

## **Father-Child Contact after Separation:**

### **Evidence from German Panel Data**

**Heike Trappe**

(University of Rostock, Germany)

**Michaela Kreyenfeld**

(Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research, Rostock, Germany &  
Hertie School of Governance, Berlin, Germany)

**Katja Köppen**

(University of Rostock, Germany)

With the increase in separation and divorce rates, non-resident fathers have become a growing group in all European countries. The contact that these fathers keep with their children is a policy relevant issue which has been intensively addressed in previous research for English-speaking countries. For continental Europe, there has been far less research on this topic. In this paper, we use data from the German Family Panel (pairfam) to study the determinants of father-child contact after separation. We particularly investigate how fathers' partnership history affects the contact that men have with children from prior unions. Taking into account socio-economic characteristics, custody and child support arrangements, we find that union context and custody arrangement at first birth are the most important factors which impact the frequency of contact between non-resident fathers and their minor children. Further analyses will capitalize on the panel structure of data that gives longitudinal information on father-child contact over seven consecutive years. Here we explore how changes in the partnership domain of the father's life course impact father-child contact. Our data structure allows us to investigate whether findings are robust when individually specific heterogeneity is accounted for.

Key words: non-resident fathers, father-child contact, Germany, life course, family policy

## BACKGROUND

The images and expectations of fatherhood have undergone radical changes in recent decades. It is not only that the normative pressures to act as an ‘involved father’ has increased over time, but also the desire of fathers themselves to be present in the life of their children. Despite these important forces that push men to be more involved in the upbringing of their children, there are also strong counteracting forces which work in opposite directions. Growing separation and divorce rates combined with the tendency that children regularly reside with their mother after separation create a barrier for a growing number of men to remain involved in the lives of their children after union dissolution. Against this background, researchers have diagnosed a polarization (Furstenberg 1988) or diversification (Hochschild 1995) of fatherhood - with involved and resident fathers on the one hand and non-resident fathers who have difficulties to maintain a close relationship with their children on the other hand.

It can be assumed that the changing role of fathers in society and the desire for a stronger involvement in the upbringing of their children have also altered the behavior of separated fathers. In addition legal regulations have increasingly supported the rights of non-resident fathers. However, little research exists that shows how prior and future life course experience of fathers influence men’s subsequent behavior and how this is influenced by legal regulations. Prior research has identified several determinants of fathers’ involvement after separation.

One of the key predictor of father involvement has been shown to be the fathers’ union history and the involvement of the father with his children prior to separation. Fathers who have never co-resided with the mother of their children often remain absent from their children’s lives altogether (Kiernan 2006). For fathers who lived with their children, father-child contact varies by length and type of partnership, age of the children and duration of separation (Stephen et al. 1994; Stephens 1996; Tach et al. 2010). There is evidence from longitudinal data that quantity and intensity of father-child contact deteriorates with duration of separation (Cheadle et al. 2010). It has, however, also been shown that older children often intensify the relationship to their biological fathers when they reach an age which enables them to establish contact by themselves (Scott et al. 2007). The partnership biography of both biological mother and father are other decisive factors in explaining the relationship of non-resident fathers with their children. There is consistent evidence that the quality and intensity of the relationship between the non-resident father and his children worsens, when either the

mother or the father re-partners (Bradshaw et al. 1999; Stephens 1996; Stewart 2010). The frequency and intensity of contact between the non-resident father and his children declines particularly when the mother moves in with a new partner, and thus forms a stepfamily. The arrival of a new child in the stepfamily is another factor that alters the relationship of the non-resident father and his children (Juby et al. 2007). Apart from these socio-demographic determinants, the legal context is another parameter that shapes the frequency and quality of father-child contact. There is evidence that the amount and regularity of maintenance payments are positively associated with close father-child contact (Cheadle et al. 2010; Hofferth et al. 2010). Shared custody is another factor that has been shown to be positively related to the relationship that non-resident fathers have with their children (Seltzer 1998; Stephen et al. 1994). However, it has been rather difficult to establish causality so far, as fathers who regularly pay child support or opt for a joint custody differ in many other respects from less involved fathers.

