Living Apart Together: 40 Years of Sociodemographic Research on LAT Relationships

Christophe Giraud
Translation Catriona Dutreuilh

In Population 2023/1 Vol. 78 , pages 51 to 82
Publisher Ined Éditions

ISSN 1634-2941
DOI 10.3917/popu.2301.0051
Uploaded: 07/27/2023

Living Apart Together: 40 Years of Sociodemographic Research on LAT Relationships

Christophe Giraud*

Abstract

This article retraces the history of research on non-cohabiting unions, today commonly called *living apart together* (LAT) in the international scientific literature, and how they were first brought to light. The notion was first used in 1980 by the Dutch demographer Cees J. Straver, then redefined by Jan Trost and John Haskey in the early 2000s. It was gradually included and operationalized in national and international statistical surveys conducted in the 1990s and 2000s. LAT relationships have been analysed from various angles: comparison of non-cohabiting relationships with other partnerships (marriage and consensual union), comparison of different types of non-cohabiting relationships, and analysis of their outcomes over time. This intellectual history is punctuated by a recurring question: are these relationships the consequence of structural constraints (e.g. long periods in education, difficulty finding a stable job, etc.) or do they reflect the emergence of new values and expectations?

Keywords

non-cohabiting relationship, living apart together (LAT) relationship, quantitative surveys, couple

Since the 1980s, social scientists in Western Europe have identified new types of relationships between non-cohabiting intimate partners, and interest in these new living arrangements has increased steadily. While several terms have been coined to describe them, they are now generally referred to as *living-apart-together relationships*, or *LAT relationships*, in English-language international publications.(1)

LAT relationships were first observed in Western Europe as new forms of intimacy emerged in the specific context of the 1970s and 1980s. It was in this period that marriage started to decline and consensual unions became more

(1) In French-language publications, other expressions are also used, such as *couples non cohabitants* or *relations chacun chez soi* in Quebec.

* Université Paris Cité and Université Sorbonne Nouvelle, CNRS, CERLIS, F-75006 Paris, France. Correspondence: christophegiraud@me.com

Translated by Catriona Dutreuilh

DOI: 10.3917/popu.2301.0051

widespread (Leridon and Villeneuve-Gokalp, 1988; Toulemon, 1996), and that unions became more unstable, with an increase in divorce and separation. In the earliest studies, LAT relationships were seen as a lifestyle choice in place of marriage, much like consensual unions in which the cohabiting partners are not legally recognized as a couple (Straver, 1981; Villeneuve-Gokalp, 1990). They amplify certain features of consensual unions, embodying a desire for independence that mirrors the growing professional and financial independence of women in society (Levin and Trost, 1999). Some authors saw LAT relationships as a stable and lasting arrangement, an alternative to marriage or consensual union, a new mode of family life (Levin and Trost, 1999; Levin, 2004; Roseneil and Budgeon, 2004). For others, these new forms of intimate relationships developed in parallel with the introduction of welfare benefits for divorcees and lone-parent families that enabled them to live decently without a cohabiting partner (Straver, 1981). Seen from this angle, these relationships represent a living arrangement linked to the events and accidents of life, a far cry from the relational ideal of individual independence from the collective norms defined by Western societies (Haskey and Lewis, 2006; Duncan and Phillips, 2010).

This article looks back on almost 40 years of research and debate on these LAT relationships. It begins by examining the divergence between the definitions and the methods used to objectify these new living arrangements. It then provides an overview of the most salient results on Western Europe, the countries of North America, and the Pacific (Japan, Australia, New Zealand) reported so far in the literature and concludes with a panorama of current research perspectives.

I. LAT relationships in industrialized countries: a gradual and collective discovery

The earliest research on these new forms of intimate relationships emerged in the late 1970s following major demographic shifts across Europe that included a sharp uptrend in consensual unions and divorce. Interest gradually spread across Western Europe, and the first statistical measures of LAT relationships were published in the 1980s and 1990s.

1. The birth and spread of an idea: competing definitions

The term *LAT* did not take hold in the international scientific literature until the early 2000s, with articles by Levin and Trost in 1999 and Levin in 2004, but its history is longer. According to Trost himself (2016), the acronym was first coined by Dutch journalist Michiel Berkel in a 1978 article entitled 'De Nieuwe Vrijgezellen: Samen Apart' ('The New Singles: Together Apart'), thinking of the Dutch film *Frank & Eva, Living Apart Together* (1973). Trost explains how, at an international family research seminar in Budapest in 1980,

an (unnamed) Dutch colleague told him about a new type of informal non-cohabiting relationship that remained largely invisible and undocumented. This colleague was referring to work by Straver,(2) a researcher at the Netherlands Institute of Social Sexological Research who had just completed a qualitative study of unmarried couples and published two papers on his work, one in German and the other in English (Straver, 1980, 1981). In Straver's article, the term LAT referred to stable intimate relationships in which both partners (whatever their sexual orientation) have a strong preference for economic and residential independence but whose intimate relationship is key to their personal life satisfaction. Straver used the term without any clear reference to Berkel, and without defining it, which suggests it had already been widely understood in the Netherlands.

Intimate non-cohabiting relationships were not Straver's discovery. Several researchers were working at that time on 'commuter marriages' in which, for work-related reasons, the partners live separately for part of each week (Straver, 1980, 1981). In LAT relationships, on the other hand, non-cohabitation is chosen voluntarily by the partners. They may live separately for practical or material reasons,(3) but this type of informal union is not seen as an imposition: it is chosen or preferred because it also offers independence.

The term LAT soon gained a foothold in the scientific literature: as early as 1980, a question on the social acceptability of LAT relationships was included in the annual Dutch public opinion survey 'Social and Cultural Reports' (reproduced in van der Kaa, 1987, p. 8). In Belgium and the Netherlands, the expression was soon adopted widely with no definition provided (Lesthaeghe, 1991). For Lesthaeghe, it became a manifestation of the ongoing second demographic transition in Western Europe, carried forward by the values of individual emancipation. In later Dutch research on intimate relationships among older adults, De Jong Gierveld (2002) analysed non-cohabiting relationships, explicitly labelled LAT, without reference to Straver or any other authors in this field.

A German translation of the term (*getrennt zusammen leben*) was used from 1987 in scientific publications that made explicit reference to Straver. LAT was cited as one of the possible futures for the individualized and pluralized family (Hoffmann-Nowotny, 1987, cited by Schlemmer, 1995), as outlined by Beck (1986/2001). In Germany, the expression was later popularized by the journalist Schmitz-Köster (1990) in an essay entitled *Liebe auf Distanz. Getrennt zusammen leben* [*Love at a Distance: Living Apart Together*].(4) A series of empirical studies nurtured discussion on the meaning and scope of these LAT

(2) The sociologist Jan Trost (1935–2018), a specialist in non-marital cohabitation, published a text in Dutch on 'significant others' with Cees J. Straver (1928–2020) in the early 1980s.

(3) As shown by Straver, LAT partners take advantage of welfare measures designed to protect lone mothers and divorcees. If they lived together, they would lose the benefits to which one of them is entitled. Non-cohabitation guarantees a regular additional income for one of the partners.

(4) All foreign-language expressions are translated into English by the translator of the present article.

relationships (Schlemmer, 1995; Seidenspinner et al., 1996). But in the 1980s and 1990s, the term still faced competition from other expressions, such as 'partners with separate households' (*Partnerschaften mit getrennten Haushalten*; Schneider, 1996). The question was hotly debated in Germany, where Schneider, who studied LAT relationships among young people, showed that these were not intimate relationships chosen for their intrinsic qualities, but rather as make-do arrangements or as a starting point for sexual relations. Only 13% of the relationships studied were experienced as a 'temporary or permanent alternative to consensual union or marriage' (Schneider, 1996, p. 96).

In France, qualitative studies published in the 1980s spoke of couples *sans domicile commun* (without a shared home) or of *conjugalité non cohabitante* (non-cohabiting couple relationships) (Chalvon-Demersay, 1983). Several quantitative studies then revealed the existence of these relationships among individuals with previous experience of separation or divorce. In their studies of life after divorce, Villeneuve-Gokalp (1994, 1997) and Martin (1994, 1997) highlighted the widespread existence of these separate living arrangements among repartnered individuals, sometimes followed by cohabitation.(5) Likewise, Caradec (1996) was among the first to identify these *jeunes couples âgés* (young older couples) and non-cohabiting intimate relationships among widows, widowers, and divorcees beyond age 50.(6) The terminology was still variable. French expressions included *couples non cohabitants* (non-cohabiting couples) (Leridon and Villeneuve-Gokalp, 1988; Le Gall and Martin, 1988; Martin, 1994); *couples chacun chez soi* (couples living apart) or *semi-cohabitation* (semi-cohabitation) (Villeneuve-Gokalp, 1997); and *relations intermittentes* (intermittent relationships), an arrangement favoured by *jeunes couples âgés* (Caradec, 1996). Depending on the context, emphasis was sometimes placed on the idea of deliberate choice and sometimes on the specific constraints of repartnering at a given age: female divorcees take longer to find a stable new partner than male divorcees but more often have non-cohabiting relationships. Older adults (over age 50) tend to have relatively stable intermittent relationships, each preferring to remain in their own home, surrounded by the memories of their life.

