



## **Surely Yes, Surely Not, As Soon As, Maybe, At Times, Surely One Day: Understanding Declared Fertility Intentions<sup>1</sup>**

**Laura Bernardi**

University of Lausanne

[laura.bernardi@unil.ch](mailto:laura.bernardi@unil.ch)

**Monika Mynarska**

Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw

[m.mynarska@uksw.edu.pl](mailto:m.mynarska@uksw.edu.pl)

### ***Executive Summary***

This research focuses on the subjective expression of the intention to have a child within a given time frame. It is written within the framework of the European Commission project “Reproductive decision-making in a macro-micro perspective” (REPRO). It describes part of the analytical work completed within the REPRO Work Package 5 devoted to understanding reproductive decision-making processes through qualitative interpretative data analyses. In particular, in this report we present an empirically grounded typology of individual orientations and life course contingencies leading to positive, negative or undefined fertility intentions.

Our qualitative study takes a bottom up approach to classify fertility intentions starting from subjective reports of fertility goals and related intentions. We explore fertility goals, the relation between fertility goals and fertility intentions and the way in which specific intentions are motivated, argued for, and interpreted by subjects. One major aim is to evaluate the notion of intention as conceptualised by Theory of Planned Behaviour for predicting actions towards a complex goal of having a child in a given time frame. A second aim is to contrast our empirically grounded typology with the indicators of fertility intentions used in demographic surveys in order to assess the validity. of such indicators.

---

<sup>1</sup> We would like to acknowledge all researchers who contributed to the coding of interviews on which this report is based for their invaluable contribution in the original language. In order Laura Cavalli, Arianna Caporali Clémentine Rossier, Sylvia Keim, Andreas Klärner, Anne Salles, Sara Brachet, Marie Thérèse Letablier, Elitsa Dimitrova, Atanas Atanasov and Judit Durst. A special thank goes to Clémentine Rossier for her insightful comments of the unfinished draft

Individuals in different European countries declared their fertility intentions in semi-structured interviews and we classify them according to the clarity of the goal, the strength with which it is expressed, and the time horizon for its realization. Data consist of 261 interviews conducted in Italy, France, Germany, and Poland and collected between 2004 and 2007 with individuals at the beginning of family formation (179 women, mean age: 30.4 and 82 men, mean age: 30). As many as 114 individuals in the sample are already parents (in the vast majority of cases: with one child), while 147 are childless.

The national research teams collected all data analysed in this research and analyzed them in the original language. For each data set we performed a thematic coding of fertility intentions. In each interview, passages related to fertility intentions were identified and labelled according to the type of intentions they reveal. Coordination group put together the various typologies, provided by national teams, and constructed a commonly shared coding structure. This structure has been reviewed and confirmed by national teams.

Altogether, we developed six categories of fertility intentions, which cover exhaustively all cases encountered in the interviews. The six categories are distinguished according to the presence of a clearly expressed desire to have a child the presence of a clear time frame for it.

***Category 1: “Surely yes”, intention to have a child (29 childless and 32 parents)***

The first category includes respondents, who have a clear-cut and strong intention to become parents. The intention here is a concrete project, the time frame is short or the active attempts to get pregnant are already in place. The interviewees value children greatly and their narrations list advantages of parenthood versus childlessness. They also offer multiple reasons for believing that the right time for them to have a child has come.

Childless respondents mention primarily the emotional values of children: love, joy and happiness related to parenthood. They want to transfer their genes, their character features, their knowledge to their offspring. They also believe that parenthood belongs to being in a couple relationship, reinforcing its stability. They outline also the reasons for which they feel ready to have a child and take active steps towards childbearing at this given moment of time. Their readiness is defined by (1) being mature and responsible enough to become parents; (2) being in the relationship that is stable and settled enough to provide a secure space for childbearing; (3) being able to provide for the future offspring. Moreover, biological age is mentioned in relation to a development of fertility intentions. Generally respondents in this category are inclined towards rather young parenthood, as it makes childrearing burdens lighter and communication with a child easier. Age is related also to the concept of the woman’s biological clock and her subjectively defined fertility limits.

Narrations of parents who plan to have another child in the close future mostly focus on the advantages of having large families (they bring a great deal of joy and happiness). As to the timing, when the respondents explain the reasons for intending a second (next) child very soon, they recurrently refer to an *ideal spacing* between children by indicating that their first (previous) child is just the right age for them to have another baby (two to four years old).

Apart from the respondents with conception difficulties – the interviewees in this category are intending and also virtually certain to have a child in the next three years.

### ***Category 2: “Surely Not”, intention not to have a child (10 childless and 30 parents)***

The second category locates on the other end of the fertility intentions continuum. Respondents included here are adamant in reporting their intentions not to have any or any additional child.

As for the childless respondents, their position is generally related to two aspects: they either completely miss desire to have a child or they have highly valued life-priorities perceived as competing and incompatible with having children. These priorities include self-fulfillment at work, personal development, artistic expression, high standards of living, personal freedom, traveling, hobbies and so forth. In their opinion these things do not go with childbearing. Moreover, they perceive parenthood as strenuous. They think that childbearing is demanding economically and in terms of parental time and devotion.

As for parents in this category, they most of all declare that they do not intend to have another child because they have reached the desired number of children or that the number of children they have is optimal given their life situation. They believe that the life they have now is nicely balanced. They are able to provide their child (children) with sufficient amount of care and resources, but also they have managed to reconcile their family life and other life spheres. Another child would destroy this equilibrium in the respondents' opinion.

A separate reason for a clear negative intention relates to respondents' age. Some of them simply feel too old to enter the burden of childbearing once more. Finally, some bad or painful experiences with their previous child (children) may prevent parents from having another one.

The most distinctive feature of all respondents belonging to this category is their satisfaction with the life-style they live at the moment and their conviction that having a child or another child would damage it. They are happy childless or with the number of children they have at the moment and they do not imagine themselves changing that.

### ***Category 3: “As soon as”, contingent intentions (36 childless and 20 parents).***

The category we named “as soon as” refers to those individuals who mention a variety of reasons which interfere with their intention to have an otherwise presently desired child. Conditions in this category are generally perceived to be external factors, not necessarily in control of respondents. Childbearing desire and motivation to act are at odds for these respondents and considerations of childbearing timing are explicit and crucial.

Generally, the respondents in this category express strong desire to have a child as soon as possible and lacking the appropriate conditions to proceed to childbearing is a stressful situation for them. External obstacles to childbearing are of four types. First, there are relational issues: There has to be a partner, he / she must be “the right one”, and both should be ready for parenthood. Second, being enrolled in education also means postponing childbearing. However, for the respondents in this category, completing school is expected or hoped to be happening rather soon. Third, there are issues related to employment. The respondents intend to have a child as soon as their job is stable enough (i.e. when they have a permanent contract or some job seniority). The fourth aspect relates to housing: the respondents in this category may postpone their fertility plans until they have sufficient living conditions. The four types of obstacles differ strongly as to a predictability of overcoming them, hence the behavioural outcome of fertility intention will vary for the respondents in this category.

Housing quality and location as well as working conditions and salary are even more crucial obstacles to having a second (next) child. Interviewees with children are generally able

to calculate more accurately what resources (in terms of money and time) are required for another child.

In this category the crucial dimension characterizing childbearing intentions is a weak perceived behavioural control. The perception of a weak control depends on a variety of different reasons and such reasons are crucial to differentiate respondents who can indicate when they may start try actively to have a child and those who can not do so.

***Category 4: “Surely one day”, far intentions (45 childless respondents and 8 parents)***

In this category we predominantly find respondents who desire to have a first child, and yet mostly because of their young ages or the specific life course stage in which they live parenthood is perceived as something that does not belong to the near future. Their reasoning is less centred on external obstacles and conditions and more on the perceived distance with the issue.

The distance is related to young age, a lack of economic independence or a lack of a partner but it is also normatively defined by established sequencing of life course transitions. Individuals still enrolled education want to complete it, find a job, leave parental home, enter a stable union and finally plan childbearing. If these conditions, taken one by one are the same for respondents in the “as soon as” category, their cumulative effect is to extend the time span needed to make all transitions. As a consequence childbearing considerations are push far forward into an undefined future. Moreover, life course development is perceived to be an important moderator for family planning also in the sphere of emotional or personal development. Respondents say that they are still not mature enough, not ready, not adult enough etc. to become parents.

As for the few parents in this category, they also perceive having a second child as something that belongs to a distant future. Practically in all cases this is related to adverse experiences with first childbearing: it had been unplanned or resulted in some crisis (of economic nature or related to parents’ relationship). Recently or currently experienced hardship pushes the plans for a second child away, but do not exclude them completely.

What is common for all respondents in this category is that they do not feel at the stage of their life, when they can even consider childbearing. They frequently express extremely positive attitudes towards children and a very strong desire to have a (another) child one day, but they think about it in a very far time perspective.

***Category 5: “Maybe” uncertain intentions (19 childless and 21 parents).***

In this category we find cases in which respondents do not express any strong desire to have a child, but the possibility of having a baby in the next three years is not ruled out. These are individuals who sometimes openly declare that they have never thought about becoming parent or having another child. They are uncertain about the concept of parenthood in general, but also about the time frame they would prefer, and want to maintain an open and non-committing attitude towards the possibility of childbearing. The respondents in the category are rather vague about their fertility intentions and, even when prompted, they are not able to give any precise time frame: it might be in one year’s time, but also in ten years’ time.

Several dimensions recur in combination with uncertain intentions. First, problems with relationship shake childbearing intentions: a recent crisis, but even more general doubts on whether the current partner is the “right” one. Secondly, even a strong desire for children, may not lead to formulate clear intentions when other goals (mainly educational and professional development) have priority over parenthood. The effect is to blur the intention

time frame for parenthood. Thirdly, and quite frequently, respondents in this category express various fears related to parenthood: losing personal freedom, reducing the standard of living, not being able to balance family and childbearing, being a bad parent. Some bad examples of parenthood from their own childhood are mentioned as well to give consistence to such worries. Notably, these arguments echo those given by the respondents in our “surely no” category. Yet, for the previous category, they were decisive for excluding childbearing from their life-plans. They do not have such strength here. What is remarkable is the small space that financial matters occupy in these interviews. Even if they appear, they are not main arguments for respondent’s uncertainty.