In this project, we add to the literature on the determinants of father-child contact. Our research strategy is innovative in at least two ways. Firstly, this study is among the first ones addressing the topic of father-child contact for a continental European country. For other continental European countries, there is only very scarce and predominantly descriptive research on this issue (see e.g., Régnier-Letabier 2013). Thus, the question has remained unanswered whether prior findings on the determinants of father-child contact, that mainly exist for English-speaking countries, can be transferred to other countries with different legal regulations and a different cultural understanding of fatherhood. Secondly, we have access to detailed union and fertility histories that allow us to place fathers' behavior into biographical context and evaluate how the father's union history shapes his current involvement with his children. Thirdly, our data allows us to study how father-child contact is influenced by joint parenting and custody payments. We can, thus, put the question upfront how social policy background may influence the contact of non-resident fathers with their children. There are caveats to evaluating policy effects with our data, though. As we draw on cross-sectional data, it is difficult to tease out the causal impact of joint parenting and custody payment for father-child contact. However, we have decent information on fathers' background characteristic available to account for potential confounding factors.

## INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT AND HYPOTHESES

One of the characteristic features of the German legal framework concerns the treatment of unmarried father. Until 1998, unmarried fathers had basically no legal rights towards their children. Only divorced fathers were granted the option of joint physical custody ('*gemeinsames Sorgerecht*') which includes a say in all relevant areas of a child's life such as the decision on the place of residence of the child (Dethloff 2005). The pivotal reform of the family law in 1998 that finally granted unmarried fathers joint legal custody remained limited in scope as unmarried father's custody rights were still contingent on the approval of the mother. Only after the intervention of the European Court of Justice was the German federal court prompted to initiate a change of this regulation in 2013.

For Germany, the standing of unmarried fathers is a sensitive policy issue due to the radical differences in family structures between western Germany and eastern Germany. More than 20 years into German re-unification, family structure between the formerly two separated parts of Germany radically differ. In western Germany about 25 percent of all births and 37 percent of first births are to unmarried women. In eastern Germany, more than 60 percent of all births and three quarter of all first births are to unmarried women (Pötzsch 2012). More detailed analysis based on the German family panel has shown that these are largely births to women who cohabit with their partners. Compared to other countries, the share of single mother, i.e. women who do not live with a partner when their children are born are extremely high in cross-national perspective (SOURCE).

Given the obstacles that unmarried fathers face to be present in the life of their children, one would expect that they are less likely to keep contact with their children after separation than previously married fathers (*Hypothesis 1*). Due to the high share of non-marital births in eastern Germany, one would also expect that eastern German fathers are less likely to keep contact with their children than their western German counterpart. East-West differences may disappear, however, after the differences in union histories are accounted for (*Hypothesis 2*).

## METHOD

### *Data*

This study is based on data from the 2008/09-launched German family panel pairfam ("Panel Analysis of Intimate Relationships and Family Dynamics"), a multi-disciplinary, longitudinal study for researching partnership and family dynamics in Germany (Huinink et al. 2011). The annually surveyed nationwide random sample includes information from more than 12.000

respondents of the birth cohorts 1971-73, 1981-83 and 1991-93, as well as information on their partners, parents, and children. In 2009/10, a subsample (DemoDiff) was drawn that oversampled eastern Germans of the cohorts 1971-73 and 1981-83. This sample, which enhances the possibilities to conduct in-depth comparisons of the eastern and western German population, was motivated by the observation that marked differences in family dynamics between eastern and western Germans remained, even for those cohorts that were raised after unification (Kreyenfeld et al. 2012). By now, there are seven waves of data from the German family panel available. The German family panel is well-suited for understanding how father-child contact is contingent on the prior and current union history of the father as it includes detailed information on the union history of the respondents. The data provides a full retrospective account of the union history of all respondents, including spells of living apart together relationships (LAT). Also in another respect, the data goes beyond prior family surveys. It is here possible to clearly relate children to partnerships, because respondents are requested to provide the name of the fathers of all children as well as the name of all partners. In wave 2, which will be used in this study, information on custody regulations, child support and father-child contact is included as well.

#### *Sample for investigation*

In this study, we use information on male respondents of the birth cohorts 1971-73 and 1981-83 from the second wave of the German family panel. The younger cohorts (1991-93) are excluded as hardly anyone of these cohorts has any children yet. At interview in 2009/10, the respondents from the cohorts 1971-73 were on average about 38 years of age and from the cohorts 1981-83 they were at the end of their twenties. There are 1382 fathers in the sample who have fathered 2473 children. For the investigation of father-child contact, the sample is further reduced to non-resident fathers with valid information on the contact they have with their children, which are 198 fathers with 293 children (for an overview on the sample, see Table 1 in the Appendix).

