FamiliesAndSocieties
Working Paper Series
Changing families and sustainable societies:
Policy contexts and diversity over the life course and across generations

12 (2014)

Coping strategies under uncertain, precarious employment conditions in Switzerland

Doris Hanappi, Valérie-Anne Ryser, and Laura Bernardi

A project funded by European Union's Seventh Framework Programme under grant agreement no. 320116

Coping strategies under uncertain, precarious employment conditions in Switzerland

Doris Hanappi[1], Valérie-Anne Ryser[1], and Laura Bernardi[1]

Abstract:
This report provides insights on childbearing decisions seen as outcomes of coping strategies in work and family reconciliation under economic uncertainty and precariousness within the single-country setting, Switzerland. To more clearly understand the linkage between institutional context, employment uncertainty and childbearing decisions of both genders, our report addresses the relationship between employment and childbearing intentions—as the early onset of childbearing decision-making—focusing on how men's and women's subjective perceptions about job stability and job prestige relate to fertility intentions and how gender role attitudes moderate this relationship. Empirical findings from the Swiss Household Panel (SHP), where we estimate separate models of fertility intentions for men and women without children and for those with at least one child, show that instable jobs are significantly and negatively associated with the intention of having a first child for women. The effect of job prestige is more complex and mediated by gender role attitudes.

Keywords: fertility intentions, employment uncertainty, occupational prestige, family life course, gender roles

Affiliation:
1. Université de Lausanne

Acknowledgement: The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement no. 320116 for the research project FamiliesAndSocieties.

Contents

1. Introduction 2

2. Background 4
2.1. Fertility Intentions: A Conceptualization 4
2.2. Job Quality and Fertility Intentions 5
2.3. Parenthood and Fertility Intentions 7

3. Employment and Fertility in Switzerland 8

4. Method 11
4.1. Data and Sample 11
4.2. Measures 12
4.2.1. Dependent Variable 12
4.2.2. Explanatory Variables 12
4.2.3. Analysis 15

5. Multivariate Results 16
5.1. Job quality and gender role attitude 16
5.2. Socio-demographic variables 19

6. Discussion 19

References 26

1. Introduction

Since decades, fertility levels in industrialized countries remained below expressed intentions. Despite policy endeavors to narrow the gap between actual and intended family size in Europe, recent estimates suggest that many Europeans will have less children than actually intended at the end of their reproductive life-span (Testa, 2012). This implies that most will have one or two instead of two or three children, and a part of them will remain childless. Switzerland makes no exception to these trends and it currently displays 20% of childless women older than 40 (OFS, 2011).

Research about the impact of employment on childbearing intentions has focused on factual employment uncertainty (Blossfeld & Hofmeister, 2007; Blossfeld, Klijzing, Mills, & Kurz, 2005; Kreyenfeld, Andersson, & Pailhé, 2012; Pailhé & Solaz, 2012; Schmitt, 2012; T. Sobotka, Skirbekk, & Philipov, 2011), and on perceived job insecurity and precariousness (Bernardi, Klaerner, & von der Lippe, 2008; Giesecke, 2009; Golsch, 2003; Scherer, 2009; Steiber & Haas, 2009). A Swiss study provides first evidence for long-term consequences of employment uncertainty on fertility showing that an increase in the experience of employment uncertainty causes people to abandon their intention to have a child (Hanappi, et al., 2012). Yet, studies acknowledging what resources men and women activate to re-conciliate work and family were limited to investigating education and income (e.g. Kreyenfeld, Andersson, & Pailhé, 2012), or social support (Bernardi, Ryser, and Le Goff, 2012). The only study that accounted for a job-related resource in addition to income has examined ‘work control’ (Begall & Mills, 2011). In this report we argue that employment may take the form of a ‘good job’ operating as a resource for men’s and women’s work and family reconciliation. Therefore, we study how two dimensions of employment affect the intentions of men and women to have a child in the near future:

employment uncertainty and occupational prestige as a proxi for 'good jobs'. Moreover, the relationship between these dimensions of employment and fertility intentions has rarely been examined with consideration of the employment situation of both partners jointly. Last, little research addressed the fact that employment may affect fertility intentions differently depending on beliefs about gender roles. This lack of studies is remarkable given that we know that gender role attitudes are important elements in defining the work-family balance individuals choose to have given the constraints they face (Gornick & Meyers, 2005; Hobson & Oláh, 2006; Oláh, 2003). In this report we propose and test how two dimensions of employment depending on beliefs about gender roles impact childbearing intentions. We thus complement a comparative study on gender equality and fertility published in the *European Journal of Population* by Neyer, Lappegård, and Vignoli (2011) which uses factual information to measure gender equality in employment and the family on childbearing intentions of men and women.

Using individual-level data from the Swiss Household Panel (SHP) for the period 2002-2011, we apply hierarchical two-level nested models to estimate the relationship between job quality and gender role attitude on the intention to have a first or an additional child within the next two years. The transition to parenthood is substantially different from the decision to have additional children (Friedman, Hechter, & Kanazawa, 1994; Hoffman & Manis, 1979; Liefbroer, 2005; Nauk, 2007; Philipov, Spéder, & Billari, 2006; Spéder & Kapitány, 2009). Therefore we assume that the relationship between employment characteristics and fertility intentions also vary depending on the couple parity.

We focus our analysis on intended births and treat fertility intentions as dependent variables (for example, see Philipov, et al., 2006). The unit of analysis is the individual.

Though the SHP is a household dataset, we renounced the opportunity to use the partners' own answers (like it is done in Testa et al 2011) and we use instead the individual's reported data on job characteristics and fertility intentions of the partners. We also opted for using a cross-sectional data set, despite having longitudinal data, because unlike actual childbirths that depend on prior existing conditions, fertility intentions are rather impacted instantaneously by the current situation an individual faces (e.g. employment, partnership). Overall, the reason for this choice is that the number of missing data would reduce too much our sample size and we will not be able to appropriately test the main hypotheses on subjective perceptions on job characteristics and attitudes towards gender roles. Using jointly information on job characteristics of each individual partner in a household helps to understand the relationship between an individual job situation and the formation of fertility intentions (Gallie & Russell, 2009; Jacobs & Gerson, 2001).

2. Background

2.1. Fertility Intentions: A Conceptualization

Past evidence showed that the reproductive decisions could be well approximated by the use of fertility intentions (Hermalin, Freedman, Sun, & Chang, 1979; Schoen, Kim, Nathanson, & Fields, 1999; Westoff & Ryder, 1977). Being located between ideal fertility and actual behavior, they were shown to correlate positively with the subsequent childbearing behavior at individual level (Ajzen, 1991; Miller & Pasta, 1995). Yet, the empirical findings were mixed and some caution about the use of intentions as predictors for fertility remains because correspondence between individual intentions and actual behavior is weak (Quesnel-Vallee & Morgan, 2003). Nevertheless, the shorter the time interval between the intention formation and realization (2-3 years), the more correspond intentions with actual fertility behavior (Schoen, et al., 1999).

Short-term intentions are thus not only influenced by spouse's intentions, life-course factors (primarily age, parity, and marital status), and infecundity as found by Miller and Pasta (Miller & Pasta, 1995), but sensitive to external conditions of their realization (e.g., Philipov & Bernardi, 2011). Work and careers are considered to constrain the enactment of fertility plans and might be a reason why fertility intentions are not formulated. Because our research focuses on determinants of fertility plans, we focus on job quality, assuming that it makes their enactment more realistic and thereby predicts the intention to have children.