***Category 6: “At times”, ambivalent intentions (8 childless women and 3 mothers)***

This category includes only women, who are characterized by waving between the desire to have a child and its opposite. Interviews contain extracts in which respondents declare to intend a child soon and other in which they state that they could imagine remaining (for a longer time or permanently) childless or with one child only. These contrasting directions are not justified with reference to material conditions, life course situations or biographical age. Rather, waving is related to individuals’ alternating between more or less defined fears of the responsibility of childrearing or to perceived personal immaturity on the one hand, and the foreseen satisfactions of having a child or a second child on the other hand.

Childless respondents in this group hold behavioral beliefs, which contrast positive aspects of childlessness with the disadvantages of parenthood. According to them, motherhood is a difficult, demanding, strenuous, and excessively time-intensive task; especially it is perceived to have a negative impact on the couple (child-care would lead to breaking up for some respondents) and it limits one’s freedom and independence. By contrast, childfree means to be responsible only for oneself and dedicate one’s own time and energy to other valued activities: studying, pursuing a professional career, going out, travelling, having hobbies, etc. A strong perceived incompatibility of a possible desired parenthood with other life course spheres is similar to the one described by the respondents in “surely no” category. However, for the respondents in ambivalent category living a childless life is not an easy alternative: fears of loneliness and the emotional and practical consequences are frequent themes as well as the positive feeling related to the presence of children in the household. Concerns with care and well being in old age and the fact that children are “cute” and a necessary part of a family provide enough reasons not to take a final decision against parenthood.

Similar is true also for the three parents who are ambivalent about having a second child, divided between a two-child family norm and the lack of inner motivation to have another child. The comparative analysis of semi-structured interviews focusing on childbearing intentions produced a typology of intentions along three dimensions: the goal towards which the intention is directed, the strength with which the intention is expressed, and the envisaged time horizon to realize it.

One motivation for our study was to evaluate the notion of intention, as it is conceptualized in the Theory of Planned Behaviour, as a tool to predict action towards complex goals like having a child in a given time frame. The Theory of Planned Behaviour theoretically defines intentions as composed of two types of elements: beliefs (attitudinal, normative, and control beliefs) and their strength (subjective evaluation of the strength of beliefs). Our results show that the dimensions identified in the analysis of our respondents’ declarations about their childbearing intentions and goals can easily be related to the elements of the TPB: beliefs are captured by the childbearing goals and the place they are given in the

life course, while the strength of the intention lay in the more or less clear definition of the goal and in the shorter or longer time frame for its realization.

A second motivation for our study was to evaluate the validity of fertility intentions indicators such as those we find in the Gender and Generation Survey. In the GGS childbearing intentions are measured by means of a single question (“Do you intend to have a (another) child within the next three years?”). The possible answers are: yes, probably yes, probably no, not. In our qualitative data, we revealed numerous types and sources of uncertainty, which are not account for in the survey question. Uncertainty revealed in the questionnaire is rather inconclusive regarding the behaviour that is intended. The answer options seem to mix two different issues at the same time: whether people want a child at all (the goal, the outcome) and in case they do, whether they want it soon or not, or have no idea when. Our qualitative results show that there should be a distinction between reasons related to the desirability of the outcome and those related to the ability or will to define a time frame for it. If we do not understand the nature of the uncertainty intention behind the survey answer given, predictive validity would be weaker.

To conclude, we would suggest modifying the direct question on intentions. A possibility to increase the information in the answer would be to add a direct follow up question in case of answers like “probably yes, probably not” which would ask what the uncertainty depends on. Qualitative data may also be used as a base to create a list of possible closed answers to such question. Another possibility would be to separate the measurement of fertility intentions in a two step-question: one step to capture the intended goal and the other to capture the intended timing. This may distinguish more clearly the two dimensions of intentions (positive, ambivalent, uncertain, or negative attitudes towards having a child) and in case of positive feelings, timing of the foreseen child (clearly defined in the short term or less clearly defined in the distant future).

## 1. Introduction

Scholars are divided about the usefulness of measuring childbearing intentions and about their predictive value when it comes to either achieved family size or actual childbearing in a given time frame. A recent literature review of the issue concludes that there are diverging empirical results as far as the realization of intended family size is concerned because of the adaptation of intentions to developments occurring in the life course. Similarly, the predictability of realization within a given time frame of 2 to 4 years is not conclusive. On the contrary, there is consensus about the predictive value of intended childlessness that would efficiently discriminate individuals who will indeed have no children. The same consensus exists on the effect of the certainty of the intention: certain intentions predict behavior accurately (Zsolt and Kapitany 2009).

Ajzen's (1988, 1991) "Theory of Planned Behaviour" (from now on TPB) conceptualizes intentions as a crucial mediator between attitudes, norms, and individual perceived ability to perform the behaviour on the one side and behaviour on the other side (Miller and Pasta 1995, Barber 2001). TPB gained credit among demographers interested in the discrepancy between declared intentions and future realization for the economic way of modelling and measuring the effect of soft on intentions and behaviour through one single construct, the intention to perform the behaviour. An evolution of the original expectancy value theory (Fishbein 1967, Fishbein and Ajzen 1975) is currently being tested for the first time on a large-scale representative sample with data from the Gender and Generation Survey to measure fertility intentions and their relation to subsequent fertility behaviour. According to the theory (Ajzen 1988, 1991) the occurrence of a specific behaviour is predicted by two elements: individuals' motivation to behave that way on the one hand (their "intention"), and their ability to do so on the other hand, given their competence and resources (their "actual behavioural control"). Individuals' intentions are shaped in turn by three factors: their perceived ability to perform the behaviour ("perceived behavioural control") which depends heavily on their actual capacity to do it, their evaluation of the short-term and long-term gains and appropriateness of the behaviour ("attitude toward the behaviour"), and finally, their perception that significant others want them to behave that way ("subjective norm"). This last factor is what Ajzen (1991: 188) calls the "social factor [of behaviours]; it refers to the perceived social pressure to perform or not to perform the behaviour".

There are a few difficulties with the TPB applied to the intention to have a child and its realization. First, it has been often argued that one critical issue with expectancy-value models, including TPB, is that they measure well the strength of a given intention, but do not account for the possibility of competing intentions (Barber 2001). However, one could argue that the effect of competing intentions on the behaviour of interest is implicitly discounted for through attitudes. In the case of childbearing intentions, I may highly value having a child soon, but I may also value and intend to perform as a professional classic dancer at the same time; since the two are simultaneously incompatible, the strength of my attitudes towards having a child will be lowered.

Second, the definition of having a child as a behavioural goal is problematic in itself. Having a child is rather the product of other behaviours but not a behaviour in itself. Ajzen himself, one of the fathers of this theoretical model, makes the distinction between outcomes and behavioural goals and insists that it is the intention about the behavioural goal that shall be measured, and not the intention towards outcomes (Ajzen). However, having a child can be considered a behavioural goal as long as the pregnancy is planned. Similarly, not having a child is a behavioural goal as long as pregnancy prevention is intended.

Yet, having a child or not is a complex goal since it requires that actors intend and perform a number of other behaviours, like a consistent sexual intercourse and contraceptive pattern. In this framework a planned pregnancy, which does not eventually occur, would be the consequence of lack of actual control (infertility or absence of sexual intercourse) as much as an unplanned pregnancy (contraceptive failure). The situation is similar to that of competing behaviours. If one intends to have a child but not to perform the intermediary behaviours necessary to enhance the pregnancy, then attitudes towards having a child should be reduced. The same is true in the case in which one does not intend to have a child but not to behave so to prevent a pregnancy.

Such complexity of childbearing as a target of intention, or a goal, rises from the issue of whether having a child is a behaviour or an outcome of a series of behaviours? If we can consider it a behaviour, is the declared intention a sufficiently powerful predictor? In general, more difficult goals require higher-level of commitment and implementation intentions (Gollwitzer and Brandstätter 1997), than easy goals do. To anticipate difficulties is more complicated, too. For this reason accomplishment rates are lower in case of complex behaviours.

Our qualitative study takes a bottom up approach to classify fertility intentions starting from subjective reports of fertility goals and related intentions. We explore fertility goals, the relation between fertility goals and fertility intentions and the way in which specific intentions are motivated, argued for, and interpreted by subjects. One major aim is to evaluate the notion of intention (as conceptualised by TPB) for predicting actions towards a complex goal of having a child in a given time frame. A second aim is to contrast our empirically grounded typology with the indicators of fertility intentions used in demographic surveys in order to assess the validity of such indicators

## 2. Data: fertility intentions in semi-structured interviews

For the purposes of this research, we analyse a set of semi-structured interviews, collected in Italy, Germany, Poland, and France between 2004 and 2007. Our sample consists of 97 interviews conducted in Cagliari and Naples (Italy), 92 in Rostock and Lübeck (Germany), 45 in Warsaw (Poland) and 27 in Poitiers (France). In all settings, we interviewed women and men of different marital status and parity. Besides Italian sample, where more women were interviewed, in other countries there are no large differences between the number of male and female respondents.

**Table 1. Samples by country and gender**

Country	Women	Men	Total
Italy	87	10	97
Germany	53	39	92
Poland	24	21	45
France	15	12	27
Total	179	82	<b>261</b>

In most national samples, age varies between 20 and 35. Only 27 women (25 in the Italian and 2 in the German sample) and 5 men (3 in the Italian and 2 in the German sample) are older than 35. The mean age of all female respondents is 30.4, for men, it is 30. Because we are interested in intentions for a first as well as for a second (and sometimes a third) child, we consider all respondents, whether they are childless (56% or 147 individuals) or with

offspring (44% or 114 individuals). Among those with children, parents of one are prevailing (87 respondents, including 9 cases of respondents pregnant for the first time at the moment of the interview). Our sample also includes varied marital statuses, although a vast majority of the respondents are in a stable relationship. As many as 107 of them are married and another 103 are in informal relationships (47 cohabiting, 56 – still living apart). Finally, 47 individuals in our sample are not in partnership (ever married ever cohabited, separated, or divorced) at the time of the interview.