#### *Variables*

*Dependent variable.* The dependent variable in our investigation is the frequency of personal contact between the non-resident father and his child. Respondents could choose between the following seven categories: daily, several times per week, once per week, 1 – 3 times per month, several times per year, less often or no contact at all. We collapsed these categories into three groups that distinguish between less than every month (*rarely*), several times per

month, and at least every week (*several times per week*). As respondents might have more than one child, a father might have a non-residential relationship with several children, or he may not live together with a child while he resides with another child that he has with a new partner. In the multivariate analysis, we accounted for it by providing robust standard errors for the regression estimates to allow for multiple observations per person. In the descriptive analysis, we have dealt with this issue by providing descriptive statistics on the level of the child as well as on the level of the father. For analysis on the father-level, we distinguished non-residential and residential fathers. Non-resident fathers have been defined as fathers who have at least one child that lives with the biological mother or that lives with both parents alternately. A residential father co-resides with the mother and his children and does not have any children that co-reside with the biological mother only.

*Independent variables.* Education was measured as low (no vocational and no college degree), medium (vocational degree) and high (university degree). Employment status of the father considers three main categories: full-time employment, unemployment and other. Country of origin distinguishes fathers who were born in eastern Germany, western Germany and in another country. Custody regulations consider whether the non-resident father has joint custody with the mother or whether the mother has sole custody. Maintenance payments distinguish fathers who pay child support from those fathers who do not. Unfortunately, the corresponding data does not distinguish for which of the children child support was paid. Cohort membership indicates whether the father was born between 1971-73 or between 1981-83. The birth order of the child (as it relates to the father) is included in three categories (first, second, third or higher) whereas the age of the child has been measured continuously. To depict the union history of the non-resident father, four variables have been constructed.<sup>1</sup> Family status was measured at two points in time: at childbirth and at time of the interview. It includes the following categories: single, living apart together, cohabiting and being married. Duration of separation is accounted for by categorical variables (0-3 years since separation, 3-6 years since separation, more than 6 years since separation, not in union at childbirth). Finally, it is regarded whether there is at least one more child with a new partner.

### *Analytic strategy*

---

<sup>1</sup> In order to generate these variables, we have drawn on the cleaned union and fertility history produced by Schnor and Bastin (2012).

First, we present descriptive findings on the prevalence of non-resident fathers and the socio-economic composition of this population. Second, descriptive results on the frequency of father-child contact are provided. Finally, the determinants of father-child contact are assessed in a multivariate framework. Since the frequency of father-child contact is measured by an ordinal variable, we use an ordered logistic regression model:

$$Y_i^* = \beta X_i + \varepsilon_i$$

where  $X_i$  is a vector of independent variables with coefficient vector  $\beta$ .  $\varepsilon_i$  is the random disturbance term, which is assumed to be independent of  $X_i$  and follows a logistic distribution. The outcome variable  $Y_i^*$  is unobserved but an observation rule defines  $Y_i$  representing the category into which  $Y_i^*$  falls:  $Y_i = 0$  if  $Y_i^* \leq \delta_1$

$$Y_i = 1 \text{ if } \delta_1 < Y_i^* \leq \delta_2$$

$$Y_i = 2 \text{ if } Y_i^* > \delta_2$$

where  $\delta_s$  are unknown threshold parameters to be estimated. Coefficients and thresholds are estimated by maximum likelihood method (Liao 1994).

## RESULTS

### *Descriptive Results – Prevalence of non-residential fatherhood and group characteristics*

Table 1 provides information on the co-residence of children with their parents. We distinguish five types of living arrangements: co-residing with father and mother, co-residing with mother (but not father), shared parenting, co-residing with father (but not mother) and other types of arrangements such as living alone or with other relatives. The table suggests that the majority of children in our sample, around 83 percent, co-reside with their parents whereas 8 percent live with their mother. Only 1 percent of children live with both of their parents alternately (shared parenthood) and 4.5 percent co-reside with their father. In the subsequent part of this paper, we compare children with resident and non-resident fathers only. Thus, children who live with their father only, alone, or with other relatives are excluded from the analyses and the small group of fathers that opted for an arrangement of shared parenthood is considered as non-resident fathers here.

