertility intentions between wave 1 and 2, persons childless at wave 1, including changes in employment.

	Model 1	Model 2			Model 3			Model 4		
Wave 1	Definitely no	Probably no			Probably yes			Definitely yes		
Wave 2	Probably no	Definitely no	Probably no	Probably yes	Probably no	Probably yes	Definitely yes	Probably yes	Definitely yes	Had or expected a child
Employment status at wave 1 and wave 2 (ref.= employed – employed)										
Unemployed – unem-ployed	-0.07	-0.02	0.02	-0.01	0.22*	-0.13	-0.09	-0.09	0.13	-0.03
Student – student	-0.12**	0.23***	-0.02	-0.21***	0.13	-0.11	-0.01	0.17	-0.08	-0.09
Unemployed – employed	-0.03	0.08*	-0.02	-0.06	0.03	-0.01	-0.02	0.08	0.02	-0.10
Employed – unemployed	-0.05	0.11*	-0.06	-0.05	0.18**	-0.19**	0.01	-0.01	0.06	-0.05
Leave/homemaker –leave/homemaker	-0.29				0.76***	-0.44***	-0.32***	-0.19***	-0.02	0.21
Employed – leave/home-maker	Omitted	0.12	-0.04	-0.08	0.11	-0.02	-0.09	-0.17***	-0.23***	0.40***
Other	-0.05	0.29***	-0.21***	-0.08	-0.07	0.09	-0.02	-0.03	-0.23***	0.26***
Pseudo R ²	0.1362	0.1014			0.1242			0.1785		
Observations	1090	1018			767			759		

Note: See Section 4 on detailed information on various changes in the employment status. In model 1 the omitted observations predict failure perfectly. Controlled for age, partnership status at both waves, country, and sex. See Table A6 for the entire model.

- * p < 0.05.
- ** p < 0.01.
- *** p < 0.001.

Source: GGS, individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1. Austria, France, Hungary, and Poland.

Table 6

Estimated Average Marginal Effects for larger changes in short-term fertility intentions between wave 1 and 2, persons childless at wave 1, including changes in employment.

	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8
	Larger changes upwards from		Larger changes downwards from	
	... definitely no	... probably no	... probably yes	... definitely yes
Employment status at wave 1 and wave 2 (ref.=employed – employed)				
Unemployed – unemployed	-0.09	-0.27**	0.23*	-1.22
Student – student	-0.16***	-0.16*	0.28*	0.16
Unemployed – employed	-0.02	0.00	0.05	0.12 ⁺
Employed – unemployed	0.01	-0.02	0.09	0.09
Leave/homemaker – leave/homemaker	omitted	omitted	omitted	omitted
Employed – leave/homemaker	0.01	0.27*	0.04	0.10
Other	0.01	0.21*	-0.03	omitted
Pseudo R ²	0.2736	0.4021	0.1295	0.2465
Observations	1071	703	420	323

Note: Remark: Controlled for age, partnership status at both waves, country, and sex. See Table A7 for the entire model. In models 5–8 the omitted observations predict failure perfectly.

- ⁺ p < 0.1.
- * p < 0.05.
- ** p < 0.01.
- *** p < 0.001.

Source: GGS, individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1. Austria, France, Hungary, and Poland.

hypothesis H4 (Tables 5 and 6). Persons in education throughout the observed period were more likely to further postpone short-term intentions in the sense that they less often changed from “definitely no” to “probably no” and from “probably no” to “probably yes,” and moved significantly more often from “probably no” to “definitely no” (Table 5, models 1 and 2). Further, we observe less often larger upwards and more often larger downwards changes in this group, indicating that they further postpone childbearing due to their enrolment in education (Table 6, models 5–8). Gradual downwards revisions of uncertain short-term intentions (“probably yes”) were associated with uncertain economic circumstances related to unemployment at both waves, losing a job, or longer periods of parental leave or homemaking (Table 5, model 3). Among respondents unemployed and answering “probably yes” at wave 1, those remaining unemployed were more likely to revise downward (Table 5, model 3) while those becoming employed were similar to those always employed. We may conclude that finding a job allows respondents to pursue their positive fertility intentions. Symmetrically those who became unemployed were more likely to revise downwards. As the group “leave – homemaker at both waves” is very small, we refrain from interpreting the large AMEs in Table 5. Unemployment at both observations was also associated with more frequent larger downwards transitions from uncertain positive intentions and less frequent upwards transitions from uncertain negative intentions (Table 6, models 6 and 7). Additionally, persons losing employment more often revised their uncertain intentions downwards from “probably no” to “definitely no” (Table 5, model 3). Finally, the realisation of certain fertility intentions was associated with entering parental leave (Table 5, model 4). For results on employment including all parities we refer to Tables A8 and A9.

Gender differences turned out to be minor, with men more often providing identical uncertain answers at both waves (Table 3, model 2; Table 4, model 6). We might conclude that women tend to revise uncertain short-term intentions more frequently than men. Finally, differences across countries were substantial. Negative uncertain short-term intentions were changed or revised to a larger extent in Italy and positive uncertain ones in France and in Hungary (Table 3, model 2; Table 4, model 6).




Fig. 4. Overall fertility intentions at wave 1 and wave 2. Source: GGS, 12,530 individuals aged 18 to 45 years at wave 1, Austria, France, Italy, Poland. Weighted data.




Fig. 5. Comparison of overall fertility intentions between wave 1 and wave 2. Source: GGS, 12,530 individuals aged 18 to 45 years at wave 1, of which 5121 were childless, 2526 had one child, and 4883 had two or more children at wave 1. Austria, France, Italy, Poland. Weighted data.

Model fit ranged between 0.09 and 0.18 for gradual transitions and between 0.09 and 0.40 for larger changes in short-term fertility intentions, indicating that the socio-demographic characteristics included in our models explained to a larger extent larger changes in short-term intentions of childless person than gradual transitions. Model fit was comparably high for larger upwards changes from “probably no” (Tables 4 and 6, models 6).

5.2. Overall fertility intentions

When combining plans for the next three years and the time thereafter, we found that about four in ten surveyed persons were uncertain and answered the question on intending a(nother) child in the future either with “probably yes” (29%) or “probably no” (13%) at the time of wave 1 (Fig. 4a). At the time of wave 2, three in ten gave an uncertain response (19% “probably yes,” nine percent “probably no”), and 15% either had a child between waves or were expecting a child at the time of wave 2 (Fig. 4b).

Compared to short-term intentions, answers varied even more so with age and reflect reproductive behaviour in young and middle adulthood (Fig. 4). The share of respondents “definitely” or “probably” intending no child in the future was low among persons below age 25 years and reached levels above 80% at age 40 years and above. At young

adulthood ages, about four in ten “definitely” wanted to have children in the future. The share of respondents expressing uncertainty regarding overall fertility intentions was high, amounting up to 56% until the early 30s “Probably yes” answers outnumbered “probably no” answers until the mid-30s. With increasing age, this relationship reversed and the group “probably not” intending (further) children outnumbered those “probably” intending (further) children (Fig. 4). By the time of the second interview, a substantial group (four in ten) had finished child-bearing and was certain to intend no (further) children. As expected, intentions to have a(nother) child at some point in the future were mentioned more often than intentions to have a child in the near future (“definitely yes:” 23 versus 12%; “probably yes:” 29 versus 17%; Figs. 2a and 4a). This was especially the case for childless.

Comparing overall fertility intentions at wave 1 and wave 2, we found that—similar to short-term intentions—the largest group in the surveyed population by far comprised those who answered “definitely no” in both waves (29%, Fig. 5a). The second-largest group comprised persons who answered “probably yes” in both waves (around 10%). As with short-term intentions, very few people changed their intention from one extreme to the other, such as from “definitely yes” to “definitely no.”

Stability in overall fertility intentions was also substantial, as one in two (49%) gave the same answer at both waves. Further, 13% realised

Table 7
Estimated Average Marginal Effects for gradual transitions in overall fertility intentions between wave 1 and 2.

