



Centre de recherche en démographie  
Institut d'analyse du changement dans l'histoire  
et les sociétés contemporaines  
UCLouvain

## Family structure and proximity to kin during childhood

Christine Schnor  
Joan Damiens  
Luisa Fadel  
Alice Rees  
Zuzana Zilincikova

Document de travail

32

octobre 2022  
[www.uclouvain.be/demo](http://www.uclouvain.be/demo)

### Family structure and proximity to kin during childhood

*To be submitted as a descriptive findings paper to Demographic Research (word limit 2500)*

Authors: Christine Schnor, Joan Damiens, Luisa Fadel, Alice Rees, Zuzana Zilincikova

#### Abstract

##### Background

Literature started to describe proximity to kin over the life course, concentrating on general patterns. Little is known about kin proximity during childhood and how this varies with family structure.

##### Objective

We provide estimates on kinship structures and proximity to kin for children living with both parents, with only one parent (distinguishing whether the other parent is deceased, never registered, and in case of being alive, where the other parent lives (in the country vs. abroad)) or with no parent. Following two birth cohorts over childhood, we evaluate changes over the children's life course and across time.

##### Methods

Data come from Belgian register-based data (DEMOBEL). We rely on information over household configuration, intergenerational links and place of residence of children born in 1992 and 2003, at age 8 and 16. We estimate the percentage of children having at least one relative (great-grandparents, grandparents, aunts/uncles, (half-)siblings) that are alive, living in the same household or living close and the average number of kin, by type of family structure and children's age.

##### Results

Children living with both parents lived more often close to at least one grandparent and aunt/uncle than children living with only one parent. This gap is greater at age 16 than at age 8, but it is smaller for children born in 2003 compared to 1992.

##### Contribution

The life course of children has diversified in recent decades. Documenting how kinship structures differ for children living in different family structures enables to better understand inequalities in the possibilities of informal support.

## 1. Introduction

Nuclear families are considered the building blocks of modern societies, but extended family networks continue to play a crucial role in an individual's life. Kinship networks may provide information, emotional support or even assistance, serving as part of the "protective cocoon" around the nuclear family unit (Furstenberg 2020). Geographical distance to kin shapes contact, emotional and instrumental support and informal care relations (Kolk 2017; Mulder and Van den Meer 2009). Both migration propensities and family relationships influence the distance to family members throughout the life course (Wrzus et al. 2013; Kolk 2017). This study responds to the recent call (Furstenberg 2020; Furstenberg et al. 2020) for more research that compares kinship networks across family forms. Kinship relations seem to increase in importance in non-standard families, corresponding to their function as "weak ties" that are activated in situations of need and may form an important resource (Albertini et al. 2018; Furstenberg et al. 2020; Cooney 2021). However, kinship as a social resource is not distributed evenly (Furstenberg and Kaplan 2007).

From the perspective of minor children, recent societal trends have brought major changes to their kinship structures. First, lower fertility rates and increasing life expectancy have led to more but smaller generations being alive, which may imply more interactions with vertical kin and that these relations increase in significance and emotional intensity (Bengtson 2001; Furstenberg 2020). Fertility postponement on the other hand has led to higher ages at grandparenthood, eventually reducing their availability for children. Second, family life has diversified in the past decades. Children increasingly live with only one parent, because the parents separated or never lived together or eventually because one parent passed away. Increasing separation and divorce rates have also produced more families in which children do not live together with all siblings.

On the one hand, kinship relations with the non-resident parent side (if existing) may get truncated, especially in case of greater geographical distance (Amato et al. 2009; Cheadle et al. 2010; Zartler 2021). On the other hand, children's time spent with both parents after separation has increased, thereby allowing also more continuity in interactions with maternal and paternal kin (Sodermans et al. 2013; Vanassche 2013). Literature has demonstrated the importance of grandparents in providing support to children, directly or through the parents (Hagestad 2006), especially after parental separation (Cooney 2021). Whereas children living with only one parent may especially profit from the presence of other family members (Jappens and Van Bavel 2019), they also encounter more changes in residence, implying possible changes in

proximity to kin (Schnor and Mikolai 2020; Thomas and Dommermuth 2020). Parental separation may strengthen some family ties while weakening others (e.g. towards non-resident siblings, parents of non-resident parents).

