It takes two to tango: couples' happiness and childbearing

Arnstein Aassve[1], Bruno Arpino[2], Nicoletta Balbo[1]

1 - Department of Policy Analysis and Public Management and Carlo F. Dondena Centre for Research on Social Dynamics and Public Policies, Bocconi University, Milan, Italy; arnstein.aassve@unibocconi.it; balbo.nicoletta@unibocconi.it.

2 - Department of Political and Social Sciences and the Research and Expertise Centre for Survey Methodology (RECSM), Pompeu Fabra University, Barcelona, Spain; bruno.arpino@upf.edu.

Abstract

Existing literature has so far considered the role of the individual's subjective well-being on fertility, neglecting the importance of the partner's well-being. Using data from the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS) and fixed-effect models estimated separately by parity, we find that in the couple, women's happiness matter more than that of the male partner in terms of having the first child. In contrast, we find the opposite effect for the progression to the second child. We also find support for a multiplicative effect of partners' SWB on the decision to have a first child. Our results show that failing to acknowledge that the subjective well-being of both partners matter for the inherently joint decision making of childbearing, can lead to a biased view of how subjective well-being affects fertility.

1. **Introduction**

No longer limited to psychology, studies on subjective wellbeing and the way it links with various behavioral aspects, are finding their way into the social sciences. Within demography, there has been a particular focus on the relationship between subjective wellbeing and childbearing. Starting with Aassve et al. (2005) and Kohler et al. (2005), the idea is that a key motivational reason behind childbearing must come from individuals deriving positive wellbeing from parenthood. Whereas Aassve et al. (2005) took a comparative perspective, thereby considering the role of context, and Kohler et al. (2005) using data on Danish twins for a causal interpretation, recent years have witnessed a large number of studies that consider the dynamic interplay between childbearing and subjective wellbeing (e.g., Billari 2009; Aassve et al., 2012; Margolis and Myrskylä 2011, 2015).

The vast majority of these studies, however, focuses on *individuals'* or rather the *respondents'* wellbeing (e.g., Myrskylä and Margolis 2014). This is perhaps surprising because the venture of childbearing is necessarily a joint decision of the two partners involved. In this paper we ask the question to what extent a couple-perspective bring insights into the relationship between subjective wellbeing and couples' childbearing decision making. Consequently, childbearing events constitute the dependent variable, and the key explanatory variable refers to the reported level of happiness of both partners. The analysis is then implemented by parity, acknowledging that potential coherency or mismatch between the two partners may have different impact when considering becoming a parent first time, as opposed to the decision to have another child. Of particular interest is to understand to what extent a potential mismatch in subjective wellbeing across partners may affect their decision making. Similarly,

interest lies in understanding to what extent there are multiplicative effects. That is, can one detect an alleviated effect on childbearing if both partners are closely in line when it comes to their reported subjective wellbeing?

The analysis is based on the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS), from which we observe fertility behaviors and subjective well-being of couples over a period of 18 years (from 1991 to 2008). We engage in a series of fixed-effects models to investigate whether happiness of the two partners considered together affects fertility.

2. **Background**

There is now a growing body of studies considering the relationship between fertility and subjective wellbeing. Compared to earlier studies of fertility within the field of demography, this line of analysis represents a considerable shift. But given the introduction of the Second Demographic Transition (SDT) some 40 years ago, the paradigm of subjective wellbeing comes naturally when considering childbearing behavior. Inspired by the rise of Post-Materialism (Inglehart 1971), the main idea of the SDT is that the family has become less essential (Van de Kaa 1987), and so new demographic behavior are emerging, which would include divorce, cohabitation and out-of-wedlock childbearing and, importantly, fertility postponement and decline (Aassve et al. 2013). Implicit in the SDT lies the idea that individuals' value orientation are changing with an increasing emphasis on freedom of expression and, importantly, psychological wellbeing. Individuals are in a continuous quest for improving their subjective wellbeing (Le Moglie et al. 2015), but given the ever increasing complexity of individuals' lives, obtaining fulfillment through children becomes necessarily only

one element out of many. In other words, the wellbeing associated with childbearing, increasingly depends on the timing, context and the way it is compatible with a range of other activities that individuals now give high priority.

