



UNIVERSITY
OF WARSAW



Faculty
of Economic
Sciences

WORKING PAPERS

No. 13/2022 (389)

WHEN ARE WOMEN WHO WORK FROM HOME MORE LIKELY TO HAVE CHILDREN?

BEATA OSIEWALSKA
ANNA MATYSIAK
ANNA KUROWSKA

 **LabFam**

INTERDISCIPLINARY CENTRE
FOR LABOUR MARKET AND FAMILY DYNAMICS

WARSAW 2022



When are women who work from home more likely to have children?

Beata Osiewalska^a, Anna Matysiak^b, Anna Kurowska^c

^a *University of Warsaw, Faculty of Economic Sciences; LabFam - Interdisciplinary Centre for Labour Market and Family Dynamics; Cracow University of Economics*

^b *University of Warsaw, Faculty of Economic Sciences; LabFam - Interdisciplinary Centre for Labour Market and Family Dynamics*

^c *University of Warsaw, Faculty of Political Sciences and International Relations; LabFam - Interdisciplinary Centre for Labour Market and Family Dynamics*

*Corresponding author: b.osiewalska@uw.edu.pl

Abstract: We examine the timely yet severely under-researched interplay between the opportunity to work from home and childbearing. According to previous research, home-based work (HBW) may both facilitate and jeopardise work-family balance, depending on family and work circumstances. Following this research, we develop a theoretical framework on whether and under which conditions HBW may facilitate fertility. We perform random-effect logistic regression on UK Household Longitudinal Survey 2009-2019 data and consider a set of potential moderators related to woman's family and work context. Our findings suggest that HBW can indeed help certain women have children, but only those who live far from their offices or want to combine paid work and care but receive little support from their partners. This is not the case for other women, likely because HBW entails higher expectations toward workers to perform more housework, leads to more multitasking and may have negative consequences for women's work careers.

Keywords: fertility, childbearing, home-based work, remote work, work flexibility

JEL codes: J13

Acknowledgements: The work on this manuscript by Beata Osiewalska and Anna Kurowska has been financed by the ERC grant "Globalisation- and Technology-Driven Labour Market Change and Fertility" (LABFER, grant agreement No 866207). Anna Matysiak was funded by the National Agency of Academic Exchange (NAWA) under the Polish Returns 2019 Programme.

1. Introduction

Incompatibilities between paid work and care have been argued to be one of the main reasons for dramatic fertility declines in industrialized countries in the second half of the 20th century (Brewster & Rindfuss, 2000; Engelhardt et al., 2004). These incompatibilities were partly a product of the separation of paid labour from family spheres during industrial revolutions when workers began working outside of their homes (Goldscheider et al., 2015). The digital revolution, which is currently on the way, has the potential to change this status quo again and bring paid work back home. The development of internet, cloud computing and video conferencing increasingly enable workers to conduct at least some of their paid work at home. The COVID-19 pandemic has shown that home-based work (HBW) is a realistic option for a substantial number of workers (ILO, 2020). Will the opportunity to work from home thus ease the incompatibilities between paid work and family and consequently lead to higher fertility? There is no obvious answer to this question. On the one hand, HBW may indeed improve work-family reconciliation by allowing workers to save on commuting time or organising work more flexibly around family obligations (Chung & Van der Lippe, 2020; Felstead et al., 2002), especially among mothers (Mas & Pallais, 2017). On the other hand, however, HBW may also exacerbate work-family conflict, by blurring the boundaries between paid work and family life (Demerouti et al., 2014). Past research showed that HBW can lead to longer work hours and more intense work (Felstead & Henseke, 2017; Kelliher & Anderson, 2010), result in work interruptions (Delanoeije et al., 2019; Powell & Craig, 2015) or higher total workload (Ammons & Markham, 2004; Kurowska, 2020). Finally, it may have negative consequences on workers' careers (Munsch, 2016). While there has been abundant research on various consequences of HBW on workers' lives, studies which look at the links between HBW and childbearing are scarce. One study that addressed this topic directly focused on fertility intentions: Sinyavskaya and Billingsley (2015) showed that Russian women who have access to HBW have higher first and second birth intentions. Other studies that mention potential HBW-fertility link address it rather indirectly, e.g. by looking at fertility effects of the spread of the broadband internet and its usage, but not exactly at HBW (Billari et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2021).

We fill this research gap and examine the interplay between access to and use of HBW and childbearing in the pre-pandemic context of the United Kingdom. The pandemic years are not covered in order to discard the confounding effects of the pandemic (e.g. school closures) on HBW and fertility. The UK was selected as the share of employees who work from home was one of the highest there among European countries already before the outbreak of the pandemic (Eurofound, 2020; Felstead & Reuschke, 2020). At the same time, HBW in the UK may indeed

constitute an attractive work arrangement to combine paid work and care as public childcare provision is there relatively poor and the pressure on men to work long hours is high (Adler & Lenz, 2015; Yerkes & Javornik, 2019). We focus on women as in the UK they are still mostly responsible for combining paid work with childcare (McMunn et al., 2020). Women were also repeatedly found to work from home explicitly to accommodate work and family duties while men to prolong working hours or avoid workplace interruptions (Powell & Craig, 2015; Sullivan & Lewis, 2001). In order to provide a comprehensive overview of the interplay between HBW and fertility, we study two outcomes – the first and second birth – which are the most common birth transitions in the UK.

As the links between HBW and fertility are theoretically complex, the main objective of our study is to investigate not only *whether* but mostly *under which conditions* women who (have the opportunity to) work from home are most likely to have a child. We are thus not aiming at establishing a single causal effect of HBW on childbearing, isolated from women's job and family situations. Instead, we expect that the relationship between HBW and birth transitions will depend on a woman's work and life circumstances, such as the distance to the workplace, housing conditions, involvement of the partner in paid and unpaid work or woman's work settings. In the following section of the paper, we develop a conceptual framework in which we outline how and under which conditions woman's access to and use of HBW may facilitate fertility behaviour. We also derive a set of research hypotheses which we later verify on the data from the UK Household Longitudinal Study for the years 2009-2019, using discrete-time logit models.

This study has numerous contributions. First, we contribute to the demographic literature on paid work and fertility which concluded that incompatibilities between paid work and care are an important impediment to fertility (Brewster & Rindfuss, 2000; McDonald, 2000). This literature has established numerous factors which ease the conflict between paid and unpaid labour and help working women to have children, such as public policies (Baizan et al., 2016), working time flexibility (Begall et al., 2015) and male partners' involvement in childcare (Cooke, 2009; Torr & Short, 2004). With this study, we introduce another dimension that may potentially facilitate work and family reconciliation, namely workplace flexibility. Second, we add to the literature on HBW, which outlines numerous consequences of this work arrangement for workers' life, such as work-family balance (Allen et al., 2013; Gajendran & Harrison, 2007), psychological well-being and health (Oakman et al., 2020), time use (Powell & Craig, 2015), working conditions (Pabilonia & Vernon, 2022) or work careers (Golden & Eddleston, 2020), but not yet fertility.

Our study is extremely timely as the shift toward HBW has substantially accelerated during the COVID-19 pandemic when one in two employees have been working from home on a regular basis (Eurofound, 2020). This form of working will likely be more common in the aftermath of the pandemic as it turned out that many jobs can be effectively performed at home (Dingel & Neiman, 2020) and employees increasingly report a desire to perform at least some work from home (Felstead & Reuschke, 2020). It is thus of vast social importance to understand whether and under which conditions HBW may facilitate or restrict family-related decisions so that proper policies are implemented to allow young adults to benefit from the expansion of this new work arrangement and at the same time protect them from its negative consequences.

2. Conceptual Framework

In general, HBW should help women to have children provided that it improves the conditions for work-family reconciliation. The link between HBW and work-family balance is not that clear, however. On the one hand, HBW can help reduce work-family interference as it allows workers to organise work more flexibly around family obligations, i.e. to perform work when children are in daycare/school, are taken care of by another parent, or sleep (Chung & Van der Lippe, 2020; Felstead et al., 2002). Home-based workers may also save time as they do not have to commute, they experience fewer workplace interruptions, or can perform paid work in parallel to some household tasks (e.g. laundry or cooking) (Bailey & Kurland, 2002; Hill et al., 2003). Finally, HBW may also help parents to be more present in their children's lives even if children are taken care of by somebody else in the meantime or are large enough to manage without direct supervision (Callister & Singley, 2004).

On the other hand, however, HBW may exacerbate work-family conflict. No clear definition of the beginning and the end of the working day and no physical boundaries between the workplace and home, both implicit to HBW, may lead to the blurring of the boundaries between paid work and family life and to the spillover from one sphere to the other (Glavin & Schieman, 2012; Lott, 2020). Empirical studies indeed show that employees working from home often experience interruptions to their work time, perform more multitasking and tend to prolong their work late into the evening (Hill et al., 2003; Powell & Craig, 2015). They may also work harder or longer than their office-based counterparts in order to compensate their employers for the lack of their presence in the workplace (Felstead & Henseke, 2017; Kelliher & Anderson, 2010). Finally, there is evidence that women who work from home are expected to do more housework (Ammons & Markham, 2004) and experience a higher total workload (Kurowska,

2020). For all these reasons, home-based workers, in particular mothers, may face more tensions between paid work and family life.

Previous empirical studies provide mixed evidence on the links between HBW and work-family conflict though meta-studies indicate the relationship to be weak but negative (Allen et al., 2013; Gajendran & Harrison, 2007). It was also demonstrated that the relationship between HBW and work-family conflict depends on numerous family- and work-related circumstances. In particular, HBW was found to increase the negative spillover from one sphere to the other if it was linked to long working hours (Peters & Van Der Lippe, 2007; Van Der Lippe & Lippényi, 2020) and limited opportunities for a physical separation of the two life spheres (Baruch, 2000; Solís, 2016). At the same time, long commuting time increases the work-family conflict (Bai et al., 2021; Voydanoff, 2005).

All these considerations lead us to the following expectations:

Hypothesis 1. The relationship between HBW and fertility is positive for childless women as well as mothers provided that HBW improves the conditions for work and family reconciliation. We thus expect that women who have the opportunity to or actually work from home will be more likely to have a(nother) child if HBW allows them to make substantial savings on commuting time (*Hypothesis 1a*), they have a spacious apartment which allows them to physically separate paid work from family life(*Hypothesis 1b*); or their HBW is not linked with long working hours (*Hypothesis 1c*).

The experience of work-and-family conflict by a woman does not only depend on her job or housing conditions, but also on the extent to which she shares unpaid work with her partner. Higher involvement of men in childcare takes away some of the duties usually held by women, weakens women's work-family tensions, and provides room for further childbearing (Goldscheider et al., 2015). Empirical research has shown that women whose partners are more involved in childcare or take at least a small proportion of parental leave are more likely to have a second child (Cooke, 2009; Duvander et al., 2010). At the same time, women who do not receive support from their partners at home but who want to continue working after becoming mothers need to search for other solutions to combine the two activities. Flexible work arrangements, such as HBW, may thus facilitate their childbearing decisions. In other words, we expect:

Hypothesis 2. The relationship between HBW and fertility will be positive for women whose partners are strongly involved in paid work (e.g. work long hours) (*Hypothesis 2a*) and/or, in case of mothers, whose partners perform relatively little childcare (*Hypothesis 2b*).

Apart from affecting women's work-life balance, HBW may also impact women's childbearing behaviours by influencing their work careers. Even though women who have the possibility to work from home are more likely to be in the labour force (Arntz et al., 2019; Chung & Van Der Horst, 2018), HBW may diminish their chances for a professional development. Persons working from home tend to have fewer networking opportunities, less influence over what is happening at the workplace and poorer access to training (Baruch, 2000; Martinez & Gómez, 2013). They are also less visible at work (Richardson & Kelliher, 2015) and may be perceived as less committed to work, thus experience so-called 'flexibility stigma' (Coltrane et al., 2013). Consistently with these arguments, studies found that home-based workers are, net of their work effort, less likely to be promoted (Fernandez-Lozano et al., 2020) and earn lower hourly wages (Arntz et al., 2019; Golden & Eddleston, 2020). The fear of being stigmatized at the workplace might cause job-related tensions or worries that may affect women's childbearing behaviours, though the direction of this influence might depend on parity. Studies show that perceived job uncertainty is linked to the postponement of motherhood (Kreyenfeld, 2010; Vignoli et al., 2020; Wood & Neels, 2017). As such, childless women facing job-related distress may be more likely to postpone the decision to have a child in order to gain additional time to establish or improve their position in the labour market. Mothers, in turn, may react differently. Having to take care of one child, they face more limited opportunities for improving their position in the labour market than childless women. Consequently, their opportunity costs of having a second child may be lower than those of childless women, if they have a dissatisfying job and are not responsible for maintaining the family financially (Kreyenfeld & Andersson, 2014). Hence, we expect that:

Hypothesis 3. The implications of HBW for women's professional careers shape the relationship between HBW and fertility differently for childless women and mothers. If HBW entails distress about employment, childless women may postpone or abandon their decision to have a child in order to improve their position in the labour market (*Hypothesis 3a*). Mothers, in contrast, may choose to have another child if they work from home and feel tense with their employment situation as they already are on the "mummy track" and having another child might be more fulfilling than a displeasing job (*Hypothesis 3b*).

While considering the potential link between childbearing and HBW, we also differentiate between access to HBW and use of HBW. Having access to HBW means that one is able to work from home but may not use this possibility (Chung & Van Der Horst, 2018). Access to HBW may be as important for childbearing decisions of childless women as the real use of it, as they may plan to enact it after childbirth. For the childbearing decisions of mothers, in turn,

the access to HBW might be of less importance than its use, as mothers might have already used HBW in order to combine paid work with care of their first child. They are thus better informed whether HBW is indeed helpful for reconciling paid work and childcare and how it may affect their work careers. Thus, we expect:

Hypothesis 4: The relationship between HBW and fertility depends on whether a woman has only access to HBW or she uses this work arrangement. We expect, that access to HBW is as important as the use of HBW for the decisions to enter motherhood (*Hypothesis 4a*). For mothers, in turn, the regular use of HBW should be more important for their decision to have another child than just access to HBW (*Hypothesis 4b*).

3. The UK Context

Our study is located in the United Kingdom (UK), a liberal welfare state where combining paid work and care was for a long time left to families (Lewis & Campbell, 2007). It thus displays a rather restricted supply of public childcare (Yerkes & Javornik, 2019). Private childcare, in turn, is very expensive and costs one third of the average couple wage (OECD, 2022). Maternity leave is up to 12 months plus 18 weeks of parental leave, out of which the first six weeks are paid at 90% of a woman's pre-birth average weekly earnings, 33 weeks at a flat rate with a maximum of 152 pounds per week, and the rest is unpaid (GOV.UK, 2022b). With time, leave entitlements have also been extended to fathers, but men rarely make use of them (Kaufman, 2018). The UK is also characterised by strong social support for the modernised male breadwinner model, with a father working full-time and a mother part-time in addition to fulfilling childcare (Lyonette et al., 2011). Many couples indeed live in such an arrangement (McMunn et al., 2020). In addition, British men work relatively long hours compared to men in other European countries (Cousins & Tang, 2004; Eurostat, 2022a).

In this context, flexible working arrangements, including HBW, may serve as a convenient solution to combine paid work and care. Indeed, the proportion of workers who at least sometimes work from home was in the UK, next to the Nordic countries, one of the highest in Europe and amounted to 26% in 2019 (Eurostat, 2022b). Moreover, this proportion was that high already in the late 1990s. The right to request flexible work, including HBW, is guaranteed by the British law (GOV.UK, 2022a). This policy was introduced in 2003 explicitly to ease work-family tensions and support women's employment (Chung & Van Der Horst, 2018). Initially it was granted only to parents of children under six, but was gradually extended to all workers who have been employed for the past 26 weeks at the workplace. HBW is also the most preferred working arrangement among all the available flexible arrangements in the UK (Van

Wanrooy et al., 2013). It is mainly widespread among white-collar workers in the service jobs which do not require often face-to-face interaction (e.g. financial, legal or scientific services) (Felstead & Reuschke, 2020). Approximately 45% of workers holding managerial or professional positions have ever worked from home in 2019, whereas among those working in elementary occupations this share was lower than 5% (ONS, 2020).

4. Data & Method

We use UK Understanding Society (UKHLS) waves 1 to 10, which cover the period 2009 to 2019 (ISER, 2022). UKHLS is one of the largest annual longitudinal studies that interviews members of approximately 40,000 households. It collects information on many aspects of peoples' lives, including family and professional careers. It contains questions on both partners' employment statuses, availability and use of HBW, and other job characteristics as well as housing conditions, and involvement in unpaid labour.

We focus on women at reproductive age (18-44), which gave us almost 25,000 respondents. At first, we selected only those women who participated in at least two waves, not necessarily subsequent (20,000 women), lived in a heterosexual union (we allow for the change of a partner) and had complete information about the partner (10,000 women). Next, we chose women for whom household data, i.e., the number of bedrooms, were provided (*hhresp* file) (4 cases excluded). We also excluded extreme cases (outliers), that cover situations in which a woman (a man) works more than 70hrs (90hrs) per week (including overtime), earns more than 7,000 (8,000) GBP gross per month, lives in an apartment of more than 6 bedrooms or commutes longer than 2 hours (78 respondents). Further, we divided our sample into two event-history subgroups: childless women for the transition to the first birth (3,192 women) and one-time mothers for the transition to the second birth (3,365 women). We do not consider higher parity progressions as there were too few births to perform reliable analysis. We then excluded woman-years in which women were not employed or were self-employed (2,796 childless women and 2,599 mothers left in the sample). Lastly, we selected only cases for which we had complete information about births and access to / use of HBW. Our final sample consists of 2,025 childless women (in total 5,603 woman-years) and 1,802 mothers (4,439 woman-years). Within this sample we observed 748 first and 728 second births.

We applied random-effect logit models separately for the transition to the first and second birth. Our key explanatory variable is the *perceived access to and use of HBW* and is constructed on the basis of two questions. The first regards the availability of flexible arrangements at the workplace “*If you personally needed any, which of the following arrangements are available*

at your workplace?”. From a set of available answers, one of which was “*To work from home on a regular basis*”, respondents were supposed to choose all that apply to them. The second question was asked to those who reported having access to flexible work arrangements: *Do you currently work in any of these ways?* and one of the possible answers was “*To work from home on a regular basis*”. Based on these questions we built our measure of accessibility and use of HBW that consists of three categories:

- *no access* - a woman has no possibility to work from home on a regular basis at her workplace (reference category); this group accounts for 78% of woman-years selected for the analysis of the first-birth risk and 82% of the woman-years for second-birth risk;
- *access, no use or non-regular use* – a woman has the possibility to work from home on a regular basis, but she *either does not make use of this possibility at all or she uses it on a non-regular basis* (15% of the first-birth and 10% of the second-birth woman-years); Unfortunately, we were not able to separate non-regular use of HBW from access but no use of HBW.
- *access, regular use* - a woman works from home on a regular basis (7% of the first-birth and 8% of the second-birth woman-years).

Our approach to measuring HBW pertains thus to its accessibility and use on a regular basis and is consistent with the approach applied in past studies on UKHLS (Chung & Van Der Horst, 2018, 2020). In addition, UKHLS allows for identifying respondents who mainly work at home, by asking them about their main job location. However, there are very few women in our sample who *mainly* work at home (less than 2% of the sample), too few to perform interactions required to test our hypotheses. As such, we include this variable as a control in our models only (robustness checks).