We know little about the presence of and proximity to great-grandparents in children's life. Likewise, there is little knowledge on extended kin such as aunts and uncles, who have been often grouped in an 'other relatives' category including also cousins, in-laws etc (Furstenberg 2020). Existing studies point to the strong bonds between siblings during the entire life course, especially if they live nearby, which may create ties also to nieces and nephews (Langer and Ribarich 2007; White 2001; Furstenberg 2020).

Literature only recently started to describe kinship networks and proximity to kin over the life course, using mostly high-quality register data from the Nordic countries and concentrating on general patterns (Ghosh et al 2019; Kolk 2017; Kolk et al. 2021). Little attention has been devoted to kin proximity during childhood and how these might vary with family structure. In view of increasing family instability and the fact that proximity is an important pre-condition for support, there is a need to know more about the non-resident kin structures of children and how these are organized across space.

Using high-quality population data from Belgium, this study investigates how kinship structures and proximity to kin differ between children living with both parents, with only one parent (distinguishing separated parents from families in which the parent died or was not registered) or without parents, and how these differences change over the children's life course and by birth cohort. Our focus is on "biological" kin: although we acknowledge the importance that step and in-law kin may have for families, in order to reduce complexity, we concentrated on "biological" family ties. According to evolutionary biology, biological kinship evokes a sense of shared belonging and social solidarity, and step-relations as well as in-law relations are not invariably considered to be relatives (Furstenberg 2020; Furstenberg et al. 2020; Neyer and Lang 2003). We put "biological" in quotation marks as we refer to the reality of the administrative data: the registered parent can also be the co-parent in a same-sex couple or an adoptive parent; the child may be conceived through donor sperm/egg or in an affair that was not disclosed to the registered parent. Nevertheless, the other relations (with parents, siblings) refer mostly to biological ties, for this reason we still use this term. We account for the following kin: great-grandparents, grandparents, aunts and uncles, full siblings and half-siblings.

## 2. Data and methods

### 2.1 Data

This study relies on data from National registers covering the entire resident population of Belgium for the period 1992-2020 ([DEMOBEL](#)) provided by Direction générale Statistique - Statistics Belgium). Our sample includes children born 1992 and 2003 in Belgium; to evaluate changes over children's life course, we consider their kinship structures at two ages (8 and 16), referring to the situation as of January 1 in the respective calendar year (cohort 1992: 2001, 2009; cohort 2003: 2012, 2020).

### 2.2 Measures and methods

*Family structures.* Each child has up to two registered parents in the data; we distinguish the child's family structure based on the presence of these parents in the household. If only one parent was registered (about 2% of cases, similar proportions were found in other countries e.g. Finland (Schnor and Jalovaara 2020: 407), we have information only on this parent (mostly the mother)<sup>1</sup> and its kin, with implications for the statistics of kinship. In all other cases, we have information on both maternal and paternal kin residing in Belgium. If parents are separated but both living in Belgium, we can estimate the proximity of the (non-)resident parent to their side of the family. If a parent moved abroad<sup>2</sup>, this is not possible, that is why we assigned these families a separate category. We distinguish the following family structures: (1) living with both parents; (2) living with one parent, parents separated; (3) living with one parent, other parent died; (4) living with one parent, other parent moved abroad; (5) living with one parent, other parent not registered; (6) Not living with parents.<sup>3</sup>

*Kinship.* (Great-) grandparents are the registered (grand-) parents of the child's parents. A child can have up to 4 grandparents and up to 8 great-grandparents. Aunts and uncles are the registered (half-) siblings of each parent. The maximum number of aunts and uncles in the data is 28 (interquartile range [2;6]). Full siblings are defined as other registered children from the same couple of parents. Half-siblings are children to only one of the child's parents. In the data, the maximum number of full siblings is 17 (interquartile range [1; 2]), the maximum number of half-siblings is 29 (interquartile range [0; 0]).

<sup>1</sup> 79% the cohort 1992, 92% for the cohort 2003.

<sup>2</sup> In 98% of the cases the father.

<sup>3</sup> For this group, we provided statistics on the presence and proximity of the parents in the notes below each Table.

