

The Changing Shape of Ties in European Families: Profiles and Intentions of LAT Couples

Luis Ayuso Sánchez

University of Malaga

Ana Maria Goldani

Princeton University

This paper is part of our broad interest in the diversity of families and the growing alternatives to the life long marriage model that contributes to a growing range of family arrangements. In the global context, families have undergone dramatic changes produced by high rates of divorce, cohabitation, unwed motherhood, the new visibility of same sex relationships, the (re) emergence of step families and working mothers, and a sharp rise in the number of single person households, where once married-couple households were the norm. There also has been a large-scale and steady historical growth trend in the number of people living alone (singledom), and in living-apart-together arrangements (LAT). Despite the diversity of forms and rhythms in this process of family reinvention, such new arrangements are already considered a global trend. These trends are often considered to be a consequence of the growing tendency in the personal search for freedom and autonomy, an opening up of personal choices for men and women in the context of a global economy and the Internet revolution. To some authors, family diversity is a sign of cultural deviance or collapsing values while others maintain that “deviant” family forms are not dysfunctional at all but are adaptive and flexible arrangements responding to social and cultural changes.

Heterosexual marriage has been the “benchmark” for understanding the process of family formation, although homosexual and cohabiting relationships have always existed. Over the last two decades, cohabitation has become common practice in several societies (Bumpass & Lu, 2000). There has been a gradual retreat from marriage and growth and diversity of cohabitation types. In fact, cohabitation is becoming more like formal marriage in that both are childrearing institutions as families formed outside of marriage grow in number, policy makers and individuals have sought to formalize aspects of non marital family relationships, such as when the father of a child born outside of marriage is formally identified as that child's father through the establishment of legal paternity (Seltzer, 2000).

The movement towards cohabitating unions is not new for many countries of Central, Western and Northern Europe. Historically, people who could not afford to marry and/or were not legally entitled to marry practiced cohabitation. The contemporary growth of cohabitation has been attributed to changes in dating and sexual relationships among unmarried people, associated with the rise of individual ideology (Rindfuss and Van den Heuvel 1990). Also associated with the increase in cohabitation are the decline in marriage rates and a movement to a later age at marriage, as observed in many European countries since the 1980s (Kiernan, 2000). Putting this all together, Sobotka and Toulemon (2008:85) note that, “family and living arrangements are currently heterogeneous across Europe, but all countries seem to be making the same shifts: towards fewer people living together as a couple, especially in marriage¹; an increased

¹ Due to both marriage decline and marriage postponement, the proportion of married people declined rapidly, particularly among men and women under age 30. This trend is particularly strong in the post-communist countries of Central and Eastern Europe (Sobotka and Toulemon, 2008).

number of unmarried couples; more children born outside marriage; and fewer children living with their two parents.”

Therefore, worldwide conjugal transformations over the last 30 years include a gradual retreat from marriage and a growing number of couples living together without marrying. As a result, marriage has become less important in the transition for adulthood, for the identity for men and women and for defining heterosexual relationships. It has also become less relevant as a context for sexual expression and for bearing and rearing children. Moreover, marriage has become less sacred, being increasingly viewed as a secular rather than religious institution (Sobotka and Toulemon, 2008, p. 91). All of these changes may also have encouraged the development of double residences for couples. Couples that share a residence throughout the life course may become less common as labor markets become less localized and more globalized, and as women's workforce participation increases. Changes in the labor market, including growing demands for higher educated workers and workers willing to relocate in a global economy, increased standards of living, and change in family responsibilities and living arrangements may be shaping new types of relationships. Developing communication and ease of travel allow some virtual relationships to develop into long distance relationships. As part of these macro developments, a growing process of gender equality and equity in contemporary society plays an important role in shaping the type of partnership.

Therefore, the couple or the family is no longer exclusively defined as a space where love and domestic work circulate in a single household. As some author's note, “if the family distributes this desire and hard-to-find commodity on other markets, it also produces the construction of the

identities of each of its members” (Bawin-Legros and Gauthier, 2001:43). Couples living apart together (LAT) increasingly have become part of the spectrum of couples’ partnership arrangements. Wilfield’s (1985) classic distinguishes marriages by residence between a commuting marriage which refers to couples having a common household but one or both have a seasonal residence and LATs, where each resides in a separate household. Roseneil (2006) distinguishes among LATs that are regrettably apart, gladly apart or undecidedly apart. Schneider and Meil (2008) introduce the term Long Distance Relationships to highlight the importance of geographic distance between households as a critical factor in the LAT arrangements. In the Caribbean region, the so-called Visiting Unions are common, which involve couples with or without children that do not cohabit but maintain sexual relations. These are publicly and socially acknowledged relationships with a certain degree of stability and involve a moral and affective union (Ariza and Oiveira 2001). Recently, Cherlin et al (2008) uses the term Living Together Apart (LTA) to refer to situations of cohabitation without any affective relation.

LATs challenge previous assumptions in at least three ways. First, it challenges the common assumption that living together in the same household is required for consideration as a couple. Secondly, LATs push the boundary between marriage and cohabitation and contribute to new meanings of family. Third, and a central issue in academic discussions about family, is that the growing LAT arrangements challenge the notion that marriage and childbearing is the centerpiece of family studies. The two-household couple seems to be the new style and like the couples living together without marrying did before, it has further loosened the rigid bonds of the traditional marriage model.

Attempts to study couples living apart together (LAT) face several conceptual and technical challenges. In some ways examining this type of partnership is like chasing a “moving target”, considering limited data that is usually designed and collected under assumptions of the traditional marriage model. Thus, we would first like to argue that the use of a traditional heterosexual marriage cultural framework is an inadequate model for understanding the diversity and meaning of non-cohabiting relationships. However, the widespread practice of the marriage model and the role of social norms on partner’s behavior can’t be forgotten. As Simmel observed in the 19th century, there is no intimacy without norms. Thus, it seems that the life of a non-residential couple depends on the way in which it manages its intimacy and external norms, rendered concrete through the eyes of others (Bawin-Legros and Gauthier, 2001:44).

Sexual orientation and LAT relationships can also be discussed in terms of external norms. Homosexuals in cultural settings that emphasize the value of self-expression would be more accepted (Adamczyk and Pitt, 2009). Thus, gay men and lesbians seem to be in LAT unions for the same reasons that heterosexuals are – to balance desires for intimacy and personal autonomy or because of economic constraints (Strohm et.al. 2009). However, the opportunities are different because policies based on couples as heterosexuals limit the opportunities of same-sex couples. If they cannot marry and cannot adopt children, then non-residential partnerships are more attractive to lesbians and gay men than to heterosexual men and women (Carpenter and Gates, 2008).

Qualitative studies suggest that divorced persons may opt for non-residential partnerships in order to maintain their autonomy and to avoid falling into previous habits that they associated with the failure of their

former relationship (Levin, 2004, Haskey 2005, Haskey and Lewis, 2006). Thus, people opting to live apart together could be using it as a strategy to maintain egalitarian ideals and independence. LAT relationships appear as an arrangement that enable individuals to balance autonomy with obligations throughout their life course, which is important for understanding current family ties in diverse societies.

Finally, contextual and individual factors shape and constrain choices about couples living apart together. Previous studies suggest that financial resources, available housing, health conditions, education, gender attitudes and gender practices, levels of egalitarianism and the ideal of motherhood are important factors (Holmes, 2004). A study of France shows that almost three fifths of individuals in LAT relationships report that they are living apart from their partner because of circumstances out of their control, such as financial difficulties, which were more likely among younger than older adults (Loilier and Villeneuve-Gokalp 2008).