We test our research hypotheses by interacting our main explanatory covariate with a set of moderating variables. The H1 presupposes that HBW is positively related to childbearing if it provides potential to improve the conditions to reconcile paid work and care, e.g. allows women to save on commuting time, separate paid work from family responsibilities thanks to having a spacious apartment or when HBW is not linked with long working hours. We measure the commuting time with responses to the following question: *About how much time does it usually take for you to get to work each day, door to door (in minutes)?*. For most of our respondents the commuting time is larger than zero, besides 103 persons who solely work from home and there is no office they could commute to. Zero answers were retained in our analysis, but we also performed a robustness check to verify whether and how they affect our findings (section on robustness check). Number of bedrooms is used to assess respondents' opportunities

to physically separate paid work from family life and is measured by the question: *How many bedrooms are there here excluding any bedrooms you may let or sublet?*. UKHLS provides also information on the number of usual normal working hours (*Thinking about your (main) job, how many hours, excluding overtime and meal breaks, are you expected to work in a normal week?*) and overtime hours (*And how many hours overtime do you usually work in a normal week?*). Both these numbers were used to calculate the usual total working hours per week. In our next hypothesis, H2, we expect that HBW will be more likely to facilitate fertility decisions for women, whose partners are strongly involved in paid work or relatively little involved in childcare. We are lucky to have information on the number of partner's usual working hours per week, including overtime (built in a similar manner to women's total working hours). We accounted for partners' involvement in childcare, using the question *Who is mainly responsible for looking after the children?*. Furthermore, H3 hypothesises that the relationship between HBW and fertility is shaped by the perceived implications this work arrangement may have on women's professional career. We measure these perceived implications by woman's job anxiety – a variable constructed by the UKHLS team as a sum of the responses to the following question: *Thinking of the past few weeks, how much of the time has your job made you feel tense (1) / uneasy (2) / worried (3)?*

We also included in our models a series of control variables: woman's age (18-24; 25-29; 30-34; 35-39; 40-44), ethnicity (British/Irish; Asian; Indian; Black; Other white; Other), partnership status (Cohabiting; Married), her family orientation (question on *How important is the family to your sense of who you are?*), educational level (Medium or low; High), income (usual gross pay per month in the current job) and period (2009-2012; 2013-2016; 2017-2019). The models for the transition to the second child additionally include age of the first child in years (0-1; 2-3; 4-6; 7 or more) and a dummy variable measuring the use of external childcare (*Do you ever use any type of (external) childcare for your child /-ren?*). Details on control variables as well as summary statistics of all variables used in this analysis can be found in tables: Table 10 and 11.

Our main explanatory variable, the moderating variables and the control covariates are all lagged as the occurrence of a birth happens later than the decision to have a child was made. We lagged them by a year (if a woman was not pregnant in the wave preceding childbearing) or two years (if a woman was already pregnant in the wave before childbearing and this pregnancy ended with a live birth).

Most of the variables we included are measured annually, except for the measure of HBW and job anxiety. These data are collected within the UKHLS *work condition* module, which is

included in the survey every second year, starting with wave 2. We implemented the following strategy to impute these missing data. In waves in which working arrangements were not collected we imputed the missing value by the answers coming from the next nearest wave that collects this information, but only if a woman had not changed the job and employer between these two waves (the so-called *imputation up*). Otherwise, if a woman changed her job or employer, we imputed the missing value by linear bootstrapping (less than 5% of all values were bootstrapped). As such we assumed that flexible work arrangements do not change within the same job/employer. Similarly, data on family orientation were collected every third wave (*Identity* module, wave 2, 5, and 8), and we imputed the missing data by the next/previous nearest non-missing value and bootstrapped the remaining missing cases. We checked the robustness of our results to this imputation strategy (for details see robustness checks).

5. Results

We built our final model stepwise, starting with the basic model of our key explanatory variable (access to and use of HBW) and controls (Model 1) and adding every potential moderating effect (Model 2-6). Out of these models two are discussed: model 1 which contains only main effects and model 6 with all interactions between HBW and the moderating variables (Table 1). All of the remaining models are available in Table 1. The interpretation of our moderating effects is based on predicted birth probabilities (plotted in Figures 1-5). We evaluate whether the difference between two predicted probabilities is significant by comparing 83% confidence intervals. We do it following Austin and Hux (2002) who showed that two probabilities differ from each other with the p-value at around 0.05 if 83% CI do not overlap.

Throughout the section we use the following terminology: we talk about on-site workers when we refer to persons who do not have opportunity (access) to HBW. The remaining persons have access to HBW and may use it regularly (regular home-based workers, regular HBW) or may use it irregularly or not at all (occasional/irregular home-based workers).

5.1 Main Effects


In the first step, we investigate whether access to HBW and its occasional versus regular use are related to fertility transitions in our sample of women (Model 1, Table 1). We find that both categories of women, occasional and regular home-based workers, are less likely to have a first child than women who work on-site and do not declare access to HBW (odds ratios of 0.70 and 0.63 respectively). No significant relationship between HBW, neither regular nor irregular, and second birth risks is observed. Next, we investigate whether the relationships between HBW

and birth transitions depend on women's family and job circumstances, as stated in our hypotheses.

5.2 Conditions for Work-Family Reconciliation

In our first hypothesis (H1), we expected that women who work from home will be more likely to have a child if HBW creates better opportunities for work-family reconciliation. Consistently with this expectation we find that HBW facilitates birth transitions if it allows to save on commuting time. More specifically, women who work from home regularly and live near their workplaces are less likely to have their first child than on-site workers (Figure 1, left-hand side). However, the probability of first birth among women who work from home regularly increases with a rise in commuting time and becomes similar to that of on-site workers once commuting time is half an hour or more. As such, benefits from regular HBW in case of long commuting compensate for drawbacks that this working arrangement brings to childless women. The gains from “no need to commute” are even more evident among mothers: women who have the possibility to work from home (either occasional or regular) and gain a substantial amount of time from no commuting are more likely to have a second child than on-site counterparts, which is not the case at short commuting time (Figure 1, right-hand side).

Figure 1 Predicted probabilities of the first- and second-birth by HBW and commuting time




Source: Own calculations based on UKHLS data

We also verified whether women who work from home are more likely to give birth than onsite working women if they have a spacious apartment. Our findings in that respect are mixed. We do find that the risk of first and second birth increases with the increase in the apartment size among occasional home-based workers (Figure 2). Thus, women who have access to HBW but

use it irregularly (or not at all) and have a large apartment are as likely to have a(nother) child as women with similarly large apartments but without access to HBW. At small apartment sizes, irregular home-based workers are less likely to have a first or second child. These findings could suggest that occasional home-based workers do not fully make use of HBW because they face housing constraints which subsequently limit their opportunities to combine paid work and care and to have a child. This suggestion does not seem plausible, however, given the childbearing behaviours of women who regularly use of HBW. The risk of first birth for these women does not depend on the apartment size and the second birth risk even declines with an increase in the number of bedrooms. In order to better understand the role of apartment size in shaping childbearing behaviours of home-based workers we performed a triple interaction between HBW, apartment size and commuting time as larger apartments may be located in the suburbs. However, this expectation was not supported (Table 4). We also included both of these variables: number of bedrooms and commuting time separately into our models to eliminate their potential confounding effects, and the results hold (Table 3).

Figure 2 Predicted probabilities of the first- and second-birth by HBW and number of bedrooms




Source: Own calculations based on UKHLS data

Finally, we examined whether birth risk is higher when HBW is not accompanied by longer work hours. Our findings are consistent with this expectation but only for childless women and only when it comes to irregular use of HBW. In this group of women, the probability of first birth increases with decreasing number of hours worked per week. Consequently, the risk of entering motherhood is lower among occasional home-based employees working more than 40

hours a week than among on-site workers who work similarly long (Figure 3, left-hand side). We further explored this finding by allowing a non-linear relationship between childbearing and work hours, and the results hold (Table 8). We also checked the triple interaction between HBW, work hours and women's job status (measured by income), as those more established in the labour market might be more prone to turn to motherhood as the negative consequences of entering motherhood for a career development decline with its advancement (Leung, 2016). Nonetheless, the interaction was insignificant and did not change the considered relationship between work hours and childbearing (Table 3).

Figure 3 Predicted probabilities of the first- and second-birth by HBW and women's workhours




Source: Own calculations based on UKHLS data

5.3 The Role of the Partner's Engagement in Paid Work and Childcare


In our second hypothesis (H2), we supposed that women who have the opportunity to HBW may be more likely to have a (subsequent) child if their partners are strongly involved in paid labour (H2a) and/or weakly involved in childcare (H2b). We find no support for the hypothesis H2a, neither in the linear (Figure 4) nor in the non-linear relationship (robustness check). We do find, however, some support for the hypothesis H2b, namely mothers who have access to HBW are more likely to have the second child in case they are more responsible for childcare than their partners (Figure 5). The interaction term between HBW and women's responsibility for childcare is positive for both categories of home-based workers though significant only for occasional HBW (Model 6, Table 1).

Figure 4 Predicted probabilities of the first- and second-birth by HBW and men's workhours



Source: Own calculations based on UKHLS data

Figure 5 Predicted probabilities of the second-birth by HBW and responsibility for childcare




Source: Own calculations based on UKHLS data

5.4 Work-Related Distress and Worries

Next, we hypothesised that the potentially negative consequences of HBW for women's professional career lower birth risk for childless women (H3a), but increase it for mothers who have access to / make use of HBW (H3b). Our findings are quite consistent with these hypotheses. First, we find that childless women are more likely to postpone or even abandon childbearing if they experience high job anxiety while working regularly from home than on-site workers with similar level of job distress (Figure 6, left-hand side). Second, we observe an increase in job anxiety to be related to a very steep rise in second birth risks among regular

home-based workers. As a result, mothers who work from home on a regular basis and experience high levels of job anxiety have the highest probabilities of the second birth (Figure 6, right-hand side). Noteworthy, we do not find first birth risks to decline and second birth risks to increase with a rise in job anxiety for occasional home-based workers.

Figure 6 Predicted probabilities of the first- and second-birth by HBW and job anxiety



Source: Own calculations based on UKHLS data

5.5 Irregular vs Regular Use

Finally, we expected the access to HBW to be as important for the transition to motherhood as the regular use of HBW (H4a) and less important than the regular use for the progression to the second child (H4b). Our evidence in that respect is inconsistent. Our main effect model (Model 1) indeed suggests that access to HBW (no matter whether enacted regularly or not) is negatively related to first birth risks, which stays in line with hypotheses H4a. However, we find no significant relationship between any HBW category and second birth risks (contrary to H4b). The interaction model (Model 6) also provides findings inconsistent with our hypotheses, with the regular use of HBW and access to HBW playing an interchangeable role for birth transitions depending on the woman's circumstances (Figures 1-5).

5.6 Robustness Checks

We performed a series of robustness checks. First, several other possible confounders of the relationship between HBW and birth transitions were considered. These include the type of settlement (urban/rural), distance to woman's mother, woman's occupation, part-time / full-

time contract, incidence of weekend work, job security, time spent on housework, male partner's income and his access to and use of HBW. None of these variables changed the studied relationships (Table 6). Second, we accounted for potential nonlinearity of the relationship between our continuous moderators and the response variable by including categorical covariates instead of continuous, and we did not find any significant change in our findings (Table 5). In particular, we grouped commuting time into several categories, among which one included women whose commuting time was zero. Distinguishing this category did not change our findings, and the estimation coefficients for the moderators and key explanatory variables hold the same (Table 5). Third, we considered the variable "*Main job location: at home*" as a control variable in our models. The findings from the basic model do not change, but in addition to them we find that mothers who mainly work at home are less likely to have the second child (Table 7). However, this finding loses its significance once we interact our major HBW indicators (access to and regular use of HBW) with the moderators (Table 7). Further, several imputations of missing data to HBW and job anxiety measures were made to assess how much imputed values impacts our results. We allowed for different imputations (bootstrapping, imputations up and down) and the results did not change significantly (Table 9). Finally, we verified whether our findings are not affected by the overrepresentation of low educated women, with little access to HBW, in the reference category (on-site workers). To this end, we tested all our hypotheses on a sample of women with high education only and obtained very similar findings to those on a full sample (Table 2).

6. Conclusions and Discussion

In their seminal paper on fertility and women's employment, Brewster and Rindfuss (2000) argued that incompatibilities between paid work and care are a typical characteristic of industrialised societies in which workplaces are situated in distant locations from home and work schedules cannot be easily accommodated to childcare needs. They claimed this physical separation of paid work and family life to be responsible for a dramatic decline in fertility which took place in the second half of the twentieth century in Western Europe, Northern America or Australia as women were massively entering the labour force. No longer than two decades after their publication it was estimated that around 40% of jobs in Western Europe and the US can be entirely performed at home (Dingel & Neiman, 2020). At this stage a question has emerged about the consequences of the possible spread of HBW for fertility. Surprisingly, while plenty of research has investigated the link between HBW and various aspects of workers' lives, no study has yet examined its relation to childbearing. In this paper, we close this gap by examining

whether and under which conditions women who have access to HBW or carry at least some of their paid work at home are more likely to have a(nother) child in the pre-pandemic context of the UK (2009-2019).

We showed that both access to and use of HBW were negatively associated with the transition to motherhood and were unrelated to the progression to second child. This finding is clearly at odds with the idea that bringing paid work home would lead to an increase in fertility. We rather find that HBW may help working women have children, but only in certain circumstances, namely when it improves conditions for work and family reconciliation. This result is very consistent with the literature on HBW and work-life balance, which shows that HBW may facilitate combining paid work and care but it may also intensify tensions between paid work and family life, depending on woman's family and work context (Demerouti et al., 2014; Gajendran & Harrison, 2007). Most importantly, we found that HBW helps women to have children when it entails substantial savings on commuting time. Noteworthy, women who work from home but live close to their office are actually less likely to become mothers than their office-based counterparts. For these women, HBW is thus not beneficial for family formation. We also found small support for the hypothesis that HBW is more likely to facilitate fertility if it is performed in a relatively large apartment, allowing for a physical separation between paid work and family life, and does not entail long working hours. These findings are, however, much more blurred and depend on parity as well as the extent to which HBW is executed. Furthermore, our findings suggest that HBW helps childbearing decisions of those mothers whose partners are little involved in childcare (though we do not find a similar pattern for women whose partners work long hours for pay). This finding is in line with our hypothesis that women who want to combine paid work and care but cannot count on their partners and face limited public childcare provision, as it is in the UK, have to rely on other solutions, such as flexible work arrangements. This finding is also consistent with the past literature which showed that women who choose to work from home do it explicitly to accommodate paid work and family demands without questioning having unequal division of unpaid labour (Bailey & Kurland, 2002; Hilbrecht et al., 2008). Notably, however, women who divide childcare more equally with their partners are not more likely to have a child when they work from home compared to office-based workers which again shows that HBW is not the right solution for all. Apart from affecting women's work-life balance, HBW may also impact women's childbearing behaviours by influencing their work careers. Even though women are more likely to be in the labour force thanks to the possibility of working from home, HBW may also jeopardise their professional careers. Consistently with our expectations, we found that childless women who

work from home and experience job-related stress are more likely to postpone transition to motherhood than on-site workers in the same work situation. Mothers, in contrast, whose regular work from home entails high levels of anxiety tend to escape the stress-causing employment by having another child. Although these differential behaviours of childless women and mothers may seem astonishing at the first sight they find support in the past literature, in particular on employment uncertainty and fertility. These studies suggest an ambiguous relationship between women's employment and fertility (Becker, 1991; Oppenheimer, 1997), with an increasing number of research demonstrating that women in contemporary post-industrial societies postpone the decision to have the first child until they establish their position in the labour market (Kreyenfeld & Andersson, 2014; Matysiak, 2009; Vignoli et al., 2020). Mothers, at the same time, are more limited in their opportunities to improve labour market situation since they already have one child they have to take care of. Hence, HBW does facilitate progression to the second child but as a way out of the dissatisfying work rather than an environment supportive of work and family reconciliation.

All in all, our findings suggest that HBW is not a great remedy to women's incompatibility problems and that bringing paid work home will not result in immediate gains in fertility. We rather show that HBW can help certain women have children, e.g. those who would have to spend much time commuting if they had to work from the office or women who want to combine paid work and care but receive little support from their partners. For larger gains in fertility to be achieved, HBW would have to entail lower costs for the remaining women. These costs may cover larger expectations toward women who work from home to perform more housework and childcare (Ammons & Markham, 2004), higher total workload (Kurowska, 2020) or psychological distress resulting from multitasking or fragmented working time (Hill et al., 2003). Last but not least, HBW may also entail negative consequences for women's work careers, in particular if these are related to the negative perception of female home-workers by employers who associate this work arrangement with lower work commitment and especially if this perception is gendered and related to women's care obligations (Munsch, 2016). Our findings suggest thus that the spread of HBW will not have spectacularly positive effects on fertility without further progress in gender equality and higher acceptance of flexible work arrangements among employers.

Our study is not without limitations. First, our data, which notably is one of the few panel surveys which provides longitudinal information on workplace flexibility, did not allow us to precisely distinguish between access to HBW and its use. We were able to separate those who use HBW on a regular basis from those who have access to HBW but do not use it regularly,

but within the latter group we could not distinguish those workers who do not use HBW at all. Moreover, it remains unclear what 'regular use' means for respondents and how frequent it is. As such, future surveys should pay attention to the way questions on HBW are asked as this way of working will certainly be more widespread in this decade than it was in the years covered by this study. A related issue is whether all survey respondents, who answered the question on having the opportunity to work from home, indeed knew with certainty they have such an option. This problem should be less acute in the future as the COVID-19 pandemic made it much more evident to people which jobs and occupations can be done from home and what are the employers' attitudes to this work arrangement. We tried to minimise it by locating our study in the UK, which provides every employee with the right to ask for work flexibility and yield one of the highest shares of HBW across developed countries. Nonetheless, the numbers of women working regularly from home were quite low, which might have affected the significance of some of our estimates. Finally, our study clearly faces selection problems as women who intend to have a child may be more likely to choose flexible work arrangements before becoming pregnant. Unfortunately, due to data restrictions, we were not able to control for women's fertility intentions, but we accounted for women's family orientation which should at least partly capture women's fertility desires. What is more, if our findings were indeed driven by the selection of women planning a pregnancy into HBW, we should rather find a positive link between HBW and fertility, which we do not. Nonetheless, more research should be conducted on the topic, in particular in the post-pandemic context with more widespread and less selective incidence of HBW.

Despite these limitations, our study provides an important contribution to research in the field of family and work by being a first comprehensive study on HBW and fertility, which not only provides novel empirical findings but also outlines a theoretical framework on how HBW may affect fertility behaviours. As such the study has a potential to stimulate future research on the topic, which will likely become widely discussed among demographers due to a rapid development of information and communication technologies supportive of HBW during the COVID-19 pandemic and the change of employers' and employee's behaviours and attitudes in that respect. Future studies could certainly use better analytical methods in order to address the selection bias or to isolate tempo from quantum effects. More cross-country comparative research is also needed to examine whether our findings hold in other welfare state contexts or gender or care regimes.

