

Does Adherence to Masculine Norms Shape Fathering Behavior?

Richard J. Petts<sup>a\*</sup>  
Ball State University

Kevin M. Shafer<sup>b</sup>  
Brigham Young University

Lee Essig<sup>c</sup>  
Brigham Young University

To cite this article, please use the following citation:

Petts, Richard J., Kevin M. Shafer, and Lee W. Essig. 2018. "Does Adherence to Masculine Norms Shape Fathers' Behaviors?" *Journal of Marriage and Family* 80:704-720.

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Petts, R.J., Shafer, K.M. and Essig, L. (2018), Does Adherence to Masculine Norms Shape Fathering Behavior?. *J. Marriage Fam*, 80: 704-720. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12476>, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12476>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions. This article may not be enhanced, enriched or otherwise transformed into a derivative work, without express permission from Wiley or by statutory rights under applicable legislation. Copyright notices must not be removed, obscured or modified. The article must be linked to Wiley's version of record on Wiley Online Library and any embedding, framing or otherwise making available the article or pages thereof by third parties from platforms, services and websites other than Wiley Online Library must be prohibited.

<sup>a</sup>Richard J. Petts (corresponding author), Department of Sociology, Ball State University, 222 North Quad, Muncie, IN 47306.

<sup>b</sup>Department of Sociology, Brigham Young University, 2019 JFSB, Provo, UT 84602.

<sup>c</sup>School of Family Life, Brigham Young University, 2086 JFSB, Provo, UT 84602.

ABSTRACT

Research suggests that many fathers struggle balancing hegemonic masculine norms with new fatherhood ideals. This study utilizes data on 2,194 fathers from a national study on fathers of children aged 2-18 and incorporates a comprehensive assessment of masculine norms to examine whether adherence to masculine norms is associated with father involvement, and whether this relationship is mediated by fathers' adherence to the new fatherhood ideal that promotes engaged, nurturing parenting. Results suggest that fathers who more closely adhere to masculine norms are less involved in instrumental and expressive parenting, and are more likely to engage in harsh discipline, than fathers who are less masculine. Adherence to masculine norms also reduces the likelihood of embracing the new fatherhood ideal, and adherence to the new fatherhood ideal at least partially mediates the relationship between masculinity and father involvement. Overall, despite changing expectations for fathers, hegemonic masculine norms continue to shape fathers' behavior.

Keywords: fatherhood; father-child relations; fathers; gender; parental investment/involvement

### Does Adherence to Masculine Norms Shape Fathers' Behaviors?

Over the past several decades, American fatherhood has been dramatically changed due to shifting paternal expectations and behaviors (Bianchi, Robinson, & Milkie, 2006; Galinsky, Aumann, & Bond, 2011). While traditional fatherhood emphasizes the breadwinner role, the new fatherhood ideal has expanded paternal roles to include active engagement in children's lives (Marsiglio & Roy, 2012). As a result, fathers spend more time parenting children than ever before—although gender differences in parenting persist (Bianchi et al., 2006). The shifting expectations and behaviors around fatherhood have seemingly benefited children, who tend to be healthier, happier, have fewer behavioral problems, and do better in school when they have highly involved fathers (Amato & Rivera, 1999; Lamb, 2010; Sarkadi et al., 2008). Accordingly, scholars have turned their attention to factors that may promote greater paternal engagement.

Although fatherhood has changed in the U. S., expectations of fatherhood remain rooted in a traditional gendered division of labor reinforced by hegemonic masculinity. That is, the primary expectations for fathers reflect dominant masculine norms such as providing and lack of emotional expression (Connell, 1995). Yet, men increasingly embrace the new fatherhood ideal, which emphasizes roles more traditionally aligned with maternal parenting expectations, like caregiving (Marsiglio & Roy, 2012; Townsend, 2002). The desire to adhere to alternative ways of fathering that can contradict prevailing norms of masculinity has created a “new male mystique” where men often struggle to meet both traditional and contemporary fathering expectations (Aumann, Galinsky, & Matos, 2011; Davis & Greenstein, 2009). As such, it is important to understand how men develop their attitudes and behaviors as fathers (Pleck, 2010).

To date, however, research on the relationship between adherence to masculine norms and fathering has yielded mixed results, which may be due, in part, to the fact that many studies

use measures of masculinity that do not fully capture hegemonic masculine norms (Bulanda, 2004; Davis & Greenstein, 2009; Hofferth & Goldschreider, 2010; Pleck, 2010; Stykes, 2015). As such, we know relatively little about the relationship between adherence to masculine norms, fathering attitudes, and fathering behaviors. Using a national sample of fathers with children ages 2-18, we address this question and extend the literature in three key ways. First, we use a multidimensional and more comprehensive indicator of masculinity than used in prior studies. Second, we consider whether masculine norm adherence influences fathering in different ways by including numerous instrumental and expressive parenting behaviors as outcomes. Third, we consider whether adherence to traditional masculine norms and the new fatherhood ideal may be used to develop competing or complementary identities that shape the ways in which men parent. In particular, we assess whether the relationship between masculinity and father involvement may be mediated by the degree to which men embrace the new fatherhood ideal.

## CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

### *Father Involvement*

Contemporary fatherhood is characterized by the expectation that men should be highly involved in parenting, contribute significant time to housework, and be an engaged and equitable spouse, partner, or co-parent (Gerson, 2010)—what has been termed the “new fatherhood ideal.” To this end, men are more engaged with their families than ever before. Recent estimates show that American mothers and fathers, on average, work nearly the same number of hours per week in paid work, housework, and childcare collectively (Pew Research Center, 2013). Yet, gender gaps in time spent on childcare and household tasks remain; women spent about 33 hours per week doing housework or engaging in direct care of children, while men averaged only 16 hours (Parker & Livingston, 2017). There are also variations in father involvement by relationship and

resident status (Berger et al., 2008; Jones & Mosher, 2013). Although societal pressures, political and institutional barriers, and gender expectations often prevent men from their ideal levels of involvement (Daly, 1996), more fathers report that emotional availability, family time, and father-child bonding are important today than in previous generations (McGill, 2014).

Because contemporary fatherhood consists of various roles and expectations, scholars typically use multidimensional constructs of father involvement. One prominent model of father involvement includes three dimensions: (a) engagement through caregiving, play, and including children in routine activities, (b) emotional, social, and psychological availability to children, and (c) responsible parenting by providing necessities for the care and development of children (Lamb et al., 1985). More recently, Pleck (2010, 2012) introduced a five dimension model consisting of positive engagement with the child, warm parenting behaviors such as hugging and praise, awareness of children's activities and communication (monitoring), indirect care (engaging in activities that are for the child but not with the child, such as advocating for the child and scheduling child activities), and ensuring that children's needs are met.

Despite the strengths of these models, many studies only focus on a narrow set of these behaviors (primarily engagement) (Finley & Schwartz, 2004; Pleck, 2010). The current study builds on these theories of father involvement to focus on multiple aspects of instrumental parenting (engagement, monitoring, and harsh discipline) and expressive parenting (warmth and emotional support) (Finley & Schwartz, 2004). Given that paternal involvement in expressive parenting is particularly understudied and may vary by how men view their role as parents (i.e., embracing traditional norms or the new fatherhood ideal), this approach allows for an assessment of how fathering attitudes and identities uniquely shape various parenting behaviors.

### *Identity and Fathering*

Identity theory suggests that identities are formed when individuals attach meaning to social statuses (e.g., man, husband, father, etc.) and their associated roles (e.g., breadwinner, caregiver, etc.) (Rane & McBride, 2000). Because individuals occupy multiple statuses, they are able to take on any number of identities; identities that are central to an individual are more likely to influence attitudes and behaviors than peripheral identities (Pasley, Petren, & Fish, 2014; Stryker, 1968). For example, men who view their occupation as their most important identity may spend more time working than with their family. Although this process is rooted in personal psychology, structural factors including cultural context and group membership play an important role in shaping how individuals see themselves (Risman, 2004; Stryker, 1968).

An important structural factor that helps shape personal identity is gender norms (Risman, 2004). For men, dominant masculine norms—or hegemonic masculinity—are a set of societal expectations that regulates attitudes and behaviors considered acceptable for men across social contexts (Connell, 1995). As a result, scholars typically conceptualize hegemonic masculine norm adherence (hereafter, masculine norm adherence or masculinity) as a multidimensional measure of attitudes and behaviors. In an initial operationalization of masculine norm adherence, Levant and colleagues (1992) included restrictive emotionality, strict avoidance of the feminine, toughness, aggressiveness, self-reliance, achievement, detached relationships, homophobia, and hyper-sexuality as domains of hegemonic masculinity. A revised measure by Mahalik and colleagues (2003) included dominance over women, hyper-competitiveness, and risk-taking behaviors as additional features of hegemonic masculinity.

Because of its broad effects on behavior, social scientists have applied measures of masculine norm adherence to outcomes including health (Courtenay, 2000) and intimate partner violence (Hearn & Whitehead, 2006). Fewer studies have considered how masculinity may

influence family interactions. The few studies that have considered the association between masculinity (often measured as traditional gender ideology) and father involvement provide no definitive answer about the relationship. One set of studies finds that men who endorse traditional gender attitudes (i.e., gender ideology, sex-role traditionalism, or traditional fathering roles) are less likely to be engaged in their children's lives than egalitarian fathers (Bulanda, 2004; DeMaris et al., 2011; Gaertner et al., 2007; NICHD Early Child Care Research Network, 2001). Another set of studies suggests there is no statistically significant relationship between gender ideology or adhering to traditional fathering roles and father involvement (Marsiglio, 1991; Stykes, 2015). Still other studies suggest that attitudes associated with masculinity are positively associated with father involvement. For example, Hofferth and Goldschreider (2010) found that traditional family attitudes were associated with more frequent praise and affection towards children, but only among fathers fulfilling nontraditional roles (i.e., working less than their wives). Wilcox (2004) also suggests that such patterns may be associated with paternal religiosity, which often emphasizes both traditional gender roles and involvement with children.

The operationalization and conceptualization of masculine norm adherence may help explain divergent findings in the extant literature. For example, many studies use gender role ideology as a proxy for masculinity (Auster & Ohm, 2000; Saez, Casado, & Wade, 2010). While non-egalitarian attitudes are common among men who strongly adhere to masculine norms (Mahalik et al., 2003), such attitudes are not wholly dependent upon masculine norm adherence. For example, numerous demographic, family, and socioeconomic characteristics are predictive of traditional gender ideologies in men (Davis & Greenstein, 2009). Moreover, gender ideology may not be a central component of personal identity—particularly for men, who often have a less vested interest in egalitarianism than women (Bolzendahl & Myers, 2004). Thus, a broader

conceptualization of masculine identity may inform our understanding of how masculinity may shape fathers' identities and their involvement with their children (Pleck, 2010).