Scope of the Study

Our research paper is based on data obtained from the Generations and Gender Survey (GGG)², a cross-national comparative, retrospective and prospective study of the dynamics of family relationships in industrialized countries. It is the core activity of the Generations and Gender Programmed, coordinated by the Population Activities Unit (PAU) of United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) in Geneva. The GGS is designed as a panel survey with at least three waves at an interval of three years and uses a probability sample representing a country's non-institutional population aged 18-79. A large part of the

² The authors thankfully acknowledge the Population Activities Unit, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, for permission to use the GGS data for analysis.

survey questionnaire is devoted to questions on family situation at the time of the interview, family related events experienced in the past, and intentions of respondents to engage in vital events such as forming a partnership, having children and leaving the parental home. GGS is an innovative survey and offers a special opportunity to examine the variety of partnership arrangements. It represents one of the best sources to capture people living apart together (LAT).

The GGS key question used to define LAT was: “Are you currently having an intimate (couple) relationship with someone you're not living with? (This may also be your spouse if he/she does not live together with you. Our survey does not only cover heterosexual relationships, but also same-sex relationships. If you have a partner of the same sex, please answer the following questions as well).” In our study the percent of couples living apart together (LAT) is based on individuals who declared to be in a union but were not living together. We mostly used sections 3, 8, 9, and 11 of the questionnaire and sub-module C³. The countries of reference are those for which the micro-data from the first wave of the survey (2005-2007) were available to the authors in the Summer of 2010 and which offer detailed information on LATs: Bulgaria, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, the Netherlands, Romania and Russia. According to Puur et al (201:140), these countries represent “ a historical and contemporary demographic diversity in Europe, and cover almost the whole spectrum of

³ . Section 3 addresses the current co-resident partner or spouse situation (questions # 301 to #305) and the current non-resident partner or spouse situation (questions #306 to # 318), as well as the intentions of union formation (#319 to 324) the partnership history (#325 to 337) and the intentions to have children (#622 to #630). Sections 8 and 9 cover activity and income (questions #802 to #860) and section 11 provides information on value orientations and attitudes (question #1101 to # 1115). Some optional sub-modules, like sub-module C on intentions of breaking up the relationship were used when available for the country.

demographic modernization in the region. From the vanguard like France to the latecomers such as Georgia and the Russian Federation.” The sample size for the entire data set is 39,814 and our sample of LATs is 3,277.

Among our research questions, we will discuss: what is the profile of LAT’s and what accounts for country variations? Are LAT unions only for the young? What is the proportion of LATs related to the predominant cultural model of marriage in each country? Are LAT’s truly transitional arrangements or are they a new form of partnership? What are the future perspectives of current LAT’s and how is this related with the intention to have children? Does holding more modern gender role attitudes influence the pattern of unions?

To discuss and analyze our findings we draw on previous studies on distant relationships in general and on living apart together, in particular. Although there have not been that many studies on couples living in two different households, a brief inventory by Holmes (2004a and 2004b) suggests that the treatment of distance relationships varies among disciplines.

Geographers have examined them as a form of work-related mobility rather than in relation to intimacy (Greene et al.1999) while sociologists have been more interested in new living patterns amongst young people. For them, couples who Live Apart Together (LATs) are a subset of those relating at a distance but for whom distance poses particular challenges. Some pioneer studies on the subject of living apart together are: the commuter marriage (Gerstel and Gross 1984), trans-household relationships among young people (Heath 1999, 2004) and another on couples whom Live Apart Together (Levin 2004). The term shuttles has also been used to refer to those couples that maintain two residences for work-related reasons, one of which is the normal place of residence and the other near their work (Limmer and Schneider 2008:34).

Liefbroer, Seltzer, also examined the prevalence and meaning of Living Apart Together relationships across Europe and Poortman (2011) in a paper presented at PAA 2011. By using the same survey data of GGS like us, for most of the same countries but with a slightly different methodological approach, we present similar findings in terms of prevalence and variations by country and diversity of LATs.⁴ Departing from the Second Demographic Transition Model, Liefbroer Seltzer and Poortman expected that Living Apart Together would be a living arrangement that indicates that independence and autonomy are valued more and commitment is valued less in intimate relationships. Their findings show that a minority only mentioned LAT for reasons of independence and autonomy. In France and Germany, for example, it was mentioned by 20 to 25 per cent of all respondents who had a LAT relationship. They conclude that -- in contrast to what is often assumed – LAT is mainly a living arrangement that people enter into because of practical reasons. At the same time, they found that “people who opt for LAT because they value independence have more liberal views than people in other partner statuses and that the higher educated and the less religious are overrepresented among them, also fits with expectations from SDT theory” (2011: 11).

Some recent studies for the U.S. suggest that high levels of cohabitation are not necessary for the occurrence of LAT unions and that among whites, one-fourth of couples who lived apart resume their relationships within a

⁴ Unfortunately, we only got to see Liefbroer, Seltzer and Poortman’s paper when we were almost finishing our research. Note that their definition of LATs come from the same survey’s question. However, we consider the total adult population that was previously and is currently in a union as a reference while Liefbroer et.al. use this population but use those persons that have never been in a union to estimate LATs.

year of marriage ((Strohm, et. Al. 2009). The experience of living apart together in the US also does not seem to be one isolated episode among married couples. At least 60% end up living apart together at least once more, with half of the experiences occurring within the first six months of resuming the relationship (Binstock and Thornton, 2003: 440). Some qualitative studies show that some couples consider LAT a desirable and desired form of union while others clearly speak of their situation as a transitory phase while waiting for the “real thing” to come along (Bawin–Legros and Gauthier 2011:40). Among homosexual couples in California, 11 percent of lesbian and gay men, ages 18 to 59, were in non-residential partnerships and their partnerships are of shorter duration than cohabitating unions, particularly for lesbians (Carpenter and Gates, 2008).

Among other possibilities for answering the above questions, the literature emphasizes that greater longevity now offers a series of new stages of life course and opportunities for marriage, divorce, remarriage, and all sorts of negotiation and domestic arrangements. One argument is that in stretching longevity, the risk of breakdown increases and the LATs offer a solution for intimate relationships to last for longer periods. Also, Rindfuss and Stephen (1990) found a substantial effect of spousal absence on the risk of dissolution in the subsequent 3 years of living at a distance. Finally, an important controversy to be addressed here is related to the nature of the LATs. One view is that the LAT is a part of the “going steady” process, often a precursor, of a common-law union or marriage. Another view sustains that LATs are a more permanent arrangement by individuals who do not want to or are not able to share a home.

Descriptive Findings

The comparative analysis of the GGS survey for eight countries indicates considerable variation in couples arrangements (Table 1) although the so-called traditional marriage, (legal married couples living in the same household) remains the predominant cultural model in all of them. Among all adults, 17-79 years old and that declared having a partner; the proportion married varies across countries from 68.3% in France to 90.0% in Romania. Couples living together but not married vary from 5.2% in Romania to 16.9% in France and the proportion of couples living apart together (LAT) varies from 2.3% in Georgia to 14.7% in France. It is important to note that among couples living apart together, the majority is not legally married (from 4.8 % in France to 11.2% in Russia).