Research on LAT relationships expanded in the 1990s in the Scandinavian countries. Levin and Trost conducted an initial sample survey in Sweden in 1993 (Appendix Table A.2). As in other countries of continental Europe, informal unions are frequent in Sweden and Norway, and include a large share of non-cohabiting relationships identified by the term *särbo*(7) from the early 1980s. The rapid acceptance of a specific term for these relationships is interpreted as a form of institutionalization (Trost, 2016).

(5) In 1988, Martin (1994, 1997) conducted a survey of divorced women receiving welfare benefits from the Caisse d'allocations familiales of the Calvados *département*, and observed that a non-negligible share had formed new non-cohabiting relationships after their divorce.

(6) These studies were read beyond France. Levin and Trost (1999) cite Caradec and his 'intermittent cohabitation' category, referring to its characteristics to define those of LAT relationships.

(7) Derived from the word *sambo* referring to non-marital cohabitation (Levin and Trost, 1999).

In the United States and other core English-speaking countries, studies of changes in intimate relationships are influenced by the importance of marriage, an institution much more strongly embedded in these societies than in continental Europe. They focus on commuter marriages (Gerstel and Gross, 1984) and on dating relationships. Here too, the vocabulary is changeable. In the title of his book, Winfield (1985) associates commuters and living together, apart. Unlike LAT relationships, the partners in commuter marriages always have a principal marital dwelling (clearly distinct from the secondary home), and their geographical separation stems from employment constraints rather than a choice to live apart. However, pioneering qualitative studies, such as that of Bulcroft and O'Connor on 'dating' relationships between older adults, confirmed the existence of stable informal non-cohabiting unions. They resemble LAT (although the term is not used) in that the partners live in separate homes, but the word *dating* suggests that these relationships concern the period between the first encounter and union formation.

In the United Kingdom, the term LAT appeared later (to our knowledge) and was first used by Murphy (1996) and by Heath (1999) with reference to young people's romantic relationships. Davidson (2001) also examines the desire among widows for new, stable non-cohabiting intimate relationships but uses the term *romantic partnership*, not LAT. While scholars recognized various forms of non-cohabiting relationship, no particular term gained foothold before the 2000s. The first quantitative studies in the United Kingdom on LAT relationships were those of Haskey (2005) and Haskey and Lewis (2006). Their publications cited Levin and Trost, and De Jong Gierveld and Caradec for France, but not Straver or earlier German research.

In short, stable non-cohabiting relationships were attracting substantial interest, but the way they were defined and interpreted was linked to the social structures of the countries where they were observed. With the spread of informal unions in Western Europe, non-cohabiting relationships were seen as a new type of couple relationship, in competition with more traditional family forms; by contrast, in English-speaking countries with a strong matrimonial tradition, researchers focused their attention on 'commuter marriages' in which the spouses are obliged to live separately for work-related reasons, or on premarital 'dating' relationships.

2. The gradual inclusion of LAT relationships in major quantitative surveys

In the wake of these surveys,[8] several discussions on the transformation of family structures took place in a context of growing internationalization of statistical tools. The Geneva-based United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) gave particular impetus for the circulation of notions

(8) An exhaustive list (we hope) of the surveys with published results conducted in each industrialized country is provided in Appendix Table A.2.

and questions about new forms of intimate relationship and family life. The 1990s saw a series of major empirical quantitative studies to measure the prevalence of LAT relationships, and non-marital relationships more generally, in many Western European countries. The Population Activities Unit, a group of experts from several UNECE member countries, set up the Fertility and Family Survey (FFS). The FFS measured 'LAT relationships' or 'non-co-residential partnerships'[9] and provided a first set of comparative statistics (Kiernan, 2002) for a population aged 20–49. The FFS question on LAT drew upon the experience of the 1985 survey of family situations administered in France to individuals aged 21–44 (Villeneuve-Gokalp, 1994). Between 1988 and 1999, 24 countries conducted a similar survey,[10] with a specific question addressed to respondents not living with a partner: 'Are you currently having an intimate relationship with someone who lives in a separate household?' The survey also included a question on the 'reasons for not living together', with a 'forced LAT' response category in parallel to that of 'marital discord'. Forced LAT refers to external circumstances that prevent the couple from living together (Festy and Prioux, 2002). Here too, the two parallel interpretations of LAT relationships—chosen or forced—were present in the survey.

In parallel, national surveys including questions on non-cohabiting relationships were conducted in several industrialized countries. In West Germany, the first questions on this topic were included in general population surveys, such as the German Socio-Economic Panel from 1992, or the *Familiensurvey* panel from 1994. Schneider (1996), for example, uses these data to study young adult romantic relationships. In Norway and Sweden, Levin and Trost devised several questions for a quantitative survey conducted in 1993 and repeated in 1998 (and in 2001 for Sweden). Their analyses were published in several papers (Levin and Trost, 1999; Levin, 2004). In the Netherlands, from 1992, the NESTOR-Living Arrangements and Social Networks survey explored intimate relationships among over-55s and, for the first time, asked questions about non-cohabiting relationships (although the term LAT was not used). Their findings were analysed in the very first studies of LAT relationships among older adults (De Jong Gierveld, 2002), as the scope of the FFS survey was limited to people under age 50.

In the United Kingdom, which did not take part in the FFS survey, the earliest studies were those of Haskey (2005), based on the Omnibus Survey conducted by the Office for National Statistics in 2002–2003, soon followed by several more.

(9) Translated into French in 2001 by the term *semi-cohabitation* (Pinelli et al., 2001).

(10) Norway (1988–1989), Finland (1989–1990), Canada (1990), Poland (1991), Belgium (1991–1992), Germany (1992), Hungary (1992–1993), Sweden (1992–1993), Netherlands (1993), Estonia (1994), France (1994), Spain (1994–1995), Lithuania (1994–1995), Slovenia (1994–1995), Switzerland (1994–1995), United States (1995), Latvia (1995), New Zealand (1995), Austria (1995–1996), Italy (1995–1996), Bulgaria (1997), Portugal (1997), Czech Republic (1997), and Greece (1999).

In the early 2000s, at the international level and in Europe especially, UNECE, via its Population Activities Unit, launched a new major comparative survey, this time longitudinal, as part of the Generation and Gender Surveys (GGS) programme (Régnier-Loilier et al., 2010), which involved a large number of European and non-European countries.(11) GGS followed on from the FFS and broadened its scope to include respondents aged 18–79. As in the FFS, non-cohabiting relationships were explicitly studied, and the term LAT was used in the ensuing publications. The first French survey wave took place in 2005, followed by two more in 2008 and 2011.

The more recent French Family and Housing Survey (INSEE–INED, 2011) included questions about non-cohabiting relationships, and the EPIC survey of individual and partnership trajectories (INED–INSEE, 2013–2014) collected information on 'non-cohabiting couples' and 'serious intimate relationships'.

The first surveys in Southern Europe are more recent. After the Italian version of the FFS in 1995, a new survey providing data on LAT relationships was conducted in 2009, using the corresponding question module of the GGS (Régnier-Loilier, 2016). In Spain, two fertility surveys derived from the FFS and including questions on non-cohabiting relationships took place in 1999 and 2006. To our knowledge, no studies on LAT relationships in Portugal have been published, and no new surveys have been conducted since the FFS in 1997 (Portugal did not take part in the GGS). In other regions of the world, Japan appears to be a pioneer; its first survey covering non-cohabiting relationships dates to 1987. The same might be said for Australia: its first survey took place in 1996, a year after the FFS survey in New Zealand. In the United States, the General Social Survey conducted in 1996–1998 provided the first data on unmarried individuals with a 'main romantic involvement', but the first analyses of its findings were not published until a decade later (Strohm et al., 2009). These papers use the term LAT relationship, by that time well established in the scientific vocabulary, but it was not used in the survey itself. A variety of other surveys followed, such as the National Social Life, Health, and Aging Project (2005–2006), analysed by Brown et al. (2013). In Canada, these relationships were first measured in the 2001 General Social Survey (Milan and Peters, 2003).

This chronology of the various quantitative surveys that include questions on non-cohabiting relationships (see full list in Appendix Table A.2) reveals how demographic surveys progressively began to encompass this form of living arrangement and how international surveys organized under the impetus of UNECE shaped the timing, methodology, and tools to objectify these relationships for all quantitative surveys.

(11) Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, Russia, and Sweden.

II. Definition and operationalization of LAT relationships

1. A 'couple-oriented' definition

Under the definition agreed in the early 2000s, LAT relationships are the share of stable non-cohabiting relationships that are freely chosen and not imposed by material constraints. They are very different from (unstable) dating relationships or commuter marriages (imposed for employment reasons).

For Levin and Trost, the partners in LAT relationships (married or not) do not share a household but see themselves, and are seen by their social network, as a couple:

> A couple which does not share the same household; both of them live in their own households, in which other persons might also live; they define themselves as a couple; and they perceive that their close social network also does so. LAT relationships can be constituted by people of same or of opposite gender. (Levin and Trost, 1999, p. 281)

Trost (1998) explicitly dissociates LAT relationships from transient 'going steady couples' of young adults who are dating and may eventually cohabit. By giving a subjective definition of the couple, Trost differentiates between LAT relationships and dating relationships that do not necessarily lead to a stable union (Lagrange, 1998; Bozon, 2008). Today, we might add that LAT relationships should not be likened to 'casual sexual relationships and experiences' such as 'sex-friends' or 'friends with benefits' that may be relatively lasting and stable (Boislard et al., 2016).

