Title: Gender role-set, family orientations, and fertility intentions in Switzerland

Introduction

Contemporary low levels of fertility in Switzerland as well as in many other European regions raised questions about the determinants of shrinking family sizes and raise in childlessness. Most studies indicate that fertility would be up to levels around replacement if the desired family size, be it measured by the ideal or the expected number of children, were actually realised. Yet, this is not the case and the gap between the declared desired number of children of a couple and the actual number of children born by the same couple reflects the existence of some non realised fertility. Such gap would indicate a "latent demand for family polices" (Chesnais p. 133). The fertility gap indicates the existence of a window of opportunities offering the chance to elaborate family and child-friendly policies. However, in order to design efficient policies research needs to identify the determinants of the gap. A key issue is the gendered nature of parenthood and the gender norms which rules the appropriate parenthood for men and women differently. .

Gender between work and family

The double burden and gender systems

The stalled revolution and the double burden have been indicated as one of the causes for the emergence and persistence of low fertility and increased childlessness in the late XX century. McDonald (2000) seminal paper on gender system and family dynamics argues convincingly that those gender systems in which equality is expected and supported in the public sphere of the market and the law and not in the domestic sphere of the family relations and responsibilities are likely to experience low fertility. McDonald's prototypes for such gender systems are contemporary Southern European countries like Italy and Spain, where the high expectations on women's time in the domestic sphere would be avoided by delaying or forgoing additional family responsibilities represented by children.

While McDonald's arguments are macro, his explanation relies on the micro level: a woman who competes on the public sphere on a gender equal treatment and who expects at the same time to be mostly responsible for house and child care will perceive high costs-opportunities in having a child or any additional child. On the one hand an unequal treatment of men and women on the labor market in favour of women would be perceived as unfair in modern democratic societies, which stress citizens' equality and is not viable. On the other hand, the necessity to choose a part-time employment or to opt for a temporarily or permanent exit out of the labour market will reduce women's life-long earnings and career opportunities. The result would be that the overall domestic and labor market workload, the double burden, is perceived as too stressful and have discouraging effects on fertility.

Most of this empirical evidence applying McDonald's hypotheses at the micro level by studying the relation between couple's role-set and fertility shows a negative effect of the unequal role-set on fertility on both second and third births. (Cooke 2003, Olah 2003, Tazi-Preve et al. 2004, Torr and Short 2004, Mills et al. 2008). The perception of an unfair division of domestic labour within the couple has been associated with a greater likelihood of depression and divorce, negative opinions of marital quality and overall satisfaction (Coltrane 2000). However, such studies raise the issue of whether the share of domestic tasks alone does accurately tell the whole

story. In other words, fertility decisions may be related not only to the amount of domestic work, but also to the *overall* workload share (*total time* spent on paid and unpaid work taken together) between men and women in each couple. Such share is broadly similar in most industrialized countries (Bianchi et al., 2006; Robinson and Godbey, 1997; Greenstein, 2000; Shelton and Firestone, 1989, Bittman and Wajcman 2004).

Swizerland: inconsistent public and private gender spheres

Contemporary Switzerland fits well McDonald category of countries where gender spheres are inconsistent. On the one hand, equality between men and women at the institutional level is granted. At each political level (confederation, canton, municipality) as well as other institution, like universities, all have gender equality offices in charge of promoting women's professional career and often men's participation domestic work. Social beliefs and norms favour gender equality and particularly childless couples value it (Levy et al, 1997, Le Goff et al, 2009). On the other hand, gender practices show a different picture of the labor market, much more gender biased than the one portrayed by the official regulations. Several studies show that inequalities between men and women are part of every day experience, especially after the transition to parenthood. Most of women reduce their working time once they become mother (Le Goff et al 2009), to the point that Swiss women's pattern of labour market participation has been labelled *maternal part-time work* (Anxo et al 2006). Data from the Swiss census 2000 show that part-time working schedules became the norms for mothers in Switzerland. While at the end of the 1980s the pattern was rather characterized by the discontinuation of the labor force participation of mothers of young children, during the 1990s part time employment became the preferred alternative (Le Goff, 2005;Widmer and Ritschard, 2009). By contrast, men's participation in the labour market, mostly full time, is insensitive to the parental status or the number of children they have. The decreased time that women work in the labor market after the transition to parenthood corresponds to an equivalent increase in the time they devote to domestic work (Henchoz and Wernli, in Press) and to the emergence of a more traditional gender role set even among those couples who before the birth of the child declared being in favor of an equal sharing (Le Goff et al, 2009).