Table 1 also offers a general socioeconomic profile of the couples living apart together (LAT) in the eight countries. The diversity among countries shows that LATs are mostly heterosexual couples, with same sex couples varying from less than 1% in Russia to 3.4% in Germany. The LAT couples are not so young as commonly assumed (mean age varies from 28.7 in Bulgaria to 38.9 in Netherland) and most of them have at least a high school and/or college education (80.3 in France up to 98% in Germany). In terms of their work situation, the majority of LATs have at least one partner currently working, who varies from 56.3% in France to 69.7% in Hungary and LATs with at least one student varies from 12.6% in Netherlands to 22.8% in Bulgaria. Finally, from the same table, the proportion of people living with their parents is greater than the proportion that is students, in all countries. Taking the extreme cases, for example, in 12% of LATs in the Netherlands at least one persons is a student, while 14.3% of LATs in that country live with a parent. At the other extreme,

22.8% of LATs in Bulgaria are students and 71.8% of LATs live with a parent. These results should be viewed in conjunction with the reasons couples gave for been living in two different households.

Table 1 also shows that couples in dual residence (LAT) have frequent contact and report being happy. More than two-thirds of couples have daily or weekly contact, in all countries (83.6% in France to 91.6% in the Netherlands). The level of satisfaction of the couples in LATs, measured on a scale of 0 to 10, varies from 7.2 in Russia to 8.6 in the Netherlands. These numbers expressing considerable satisfaction are consistent with a relatively low proportion of couples in most of the countries that reported that they were considering finishing their relationship in the previous year, which varies from 17% in Bulgaria to 35.9% in Russia.

Table 2 shows details of LAT relationships in terms of duration, nature and reasons for couples to be living-apart-together across the countries. The average duration of LAT relationships is highest in Russia (4.7 years) and lowest in Germany (3.5 years). In fact, the duration of LATs in most of the countries is bi-modal with more than a third with one year or less of duration (39.3% in Germany to 43.5% in Bulgaria), and about a quarter of the LATs with 5 or more years of duration (21.8% in Bulgaria to 30.1% in France). The nature of LATs may be understood as “LATs by choice” or “obligated LATs”, meaning that at least one of the partners said that they live apart together because they want to or they are obligated to be in this partnership because of circumstances. This classification shows Germany with the highest proportion of “LATs by choice” at 54.4%, and Russia with the highest proportion of “obligated LATs” at 67.2%. Couples in dual residences that are obligated by circumstances in France represent 56.1% and 54.8% in Bulgaria.

Why are some couples living apart together, instead of being married or cohabiting in the same household? Among those couples in “LATs by choice”, the two main reasons are (1) the desire of at least one partner to remain independent, where France represents the highest proportion at 50.6 %, and (2) at least one of the partners said that they don’t feel they are ready to live together, with Bulgaria representing the highest proportion at 53.1%. On the other hand, couples in “obligated LATs”, gave more varied reasons to be in this situation and they were more diverse across countries. Work, housing and economic circumstances are the three main reasons mentioned by at least one of the partners for being in an “obligated LAT”. The order of importance among these reasons varies across countries. While 37.2% of couples in France and 35.2% in Germany point to work circumstances as the main reason to be in an “obligated LAT”, housing difficulties appear as the main reason for being in this situation, in other countries (32.0% in Russia, 27.0% in Rumania 25.3% in Bulgaria). Economic reasons obligating couples to live apart together are most important in Bulgaria (24.7%) and Romania (22.5%). Finally, a category of “other causes “ corresponds to about a quarter of the reasons for couples to be in “obligated LATs” across all countries (except in Germany at 19%).

Table 3 reveals future perspectives of LATs, based on partner’s reports of their intentions to change marital status and/or have children in the next three years. Among those LATs with intentions of changing their marital status, the proportion intending to cohabit in the next three years is noticeable in France (51.8%), Germany (39.1%) and the Netherlands (32.0%). Secondly, there is a movement towards a formalization of the LATs in marriage (Rumania, 67.8%, Bulgaria 45.3% and Russia 38.3%). Finally, the proportion of those who are in LATs and intend to continue in

this situation appears strongest in Russia (45.1%), the Netherland (42.0%) and Germany (41.3%), and lowest in Romania (20.7%), France (28.4%) and Bulgaria (29.1%). These last statistics get a little stronger in all countries if we add those LATs who intend to marry but continue in a dual residence.

Therefore, LAT's intentions seem to indicate that couples living in dual residence, contrary to a common thesis, are not just a new form of temporary arrangement that people find to accommodate their needs in waiting for an appropriate time to marry but they appear to be an option for a stable partnership. Except for Romania, the LAT's intentions also suggest that cohabitation and not formal marriage is the most desired next step for couples living apart together (LATs). Reinforcing the idea that LATs and cohabitation are becoming more like formal marriage in that both are childrearing institution are the proportions of LATs that intend to marry but remain in two residences. Although small, less than 1% in France up to 3.6% in Russia, these proportions are in addition to those couples that intend to have children and remain LATs. The intentions of LATs to have children reveal that except for those couples in Germany (23.7%), well over a third and sometimes over half of LAT couples across countries are planning to have children in the next three years. This intention is particularly strong in France (63.8%), followed by Bulgaria (53.6%), Rumania (49.7%), and Russia (36.3%).

Table 4 explores LATs' intentions of both having children and changing marital status in the next three years. One general trend across countries is that the lowest proportion of couples desiring to have children are those LATs that want to remain in this marital situation while the highest proportion of LATs desiring children are those with intentions to get

married in the next three years. France is the exception to this late tendency, because French LAT couples have the highest proportion with both intentions - to have children and to move to cohabit, instead of marry, in the next three years (66.2%).

Summarizing, and putting together both intentions of LATs to change marital status and to have children, the estimated proportions at the bottom of Table 4 suggest a close relationship between these two intentions. Thus, the relationship between those LATs that intend to have children and at the same time intend to cohabit (live together) is very high in France (94.2%) and Rumania (94.0%) followed by Germany (88.5%), Bulgaria (85.2%) and Russia (72%). When the same relationship is estimated between having children and getting married, the association does not appear so strong. Only in Rumania would LATs couples expecting to have children intend to marry more (97.5%) than cohabit (94.0%). In all other countries, LAT couples with intentions to have children would be more likely to live together in cohabitation as legally married.

Multivariate Analysis

We now proceed to the multivariate analysis in which we present in Tables 5 to 7 with three separate dependent variables. Table 5 examines the likelihood of being LATs among all couples using a dichotomous logistic regression, Table 6 uses multinomial logit regression to analyze the intentions of couples of whether to continue in LAT relationships, cohabit or marry and Table 7 uses logistic regression to investigate the likelihood of voluntarily being in LATs compared to those that are in LATs because of a housing, financial or other constraint.

We begin our analysis with Table 5, which presents three models with odds ratios predicting the likelihood of being in LATs among all couples. Model 1 examines the likelihood of being in LATs with controls for sex, country and age; Model 2 adds social constraints such as education, occupation, whether the couples has children and whether at least one of them lives with their parents; and Model 3 adds “individualization and gender” variables.

In Model 1, we were particularly concerned with the effects of life cycle, which we operationalize with age groups that capture important transitions, particularly regarding cohabitation and marriage. Model 1 results reveal that 18-24 year olds are more than 11 (11.526) times as likely and 25-32 years olds are just over twice (2.177) as likely as 33-40 year olds to be in LAT relationships. These results suggest that the life cycle beginning at 18 and in the early 20s is marked by a sharp transition from living apart to living together and that transition continues into the late 20s and throughout the 30s, though at a slower rate. Moreover, though, the likelihood of living apart for couples consistently continues to decline throughout the remainder of the life cycle so that by their 70s, couples are only one-quarter (.259) as likely as 33-40 year olds to be in such relationships. The fact that the decline continues at later ages suggests that LATs are not simply a product of life changes at the traditional life cycle stage of marrying for the first time. Model 1 also shows that with age and gender controls, that France has the highest rate of LATs, followed by Germany and Russia with roughly 80 percent of the likelihood of France (.832 and .786), and with Bulgaria and Rumania just less than 40 percent of likelihood as France (.382 and .374). These findings are consistent with those found in Table 1.