Unlike Trost and Levin, Haskey (2005) excludes geographically separated married couples from LAT relationships. For him, commuter marriages are outside the scope of LAT. Although unmarried and living apart, LAT partners see themselves as a couple and are considered as such by their family and friends. In terms of its stability, its public and exclusive nature, their relationship is comparable to that of a marriage or a consensual union.

2. Detecting LAT relationships by identifying non-cohabiting couples

This 'couple-oriented' definition of LAT is difficult to operationalize. Quantitative surveys objectify non-cohabiting relationships by asking whether (and sometimes since when) the respondent forms a couple or is in a relationship 'similar to marriage' with someone who does not live in the same household. However, they give little precise idea of how the relationship is perceived by both partners (quantitative surveys only interview one partner in a non-cohabiting relationship) and, even less so, by their respective families (assuming that the relationship is public—another aspect that is generally unknown).

For example, for the 1986 and 1994 Family Situations surveys used by Villeneuve-Gokalp (1997), the respondents in non-cohabiting couples are those

who report living as a couple (*vivre en couple*) but whose partner is not always included in the household composition table. For the surveys by Levin and Trost (1999) and Levin (2004) in Sweden in 1993, 1998, and 2001, marriage was the reference: 'Do you live in a marriage-like relationship with someone while maintaining separate homes?'

The choice of a question where 'couple' or 'marriage' are referred to explicitly produces low estimates of the number of non-cohabiting relationships. In France, in both 1986 and 1994, among adults aged 20–49, 2% of married respondents and 8% of unmarried respondents were in a couple but did not always live together in the same home. In the 2011 Family and Housing Survey, 2% of respondents reported 'being currently in a couple' (*être actuellement en couple*), formal unions included, but not living with their partner. In the 2013–2014 EPIC survey, 6% of respondents were in non-cohabiting couples (Régnier-Loilier, 2019).(12)

3. Detecting non-cohabiting relationships and identifying LAT

People in non-cohabiting relationships can also be counted using indicators other than the subjective reporting of their couple status. The aim remains the same: to identify intimate partner relationships viewed as an alternative to marriage or cohabitation. Non-cohabiting relationships are first identified, and additional questions are used to obtain objective data on their stability and on whether non-cohabitation is involuntary or freely chosen.

In the European FFS, a first question was asked to people not in a cohabiting union: 'Are you currently having an intimate relationship with someone who lives in a separate household?' (Kiernan, 2002). Likewise, in the 2002–2003 Omnibus Survey used by Haskey, a very similar question was asked to respondents who were neither married nor cohabiting (Haskey, 2005, p. 36): 'Do you currently have a regular partner?' The question suggests the stability of the relationship (with the term 'regular') but says nothing about its exact duration, how the partners define it, how it is perceived by others, or whether it is involuntary or chosen.

In the central module of the first GGS wave (2005), the question wording reflects the researchers' uncertainties about how these relationships should be named:

> 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.

(12) The questionnaire, identical to that of EFL, included the question: 'Are you currently in an intimate relationship? Yes, with a person living in this dwelling / Yes, with a person not living in this dwelling / No.' ('Êtes-vous actuellement en couple ? Oui, avec une personne qui vit dans le logement / Oui, avec une personne qui ne vit pas dans le logement / Non.')

In the French version of GGS 2005 (*Étude des relations familiales et intergénérationnelles* [ERFI]), the notion of 'intimate relationship' was translated in a way that avoids any association with 'sexual relations'. Respondents without a cohabiting partner were asked the following question (taken from the ESF survey): 'Are you currently in a stable intimate relationship with someone you're not living with? This may also be your spouse if he/she does not live together with you.'(13) The notion of stable intimate relationship (*relation amoureuse stable*) does not imply that the two partners see themselves as 'a couple' but excludes short-term relationships. It thus covers a wide range of intimate relationships, on condition that they are lasting and include a romantic component.

After identifying non-cohabiting relationships, the next step is to identify LAT. To do so, the indicators focus not on the length of the relationship or its 'freely chosen' nature, but on how it is perceived by the partners themselves. Some authors use the term LAT solely in reference to non-cohabiting relationships that have lasted for a certain length of time: at least 2 years for certain Spanish studies (Castro-Martín et al., 2008), at least 1 year in Germany (Schneider, 1996).(14)

Other authors limit its usage to individuals in a position to choose their preferred type of relationship. Young people in education and with limited financial resources often need to continue living long term with their parents and to postpone any plans to move in with their partner (Galland, 1997). For this reason, some researchers exclude these young people who have no real choice in the matter (Haskey and Lewis, 2006), or only consider non-cohabiting partners aged over 23 (Strohm et al., 2009). Likewise, geographical distance between the partners' homes is a major constraint for long-distance relationships (Krapf, 2018). One qualitative study, for example, was limited to partners aged at least 25 who had chosen to live apart despite living in the same urban agglomeration (Kobayashi et al., 2017).(15)

Following on from Haskey, other researchers excluded married couples living apart because they often have a shared income, a main family home, and a secondary residence occupied a few days a week by one of the partners working away from home. Having separate dwellings is not a sufficient criterion and must be specified to identify a LAT relationship: each partner must pay for their dwelling from their own income. The partners' financial independence (with respect to each other and to their respective parents) is thus an increasingly important criterion for distinguishing LAT from other types of non-cohabiting relationships (Lyssens-Danneboom et al., 2015; Benson et al., 2017).

(13) 'Avez-vous actuellement une relation amoureuse stable avec quelqu'un avec qui vous ne vivez pas ? Il peut éventuellement s'agir de votre époux/épouse si vous ne vivez pas ensemble.'

(14) On the questions of definitions and indicators, see also Régnier-Loilier (2018) and Pasteels et al. (2017).

(15) This criterion of geographical distance or proximity has never been used in a quantitative survey to define LAT relationships.

4. Towards a less couple-oriented approach to LAT relationships

By limiting the notion of LAT to 'couples living apart by choice', the debate became unduly focalized on the question of 'real' LAT (stable, freely chosen non-cohabiting relationships) and 'false' LAT (casual short-term relationships, dating, etc.). As a result, the potentially new phenomenon—the growing prevalence of varied forms of stable non-cohabiting relationships—was overlooked for many years. Seen from this new angle, the relationships of interest may last for several months or several years; the partners do not necessarily see themselves as a 'couple', but their relationship should not automatically be seen as (purely) sexual or as a prelude to cohabitation.

To objectify these stable non-cohabiting relationships, the indicator used in FFS or GGS can be employed, i.e. the respondents' answer to the question about being in an 'intimate relationship', regardless of duration or perception of being in a couple or not. This choice had a major impact on measures of the prevalence of LAT relationships. Régnier-Loilier's comparison (2018) of two recent French surveys is edifying. In the 2005 ERFI survey, 8.7% of individuals aged 18–79 were in a stable non-cohabiting intimate relationship. In the 2011 Family and Housing Survey, just 2.7% of respondents aged 18–79 reported being 'in a couple' with a person living in a different household. When the expression 'in a couple' is used, the share of LAT relationships is more than halved.(16)

The notion of 'stable intimate relationship' has progressively gained a foothold in surveys to measure LAT relationships, defined more broadly than in the past. Estimates produced with this indicator in the industrialized countries of Western Europe, North America, and the English-speaking Pacific give a prevalence of between 8% and 10%.(17) Appendix Table A.1 provides estimates of the prevalence of LAT relationships in selected countries. The various surveys conducted, the questions asked, and the sample characteristics are listed by country in Appendix Table A.2. As noted by Reimondos et al. (2011), these estimates are difficult to interpret. First, they concern samples with different characteristics, notably in terms of age range. Secondly, they may reflect differences in the way the question is understood (the questionnaire wording varies from one country to the next), as much as differences in attitude towards this type of intimate relationship.

The 2020 GGS survey no longer uses a specific term to define a union, but records whether the respondent has a 'partner' and, if so, whether they live together.(18) But this term is an anglicism which, if unqualified, does not

(16) Likewise, in 1994, 1.5% of respondents reported being in a non-cohabiting couple, and 8% reported being in a stable intimate relationship (Villeneuve-Gokalp, 1994).

(17) The countries of Eastern Europe (excluding Russia) that took part in the GGS survey have a lower prevalence of LAT than Western Europe, generally around 5% (Liefbroer et al., 2015).

(18) The 2020 GGS survey uses two questions to identify non-cohabiting relationships (which include commuter marriages): 'Do you have a partner?' and 'Does your partner live with you in the same household?' *Partner* is used as a generic term that refers to individuals who are married, in an informal union, or in a non-cohabiting relationship.

necessarily make sense in French. It can be translated as *conjoint*, but this term is more appropriate for married couples than for non-cohabiting relationships. This new terminological choice does not resolve the problem of how to identify non-cohabiting relationships and will disrupt the continuity of statistical measures.

It is difficult to measure changes in non-cohabiting relationships from one decade to the next, as surveys were not always repeated. In France, the prevalence of stable intimate relationships among adults aged under 50 changed little over 2 decades (7% in 1986, 8% in 1994 for adults under age 50, and 8% in 2005 for adults aged 18–79). In Canada, among the over-20s, the percentage was 8% in 2001 and 7% in 2011 (Turcotte, 2013). In Germany, Asendorpf (2008) observed a slight increase, from 8.5% in 1992 to 10.9% in 2006, in the proportion of unmarried people with a stable partner living in another household. Prevalence in these countries appears to be changing little, if at all.