*Kinship proximity.* We measure proximity to kin by their presence in the municipality and household, where the child (and, in case of separated parents, the non-resident parent) is living. Belgium is comprised of 589 municipalities with a median area of 40 km<sup>2</sup> and median population density of 308 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> (Statistics Belgium 2021). Municipalities build a relevant spatial structure in people's everyday lives as they provide local infrastructure (such as schools and leisure organizations), a sense of identity, and location-specific capital (Mulder and Wagner 2012; Mulder 2007). Belgians generally move over rather short distances as they consider important to stay close to relatives (Thomas et al 2017).

*Methodological approach.* We show the percentage of children having at least one kin of a specific type (great-grandparent, grandparent, aunt/uncle, full sibling, half sibling) being alive and a) living in Belgium, b) living in the same household or c) living close (in the same municipality in a different household). Secondly, we inform about the mean number of specific kin if there is at least one kin that falls in that category (e.g. mean number of grandparents living close for children who have at least one grandparent living close).

## 3. Results

Overall, our statistics demonstrate that although the number of kin alive was largely similar, children living with both parents lived more often close to at least one grandparent and aunt/uncle than children living with only one parent (parents separated, half-orphans). Children living in more marginalised family structures (having one registered parent, one parent living abroad, living with no parent) had the smallest number of adult kin in proximity.

### 3.1 Comparison of family proximity across family structures and ages, birth cohort 1992

Table 1 shows the estimates for children born in 1992 and aged 8 on 01/01/2001. The majority of these children had great-grandparents (60%), grandparents (95%), aunts or uncles (93%) and full siblings (80%), whereas only 15% had half-siblings. Adult kin other than parents did generally not live in the child's household, but about half of the children had at least one aunt or uncle (54%) and one grandparent (55%) living close, and only 9% lived close to their great-grandparents. Most half-siblings lived either in close proximity or in the household of the child. Table 2 shows the estimates for the same birth cohort at age 16 (on 01/01/2009). At age 16, these children had less often at least a great-grandparent alive and a higher average number of

half-siblings compared to age 8; the number of full siblings remained rather unchanged. Less children lived close to adult kin.

Comparing the statistics for children born in 1992 aged 8 across family structures (Table 1), we see that children with two parents living in Belgium (either in the same or separate households) as well as half-orphans had a similar proportion of great-grandparents, grandparents, and aunts/uncles alive, whereas the proportion is lower for children with a parent that was not registered or moved abroad and for children living without their parents.

This also translates into a lower mean number of adult kin living in close proximity to the child in the latter types of family structures. Children living with both parents lived more often close to at least one grandparent and aunt/uncle than children living with only one parent. In separated families, non-resident parents lived more often with their own parents than resident parents, but less often in close proximity to them. Almost half of the children not living with their parents either lived with (25%) or close to (21%) their grandparents and about 40% lived with or close to their aunts/uncles. Whereas about 8% of children living with both parents had half-siblings, this amounts to 30-39% in one parent families in which the other parent lives elsewhere or died and is even higher among children for which the second parent is not registered (71%) or who did not live with their parents (56%). Across family structures, a considerable proportion of these half-siblings did not live in the child's household, this is even the case if one parent passed away. At age 16 (Table 2), fewer children lived with both parents and close to adult kin. The gap in proximity to adult kin increased between children having parents living together and those having separated parents. There is less proximity to adult kin for half-orphans at age 16 than age 8. Children not living with their parents show most continuity in proximity to adult kin; the growing number of (half-) siblings did not result in higher proportions of co-residence.

3.2 Comparison of proximity to kin across birth cohorts 1992 and 2003

Table 3 shows the estimates for children born in 2003 and aged 8 on 01/01/2012. Compared to the 1992 birth cohort, children born in 2003 a little higher proportion had at least one great-grandparent alive, but fewer had at least one grandparent or aunt/uncle alive and living in Belgium<sup>4</sup>. The number of kin of these types living in the same municipality increased for (great-

<sup>4</sup> Additional analyses reveal that this is due to a higher proportion of children with non-Belgian family members in the birth cohort 2003.

) grandparents, but decreased for aunts and uncles. Co-residence with grandparents and aunts/uncles did not change across cohorts. Children born in 2003 had a similar number of full siblings, but more half-siblings; patterns of co-residence and proximity remained similar across cohorts.