As far as educational attainment of our respondents is concerned, our sample is made of individuals with secondary or higher education. Due to differences in educational levels between the analysed countries, we distinguish only two educational groups: 107 respondents (41%) have some tertiary education completed, while 154 did not obtain any tertiary degree. Among the latter group there are individuals with secondary general as well as secondary professional or vocational education. Moreover, 32 respondents among those with secondary education were enrolled at the university at the moment of the interview.

The national research teams collected all data analysed in this research. The ultimate goal of each interview was to obtain a detailed account of respondent's experiences, perceptions and intentions related to having children. Even though, a general, semi-structured interview guideline was prepared for each interview, the researchers always made sure to ask questions in an open, non-directive way and to remain perceptive to the respondents' stories. In each country setting, interviews were conducted by well-trained interviewers. They carried out the interviews in a conversational manner that enhanced respondents' openness and allowed for obtaining rich, in-depth data.

All interviews were recorded (with interviewees' permission) and transcribed verbatim. Each national team was responsible for analysing their data. That allowed for conducting all analyses in the original language of the country and to avoid any distortions related to inaccurate translation. A general strategy for our comparative analysis is outline in the next section.

### **3. Methodology: Comparative qualitative analysis**

As each national team worked with their own set of data it was crucial to clearly outline a common strategy for data analysis. For each data set we performed a thematic coding of fertility intentions, which was coordinated as follows. First, a working meeting of all national teams was organised to establish a common ground for analyses. During this meeting, aims of the research and its theoretical underpinning have been presented in details by a coordination group. In the weeks following the meeting, each team classified and coded the relevant passages of their own interviews. They identified passages related to fertility intentions and labelled them according to the type of intentions they could identify. Each team sent their work to the coordination group, which put together the various typologies to construct a commonly shared coding structure. This structure has been then reviewed and confirmed by national teams. All the interviews were then recoded according to the common typology.

We developed six categories of fertility intentions, which cover exhaustively all cases encountered in the interviews. The six categories are distinguished according to the presence of a clearly expressed desire to have a child the presence of a clear time frame for it.

The categorization is mutually exclusive (no interview is coded under two categories); in cases in which intentions could fit two or more categories, the relative weight of the

conflicting interviews passages has been considered to assign the intention to a specific category group.

After all interviews were coded into fertility intention categories, each national team was asked to characterise the respondents belonging to each of the categories. For each category national teams provided information on the number of respondents, their age and sex as well as their life situation (relationship status, living arrangements, education and employment). More importantly, the national teams provided also details on how the respondents in each category express and reason their fertility intentions. For each type of fertility intention and for each national setting short summaries were prepared, describing the way in which the respondents speak of their intentions. Main reasons and explanations, given by respondents in relation to their fertility plans were also listed. All the above characteristics were prepared separately for childless respondents and for those with a child (or children) already.

After all the summaries were completed, they were again taken over by the coordination group and combined together. In the next section we illustrate and comment on each of the intentional categories (a summary table in the appendix shows the sample distribution by declared childbearing intention and by parity).

#### **4. Findings: A typology of declared fertility intentions**

##### *4.1. "Surely yes", intention to have a child (29 childless and 32 parents)*

The first category includes respondents, who have a clear-cut and strong intention to become parents. The intention here is a concrete project, the time frame is short or the active attempts to get pregnant are already in place. In their narrations, the interviewees express their belief that childbearing produces a variety of benefits, which would motivate their desire to have a child. Childless respondents mention primarily the emotional values of children: love, joy and happiness related to parenthood. They want to transfer their genes, their character features, their knowledge to their offspring. They also believe that parenthood belongs to being in a couple relationship, reinforcing its stability. Altogether, they show very positive attitudes towards parenthood that fuel their intention to have a child soon<sup>2</sup>.

Similarly respondents outline the reasons for which they take active steps towards childbearing at this given moment of time. Many declare that they simply feel "ready" to have children. This readiness refers to three dimensions. First, it is related to individual developmental phase: interviewees feel mature and responsible enough to become parents. Second, readiness has a couple dimensions: the relationship is stable and settled enough to provide a secure space for childbearing. Finally, respondents' readiness to have children is related to prospective parents' ability to provide for the future offspring. In the vast majority of cases, the respondents in this category have ended their education; they have a more or less secure employment and are financially independent.

Feeling ready for parenthood is already perceived and described as a turning point in life, as much as the actual transition to parenthood. Parenthood for men particularly seems to represent the actual real marker for becoming an adult and responsible individual. This is well illustrated by the case of a German respondent. He is 34 and lives together with his partner. They are childless, but they are intending to change this status soon. In the interview he

---

<sup>2</sup> A complete list of the values of children mentioned in the interviews goes beyond the scope of this report. However, in our next deliverables we will include comparative studies looking at the values of children in a few different countries: Poland, France Italy and Hungary

explains that he developed the desire to have a child to the point that it has recently become a very concrete plan. He has reached the stage in life when to “take responsibility” as a father.

“Earlier I never thought about children. But since three, four years it gets clearer and since two years I know for sure that we want to have children (...) Now there is the model ‘family’ (...) Now, it is important for me to earn money and to take responsibility as a father. That’s my perspective. That’s the most important. We want to found a family and this is beautiful.” (Germany, Male, 34, cohabiting, childless)

Biological age is also mentioned in relation to a development of fertility intentions. Generally respondents in this category are inclined towards rather young parenthood. They believe it makes childrearing burdens lighter and communication with a child easier. Age is related also to the concept of the woman’s biological clock. Some female respondents in this category say explicitly that for them it is “the highest time” to become mothers. They have a strong desire to have children, and at the same time they are aware that getting pregnant might become more and more difficult for them, as they get older. They feel prompted to take some action towards motherhood. The “latest late age” varies between countries and respondents but ranges between 30 and 40 in all cases.

The respondents in this category rarely refer to any external obstacles to having children. If they do so, they rather speak of having overcome them or they try to neglect their importance. Some respondents list various conditions that make their decision to become parents easier at a given moment: stable job, sufficient income, satisfactory living conditions, etc. At other cases, they acknowledge that even though not everything is perfect in their lives, they feel ready to take a responsibility of parenthood.

This is well illustrated by a case of an Italian respondent. She is 29, married and childless. She and her husband have been waiting for a year and a half in order to ensure the necessary material and emotional stability to their union and they had agreed before marrying about such waiting time. They used the pill all the way through this period while at the moment of the interview they are actively trying to have a child.

“All those objectives that make you feel calm and allow you to make a choice, because choosing to have a child must be a well-thought choice. You need to be ready, prepared to make it, even though I do believe you are never really ready and prepared. The perfect moment will not be there but there is a moment in which you decide and say ‘ok now, despite this and this and that – I can do it!’ and I think for me this moment has arrived, for me and for my husband.” (Italy, Female, 29, married, childless)

This is the category where we find respondents who experienced conception problems. Some of them are undergoing infertility treatment. These respondents are engaged to become parents and their childbearing intentions are exceptionally strong. Almost paradoxically yet, even if perceived control is high (they claim they believe in the final result) the outcome of such strong intention is questionable, as some of them have been trying – in vain – to have a child for several years already.

Narrations of parents who plan to have another child in the close future mostly focus on the advantages of having large families and on issues related to appropriate spacing between children. They see large families as bringing a great deal of joy and happiness. In the Polish interviews, the respondents who want to have big families recurrently bring up an image of Christmas with lots of children and (later) grandchildren, describing it as something beautiful and most wanted. A strong desire for having a large family is especially profound among Italian and French respondents. It is seen as something natural and highly valued.

The timing for the next child is commonly explained by the age of a first (previous) kid. According to the respondents in this category, there seems to be some *ideal spacing* for having subsequent children. According to the respondents, it should be more than two years so the first child gains some independence from the parents. But it should not be longer than

four years, so that children can play and grow up together. A short distance between the children is beneficial also because parents “have practice” in caring for a small child. When the interviewees in this category explain the reasons for intending a second (next) child very soon, they refer to such *ideal spacing* by indicating that their first (previous) child is just the right age.

Another set of arguments relates to having a second (next) child with a new partner. Some female respondents in our sample have had children in their former relationships. Currently, they intend to have a child *for* their new partner or to reinforce the stability of their new partnership.

Summarizing, respondents in this category share a strong and defined intention to have a child soon and they often are already searching actively to conceive. They all value children greatly and their narrations list advantages of parenthood versus childlessness. Finally, they offer multiple reasons for believing that the right time for them to have a child has come. Apart from those with conception difficulties – these respondents are intending and also virtually certain to have a child in the next three years.

#### 4.2. “Surely Not”, intention not to have a child (10 childless and 30 parents)

The second category locates on the other end of the fertility intentions continuum. Respondents included here are adamant in reporting their intentions not to have any or any additional child. As for the childless respondents, their position is generally related to two aspects: they either completely miss desire to have a child or they have highly valued life-priorities perceived as competing and incompatible with having children.

These priorities include self-fulfilment at work, personal development or artistic expression. The respondents in this category greatly value high standards of living, personal freedom and flexibility. They enjoy travelling, have various hobbies, want to spend their free time doing various leisure activities and having fun. All these things, in their opinion, do not go with childbearing. Moreover, they perceive parenthood as strenuous. They think that childbearing is demanding economically and in terms of parental time and devotion.

The fact, that the respondents in this category give priority to life-goals other than children is visible also in the narration flow. For the Italian interviews it has been noted that even if respondents are directly asked about childbearing and they start to speak about it, they quite swiftly change the topic and put their private life (in terms of independence, fun or career) beforehand.

A respondent from Lübeck is a typical example for this category. She is childless, 31 years old. She is in a stable relationship, but she does not cohabit with her partner. She is employed full time and she highly values her independence without having a family.

“I have a steady boyfriend and everything is nice and well, but with children and family...? It is good the way it is now. We’ve been together for two years, but marriage and children? No! I think I would blow. I still want to travel too much and keep my independence. So that I could say: Oh, I like it here, I want to stay here. Or to establish myself at some other place, and this is very difficult with children. Actually, it is not really feasible. (...) From my feeling I would say: no children. Maybe this will change in five years’ time, but at the moment I would say: no children, I cannot imagine having children. Not in my world.” (Germany, Female, 31, LAT, childless)

Notably, some respondents in this category stress that if one decides to have a child, one should raise it “properly”. According to these interviewees, when a child comes, parents should dedicate their time and energy to childrearing. And as these respondents do not feel able to take such a burden, they believe that childlessness is not only better for them, but also for their potential child. They would not be able to be good parents. The dilemma is especially

strong in the Lübeck sample (west Germany), where women believe that a child suffers if both parents work and they do not want to be “working mums” as that would hurt their future children. At the same time, they do not want to sacrifice their work and thus do not intend to become mothers.