There is consequently no surprise that in recent years a series of studies analyzing the relationship between happiness and childbearing has emerged (Aassve et al. 2012b; Balbo and Arpino 2014; Baranowska and Matysiak 2011; Billari and Kohler 2009; Kohler et al. 2005; Margolis and Myrskylä 2011, 2015; Myrskylä and Margolis 2014). In most of these studies, subjective wellbeing is proxied either by a measure of life satisfaction, or more frequently, the reported level of happiness, and held up against childbearing behavior. Linking happiness or subjective wellbeing with fertility provides a measure of the way individuals associate childbearing with something positive, the idea being that fertility is higher in those areas where couples derive high SWB from childbearing (Aassve et al. 2015). What is less emphasized in the recent contributions on the nexus between SWB and childbearing, is that the latter is necessarily a joint decision between two partners. In fact the vast majority of studies so far take the respondent as the unit of analysis - holding his or her SWB together with childbearing events. In other words, if one believes that SWB of the respondent has a direct effect on childbearing behavior, which is indeed demonstrated by Le Moglie et al. (2015), then intuitively one would also expect the SWB of the partner to play a role. Exactly how the SWB of the respondent interacts with the SWB of the partner for childbearing decision making is not at all clear - nor is it obvious how any such interactions may differ across parity.

There is however strong evidence that the reported SWB of the respondent is not independent of the SWB of the partner. In a recent study, Powdthavee (2009), using the

British Household Panel Survey (BHPS), demonstrates a positive correlation between spouses' self reported life satisfaction. He also explores the underlying mechanism behind the correlation, and postulates three key factors. First, individuals with an innate inclination towards higher life satisfaction may also partner individuals who are similar in this respect. This follows up on an established literature on assortative mating (Becker 1974; Becker et al. 1977; Barter and King 2008; Greenwood et al. 2014). Second, partnerships allow sharing of physical and emotional resources that are unavailable if remaining single, and third, any observed correlation may be a result of direct spillover in SWB within the couple. This last mechanism refers to the idea that if one partner cares about the other, then the SWB of the latter becomes a significant driver of the SWB of the former - and vice versa. Using a dynamic panel model and adjusting for measurement errors, Powdthavee indeed finds evidence of significant spillover effects.

Of interest in our context however, is to what extent partners' wellbeing may affect objective measures of demographic behavior. There is a large literature demonstrating that dissimilarity in partner's characteristics tend to affect marital stability, the argument being that dissimilarity associates positively towards marital disruption (Jalovaara 2003; Clarkwest 2007; Milewski and Kulu 2014). When it comes to assessing the effect of dissimilarity measured in terms of SWB, the literature is less developed, but there are exceptions. Guven et al. (2012) use longitudinal data from Germany, UK and Australia, to assess to what extent a gap in reported SWB of the spouses affects the likelihood of divorce. Using fixed effect estimation techniques, they find that indeed a higher satisfaction gap gives a higher likelihood of partnership dissolution - and these results are robust to a range of specifications - and across the

three longitudinal surveys considered. Their argument is that when it comes to assessing the role of one's own SWB with respect to objective measureable outcomes, such as a divorce, the key reference group is in fact that of the spouse. The analysis of Guven et al. also uncover other interesting insights. For instance, the positive effect of the SWB gap on divorce, is not only driven by any deviation away from the baseline case at the time of partnering, but also that the absolute level of the gap matters. Secondly, the effects are potentially asymmetric, and for divorce, they find that its likelihood increases especially when the wife has a lower level of SWB than the husband, but not the other way around.

To the best of our knowledge there are so far no studies considering the effect of partners' joint SWB on childbearing. There are however, several studies concerning SWB and fertility where the respondent is taken as the unit of analysis. Many of these, perhaps the majority, considers the impact of childbearing on SWB. In other words, in the empirical analysis, the dependent variable typically refers to the reported level of SWB, and childbearing events are taken as the key explanatory variables. However, one frequently observed pattern is that SWB increases prior to childbearing, whereas after the childbearing event there is a great deal of adaption, and often the positive anticipation effect is subsequently neutralized (Balbo and Arpino 2014; Clark et al. 2010; Myrskylä and Margolis 2014). The very fact that there is a significant anticipation effect, has prompted interest to understand to what extent an increase in SWB leads to an increase in the probability of childbearing. Such an approach is taken by Le Moglie et al. (2015). They use the German Socio Economic Panel Survey to analyze how SWB affects the likelihood of having children. Their study puts a particular focus on the way personality traits interacts with both SWB and childbearing, and importantly, they do so

separately by parity. They find that higher SWB leads to a higher likelihood of childbearing, but only for the second child. For the onset of parenthood, and having the third child, there is no effect. However, their results are of high importance, because low fertility, other than driven by childlessness, is in large part explained by lower progression to having the second child. Moreover, for the progression to the second child, the effect is significant only for women.