Model 2 adds constraints, including whether they live with parents or are students, which speaks to their housing situation and the temporary status of being a student, both of which imply potential financial and housing constraints. On the other hand, living with parents or in student housing, may also provide financial opportunities to save money that would be spent on rent, which could be considered in the same dimension of “constraints.” Table 5 shows that persons living with a parent or in couples in which they or their partner is a student are more than eight times (8.739 and 8.072) (Model 3) as likely to be in a LAT compared with persons in other situations. In terms of education, which is generally associated with financial resources, there is also a clear negative relationship with being in a LAT relation, where the university educated have a 35 percent (1.346) greater likelihood of being in a LAT compared to those with secondary education and the least educated have the least likelihood (.866). Couples with a member being unemployed clearly have greater financial constraints and they are one quarter less likely (.755) than others to be in LATs. These results are consistent with the socio demographic profile of the LATs as young and skilled people as shown by Regnier-Loilier, et al. (2009), Ermisch and Siedler, (2009), Castro et al. (2008) for France, Britain and Spain. Finally, we find that it does not matter whether children are present to be in a LAT relation.

Finally, Model 3 adds variables on individualization and gender beliefs. Neither of the attitudinal questions was related to being in a LAT relation. On the other hand, having been in a previous relationship led to an individual being fully 8.4 times as likely to be in a LAT relation compared to those with no previous relation. This suggests that a commitment to marriage by living together greatly diminishes for those persons who have previously had a marital or cohabiting relationship. Note that the models in

Table 6 are only regarding LATs who are asked about their future intentions.

Table 6 uses a multinomial logistic regression to predict whether individuals in LAT relationships intend to cohabit, marry or continue to be in LATs within the next three years. Model 1 uses similar variables as Model 1 in Table 5 and finds that 18-24 year olds are about 50 percent more likely than 33-40 year olds to intend on cohabiting (1.549) or marry (1.497) rather than remain in a LAT relation while 25-32 year olds also have a roughly 50 percent greater intention of cohabiting (1.408) than the 33-40 year olds, but they are nearly three times as likely to plan on marriage (2.892). As of their 40s and beyond, the intentions of LATs to cohabit or marry, decline significantly with age. By their 50s and 60s, they are about one-quarter as likely as 33-40 year olds to plan on cohabiting or marrying. Thus, young persons are more likely to plan for marriage or cohabitation than remain in LATs, though such intentions decline markedly as of their 30s. Moreover, it seems that a considerable number of even young people intend to remain in LATs, though there is a somewhat greater number than plan on marrying or cohabiting.

The country controls show that the French LATs are especially intent on planning to cohabit. The Germans are only 39 percent (.390) as likely as the French to intend to cohabit in the next three years and LATs intentions to cohabit are even lower in the other countries, with Russians only 11.2 percent as likely as the French to cohabit. Regarding marriage, Romanians are nearly three and a half (3.438) times as likely as the French to intend to marry and the Germans are less than half (.431) as likely. Together the two columns in Model 1 suggest that Germans are the most likely to continue as LATs while French LATs intend to cohabit and the Rumanian LATs seek

to marry. The desire to marry more often in Rumania is probably due to the importance of marriage in Rumanian culture, where 90 percent of couples are married (Table 1), making it the predominant cultural form in that country.

Model 2 of Table 6 adds constraints variables, which are the same as those of Model 2 in Table 5 except that we now use self-reported constraints, whether financial, work, housing or health related. Note that these constraints were not available for the analysis of couples that we presented in Table 5. Model 2 shows that level of education and the condition of being a student or being unemployed did not affect one's intentions but financial, housing and health constraints did. The introduction of these variables had little effect on the age or country effects. Access to housing is critical for both expectations to cohabit (1.136) and to marry (1.211) as persons who report this barrier as important are also those that expect to continue being LATs. LATs who reported a lack of housing as the principal obstacle to living together, expect that in proximate years this problem will be resolved and the couple will be able to either marry or cohabit.

However, when living apart depends on health conditions, LATs expect that they will continue in this situation. One's financial condition is especially important (.164) in decisions to cohabit. The lack of resources and poor access to housing lead to a greater probability of expecting to live in LATs in the future.

Model 3 of Table 6 represents the full model in which we add characteristics of the current relation and attitudinal questions. We find that persons with less frequent contact are less likely to intend to cohabit or marry. Also, persons that are more satisfied with the relation and those that

plan to have children are also more likely to intend to cohabit but they are especially more likely to intend to marry.

Table 7 shows logistic regression results that predict becoming a LAT by choice compared to persons who are in LAT relationships because of obligation, presumably due to social constraints of some kind. We present three models that are similar to the ones presented in Table 6. Model 1 shows that LATs by conviction increase with age, suggesting that older persons become LATs for lifestyle reasons and are no longer LATs simply because of socioeconomic constraints that prevent them from cohabiting or marrying. Persons in LATs that are in their 60s and 70s, in particular, are 1.7 and 2.4 times as likely as their 33-40 year old counterparts to be in LATs because they want to. These findings coincide with those of Karlsson and Borrel (2002), which emphasize the greater importance of autonomy in couple relations at these ages and which they often did not have when they were younger. By country, Germans and Romanians in LATs are the most likely to be in these relations by choice while Russians are the least likely.

Model 2 reveals that among the modeled sociodemographic constraints, having at least one member of the relationship being a student actually reduces the probability that they will be in a LAT relationship by choice. The odds ratio for those in couples with at least one student shows that they are less than two-thirds (.660) as likely to be in LATs by choice. Among self-reported constraints, work, housing and health affect whether the person is in a LAT by choice rather than a LAT because of such constraints. Similarly, job-related (.781) and housing (.799) difficulties contribute to LAT not being a choice, while health constraints lead to a greater likelihood to be in a LAT by choice (1.225). Young couples in which at least one member is a student and that have difficulty in accessing

the job market and housing, live in relations that often confine them to being in LAT relationships while older and healthy persons make choices to be in LAT relationships by choice.

Finally, model 3 shows that persons in longer lasting relations and those expecting to have children are less likely to be in a LAT by choice. With the full model in Table 7, there are no longer differences by age. The probability of being in a LAT by choice diminishes by about 4 percent (1-.961) with each year more that one is in a relationship. In terms of frequency of contact, the relation with being in a LAT by choice is U-shaped where those with weekly contact are most likely to be in a LAT by choice where as those with daily contact and with monthly or yearly contact are less likely. Finally, those who expect to have children or are more satisfied with their relationship, are less likely to be in LATs by choice.

Discussion and Conclusions

“Living Apart Together (LAT) relations are definitely a new trend in the relational behavior of couples and they are not only a temporary strategy of “flight from marriage”, along with alternatives of postponement of marriage and unmarried cohabitation. The LATs represent to the 2000’s what the decrease of age of first sexual intercourse represented to the 1990s in terms of changing couples’ relational behavior in Western European countries. Premarital sex has in become a virtually general behavioral pattern in most countries, although differences in age at first intercourse continue to exist, - earlier in Northern Europe than in Central, and especially Southern Europe (Boson and Kantilla, 1997). Although LATs are not yet at the same level of prevalence as premarital sex, their proportions vary along the same line among those countries and contribute

to the increased diversity of family arrangements—consensual unions, single parent families, reconstituted families, childless couples.

