

Parenting Desires and Sexual Identities*

MARTA VOHLÍDALOVÁ and HANA MAŘÍKOVÁ**

Institute of Sociology, Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague

Abstract: The paper asks how parenting desires are associated with the construction of sexual identity and what factors most influence whether gays/lesbians, bisexuals, and heterosexuals declaring same-sex attraction want to have (more) children. The subject has been explored mainly in the Western liberal and gay-family-friendly legislation and social environment so far. Our study was conducted in the Czech Republic, a CEE country where sexual minorities face strong legal and social barriers to non-heterosexual parenthood. In an online survey (N = 882) conducted in 2019 among self-identified gay, lesbian, bisexual, and heterosexual people with same-sex attraction, we found a considerable gap in parenting desires by sexual identity. Parenting desires are weaker among homosexuals, especially men, while bisexuals are closer to heterosexuals in their parenting desires. Our research suggests that in the context of discussions of parenthood Czech women are unwilling to identify as lesbians and opt instead to claim a different sexual identity. Our findings indicate that the structural barriers to parenthood thus play a much more important role than the overall liberal-minded atmosphere in the Czech Republic.

Keywords: parenting desires, sexual identities, LGB individuals, Czech Republic/Czechia, CEE country, survey methodology

Sociologický časopis/Czech Sociological Review, 2022, Vol. 58, No. 6: 603–635

<https://doi.org/10.13060/csr.2023.006>

* Acknowledgement: We would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments. Our special thanks are addressed to Mr Jan Burianec and his colleagues from the StemMark agency who helped us to design the sampling procedure and who supported us to be able to address all the methodology comments of the reviewers.

** Direct all correspondence to: Marta Vohlídalová, Institute of Sociology, Czech Academy of Sciences, Jilská 1, 110 00 Praha 1, Czech Republic, e-mail: Marta.Vohlidalova@soc.cas.cz; Hana Maříková, Institute of Sociology, Czech Academy of Sciences, Jilská 1, 110 00 Praha 1, Czech Republic, e-mail: Hana.Marikova@soc.cas.cz.

Introduction

With¹ a changing social climate and advancing reproductive technologies, Western societies are opening parenthood up to non-heterosexuals. Homosexuality no longer necessarily means that a man or woman must remain childless [Patterson 2001]. Nevertheless, in 2011, there were only about 1000 children living in the families of Czech same-sex couples according to the Czech census [Sloboda 2020]. Although the actual number of children growing up in Czech same-sex households is undoubtedly much higher, it could hardly be said that there has been a baby-boom among Czech gay or lesbian couples [cf. Johnson and O'Connor 2002; Patterson 2001].

The opportunities that people with non-normative sexualities have to start a family differ by how friendly different cultures are to their reproductive rights or to the rights of single individuals. Although many countries have granted rights to non-heterosexuals that are equal to those of heterosexuals, in some countries these opportunities are strongly constrained by laws and public opinion [Costa and Bidell 2017]. Although in many countries society is much more tolerant of homosexuality than before [McCormack 2018], the domain of family, parenthood, and childcare has resisted these liberalising tendencies, and there is persistent 'institutional heterosexism' (laws and other settings explicitly prohibiting adoption or ART for same-sex couples). Furthermore, a backlash against sexual minority rights has emerged in the EU in recent decades, and not just in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) [Kuhar and Patternote 2017].

The efforts to promote the reproductive rights of non-heterosexual individuals have brought questions about their parenting preferences to the fore. Gato et al. [2017] provide an insightful review on this subject and have identified its blind spots. One of the issues they highlight is the lack of research on the impact of factors specific to individual cultures on the parenting desires and intentions of people with non-heterosexual sexual orientation (e.g. the role of internalised homophobia and social stigma, 'institutional heterosexism' and gatekeeping, generational changes within various cultural contexts). The authors also note the need to examine contexts outside the Anglosphere, which has been the predominant focus in the literature so far, and to look at the parenting desires and intentions of bisexuals as well [Gato et al. 2017].

We aim to address at least some of these blind spots in our paper. We ask how people with non-heterosexual orientation (lesbian women, gay² men, bi-

¹ The paper was supported by the Czech Science Foundation within the project 'Parental Desires and Intentions of Gays, Lesbians and Bisexual Men and Women in the Czech Republic' (Reg. Project No.: 18-07456S); and with the institutional support of RVO 68378025.

² (A) gay is a commonly used synonym for (a) homosexual. Because homosexuality was long treated as a disease or at least as undesirable, some of this old negativity still clings to the word homosexual, especially as a noun. 'Gay' is a newer concept and is free from

sexuals, and heterosexuals declaring same-sex attraction) perceive parenthood, whether parenthood is among their life priorities, and whether they want to become parents at all (i.e. what are their parenting desires). Second, we explore how various types of factors interact with their sexual identities and how they influence their parenting desires.

Our study explores the role of various factors on the parenting desires and attitudes of the above-mentioned non-normative sexualities in the cultural context of the Czech Republic, a CEE country that exhibits a peculiar mix of opposing tendencies. On the one hand, Czech society is highly secular, the influence of the Catholic Church is very limited, attitudes to gay men and lesbian women are tolerant, and there is a long tradition of civil unions available to these men and women [Burešová 2020]. On the other hand, strong ‘institutional heterosexism’ persists. Same-sex couples are explicitly prohibited from adopting and from access to ART and single women are not allowed access to ART either. Studying this particular context should therefore shed light on the various roles played by strong legal barriers and relatively liberal attitudes to non-heteronormative sexualities in societies.

Our study is based on a unique online questionnaire survey of a sample of 882 respondents including self-identified bisexuals, gay men, lesbian women, and heterosexuals who declared a same-sex sexual or romantic attraction. The research design of the study and the method used in the analysis allowed us to compare the differences between these groups.

We argue that in a cultural context with a high level of ‘institutional heterosexism’ but liberal attitudes towards gay men and lesbians, sexual identity is strongly and gender-specifically associated with people’s notions about parenthood and reflects the actual structural barriers to parenthood in society rather than liberal attitudes towards non-heterosexuals. Furthermore, our research suggests that women, in particular, seem to have very flexible sexual identities when reflecting on parenting issues.

Sexual orientation, identity, and parenthood

Parenting desires are considered a precursor to parenting intentions, as stated wishes or beliefs about what one wants or would like to do [e.g. Baiocco and Laghi 2013; Riskind and Patterson 2010]. Quantitative studies on LGB³ individu-

this negative connotation. The term gay is mainly used for men, i.e. gay men or just gays. However, the term ‘gay women’ is not uncommon either. In this text, we use the term gay men (or gays) and lesbian women (or lesbians) for men and women identifying as homosexuals. In some established phrases, such as ‘gay-family friendly legislation’ or ‘anti-gay-family legislation’ we use the term ‘gay’ to mean ‘homosexual’.

³ LGB is an acronym for lesbian (L), gay (G), and bisexual (B) individuals.

als' parenting desires [for an overview see Gato, Santos and Fontaine 2017] are highly heterogeneous in terms of how they define their research problem and their representativeness, sample composition, sampling methods, and social and cultural context, etc. Their findings are difficult to compare because of methodological and often also cultural differences. Nevertheless, subject to some simplification, the existing evidence suggests the following:

- (i) Gay men and lesbian women exhibit weaker parenting desires and intentions than heterosexuals [e.g. Riskind and Patterson 2010; Baiocco and Laghi 2013].
- (ii) Lesbians declare stronger parenting desires than gay men [ibid.]. This is because parenthood continues to be strongly associated with femininity, while men's homosexuality tends to imply childlessness.
- (iii) Few studies have focused on bisexuals [Costa and Bidell 2017; Riskind and Tornello 2017; Herek et al. 2010]. Some US studies indicate that in terms of their parenting desires and intentions bisexuals resemble heterosexuals more than they do lesbians and gay men [Riskind and Tornello 2017].

Research has revealed several factors that significantly influence parenting desires in the context of sexual identity and gender. Some of these studies have distinguished the categories of sociodemographic, personal, relational, and contextual factors [Gato, Santos and Fontaine 2017] and cultural factors [Leal, Gato and Tasker 2018].