The theory of gendered master status postulates the idea of two major social integrations which differ between men and women (Krüger et Levy, 2000 and 2001) : family and work. Since the priority integration for women remains in the domestic sphere which does not mean that women are excluded from the labor market, but that their professional path is subordinate to family life. For men, the professional integration has the priority while family life is subordinate to it. Several recent studies demonstrate that women and men professional trajectories remain quite different (Levy, Gauthier and Widmer, 2006; Widmer and Ritschard, 2009). They specify that, compared to men's, women's professional trajectories are more heterogeneous and sensitive to characteristics such as education level, number of children, and cohort. These different studies show that women's working pattern are constructed and negotiated within the limits represented by family life, while men's family involvement is limited by the demands of the professional life.

Fertility intentions and the gendered workload

Childbearing behaviour may be predicted by declared intentions to have a child. For this reason, research on fertility intentions attracted the attention of social psychologists and demographers (Miller and pasta 199?, Philipov et al 2008) as important antecedents of fertility. Yet, the empirical literature highlights that there often are large discrepancies between declared intentions and realized behaviour due to the instability of intentions, to external and unpredicted factors intervening between the intention formulation of and its foreseen realization. However, the gap intention-realization is substantially smaller when intentions refer to a precise and relatively short

time interval (2-3 years) rather than the whole life course and when they are formulated with respect to the next child only rather than to the overall fertility (final number of children) of a couple (quote). Fertility intentions is often found to be correlated to individual socio-demographic characteristics similar to those that matters for behaviour (like age, parity, marital and employment status), to ideational factors like norms and values (like religious affiliation and practices, family and gender values), and to institutional opportunity structures (like childcare availability and social networks support).

Despite such blooming interest in fertility intentions, the effect of paid and unpaid labour shares between man and woman in a couple, on their fertility intentions is rarely addressed (see Mills et al. 2008). The main question to answer would be: Are couples in which the woman takes primary responsibilities of the domestic sphere and share equally with their partner the paid work load less likely to intend or have a child than couples where both partners take equal responsibilities for both spheres? Rizzi at al. (forthcoming) address this question by analyzing couples' role-sets based on partners' share of domestic and paid work jointly and their relations to women's fertility intentions controlling for measures of familistic values in the Italian context. The starting point of Rizzi *et al* is the identification of a typology of couples' role-sets, built on the basis of the number of hours that each partner devotes to either domestic tasks or paid work and the gaps between the partners' share in *domestic work hours* and in *(paid) labour work hours*. Results show that a *traditional role-set* – in which the woman carries out most of the domestic work and the man most of the paid labour – is predominant in Italy, even among working women. They observe no association between the way in which partners arrange their share of paid and unpaid work and women's intention to have a first child. In contrast, there is evidence of negative effects of roles sets in which women do most of the domestic work and as much as paid work as men on the intentions to have a second child; the opposite is true among couple sharing equally domestic and paid work.

An analysis of the effect of workload share on fertility cannot ignore the important mediating role that perceived satisfaction with the gender division of tasks may have in shaping individual well-being. Well-being and the perceived quality of the relationships have been pointed out in the theoretical literature as crucial, but again little empirical research examines its effects on fertility jointly with the actual workload share. A few exceptions are the study by Benin (1988) who uses US data from the 1980s to show that an important determinant of satisfaction with partners' workload share is its perceived fairness. Women were not happy with just "minimal participation" from their partner, disconfirming the idea that just a symbolic participation would be enough to reduce status distinction between partners and therefore be sufficient to satisfy their partner. However, fair arrangements corresponded to very different combinations of shares depending whether equity was considered as: a) an equal share of household tasks independently of the share of paid work; b) an equal share in household tasks which are typical female (housework chores or care) independently from other tasks (technical, administrative); c) a share that would account for "reward maximization" depending on exogenously given preferences (women prefer caring tasks, husband's success contributes prestige and status to the family, preference for not having arguments on how tasks shall be performed when they are shared).

The most recent study on fertility intentions in Switzerland based on Family and Fertility Survey data of 1994 (Coenen Huther, 2005) shows that intentions to have a child within 24 months decreased with age of women and men and with parity. Religion also plays a role. Catholics, whatever their level of engagement with religious practices, were more likely to intend to have a child than Protestants. Women who declared not to belong to any religion more often declared to have no intention to have a child. The most frequent reasons for which childless women declare not to intend to have a child are related to the difficulty to conciliate family and professional lives, worries associated with parenting itself, and problems related to time scarcity. All these factors concerns the responsibility involved in parenting in general and mothering in

particular and not so much the economic costs of children *per se*. However mothers of one child or more who do not intend to have another child mention more frequently economic costs more than scarce time budget. Difficulties to conciliate family and professional lives and worries about parenting do not discriminate between mothers and non-mothers. In the next sections we are going to examine the role of couples' gender role set, partners' satisfaction with it, and of attitudes towards family and gender on fertility intentions in Switzerland in the early XXI century.