In addition to masculine norms, men's identities may also be shaped by the new fatherhood ideal. As such, men who see fatherhood as central to their identity may be more actively engaged parents compared to men with less salient father identities (Goldberg, 2015; Hofferth et al., 2013; Pasley et al., 2014). This may be true for stepfathers and nonresident fathers as well (Goldberg, 2015; Marsiglio, 2004). Indeed, men who believe fathers should take on nurturing roles show more warmth to their children and are more engaged parents than men who identify as breadwinners (Adamsons & Pasley, 2016; McGill, 2014; Rane & McBride, 2000). Similarly, some fathers (including stepfathers and nonresident fathers) emphasize "being there" for their children over traditional paternal tasks (Marsiglio, 2004; Edin & Nelson, 2013), which may be due to changes in what men see as paternal responsibilities (Maurer, Pleck, & Rane 2003). Thus, men who identify with the new fatherhood ideal should be more engaged in instrumental and expressive parenting behaviors than men who do not.

#### *Masculine Identity, the New Fatherhood Ideal, and Fathering*

The extant literature provides some evidence that identities shaped by masculine norms and the new fatherhood ideal may both be independently associated with father involvement. However, it is unclear how these two sets of expectations may be related to one another, and how this interrelationship may be associated with father involvement. It is possible that a salient masculine identity may reduce the likelihood that men embrace the new fatherhood ideal, and be associated with lower levels of involvement with children. More specifically, men who strongly adhere to traditional masculine roles may choose to emphasize paternal roles like breadwinner and disciplinarian (Miller, 2011). For example, masculine norms strongly emphasize emotional

stoicism (Connell, 1995). Thus, adherence to these norms may reduce the likelihood that men embrace new fatherhood ideals that encourage fathers to be affectionate and nurturing (Hofferth & Goldscheider, 2010). Similarly, men who strongly identify with the new fatherhood ideal may deemphasize, reject, or reshape traditional masculinity to take on contemporary fathering roles. For example, men who actively engage in parenting behaviors traditionally performed by mothers, like caregiving, often embrace a 'caring masculinity' in which they reshape their masculine identity to allow for more active caregiving than is expected within hegemonic masculinity (Elliott, 2016; Lee & Lee, 2016). Men may also reject masculine expectations of emotional stoicism and independence to take on a primary parenting role (Lee & Lee, 2016). Thus, father involvement may be shaped by how men navigate and embrace the varying expectations associated with cultural norms of masculinity and fatherhood.

#### *Other Factors*

Other factors may also shape the relationships between masculinity, the new fatherhood ideal, and father involvement. For example, religious fathers are more likely to endorse traditional gender norms, but also report higher levels of engagement than other fathers (Wilcox, 2004). Also, men who had involved fathers while growing up are more likely to have positive fathering attitudes and be more engaged fathers themselves (Guzzo, 2011; Nicholson, Howard, & Borkowski, 2008). Moreover, traditional fathering contexts (e.g., married, biological parent) may increase the likelihood of following traditional gendered norms compared to less traditional fathering contexts (e.g., cohabiting, nonresident, stepparent), yet may also be associated with greater father involvement (Davis & Greenstein, 2009; Jones & Mosher, 2013; Townsend, 2002).

We also incorporate other contextual factors that may influence the relationship between masculinity and father involvement including father's age, race/ethnicity, education, income,

hours worked, family size, involvement prior to the birth of a child, native status, child's age and gender, and neighborhood and regional variations (Jones & Mosher, 2013; Vogel et al. 2011).

*The Current Study*

Although many American fathers have embraced the new fatherhood ideal (Bianchi et al., 2006), substantial variability in father involvement remains (Pleck, 2012). This may be partially rooted in the fact that fathers feel compelled to engage in traditional fatherhood (Aumann et al., 2011). These issues raise important questions about why certain fathers are actively engaged in children's lives while other fathers are not. It may be that adherence to masculine norms and the new fatherhood ideal are key factors associated with active paternal engagement. However, few studies have explored these relationships. Addressing this gap, three hypotheses guide this study:

- (1) Adherence to masculine norms is negatively associated with adherence to the new fatherhood ideal.
- (2) Greater adherence to masculine norms is associated with less frequent father involvement.
- (3) Fathers who adhere to masculine norms are less involved with their children because they are less likely to embrace the new fatherhood ideal.

DATA AND METHODS

*Data*

Our study utilized the Survey of Contemporary Fatherhood (SCF), a survey investigating factors predictive of father involvement. SCF is a national sample of 2,297 fathers, social fathers, stepfathers, and father figures in the U.S., collected by an interdisciplinary team of investigators from several universities in 2015. To be included in SCF, respondents had to be: (1) at least 18 years old, (2) a biological (residential or non-residential) father, residential stepfather, or

residential father figure (defined as living with a non-biological, non-adopted child in a home with the child's biological or adoptive mother, but not in a marital relationship), (3) have English language proficiency, and (4) the ability to access the survey via the internet. Fathers responded to questions about a focal child between the ages of 2 and 18, defined as the youngest biological child, adopted child, stepchild, foster child, or child for which they are a father or father figure.

SCF is a quota sample, which was used to capture various paternal roles (biological parent, stepparent, etc.) and because quota samples often produce similar results to random samples (Weinberg, Freese, & McElhattan, 2014). Potential respondents were part of a Qualtrics opt-in online panel. Panelists are recruited through online and off-line advertising, and must complete a registration form to be eligible for the panel. Panelists are restricted in the number of surveys they may complete in a year, must regularly update their information to remain in the panel, and are monitored on sociodemographic questions to ensure consistency across responses. Qualtrics provides access to approximately 100,000 panelists, who are randomly selected and proportioned for surveys according to the general population. For the SCF, once individuals were randomly selected, they were contacted about their potential eligibility for the survey and provided a link to a screening site where final eligibility regarding race/ethnicity, paternal role, and geographic residence was determined. Those who met eligibility requirements were then able to complete the survey.

