

Young Australians' concerns and trust are related to their family formation goals

Supplementary materials – Issue 16 | June 2026

Study measures

In this research, LSAC data from B and K cohorts from Wave 10 (in 2023) and Waves 1–8 were used. The outcome and exposure variables were from Wave 10, and socio-demographic control variables were from Waves 1–8. Further details of the outcome and exposure variables are provided in the main snapshot report, and details on the variables used as controls are provided in the next section. Information on the study design, questionnaires, statistical considerations, data files and other data resources are available via the LSAC Data user guide.

Exposures

Concern for economy: Young people were asked about their level of concern about 3 economic issues:

- global economic problems
- being able to afford to buy a house
- capacity to get job in chosen area of training or interest.

There were 5 response options ranging from 'not at all' to 'very much' concerned. Responses were included if the young person answered all three of the economic concern questions. Of the responding sample ($n = 4,407$), 94.6% ($n = 4,167$) answered all three questions.

Concern for environment: Young people were asked about their level of concern about 3 environmental items:

- climate change
- extreme weather events (e.g. droughts, bushfires, floods or cyclones)
- other environmental issues (e.g. species extinction, pollution).

There were 5 response options ranging from 'not at all' to 'very much' concerned. An overall level of environmental concern was calculated by averaging the level of concern for each of the 3 environmental items. Responses were included if the young person answered all 3 of the environmental concern questions. Of the responding sample ($n = 4,407$), 94.6% ($n = 4,168$) answered all 3 questions.

Institutional trust: Young people were asked about how much trust they had in 12 Australian institutions, with 4 response options (a lot of trust, some trust, a little trust, no trust).

The full list of 12 institutions was:

- hospitals
- the police
- educational institutions or systems
- legal systems/the law courts
- Australia's social welfare system (e.g. health care, unemployment benefits, housing or childcare assistance)
- banks and financial institutions
- churches or religious institutions
- news from social media
- traditional news media (e.g. TV news, newspapers (including online))

- politicians and political parties
- scientists
- the Australian Defence Forces.

For this snapshot, we used a subset of 5 items representing Australian public institutions that participants were likely to be familiar with, based on groupings in previously published research (Gortfelder et al., 2024):

- hospitals
- the police
- educational institutions or systems
- legal systems/the law courts
- Australia's social welfare system (e.g. health care, unemployment benefits, housing or childcare assistance).

Scores were reverse-coded so that higher scores indicated higher levels of trust. The average amount of trust in Australian public institutions was calculated by averaging the responses of young people who responded to all 5 questions. Of the responding sample ($n = 4,407$), 85.5% ($n = 3,766$) responded to all 5 questions.

Social trust: Young people were asked about their level of social trust with the following question: 'On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is not at all and 10 is completely, in general how much do you trust most people?'

Response options ranged from 0 to 10, with lower scores indicating lower levels of social trust. Of the responding sample ($n = 4,407$), 94.4% ($n = 4,160$) responded to this question.

Control measures

Gender: At Wave 10, young people were asked for the first time about their gender identity. Gender was analysed using the current best-practice, two-step method (Kidd et al., 2022) by using information on sex at birth and gender identity. Young people whose gender identity was the same as the gender assigned at birth were categorised as that gender (cisgender young men and cisgender young women). Young people whose gender identity was different to the gender assigned at birth, including those who are trans, who identified as non-binary, who used a different term and who were unsure or questioning their gender identity, were categorised as trans and gender diverse. Gender was coded 0 (cisgender man/male), 1 (cisgender woman/female) or 2 (trans and gender diverse).

Persistent neighbourhood disadvantage: the SEIFA Index of Advantage and Disadvantage (SEIFA) was used as an indicator of neighbourhood disadvantage. Young people were considered to be experiencing neighbourhood disadvantage if they were living in neighbourhoods with a SEIFA score in the lowest 25%, relative to the other young people in the LSAC sample. For this analysis, persistent neighbourhood disadvantage is indicated by a count of the number of waves (Waves 1–8) where the young person was experiencing neighbourhood disadvantage, with values ranging from 0 to 8.

This approach is similar to that taken by Warren and Edwards (2017).

Sibling status: At each survey waves, a parent or guardian indicated the number of siblings the young person had. Sibling status indicates whether the young person had any siblings at age 8–9 years and was coded 0 (only child) or 1 (has at least one sibling).

Whether parents ever separated: At each of Waves 1–8, interviewers gathered information about the household composition. This variable indicates whether the young person experienced, across Waves 1–8, a change in household composition from 2 biological parents to any other household composition. Parental separation was coded 0 (no separation occurred) or 1 (family separation occurred at any time point).

Language other than English at home (age 4–5): When the young person was aged 4–5 years, a parent or guardian indicated whether the young person spoke a language other than English at home. Language other than English at home was coded 0 (English only) or 1 (language other than English spoken at home).

Family financial status (average waves 1–8): At each of Waves 1–8, parents were asked about their financial situation with the following question: 'Given your current needs and financial responsibilities, how would you say you and your family are getting on?' Response options included 'prosperous', 'very comfortable', 'reasonably comfortable', 'just getting along', 'poor' and 'very poor'. The family financial status at each of Waves 1–8 was averaged to get an indicator of the average family financial situation across the young person's childhood and adolescence. The categories were collapsed to form a binary indicator of 'at least comfortable' (comprising 'prosperous', 'very comfortable' and 'reasonably comfortable') and 'not comfortable' (comprising 'just getting along', 'poor' and 'very poor'). Average family financial status was coded 0 (at least comfortable) or 1 (not comfortable).