For our analysis, the study by Le Moglie et al. (2015) gives important clues to what expect. First, one may expect different effects depending on parity. Secondly, there might be gender dominance when deciding to have children. In line with Testa et al. (2011), we are interested in understanding if the SWB of the female partner has a stronger impact on the childbearing decision than the male partner. The research questions of this study are consequently summarized as follows: 1) Does the subjective well-being of one partner, either the female or male, prevail over the other in the decision of having a(another) child? 2) Is there a multiplicative effect of the subjective well-being of the two partners in the decision of having a(nother) child? Building on the findings of Testa et al. (2011), that shows that women have a greater influence on fertility decisions than men, we postulate that SWB of the female partner plays a stronger role than male partner's SWB, though *a priori* we do not have a specific hypothesis regarding differential effects for parities. We moreover pose another hypothesis about the multiplicative effect of both partners' happiness. Specifically we test whether having a child is more likely in couples where both partners have a high level of SWB compared with couples in which only one partner has a high SWB.

3. Data and methods

3.1. Sample selection and measurements

We use the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS), an annual panel survey consisting of a nationally representative sample of about 5,500 households recruited in 1991, containing a total of approximately 10,000 interviewed individuals. Participants are re-interviewed each successive year for 18 years and, if they split from original households to form new households, they are followed and all adult members of these households are also interviewed. Similarly, new members joining sample households become eligible for interview and children are interviewed as they reach the age of 16. The BHPS dataset is well-suited to investigating the relationship between happiness and fertility because it provides information on several socio-economic characteristics, fertility history, and subjective well-being measured over time.

We select only observations for couples, either married or cohabiting, which means that we exclude from the analyses observation-years where individuals where observed as single, divorced or widowed and we also excluded partnered individuals for which the information on the partner was missing. We select all couple-year observations for heterosexual couples where the women is aged 16-45 and the men is aged 16-50. To allow the effect of happiness to differ by parity we considered separately the transition to the first, second and higher order births. After deletion of missing values and a few cases of multiple births our working samples consists of 1314, 1377 and 1294 couples for the analyses of the first, second and higher order births respectively, corresponding to 5874, 7779 and 7757 couple-year observations. Of course the same couple could experience more than one transition during the observation period, whereas others may have entered the survey with already one or

more children. The number of couples experiencing the transition to the first, second and third (or higher order) birth during the observation period are 315, 376 and 184, respectively.

The key explanatory variables measure women and men's happiness. The BHPS questionnaire ask: *Have you recently been feeling reasonably happy, all things considered?*". Possible responses are: *more than usual, same as usual, less so and much less*. This question is asked in each wave of the survey and therefore it was preferred to the question on life satisfaction that is missing in 6 waves of BHPS (wave 1 to 5 and wave 11). As reported by Myrskylä and Margolis (2014), happiness and life satisfaction are highly correlated and offer consistent results. Since the percentage of respondents who declared to feel "much less happy than usual" was extremely low (< 3% for both men and women), we decided to group this and the "less so" categories. We introduced two categorical variables in our regression models measuring women and men reported happiness separately: women (men) "happier than usual" and "less happy than usual". The reference category is "as happy as usual".

To test for possible interaction between partners' happiness, in a second analysis we built 9 couple types based on the combination of the happiness levels of both partners: both man and woman less happy than usual; man less happy than usual and women at the usual level and so on (reference: both partners at the usual level).