Wave 1	Model 1	Model 2			Model 3			Model 4		
	Definitely no	Probably no			Probably yes			Definitely yes		
Wave 2	Probably no	Definitely no	Probably no	Probably yes	Probably no	Probably yes	Definitely yes	Probably yes	Definitely yes	Had or expected a child
Age (wave 1) (ref.=30–34)										
18–29	0.01	-0.06	-0.06	0.11***	-0.07***	0.01	0.06**	0.01	0.05*	-0.06**
35–39	-0.08***	0.16***	-0.09***	-0.08***	0.08***	0.01	-0.09**	0.03	0.03	-0.06**
40–45	-0.12***	0.26***	-0.15***	-0.11***	0.20***	-0.04	-0.16***	0.09	-0.01	-0.08*
Parity (ref.=childless)										
1 child	-0.03	0.23***	-0.11**	-0.12***	0.13***	-0.02	-0.11***	0.06**	-0.13***	0.07***
2 + children	-0.04**	0.26***	-0.12***	-0.14***	0.23***	-0.05	-0.18***	0.17***	-0.27***	0.10***
Partnership status at wave 1 and wave 2 (ref.=cohabiting – cohabiting)										
LAT – LAT	0.06 ⁺	0.07	-0.09	0.03	-0.08***	0.17***	-0.09*	0.21***	0.31***	-0.51***
No partner – no partner	0.03*	-0.04	-0.00	0.04	0.04*	0.11***	-0.15***	0.42***	0.16***	-0.58***
(Cohabiting) partner – no partner	0.02	0.01	-0.04	0.03	0.01	0.10**	-0.12***	0.36***	0.16***	-0.51***
No (cohabiting) partner – cohabiting	-0.00	-0.17**	-0.04	0.21***	-0.06***	-0.03	0.09**	0.13***	0.09***	-0.22***
No partner – LAT	-0.01	-0.34***	-0.10	0.44***	-0.05*	0.13**	-0.08	0.28***	0.24***	-0.52***
Cohabiting – LAT	0.02	-0.10	0.09	0.01	-0.05	0.22*	-0.17	0.43***	0.16	-0.59***
Country (ref.=Austria)										
France	-0.06***	0.21***	-0.11*	-0.10***	-0.08***	-0.09**	0.17***	-0.12***	0.02	0.10***
Italy	0.02	0.03	-0.03	-0.00	-0.09***	-0.03	0.13***	-0.06**	-0.04	0.10***
Poland	0.06***	-0.11***	0.16***	-0.05**	0.04	0.07**	-0.11***	0.02	-0.10***	0.08***
Sex (ref.=female)										
Male	0.06***	-0.09***	0.02	0.06***	-0.02	0.02	-0.00	0.06***	-0.08***	0.02
Pseudo R ²	0.1167	0.1927			0.1265			0.2207		
Observations	4142	1620			2261			2352		

Note:
⁺ p < 0.1.
^{*} p < 0.05.
^{**} p < 0.01.
^{***} p < 0.001.

Source: GGS, individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1, Austria, France, Italy, and Poland.

previously mentioned intentions. Therein, we observe a change in overall fertility intentions between waves among almost four out of ten. As with short-term intentions, gradual transitions were more frequent (26%) than larger shifts (12%), while uncertain intentions were a common source of change between waves, also supporting hypotheses H1 and H2 for overall fertility intentions. “Probably no” answers turned out to be the least stable: In this group, about one in four gave the same answer at wave 2, whereas more than one half revised downwards towards “definitely not” and much fewer revised upwards towards intending further children. Additionally, a non-negligible share had or expected a child at wave 2, while “probably” not intending (further) children at wave 1. The “probably yes” group was somewhat more stable: More than one third gave the same answer at wave 2. Further, roughly 20% moved to “certainly yes” or had/expected a child at wave 2, respectively, and downwards revisions were less frequent.

Similar to short-term intentions, uncertain responses appeared to be a transitional phase towards either definitely negative or definitely positive fertility intentions (or the birth of a child), with infrequent changes from definitely negative to definitely positive intentions. However, for overall intentions, the direction of change tended towards certainly negative intentions, while the direction of revision to short-term intentions was more varied. Interestingly, a comparison between revisions in short-term and overall fertility intentions revealed that these turned out to be at the same level, namely 36%.

A differentiation by parity revealed that the childless reported the most transitory overall fertility intentions (Fig. 5b), with 43% reporting a change in their intentions, and 16% having or expecting transition to parenthood. Stability increased modestly with parity, as revisions were less frequent among parents of one or two and more children (34% and

27%, respectively). As mentioned in the chapter on short-term fertility intentions, a substantial share of persons with one child at wave 1 had or expected a second child at wave 2. In contrast to short-term intentions, we see the stability coming from different sources: For the childless, stability was found in positive intentions, whereas for those with more children, the stability came from negative intentions. Splitting the parity group two or more children into parents with two children and parents with three or more children reveals that the latter more often changed uncertain negative to certain negative intentions (Figure A6). As with short-term intentions, dynamics were similar by sex and parity (Figure A7).

Overall fertility intentions varied between countries (Figures A8 and A9). Answers were somewhat similar in Austria, Italy, and Poland, but were different in France, where “definitely no” answers were more prevalent than in the other three countries. At wave 1, uncertainty was large in Poland and Italy (53% and 49%, respectively), tended to be less frequently mentioned in Austria (42%), and comprised a much smaller group in France (22%) (Figure A8). Uncertain positive intentions varied between 21% and 34%. However, the share of individuals with uncertain negative intentions varied substantially and was as high as 23% in Poland and as low as one percent in France. The group definitely intending to have (further) children was largest in Austria and France (27 to 28%) and smallest in Poland (17%). Revisions ranged between 25% in France and 41% in Austria and Italy (Figure A10). Across all countries, revisions became less frequent with increasing parity. We observed frequent changes among childless Italians (49% changed their intentions between waves and 14% had a child), with comparably larger groups changing between “probably yes” and “definitely yes” (Figure A10), whereas this was less often the case in Poland and France (38%

Table 8
Estimated Average Marginal Effects for larger changes in overall fertility intentions between wave 1 and 2.

	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8
	Larger changes upwards from		Larger changes downwards from	
	... definitely no	... probably no	... probably yes	... definitely yes
Age (wave 1) (ref.=30–34)				
18–29	0.20***	0.14*	-0.08**	-0.11**
35–39	-0.07***	-0.12**	0.19**	0.15*
40–45	-0.12***	-0.20***	0.33***	0.31***
Parity (ref.=childless)				
1 child	-0.07***	0.13*	0.15***	0.22***
2 + children	-0.12***	0.01	0.28***	0.40***
Partnership status at wave 1 and wave 2 (ref.=cohabiting – cohabiting)				
LAT – LAT	0.01	0.14	-0.12*	-0.11
No partner – no partner (Cohabiting)	-0.01	-0.15*	0.00	0.12***
(Cohabiting) partner – no partner	0.02	-0.05	-0.02	0.08+
No (cohabiting) partner – cohabiting	0.10***	0.37***	-0.05	-0.04
No partner – LAT	0.01	0.35*	-0.11*	0.10+
Cohabiting – LAT	0.05	-0.33+	-0.12	0.08
Country (ref.=Austria)				
France	-0.13	0.02	0.06+	-0.07+
Italy	0.00	0.03	-0.03	0.02
Poland	0.01	-0.15**	-0.09***	-0.00
Sex (ref.=female)				
Male	0.04***	0.06+	-0.08***	0.05*
Pseudo R ²	0.3417	0.1619	0.2686	0.2735
Observations	4199	674	1807	1075

Note:
+ p < 0.001.
* p < 0.05.
** p < 0.01.
*** p < 0.001.

Source: GGS, individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1, Austria, France, Italy, and Poland.

revised; 17 to 22% had or expected a newborn).