Like other alternative forms of partnership the Living Apart Together (LAT) relations are illustrative of shifts from normative action towards individual choice behavior, from complementarities towards egalitarianism, from a commanding towards a negotiating of housekeeping, from a one earner to dual earner couples, etc... All these changes can be interpreted partly as the result, but also partly as the cause of changes in the relational contents, dynamics and processes of partnership, as part of the choices and constraints of being part of societies affected by a growing global economy and large-scale political and social changes in society. Our findings from the GGS support some of these claims as we discuss the relationship of LATs with the cultural model of marriages, the life cycle stage of couples, the diversity of structural constraints and the choices made by the partners in negotiating their relationship as well as their perceptions of gender equality.

The results show that the nature of LATs varies widely across countries and the comparability among them poses interesting questions. How can LAT couples and their reasons to be in such partnerships be so different among the countries? Our first argument here is that even if the equalization between lives situations in those European countries were achieved - a declared goal of the European Union -, the paths towards it will have been different across countries. Secondly, there is no integrated model of employment and family in the region, which considers the structures of different life styles and their different connections to the values of freedom and equality. In fact, the results suggest that the alternative models of partnership in a country seem to be associated with its

dominant cultural marriage model.

Based on the descriptive findings across countries, we suggest that there are three different models of partnership arrangements: an extreme model represented by France, with the highest proportion of couples living apart together (about 15% of the total couples in union) and the lowest proportion of married couples (68%). An intermediary group of countries includes Germany, the Netherlands and Russia, where LATs represent between 10 and 12% of all couples and traditionally married couples are between 75 and 80%. At the other extreme are Bulgaria, Georgia, Hungary and Romania, with the lowest proportions of LATs at between 2% and 7%, and with the highest proportion of married couples, between 80 and 90%. Therefore, the diversity of couple arrangements seems to be influenced by the dominant cultural model of marriage in each country. In addition to nuptiality patterns, with rates of divorce and second unions varying, several other demographic changes should be considered concurrently to better understand LATs as part of the partnership arrangements.

What are the commonalities among LATs in different countries? We find that partner arrangements in two different households (LATs) are definitely not merely a youth phenomena. By taking into account the stage of life cycle, our descriptive results show the mean age of LAT relationships is in the mid thirties and that more than two-thirds have been in LAT relationships for 3 or more years, suggesting that LATs are an option for all ages and not only for youth. The statistical models confirmed this and despite the initial higher probabilities of the youngest group (18-24) being in a LAT relationship, when we controlled for other individual and contextual variables, this age group difference diminishes. Thus, the likelihood of being in LATs for 18-24 year olds becomes similar to that

other age groups. The remaining higher proportions of LATs among the youngest appear associated with constraints in the initial process of union formation. The probability to be Living Apart together by “obligation” is higher until age 32 while the probability to be in LATs as an “option” increases with the age of the partners.

Along the same line, we seek to understand the probabilities that individuals choose a partnership without coresidence. The multivariate analysis shows an expected positive correlation between Living Apart Together and the variety of forms of partnership prevalent in a country. In other words, when there is a growing acceptance of alternative forms of partnership in a country, and marriage and cohabitation is not the dominant model, then the probability of LATs increases. To at least one author, this type of society could be characterized as going through a process of “familial postmodernization” (Meil, 1999).

The individual profile of partners that are living apart together (LAT) also suggests that some objective life conditions are an important part of their choices or constraints shaping their partnership. For example, when the couple is young, and at least one is a student and is living with their parents, this increases their probability to be a LAT. An acceptable conclusion then is that a high prevalence of LATs in a country is associated with an older age of marriage and a greater diversity of unions.

LAT relations appear highly desirable in those cases in which contact between partners is frequent, when there is no intention to have children and when one partner is not convinced or satisfied with the current partner.

All these results suggest that in those countries with a highly developed technological system of communication and a generally low level of fertility----the Living Apart Together (LAT) relations are likely to increase.

Therefore, as the multivariate analysis shows, specific structural barriers and individual attributes are key elements for being in a Living Apart Together (LAT) relation by “choice” or by “obligation”. It is true for both young adults and more mature adults, however, that the type of barriers and individual expectations vary according to the life cycle stage of the partners. For example, among the young adults, the experience of Living Apart Together (LAT) appears as a stage towards cohabitation while they solve their difficulties in terms of studies, locale of residence and housing. Among more mature adults, LAT relations appears to be associated with previous coresident experiences, which increase the probability that they will remain in LATs relationships.

In discussing the relationship between LATs and children through the future intentions of the couples, it might be helpful to remember the 1990’s debate about the two revolutions in the norms underlying family life in Western society: the revolution affecting the relationships between men and women and the other affecting the relationship between parents and children. Both of these revolutions have traditionally been interpreted as part of an overall decline in families, i.e., the decreasing importance of family relationships in adult life. However, both our descriptive and multivariate analyses suggest that the revolution in the norms are not necessarily determining family decline nor affecting family relationships in adult life. In fact, the complexity of elements involved in the process of decision making of the type of partnership demands a sophisticated range

of different source of information. The Generations and Gender Survey (GGS) is one of these sources and helped us to contribute to the debate on the controversies of family decline and changes in norms.

Across all countries, there are a small proportion of LAT couples that are considering having a child in the next 3 years. However, most of that plan to give up their dual-residence distance relationships. Thus, to some it means giving up their independence and autonomy for the sake of a child. What is also observed is that individualization processes have changed intimate relationships, without necessarily bringing women freedom from the obligation or desire to care. For instance, even individuals that declared to be in LATs by choice and in order to maintain their independence, believe that when it comes to children the appropriate situation for them is to have both parents living together. This apparent contradiction suggests that maternity and cohabitation of couples continues to be valued as the adequate environment to have a family. In fact, cohabiting in the same household appears to be more important than marrying when the LAT couples are planning to have a child.

Regarding country differences, and the role of a certain predominant cultural model of unions, we find that most of those persons in Living Apart Together relations in France are expecting to cohabit in the next three year, while those LATs in Rumania plan to be married and the LATs in Germany expect to remain in the same situation. What couples have in common, across countries is that the life cycle stage of the partnership is crucial in projecting the future of the LATs. Among the youth, in the early stage of union formation, the main project in planning the future of their relationship is to move in together in a cohabitation format. Among older couples, with a longer duration of LATs, their future plans involve a more

stable choice, like moving in together and marrying. In planning the future, couples in LATs are also weighing their resources in terms of access to housing, financial conditions and their individual lifestyle expectations.

Other factors contributing to the process of what to do with the relationship in the next three years are the frequency of visits between the couple, the level of satisfaction with the partner and the intentions to have children . The positive association between the desire to have children and the option for cohabiting in the future is particularly strong. This fact and the higher proportion of Living Apart Together (LAT) among the young couples could be a response to declining fertility rates in some of the countries.

Concluding, our findings suggest that couples living apart together are contributing to reshape the ties in European families. Although not a revolutionary movement with a spike in prevalence rates, couples living apart together have nevertheless become an alternative to a marital union and family organization, along with married couples and couples in cohabitation. These couples living apart together are result of an individual option, associated with the desire for privacy, to maintain egalitarian ideals and independence. For most of them, living apart together represents an adaptive arrangement to meet the needs of a life cycle period, particularly among the young couples, and for practical reasons such as socio-economic constraints. What seems clear is that couples living apart together (LAT), spread through all age groups in European countries, challenge the common idea that to be a couple and then a family, you should be a married couple or at least live under the same roof.