Several data quality checks were used in SCF, including attention filters (i.e., "trap questions"), identification of careless respondents, safeguards against multiple submissions, and survey length minimums. These strategies were employed in accordance with the best practices in online data collection guidelines set forth by the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) (Baker et al., 2010). Multiple demographic characteristics were also used in

the sampling scheme and screening process to reduce the possibility of biased results (Smith et al., 2016; Terhanian et al., 2016). Finally, post-collection data quality checks were performed with a particular focus on parent age, child age, and other open-ended questions. These post-hoc data quality checks removed approximately 4% of respondents from the sample.

Thus, of the 2,244 fathers from the SCF that have valid data, this study focuses on 2,194 fathers who identify as the biological, adoptive, or stepfather for the focal child (50 fathers who report being a foster or “other” father were excluded from this study).

Prior research has shown that online opt-in panels are relatively representative of individuals with regular access to the internet (Tourangeau, Conrad, & Cooper, 2013). Yet, one concern with online panels is that they may exclude or underrepresent marginalized groups. While it is unclear what the overall Qualtrics panel looks like, the 2012 Current Population Survey found that slightly more than 80% of adult Americans had regular access to the internet, and racial gaps in internet usage have closed considerably since 2012, although gaps due to income, education, and rural vs. urban communities persist (Pew Research Center, 2016).

In general, the demographic estimates from the full SCF sample appear similar to those from other national datasets. For example, fathers in the SCF appear similar with respect to race/ethnicity, education, and income to fathers in nationally representative data recently collected by Pew Research (Survey of American Parents). Likewise, fathers in the SCF are similar to fathers from the National Survey of Family Growth on resident status (Shafer et al., In Press). Despite these similarities, nonresident fathers, low-SES fathers, and racial/ethnic minorities are underrepresented in the SCF. Thus, consistent with other studies using quota sampling, results from this study are not nationally representative (Yang & Banamah, 2014).

Regardless, the quality of measures used and large national sample still provide useful insight into the potential association between masculinity and father involvement.

*Dependent Variables*

SCF was designed with developmentally appropriate measures of father involvement, acknowledging that fathers do not parent similarly across a child's life course. Thus, different questions were asked about children aged 2-8 and 9-18, and separate measures were constructed by child age. SCF includes measures from datasets commonly used in research on fatherhood and parenting. Because standard measures of father involvement are lacking, exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses (EFA and CFA, respectively) were used on all measures. Following recommendations by Kline (2013), we first randomly split the 2-8 and 9-18 year old subsamples in half, and ran EFA on one half of the data and CFA on the other. We ran the EFA first, keeping all variables that had factor loadings of .40 or greater on factors with Eigenvalues greater than one. Using these results, we then ran CFA models, which showed good fit and indicated that all measures loaded at .60 or greater. These analyses are available upon request.

*Instrumental Engagement.* We incorporate three measures of instrumental engagement. First, separate indicators of *engagement* for fathers of younger and older children are used. For fathers with younger children, engagement was measured with items used in the Early Childhood Longitudinal Survey-Birth Cohort (ECLS-B) indicating how often (1 = *never* to 6 = *more than once a day*) fathers interact with their child in 14 activities such as playing, singing songs, and taking on errands ( $\alpha = .89$ ). For fathers with children ages 9-18, engagement was measured with items from the NICHD Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development (SECCYD) that indicate how often (1 = *not at all* to 5 = *everyday*) fathers engage in six activities such as eating evening meals with child and discussing family activities ( $\alpha = .91$ ). Responses are summed and

the means are used as the indicators. Second, *monitoring* was based on measures from the SECCYD and is only available for fathers of older children. It indicates how much fathers know about (1 = *not at all* to 4 = *everything*) nine items such as who child spends their time with and how child spends their money. Responses are summed ( $\alpha = .90$ ) and the mean is used as the indicator. Third, *harsh discipline* is indicated by items from the Parent-Child Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus et al., 1998). Items from this scale were asked to fathers of younger and older children, and separate indicators were constructed based on the CFA models. For fathers with children ages 2-8, harsh discipline indicates how likely (1 = *not likely* to 4 = *very likely*) fathers would (a) spank, (b) hit child back, and (c) make fun of child if child were to get angry at father ( $\alpha = .70$ ). For fathers of children ages 9-18, harsh discipline indicates how frequently (1 = *never* to 4 = *always*) fathers (a) criticize, (b) shout or yell, (c) threaten with physical harm, (d) grab, push, hit, or shove, (e) strike or hit with hands or an object, and (f) insult or swear at child ( $\alpha = .90$ ). Responses were summed and the means are used as the indicators.

*Expressive Engagement.* We incorporate two measures of expressive engagement. First, separate indicators of *warmth* are used. For fathers of younger children, warmth is indicated by eight items from the ECLS-B such as the use of affectionate nicknames and hugging and kissing child ( $\alpha = .87$ ). Items were assessed on a 1 (*not at all like me*) to 5 (*exactly like me*) scale. For fathers of children ages 9-18, items came from the SECCYD and indicate how often (1 = *never* to 4 = *always*) fathers engage in nine behaviors such as letting their child know they care about them and acting loving and affectionate toward their child ( $\alpha = .91$ ). Responses were summed and the means are used as the indicators. Second, *emotional support* is only available for fathers of older children, and indicates fathers' agreement (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*) to a series of six statements such as whether the child turns to father when upset and whether

child seeks father out when something bad happens ( $\alpha = .85$ ). These questions were based on items from the SECCYD and the National Survey of Family Growth. Responses are summed and the mean is used as the indicator.