Data and measures

We realized this study using the data collected in the «Living in Switzerland» project. This project is conducted by the Swiss Household Panel (SHP), which is based at FORS, the Swiss Centre of Expertise in the Social Sciences, located at the University of Lausanne. The project is devoted to analyze changing living conditions in Switzerland and is funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNF). For our purpose, the SHP data are interesting because they are longitudinal data and contain the relevant information on both partners of a couple. Two random samples of households are followed yearly and all household members older than 14 years are interviewed separately. The first cohort is followed since 1999 and the second since 2004. Because question about fertility intentions is asked only since 2002, we use a subsample of the first cohort starting in 2002 only. About 2'513 women of the two cohorts were asked, at least once, about their fertility intention. However for the purpose of our article, we selected only women who are living in couple (married or cohabiting) and aged between 18 to 45 for whom we also have their partner' interview data. Then analysis is conducted on a subsample of about 3'058 observations across waves.

Dependent Variable

Our dependant variable is the intention to have a child (or another child) in the following 24 months from the interview (reference period). Fertility intentions are measured using a three point scale: (1) women who intend to have a child, (2) women who do not know if they want a child, (3) women who do not intend to have a child. Descriptive analysis show us that at each wave of the SHP, the majority of childless women declare to plan to have a child within this period while the majority of women with already one child do not plan to have another one (Table 1). In both subsamples, women who do not know if they want a child are rare. For this reason, we computed a dichotomous independent variable in which these answers are regrouped with positives intentions to have a child.

Partners' workload variables

Gender gap index. The SHP presents rich information on couples' domestic and work balance : the numbers of hours weekly devoted by men and women to domestic work and to professional work respectively . However, these questions do dot include time devoted to child care. The average time dedicated to domestic work is around 18 hours a week for women's observations, but with strong differences between mothers and non mothers. Not surprisingly, domestic work is less important in the case of childless women than in the case of women with at least one child. By contrast, there are no difference between men for whom implication in domestic work reach a little more than five hours. The amount of time spent by childless women on paid work is larger than that of mothers. The number of hours they work approaches the number of paid work of their partner. In the case of men, there are no differences according to the fact they are father or not (see Table 1).

To go beyond a first descriptive approach and in order to take account of the workload rate and household rate from men and women within a couple, we computed two relative indexes. First, we divided women's number of domestic hours a week by their partner's number of domestic hours a week. When this indicator is higher than one it indicates that women do more household

compared to men. Second, we divided man's number of paid labor hours a week by his partner's number of paid labor hours a week. A value higher than one means that the man does more paid work than his partner.

Satisfaction with domestic task. In order to measure the perception women have about the division of domestic task within a couple, we have a three point scale from zero "*not at all satisfied*" to one "*very satisfied*" with how household is shared. Childless women are more satisfied than women with children (Table 1).

Gender attitude. We computed a three point indicator which measures gender attitude toward equality between men and women. This indicator is composed by three items: (1) if women think that they are in general penalized compared to men, (2) if women think that they are personally penalized, and (3) if they are in favor of measure to promote equality between men and women. This scale starts from zero, "*not at all penalized*" to one, "*strongly penalized*". Cronbach's Alpha rises from 0.65 to 0.72 among waves[1].

Familistic attitude. Two items are taken into account: the first one considers, on a three point scale, from zero, "*completely disagree*", to one, "*completely agree*" if women think that having a job preserves independence.

The second one measures on a three point scale if women think that a child suffers with working mother from zero, "*completely disagree*", to one, "*completely agree*".

Control and intermediate variables:
We also control for socio-demographic variables like women education (high, middle or low)-, occupation (full time, part time, being in training, looking for a job and being an housewife)-, and age. The control for age deserves a comment. There exist normative beliefs about the appropriate age for a woman to bear a child, and particularly age upper limits. As a consequence we expect a non linear effect for age (intentions increasing and then decreasing with age) we then add a quadratic effect of the age.

Social support. Finally, we control for social support. With two indicators we measure the amount of social support received by women. One item measures if women receive practical support from relatives on a three point scale from zero, "*not at all*" to one "*a great deal*". Moreover, we also have one item in order to know if women receive emotional support from relatives on a three point scale from zero, "*not at all*" to one "*a great deal*".[2]

about here Tab. 1

Results
As we use a six years follow up panel data from 2002 to 2007, there is as a minimum one declared fertility intention for each woman, and in most cases information on multiple points in time. On these data we perform a variety of multilevel models. We estimate nested hierarchical 2-level models in which the lower level represents the survey wave and the higher level the individual woman. The estimated models allow to disentangle interindividual measures (level of women) and intraindividual measures (level of waves) (Hox 2002; Singer and Willett 2003). We estimate fixed effects for the intercept and the different covariates as well as a random effect for the intercept. The hypothesis is that the intercept varies for each woman, according to unknown characteristics, while there are no variation in the effect of different covariates between. This hypothesis a sole random effect on the intercept is often made in the case of logistic regression.