7. Tables

TABLE 0. Variables' codebook

Covariate	Levels	Coded in models as
Woman' age	18-24	agecat18-24
	25-29	agecat25-29
	30-34	ref. level
	35-39	agecat35-39
	40 or more	agecat: 40 or more
Period	2009-2012	ref. level
	2013-2016	period2013-2016
	2017-2019	period: 2017+
Ethnicity	British/Irish	ref. level
	Asian	ethn: asian
	Indian	ethn: indian
	Black	ethn: black
	Other white	ethn: other white
	Other	ethn: other
Partnership status	married	ref. level
	cohabiting	cohabiting: TRUE
Family orientation	medium and low	ref. level
	high	famoriented 2
Educational level	medium or low	ref. level
	high	high educational level:
W's income	gross per month, in thousand GBP	scale(paygu_dv)
Home-based work	No access, no use	ref.level
	Access, no use or non regular use	hbw: Access,non-regular
	Access, regular use	hbw: Access,regular use
Commuting time	in minutes	scale(jbttwt)
No. of bedrooms	number	hsbeds
W's workhours	usual + overtime, per week	scale(workhours)
M's workhours	usual + overtime, per week	scale(workhours.p)
Job anxiety subscale	the higher the more anxious	scale(jobanxiety)
Childcare responsibility	other	ref.level
	mainly woman's	husitsW
Use of external childcare	No	ref.level
	Yes	ccare
First child' age	0-1	kagecat0-1
	2-3	ref.level
	4-6	kagecat4-6
	7+	kagecat: 7 or more

TABLE 0. Continued

Interactions between HBW and:

commuting time		hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jbttwt) hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jbttwt)
no.of bedrooms		hbwAccess, non-regular use:hsbeds hbwAccess, regular use:hsbeds
W's workhours		hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours) hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours)
M's workhours		hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours.p) hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours.p)
job anxiety		hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jobanxiety) hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jobanxiety)
Other controls		
Main location of W's job	other places at home	ref.level jblochome
Type of settlement	urban rural	ref.level as.factor(rural)1
Distance to W's mother	Less than 15 minutes 15-30 mins 30 mins - 1 hour 1-2 hours More than 2 hours Abroad	ref.level as.factor(mafar)2 as.factor(mafar)3 as.factor(mafar)4 as.factor(mafar)5 as.factor(mafar)6
W's occupation	ISCO88 1 digit	occupation ISCO 1 digit
Part time job	no yes	ref.level as.factor(jbft_dv)2
Working during weekends	no yes	ref.level weekends: weekends 1
Job security	secure insecure	ref.level insecure
M's to W's income	relative	Mto Wincome
M's home-based work	No access, no use Access, no use or non regular use Access, regular use	ref.level hbw p: Access,non-regular use hbw p: Access,regular use
W's usual housework hours	per week	scale(houseworkHrs)
W's income	square	scale(paygu_dv2)
Commuting time	square	scale(jbttwt2)
W's workhours	square	scale(workhours2)
M's workhours	square	scale(workhours.p2)
Job anxiety	square	scale(jobanxiety2)

TABLE 1. Estimates of the random effect logit model on the probability of first and second births - MAIN RESULTS

CHILDLESS <i>Predictors</i>	Model 0		M1=M0 + moderators		M2=M1 + commuting & hbw		M3=M2 + no.of bedrooms & hbw		M4=M3 + W's workhours & hbw		M5=M4 + M's workhours & hbw		M6 = M5 + job anxiety & hbw		M7 - significant interactions left	
	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	0.314	<0.001	0.259	<0.001	0.257	<0.001	0.274	<0.001	0.276	<0.001	0.275	<0.001	0.275	<0.001	0.256	<0.001
agecat18-24	0.633	0.009	0.689	0.036	0.685	0.034	0.675	0.028	0.677	0.029	0.675	0.028	0.676	0.029	0.688	0.036
agecat25-29	0.756	0.018	0.803	0.068	0.803	0.069	0.799	0.063	0.798	0.061	0.797	0.060	0.794	0.056	0.803	0.069
agecat35-39	0.448	<0.001	0.441	<0.001	0.440	<0.001	0.435	<0.001	0.433	<0.001	0.433	<0.001	0.430	<0.001	0.438	<0.001
agecat: 40 or more	0.039	<0.001	0.045	<0.001	0.046	<0.001	0.045	<0.001	0.045	<0.001	0.045	<0.001	0.045	<0.001	0.045	<0.001
period2013-2016	1.040	0.709	1.033	0.762	1.032	0.769	1.035	0.749	1.035	0.750	1.036	0.740	1.033	0.761	1.031	0.774
period: 2017+	0.696	0.027	0.690	0.026	0.688	0.025	0.686	0.024	0.681	0.021	0.681	0.022	0.683	0.022	0.683	0.022
ethn: asian	0.525	0.047	0.718	0.314	0.732	0.343	0.729	0.338	0.734	0.348	0.735	0.351	0.737	0.355	0.737	0.354
ethn: indian	0.699	0.115	0.667	0.095	0.666	0.094	0.674	0.104	0.676	0.107	0.675	0.107	0.669	0.098	0.667	0.096
ethn: black	0.832	0.599	0.883	0.731	0.877	0.717	0.871	0.703	0.896	0.763	0.894	0.759	0.896	0.761	0.902	0.775
ethn: other white	0.798	0.331	0.950	0.826	0.958	0.856	0.954	0.843	0.965	0.881	0.964	0.878	0.961	0.864	0.968	0.891
ethn: other	0.941	0.881	0.941	0.892	0.971	0.947	0.975	0.955	0.974	0.953	0.978	0.961	0.982	0.968	0.970	0.945
cohabiting: TRUE	0.277	<0.001	0.301	<0.001	0.300	<0.001	0.299	<0.001	0.297	<0.001	0.296	<0.001	0.299	<0.001	0.298	<0.001
famoriented 2	1.622	<0.001	1.548	<0.001	1.549	<0.001	1.553	<0.001	1.556	<0.001	1.558	<0.001	1.558	<0.001	1.552	<0.001
high educational level:	0.987	0.911	1.000	0.998	1.002	0.985	0.998	0.987	0.992	0.948	0.991	0.943	0.997	0.983	0.997	0.981
scale(paygu_dv)	1.246	<0.001	1.218	0.003	1.220	0.003	1.217	0.003	1.222	0.003	1.223	0.003	1.224	0.003	1.225	0.003
hbw: Access,non-regular	0.672	0.006	0.700	0.015	0.705	0.017	0.385	0.038	0.380	0.034	0.375	0.032	0.372	0.031	0.729	0.032
hbw: Access,regular use	0.598	0.010	0.626	0.022	0.551	0.006	0.736	0.626	0.739	0.631	0.741	0.634	0.763	0.669	0.563	0.012
scale(jbttwt)			0.918	0.094	0.889	0.050	0.889	0.050	0.888	0.048	0.888	0.048	0.888	0.048	0.888	0.048
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jbttwt)					0.901	0.504	0.907	0.531	0.919	0.587	0.916	0.577	0.916	0.577	0.910	0.547
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jbttwt)					1.346	0.035	1.348	0.034	1.352	0.033	1.352	0.034	1.388	0.023	1.351	0.033
hsbeds			1.055	0.357	1.056	0.355	1.032	0.624	1.031	0.630	1.032	0.622	1.032	0.625	1.059	0.331
hbwAccess, non-regular use:hsbeds							1.258	0.161	1.283	0.127	1.286	0.123	1.291	0.119		
hbwAccess, regular use:hsbeds							0.900	0.634	0.904	0.652	0.903	0.651	0.886	0.591		
scale(workhours)			1.055	0.368	1.054	0.373	1.055	0.372	1.080	0.218	1.082	0.209	1.080	0.217	1.078	0.225
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours)									0.757	0.133	0.743	0.114	0.727	0.092	0.779	0.173
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours)									0.923	0.744	0.918	0.731	0.960	0.873	0.905	0.680
scale(workhours.p)			1.038	0.449	1.036	0.475	1.037	0.459	1.038	0.448	1.026	0.631	1.026	0.629	1.037	0.468
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours.p)											1.097	0.547	1.102	0.530		

TABLE 1. Continued

hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours.p)										1.034	0.881	1.048	0.836		
scale(jobanxiety)		0.989	0.820	0.985	0.763	0.985	0.765	0.986	0.782	0.987	0.787	0.986	0.794	0.986	0.777
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jobanxiety)												1.107	0.475		
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jobanxiety)												0.785	0.281		
Random Effects															
σ^2	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29
τ_{00}	0.98 _{pidp}	0.80 _{pidp}	0.80 _{pidp}	0.81 _{pidp}	0.82 _{pidp}	0.82 _{pidp}	0.81 _{pidp}	0.82 _{pidp}	0.82 _{pidp}	0.82 _{pidp}	0.81 _{pidp}	0.81 _{pidp}	0.81 _{pidp}	0.81 _{pidp}	0.81 _{pidp}
ICC	0.23	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20
N	2025 _{pidp}	1898 _{pidp}	1898 _{pidp}	1898 _{pidp}	1898 _{pidp}	1898 _{pidp}	1898 _{pidp}	1898 _{pidp}	1898 _{pidp}	1898 _{pidp}	1898 _{pidp}	1898 _{pidp}	1898 _{pidp}	1898 _{pidp}	1898 _{pidp}
Observations	5603	5047	5047	5047	5047	5047	5047	5047	5047	5047	5047	5047	5047	5047	5047
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.231 / 0.407	0.218 / 0.371	0.221 / 0.374	0.222 / 0.376	0.222 / 0.377	0.222 / 0.378	0.223 / 0.376	0.221 / 0.374	0.222 / 0.376	0.222 / 0.377	0.222 / 0.378	0.223 / 0.376	0.221 / 0.374	0.221 / 0.374	0.221 / 0.374

MOTHERS	Model 0		M1=M0 + moderators		M2=M1 + commuting & hbw		M3=M2 + no.of bedrooms & hbw		M4=M3 + W's workhours & hbw		M5=M4 + M's workhours & hbw		M6 = M5 + job anxiety & hbw		M7 - significant interactions left	
	<i>Uaas</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Uaas</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Uaas</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Uaas</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Uaas</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Uaas</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Uaas</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Uaas</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	0.249	<0.001	0.133	<0.001	0.131	<0.001	0.137	<0.001	0.137	<0.001	0.143	<0.001	0.141	<0.001	0.141	<0.001
agecat18-24	1.064	0.753	1.085	0.692	1.074	0.733	1.066	0.758	1.071	0.744	1.082	0.706	1.077	0.725	1.071	0.744
agecat25-29	0.971	0.809	0.989	0.932	0.973	0.831	0.984	0.902	0.986	0.912	0.994	0.962	1.000	0.998	0.997	0.983
agecat35-39	0.619	<0.001	0.607	<0.001	0.604	<0.001	0.614	<0.001	0.612	<0.001	0.614	<0.001	0.619	<0.001	0.623	<0.001
agecat: 40 or more	0.146	<0.001	0.148	<0.001	0.149	<0.001	0.152	<0.001	0.151	<0.001	0.151	<0.001	0.153	<0.001	0.154	<0.001
period2013-2016	0.983	0.864	1.000	0.999	1.006	0.952	1.000	0.996	1.001	0.990	0.994	0.957	1.001	0.993	0.996	0.970
period: 2017+	0.459	<0.001	0.480	<0.001	0.488	<0.001	0.483	<0.001	0.483	<0.001	0.480	<0.001	0.478	<0.001	0.478	<0.001
ethn: asian	1.199	0.507	1.310	0.344	1.332	0.318	1.335	0.314	1.340	0.309	1.316	0.341	1.320	0.338	1.310	0.349
ethn: indian	0.726	0.112	0.842	0.416	0.852	0.450	0.849	0.440	0.845	0.428	0.843	0.425	0.851	0.453	0.854	0.462
ethn: black	1.242	0.467	1.458	0.234	1.530	0.184	1.532	0.184	1.546	0.176	1.523	0.194	1.545	0.183	1.526	0.193
ethn: other white	0.451	0.001	0.463	0.002	0.471	0.003	0.476	0.003	0.478	0.004	0.478	0.004	0.476	0.004	0.475	0.003
ethn: other	1.959	0.058	2.071	0.048	2.140	0.041	2.116	0.044	2.114	0.045	2.217	0.034	2.217	0.034	2.170	0.038
cohabiting: TRUE	0.821	0.091	0.848	0.179	0.837	0.149	0.841	0.161	0.841	0.162	0.843	0.167	0.837	0.155	0.838	0.156
famoriented 2	1.173	0.241	1.159	0.297	1.161	0.296	1.161	0.295	1.166	0.284	1.176	0.260	1.184	0.243	1.168	0.279
high educational level:	1.203	0.084	1.102	0.385	1.103	0.386	1.097	0.412	1.093	0.430	1.087	0.462	1.082	0.490	1.091	0.440
scale(paygu_dv)	0.986	0.797	1.032	0.646	1.030	0.673	1.037	0.608	1.041	0.570	1.045	0.531	1.050	0.494	1.042	0.563
ccare	1.615	<0.001	1.678	<0.001	1.707	<0.001	1.719	<0.001	1.719	<0.001	1.725	<0.001	1.729	<0.001	1.724	<0.001

TABLE 1. Continued

kagecat0-1	0.781	0.037	0.750	0.021	0.749	0.021	0.749	0.021	0.748	0.020	0.745	0.019	0.745	0.019	0.748	0.021
kagecat4-6	0.755	0.044	0.735	0.035	0.734	0.036	0.738	0.039	0.740	0.041	0.744	0.046	0.745	0.047	0.741	0.043
kagecat: 7 or more	0.214	<0.001	0.234	<0.001	0.230	<0.001	0.227	<0.001	0.228	<0.001	0.225	<0.001	0.224	<0.001	0.225	<0.001
hbw: Access,non-regular	0.895	0.469	0.854	0.319	0.745	0.093	0.138	0.004	0.137	0.003	0.075	0.001	0.072	0.001	0.081	0.001
hbw: Access,regular use	1.201	0.289	1.116	0.550	1.052	0.793	3.290	0.077	3.365	0.072	3.115	0.109	3.950	0.061	3.517	0.080
scale(jbttwt)			1.101	0.048	1.010	0.868	1.009	0.885	1.007	0.904	1.007	0.910	1.006	0.916	1.008	0.892
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jbttwt)					1.438	0.013	1.466	0.010	1.469	0.010	1.471	0.012	1.490	0.010	1.460	0.012
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jbttwt)					1.277	0.060	1.254	0.084	1.269	0.072	1.277	0.067	1.263	0.083	1.242	0.103
hsbeds			1.182	0.011	1.185	0.011	1.161	0.042	1.160	0.043	1.160	0.044	1.159	0.045	1.162	0.041
hbwAccess, non-regular use:hsbeds							1.744	0.009	1.747	0.009	1.875	0.004	1.873	0.004	1.851	0.005
hbwAccess, regular use:hsbeds							0.686	0.085	0.686	0.084	0.679	0.080	0.639	0.051	0.647	0.053
scale(workhours)			0.923	0.190	0.923	0.192	0.919	0.173	0.929	0.251	0.922	0.210	0.921	0.204	0.912	0.140
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours)									0.977	0.897	1.032	0.864	1.066	0.736		
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours)									0.879	0.479	0.893	0.539	0.779	0.198		
scale(workhours.p)			0.954	0.343	0.952	0.326	0.955	0.357	0.955	0.357	0.973	0.623	0.973	0.620	0.951	0.324
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours.p)											0.776	0.174	0.770	0.164		
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours.p)											1.029	0.871	0.977	0.896		
husits W			1.337	0.004	1.333	0.005	1.349	0.003	1.350	0.003	1.242	0.053	1.244	0.052	1.245	0.049
hbwAccess, non-regular use:husitsW1											1.965	0.047	2.017	0.040	1.852	0.064
hbwAccess, regular use:husitsW1											1.220	0.583	1.274	0.511	1.344	0.412
scale(jobanxiety)			0.960	0.408	0.959	0.400	0.962	0.439	0.964	0.461	0.963	0.448	0.949	0.345	0.949	0.345
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jobanxiety)													0.826	0.273	0.841	0.316
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jobanxiety)													1.635	0.016	1.513	0.031
Random Effects																
σ^2	3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29	
τ_{00}	0.31 _{pidp}		0.37 _{pidp}		0.40 _{pidp}		0.40 _{pidp}		0.40 _{pidp}		0.41 _{pidp}		0.42 _{pidp}		0.41 _{pidp}	
ICC	0.09		0.10		0.11		0.11		0.11		0.11		0.11		0.11	
N	1802 _{pidp}		1720 _{pidp}		1720 _{pidp}		1720 _{pidp}		1720 _{pidp}		1720 _{pidp}		1720 _{pidp}		1720 _{pidp}	
Observations	4439		4145		4145		4145		4145		4145		4145		4145	
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.316 / 0.375		0.310 / 0.380		0.311 / 0.387		0.317 / 0.391		0.317 / 0.391		0.320 / 0.395		0.322 / 0.400		0.321 / 0.397	

TABLE 2. Estimates of the random effect logit model on the probability of first and second births - HIGHLY EDUCATED WOMEN ONLY

CHILDLESS <i>Predictors</i>	Model 1 for all		Model 1 for highly educated		Model 6 for all		Model 6 for highly educated	
	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	0.259	<0.001	0.345	<0.001	0.275	<0.001	0.381	<0.001
agecat18-24	0.689	0.036	0.463	0.002	0.676	0.029	0.453	0.001
agecat25-29	0.803	0.068	0.730	0.022	0.794	0.056	0.721	0.018
agecat35-39	0.441	<0.001	0.501	<0.001	0.430	<0.001	0.482	<0.001
agecat: 40 or more	0.045	<0.001	0.055	<0.001	0.045	<0.001	0.054	<0.001
ethn: asian	0.718	0.314	0.581	0.128	0.737	0.355	0.600	0.156
ethn: indian	0.667	0.095	0.641	0.101	0.669	0.098	0.637	0.099
ethn: black	0.883	0.731	0.832	0.629	0.896	0.761	0.860	0.693
ethn: other white	0.950	0.826	0.978	0.932	0.961	0.864	1.000	0.999
ethn: other	0.941	0.892	0.772	0.592	0.982	0.968	0.790	0.627
cohabiting: TRUE	0.301	<0.001	0.276	<0.001	0.299	<0.001	0.271	<0.001
period2013-2016	1.033	0.762	0.969	0.796	1.033	0.761	0.975	0.838
period: 2017+	0.690	0.026	0.562	0.002	0.683	0.022	0.554	0.002
famoriented 2	1.548	<0.001	1.323	0.045	1.558	<0.001	1.328	0.044
high educational level:	1.000	0.998			0.997	0.983		
scale(paygu_dv)	1.218	0.003	1.112	0.153	1.224	0.003	1.111	0.160
hbw: Access,non-regular use	0.700	0.015	0.786	0.132	0.372	0.031	0.374	0.047
hbw: Access,regular use	0.626	0.022	0.657	0.057	0.763	0.669	0.619	0.476
scale(jbttwt)	0.918	0.094	0.934	0.248	0.888	0.048	0.890	0.103
hsbeds	1.055	0.357	1.068	0.329	1.032	0.625	1.028	0.722
scale(workhours)	1.055	0.368	1.097	0.168	1.080	0.217	1.127	0.095
scale(jobanxiety)	0.989	0.820	1.037	0.516	0.986	0.794	1.075	0.259
scale(workhours.p)	1.038	0.449	1.027	0.635	1.026	0.629	1.012	0.848
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jbttwt)					0.916	0.577	0.988	0.942
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jbttwt)					1.388	0.023	1.399	0.034
hbwAccess, non-regular use:hsbeds					1.291	0.119	1.334	0.100
hbwAccess, regular use:hsbeds					0.886	0.591	0.998	0.994
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours)					0.727	0.092	0.750	0.169
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours)					0.960	0.873	0.907	0.728
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jobanxiety)					1.107	0.475	0.914	0.567
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jobanxiety)					0.785	0.281	0.710	0.146
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours.p)					1.102	0.530	1.083	0.633
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours.p)					1.048	0.836	1.129	0.611
Random Effects								
σ^2	3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29	
τ_{00}	0.80 _{pidp}		0.55 _{pidp}		0.81 _{pidp}		0.57 _{pidp}	
ICC	0.20		0.14		0.20		0.15	
N	1898 _{pidp}		1318 _{pidp}		1898 _{pidp}		1318 _{pidp}	
Observations	5047		3469		5047		3469	
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.218 / 0.371		0.223 / 0.334		0.223 / 0.376		0.231 / 0.344	