The most recent sociodemographic surveys, such as the EPIC survey, now adopt this approach, which moves away from a couple-oriented definition to encompass all stable non-cohabiting relationships. Additional indicators serve to specify their characteristics (based on the principle that relationship durations and levels of constraint are very heterogeneous). The notion of LAT relationships is still used, but now refers to all stable non-cohabiting relationships. This shift in approach has been widely accepted among statisticians; the demographers in the UNECE Task Force on Families and Households that prepares upcoming surveys on the topic of LAT[19] have excluded any reference to being coupled or to a minimum duration (UNECE, 2011).

III. Analysing LAT relationships: from alternative lifestyle to 'contextual intimacies'

Three main types of analyses are found in published quantitative studies on LAT or non-cohabiting relationships. Attention is shifting progressively from an analysis of this alternative lifestyle choice towards an understanding of these relationships in relation to their social context and the partners' personal life histories.

1. Stable non-cohabiting relationships: a preference for modern values?

The first type of analysis assumes that LAT relationships represent an alternative lifestyle and compares them with other types of living arrangement (marriage, cohabitation, singlehood). These studies seek to identify the

(19) This is the case, for example, for the second round of GGS surveys under way in Europe since 2020.

factors behind the choice of one or other arrangement, considering that individuals are free to decide (within a certain set of constraints) between several different options.

Convergent results are found in all countries: the prevalence of LAT decreases with individuals' age and increases with educational level (LAT relationships are frequent among students) and at certain times of life (after a separation especially). Little difference is observed across social categories. Using GGS survey data, Liefbroer et al. (2015) showed that most LAT relationships in Western and Eastern Europe, mainly among young adults, are a prelude to cohabitation. They may be an alternative to cohabitation for older adults and for people with children from a previous union (De Jong Gierveld and Merz, 2013; Van der Wiel et al., 2020). Régnier-Loilier (2019) also highlighted the prevalence of LAT relationships after separation or divorce. These studies suggest that the choice of LAT is more strongly influenced by individual life histories than by social background.

2. Intimate relationships shaped by the life course

A second series of statistical studies focuses exclusively on the population of individuals in stable non-cohabiting relationships ('stable romantic relationships'), with the aim of identifying their various configurations to better assess their stability and the role of the constraints and values associated with each one. Automatic statistical classification techniques have been used to produce typologies of non-cohabiting relationships. Many of the identified types are similar from one country to another—in France (Beaujouan et al. 2009); in other countries of Northern, Western, and Eastern Europe (Pasteels et al., 2017); and even in Australia (Reimondos et al., 2011). These types are broadly constructed from three major structuring variables: partners' ages, length of LAT relationship, and union history. Three main profiles of stable non-cohabiting relationships can be identified: young childless adults (who may have already cohabited with a partner) whose LAT relationships are generally followed by cohabitation, lone parents, and older adults (with no co-resident children). These last two profiles more often reflect a long-term life choice (for the latter especially). They are less numerous, however, and their visibility is often limited by the statistical weight of young non-cohabiting couples, leading some specialists to conclude that stable non-cohabiting relationships are primarily a prelude to living together (Castro-Martín et al., 2008; Duncan et al., 2013).

These three profiles reveal the heterogeneity of non-cohabiting relationships. The decision not to live together must be viewed in relation to the partners' histories and life events, such as previous union dissolutions. Several authors have highlighted the caution that characterizes these relationships: caution among young people, whose social position is still uncertain; caution among divorcees who have experienced the fragility of life as a couple. LAT

relationships do not appear to be a life ideal for those involved, but rather a circumspect relational strategy (Haskey and Lewis, 2006).

In recent, mainly qualitative, studies (Connidis et al., 2017), cohabiting and non-cohabiting living arrangements are no longer primarily associated with individual characteristics, but with periods in the life course and a social context, such as being in education, recently divorced with young children, retired, etc. When the context changes (first stable job, divorce settled, children no longer in the home, and retirement), living arrangements may also change, with the transition from LAT to cohabitation, for example. Stable non-cohabiting relationships are a form of partnership closely associated with a specific context, continuing as long as the context remains unchanged.

3. Stable and labile non-cohabiting relationships

A last, more recent series of studies aims to measure the duration, fragility, and lability of stable intimate relationships. If non-cohabiting relationships are simply a short-lived default option, how do they evolve? Repeated surveys such as GGS (used, for example, in Ayuso, 2019) or the German Socio-Economic Panel (Ermisch and Siedler, 2008) provide a means to measure cohabitation preferences and the outcomes of non-cohabiting relationships. Using GGS data, Lewin (2018) shows how the desire to cohabit is not always shared by partners in a stable intimate relationship. Among young people, women more often want to cohabit (or marry and start a family) than men. Among older adults, the opposite it true: women, who often assume most domestic tasks in a household, prefer to maintain a non-cohabiting relationship (Karlsson and Borell, 2002).

Additionally, a large distance between the partners' homes reduces the likelihood of cohabitation and increases the risk of separation (Krapf, 2018; Wagner et al., 2019). Using data from the ERFI survey (GGS 2005, 2008, and 2011), Régnier-Loilier (2016) described the situations after 3 and 6 years of non-cohabiting partners who were together in 2005. He showed that LAT relationships often evolve over time, which we can define as their *lability*. Only 11% of people in LAT relationships in 2005 were still in the same situation 6 years later. Older adults were the most stable category (6 in 10 were still in a LAT relationship with the same person). It was among young adults that non-cohabiting relationships were most labile and that cohabitation rates (with the same or a different partner) were highest 6 years later. The profile of separated parents is similar to that of older adults, with a high proportion remaining in long-term non-cohabiting relationships.

Non-cohabiting relationships (excluding commuter marriages) are particularly labile due to a key characteristic highlighted by qualitative studies, namely the 'low degree of institutionalization', which implies a precarious economic status (Karlsson and Borell, 2002). Often absent in these relationships are shared budget, assets, or social protection. Each partner remains in sole

control of his or her property, which may simplify separation. As non-cohabiting relationships are labile, with transitions between living together and living apart, yet stable enough to be observed in statistical surveys, it is easy to understand why their frequency has changed little over 2 decades.

Qualitative surveys of young adults (Giraud, 2017) and over-50s (Giraud, 2020) show the extent to which intimate relationships are built on 'relational contracts' negotiated under specific emotional, social, and biographical circumstances. Before completing their education, young people agree to 'go out together', then 'be together' while living apart. This relational contract can be renegotiated when the context changes, e.g. if the partners find a steady job. Among over-50s who are separated or divorced, the presence of teenage children in the home is often the reason for living apart. The change of circumstances after the children's departure may modify the relational contract. While young people expect to move in together at some point, this is less often the case for the over-50s. Non-cohabiting relationships are thus a form of 'contextual intimacy', i.e. a negotiated intimate partnership arrangement tied to a specific emotional, social, and biographical context.

They are a close combination of freedom and constraint. Young partners will negotiate the best way to be together based on their values and the constraints that limit their freedom of choice. As these agreements (not only about living apart but also about the frequency of meeting) are negotiated and amendable, young people do not see their non-cohabiting relationships as a restriction of their freedom (Régnier-Loilier, 2018).

Conclusion

Quantitative research on families and couples over the last 40 years has led to the definition of a new category, that of LAT relationships, seen as a new type of intimate partner relationship that offers an alternative to the reputedly more traditional options of marriage or non-marital cohabitation. More recent research encompasses all types of stable non-cohabiting relationships.

The prevalence of non-cohabiting couples is quite low. By contrast, the share of stable non-cohabiting relationships or 'stable intimate relationships' is larger in all industrialized countries, while remaining at a moderate level (around 10% of individuals) over successive decades. The heterogeneity of these non-cohabiting relationships, and their contextual nature especially, are closely linked to the partners' life histories and life events: premarital non-cohabiting relationships between young people wishing to test their emotional and sexual compatibility before moving in together; post-divorce non-cohabiting relationships, specific to women in lone-parent families; more stable non-cohabiting relationships between older adults (after separation, divorce, or widowhood) whose children have left home.

Contrary to the hypothesis that these relationships reflect a preference for a particular type of intimate and sexual relationship, they tend to be associated with a particular stage in the life cycle and may evolve into cohabiting relationships over time. The lability of non-cohabiting relationships testifies to the negotiated and contextual nature of intimacy today. Living arrangements between partners are not linked primarily to an ideological standpoint, as in the 1970s, when the rejection of marriage was seen as a challenge to bourgeois values, but rather the result of negotiation between partners in a given context of material and ideological constraints. One or other form of living arrangement is cautiously tested and maintained so long as the original context remains unchanged and the relationship satisfies the partners.

Contemporary intimacy has not become 'liquid' (Bauman, 2004) in the sense that individuals have not become 'consumers' who only stay in a relationship 'until they find something better'. It has become more 'contextual', with relationships being tied to a certain social and emotional context via interpersonal agreements, and continuing in the same form so long as the context remains unchanged. Stable non-cohabiting relationships illustrate a desire among individuals to develop intimate relationships in material and moral contexts that have become more complex and uncertain. Here, the modernity of this type of relationship lies not so much in a preference for a particular living arrangement, but rather in the capacity of individuals to jointly define the relationship that matches their needs at a specific moment in their life course and to revise and renegotiate their agreed choices.

The overuse of the term LAT has concealed the existence of this very varied set of intimate relationships in which the partners do not necessarily see themselves as a couple, and that do not necessarily represent a midpoint between casual sexuality and a stable couple relationship (Piazzesi et al., 2020). For these reasons, non-cohabiting relationships should be studied in their full diversity and in relation to individual life histories, without assuming that they correspond to a stable couple relationship over the long term and without imposing limits as to their voluntary or involuntary nature. The questions of economic integration and of care sharing between partners should also be examined more fully in questionnaires or qualitative surveys.