[Tab. 1 about here]



Table 1 shows that children with fathers of non-German nationality were most likely to co-reside with both of their parents. In addition, there are marked differences between children from East and West Germany with East German children being more likely to have a non-resident father (15.1 percent) than West German children (10.1 percent). This is not so much a result of a higher propensity of separations of couples with children in the eastern part of the country (Schnor 2012) but more a consequence of a higher prevalence of couples who broke up during pregnancy or of relatively uncommitted relationships in the East as compared to the West (Bastin 2012).

Table 2 gives an overview on the composition of resident and non-resident fathers, on the child as well as on the father level. Children with non-resident fathers are less likely to be born into a married family but are more likely to have a single mother than children with resident fathers. They are somewhat older than the one of resident fathers but have at the same time younger fathers. In addition, it is interesting to note that the majority of parents of children with non-resident fathers have joint custody for their children and for almost three quarters of these children the fathers pay child support.

Regarding socio-demographic characteristics, it is obvious that non-resident fathers stick out in several ways. Non-resident fathers are less likely to be highly educated and more likely to have a medium education than their counterparts. However, there is no particular concentration of separated fathers at the lowest stratum of the educational hierarchy. Nevertheless, this group is clearly disadvantaged in terms of employment. They are more than twice as likely as resident fathers to be unemployed at the time of interview and have lower chances of full-time employment suggesting that there might be harsh economic circumstances for part of this group. In addition, non-resident fathers have a slightly higher number of children than resident fathers and they were considerably younger at childbirth.

[Tab. 2 about here]

#### *Descriptive Results – Frequency of father-child contact*

Frequency of father-child contact refers to close personal contact. Respondents were asked how often they see their children. Table 3 reveals a reverse U-shaped pattern with a peak in

the middle category and lower frequencies at both ends of the distribution. About 40 percent of the children in our sample see their non-resident fathers several times a month and around a third has less or more frequent contact which is roughly in line with research of other European countries.

[Tab. 3 about here]

#### *Multivariate Results – Determinants of father-child contact*

We start with a set of models which include variables related to the partnership history of the father that are introduced stepwise (Table 4).

Fathers of older children are less likely to see them often than fathers of younger children. This might partly be because older children simply “opt out”. Fathers who were married at childbirth or cohabiting have more frequent contact with their children than fathers having been living alone or apart from their partners. Fathers tend to see their first child more often than children of higher order. When introducing the duration since separation including the category “not in a relationship at childbirth”, the positive and significant impact of cohabiting at childbirth vanishes. This suggests that fathers were cohabiting with their partner but not necessarily with their child. What really matters for father-child contact is whether they lived with their children. Fathers who were not in a relationship with the mother at the birth of their child are far less likely to establish a close relationship based on personal contact later on. The longer it has been since the parents got separated the lesser the father-child contact. Controlling for fathers’ current family status does not add to the model because of a relatively high correlation with family status at childbirth. Having children with a new partner strongly reduces the frequency of father-child contact.

The following set of models focuses on socio-economic characteristics and arrangements after separation (Table 5).

[Tab. 5 about here]

Adding fathers' employment status to the basic model indicates that unemployed fathers are somewhat less likely to have frequent contact with their children than fathers working full-time. Noteworthy, level of education which is an indicator for economic resources does not have a significant influence on father-child contact. The single most important factor is the custody arrangement. It wipes out the positive impact of a more institutionalized relationship at childbirth on the frequency of father-child contact. Having joint custody with the ex-partner makes a regular contact to the children much more likely. Paying child support does not have an additional impact.

[Tab. 6 about here]

Table 6 investigates the idea of a close interaction between family status at childbirth and custody arrangements. Contrary to expectations, the positive association between joint custody arrangements and father-child contact is independent of the family status at the time of childbirth. Across all family statuses, a sole custody of the mother lowers the frequency of father-child contact considerably.

## DISCUSSION

In this paper, we presented results on the determinants of father-child contact in Germany. Our analyses have shown that non-resident fathers are a sizeable group in Germany, a group that is more prevalent in eastern than in western Germany. One reason might be that non-marital childbearing and lone motherhood are far more common in East than in West Germany going back to different partnership dynamics in the past and still varying opportunity structures in the present (Huinink et al. in press). Non-resident fathers in Germany are a select group in several ways. They are more likely to be less educated, younger at childbirth and economically disadvantaged than fathers in general. These unfavorable characteristics have been found in other countries as well (see for the UK: Bradshaw et al. 1999, for the US: Goldscheider et al. 2009, Tach/Edin 2011). However, there might be important cross-national differences in the size of this relative disadvantage and in the underlying mechanisms. A closer inspection of the economic situation of non-resident fathers in Germany is certainly warranted.