Labour force status (of the young person): This variable categorises the labour force status of young people at Wave 10, and is coded 0 (employed), 1 (unemployed) or 2 (not in the labour force).

Study status (of the young person): This variable indicates whether the young person is currently studying in school or another educational institution at Wave 10. Study status is coded 0 (currently studying) or 1 (not currently studying).

Relationship status (of the young person): At Wave 10, young people were asked if they were in a relationship and, if they were, if they were cohabiting with their partner. This variable combines responses to these 2 questions into a single variable with 3 categories, coded as 0 (does not have a partner), 1 (has partner but not cohabiting) or 2 (partnered and cohabiting).

Remoteness: The remoteness area indicator used was the Australian Statistical Geography Standard (ASGS) remoteness structure that divides Australia into 5 classes of remoteness based on a measure of relative access to services. Categories for outer regional, remote and very remote were combined into a single category 'outer regional/remote'.

Two values were used for remoteness. Remoteness at age 4–5 years and at Wave 10 was used and was coded as 0 (major city), 1 (inner regional area) or 2 (outer regional, remote or very remote).

Characteristics of the study sample

The study sample ($n = 3,434$) consists of young people who reported on the family formation measure collected at Wave 10 and at least one of the four exposure measures: environmental concern, economic concern, institutional trust and social trust. The characteristics of the study sample are presented in Table S2.

Table S1: Characteristics of the study sample

Characteristics of the young people	$n = 3,434$ $n(\%)$
Gender identity at Wave 10	
Man/male	1,694 (49.4%)
Woman/female	1,652 (48.1%)
Trans and gender diverse	85 (2.5%)
Cohort (age)	
B (19–20 years)	1,837 (53.5%)
K (23–24 years)	1,597 (46.5%)
Remoteness area (ABS) at age 4–5 years	
Major city	2,369 (69.8%)
Inner regional	631 (18.6%)
Outer regional or remote	393 (11.6%)
Remoteness area (ABS) at Wave 10	
Major cities	2,638 (78.8%)
Inner regional	524 (15.7%)
Outer regional/remote/very remote	186 (5.6%)
Siblings at age 8 to 9 years	
Only child	276 (8.2%)
Has sibling	3,100 (91.8%)
Whether experienced parental separation	
No	2,886 (84.0%)
Yes	548 (16.0%)
Main language spoken at home	
English	3,071 (90.4%)
Another language	326 (9.6%)

Characteristics of the young people	n = 3,434 n(%)
Family financial status (average across Waves 1-8)	
At least comfortable	2,694 (78.5%)
Not comfortable	740 (21.5%)
Labour force status at Wave 10	
Employed	3,007 (87.8%)
Unemployed	206 (6.0%)
Not in the labour force	213 (6.2%)
Study status at Wave 10	
Currently studying	1,658 (54.2%)
Not currently studying	1,401 (45.8%)
Relationship status at Wave 10	
Does not have partner	1,810 (52.7%)
Has partner but not cohabiting	1,158 (33.7%)
Partnered and cohabiting	466 (13.6%)

Source: LSAC B and K cohorts, Wave 10 and Waves 1-8

Analysis

In this research, we explore the association between young people's concerns about environmental and economic issues, their level of institutional and social trust and their family formation goals, using information gathered at Wave 10, when the young people were aged 19-20 or 23-24 years.

We used multinomial logistic regression to investigate the association between concerns and family formation goals and institutional trust and family formation goals. The dependent variable, whether young people hope to have children, was coded as 0 = no, 1 = yes and 2 = haven't considered.

The independent variables environmental concern and economic concern were coded as 0 = not at all or a little bit, 1 = somewhat and 2 = quite a bit or very much.

The independent variable institutional trust was used as a continuous variable with values from 1 (no trust) to 4 (a lot of trust). The dependent variable social trust was used as a continuous variable with potential values from 0 to 10.

We analysed each of the independent variables (environmental concern, concern about global economic problems, concern about finding jobs, concern about housing affordability, institutional trust and social trust) separately, adjusting for confounding factors (remoteness, number of siblings, parental separation, main language spoken at home, family financial status, labour force status, relationship status and cohort). We also analysed the data separately by gender for young men and young women (the sample of trans and gender diverse young people was too small to analyse separately). We then used the predicted model to estimate marginal effects.

Limitations of this analysis and measures used

Some limitations should be considered. First, this analysis uses measures that indicate how concerned young people are about environmental and economic issues. The economic concern measure captures the concerns young people may have about current and future economic conditions but it may not reflect their current financial status, including any cost-of-living pressures or other financial stressors they may be experiencing. More research is needed to understand how young people's current financial status is related to their family formation goals.

Second, this analysis captures how young people feel about future family formation at ages 19-20 and 23-24 in 2023. Young people's views on family formation are likely to continue to evolve throughout adulthood. Continued research using LSAC data will help us understand how family formation goals evolve across the life course.

Table S2a: Full study sample, association between overall level of concerns and family formation goals

Exposure variable (<i>n</i>)	Whether hoping to have children					
	No [reference category]		Yes		Haven't considered	
	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value
Concern for environment (2,882)						
Not at all/a little concerned (reference category)	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Somewhat concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.270 [-0.635, 0.094]	0.146	-0.145 [-0.629, 0.339]	0.555
Quite a bit/very much concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.739 [-1.060, -0.418]	0.000	-0.352 [-0.742, 0.037]	0.076
Concern for future economy (2,881)						
Not at all/a little concerned (reference category)	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Somewhat concerned	ref.	ref.	0.240 [-0.144, 0.625]	0.220	0.405 [-0.104, 0.914]	0.118
Quite a bit/very much concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.290 [-0.629, 0.049]	0.094	-0.143 [-0.568, 0.283]	0.510

Notes: Multinomial logistic regression used to assess the association between the specific predictor (concerns for environment, global economic problems, finding jobs or housing affordability) and fertility goals (no, yes, haven't considered), adjusting for gender, remoteness, number of siblings, parental separation, main language spoken at home, family financial status, age, study status, labour force status and relationship status. Marginal probabilities were estimated using the fitted models. *n* = sample size; *p* = probability; CI = confidence interval; ref. = reference.