#### *Masculine Norms*

Adherence to masculine norms was measured with the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI; Mahalik et al., 2003). We used a short version of the CMNI that consisted of 22 items, which has been shown to be strongly correlated with the full CMNI (Burns & Mahalik, 2008; Hamilton & Mahalik, 2009). The CMNI addresses various masculine norms such as emotional control, risk-taking, self-reliance, power over women, and homophobia. Each item in the CMNI is measured on a 0 (strongly disagree) to 3 (strongly agree) scale. Items were summed, and higher scores indicated greater adherence to masculine norms ( $\alpha = .71$ ).

#### *New Fatherhood Ideal*

We assess fathers' adherence to the *new fatherhood ideal* through responses to seven items (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*): (a) it is essential for the child's well-being that fathers spend time interacting and playing with their children, (b) it is difficult for men to express warm and tender affectionate feelings toward children (reverse coded), (c) a father should be as heavily involved in the care of his child as the mother, (d) fathers play a central role in the child's personality development, (e) fathers are able to enjoy children more when they are older (reverse coded), (f) the way a parent treats a child in the first 4 years has important lifelong effects, (g) if it keeps him from getting ahead in his job, a father is too involved with his children (reverse coded), and (h) in general, fathers and mothers are equally good at meeting their children's needs. Responses are summed ( $\alpha = .70$ ) and the mean is used as the indicator.

#### *Control Variables*

A number of variables were also included as controls. These include father's age, education (1 = *did not complete high school* to 5 = *completed a graduate degree*), race/ethnicity (White, Black, Latino, and other race/ethnicity, with White as the reference category), and income (1 = *no income* to 8 = *\$140,000 or more*). Father's hours worked was classified as (a) unemployed, (b) works part-time (less than 35 hours a week), (c) works full-time (35-50 hours a week, used as reference category), or (d) works more than full-time (more than 50 hours a week). Father's religiosity is indicated by responses to 11 items from the Centrality of Religiosity Scale, which assesses involvement in religious behaviors and experiences (Huber & Huber, 2012). Family structure is indicated by a set of mutually exclusive variables that assess fathers' resident status and relationship to the birth mother: (a) father is married to the birth mother (used as reference category), (b) father cohabits with birth mother, (c) father resides with child and is married to, or cohabiting with, someone other than the birth mother, (d) single father, and (e) nonresident father. Controls are also included to indicate whether the father is a stepfather (biological/adoptive father is the reference category), number of other children, child's age, child's sex (1 = *male*), whether father was born in the U.S., whether the father resides in an (a) urban (used as reference category), (b) rural, or (c) suburban area, and whether the father resides in the (a) northeast, (b) midwest (used as reference category), (c) south, or (d) west. Six items from the Nurturant Fathering Scale (Finley & Schwartz, 2004) are used to indicate fathers' perceptions of their relationships with their own father (whether their father supported them, was someone they could confide in, etc.) Responses are summed ( $\alpha = .95$ ) and the mean is used as the indicator. Finally, fathers were asked about their involvement (1 = *yes*) in 10 activities during their child's prenatal and early postnatal periods such as attending an ultrasound and being present in the delivery room. Responses are summed ( $\alpha = .93$ ) to indicate prenatal involvement.

*Analytic Strategy*

A series of regression models was used to test the hypotheses. We first used ordinary least squares (OLS) regression to assess whether adherence to masculine norms is associated with adherence to the new fatherhood ideal. We then used OLS models to assess whether adherence to masculine norms is associated with each indicator of father involvement, and then added the new fatherhood ideal variable in a separate model to assess whether this mediates the relationship between masculinity and father involvement. Standardized coefficients are presented to illustrate relative effect sizes among the predictor variables. Formal tests of mediation were also conducted using the bootstrapping method. Analyses were run using 5,000 bootstrap samples for each dependent variable, and significant mediating effects were determined using 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals (Preacher & Hayes, 2008).

Although missing data is not a major concern (less than 3% of cases include missing data), multiple imputation is used to preserve sample size (combined results from ten imputed models are used). Results are consistent in supplementary models using listwise deletion.

## RESULTS

Summary statistics are presented in Table 1. Overall, fathers in this sample appear to be relatively involved. For example, fathers of younger children engaged with them several times a week ( $M = 4.18$ ). Fathers of older children engaged with their child between once and several times a week ( $M = 3.45$ ), and knew “a lot” about their child’s activities ( $M = 3.29$ ). Fathers of younger ( $M = 2.37$ ) and older children ( $M = 1.34$ ) only sometimes engaged in harsh discipline. Fathers of younger children stated that warm behaviors toward their child are “very much like me” ( $M = 4.04$ ), and fathers of older children acted warm towards their child between often and always, on average ( $M = 3.31$ ). Finally, fathers of older children also generally agreed that their

child turns to them for emotional support ( $M = 3.90$ ). Surprisingly, fathers in the SCF did not appear to strongly conform to masculine norms; on average, fathers disagreed with statements measuring conformity to masculine norms ( $M = 27.95$ ). In contrast, fathers in the SCF, on average, generally agreed with statements linked to the new fatherhood ideal ( $M = 4.08$ ).

----- Insert Table 1 About Here -----

Results from regression models predicting fathers' adherence to the new fatherhood ideal are presented in Table 2. As expected, masculinity was negatively associated with adherence to the new fatherhood ideal ( $\beta = -0.39, p < .001$ ). That is, close adherence to masculine norms reduced the likelihood that fathers endorse statements regarding the importance of fathers, and father involvement specifically, in children's lives. Masculinity was also the strongest predictor of adherence to the new fatherhood ideal in the model, with a standardized coefficient over twice as large as the second strongest predictor (prenatal involvement).