- (a) *Sociodemographic factors* primarily include sex/gender, age, race/ethnicity, and sometimes nationality [Costa and Bidell 2017], as well as education level, socio-economic status, perceived health, religiosity, etc.
- (b) *Personal factors* comprise mainly the internalisation of anti-homosexual prejudice and openness about one's non-heterosexual orientation as well as one's motivations to become a parent [e.g. Gato, Leal and Tasker 2019].
- (c) *Relational factors* typically include partnership status or the partner's parenting motivations [Gato, Santos and Fontaine 2017], and sometimes also that the partners agree on parenthood plans. The perception of being supported by one's close social environment, especially family of origin, partner, and close friends, is also considered an important factor [Baiocco and Langhi 2013].
- (d) *Contextual factors* relate mainly to the perceived living standard; access to LGB support networks, information, and social, legal, and medical barriers.
- (e) *Cultural factors* include familism and the value of motherhood as representing a key aspect of female identity [Leal, Gato and Tasker 2018] and the association of childlessness with gay masculinity [Connell and Messerschmidt 2005].

It has been found that the effect of many factors on parenting desires and intentions, like age, may be significantly shaped by the cultural, legislative, and methodological differences that exist between studies [e.g. Gato, Santos and Fontaine 2017]. This underlines the need to contextualise findings in the cultural context of a given society.

Cultural context: the attitudes of Czech society to same-sex couples and their rights and the legal framework

Heteronormativity in the Czech Republic is inscribed in the institutional framework of family life. It manifests itself in the continued inequality of the rights and status of same-sex couples [Burešová 2020]. Although the Czech Republic was one of the first post-socialist countries to legislate civil unions (in 2006), same-sex marriage has not been legalised, despite multiple civic initiatives. Existing laws do not allow (non-biological) second-parent adoption in same-sex couples, let alone joint adoption; surrogacy is not adequately regulated by the Czech law [see Burešová 2020; Sivák 2021], and IVF is not available to single women either,⁴ let alone lesbian couples⁵ [Hašková and Sloboda 2018]. The legal framework in a society, however, can importantly influence the parenting desires of non-heterosexuals [Baiocco, Argalia and Laghi 2014].

Czech public opinion has been continuously supportive of some rights for same-sex couples to a legally or formally recognised partnership and parenthood, with high long-term acceptance of civil unions (around 75%), while approximately 50% of the population endorse same-sex marriage. Although in 2005 only 19% of the population supported the right of gay men and lesbians to adopt children, by 2017 the figure had grown to 51% of the population supporting the adoption of non-biological children and 68% of the population endorsing the adoption of a partner's child. These rights are more often supported by women and younger people (up to the age of 44), by people who are satisfied with their living standard and with their life, and by those who declare a centrist or liberal-right political orientation or report having gay/lesbian friends [CVVM 2019]. According to the Eurobarometer on Discrimination [2019], the Czech Republic scores below the EU average on support for the rights of gays and lesbians: 57% of the Czech

⁴ ART including IVF are available to women under the age of 49.

⁵ Same-sex couples are not the only group that is denied access to ART and adoption in the Czech Republic and in this context the term 'bionormativity' can be used. Given that we are concerned with the issue of access to parenting (which has biological and social dimensions) for people with gay identities in comparison to some other sexual identities, the use of the term heteronormativity is legitimate. One of the features of heteronormativity is essentialism, which constructs heteronormativity and the resulting marginalisation of non-heterosexuality as 'natural' [cf. Kimmel 2003] and thus leads to the exclusion of people with gay identities from reproduction.

population endorsed equal rights for gays/lesbians and for heterosexuals (compared to the EU-28 average of 76%), while 48% agreed with same-sex marriage (the EU-28 average was 67%).

Despite its low religiosity, Czech society exhibits remarkably conservative attitudes to private and family life. The prevailing notion of the ideal family continues to be that of a heterosexual nuclear family, preferably with two biological children, although partnerships and family arrangements, in reality, are much more diverse and often at odds with this ideal [Hašková et al. 2014; Sloboda 2020].

The parenting desires and intentions of people with non-heterosexual identity is an under-researched topic in the Czech Republic. To now there has been only one study, which was conducted online on a non-representative sample of 408 lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals, where 71% of childless people expressed the desire to have a child [Hájková 2014].

Methodology

Participants

The dataset (further referred as LGB Parenting 2019) originates from a research project that examined non-heterosexuals' notions of parenthood that primarily included people who self-identified as lesbian, gay, or bisexual. The sample for this research also included self-identified heterosexuals who exhibited same-sex romantic or sexual attraction. In addition to parenting desires and intentions, we also studied the obstacles to parenthood perceived by different groups of lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals and which pathways to parenthood they preferred. The inclusion of individuals with heterosexual identity declaring same-sex attraction allowed us to compare non-heterosexuals with people who see themselves as heterosexuals, even if their sexual preferences might be much more complex.

To sum up, our sample, collected in 2019, comprised 882 respondents in total, of whom 127 identified as gay men, 29 as lesbian women, 96 as bisexual men, and 177 as bisexual women. In addition, there were 95 men and 319 women who identified as heterosexual and reported same-sex attraction (i.e. agreed with the statement that they had felt romantic or sexual attraction to one or more same-sex persons in the past five years); 16 men and 23 women in the sample were unable or unwilling to state their sexual identity while reporting same-sex attraction. The sample only included the 25–49 age group because this is the age at which the issue of parenthood is the most relevant.

Measurement of sexual orientation

Measuring the preferences of people with non-normative sexualities raised the question of how to operationalise and measure sexual orientation. The way sexu-

al preferences are defined strongly shapes how many people are included in the category of 'non-normative sexualities and what their characteristics are.

There is some level of consensus on the three main elements of sexual orientation that can be used for measurement: sexual identity (how one identifies, typically measured on some form of gay-straight scale), sexual behaviour/experience (whom one has sex with, typically indicated by the gender of sexual partners), and sexual attraction (whom one feels sexually attracted to, again in terms of same-sex or opposite-sex individuals) [Wolff et al. 2017; Mishel 2019; Truman et al. 2019].

Large-n representative studies, mostly in the fields of criminology or health, indicate that the above three elements often do not necessarily overlap at the individual level [Geary et al. 2018]. For example, people exhibiting same-sex behaviour and same-sex attraction do not necessarily identify as gays, lesbians, or bisexuals [e.g. Carrillo and Hoffman 2018; Diamond 2005]. Higher levels of congruence between attraction, behaviour, and identity are found among women than men – a fact likely associated with the predominant norm of hegemonic masculinity, which, unlike femininity, requires strict heterosexuality [Connell and Messerschmidt].

The number of people who identify as gay, lesbian, or bisexual people thus tends to reflect the different ways in which sexual orientation is defined. The lowest numbers of them are found when sexual orientation is defined in terms of identity: studies measuring how many people identify as bisexual, gay, or lesbian have typically put the share at around 2–3% of the population; other studies have found much larger numbers of people indicate same-sex attraction or to have engaged in same-sex behaviour [Geary et al. 2018; Mishel 2019; Truman et al. 2019; Wolff et al. 2017; Richters et al. 2014]. Since non-heteronormative sexualities are disadvantaged in multiple ways, including labour market and access to housing, and are disproportionately often exposed to negative stigmatisation by society [for a review see Mishel 2019], it is no surprise that they avoid identifying as lesbian, gay or bisexual.

The operationalisation of sexual orientation in a study has to be consistent with the research goals. In our study of parenthood and parenting desires and intentions, we defined sexual orientation primarily in terms of identity, as this approach works better with topics such as discrimination or negative aspects of non-heterosexuals' lives [e.g. Scandurra et al. 2019].

Kinsey et al. [1948] operationalised sexual identities on a 7-item scale that ranged from 'exclusive heterosexuality' to 'exclusive homosexuality'. Contemporary research often uses a three-item scale of self-identification (lesbian/gay, bisexual, straight) [for an overview see Savin-Williams and Vrangalova 2013]. Some authors [Vrangalova and Savin-Williams 2012], for instance, recommend including the categories of 'mostly heterosexual' and 'mostly homosexual' to facilitate self-classification for those without a clearly defined sexual identity.

In our study, sexual identity was measured by the single-response item 'How would you personally identify?' with the options of heterosexual, bisexual,

gay/lesbian, other, don't know, and can't say. People other than bisexual or gay/lesbian were asked whether they had felt in the past five years any romantic or sexual attraction to a person of the same sex.