---

[1] The cronbach alpha is a measure of a psychometric scale internal consistency (Cronbach, 1951).
[2] In the analyses presented in this paper, we will not take into consider religion involvement since this variable does not have any impact on child intention within 24 months.

Models were estimating using HLM software, version 6 (Bryk and Raudenbush 1992). The method of estimation chosen is full maximum likelihood.

Note however that we will distinguish in our analyses two subsamples, childless women (739 observations) and women with at least one child (2319 observations). This distinction is guided by the fact that in Switzerland, the transition to the parenthood often corresponds to a moment in which couples become non-egalitarian in their practice and norms after being until this transition egalitarian (Levy et al, 1997; Le Goff et al, 2009).

Descriptive Results

Before showing results of HLM model, we propose role-sets typology presented below (Table 2), inspired of the one proposed by Rizzi, Judd, White, Bernardi and Kertzer (forthcoming). According to Rizzi, et al. (forthcoming) division of task within a couple can be divided in nine different categories ranged from a traditional role-set to egalitarian role-set with a wide range of combinations. The *traditional-role-set* describes the situation where women do more domestic work in comparison with their partner. The *super-women* cluster is characterized by women's extra hours in domestic work whereas they have the same amount of paid labour work in comparison to their partner. The *ultra women* cluster groups women with extra hours in both, paid and domestic work. By contrast the *egalitarian role-set* concerns couple where both partners have the same amount of domestic and paid work. The *super man* cluster is defined when the man experiments extra hours in paid labour but have the same amount of domestic work compared to their partner. The *ultra man* cluster is composed by men with extra hours in both domestic and paid labour,. whereas, *post modern* supermen do extra hours in domestic work only. The *reversed traditional role-set* describes women who do more paid and do less domestic hours compared to their partner. Finally the *post modern super women* do extra hours in paid labor not in domestic work.

Typologies of role-sets in the SHP data

Not very surprisingly, the most frequent role-set for people living in Switzerland is the traditional one in which the man carried a heavier burden in paid labor and the women in domestic work. This traditional role-set increases with the number of children. Couples adopt a traditional role-set after the transition to parenthood, and more so when they have more than one child.

The second more important division of task cluster is *ultra women role-set* in which women are expected to participate in the labor market and in domestic work as well. The third important cluster is, as presented by the authors, *ultra man. Egalitarian role-set* is quite marginal. Moreover, majorities of women in this group do not have any children and also work full time. Finally our descriptive statistics show us that several role-set like reversed and postmodern role-sets, which are in fact extremely marginal, go beyond equality and represent new tendencies and, maybe, future challenges in the division of task within a couple.

about here Tab. 2

Multilevel analysis

We estimated different models on each of the two subsamples of childless women and women with at least one child. In the first model we introduced indicators related to familistic attitudes. In the models 2, 3, 4 and 5 we progressively bring in partners' workload variables, control and intermediate variables. The first model shows us that women who agree with the idea that job preserves independence are less likely to develop the intention to have a child within the period ($ß = -0.129$; $p < .01$). However, being in favor of gender equality has a positive impact on the intention to have a child within 24 months.

6

The second model shows us that being satisfied with the way household is shared is positively related with the intention to have a child like the situation where women do more household compared to their partner. Estimated Coefficient is however only significant at the 10% level and becomes non-significant in other models in which are added supplementary covariates. As expected, the third model shows a quadratic effect of age. Intention to have a child first increases with age but flattens down at higher age. The fourth model shows that there are no differences between women working full time or part time in their intention. Such an absence of differences could mean that intention is not related to the economic level of women. To be in formation is strongly negatively related to the intention to have a child. This result can be related to the classic result in life course analysis that women give rarely birth to a first child when they are in education, whatever the grade attented (Blossfeld and Huininck, 1991). Looking for a job has however a positive effect on the intention to have a child. The fifth model demonstrated that familistic attitude, socio-demographic variables and social support do not have any influence on the intention to have a child. Moreover, the two variables emotional and practical support does not improve the fit of the model: it is shown by the LMV score which does not decrease with the introduction of the two social support variables.