----- Insert Table 2 About Here -----

Results from models predicting fathers' instrumental engagement with younger children are presented in Table 3. As shown in the odd numbered models, results provided consistent evidence in support of our second hypothesis that masculinity would be negatively associated with father involvement; fathers who more strongly adhered to norms of masculinity were engaged in their children's lives less frequently ( $\beta = -0.11, p < .001$ ) and were more likely to engage in harsh discipline ( $\beta = 0.35, p < .001$ ) than fathers who less closely adhered to masculine norms. Masculinity was also a relatively strong predictor of instrumental engagement.

----- Insert Table 3 About Here -----

Results in the even numbered models of Table 3 include fathers' attitudes regarding the new fatherhood ideal to test the third hypothesis that the relationship between masculinity and

father involvement would be mediated by adherence to the new fatherhood ideal, and results provided some support for this hypothesis. First, as shown in Model 2, adherence to the new fatherhood ideal was positively associated with engagement ( $\beta = 0.07, p < .05$ ) and masculinity became a weaker predictor of engagement ( $\beta = -0.07, p < .01$ ). Results from formal mediation tests provided further support for partial mediation, suggesting that adherence to the new fatherhood ideal mediated approximately 21% of the association between masculinity and engagement (results not shown). Similarly, as shown in Model 4, adherence to the new fatherhood ideal reduced the likelihood of engaging in harsh discipline ( $\beta = -0.16, p < .001$ ), and masculinity became more weakly associated with harsh discipline once this variable is included in the model ( $\beta = 0.29, p < .001$ ). Results from formal mediation tests suggested that adherence to the new fatherhood ideal mediated approximately 16% of the association between masculinity and harsh discipline for fathers of younger children (results not shown).

Results from regression models predicting fathers' instrumental engagement with older children are presented in Table 4. Similar to results in Table 3, results provided consistent evidence in support of our second hypothesis; fathers who more strongly adhered to norms of masculinity were engaged in their children's lives less frequently ( $\beta = -0.11, p < .001$ ), monitored their children less frequently ( $\beta = -0.15, p < .001$ ), and were more likely to engage in harsh discipline ( $\beta = 0.36, p < .001$ ) than fathers who less closely adhered to norms of masculinity. Masculinity also appeared to be a relatively strong predictor of instrumental engagement.

----- Insert Table 4 About Here -----

Results in the even numbered models of Table 4 include fathers' attitudes about the new fatherhood ideal. Results again provided support for the third hypothesis. As shown in Model 2,

adherence to the new fatherhood ideal was positively associated with engagement ( $\beta = 0.28, p < .001$ ) and masculinity was no longer significantly related to engagement once this variable was included. Results from formal mediation tests suggested that adherence to the new fatherhood ideal mediated approximately 91% of the association between masculinity and engagement (results not shown). Similarly, as shown in Model 4, adherence to the new fatherhood ideal was positively associated with monitoring ( $\beta = 0.33, p < .001$ ) and masculinity was no longer significantly related. Results from formal mediation tests suggested that adherence to the new fatherhood ideal mediated approximately 91% of the association between masculinity and monitoring (results not shown). As shown in Model 6, adherence to the new fatherhood ideal also reduced the likelihood of engaging in harsh discipline ( $\beta = -0.26, p < .001$ ), and masculinity became a weaker predictor of harsh discipline once this variable was included in the model ( $\beta = 0.25, p < .001$ ). Results from formal mediation tests (not shown) suggested that adherence to the new fatherhood ideal mediated 27% of the association between masculinity and harsh discipline.

Results from regression models predicting fathers' expressive engagement are presented in Table 5. As shown in the odd numbered models, results again provided consistent evidence in support of our second hypothesis; masculinity was negatively associated with warmth toward younger children ( $\beta = -0.21, p < .001$ ) and older children ( $\beta = -0.25, p < .001$ ), as well as emotional support toward older children ( $\beta = -0.30, p < .001$ ). Again, masculinity was a relatively strong predictor of expressive engagement, as this was the largest coefficient in each model.

----- Insert Table 5 About Here -----

Results in the even numbered models of Table 5 include adherence to the new fatherhood ideal, and results again provided support for the third hypothesis. As shown in Model 2,

adherence to the new fatherhood ideal was positively associated with warmth toward younger children ( $\beta = 0.50, p < .001$ ) and masculinity was no longer significantly related to warmth. Similarly, as shown in Model 4, adherence to the new fatherhood ideal was positively associated with warmth toward older children ( $\beta = 0.49, p < .001$ ) and masculinity was no longer significantly related. Results from formal mediation tests provided further support for mediation, suggesting that adherence to the new fatherhood ideal mediated approximately 85% of the associations between masculinity and warmth (results not shown). As shown in Model 6, adherence to the new fatherhood ideal was positively associated with emotional support ( $\beta = 0.44, p < .001$ ) and the association between masculinity and emotional support weakened once this variable was included ( $\beta = -0.12, p < .001$ ). Results from formal mediation tests suggested that adherence to the new fatherhood ideal mediated approximately 63% of the association between masculinity and emotional support.

## DISCUSSION

In recent decades, fathers have been encouraged to be more involved with their children. At the same time, traditional gender norms which emphasize distinctive, separate roles for men and women still persist (Bianchi et al., 2006; Aumann et al., 2011). These conflicting norms may be important for understanding variability in paternal involvement. We addressed this question by examining how adherence to masculine norms is associated with the new fatherhood ideal and a broad range of both instrumental and expressive fathering behaviors. Building on prior studies, we used a more comprehensive measure of adherence to masculine norms than prior studies. As such, we focused on three hypotheses regarding relationships between masculinity, new fatherhood, and father involvement.