Sampling procedure

It is difficult to collect a representative sample of lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals and pertinent studies to date have mostly relied on convenience (or community-based) samples [Baiooco and Laghi 2013; Costa and Bidell 2017]. Although Krueger et al. [2020] argue that well-done community-based sampling is a suitable tool for LGBTQ+⁶ population sampling, they pointed out that the sample yielded using this sampling method differs from the sample produced using a probability-based method. In their study, the LGBTQ+ sample created using community-based sampling included fewer bisexuals, more people with higher education and higher socioeconomic status, and more people living in urban areas than would have been in the sample they would have had using probability-based sampling [Krueger et al. 2020]. In general, the quality of the LGBTQ+ community-based samples depends on where the data are collected (the variability of the chosen venues). The situation is particularly complicated when there is neither the necessary sampling frame for the entire group nor detailed knowledge of its parameters, like in our case.⁷

Our sample was recruited via a large online panel (the Czech National Panel; CNP) including more than 55 000 respondents. Online surveys are a good way of reaching our age group (25–49), in which more than 95% of people claim to use the Internet every day [CZSO 2019].

The panel includes the Czech internet population aged 15–65 and its management and recruitment are guided by a rigid methodology. The identity of panel respondents is verified in several ways (by telephone, the respondent's address, and bank account). Unreliable respondents are excluded from the panel (CNP uses lie scores, an analysis of the time spent filling out a questionnaire, and special questions to check whether the respondent is paying attention). Moreover, respondents are motivated by being able to choose both financial and quasi-financial incentives (they can donate the 'money' they earn to charity) to participate in surveys to prevent the 'professionalisation' of respondents in the CNP. According to the StemMark (SM) representative, the use of quasi-financial incentives among CNP participants is very popular.

⁶ LGBTQ+ is the acronym for lesbian (L), gay (G), bisexual (B), transgender (T), queer (Q) and other (+) persons than heterosexual/straight-identified ones.

⁷ There are no relevant census data, and general population surveys have produced extremely small samples of non-heterosexuals [Weiss and Zvěřina 2012].

The sampling procedure can be described as follows. First, the quotas were set for the age group 25–49. The agency uses ‘internal tables’ that are regularly revised according to Czech Statistical Office data (population data and Labor Force Survey data) to set quotas for the Czech population.⁸ The quotas were based on sex, age group, education, region, and size of the place of residence in our survey (see Table 3 in the Appendix), including cross-quotas for age group and sex and age group and education. The aim was to send the screening questionnaire on sexual identity only to the representative sample of people between the ages of 25 and 49. However, the share of people who screened out was massive. The screening questionnaire on sexual identity was thus immediately sent to all participants in the 25–49 age group registered in the panel (12 655 people in total). Only those who identified as either gay, lesbian, bisexual, or heterosexual experiencing same-sex attraction were invited to fill in the main questionnaire. The screening questionnaire was completed by 5533 respondents (44%), of which 4630 (84%) were screened out (i.e. they did not identify as either gay, lesbian, bisexual, or heterosexual experiencing same-sex attraction). Out of those who were not screened out, 796 filled in the main questionnaire completely and the remaining 107 respondents only partly completed the questionnaire. The SM agency calculated a non-response rate of 2% for the *main* questionnaire based on these 107 incomplete questionnaires out of the 903 respondents who were not screened out (see Table 1 in the Appendix for details). The response rate for the *screening* questionnaire was 44%.

The main round of fieldwork yielded 796 respondents (49% men and 51% women). The structure of respondents addressed in the first wave of data collection (i.e. everyone who was sent the screening questionnaire regardless of their sexual identity) was compared with the initial quota for the population aged 25–49. As Table 3 in the Appendix shows, the structure of respondents addressed in the first wave was roughly in line with the original quotas, except for the share of men and women in the data set (more women were addressed to fill in the screening questionnaire regardless of their sexual identity than men). Even though women were overrepresented in the first wave of data collection, self-identified lesbians were probably under-represented⁹ in the sample (N = 17). Moreover, a large share of the sample was made up of people who self-identified as heterosexuals with same-sex attraction (47%).

⁸ According to an SM representative, the agency set cross-quotas for selected variables based on their (unpublished) ‘internal tables’ (cross-quotas for age combined with sex, education, size of the place of residence, and region – were used). The ‘internal tables’ are regularly updated according to CZSO population data and LFS data (year 2019 in our case). The quotas were set for the population aged 25–49 years.

⁹ In community studies conducted in the Czech Republic 2003–2020, the lesbians comprised about 17–41% of gay-identified individuals [for details see Pitoňák 2021: 444].

Second, to increase the share of people with non-heterosexual identities in our sample (gay men/lesbians and bisexual individuals) we conducted the second round of data collection about one month after the first wave using the StemMark agency's Dialog Panel, which contains 10 549 registered respondents. The methodology used to recruit the participants for the Dialog Panel and the quality check of the survey process of this panel are similar to those of the CNP, which means that the data are compatible. We sent the short screening questionnaire on sexual identity to 3381 new respondents aged 25–49 registered in the Dialog Panel and 1547 of them responded (see Table 2 in Appendix). Those who identified as gay, lesbian, and bisexual were given the main questionnaire. The main questionnaire was completed through the Dialog Panel by 86 respondents (18 bisexual men, 25 bisexual women, 12 lesbians, and 31 gay men). The response rate for the screening questionnaire was 46%.

The final sample (containing data from both waves of data collection) included 882 individuals (38% men and 62% women). The number of lesbian-identified women, however, remained very low (only 29 in total).

The structure of the final sample was roughly in line with the quotas set for the general population aged 25–49 years at the beginning of data collection, except in the case of sex (see Table 3 in the Appendix for details). The share of women in the final sample is about 11 percentage points higher than their corresponding share in the population aged 25–49 years.

The limitations of our sample

The small number of self-identified lesbians was one of the most challenging aspects of our survey. We were initially concerned by this fact and doubted that the right sampling approach had been applied. We had been extremely careful in developing our research design and especially the sampling method, and we commissioned the fieldwork to a high-quality professional polling agency that possessed the necessary know-how.

Current literature on sexual identity offers us some explanations. Sexual identity is found to be both flexible and fluid – for example, it is prone to transform over time or according to context [Carrillo and Hoffman 2018]. While flexibility means that people 'engage in sexual behaviours with people of the sex that is not the one they are primarily attracted to', fluidity 'relates to one's sexual orientation changing over time' [McCormack 2018: 6]. Diamond [2005] demonstrated this in a longitudinal study of lesbian women, in which some women retained their sexual identity over time, others never accepted a lesbian identity, and others changed their identity depending on various situational factors. Sexual identity in bisexuals is also found to be fluid, as they are much less likely than lesbians and gays, for instance, to come out to their friends or family, especially if they live in an opposite-sex relationship or have or are expecting children [Gold-

berg et al. 2018]. Studies have also found that the sexual identity of men who have sex with men may also be flexible [Carrillo and Hoffman 2018].

However, based on the above-mentioned studies on the relationship between sexual identity and parenthood and on the flexibility and fluidity of sexual identities, we came to believe that, rather than sampling bias, we had encountered a much more deeply-rooted link between parenthood and sexual identity in the Czech cultural context.

We believe that the under-representation of lesbians in the sample is primarily attributable to the research topic. Our respondents were informed that the study dealt primarily with parenthood and parenting desires and intentions. There seems to be a tendency among women (yet surprisingly not men) to identify as straight (with 65.5% of straight-identified women in the sample) or bisexual [cf. Goldberg et al. 2018; Diamond 2005]. This may be due to the strong emphasis placed on becoming a parent among women generally and the strong association between (especially biological) parenthood and heteronormativity. While this hypothesis, of course, requires a much more detailed (and probably rather qualitative) examination, it seems to be in line with existing research evidence. Thus, even if convenience and community-based sampling would have helped us to recruit more lesbians in our sample, it would have failed to reveal this important tendency within the general population.

Furthermore, we are aware that our sample was not collected via probability sampling, which is considered to be the 'gold standard' of academic research. However, our strategy used a more affordable way of sampling an elusive population by addressing more than 12 000 people in a given age group to collect our sample. We are aware of the fact that we cannot use our data, for example, to map the representation of various groups with non-normative sexual identities in society. But it was not our aim to do so. Our analysis focuses primarily on comparing the opinions and preferences of different sexuality groups and understanding how the preferences for parenthood and the perception of barriers are shaped by non-heterosexual identity. In our opinion, this is hindered neither by the nature of the sampling using online panels nor by the fact that when recruiting our sample we addressed more women respondents (regardless of their sexual identity) than corresponds to their actual share in the population.