2.2. Job Quality and Fertility Intentions

Work by Begall and Mills (Begall & Mills, 2011) on fertility intentions ties directly to the issue of workplace characteristics that were found to facilitate work and fertility (Hochschild & Manchung, 1989). In this respect, pointed Voydanoff (1988) to the potential of work control and schedule flexibility for an improved family functioning in dual-earner households. It is, thus, job quality rather than job quantity or work hours that is key to the employment-fertility nexus.

Given that employment grants *job stability* and is *socially acceptable* it should rather be compatible with child rearing and would not constrain fertility intentions any longer. In order to evaluate the ways in which jobs affect fertility intentions, we formulate hypotheses for men and women with and without children separately.

With regard to the *job stability* argument of work, micro-economic models of fertility linked job instability associated with the unreliable or lower (men's) economic provider role or higher mothers' career costs to lower fertility (e.g. forgone promotions, lock-in to

mommy tracks) (Blossfeld & Hofmeister, 2007; Philipov, et al., 2006). Job instability is associated with control over work, which has also been found to facilitate a combination of work and family (Voydanoff, 2005). One aspect of control is that over income, more specifically the extent to which a job affords the individual holders with control over future income. Instable jobs, instead, add worries about job loss and income loss (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985), and decrease income predictability, which in turn affect the likelihood that individuals will choose parenthood (Adsera, 2005; Kreyenfeld, et al., 2012). We assume that this is particularly true for the first child intentions for which economic conditions of both partners play a major role. In our analysis we therefore expect to observe *that the experience of job instability will lead to lower fertility intentions among women and men without children (Hypothesis 1).*

Focusing on job instability is insufficient in the European setting, where policy endeavors concentrate on making work more conducive to parenthood (Kohler, Billari, & Ortega, 2006). In such an institutional context, job quality should gain importance. The prestige of an occupation is an important parameter in this respect, because it might afford privileges in the workplace that buffer work demands (Simpson & Simpson, 1960; Treiman, 1970; for a comprehensive review see Wegener, 1992). But there is surprisingly no empirical work considering the effects of prestige on fertility intentions. Kalmijn (Kalmijn, 2011) hypothesized that high-status jobs select men into marriage, and Schieman and Galvin (Schieman & Glavin, 2008; Simpson & Simpson, 1960) found that these jobs correlate with high responsibility, potentially competing with female caregiving. In our analysis, we take up this issue and ask whether *high levels of job prestige will increase the likelihood that men intend to have a first child (Hypothesis 2),* assuming that their provider role is reinforced.

Social acceptance especially of maternal employment is a crucial issue, reflecting the desirable way of combining domestic and care work. Parents may be concerned that especially maternal employment could affect child well-being, because the care of a working mother may be insufficient (Steiber & Haas, 2009). In this respect vary perceived trade-offs between working and child rearing (Mason & Kuhlthau, 1989). Moreover, women who combine child rearing and employment may be confronted with restrictive attitudes towards employment after child birth and also with strong normative expectations of what is good mothering, particularly for children of younger ages (Hank & Kreyenfeld, 2003; Rindfuss & Brewster, 1996). In our analysis we take this question one step further and ask whether *gender role attitude moderates the impact of job prestige and stability on men's and women's intention to start a family* (*Hypothesis 3).* Assuming disapproval of maternal employment to indicate sensitiveness to increased tensions between work and family would reinforce negative effects of job instability and weaken positive effects of job prestige on first child intentions.

2.3. Parenthood and Fertility Intentions

The transition to parenthood is an important life-course marker found to operate through strength, continuity, and urgency of intention (Miller & Pasta, 1995; White & McQuillan, 2006). One implication of the life-course perspective is that changes in trajectories, for example the arrival of a first child, are likely to influence intentions (Corijn, Liefbroer, & de Jong Gierveld, 1996). Beyond life course markers, Morgan (2003) introduced the concept of competition arguing that some life experiences compete with childbearing. These include work-family competition due to increased domestic workload from

dependent children in the home that can cause a lower likelihood to advance on a second a child (Gerson Jacobs 2004).

Regarding work-family competition, studies suggest that parenthood accentuate the gender-specialization in the couple (Bernardi, Ryser, & Le Goff, 2012; Bühlmann, Elcheroth, & Tettamanti, 2009; Dribe & Stanfors, 2009; Grunow, Schulz, & Blossfeld). Krüger and Levy (Krüger & Levy, 2001) suggested in their 'master status' approach that after the birth of the first child, parents re-define family roles towards the 'female care-giver' and 'male breadwinner' model of the family. Whereas maternal employment is incompatible with further childbearing (Brewster & Rindfuss, 2000), having a stable, well-paying job reaffirms the male provider role. Finally, because the birth of a first child confronts parents with actual work and care choices, we expect that parenthood sets off any moderating effects between gender role attitudes and job quality on fertility intentions *(Hypothesis 4).*

3. Employment and Fertility in Switzerland

Switzerland has a long history of low fertility that distinguishes it from other European countries. It currently has one of the lowest cohort fertility rates globally (Tomáš Sobotka, 2011). In 2011, TFR in Switzerland was 1.52 ranking it below the EU-27 average (EU, 2010). Low fertility in Switzerland is largely related to its childlessness rate of above 20% among mainly higher educated women, which is the highest rate globally. Facing high opportunity costs for childbearing make it difficult to balance occupational careers with domestic and care work. Caldwell described Switzerland (together with Austria and Germany) as a "third fertility compromise" where a "hardly bearable compromise" between work and family has produced remarkably stable low fertility rates (Caldwell, 2008; Tomáš Sobotka, 2011).

One factor for this phenomenon is the ‘liberal’ Swiss labor market that provides low employment protection grouping it together with the U.S. below the OECD average (for detail, see: OECD Employment Protection Database, 2013 update). For disproportionately more women than men who entered into less stable, lower-paying jobs Switzerland is an unfavorable context for childbearing.

Incompatibility between work and family resulted in maternal part-time work being the preferred mode to re-conciliate competing roles (73% of women participate in the labor force) (FSO, 2013). For many women the arrival of a second child is incompatible with employment, thus affecting employment trajectories in the long run. This is explained by the weak welfare provision for families (Charles, Buchmann, Halebsky, Powers, & Smith, 2001; Monnier, 2006). First, the Swiss system of public child care was found to operate as a disincentive of labor force participation, because if middle-income families increase their occupation rate of the ‘second earner’, they generate a higher household income that increases the public child care tariffs more than those families actually gain from additional income (Bütler & Ruesch, 2009).

Second, Switzerland has not yet introduced parental leave policies. Maternity leave regulations grant mothers the right to take time off from work to care for children for 98 days following birth. The replacement rate amounts 80% of previous earnings and is rendered in the form of daily allowances. The maternity insurance, introduced in 2005, grants mothers 14 weeks (98 days respectively), with additional protection rights for the weeks 15 and 16 such as staying at home without receiving pay. Because benefits are related to previous earnings, they represent a strong incentive to have labor market attachment before becoming mother. As there is no paternity leave for fathers, mothers and

fathers are differentially engaged parents. Moreover, primary school schedules and rigid public office opening hours cause organizational hurdles for dual-earner families and single parents (Charles, et al., 2001).