TABLE 2. Continued

MOTHERS <i>Predictors</i>	Model 1 for all		Model 1 for highly educated		Model 6 for all		Model 6 for highly educated	
	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	0.133	<0.001	0.149	<0.001	0.141	<0.001	0.166	<0.001
agecat18-24	1.085	0.692	0.965	0.928	1.077	0.725	0.974	0.948
agecat25-29	0.989	0.932	1.006	0.974	1.000	0.998	1.010	0.956
agecat35-39	0.607	<0.001	0.617	0.003	0.619	<0.001	0.631	0.005
agecat: 40 or more	0.148	<0.001	0.167	<0.001	0.153	<0.001	0.175	<0.001
ethn: asian	1.310	0.344	1.681	0.114	1.320	0.338	1.684	0.120
ethn: indian	0.842	0.416	0.728	0.227	0.851	0.453	0.747	0.276
ethn: black	1.458	0.234	1.372	0.398	1.545	0.183	1.325	0.463
ethn: other white	0.463	0.002	0.392	0.006	0.476	0.004	0.408	0.010
ethn: other	2.071	0.048	3.331	0.010	2.217	0.034	3.670	0.007
cohabiting: TRUE	0.848	0.179	0.738	0.087	0.837	0.155	0.727	0.078
period2013-2016	1.000	0.999	1.025	0.863	1.001	0.993	1.026	0.856
period: 2017+	0.480	<0.001	0.503	0.002	0.478	<0.001	0.500	0.002
famoriented 2	1.159	0.297	1.260	0.216	1.184	0.243	1.308	0.164
kagecat0-1	0.750	0.021	0.652	0.010	0.745	0.019	0.652	0.011
kagecat4-6	0.735	0.035	0.729	0.110	0.745	0.047	0.747	0.146
kagecat: 7 or more	0.234	<0.001	0.267	<0.001	0.224	<0.001	0.253	<0.001
ccare: ccare 1	1.678	<0.001	1.956	<0.001	1.729	<0.001	2.016	<0.001
high educational level:	1.102	0.385			1.082	0.490		
scale(paygu_dv)	1.032	0.646	1.099	0.274	1.050	0.494	1.115	0.214
hbw: Access,non-regular use	0.854	0.319	1.064	0.747	0.072	0.001	0.100	0.009
hbw: Access,regular use	1.116	0.550	1.293	0.246	3.950	0.061	2.846	0.224
scale(jbttwt)	1.101	0.048	1.154	0.025	1.006	0.916	1.078	0.345
hsbeds	1.182	0.011	1.076	0.386	1.159	0.045	1.019	0.844
scale(workhours)	0.923	0.190	0.859	0.061	0.921	0.204	0.848	0.058
scale(jobanxiety)	0.960	0.408	0.958	0.511	0.949	0.345	0.927	0.312
scale(workhours.p)	0.954	0.343	0.962	0.558	0.973	0.620	0.999	0.992
husits W: husits W 1	1.337	0.004	1.567	0.001	1.244	0.052	1.505	0.008
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jbttwt)					1.490	0.010	1.244	0.255
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jbttwt)					1.263	0.083	1.200	0.282
hbwAccess, non-regular use:hsbeds					1.873	0.004	1.922	0.012
hbwAccess, regular use:hsbeds					0.639	0.051	0.780	0.342

TABLE 2. Continued

hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours)			1.066	0.736	1.169	0.482
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours)			0.779	0.198	0.810	0.359
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours.p)			0.770	0.164	0.651	0.093
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours.p)			0.977	0.896	0.953	0.819
hbwAccess, non-regular use:husitsW1			2.017	0.040	1.607	0.236
hbwAccess, regular use:husitsW1			1.274	0.511	1.079	0.862
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jobanxiety)			0.826	0.273	0.814	0.325
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jobanxiety)			1.635	0.016	1.894	0.009
Random Effects						
σ^2	3.29	3.29	3.29		3.29	
τ_{00}	0.37 _{pidp}	0.53 _{pidp}	0.42 _{pidp}		0.59 _{pidp}	
ICC	0.10	0.14	0.11		0.15	
N	1720 _{pidp}	986 _{pidp}	1720 _{pidp}		986 _{pidp}	
Observations	4145	2385	4145		2385	
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.310 / 0.380	0.281 / 0.380	0.322 / 0.400		0.296 / 0.403	

TABLE 3. Estimates of the random effect logit model on the probability of first and second births - MODERATOR INCLUDED SEPARATELY

CHILDLESS <i>Predictors</i>	Model 0		Model 1		M1+commuting time		M1+no. of bedrooms		M1+W's workhours		M1+M's workhours		M1+job anxiety		M6 - all together	
	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>P</i>
(Intercept)	0.314	<0.001	0.259	<0.001	0.257	<0.001	0.276	<0.001	0.258	<0.001	0.258	<0.001	0.259	<0.001	0.275	<0.001
agecat18-24	0.633	0.009	0.689	0.036	0.685	0.034	0.679	0.030	0.691	0.038	0.688	0.036	0.690	0.037	0.676	0.029
agecat25-29	0.756	0.018	0.803	0.068	0.803	0.069	0.799	0.062	0.803	0.067	0.802	0.067	0.801	0.065	0.794	0.056
agecat35-39	0.448	<0.001	0.441	<0.001	0.440	<0.001	0.436	<0.001	0.439	<0.001	0.442	<0.001	0.439	<0.001	0.430	<0.001
agecat: 40 or more	0.039	<0.001	0.045	<0.001	0.046	<0.001	0.045	<0.001	0.045	<0.001	0.045	<0.001	0.045	<0.001	0.045	<0.001
ethn: asian	0.525	0.047	0.718	0.314	0.732	0.343	0.715	0.308	0.723	0.324	0.718	0.315	0.719	0.315	0.737	0.355
ethn: indian	0.699	0.115	0.667	0.095	0.666	0.094	0.675	0.105	0.668	0.096	0.666	0.093	0.664	0.091	0.669	0.098
ethn: black	0.832	0.599	0.883	0.731	0.877	0.717	0.876	0.716	0.905	0.784	0.881	0.726	0.885	0.734	0.896	0.761
ethn: other white	0.798	0.331	0.950	0.826	0.958	0.856	0.946	0.814	0.959	0.860	0.949	0.823	0.947	0.816	0.961	0.864
ethn: other	0.941	0.881	0.941	0.892	0.971	0.947	0.946	0.902	0.941	0.891	0.947	0.903	0.942	0.894	0.982	0.968
cohabiting: TRUE	0.277	<0.001	0.301	<0.001	0.300	<0.001	0.300	<0.001	0.299	<0.001	0.300	<0.001	0.302	<0.001	0.299	<0.001
period2013-2016	1.040	0.709	1.033	0.762	1.032	0.769	1.036	0.742	1.033	0.764	1.034	0.757	1.030	0.780	1.033	0.761
period: 2017+	0.696	0.027	0.690	0.026	0.688	0.025	0.689	0.025	0.686	0.024	0.690	0.026	0.691	0.026	0.683	0.022
famoriented 2	1.622	<0.001	1.548	<0.001	1.549	<0.001	1.552	<0.001	1.551	<0.001	1.550	<0.001	1.547	<0.001	1.558	<0.001
high educational level:	0.987	0.911	1.000	0.998	1.002	0.985	0.995	0.970	0.994	0.962	1.000	0.999	1.003	0.977	0.997	0.983
scale(paygu_dv)	1.246	<0.001	1.218	0.003	1.220	0.003	1.215	0.004	1.223	0.003	1.218	0.003	1.219	0.003	1.224	0.003
hbw: Access,non-regular use	0.672	0.006	0.700	0.015	0.705	0.017	0.378	0.034	0.725	0.029	0.697	0.014	0.700	0.015	0.372	0.031
hbw: Access,regular use	0.598	0.010	0.626	0.022	0.551	0.006	0.822	0.751	0.633	0.034	0.626	0.022	0.627	0.022	0.763	0.669
scale(jbttwt)			0.918	0.094	0.889	0.050	0.919	0.099	0.918	0.097	0.917	0.092	0.920	0.104	0.888	0.048
hsbeds			1.055	0.357	1.056	0.355	1.031	0.637	1.058	0.336	1.056	0.353	1.055	0.363	1.032	0.625
scale(workhours)			1.055	0.368	1.054	0.373	1.056	0.365	1.078	0.229	1.055	0.368	1.054	0.374	1.080	0.217
scale(jobanxiety)			0.989	0.820	0.985	0.763	0.989	0.821	0.990	0.834	0.989	0.820	0.989	0.843	0.986	0.794
scale(workhours.p)			1.038	0.449	1.036	0.475	1.040	0.433	1.039	0.442	1.030	0.582	1.039	0.438	1.026	0.629
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jbttwt)					0.901	0.504									0.916	0.577
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jbttwt)					1.346	0.035									1.388	0.023
hbwAccess, non-regular use:hsbeds							1.264	0.152							1.291	0.119
hbwAccess, regular use:hsbeds							0.906	0.652							0.886	0.591
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours)									0.774	0.162					0.727	0.092
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours)									0.939	0.791					0.960	0.873
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours.p)											1.045	0.772			1.102	0.530
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours.p)											1.063	0.778			1.048	0.836
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jobanxiety)													1.062	0.672	1.107	0.475
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jobanxiety)													0.859	0.475	0.785	0.281
Random Effects																
σ^2	3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29	
τ_{00}	0.98	pidp	0.80	pidp	0.80	pidp	0.81	pidp	0.80	pidp	0.80	pidp	0.79	pidp	0.81	pidp
ICC	0.23		0.20		0.20		0.20		0.20		0.20		0.19		0.20	
N	2025	pidp	1898	pidp	1898	pidp	1898	pidp	1898	pidp	1898	pidp	1898	pidp	1898	pidp
Observations	5603		5047		5047		5047		5047		5047		5047		5047	
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.231 / 0.407		0.218 / 0.371		0.221 / 0.374		0.219 / 0.373		0.218 / 0.371		0.218 / 0.371		0.218 / 0.369		0.223 / 0.376	

TABLE 3. Continued

MOTHERS <i>Predictors</i>	Model 0		Model 1		M1+commuting time		M1+no. of bedrooms		M1+W's workhours		M1+M's workhours		M1+job anxiety		M6 - all together	
	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>P</i>
(Intercept)	0.249	<0.001	0.133	<0.001	0.131	<0.001	0.139	<0.001	0.133	<0.001	0.137	<0.001	0.134	<0.001	0.141	<0.001
agecat18-24	1.064	0.753	1.085	0.692	1.074	0.733	1.076	0.724	1.086	0.690	1.100	0.646	1.077	0.722	1.077	0.725
agecat25-29	0.971	0.809	0.989	0.932	0.973	0.831	1.000	1.000	0.991	0.941	0.997	0.979	0.991	0.942	1.000	0.998
agecat35-39	0.619	<0.001	0.607	<0.001	0.604	<0.001	0.617	<0.001	0.606	<0.001	0.608	<0.001	0.613	<0.001	0.619	<0.001
agecat: 40 or more	0.146	<0.001	0.148	<0.001	0.149	<0.001	0.151	<0.001	0.147	<0.001	0.148	<0.001	0.149	<0.001	0.153	<0.001
ethn: asian	1.199	0.507	1.310	0.344	1.332	0.318	1.316	0.335	1.317	0.335	1.296	0.364	1.304	0.353	1.320	0.338
ethn: indian	0.726	0.112	0.842	0.416	0.852	0.450	0.837	0.399	0.841	0.413	0.843	0.418	0.851	0.446	0.851	0.453
ethn: black	1.242	0.467	1.458	0.234	1.530	0.184	1.471	0.225	1.463	0.231	1.438	0.255	1.477	0.221	1.545	0.183
ethn: other white	0.451	0.001	0.463	0.002	0.471	0.003	0.467	0.003	0.463	0.002	0.465	0.002	0.461	0.002	0.476	0.004
ethn: other	1.959	0.058	2.071	0.048	2.140	0.041	2.039	0.054	2.057	0.051	2.157	0.038	2.067	0.049	2.217	0.034
cohabiting: TRUE	0.821	0.091	0.848	0.179	0.837	0.149	0.853	0.195	0.849	0.180	0.849	0.182	0.845	0.171	0.837	0.155
period2013-2016	0.983	0.864	1.000	0.999	1.006	0.952	0.993	0.946	1.002	0.988	0.995	0.961	1.003	0.979	1.001	0.993
period: 2017+	0.459	<0.001	0.480	<0.001	0.488	<0.001	0.474	<0.001	0.481	<0.001	0.476	<0.001	0.478	<0.001	0.478	<0.001
famoriented 2	1.173	0.241	1.159	0.297	1.161	0.296	1.158	0.300	1.163	0.285	1.169	0.271	1.157	0.303	1.184	0.243
kagecat0-1	0.781	0.037	0.750	0.021	0.749	0.021	0.751	0.021	0.749	0.020	0.746	0.019	0.752	0.022	0.745	0.019
kagecat4-6	0.755	0.044	0.735	0.035	0.734	0.036	0.738	0.038	0.735	0.036	0.739	0.040	0.734	0.035	0.745	0.047
kagecat: 7 or more	0.214	<0.001	0.234	<0.001	0.230	<0.001	0.231	<0.001	0.234	<0.001	0.232	<0.001	0.233	<0.001	0.224	<0.001
ccare: ccare 1	1.615	<0.001	1.678	<0.001	1.707	<0.001	1.687	<0.001	1.682	<0.001	1.681	<0.001	1.675	<0.001	1.729	<0.001
high educational level:	1.203	0.084	1.102	0.385	1.103	0.386	1.095	0.418	1.099	0.396	1.097	0.407	1.100	0.393	1.082	0.490
scale(paygu_dv)	0.986	0.797	1.032	0.646	1.030	0.673	1.040	0.569	1.033	0.644	1.035	0.616	1.035	0.622	1.050	0.494
hbw: Access,non-regular use	0.895	0.469	0.854	0.319	0.745	0.093	0.174	0.008	0.847	0.300	0.622	0.054	0.846	0.295	0.072	0.001
hbw: Access,regular use	1.201	0.289	1.116	0.550	1.052	0.793	3.677	0.050	1.138	0.488	1.010	0.969	1.159	0.425	3.950	0.061
scale(jbttwt)			1.101	0.048	1.010	0.868	1.097	0.058	1.101	0.047	1.100	0.052	1.100	0.051	1.006	0.916
hsbeds			1.182	0.011	1.185	0.011	1.162	0.039	1.182	0.011	1.188	0.009	1.178	0.013	1.159	0.045
scale(workhours)			0.923	0.190	0.923	0.192	0.919	0.169	0.925	0.221	0.922	0.187	0.916	0.154	0.921	0.204
scale(jobanxiety)			0.960	0.408	0.959	0.400	0.963	0.446	0.961	0.419	0.960	0.413	0.947	0.316	0.949	0.345
scale(workhours.p)			0.954	0.343	0.952	0.326	0.958	0.387	0.954	0.342	0.973	0.611	0.949	0.297	0.973	0.620
husits W: husits W 1			1.337	0.004	1.333	0.005	1.354	0.003	1.338	0.004	1.239	0.053	1.344	0.003	1.244	0.052
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jbttwt)					1.438	0.013									1.490	0.010
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jbttwt)					1.277	0.060									1.263	0.083
hbwAccess, non-regular use:hsbeds							1.694	0.011							1.873	0.004
hbwAccess, regular use:hsbeds							0.673	0.068							0.639	0.051
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours)									1.061	0.730					1.066	0.736
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours)									0.917	0.622					0.779	0.198
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours.p)											0.840	0.320			0.770	0.164
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours.p)											0.964	0.829			0.977	0.896
hbwAccess, non-regular use:husitsW1											1.751	0.079			2.017	0.040
hbwAccess, regular use:husitsW1											1.205	0.596			1.274	0.511
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jobanxiety)													0.878	0.429	0.826	0.273
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jobanxiety)													1.450	0.047	1.635	0.016

TABLE 3. Continued

Random Effects								
σ^2	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29
τ_{00}	0.31 _{pidp}	0.37 _{pidp}	0.40 _{pidp}	0.37 _{pidp}	0.37 _{pidp}	0.38 _{pidp}	0.37 _{pidp}	0.42 _{pidp}
ICC	0.09	0.10	0.11	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.11
N	1802 _{pidp}	1720 _{pidp}	1720 _{pidp}	1720 _{pidp}	1720 _{pidp}	1720 _{pidp}	1720 _{pidp}	1720 _{pidp}
Observations	4439	4145	4145	4145	4145	4145	4145	4145
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.316 / 0.375	0.310 / 0.380	0.311 / 0.387	0.315 / 0.384	0.310 / 0.380	0.311 / 0.383	0.312 / 0.382	0.322 / 0.400

TABLE 4. Estimates of the random effect logit model on the probability of first and second births - FURTHER INTERACTIONS