Results

Sexual identity and parenthood

A large share of respondents (N = 348; 52%) reported that they had children; this was more often the case of women (64%) than men (33%). Differences by sexual identity were statistically significant in both groups. Parenthood was most often reported by self-identified heterosexuals with same-sex attraction (58% of men

and 64% of women), for whom with some simplification we use the term 'heterosexuals' in the text below, followed by bisexuals (45% of men and 69% of women), and least often by lesbian women (N = 7; 24%) and gay men (N = 10; 8%). Among the respondents with no reported sexual identity, 3 of the 16 men (19%) and 15 of the 23 women (65%) had children. The children of gays and lesbians had in most cases been conceived in prior heterosexual relationships. Our findings are in line with existing research evidence from different cultural contexts indicating that gays and lesbians are more often childless/childfree than the heterosexual population. For instance, a Pew Research Center [2013] study on US residents aged 15–60 found 31% of lesbians and 16% of gay men to be parents; a Portuguese study revealed only about 7% of LGB individuals aged 18–78 to be parents [Costa and Bidell 2017].

Parenthood as a priority?

Czech society has consistently placed a strong emphasis on family and parenthood [Hašková et al. 2014]. Despite the widespread trend of postponing parenthood, especially since 1989, voluntary childlessness does not seem to be a generally accepted or common life strategy [Hašková 2009]. Our data also reflect the high value placed on becoming a parent: 69.5% of all, 79.6% of female, and 52.8% of male respondents declared that starting a family and raising children was a priority in their life.

There was a distinct group of lesbian women and especially gay men who supported that opinion much less than other people in the sample. Only 27.6% of gay men stated 'becoming a parent' to be a life priority, compared to 12 out of 29 gay women (41%); the latter figure is less than half of the percentage of heterosexual women who claim parenthood to be a priority (84.6%). The attitudes of people with no reported sexual identity seem to be closer to those of bisexuals, but this is merely a suggested trend given their low representation in the sample. Self-identified bisexuals were much closer to heterosexual people than to gays and lesbians. Our finding indicates that parenthood is predominantly associated with heterosexual and bisexual identities (Table 1), while gays and lesbians are much more likely to construct their identities as distant from parenthood.

Elsewhere, we demonstrate that lesbians and especially gay men attach more importance than others to social relations that are not directly associated with starting one's own family and tend instead to prioritise finding a steady romantic partner or forming close friendships. They are also much more tolerant of different non-biological forms of parenthood (adoption, foster care, step-parenting, etc.), as opposed to the dominant preference for having biological children that was observed in the other groups [Maříková and Vohlídalová 2019, 2022].

Table 1. How important is it for you to start a family and raise children? (sorted by sexual identity)

	Men*				Women*			
	Hetero- sexuals	Bisexuals	Gays	Other/NA	Hetero- sexuals	Bisexuals	Lesbians	Other/NA
It is important	74.7%	64.6%	27.6%	56.3% (N = 9)	84.6%	76.8%	41.4%	60.8% (N = 14)
Neither /nor	11.6%	14.6%	26.0%	25.0% (N = 4)	6.9%	10.2%	37.9%	8.7% (N = 2)
It is not important	9.5%	16.7%	40.9%	18.8% (N = 3)	6.9%	10.7%	13.8%	17.4% (N = 4)
Don't know	4.2%	4.2%	5.5%	0.00%	1.6%	2.3%	6.9%	13.0% (N = 3)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.00%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100%
N	95	96	127	16	319	177	29	22

Source: LGB Parenting 2019.

Note: * statistically significant differences between sexual identity groups, tested by χ^2 test ($\alpha = 0.01$).

Factors affecting parenting desires

Respondents were asked whether they wanted to have a (or another) child. The basic descriptive analysis revealed similar trends as indicated above.

Among men, but not women, the desire to have a (or another) child was significantly associated with sexual identity. Self-identified heterosexual men were the most likely to want children (58%), followed by bisexual-identified men (52%) and men with no reported sexual identity (50%; $N = 8$). In contrast, gay-identified men were much less likely than others to want (more) children – only less than 28% expressed this desire (see Table 2). The share of respondents who did not want (more) children or were unable to answer the question was also much higher among gay-identified men.

The differences among women were not statistically significant. The proportion of women who stated that they wanted to have (more) children ranged between 54% among self-identified heterosexual women and 48% among self-identified lesbians. Nevertheless, the share of respondents unable to answer this question was considerably larger among lesbians and women with no reported sexual identity. While again this is rather a suggested trend given the small numbers of these categories in the sample, these women seemed to view their parenthood choices as complicated and ambiguous.

The finding that parenting desires are strongly shaped by sexual identities was also confirmed in the subsample of childless respondents. Here, 70% of men and 76% of women who identified as heterosexuals wanted children, followed by 55% of men and 53% of women who identified as bisexual, but the proportion of childless gay men and lesbian women was considerably lower (29% among gay men and 50% among lesbian women). Gay men and lesbian women also had the largest percentage of respondents unable to answer the question (17–24%).

Regression models

To explore in greater depth the effect that various factors have on the parenting desires of non-heterosexuals, we conducted binary logistic regression with the dependent variable ‘respondent wants/doesn’t want to have (more) children’ (0 = no, 1 = yes) (see Table 3). We estimated three models for each sexual identity group. Individuals with no reported sexual identity were excluded from this part of the analysis due to the low n .

To explore the intersection between gender and sexual identity and to estimate their unadjusted effect on parenting desires, we constructed a special model that includes the intersection of sex and sexual identity (see Table 4). The estimated regression models explained about 28% of the variability in parenting desires among heterosexual and bi-identified people and nearly 42% of the variability among the gay and lesbian-identified groups.

Table 2. Do you want to have (more) children (whether or not your own)?

		Heterosexuals	Bisexuals	Gays/Lesbians	Other/NA	Total
Men*	Yes	57.9%	52.1%	27.6%	50.0%	44.3%
	No	34.7%	38.5%	48.0%	18.8%	40.1%
	Don't know	7.4%	9.4%	24.4%	31.3%	15.6%
	Total %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Women	Total (N)	96	95	127	16	334
	Yes	54.5%	46.9%	48.3%	50.0%	51.6%
	No	39.8%	45.8%	34.5%	18.8%	41.4%
	Don't know	5.6%	7.3%	17.2%	31.3%	6.9%
	Total %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Total (N)	319	177	29	23	548

Source: LGB Parenting 2019.

Note: * statistically significant differences between sexual identity groups, tested by χ^2 test ($\alpha = 0.01$).

Based on the literature review and the categorisation of factors influencing parenting desires suggested by Gato et al. [2017], the effect of the following explanatory variables was tested in our models:

- (i) *sociodemographic factors* (age, sex, education, sexual identity)
- (ii) *personal factors* (a strong family orientation,¹⁰ satisfaction with one's own sexual identity,¹¹ prejudiced against the parenting skills of gay men/lesbian women¹²)
- (iii) *relational factors* (social support,¹³ gay or lesbian parents among friends, already has kids, type of partnership)
- (iv) *contextual factors* (subjective assessment of the household's living standard, size of the place of residence, health issues, ART access conditions, legal aspects of same-sex parenting, considerations about the child being accepted in the community).

The above-mentioned factors were included in the models that were estimated separately for each sexual identity group, whereby it was possible to compare their effect on the parenting desires of straight, bisexual, and gay/lesbian-identified respondents (see Table 3).

Sociodemographic factors

Our results are consistent with the findings of numerous studies [e.g. Gato, Santos and Fontaine 2017] that have demonstrated the significant effects that sexual identity, sex, and age have on parenting desires. Stronger parenting desires are exhibited by heterosexuals (compared particularly to gays and lesbians) and young people (compared to older ones). Taking into account the raw effect of sex and sexual identity (i.e. without controlling for the effect of other variables), heterosexual-identified people have a 3.6 times higher chance and bisexual-iden-

¹⁰ Support the statement: 'Watching children grow up is the greatest joy in life.' (1= yes)

¹¹ The index summarises a battery on respondents' satisfaction with their sexual identity, ranging from 1 (completely satisfied) to 8 (completely dissatisfied); The battery included questions on concealing one's sexual identity; feeling sad about one's sexual identity; finding it morally wrong; being proud of it; and considering it an important part of oneself.

¹² Index constructed based on respondents' opinions on whether (i) two gay women and (ii) two gay men can rear a child as well as a heterosexual couple (1 = strongest support, 10 = lowest support for gay parenting capabilities).

