

Supplementary Table S3. Detailed Spearman Correlation Matrix of Subscales and Items

	WFC1	WFC2	WFC3	RDAS1	RDAS2	RDAS3	Gad1	Gad2	Gad3	Gad4	Gad5	Gad6	Gad7	FI
WFC1	1													
WFC2	0.525	1												
WFC3	0.380	0.491	1											
RDAS1	-0.018	0.053	-0.044	1										
RDAS2	0.011	-0.020	-0.206	0.174	1									
RDAS3	-0.048	0.033	-0.046	0.620	0.403	1								
Gad1	0.090	-0.084	-0.073	0.083	0.109	0.129	1							
Gad2	0.049	-0.085	-0.055	0.019	0.091	0.077	0.291	1						
Gad3	0.101	-0.099	-0.058	0.117	0.143	0.132	0.275	0.247	1					
Gad4	0.034	-0.083	-0.074	0.073	0.032	0.078	0.331	0.380	0.224	1				
Gad5	0.109	-0.090	-0.024	0.061	0.108	0.037	0.247	0.158	0.290	0.127	1			
Gad6	0.020	-0.099	-0.058	0.140	0.091	0.101	0.250	0.239	0.158	0.272	0.206	1		
Gad7	0.049	-0.107	-0.066	0.071	0.113	0.020	0.162	0.144	0.062	0.162	0.337	0.176	1	
FI	-0.207	-0.226	-0.086	0.419	0.108	0.372	0.177	0.089	0.165	0.145	0.135	0.136	0.124	1

The bolded value indicates statistical significance at $p < 0.05$.

Prior to conducting the structural equation modeling, Spearman's rank correlation coefficients were calculated to examine the bivariate associations among the main study constructs. As presented in Table 7, all main variables were significantly correlated with fertility intention (FI) in the expected directions: work–family conflict (WFC) showed a significant negative correlation with FI ($r = -0.228$, $p < 0.001$), whereas revised dyadic adjustment scale (RDAS) ($r = 0.427$, $p < 0.001$) and generalized anxiety disorder (GAD) ($r = 0.253$, $p < 0.001$) were positively correlated with FI. Importantly, the correlations among the predictor constructs (WFC, RDAS, and GAD) were weak ($|r| \leq 0.101$), indicating no evidence of problematic multicollinearity. These bivariate associations confirm that the directional relationships observed in the subsequent SEM were already present in the raw data. The detailed correlation matrix for all individual subscales and items is provided in Table 6.