CHILDLESS	Model 0		Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 3+commuting time&no. of bedrooms		Model 4		Model 4+W's income&W's workhours		Model 6 - full model	
	Odds Ratios	p	Odds Ratios	p	Odds Ratios	p	Odds Ratios	p	Odds Ratios	p	Odds Ratios	p	Odds Ratios	p	Odds Ratios	p
(Intercept)	0.314	<0.001	0.259	<0.001	0.257	<0.001	0.274	<0.001	0.275	<0.001	0.276	<0.001	0.278	<0.001	0.275	<0.001
agecat18-24	0.633	0.009	0.689	0.036	0.685	0.034	0.675	0.028	0.675	0.028	0.677	0.029	0.678	0.030	0.676	0.029
agecat25-29	0.756	0.018	0.803	0.068	0.803	0.069	0.799	0.063	0.799	0.062	0.798	0.061	0.798	0.061	0.794	0.056
agecat35-39	0.448	<0.001	0.441	<0.001	0.440	<0.001	0.435	<0.001	0.435	<0.001	0.433	<0.001	0.433	<0.001	0.430	<0.001
agecat: 40 or more	0.039	<0.001	0.045	<0.001	0.046	<0.001	0.045	<0.001	0.045	<0.001	0.045	<0.001	0.045	<0.001	0.045	<0.001
ethn: asian	0.525	0.047	0.718	0.314	0.732	0.343	0.729	0.338	0.725	0.330	0.734	0.348	0.735	0.350	0.737	0.355
ethn: indian	0.699	0.115	0.667	0.095	0.666	0.094	0.674	0.104	0.677	0.108	0.676	0.107	0.677	0.109	0.669	0.098
ethn: black	0.832	0.599	0.883	0.731	0.877	0.717	0.871	0.703	0.870	0.701	0.896	0.763	0.901	0.773	0.896	0.761
ethn: other white	0.798	0.331	0.950	0.826	0.958	0.856	0.954	0.843	0.955	0.843	0.965	0.881	0.966	0.884	0.961	0.864
ethn: other	0.941	0.881	0.941	0.892	0.971	0.947	0.975	0.955	0.968	0.942	0.974	0.953	0.975	0.954	0.982	0.968
cohabiting: TRUE	0.277	<0.001	0.301	<0.001	0.300	<0.001	0.299	<0.001	0.299	<0.001	0.297	<0.001	0.297	<0.001	0.299	<0.001
period2013-2016	1.040	0.709	1.033	0.762	1.032	0.769	1.035	0.749	1.035	0.750	1.035	0.750	1.034	0.753	1.033	0.761
period: 2017+	0.696	0.027	0.690	0.026	0.688	0.025	0.686	0.024	0.685	0.023	0.681	0.021	0.680	0.021	0.683	0.022
famoriented 2	1.622	<0.001	1.548	<0.001	1.549	<0.001	1.553	<0.001	1.554	<0.001	1.556	<0.001	1.554	<0.001	1.558	<0.001
high educational level:	0.987	0.911	1.000	0.998	1.002	0.985	0.998	0.987	0.997	0.980	0.992	0.948	0.992	0.949	0.997	0.983
scale(paygu_dv)	1.246	<0.001	1.218	0.003	1.220	0.003	1.217	0.003	1.218	0.003	1.222	0.003	1.227	0.003	1.224	0.003
hbw: Access,non-regular use	0.672	0.006	0.700	0.015	0.705	0.017	0.385	0.038	0.384	0.037	0.380	0.034	0.379	0.034	0.372	0.031
hbw: Access,regular use	0.598	0.010	0.626	0.022	0.551	0.006	0.736	0.626	0.720	0.604	0.739	0.631	0.734	0.624	0.763	0.669
scale(jbttwt)			0.918	0.094	0.889	0.050	0.889	0.050	0.930	0.624	0.888	0.048	0.888	0.048	0.888	0.048
hsbeds			1.055	0.357	1.056	0.355	1.032	0.624	1.031	0.631	1.031	0.630	1.031	0.633	1.032	0.625
scale(workhours)			1.055	0.368	1.054	0.373	1.055	0.372	1.055	0.371	1.080	0.218	1.074	0.270	1.080	0.217
scale(jobanxiety)			0.989	0.820	0.985	0.763	0.985	0.765	0.985	0.761	0.986	0.782	0.987	0.785	0.986	0.794
scale(workhours.p)			1.038	0.449	1.036	0.475	1.037	0.459	1.037	0.462	1.038	0.448	1.039	0.442	1.026	0.629
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jbttwt)					0.901	0.504	0.907	0.531	0.908	0.539	0.919	0.587	0.919	0.588	0.916	0.577
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jbttwt)					1.346	0.035	1.348	0.034	1.354	0.032	1.352	0.033	1.352	0.033	1.388	0.023
hbwAccess, non-regular use:hsbeds							1.258	0.161	1.259	0.159	1.283	0.127	1.282	0.127	1.291	0.119
hbwAccess, regular use:hsbeds							0.900	0.634	0.907	0.659	0.904	0.652	0.905	0.657	0.886	0.591
scale(jbttwt):hsbeds									0.983	0.740						
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours)											0.757	0.133	0.761	0.145	0.727	0.092
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours)											0.923	0.744	0.932	0.777	0.960	0.873
scale(paygu_dv):scale(workhours)													0.988	0.782		
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jobanxiety)															1.107	0.475
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jobanxiety)															0.785	0.281
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours.p)															1.102	0.530
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours.p)															1.048	0.836
Random Effects																
σ^2	3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29	
τ_{00}	0.98	τ_{pidp}	0.80	τ_{pidp}	0.80	τ_{pidp}	0.81	τ_{pidp}	0.81	τ_{pidp}	0.82	τ_{pidp}	0.81	τ_{pidp}	0.81	τ_{pidp}
ICC	0.23		0.20		0.20		0.20		0.20		0.20		0.20		0.20	
N	2025	τ_{pidp}	1898	τ_{pidp}	1898	τ_{pidp}	1898	τ_{pidp}	1898	τ_{pidp}	1898	τ_{pidp}	1898	τ_{pidp}	1898	τ_{pidp}
Observations	5603		5047		5047		5047		5047		5047		5047		5047	
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.231 / 0.407		0.218 / 0.371		0.221 / 0.374		0.222 / 0.376		0.222 / 0.376		0.222 / 0.377		0.222 / 0.376		0.223 / 0.376	

TABLE 4. Continued

MOTHERS <i>Predictors</i>	Model 0		Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model		Model 4		Model 4+W's		Model 6 - full	
	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	0.249	<0.001	0.133	<0.001	0.131	<0.001	0.137	<0.001	0.139	<0.001	0.137	<0.001	0.133	<0.001	0.141	<0.001
agecat18-24	1.064	0.753	1.085	0.692	1.074	0.733	1.066	0.758	1.076	0.724	1.071	0.744	1.086	0.690	1.077	0.725
agecat25-29	0.971	0.809	0.989	0.932	0.973	0.831	0.984	0.902	1.000	1.000	0.986	0.912	0.991	0.941	1.000	0.998
agecat35-39	0.619	<0.001	0.607	<0.001	0.604	<0.001	0.614	<0.001	0.617	<0.001	0.612	<0.001	0.606	<0.001	0.619	<0.001
agecat: 40 or more	0.146	<0.001	0.148	<0.001	0.149	<0.001	0.152	<0.001	0.151	<0.001	0.151	<0.001	0.147	<0.001	0.153	<0.001
ethn: asian	1.199	0.507	1.310	0.344	1.332	0.318	1.335	0.314	1.316	0.335	1.340	0.309	1.317	0.335	1.320	0.338
ethn: indian	0.726	0.112	0.842	0.416	0.852	0.450	0.849	0.440	0.837	0.399	0.845	0.428	0.841	0.413	0.851	0.453
ethn: black	1.242	0.467	1.458	0.234	1.530	0.184	1.532	0.184	1.471	0.225	1.546	0.176	1.463	0.231	1.545	0.183
ethn: other white	0.451	0.001	0.463	0.002	0.471	0.003	0.476	0.003	0.467	0.003	0.478	0.004	0.463	0.002	0.476	0.004
ethn: other	1.959	0.058	2.071	0.048	2.140	0.041	2.116	0.044	2.039	0.054	2.114	0.045	2.057	0.051	2.217	0.034
cohabiting: TRUE	0.821	0.091	0.848	0.179	0.837	0.149	0.841	0.161	0.853	0.195	0.841	0.162	0.849	0.180	0.837	0.155
period2013-2016	0.983	0.864	1.000	0.999	1.006	0.952	1.000	0.996	0.993	0.946	1.001	0.990	1.002	0.988	1.001	0.993
period: 2017+	0.459	<0.001	0.480	<0.001	0.488	<0.001	0.483	<0.001	0.474	<0.001	0.483	<0.001	0.481	<0.001	0.478	<0.001
famoriented 2	1.173	0.241	1.159	0.297	1.161	0.296	1.161	0.295	1.158	0.300	1.166	0.284	1.163	0.285	1.184	0.243
kagecat0-1	0.781	0.037	0.750	0.021	0.749	0.021	0.749	0.021	0.751	0.021	0.748	0.020	0.749	0.020	0.745	0.019
kagecat4-6	0.755	0.044	0.735	0.035	0.734	0.036	0.738	0.039	0.738	0.038	0.740	0.041	0.735	0.036	0.745	0.047
kagecat: 7 or more	0.214	<0.001	0.234	<0.001	0.230	<0.001	0.227	<0.001	0.231	<0.001	0.228	<0.001	0.234	<0.001	0.224	<0.001
ccare: ccare 1	1.615	<0.001	1.678	<0.001	1.707	<0.001	1.719	<0.001	1.687	<0.001	1.719	<0.001	1.682	<0.001	1.729	<0.001
high educational level:	1.203	0.084	1.102	0.385	1.103	0.386	1.097	0.412	1.095	0.418	1.093	0.430	1.099	0.396	1.082	0.490
scale(paygu_dv)	0.986	0.797	1.032	0.646	1.030	0.673	1.037	0.608	1.040	0.569	1.041	0.570	1.033	0.644	1.050	0.494
hbw: Access,non-regular use	0.895	0.469	0.854	0.319	0.745	0.093	0.138	0.004	0.174	0.008	0.137	0.003	0.847	0.300	0.072	0.001
hbw: Access,regular use	1.201	0.289	1.116	0.550	1.052	0.793	3.290	0.077	3.677	0.050	3.365	0.072	1.138	0.488	3.950	0.061
scale(jbttwt)			1.101	0.048	1.010	0.868	1.009	0.885	1.097	0.058	1.007	0.904	1.101	0.047	1.006	0.916
hsbeds			1.182	0.011	1.185	0.011	1.161	0.042	1.162	0.039	1.160	0.043	1.182	0.011	1.159	0.045
scale(workhours)			0.923	0.190	0.923	0.192	0.919	0.173	0.919	0.169	0.929	0.251	0.925	0.221	0.921	0.204
scale(jobanxiety)			0.960	0.408	0.959	0.400	0.962	0.439	0.963	0.446	0.964	0.461	0.961	0.419	0.949	0.345
scale(workhours.p)			0.954	0.343	0.952	0.326	0.955	0.357	0.958	0.387	0.955	0.357	0.954	0.342	0.973	0.620
husits W: husits W 1			1.337	0.004	1.333	0.005	1.349	0.003	1.354	0.003	1.350	0.003	1.338	0.004	1.244	0.052
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jbttwt)					1.438	0.013	1.466	0.010			1.469	0.010			1.490	0.010
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jbttwt)					1.277	0.060	1.254	0.084			1.269	0.072			1.263	0.083
hbwAccess, non-regular use:hsbeds							1.744	0.009	1.694	0.011	1.747	0.009			1.873	0.004
hbwAccess, regular use:hsbeds							0.686	0.085	0.673	0.068	0.686	0.084			0.639	0.051
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours)											0.977	0.897	1.061	0.730	1.066	0.736
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours)											0.879	0.479	0.917	0.622	0.779	0.198
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours.p)															0.770	0.164
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours.p)															0.977	0.896
hbwAccess, non-regular use:husitsW1															2.017	0.040
hbwAccess, regular use:husitsW1															1.274	0.511
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jobanxiety)															0.826	0.273
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jobanxiety)															1.635	0.016

TABLE 4. Continued

Random Effects								
σ^2	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29
τ_{00}	0.31 _{pidp}	0.37 _{pidp}	0.40 _{pidp}	0.40 _{pidp}	0.37 _{pidp}	0.40 _{pidp}	0.37 _{pidp}	0.42 _{pidp}
ICC	0.09	0.10	0.11	0.11	0.10	0.11	0.10	0.11
N	1802 _{pidp}	1720 _{pidp}	1720 _{pidp}	1720 _{pidp}	1720 _{pidp}	1720 _{pidp}	1720 _{pidp}	1720 _{pidp}
Observations	4439	4145	4145	4145	4145	4145	4145	4145
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.316 / 0.375	0.310 / 0.380	0.311 / 0.387	0.317 / 0.391	0.315 / 0.384	0.317 / 0.391	0.310 / 0.380	0.322 / 0.400

TABLE 5. Estimates of the random effect logit model on the probability of first and second births - CATEGORICAL MODERATORS INCLUDED

CHILDLESS <i>Predictors</i>	Model 6		Commuting time as categorical		W's workhours as categorical		M's workhours as categorical		Job anxiety as categorical	
	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	0.275	<0.001	0.294	<0.001	0.283	<0.001	0.278	<0.001	0.271	<0.001
agecat18-24	0.676	0.029	0.675	0.028	0.687	0.036	0.678	0.030	0.672	0.026
agecat25-29	0.794	0.056	0.789	0.045	0.798	0.061	0.793	0.055	0.790	0.050
agecat35-39	0.430	<0.001	0.432	<0.001	0.423	<0.001	0.431	<0.001	0.429	<0.001
agecat: 40 or more	0.045	<0.001	0.044	<0.001	0.044	<0.001	0.045	<0.001	0.045	<0.001
ethn: asian	0.737	0.355	0.742	0.370	0.728	0.337	0.730	0.342	0.747	0.377
ethn: indian	0.669	0.098	0.664	0.089	0.667	0.097	0.669	0.100	0.676	0.106
ethn: black	0.896	0.761	0.880	0.727	0.914	0.806	0.903	0.779	0.897	0.765
ethn: other white	0.961	0.864	0.970	0.899	0.960	0.862	0.978	0.926	0.940	0.793
ethn: other	0.982	0.968	0.975	0.956	0.978	0.960	0.974	0.953	0.966	0.938
cohabiting: TRUE	0.299	<0.001	0.297	<0.001	0.299	<0.001	0.296	<0.001	0.299	<0.001
period2013-2016	1.033	0.761	1.040	0.702	1.039	0.724	1.041	0.710	1.037	0.736
period: 2017+	0.683	0.022	0.695	0.028	0.680	0.021	0.689	0.026	0.684	0.023
famoriented 2	1.558	<0.001	1.553	0.001	1.557	<0.001	1.548	<0.001	1.555	<0.001
high educational level:	0.997	0.983	1.001	0.993	0.995	0.964	0.991	0.939	0.991	0.942
scale(paygu_dv)	1.224	0.003	1.210	0.005	1.272	<0.001	1.230	0.002	1.220	0.003
hbw: Access,non-regular use	0.372	0.031	0.394	0.055	0.358	0.027	0.407	0.054	0.375	0.039
hbw: Access,regular use	0.763	0.669	0.592	0.445	0.745	0.646	0.864	0.821	0.839	0.793
scale(jbttwt)	0.888	0.048			0.882	0.038	0.887	0.046	0.887	0.046
hsbeds	1.032	0.625	1.031	0.641	1.028	0.671	1.031	0.634	1.031	0.631
scale(workhours)	1.080	0.217	1.082	0.212			1.079	0.225	1.077	0.235
scale(jobanxiety)	0.986	0.794	0.984	0.776	0.991	0.875	0.986	0.796		
scale(workhours.p)	1.026	0.629	1.029	0.598	1.032	0.554			1.026	0.628
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jbttwt)	0.916	0.577			0.916	0.580	0.947	0.731	0.932	0.653
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jbttwt)	1.388	0.023			1.396	0.022	1.414	0.017	1.362	0.031
hbwAccess, non-regular use:hsbeds	1.291	0.119	1.295	0.123	1.298	0.109	1.287	0.124	1.303	0.106
hbwAccess, regular use:hsbeds	0.886	0.591	0.875	0.565	0.899	0.637	0.881	0.578	0.900	0.641
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours)	0.727	0.092	0.717	0.102			0.719	0.088	0.743	0.119
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours)	0.960	0.873	0.960	0.876			0.969	0.906	0.951	0.844
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jobanxiety)	1.107	0.475	1.120	0.435	1.125	0.410	1.115	0.448		
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jobanxiety)	0.785	0.281	0.771	0.264	0.793	0.299	0.791	0.299		
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours.p)	1.102	0.530	1.081	0.623	1.107	0.510			1.091	0.567
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours.p)	1.048	0.836	1.028	0.907	1.049	0.833			1.024	0.916

TABLE 5. Continued

comtime: 0 min		0.989	0.983			
comtime31-60 min		0.856	0.226			
comtime: 61 min or more		0.641	0.146			
hbwAccess, non-regular use:comtime0 min		0.000	0.981			
hbwAccess, regular use:comtime0 min		1.239	0.807			
hbwAccess, non-regular use:comtime31-60 min		0.753	0.384			
hbwAccess, regular use:comtime31-60 min		1.539	0.382			
hbwAccess, non-regular use:comtime61 min or more		2.218	0.223			
hbwAccess, regular use:comtime61 min or more		5.932	0.004			
wrkhrs: 30 or less				0.898	0.540	
wrkhrs: 50 or more				0.985	0.929	
hbwAccess, non-regular use:wrkhrs30 or less				2.752	0.070	
hbwAccess, regular use:wrkhrs30 or less				0.996	0.996	
hbwAccess, non-regular use:wrkhrs50 or more				0.287	0.040	
hbwAccess, regular use:wrkhrs50 or more				0.721	0.593	
wrkhrs.p31-49						0.890 0.616
wrkhrs p: wrkhrs: 50 or more						1.023 0.865
hbwAccess, non-regular use:wrkhrs.p31-49						0.000 0.938
hbwAccess, regular use:wrkhrs.p31-49						0.713 0.709
hbwAccess, non-regular use:wrkhrs.p50 or more						0.851 0.653
hbwAccess, regular use:wrkhrs.p50 or more						0.528 0.242
jobanx: medium						1.058 0.621
jobanx: high						1.022 0.913
hbwAccess, non-regular use:jobanxmedium						0.748 0.371
hbwAccess, regular use:jobanxmedium						0.743 0.483
hbwAccess, non-regular use:jobanxhigh						1.676 0.267
hbwAccess, regular use:jobanxhigh						0.947 0.947
Random Effects						
σ^2	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29
τ_{00}	0.81 _{pidp}	0.82 _{pidp}	0.82 _{pidp}	0.83 _{pidp}	0.80 _{pidp}	0.80 _{pidp}
ICC	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20
N	1898 _{pidp}	1898 _{pidp}	1898 _{pidp}	1898 _{pidp}	1898 _{pidp}	1898 _{pidp}
Observations	5047	5047	5047	5047	5047	5047
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.223 / 0.376	0.262 / 0.409	0.226 / 0.380	0.386 / 0.509	0.224 / 0.376	

MOTHERS <i>Predictors</i>	Model 6		Commuting time as categorical		W's workhours as categorical		M's workhours as categorical		Job anxiety as categorical	
	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	0.141	<0.001	0.140	<0.001	0.129	<0.001	0.138	<0.001	0.148	<0.001
agecat18-24	1.077	0.725	1.090	0.678	1.075	0.731	1.074	0.736	1.078	0.725
agecat25-29	1.000	0.998	1.011	0.935	1.000	0.998	0.993	0.959	0.993	0.957
agecat35-39	0.619	<0.001	0.621	<0.001	0.617	<0.001	0.618	<0.001	0.616	<0.001
agecat: 40 or more	0.153	<0.001	0.152	<0.001	0.152	<0.001	0.152	<0.001	0.150	<0.001
ethn: asian	1.320	0.338	1.305	0.352	1.324	0.334	1.340	0.312	1.296	0.377
ethn: indian	0.851	0.453	0.873	0.526	0.858	0.477	0.844	0.430	0.829	0.386
ethn: black	1.545	0.183	1.555	0.171	1.591	0.158	1.529	0.195	1.475	0.242
ethn: other white	0.476	0.004	0.470	0.003	0.481	0.004	0.471	0.003	0.472	0.003
ethn: other	2.217	0.034	2.130	0.039	2.259	0.031	2.146	0.043	2.240	0.034
cohabiting: TRUE	0.837	0.155	0.843	0.165	0.833	0.145	0.827	0.130	0.832	0.143
period2013-2016	1.001	0.993	1.005	0.959	0.996	0.972	1.004	0.968	1.013	0.901
period: 2017+	0.478	<0.001	0.477	<0.001	0.475	<0.001	0.480	<0.001	0.483	<0.001
famoriented 2	1.184	0.243	1.187	0.236	1.192	0.227	1.181	0.251	1.175	0.267
kagecat0-1	0.745	0.019	0.753	0.014	0.743	0.019	0.739	0.016	0.738	0.016
kagecat4-6	0.745	0.047	0.750	0.051	0.746	0.049	0.739	0.041	0.749	0.053
kagecat: 7 or more	0.224	<0.001	0.223	<0.001	0.223	<0.001	0.224	<0.001	0.221	<0.001
ccare: ccare 1	1.729	<0.001	1.718	<0.001	1.731	<0.001	1.723	<0.001	1.734	<0.001
high educational level:	1.082	0.490	1.073	0.533	1.072	0.544	1.077	0.516	1.079	0.507
scale(paygu_dv)	1.050	0.494	1.056	0.443	1.041	0.564	1.046	0.527	1.045	0.544
hbw: Access,non-regular use	0.072	0.001	0.061	<0.001	0.075	0.001	0.085	0.001	0.096	0.002
hbw: Access,regular use	3.950	0.061	3.889	0.071	3.244	0.110	4.995	0.032	2.750	0.168
scale(jbttwt)	1.006	0.916			1.006	0.925	1.006	0.917	1.005	0.928
hsbeds	1.159	0.045	1.159	0.043	1.159	0.046	1.168	0.035	1.158	0.048
scale(workhours)	0.921	0.204	0.919	0.189			0.925	0.227	0.923	0.219
scale(jobanxiety)	0.949	0.345	0.950	0.349	0.945	0.303	0.949	0.342		
scale(workhours.p)	0.973	0.620	0.974	0.636	0.970	0.585			0.973	0.624
husits W: husits W 1	1.244	0.052	1.242	0.053	1.241	0.055	1.262	0.039	1.245	0.052
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jbttwt)	1.490	0.010			1.501	0.009	1.453	0.015	1.473	0.013
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jbttwt)	1.263	0.083			1.255	0.093	1.270	0.080	1.289	0.064
hbwAccess, non-regular use:hsbeds	1.873	0.004	1.984	0.002	1.882	0.004	1.840	0.006	1.863	0.005
hbwAccess, regular use:hsbeds	0.639	0.051	0.656	0.069	0.640	0.052	0.629	0.045	0.672	0.078
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours)	1.066	0.736	1.061	0.754			1.073	0.711	1.092	0.645
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours)	0.779	0.198	0.742	0.129			0.785	0.215	0.744	0.137
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours.p)	0.770	0.164	0.776	0.170	0.771	0.168			0.774	0.178
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours.p)	0.977	0.896	1.020	0.912	0.984	0.928			0.980	0.910