Table A.1. Data sources and estimation of the frequency of stable non-cohabiting relationships (LAT) in selected countries

Reference	Country and data source	Dates	Sample size	Population	Estimation of LAT relationships and identification criteria
	Germany				
Asendorpf (2008)	Socio-Economic Panel	1992–2006	*N* = 21,565 in 1992	Germans aged over 18	In 1992, 8.5% of respondents in a relationship for more than 2 years were 'neither married nor in a cohabiting couple' but 'in a close relationship with a partner who lives in a separate household' ('nicht "verheiratet, mit Ehepartner zusammenlebend" aber "feste Partnerschaft mit Partner außerhalb des eigenen Haushalts"'). In 2006, the proportion was 10.9%.
Schneider and Ruckdeschel (2003)	*Familiensurvey*	1994–2000		Individuals aged 18–61	8% of respondents in 1994 and 9% in 2000 in 'relationships with two dwellings' ('Partnerschaften mit zwei Haushalten')
	Spain				
Castro-Martín et al. (2008)	Spanish Fertility Survey	1999	*N* = 7,740 women	Ages 15–49	10.5% of women aged under 50 had been in a stable non-cohabiting relationship for at least 2 years.
Ayuso (2012)	*Fecundidad y valores en la España del siglo XXI*	2006	*N* = 9,737 women	Ages 15 and over	8% of non-cohabiting unmarried women were currently in a 'couple relationship (that includes sexual relations) with someone living in another household' ('una relación de pareja [que incluya relaciones sexuales] con alguien que vive en otro hogar').
	France				
Villeneuve-Gokalp (1997)	*Enquête Situations familiales et emploi* in conjunction with the Labour Force survey. French version of FFS	1994	*N* = 4,973	Ages 20–49	7% of people not in a cohabiting couple were in a 'stable intimate relationship'.
Régnier-Loilier (2016)	ERFI–GGS	2005–2008–2011	*N* = 10,079	Ages 18–79	8% of respondents not in a cohabiting couple in 2005 (including married couples if not living together) were in a 'stable intimate relationship'.
Régnier-Loilier (2019)	EPIC	2013–2014	*N* = 7,825	Ages 26–65	6% of respondents were in a couple with a partner not living in the same dwelling.

Table A.1 (cont'd). Data sources and estimation of the frequency of stable non-cohabiting relationships (LAT) in selected countries

Reference	Country and data source	Dates	Sample size	Population	Estimation of LAT relationships and identification criteria
	Great Britain				
Duncan and Phillips (2010)	British Social Attitudes Survey	2006	*N* = 320	Individuals aged 18 and over in LAT relationships	10% of respondents had a 'non-cohabiting regular relationship'.
Coulter and Hu (2015)	United Kingdom Household Longitudinal Study in Great Britain (excluding Northern Ireland)	2011–2012	*N* = 37,900	Persons with a partner (cohabiting or not)	9% of respondents had 'a steady relationship with someone you are not living with here, whom you think of as your "partner"'.
	Italy				
Régnier-Loilier and Vignoli (2018)	Household Multipurpose Survey *Famiglia e Soggetti Sociali*	2009	*N* = 50,000	Scope of Italian survey not specified in the article	10% of respondents aged 18–79 were 'currently in a couple relationship with a partner you're not living with'.
	Sweden				
Levin and Trost (1999)	Omnibus survey conducted by Skandinavisk Opinion	1993 and 1998	1993 (*N* = 1,021) 1998 (*N* = 2,121)	Ages 18–74	In 1993, 6% of unmarried and non-cohabiting respondents were in a non-cohabiting couple (but only 4% of all respondents). In 1998, 12% of unmarried and non-cohabiting respondents were in a non-cohabiting couple.
Levin (2004)	Swedish Opinion Research Survey	2001	—	—	In 2001, 14% of unmarried and non-cohabiting respondents were in a non-cohabiting couple.
	Outside Europe				
	Australia				
Glezer (1997)	Australian Family Life Course Study	1996	*N* = 1,964	Ages 25–50	6% (but question not specified)
Reimondos et al. (2011)	Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia	2005	*N* = 12,066	Age 18+	9% of respondents were in an 'intimate ongoing relation with someone you are not living with'.

Table A.1 (cont'd). Data sources and estimation of the frequency of stable non-cohabiting relationships (LAT) in selected countries

Reference	Country and data source	Dates	Sample size	Population	Estimation of LAT relationships and identification criteria
	Canada				
Mila and Peters (2003)	General Social Survey	2001	*N* = 24,000	Ages 15 and over	8% of respondents were 'in an intimate relationship with someone who lives in a separate household'.
Turcotte (2013) Chai Lei (2015)	General Social Survey	2011	*N* = 22,435	Ages 15 and over	7% of respondents who were neither married nor cohabiting were 'currently in an intimate couple relationship with someone you are not living with'.
	United States				
Strohm (2009)	US General Social Survey	1996–1998	*N* = 3,584	Ages 23–70	7% of men and 6% of women 'have a main romantic involvement – a (man/woman) you think of as a steady, a lover, a partner, or whatever', followed by a second question to determine whether the respondent cohabits with the person in question.

Table A.2. Quantitative surveys including questions on LAT or non-cohabiting relationships

Reference	Term	Data source	Dates	Sample	Country	Population	Question or criterion for identifying LAT relationships
		Germany					
Schneider (1996) Schneider and Ruckdeschel (2003)	*Partnerschaften mit zwei Haushalten*	*Familiensurvey* (Panel)	1994 and 2000	*N* = 9,790 in 2000	Germany (East and West)	Ages 18–61	A respondent who does not live with a partner but has a stable intimate relationship (*feste Partnershaft*) that has lasted at least 1 year (for genuine LAT relationships)
Krapf (2018), Lois (2012), Wagner et al. (2019)	LAT relationship	German Family Panel pairfam (Panel Analysis of Intimate Relationships and Family Dynamics)	6th wave: 2008–2009	*N* = 12,402	Germany (East and West)	Birth cohorts 1991–1993 1981–1983 1971–1973 German-speaking men and women	'In the following, I'll ask you about steady relationships. Do you currently have a partner in this sense?' (answering categories were *yes/no, don't know, no answer*). Respondents with a partner were asked whether they were living with their partner in the same dwelling.
Asendorpf (2008)	LAT relationship	Socio-Economic Panel	1992–2006	*N* = 21,565 in 1992	Germany	Germans aged over 18	'nicht "verheiratet, mit Ehepartner zusammenlebend" aber 'feste Partnerschaft mit Partner außerhalb des eigenen Haushalts'
		Spain					
Castro-Martín et al. (2008)	LAT or non-residential partnership	Spanish Fertility Survey	1999	*N* = 7,740 women	Spain	Ages 15–49	Relationship has lasted at least 2 years
Ayuso (2012)	LAT	*Fecundidad y valores en la España del siglo XXI*	2006	*N* = 9,737 women	Spain	Ages 15 and over	'¿Tiene usted actualmente una relación de pareja (que incluya relaciones sexuales) con alguien que vive en otro hogar?', question asked only to respondents who are neither cohabiting nor married + number of married partners not living together.

Table A.2 (cont'd). Quantitative surveys including questions on LAT or non-cohabiting relationships

Reference	Term	Data source	Dates	Sample	Country	Population	Question or criterion for identifying LAT relationships
		Europe					
Kiernan (2002)	Non-co-residential relationships / LAT	European Fertility and Family Survey	From 1988 to 1994 in France 1999 across different countries		23 UNECE countries + New Zealand (list above) (except GB which did the British Household Panel Survey)	Ages 20–49	Respondents not in a cohabiting couple were asked, 'Are you currently having an intimate relationship with someone who lives in a separate household?'. But there is no estimate for the population as a whole. Note that each country adapted the questionnaire.
Kiernan (2002)		+British Household Panel Survey	1992	Wave 2	GB		
Liefbroer et al. (2015) Pasteels et al. (2017) Lewin (2018) Ayuso (2019)	LAT relationships	GGS	2005–2008–2011	3 waves	Europe	Ages 18–79	Respondents in LAT partnerships were identified in the survey as those who responded affirmatively to the question, 'Do you have a partner at the moment, that is to say, someone with whom you have had a relationship for at least three months?' and then answered negatively to the question, 'Does your partner live with you here?'
		Finland					
UNECE (2011)	—	Population Policy Acceptance Survey	2002	*N* = 6,864	Finland	Ages 18–69	I have a partner, with whom I have lived together since year xxxx; (2) I have a partner, but we live in separate households; (3) I don't have a partner.
UNECE (2011)	—	Finnish National Sex Survey	1992, 1999, 2007	~ 6,000	Finland	Ages 18–64	'Do you currently live in a consensual union?: (1) Yes; (2) No'; followed by 'Do you have some other steady sexual relationship, but you are not living together?: (1) No (2) Yes, one (3) Yes, two or more.'
UNECE (2011)	—	Welfare and Services in Finland (panel survey)	2004	—	Finland	—	—

Table A.2 (cont'd). Quantitative surveys including questions on LAT or non-cohabiting relationships