Keeping in line with the existing literature (Margolis and Myrskylä, 2015; Myrskylä and Margolis and 2014; Pollmann-Shult 2014), we introduced a set of control variables. We introduced a dummy variable indicating whether the couple is cohabiting or married (Keizer and Schenk 2012). All the other control variables refer to

individuals' characteristics and are measured for both partners separately. In particular, we controlled for both partners' age, health and working status. Age and health are introduced as numerical variables. Health is measured by self-rated health on a five-point scale (higher scores indicate worse health). Working status is introduced trough a set of two dummy variables (inactive, unemployed), "employed" being the reference category. Initially, we also tried to control for both partners' education levels. However, in our samples there is very little variation in education levels over time for the same individual and this made the estimation of the education coefficients imprecise in the fixed-effect models. Therefore, we present models without this control variable.

3.2. Empirical approach

Estimation of the relationship between SWB and fertility is potentially prone to endogeneity problems (Le Moglie 2015; Kravdal 2014). First, unobserved factors may influence both the decision to have a(nother) child and subjective wellbeing. Second, both the relationship between fertility and subjective wellbeing can work in both directions. In fact, several studies show that fertility influences individuals' subjective wellbeing (Myrskylä and Margolis 2014; Balbo and Arpino 2014), while others find evidence in support of the reversed causality direction (Le Moglie et al. 2015; Aassve et al. 2012). To deal with the problem of unobserved confounders, most of the recent contributions in this field make use of longitudinal models with (individual) fixed-effects (Myrskylä and Margolis 2014). To partially deal with the problem of reversed causality, the key explanatory variables are specified with a temporal lag (Le Moglie et

al 2015). We follow the state-of-the-art approach and estimate the following fixed-effect logistic models:

$$\text{logit}\ \left(\mathrm{P}\left(\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{it}}=1\right)\right)=\beta_0+\beta_1\left(\text{men less happy}\right)_{it-1}+\beta_2\left(\text{men happier}\right)_{it-1}+\beta_3\left(\text{women less happy}\right)_{it-1}+\beta_4\left(\text{women happier}\right)_{it-1}+\alpha X_{it-1}+\eta_i, \quad (1)$$

where *i* and *t* refer to couples and years, respectively. Y is a binary variable that takes the value 1 if the couple *i* experiences a birth transition from *t-1* to *t*, and β_1 to β_4 are the effects of our interest. Again, it is worth noting that the reference category consists couples who report the same level of happiness. X is the set of control variables and η_i represent the couple fixed-effect. Note that this fixed-effect removes unobserved time-invariant confounders that refer to the couple *per se* and to both partners. We estimate model (1) by parity. Specifically, we consider three analyses: for the transition to the first, second and higher order parities. For example, in the first case we only select couple-year observations where the couple is either childless or has one child. To test the multiplicative effect of partners' happiness we also estimated the fixed-effect models including the couples' happiness types described above instead of the four explanatory variables listed in equation 1. Note that all the independent variables are included with one year lag.

4. Results

4.1. Descriptive statistics

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics on the independent variables. For those couples experiencing the birth of a child during the observation period, we calculate the percentage in each category of the independent variables in the year preceding the birth

of a child. For the continuous variables we present the average values. We observe that in the year preceding the birth of the first child the majority of men and women declare to be as happy as usual (69.5% of men and 54.6% of women). Both the percentage of women that are less happy and happier than usual are higher than the corresponding percentages for men. The differences across genders are reduced when considering the year preceding the second or higher order births. The percentage of women that declare to be as happy as usual increase to reach the value for men that is stably around 68%. In particular, the percentage of women happier than usual decreases from 34% in the year before the first child's birth to 20% and 13% in the year before the second and higher order parity births, respectively.

[INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

As for the control variable, we observe that 17% of the couples experiencing the birth of the first child during the observation period were cohabiting the year before. This percentage reduces for higher order parities. Men and women giving births during the observation period are, on average, in good health (around 2 points) in the year before births occurred and show similar average values of self-reported health. We also notice that the percentage of inactive women increases considerably for higher order parities.

Table 2 provides us with an overview of how many couples have partners with similar or different happiness level and shows which couple's types are more common. In this case, for the sake of brevity, we averaged over the three samples of table 1. The

most common type (45% of all the couples observed at the year before a birth) is the one in which both partners are at the usual level of happiness, followed by those couples in which either the man or the woman is happier than usual while the partner is as happy as usual (12% and 15%, respectively). There are also quite a few couples where one of the partner is less happy than usual and the other partner's happiness is at the usual level. Other couple types are less prevalent. Given the presence of these "discordant" couples, the association between partners' happiness is high but not too strong to make us worried about multi-collinearity (the Kendall's tau rank correlation coefficient is 0.16, $p = 0.03$). However, estimating the association between some of the 9 partners' happiness combination and fertility may be hampered by low N in some of the cells of table 2.

[INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

4.2. Fixed-effects models results

Table 3 reports estimates of fixed-effects logistic regressions predicting childbirth probabilities as function of both partner's happiness, our explanatory variables of interest, and a set of time-varying control variables. Note that the sample sizes used for the estimation of our regression models (2108, 2987 and 1693 couple-year observations) are smaller than those of the initial working samples because the fixed-effect estimator removes all observations with no within-couple variation.

[INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

Table 4 present estimates of fixed-effect logistic regression models where the key explanatory variables are the 9 couple types obtained combining partners' happiness. Estimates of the first model in Table 4 show that either when the man or the woman is happier than usual, the probability of having a first child increases (as with respect to when he or she is at the usual happiness level) and the effect is strongly significant. Moreover, the effect is greater when the woman is happier than compared to the other way around. Moreover, when women report to be less happy than usual the probability for the couple to experience the transition to the first birth decreases. When considering transitions to second or higher order parities, we do not find any significant effect of SWB either for women or for men.

In Table 4 we report the estimates of fixed-effects logistic regressions where we test for interactions between partners' happiness. We do so by introducing dummies for couples types based on the combination of partners' levels of happiness (the reference being both partners at the usual level of happiness). Estimates in the first column show that four types of couples have significantly higher probabilities to have a first child than couples where both partners are as happy as usual. This includes couples where one of the partners reports an above-average level of happiness, while the other is at the usual level. However, we notice that when the woman is more happy, the positive effect on the probability to have the first child is bigger and more significant than the case where the man is happier than usual. We also find support for a multiplicative effect: when both partners are happier than usual the positive effect on fertility is stronger than when only one of the two is happier, while the other partner's happiness is at the usual level. Finally, we find that even when the man is less happy than usual but the woman is

happier than usual, the probability to have the first child is higher than for couples where both partners are at the usual level of happiness.

For higher order transitions, consistently with the results in Table 4, we generally find no significant differences among the different couple's types. However, the second column in Table 4 shows an interesting phenomenon. The three types of couples that show significantly higher probabilities of having a second child are those in which is the man to be happier than usual, regardless of the level of woman's happiness.

[INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE]

5. Conclusions

The aim of the paper was to bring further insights into the relationship between subjective wellbeing and childbearing decision making by taking a couple perspective. Existing literature on the relationship between SWB and fertility has taken the respondent as the unit of analysis, neglecting that the decision to have a child is a couple decision. We uncover whether there is a gender dominance when deciding to have children. Moreover we explore to what extent a potential coherency or mismatch in subjective wellbeing across partners may affect their fertility decision making. By doing so we investigated to what extent there are multiplicative effects of the two partners' subjective wellbeing, that is a stronger effect on childbearing if both partners report consistent happiness level. We also implement our analysis by parity, since the

subjective wellbeing of the two partners as well as their mismatch or coherency may differently affect the decision to have a first child or another one.

We find that women's happiness matter more than that of the male partner in the decision to have the first child. However an opposite effect appears for the second child, where it seems the SWB of the male partner is more relevant than that of the female partner. This is an important finding, that shows that there is not a one sided and general gender dominance in the fertility decision making when the SWB is concerned. In fact it depends on the parity. This result also implies that studying either men or women separately can be misleading.

Another key finding is that there is a multiplicative effect of the SWB of both partners on the decision to have a first child. We indeed observe that when both the woman and the man report a particularly high level of happiness the probability of becoming parents increases more than when only one of the two partners is happier than usual. Put another way, a coherent and high level of SWB of both partners leads to the highest probability for the couple to have a first child. Once again, this is an important result because it shows that an individual perspective may provide only a partial understanding of the SWB-fertility relationship.

References

Aassve, A, Mazzuco, S., & Mencarin,i L. (2005). Childbearing and wellbeing: A Comparative Analysis of Welfare Regimes in Europe. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 15(3), 283- 299.