TABLE 5. Continued

hbwAccess, non-regular use:husitsW1	2.017	0.040	2.176	0.022	1.993	0.045	1.869	0.068	1.995	0.046
hbwAccess, regular use:husitsW1	1.274	0.511	1.283	0.497	1.283	0.498	1.235	0.568	1.132	0.740
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jobanxiety)	0.826	0.273	0.816	0.241	0.835	0.304	0.833	0.293		
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jobanxiety)	1.635	0.016	1.618	0.017	1.641	0.017	1.681	0.011		
comtime: 0 min			1.151	0.726						
comtime31-60 min			1.010	0.942						
comtime: 61 min or more			1.135	0.717						
hbwAccess, non-regular use:comtime0 min			0.000	0.980						
hbwAccess, regular use:comtime0 min			0.390	0.148						
hbwAccess, non-regular use:comtime31-60 min			1.313	0.437						
hbwAccess, regular use:comtime31-60 min			1.796	0.171						
hbwAccess, non-regular use:comtime61 min or more			3.520	0.071						
hbwAccess, regular use:comtime61 min or more			1.037	0.958						
wrkhrs: 30 or less					1.196	0.155				
wrkhrs: 50 or more					1.273	0.332				
hbwAccess, non-regular use:wrkhrs30 or less					0.929	0.829				
hbwAccess, regular use:wrkhrs30 or less					1.792	0.140				
hbwAccess, non-regular use:wrkhrs50 or more					0.745	0.737				
hbwAccess, regular use:wrkhrs50 or more					0.516	0.376				
wrkhrs.p31-49							1.431	0.103		
wrkhrs p: wrkhrs: 50 or more							0.982	0.892		
hbwAccess, non-regular use:wrkhrs.p31-49							0.655	0.650		
hbwAccess, regular use:wrkhrs.p31-49							0.472	0.288		
hbwAccess, non-regular use:wrkhrs.p50 or more							0.860	0.703		
hbwAccess, regular use:wrkhrs.p50 or more							0.605	0.258		
jobanx: medium									0.945	0.631
jobanx: high									0.850	0.431
hbwAccess, non-regular use:jobanxmedium									0.425	0.028
hbwAccess, regular use:jobanxmedium									1.392	0.425
hbwAccess, non-regular use:jobanxhigh									0.790	0.695
hbwAccess, regular use:jobanxhigh									9.640	0.005
Random Effects										
σ^2	3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29	
τ_{00}	0.42 _{pidp}		0.41 _{pidp}		0.44 _{pidp}		0.43 _{pidp}		0.46 _{pidp}	
ICC	0.11		0.11		0.12		0.11		0.12	
N	1720 _{pidp}		1720 _{pidp}		1720 _{pidp}		1720 _{pidp}		1720 _{pidp}	
Observations	4145		4145		4145		4145		4145	
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.322 / 0.400		0.388 / 0.457		0.323 / 0.402		0.322 / 0.400		0.324 / 0.407	

TABLE 6. Continued

hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jbttwt)	1.490	0.010	1.491	0.010	1.450	0.019	1.494	0.009	1.484	0.011	1.496	0.009	1.491	0.010	1.501	0.009	1.450	0.029	1.485	0.011	1.508	0.008
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jbttwt)	1.263	0.083	1.269	0.078	1.224	0.142	1.266	0.080	1.259	0.088	1.257	0.091	1.263	0.084	1.262	0.085	1.172	0.309	1.259	0.088	1.270	0.077
hbwAccess, non-regular use:hsbeds	1.873	0.004	1.867	0.004	1.904	0.005	1.868	0.004	1.877	0.004	1.864	0.005	1.875	0.004	1.879	0.004	1.992	0.005	1.861	0.005	1.880	0.004
hbwAccess, regular use:hsbeds	0.639	0.051	0.641	0.052	0.643	0.063	0.655	0.065	0.637	0.050	0.638	0.050	0.639	0.050	0.636	0.049	0.519	0.018	0.632	0.046	0.649	0.060
hbwAccess, non-regular	1.066	0.736	1.064	0.743	1.006	0.978	1.064	0.742	1.075	0.703	1.051	0.792	1.066	0.735	1.084	0.674	1.164	0.455	1.065	0.740	1.089	0.655
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours)	0.779	0.198	0.782	0.206	0.808	0.288	0.782	0.203	0.783	0.208	0.778	0.195	0.779	0.197	0.786	0.215	0.942	0.786	0.774	0.187	0.795	0.239
hbwAccess, non-regular	0.770	0.164	0.769	0.162	0.818	0.305	0.779	0.181	0.770	0.165	0.768	0.161	0.769	0.163	0.769	0.162	0.775	0.224	0.765	0.155	0.774	0.173
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours.p)	0.977	0.896	0.976	0.892	0.997	0.987	0.967	0.848	0.981	0.913	0.977	0.893	0.977	0.893	0.976	0.892	1.043	0.841	0.977	0.894	0.978	0.901
hbwAccess, non-regular use:husitsW1	2.017	0.040	2.002	0.043	1.601	0.181	2.035	0.038	2.036	0.038	2.025	0.039	2.019	0.040	2.025	0.039	1.525	0.249	1.958	0.050	2.022	0.040
hbwAccess, regular use:husitsW1	1.274	0.511	1.269	0.518	1.070	0.860	1.291	0.488	1.284	0.497	1.240	0.560	1.273	0.512	1.265	0.523	1.492	0.342	1.244	0.553	1.285	0.497
hbwAccess, non-regular	0.826	0.273	0.825	0.270	0.827	0.296	0.832	0.292	0.826	0.272	0.821	0.258	0.826	0.272	0.827	0.277	0.978	0.903	0.822	0.262	0.828	0.279
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jobanxiety)	1.635	0.016	1.633	0.017	1.612	0.024	1.643	0.015	1.633	0.017	1.623	0.018	1.635	0.016	1.643	0.015	1.511	0.075	1.631	0.017	1.654	0.014
as.factor(rural)1			1.088	0.500																		
as.factor(mafar)2					1.076	0.603																
as.factor(mafar)3					0.947	0.771																
as.factor(mafar)4					1.151	0.526																
as.factor(mafar)5					0.920	0.631																
as.factor(mafar)6					0.909	0.681																
occupation ISCO 1 digit							0.968	0.340														
as.factor(jbft_dv)2									1.076	0.680												
weekends: weekends 1											1.157	0.153										
insecure													0.982	0.914								
Mto Wincome															0.962	0.283						
hbw p: Access,non-regular use																	0.704	0.057				
hbw p: Access,regular use																	1.034	0.826				
scale(houseworkHrs)																			1.077	0.138		
scale(paygu_dv2)																					0.807	0.212
Random Effects																						
σ^2	3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29	
τ_{00}	0.42	pidp	0.43	pidp	0.45	pidp	0.41	pidp	0.43	pidp	0.43	pidp	0.42	pidp	0.43	pidp	0.40	pidp	0.43	pidp	0.43	pidp
ICC	0.11		0.11		0.12		0.11		0.12		0.12		0.11		0.12		0.11		0.11		0.11	
N	1720	pidp	1720	pidp	1602	pidp	1698	pidp	1719	pidp	1720	pidp	1720	pidp	1720	pidp	1309	pidp	1715	pidp	1720	pidp
Observations	4145		4145		3919		4086		4139		4145		4145		4145		3102		4133		4145	
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.322 / 0.400		0.323 / 0.400		0.340 / 0.420		0.321 / 0.397		0.323 / 0.401		0.323 / 0.401		0.322 / 0.400		0.323 / 0.401		0.360 / 0.429		0.323 / 0.400		0.323 / 0.401	

TABLE 7. Estimates of the random effect logit model on the probability of first and second births - MODELS WITH MAIN JOB LOCATION

CHILDLESS <i>Predictors</i>	Model 1		M1+main job location at home		Model 6		M6+main job location at home	
	<i>Odds</i>		<i>Odds</i>		<i>Odds</i>		<i>Odds</i>	
	<i>Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	0.259	<0.001	0.258	<0.001	0.275	<0.001	0.274	<0.001
agecat18-24	0.689	0.036	0.689	0.036	0.676	0.029	0.677	0.029
agecat25-29	0.803	0.068	0.803	0.068	0.794	0.056	0.794	0.056
agecat35-39	0.441	<0.001	0.441	<0.001	0.430	<0.001	0.429	<0.001
agecat: 40 or more	0.045	<0.001	0.045	<0.001	0.045	<0.001	0.045	<0.001
ethn: asian	0.718	0.314	0.717	0.312	0.737	0.355	0.736	0.352
ethn: indian	0.667	0.095	0.666	0.094	0.669	0.098	0.665	0.094
ethn: black	0.883	0.731	0.883	0.732	0.896	0.761	0.897	0.764
ethn: other white	0.950	0.826	0.950	0.827	0.961	0.864	0.962	0.871
ethn: other	0.941	0.892	0.942	0.893	0.982	0.968	0.985	0.973
cohabiting: TRUE	0.301	<0.001	0.301	<0.001	0.299	<0.001	0.299	<0.001
period2013-2016	1.033	0.762	1.033	0.765	1.033	0.761	1.031	0.775
period: 2017+	0.690	0.026	0.690	0.026	0.683	0.022	0.682	0.022
famoriented 2	1.548	<0.001	1.548	<0.001	1.558	<0.001	1.558	<0.001
high educational level:	1.000	0.998	1.000	0.998	0.997	0.983	0.997	0.983
scale(paygu_dv)	1.218	0.003	1.217	0.003	1.224	0.003	1.221	0.003
hbw: Access,non-regular use	0.700	0.015	0.700	0.015	0.372	0.031	0.375	0.032
hbw: Access,regular use	0.626	0.022	0.621	0.022	0.763	0.669	0.760	0.663
scale(jbttwt)	0.918	0.094	0.919	0.108	0.888	0.048	0.892	0.058
hsbeds	1.055	0.357	1.055	0.358	1.032	0.625	1.033	0.618
scale(workhours)	1.055	0.368	1.055	0.366	1.080	0.217	1.081	0.212
scale(jobanxiety)	0.989	0.820	0.989	0.823	0.986	0.794	0.987	0.806
scale(workhours.p)	1.038	0.449	1.038	0.451	1.026	0.629	1.025	0.645
jblochome			1.093	0.842			1.367	0.491
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jbttwt)					0.916	0.577	0.917	0.577
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jbttwt)					1.388	0.023	1.411	0.018
hbwAccess, non-regular use:hsbeds					1.291	0.119	1.288	0.121
hbwAccess, regular use:hsbeds					0.886	0.591	0.877	0.561
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours)					0.727	0.092	0.730	0.095
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours)					0.960	0.873	0.957	0.864
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jobanxiety)					1.107	0.475	1.106	0.481
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jobanxiety)					0.785	0.281	0.780	0.269
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours.p)					1.102	0.530	1.104	0.522
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours.p)					1.048	0.836	1.051	0.826

TABLE 7. Continued

Random Effects				
σ^2	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29
τ_{00}	0.80 _{pidp}	0.80 _{pidp}	0.81 _{pidp}	0.80 _{pidp}
ICC	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20
N	1898 _{pidp}	1898 _{pidp}	1898 _{pidp}	1898 _{pidp}
Observations	5047	5047	5047	5047
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.218 / 0.371	0.218 / 0.371	0.223 / 0.376	0.224 / 0.376

MOTHERS <i>Predictors</i>	Model 1		M1+main job location at home		Model 6		M6+main job location at home	
	<i>Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	0.133	<0.001	0.131	<0.001	0.141	<0.001	0.141	<0.001
agecat18-24	1.085	0.692	1.080	0.712	1.077	0.725	1.075	0.731
agecat25-29	0.989	0.932	0.983	0.896	1.000	0.998	0.999	0.993
agecat35-39	0.607	<0.001	0.612	<0.001	0.619	<0.001	0.623	<0.001
agecat: 40 or more	0.148	<0.001	0.149	<0.001	0.153	<0.001	0.154	<0.001
ethn: asian	1.310	0.344	1.314	0.340	1.320	0.338	1.319	0.340
ethn: indian	0.842	0.416	0.854	0.458	0.851	0.453	0.860	0.482
ethn: black	1.458	0.234	1.513	0.195	1.545	0.183	1.570	0.169
ethn: other white	0.463	0.002	0.462	0.002	0.476	0.004	0.474	0.004
ethn: other	2.071	0.048	2.053	0.052	2.217	0.034	2.205	0.036
cohabiting: TRUE	0.848	0.179	0.845	0.170	0.837	0.155	0.835	0.151
period2013-2016	1.000	0.999	1.001	0.993	1.001	0.993	1.002	0.982
period: 2017+	0.480	<0.001	0.481	<0.001	0.478	<0.001	0.479	<0.001
famoriented 2	1.159	0.297	1.155	0.310	1.184	0.243	1.182	0.249
kagecat0-1	0.750	0.021	0.751	0.022	0.745	0.019	0.746	0.020
kagecat4-6	0.735	0.035	0.741	0.041	0.745	0.047	0.749	0.051
kagecat: 7 or more	0.234	<0.001	0.231	<0.001	0.224	<0.001	0.222	<0.001
ccare: ccare 1	1.678	<0.001	1.675	<0.001	1.729	<0.001	1.722	<0.001
high educational level:	1.102	0.385	1.103	0.382	1.082	0.490	1.085	0.475
scale(paygu_dv)	1.032	0.646	1.032	0.650	1.050	0.494	1.048	0.508
hbw: Access,non-regular use	0.854	0.319	0.867	0.369	0.072	0.001	0.070	0.001
hbw: Access,regular use	1.116	0.550	1.276	0.217	3.950	0.061	4.139	0.054
scale(jbttwt)	1.101	0.048	1.076	0.149	1.006	0.916	1.001	0.990
hsbeds	1.182	0.011	1.190	0.009	1.159	0.045	1.161	0.043
scale(workhours)	0.923	0.190	0.919	0.171	0.921	0.204	0.921	0.202
scale(jobanxiety)	0.960	0.408	0.959	0.399	0.949	0.345	0.949	0.345

TABLE 7. Continued

scale(workhours.p)	0.954	0.343	0.956	0.362	0.973	0.620	0.972	0.602
husits W: husits W 1	1.337	0.004	1.352	0.003	1.244	0.052	1.249	0.048
jblochome			0.494	0.070			0.582	0.208
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jbttwt)					1.490	0.010	1.483	0.011
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jbttwt)					1.263	0.083	1.183	0.247
hbwAccess, non-regular use:hsbeds					1.873	0.004	1.892	0.004
hbwAccess, regular use:hsbeds					0.639	0.051	0.652	0.065
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours)					1.066	0.736	1.062	0.751
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours)					0.779	0.198	0.763	0.168
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours.p)					0.770	0.164	0.771	0.168
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours.p)					0.977	0.896	0.999	0.995
hbwAccess, non-regular use:husitsW1					2.017	0.040	2.021	0.040
hbwAccess, regular use:husitsW1					1.274	0.511	1.319	0.455
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jobanxiety)					0.826	0.273	0.824	0.268
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jobanxiety)					1.635	0.016	1.618	0.019
Random Effects								
σ^2	3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29	
τ_{00}	0.37 _{pidp}		0.39 _{pidp}		0.42 _{pidp}		0.44 _{pidp}	
ICC	0.10		0.11		0.11		0.12	
N	1720 _{pidp}		1720 _{pidp}		1720 _{pidp}		1720 _{pidp}	
Observations	4145		4145		4145		4145	
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.310 / 0.380		0.311 / 0.385		0.322 / 0.400		0.323 / 0.402	

TABLE 8. Estimates of the random effect logit model on the probability of first and second births - NONLINEARITY OF MODERATORS CONSIDERED

CHILDLESS	Model 1		M1+ commuting time^2		M1+ W's workhours^2		M1+ M's workhours^2		M1+ job anxiety^2	
	Odds Ratios	p	Odds Ratios	p	Odds Ratios	p	Odds Ratios	p	Odds Ratios	p
(Intercept)	0.259	<0.001	0.258	<0.001	0.259	<0.001	0.259	<0.001	0.255	<0.001
agecat18-24	0.689	0.036	0.689	0.036	0.689	0.036	0.689	0.036	0.691	0.038
agecat25-29	0.803	0.068	0.803	0.067	0.803	0.067	0.802	0.067	0.804	0.070
agecat35-39	0.441	<0.001	0.441	<0.001	0.441	<0.001	0.441	<0.001	0.438	<0.001
agecat: 40 or more	0.045	<0.001	0.045	<0.001	0.045	<0.001	0.045	<0.001	0.045	<0.001
ethn: asian	0.718	0.314	0.718	0.315	0.720	0.317	0.717	0.312	0.725	0.328
ethn: indian	0.667	0.095	0.668	0.095	0.668	0.095	0.668	0.096	0.654	0.081
ethn: black	0.883	0.731	0.883	0.731	0.887	0.740	0.886	0.737	0.885	0.736
ethn: other white	0.950	0.826	0.949	0.824	0.951	0.831	0.950	0.828	0.944	0.806
ethn: other	0.941	0.892	0.941	0.891	0.944	0.897	0.940	0.890	0.952	0.912
cohabiting: TRUE	0.301	<0.001	0.301	<0.001	0.300	<0.001	0.301	<0.001	0.300	<0.001
period2013-2016	1.033	0.762	1.033	0.761	1.034	0.758	1.034	0.756	1.035	0.747
period: 2017+	0.690	0.026	0.690	0.026	0.691	0.027	0.691	0.026	0.692	0.027
famoriented 2	1.548	<0.001	1.548	<0.001	1.546	<0.001	1.547	<0.001	1.544	<0.001
high educational level:	1.000	0.998	1.000	0.997	1.001	0.994	1.000	0.998	1.007	0.952
scale(paygu_dv)	1.218	0.003	1.218	0.003	1.217	0.003	1.217	0.003	1.225	0.003
hbw: Access,non-regular use	0.700	0.015	0.700	0.015	0.698	0.014	0.699	0.014	0.698	0.014
hbw: Access,regular use	0.626	0.022	0.627	0.023	0.625	0.022	0.625	0.021	0.628	0.023
scale(jbttwt)	0.918	0.094	0.931	0.606	0.917	0.092	0.917	0.094	0.920	0.104
hsbeds	1.055	0.357	1.055	0.356	1.055	0.358	1.055	0.362	1.058	0.338
scale(workhours)	1.055	0.368	1.055	0.369	1.123	0.592	1.054	0.378	1.057	0.356
scale(jobanxiety)	0.989	0.820	0.989	0.818	0.990	0.834	0.989	0.824	0.818	0.146
scale(workhours.p)	1.038	0.449	1.038	0.447	1.039	0.438	1.107	0.590	1.037	0.461
scale(jbttwt2)			0.985	0.911						
scale(workhours2)					0.940	0.763				
scale(workhours.p2)							0.938	0.725		
scale(jobanxiety2)									1.222	0.140
Random Effects										
σ^2	3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29	
τ_{00}	0.80 _{pidp}		0.80 _{pidp}		0.80 _{pidp}		0.80 _{pidp}		0.81 _{pidp}	
ICC	0.20		0.20		0.20		0.20		0.20	
N	1898 _{pidp}		1898 _{pidp}		1898 _{pidp}		1898 _{pidp}		1898 _{pidp}	
Observations	5047		5047		5047		5047		5047	
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.218 / 0.371		0.218 / 0.371		0.218 / 0.371		0.218 / 0.371		0.219 / 0.373	