Source: LSAC B and K cohorts, Wave 10 and Waves 1-8

Table S2b: Full study sample, marginal probabilities of family formation goals by level of concern about environment and economic issues

Exposure variable (<i>n</i>)	Whether hoping to have children		
	No	Yes	Haven't considered
	Predicted margins [95% CI]		
Concern for environment (2,882)			
Not at all/a little concerned	11.4 [8.8, 13.9]	77.9 [74.7, 81.1]	10.7 [8.4, 13.0]
Somewhat concerned	14.1 [11.1, 17.1]	74.4 [70.8, 78.0]	11.5 [8.8, 14.2]
Quite a bit/very much concerned	19.9 [17.3, 22.6]	66.9 [63.8, 70.0]	13.1 [11.0, 15.3]
Concern for future economy (2,881)			
Not at all/a little concerned	14.6 [11.1, 18.1]	74.5 [70.2, 72.9]	10.9 [7.9, 13.8]
Somewhat concerned	11.6 [9.1, 14.2]	75.4 [71.9, 78.9]	12.9 [10.1, 15.8]
Quite a bit/very much concerned	18.2 [15.9, 20.5]	70.1 [67.3, 72.9]	11.7 [9.8, 13.6]

Notes: Multinomial logistic regression used to assess the association between the specific predictor (concerns for environment, global economic problems, finding jobs or housing affordability) and fertility goals (no, yes, haven't considered), adjusting for gender, remoteness, number of siblings, parental separation, main language spoken at home, family financial status, age, study status, labour force status and relationship status. Marginal probabilities were estimated using the fitted models. *n* = sample size; CI = confidence interval.

Source: LSAC B and K cohorts, Wave 10 and Waves 1-8

Table S3a: Cisgender young men, association between concerns and family formation goals

Exposure variable (<i>n</i>)	Whether hoping to have children					
	No (reference category)		Yes		Haven't considered	
	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value
Concern for environment (1,390)						
Not at all/a little concerned (reference category)	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Somewhat concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.051 [-0.527, 0.425]	0.834	0.355 [-0.217, 0.926]	0.223
Quite a bit/very much concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.544 [-0.967, -0.121]	0.012	-0.183 [-0.703, 0.338]	0.491
Concern for economy (1,390)						
Not at all/a little concerned (reference category)	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Somewhat concerned	ref.	ref.	0.101 [-0.394, 0.597]	0.688	0.303 [-0.354, 0.960]	0.365
Quite a bit/very much concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.273 [-0.709, 0.162]	0.218	-0.0651 [-0.607, 0.477]	0.813

Notes: Multinomial logistic regression used to assess the association between the specific predictor (concerns for environment, global economic problems, finding jobs or housing affordability) and fertility goals (no, yes, haven't considered), adjusting for remoteness, number of siblings, parental separation, main language spoken at home, family financial status, age, study status, labour force status and relationship status. Marginal probabilities were estimated using the fitted models. *n* = sample size; *p* = probability; CI = confidence interval; ref. = reference.

Source: LSAC B and K cohorts, Wave 10 and Waves 1-8

Table S3b: Cisgender young men, marginal probabilities of family formation goals by level of concern about environment and economy

Exposure variable (<i>n</i>)	Whether hoping to have children		
	No	Yes	Haven't considered
	Predicted margins [95% CI]		
Concern for environment (1,390)			
Not at all/a little concerned	13.4 [10.0, 16.8]	74.4 [70.2, 78.5]	12.2 [9.3, 15.1]
Somewhat concerned	13.2 [9.2, 17.2]	69.9 [64.3, 75.4]	17 [12.5, 21.5]
Quite a bit/very much concerned	19.9 [15.8, 23.9]	65 [60.0, 70.1]	15.1 [11.1, 19.0]
Concern for economy (1,390)			
Not at all/a little concerned	14.5 [10.2, 18.8]	72.8 [67.3, 78.3]	12.7 [8.6, 16.9]
Somewhat concerned	12.9 [9.1, 16.8]	71.8 [66.5, 77.1]	15.3 [11.0, 19.6]
Quite a bit/very much concerned	17.6 [14.4, 20.8]	67.9 [63.6, 72.2]	14.5 [11.3, 17.7]

Notes: Multinomial logistic regression used to assess the association between the specific predictor (concerns for environment, global economic problems, finding jobs or housing affordability) and fertility goals (no, yes, haven't considered), adjusting for remoteness, number of siblings, parental separation, main language spoken at home, family financial status, age, study status, labour force status and relationship status. Marginal probabilities were estimated using the fitted models. *n* = sample size; CI = confidence interval.