According to multivariate analyses, parity was statistically significantly associated with changes in overall fertility plans. The likelihood of revising intentions downwards increased with the number of children (Table 7, models 2 and 3). For example, a 30 to 34-year-old woman with one child, living in Austria, cohabiting with her partner at both waves, and being employed at both waves was more likely (23%) to revise a “probably no” to a “definitely no” answer and to revise a “probably yes” to a “probably no” answer (13%) than a childless Austrian woman with the same partnership and employment characteristics. Women with two or more children had even higher probabilities of revising the described intentions downwards (26% and 23%, respectively). Further, we observe substantially more often larger changes downwards among parents with two or more children (Tables 8 and 9, models 7 and 8). Age was crucial for changes in overall fertility intentions: With increasing age, intentions were revised downwards from “probably yes” to “probably no,” and from “probably no” to “definitely no.” Larger changes upwards were frequent among person in their thirties, larger changes

downwards in the age group 40–45 years (Table 8). Further, men gradually changed their overall intentions upwards more often, from “definitely no” to “probably no,” and from “probably no” to “probably yes” (Table 7). By contrast, women more often transitioned from “probably not” to “definitely not” intending (further) children, even after controlling for age. In line, larger changes were more prevalent among men, and larger changes downwards more prevalent among women (Table 8, model 5–7).

Regarding partnership, entering a union as well as separating from a partner were related with changes in overall fertility intentions, supporting hypothesis H3 for overall fertility intentions. On the one hand, union formation (either cohabiting or LAT) was associated with upwards changes (from “probably no” to “probably yes”, and from “probably yes” to “definitely yes” when entering a cohabitation). Moreover, those entering a cohabitation and previously not intending (further) children also reported more often larger changes upwards (Table 8, models 5–6). On the other hand, those having a partner at wave 1 and being single at wave 2 were less likely to revise from “probably yes” to “definitely yes” and more likely to answer with “probably yes” at both waves (Table 7). Further, having no partner at both waves was associated larger changes downwards from “definitely” intending (further) children (Table 8, model 8). Unlike partnership context, changes in the employment situation were related with gradual changes in overall fertility intentions to a lesser degree (Tables 7 and 8). Changes from “probably yes” to “certainly yes” were observed to a higher extent among persons losing a job on the one hand, and among those in education at both points in time on the other hand. Further, moves from “probably yes” to “definitely yes” were more likely among women and men in education at both times, and less likely among persons experiencing unemployment at both times. Larger upwards changes in overall fertility intentions were more frequent among those (still) in education at both waves and those ending employment for parental leave or for looking after the family (Table 10, Models 5–6). As the estimated effects for employment were generally smaller in size and less often statistically significant in the regressions for overall fertility intentions than for short-term intentions, our results support hypothesis H5 that life events are correlated to a lower extent with overall intentions than with short-term intentions.

Model fit ranged between 0.12 and 0.23 for gradual transitions and between 0.16 and 0.35 for larger changes in overall fertility intentions. Similar to short-term intentions, we find that the socio-demographic characteristics included in our models explained to a larger extent larger changes than gradual transitions. Model fit was comparably high for larger upwards changes from “definitely no” (Tables 8 and 10, models 1).

6. Discussion

Uncertainty is large for both short-term and long-term fertility intentions. A substantial proportion of women and men are uncertain when asked about intending to have (another) child in the near future (i. e., during the next three years) or later. Their share amounts to about 40% in the observed five European countries in this study, and their numbers are in line with previous finding (Jones, 2017; Ní Bhrolcháin & Beaujouan, 2019). As underlined by scholars in the realm of fertility and family, fertility intentions are not stable (Bernardi et al., 2015; Heiland et al., 2008) and our study provides further evidence therein. Our findings lend support to the cognitive-social model of Bachrach & Morgan (2013), by identifying how intentions are revised when conditions and circumstances change, particularly in the case of short-term intentions. When taking uncertainty into account, we find that roughly four in ten changed their short-term intentions in a three- or four-year period, and a similar share revised overall fertility in this time interval.

The differentiation between certain and uncertain intentions reveals that uncertain intentions are an especially common source of change between waves and “probably no” are often transitory and the least

Table 9
Estimated Average Marginal Effects for gradual transitions in overall fertility intentions between wave 1 and 2, including changes in employment.

	Model 1	Model 2			Model 3			Model 4		
Wave 1	Definitely no	Probably no			Probably yes			Definitely yes		
Wave 2	Probably no	Definitely no	Probably no	Probably yes	Probably no	Probably yes	Definitely yes	Probably yes	Definitely yes	Had or expected a child
Employment status at wave 1 and wave 2 (ref.= employed – employed)										
Unemployed – unemployed	-0.01	0.04	0.04	-0.09***	0.02	-0.03	0.01	0.12	-0.09	-0.03
Student – student	-0.01	0.31***	-0.26***	-0.05	-0.04	-0.09	0.13**	-0.10**	0.24***	-0.14**
Unemployed – employed	0.00	0.02	-0.02	-0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.00	-0.03	0.09**	-0.06*
Employed – unemployed	0.00	0.06	-0.08	0.01	-0.05	-0.07	0.13**	0.02	0.09	-0.10**
Leave/homemaker – leave/homemaker	-0.03	0.02	-0.03	0.00	0.10	0.10	-0.20***	-0.13*	0.01	0.11**
Employed – leave/homemaker	omitted	0.16	-0.03	-0.13***	0.04	-0.03	-0.01	-0.17***	-0.05	0.23***
Other	0.00	0.06	-0.02	-0.05	-0.00	0.06	-0.06	-0.04	-0.09*	0.12***
Pseudo R ²	0.1366	0.2022			0.1438			0.2274		
Observations	3211	1154			1693			1877		

Note:
Remark: In model 1 the omitted observations predict failure perfectly. Controlled for age, partnership status at both waves, country, and sex. See Table A10 for the entire model.
* p < 0.05.
** p < 0.01.
*** p < 0.001.

Source: GGS, individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1, Austria, France, and Poland.

Table 10
Estimated Average Marginal Effects for larger changes in overall fertility intentions between wave 1 and 2, including changes in employment.

	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8
	Larger changes upwards from		Larger changes downwards from	
	... definitely no	... probably no	... probably yes	... definitely yes
Employment status at wave 1 and wave 2 (ref.=employed – employed)				
Unemployed – unemployed	-0.05	-0.15	0.11 ⁺	0.09
Student – student	0.06 ⁺	0.46*	0.10	-0.02
Unemployed – employed	0.03 ⁺	0.02	-0.00	0.06
Employed – unemployed	-0.03	0.08	0.03	0.03
Leave/homemaker – leave/homemaker	0.02	0.22**	0.11 ⁺	0.10
Employed – leave/homemaker	0.14***	0.52***	0.05	0.19**
Other	-0.00	0.19*	0.08	0.20***
Pseudo R ²	0.3527	0.2453	0.3322	0.3309
Observations	3301	545	1342	853

Note:
Remark: Controlled for age, partnership status at both waves, country, and sex. See Table A11 for the entire model.
⁺ p < 0.001.
* p < 0.05.
** p < 0.01.
*** p < 0.001.

Source: GGS, individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1. Austria, France, and Poland.

stable. We find that almost at all ages, the group of persons with uncertain positive intentions is larger than the one with certain positive intentions. As seen in existing literature such as [Brzozowska and Beaujouan \(2021\)](#), our findings also support the idea that the two certain responses of definitely intending and definitely not intending (a)noth child are relatively stable and that realisation of short-term intentions are comparably high in the group of those “definitely” intending a child in the near future ([Buber-Ennser et al., 2014](#)). Moreover, especially for analyses on the realisation of short-term fertility intention, the differentiation between “definitely” and “probably” intending in a child in the near future is crucial.

Our findings support the argument that uncertain and certain responses should not be broadly combined into either positive or negative intentions ([Ní Bhrolcháin & Beaujouan, 2011](#)), and suggest that intentions may be imagined sequentially—moving up or down a spectrum of certainty with “definitely no” and “definitely yes” as opposite poles. The formation of childbearing plans (and their following realisation) appears to occur often in a step-by-step process via gradual transitions. Larger changes in fertility intentions within a period of three to four years are less common.