Reference	Term	Data source	Dates	Sample	Country	Population	Question or criterion for identifying LAT relationships
		France					
Villeneuve-Gokalp (1994)	Being in a stable romantic relationship	*Enquête Situations familiales et emploi* in conjunction with the Labour Force survey	1985	*N* = 4,091 adults	France	Ages 20–49	At present: 'Actuellement, avez-vous une relation amoureuse stable ?'
Martin (1994)	Non-cohabiting couples	Ad hoc survey	1987 and 1990	*N* = 336 Beneficiaries of child welfare and lone-parent welfare benefits	France (Calvados)	Separated for at least 1 year	—
Villeneuve-Gokalp (1997)	Living apart as a couple	*Enquête Situations familiales et emploi* in conjunction with the Labour Force survey. French version of FFS	1994	*N* = 4,973	France	Ages 20–49	'Avez-vous une relation amoureuse stable ?' (for those not living with a partner). The partner is then referred to in the questions as *votre ami*.
Rallu and Kojima (2000)	Having a girlfriend/ boyfriend/partner but not cohabiting	FFS (French FFS)	1994	—	France	Ages 21–34 (for the comparison)	'relation amoureuse stable'
Régnier-Loilier (2016)	Being in a stable romantic relationship	ERFI–GGS	2005–2008–2011	*N* = 10,079	France	Ages 18–79	'Avez-vous actuellement une relation amoureuse stable avec quelqu'un avec qui vous ne vivez pas ? Il peut éventuellement s'agir de votre époux/épouse si vous ne vivez pas ensemble. Oui/Non'
Régnier-Loilier (2018)	Non-cohabiting couples	EFL in conjunction with annual census survey	2011	*N* = 359,669	France	Ages 18 and over	Oui avec une personne qui vit dans le logement ? Oui avec une personne qui vit dans le logement/ Oui avec une personne qui vit dans un autre logement/Non.'
Régnier-Loilier (2019)	Non-cohabiting couples; non-cohabiting relationships; serious intimate relationships	EPIC	2013–2014	*N* = 7,825	France	Ages 26–65	'Q1 : Oui, avec une personne qui vit dans le logement/Oui, avec une personne qui ne vit pas dans le logement/Non.'

Table A.2 (cont'd). Quantitative surveys including questions on LAT or non-cohabiting relationships

Reference	Term	Data source	Dates	Sample	Country	Population	Question or criterion for identifying LAT relationships
		Great Britain					
Haskey (2005)	LAT relationship	Omnibus Survey by the Office for National Statistics	2002–2003	*N* = 5,544	United Kingdom (excluding Northern Ireland)	Ages 16–59	'Do you currently have a regular partner?' (only for unmarried, non-cohabiting respondents)
Haskey and Lewis (2006)	LAT relationship	Omnibus Survey by the Office for National Statistics	2004	*N* = 1,686	United Kingdom (excluding Northern Ireland)	Ages 16–59	'Are you currently in an intimate relationship with someone, a partner, who lives in another household?'
Haskey and Lewis (2006)	LAT relationship	British Household Panel Study	1998 8th wave	*N* = 10,300 in Wave 1 (1991)	United Kingdom (excluding Northern Ireland)	Ages 16 and over	'Do you have a steady relationship with a male or female friend whom you think of as your "partner" even though you are not living together?'
Haskey and Lewis (2006)	LAT relationship	Omnibus Survey by the Office for National Statistics	2002–2003	*N* = 5,544	United Kingdom (excluding Northern Ireland)	Ages 18–59	'Do you currently have a regular partner?'
Duncan and Phillips (2010)	LAT relationship	British Social Attitudes Survey	2006	*N* = 320	United Kingdom (excluding Northern Ireland)	Individuals aged 18 and over in a LAT relationship	'non-cohabiting regular relationship'
Duncan and Phillips (2010)	LAT relationship	Omnibus Survey by the Office for National Statistics	2002– 2003	*N* = 5,544	United Kingdom (excluding Northern Ireland)	Ages 18–59	'Do you currently have a regular partner?'
Coulter and Hu (2015)	LAT relationship	United Kingdom Household Longitudinal Study in GB (excluding Northern Ireland)	2011–2012	*N* = 37,900	United Kingdom (excluding Northern Ireland)	People with a partner	'Do you have a steady relationship with someone you are not living with here, whom you think of as your "partner"?'
Ermisch and Siedler (2008)	LAT relationships	British Household Panel Study	1998 and 2003	Wave 8 for 1998	United Kingdom (excluding Northern Ireland)	A question on LAT used by Haskey	'Do you have a steady relationship with a male or female friend whom you think of as your "partner", even though you are not living together?'

Table A.2 (cont'd). Quantitative surveys including questions on LAT or non-cohabiting relationships

Reference	Term	Data source	Dates	Sample	Country	Population	Question or criterion for identifying LAT relationships
		Italy					
Di Giulio (2007)		Fertility and Family Survey	1995	*N* = 4,824 women and 1,206 men	Italy	Ages 20–49	'Are you currently having an intimate (couple) relationship with someone you are not living with?' (only for unmarried women)
Régnier-Loilier and Vignoli (2018)	LAT relationships	Household Multipurpose Survey *Famiglia e Soggetti Sociali*	2009	*N* = 50,000	Italy	All ages	'Are you currently having a couple relationship with a partner you're not living with? Yes/No.'
		Netherlands					
De Jong Gierveld (2002) Dykstra (1998)	LAT relationship	NESTOR-Living Arrangements and Social Networks survey	1992	*N* = 4,494	Netherlands	Ages 55–99	'1) Are you currently living with someone (person of the opposite or the same sex) whom you consider to be a partner? 2) Is there someone with whom you do not share living quarters, but with whom you do consider to be a partner?'
De Jong Gierveld and Merz (2013)	LAT relationship	Netherlands Kinship Panel Study	Wave 1 (2003–2004)	*N* = 8,161	Netherlands	Ages 18–79	Respondents in LAT partnerships were identified in the survey as those who responded affirmatively to the question, 'Do you have a partner at the moment, that is to say, someone with whom you have had a relationship for at least three months?' and then answered negatively to the question, 'Does your partner live with you here?'
Van der Wiel et al. (2020)	LAT relationship	Netherlands Kinship Panel Study Dutch GGS	Waves 1–4	Wave 2 (2006–2007) *N* = 6,085	Netherlands	Ages 18–79	Respondents in LAT partnerships were identified in the survey as those who responded affirmatively to the question, 'Do you have a partner at the moment, that is to say, someone with whom you have had a relationship for at least three months?' and then answered negatively to the question, 'Does your partner live with you here?'
Poortman and Hewitt (2015)	LAT relationship	Netherlands Kinship Panel Study Dutch GGS	2005	*N* = 973	Netherlands	Divorcees not in a cohabiting relationship, ages 18–79	—
UNECE (2011)		Family and Fertility survey	2008		Netherlands	Men and women born between 1945 and 1989	'Do you have/want a partner without cohabiting?'

Table A.2 (cont'd). Quantitative surveys including questions on LAT or non-cohabiting relationships

Reference	Term	Data source	Dates	Sample	Country	Population	Question or criterion for identifying LAT relationships
		Sweden					
Levin and Trost (1999)	LAT, *särbo*	Omnibus survey conducted by Skandinavisk Opinion	1993 and 1998	1993 (*N* = 1,021) 1998 (*N* = 2,121)	Sweden	Ages 18–74	'Do you live in a marriage-like relationship with someone while maintaining separate homes?'
Levin (2004)	LAT, *särbo*	Swedish Opinion Research Survey	2001	—	Sweden	—	Not specified
		Outside Europe					
		Australia					
Glezer (1997)	Part-time or LAT relationship	Australian Family Life Course Study	1996	*N* = 1,964	Australia	Ages 25–50	-—
Reimondos et al. (2011)	LAT relationships	Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia	2005	*N* = 12,066	Australia	Ages 18 and over	Intimate ongoing relation
		Canada					
Milan and Peters (2003)	LAT couples	General Social Survey	2001	*N* = 24,000	Canada	Ages 15 and over	'Are you in an intimate relationship with someone who lives in a separate household?'
Turcotte (2013) Chai Lei (2015)	LAT couples	General Social Survey	2011	*N* = 22,435	Canada	Ages 15 and over	'Are you currently in an intimate couple relationship with someone you are not living with?' Question asked to people who were neither married nor cohabiting.

Table A.2 (cont'd). Quantitative surveys including questions on LAT or non-cohabiting relationships

Reference	Term	Data source	Dates	Sample	Country	Population	Question or criterion for identifying LAT relationships
		United States					
Strohm (2009)	LAT	US General Social Survey	1996–1998	*N* = 3,584	USA	Ages 23–70	'Do you have a main romantic involvement—a (man/woman) you think of as a steady, a lover, a partner, or whatever?', followed by a second question to determine whether respondent lives with partner in question or not.
Strohm (2009)	LAT	California Quality of Life Survey	2004–2005	*N* = 1,781	California	Ages 23–70	'When we began the interview, you indicated that you were not married or currently living with a partner. Do you have a relationship partner but maybe the two of you don't live together?'
Brown et al. (2013)	Dating relationship	National Social Life, Health, and Aging Project	2005–2006	*N* = 3,005 Community-dwelling persons	USA	Ages 57–85	'Do you currently have a romantic, intimate, or sexual partner?'
		Japan					
Iwasawa (2004)	Non-cohabiting couples	Japanese National Fertility Surveys	9th (1987) 10th (1992) 11th (1997)	9th survey (*N* = 11,788) 10th survey (*N* = 13,216) 11th survey (*N* = 11,534)	Japan	Unmarried men and women and married women aged 18–49	'To have a partner, that is, who are considered to be currently in a sexually intimate relationship'
Rallu and Kojima (2000)	'has friend(s) of the opposite sex' (Japan)	Japanese National Fertility Survey	1982–1992 (10th wave)	in 1992 (*N* = 8,000)	Japan	Ages 21–34	'Have friends of the opposite sex'

Note: A very detailed list of available surveys is given in UNECE (2011), which provided some of the information given here.