Source: LSAC B and K cohorts, Wave 10 and Waves 1-8

Table S4a: Cisgender young women, association between concerns and family formation goals

Exposure variable (n)	Whether hoping to have children					
	No (reference category)		Yes		Haven't considered	
	Coefficient [95% CI]	p value	Coefficient [95% CI]	p value	Coefficient [95% CI]	p value
Concern for environment (1,422)						
Not at all/a little concerned	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Somewhat concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.758 [-1.451, -0.0639]	0.032	-1.148 [-2.111, -0.091]	0.033
Quite a bit/very much concerned	ref.	ref.	-1.148 [-1.773, -0.523]	0.000	-0.862 [-1.694, -0.0308]	0.042
Concern for future economy (1,421)						
Not at all/a little concerned	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Somewhat concerned	ref.	ref.	0.472 [-0.203, 1.148]	0.17	0.667 [-0.179, 1.513]	0.122
Quite a bit/very much concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.288 [-0.843, 0.267]	0.308	-0.172 [-0.977, 0.633]	0.674

Notes: Multinomial logistic regression used to assess the association between the specific predictor (concerns for environment, global economic problems, finding jobs or housing affordability) and fertility goals (no, yes, haven't considered), adjusting for remoteness, number of siblings, parental separation, main language spoken at home, family financial status, age, study status, labour force status and relationship status. Marginal probabilities were estimated using the fitted models. n = sample size; p = probability; CI = confidence interval; ref. = reference.

Source: LSAC B and K cohorts, Wave 10 and Waves 1-8

Table S4b: Cisgender young women, marginal probabilities of family formation goals by level of concern about environment and economy

Exposure variable (n)	Whether hoping to have children		
	No	Yes	Haven't considered
	Predicted margins [95% CI]		
Concern for environment (1,422)			
Not at all/a little concerned	7.22 [3.3, 11.1]	84 [78.8, 89.2]	8.77 [4.7, 12.8]
Somewhat concerned	14.4 [10.1, 18.7]	79.7 [75.2, 84.3]	5.89 [3.4, 8.4]
Quite a bit/very much concerned	18.7 [15.7, 21.7]	71.6 [68.0, 75.1]	9.74 [7.4, 12.0]
Concern for economy (1,421)			
Not at all/a little concerned	14.3 [8.2, 20.3]	78.1 [71.5, 84.7]	7.62 [3.7, 11.6]
Somewhat concerned	9.33 [5.9, 12.7]	81.1 [75.8, 86.3]	9.62 [6.03, 13.0]
Quite a bit/very much concerned	17.8 [14.8, 20.9]	74.1 [70.7, 77.5]	8.07 [6.1, 10.1]

Notes: Multinomial logistic regression used to assess the association between the specific predictor (concerns for environment, global economic problems, finding jobs or housing affordability) and fertility goals (no, yes, haven't considered), adjusting for remoteness, number of siblings, parental separation, main language spoken at home, family financial status, age, study status, labour force status and relationship status. Marginal probabilities were estimated using the fitted models. n = sample size; CI = confidence interval.

Source: LSAC B and K cohorts, Wave 10 and Waves 1-8

Table S5a: Full study sample, association between three environmental issues and family formation goals

Exposure variable (<i>n</i>):	Whether hoping to have children					
	No (reference category)		Yes		Haven't considered	
	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value
Concern about climate change (2,882)						
Not at all/a little concerned (reference category)	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Somewhat concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.113 [-0.499, 0.274]	0.567	-0.197 [-0.709, 0.315]	0.450
Quite a bit/very much concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.627 [-0.936, -0.318]	0.000	-0.269 [-0.655, 0.116]	0.170
Concern about extreme weather events (2,882)						
Not at all/a little concerned (reference category)	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Somewhat concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.270 [-0.613, 0.0731]	0.122	-0.070 [-0.507, 0.367]	0.753
Quite a bit/very much concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.464 [-0.779, -0.149]	0.004	-0.332 [-0.725, 0.0605]	0.097
Concern about other environmental issues (2,882)						
Not at all/a little concerned (reference category)	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Somewhat concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.285 [-0.653, 0.0826]	0.128	-0.268 [-0.746, 0.210]	0.271
Quite a bit/very much concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.817 [-1.148, -0.486]	0.000	-0.391 [-0.790, 0.007]	0.054

Notes: Multinomial logistic regression used to assess the association between the specific predictor (concerns for environment, global economic problems, finding jobs or housing affordability) and fertility goals (no, yes, haven't considered), adjusting for gender, remoteness, number of siblings, parental separation, main language spoken at home, family financial status, age, study status, labour force status and relationship status. Marginal probabilities were estimated using the fitted models. *n* = sample size; *p* = probability; CI = confidence interval; ref. = reference.

Source: LSAC B and K cohorts, Wave 10 and Waves 1-8

Table S5b: Full study sample, marginal probabilities of family formation goals by level of concern about 3 environmental items

Exposure variable (<i>n</i>)	Whether hoping to have children		
	No	Yes	Haven't considered
	Predicted margins [95% CI]		
Concern about climate change (2,882)			
Not at all/a little concerned	12.0 [9.4, 14.6]	76.9 [73.5, 80.3]	11.0 [8.7, 13.4]
Somewhat concerned	13.4 [10.2, 16.5]	76.5 [72.7, 80.3]	10.1 [7.4, 12.8]
Quite a bit/very much concerned	19.3 [16.8, 21.7]	67.3 [64.3, 70.3]	13.4 [11.2, 15.7]
Concern about extreme weather events (2,882)			
Not at all/a little concerned	12.7 [10.0, 15.3]	76.0 [72.8, 79.2]	11.3 [9.0, 13.6]
Somewhat concerned	15.5 [12.4, 18.6]	71.6 [68.0, 75.3]	12.9 [10.2, 15.5]
Quite a bit/very much concerned	18.3 [15.7, 20.9]	70.0 [66.9, 73.0]	11.7 [9.6, 13.8]
Concern about other environmental issues (2,882)			
Not at all/a little concerned	10.9 [8.4, 13.4]	78.2 [75.1, 81.3]	10.9 [8.6, 13.1]
Somewhat concerned	14.0 [10.9, 17.0]	75.5 [71.8, 79.1]	10.6 [8.1, 13.1]
Quite a bit/very much concerned	20.4 [17.7, 23.1]	66.1 [62.9, 69.3]	13.6 [11.4, 15.7]