As for parents in this category, they most of all declare that they do not intend to have another child because they have reached the desired number of children or that the number of children they have is optimal given their life situation. They believe that the life they have now is nicely balanced. They are able to provide their child (children) with sufficient amount of care and resources. They have managed to reconcile their family and work life. Also their relationship is satisfactory with the number of children they have. Another child would destroy this equilibrium in the respondents’ opinion. With more children, it would be difficult for the parents, but also for the children as they would receive less of parental resources and attention.

In a few cases, the respondents show also that at the given moment they would like to give priority to other life-goals, which were overshadowed by parenthood before. When their child (children) get a little bigger they want to concentrate on their professional career or continue education. In their opinion, another child would make it impossible.

Another reason for a clear negative intention relates to respondents’ age. Some of them simply feel too old to enter the burden of childbearing once more. Finally, some bad or painful experiences with their previous child (children) may prevent parents from having another one. These might be experiences related to a difficult pregnancy and delivery, but also to problems with a child, such as child’s illness. Notably, the parents that belong to this category are usually absolutely certain that they will not change mind in respect to having another child. In some cases, they even convince their partners that another baby is not an option.

The most distinctive feature of all respondents belonging to this category is their satisfaction with the life-style they live at the moment and their conviction that having a child or another child would damage it. They are happy childless or with the number of children they have at the moment and they do not imagine themselves changing that. Even though they believe that children are great or that having second (next) child might be generally good (e.g. for their first child) – they do not believe that it would be good *for them* and *for their* child (children). Consequently, they exclude childbearing from their lives.

#### 4.3. “As soon as”, contingent intentions (36 childless and 20 parents).

The category we named “as soon as” refers to those individuals who mention a variety of reasons which interfere with their intention to have an otherwise presently desired child. Conditions in this category are generally perceived to be external factors, not necessarily in control of respondents, and whose change does not seem to be predictable. Childbearing desire and motivation to act are at odds for these respondents and considerations of childbearing timing are explicit and crucial.

There is a great range of degrees as far as the strength with which children are desired. Generally, the youngest respondents in this category express particularly strong desire to have a child as soon as possible, suggesting a strong family-oriented attitude on their part. For many of those with a strong desire to have a child, lacking the appropriate conditions (sufficient behavioural control) to proceed to childbearing is a stressful situation. External obstacles are of four types: relational issues, on going training or education, employment instability, and inappropriate housing.

Relational issues can be summarized as follows: There has to be a partner, he / she must be “the right one”, and both should be ready for parenthood. All three conditions are rather undefined in terms of timing. Single and recently separated respondents postpone their childbearing plans because the commonly shared social representation of parenthood involves being in a couple. A typical example comes from the Italian sample: it is a case of 31 year-old single woman. She has an intense desire for becoming parent (“I have been baby-sitting all my cousins”, “I am born wanting children”, “a woman who has no children is not a woman”), but she has not met the right person yet. A previous serious relationship did not end up in marriage because of their different way of facing problems and life. She thinks that children should be born and raised in a couple. Her being single the only obstacle between her desire to become mother and having a child, but an obstacle she imagines to overcome only finding a partner.

“When I joke I say: Insemination, or the first man who passes by, because i have this huge desire. But I cannot think only about myself , I have to think for the child too, one day. It will be already difficult enough to live in society but if I make him start on the wrong foot...” (Italy, Female, 31, single, childless)

For couples, partners’ lack of desire for children postpones respondents’ childbearing intentions as well as getting to know better a partner to make sure that is “the right one” for family building.

Being enrolled in education also means postponing childbearing. However, in contrast to the solution to relational issues, the time for completing school is relatively predictable, and childbearing is conditioned to an event, which can be placed with some certainty in a given time frame. Moreover, such event is expected or hoped to be happening rather early and not in some distant future.

Concerns with employment stability present various concerns with respect to predictability. Waiting for a permanent contract to have a child may be not easy to define in terms of timing while waiting to acquire job seniority and a related better economic treatment is. Since there are some differences between the countries as to whether one or both partners should ideally have a stable employment (e.g. in Italy and west Germany – at least one partner should be sure about his or her job position; in Poland and France both of them should be in stable jobs).

For instance, for a male Polish respondent his unemployment is the only obstacle to having a child. He is 30 and married. He wants to have a child very much and his wife is also ready for it. Yet, he is unemployed and fears financial consequence of their decision. It is absolutely critical for him to have a job, because otherwise his wife would not be able to stay at home for some time after a child is born.

“Finance, that’s a problem. Well for a child you need to have something saved, at least some money. Or I don’t know – if D. [wife] doesn’t work [for some time] and raise a child I should have some job then, and at the moment there’s no such opportunity and that holds us back. This issue most of all: finance.” (Poland, Male, 30, married, childless)

Similar to employment related conditions, housing represents an obstacle, which can be more or less easy to overcome. Finding a larger flat is less unpredictable for an already cohabiting couple than needing to ensure the financial means for moving in together for a couple still having separate households.

The need for their first child to have a sibling, having larger families, or simply the “obvious” need for children derived from a loving relationship are at the base for the rather strong desire for a second child in respondents who are parents of one. Housing quality and location as well as working conditions and salary are even more crucial external factors than for childless respondents to wait before translating a desire into concrete childbearing

intentions. Respondents with children are generally better able to calculate accurately what resources (in terms of money and time) are required for another child. They also are aware that the strategy applied organizes childcare for the first child cannot be applied for the second (bringing two children on the work place or leaving two children to an older grandmother are not viable options). A case of a French respondent illustrates it well. The woman is 29 years old and a mother of one. Already her first child was quite carefully planned. She decided to have it after some conditions were met. She says: “after ten years living together, all the conditions were met to take the decision: both of us had a job, and my partner had already limited his travelling abroad.” The same type of planning appears for the second child – with living arrangements being focal. She says “yes, I would like to have another child and for L. (her son) this would be better”. Having at least two children seems to her something normal. But she wants to have better living conditions before she can have the second kid. She wants to live in the South of France closer to her own family and to her partner’s family. She already knows how strenuous it is to care for a child and she wants to have a second one, when she lives closer to her family, able to ask for their help. Her partner has already started looking for a job in the southern France. As soon as he gets a sustainable offer, she will candidate for mobility and they will move and have a second child.

A relatively specific condition for this subgroup of respondents, which leaves little space for uncertainty about timing, is the concern for the age of the first child. It has been mentioned that the parents who intend to have a second child soon (first category: “Surely yes”) also refer to this issue. In the first category the interviewees argued that they want to have a child now because they have reached the proper spacing. Instead, the respondents in this category argue that they need to wait with a second child and that they will have it as soon as the proper spacing is reached. Compared to their counterparts in the first category, they stress more that having a second child soon after a first is strenuous. It also appears to be a difference between the two categories as to what spacing is perceived as ideal. While the interviewees in the first category spoke of two to four years, for the ones in this category the break seems to be larger: children interval shall lie between three and six (generally the entry into maternal school and primary school of the first child).

In this category the crucial dimension characterizing childbearing intentions is a weak perceived behavioural control. The perception of a weak control depends on a variety of different reasons and such reasons are crucial to differentiate respondents who can indicate when they may start try actively to have a child and those who can not do so.

#### *4.4. “Surely one day”, far intentions (45 childless respondents and 8 parents)*

In this category we predominantly find respondents who desire to have a first child, and yet mostly because of their young ages or the specific life course stage in which they live (living with their parents, not having had a partner in the last few years) parenthood is perceived as something that does not belong to the near future. Their reasoning is less centred on external obstacles and conditions and more on the perceived distance with the issue as a priority. These respondents feel that having a (another) child is currently not one of the decisions to take, they do not consider it for the time being, and feel a later point in time to be more appropriate. These answers echo life course sequencing of the transition to adulthood (“I knew I had to grow up for that [having children]. First you have to have a flat; you have to have a job (...) first education, a flat, a job.”): respondents who have not yet left the parental home, are still in formal education, without a stable employment have, in their perspective, not even entered the “population at risk” susceptible to decide about having a child. Rather, they express at times surprise in observing that their own peers are occasionally becoming parents. They foresee to feel unhappy in the event of a pregnancy, they have no concrete ideas

on what kind of partnership they would want for having a child, on what should be a good moment for having a child, or on how to organize a family life.

If any time frame is given, the absolutely shortest perspective is “about 3 or 4 years”. Some respondents in their mid-twenties state that they will be in their middle/late thirties when they will have children. Others say that the age for having a first child does not really matter; it depends on “when one feels really ready”. A considerable number of the respondents in this category are – not surprisingly – single and have rather pessimistic attitudes towards chances of being in a couple any times soon. Finding a good partner is portrayed as something difficult to achieve and arguments range from the lack of common values to the longing for a passionate relationship etc.). Respondents living an unsatisfying, short term, or open partnership do not make having children a topic in the first place. In such cases, the interview is a place where to reveal brake-up plans and the intentions to stay alone for some time thereafter.

A typical example of this category is a man from France, 27 year-old, who does not find himself at a life-stage, when he feels he can concretely consider childbearing. He is single, studying, still financially dependent on his parents. He wants to have children one day, but nothing pushes him to start a family at that stage of his life.

“In an absolute sense, yes of course! I intend to start a family later. Yes. But it's not something I'm thinking about every morning (...) There is a whole sequence to be put into place... Right now, basic things like the fact that I'm not earning a living at the moment; I don't think I can have a child yet. Besides you have to find the right person”. (France, Male, 27, single, childless)

Being in an early phase of the professional trajectory or a distant perspective to exit education are sufficient reasons to put childbearing desires in a stand by mode. Those who are just starting as independent workers and know it will take years to achieve their projects or those who enter careers where progress is made after several years claim to be far too “distracted” to think of having a child. For others being in the job market at all is the way to start thinking of parenthood. Financial dependency (all of them are still supported by their parents – at least to some extent) makes childbearing a rather low priority.