Against this country context, our empirical analysis examines whether job quality influences a woman's and man's likelihood of first and additional child intentions. Job stability and prestige, and an inegalitarian gender-role attitude (i.e., the attitude towards maternal employment) were considered most characteristic of the Swiss situation. Estimating nested hierarchical two-level models, we use job quality and gender attitude as predictors.

We control the respondent's age, education, and income. In line with other studies, we use the respondent's educational attainment as an indicator of work orientation (Blossfeld & Huinink, 1991; Hank & Kreyenfeld, 2003) to control for selection of less work-oriented women into less prestigious jobs via less demanding educational tracks much earlier in life (e.g. for the effect of parenthood on work see e.g., Kaufman & Uhlenberg, 2000). Having dependent children in the home increases the time demands, thus we distinguish respondents with and without children, controlling for the age of the youngest child were appropriate. We control for partner characteristics including marital status, partner fertility intentions, and partner employment (Philip Morgan, 2003). Partnership status predicts first and additional child intentions (Philipov, et al., 2006; Spéder & Kapitány, 2009), being an important pre-condition for childbearing (Thomson, 1997; Voas, 2003). Moreover, is marriage more predictive of fertility intentions than cohabiting, even though differences in effects are decreasing (Perelli-Harris, et al., 2009). We also control for partner childbearing

intentions (Miller & Pasta, 1995) and partner employment as indicator for the couple context (Gallie & Russell, 2009).

4. Method

4.1. Data and Sample

The individual-level data were made available by the Swiss Household Panel (SHP) at the Swiss Centre of Expertise in the Social Sciences (FORS) (University of Lausanne; see http://www.swisspanel.ch, for a description of the data set). Data collection started in 1999 with a total sample of 5,074 households containing 12,931 household members. In 2004, a second sample of 2,538 households with a total of 6,569 household members was added. Our period of study cover the 2002-2011 waves, because it was the first year that the SHP collected information on short-term fertility intentions. The SHP personal questionnaire contains fertility histories and employment information.

Our sample consists of 552 childless women and 923 women with children, and 588 childless men and 1119 men with children from age 22 onward, for whom we have at least one recorded fertility intention. The upper age limit is 45 years for women and 50 years for men. We further restrict our sample to individuals living together with their partner or spouse, and for whom we have their partner employment information. Focusing on the pressures the individual men or women experience to combine work and family, we also opted to examine only survey participants who were active on the labor market to study the various mechanisms involved in paid employment and fertility. We took into account that the partner could be unemployed or in training. Further descriptive statistics are displayed in Table 1.

<Insert Table 1 about here>

4.2. Measures

4.2.1. Dependent Variable

Our *dependent variable* is the *intention to have a child* (or another child) in the 24 months following the interview. The question reads, "Do you intend to have a child in the next 24 months?", answered on a three-point scale (yes, don't know, no). Despite that uncertain intentions are meaningful answers (Morgan, 1981) we did not take into account this category; descriptive statistics of each wave showed that persons with uncertain intentions were very rare. Fertility intentions are frequently used as the dependent variable in studies of micro-level predictors of fertility (Miller & Pasta, 1995; Philipov, et al., 2006; Westoff & Ryder, 1977). Especially for those interested in examining the effect of external conditions leading to fertility behavior, short-term fertility intentions which refer to a period of 2-3 years are valuable (Billari, Philipov, & Testa, 2009; Heaton, Jacobson, & Holland, 1999), because it can be assumed that individuals anticipate the effects of their partnership, housing, and economic conditions on the realization of their fertility plans.

4.2.2. Explanatory Variables

Job quality measures. J*ob instability* is measured for employed and self-employed respondents [1]. The specialized literature on job stability suggests that it often comes in the form of limited-duration contracts used to adjust the workforce in response to varying supply and demand conditions (Kalleberg, 2009), or as perceived job insecurity, which reflects worries about one's job. Both forms can be observed on the liberal and future-oriented Swiss labor market that provides little protection to its employees, irrespective of whether they are in permanent or temporary employment (OECD, 2011; Szydlik, 2007). Paugam (2000) emphasizes that the combination of both job quality aspects reflects how

[1] Respondents could be employed by private household, employee of own public limited or limited liability company, self-employed, and partner in his/her relative's firm, and employee of a private firm or government organization.

integrated individuals are on the labor market. Therefore we intended to construct a variable as a proxi of professional integration (Paugam, 2000) that captured objective and subjective aspects. Small cell sizes suggested however to collapse information about perceived job insecurity of permanent employees and self-employed respondents with contractual instability of temporary employees for which data indicate some association with perceived employment condition (about 5% of respondents in the SHP) (Greppi, Mario Lucchini, Assi, & Marazzi, 2010). We constructed a dichotomic variable where 0 means stable and 1 means unstable job conditions. Individuals are considered unstable in the job if they stated to feel insecure about their job or if they had a contract duration shorter than 3 years.

Job prestige is measured by the Treiman's prestige scale that is based on occupational prestige ratings using the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO) (Ganzeboom and Treiman 1996). This scale models a prestige hierarchy whose scores range between 0 (lowest prestige) and 100 (highest prestige), and it is supposedly independent of national and cultural settings.

Gender role attitude related to the private sphere in the SHP is based on a question from the International Social Survey Program ISSP – Families and changing gender roles II/III (1991). The item is "Child suffers with working mother" and reflects approval of maternal employment (Steiber & Haas, 2009). It is reported on an eleven-point scale, ranging from 0 = completely disagree to 10 = completely agree. This item has been recoded in a dichotomic variables: 0 = completely disagree and 1 = completely agree for the analysis. It is the only gender role attitude in the SHP questionnaire that refers to the gender attitude on

the work-family interface, and has to be understood has providing a rough approximation of gender relations at work and in the family.

Control variables. Age centered around the grand mean entered our multilevel models. The *level of education* was measured by a categorical variable we computed that takes into account the highest level of education achieved. It distinguishes between individuals with a low level of education (i.e., incomplete compulsory school, compulsory school, elementary vocational training; domestic science course, 1 year school of commerce, or a general training school); a middle level of education (i.e., an apprenticeship, technical or vocational school, full-time vocational school, bachelor/maturity); or a high level of education (i.e., vocational high school with a master's certificate, or federal certificate; university, or academic high school). *Household income* as the yearly total net income of all the persons in the household was introduced. In the logit models we used the log of the household income. In order to measure the extent an individual contributes to the household, an indicator called *contribution to the household income* was computed ranging from 1 = the individual income matches exactly the household income (i.e. individual income in nominator), whereas higher scores mean a higher contribution to the household income. If applicable, we controlled for *the age of the youngest child* (coded as 1 = a child aged between 1 month to 3 years, 2 = a child aged between 4 to years 5; 3 = a child aged between 6 to 12 years, 4 = a child aged 13 years or older). We controlled whether participants are *married* or not, because even if births outside marriage are relatively frequent in Switzerland, married couples may hold different, potentially more, unequal gender attitudes. We also controlled for *the partner's child intention* coded 0 = not having the intention to have a child within 24 month, 1 having the intention to have a child within 24 month. To capture partner employment, we controlled for *the partner's occupational*

status: whether the partner is at home, in training, work full-time or part-time, or whether the partner is jobless.