In terms of the regularity of close contact of non-resident fathers with their children, we find a tendency towards polarization. About a third of fathers is more or less absent from the lives of

their non-resident children while another third has very regular contact. We are aware that seeing the child can mean a variety of things and involve very different activities (Bradshaw et al. 1999) and that the frequency of contact might be a poor proxy for relationship quality (Amato/Gilbreth 1999). However, we just start to explore this topic in Germany so that all information is valuable to improve our sparse knowledge base.

Regarding the determinants of father-child contact, our results indicate in line with previous research (Bradshaw et al. 1999) that the family status at childbirth matters for a continuing relationship with the child. Fathers who were married more regularly see their children than cohabiting fathers or fathers in less institutionalized relationships, like living apart together. What seems to be of even greater importance is whether the father has ever been in a relationship with the mother of his child. Fathers who never shared this experience are far less likely to establish a close relationship later on (Kiernan 2006). The arrival of a stepchild within a new relationship of the father clearly reduces the frequency of contact with his non-residing children, which is in line with previous studies (Bradshaw et al. 1999, Juby et al. 2007). These findings point to the relevance of the life course perspective for understanding father-child contact after separation. With respect to the living situation after separation, our research confirms the importance of custody arrangements (Seltzer 1998). As expected, fathers who have joint custody with the mother are considerably more likely to see their child regularly. As noted, the causality might run both ways since fathers who share custody might be more involved in the first place. As we could show, the positive association between custody arrangements and father-child contact holds across all family statuses at childbirth. It shall be noted that in Germany only since the legal reform of 1998 joint custody after divorce is the norm and it is possible for parents who are not married to apply for joint custody insofar the mother agrees (Peschel-Gutzeit 2009). Interesting and unexpected is that paying child support does not have a decisive impact on the frequency of father-child contact. For the relatively young cohorts we have been investigating here, the most recent policy reforms seem to be supportive in enabling a more regular contact between fathers and their non-resident children.

## REFERENCES

- Amato, Paul R. and Joan G. Gilbreth (1999), Nonresident Fathers and Children's Well-Being: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 61(3): 557-573.
- Bastin, Sonja et al. (in press), Diversität der Familienformen in Ost- und Westdeutschland. In: Krüger, Dorothea et al. (Eds.): *Familie(n) heute – Entwicklungen, Kontroversen, Prognosen*. Wiesbaden: Juventa.
- Bradshaw, Jonathan et al. (1999), *Absent Fathers?* New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bures, Regina M. (2009), Living Arrangements over the Life Course: Families in the 21st Century. *Journal of Family Issues* 30(5): 579-585.
- Cheadle, Jacob E. et al. (2010), Patterns of Nonresident Father Contact. *Demography* 47(1): 205-225.
- Goldscheider, Frances et al. (2009), Fatherhood across Two Generations: Factors Affecting Early Family Roles. *Journal of Family Issues* 30(5): 586-604.
- Hofferth, Sandra et al. (2010), Child Support, Father–Child Contact, and Preteens' Involvement with Nonresidential Fathers: Racial/Ethnic Differences. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 31(1): 14-32.
- Huinink, Johannes et al. (2011), Analysis of Intimate Relationships and Family Dynamics (pairfam): Conceptual Framework and Design. *Zeitschrift für Familienforschung* 23(1): 77-101.
- Huinink, Johannes et al. (in press), Familie und Partnerschaft in Ost- und Westdeutschland. Eine Bilanz. In: Huinink, Johannes et al. (Eds.): *Familie und Partnerschaft in Ost- und Westdeutschland – Ähnlich und doch immer noch anders*. Sonderheft 9 der Zeitschrift für Familienforschung. Opladen: Barbara Budrich.
- Juby, Heather et al. (2007), Nonresident Fathers and Children: Parents' New Unions and Frequency of Contact. *Journal of Family Issues* 28(9): 1220-1245.
- Kiernan, Kathleen (2006), Non-residential Fatherhood and Child Involvement: Evidence from the Millennium Cohort Study. *Journal of Social Policy* 35(4): 651-669.
- Kreyenfeld, Michaela et al. (in press), DemoDiff: A Data Set for the Study of Family Change in Eastern (and Western) Germany. *Schmollers Jahrbuch*.
- Liao, Tim Futing (1994), *Interpreting Probability Models: Logit, Probit, and Other Generalized Linear Models*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Peschel-Gutzeit, Lore Maria (2009), Entwicklung der Rechtsstellung des Vaters in den letzten 100 Jahren. In: Jurczyk, Karin/Andreas Lange (Eds.), *Vaterwerden und Vatersein heute: Neue Wege - neue Chancen!* Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung: 47-59.