Priority is not only objectively defined by economic emancipation but also normatively defined by established sequencing of life course transitions. Individuals still enrolled in tertiary education or in vocational training want to complete their education, find a job, leave home, enter a stable cohabiting union and finally plan childbearing. If these conditions, taken one by one are the same for respondents in the “as soon as” category, their cumulative effect is to extend the time span needed to make all transitions. As a consequence childbearing considerations are push far forward into an undefined future.

Life course development is perceived to be an important moderator for family planning also in the sphere of emotional or personal development. Respondents sometimes refer to their psychological age, saying the “feel too young”, and that they are still “not ready” to become parents. They say that they are still not mature enough, not ready, not adult enough etc. to become parents. They still would like to have “fun” and gain life experience that they feel different from family life experience and the privilege way to maturity and self-equilibrium. Only then parenthood and related childbearing intentions will get concrete.

Often, life course stages are defined in relative terms by contrasting oneself with the family situation of peers in informal personal networks. Respondents who indicate childbearing as being far because ideally they will have children in their mid/late thirties or early forties also state that also their parents got their children late and that many of their friends are childless.

As for the few parents in this category, they also perceive having a second child as something that belongs to a distant future. Practically in all cases this is related to adverse experiences with first childbearing: it had been unplanned or resulted in some crisis (of economic nature or related to parents' relationship). Recently or currently experienced hardship pushes the plans for a second child away, but do not exclude them completely.

What is common for all respondents in this category is that they do not feel at the stage of their life, when they can even consider childbearing. They frequently express extremely positive attitudes towards children and a very strong desire to have a (another) child, but they think about it in a very far time perspective.

#### 4.5. *"Maybe" uncertain intentions (19 childless and 21 parents).*

These are cases in which respondents do not express any strong desire to have a child, but the possibility of having a child in the next three years is not ruled out as it is in the case of those who surely do not want a child ("surely not") or those who condition their family planning to other contingencies ("as soon as"). These are individuals who sometimes openly declare that they have never thought about becoming parent or having another child. They are uncertain about the idea of becoming parents in general, but also about the time frame they would prefer, and want to maintain an open and non-committing attitude towards the possibility of childbearing.

The respondents in the category are rather vague about their fertility intentions and, even when prompted, they are not able to give any time frame. In some cases, the respondents say that they are simply not ready for children yet and they do not really consider this topic. It is "not on the agenda" or even completely "taboo" issue for now. In some cases, they have never thought about it, they find it difficult to talk about parenthood in the interview, or they feel confused when they are asked about their fertility intentions. In other cases, even though the issue has been considered, the inability to take a decision on whether and when to have a child stays. They feel that it is almost impossible to choose or define the "right" moment for having children postponing childbirth associates with the hope that some day they will "feel" that a "right" moment has arrived. Some say explicitly that it is not an issue one can account on 'years', but rather a matter of their 'inner conviction', of 'feeling'. The "inner" time horizon is very undefined, and therefore hardly predictable: respondents say that they could feel such "inner conviction" in ten years' time or even as early as next year. They simply cannot define it better in terms of time.

Several dimensions recur in combination with uncertain intentions. First, problems with relationship shake childbearing intentions: a recent crisis, but even more general doubts on whether the current partner is the "right" one. Secondly, even a strong desire for children, may not lead to formulate clear intentions when other goals (mainly educational and professional development) have priority over parenthood. The effect is to blur the intention time frame for parenthood. Thirdly, and quite frequently, respondents in this category express various fears related to parenthood: losing personal freedom, reducing the standard of living, not being able to balance family and childbearing, being a bad parent. Some bad examples of parenthood from their own childhood are mentioned as well to give consistence to such worries. Notably, these arguments echo those given by the respondents in our "surely no" category. Yet, for the previous category, they were decisive for excluding childbearing from their life-plans. They do not have such strength here.

An example here might be a Polish man, aged 30 and childless, who cohabits with his partner and has been interviewed in the period in which his couple was busy with wedding preparation. His partner would like to have a child as soon as possible, while he, despite

sharing her desire to have children, expresses his indecision about a precise timing. He finds it difficult to tell whether the right moment has come:

“We do talk [about children], but generally. Even before we moved in together, I knew A. [partner] wanted to have children. I’m still undecided. I mean, it’s not that I wouldn’t like to have children at all, but I don’t know if at this moment. (...) A. is thinking about a child in some close perspective, I’m thinking about some more distant perspective.

*How divergent are those two perspectives?*

How divergent they are... Well, A. would like to have it as soon as possible, so, let’s say, within a year. While for me it’s not a matter of years but a matter of my approach. I don’t know, of being convinced (...) Children are wonderful without a doubt. Yes, I would like to have children. That’s for sure. But I guess “when” is the most important question here. Because maybe not within a year, but within two or three, or... I’d like to have some fun, have no commitments, duties. (...) The problem is rather in me, because I don’t know if I want another year of freedom because later it will be like that: work, home, child, wife, this and that. And we’re tied for some time, we have no possibility of moving. And here comes another aspect: maybe we should change the flat, this or that. You know, a child means expenses, there are lots of aspects which determine me, which I’m considering all the time. But I don’t exclude it, I don’t say: no.” (Poland, Male, 30, cohabiting, childless)

What is remarkable is the small space that financial matters occupy in these interviews. Even if they appear, they are not main arguments for respondent’s uncertainty. A German respondent, woman of age 29, childless at the moment interview, mentions job insecurity and not finished education of her partner as factors that play a role in her lack of precise childbearing intention. Yet, she argues that the right moment for a child will simply come – and even though she wants to work for some time before she becomes a mother, she does not exclude taking this step earlier.

“Well, if it happens, it happens, this is not the question, I would not abort. But, if you can plan it, you should not plan that the child comes when the future is uncertain, when both partners do not know exactly where to go. And today, well, my job is safe, this I know, but so safe that I can say really safe and as woman you are out of the job for some time, therefore...

*So what would be a good time?*

I think a good time would be when both can really imagine having a child. This can be maybe end of this year or next year or in two or three years. I am very spontaneous there, as I said one can not plan these things. I think I would feel better if he had finished his education and then to say we marry, but it is not that I say: when you are done with your studies we can marry. Let’s say if I get cracked at the end of this year and feel that I must marry before turning thirty, I don’t know.” (Germany, Female, 29, cohabiting, childless)

When couples already have a child, their uncertainty towards parity progression is rather due to experiences with the first child. If the birth and caring for the first child was a stressful time respondents suspend any decision concerning further births. Unplanned pregnancy are extreme cases but they can leave parents with mixed feelings about their further fertility intentions, because the birth may have changed and made the couple’s equilibrium more fragile. Pregnant women represent a group apart: until the first child is born they claim not being able to make any precise decision; decisions will depend on how it goes with the first. Some of them want to have two children and they express a quite strong desire for big families, but since they are uncertain about how they will organize their life after births, they are not sure about time frame for another child. While they can be very strongly talking about desires for another child, pinning them down to express an intention and a time for a second birth seems to be non realistic. Too many incognitos surround the first child: its health, its character, how it will change the couple budget and life style, their relationship, and the parents’ working life, especially the mother ability to go back to work full time. Women in particular are not sure if they are able to combine job and family adequately as often they did work before their first pregnancy and are aware of problems of reinsertion after parental leave. The uncertainty related to employment translates on uncertain childbearing intentions in this group. Focusing on “self-realisation” and career with two children, although an ideal

family size is hazardous. A woman conditions the decision to have a second child to the fact of not having any good options for advancement in her job and that was not a sure perspective at the moment of the interview so that she could not tell anything precise about intentions. T

The above considerations relate also to an issue of child-care arrangements and work-family reconciliation. Being vague and undecided about family planning issues is not in contrast with having strong desires for children. They simply leave the issue open, occasionally explicitly declaring that they have never really considered the idea concretely although this option is not ruled.

#### 4.6. “At times”, ambivalent intentions (8 childless women and 3 mothers)

This category includes only women, who are characterized by waving between the desire to have a child and its opposite. Interviews contain extracts in which respondents declare to intend a child soon and other in which they state that they could imagine remaining (for a longer time or permanently) childless or with one child only. These contrasting directions are not justified with reference to material conditions, life course situations or biographical age. Rather, waving is related to individuals’ alternating between more or less defined fears of the responsibility of childrearing or to perceived personal immaturity on the one hand, and the foreseen satisfactions of having a child or a second child on the other hand.

A 34 years old woman in a LAT relationship, full-time employed declare to be enjoying her childless life-style. She is waving between desire to have a child and its opposite: she thinks she is probably ready for the life course transition implied with parenthood, but she has doubts on her ability of being a mother. She is panicked about the changes that a child would bring into her life.

“I don't know... the need of organize the full life... Everyday routine... from the morning till the night, everything scheduled.. I'd need to transform my whole life... But sometimes the idea of becoming mother excites me..., sometimes I say ‘why not?’ but then.. oh my God, no..!” (Italy, Woman, 34, LAT, childless)

In many cases, the ambivalence is visible in the way in which they express their intentions and desires: precisely in some passages they talk about childbearing as something so distant to them that it seems it will never happen and yet in other passages they use the present tense when they express their intentions about their children.