Notes: Multinomial logistic regression used to assess the association between the specific predictor (concerns for environment, global economic problems, finding jobs or housing affordability) and fertility goals (no, yes, haven't considered), adjusting for remoteness, number of siblings, parental separation, main language spoken at home, family financial status, age, study status, labour force status and relationship status. Marginal probabilities were estimated using the fitted models. *n* = sample size; CI = confidence interval.

Source: LSAC B and K cohorts, Wave 10 and Waves 1-8

Table S6a: Full study sample, association between 3 economic issues and family formation goals

Exposure variable (<i>n</i>)	Whether hoping to have children					
	No (reference category)		Yes		Haven't considered	
	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value
Concern for global economic problems (2,881)						
Not at all/a little concerned (reference category)	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Somewhat concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.162 [-0.546, 0.222]	0.407	-0.269 [-0.766, 0.229]	0.289
Quite a bit/very much concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.530 [-0.851, -0.210]	0.001	-0.573 [-0.977, -0.169]	0.006
Concern about finding jobs in chosen field (2,881)						
Not at all/a little concerned (reference category)	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Somewhat concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.367 [-0.714, -0.0202]	0.038	-0.398 [-0.866, 0.0696]	0.095
Quite a bit/very much concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.606 [-0.905, -0.308]	0.000	-0.352 [-0.733, 0.0293]	0.070
Concern about housing affordability (2,882)						
Not at all/a little concerned (reference category)	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Somewhat concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.056 [-0.549, 0.436]	0.822	0.090 [-0.569, 0.748]	0.788
Quite a bit/very much concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.092 [-0.271, 0.455]	0.618	0.159 [-0.354, 0.673]	0.541

Notes: Multinomial logistic regression used to assess the association between the specific predictor (concerns for environment, global economic problems, finding jobs or housing affordability) and fertility goals (no, yes, haven't considered), adjusting for gender, remoteness, number of siblings, parental separation, main language spoken at home, family financial status, age, study status, labour force status and relationship status. Marginal probabilities were estimated using the fitted models. *n* = sample size; *p* = probability; CI = confidence interval; ref. = reference.

Source: LSAC B and K cohorts, Wave 10 and Waves 1-8

Table S6b: Full study sample, marginal probabilities of family formation goals by level of concern about 3 economic issues

Exposure variable (<i>n</i>)	Whether hoping to have children		
	No	Yes	Haven't considered
	Predicted margins [95% CI]		
Concern for global economic problems (2,881)			
Not at all/a little concerned	12.0 [9.2, 14.8]	75.1 [71.7, 78.4]	12.9 [10.3, 15.6]
Somewhat concerned	14.0 [11.0, 17.0]	74.5 [71.0, 78.0]	11.5 [9.0, 14.1]
Quite a bit/very much concerned	18.8 [16.3, 21.3]	69.8 [66.7, 72.9]	11.4 [9.4, 13.5]
Concern about finding jobs (2,882)			
Not at all/a little concerned	11.9 [9.6, 14.1]	76.6 [73.7, 79.4]	11.6 [9.4, 13.7]
Somewhat concerned	16.2 [12.6, 19.9]	73.1 [69.1, 77.2]	10.6 [7.9, 13.3]
Quite a bit/very much concerned	19.0 [16.3, 21.7]	68.0 [64.9, 71.2]	13.0 [10.8, 15.1]
Concern about housing affordability (2,881)			
Not at all/a little concerned	16.6 [12.3, 20.9]	72.3 [67.0, 77.6]	11.1 [7.2, 15.0]
Somewhat concerned	17.1 [11.9, 22.2]	70.5 [64.8, 76.1]	12.4 [8.9, 16.0]
Quite a bit/very much concerned	15.3 [13.5, 17.1]	72.8 [70.5, 75.0]	11.9 [10.3, 13.5]

Notes: Multinomial logistic regression used to assess the association between the specific predictor (concerns for environment, global economic problems, finding jobs or housing affordability) and fertility goals (no, yes, haven't considered), adjusting for gender, remoteness, number of siblings, parental separation, main language spoken at home, family financial status, age, study status, labour force status and relationship status. Marginal probabilities were estimated using the fitted models. *n* = sample size; CI = confidence interval.

Source: LSAC B and K cohorts, Wave 10 and Waves 1-8

Table S7a: Cisgender young women, association between 3 economic issues and family formation goals

Exposure variable (<i>n</i>)	Whether hoping to have children					
	No (reference category)		Yes		Haven't considered	
	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value
Concern for global economic problems (1,422)						
Not at all/a little concerned	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Somewhat concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.380 [-1.008, 0.248]	0.235	-0.794 [-1.613, 0.0254]	0.057
Quite a bit/very much concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.749 [-1.314, -0.184]	0.010	-0.725 [-1.432, -0.019]	0.044
Concern about finding jobs in chosen field (1,421)						
Not at all/a little concerned	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Somewhat concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.340 [-0.867, 0.187]	0.205	-0.395 [-1.170, 0.381]	0.317
Quite a bit/very much concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.802 [-1.202, -0.403]	0.000	-0.639 [-1.259, -0.0193]	0.043
Concern about housing affordability (1,422)						
Not at all/a little concerned	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Somewhat concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.455 [-1.264, 0.355]	0.270	-0.918 [-2.175, 0.340]	0.152
Quite a bit/very much concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.221 [-0.818, 0.375]	0.466	-0.328 [-1.203, 0.547]	0.462

Notes: Multinomial logistic regression used to assess the association between the specific predictor (concerns for environment, global economic problems, finding jobs or housing affordability) and fertility goals (no, yes, haven't considered), adjusting for remoteness, number of siblings, parental separation, main language spoken at home, family financial status, age, study status, labour force status and relationship status. Marginal probabilities were estimated using the fitted models. *n* = sample size; *p* = probability; CI = confidence interval.