Scott, Mindy E. et al. (2007), Postdivorce Father-Adolescent Closeness. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 69(5): 1194-1209.

Schnor, Christine (in press), Trennungsrisiko von Paaren mit Kindern: Der Einfluss der Religion in West- und Ostdeutschland. In: Huinink, Johannes et al. (Eds.): *Familie und Partnerschaft in Ost- und Westdeutschland – Ähnlich und doch immer noch anders*. Sonderheft 9 der Zeitschrift für Familienforschung. Opladen: Barbara Budrich.

Schnor, Christine and Sonja Bastin (2012), Partners and Babies. Partnership and Fertility Histories of the German Family Panel (pairfam) as an Event History Data Set Internal Report. Rostock: Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research.

Seltzer, Judith A. (1998), Father by Law: Effects of Joint Legal Custody on Nonresident Fathers' Involvement with Children. *Demography* 35(2): 135-146.

Stephen, Elizabeth Hervey et al. (1994), Near and Far: Contact of Children with Their Non-Residential Fathers. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage* 20(3-4): 171-191.

Stephens, Linda S. (1996), Will Johnny See Daddy This Week? *Journal of Family Issues* 17(4): 466-494.

Stewart, Susan D. (2010), Children with Nonresident Parents: Living Arrangements, Visitation, and Child Support. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72(5): 1078-1091.

Tach, Laura et al. (2010), Parenting as a "Package Deal": Relationships, Fertility, and Nonresident Father Involvement Among Unmarried Parents. *Demography* 47(1): 181-204.

Tach, Laura and Kathryn Edin (2011), The Relationship Contexts of Young Disadvantaged Men. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 635(1): 76-94.

## APPENDIX

### Tables & Figures

Table 1: Living arrangement of children by place of birth, column percent (child perspective)

	West Germany	East Germany	Other	Total	<i>N</i> <i>(children)</i>
Child co-resides with father and mother	80.8	75.4	90.3	82.6	1990
Child co-resides with mother (but not father)	8.5	14.1	5.1	8.3	263
Shared parenting	1.6	1.0	0.1	1.1	30
Child co-resides with father (but not mother)	5.2	6.5	2.0	4.5	115
Other (child lives alone, with relatives etc.)	4.0	3.1	2.5	3.5	75
Total	100	100	100	100	2473
N (children)	1214	862	397	2473	
N (fathers)	672	513	197	1382	

Notes: Weighted estimates. Weight is product of cross-sectional post-stratification weight of wave 1 and longitudinal weight of wave 2. Source: German family panel 2009/10

Table 2: Characteristics of Non-residential and Residential Fathers: Child and Father Level, Column Percent

	Resident	Non-Resident
<b>Child level</b>		
Family status at birth		
Single/LAT	0.04	0.32
Cohabiting	0.20	0.25
Married	0.76	0.43
Custody		
Joint custody	-	0.48
Mother sole custody	-	0.36
Missing	-	0.16
Child support		
No payments	-	0.25
Child support payments	-	0.72
Missing		0.02
Mean age of child (st. error)	6.41 (0.09)	9.73(0.28)
Mean age at father at birth (st. error)	29.71 (0.10)	26.54 (0.26)
N (children)	1990	293
<b>Father level</b>		
Place of birth		
West Germany	0.65	0.70
East Germany	0.11	0.19
Other	0.24	0.12
Level of education		
No degree	0.14	0.15
Vocational degree	0.60	0.67
University degree	0.26	0.17
Employment status		
Full-time employed	0.89	0.78
Unemployed	0.05	0.14
Other	0.06	0.08
Mean number of children (st. error)	1.86 (0.03)	2.01 (0.08)
N (fathers)	1,062	198