TABLE 8. Continued

MOTHERS <i>Predictors</i>	Model 1		M1+ commuting time^2		M1+ W's workhours^2		M1+ M's workhours^2		M1+ job anxiety^2		M6+ job anxiety^2		M6	
	<i>Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Ratios</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	0.133	<0.001	0.134	<0.001	0.133	<0.001	0.133	<0.001	0.132	<0.001	0.140	<0.001	0.141	<0.001
agecat18-24	1.085	0.692	1.081	0.707	1.079	0.714	1.087	0.687	1.069	0.748	1.058	0.790	1.077	0.725
agecat25-29	0.989	0.932	0.985	0.909	0.990	0.939	0.986	0.916	0.990	0.935	1.001	0.995	1.000	0.998
agecat35-39	0.607	<0.001	0.607	<0.001	0.607	<0.001	0.606	<0.001	0.611	<0.001	0.624	<0.001	0.619	<0.001
agecat: 40 or more	0.148	<0.001	0.148	<0.001	0.148	<0.001	0.148	<0.001	0.145	<0.001	0.150	<0.001	0.153	<0.001
ethn: asian	1.310	0.344	1.307	0.347	1.297	0.362	1.305	0.350	1.295	0.364	1.307	0.355	1.320	0.338
ethn: indian	0.842	0.416	0.839	0.405	0.847	0.430	0.841	0.413	0.845	0.425	0.855	0.466	0.851	0.453
ethn: black	1.458	0.234	1.433	0.259	1.451	0.241	1.447	0.245	1.429	0.261	1.515	0.203	1.545	0.183
ethn: other white	0.463	0.002	0.461	0.002	0.462	0.002	0.463	0.002	0.460	0.002	0.473	0.003	0.476	0.004
ethn: other	2.071	0.048	2.071	0.048	2.067	0.049	2.066	0.049	2.027	0.055	2.168	0.040	2.217	0.034
cohabiting: TRUE	0.848	0.179	0.848	0.177	0.848	0.177	0.842	0.162	0.842	0.162	0.831	0.138	0.837	0.155
period2013-2016	1.000	0.999	0.999	0.991	0.999	0.993	1.003	0.979	0.995	0.962	0.996	0.966	1.001	0.993
period: 2017+	0.480	<0.001	0.480	<0.001	0.480	<0.001	0.479	<0.001	0.474	<0.001	0.471	<0.001	0.478	<0.001
famoriented 2	1.159	0.297	1.158	0.300	1.159	0.297	1.159	0.297	1.162	0.289	1.188	0.235	1.184	0.243
kagecat0-1	0.750	0.021	0.751	0.022	0.752	0.022	0.750	0.021	0.748	0.020	0.745	0.019	0.745	0.019
kagecat4-6	0.735	0.035	0.735	0.035	0.736	0.036	0.734	0.034	0.735	0.036	0.746	0.048	0.745	0.047
kagecat: 7 or more	0.234	<0.001	0.234	<0.001	0.234	<0.001	0.233	<0.001	0.235	<0.001	0.224	<0.001	0.224	<0.001
ccare: ccare 1	1.678	<0.001	1.685	<0.001	1.689	<0.001	1.681	<0.001	1.688	<0.001	1.740	<0.001	1.729	<0.001
high educational level:	1.102	0.385	1.104	0.377	1.098	0.402	1.097	0.409	1.109	0.352	1.090	0.450	1.082	0.490
scale(paygu_dv)	1.032	0.646	1.033	0.643	1.033	0.643	1.033	0.640	1.035	0.616	1.053	0.464	1.050	0.494
hbw: Access,non-regular use	0.854	0.319	0.855	0.325	0.856	0.328	0.856	0.325	0.852	0.314	0.073	0.001	0.072	0.001
hbw: Access,regular use	1.116	0.550	1.100	0.608	1.113	0.560	1.113	0.560	1.111	0.567	3.981	0.058	3.950	0.061
scale(jbttwt)	1.101	0.048	1.026	0.838	1.102	0.045	1.099	0.051	1.101	0.047	1.007	0.911	1.006	0.916
hsbeds	1.182	0.011	1.182	0.011	1.182	0.011	1.183	0.011	1.186	0.009	1.164	0.039	1.159	0.045
scale(workhours)	0.923	0.190	0.923	0.192	0.802	0.291	0.923	0.194	0.922	0.185	0.921	0.203	0.921	0.204
scale(jobanxiety)	0.960	0.408	0.960	0.410	0.960	0.408	0.960	0.409	0.728	0.016	0.704	0.010	0.949	0.345
scale(workhours.p)	0.954	0.343	0.953	0.336	0.954	0.344	0.818	0.307	0.953	0.330	0.971	0.592	0.973	0.620
husits W: husits W 1	1.337	0.004	1.337	0.004	1.335	0.004	1.344	0.003	1.324	0.005	1.231	0.064	1.244	0.052
scale(jbttwt2)			1.075	0.553										
scale(workhours2)					1.158	0.482								
scale(workhours.p2)							1.171	0.420						
scale(jobanxiety2)									1.350	0.022	1.378	0.016		
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jbttwt)											1.488	0.010	1.490	0.010
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jbttwt)											1.265	0.081	1.263	0.083
hbwAccess, non-regular use:hsbeds											1.866	0.004	1.873	0.004
hbwAccess, regular use:hsbeds											0.637	0.048	0.639	0.051

TABLE 8. Continued

hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours)						1.055	0.778	1.066	0.736
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours)						0.772	0.182	0.779	0.198
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours.p)						0.774	0.173	0.770	0.164
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours.p)						0.976	0.890	0.977	0.896
hbwAccess, non-regular use:husitsW1						2.003	0.042	2.017	0.040
hbwAccess, regular use:husitsW1						1.280	0.502	1.274	0.511
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jobanxiety)						0.836	0.291	0.826	0.273
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jobanxiety)						1.677	0.010	1.635	0.016
Random Effects									
σ^2	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29		3.29	
τ_{00}	0.37 _{pidp}	0.37 _{pidp}	0.37 _{pidp}	0.37 _{pidp}	0.37 _{pidp}	0.37 _{pidp}	0.42 _{pidp}	0.42 _{pidp}	
ICC	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.11	0.11	
N	1720 _{pidp}	1720 _{pidp}	1720 _{pidp}	1720 _{pidp}	1720 _{pidp}	1720 _{pidp}	1720 _{pidp}	1720 _{pidp}	
Observations	4145	4145	4145	4145	4145	4145	4145	4145	
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.310 / 0.380	0.310 / 0.380	0.310 / 0.380	0.311 / 0.381	0.312 / 0.381	0.325 / 0.401	0.322 / 0.400		

TABLE 9. Estimates of the random effect logit model on the probability of first and second births - DIFFERENT IMPUTATIONS CONSIDERED

CHILDLESS	M1 imputed up		M1 imputed down-up		M1 imputed down		M1 different bootstrapping		M6 imputed up		M6 imputed down-up		M6 imputed down		M6 different bootstrapping	
	Odds Ratios	p	Odds Ratios	p	Odds Ratios	p	Odds Ratios	p	Odds Ratios	p	Odds Ratios	p	Odds Ratios	p	Odds Ratios	p
(Intercept)	0.259	<0.001	0.248	<0.001	0.190	<0.001	0.251	<0.001	0.275	<0.001	0.252	<0.001	0.208	<0.001	0.277	<0.001
agecat18-24	0.689	0.036	0.668	0.023	0.937	0.758	0.680	0.031	0.676	0.029	0.662	0.021	0.922	0.704	0.664	0.023
agecat25-29	0.803	0.068	0.804	0.067	0.889	0.400	0.797	0.060	0.794	0.056	0.801	0.062	0.882	0.369	0.789	0.051
agecat35-39	0.441	<0.001	0.413	<0.001	0.396	<0.001	0.441	<0.001	0.430	<0.001	0.409	<0.001	0.391	<0.001	0.429	<0.001
agecat: 40 or more	0.045	<0.001	0.035	<0.001	0.041	<0.001	0.045	<0.001	0.045	<0.001	0.035	<0.001	0.040	<0.001	0.045	<0.001
ethn: asian	0.718	0.314	0.734	0.340	0.644	0.263	0.718	0.316	0.737	0.355	0.746	0.367	0.636	0.251	0.719	0.320
ethn: indian	0.667	0.095	0.642	0.068	0.585	0.073	0.656	0.084	0.669	0.098	0.642	0.069	0.585	0.074	0.658	0.087
ethn: black	0.883	0.731	0.838	0.626	0.855	0.740	0.872	0.706	0.896	0.761	0.844	0.640	0.835	0.704	0.864	0.688
ethn: other white	0.950	0.826	0.940	0.792	1.081	0.781	0.941	0.796	0.961	0.864	0.943	0.803	1.082	0.781	0.958	0.856
ethn: other	0.941	0.892	0.868	0.752	0.759	0.631	0.920	0.852	0.982	0.968	0.885	0.785	0.782	0.672	0.963	0.933
cohabiting: TRUE	0.301	<0.001	0.300	<0.001	0.284	<0.001	0.298	<0.001	0.299	<0.001	0.299	<0.001	0.284	<0.001	0.295	<0.001
period2013-2016	1.033	0.762	1.013	0.904	1.084	0.536	1.038	0.731	1.033	0.761	1.010	0.923	1.080	0.555	1.044	0.691
period: 2017+	0.690	0.026	0.684	0.020	0.757	0.134	0.693	0.028	0.683	0.022	0.679	0.018	0.758	0.139	0.689	0.027
famoriented 2	1.548	<0.001	1.569	<0.001	1.659	0.001	1.599	<0.001	1.558	<0.001	1.568	<0.001	1.663	0.001	1.605	<0.001
high educational level:	1.000	0.998	1.015	0.903	1.162	0.296	1.002	0.990	0.997	0.983	1.012	0.922	1.154	0.321	0.999	0.996
scale(paygu_dv)	1.218	0.003	1.251	0.001	1.289	0.001	1.215	0.004	1.224	0.003	1.254	0.001	1.294	0.001	1.219	0.004
hbw: Access,non-regular use	0.700	0.015	0.693	0.013	0.660	0.014	0.724	0.026	0.372	0.031	0.492	0.121	0.323	0.039	0.307	0.011
hbw: Access,regular use	0.626	0.022	0.601	0.011	0.583	0.027	0.630	0.024	0.763	0.669	0.998	0.998	0.750	0.700	0.697	0.576
scale(jbttwt)	0.918	0.094	0.931	0.156	0.924	0.191	0.919	0.101	0.888	0.048	0.924	0.177	0.946	0.414	0.899	0.077
hsbeds	1.055	0.357	1.071	0.237	1.059	0.412	1.056	0.352	1.032	0.625	1.067	0.311	1.028	0.718	1.019	0.768
scale(workhours)	1.055	0.368	1.038	0.532	1.033	0.649	1.055	0.369	1.080	0.217	1.051	0.420	1.042	0.583	1.072	0.269
scale(jobanxiety)	0.989	0.820	0.964	0.456	1.058	0.331	0.981	0.694	0.986	0.794	0.949	0.343	1.029	0.652	0.978	0.684
scale(workhours.p)	1.038	0.449	1.038	0.446	1.008	0.897	1.038	0.452	1.026	0.629	1.033	0.539	1.004	0.946	1.018	0.740
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jbttwt)									0.916	0.577	0.866	0.353	0.801	0.224	0.847	0.298
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jbttwt)									1.388	0.023	1.197	0.204	1.007	0.970	1.362	0.032
hbwAccess, non-regular use:hsbeds									1.291	0.119	1.145	0.409	1.306	0.171	1.396	0.043
hbwAccess, regular use:hsbeds									0.886	0.591	0.821	0.380	0.924	0.754	0.901	0.649
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours)									0.727	0.092	0.909	0.627	1.000	1.000	0.763	0.152
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours)									0.960	0.873	0.892	0.634	0.854	0.606	1.099	0.711
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jobanxiety)									1.107	0.475	1.136	0.374	1.196	0.281	1.110	0.467
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jobanxiety)									0.785	0.281	0.907	0.642	1.016	0.951	0.761	0.228
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours.p)									1.102	0.530	1.017	0.919	1.003	0.988	1.180	0.275
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours.p)									1.048	0.836	1.052	0.814	1.052	0.844	1.042	0.850
Random Effects																
σ^2	3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29		3.29	
τ_{00}	0.80	<small>pidp</small>	0.84	<small>pidp</small>	0.87	<small>pidp</small>	0.83	<small>pidp</small>	0.81	<small>pidp</small>	0.85	<small>pidp</small>	0.89	<small>pidp</small>	0.85	<small>pidp</small>
ICC	0.20		0.20		0.21		0.20		0.20		0.20		0.21		0.21	
N	1898	<small>pidp</small>	1905	<small>pidp</small>	1452	<small>pidp</small>	1898	<small>pidp</small>	1898	<small>pidp</small>	1905	<small>pidp</small>	1452	<small>pidp</small>	1898	<small>pidp</small>
Observations	5047		5252		3841		5047		5047		5252		3841		5047	
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.218 / 0.371		0.238 / 0.393		0.249 / 0.406		0.218 / 0.376		0.223 / 0.376		0.241 / 0.396		0.253 / 0.412		0.225 / 0.384	

TABLE 9. Continued

MOTHERS <i>Predictors</i>	M1		M1 imputed down-up		M1 imputed down		M1 different bootstrapping		M6		M6 imputed down-up		M6 imputed down		M6 different bootstrapping	
	Ratios	p	Ratios	p	Ratios	p	Ratios	p	Ratios	p	Ratios	p	Ratios	p	Ratios	p
(Intercept)	0.133	<0.001	0.153	<0.001	0.120	<0.001	0.125	<0.001	0.141	<0.001	0.155	<0.001	0.147	<0.001	0.133	<0.001
agecat18-24	1.085	0.692	1.101	0.635	1.127	0.669	1.078	0.718	1.077	0.725	1.101	0.635	1.130	0.663	1.079	0.719
agecat25-29	0.989	0.932	0.999	0.991	1.222	0.211	0.987	0.919	1.000	0.998	1.004	0.973	1.264	0.148	0.996	0.973
agecat35-39	0.607	<0.001	0.593	<0.001	0.536	<0.001	0.609	<0.001	0.619	<0.001	0.604	<0.001	0.541	<0.001	0.623	<0.001
agecat: 40 or more	0.148	<0.001	0.139	<0.001	0.132	<0.001	0.148	<0.001	0.153	<0.001	0.143	<0.001	0.137	<0.001	0.154	<0.001
ethn: asian	1.310	0.344	1.190	0.533	1.514	0.245	1.313	0.340	1.320	0.338	1.128	0.670	1.413	0.335	1.238	0.463
ethn: indian	0.842	0.416	0.833	0.367	0.775	0.339	0.849	0.436	0.851	0.453	0.823	0.340	0.792	0.383	0.860	0.482
ethn: black	1.458	0.234	1.677	0.084	1.275	0.571	1.440	0.251	1.545	0.183	1.687	0.084	1.290	0.558	1.538	0.187
ethn: other white	0.463	0.002	0.499	0.004	0.462	0.016	0.462	0.002	0.476	0.004	0.508	0.005	0.473	0.020	0.481	0.004
ethn: other	2.071	0.048	2.011	0.053	1.337	0.573	2.040	0.053	2.217	0.034	2.085	0.042	1.189	0.743	2.226	0.034
cohabiting: TRUE	0.848	0.179	0.813	0.084	0.732	0.047	0.852	0.192	0.837	0.155	0.805	0.071	0.727	0.044	0.842	0.166
period2013-2016	1.000	0.999	0.990	0.921	0.995	0.969	1.002	0.987	1.001	0.993	0.976	0.815	0.986	0.915	1.006	0.952
period: 2017+	0.480	<0.001	0.491	<0.001	0.562	0.003	0.479	<0.001	0.478	<0.001	0.480	<0.001	0.548	0.002	0.478	<0.001
famoriented 2	1.159	0.297	1.047	0.733	1.124	0.496	1.251	0.118	1.184	0.243	1.071	0.609	1.173	0.362	1.279	0.093
kagecat0-1	0.750	0.021	0.780	0.041	0.838	0.229	0.750	0.021	0.745	0.019	0.794	0.058	0.847	0.263	0.750	0.022
kagecat4-6	0.735	0.035	0.732	0.030	0.803	0.196	0.736	0.036	0.745	0.047	0.745	0.041	0.819	0.243	0.745	0.046
kagecat: 7 or more	0.234	<0.001	0.259	<0.001	0.257	<0.001	0.234	<0.001	0.224	<0.001	0.252	<0.001	0.247	<0.001	0.223	<0.001
ccare: ccare 1	1.678	<0.001	1.648	<0.001	1.814	<0.001	1.683	<0.001	1.729	<0.001	1.670	<0.001	1.794	<0.001	1.723	<0.001
high educational level:	1.102	0.385	1.125	0.279	1.155	0.304	1.102	0.384	1.082	0.490	1.112	0.328	1.107	0.475	1.091	0.444
scale(paygu_dv)	1.032	0.646	1.025	0.710	1.031	0.731	1.034	0.625	1.050	0.494	1.035	0.609	1.067	0.479	1.054	0.462
hbw: Access,non-regular use	0.854	0.319	0.947	0.714	1.172	0.380	0.853	0.311	0.072	0.001	0.197	0.017	0.056	0.001	0.080	0.001
hbw: Access,regular use	1.116	0.550	1.171	0.396	1.123	0.629	1.111	0.565	3.950	0.061	4.417	0.037	3.254	0.193	3.606	0.078
scale(jbttwt)	1.101	0.048	1.085	0.083	1.014	0.824	1.102	0.045	1.006	0.916	1.016	0.780	0.998	0.982	1.004	0.947
hsbeds	1.182	0.011	1.198	0.004	1.243	0.008	1.182	0.011	1.159	0.045	1.193	0.012	1.164	0.095	1.151	0.057
scale(workhours)	0.923	0.190	0.918	0.149	0.881	0.102	0.924	0.199	0.921	0.204	0.914	0.151	0.889	0.147	0.916	0.175
scale(jobanxiety)	0.960	0.408	0.978	0.644	1.064	0.305	0.949	0.291	0.949	0.345	0.972	0.595	1.065	0.344	0.935	0.226
scale(workhours.p)	0.954	0.343	0.952	0.314	1.000	0.998	0.953	0.329	0.973	0.620	0.975	0.644	1.013	0.854	0.960	0.460
husits W: husits W 1	1.337	0.004	1.117	0.264	0.872	0.278	1.338	0.004	1.244	0.052	1.060	0.598	0.844	0.230	1.251	0.047
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jbttwt)									1.490	0.010	1.410	0.017	0.927	0.677	1.475	0.011
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jbttwt)									1.263	0.083	1.142	0.314	1.093	0.607	1.255	0.092
hbwAccess, non-regular use:hsbeds									1.873	0.004	1.479	0.056	2.629	<0.001	1.820	0.005
hbwAccess, regular use:hsbeds									0.639	0.051	0.648	0.046	0.688	0.182	0.675	0.082
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours)									1.066	0.736	1.017	0.922	0.867	0.500	1.115	0.549
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours)									0.779	0.198	0.845	0.388	0.750	0.263	0.800	0.245
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(workhours.p)									0.770	0.164	0.809	0.225	0.984	0.939	0.781	0.179
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(workhours.p)									0.977	0.896	0.939	0.709	0.897	0.623	1.091	0.609
hbwAccess, non-regular use:husitsW1									2.017	0.040	1.541	0.160	1.218	0.592	1.988	0.040
hbwAccess, regular use:husitsW1									1.274	0.511	1.042	0.912	1.217	0.683	1.067	0.859
hbwAccess, non-regular use:scale(jobanxiety)									0.826	0.273	0.793	0.158	0.785	0.198	0.822	0.253
hbwAccess, regular use:scale(jobanxiety)									1.635	0.016	1.630	0.013	1.688	0.052	1.698	0.011