The life-course approach, which simultaneously considers interdependent changes in individual trajectories ([Udry, 1983](#)) proved to be an appropriate framework for studying fertility intentions and revisions therein. In line with previous literature on overall intentions (e.g., [Kuhnt et al., 2021](#)), partnership appears to be a leading life domain in the revision of short-term intentions. Entering a cohabitation or breaking up with the partner is related to gradual, but especially also with larger changes in fertility intentions. Changes in employment seem to be more influential in revising short-term intentions, while partnership and changes therein are crucial for changes and revisions of both short- and long-term intentions. Further, partnership appears to be more relevant in revising positive short-term intentions. In line with previous studies (e.g., [Jones, 2017](#)), age and parity are crucial in the context of certainty and uncertainty of fertility intentions and changes therein. This is reflected in a large share of persons certainly intending a child in the future in young adulthood and a majority of persons certainly not intending further children in the near future. Moreover, the fertility

intentions of parents with two or more children are more stable, while the childless show the most transitory short-term intentions.

Several limitations should be mentioned. First, as persons who were definitely or probably intending to have a child in the near future were not further asked about their overall fertility intentions, we recoded their overall fertility intentions to match their short-term intentions. The possible bias is that some respondents who answered “probably yes” for short-term intentions would have answered “definitively yes” for overall intentions; the bias is present at both waves. Second, variation in attrition might lead to somewhat biased results regarding uncertainty and dynamics therein. As respondents uncertain about their short-term intentions less often participated in the second wave, dynamics might be even larger and we might underestimate the dynamics in fertility intentions. Previous studies showed that fecundity, sexual orientation and traditional attitudes are associated with attrition in the GGS (Buber-Ennser, 2014). Our observation that throughout all countries, attrition is higher among respondents with uncertain fertility intentions, provides new evidence that fertility-relevant characteristics are associated with panel-dropout in surveys in the realm of family and fertility. Third, partnership context and individuals’ employment situation are only two domains interfering with individuals’ fertility intentions. Further aspects include the partners’ employment situation, housing, health as well as priorities in life and changes therein. We agree with Kuhnt et al. (2021) that considering the couple-level experiences of “linked lives” (Elder, 1994) is crucial in moving forward in family research, especially considering the significance of partnership.

The uncertainty of intentions is of interest for policy considerations, because those who are uncertain may be more likely to be influenced by family policies (Kuhnt et al., 2021). Brehm and Schneider (2019) argue that studies often fail to explain the complexity and dynamic nature of fertility intentions, but this can be partially addressed by disaggregating by levels of certainty. When studying intentions, both cross-sectionally and longitudinally, it is important to consider the level of certainty

alongside the instability of intentions. We suggest that future research should continue to distinguish intentions by degree of certainty in their theoretical framing and further examine approaches to incorporate the frequent revisions and fluctuations in short-term and overall intentions over the life course. Surveys might consider uncertainty in broader or more dynamic ways, such as including options for respondents to answer ambivalently or ambiguously in order to better capture uncertainty and improve the analytical options for the inclusion of uncertainty in analyses.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Isabella Buber-Ennser: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Ross Barker:** Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.

Declaration of Competing Interest

None.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Zuzanna Brzozowska for her feedback and sharing post-stratification weights for the Polish sample. Furthermore, we are grateful to Maria Rita Testa, Eva Beaujouan, Brian Buh, and the Demography of Austria group at the Vienna Institute of Demography for their valuable comments.

Austrian Research Foundation (FWF, P 31357-G29).

Appendices




Fig. A1. Comparison of individual’s short-term fertility intentions between wave 1 and wave 2, among parents with two or more children. Source: GGS, 6148 individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1, Austria, France, Hungary, Italy, Poland. Weighted data.




Fig. A2. Comparison of individual's short-term fertility intentions between wave 1 and wave 2, by gender. Source: GGS, 15,369 individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1, Austria, France, Hungary, Italy, Poland. Weighted data.




Fig. A3. Comparison of short-term fertility intentions at wave 1, by country. Source: GGS, 15,369 individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1, Austria, France, Hungary, Italy, Poland. Weighted data.




Fig. A4. Comparison of short-term fertility intentions at wave 2, by country. Source: GGS, 15,369 individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1, Austria, France, Hungary, Italy, Poland. Weighted data.




Fig. A5. Comparison of individual's short-term fertility intentions between wave 1 and wave 2, by country. Source: GGS, 15,369 individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1, Austria, France, Hungary, Italy, Poland. Weighted data.




Fig. A6. Comparison of individual's overall fertility intentions between wave 1 and wave 2, among parents with two or more children. Source: GGS, 4883 individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1, Austria, France, Italy, Poland. Weighted data.





Fig. A7. Comparison of individual's long-term fertility intentions between wave 1 and wave 2, by gender. Source: GGS, 10,357 individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1, Austria, Italy, Poland. Weighted data.




Fig. A8. Comparison of overall fertility intentions at wave 1, by country. Source: GGS, 10,357 individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1, Austria, France, Italy, Poland. Weighted.




Fig. A9. Comparison of overall fertility intentions at wave 2, by country. Source: GGS, 10,357 individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1, Austria, France, Italy, Poland. Weighted.



Fig. A10. Comparison of individual's long-term fertility intentions between wave 1 and wave 2, by country. Source: GGS, 10,357 individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1, Austria, Italy, Poland. Weighted data.

Table A1
Unweighted sample size and attrition, by short-term intention at wave 1 and country.

	Austria	France	Hungary	Italy	Poland	Total
Definitely no	1907	2353	1663	2222	3526	11,671
Probably no	1011	443	778	1546	2020	5798
Probably yes	746	662	547	974	1387	4316
Definitely yes	491	586	483	388	818	2766
Total	4155	4044	3471	5130	7751	24,551
Attrition						
Definitely no	22%	34%	23%	33%	42%	33%
Probably no	23%	38%	27%	33%	45%	35%
Probably yes	26%	37%	25%	37%	52%	39%
Definitely yes	21%	34%	24%	32%	45%	33%
Total	23%	35%	24%	34%	45%	34%

Source: GGS, 24,551 individuals aged 18-45 years at wave 1, physically able to have a child and with information on short-term fertility intention at wave 1. Austria, France, Hungary, Italy, Poland. Unweighted data.

Table A2
Intentions at wave 1 and wave 2, possible combinations.

		Wave 2				
		Definitely no	Probably no	Probably yes	Definitely yes	Newborn child
Wave 1	Definitely no	No change	Gradual transition	Larger change upwards	Larger change upwards	Larger change upwards
	Probably no	Gradual transition	No change	Gradual transition	Larger change upwards	Larger change upwards
	Probably yes	Larger changes downwards	Gradual transition	No change	Gradual transition	Realisation of intention
	Definitely yes	Larger changes downwards	Larger changes downwards	Gradual transition	No change	Realisation of intention

Table A3
Sample description, in percentages.

	Sample on short-term intentions	Sample on overall intentions
Age (wave 1)		
Mean (SD)	33.3 (7.4)	33.0 (7.7)
Sex		
Male	42.0%	41.7%
Female	58.0%	58.3%
Parity (wave 1)		
Childless	39.5%	40.9%
1 child	20.5%	20.2%
2 children	29.1%	28.7%
3 or more children	11.0%	10.3%
Partnership status at wave 1 and wave 2		
Cohabiting – cohabiting	59.7%	58.8%
LAT – LAT	2.4%	2.7%
No partner – no partner	18.4%	18.9%
Partner – no partner	6.3%	6.3%
No partner – cohabiting	8.8%	9.1%
No partner – LAT	3.5%	3.5%
Cohabiting – LAT	0.9%	0.8%
Country		
Austria	19.7%	23.8%
France	16.4%	19.5%
Hungary	17.0%	0%
Italy	19.5%	23.3%
Poland	27.4%	33.3%
Total	100%	100%
N	15,369	12,530
Subsample excluding Italy	Sample on short-term intentions	Sample on overall intentions
Employment		
Employed - employed	63.6%	63.3
Unemployed - unemployed	3.5%	3.4
Student - student	3.0%	3.8

(continued on next page)

Table A3 (continued)

	Sample on short-term intentions	Sample on overall intentions
Unemployed - employed	13.9%	14.5
Employed - unemployed	4.6%	4.0
Leave/homemaker – leave/homemaker	4.0%	4.1
Employed – leave/homemaker	2.9%	2.6
Other	4.5%	4.3
Total	100%	100%
N	12,369	9609

Source: GGS, 15,369 individuals aged 18-45 years at wave 1, physically able to have a child and with information on short-term fertility intention at wave 1 and at wave 2. Austria, France, Hungary, Italy, Poland. Unweighted data.