about here Tab. 3

In the case of women who already have at least one child, Table 4 shows that familistic attitudes, gender opinion and division of task within a couple have an influence on the intention to have an extra child. The first model indicates that women who agree that a child suffers because his mother is working are less likely to have another child. But the significance disappears when all covariates are introduced in the model. Being in favor of gender measure has a positive impact on the intention to have a child within 24 months, this effect being more and more significant when adding other covariates. Satisfaction with household task has a positive impact on the intention to have a child within 24 months. We observe 1.127 times odds of giving a positive response *vs* giving a negative response.
The second model presents the fact that women who do more household work than their partner are less likely to have another child. The third model presents that intention to have a child within the period depends on the age of the individual. As in the case of childless women, intentions to have a child first increases with age and second decreases. . The fourth model underlines that working full time is negatively related to the intention to have another child as well as a low level of education is associated to no intentions to have a child. By contrast, women with a high level of education develop intentions to have a child within 24 months more often than women with a middle level. The last model indicates that practical support is negatively related, but only at the level of 10%, to the intention to have a child whereas to beneficiate of an emotional support is positively related to this intention.

about here Tab. 4

Conclusion

Several results obtained in this first investigation on fertility intentions justify the longitudinal approach we develop in the analysis of the household panel. First, intentions to have children are strongly related with age. Results we obtain in model estimations on the subsample of childless women as well on the subsample of women with at least one child suggests that there is a period in the life course during which they develop intentions to have a child. Three phases can then be described with first a period of their life during which women do not want (yet) to have a child, especially if they are in formation or at school. In a second phase, they can develop intentions to have a child while in a third phase, they do not want anymore children whatever they have or

have not children. Results thus suggests the presence of a normative window for childbearing and are in the same sense of results presented by Sauvain-Dugerdil (2005) on the basis of Swiss FFS data collected in the nineties[3] : she indicated that among women who did not want to have another child, the youngest often mentioned reasons on the shortness of the household or on the conciliation between professional and family life while the oldest often mentioned reasons related to their age.

Intentions to have a child within the next two years do not follow the same process according to the fact that women are childless or not. This cleavage between childless and already mothers is interesting to note because the transition to parenthood is in Switzerland the moment in the life course for women and their partner during which the gendered mater status appears (Levy et al 1997; Le Goff et al, 2009). Results we have obtained with model estimation on SHP data are very different according to this cleavage. Couples adopt a traditional role-set after the transition to parenthood, and more often when they have more than one child. In this sense, traditional couples are less likely to intend another child maybe because most of them have already reached their desired family size.

In the case of childless women, intention to have a child within two years depends from egalitarian values and not from factual measures except age and to be in training. More women agree with gender egalitarian values and more they declare to have the intentions to have a child, in accordance with most results found in other countries that show that inequality in couples is negatively related with fertility (Cooke 2003, Mills et al, 2008). However, in a paradoxical manner, women who consider that the occupation of a job on the labor market is synonymous of independence are less enthusiastic to have children. This last result means that, in a context with poor child care as in Switzerland, having children can be considered a threat to independence. Arguments about the necessary role of education and care of mothers in the development of the child, which are often defended by conservative parties, do not seem to exercise any strong influence on the development of intention to have children.

In the case of women with already children, gender opinion plays a similar role in intentions to have children than was observed for childless women. Our results for childless women and women with children are in line with Mc Donald's hypothesis (2000): at the micro level when gender equity in the private sphere is in phase with gender equity as promoted in the public sphere, which is the case in Switzerland, then fertility intention is enhanced. Couples with a preference of egalitarian roles have a higher likelihood to intend to have a/another child while satisfaction with the division of household tasks has a positive effect on the intention to have another child as well. However, intention to have children within two years is also conditioned by the satisfaction with the household task, the equilibrium in paid working time between each partner, the possibility to beneficiate of emotional support rather than practical support. The experience related to the rise of the first child seems to have played a role on the formation of the intention to have a new child. However, if the idea that a job preserves the independence does not have anymore effect, the fact for a woman to have a full time job is negatively related to intentions to have a further child.

Finally, these first investigations on fertility intentions rather confirm the thesis that fertility, and more exactly, the desire of children, occur in more egalitarian couples. However, this view is challenged by other factor sets. First, these factors are related to the wish of independence of some women, which is not necessarily linked to egalitarian values. Second, these factors can be related to the economic situation of the couple, especially when they already have one child or

---

[3] The Fertility and Family Survey was commissioned by the Swiss Federal Statistical Office in the early nineties. This survey enables Switzerland to take part in the international Fertility and Family Survey (FFS) project launched by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe.

several. In further investigations, we wish to analyze the change in fertility intentions during the life-course, especially when women begin to develop the intention to have a child or when they do not want anymore to have children. Tentative to develop investigations in order to analyze these two "events" showed us that some further waves of SHP have to be collected before to have a great number of such changes in fertility intentions A second promising avenue for further research is to exploit the longitudinal information of the SHP to study the relationship between fertility intentions and their subsequent realization. Is the couple role-set an actual mediator for the probability that women have the child they wished for or vice versa do they change their intention?