4.2.3. Analysis

To analyze the likelihood to intend a first child (additional child, respectively) we apply nested hierarchical two-level models, in which we make use of data from multiple observations (DiPrete & Forristal, 1994) and take their non-independence into account (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002). In our models, each individual is allowed to contribute multiple observations that are considered more similar than observations by different persons within the same year. Our analytical priority was on testing the two main hypotheses on job quality and gender role attitudes, and keeping control for the main partner's characteristics. To maintain a sufficuent sample size under these constraints, the only possible modeling choice was pooling data from different waves sacrificing the possibility to make full use of the longitudinal nature of the data set. In contrast, applying standard fixed effects models for our non-independent data would violate the assumption of independent observations and thereby produce too small standard errors, resulting in many unsubstantiated significant effects (Hox, 2010). In most cases, data on fertility intentions covered multiple time points. The binary nature of our dependent variable made us use a set of hierarchical logit models with various intra-individual time-dependent measures (from up to ten time points) nested in the individual respondent.

Fertility intentions are considered as dependent on the respondent's situation at the time of the interview and not the situation they were in at the beginning of the follow-up interview (Hox, 2002; Singer & Willett, 2003). This makes hierarchical two-level models appropriate because they allow for unequal distances between time points to which annual individual

observations were collected. In particular, we computed logit models using the HLM software, version 6 (Bryk & Raudenbush., 1992); we used unit-specific models to account for processes at level-1 recurring within each individual (e.g. yearly observation of the same individual measures). We used the PQL and the method of estimation was the restricted maximum likelihood.

5. Multivariate Results

We estimated two main models for the likelihood to intend a first and an additional child, for men and women separately, because the decision to start a family is qualitatively different from intending additional children (Barber, 2001; Dommermuth, Klobas, & Lappegard, 2011; Hobcraft & Kiernan, 1995). The regression results of the logistic multilevel analysis are presented in Table 2 and Table 3. All models in the left panel include the explanatory factors of job quality on intentions controlled for sociodemographic and partner variables. Those in the right panel include interactions terms of job instability and prestige with gender role attitude.

5.1. Job quality and gender role attitude

In the analysis of the likelihood to intend a(nother) child, the job quality coefficients indicate different mechanisms for men and women. Our findings support previous research in this respect (for an overview see e.g., Bianchi & Milkie, 2010; Buchmann & Charles, 1995; Charles, et al., 2001). Moreover, our results confirm that these mechanisms are markedly different for respondents with and without children. They support existing evidence that employment-related factors, that help reconcile work and family, become differentially salient for women and men after the birth of the first child (Brewster & Rindfuss, 2000).

We tested in *Hypothesis 1* whether perceived job instability reduces first child intentions for men and women. Our results confirmed this hypothesis for childless women. In other words, women who perceive job instability are less likely to intend to have a first child. This is illustrated by the negative significant coefficient in Table 2 (*B*=-0.853; *p*<0.001; *odds ratio*=0.426). For men, this coefficient is insignificant but points into the same direction.

We find partial support for *Hypothesis 2* where we anticipated that higher job prestige would translate into higher fertility intentions for childless men. As mentioned earlier, job prestige is often combined with high responsibility that is a job quality that can be difficult to combine with having children. Assuming that challenging prestige jobs are held by men who prioritize work over having children and/or are more sensitive to trade-offs (e.g. consequences of maternal employment on child well-being), we employed an interaction of job prestige and gender role attitude. Indeed, the interaction term turned out to be significant (*B*=-0.036; *p*<0.05; *odds ratio*=0.964) indicating that men's job prestige reduces first child intentions if respondents disapprove maternal employment. In these models (Table 2, right panel) we find a positive direct effect of job prestige on fertility intentions of childless men (*B*=0.023; *p*<0.1; *odds ratio*=1.023). This might be attributed to the mere effect of resources available if men have a high-status job irrespective of their gender role attitude. In sum, with regards to our *Hypothesis 3* interacting job prestige with gender role attitude shows a negative significant effect to intend fatherhood, thereby reflecting the tension between gains and strains job prestige introduces to family life (Marshall & Barnett, 1993).

<Insert Table 2>

<Insert Table 3>

We also tested models for respondents with children (see Table 3). Our expectation in *Hypothesis 4* was that the higher time pressure from parenthood would make job stability more salient for men's fertility intentions. Effects for job stability turned out to be insignificant. But interacting job instability with gender role attitude shows a strong joint effect on fertility intentions of fathers who worry that a child suffers with a working mother (*B*=1.140; *p*<0.05; *odds ratio*=3.125). This contradicts our prior assumption that parenthood would set off effects of gender attitude and its interplay with job prestige and stability. A plausible explanation is that the fathers who balance instable jobs with family demands are also placing high importance to their job and family. Therefore, these men are most likely to invest in paid labor, whilst at the same time not compromising their family plans. For women, the results confirm that motherhood indeed sets off negative effects of job instability on fertility intentions. This suggests that the decision to have additional children is driven other factors, outside of a woman's employment situation (Brewster & Rindfuss, 2000).

Coefficients for job prestige show positive effects for fathers (*B*=0.021; *p*<0.1; *odds ratio*=1.021) similar to the model for childless men, contradicting our expectation that fatherhood would make job prestige more salient. Interacting job prestige with gender role attitude shows that fathers with prestige jobs disapproving maternal employment are less likely to intend an additional child (*B*=-0.026; *p*<0.1; *odds ratio*=0.974). Therefore, our results show that despite positive effects of father's job prestige on subsequent child intentions, high-status jobs are coupled with disapproval of maternal employment limit fertility. Findings for mothers, show no significant relationship between intentions to have

subsequent children and job prestige, instability, and gender attitude. High-status jobs might thus not be the ones that improve work-family facilitation of mothers.

5.2. Socio-demographic variables

In all models, coefficients of the individual control variables are as expected. For women and men, there is a negative age effect on child intentions, which is consistent with the assumption that older respondents are less likely to intend a child (see e.g., Philipov, et al., 2006). Partner intentions increases first and subsequent child intentions (Berrington, 2004). Being married increases the likelihood for women and men without children, to intend a first child. In order to explore the idea that women and men with dependent children are more influenced by characteristics of their current job because they are confronted with difficulties in combining child rearing and work, we controlled in the models for the age of the youngest child. Results indicate that having at least one dependent child under the age of 6 years in the home significantly predicts the intention to have a subsequent child. The effects are most significant with dependent children aged between 0 and 3 years (B=1.407; p<0.001; *odds ratio*=4.085 for women; B=1.377; p<0.001; *odds ratio*=3.963 for men). This indicates that birth spacing is largely driven by the desire to have children of similar age and eventually economizing total care over one's reproductive life-span, contradicting our expectation that current domestic workload would limit fertility in families with dependent children.

6. Discussion

Given that women's work orientation and career aspiration are a phenomenon of the large social, demographic, and ideational change (Lesthaege & Neidert, 2006), the compatibility of child rearing and women's employment is a pre-condition to higher fertility rates. This

study provides empirical evidence of how important workplace conditions are for reproductive decision-making and informs policy makers who are mostly focused on family or employment policy measures (e.g. parental leave regulations, taxation), about people's concerns regarding their employment quality and insecurity as a key factor in developing concrete childbearing plans.