Table A4

Estimated Average Marginal Effects for gradual transitions in short-term fertility intentions between wave 1 and 2. Persons with one child at wave 1.

Wave 1	Model 1	Model 2			Model 3			Model 4		
	Definitely no	Probably no			Probably yes			Definitely yes		
Wave 2	Probably no	Definitely no	Probably no	Probably yes	Probably no	Probably yes	Definitely yes	Probably yes	Definitely yes	Had or expected a child
Age (wave 1) (ref.=30–34)										
18–29	0.10	-0.09	0.01	0.09	0.14**	-0.08	-0.07	-0.03	-0.02	0.06
35–39	-0.07 ⁺	0.14**	-0.03	-0.11***	0.12	0.04	-0.16**	0.09*	-0.07	-0.02
40–45	-0.13***	0.28***	-0.14**	-0.14***	0.15	0.10	-0.25***	0.10	0.15	-0.24*
Partnership status at wave 1 and wave 2 (ref.= cohabiting – cohabiting)										
LAT – LAT	0.12*	0.20	-0.20*	0.00	-0.16	0.03	0.13	0.88***	-0.15***	-0.73***
No partner – no partner	0.05*	0.15**	-0.10*	-0.05	0.14	0.07	-0.21***	0.71***	0.02	-0.73***
(Cohabiting) partner – no partner	-0.01	-0.07	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.06	-0.09	0.17	0.06	-0.23*
No (cohabiting) partner – cohabiting	0.02	-0.09	-0.02	0.12	-0.14	-0.03	0.17	0.09	0.11	-0.20
No partner – LAT	0.13**	-0.08	0.06	0.03	-0.05	0.06	-0.02	-0.12***	0.42	-0.30
Cohabiting – LAT	-0.05	0.05	-0.04	-0.01	-0.22	0.20	0.01	0.88***	-0.15***	-0.73***
Country (ref.=Austria)										
France	-0.08*	0.11	-0.13	0.02	0.02	-0.14	0.11	-0.10**	0.05	0.05
Hungary	-0.01	0.08	-0.04	-0.04	0.11	-0.14*	0.03	-0.02	0.02	0.00
Italy	0.05 ⁺	0.12*	-0.08	-0.04	-0.18*	0.03	0.15*	-0.09	0.01	0.07
Poland	0.05*	0.00	0.04	-0.04	0.06	0.03	-0.09	0.01	0.02	-0.03
Sex (ref.=female)										
Male	0.08***	-0.03	0.02	0.01	-0.03	-0.02	0.05	-0.05	0.02	0.03
Pseudo R ²	0.1699	0.0921			0.0786			0.0719		
Observations	1000	548			316			504		

Note:

- ⁺ p < 0.1.
- * p < 0.05.
- ** p < 0.01.
- *** p < 0.001.

Source: GGS, individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1, Austria, France and Poland.

Table A5

Estimated Average Marginal Effects for gradual transitions in short-term fertility intentions between wave 1 and 2. Persons with two or more children at wave 1.

Wave 1	Model 1	Model 2			Model 3			Model 4		
	Definitely no	Probably no			Probably yes			Definitely yes		
Wave 2										
Age (wave 1) (ref.=30–34)										
18–29	0.05 ⁺	-0.07	-0.06	0.13***	-0.11	0.24*	-0.13	0.07	-0.02	-0.04
35–39	-0.04*	0.12***	-0.13***	0.01	0.09	0.01	-0.10	-0.04	0.13*	-0.08
40–45	-0.09***	0.23***	-0.21***	-0.03**	0.20	0.00	-0.20**	0.13	0.07	-0.21
Partnership status at wave 1 and wave 2 (ref.= cohabiting – cohabiting)										
LAT – LAT	0.07	-0.04	0.08	-0.05***				-0.13***	0.93***	-0.80***
No partner – no partner	-0.02	-0.11	0.13	-0.02	-0.48***	0.67**	-0.19***			
(Cohabiting) partner – no partner	0.05*	0.10	-0.06	-0.05***				0.05	-0.05**	0.01

(continued on next page)

Table A5 (continued)

Wave 1	Model 1	Model 2			Model 3			Model 4		
	Definitely no	Probably no			Probably yes			Definitely yes		
Wave 2										
No (cohabiting) partner – cohabiting	0.05	-0.10	0.00	0.10	-0.23	0.26	-0.04	-0.13***	0.10	0.03
No partner – LAT	0.04	-0.35**	0.40**	-0.05***						
Cohabiting – LAT	0.09**	-0.12	0.06	0.06	-0.48***	0.67***	-0.19***			
Country (ref.=Austria)										
France	-0.05**	0.10	-0.11*	0.00	-0.21	0.04	0.16	0.03	-0.06	0.03
Hungary	0.03	0.03	-0.01	-0.02	-0.03	0.17	-0.14	0.07	-0.04	-0.03
Italy	0.04**	0.04	-0.03	-0.02	-0.19	-0.01	0.10	-0.02	-0.12	0.13
Poland	0.03 ⁺	-0.10**	0.10**	-0.00	0.18	-0.07	-0.10	0.07	-0.03	-0.04
Sex (ref.=female)										
Male	0.04***	-0.09***	0.08***	0.02	-0.09	-0.02	0.11	-0.10	-0.02	0.11
Pseudo R ²	0.0911	0.0759			0.1530			0.1856		
Observations	4213	1067			123			123		

Note:

⁺ p < 0.1.

* p < 0.05.

** p < 0.01.

*** p < 0.001.

Source: GGS, individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1, Austria, France, Hungary, Italy and Poland.

Table A6

Estimated Average Marginal Effects for gradual transitions in short-term fertility intentions between wave 1 and 2. Persons childless at wave 1, including changes in employment.

Wave 1	Model 1	Model 2			Model 3			Model 4		
	Definitely no	Probably no			Probably yes			Definitely yes		
Wave 2										
	Probably no	Definitely no	Probably no	Probably yes	Probably no	Probably yes	Definitely yes	Probably yes	Definitely yes	Had or expected a child
Age (wave 1) (ref.=30–34)										
18–29	0.01	-0.15***	0.07	0.08*	-0.03	-0.02	0.05	-0.02	0.02	0.00
35–39	-0.23**	0.10	-0.02	-0.09	0.04	-0.05	0.02	0.08	0.03	-0.11*
40–45	-0.31***	0.27***	-0.01	-0.26***	0.13	0.06	-0.19***	0.09	0.08	-0.17**
Partnership status at wave 1 and wave 2 (ref.=cohabiting – cohabiting)								0.00	0.00	0.00
LAT - LAT	0.12	-0.03	0.03	-0.00	0.04	0.10	-0.13	0.03	0.31***	-0.35***
No partner – no partner	0.15*	-0.03	0.19***	-0.15***	0.21***	0.10*	-0.31***	0.47***	0.03	-0.50***
(Cohabiting) partner - no partner	0.23**	0.02	0.19**	-0.21***	0.14*	0.08	-0.23***	0.30***	-0.02	-0.28***
No (cohabiting) partner – cohabiting	0.30***	-0.10*	0.01	0.09	-0.04	-0.01	0.05	0.01	0.04	-0.05
No partner - LAT	0.21**	-0.01	0.04	-0.03	0.13*	0.15*	-0.28***	0.26**	0.16	-0.42***
Cohabiting - LAT	0.09	0.25*	0.04	-0.29***	0.11	0.24	-0.35***	0.26*	0.24	-0.50***
Employment status at wave 1 and wave 2 (ref.=employed – employed)										
Unemployed – unemployed	-0.07	-0.02	0.02	-0.01	0.22*	-0.13	-0.09	-0.09	0.13	-0.03
Student – student	-0.12**	0.23***	-0.02	-0.21***	0.13	-0.11	-0.01	0.17	-0.08	-0.09
Unemployed – employed	-0.03	0.08*	-0.02	-0.06	0.03	-0.01	-0.02	0.08	0.02	-0.10
Employed – unemployed	-0.05	0.11*	-0.06	-0.05	0.18**	-0.19**	0.01	-0.01	0.06	-0.05
Leave/homemaker – leave/homemaker	-0.29	omitted	omitted	omitted	0.76***	-0.44***	-0.32***	-0.19***	-0.02	0.21
Employed – leave/homemaker	omitted	0.12	-0.04	-0.08	0.11	-0.02	-0.09	-0.17***	-0.23***	0.40***
Other	-0.05	0.29***	-0.21***	-0.08	-0.07	0.09	-0.02	-0.03	-0.23***	0.26***
Country (ref.=Austria)										
France	-0.24***	0.16***	-0.10*	-0.05	-0.10*	-0.06	0.17***	-0.06*	-0.19***	0.26***
Hungary	-0.06	0.07*	-0.14***	0.07	-0.08*	-0.08	0.16***	0.02	-0.04	0.02
Poland	0.04	0.01	-0.04	0.03	0.06	0.00	-0.07*	0.02	-0.15***	0.13***
Sex (ref.=female)										