¹³ We used a set of questions on different environments in which a person is usually able to find support and understanding: a partner, friends, and family members. The resulting index ranged from 1 (no support at all) to 4 (support from all of the above groups).

tified people have an almost 2.9 times higher chance of declaring they want to have (more) children compared to gay men and lesbian women (see Table 4).

Since sex and sexual identity are among the main factors we are interested in, we also modelled the interaction between sex and sexual identity, which allowed us to compare together all the combinations of these variables (see Tables 4 and 5). The model found that gay men had the weakest parenting desires among all the groups observed here. If we compare them with other groups of men, heterosexual men have about a 3.6 times higher chance and bisexual men about a 3 times higher chance of wanting (more) children when compared to gay men.

If we compare gay men to women, the most striking difference can be identified for heterosexual women, who have nearly a 9 times greater chance, and bisexual women who have a 7 times higher chance of wanting (more) children than gay men. Even lesbian women are 2.5 times more likely to want a child than gay men. Thus, in the Czech context, being a gay man seems to be very strongly associated with accepting childlessness.

As regards other sociodemographic factors, age seems to play an important role in all sexual identity groups. People aged 45+ are the least likely to want to have (more) children. People aged 25–30 have about a 14 times greater chance if they are heterosexual-identified, a 20 times greater chance if they are bi-identified, and a 36 times higher chance if they are gay/lesbian-identified to say that they do want to have (more) children compared to their counterparts aged 45–49 years. The fact that the age differences are the most pronounced within the gay/lesbian-identified group might support the hypothesis that the younger generation of gays and lesbians seem to accept parenthood as a possible part of their life to a much greater degree than those in the older generations [Riskind et al. 2013].

Education generally does not seem to play an important role in parenting desires in any of the sexual identity groups in our sample

Personal factors

As studies have demonstrated [e.g. Murphy 2013], many people, especially lesbians and gays, feel stigmatised and feel they may be inadequate and incapable of raising children, which may negatively affect their parenting desires. Our model suggests that while having a strong family orientation increases the chance of wanting (more) children, having prejudices about gay/lesbian parenting skills and the level of satisfaction with one's own sexual identity do not seem to play an important role in parenting desires, except in the case of heterosexual-identified people. Heterosexuals are the only group in which the rule applies that the greater a person's satisfaction with his or her sexual identity, the more likely it is that they will want to have children.

As for family orientation, our results suggest that it is in the gay/lesbian-identified group that this factor plays the most important role. While heterosexu-

al-identified people who agree with the statement that 'watching children grow up is the greatest joy in life' are twice as likely as those who disagree with this statement to want to have (more) children, bi-identified people are 2.9 times more likely. In the case of gay/lesbian-identified people, agreement with this statement is accompanied by a more than fivefold increase in the chance that they will want to have children.

Relational factors

Research shows that family and partnership status are among the key factors that influence the parenting desires of the general population [Sobotka 2004]. One frequently cited reason for childlessness is the absence of a suitable partner [Hašková and Vohlídalová 2014]. Although the effect of this factor was not found to be statistically significant in either of our sexual identity groups, the values of the regression coefficients suggest that being in a monogamous partnership, being a dating single, or being single in an 'open' relationship increases the chances that a person wants to have children, especially in the case of bi-identified and gay/lesbian-identified respondents.

One of the strongest predictors of the parenting desires of heterosexual-identified people proved to be the fact of whether a person already had children. Already having children reduces the chances that a person wants to have another child by about 60% in the case of heterosexual-identified people. This factor does not have a statistically significant effect in the case of bisexual and gay/lesbian-identified people, but the values of the regression coefficients suggest that the direction of this effect is very similar in this case as well. The fact of already having children may influence a person's willingness to have another child when faced with multiple constraints on doing so.

For LGB people the level of social support they have is very important in their considerations about becoming a parent [e.g. Gato, Santos and Fontaine 2017]. LGB pathways to parenthood are very complicated and LGB parents can be expected to face much greater social obstacles than straight parents. Surprisingly, the social support index does not have a statistically significant effect on parenting desires in our models. Having a lesbian or gay friend who is a parent does not seem to be significant either.

Contextual factors

Contextual factors, in general, seem to play a much more important role in the parenting desires of gay/lesbian-identified people than others. The household living standard proved to be an important factor in parenting considerations [Hašková et al. 2014] and was cited as one of the factors that influence the ability

Table 3. Binary logistic regression models: Do you want (more) children? (1 = yes, 0 = no) – first part

Factors	Categories	MODEL 1: heterosexual sexual identity	MODEL 2: bisexual sexual identity	MODEL 3: gay sexual identity
		Exp(B)	Exp(B)	Exp(B)
Constant (B)	X	0.053**	0.02***	0***
Sex	Men (<i>ref. cat.</i>)	1	1	1
	Women	0.91	0.499**	2.211
Education	Sig.	No	No	No
	Secondary without the school-leaving exam or lower (<i>ref. cat.</i>)	1	1	1
Sociodemographic factors	Secondary with the school-leaving exam	0.729	0.477*	0.706
	Tertiary	0.953	0.688	0.548
Age	Sig.	***	***	**
	25–30	13.933***	20.293***	36.549**
	31–44	5.357***	12.197***	12.528**
	45–49 (<i>ref. cat.</i>)	1	1	1

Table 3. Binary logistic regression models: Do you want (more) children? (1 = yes, 0 = no) – second part

Factors	Categories	MODEL 1: heterosexual sexual identity	MODEL 2: bisexual sexual identity	MODEL 3: gay sexual identity
		Exp(B)	Exp(B)	Exp(B)
Personal factors	Strong family orientation	1	1	1
	Satisfaction with one's own sexual identity	Yes	2.094**	2.974***
				5.264***
			1.228*	1.178
	LG parenting prejudices	1.067	0.975	0.92
Relational factors	Social support index	1.03	1.398*	0.861
	LG parents within friends	1	1	1
				0.87
	Already has kids	Yes	1.192	
		No (ref. cat.)	1	1
	Partnership	Yes	0.339***	0.513
		Sig.	No	No
		Single, not dating (ref. cat.)	1	1
	Single, dating			
		1.12	2.114	1.844
	Monogamous relationship			
		1.243	1.655	1.797

Table 3. Binary logistic regression models: Do you want (more) children? (1 = yes, 0 = no) – third part

Factors	Categories	MODEL 1: heterosexual sexual identity	MODEL 2: bisexual sexual identity	MODEL 3: gay sexual identity
		Exp(B)	Exp(B)	Exp(B)
Living standard (subjective)	<i>Not good (ref. cat.)</i>	1	1	1
City size	Good	1.226	0.981	19.161**
	Sig.	No	No	**
	Village up to 5000 inhabitants	1.195	1.079	6.587***
	Small to medium-size city (up to 100 000 Inhabitants)	1.167	1.087	1.246
Contextual factors	<i>Big city over 100 000 inhabitants (ref. cat.)</i>	1	1	1
	ART conditions (considering)	1.495	1.548	3.158**
	<i>No (ref. cat.)</i>	1	1	1
	Legal aspects (considering)	1.554	0.518	0.773
Health (considering health issues – my or partner's)	<i>No (ref. cat.)</i>	1	1	1
	Yes	1.411	1.433	1.063
	<i>No (ref. cat.)</i>	1	1	1
	Acceptance of a child in the community (considering)	0.708	1.409	0.431
	<i>No (ref. cat.)</i>	1	1	1

Table 3. Binary logistic regression models: Do you want (more) children? (1 = yes, 0 = no) – fourth part

Model fit	Factors	Categories	MODEL 1: heterosexual sexual identity	MODEL 2: bisexual sexual identity	MODEL 3: gay sexual identity
			Exp(B)	Exp(B)	Exp(B)
Model fit	Nagelkerke R Square	X	0.281	0.288	0.419
	χ^2	X	***	***	***
	Hosmer-Lewenshof test	X	Not significant	Not significant	Not significant

Source: LGB Parenting 2019.

Note: Statistical significance of regression coefficients: * 10%, ** 5%, ***0.01%.

Table 4. Binary logistic regression model: Do you want (more) children? Unadjusted effect of sex and sexual identity and their intersection

Factors	Categories	B	Sig.	Exp(B)
Constant (B)	X	0.318	0.000	1.375
Sexual identity	Heterosexual	1.285	0.000	3.614
	Bisexual	1.05	0.000	2.857
	<i>Gay/lesbian (ref. cat.)</i>	0	x	1
Sex	<i>Men (ref. cat.)</i>	0	x	1
	Women	0.897	0.033	2.453
Sex*Sexual identity		x	0.063	x
	Women*bisexual	-1.034	0.032	0.356
	Women*heterosexual	-1.105	0.025	0.331

Source: LGB Parenting 2019.