This analysis recognizes the link between workplace conditions and perceptions and individual fertility decisions, and the particular importance of employment for first child intentions. We estimate the relationship between job quality on the likelihood of women's and men's first and additional child intentions in Switzerland. Our results show that whilst socio-demographic factors (age, age of the youngest child, education, marital status) are the strongest determinants of fertility intentions—job instability and prestige further improve our understanding of fertility decision-making. Instable jobs significantly decrease first child intentions for women, confirming our expectations and previous research of their negative effect on the timing of first birth (Bernardi, et al., 2012; Golsch, 2003; Kreyenfeld, 2009). Job prestige effects, as well as several interactions, were tested for their effects on women's and men's fertility intentions; not all effects were as we expected. Job prestige when interacted with men's disapproval of maternal employment even decreases their fertility decisions; men's job instability operates in the opposite direction in this respect. For women results indicate to effects of job instability on first child intentions, but motherhood sets off any employment related effects. How can we explain the gap between the obvious conceptual significance of job quality to buffer work-family conflicts (Oppenheimer, 1988; Voydanoff, 2005) and the empirical opposed effects for the intention to have children in Switzerland?

First of all, our analysis points to major shortcomings in the functioning of the Swiss employment system, the structure of which has heavily promoted equal opportunities for men and women since the 1980s. The compatibility of child rearing and employment, with its specific demands regarding schedule flexibility and autonomy in the organization of work, was not yet part of the political agenda, and high-status jobs were designed as career tracks that offer quality training and promotions against continuous work commitment. Although there is a Europe-wide, universal policy of encouraging female labor-market participation as well as reducing domestic workload, it has not yet transferred to major changes in social policy support for families in all countries (Rubery, Smith, Anxo, & Flood, 2001). In Switzerland, employment, and careers in particular, are often perceived as impossible to reconcile with child rearing. To make quality jobs to an integrative part that couples take into account in their fertility planning, job designs must provide options that parents consider as realistic conditions to pursue their work and career goals.

Second, our study points to challenges in empirically addressing the role of job quality. It is not only difficult to measure job quality, but one needs to account for the heterogeneity of parental needs. Parents are likely to experience multiple demands depending on different care arrangements (Smith, 2000) and couple employment patterns (Gallie & Russell, 2009), which might not be adequately captured by a few single indicators, such as stable work conditions and access to various privileges in the workplace. Future investigation should include further dimensions of job quality to obtain a differentiated understanding of the relevant factors in the relationship between working conditions and women's and men's fertility decision-making. The same is applicable to the measurement of gender role attitude which depending on the various items used leads to varied outcomes (Goldscheider, Oláh, & Puur, 2010; Puur, Oláh, Tazi-Preve, & Dorbritz). It can well be that scholars would

argue that especially women's employment is endogenous with her fertility decisions and child births. A common strategy to statistically address this issue is implementing structural equation models or designing fixed effects models (Rindfuss, Guilkey, Morgan, & Kravdal). It was however not possible to overcome this issue in our current study design because we included only employed respondents for whom information on job stability and prestige are available. It was also not possible, for example, to distinguish among respondents in high-status jobs those who would make use of the flexibility to combine work with family from those who are career oriented and thus less likely to intend to have a child. Future research should therefore address these issues using longitudinal designs or by applying the above mentioned techniques.

Finally, it is vital to see how the employment system is embedded into the country's broader welfare state institutions (McDonald, 2000), such as the income tax, and parental leave system. Switzerland is generally grouped into the liberal welfare state regimes that provide weak support for families coupled with no paternity leave provisions that underpins the traditional male breadwinner and female homemaker model(Esping-Andersen, 2009). If this welfare state type is directed towards the family traditionalism, the highest stable and privileged jobs will not suffice increasing labor force participation and fertility.

Table 1. Descriptive Sample Statistics

	Childless women	Childless men	Women with at least one child	Men with at least one child
N	552	588	923	1119
Dependent variable				
Intention to have a child within 24 months				
Yes	29.3%	26.0%	19.2%	21.6%
No	59.2%	60.2%	55.3%	54.6%
Sociodemographic variables				
Age groups				
Mean age	31.2 years	34.05 years	36.3 years	38.39 years
22-30 years of age	53.6%	39.6%	12.8%	7.5%
31-39 years of age	29.2%	33.3%	58.3%	41.45%
40-45 years of age	17.2%	16.5%	28.9%	31.7%
45-50 years of age		10.5%		19.3%
Civil status				
Single, never married	59.6%	54.4%	5.1%	6.0%
Married	36.1%	36.2%	89.7%	90.3%
Separated	0.7%	1.2%	0.9%	0.4%
Divorced	3.4%	7.8%	4.1%	3.2%
Widower/widow	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%
Level of education				
Low education	8.3%	5.3%	11.6%	5.1%
Middle education	52.4%	45.2%	60.2%	44.8%
High education	39.3%	49.5%	28.2%	50.1%
Being active on the labor market				
Active on the labor market	98.4%	98.3%	98.4%	98.5%
Unemployed	1.6%	1.7%	1.6%	1.5%
Income: mean, CHF net				
Individual net	50138.45CHF	70621.50CHF	30718.80CHF	88519.45CHF
Household net	123010.90CHF	128081.75CHF	113172.35CHF	114486.25CHF
Number of children				
One			37.7%	38.5%
Two			42.0%	42.1%
Three or plus			20.3%	19.4%
Explanatory variables				
Job quality:				
Job stability	79.3%	80.6%	78.3%	87.7%
Job instability	18.3%	17.0%	17.0%	10.6%
Job prestige: mean	47.13	47.56	44.24	46.73
Gender attitudes: child suffers with a working mother				
Not at all	53.3%	38.9%	58.2%	37.4%
Yes	46.0%	59.7%	40.5%	61.8%

Note: Data are from the Swiss Household Panel (2002-2011); authors' calculations. Descriptive statistics refer to first observation recorded for each respondent (at least one observation).

Table 2. Results of (multilevel) logit models for first child intentions of women and men