Bibliography (to be completed)

Blossfeld, Hans-Peter & Johannes Huinink. 1991. "Human Capital Investments or Norms of Role Transition? How Women's Schooling Affects the Process of Family Formation". *American Journal of Sociology* 97:143-168.

Anxo, Dominique, Colette Fagan, Inmaculada Cebrian, and Gloria Moreno. 2006. "Pattern of labour market integration in Europe -a life course perspective on time policies." *Socio-Economic Review* 5:233-260.

Bryk, Anthony S. and Stephen W. Raudenbush. 1992. *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Coenen Huther Josette. 2005. Le souhait d'enfant. Un idéal situé. in Le Goff, Jean-Marie, Claudine Sauvain-Dugerdil, Clémentine Rossier, and Josette Coenen-Huther. (eds). *Maternité et parcours de vie*. Berne: Peter Lang. pp 85-136.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16(3)*, 297-334.

Henchoz, C., Wernli, B. (forthcoming 2010) Cycle de vie et travaux ménagers en Suisse. L'investissement ménager des hommes et des femmes lors de différentes étapes de la construction de la famille. Revue suisse de sociologie.

Hox, Joop J. 2002. *Multilevel analysis. Techniques and applications*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Krüger, Helga und René Levy (2000). Masterstatus, Familie und Geschlecht. Vergessene Verknüpfungslogiken zwischen Institutionen des Lebenslaufs. *Berliner Journal für Soziologie*, 3, 379-401.

Krüger, Helga and René Levy. 2001. "Linking life course, work, and the family: Theorizing a not visible nexus between women and men." *Journal of Sociology* 26:145-166.

Le Goff Jean-Marie. 2005. Vie professionnelle et fécondité. in Le Goff, Jean-Marie, Claudine Sauvain-Dugerdil, Clémentine Rossier, and Josette Coenen-Huther. (eds). *Maternité et parcours de vie*. Berne: Peter Lang. pp 239-280.

Levy, René, Jacques-Antoine Gauthier, and Eric Widmer. 2006. "Entre contraintes institutionnelle et domestique : les parcours de vie masculins et féminins en Suisse." *Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers canadiens de sociologie* 31:461-489.

McDonald, P. 2000. "Gender equity, social institutions and the future of fertility." *Journal of Population Research* 17:1-16.

Rizzi, Ester, Maya Judd, Michael White, Laura Bernardi, and David Kertzer. submitted. "Familistic attitudes, dual burden and fertility intentions in Italy.

Sauvain-Dugerdil Claudine (2005). La place de l'enfant dans les projets de vie: temporalité et ambivalence. in Le Goff, Jean-Marie, Claudine Sauvain-Dugerdil, Clémentine Rossier, and Josette Coenen-Huther. (eds). *Maternité et parcours de vie*. Berne: Peter Lang. pp 281-318."

Singer, Judith D. and John B. Willett. 2003. *Applied longitudinal data analysis: Modeling change and event occurrence*. Oxford: University Press.

Widmer, Eric.D. and Gilbert Ritschard 2009. The de-standardization of the life course: are men and women equal?. Advances in Life course Research. 14: 28-39

Table 1: Sample characteristics (women aged between 18 to 45 years old, in couple)

2513 WOMEN WERE INTERVIEWED AT LEAST ONCE	WOMEN AGED BETWEEN 18 TO 45 YEARS OLD *IN COUPLE*		
VARIABLES	**3058 OBSERVATIONS**	739 OBSERVATIONS CHILDLESS WOMEN	2318 OBSERVATIONS WOMEN WITH AT LEAST ONE CHILD
DEPENDENT VARIABLE			
Intentions to have a child in next 24 month			
No	76.4 %	40.6 %	83.3 %
Don't know	2.5 %	4.5 %	1.9 %
Yes	21.1 %	54.9 %	14.8 %
PARTNERS' WORKLOAD VARIABLES			
Satisfaction with organization of domestic work			
No - Little	22.4 %	16.9 %	24.2 %
Somewhat	39.5 %	36.4 5 %	40.6 %
Yes-very satisfied	38 %	46.6 %	35.2 %
Women domestic hours	17.98 hours / week	8.78 hours / week	20.97 hours / week
Men domestic hours per week	5.71 hours / week	5.12 hours / week	5.90 hours / week
Women labor hours	25.87 hours / week	37.54 hours / week	20.88 hours / week
Men labor hours	44.95 hours / week	44.30 hours / week	45.15 hours / week
CONTROL AND INTERMEDIATE VARIABLES			
Women's age groups			
Less than 30 years old	15.3 %	41.5 %	6.9 %
30-34 years old	24.0 %	28.0 %	22.8 %
35-39 years old	33.4 %	16.4 %	38.9 %
40-44 years old	27.2 %	14.1 %	31.4 %
Women's education			
Low education	7.3 %	4.1 %	8.4 %
Middle education	70.3 %	62.5 %	72.9 %
High education	22.3 %	33.4 %	18.8 %
Women's occupational status			
Occupied full-time	19.9 %	60.7 %	7 %
Occupied part-time	49.7 %	29.7 %	56 %
Housewife	28 %	2.5 %	36.1 %
Looking for a job	1 %	1.4 %	0.8 %
training	1.5 %	5.7 %	0.2 %
Practical support			
Not at all	15.3 %	11.5 %	16.5 %
A little	45.4 %	40.9 %	46.9 %
A great deal	39.2 %	47.6 %	36.6 %