Note: Model fit: Nagelkerke R Square 0.05, χ^2 stat. sig. ($p = 0.000$), Hosmer-Lewenshof test not stat. sig.

Table 5. B coefficients for all combinations of interacting variables (sex*sexual identity)

	B	Exp(B)
Gay man (ref. cat.)	0	1
Heterosexual man	1.285	3.614668
Bisexual man	1.05	2.857651
Heterosexual women	2.182	8.864017
Lesbian women	0.897	2.452235
Bisexual women	1.947	7.007633

Source: LGB Parenting 2019.

to afford costly ART (if available to lesbians or single women) [Gato et al. 2017; Berkowitz and Marsiglio 2007; Mezey 2008]. Our model suggests that the household living standard plays a statistically significant role, particularly for gay/lesbian-identified respondents. Those gay/lesbian-identified respondents who self-evaluated their living standard as good have a 19 times higher chance of wanting to have children than those who assessed their living standard as poor. For other sexual identity groups, the effect of this factor was not found to be significant.

The size of the person's place of residence seems to have a significant effect on the parenting desires of gay/lesbian-identified people only: people who live in villages with fewer than 5000 inhabitants display a stronger desire to have (more) children – about 6 times stronger than the level of interest observed among inhabitants of large cities (100 000+ inhabitants). This finding is rather surprising given that we would expect that the big-city environment (because of the anonymity it provides and the more tolerant attitudes towards the LGB community) would have a positive effect on the desire of gays and lesbians to have children. Simple descriptive statistics managed to shed some light on this unexpected finding: gay/lesbian people in our sample tend more often than others to live in places located in the vicinity of a big city. This means that, even if officially their place of residence is a small village, they live in locations that are closely connected to major cities, like Prague, Brno, or Pilsen.

Last but not least, for gay/lesbian-identified people, there is a statistically significant link between parenting desires and the fact of whether they would consider ART when they were thinking about becoming a parent. Those who would consider ART had a 3 times greater chance of wanting to have children than those who would not consider using ART.

Discussion and conclusion

Consistent with other studies, we found that parenting desires and the importance ascribed to starting a family are considerably lower in the lesbian, gay, and bisexual people population than among heterosexuals experiencing same-sex attraction. In this respect, sexual identity plays a much more important role among men than women [e.g. Baiocco and Laghi 2013; Costa and Bidell 2017; D'Augelli et al. 2007; Riskind and Patterson 2010].

The analysis demonstrated that the attitudes of bisexual-identified people are often closer to those of heterosexual-identified individuals than to gay/lesbian-identified people – a finding similar to what some other studies have shown [Leal, Gato and Tasker 2018; Riskind and Tornello 2017]. Compared to gays and lesbians, the pathways to parenthood of bisexual-identified people are much easier, especially if they have a partner of the opposite sex [Brewster et al. 2014].

Of the groups we studied, heterosexual-identified women are the ones who ascribe the most importance to having a family. They are followed by bisexual

women, heterosexual men, bisexual men, and lesbians. Gay men are the least likely to consider becoming a parent important.

Being a gay man is also one of the most important individual factors that determine whether or not people want children (less than 28% of gay men indicate wanting to have children, in contrast to 52% of bisexual and 57% of heterosexual men). Gay men are also more likely to be unable to answer the question of whether or not they want children (with more than 24% indicating they don't know, compared to less than 10% of bisexual- or heterosexual-identified individuals who were able to answer this). This finding suggests that surveys of parenting desires should provide a response option that would allow people to express their uncertainty on this question.

Our study also indicated a certain level of flexibility and fluidity of sexual identities, particularly for women, related to the consideration of being a parent in the Czech social and cultural context. Despite the strict data collection methods we used, self-identified lesbians were strongly under-represented in our dataset. In the light of research evidence on the construction of individual sexual identity within any wider cultural and social context [e.g. Carrillo and Hoffman 2018; Diamond 2005], we believe that this imbalance reflects the strictly hetero-normative perceptions of parenthood that prevail in Czech society. In a society where gay parenting is not legally recognised, where motherhood is a key aspect of female identity [Hašková and Zamykalová 2006], and where biological parenthood is strongly preferred, it seems understandable that, in the context of parenthood considerations, lesbian women self-identify as categories that offer them the potential to become a parent (i.e. as heterosexual or bisexual women). This hypothesis, however, would require further research.

The absence of the same effect among gay men is likely due to the much stronger link between childlessness and the gay identity and lifestyle. As Murphy [2013] states, the very question of parenthood is a relatively novel one for most gay men since they have largely internalised the view that being gay equates with being childless/childfree. Our findings, consistent with those of Sokolová [2009], suggest that this norm is still strong in the Czech Republic.

In Czech society, it is still easier for lesbian women than gay men to access ART to fulfil their dream of becoming a parent. Gay men therefore might be less likely from the very outset to give any consideration to the idea of becoming a parent. A study by a private healthcare facility [Turcan et al. 2020] mapping the increase in the desire to become a parent among lesbian women after registered partnerships were introduced in the legislation (in 2006) showed that lesbian women often adopt the strategy of having 'a fictitious partner'. This strategy is a way for lesbian women to legally undergo IVF. For gay men, pursuing the surrogacy option means travelling to a country where surrogacy is legal, which requires at least considerable financial resources and certain 'know-how'.

In addition to sexual identities, parenting desires are generally determined by other variables. Our analysis draws from the typology of factors that influence

parenting desires proposed by Gato et al. [2017]. They divided these factors into four groups: sociodemographic, personal, relational, and contextual. We focused on how these various types of factors interact with sexual identity and what roles they play for different sexual identity groups.

To conclude, the factors that increase the odds of wanting (more) children among all groups (lesbians/gays, bisexuals, and heterosexuals with same-sex attraction) are a younger age and having a strong family orientation. For gay and lesbian individuals, in particular, living in a small village with less than 5000 inhabitants (which proved to be mostly smaller suburban areas close to major cities) was also found to have a positive effect on parenting desires. It is possible that obtaining more affordable but also more spacious and better-quality housing is considered – and not just by gay and lesbian people – a necessary precondition for starting a family [Hašková et al. 2014]. In contrast, being older, already having children, and being single without a partner decrease the odds of wanting (more) children.

Contrary to our expectations based on our review of the literature, neither social support nor prejudices against lesbian and gay parenting skills had a statistically significant effect in our sample. While our data do not allow us to assess the net effect of the restrictive ‘anti-gay-family’ legislation and ‘institutionalised heterosexism’ in the Czech Republic, the data do suggest that the effect of these two factors is very strong. It is reflected both in the strong link between parenting desires and heterosexual (or bisexual) sexual identity and in the fact that some lesbian women probably claimed non-gay identity when taking part in research on parenting desires.

On the matter of generational change, young gay- and lesbian-identified people under the age of 30 generally express more of a desire to become parents than do their counterparts over the age of 45. However, the results are not conclusive about whether this is proof of a generational change [as identified by Riskind and Patterson 2010; Riskind et al. 2013] or whether it is simply a reflection of differences between people in different stages of the life course. However, this finding requires further research.

The level of detail that our analysis could go into was severely limited by the under-representation of self-identified lesbians in our sample, a drawback that would probably not have occurred if we had pursued convenience sampling. However, given the strict fieldwork procedures of our study, we believe that we have shed light on the subject matter by revealing an extremely important phenomenon, which is the apparent unwillingness of (some) lesbian women to identify as lesbians when they are talking about becoming a parent. At the same time, we have drawn attention to some of the limitations that quantitative research on this subject suffers from given the flexible and contextual nature of sexual identity. We have also demonstrated the possibility of using high-quality online panels, such as CNP, for sampling elusive populations. Moreover, online panels may be an affordable method of quantitative data collection in research on sensitive

topics (such as sexual identity, sexuality, etc.) that seeks to compare individual groups and maps the topic in its greater heterogeneity than community-based research would allow [Krueger et al. 2020].

The recent public debate on the issue of same-sex couples in the Czech Republic seems to be more inclined towards widening the rights of same-sex couples and making their status more equal to that of heterosexual ones [e.g. Sloboda 2021]. It would be therefore useful to study how these changes are reflected in the individual parenting desires and intentions of gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals.