Aassve, A., Goisis, A., & Sironi, M. (2012). Happiness and Childbearing across Europe. *Social Indicator Research*, 108(1), 65-86.

Aassve, A., Sironi, M., & Bassi, V. (2013). Explaining Attitudes Towards Demographic Behaviour. *European Sociological Review*, 29(2), 316-333.

Balbo, N., & Arpino, B. (2014). *The role of family orientations in shaping the effect of fertility on subjective well-being.* Swellfer WP n.4, Collegio Carlo Alberto, Italy.

Baranowska, A., & Matysiak, A. (2011) Does parenthood increase happiness? Evidence for Poland. *Vienna Yearbook of Population Research*, Vol. 9, (2011), pp. 307-325.

Billari, F. C. (2009). The Happiness Commonality: Fertility Decision in Low-Fertility Settings. In UNECE (Ed.), *How Generations and Gender Shape Demographic Change* (pp. 7-38). New York and Geneva: United Nations.

Greenwood, J., Guner N., Kocharkov, G., & Santos C. (2014). Marry Your Like: Assortative Mating and Income Inequality. *American Economic Review*, 104(5), 348–53.

Guven, C., Senik, C., & Stichnoth, H. (2012). You can't be happier than your wife: Happiness gaps and divorce. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 82(1), 110–130.

Inglehart, R. (1971). The Silent Revolution in Europe: Intergenerational Change in Post-Industrial Societies, *American Political Science Review*, 65(4), 991–1017.

Keizer, R., & Schenk, N. (2012). Becoming a parent and relationship satisfaction: A longitudinal dyadic perspective. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 74*(4), 759-773.

Kohler, H., Behrman, J. R., & Skytthe, A. (2005). Partner + children = happiness? The effects of partnerships and fertility on well-being. *Population and Development Review*, 31(3), 407– 445.

Kravdal, O. (2014). The Estimation of Fertility Effects on Happiness: Even More Difficult than Usually Acknowledged. *European Journal of Population*, doi 10.1007/s10680-013-9310-9.

Le Moglie, M., Mencarini, L., & Rapallini, C. (2015). Is it just a matter of personality? On the role of life satisfaction in childbearing behavior. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, forthcoming.

Margolis, R., & Myrskylä M. (2011). A Global Perspective on Happiness and Fertility. *Population and Development Review*, *37*(1), 29-56.

Margolis, R., & Myrskylä, M. (2015). Parental well-being surrounding first birth as a determinant of further parity progression. *Demography*, 52(4), 1147-1166.

Myrskylä, M., & Margolis, R. (2014). Happiness: before and after the kids. *Demography*, 51(5), 1843-1866.

Pollmann-Shult, M. (2014). Parenthood and Life Satisfaction: Why Don't Children Make People Happy? *Journal of Marriage and Family, 76*, 319–336.

Powdthavee, N. (2009). I can’t smile without you: Spousal correlation in life satisfaction. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 30, 675–689.

Testa, M.R., Cavalli, L., & Rosina, A. (2011), Couples' childbearing behaviour in Italy: which of the partners is leading it? *Vienna Yearbook of Population Research*, 157-178.

Van de Kaa, D. J. (1987). Europe’s Second Demographic Transition, *Population Bulletin*, 42 (1), Washington, The Population Reference Bureau.

Tables

Table 1. Descriptive statistics (%) on independent variables measured one year before the birth of a child, by parity.

Independent variables measured at t-1	First child	Second child	Third+ child
Man's happiness			
less happy than usual	8.3	12.5	10.4
as usual	69.5	68.2	68.7
happier than usual	22.2	19.4	20.9
Woman's happiness			
less happy than usual	11.1	10.6	18.5
as usual	54.6	69.5	68.7
happier than usual	34.3	19.9	12.8
Coabithing couple	17.1	15.6	13.3
Man's age (mean)	31.6	32.5	33.7
Woman's age (mean)	29.4	30.1	31.3
Man's health (mean)	1.9	1.9	2.0
Woman's health (mean)	2.0	2.0	2.1
Man's working status			
inactive	1.6	3.2	3.3
unemployed	5.7	6.6	10.9
employed	92.7	90.2	85.8
Woman's working status			
inactive	4.1	38.2	56.4
unemployed	3.2	4.8	0.9
employed	92.7	57.0	42.7
Number of couples	315	376	184

Table 2. Combination of women's and men's happiness, all parities.