Table 4 shows the estimates for children born in 2003 and aged 16 on 01/01/2020. Patterns of co-residence remained rather similar across cohorts. The gap in proximity to grandparents and aunts/uncles between children living with both parents versus with one parent was lower than in the older cohort.

3.3 Patterns in kinship proximity across family structures and cohorts

Table 5 shows the proportion of children aged 16 with different combinations of adult kin living close across family structures and birth cohorts. For both cohorts, children living with both parents lived more often in proximity to *both* grandparents and aunts/uncles (2003 cohort: 30%, vs. 25% when parents are separated, vs. 20% when the child lives with no parent). Likewise, having *no* kin living close was more prevalent among children not living with both parents. These differences were smaller in cohort 2003 compared to cohort 1992. Similar proportions of children of different family structures lived close only to grandparents or only to aunts/uncles and very few lived close to great-grandparents, grandparents, and aunts/uncles.





Table 5: Proportion of children aged 16 with adult kin living in child's municipality over family structures, birth cohorts 1992 and 2003

| At least one adult kin of specific type living close to child (either in same or different household) |   |              | Children living with both parents |             | Living with one parent |             |             |             | Parent registered |             | Parent abroad | moved       |             | Not living with parents |             |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|--------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------|-------------|
|                                                                                                       |   |              | Cohort 1992                       | Cohort 2003 | Parents separated*     | Cohort 1992 | Cohort 2003 | Cohort 1992 | Cohort 2003       | Cohort 1992 |               | Cohort 1992 | Cohort 2003 | Cohort 1992             | Cohort 2003 |
| Great-grandparents                                                                                    | ✓ | Grandparents |                                   |             |                        |             |             |             |                   |             |               |             |             |                         |             |
|                                                                                                       |   |              | ✓                                 |             | ✓                      |             |             |             |                   |             |               |             |             |                         |             |
| None                                                                                                  |   |              |                                   | ✓           |                        |             |             |             |                   |             |               |             |             |                         |             |
| None                                                                                                  |   |              |                                   |             | ✓                      |             |             |             |                   |             |               |             |             |                         |             |
| None                                                                                                  |   |              | ✓                                 |             |                        |             |             |             |                   |             |               |             |             |                         |             |
| None                                                                                                  |   | None         |                                   |             |                        |             |             |             |                   |             |               |             |             |                         |             |
| None                                                                                                  |   | None         |                                   |             |                        |             |             |             |                   |             |               |             |             |                         |             |

Table notes (to be placed below respective table)

Table 1: (\*) 45.7% had both parents alive and living in Belgium (among them, 23.3% had at least one parent living in same municipality); 35.7% had only one parent alive and living in Belgium (second parent either not registered, moved abroad or deceased) (among them, 35.5% had this parent living in same municipality); 2.7% were orphans; 15.9% had both parents moved abroad (in this case, we have no information on the parent's survival).

Table 2: (\*) 40.3% had both parents alive and living in Belgium (among them, 15.9% had at least one parent living in same municipality); 41.4% had only one parent alive and living in Belgium (second parent either not registered, moved abroad or deceased) (among them, 30.9% had this parent living in same municipality); 8.2% were orphans; 10.2% had both parents moved abroad (in this case, we have no information on the parent's survival).

Table 3: (\*) 44.2% had both parents alive and living in Belgium (among them, 15.9% had at least one parent living in same municipality); 39.5% had only one parent alive and living in Belgium (second parent either not registered, moved abroad or deceased) (among them, 31.6% had this parent living in same municipality); 2.6% were orphans; 13.7% had both parents moved abroad (in this case, we have no information on the parent's survival).

Table 4: (\*) 41.4% had both parents alive and living in Belgium (among them, 14.3% had at least one parent living in same municipality); 41.3% had only one parent alive and living in Belgium (second parent either not registered, moved abroad or deceased) (among them, 26.0% had this parent living in same municipality); 6.9% were orphans; 10.4% had both parents moved abroad (in this case, we have no information on the parent's survival).

Table 5: (\*) Only the proximity to the residence of the child was considered (not the proximity to the non-resident parent).