*Masculinity and the New Fatherhood Ideal*

We found support for the first hypothesis by showing a negative association between adherence to masculine norms and endorsement of the new fatherhood ideal. We provide further support for the small body of studies which suggest that dominant masculine norms may be incompatible with the prioritization of nurturing, engaged fatherhood (Connell, 1995; Lee & Lee, 2016; Marsiglio & Roy, 2012; Townsend, 2002). It may be difficult for men to balance the competing norms of contemporary fatherhood with traditional masculinity. As a result, fathers may emphasize the set of roles that is most compatible with the aspect of their identity that is most central (Aumann et al., 2011; Pasley et al., 2014). Men who view their masculine identity as more salient may be less likely to perceive father involvement as significant for their child's development or well-being. In contrast, men who adopt a salient father identity, centered in roles associated with the new fatherhood ideal, may be less likely to adhere to hegemonic masculine norms which may contradict their paternal identity. As such, embracing the new fatherhood ideal may require fathers to reject traditional masculinity in favor of a caring masculinity (Elliott, 2016; Lee & Lee, 2016).

*Masculinity and Father Involvement*

Expanding on prior research addressing the relationship between gender ideology and fathering, our results supported the second hypothesis by finding that greater adherence to masculine norms is consistently (across aspects of father involvement as well as for involvement with younger and older children), and strongly (relative to other predictors), negatively associated with instrumental and expressive parenting by fathers. Furthermore, masculine norm adherence was associated with a greater likelihood of using harsh discipline. These findings suggest that greater adherence to masculine ideals may lead fathers to emphasize aspects of

parenting that are consistent with these ideals such as providing, independence, and lack of emotional expression (Connell, 1995). Thus, men who adhere to norms of masculinity may be less likely to engage in supportive parenting behaviors, while also having a higher likelihood of engaging in authoritarian (and potentially harmful) parenting practices relative to fathers who less closely adhere to masculine norms (Gaertner et al., 2012; Hofferth & Goldscheider, 2010). Although some research suggests that traditional gender ideology increases paternal involvement in some instrumental parenting tasks (especially those that promote traditional masculine norms such as autonomy), results here are consistent with studies finding that egalitarian fathers are more likely to be involved with their children and engage in more caregiving tasks than more traditional fathers (Bulanda, 2004; Hofferth & Goldscheider, 2010).

As such, results from this study inform father involvement theories in showing that adherence to traditional gender norms are a key predictor of various aspects of father involvement. In particular, gender norms appear to be influential predictors of instrumental (engagement and monitoring) as well as expressive parenting (warmth and emotional support). These results support both the Lamb et al. (1985) and Pleck (2010, 2012) models of father involvement, and extends our knowledge on expressive parenting behaviors in particular. In doing so, this study also demonstrates the need for more research to examine understudied aspects of father involvement such as expressive parenting and responsibility.

#### *Masculinity, New Fatherhood, and Involvement*

Finally, we found support for the third hypothesis suggesting that fathers who adhere to norms of masculinity are less involved with their children, at least in part, because they are less likely to embrace the new fatherhood ideal. Because of the contrasting expectations of traditional masculinity and the new fatherhood ideal (Connell, 1995; Gerson, 2010), men may behave in

ways that match their most salient identity (Pasley et al., 2014; Stryker, 1968). More specifically, our results suggest that men who identify strongly with traditional masculinity may deemphasize the significance of their engagement as fathers, resulting in lower levels of father involvement relative to less masculine men. In contrast, men who see traditional masculinity as a less salient aspect of their identity may be more likely to see fatherhood as a central aspect of their identity, increasing the likelihood that they engage in both instrumental and expressive parenting (and decreasing the likelihood that they use harsh punishments). Thus, results suggest that fathers' identities as men and fathers are interrelated and are associated with the degree to which fathers engage in instrumental and expressive parenting.

Given that hegemonic masculinity persists as the dominant gender norm in the U.S., results from this study suggest that further increasing father involvement may require changing the current gendered structure of society (Connell, 1985; Risman, 2004). Although there is some evidence that some fathers reject masculine norms to develop a caring masculinity that is more consistent with their father identity (Elliott, 2016; Lee & Lee, 2016), and that increased cultural acceptance of the new fatherhood ideal has led to increased father involvement, there may also be consequences associated with rejecting masculinity. For example, most institutions are gendered and reward adherence to hegemonic masculinity in the form of higher wages, reduced discrimination, etc. (Killewald, 2013; Risman, 2004). Understanding these processes more fully will be important in developing strategies to further reduce gender inequality.

#### *Limitations*

These findings should be tempered by the limitations of our study, however. Most notably, the use of cross-sectional data limits the conclusions we can draw in two significant ways. First, we are only able to establish associations between adherence to masculine norms,

the new fatherhood ideal, and father involvement. While gender role norms and father identities likely influence father involvement, fathers may also reshape their identities and perceptions of gender and fatherhood based on interactions with their child (Pasley et al., 2014; Stryker, 1968). Second, the relationship between adherence to masculine norms and adherence to the new fatherhood ideal may be bidirectional. Although men's masculine identities likely form prior to their identities as fathers (given that gender socialization starts from birth and that parenthood is not connected to male identity in the way that it is connected to female identity), it is reasonable to expect that father identities also shape men's conceptions of masculinity. To truly test this relationship, longitudinal data with measures of masculinity before and after fatherhood would be necessary. To our knowledge, however, such data does not exist. Nevertheless, this study contributes to the literature by uncovering the associations between these aspects of identity and father involvement. Future research should utilize longitudinal data to better understand the causal pathways between masculinity, father identities, and father involvement.