Childless respondents in this group hold behavioural beliefs, which contrast positive aspects of childlessness with the disadvantages of parenthood. According to them, motherhood is a difficult, demanding, strenuous, and excessively time-intensive task; especially it is perceived to have a negative impact on the couple (child-care would lead to breaking up for some respondents) and it limits one’s freedom and independence. By contrast, childfree means to be responsible only for oneself and dedicate one’s own time and energy to other valued activities: studying, pursuing a professional career, going out, travelling, having hobbies, etc. A strong perceived incompatibility of a possible desired parenthood with other life course spheres seems to be at the origin of intentional ambivalence. A fulfilling employment (rather than a mere time incompatibilities of childcare and paid work), an intense social life, and an harmonious couple are not only extremely valued, but also contrasted with being a good mother. These arguments are a sufficient justification to remain childless for those who intend no children for sure; on the contrary for the individuals in the “ambivalent” group, living a childless life is not an easy alternative and the arguments are not sufficient to give up the idea of parenthood. Fears of loneliness and the emotional and practical consequences are frequent themes as well as the positive feeling related to the presence of children in the household. Concerns with care and well being in old age and the fact that

children are “*cute*” and a necessary part of a family provide enough reasons not to take a final decision against parenthood. Polish respondents in particular add a strong age norm component to their ambivalence. They declare that they *will* want to have a child one day – even though they are not yet convinced to intend it any time soon. The register of natural and biological age at reproduction is used to justify that they will not be able to postpone motherhood forever and will end up intending a child. This is illustrated by the case of the young married woman in Warsaw. She expresses her ambivalence concerning childbearing by referring to her biological age (“time flies and I should develop some interest in it”), to her current lack of interest in parenthood and children (“I don’t have maternal instinct at all, moreover, when I see somebody else’s children, they in fact irritate me”) and to goals, competing with motherhood (however undefined: “develop, learn, meeting people, work, I don’t know. Everything but children”):

“I do (want to have a child), but honestly speaking it’s not a normal way of thinking, normal as a woman thinks about a child. And I guess this “not-being-normal” it’s connected to the fact that I don’t think about a child, because I want to have a child now, but I think about a child, because... I have this thinking that I will turn 30 soon and that’s a kind of magic number for me, because I think that there is a time when one should have children. If I will want to have children after I’m 40 – it’s going to be too late and it’s a kind of bottom line for me. The health issues are also important here, because my last visit to the women’s doctor ended up with some comment that gave me a lot of to think about: that one cannot postpone it till – nobody knows when. It’s time to consider it. The think that I keep telling myself that I am still young – that’s OK, but you cannot fool biology and it’s time to think it over. And this is rather the reason why I think about children, not that I would like to have kids so much now and I have so strong maternal instinct. I don’t have maternal instinct at all, moreover, when I see somebody else’s children, they in fact irritate me. They are fun, but for an hour, later I go crazy and when I think I would need to take care of them the whole day – I’m devastated! And I try to cheer myself up by the fact that a pregnant woman develops her maternal instincts, because it’s biology. But should I trust biology – I don’t know

*So there weren’t any moments when you wanted to have a child?*

No! Never, not at all. Moreover, I have always thought that I had plenty of time for those things. That I can develop, learn, meeting people, work, I don’t know. Everything, but children.

*So this thinking now – is it rather a rational thinking?*

Yes, definitely yes. I know that we don’t have financial stabilization now, my husband is looking for a job, we don’t have our own flat, but... time flies and I should develop some interest in it. Some people even in a more difficult situation are able to manage – so we will manage too. But... it’s kind of difficult to imagine, to be honest.” (Poland, woman, 29, married, childless)

An additional element, which emerges from interviews in this category, is crucial to evaluate the extent to which the time dimension crucially defines the relationship between attitudes and intentions. The young Polish woman of the example says that she believes she will have a positive attitude towards childbearing once she reaches the “right” age. Dispositional theory would call this a conditional attitude of the kind “I believe that A when B (Bradley 1999). In our example the woman believe that she will intend a child when her age will be closer to the upper limit for parenthood. However, such believe does not necessarily mean that once she ages, she will indeed experience the foreseen positive attitude towards having a child. She may well have a different attitude than what now she thinks she will have. And maybe this will happen precisely because she reaches an older age (for instance she will have experience by then that waiting a few more years is feasible and that her body has not dramatically changed). In other words, the conditional attitude does not express a counterfactual (an attitude that the woman would have had if she was older), but rather just an attitude that she has presently thinking of herself reaching an older age. Conditional attitudes are important element in the discussion of the stability of intentions over time and therefore also for the predictability of behaviour on the basis of declared intentions.

All in all, women in this category would feel relieved if they could feel a (stronger) desire to have or not to have a child, rather than being stacked between subjective norms and competing goals. Intentional ambivalence is indeed best understood in terms of competing goals (Barber 2001) than in terms of lacking behavioural control (Ajzen 1991). This is true also for the three parents who are ambivalent about having a second child, divided between a two-child family norm and the lack of inner motivation to have another child. In one case, the woman heart says ‘yes’ at times and ‘no’ at others, as she puts it, because her strong desire for a second child conflicts with the negative feelings associated with a bad partnership experience and with the concern about a too long birth interval between the two siblings.

## 5. Discussion: a note on validity

The comparative analysis of semi-structured interviews focusing on childbearing intentions produced a typology of intentions along three dimensions: the goal towards which the intention is directed, the strength with which the intention is expressed, and the envisaged time horizon to realize it. The combination of these three dimensions produced six categories (see previous section for the detailed description of them).

One motivation for our study was to evaluate the notion of intention, as it is conceptualized in the Theory of Planned Behaviour, as a tool to predict action towards complex goals like having a child in a given time frame. The TPB theoretically defines intentions as composed of two types of elements: beliefs (attitudinal, normative, and control beliefs) and their strength (subjective evaluation of the strength of beliefs). Our results show that the dimensions identified in the analysis of our respondents’ declarations about their childbearing intentions and goals can easily be related to the elements of the TPB: beliefs are captured by the childbearing goals and the place they are given in the life course, while the strength of the intention lay in the more or less clear definition of the goal and in the shorter or longer time frame for its realization.

A second motivation for our study was to evaluate the validity of fertility intentions indicators such as those we find in the Gender and Generation Survey. In the GGS childbearing intentions are measured by means of a single question (“Do you intend to have a (another) child within the next three years?”). The possible answers are: yes, probably yes, probably no, not. Our results partially interrogate the validity of indicators of this kind, both in terms of construct validity and in terms of predictive validity (Cronbach and Meehl 1955). Let us consider construct validity first. In psychometric theory, construct validity tells us how well the question (or a whole questionnaire) reflects the theoretical concept that it is meant to measure. In our case the GGS survey question should reflect intention to have a child in a frame of three years. Intentions should be measured in the way defined by the TPB, indicating both motivational aspects: its goal and strength (“*how hard* people are willing to try (...) in order to perform the *behaviour*” Ajzen 1991, p. 181).

Our results suggest that the question does well in capturing the goal-related motivational aspects of the construct (discriminating between the two groups of yes/probably yes and no/probably not). However, for the middle options in the scale (Probably yes or probably not) we cannot say whether respondents the strength of their intention is weak or that they are uncertain or ambivalent about their goal. Uncertainty revealed in the questionnaire is rather inconclusive regarding the behaviour that is intended. The answer options seem to mix two different issues at the same time: whether people want a child at all (the goal, the outcome) and in case they do, whether they want it soon or not, or have no idea when. Our qualitative results show that there should be a distinction between reasons related to the desirability of the outcome and those related to the ability or will to define a time frame

for it. In both cases in which there are either uncertain goals or uncertain time frames, the strength of the intentions is affected. However the distinction is important for inferences on predictive validity.

Predictive validity is closely related to the issues of construct validity. Predictive validity relates to the predictive power of the survey question. A question has high predictive validity if it predicts individual behaviour well. If we do not understand the nature of the uncertainty intention behind the survey answer given, predictive validity would be weaker. The typology of fertility intentions, developed from empirical data following a bottom-up approach, shows how declarations by women who are either ambivalent or whose decision depend on external conditions are likely to vary their intentions depending on short term variation in either their contingent situation or in the degree of definition of their childbearing goal.

To conclude, we would suggest modifying the direct question on intentions. A possibility to increase the information in the answer would be to add a direct follow up question in case of answers like “probably yes, probably not” which would ask what the uncertainty depends on. Qualitative data may also be used as a base to create a list of possible closed answers to such question. Another possibility would be to separate the measurement of fertility intentions in a two step-question: one step to capture the intended goal and the other to capture the intended timing. This may distinguish more clearly the two dimensions of intentions (positive, ambivalent, uncertain, or negative attitudes towards having a child) and in case of positive feelings, timing of the foreseen child (clearly defined in the short term or less clearly defined in the distant future).

## 6. References

- Ajzen, I. (1988). Attitudes, personality, and behaviour. Milton-Keynes: Open University Press.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The Theory of Planned Behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50: 179-211.
- Barber, J. S. (2001). Ideational influences on the transition to parenthood: Attitudes toward childbearing and competing alternatives. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 64 (2): 101-127.
- Cronbach, L.J., Meehl, P.E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52, 281-302.
- Fishbein, M. (1967). Attitude and the prediction of behavior. In M. Fishbein (Ed.), *Readings in attitude theory and measurement* (pp. 477-492). New York: Wiley.
- Fishbein, M., Ajzen, I. (1975). Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Gollwitzer, P. M., Brandstätter, V. (1997). Implementation intentions and effective goal pursuit. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73: 186-199.
- Miller, W. (1994). Childbearing Motivations, Desires and Intentions: A Theoretical Framework. *Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs*, 120.

Miller, W., Pasta, D.J. (1995). Behavioral intentions: which ones predict fertility behavior in married couples. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 25: 218-250.

Miller, W.B., Severy, L.J., Pasta, D.J. (2004). A framework for modeling fertility motivation in couples. *Population Studies*, 58(2): 193-205.