(continued on next page)

Table A6 (continued)

	Model 1	Model 2			Model 3			Model 4		
Wave 1	Definitely no	Probably no			Probably yes			Definitely yes		
Wave 2	Probably no	Definitely no	Probably no	Probably yes	Probably no	Probably yes	Definitely yes	Probably yes	Definitely yes	Had or expected a child
Male	0.04	-0.01	0.05	-0.05	0.03	0.05	-0.08**	-0.02	-0.15***	0.16***
Pseudo R ²	0.1362	0.1014			0.1242			0.1785		
Observations	1090	1018			767			759		

Note:
 Remarks: See Section 4 on detailed information on various changes in the employment status. In models 1 and 2 the omitted observations predict failure perfectly.
 * p < 0.05.
 ** p < 0.01.
 *** p < 0.001.

Source: GGS, individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1. Austria, France, Hungary and Poland.

Table A7

Estimated Average Marginal Effects for larger changes in short-term fertility intentions between wave 1 and 2, persons childless at wave 1, including changes in employment.

	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8
	Larger changes upwards from		Larger changes downwards from	
	... definitely no	... probably no	... probably yes	... definitely yes
Age (wave 1) (ref.=30–34)				
18–29	0.05	-0.01	-0.07	-0.00
35–39	-0.16*	-0.15*	0.18*	0.15 ⁺
40–45	-0.31***	-0.27*	0.27**	0.24*
Partnership status at wave 1 and wave 2 (ref.=cohabiting – cohabiting)				
LAT – LAT	-0.01	-0.19**	0.02	0.20*
No partner – no partner	-0.22***	-0.48***	-0.03	0.44***
(Cohabiting) partner – no partner	-0.14*	-0.57***	-0.05	0.33***
No (cohabiting) partner – cohabiting	0.22***	-0.03	0.13	0.05
No partner – LAT	-0.02	-0.22***	-0.02	0.32**
Cohabiting – LAT	-0.30*	-0.29*	-0.23	0.18
Employment status at wave 1 and wave 2 (ref.=employed – employed)				
Unemployed – unemployed	-0.09	-0.27**	0.23*	-1.22
Student – student	-0.16***	-0.16*	0.28*	0.16
Unemployed – employed	-0.02	0.00	0.05	0.12 ⁺
Employed – unemployed	0.01	-0.02	0.09	0.09
Leave/homemaker – leave/homemaker	omitted	omitted	omitted	omitted
Employed – leave/homemaker	0.01	0.27*	0.04	0.10
Other	0.01	0.21*	-0.03	omitted
Country (ref.=Austria)				
France	-0.03	0.06	0.12 ⁺	-0.02
Hungary	0.13**	0.13**	0.03	0.00
Poland	0.19***	0.10*	-0.09	0.04
Sex (ref.=female)				
Male	-0.01	-0.04	-0.02	0.08
Pseudo R ²	0.2736	0.4021	0.1295	0.2465
Observations	1071	703	420	323

Note:
 Remark: In models 5–8 the omitted observations predict failure perfectly.
⁺ p < 0.001.
 * p < 0.05.
 ** p < 0.01.
 *** p < 0.001.

Source: GGS, individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1. Austria, France, Hungary, and Poland.

Table A8

Estimated Average Marginal Effects for gradual transitions in short-term fertility intentions between wave 1 and 2, Average Marginal Effects, including changes in employment.

	Model 1	Model 2			Model 3			Model 4		
Wave 1	Definitely no	Probably no			Probably yes			Definitely yes		
Wave 2	Probably no	Definitely no	Probably no	Probably yes	Probably no	Probably yes	Definitely yes	Probably yes	Definitely yes	Had or expected a child
Age (wave 1) (ref.=30–34)										
18–29	0.05*	-0.11***	0.03	0.08**	0.01	-0.01	0.00	-0.02	-0.00	0.02
35–39	-0.06***	0.13***	-0.06*	-0.06**	0.06	-0.01	-0.05	0.05	0.00	-0.06
40–45	-0.14***	0.28***	-0.11***	-0.16***	0.17**	0.02	-0.19***	0.07	0.10	-0.17***
Parity (ref.=childless)										
1 child	-0.10***	0.21***	-0.02	-0.19***	0.18***	-0.03	-0.14***	0.00	-0.09***	0.09***
2 + children	-0.10***	0.31***	-0.07*	-0.25***	0.25***	-0.04	-0.21***	0.04	-0.17***	0.13**
Partnership status at wave 1 and wave 2 (ref.=cohabiting – cohabiting)										
LAT – LAT	0.06*	-0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.00	0.11	-0.11	0.07	0.34***	-0.41***
No partner – no partner	0.04**	-0.02	0.10***	-0.07**	0.17***	0.09*	-0.26***	0.49***	0.05	-0.54***
(Cohabiting) partner – no partner	0.08***	0.01	0.08	-0.08**	0.12*	0.08	-0.20***	0.26***	0.00	-0.27***
No (cohabiting) partner – cohabiting	0.10***	-0.13**	0.03	0.09**	-0.08*	0.01	0.07	0.02	0.06	-0.08*
No partner – LAT	0.08***	-0.02	0.02	0.00	0.09	0.14*	-0.23***	0.23**	0.19	-0.41***
Cohabiting – LAT	0.08*	0.11	-0.00	-0.11	-0.01	0.25*	-0.24***	0.35***	0.21	-0.55***
Employment status at wave 1 and wave 2 (ref.=employed – employed)										
Unemployed – unemployed	-0.03	-0.01	0.00	0.00	0.16	-0.09	-0.07	-0.05	0.07	-0.02
Student – student	-0.05*	0.17***	-0.04	-0.13***	0.12	-0.10	-0.02	0.12	-0.09	-0.03
Unemployed – employed	0.00	0.02	-0.01	-0.02	0.01	0.03	-0.04	0.04	-0.01	-0.03
Employed – unemployed	-0.03	0.11**	-0.12**	0.01	0.13*	-0.16**	0.04	0.02	0.07	-0.08
Leave/homemaker –leave/homemaker	-0.04	0.07	-0.08	0.01	0.15	0.07	-0.23***	-0.16***	-0.08	0.24***
Employed – leave/homemaker	-0.03	0.26***	-0.17**	-0.09	0.04	0.03	-0.07	-0.16***	-0.17***	0.34***
Other	-0.01	0.13**	-0.09*	-0.03	0.01	0.03	-0.04	-0.05	-0.15***	0.20***
Country (ref.=Austria)										
France	-0.10***	0.14***	-0.11***	-0.04	-0.10**	-0.08	0.18***	-0.07**	-0.10***	0.16***
Hungary	0.01	0.07**	-0.08**	0.01	-0.04	-0.08*	0.12***	0.01	-0.02	0.01
Poland	0.03*	-0.02	0.01	0.00	0.08**	-0.01	-0.07**	0.01	-0.08**	0.07*
Sex (ref.=female)										
Male	0.04***	-0.03*	0.04**	-0.01	0.02	0.02	-0.04	-0.04**	-0.08***	0.12***
Pseudo R ²	0.2428	0.1762			0.1070			0.1509		
Observations	5445	2224			1114			1294		

Note:

* p < 0.05.

** p < 0.01.

*** p < 0.001.

Source: GGS, individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1, Austria, France, Hungary, Italy, and Poland.