Source: LSAC B and K cohorts, Wave 10 and Waves 1-8

Table S7b: Cisgender young women, marginal probabilities of family formation goals by concern about 3 economic issues

Exposure variable (<i>n</i>)	Whether hoping to have children		
	No	Yes	Haven't considered
	Predicted margins [95% CI]		
Concern for global economic problems (1,422)			
Not at all/a little concerned	9.7 [5.6, 13.9]	80.5 [75.2, 85.8]	9.8 [6.0, 13.5]
Somewhat concerned	14.0 [9.9, 18.0]	79.6 [7.5, 8.5]	6.4 [3.8, 9.0]
Quite a bit/very much concerned	18.2 [14.7, 21.6]	72.9 [0.689, 0.768]	9.0 [6.5, 11.4]
Concern about finding jobs in chosen area (1,421)			
Not at all/a little concerned	10.0 [7.2, 12.8]	81.5 [77.8, 85.3]	8.5 [5.6, 11.4]
Somewhat concerned	13.4 [8.7, 18.2]	78.8 [73.5, 84.2]	7.2 [4.7, 10.8]
Quite a bit/very much concerned	19.2 [15.8, 22.5]	72.1 [68.4, 75.8]	8.7 [6.3, 11.2]
Concern about housing affordability (1,422)			
Not at all/a little concerned	12.2 [6.3, 18.1]	78.0 [71.6, 85.4]	9.8 [4.1, 15.5]
Somewhat concerned	18.4 [10.2, 26.6]	75.6 [67.1, 84.1]	6.0 [1.9, 10.1]
Quite a bit/very much concerned	14.8 [12.5, 17.2]	76.5 [73.8, 79.2]	8.6 [6.9, 10.4]

Notes: Multinomial logistic regression used to assess the association between the specific predictor (concerns for environment, global economic problems, finding jobs or housing affordability) and fertility goals (no, yes, haven't considered), adjusting for remoteness, number of siblings, parental separation, main language spoken at home, family financial status, age, study status, labour force status and relationship status. Marginal probabilities were estimated using the fitted models. *n* = sample size; CI = confidence interval.

Source: LSAC B and K cohorts, Wave 10 and Waves 1-8

Table S8a: Cisgender young men, association between 3 economic concerns and family formation goals (continued)

Exposure variable (<i>n</i>)	Whether hoping to have children					
	No (reference category)		Yes		Haven't considered	
	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value
Concern for global economic problems (1,390)						
Not at all/a little concerned (reference category)	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Somewhat concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.038 [-0.539, 0.464]	0.883	0.086 [-0.533, 0.704]	0.785
Quite a bit/very much concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.416 [-0.825, -0.008]	0.046	-0.498 [-1.030, 0.034]	0.066
Concern about finding jobs in chosen field (1,390)						
Not at all/a little concerned (reference category)	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Somewhat concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.392 [-0.848, 0.0646]		-0.368 [-0.954, 0.217]	
Quite a bit/very much concerned	ref.	ref.	-0.440 [-0.886, 0.006]		-0.146 [-0.665, 0.372]	
Concern about housing affordability (1,390)						
Not at all/a little concerned (reference category)	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Somewhat concerned	ref.	ref.	0.064 [-0.628, 0.756]	0.856	0.368 [-0.499, 1.234]	0.404
Quite a bit/very much concerned	ref.	ref.	0.178 [-0.292, 0.648]	0.457	0.212 [-0.434, 0.859]	0.519

Notes: Multinomial logistic regression used to assess the association between the specific predictor (concerns for environment, global economic problems, finding jobs or housing affordability) and fertility goals (no, yes, haven't considered), adjusting for remoteness, number of siblings, parental separation, main language spoken at home, family financial status, age, study status, labour force status and relationship status. Marginal probabilities were estimated using the fitted models. *n* = sample size; *p* = probability; CI = confidence interval; ref. = reference.

Source: LSAC B and K cohorts, Wave 10 and Waves 1-8

Table S8b: Cisgender young men, marginal probabilities of family formation goals by level of concern about 3 economic issues (continued)

Exposure variable (<i>n</i>)	Whether hoping to have children		
	No	Yes	Haven't considered
	Predicted margins [95% CI]		
Concern for global economic problems (1,390)			
Not at all/a little concerned	13.0 [9.4, 16.7]	72.3 [67.7, 76.8]	14.7 [11.0, 18.3]
Somewhat concerned	13.2 [9.1, 17.3]	70.6 [65.3, 76.0]	16.1 [12.0, 20.3]
Quite a bit/very much concerned	18.6 [15.2, 22.0]	68.6 [64.3, 72.9]	12.8 [9.6, 16.0]
Concern about finding jobs in chosen field (1,390)			
Not at all/a little concerned	12.8 [9.6, 16.0]	73.6 [69.4, 77.8]	13.6 [10.5, 16.7]
Somewhat concerned	17.7 [12.7, 22.7]	69.3 [63.3, 75.2]	13.0 [8.7, 17.4]
Quite a bit/very much concerned	17.7 [13.5, 21.8]	66.2 [61.0, 71.3]	16.2 [12.6, 19.8]
Concern about housing affordability (1,390)			
Not at all/a little concerned	17.4 [11.5, 23.2]	69.4 [62.2, 76.6]	13.2 [7.6, 18.8]
Somewhat concerned	15.7 [9.0, 22.4]	67.1 [59.4, 74.9]	17.2 [11.1, 23.2]
Quite a bit/very much concerned	14.9 [12.5, 17.4]	71.1 [67.6, 74.5]	14.0 [11.4, 16.6]