	Childless women	Childless men	Childless women	Childless men
N; Observations	552; 1254	588; 1338	552; 1254	588; 1338
Fixed effects				
Intercept	-7.772*	-4.128	-8.389*	-4.516
	(0.0004)	(0.016)	(0.0002)	(0.011)
Work characteristics				
Job instability	-0.853**	0.065	-0.613	-0.250
(ref. stability)	(0.426)	(2.441)	(0.542)	(0.778)
Professional prestige	0.009	0.004	0.0118	0.023+
	(1.009)	(1.005)	(1.012)	(1.023)
Gender attitude				
Child suffers with			0.630	1.462+
working mother			(1.877)	(4.315)
Interactions				
Prof prest. * child			-0.006	-0.036*
suffers with working			(0.994)	(0.964)
mother				
Instability * child suffers			-0.684	0.589
with working mother			(0.504)	(1.802)
Socio-demographic factors				
Age	-0.085***	-0.052***	-0.087***	-0.053**
	(0.918)	(0.949)	(0.917)	(0.948)
Low level of education	-0.553	-0.047	-0.593	-0.047
(ref. middle)	(0.575)	(0.954)	(0.552)	(0.954)
High level of education	0.352	0.362	0.393+	0.349
(ref. middle)	(1.422)	(1.436)	(1.482)	(1.418)
Household income	0.390	0.073	0.415	0.035
	(1.477)	(1.076)	(1.515)	(1.035)
Contribution to the hh	0.374	0.354	0.447	0.466
income	(1.454)	(1.424)	(1.564)	(1.594)
Marital status	0.958***	0.892***	0.965***	0.882***
(1=married)	(2.608)	(2.441)	(2.626)	(2.415)
Partner characteristics				
Partner's child intention	3.467***	3.467***	3.483***	3.496***
	(32.035)	(32.070)	(32.567)	(32.981)
Partner at home	1.229	0.507	1.020	0.501
(ref. part time)	(3.417)	(1.661)	(2.774)	(1.650)
Partner training	-0.005	-0.982+	-0.006	-0.938
(ref. part time)	(0.995)	(0.374)	(0.994)	(0.391)
Partner full time	0.102	0.366	0.075	0.375
(ref. part time)	(1.107)	(1.442)	(1.078)	(1.456)
Partner jobless	-0.043	-0.921	-0.039	-0.941
(ref. part time)	(0.958)	(0.398)	(0.961)	(0.390)
Random effect				
Intercept	1.093	1.180	1.075	1.184
Log-Likelihood	*-1593.693*	*-1677.947*	-1600.099	*-1979.017*

Note. Data are from the Swiss Household Panel (2002-2011); authors' calculations.
Logit Models, coefficients and odds ratio (round bracket).
+ $p \leq .1$;* $p \leq .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$. Mode of estimates: restricted PQL.

Table 3. Results of (multilevel) logit models for subsequent child intentions of women and men

N; Observations	Women with at least one child 923; 2771	Men with at least one child 1119; 3839	Women with at least one child 923; 2771	Men with at least one child 1119; 3839
Fixed effects				
Intercept	-3.892	-5.908+	-3.468	-6.399+
	(0.020)	(0.002)	(0.031)	(0.002)
Work characteristics				
Job instability	0.096	0.222	0.306	-0.438
(ref. stability)	(1.101)	(1.249)	(1.359)	(0.645)
Professional prestige	0.009	0.007	0.002	0.021+
	(1.009)	(1.007)	(1.002)	(1.021)
Gender attitude				
Child suffers with working mother			-0.771 (0.462)	1.099 (3.002)
Interactions				
Prof prest. * child suffers with working mother			0.0208 (1.021)	-0.026+ (0.974)
Instability * child suffers with working mother			-0.651 (0.522)	1.140* (3.125)
Socio-demographic factors				
Age	-0.075*	-0.107***	-0.074*	-0.107***
	(0.927)	(0.898)	(0.928)	(0.898)
Low level of education	-0.372	0.991	-0.300	0.946*
(ref. middle)	(0.689)	(2.693)	(0.741)	(2.577)
High level of education	0.258	0.168	0.292	0.162
(ref. middle)	(1.294)	(1.183)	(1.340)	(1.177)
Household income	-0.146	0.161	-0.161	0.147
	(0.863)	(1.175)	(0.850)	(1.158)
Contribution to the hh income	0.562 (1.754)	-0.558 (0.572)	0.616 (1.851)	-0.546 (0.579)
Marital status	0.233	-0.310	0.229	-0.305
(1=married)	(1.268)	(0.733)	(1.257)	(0.737)
Partner characteristics				
Partner's child intention	4.329***	4.358***	4.362***	4.425***
	(75.879)	(78.071)	(78.390)	(83.498)
Partner at home	-0.217	0.012	-0.199	0.036
(ref. part time)	(0.805)	(1.012)	(0.819)	(1.036)
Partner training	-0.005	1.323	0.039	1.280
(ref. part time)	(0.995)	(3.755)	(1.039)	(3.598)
Partner full time	0.405	-0.114	0.408	-0.050
(ref. part time)	(1.499)	(0.892)	(1.503)	(0.951)
Partner jobless	-0.547	0.685	-0.591	0.650
(ref. part time)	(0.578)	(1.985)	(0.553)	(1.917)
Age of the youngest kid				
Aged between 0-3	1.407***	1.377***	1.421***	1.362***
(ref. 6-12 years old)	(4.085)	(3.963)	(4.140)	(3.903)
Aged between 4-5	0.941**	0.449+	0.955**	0.427
(ref. 6-12 years old)	(2.562)	(1.566)	(2.599)	(1.533)
13 years old and older	-0.602	-0.141	-0.590	-0.153
(ref. 6-12 years old)	(0.547)	(0.868)	(0.554)	(0.858)
Random effect				
Intercept	1.182	1.121	1.185	1.134
Log-Likelihood	*-3100.743*	*-4404.816*	*-3093.488*	*-4387.659*

Note. Data are from the Swiss Household Panel (2002-2011); authors' calculations. Logit Models, coefficients and odds ratio (round bracket). + $p \leq .1$;* $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$. Mode of estimates: restricted PQL.

References

Adsera, A. (2005). Vanishing children: From high unemployment to low fertility in developed countries. *The American Economic Review, 95*(2), 189-193.

Ajzen, I. (1991). The Theory of Planned Behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50*, 179-211.

Barber, J. S. (2001). Ideational influences on the transition to parenthood: Attitudes toward childbearing and competing alternatives. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 64*(2), 101-127.

Begall, K., & Mills, M. (2011). The impact of subjective work control, job strain and work-family conflict on fertility intentions. *European Journal of Population, June* (Published online: 12 October 2011). doi: 10.1007/s10680-011-9244-z

Bernardi, L., Klaerner, A., & von der Lippe, H. (2008). Job insecurity and the timing of parenthood: a comparison between Eastern and Western Germany. *European Journal of Population, 24*(3), 287-313.

Bernardi, L., Ryser, V.-A., & Le Goff, J.-M. (2012). Gender Role-Set, Family Orientations, and Women's Fertility Intentions in Switzerland. *Swiss Journal of Sociology, 39*(1), 9-31.

Berrington, A. (2004). Perpetual postponers? Women's, men's and couples' fertility intentions and subsequent fertility behaviour. *Statistical Sciences Research Institute, S3RI Applications and Policy Working Papers*(A04/09), 28pp.

Bianchi, S. M., & Milkie, M. A. (2010). Work and family research in the first decade of the 21st century. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 72*(3), 705-725.

Billari, F. C., Philipov, D., & Testa, M. R. (2009). Attitudes, norms and perceived behavioural control: explaining fertility intentions in Bulgaria. *European Journal of Population/Revue européenne de Démographie, 25*(4), 439-465.

Blossfeld, H. P., & Hofmeister, H. (Eds.). (2007). *Globalization, uncertainty and women's careers: an international comparison*. Chelteham, UK /Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Blossfeld, H. P., & Huinink, J. (1991). Human capital investments or norms of role transition? How women's schooling and career affect the process of family formation. *The American Journal of Sociology, 97*(1), 143-168.

Blossfeld, H. P., Klijzing, E., Mills, M., & Kurz, K. (Eds.). (2005). *Globalization, uncertainty and youth society*. London/New York: Routledge.

Brewster, K. L., & Rindfuss, R. R. (2000). Fertility and women's employment in industrialized nations. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26*, 271-296.