Table A9

Estimated Average Marginal Effects for larger changes in short-term fertility intentions between wave 1 and 2, Average Marginal Effects, including changes in employment.

	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8
	Larger changes upwards from		Larger changes downwards from	
	... definitely no	... probably no	... probably yes	... definitely yes
Age (wave 1) (ref.=30–34)				
18–29	0.12***	0.03	-0.07	-0.02
35–39	-0.09***	-0.10**	0.20***	0.15*
40–45	-0.14***	-0.17***	0.27***	0.19*
Parity (ref.=childless)				
1 child	-0.06***	-0.04	0.24***	0.30***
2 + children	-0.12***	-0.17***	0.35***	0.51***
Partnership status at wave 1 and wave 2 (ref.=cohabiting – cohabiting)				

(continued on next page)

Table A9 (continued)

	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8
	Larger changes upwards from		Larger changes downwards from	
	... definitely no	... probably no	... probably yes	... definitely yes
LAT – LAT	0.01	-0.17*	0.05	0.16
No partner – no partner	-0.07***	-0.48***	-0.02	0.46***
(Cohabiting) partner – no partner	-0.05**	-0.48***	-0.01	0.28**
No (cohabiting) partner – cohabiting	0.11***	0.07 ⁺	-0.06	-0.00
No partner – LAT	0.01	-0.19***	-0.03	0.27*
Cohabiting – LAT	0.01	-0.20	-0.14	0.23*
Employment status at wave 1 and wave 2 (ref.=employed – employed)				
Unemployed – unemployed	-0.03	-0.05	0.22*	-0.20
Student – student	-0.08***	-0.19*	0.27 ⁺	0.15
Unemployed – employed	-0.02	-0.01	-0.00	0.09
Employed – unemployed	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.08
Leave/homemaker – leave/homemaker	0.03	0.29***	0.18 ⁺	-0.04
Employed – leave/homemaker	0.17***	0.47***	-0.03	0.02
Other	0.03*	0.17**	0.06	0.09
Country (ref.=Austria)				
France	-0.01	0.11*	0.12*	-0.14*
Hungary	0.03*	0.07 ⁺	0.07	-0.05
Poland	0.06***	0.03	-0.05	-0.01
Sex (ref.=female)				
Male	0.03***	0.04	-0.03	0.05
Pseudo R ²	0.3534	0.2779	0.2443	0.2389
Observations	5391	1270	807	571

Note:

- ⁺ p < 0.1.
- * p < 0.05.
- ** p < 0.01.
- *** p < 0.001.

Source: GGS, individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1. Austria, France, Hungary, and Poland.

Table A10

Estimated Average Marginal Effects for gradual transitions in overall fertility intentions between wave 1 and 2, including changes in employment.

Wave 1	Model 1	Model 2			Model 3			Model 4		
	Definitely no	Probably no			Probably yes			Definitely yes		
Wave 2	Probably no	Definitely no	Probably no	Probably yes	Probably no	Probably yes	Definitely yes	Probably yes	Definitely yes	Had or expected a child
Age (wave 1) (ref.=30–34)										
18–29	-0.01	-0.10*	-0.05	0.14***	-0.07***	0.06	0.01	0.02	0.04	-0.06**
35–39	-0.07***	0.17***	-0.11***	-0.06**	0.08**	0.03	-0.05	0.00	0.06	-0.06
40–45	-0.12***	0.28***	-0.18***	-0.10**	0.26***	-0.16*	-0.10***	0.10	-0.03	-0.07
Parity (ref.=childless)										
1 child	-0.02	0.24***	-0.16***	-0.08**	0.16***	-0.01	-0.15***	0.06*	-0.13***	0.07***
2 + children	-0.03 ⁺	0.27***	-0.17***	-0.11***	0.25***	-0.06	-0.19***	0.20***	-0.26***	0.05
Partnership status at wave 1 and wave 2 (ref.=cohabiting – cohabiting)										
LAT – LAT	0.07*	0.06	-0.09	0.03	-0.09***	0.19***	-0.11**	0.21***	0.23***	-0.44***
No partner - no partner	0.04*	-0.06	0.02	0.04	0.05*	0.12**	-0.17***	0.41***	0.10**	-0.51***
(Cohabiting) partner - no partner	0.04	-0.04	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.13**	-0.17***	0.35***	0.07	-0.42***
No (cohabiting) partner – cohabiting	-0.03	-0.25***	0.01	0.24***	-0.07***	-0.01	0.06	0.14***	0.04	-0.18***
No partner – LAT	-0.01	-0.33***	-0.11	0.44***	-0.05	0.16***	-0.11**	0.30***	0.16***	-0.45***
Cohabiting – LAT	0.02	-0.11	0.10	0.01	-0.05	0.22**	-0.17*	0.41***	0.13	-0.53***
Employment status at wave 1 and wave 2 (ref.=employed – employed)										
Unemployed – unemployed	-0.01	0.04	0.04	-0.09***	0.02	-0.03	0.01	0.12	-0.09	-0.03
Student – student	-0.02	0.31***	-0.26***	-0.05	-0.04	-0.09	0.13**	-0.10**	0.24***	-0.14**
Unemployed – employed	0.00	0.02	-0.02	-0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.00	-0.03	0.09**	-0.06*
Employed – unemployed	0.00	0.06	-0.08	0.01	-0.05	-0.07	0.13**	0.02	0.09	-0.10**
Leave/homemaker – leave/homemaker	-0.03	0.02	-0.03	0.00	0.10	0.10	-0.20***	-0.13 ⁺	0.01	0.11**

(continued on next page)

Table A10 (continued)

Wave 1	Model 1	Model 2			Model 3			Model 4		
	Definitely no	Probably no			Probably yes			Definitely yes		
Wave 2	Probably no	Definitely no	Probably no	Probably yes	Probably no	Probably yes	Definitely yes	Probably yes	Definitely yes	Had or expected a child
Employed – leave/homemaker	omitted	0.16	-0.03	-0.13***	0.04	-0.03	-0.01	-0.17***	-0.05	0.23***
Other	0.00	0.06	-0.02	-0.05	-0.00	0.06	-0.06	-0.04	-0.09*	0.12***
Country (ref.=Austria)										
France	-0.06***	0.20***	-0.10	-0.11***	-0.08***	-0.10**	0.17***	-0.13***	0.00	0.12***
Poland	0.06***	-0.12***	0.16***	-0.04**	0.04*	0.06**	-0.10***	0.02	-0.11***	0.09***
Sex (ref.=female)										
Male	0.05***	-0.06***	0.02	0.08***	-0.01	0.03	-0.02	0.04*	-0.08***	0.04**
Pseudo R ²	0.1366	0.2022			0.1438			0.2274		
Observations	3211	1154			1693			1877		

Note:

- + p < 0.1.
- * p < 0.05.
- ** p < 0.01.
- *** p < 0.001.

Source: GGS, individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1, Austria, France and Poland.

Table A11

Estimated Average Marginal Effects for larger changes in overall fertility intentions between wave 1 and 2, including changes in employment.

	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8
	Larger changes upwards from		Larger changes downwards from	
	... definitely no	... probably no	... probably yes	... definitely yes
Age (wave 1) (ref.=30–34)				
18–29	0.16***	0.11 ⁺	-0.11***	-0.09*
35–39	-0.07***	-0.08	0.20***	0.17*
40–45	-0.12***	-0.12*	0.34***	0.31***
Parity (ref.=childless)				
1 child	-0.07***	0.15*	0.15***	0.22***
2 + children	-0.12***	0.01	0.27***	0.34***
Partnership status at wave 1 and wave 2 (ref.=cohabiting – cohabiting)				
LAT – LAT	0.00	0.02	-0.11*	-0.11
No partner – no partner	-0.01	-0.21**	-0.05	0.10*
(Cohabiting) partner – no partner	0.03 ⁺	-0.14	-0.00	0.09 ⁺
No (cohabiting) partner – cohabiting	0.11***	0.29***	-0.03	-0.08 ⁺
No partner – LAT	0.01	0.38**	-0.10*	0.09 ⁺
Cohabiting – LAT	0.06	-0.32*	-0.11	0.08
Employment status at wave 1 and wave 2 (ref.=employed – employed)				
Unemployed – unemployed	-0.05	-0.15	0.11 ⁺	0.09
Student – student	0.06 ⁺	0.46*	0.10	-0.02
Unemployed – employed	0.03 ⁺	0.02	-0.00	0.06
Employed – unemployed	-0.03	0.08	0.03	0.03
Leave/homemaker – leave/homemaker	0.02	0.22**	0.11 ⁺	0.10
Employed – leave/homemaker	0.14***	0.52***	0.05	0.19**
Other	-0.00	0.19*	0.08	0.20***
Country (ref.=Austria)				
France	-0.01	0.11	0.05	-0.07*
Poland	0.01	-0.14**	-0.07**	-0.01
Sex (ref.=female)				
Male	0.06***	0.20***	-0.05*	0.04
Pseudo R ²	0.3527	0.2453	0.3322	0.3309
Observations	3301	545	1342	853

Note:

- + p < 0.1.
- * p < 0.05.
- ** p < 0.01.
- *** p < 0.001.