TABLE 9. Continued

Random Effects								
σ^2	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.29
τ_{00}	0.37 _{pidp}	0.34 _{pidp}	0.63 _{pidp}	0.37 _{pidp}	0.42 _{pidp}	0.33 _{pidp}	0.64 _{pidp}	0.42 _{pidp}
ICC	0.10	0.09	0.16	0.10	0.11	0.09	0.16	0.11
N	1720 _{pidp}	1757 _{pidp}	1317 _{pidp}	1720 _{pidp}	1720 _{pidp}	1757 _{pidp}	1317 _{pidp}	1720 _{pidp}
Observations	4145	4339	3168	4145	4145	4339	3168	4145
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	0.310 / 0.380	0.306 / 0.370	0.323 / 0.432	0.311 / 0.381	0.322 / 0.400	0.316 / 0.378	0.335 / 0.443	0.322 / 0.399

TABLE 10. Summary statistics - continuous covariates

Variable	Levels	CHILDLESS		MOTHERS	
		Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
HEW	No access, no use	4353	77.7	3704	81.9
	Access, non-regular use	837	14.9	468	10.3
	Access, regular use	413	7.4	350	7.7
	Total	5603	100	4522	100
Number of bedrooms	0	7	0.1		
	1	645	11.6	87	1.9
	2	1902	34.1	1321	29.3
	3	2349	42.1	2353	52.3
	4	561	10.1	643	14.3
	5	85	1.5	84	1.9
	6	29	0.5	13	0.3
	Total	5578	100	4501	100
Age	30-34	1498	26.7	1358	30
	18-24	845	15.1	273	6
	25-29	1886	33.7	816	18
	35-39	788	14.1	1276	28.2
	40 or more	586	10.5	799	17.7
	Total	5603	100	4522	100
Period	2009-2012	2404	42.9	1858	41.1
	2013-2016	2438	43.5	2023	44.7
	2017+	761	13.6	641	14.2
	Total	5603	100	4522	100
Ethnicity	british/irish	4699	83.9	3622	80.1
	asian	169	3	123	2.7
	indian	252	4.5	310	6.9
	black	111	2	104	2.3
	other white	286	5.1	310	6.9
	other	86	1.5	53	1.2
	Total	5603	100	4522	100
Cohabiting	married	2561	45.7	3285	72.6
	cohabiting	3042	54.3	1237	27.4
	Total	5603	100	4522	100
Family oriented	no	1495	26.7	658	14.6
	yes	4108	73.3	3864	85.4
	Total	5603	100	4522	100
Educational level	other	1764	31.5	1939	42.9
	high	3839	68.5	2583	57.1
	Total	5603	100	4522	100
Childcare responsibility	other			2426	53.9
	mainly woman's			2078	46.1
	Total			4504	100
First child's age	2-3			969	21.4
	0-1			1606	35.5
	4-6			758	16.8
	7 or more			1189	26.3
	Total			4522	100
Use of external childcare	0			1773	39.9
	1			2666	60.1
	Total			4439	100

TABLE 11. Summary statistics - continuous covariates

Variable	CHILDLESS						MOTHERS					
	Min.	1st Qu.	Median	Mean	3rd Qu.	Max.	Min.	1st Qu.	Median	Mean	3rd Qu.	Max.
commuting time (minutes)	0	15	25	28.92	40	120	0	10	20	24.48	30	120
W's workhours per week	0	37	39	38.92	44	70	0	23	34	31.71	39	70
M's workhours per week	0	37.5	40.5	42.57	47	90	0	38	41	43.02	47.5	90
Job anxiety	0	2	3	3.57	5	12	0	1	3	3.32	5	12
W's income (gross per month, in thousands GBP)	0.04	1.3	1.83	1.98	2.5	6.9	0	0.87	1.46	1.66	2.2	6.5

8. References

- Adler, M. A., & Lenz, K. (2015). *Comparative father involvement: The dynamics of gender culture, policy and practice* (Vol. 231). The University of Chicago Press Books.
- Allen, T. D., Johnson, R. C., Kiburz, K. M., & Shockley, K. M. (2013). Work–family conflict and flexible work arrangements: Deconstructing flexibility. *Personnel psychology*, *66*(2), 345-376.
- Ammons, S. K., & Markham, W. T. (2004). Working at home: Experiences of skilled white collar workers. *Sociological Spectrum*, *24*(2), 191-238.
- Arntz, M., Sarra, B. Y., & Berlingieri, F. (2019). Working from home: Heterogeneous effects on hours worked and wages. *ZEW-Centre for European Economic Research Discussion Paper*(19-015).
- Austin, P. C., & Hux, J. E. (2002). A brief note on overlapping confidence intervals. *Journal of Vascular Surgery*, *36*(1), 194-195. <https://doi.org/10.1067/mva.2002.125015>
- Bai, B., Gopalan, N., Beutell, N., & Ren, F. (2021). Impact of Absolute and Relative Commute Time on Work–Family Conflict: Work Schedule Control, Child Care Hours, and Life Satisfaction. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10834-021-09752-w>
- Bailey, D. E., & Kurland, N. B. (2002). A review of telework research: findings, new directions, and lessons for the study of modern work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *23*(4), 383-400. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.144>
- Baizan, P., Arpino, B., & Delclòs, C. E. (2016). The Effect of Gender Policies on Fertility: The Moderating Role of Education and Normative Context. *European Journal of Population*, *32*(1), 1-30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10680-015-9356-y>
- Baruch, Y. (2000). Teleworking: benefits and pitfalls as perceived by professionals and managers. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, *15*(1), 34-49. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-005x.00063>
- Becker, G. S. (1991). *A treatise on the family: Enlarged edition*. Harvard University Press.
- Begall, K., Mills, M., & Ganzeboom, H. B. G. (2015). Non-Standard Work Schedules and Childbearing in the Netherlands: A Mixed-Method Couple Analysis. *Social Forces*, *93*(3), 957-988. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/sou110>
- Billari, F. C., Giuntella, O., & Stella, L. (2019). Does broadband Internet affect fertility? *Popul Stud (Camb)*, *73*(3), 297-316. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00324728.2019.1584327>
- Brewster, K. L., & Rindfuss, R. R. (2000). Fertility and Women's Employment in Industrialized Nations. *Annual review of sociology*, *26*(1), 271-296. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.271>

- Callister, P., & Singley, S. G. (2004). *A double burden or the best of both worlds? A research note on simultaneous paid work and childcare in New Zealand* (Callister and Associates Working Paper, Issue).
- Chung, H., & Van Der Horst, M. (2018). Women's employment patterns after childbirth and the perceived access to and use of flexitime and teleworking. *Human Relations*, 71(1), 47-72. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726717713828>
- Chung, H., & Van Der Horst, M. (2020). Flexible Working and Unpaid Overtime in the UK: The Role of Gender, Parental and Occupational Status. *Social Indicators Research*, 151(2), 495-520. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-018-2028-7>
- Chung, H., & Van der Lippe, T. (2020). Flexible working, work–life balance, and gender equality: Introduction. *Social Indicators Research*, 151(2), 365-381.
- Coltrane, S., Miller, E. C., Dehaan, T., & Stewart, L. (2013). Fathers and the Flexibility Stigma. *Journal of Social Issues*, 69(2), 279-302. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12015>
- Cooke, L. P. (2009). Gender Equity and Fertility in Italy and Spain. *Journal of Social Policy*, 38(1), 123-140. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0047279408002584>
- Cousins, C. R., & Tang, N. (2004). Working time and work and family conflict in the Netherlands, Sweden and the UK. *Work, employment and society*, 18(3), 531-549.
- Delanoëje, J., Verbruggen, M., & Germeys, L. (2019). Boundary role transitions: A day-to-day approach to explain the effects of home-based telework on work-to-home conflict and home-to-work conflict. *Human Relations*, 72(12), 1843-1868. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726718823071>
- Demerouti, E., Derks, D., Ten Brummelhuis, L. L., & Bakker, A. B. (2014). New Ways of Working: Impact on Working Conditions, Work–Family Balance, and Well-Being. In (pp. 123-141). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-8854-0_8
- Dingel, J. I., & Neiman, B. (2020). How many jobs can be done at home? *Journal of Public Economics*, 189, 104235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2020.104235>
- Duvander, A.-Z., Lappegård, T., & Andersson, G. (2010). Family policy and fertility: fathers' and mothers' use of parental leave and continued childbearing in Norway and Sweden. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 20(1), 45-57. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928709352541>
- Engelhardt, H., Kögel, T., & Prskawetz, A. (2004). Fertility and women's employment reconsidered: A macro-level time-series analysis for developed countries, 1960–2000. *Population studies*, 58(1), 109-120.
- Eurofound. (2020). *Telework and ICT-based mobile work: Flexible working in the digital age* (New Forms of Employment Series, Issue).

- Eurostat. (2022a). Average number of usual weekly hours of work in main job, by sex, age, professional status, full-time/part-time and occupation [lfsa_ewhuis]. Eurostat Statistics Database. Accessed: 25th Feb 2022.
- Eurostat. (2022b). Employed persons working from home as a percentage of the total employment, by sex, age and professional status (%) [lfsa_ehomp]. Eurostat Statistics Database. Accessed: 25th Feb 2022.
- Felstead, A., & Henseke, G. (2017). Assessing the growth of remote working and its consequences for effort, well-being and work-life balance. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 32(3), 195-212.
- Felstead, A., Jewson, N., Phizacklea, A., & Walters, S. (2002). Opportunities to work at home in the context of work-life balance. *Human resource management journal*, 12(1), 54-76.
- Felstead, A., & Reuschke, D. (2020). Homeworking in the UK: before and during the 2020 lockdown.
- Fernandez-Lozano, I., González, M. J., Jurado-Guerrero, T., & Martínez-Pastor, J.-I. (2020). The Hidden Cost of Flexibility: A Factorial Survey Experiment on Job Promotion. *European Sociological Review*, 36(2), 265-283. <https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcz059>
- Gajendran, R. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2007). The good, the bad, and the unknown about telecommuting: meta-analysis of psychological mediators and individual consequences. *Journal of applied psychology*, 92(6), 1524-1541. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1524>
- Glavin, P., & Schieman, S. (2012). Work–Family Role Blurring and Work–Family Conflict. *Work and Occupations*, 39(1), 71-98. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888411406295>
- Golden, T. D., & Eddleston, K. A. (2020). Is there a price telecommuters pay? Examining the relationship between telecommuting and objective career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 116, 103348. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2019.103348>
- Goldscheider, F., Bernhardt, E., & Lappegård, T. (2015). The gender revolution: A framework for understanding changing family and demographic behavior. *Population and development review*, 41(2), 207-239.
- GOV.UK. (2022a). Flexible working. Government Digital Service. Accessed: 25th Feb 2022. <https://www.gov.uk/flexible-working>.
- GOV.UK. (2022b). Maternity pay and leave. Government Digital Service. Accessed: 25th Feb 2022. <https://www.gov.uk/maternity-pay-leave/pay>.
- Hilbrecht, M., Shaw, S. M., Johnson, L. C., & Andrey, J. (2008). ‘I’m Home for the Kids’: Contradictory Implications for Work-Life Balance of Teleworking Mothers. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 15(5), 454-476. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2008.00413.x>

- Hill, E. J., Ferris, M., & Mårtinson, V. (2003). Does it matter where you work? A comparison of how three work venues (traditional office, virtual office, and home office) influence aspects of work and personal/family life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63(2), 220-241. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791\(03\)00042-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(03)00042-3)
- ILO. (2020). *ILO monitor: COVID-19 and the world of work*. I. L. Organisation. https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/WCMS_738753/lang--en/index.htm
- ISER. (2022). *Understanding Society: Waves 1-10, 2009-2019 and Harmonised BHPS: Waves 1-18, 1991-2009. [data collection]. 13th Edition* (SN: 6614. <https://doi.org/10.5255/ukda-sn-6614-14>
- Kaufman, G. (2018). Barriers to equality: why British fathers do not use parental leave. *Community, Work & Family*, 21(3), 310-325.
- Kelliher, C., & Anderson, D. (2010). Doing more with less? Flexible working practices and the intensification of work. *Human Relations*, 63(1), 83-106. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726709349199>
- Kreyenfeld, M. (2010). Uncertainties in Female Employment Careers and the Postponement of Parenthood in Germany. *European Sociological Review*, 26(3), 351-366. <https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcp026>
- Kreyenfeld, M., & Andersson, G. (2014). Socioeconomic differences in the unemployment and fertility nexus: Evidence from Denmark and Germany. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 21, 59-73. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2014.01.007>
- Kurowska, A. (2020). Gendered effects of home-based work on parents' capability to balance work with non-work: Two countries with different models of division of labour compared. *Social Indicators Research*, 151(2), 405-425.
- Lewis, J., & Campbell, M. (2007). UK Work/Family Balance Policies and Gender Equality, 1997-2005. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 14(1), 4-30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxm005>
- Liu, P., Cao, J., Nie, W., Wang, X., Tian, Y., & Ma, C. (2021). The Influence of Internet Usage Frequency on Women's Fertility Intentions—The Mediating Effects of Gender Role Attitudes. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(9), 4784. <https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/18/9/4784>
- Lott, Y. (2020). Does Flexibility Help Employees Switch Off from Work? Flexible Working-Time Arrangements and Cognitive Work-to-Home Spillover for Women and Men in Germany. *Social Indicators Research*, 151(2), 471-494. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-018-2031-z>

- Lyonette, C., Kaufman, G., & Crompton, R. (2011). 'We both need to work'. *Work, employment and society*, 25(1), 34-50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017010389243>
- Martinez, P., & Gómez, C. (2013). Trading telecommuting flexibility for fewer training opportunities? *Management Research: The Journal of the Iberoamerican Academy of Management*, 11(3), 235-259. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRJIAM-04-2012-0478>
- Mas, A., & Pallais, A. (2017). Valuing alternative work arrangements. *American Economic Review*, 107(12), 3722-3759.
- Matysiak, A. (2009). Employment first, then childbearing: Women's strategy in post-socialist Poland. *Population studies*, 63(3), 253-276. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00324720903151100>
- McDonald, P. (2000). Gender Equity in Theories of Fertility Transition. *Population and development review*, 26(3), 427-439. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2000.00427.x>
- McMunn, A., Bird, L., Webb, E., & Sacker, A. (2020). Gender divisions of paid and unpaid work in contemporary UK couples. *Work, employment and society*, 34(2), 155-173.
- Munsch, C. L. (2016). Flexible Work, Flexible Penalties: The Effect of Gender, Childcare, and Type of Request on the Flexibility Bias. *Social Forces*, 94(4), 1567-1591. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/sov122>
- Oakman, J., Kinsman, N., Stuckey, R., Graham, M., & Weale, V. (2020). A rapid review of mental and physical health effects of working at home: how do we optimise health? *BMC Public Health*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-09875-z>
- OECD. (2022). Net childcare costs (indicator). Accessed: 25th Feb 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1787/e328a9ee-en>
- ONS. (2020). *Coronavirus and homeworking in the UK labour market: 2019*. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/employmentandemployeetypes/articles/coronavirusandhomeworkingintheuklabourmarket/2019>
- Oppenheimer, V. K. (1997). Women's Employment and the Gain to Marriage: The Specialization and Trading Model. *Annual review of sociology*, 23(1), 431-453. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.23.1.431>
- Pabilonia, S. W., & Vernon, V. (2022). Telework, Wages, and Time Use in the United States. *Review of Economics of the Household*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11150-022-09601-1>
- Peters, P., & Van Der Lippe, T. (2007). The time-pressure reducing potential of telehomeworking: the Dutch case. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(3), 430-447. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190601167730>
- Powell, A., & Craig, L. (2015). Gender differences in working at home and time use patterns: Evidence from Australia. *Work, employment and society*, 29(4), 571-589.

- Richardson, J., & Kelliher, C. (2015). Managing visibility for career sustainability: a study of remote workers. In *Handbook of Research on Sustainable Careers*. Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781782547037.00013>
- Sinyavskaya, O., & Billingsley, S. (2015). The importance of job characteristics to women's fertility intentions and behavior in Russia. *Genus*, 71(1), 23-59.
- Solís, M. S. (2016). Telework: conditions that have a positive and negative impact on the work-family conflict. *Academia Revista Latinoamericana de Administración*, 29(4), 435-449. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ARLA-10-2015-0289>
- Sullivan, C., & Lewis, S. (2001). Home-based Telework, Gender, and the Synchronization of Work and Family: Perspectives of Teleworkers and their Co-residents. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 8(2), 123-145. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0432.00125>
- Torr, B. M., & Short, S. E. (2004). Second Births and the Second Shift: A Research Note on Gender Equity and Fertility. *Population and development review*, 30(1), 109-130. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2004.00005.x>
- Van Der Lippe, T., & Lippényi, Z. (2020). Beyond Formal Access: Organizational Context, Working From Home, and Work-Family Conflict of Men and Women in European Workplaces. *Social Indicators Research*, 151(2), 383-402. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-018-1993-1>
- Van Wanrooy, B., Bewley, H., Bryson, A., Forth, J., Freeth, S., Stokes, L., & Wood, S. (2013). *Employment relations in the shadow of recession: Findings from the 2011 workplace employment relations study*. Macmillan International Higher Education.
- Vignoli, D., Tocchioni, V., & Mattei, A. (2020). The impact of job uncertainty on first-birth postponement. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 45, 100308. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2019.100308>
- Voydanoff, P. (2005). Work Demands and Work-to-Family and Family-to-Work Conflict. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26(6), 707-726. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513x05277516>
- Wood, J., & Neels, K. (2017). First a job, then a child? Subgroup variation in women's employment-fertility link. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 33, 38-52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2016.09.003>
- Yerkes, M. A., & Javornik, J. (2019). Creating capabilities: Childcare policies in comparative perspective. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 29(4), 529-544. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928718808421>



UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW

FACULTY OF ECONOMIC SCIENCES

44/50 DŁUGA ST.

00-241 WARSAW

WWW.WNE.UW.EDU.PL