Notes: A non-residential father is here defined as a father who has at least one non-residential child who lives with the biological mother of the child. Vice versa, a residential father is a father who does not have any children who reside with the mother. Source: German family panel 2009/10



Table 3: Father-child contact (child perspective), column percent

	in %	Absolute
Several times per week	0.25	72
Several times per month	0.39	105
Less than several times per month (rarely)	0.30	98
Missing	0.06	18
Total (children)	1.00	293

Notes: Weighted estimates. Weight is product of cross-sectional post-stratification weight of wave 1 and longitudinal weight of wave 2. Source: German family panel 2009/10

Table 4: Results from ordered logit model, odds ratios, Dependent variable: father child contact (1: rarely 2: several times per month 3: several times per week)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
Country of birth										
West Germany	1		1		1		1		1	
East Germany	0.80		0.84		0.82		0.75		0.93	
Other	1.00		1.15		1.13		0.93		1.13	
Age of child (continuous)	0.86	***	0.84	***	0.85	***	0.88	**	0.88	**
Family status at birth										
Single/LAT	1		1		1		1		1	
Cohabiting	2.07	*	1.97	*	1.95	*	1.59		2.28	*
Married	2.48	**	2.60	**	2.63	**	2.01		2.89	*
Order of child										
First child			1		1		1		1	
Second child			0.61	*	0.60	*	0.60	*	0.62	
Third or higher order			0.37	*	0.35	*	0.31	**	0.33	*
Current family status										
Single					1		1		1	
LAT					0.78		0.91		1.02	
Cohabiting					0.85		1.13		1.66	
Married					0.47		0.64		1.24	
Duration since separation										
0-3 years							1		1	
3-6 years							0.34	*	0.34	*
More than 6 years							0.27	*	0.30	*
Not in relationship at childbirth							0.25	*	0.31	*
Children with new partner										
No									1	
Yes									0.37	*
Constant 1	0.18	**	0.11	***	0.09	***	0.04	***	0.17	*
Constant 2	1.14		0.72		0.64		0.33		1.32	
Sample Size (Fathers)	187		187		187		187		187	
Sample Size (Children)	275		275		275		275		275	
Log-Likelihood	-262		-258		-255		-250		-247	

Note: Controlled for cohort as well as missing information on control variables. \* p<0.1; \*\* p<0.5; \*\*\* p<0.01  
Source: German family panel 2009/2010.

Table 5: Results from ordered logit model, odds ratios, Dependent variable: father child contact (1: rarely 2: several times per month 3: several times per week)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
Country of birth										
West Germany	1		1		1		1		1	
East Germany	0.80		1.12		1.09		1.03		1.05	
Other	1.00		1.43		1.62		1.88		1.90	
Age of child										
(continuous)	0.86	**	0.86	**	0.86	**	0.89	**	0.89	**
		*		*		*		*		*
Family status at birth										
Single/LAT	1		1		1		1		1	
Cohabiting	2.07	*	2.02	*	2.10	*	1.83		1.80	
Married	2.48	**	2.36	*	2.54	*	1.35		1.34	
Employment status										
Full-time employed			1		1		1		1	
Unemployed			0.41	*	0.43		0.55		0.55	
Other			0.62		0.66		0.72		0.73	
Level of education										
No degree					1		1		1	
Vocational degree					1.41		1.70		1.66	
University degree					1.46		1.88		1.84	
Custody										
Joint custody							1	**	1	**
Mother sole custody							0.20	*	0.20	*
Child support										
No payments									1	
Child support payments									1.05	
Constant 1	0.20	**	0.18	**	0.24		0.16	*	0.16	*
Constant 2	1.25		1.19		1.63		1.28		1.30	
Sample Size (Fathers)	180		180		180		180		180	
Sample Size (Children)	259		259		259		259		259	
Log-Likelihood	-262		-258		-258		-243		-243	

Note: Controlled for cohort as well as missing information on control variables. \* p<0.1; \*\* p<0.5; \*\*\* p<0.01  
Source: German family panel 2009/2010.

Table 6: Results from ordered logit model, odds ratios, Dependent variable: father child contact (1: rarely 2: several times per month 3: several times per week), interaction of family status at birth and custody regulation

	Single/LAT	Unmarried	Married
Joint Custody	1	1	1
Mother has sole custody	0.05 ***	0.33 **	0.23 *

Note: Other variables in model, see Table 5 Model 5

\* p<0.1; \*\* p<0.5; \*\*\* p<0.01