Source: GGS, individuals aged 18–45 years at wave 1. Austria, France, and Poland.

References

- Ajzen, I., & Klobas, J. (2013). Fertility intentions: An approach based on the theory of planned behavior. *Demographic Research*, 29(8), 203–232. <https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2013.29.8>
- Beaujouan, É. (2013). Counting how many children people want: Influence of question filters and pre-codes. *Demográfia*, 56(5), 35–61.
- Bernardi, L., Mynarska, M., & Rossier, C. (2015). Uncertain, changing and situated fertility intentions: A qualitative analysis. In M. Philippens, A. C. Liefbroer, & J. Klobas (Eds.), *Reproductive decision-making in a macro-micro environment* (pp. 113–139). Springer. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9401-5>
- Berrington, A., & Pattaro, S. (2014). Educational differences in fertility desires, intentions and behaviour: A life course perspective. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 21, 10–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2013.12.003>
- Bachrach, C. A., & Morgan, S. P. (2013). A cognitive–social model of fertility intentions. *Population and Development Review*, 39(3), 459–485. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2013.00612.x>
- Best, H., & Wolf, C. (2012). Modellvergleich und Ergebnisinterpretation in Logit- und Probit-Regressionen [Comparing models and interpreting results in logit and probit regressions]. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 64, 377–395. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11577-012-0167-4>
- Brehm, U., & Schneider, N. F. (2019). Towards a comprehensive understanding of fertility: The model of dyadic pathways. *Comparative Population Studies*, 44, 3–36. <https://doi.org/10.12765/CPoS-2019-01en>
- Brzozowska, Z., & Beaujouan, E. (2021). Assessing short-term fertility intentions and their realisation using the Generations and Gender Survey: Pitfalls and challenges. *European Journal of Population*, 37, 405–416. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10680-020-09573-x>
- Buber-Ennser, I. (2014). Attrition in the Austrian Generations and Gender Survey: Is there a bias by fertility-relevant aspects? *Demographic Research*, 31(16), 459–496. <https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2014.31.16>
- Buber-Ennser, I., Neuwirth, N., & Testa, M. R. (Eds.). (2014). Families in Austria 2009–2013: Descriptive findings on partnerships, fertility intentions, childbearing and childrearing.
- Buhr, P., & Huinink, J. (2017). Why childless men and women give up on having children. *European Journal of Population/Revue européenne Délelött Démographie*, 33(4), 585–606. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10680-017-9429-1>
- Elder, G. H. (1994). Time, human agency, and social change: Perspectives on the life course. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 57(1), 4–15. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2786971>
- Gauthier, A. H., Cabaço, S. L. F., & Emery, T. (2018). Generations and gender survey study profile. *Longitudinal and Life Course Studies*, 9(4), 456–465. <https://doi.org/10.14301/lcs.v9i4.500>
- Gray, E., Evans, A., & Reimondos, A. (2013). Childbearing desires of childless men and women: Why are goals adjusted? *Advances in Life Course Research*, 18, 141–149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2012.09.003>
- Guzzo, K. B., & Hayford, S. R. (2020). Pathways to parenthood in social and family contexts: Decade in review. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 82(1), 117–144. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12618>
- Hayford, S. R. (2009). The evolution of fertility expectations over the life course. *Demography*, 46(4), 765–783. <https://doi.org/10.1353/dem.0.0073>
- Heiland, F., Prskawetz, A., & Sanderson, W. C. (2008). Are individuals' desired family sizes stable? Evidence from West German panel data. *European Journal of Population*, 24(2), 129–156. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10680-008-9162-x>
- Huinink, J., & Kohli, M. (2014). A life-course approach to fertility. *Demographic Research*, 30, 1293–1326. <https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2014.30.45>
- Jones, R. K. (2017). Are uncertain fertility intentions a temporary or long-term outlook? Findings from a panel study. *Women's Health Issues*, 27(1), 21–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.whi.2016.10.001>
- Kotowska, I. E., Matysiak, A., & Mynarska, M. (2016). The life of Poles: From leaving the parental home to retirement. Insights from the Generations and Gender Survey (GG-PL). Warsaw School of Economics.
- Kuhnt, A.-K., Minkus, L., & Buhr, P. (2021). Uncertainty in fertility intentions from a life course perspective: Which life course markers matter? *Journal of Family Research*, 33(1), 184–208. <https://doi.org/10.20377/jfr-426>
- Mize, T. D. (2019). Best practices for estimating, interpreting, and presenting nonlinear interaction effects. *Sociological Science*, 6, 81–117. <https://doi.org/10.15195/v6.a4>
- Morgan, S. P. (1981). Intention and uncertainty at later stages of childbearing: The United States 1965 and 1970. *Demography*, 18(3), 267–285. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2060997>
- Morgan, S. P. (1982). Parity-specific fertility intentions and uncertainty: The United States, 1970 to 1976. *Demography*, 19(3), 315–334. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2060974>
- Ní Bhrolcháin, M., & Beaujouan, É. (2011). Uncertainty in fertility intentions in Britain, 1979–2007. *Vienna Yearbook of Population Research 2011*, 9, 99–129. <https://doi.org/10.1553/populationyearbook2011s99>
- Ní Bhrolcháin, M., & Beaujouan, É. (2012). Fertility postponement is largely due to rising educational enrolment. *Population Studies*, 66(3), 311–327. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00324728.2012.697569>
- Ní Bhrolcháin, M., & Beaujouan, É. (2015). How real are reproductive goals? Uncertainty and the construction of fertility preferences. ESRC.
- Ní Bhrolcháin, M., & Beaujouan, É. (2019). Do people have reproductive goals? Constructive preferences and the discovery of desired family size. In R. Schoen (Ed.), *Analytical family demography* (pp. 27–56). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-93227-9_3
- Ní Bhrolcháin, M., Beaujouan, E., & Berrington, A. (2010). Stability and change in fertility intentions in Britain, 1991–2007. *Population Trends*, 141(1), 13–35. <https://doi.org/10.1057/pt.2010.19>
- Raybould, A., & Sear, R. (2021). Expectations after expecting: The impact of first birth on the fertility expectations of one child women in the USA and UK. SocArXiv. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/4atj7>
- Régnier-Loilier, A. (2017). Introduction. Following the same people over time to better understand family behaviour and its consequences. In A. Régnier-Loilier (Ed.), *A longitudinal approach to family trajectories in France: The generations and gender survey* (pp. 1–9). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-56001-4_1
- Régnier-Loilier, A., & Vignoli, D. (2011). Fertility intentions and obstacles to their realization in France and Italy. *Population-E*, 66(2), 361–390. <https://doi.org/10.3917/popu.1102.0401>
- Testa, M. R., & Bolano, D. (2021). When partners' disagreement prevents childbearing: A couple-level analysis in Australia. *Demographic Research*, 44(33), 811–838. <https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2021.44.33>
- Trinitapoli, J., & Yeatman, S. (2018). The flexibility of fertility preferences in a context of uncertainty. *Population and Development Review*, 44(1), 87–116. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padr.12114>
- Udry, J. R. (1983). Do couples make fertility plans one birth at a time? *Demography*, 20, 117–128. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2061230>