4. Discussion

Our findings point to important social inequalities in the availabilities of informal support by adult family members for children. Kinship networks are considered the “protective cocoon” around the nuclear family unit; although the need for support may be higher in non-standard family structures, kin proximity seems to be more the privilege of children in standard families. Whereas we decided to not distinguish family members by sex, we underline that homosexual parents are included in our statistics. Future research may include this gender perspective. Similarly, to reduce complexity we focused on biological/adoptive kin and did not account for stepfamily members, although our data would have allowed us to do so. Children in non-intact families can have more kin (step- or in-law) than this study shows, which could be seen as substitutes for biological kin in terms of support. Relying on register data, we have no information on friends that may have kin-like importance for children, nor on actual support relations. Another limitation of our data is that our information on kin is limited to the resident Belgian population. In our data, municipality is the smallest spatial unit. Our approach ignores proximity of neighbouring municipalities. We encourage future studies using other measures of proximity, e.g., measured in kilometres.

We assessed different cohorts and age stages, acknowledging that kin networks may vary over the life course and across temporal contexts. We emphasize that the life course perspective in the study of children's kinship structures needs to be more addressed in future studies. The selection into kinship structures and (im)mobility decisions requires a longitudinal approach. We need to know more about the support structures in families in which the second parent is absent, ideally distinguishing the reasons (moved away, deceased, not registered). Young children not living with their parents are rarely studied in demographic research, the present statistics demonstrate that many live with or close to their kin; more research should be dedicated to them.

In sum, this study reflects recent trends in the diversifying family structures of children and documents how kinship structures differ for children of different family structures. These differences underline inequalities in the possibilities of informal support from family members.

## 5. Acknowledgement

This study uses data from Statbel (Directorate-general Statistics – Statistics Belgium) – Demobel (adaptation of the National Register). Computational resources have been provided by the supercomputing facilities of the Université catholique de Louvain (CISM/UCL) and the Consortium des Équipements de Calcul Intensif en Fédération Wallonie Bruxelles (CÉCI) funded by the Fond de la Recherche Scientifique de Belgique (F.R.S.-FNRS) under convention 2.5020.11 and by the Walloon Region.

The authors want to thank Statistics Belgium and particularly Patrick Lusyne and Cloë Ost for preparing and making anonymised administrative data available for research, Ophélie Goffinet, data manager at the Centre for Demographic Research (DEMO) for documenting the data, the CISM team for managing the statistical servers, and Sergi Vidal (CED Barcelona) and Clara H. Mulder (University of Groningen) for their useful comments.

## 6. References

- Albertini, M., Gähler, M., & Härkönen, J. (2018). Moving back to “mamma”? Divorce, intergenerational coresidence, and latent family solidarity in Sweden. *Population, Space and Place*, 24(6), e2142.
- Amato, P. R., Meyers, C. E., & Emery, R. E. (2009). Changes in nonresident father-child contact from 1976 to 2002. *Family Relations*, 58(1), 41-53.
- Bengtson, V. L. (2001). Beyond the nuclear family: the increasing importance of multigenerational bonds: the burgess award lecture. *Journal of marriage and family*, 63(1), 1-16.
- Cheadle, J. E., Amato, P. R., & King, V. (2010). Patterns of nonresident father contact. *Demography*, 47(1), 205-225.
- Cooney, T. M. (2021). Grandparents' support to young families: Variations by adult Children's union status. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 83(3), 737-753.
- Dommermuth, L. (2016). Children as family commuters. The geographical distance between nonresident parents and children in Norway (No. 841). *Discussion Papers*.
- Furstenberg, F. F. (2020). Kinship reconsidered: Research on a neglected topic. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 82(1), 364-382.
- Furstenberg, F. F., Harris, L. E., Pesando, L. M., & Reed, M. N. (2020). Kinship practices among alternative family forms in Western industrialized societies. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 82(5), 1403-1430.
- Furstenberg, F. F., & Kaplan, S. B. (2007). Social capital and the family. In J. Scott, J. Treas, M. Richards (eds), *The Blackwell companion to the sociology of families*, MA: Backwell publishing, 218-232.
- Ghosh, A., Berg, V., Bhattacharya, K., Monsivais, D., Kertesz, J., Kaski, K., & Rotkirch, A. (2019). Migration patterns of parents, children and siblings: Evidence for patrilocality in contemporary Finland. *Population, Space and Place*, 25(5), e2208.
- Hagestad, G. O. (2006). Transfers between grandparents and grandchildren: The importance of taking a three-generation perspective. *Journal of Family Research*, 18(3), 315-332.
- Jappens, M., & Van Bavel, J. (2019). Relationships with grandparents and grandchildren's well-being after parental divorce. *European Sociological Review*, 35(6), 757-771.
- Kolk, M. (2017). A life-course analysis of geographical distance to siblings, parents, and grandparents in Sweden. *Population, Space and Place*, 23(3), e2020.
- Kolk, M., Andersson, L., Pettersson, E., & Drefahl, S. (2021). The Swedish Kinship Universe—A demographic account of the number of children, parents, siblings, grandchildren, grandparents, aunts/uncles, nieces/nephews, and cousins using national population registers. *Stockholm Research Reports in Demography*, 2021(28).
- Langer, N., & Ribarich, M. (2007). Aunts, uncles—nieces, nephews: Kinship relations over the lifespan. *Educational Gerontology*, 33(1), 75-83.
- Mulder, C. H. (2007). The family context and residential choice: A challenge for new research. *Population, space and place*, 13(4), 265-278.
- Mulder, C. H., & van der Meer, M. J. (2009). Geographical distances and support from family members. *Population, space and place*, 15(4), 381-399.
- Mulder, C. H., & Wagner, M. (2012). Moving after separation: The role of location-specific capital. *Housing Studies*, 27(6), 839-852.
- Neyer, F. J., & Lang, F. R. (2003). Blood is thicker than water: kinship orientation across adulthood. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 84(2), 310.
- Schnor, C., & Jalovaara, M. (2020). The increase in non-marital childbearing and its link to educational expansion. *Acta Sociologica*, 63(4), 400-421.
- Schnor, C., & Mikolai, J. (2020). Remain, leave, or return? Mothers' location continuity after separation in Belgium. *Demographic Research*, 42, 245-292.