Speder, Z and b. Kapitany (2009), "How are time-Dependent Childbearing Intentions Realized? Realization, Postponement, Abandonment, Bringing Forward" *European Journal of Population*, (online first)

## Appendix I

**Table 2. Sample by fertility intentions and parity**

Intention	Childless	One child	Two or more children	Total
1 (project – surely yes)	29	26	6	61
2 (contingent condition – as soon as)	36	17	3	56
3 (ambivalent)	8	3	0	11
4 (uncertain)	19	18	3	40
5 (surely one day – far)	45	8	0	53
6 (excluded – surely no)	10	15	15	40
Total	147	87	27	261

## Appendix II

Sample	Interview ID	Gender	Age	Partnership status	Parity	Fertility intention
<b>FRANCE</b>						
France/Poitiers	F02_3010em0	male	27	LAT	0	1 (project)
France/Poitiers	F03_1311ef1	female	29	LAT	1	1 (project)
France/Poitiers	F05_1812em0	male	28	cohabiting	0	1 (project)
France/Poitiers	F09_1201ef2	female	28	LAT	2	1 (project)
France/Poitiers	F11_1801ef1	female	28	married	1	1 (project)
France/Poitiers	F18_0702ef0	female	29	cohabiting	0	1 (project)
France/Poitiers	F22_2802ef0	female	29	cohabiting	0	1 (project)
France/Poitiers	F27_2406em2	male	32	married	2	1 (project)
France/Poitiers	F29_1307	male	31	married	2	1 (project)
France/Poitiers	F30_1307	male	32	married	1	1 (project)
France/Poitiers	F01_2010ef1	female	29	LAT	1	2 (contingent conditions)
France/Poitiers	F16_2901em2	male	30	married	2	2 (contingent conditions)
France/Poitiers	F23_0203ef2	female	29	married	2	2 (contingent conditions)
France/Poitiers	F13_2401ef1	female	30	cohabiting	1	3 (ambivalent)
France/Poitiers	F17_ef0	female	30	single	0	4 (uncertain)
France/Poitiers	F04_2911em0	male	27	single	0	5 (far)
France/Poitiers	F06_1812em0	male	28	single	0	5 (far)
France/Poitiers	F08_0501em0	male	30	single	0	5 (far)
France/Poitiers	F10_1301ef0	female	30	LAT	0	5 (far)
France/Poitiers	F12_2301ef0	female	27	single	0	5 (far)
France/Poitiers	F14_2401em0	male	29	single	0	5 (far)
France/Poitiers	F15_2701ef0	female	28	LAT	0	5 (far)
France/Poitiers	F20_1202ef0	female	28	married	0	5 (far)
France/Poitiers	F26_0305_ef0	female	30	single	0	5 (far)
France/Poitiers	F07_0201ef1	female	28	single	1	6 (excluded)
France/Poitiers	F24_0803em3	male	31	married	3	6 (excluded)
France/Poitiers	F28_2606em2	male	32	cohabiting	2	6 (excluded)
<b>GERMANY</b>						
Germany/Lübeck	L04_2907ot2	female	43	married	2	1 (project)
Germany/Lübeck	L06_2107mp1	male	34	married	1	1 (project)
Germany/Lübeck	L11_1108ef0	female	29	cohabiting	0	1 (project)
Germany/Lübeck	L12_0111em0	male	29	married	0	1 (project)
Germany/Lübeck	L15_1111mp1	male	34	married	1	1 (project)
Germany/Lübeck	L18_1902mp0	male	34	cohabiting	0	1 (project)
Germany/Lübeck	L18_2511ef0	female	30	cohabiting	0	1 (project)
Germany/Lübeck	L61_0811em0	male	31	married	0	1 (project)
Germany/Rostock	R01_2308em1	male	28	cohabiting	1	1 (project)
Germany/Rostock	R03_1604mf0	male	39	married	0	1 (project)
Germany/Rostock	R06_0604mf0	male	34	LAT	0	1 (project)
Germany/Rostock	R09_1011em0	male	28	cohabiting	0	1 (project)
Germany/Rostock	R10_0112em0	male	28	cohabiting	pregn (1)	1 (project)
Germany/Rostock	R10_2101fp1	female	30	cohabiting	1	1 (project)

Germany/Rostock	R12_2401em0	male	28	LAT	0	1 (project)
Germany/Rostock	R16_2611ef1	female	30	married	1	1 (project)
Germany/Rostock	R17_1703em0	male	29	married	0	1 (project)
Germany/Rostock	R39_2911em0	male	30	cohabiting	0	1 (project)
Germany/Lübeck	L02_2607ff0	female	25	married	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Germany/Lübeck	L03_0206ef0	female	30	LAT	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Germany/Lübeck	L04_0306ef0	female	30	single	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Germany/Lübeck	L08_3007ef1	female	29	married	1	2 (contingent conditions)
Germany/Lübeck	L10_0411ff0	female	31	single	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Germany/Lübeck	L10_0508ef0	female	32	single	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Germany/Lübeck	L14_0511em0	male	31	married	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Germany/Lübeck	L17_2311ef1	female	29	married	1	2 (contingent conditions)
Germany/Lübeck	L53_0808em1	male	28	married	1	2 (contingent conditions)
Germany/Lübeck	L53_0808fp1	female	29	married	1	2 (contingent conditions)
Germany/Lübeck	L55_1808mp0	male	29	married	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Germany/Lübeck	L60_1308em0	male	31	single	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Germany/Lübeck	L62_0312em0	male	29	cohabiting	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Germany/Rostock	R02_1010ef0	female	28	single	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Germany/Rostock	R04_1510ef0	female	29	single	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Germany/Rostock	R05_1710ef0	female	29	cohabiting	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Germany/Rostock	R11_2303ff1	female	29	LAT	1	2 (contingent conditions)
Germany/Rostock	R31_2203ef0	female	29	single	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Germany/Rostock	R41_1705ef1	female	30	cohabiting	1	2 (contingent conditions)
Germany/Lübeck	L12_0211fp0	female	28	married	0	3 (ambivalent)
Germany/Lübeck	L55_1108ef0	female	33	married	0	3 (ambivalent)
Germany/Rostock	R06_2910ef1	female	29	cohabiting	1	3 (ambivalent)
Germany/Rostock	R18_1003ef0	female	29	single	0	3 (ambivalent)
Germany/Rostock	R30_0903ef1	female	29	single	1	3 (ambivalent)
Germany/Lübeck	L01_2805ef0	female	29	LAT	0	4 (uncertain)
Germany/Lübeck	L06_2107ef1	female	29	married	1	4 (uncertain)
Germany/Lübeck	L13_0311ef0	female	29	cohabiting	0	4 (uncertain)
Germany/Lübeck	L15_1111ef1	female	29	married	1	4 (uncertain)
Germany/Lübeck	L16_2211ef0	female	29	LAT	0	4 (uncertain)
Germany/Lübeck	L52_2707ef0	female	31	married	0	4 (uncertain)
Germany/Lübeck	L56_1108ef0	female	30	cohabiting	0	4 (uncertain)
Germany/Lübeck	L59_2508em1	male	37	married	1	4 (uncertain)
Germany/Lübeck	L59_2508fp1	female	36	married	1	4 (uncertain)
Germany/Rostock	R02ff0	female	27	LAT	0	4 (uncertain)
Germany/Rostock	R08_0211ef0	female	29	cohabiting	0	4 (uncertain)
Germany/Rostock	R11_0612ef1	female	28	cohabiting	1	4 (uncertain)
Germany/Rostock	R15_0202em0	male	29	single	0	4 (uncertain)
Germany/Rostock	R19_0211ef1	female	31	cohabiting	1	4 (uncertain)
Germany/Rostock	R35_2311ef1	female	31	LAT	1	4 (uncertain)
Germany/Rostock	R36_2806em0	male	30	LAT	0	4 (uncertain)
Germany/Lübeck	L02_0106em0	male	29	single	0	5 (far)
Germany/Lübeck	L03_1208ff0	female	30	single	0	5 (far)
Germany/Lübeck	L05_2007em0	male	29	single	0	5 (far)
Germany/Lübeck	L07_2807em0	male	30	LAT	0	5 (far)
Germany/Lübeck	L08_3007mp1	male	30	married	1	5 (far)
Germany/Lübeck	L63_0802em0	male	31	LAT	0	5 (far)

Germany/Lübeck	L64_1102em0	male	27	single	0	5 (far)
Germany/Lübeck	L66_2102em1	male	28	married	1	5 (far)
Germany/Rostock	R03_1410ef0	female	29	LAT	0	5 (far)
Germany/Rostock	R07_0502mf0	male	29	single	0	5 (far)
Germany/Rostock	R13_3101ef0	female	30	cohabiting	0	5 (far)
Germany/Rostock	R14_0102ef0	female	29	single	0	5 (far)
Germany/Rostock	R34_0609em0	male	31	single	0	5 (far)
Germany/Rostock	R37_2311em0	male	31	LAT	0	5 (far)
Germany/Rostock	R38_0311ef0	female	30	LAT	0	5 (far)
Germany/Lübeck	L04_2207ff1	female	28	single	1	6 (excluded)
Germany/Lübeck	L09_3107em0	male	30	single	0	6 (excluded)
Germany/Lübeck	L17_0412mp1	male	34	married	1	6 (excluded)
Germany/Lübeck	L50_0408fp2	female	34	married	2	6 (excluded)
Germany/Lübeck	L50_2411em2	male	31	married	2	6 (excluded)
Germany/Lübeck	L51_2007ef0	female	31	cohabiting	0	6 (excluded)
Germany/Lübeck	L51_2408mp0	male	31	cohabiting	0	6 (excluded)
Germany/Lübeck	L54_0908ef0	female	31	LAT	0	6 (excluded)
Germany/Lübeck	L57_1608ef2	female	31	married	2	6 (excluded)
Germany/Lübeck	L58_1908ef0	female	34	single	0	6 (excluded)
Germany/Lübeck	L65_1602ef1	female	33	married	1	6 (excluded)
Germany/Rostock	R07_0111em2	male	30	married	2	6 (excluded)
Germany/Rostock	R07_0111fp2	female	28	married	2	6 (excluded)
Germany/Rostock	R21_1505ef0	female	31	single	0	6 (excluded)
Germany/Rostock	R32_2308ef2	female	30	single	2	6 (excluded)
Germany/Rostock	R33_2508em0	male	30	single	0	6 (excluded)
Germany/Rostock	R35_0912ff1	female	36	single	1	6 (excluded)
Germany/Rostock	R39_0802mf1	male	.	LAT	1	6 (excluded)
Germany/Rostock	R42_1701em2	male	30	cohabiting	2	6 (excluded)
<b>ITALY</b>						
Italy/Cagliari	Cb06_0411dv1	female	38	cohabiting	1	1 (project)
Italy/Cagliari	Cb32_0803dv1	female	37	married	1	1 (project)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp07_0811dv0	female	44	married	0	1 (project)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp11_1111dv1	female	33	married	1	1 (project)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp17_2111dg5	female	31	married	5	1 (project)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp18_2311dg0	female	31	married	0	1 (project)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp25_0903dg3	female	26	married	3	1 (project)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp27_2801dv0	female	48	married	0	1 (project)
Italy/Naples	Nb03_2510dg1	female	29	married	pregn (1)	1 (project)
Italy/Naples	Nb03_2510p1	male	35	married	pregn (1)	1 (project)
Italy/Naples	Nb04_1210dg0	female	29	married	0	1 (project)
Italy/Naples	Nb10_1011dv1	female	33	married	1	1 (project)
Italy/Naples	Nb10_1011p1	male	34	married	1	1 (project)
Italy/Naples	Nb11_2901dv1	female	35	married	1	1 (project)
Italy/Naples	Nb14_1711dv1	female	41	cohabiting	1	1 (project)
Italy/Naples	Nb15_0703p1	male	33	married	1	1 (project)
Italy/Naples	Nb15_1611dv1	female	34	married	1	1 (project)
Italy/Naples	Nb17_1101dg1	female	30	married	1	1 (project)
Italy/Naples	Nb29_1206dv1	female	37	married	1	1 (project)
Italy/Naples	Nb29_1206p1	male	38	married	1	1 (project)