MARTA VOHLÍDALOVÁ focuses on gender inequalities in the labour market, gender aspects of academic careers, sexual harassment, and sociology of the family and private life. She works as a senior researcher in the Gender & Sociology Department at the Institute of Sociology of the Czech Academy of Sciences in Prague and she is an assistant professor at Ambis University.

HANA MAŘÍKOVÁ is a senior researcher in the Gender & Sociology Department at the Institute of Sociology of the Czech Academy of Sciences in Prague. Her research interests are gender inequalities in private life as well as in the labour market and politics. She focuses on critical men's studies, the politics of care, and employment policies. She is the author and co-author of several articles and monographs.

References

- Baiocco, R. and F. Laghi. 2013. 'Sexual Orientation and the Desires and Intentions to Become Parents.' *Journal of Family Studies* 19 (1): 90–98, <https://doi.org/10.5172/jfs.2013.19.1.90>.
- Baiocco, R., M. Argalia and F. Laghi. 2014. 'The Desire to Marry and Attitudes toward Same-Sex Family Legalization in a Sample of Italian Lesbians and Gay Men.' *Journal of Family Issues* 35 (2): 181–200, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X12464872>.
- Berkowitz, D. and W. Marsiglio. 2007. 'Gay Men Negotiating Procreative, Father, and Family Identities.' *Journal of Marriage Family* 69 (2): 366–381, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2007.00371.x>.
- Brewster, K. L., K. H. Tillman and H. Jokinen-Gordon. 2014. 'Demographic Characteristics of Lesbian Parents in the United States.' *Population Research and Policy Review* 33 (4): 503–526, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11113-013-9296-3>.
- Burešová, K. 2020. *Rodičovství a partnerství gayů a leseb v českém právu*. (Gay and lesbian parenting and partnership in Czech law) Prague: IS CAS.
- Carrillo, H. and A. Hoffman. 2018. "'Straight with a Pinch of Bi': The Construction of Heterosexuality as an Elastic Category among Adult US Men.' *Sexualities* 21 (1–2): 90–108, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460716678561>.
- Connell, R. W. and J. W. Messerschmidt. 2005. 'Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept.' *Gender & Society* 19 (6): 829–859, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243205278639>.

- Costa, P. A. and M. Bidell. 2017. 'Modern Families: Parenting Desire, Intention, and Experience among Portuguese Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Individuals.' *Journal of Family Issues* 38 (4): 500–521, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X16683985>.
- CVVM. 2019. *Postoje veřejnosti k právu homosexuálů*. (Public attitudes to gay rights) Prague: IS CAS.
- CZSO. 2019. *Využívání informačních a komunikačních technologií v domácnostech a mezi jednotlivci – 2019*. (The use of information and communication technologies in households and among individuals – 2019) Retrieved 6 January 2020 (<https://www.czso.cz/csu/czso/3-pouzivani-pocitace-a-jinych-zarizeni-k-pristupu-na-internet>).
- D'Augelli, A. R. et al. 2007. 'Lesbian and Gay Youth's Aspirations for Marriage and Raising Children.' *Journal of LGBT Counselling* 1 (4): 7–30, https://doi.org/10.1300/J462v01n04_06.
- Diamond, L. M. 2005. 'A New View of Lesbian Subtypes: Stable versus Fluid Identity Trajectories over an 8-Year Period.' *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 29 (2): 119–128, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2005.00174.x>.
- Eurobarometer on Discrimination: The Social Acceptance of LGBTI People in the EU. 2019. Retrieved 20 January 2020 (https://ec.europa.eu/info/policies/justice-and-fundamental-rights/combatting-discrimination/lesbian-gay-bi-trans-and-intersex-equality/eurobarometer-social-acceptance-lgbti-people-eu-2019_en).
- Gato, J., D. Leal and F. Tasker. 2019. 'Parenting Desires, Parenting Intentions, and Anticipation of Stigma upon Parenthood among Lesbian, Bisexual, and Heterosexual Women in Portugal.' *Journal of Lesbian Studies* 23 (4): 451–463, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10894160.2019.1621733>.
- Gato, J., S. Santos and A. M. Fontaine. 2017. 'To Have or Not to Have Children? That is the Question. Factors Influencing Parental Decisions among Lesbians and Gay Men.' *Sexuality Research & Social Policy: A Journal of the NSRC* 14 (3): 310–323, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-016-0268-3>.
- Geary, R. S. et al. 2018. 'Sexual Identity, Attraction and Behaviour in Britain: The Implications of Using Different Dimensions of Sexual Orientation to Estimate the Size of Sexual Minority Populations and Inform Public Health Interventions.' *PLoS ONE* 13 (1): 1–17, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0189607>.
- Goldberg, A. E., K. R. Allen, T. Ellawala and L. E. Ross. 2018. 'Male Partnered Bisexual Women's Perceptions of Disclosing Sexual Orientation to Family Across the Transition to Parenthood: Intensifying Heteronormativity or Queering Family?' *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy* 44: 150–164, <https://doi.org/10.1111/jmft.12242>.
- Hájková, R. 2014. *Homoparentalita z pohledu gay a lesbické komunity*. (Homoparentality from the perspective of the gay and lesbian community) Thesis. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci.
- Hašková, H. 2009. *Fenomén bezdětnosti*. (The phenomenon of childlessness) Prague: SLON.
- Hašková, H. and Z. Sloboda. 2018. 'Negotiating Access to Assisted Reproduction Technologies in a Post-socialist Heteronormative Context.' *Journal of International Women's Studies* 20 (1): 53–67.
- Hašková, H. and M. Vohlídalová. 2014. 'Singles.' Pp. 103–130 in *Vlastní cestou? Životní dráhy v pozdně moderní společnosti* (One's own path? The life course in late modern society), edited by H. Hašková. Prague: SLON, IS CAS.
- Hašková, H. and L. Zamykalová. 2006. 'Mít děti – co je to za normu? Čí je to norma?' (Having children – What kind of norm is that? Whose norm is it?) *Biograf* 13 (40–41): 3–53.
- Hašková, H. (ed.), M. Vohlídalová, H. Maříková, R. Dudová, Z. Uhde, A. Křížková and

- L. Formánková. 2014. *Vlastní cestou? Životní dráhy v pozdně moderní společnosti*. (One's own path? The life course in late modern society) Prague: SLON, IS CAS.
- Herek, G. M., A. T. Norton, T. J. Allen and C. L. Sims. 2010. 'Demographic, Psychological, and Social Characteristics of Selfidentified Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Adults in a US Probability Sample.' *Sexuality Research and Social Policy* 7 (3): 176–200, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-010-0017-y>.
- Johnson, S. M. and E. O'Connor. 2002. *The Gay Baby Boom: The Psychology of Gay Parenthood*. New York: New York University Press.
- Kimmel, M. 2003. 'Masculinity as Homophobia.' Pp. 103–109 in *Reconstructing Gender*, edited by E. Disch. 3rd ed. Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.
- Kinsey, A. C., W. B. Pomeroy and C. E. Martin. 1948. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. Philadelphia, PA: W.B. Saunders.
- Krueger, E. A., J. N. Fish, P. L. Hammack, M. Lightfoot, M. D. Bishop and S. T. Russell. 2020. 'Comparing National Probability and Community-Based Samples of Sexual Minority Adults: Implications and Recommendations for Sampling and Measurement.' *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 49 (5): 1463–1475, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-020-01724-9>.
- Kuhar, R. and D. Patternote (eds.). 2017. *Anti-gender Campaigns in Europe: Mobilizing against Equality*. London: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Leal, D., J. Gato and F. Tasker. 2018. 'Prospective Parenting: Sexual Identity and Intercultural Trajectories.' *Culture, Health & Sexuality* 21 (7): 757–773, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2018.1515987>.
- Maříková, H. and M. Vohlídalová. 2019. 'Bariéry versus preferované formy rodičovství u neheterosexuální populace.' (Barriers versus preferred forms of parenting in the non-heterosexual population) *Fórum sociální politiky* 13 (6): 20–26.
- Maříková, H. and M. Vohlídalová. 2022. 'To Be or Not to Be a Parent? Parenting Aspiration of Men with Non-Normative Sexual Identities in Czechia.' *LGBTQ+ Family: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 18 (2): 101–118, <https://doi.org/10.1080/27703371.2022.2039888>.
- McCormack, M. 2018. 'Mostly Heterosexuals and the Study of Sexualities: An Introduction to the Special Issue.' *Sexualities* 21 (1–2): 3–15, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460716679378>.
- Mezey, N. J. 2008. 'The Privilege of Coming Out: Race, Class, and Lesbians' Mothering Decisions.' *International Journal of Sociology of the Family* 34 (2): 257–276.
- Mishel, E. 2019. 'Intersections between Sexual Identity, Sexual Attraction, and Sexual Behavior among a Nationally Representative Sample of American Men and Women.' *Journal of Official Statistics* 35 (4): 859–884, <https://doi.org/10.2478/jos-2019-0036>.
- Murphy, D. A. 2013. 'The Desire for Parenthood: Gay Men Choosing to Become Parents through Surrogacy.' *Journal of Family Issues* 34 (8): 1104–1124, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X13484272>.
- Patterson, C. J. 2001. 'Families of the Lesbian Baby Boom.' *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Psychotherapy* 4 (3–4): 91–107, https://doi.org/10.1300/J236v04n03_07.
- Pew Research Center. 2013. 'A Survey of LGBT Americans: Attitudes, Experiences and Values in Changing Times.' Retrieved 2 February 2020 (http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/files/2013/06/SDT_LGBT-Americans_06-2013.pdf).
- Pitoňák, M. 2021. 'Sexuální orientace jako přehlížená proměnná: terminologická, metodologická a kontextuální úskalí v otázce měření sexuality v rámci "reprezentativních" šetření. Platí stále 4 %?' (Sexual orientation as an overlooked variable: terminological, methodological, and contextual issue concerning sexuality measurement as part of 'representative' surveys. Do 4% still count?) *Československá psychologie* 65 (5): 440–458, <https://doi.org/10.51561/cspsych.65.5.440>.