The high level of couple satisfaction, the intense contact between partners, the duration of the unions as well as the high average age of LATs are also

challenging interpretations of living apart together as an indicator of weakness of commitment to intimate relationships. The search for intimacy among LAT's couples is further illustrated by their future expectations --a high proportion is planning to be living together in the next 3 years although not necessarily marrying. In other words, the two households couples (LATs) like the cohabitation couples did before, are helping to further loosen the bonds of the traditional marriage.

Reinforcing previous studies, our findings suggest that a sense of well being depends not on the form of household but on the presence of a partner regardless of whether one lives together or in a separate house. At the same time, the European couples living apart together lend support to Simmel's claim that there is no intimacy without norms. For example, in planning to have children the majority would move to live together, mostly in cohabitation, since they consider that it would be better for the children. Therefore, contextual and individual factors are shaping and constraining choices about couples living apart together and as a result these couples are helping to change the shape and ties of European families.

References

Adamczyk, Amy and Cassady, Pitt. 2009. Shaping attitudes about homosexuality: The role of religion and cultural. *Social Science Research*, 28: 338-351.

Anderson, E.A. and SPRUILL, J.W. (1993) 'the dual-career commuter family: A lifestyle on the move', *Marriage and Family Review* Vol. 19, pp. 131 - 147.

Ariza, M., and De Oliveira, O. 2001 “Contrasting Scenarios: Non-residential Family Formation Patterns in the Caribbean and Europe”, *International Review of Sociology*, Vol. 11, 1, 47-61.

Bawin-Legros, B. and Gauthier, A. 2001. Regulation of Intimacy and love semantics in couples living apart together. *International Review of Sociology* 11(1): 39-46.

Binstock, G. and Thornton, A. 2003. Separations, reconciliations, and living apart in cohabiting and marital unions. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 65(2): 432-443.

Bumpass, L. and Lu, H-H. 2000. Trends in cohabitation and implications for children's family contexts in the United States. *Population Studies* 54 (1): 29-41.

Carpenter, C. and Gates, G. 2008. Gay and Lesbian partnership: Evidence from California. *Demography* 45(3):573-590.

Cherlin, A. Cross- Barnet, C. and Burton, L. 2008. Cohabiting on the edge: Living Together Apart [electronic resource]. Three-City Study Working Paper 08-03. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University. http://web.jhu.edu/threecitystudy/Workshops/WP08_03CohabitingontheEdge.pdf .

Ermisch, J. and Siedler, T. 2009. "Living Apart Together" in M. Brynin and J. Ermisch, Changing relationships, Routledge. New York.

Gerstel, N. R. and Gross, H. 1984. Commuter Marriage: A Study of Work and Family. London: Guildford Press.

Giddens, A. 1992. The Transformation of Intimacy: Sexuality, Love and Eroticism in Modern Societies. Stanford:

Green, A. E., HOGARTH, T, and SHACKLETON, R. E. (1999) Long distance living: dual location households. Bristol: Policy Press.

Guldner, G.T. 1996. Long Distance romantic relationships: Prevalence and separation-related symptoms in college students. Journal of College Student Development, 37:289-296.

Haskey, J. 2005. Living arrangements in contemporary Britain: Having a partner who usually lives elsewhere and living apart together (LAT). Population Trends 122: 35-45.

Haskey, J. and Lewis, J. 2006. Living Apart Together in Britain: context and meaning. International Journal of Law in context, n° 2, I, 37-48.

Heath 1999,1992

Holmes, M. (2004b) 'The precariousness of choice in the new sentimental order: A comment on Bawin Legros' *Current Sociology*, Vol. 52, No. 2, pp 251-7.

Holmes, M. 2004a. 'An Equal Distance? Individualization, Gender and Intimacy in Distance Relationships', *The Sociological Review*, Vol. 52, No. 2, pp. 180 - 200.

Holmes, Mary. 2006. *Love Lives at a Distance: Distance Relationships over the Life Course*. *Sociological Research Online*, Volume 11, Issue 3.

Karlson, S. and Borrell, K. 2002. "Intimacy and Autonomy, Gender and Ageing: Living Apart Together", *Ageing International* 27 (4): 11–26.

Karp, D. 2006. *Long Distance Love: A tale of distant*. *Monday Magazine Student Survival Guide*, 27-29.

Kiernan, Kathleen. 2000. *European Perspectives on Union Formation*. In *The Ties That Bind*. Edited by Linda Waite. Chapter 3:40-56. Aldine de Gruyter

Kiernan, Kathleen. 2002. *The State of European Union: an analysis of Partnership Formation and Dissolution*. In *Dynamics of Fertility and partnership in Europe*. Insights and lessons from comparative perspective. Edited by Macura, Miroslav and Gijs Beets. Vol1. UNECE. Geneva, 2002 United Nations.

- Levin, I. 2004. 'Living Apart Together: A new family form', *Current Sociology*, Vol. 52, No. 2, pp. 223 - 240.
- Limmer, Ruth. And SCHNEIDER, Norbert. 2008. 'Studying Job-Related Spatial Mobility in Europe', en N. Schneider and G. Meil. 2008. *Mobile living across Europe (I). Relevance and diversity of job-related spatial mobility in six European countries*, Leverkusen, Barbara Budrich (13-46).
- Lorentzen, Jorgen and Wencke Mu'hleisen. 2007. Introduction: New Forms of Intimacy. *NORA—Nordic Journal of Women's Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 2–3, 80–83, June–September 2007
- Purr, Allan, Luule Sakkeus, Asta Poldama and Anne Herm. 2011. Intergenerational family constellations in contemporary Europe: Evidence from Generations and Gender Survey. *Demographic Research*, Vol.25 (4): 135-172.
- Reignier-Loilier, Eva Beaujouan and Catherine Villeneuve-Gokalp. 2009. Neither Single, nor in a couple: A Study of living apart together in France. *Demographic Research*, Vol.21:75-108
- Rindfuss, R.R. and Stephen, E.H. 1990. Marital noncohabitation: Separation does not make the heart grow fonder. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52:259-270.
- Roseneil, S. 2006. On not living with a partner: Unpicking coupledness and cohabitation, *Sociological Research Online*, Volume 11, Issue 3, <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/11/3/roseneil.html>).

Seltzer, Judith. 2000. Families Formed outside Marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Vol.62, No. 4, November, 2000. National Council on Family Relations.

Schneider, Norbert and Meil, Gerardo .2008. Mobile living across Europe (I). Relevance and diversity of job-related spacial mobility in six European countries, Leverkusen, Barbara Budrich.

Sobotoka, Tomas and Toulemon, Laurent. 2008. Changing family and partnership behaviour: Common trends and persistent diversity across Europe. *Demographic Reserch*, V 19, (6): 85-138. Max Plank Institute for Demographic Research, Rostock; Germany.

Strohm, Charles, Q., Judith A. Seltzer, Susan D. Cochran and Vickie M. Mays. 2009. "Living apart Together" relationships in the United States. *Demographic Research*, Vole 21: 177-214.

United Nations Economic Commission for Europe. 2007. Generations&Gender programme. Concepts and Guidelines. UN, New York.

Waite , Linda. 2000. Editor. Coauthors Cristine Bachrach, Michelle Hindin, Elizabeth Thomson, Arland Thornton. *The Ties That Bind: Perspectives on Marriage and Cohabitation*. Aldine de Gruyter. New York.

Winfield, F. E. 1985. *Commuter Marriage: Living Together Apart*. Columbia University Press. New York.