Women's happines	Men's happines		
	Less happy	As usual	Happier
Less happy	2.2	8.7	1.7
As usual	7.2	45.0	12.0
Happier	1.1	15.1	7.1

Table 3. Fixed-effects logistic regressions predicting childbirth probabilities as function of both partners' happiness, by parity.

Independent variables	First child	Second child	Third+ child
Man's happiness (*ref.: as usual*)			
less happy than usual	0.382	-0.078	0.342
	(0.251)	(0.213)	(0.259)
happier than usual	0.532***	0.157	-0.274
	(0.176)	(0.167)	(0.243)
Woman's happiness (*ref.: as usual*)			
less happy than usual	-0.497*	0.007	-0.068
	(0.259)	(0.190)	(0.233)
happier than usual	0.846***	-0.178	0.315
	(0.156)	(0.165)	(0.233)
Coabithing (*ref.: married*)	-1.363***	-0.731*	-0.849
	(0.348)	(0.389)	(0.522)
Man's age	0.876	0.143	-0.186
	(1.507)	(1.475)	(0.222)
Woman's age	-0.042	-0.010	0.042
	(0.111)	(0.090)	(0.220)
Man's health	-0.042	-0.010	0.065
	(0.111)	(0.090)	(0.126)
Woman's health	-0.156	0.065	-0.103
	(0.106)	(0.087)	(0.128)
Employment (*ref.: employed*)			
Inactive man	-0.364	-0.400	-0.317
	(0.551)	(0.438)	(0.481)
Unemployed man	-0.825	-0.643	0.517
	(0.550)	(0.396)	(0.347)
Inactive woman	-0.669***	0.321**	0.465**
	(0.211)	(0.139)	(0.226)
Unemployed woman	0.717*	0.133	N.A.
	(0.436)	(0.413)	
N	2108	2987	1693

Note: N.A.: coefficient not estimated due to low cell sizes. * p-value < 0.10; ** p-value < 0.05; *** p-value < 0.01.

Table 4. Fixed-effects logistic regressions predicting childbirth probabilities as function of couples happiness types, by parity.

Independent variables	First child	Second child	Third+ child
Couple's happiness (*ref.: man and woman at the usual level*)			
Man less, Woman less	-0.617	-0.667	0.496
	(0.655)	(0.490)	(0.421)
Man less, Woman usual	-0.428	0.082	-0.205
	(0.311)	(0.223)	(0.281)
Man usual, Woman usual	0.275	0.053	0.275
	(0.305)	(0.248)	(0.317)
Man more, Woman less	0.187	0.800*	0.063
	(0.533)	(0.432)	(0.582)
Man less, Woman more	1.773***	0.190	0.510
	(0.485)	(0.453)	(0.675)
Man more, Woman usual	0.517**	0.330*	-0.171
	(0.245)	(0.199)	(0.281)
Man usual, Woman more	0.783***	0.037	0.517*
	(0.189)	(0.195)	(0.270)
Man more, Woman more	1.348***	0.553*	-0.548
	(0.243)	(0.332)	(0.521)
Coabithing (*ref.: married*)	-1.372***	-0.690*	-0.890*
	(0.348)	(0.393)	(0.536)
Man's age	0.801	0.049	-0.176
	(1.506)	(1.464)	(0.221)
Woman's age	-0.766	-0.209	-0.030
	(1.506)	(1.464)	(0.219)
Man's health	-0.041	-0.014	0.068
	(0.111)	(0.091)	(0.126)
Woman's health	-0.156	0.043	-0.106
	(0.106)	(0.088)	(0.128)
Employment (*ref.: employed*)			
Inactive man	-0.339	-0.435	-0.351
	(0.555)	(0.446)	(0.480)
Unemployed man	-0.917*	-0.703*	0.482
	(0.554)	(0.402)	(0.350)
Inactive woman	-0.668***	0.333**	0.471**
	(0.211)	(0.141)	(0.228)
Unemployed woman	0.757*	-0.185	N.A.
	(0.441)	(0.414)	
N	2108	2987	1693

Note: N.A.: coefficient not estimated due to low cell sizes. * p-value < 0.10; ** p-value < 0.05; *** p-value < 0.01.