- Richters, J. et al. 2014. 'Sexual Identity, Sexual Attraction and Sexual Experience: The Second Australian Study of Health and Relationships.' *Sexual Health* 11 (5): 451–460, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/SH14117>.
- Riskind, R. G. and C. J. Patterson. 2010. 'Parenting Intentions and Desires among Childless Lesbian, Gay, and Heterosexual Individuals.' *Journal of Family Psychology* 24 (1): 78–81, <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017941>.
- Riskind, R. G., C. J. Patterson and B. A. Nosek. 2013. 'Childless Lesbian and Gay Adults' Self-efficacy about Achieving Parenthood.' *Couple and Family Psychology: Research and Practice* 2 (3): 222–235, <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032011>.
- Riskind, R. G. and S. L. Tornello. 2017. 'Sexual Orientation and Future Parenthood in a 2011–2013 Nationally Representative United States Sample.' *Journal of Family Psychology* 31 (6): 792–798, <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000316>.
- Savin-Williams, R. C. and Z. Vrangalova. 2013. 'Mostly Heterosexual as a Distinct Sexual Orientation Group: A Systematic Review of the Empirical Evidence.' *Developmental Review* 33 (1): 58–88, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2013.01.001>.
- Scandurra, C., D. Bacchini, C. Esposito, V. Bochicchio, P. Valerio and A. L. Amodeo. 2019. 'The Influence of Minority Stress, Gender, and Legalization of Civil Unions on Parenting Desire and Intention in Lesbian Women and Gay Men: Implications for Social Policy and Clinical Practice.' *Journal of GLBT Family Studies* 15 (1): 76–100, <https://doi.org/10.1080/1550428X.2017.1410460>.
- Sivák, J. 2021. *Náhradní mateřství v českém právu a související otázky*. (Surrogacy in Czech law and related issues) Prague: Wolters Kluwer ČR.
- Sloboda, Z. 2020. 'Známé neznámé registrované partnerství: statistiky RP v Česku po 14 letech.' (Known unknown registered partnership: RP statistics in the Czech Republic after 14 years) Press release. Retrieved 26 June 2020 (<https://www.soc.cas.cz/aktualita/zname-nezname-registrovane-partnerstvi-statistiky-rp-v-cesku-po-14-letech>).
- Sloboda, Z. 2021. 'Development and (Re)Organisation of the Czech LGBT+ Movement (1989–2021).' *East European Politics* 38 (2): 281–302, <https://doi.org/10.1080/21599165.2021.2015686>.
- Sobotka, T. 2004. *Postponement of Childbearing and Low Fertility in Europe*. Groningen: Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.
- Sokolová, V. 2009. 'Otec, otec a dítě: Gay muži a rodičovství.' (Father, father, and child: gay men and parenthood) *Sociologický časopis* 45 (1): 115–145, <https://doi.org/10.13060/00380288.2009.45.1.06>.
- Turcan, P., M. Prochazka, P. Pokorný, J. Kvintová, M. Sigmund, and E. Sedláta Jurasková. 2020. 'Desire for Parenthood and Associated Trends in Czech Lesbian Women.' *Sexual Medicine* 8 (4): 650–659, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esxm.2020.08.004>.
- Truman, J. L. et al. 2019. 'Measuring Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity in the National Crime Victimization Survey.' *Journal of Official Statistics* 35 (4): 835–858, <https://doi.org/10.2478/jos-2019-0035>.
- Vrangalova, Z. and R. C. Savin-Williams. 2012. 'Mostly Heterosexual and Mostly Gay/Lesbian: Evidence for New Sexual Orientation Identities.' *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 41 (1): 85–101, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-012-9921-y>.
- Weiss, P. and J. Zvěřina. 2012. *Sexuální chování v ČR: situace a trendy*. (Sexual behaviour in the Czech Republic: situations and trends) Prague: Portál.
- Wolff, M. et al. 2017. 'Measuring Sexual Orientation: A Review and Critique of US Data Collection Efforts and Implications for Health Policy.' *Journal of Sex Research* 54 (4–5): 507–531, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2016.1255872>.

Appendix: Details on sample structure and data collection

Table 1. First wave of data collection, CNP (6/2019)

	N
Respondents who completed the main questionnaire	796
Respondents who screened out (filtered out by the screening questions; i.e. heterosexual without same-sex attraction)	4630
Respondents who stopped filling in the main questionnaire	107
Total respondents who answered the screening questionnaire	5533

Note: 12 655 addressed individuals aged 25–49.

Table 2. Second wave of data collection, Dialog Panel (7/2019)

	N
Respondents who completed the main questionnaire	86
Respondents who screened out (filtered out by the screening questions; i.e. heterosexual with or without same-sex attraction)	1401
Respondents who stopped filling in the main questionnaire	60
Total respondents who answered screening questionnaire	1547

Note: 3380 addressed individuals aged 25–49.

Table 3. Original quotas and sociodemographic structure of addressed individuals and the final sample – first part

Variables		Structure of addressed individuals (1st wave of data collection) (in %)	Structure of addressed individuals (2nd wave of data collection) (in %)	Structure of the final sample	Quotas (based on the StemMark Internal tables -CZSO/LFS 2019) (in %)	Differences: quotas vs final sample
Sex	Men	36	59	38	49	-11
	Women	64	41	62	51	11
Age	25–29	27	27	19	21	-2
	30–44	61	64	62	63	-1
	45–49	11	9	19	16	3
Education	Primary	3	0	3	4	-1
	Secondary without school-leaving exam	21	22	22	28	-6
	Secondary with school-leaving exam	42	43	42	42	0
	Tertiary	33	35	32	26	6
	Up to 999 inhabitants	14	14	15	16	1
Size of the place of residence	1 000–1 999	18	14	19	20	-1
	5 000–19 999	19	16	19	19	0
	20 000–99 999	24	26	22	20	2
	100 000+	25	30	25	25	0

Table 3. Original quotas and sociodemographic structure of addressed individuals and the final sample – second part

Region	Variables	Structure of addressed individuals (1st wave of data collection) (in %)	Structure of addressed individuals (2nd wave of data collection) (in %)	Structure of the final sample	Quotas (based on the StemMark Internal tables -CZSO/LFS 2019) (in %)	Differences: quotas vs final sample
Praha		12	15	12	14	-2
Central Bohemia		14	9	14	13	1
South Bohemia		6	2	6	7	-1
Pilsner Region		4	8	5	5	0
Karlovy Vary Region		2	1	2	3	-1
Ústí nad Labem Region		9	14	9	8	1
Liberec Region		4	3	3	4	-1
Hradec Králové Region		5	5	5	4	-1
Pardubice Region		5	2	5	5	0
Vysočina Region		5	2	5	5	0
South Moravia		11	17	12	10	2
Olomouc Region		6	7	6	6	0
Zlín Region		5	2	5	5	0
Moravian-Silesian Region		12	10	12	10	2
Total		100	100	100	100	x