Bryk, A. S., & Raudenbush., S. W. (Eds.). (1992). *Hierarchical Linear Models: Applications and Data Analysis Methods.* Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Buchmann, M., & Charles, M. (1995). Organizational and institutional factors in the process of gender stratification: Comparing social arrangements in six European countries. *International Journal of Sociology, 25*(2), 66-95.

Bühlmann, F., Elcheroth, G., & Tettamanti, M. (2009). The Division of Labour Among European Couples: The Effects of Life Course and Welfare Policy on Value-Practice Configurations. *European Sociological Review, 26*(1), 49-66.

Caldwell, J. C. (2008). Three fertility compromises and two transitions. *Population Research and Policy Review, 27*(4), 427-446.

Charles, M., Buchmann, M., Halebsky, S., Powers, J. M., & Smith, M. M. (2001). The Context of Women's Market Careers. *Work and occupations, 28*(3), 371.

Corijn, M., Liefbroer, A. C., & de Jong Gierveld, J. (1996). It takes two to tango, doesn't it? The influence of couple characteristics on the timing of the birth of the first child. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 117-126.

DiPrete, T. A., & Forristal, J. D. (1994). Multilevel models: methods and substance. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 331-357.

Dommermuth, L., Klobas, J., & Lappegard, T. (2011). Now or later? The Theory of Planned Behavior and Timing of Fertility Intentions *Advances in Life Course Research, 16*, 42-53.

Dribe, M., & Stanfors, M. (2009). Does parenthood strengthen a traditional household division of labor? Evidence from Sweden. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 71*(1), 33-45.

Esping-Andersen, G. (2009). The Incomplete Revolution: Adapting to Women's New Roles. Cambridge: Polity Press.

EU. (2010). Demography Report 2010 of the Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion. Eurostat, the Statistical Office of the European Union, Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion. Brussles.

Friedman, D., Hechter, M., & Kanazawa, S. (1994). A theory of the value of children. *Demography, 31*(3), 375-401.

FSO. (2013). Labor market indicators for 2013. In F. S. O. Federal Department of Home Affairs (Ed.). Neuchâtel: FSO.

Gallie, D., & Russell, H. (2009). Work-family conflict and working conditions in Western Europe. *Social Indicators Research, 93*(3), 445-467.

Giesecke, J. (2009). Socio-economic risks of atypical employment relationships: evidence from the German labour market. *European Sociological Review, 25*(6), 629.

Goldscheider, F., Oláh, L. Sz., & Puur, A. (2010). Reconciling studies of men's gender attitudes and fertility: Response to Westoff and Higgins. *Demographic Research, 22*(8), 189-198.

Golsch, K. (2003). Employment flexibility in Spain and its impact on transitions to adulthood. *Work, Employment & Society, 17*(4), 691.

Gornick, J. C., & Meyers, M. (2005). Families that work: Policies for reconciling parenthood and employment: Russell Sage Foundation.

Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 76-88.

Greppi, S., Mario Lucchini, M., Assi, J., & Marazzi, C. (2010). The determinants of fixed-term contracts in contemporary Switzerland. *FORS Working Paper Series FORS, http://www2.unil.ch/fors/spip.php?rubrique145&lang=de,, 2010-04*.

Grunow, D., Schulz, F., & Blossfeld, H.-P. What determines change in the division of housework over the course of marriage? *International Sociology, 27*(3), 289-307.

Hanappi, D., Ryser, V.-A., Bernardi, L., & Le Goff, J.-M. (2012). Precarious Work and the Fertility Intentions-Behavior Link: An Analysis based on the Swiss Household Panel Data. *Working Paper LIVES (http://www.lives-nccr.ch/fr/page/lives-working-papers-list-papers-n78), 17*, 1-27.

Hank, K., & Kreyenfeld, M. (2003). A multilevel analysis of child care and women's fertility decisions in Western Germany. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 65*(3), 584-596.

Heaton, T. B., Jacobson, C. K., & Holland, K. (1999). Persistence and change in decisions to remian childess. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 61*(2), 531-539.

Hermalin, A. I., Freedman, R., Sun, T.-H., & Chang, M. C. (1979). Do intentions predict fertility? The experience in Taiwan, 1967-74. *Studies in Family Planning, 10*(3), 559-572.

Hobcraft, J., & Kiernan, K. E. (1995). Becoming a parent in Europe. Plenary paper for European Population Conference. *In EAPS/IUSSP proceedings of the European population conference Milan, September*, 27-65.

Hobson, B., & Oláh, L. Sz. (2006). Birthstrikes? Agency and capabilities in the reconciliation of employment and family. *Marriage & Family Review, 39*(3-4), 197-227.

Hochschild, A. R., & Manchung, A. (1989). The second shift: Working women and the revolution at home. *New York: Viking*.

Hoffman, L. W., & Manis, J. D. (1979). The value of children in the United States: A new approach to the study of fertility. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 583-596.

Hox, J. J. (2010). *Multilevel analysis: Techniques and applications*. New York and Hove: Taylor & Francis.

Hox, J. J. (Ed.). (2002). *Multilevel Analysis. Techniques and Applications*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Jacobs, J., & Gerson, K. (2001). Overworked individuals or overworked families?: Explaining trends in work, leisure, and family time. *Work and occupations, 28*(1), 40.

Kalleberg, A. (2009). Precarious work, insecure workers: Employment relations in Transition. *American Sociological Review, 74*(1), 1-22. doi: 10.1177/000312240907400101

Kalmijn, M. (2011). The Influence of Menís Income and Employment on Marriage and Cohabitation: Testing Oppenheimerís Theory in Europe. *European Journal of Population, 27*, 1-25.

Kaufman, G., & Uhlenberg, P. (2000). The influence of parenthood on the work effort of married men and women. *Social Forces, 78*(3), 931-947.

Kohler, H. P., Billari, F., & Ortega, J. A. (2006). Low Fertility in Europe: Causes, implications and policy options. In F. R. Harris (Ed.), *The Baby Bust: Who will do the Work? Who will pa the taxes?* (pp. 48-109). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Kreyenfeld, M. (2009). Uncertainties in female employment careers and the postponement of parenthood in Germany. *European Sociological Review, 26*(3), 351-366.

Kreyenfeld, M., Andersson, G., & Pailhé, A. (2012). Economic uncertainty and family dynamics in Europe: Introduction. *Demographic Research, 27*(28), 835-852. doi: 10.4054/DemRes.2012.27.28

Krüger, H., & Levy, R. (2001). Linking life courses, work, and the family: theorising a not so visible nexus between women and men. *Canadian Journal of Sociology / Cahiers canadiens de sociologie, 26*, 145-166.

Lesthaege, R., & Neidert, L. (2006). The second demogrpahic transition in the United States: Exception or textbook example? *Population and Development Review, 32*(4), 669-698.

Liefbroer, A. C. (2005). The impact of perceived costs and rewards of childbearing on entry into parenthood: Evidence from a panel study. *European Journal of Population/Revue européenne de Démographie, 21*(4), 367-391.

Marshall, N. L., & Barnett, R. C. (1993). Work-family strains and gains among two-earner couples. *Journal of Community Psychology, 21*(1), 64-78.