Italy/Naples	Np18_3010dg0	female	30	married	0	1 (project)
Italy/Naples	Np22_0702dg1	female	32	married	1	1 (project)
Italy/Naples	Np22_0702p1	male	30	married	1	1 (project)
Italy/Naples	Np28_3005dv1	female	na	married	1	1 (project)
Italy/Cagliari	Cb02_0310dg0	female	22	LAT	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Italy/Cagliari	Cb03_0710dg0	female	27	LAT	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Italy/Cagliari	Cb04_1410dg0	female	29	LAT	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Italy/Cagliari	Cb14_2911dv1	female	43	married	1	2 (contingent conditions)
Italy/Cagliari	Cb15_0212dg0	female	31	married	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Italy/Cagliari	Cb18_1212dv1	female	48	married	1	2 (contingent conditions)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp01_1810dg0	female	30	LAT	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp06_0711dv2	female	40	married	2	2 (contingent conditions)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp10_1011dg0	female	32	LAT	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp19_2012dv1	female	45	divorced	1	2 (contingent conditions)
Italy/Naples	Nb13_1201dg1	female	32	married	1	2 (contingent conditions)
Italy/Naples	Nb18_0603p1	male	26	no information	pregn (1)	2 (contingent conditions)
Italy/Naples	Nb18_2401dg1	female	25	no information	pregn (1)	2 (contingent conditions)
Italy/Naples	Nb19_1902dv0	female	31	single	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Italy/Naples	Nb22_1402dg0	female	25	single	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Italy/Naples	Nb24_1502dg0	female	22	LAT	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Italy/Naples	Np05_2805dg0	female	32	single	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Italy/Naples	Np13_1010dg0	female	27	LAT	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Italy/Naples	Np23_0703dg0	female	20	LAT	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Italy/Naples	Np24_0703p1	male	38	cohabiting	1	2 (contingent conditions)
Italy/Naples	Np25_1305dv1	female	34	married	1	2 (contingent conditions)
Italy/Cagliari	Cb08_0911dv0	female	35	single	0	3 (ambivalent)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp13_0811dv0	female	34	LAT	0	3 (ambivalent)
Italy/Cagliari	Cb05_2510dv2	female	34	married	2	4 (uncertain)
Italy/Cagliari	Cb09_1111dv0	female	32	LAT	0	4 (uncertain)
Italy/Cagliari	Cb27_1202dv2	female	37	married	2	4 (uncertain)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp03_2610dv2	female	40	LAT	2	4 (uncertain)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp04_2710dg0	female	30	single	0	4 (uncertain)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp08_0811dg0	female	32	cohabiting	0	4 (uncertain)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp20_1801dg0	female	27	cohabiting	0	4 (uncertain)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp24_0203dg1	female	32	single	1	4 (uncertain)
Italy/Naples	Nb01_1706dg1	female	27	married	pregn (1)	4 (uncertain)
Italy/Naples	Nb05_1703dv1	female	39	married	pregn (1)	4 (uncertain)
Italy/Naples	Nb06_1003dv1	female	33	cohabiting	pregn (1)	4 (uncertain)
Italy/Naples	Nb25_0705dg1	female	26	married	1	4 (uncertain)
Italy/Naples	Nb25_0705p1	male	28	married	1	4 (uncertain)
Italy/Naples	Np02_2805dg0	female	31	single	0	4 (uncertain)
Italy/Naples	Np12_0910dg0	female	25	LAT	0	4 (uncertain)
Italy/Naples	Np16_1910dg0	female	30	married	0	4 (uncertain)
Italy/Naples	Np24_0703dv1	female	38	cohabiting	1	4 (uncertain)
Italy/Cagliari	Cb07_0711dg0	female	28	LAT	0	5 (far)
Italy/Cagliari	Cb13_2311dg1	female	29	married	1	5 (far)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp05_0511dv0	female	33	LAT	0	5 (far)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp09_1011dg0	female	28	LAT	0	5 (far)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp21_0202dg0	female	27	cohabiting	0	5 (far)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp23_0103dg1	female	20	LAT	1	5 (far)

Italy/Cagliari	Cp26_1301dv0	female	36	LAT	0	5 (far)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp29_3108dg0	female	24	single	0	5 (far)
Italy/Naples	Nb08_0802dg0	female	20	LAT	0	5 (far)
Italy/Naples	Nb12_0802dg0	female	20	LAT	0	5 (far)
Italy/Naples	Nb20_1502dg0	female	24	single	0	5 (far)
Italy/Naples	Nb21_1502dg0	female	27	LAT	0	5 (far)
Italy/Naples	Nb23_1902dg0	female	20	single	0	5 (far)
Italy/Naples	Np06_0107dg0	female	32	single	0	5 (far)
Italy/Naples	Np11_0910dg0	female	22	LAT	0	5 (far)
Italy/Naples	Np14_1410dg0	female	25	LAT	0	5 (far)
Italy/Naples	Np17_2410dg0	female	25	single	0	5 (far)
Italy/Cagliari	Cb01_1409dv0	female	35	single	0	6 (excluded)
Italy/Cagliari	Cb10_1411dv1	female	36	LAT	1	6 (excluded)
Italy/Cagliari	Cb17_0912dv2	female	37	married	2	6 (excluded)
Italy/Cagliari	Cb20_1612dv2	female	41	married	2	6 (excluded)
Italy/Cagliari	Cb22_1901dg3	female	29	divorced	3	6 (excluded)
Italy/Cagliari	Cb24_3101dv2	female	42	married	2	6 (excluded)
Italy/Cagliari	Cb31_0103dv2	female	37	cohabiting	2	6 (excluded)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp02_1910dv1	female	41	married	1	6 (excluded)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp12_1311dv1	female	45	married	1	6 (excluded)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp14_1511dg0	female	29	single	0	6 (excluded)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp15_1611dg1	female	32	LAT	pregn (1)	6 (excluded)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp16_1611dv2	female	40	married	2	6 (excluded)
Italy/Cagliari	Cp22_0202dv0	female	33	married	0	6 (excluded)
Italy/Naples	Nb05_0803p1	male	47	married	1	6 (excluded)
Italy/Naples	Np25_1305p1	male	34	married	1	6 (excluded)
Italy/Naples	Np27_2705dv1	female	40	cohabiting	1	6 (excluded)
<b>GERMANY</b>						
Poland/Warsaw	W003f	female	26	married	0	1 (project)
Poland/Warsaw	W003m	male	28	married	0	1 (project)
Poland/Warsaw	W004f	female	25	married	0	1 (project)
Poland/Warsaw	W004m	male	25	married	0	1 (project)
Poland/Warsaw	W009f	female	22	married	0	1 (project)
Poland/Warsaw	W018f	female	29	married	0	1 (project)
Poland/Warsaw	W018m	male	26	married	0	1 (project)
Poland/Warsaw	W026f	female	29	married	0	1 (project)
Poland/Warsaw	W026m	male	32	married	0	1 (project)
Poland/Warsaw	W016f	female	24	cohabiting	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Poland/Warsaw	W017m	male	29	married	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Poland/Warsaw	W019m	male	30	married	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Poland/Warsaw	W020m	male	31	married	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Poland/Warsaw	W023f	female	26	cohabiting	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Poland/Warsaw	W023m	male	28	cohabiting	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Poland/Warsaw	W025f	female	28	cohabiting	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Poland/Warsaw	W102m	male	29	married	1	2 (contingent conditions)
Poland/Warsaw	W105m	male	29	married	1	2 (contingent conditions)
Poland/Warsaw	W901f	female	25	LAT	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Poland/Warsaw	W901m	male	28	LAT	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Poland/Warsaw	W911f	female	24	LAT	0	2 (contingent conditions)

Poland/Warsaw	W922f	female	28	single	0	2 (contingent conditions)
Poland/Warsaw	W017f	female	25	married	0	3 (ambivalent)
Poland/Warsaw	W019f	female	29	married	0	3 (ambivalent)
Poland/Warsaw	W921f	female	28	LAT	0	3 (ambivalent)
Poland/Warsaw	W009m	male	25	married	0	4 (uncertain)
Poland/Warsaw	W025m	male	30	cohabiting	0	4 (uncertain)
Poland/Warsaw	W102f	female	26	married	1	4 (uncertain)
Poland/Warsaw	W106m	male	27	married	1	4 (uncertain)
Poland/Warsaw	W107m	male	24	married	1	4 (uncertain)
Poland/Warsaw	W114m	male	28	cohabiting	1	4 (uncertain)
Poland/Warsaw	W024f	female	24	cohabiting	0	5 (far)
Poland/Warsaw	W024m	male	24	cohabiting	0	5 (far)
Poland/Warsaw	W106f	female	27	married	1	5 (far)
Poland/Warsaw	W107f	female	28	married	1	5 (far)
Poland/Warsaw	W112f	female	28	cohabiting	1	5 (far)
Poland/Warsaw	W114f	female	30	cohabiting	1	5 (far)
Poland/Warsaw	W908f	female	22	LAT	0	5 (far)
Poland/Warsaw	W908m	male	22	LAT	0	5 (far)
Poland/Warsaw	W913f	female	20	LAT	0	5 (far)
Poland/Warsaw	W913m	male	20	LAT	0	5 (far)
Poland/Warsaw	W915f	female	23	LAT	0	5 (far)
Poland/Warsaw	W915m	male	21	LAT	0	5 (far)
Poland/Warsaw	W105f	female	29	married	1	6 (excluded)
Poland/Warsaw	W112m	male	35	cohabiting	1	6 (excluded)