Emotional support			
Not at all	8.8 %	6.5 %	9.5 %
A little	44.3 %	39.9 %	45.7 %
A great deal	46.9 %	53.5 %	44.8 %
Number of children less than 17 living in the household			
0	24.2 %	100 %	
1	18.7 %		24.6 %
2	37.6 %		49.6 %
3	15.9 %		20.9 %
4 and more	3.6 %		29.4 %

Table 2 : Sample characteristics in function of the workload and household rate

	Household	Workload	Number of observations	Intention to have a child within 24 months (Valid percent)	Number of kids (Valid percent)	Women Education (Valid percent)	Women Occupation (Valid percent)
Traditional role-set	W > M	W < M	2047	17.3 yes 2.3 do not know 80.4 no	13.7 zero kid 19.4 one kid 43.4 two kids 23.4 more than three kids	6.6 low 75.3 middle 18 high	7.3 full time 55 part time 36.2 housewife 1.6 training / jobless
Egalitarian role-set	W = M	W = M	14	*21.4 yes* *7.1 do not know* *71.4 no*	*64.3 zero kid* *7.1 one kid* *21.4 two kids* *7.1 more than three kids*	*78.6 middle* *21.4 high*	*64.3 full time* *28.6 part time* *7.1 housewife*
Ultra woman	W > M	W > M	346	31.5 yes 3.5 do not know 65 no	50.9 zero kid 15.9 one kid 22.32 two kids 11.0 more than three	8.4 low 63 middle 28.6 high	56.4 full time 35.8 part time 6.1 housewife 1.8 training / jobless
Super women	W > M	W = M	104	30.8 yes 1.9 do not know 67.3 no	39.4 zero kid 22.1 one kid 22.1 two kids 17.4 more than three kids	18.3 low 58.7 middle 23.1 high	43.7 full time 19.4 part time 33 housewife 3.8 training / jobless
Post modern superwomen	W = M	W > M	37	*43.2 yes* *2.7 do not know* *54.1 no*	*86.5 zero kid* *5.4 one kid* *8.1 two kids*	*2.7 low* *51.4 middle* *45.9 high*	*67.6 full time* *27 part time* *5.4 training*
Reversed traditional role-set	W < M	W > M	161	23.6 yes 4.3 do not know 72 no	55.3 zero kid 16.1 one kids 17.4 two kids 11.2 more than three kids	5.6 low 59 middle 35.4 high	60.9 full time 32.9 part time 0.6 housewife 5.6 training
Post modern superman	W < M	W = M	34	*29.4 yes* *70.6 no*	*52.9 zero kid* *20.6 one kid* *17.6 two kids* *8.8 more than three*	*17.6 low* *38.2 middle* *44.1 high*	*58.8 full time* *23.5 part time* *2.9 housewife* *14.7 training /*

						kids			jobless	
Super man	W = M	W < M	77	37.7	yes	*29.9 zero kid*		*3.9 low*	*18.7 full time*	
				1.3	do not know	*19.5 one kid*		*58.4 middle*	*54.7 part time*	
				61	no	*32.5 two kids*		*37.7 high*	*20 housewife*	
						18.2 more than three kids			*6.7 training / jobless*	
Ultra man	W < M	W < M	234	23.1	yes	*29.9 zero kid*		*9 low*	*22.1 full time*	
				2.6	do not know	*18.8 1kids*		*61.5 middle*	*55.8 part time*	
				74.4	no	*39.7 2 kids*		*29.5 high*	*17.3 housewife*	
						11.5 more than 3			*4.8 training /jobless*	

Table 3 : Childless Women; Results for non linear model, logit function ; unit-specific model ; coefficient and odds ratio (round bracket).