Zakharov, S. 2008. Russian Federation: From the first to second demographic transition. *Demographic Research* 19(24): 907—972. doi:10.4054/DemRes. 2008.19.2

Table 1. Couples Living-Apart-Together (LATs) in Eight Countries

Characteristics	Bulgaria	France	Georgia	Germany	Hungary	Netherlands	Romania	Russia
% Married out of population in a union	82,5	68,3	83,6	76,7	79,6	74,5	90,3	75,3
% Cohabiting out of population in a union	10,0	16,9	13,9	11,5	14,1	15,0	5,2	13,2
% LATs out of population in a union	7,5	14,7	2,3	11,8	6,3	10,4	4,6	11,6
Sociodemographic aspects of LATs								
Male	7,2	13,2	2,7	14,0	6,3	10,2	5,5	11,6
Female	7,7	16,0	1,8	9,5	6,4	10,6	3,6	11,5
Mean age	28,7	37,3	39,8	33,1	32,2	38,9	33,3	31,6
No formal education	1,9	0,2	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,7	0,2	0,0
Primary level of education	1,5	19,6	0,7	1,7	10,4	6,3	2,7	12,9
Secondary level of education	73,3	45,9	54,1	73,1	69,9	79,2	77,3	52,4
College education	23,4	34,4	45,2	25,2	19,7	13,8	19,8	34,7
Occupied	56,7	56,3	48,3	60,5	69,7	63,0	62,9	66,2
Unemployed	16,8	10,2	27,9	11,1	7,0	5,2	5,9	8,5
Student	22,8	18,7	4,8	21,5	15,1	12,6	17,8	17,2
Retired	3,1	12,9	8,2	5,8	7,8	13,9	11,4	5,1
Household work	0,6	1,9	10,9	1,1	0,3	5,2	2,0	3,0
Neither working	23,4	27,7	-	23,7	-	-	23,0	18,2
One working	42,2	31,2	-	33,6	-	-	35,0	31,9
Both working	34,4	41,1	-	42,7	-	-	42,1	49,9
Living with parents	71,8	19,5	49,3	23,9	61,3	14,3	55,5	58,9
Specificities of LATs								
Same sex LATs	3,1	1,7	--	3,4	--	3,3	--	0,3
Married LATs	5,8	4,8	48,0	6,3	--	5,8	6,6	11,2
Less than 1 year duration	21,9	23,7	4,7	11,9	--	8,2	17,1	16,4
1-3 years duration	46,9	40,8	21,6	57,7	--	51,3	51,3	48,2
More than 3 years duration	31,1	35,5	73,6	30,4	--	40,5	31,5	35,4
Daily contact	32,7	25,0	7,5	20,8	--	27,5	22,7	28,7
Weekly contact	53,6	58,5	48,3	62,9	--	64,1	63,3	54,2
Monthly contact	9,9	14,7	14,2	12,2	--	4,5	8,1	12,3
Yearly contact	3,8	1,7	30,0	4,0	--	3,9	5,9	4,8
Couple Satisfaction ^a	7,9	8,1	6,8	8,3	--	8,6*	8,0	7,2
Considered the relationship finished last year	17,2	27,6	26,3	19,1	--	--	--	35,9

Source: Author Computations of Gender and Generation Survey (2005).

Note: Limited to persons age 18-79. Data from Bulgaria are from 2004, France from 2005, Georgia from 2006, Germany from 2005, Hungary from 2005, The Netherlands from 2003, Romania from 2005 and Russia from 2004.

^a On 1-10 scale, where 1 denotes very unsatisfied to 10, which is very satisfied

Table 2. LATs by Duration, Nature and Reason across Countries

Characteristics	Bulgaria	France	Germany	Romania	Russia
Duration of LATs					
Less than a year	21,9	23,7	11,9	17,1	16,4
1 year	21,6	17,4	27,4	22,5	23,0
2 years	15,6	14	20,2	19,3	14,9
3 years	9,6	9,5	10,1	9,5	10,4
4 years	9,4	5,4	7	7,3	5,3
5 or more years	21,8	30,1	23,4	24,2	30,1
Average years duration	3,8	4,5	3,5	4,3	4,7
Nature of LATs					
% of “LATs by Choice” Both want LAT	45.2	43.9	54.4	51.1	32.8
Only one wants LAT					
% of “Obligated LATs “	54.8	56.1	45.6	48.9	67.2
Reasons to be LATs					
“LATs by Choice “					
Economic reasons	5,1	4,2	2,4	7,8	2,9
To be independent	31,8	50,6	43,6	26,9	38,6
Because of children	4,3	5,7	1,3	4,7	3,9
Dont feel prepared to live together	53,1	28,7	33,7	48,7	32,9
Other reasons	5,8	10,8	19,1	11,9	21,6
“Obligated LATs”					
Work circumstances	18,5	37,2	35,2	11,5	8,0
Economic reasons	24,7	11,4	14,4	22,5	10,4
Housing difficulties	25,3	12,8	21,9	27,0	32,0
Legal reasons	6,3	3,4	3,9	3,5	1,7
Partner has other family	4,3	8,9	5,5	4,5	13,4
Health coditions of the partner	--	0,7	--	--	--
Other reasons	20,9	25,5	19,1	31,0	34,4

Source: Author Computations of Gender and Generations Survey (2005)

Table 3. Intentions of LATs in the Next Three Years

	Bulgaria	France	Germany	Netherland	Romania	Russia
Intentions of change in marital status						
Continue to be LATs ^a	29,1 (171)	28,4 (259)	41,3 (259)	42,0 (134)	20,7 (79)	45,1 (369)
Change to cohabitation ^b	23,2 (136)	51,8 (472)	39,1 (245)	32,0 (102)	8,6 (33)	13,1 (107)
Get married ^c	45,3 (266)	18,9 (172)	18,3 (115)	25,4 (81)	67,8 (259)	38,3 (313)
Get married and remain LAT ^d	2,4 (14)	0,9 (8)	1,2 (8)	0,6 (2)	2,9 (11)	3,6 (29)
N (Total population)	12,858	10,079	10,017	8,160	11,986	11,261
N (LATs)	689	1033	853	602	409	968
Respondents	100 (587)	100 (911)	100 (627)	100 (319)	100 (382)	100 (819)
Unknown	102	122	226	283	27	149
Intentions regarding children						
To have Children	53.6 (285)	63.8 (305)	23.7 (97)	73.6 (142)	49.7 (163)	36.1 (249)
Not to have Children	46.4 (247)	36.2 (173)	76.3 (312)	23.7 (44)	50.3 (165)	63.9 (441)
N (Respondents)	100 (532)	100 (478)	100 (409)	100 (186)	100 (328)	100 (690)

Source: Author Computations of Gender and Generations Survey (2005)

Table 4. Relationship between intentions to have children and change marital status for LAT couples in the next three years after the survey

	Bulgaria	France	Germany	Romania	Russia
Intentions of LATs					
Want a child (Total)	100 (285)	100 (305)	100 (97)	100 (163)	100 (249)
Want a child and to remain LAT	8.1 (23)	2.6 (8)	10.3 (10)	0.06 (1)	17.3 (43)
Want a child and move to cohabit	21.0 (60)	66.2 (202)	28.9 (28)	0.8 (3)	7.2 (18)
Want a child and move to marriage	66.7 (190)	30.5 (93)	59.8 (58)	92.6 (151)	69.9 (174)
Want a child, marry but remain in dual residence (LAT)	4.2 (12)	0.7 (2)	0.4 (4)	4.9 (8)	5.6 (14)
Summary measures of relationship between intentions					
Proportion of LATs planning to have children that would change to cohabitation	85.2	94.2	88.5	94.0	77.2
Proportion of LATs planning to have children and getting married	71.5	48.0	57.5	97.5	75.8