References

Asendorpf J. B. 2008. Living Apart Together: Alters- und Kohortenabhängigkeit einer heterogenen Lebensform [Age- and cohort-dependence of a heterogeneous life style]. Kölner *Zeitschrift fur Soziologie and Sozialpsychologie*, 60, 749–764. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11577-008-0035-4

Ayuso L. 2012. *Living apart together* en España: ¿Noviazgos o parejas independientes? [Living apart together in Spain: Engagements or independent couples?]. *Revista internacional de sociologia*, 70(3), 587–613. http://dx.doi.org/10.3989/ris.2011.07.18

Ayuso L. 2019. What future awaits couples Living Apart Together (LAT)? *The Sociological Review*, 67(1), 226–244. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038026118799053

Bauman Z. 2004. *L'amour liquide: de la fragilité des liens entre les hommes*. Chambon-Le Rouergue.

Beaujouan É., Régnier-Loilier A., Villeneuve-Gokalp C. 2009. Ni seuls, ni en couple. Étude des relations amoureuses stables non cohabitantes. In Régnier-Loilier A. (ed.), *Portraits de familles, l'enquête Étude des relations familiales et intergénérationnelles* (pp. 87–112). INED.

Beck U. 2001. *La société du risque. Sur la voie d'une autre modernité* (L. Bernardi, Trans.). Aubier. (Original work published 1986)

Benson J. J., Kerr S., Ermer A. 2017. Living apart together relationships in later life: Constructing an account of relational maintenance. *Contemporary Perspectives in Family Research*, 11, 193–215. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/S1530-353520170000011009

Berkel M. 1978 (14 October). De Nieuwe Vrijgezellen: Samen Apart [The new singles: Together apart]. *Den Haagse Post*, 21–24.

Boislard M.-A., van de Bongardt D., Blais M. 2016. Sexuality (and lack thereof) in adolescence and early adulthood: A review of literature. *Behavioral Sciences*, 6(1), 8. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs6010008

Bozon M. 2008. Premier rapport sexuel, première relation: des passages attendus. In Bajos N., Bozon M. (eds.), *Enquête sur la sexualité en France* (pp. 117–147). La Découverte. https://doi.org/10.3917/dec.bajos.2008.01.0117

Brown S. L., Shinohara S. K. 2013. Dating relationships in older adulthood: A national portrait. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 75(5), 1194–1202. https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12065

Bulcroft K., O'Connor M. 1986. The importance of dating relationships on quality of life for older persons. *Family Relations*, 35(3), 397–401. https://doi.org/10.2307/584367

Caradec V. 1996. Les formes de la vie conjugale des 'jeunes' couples 'âgés', *Population*, 51(4–5), 897–927. https://doi.org/10.2307/1534359

Castro-Martín T., Domínguez-Folgueras M., Martín-García T. 2008. Not truly partnerless: Non-residential partnerships and retreat from marriage in Spain. *Demographic Research*, 18(16), 443–468. https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2008.18.16

Chai L. 2015. *Living apart together in Canada: A national portrait* [Master's thesis, University of Winnipeg]. http://hdl.handle.net/1828/6404

Chalvon-Demersay S. 1983. Sans domicile commun. *Dialogue*, *Qu'est-ce qu'un non-couple?* 81, 34–38.

Connidis I. A., Borell K., Karlsson S. G. 2017. Ambivalence and living apart together in later life: A critical research proposal. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 79(5), 1404–1418. https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12417

Coulter R., Hu Y. 2015. Living apart together and cohabitation intentions in Great Britain. *Journal of Family Issues*, 38(12), 1701–1729. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X15619461

Davidson K. 2001. Later life widowhood, selfishness and new partnership choices: A gendered perspective. *Ageing and Society*, 21, 297–317. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0144686X01008169

De Jong Gierveld J. 2002. The dilemma of repartnering: Consideration of older men and women entering new intimate relationships in later life. *Ageing International*, 27(4), 61–78. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12126-002-1015-z

De Jong Gierveld J., Merz E.-M. 2013. Parents' partnership decision making after divorce or widowhood: The role of (step)children. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 75(5), 1098–1113. https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12061

Di Giulio P. 2007. Living apart together: insieme, ma separate [Living apart together: Together, but separated]. In Pinnelli A., Racioppi F., Terzera L. (eds.), *Genere, famiglia, salute*, (pp. 410–431). Franco Angeli Edizione.

Duncan S., Phillips M. 2010. People who live apart together (LATs). How different are they? *The Sociological Review*, 58(1), 112–134. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.01874.x

Duncan S., Phillips M., Roseneil S., Carter J., Stoilova M. 2013. *Living apart together: Uncoupling intimacy and co-residence* (Research Briefing). https://www.bbk.ac.uk/downloads/news/living-apart-together.pdf

Dykstra P. A. 1998. The effects of divorce on intergenerational exchanges in families. *The Netherlands' Journal of Social Sciences*, 33(2), 77–93.

Engel-Gross H. 1980. Dual-career couples who live apart: Two types. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 42(3), 567–576. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.2307/351900

Ermisch J., Siedler T. 2008. Living apart together. In Ermisch J., Brynin M. (eds.), *Changing relationships* (pp. 29–43), Routledge.

Festy P., Prioux F. 2002. *An evaluation of the Fertility and Family Surveys Project*. UNECE.

Galland O. 1997. *Sociologie de la jeunesse*. Armand Colin.

Gerstel N., Gross H. E. 1984. *Commuter marriage: A study of work and family*. Guilford.

Giraud C. 2017. *L'amour réaliste*. Armand Colin.

Giraud C. 2020. Relations non-cohabitantes après 50 ans et conjugalité. In Oris M., Gnoumou Thiombiano B., Ciobanu Ruxandra O. (eds.), *Relations sociales dans la vieillesse: solidarités et tensions* (pp. 19–28), AIDELF.

Glezer H. 1997. Cohabitation and marriage relationships in the 1990s. *Family Matters*, 47, 5–9.

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. PMID: 16411623.

Haskey J., Lewis J. 2006. Living-apart-together in Britain: Context and meaning. *International Journal of Law in Context*, 2(1), 37–48. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1744552306001030

Heath S. 1999. Young adults and household formation in the 1990s. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20(4), 545–561.

Hoffmann-Nowotny H.-J. 1987. The future of the family. In IUSSP, Central Statistical Office of Finland (eds.), *Plenaries of the European Population Conference* (pp. 113–200), Helsinki.

Iwasawa M. 2004. Partnership transition in contemporary Japan: Prevalence of non-cohabiting couples. *Japanese Journal of Population*, 2(1), 76–92.

Karlson S. G., Borell K. 2002. Intimacy and autonomy, gender and ageing: Living apart together. *Ageing international*, 27(4), 11–26. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12126-002-1012-2

Kiernan K. E. 2002. The state of European unions: An analysis of partnership formation and dissolution. In Macura M., Beets G. (eds.), *Dynamics of fertility and partnership in Europe: Insights and lessons from comparative research* (Vol. 1, pp. 57–76), United Nations.

Kobayashi K. M., Funk L., Kahn M. M. 2017. Constructing a sense of commitment in 'living apart together' (LAT) relationships: Interpretive agency and individualization. *Current Sociology*, 65(7), 991–1009. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392116653237

Krapf S. 2018. Moving in or breaking up? The role of distance in the development of romantic relationships. *European Journal of Population*, 34, 313–336. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10680-017-9428-2

Lagrange H. 1998. Le sexe apprivoisé ou l'invention du flirt. *Revue française de sociologie*, 39(1), 139–175. https://doi.org/10.2307/3322787

Le Gall D., Martin C. 1988. *Le réseau de parenté après la désunion*. CNAF, CRTS, Université de Caen.

Leridon H., Villeneuve-Gokalp C. 1988. Les nouveaux couples: nombre, caractéristiques et attitudes. *Population*, 43(2), 331–374. https://doi.org/10.2307/1532834

Lesthaeghe R. 1991. *The second demographic transition in Western countries: An interpretation* (IPD Working Paper 2). Interuniversity Programme in Demography.

Levin I. 2004. Living apart together: A new family form. *Current Sociology*, 52(2), 223–240. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392104041809

Levin I., Trost J. 1999. Living apart together. *Community, work and family*, 2(3), 279–294. https://doi.org/10.1080/13668809908412186

Lewin A. C. 2018. Intentions to live together among couples living apart: Differences by age and gender. *European Journal of Population*, 34, 721–743. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10680-017-9446-0

Liefbroer A. C., Poortman A.-R., Seltzer J. 2015. Why do intimate partners live apart? Evidence on LAT relationships across Europe. *Demographic Research*, 32(8), 251–286. https://dx.doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2015.32.8

Lois N. 2012. 'Living apart together': Sechs Typen einer heterogenen Lebensform ['Living apart together': Six types of heterogeneous living arrangement]. *Zeitschrift für Familienforschung*, 24(3), 247–268.