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Intercept	-0.370 (0.691)	-0.540 (0.582)	-1.022 0.359	-0.981 (0.375)	-2.333* (0.097)
Job preserve independence	-0.129** (0.878)	-0.125* (0.882)	-0.114* (0.892)	-0.109* (0.897)	-0.119* (0.887)
Child suffer with working mother	-0.030 (0.970)	-0.037 (0.963)	-0.012 (0.988)	-0.021 (0.979)	-0.018 (0.982)
Gender opinion	0.138** (1.150)	0.141* (1.151)	0.135* (1.145)	0.150** (1.161)	0.153** (1.165)
Satisfaction with household task	0.090 (1.095)	0.106+ (1.111)	0.119+ (1.126)	0.120+ (1.127)	0.103 (1.108)
Household rate		0.150+ (1.162)	0.188+ (1.206)	0.157 (1.170)	0.153 (1.165)
Workload rate		-0.029 (0.971)	0.019 (1.018)	0.031 (1.032)	0.039 (1.039)
Age			1.918*** (6.810)	1.879*** (6.544)	1.851*** (6.368)
Age square			-0.030*** (0.970)	-0.030*** (0.974)	-0.029*** (0.971)
Occupation full time / ref. part time				0.005 (1.005)	-0.019 (0.981)
Occupation housewife / ref. part time				0.767 (2.154)	0.700 (2.014)
Occupation training / ref. part time				-3.365** (0.034)	-3.562** (0.028)
Occupation looking for a job / ref. part time				1.889** (6.610)	1.829 (6.230)
Education low / ref. middle				0.032 (0.968)	0.167 (1.181)
Education high / ref. middle				-0.145 (0.865)	-0.122 (0.885)
Practical support					0.057 (1.059)
Emotional support					0.126 (1.134)
Random effect Standard deviation	1.504***	1.515***	1.425***	1.416***	1.992***
Variance component	2.262	2.295	2.032	2.005	1.411
Chi-square	651.599	652.050	550.628	528.381	524.442
LMV	-963.027	-962.425	-956.264	-940.669	-941.696

Note. + p < .01 ;* p < .05 ; ** p < .01 ; *** p < .001. Mode of estimates : full maximum likelihood. *N* = 377; *observations* = 706.

Table 4 : Women with at least one child; Results for non linear model, logit function ; unit-specific model ; coefficient and odds ratio (round bracket).

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Intercept	-2.78*** (0.062)	-2.577*** (0.075)	-3.043*** (0.048)	-3.079*** (0.045)	-3.417*** (0.033)
Job preserve independence	-0.002 (0.997)	-0.009 (0.990)	-0.009 (0.990)	-0.014 (0.986)	-0.016 (0.984)
Child suffer with working mother	-0.049* (0.951)	-0.039+ (0.961)	-0.062* (0.940)	-0.041 (0.959)	-0.041 (0.959)
Gender opinion	0.066+ (1.069)	0.062+ (1.064)	0.098* (1.102)	0.077* (1.080)	0.079* (1.082)
Satisfaction with household task	0.120** (1.127)	0.122** (1.129)	0.103* (1.108)	0.095* (1.100)	0.090* (1.095)
Household rate		-0.057 (0.944)	-0.030 (0.970)	-0.018 (0.982)	-0.020 (0.980)
Workload rate		-0.046+ (0.954)	-0.052+ (0.949)	-0.070* (0.932)	-0.068* (0.933)
Age			0.731** (2.079)	0.642** (1.901)	0.654** (1.924)
Age square			-0.015*** (0.985)	-0.014*** (0.986)	-0.014*** (0.986)
Occupation full time / ref. part time				-0.634+ (0.530)	-0.664+ (0.515)
Occupation housewife / ref. part time				0.110 (1.117)	0.075 (1.077)
Occupation training / ref. part time				1.633 (5.120)	1.606 (4.981)
Occupation looking for a job / ref. part time				-0.497 (0.608)	-0.617 (0.539)
Education low / ref. middle				-0.742+ (0.476)	-0.736+ (0.479)
Education high / ref. middle				0.901*** (2.463)	0.924*** (2.520)
Practical support					-0.075+ (0.927)
Emotional support					0.116* (1.122)
Random effect Standard deviation	1.387***	1.405***	1.374***	1.378***	1.383***
Variance component	1.924	1.974	1.887	1.899	1.913
Chi-square	1229.511	1239.992	1011.647	997.184	999.023
LMV	*-873.054*	*-870.934*	*-769.971*	*-757.194*	*-755.925*

Note. $+ p \leq .01$;* $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$. Mode of estimates : full maximum likelihood. $N = 858$; *observations* = 2197.