Source: Author Computations of Gender and Generations Survey (2005)

Table 5. Logistic Regressions predicting Being in a LAT Relation among all couples (Odds ratio)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Country			
Male	1.188***	0.982	1.063
Bulgaria	0.384***	0.212***	0.308***
France	---	---	---
Germany	0.832**	0.734***	0.801**
Romania	0.370***	0.258***	0.367***
Russia	0.786***	0.627***	0.591***
Life Cycle			
18-24	11.526***	3.896***	6.196***
25-32	2.177***	1.788***	2.202***
33-40	---	---	---
41-50	0.837**	0.855*	0.898
51- 60	0.674***	0.656***	0.829*
61- 70	0.401***	0.422***	0.634***
71- 79	0.259***	0.306***	0.548***
Sociodemographic Constraints			
Primary		0.890	0.866*
Secondary		---	---
College		1.317***	1.346***
At least one partner is a student		6.943***	8.072***
At least one partner is unemployed		0.765***	0.755***
Have one or more children		1.614***	1.029
Living with parents		7.541***	8.739***
Individualization and gender			
Have previously relationship			8.442***
If parents divorce, it is better for the child to be with the mother than the father ^a			1.033
In general, men are better leaders than women ^a			0.996
Model Fit Statistics			
Pseudo-R ²	0.165	0.262	0.345
Chi ²	0.000	0.000	0.000
Log likelihood	-10350.71	-8678.82	-7530.92
N	35.610	34.565	33.829

Source: Author Computations of Gender and Generations Survey (2005)

Signification level: *** p < 0,001; ** p < 0,01; * p < 0,1.

Note: ^a f Measured on a scale from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree

Table 6. Multinomial Logistic Regressions predicting Future Intentions of LATs to continue to be in a LAT relation in Three Years (Odds ratios)

	Model 1 Life Cycle		Model 2 Constraints by LATs themselves		Model 3 Individualization and negotiation	
	Intention to change to cohabitation Vs Intention to continue be LAT	Intention to get married Vs Intention to continue be LAT	Intention to change to cohabitation Vs Intention to continue be LAT	Intention to get married Vs Intention to continue be LAT	Intention to change to cohabitation Vs Intention to continue be LAT	Intention to get married Vs Intention to continue be LAT
Male	1.026	1.026	1.049	1.263*	1.143	0.975
Bulgaria	0.249***	1.222	0.209***	1.175	0.170***	0.627
France	---	---	---	---	---	---
Germany	0.390***	0.431***	0.330***	0.386***	0.296***	0.383**
Romania	0.193***	3.438***	0.132***	3.025***	0.098***	2.895**
Russia	0.112***	0.856	0.101***	0.777*	0.087***	0.693
18-24	1.549**	1.497**	1.516*	1.838**	1.281	1.622*
25-32	1.408*	2.892***	1.496*	2.925***	1.100	1.905**
33-40	---	---	---	---	---	---
41-50	0.537***	0.419***	0.508***	0.477***	0.707	0.993
51- 60	0.266***	0.226***	0.273***	0.260***	0.368	0.678
61- 70	0.253***	0.150**	0.385**	0.214**	0.747	2.188
71- 79	0.153***	0.033**	0.083**	4.74e-15		
Primary			1.117	0.701	1.873*	1.015
Secondary			---	---	---	---
College			0.876	1.200	1.009	1.278
At least one partner is a student			0.932	0.625**	0.942	0.915
At least one partner is unemployed			1.146	1.312*	1.000	1.220
One or more children			1.172	0.704*	1.322	1.121
Economic reasons ^a			1.164*	0.984	1.083	0.966
Work reasons ^b			1.027	0.977	0.987	1.004
Housing difficulties ^c			1.136*	1.211**	1.110	1.158*
Health conditions ^d			0.858*	0.863*	0.982	0.944
Duration of relationship (years)					1.031	1.033
Daily contact					---	---
Weekly contact					0.679*	0.742*
Monthly contact					0.734	0.763
Yearly contact					0.334*	0.570
Couple Satisfaction ^e					1.226***	1.460***
Intentions to have children/s					1.454***	3.108***
If parents divorce, it is better for the child to be with the mother than the father ^f					1.011	1.015
In general, men are better leaders than women ^f					0.934	1.051
Pseudo-R ²	0.151	0.151	0.167	0.167	0.243	0.243
Chi ²	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Log likelihood	-3065.42	-3065.42	-2502.78	-2502.78	-1474.86	-1474.86
N	3.306	3.306	2.740	2.740	1.794	1.794

Source: Author Computations of Gender and Generations Survey (2005)

Signification level: *** p < 0,001; ** p < 0,01; * p < 0,1.

Note:

^a Living together depends on financial situation (measure on scale, 1-not at all, 4, much)

^b Living together depends on work (measure on scale, 1-not at all, 4, much)

^c Living together depends on housing situation (measure on scale, 1-not at all, 4, much)

^d Living together depends on health condition (measure on scale, 1-not at all, 4, much)

^e Satisfaction with live life as a couple (measured on scale from 0=very unsatisfied to 10=very satisfied)

^f Measured on a scale from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree

Note 2: the cells in which there are "----" are those that were removed from the model to to multicollinearity

Table 7. Logistic Regressions predicting Probability of being in a LAT by choice compared to being a LAT by obligation.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Countries			
Male	0.954	1.075	1.076
Bulgaria	1.290*	1.286*	1.315
France	---	---	---
Germany	1.729***	1.972***	1.757**
Romania	1.608**	1.651**	1.670*
Russia	0.725**	0.685**	0.712*
Life Cycle			
18-24	0.634***	0.919	0.968
25-32	0.703**	0.799*	0.889
33-40	---	---	---
41-50	1.201	1.092	0.820
51- 60	1.246	0.943	0.950
61- 70	1.678**	1.041	0.489
71- 79	2.435**	1.710	No obs
Sociodemographic constraints			
Primary		1.037	0.985
Secondary		---	---
College		0.956	0.883
		0.660***	0.645**
		0.949	1.041
Have one or more children		1.055	1.161
Constraints by LAT members themselves			
Economic reasons ^a		0.995	0.983
Work reasons ^b		0.781***	0.835**
Housing difficulties ^c		0.799***	0.763***
Health conditions ^d		1.225***	1.274**
Individualization and negotiation			
Duration of relationship (years)			0.961**
Daily contact			---
Weekly contact			1.436**
Monthly contact			0.524**
Yearly contact			0.160***
Couple Satisfaction ^e			0.899***
Intentions to have children/s			0.782***
Have previous relationship			1.029
Pseudo-R ²	0.035	0.059	0.092
Chi ²	0.000	0.000	0.000
Log likelihood	-2550.11	-2013.66	-1231.16
N	3.842	3.118	1.990

Source: Author Computations of Gender and Generations Survey (2005)

Signification level: *** p < 0,001; ** p < 0,01; * p < 0,1.

Notes:

^a Living together depends on financial situation (measure on scale, 1-not at all, 4, much)

^b Living together depends on work (measure on scale, 1-not at all, 4, much)

^c Living together depends on housing situation (measure on scale, 1-not at all, 4, much)

^d Living together depends on health condition (measure on scale, 1-not at all, 4, much)

^e Satisfaction with live life as a couple (measured on scale from 0=very unsatisfied to 10=very satisfied)

Note 2: the cells in which there are "----" are those that were removed from the model to to multicollinearity