Notes: Multinomial logistic regression used to assess the association between the specific predictor (concerns for environment, global economic problems, finding jobs or housing affordability) and fertility goals (no, yes, haven't considered), adjusting for remoteness, number of siblings, parental separation, main language spoken at home, family financial status, age, study status, labour force status and relationship status. Marginal probabilities were estimated using the fitted models. *n* = sample size; CI = confidence interval.

Source: LSAC B and K cohorts, Wave 10 and Waves 1-8

Table S9: Full study sample, association between levels of trust and family formation goals

	<i>n</i>	Whether hoping to have children					
		No		Yes		Haven't considered	
		Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value
Institutional trust	2,620	ref.	ref.	0.534 [0.308, 0.760]	0.000	0.546 [0.228, 0.865]	0.001
Social trust	2,869	ref.	ref.	0.155 [0.093, 0.217]	0.000	0.148 [0.063, 0.234]	0.001

Notes: Multinomial logistic regression used to assess the association between the specific predictor (level of institutional or social trust) and fertility goals (no, yes, haven't considered), adjusting for gender, remoteness, number of siblings, parental separation, main language spoken at home, family financial status, age, study status, labour force status and relationship status. *n* = sample size; *p* = probability; CI = confidence interval; ref. = reference.

Source: LSAC B and K cohorts, Wave 10 and Waves 1-8

Table S10: Cisgender young men, association between levels of trust and family formation goals

	Whether hoping to have children						
	No			Yes		Haven't considered	
	<i>n</i>	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value
Institutional trust	1,252	ref.	ref.	0.441 [0.128, 0.753]	0.006	0.585 [0.173, 0.998]	0.006
Social trust	1,388	ref.	ref.	0.146 [0.060, 0.231]	0.001	0.167 [0.031, 0.274]	0.002

Notes: Multinomial logistic regression used to assess the association between the specific predictor (level of institutional or social trust) and fertility goals (no, yes, haven't considered), adjusting for remoteness, number of siblings, parental separation, main language spoken at home, family financial status, age, study status, labour force status and relationship status. *n* = sample size; *p* = probability; CI = confidence interval; ref. = reference.

Source: LSAC B and K cohorts, Wave 10 and Waves 1-8

Table S11: Cisgender young women, association between levels of trust and family formation goals

	Whether hoping to have children						
	No			Yes		Haven't considered	
	<i>n</i>	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value
Institutional trust	1,303	ref.	ref.	0.642 [0.336, 0.949]	0.000	0.427 [-0.063, 0.916]	0.088
Social trust	1,411	ref.	ref.	0.143 [0.055, 0.231]	0.002	0.057 [-0.079, 0.194]	0.41

Notes: Multinomial logistic regression used to assess the association between the specific predictor (level of institutional or social trust) and fertility goals (no, yes, haven't considered), adjusting for remoteness, number of siblings, parental separation, main language spoken at home, family financial status, age, study status, labour force status and relationship status. *n* = sample size; *p* = probability; CI = confidence interval; ref. = reference.

Source: LSAC B and K cohorts, Wave 10 and Waves 1-8

Table S12: Full study sample, Association between trust in individual public institutions and family formation goals

	Whether hoping to have children						
	No			Yes		Haven't considered	
	<i>n</i>	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value	Coefficient [95% CI]	<i>p</i> value
Hospitals	2,871	ref.	ref.	0.273 [0.106, 0.440]	0.001	0.415 [0.165, 0.666]	0.001
The police	2,867	ref.	ref.	0.419 [0.282, 0.555]	0.000	0.338 [0.157, 0.520]	0.000
Education system	2,866	ref.	ref.	0.167 [0.023, 0.312]	0.024	0.201 [-0.008, 0.409]	0.059
Legal system	2,802	ref.	ref.	0.262 [0.114, 0.410]	0.007	0.365 [0.147, 0.582]	0.001
Social welfare system	2,685	ref.	ref.	0.159 [-0.005, 0.320]	0.058	0.120 [-0.097, 0.339]	0.277

Notes: Multinomial logistic regression used to assess the association between the specific predictor (level of institutional or social trust) and fertility goals (no, yes, haven't considered), adjusting for gender, remoteness, number of siblings, parental separation, main language spoken at home, family financial status, age, study status, labour force status and relationship status. *n* = sample size; *p* = probability; CI = confidence interval; ref. = reference.

Source: LSAC B and K cohorts, Wave 10 and Waves 1-8

Table S11: Trans and gender diverse young people, level of environmental concern by family formation goals (weighted cross-tabulation)

	Level of concern for environment				Obs.
	Not at all/a little	Somewhat	Quite a bit/very much	Total	
Whether hoping to have children	Proportion [95% CI]				
No	11.2 [3.0, 34.4]	41.0 [14.8, 73.6]	36.6 [24.5, 50.5]	33.1 [22.7, 45.4]	30
Yes	61.0 [25.7, 87.6]	42.8 [17.0, 73.2]	29.7 [19.0, 43.4]	37.6 [26.5, 50.2]	31
Haven't considered	27.8 [7.4, 65.1]	16.2 [4.3, 45.3]	33.7 [20.9, 49.5]	29.3 [19.2, 42.0]	24
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	85

Note: CI = confidence interval; Obs. = observations.