Mason, K. O., & Kuhlthau, K. (1989). Determinants of child care ideals among mothers of preschool-aged children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51*(3), 593-603.

McDonald, P. (2000). Gender equity in theories of fertility transition. *Population and Development Review, 26*(3), 427-436. doi: 10.1111/j.1728-4457.2000.00427.x

Miller, W. B., & Pasta, D. J. (1995). Behavioral Intentions: Which Ones Predict Fertility Behavior in Married Couples? . *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 25*(6), 530-555.

Monnier, A. (2006). Démographie contemporaine de l'Europe: évolutions, tendances, défis. Paris: Armand Colin.

Morgan, S. P. (1981). Intention and uncertainty at later stages of childbearing: The United States 1965 and 1970. *Demography, 18*(3), 267-285.
Nauk, B. (2007). Value of Children and the Framing of Fertility: Reults from a Cross-cultural Comparative survey in 10 Societies. *European Sociological Review, 23*(5), 615-629.
Neyer, G., Lappegård, T., & Vignoli, D. (2011). Gender equality and fertility: Which equality matters? *European Journal of Population/Revue Européenne de Démographie*, 1-28.
OECD. (2011). OECD Indicators on Employment Protection - annual time series data 1985-2008 <http://www.oecd.org/document/11/0,3746,en_2649_37457_42695243_1_1_1_37457,00.html>
OFS. (2011). Geburten, Eheschliessungen, und Scheidungen im Trend. *Pressestelle OFS* (Nr. 0350-1106-90).
Oláh, L. Sz. (2003). Gendering fertility: Second births in Sweden and Hungary. *Population Research and Policy Review, 22*(2), 171-200.
Oppenheimer, V. K. (1988). A theory of marriage timing. *American Journal of Sociology, 94*(3), 563-591.
Pailhé, A., & Solaz, A. (2012). The influence of employment uncertainty on childbearing in France: A tempo or quantum effect? *Demographic Research, 26*(1), 1-40.
Paugam, S. (2000). Le salarié de la précarité. *Paris, PUF*.
Perelli-Harris, B., Kreyenfeld, M., Sigle-Rushton, W., Keizer, R., Lappegard, T., Jasilioniene, A., et al. (2009). The increase in fertility in cohabitation across Europe: Examining the intersection between union status and childbearing: Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research, Rostock, Germany.
Philip Morgan, S. (2003). Is low fertility a twenty-first-century demographic crisis? *Demography, 40*(4), 589-603.
Philipov, D., & Bernardi, L. (2011). Concepts and Operationalisation of Reproductive Decisions Implementation in Austria, Germany and Switzerland. *Comparative Population Studies-Zeitschrift für Bevölkerungswissenschaft, 36*(2-3), 495-530.
Philipov, D., Spéder, Z., & Billari, F. C. (2006). Soon, later, or ever? The impact of anomie and social capital on fertility intentions in Bulgaria (2002) and Hungary (2001). *Population Studies, 60*(3), 289-308.
Puur, A., Oláh, L. Sz., Tazi-Preve, M. I., & Dorbritz, J. Men's childbearing desires and views of the male role in Europe at the dawn of the 21st century. *Demographic Research Volume 19, 19*, 1883.
Quesnel-Vallee, A., & Morgan, S. P. (2003). Missing the target? Correspondence of fertility intentions and behavior in the US. *Population Research and Policy Review, 22*(5), 497-525.
Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods* (Vol. 1): Sage Publications, Incorporated.
Rindfuss, R. R., & Brewster, K. L. (1996). Childrearing and fertility. *Population and Development Review, 22*, 258-289.
Rindfuss, R. R., Guilkey, D. K., Morgan, S. P., & Kravdal, Ø. (2010). Child-Care Availability and Fertility in Norway. *Population and Development Review, 36*(4), 725-748.
Rubery, J., Smith, M., Anxo, D., & Flood, L. (2001). The future European labor supply: the critical role of the family. *Feminist Economics, 7*(3), 33-69.
Scherer, S. (2009). The social consequences of insecure jobs. *Social Indicators Research, 93*(3), 527-547.

Schieman, S., & Glavin, P. (2008). Trouble at the Border: Gender, Flexibility at Work, and the Work-Home Interface. *Social Problems, 55*, 590.

Schmitt, C. (2012). A Cross-National Perspective on Unemployment and First Birth. *European Journal of Population, 05 June 2012*. doi: 10.1007/s10680-012-9262-5

Schoen, R., Kim, Y. J., Nathanson, C. A., & Fields, J. (1999). Do fertility intentions affect fertility behavior? *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 61*(3), 790-799.

Simpson, R. L., & Simpson, I. H. (1960). Correlates and estimation of occupational prestige. *American Journal of Sociology, 66*(2), 135-140.

Singer, J. D., & Willett, J. B. (2003). Applied Longitudinal Data Analysis: Modeling Change and Event Occurrence. Oxford: University Press.

Smith, K. (2000). Who's minding the kids? Child care arrangements: Fall 1995 *Current Population Reports* (pp. 70-70). Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

Sobotka, T. (2011). Fertility in Austria, Germany and Switzerland: Is there a Common Pattern? *Comparative Population Studies-Zeitschrift für Bevölkerungswissenschaft, 36*(2-3).

Sobotka, T., Skirbekk, V., & Philipov, D. (2011). Economic recession and fertility in the developed world. *Population and Development Review, 37*(2), 267-306.

Sozialforschung, Z. f. e. (1991). [ISSP 1988 - Family and Changing Sex Roles].

Spéder, Z., & Kapitány, B. (2009). How are Time-Dependent Childbearing Intentions Realized? Realization, Postponement, Abandonment, Bridging Forward. *European Journal of Population, 25*, 503-523. doi: 10.1007/s10680-009-9189-7

Steiber, N., & Haas, B. (2009). Ideals or compromises? The attitude-behaviour relationship in mothers' employment. *Socio-Economic Review, 7*(4), 639-668.

Szydlik, M. (2007). *Flexiblisierung: Folgen für Arbeit und Familie*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwisseenschaften.

Testa, M. R. (2012). Family Sizes in Europe:Evidence from the 2011 Eurobarometer Survey *European Demographic Research Papers 2 Vienna*. Vienna: Vienna Institute of Demography of the Austrian Academy of Sciences.

Thomson, E. (1997). Couple childbearing desires, intentions, and births. *Demography, 34*(3), 343-354.

Treiman, D. J. (1970). Industrialization and Social Stratification*. *Sociological Inquiry, 40*(2), 207-234.

Voas, D. (2003). Conflicting preferences: a reason fertility tends to be too high or too low. *Population and Development Review, 29*(4), 627-646.

Voydanoff, P. (1988). Work role characteristics, family structure demands, and work/family conflict. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 50*(3), 749-761.

Voydanoff, P. (2005). Toward a Conceptualization of Perceived Work-Family Fit and Balance: A Demands and Resources Approach. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 67*(4), 822-836.

Wegener, B. (1992). Concepts and measurement of prestige. *Annual Review of Sociology, 18*, 253-280.

Westoff, C. F., & Ryder, N. B. (1977). The predicitive validity of repproductive intentions. *Demography, 14*(4), 431-453.

White, L., & McQuillan, J. (2006). No longer intending: The relationship between relinguished fertility intentions and Distress. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 68*(2), 478-490. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00266.x