Lyssens-Danneboom V., Mortelmans D. 2015. Living apart together: Longing for the couple, enjoying being single. *Family Science*, 6(1), 11–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/19424620.2015.1009932

Martin C. 1994. Diversité des trajectoires post-désunion. Entre le risque de solitude, la défense de son autonomie et la recomposition familiale. *Population*, 49(6), 1557–1583. https://doi.org/10.2307/1534022

Martin C. 1997. *L'après divorce: lien familial et vulnérabilité*. Presses universitaires de Rennes.

Milan A., Peters A. 2003. Couples living apart. *Canadian Social Trends*, 11-008, 2–6.

Murphy M. 1996. Family and household issues. In Dale A. (ed.), *Looking Towards the 2001 Census*, OPCS Occasional Paper 46.

Pasteels I., Lyssens-Danneboom V., Mortelmans D. 2017. A life course perspective on living apart together: Meaning and incidence across Europe. *Social Indicators Research*, 130(2), 799–817. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-015-1189-x

Piazzesi C., Blais M., Lavigne J., Lavoie Mongrain C. (eds.). 2020. *Intimités et sexualités contemporaines. Les transformations des pratiques et des représentations*. Presses universitaires de Montréal.

Pinnelli A., Hoffmann-Nowotny H.-J., Fux B. 2001. *Fécondité et nouveaux types de ménages et de formation de la famille en Europe*. Council of Europe Publishing.

Poortman A.-R., Hewitt B. 2015. Gender differences in relationship preferences after union dissolution. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 26, 11–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2015.07.002

Rallu J.-L., Kojima H. 2000 (29–31 May). *Determinants of non-formation of partnership: A French–Japanese comparison* [Paper presentation]. FFS Flagship Conference, Brussels, Belgium.

Régnier-Loilier A. 2016. Le devenir conjugal des personnes en relation non-cohabitante (pp. 111–135). In Régnier-Loilier A. (ed.), *Parcours de familles*. INED.

Régnier-Loilier A. 2018. Faire couple à distance. Prévalence et caractéristiques. In Imbert C., Lelièvre E., Lessault D. (eds.), *La famille à distance. Mobilités, territoires et liens familiaux*, (pp. 165–193). INED.

Régnier-Loilier A. 2019. Nouvelle vie de couple, nouvelle vie commune? Processus de remise en couple après une séparation. *Population*, 74(1–2), 73–102. https://doi.org/10.3917/popu.1901.0073

Régnier-Loilier A., Légaré J. 2010. Generations and Gender Programme: présentation et perspectives. *Santé, Société et Solidarité*, *no. 2, 'Politiques familiales et fécondité'*, 129–135.

Régnier-Loilier A., Vignoli D. 2018. The diverse nature of living apart together relationships: An Italy–France comparison. *Journal of Population Research*, 35, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12546-017-9197-0

Reimondos A., Evans A., Gray E. 2011. Living-apart-together (LAT) relationships in Australia. *Family Matters*, 87, 43–55.

Roseneil S., Budgeon S. 2004. Cultures of intimacy and care beyond 'the family': Personal life and social change in the early 21st century. *Current Sociology*, 52(2), 135–159. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392104041798

Schlemmer E. 1995. 'Living apart together', eine partnerschaftliche Lebensform von Singles? ['Living apart together', a partnership-based way of life for single people?]. In Bertram H. (ed.), *Das Individuum und seine Familie. Lebensformen, Familienbeziehungen und Lebensereignisse im Erwachsenenalter* (pp. 363–398). Springer.

Schmitz-Köster D. 1990. *Liebe auf Distanz. Getrennt zusammen leben* [Love at a distance: Living apart together]. Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag.

Schneider N. J. 1996. Partnerschaften mit getrennten Haushalten in den neuen und alten Bundeslandern [Partners with separate households in the new and former German Länder]. In Bien W. (eds.), *Familie an der Schwelle zum neuen Jahrtausend* (pp. 88–97). Leske & Budrich.

Schneider N. J., Ruckdeschel K. 2003. Partnerschaften mit zwei Haushalten: eine moderne Lebensform zwischen Partnerschaftideal und beruflischen Erfoldernissen [Partners with two households: A modern way of life between the ideal of partnerships and professional success] (pp. 245–258). In Bien W., Marbach J. H. (ed.), *Partnerschaft und Familiengründung, Ergebnisse der dritten Welle des Familien-Survey*. Leske & Budrich.

Seidenspinner G. et al. 1996. LAT. In Seidenspinner G. et al. (ed.), *Junge Frauen heute. Wie sie leben, was sie anders machen* (pp. 135–151). Leske & Budrich.

Straver C. J. 1980. Die nichteheliche Lebensgemeinschaft: Bericht über eine qualitative Untersuchung in den Niederlanden [Non-marital cohabitation: Report on a qualitative study in the Netherlands]. In *Partnerschaft und Identität. Die nichteheliche Lebensgemeinschaft: Tagung vom 25. bis 27. Januar* (pp. 18–43), *Loccumer Protokolle*, 3.

Straver C. J. 1981. Unmarried couples: Different from marriage? *Alternative Lifestyles*, 4, 43–74. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01082088

Strohm C. Q., Seltzer J. A., Cochran S. D., Mays V. M. 2009. 'Living Apart Together' relationships in the United States. *Demographic Research*, 21(7), 177–214. https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2009.21.7

Toulemon L. 1996. La cohabitation hors mariage s'installe dans la durée. *Population*, 51(3), 675–715. https://doi.org/10.2307/1534489

Trost J. 1998. LAT relationships now and in the future. In Koen M. (ed.), *The family: Contemporary perspectives and challenges. Festschrift in honor of Wilfried Dumon*, (pp. 209–220). Leuven University Press.

Trost J. 2016. Marriage, cohabitation and LAT relationships. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies,* 47(1), 17–26. https://www.jstor.org/stable/44109607

Turcotte M. 2013 (March). Living apart together. *Insight on Canadian Society*, 1–9.

UNECE. 2011. *Measurement of emerging forms of households and families*. United Nations. https://unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/stats/publications/Families_and_Households_FINAL.pdf

Van der Kaa D. J. 1987. Europe's second demographic transition. *Population Bulletin*, 42(1), 1–59.

Van der Wiel R., Mulder C. H., de Valk, H. A. G. 2020. From living apart to living together: Do children born before the current partnership matter? *Comparative Population Studies*, 45, 115–142. https://doi.org/10.12765/CPoS-2020-07

Villeneuve-Gokalp C. 1990. Du mariage aux unions sans papiers: histoire récente des transformations conjugales. *Population*, 45(2), 265–296. https://doi.org/10.2307/1533374

Villeneuve-Gokalp C. 1994. Après la séparation: conséquences de la rupture et avenir conjugal. In Leridon H., Villeneuve-Gokalp C., *Constance et inconstances de la famille. Biographies familiales des couples et des enfants* (pp. 137–164), PUF–INED.

Villeneuve-Gokalp C. 1997. Vivre en couple chacun chez soi. *Population*, 52(5), 1059–1081. https://doi.org/10.2307/1534530

Wagner M., Mulder C. H., Weiss B., Krapf S. 2019. The transition from living apart together to a coresidential partnership. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 39, 77–86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2018.12.002

Winfield F. E. 1985. *Commuter marriage: Living together, apart*. Columbia University Press.

Christophe Giraud • **Les relations LAT ou *Living apart together* : 40 ans de recherches sociodémographiques**

Cet article propose de retracer l'histoire de la mise en lumière des unions non cohabitantes, aujourd'hui communément appelées relations *Living apart together* (LAT) dans la littérature scientifique internationale. Cette notion est pour la première fois formulée en 1980 par le démographe néerlandais Cees J. Straver, puis redéfinie par Jan Trost et John Haskey au tournant des années 2000. Elle a été progressivement prise en compte et opérationnalisée dans les enquêtes statistiques nationales et internationales réalisées dans les années 1990 et 2000. Ces relations ont donné lieu à différentes analyses : comparaison des relations non cohabitantes avec les autres formes de vie privée (mariage, union libre), comparaison des différentes formes de relations non cohabitantes, et suivi dans la durée des relations non cohabitantes. Cette histoire intellectuelle est traversée par une question récurrente : ces relations sont-elles le fruit de contraintes structurelles (études prolongées, difficulté à trouver un emploi stable) ou le reflet de nouvelles valeurs et attentes en matière de vie privée ?

Christophe Giraud • **Las relaciones «LAT», o vivir juntos pero separados: 40 años de investigación sociodemográfica**

Este artículo se propone trazar la historia de la puesta de relieve de las uniones no convivenciales, ahora comúnmente denominadas en inglés living apart together (LAT, o vivir juntos pero separados) en la literatura científica internacional. Este concepto fue formulado por primera vez en 1980 por el demógrafo neerlandés Cees J. Straver y redefinido por Jan Trost y John Haskey a partir del año 2000. Cada vez se tuvo más en cuenta y se comenzó a incluir en las encuestas estadísticas nacionales e internacionales realizadas en las décadas de 1990 y 2000. Estas relaciones dieron lugar a distintos análisis: comparación de las relaciones no convivenciales con otras formas de vida privada (matrimonio, unión de hecho), comparación de distintas formas de relaciones no convivenciales, y seguimiento de las relaciones no convivenciales a lo largo del tiempo. Una pregunta recurrente atraviesa esta historia intelectual: ¿son estas relaciones el resultado de limitaciones estructurales (estudios prolongados, dificultad para encontrar un trabajo estable) o el reflejo de nuevos valores y expectativas relativos a la vida privada?