- Sodermans, A. K., Matthijs, K., & Swicegood, G. (2013). Characteristics of joint physical custody families in Flanders. *Demographic research*, 28, 821-848.
- Statistics Belgium (2021): Chiffres de population au 1er janvier 2021.  
[https://www.ibz.rn.fgov.be/fileadmin/user\\_upload/fr/pop/statistiques/population-bevolking-20210101.pdf](https://www.ibz.rn.fgov.be/fileadmin/user_upload/fr/pop/statistiques/population-bevolking-20210101.pdf).
- Thomas, I., Adam, A., and Verhetsel, A. (2017). Migration and commuting interactions fields: A new geography with community detection algorithm? *Belgeo: Revue Belge de Géographie* 4: 1–17.
- Thomas, M. J., & Dommermuth, L. (2020). Internal migration and the role of intergenerational family ties and life events. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 82(5), 1461-1478.
- Vanassche, S. (2013). Stepfamily configurations and trajectories following parental divorce: A quantitative study on stepfamily situations, stepfamily relationships and the wellbeing of children, PhD Thesis, KULeuven, [https://limo.libis.be/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=LIRIAS1872072&context=L&vid=Lirias&search\\_scope=Lirias&tab=default\\_tab&lang=en\\_US](https://limo.libis.be/primo-explore/fulldisplay?docid=LIRIAS1872072&context=L&vid=Lirias&search_scope=Lirias&tab=default_tab&lang=en_US)
- White, L. (2001). Sibling relationships over the life course: A panel analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63(2), 555-568.
- Wrzus, C., Hänel, M., Wagner, J., & Neyer, F. J. (2013). Social network changes and life events across the life span: a meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, 139(1), 53.
- Zartler, U. (2021). Children and parents after separation. In: Research Handbook on the Sociology of the Family. Edward Elgar Publishing, 300-313.

#### Comité d'édition

Ester Rizzi, Christine Schnor, Isabelle Theys

#### Responsable

Ester Rizzi

#### Référence de ce document

Schnor C., Damien J., Fadel L., Rees A., Zilincikova Z. (2022), *Family structure and proximity to kin during childhood*, Document de Travail 32, Centre de recherche en démographie, Louvain-la-Neuve, 16 p.

#### Contact

Isabelle Theys  
Centre de recherche en démographie  
UCLouvain  
1 Place Montesquieu bte L2.08.03  
1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgique  
Tél. 32 10 47 29 51  
[isabelle.theys@uclouvain.be](mailto:isabelle.theys@uclouvain.be)