Source: LSAC B and K cohorts, Wave 10 and Waves 1-8

Table S12: Trans and gender diverse young people, level of concern for global economic problems by family formation goals (weighted cross-tabulation)

	Level of concern for global economic problems				Obs.
	Not at all/a little	Somewhat	Quite a bit/very much	Total	
Whether hoping to have children	Proportion [95% CI]				
No	35.6 [14.3, 64.6]	23.0 [6.1, 57.7]	33.7 [21.9, 48.0]	33.1 [22.7, 45.4]	30
Yes	40.6 [17.4, 69.0]	34.9 [9.1, 74.1]	37.0 [24.6, 51.5]	37.6 [26.5, 50.2]	31
Haven't considered	23.8 [7.1, 56.]	42.2 [13.7, 77.0]	29.2 [17.6, 44.4]	29.3 [19.2, 42.0]	24
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	85

Note: n = sample size; CI = confidence interval; Obs. = observations.

Source: LSAC B and K cohorts, Wave 10 and Waves 1-8

Table S13: Trans and gender diverse young people, level of concern about finding jobs in chosen field by family formation goals (weighted cross-tabulation)

	Level of concern about finding jobs in chosen field				Obs.
	Not at all/a little	Somewhat	Quite a bit/very much	Total	
Whether hoping to have children	Proportion [95% CI]				
No	17.7 [6.4, 40.4]	37.0 [13.8, 68.3]	36.5 [23.3, 52.1]	33.1 [22.7, 45.4]	30
Yes	40.5 [15.5, 71.6]	40.0 [15.5, 70.8]	36.3 [23.7, 51.1]	37.6 [26.5, 50.2]	31
Haven't considered	41.8 [17.7, 70.5]	23.0 [6.7, 55.4]	27.2 [15.6, 42.9]	29.3 [19.2, 42.0]	24
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	85

Note: CI = confidence interval; Obs. = observations.

Source: LSAC B and K cohorts, Wave 10 and Waves 1-8

Table S14: Trans and gender diverse young people, level of concern about housing affordability by family formation goals (weighted cross-tabulation)

	Level of concern about housing affordability				Obs.
	Not at all/a little	Somewhat	Quite a bit/very much	Total	
Whether hoping to have children	Proportion [95% CI]				
No	46.7 [18.6, 77.1]	26.5 [9.0, 57.0]	32.7 [21.0, 47.0]	33.1 [22.7, 45.4]	30
Yes	35.5 [7.4, 79.1]	49.6 [18.5, 81.0]	35.8 [24.0, 49.6]	37.6 [26.5, 50.2]	31
Haven't considered	17.8 [3.3, 58.2]	23.9 [3.7, 71.9]	31.5 [20.3, 45.5]	29.3 [19.2, 42.0]	24
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	85

Note: CI = confidence interval; Obs. = observations.

Source: LSAC B and K cohorts, Wave 10 and Waves 1-8

Table S15: Trans and gender diverse young people, level of institutional trust by family formation goals

	Level of trust in public institutions				Total	Obs.
	No trust	A little trust	Some trust	A lot		
Whether hoping to have children	Proportion [95% CI]					
No	80.0 [23.5, 98.1]	39.1 [24.2, 56.5]	21.8 [9.8, 41.8]	0.0	34.0 [22.8, 47.3]	27
Yes	20.0 [1.9, 76.5]	34.8 [20.9, 52.0]	39.7 [21.3, 61.5]	100.0	38.0 [26.5, 50.9]	29
Haven't considered	0.0	26.0 [12.3, 46.8]	38.5 [20.6, 60.2]	0.0	28.0 [17.4, 41.8]	21
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	77

Note: CI = confidence interval; Obs. = observations.

Source: LSAC B and K cohorts, Wave 10 and Waves 1-8

Table S16: Trans and gender diverse young people, level of social trust (grouped) by family formation goals

	Level of trust in other people			Total	Obs.
	Don't trust	Neutral	Trust		
Whether hoping to have children	Proportion [95% CI]				
No	61.8 [40.9, 79.0]	36.2 [16.3, 62.4]	14.3 [5.7, 31.6]	33.1 [22.7, 45.4]	30
Yes	24.4 [10.6, 46.9]	29.9 [12.6, 55.7]	48.6 [30.7, 66.8]	37.6 [26.5, 50.2]	31
Haven't considered	13.8 [5.4, 31.2]	33.9 [15.2, 59.4]	37.1 [20.7, 57.1]	29.3 [19.2, 42.0]	24
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	85

Note: CI = confidence interval; Obs. = observations.

Source: LSAC B and K cohorts, Wave 10 and Waves 1-8

References

- Gortfelder, M., Neyer, G., & Andersson, G. (2024). Trust and fertility intentions in high-trust Sweden: An exploratory analysis. *Comparative Population Studies*, 49.
- Kidd, K. M., Sequeira, G. M., Rothenberger, S. D., Paglisotti, T., Kristjansson, A., Schweiberger, K. et al. (2022). Operationalizing and analyzing 2-step gender identity questions: Methodological and ethical considerations. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 29(2), 249-256.
- Warren, D., & Edwards, B. (2017). *Contexts of disadvantage*. Department of Social Services.