This study is also limited in its use of self-reported involvement by fathers. Fathers may provide biased reports of involvement based on their identities such that more masculine fathers may underreport expressive engagement to maintain their masculinity, and fathers who embrace the new fatherhood ideal may over-report their involvement. This also limits our understanding of fathers' emotional support, as the measure used in this study relies on fathers' reports of whether their child comes to them for emotional support. Having children's (or mothers') reports of father involvement and emotional support would help minimize this bias. In addition, future research should consider whether the relationship between masculinity and father involvement may differ among fathers facing various contextual constraints (Vogel et al. 2011). For example, any influence of masculinity may differ for nonresident fathers, especially those who may not be

fulfilling the provider role. Although supplementary analyses suggest that the relationships between masculinity, the new fatherhood ideal, and father involvement are consistent in models restricted to nonresident fathers, future research should further consider resident status and other contextual effects that may alter these relationships. Finally, these data are not randomized, but come from a quota sample taken from an opt-in panel. These data likely underrepresent disadvantaged fathers, which may suggest that this study provides a conservative estimate of the relationship between masculinity and father involvement as low-SES and racial/ethnic minority fathers are more likely to endorse traditional masculine norms, on average (Vogel et al., 2011). Regardless, we make no claims about the generalizability of our results and encourage future studies to further examine whether and how masculinity may influence fathering.

#### *Conclusion*

Despite these limitations, this study utilizes a comprehensive indicator of masculinity to better understand whether and how adherence to masculine norms shapes fathers' behaviors. Results from this study highlight the competing expectations that many fathers struggle balancing (Aumann et al., 2011; Davis & Greenstein, 2009), and suggest that the relative salience of each set of roles may be important in predicting father involvement. That is, fathers whose masculine identity is salient may be less likely to embrace the new fatherhood ideal, and be less involved with their child. In contrast, fathers who do not closely adhere to masculine norms may be more likely to view fatherhood as a salient identity, and be more involved with their child. Thus, gender ideology persists as an influential predictor of parenting behavior given the gendered structure of society (Risman, 2004), and future research should continue to examine the implications of this for fathers, mothers, and children.

REFERENCES

- Adamsons, K., & Pasley, K. (2016). Parents' fathering identity standards and later father involvement. *Journal of Family Issues, 37*(2), 221-244. doi: 10.1177/0192513X13514407.
- Amato, P. R. & Rivera, F. (1999). Paternal involvement and children's behavior problems. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 61*, 375-384. doi: 10.2307/353755.
- Aumann, K., Galinsky, E., & Matos, K. (2011). *The new male mystique*. New York: Families and Work Institute.
- Auster, C. J., & Ohm, S. C. (2000). Masculinity and femininity in contemporary American society: A reevaluation using the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. *Sex roles, 43*, 499-528. doi: 10.1023/A:1007119516728.
- Baker, R., Blumberg, S. J., Brick, J. M., Couper, M. P., Courtright, M., Dennis, J. M., ... & Kennedy, C. (2010). AAPOR report on online panels. *The Public Opinion Quarterly, 74*(4), 711-781.
- Berger, L. M., Carlson, M. J., Bzostek, S. H., & Osborne, C. (2008). Parenting practices of resident fathers: The role of marital and biological ties. *Journal of Marriage and Family 70*:625-639. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00510.x.
- Bianchi, S. M., Robinson J. P., & Milkie, M. A. (2006). *Changing rhythms of American family life*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Bolzendahl, C. I. & Myers, D. J. (2004). Feminist attitudes and support for gender equality: Opinion change in women and men, 1974-1998. *Social Forces, 83*, 759-789. doi: 10.1353/sof.2005.0005.

- Bulanda, R. E. (2004). Paternal involvement with children: The influence of gender ideologies. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66, 40-45. doi: 10.1111/j.0022-2455.2004.00003.x.
- Burns, S. M. & Mahalik, J. R. (2008). Treatment type and emotional control as predictors of men's self-assessed physical well-being following treatment for prostate cancer. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 9, 55-66. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.9.2.55.
- Connell, R.W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Courtenay, W. H. (2000). Constructions of masculinity and their influence on men's well-being: A theory of gender and health. *Social Science & Medicine*, 50(10), 1385-1401. doi: 10.1016/S0277-9536(99)00390-1.
- Daly, K. J. (1996). Spending time with the kids: Meanings of family time for fathers. *Family Relations*, 45, 466-476. doi: 10.2307/585177.
- Davis, S. N. & Greenstein, T. N. (2009). Gender ideology: Components, predictors, and consequences. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 35, 87-105. doi: 10.1146/annurev-soc-070308-115920.
- DeMaris, A., Mahoney, A., & Pargament, K. I. (2011). Doing the scut work of infant care: Does religiousness encourage father involvement? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 73, 354-368. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00811.x.
- Edin, K., & Nelson, T. J. (2013). *Doing the best I can: Fatherhood in the inner city*. University of California Press.
- Elliott, K. (2016). Caring masculinities: Theorizing an emerging concept. *Men and Masculinities*, 19, 240-259. doi: 10.1177/1097184X15576203.

- Finley, G. E., & Schwartz, S. J. (2004). The father involvement and nurturant fathering scales: Retrospective measures for adolescent and adult children. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 64*(1), 143-164. doi: 10.1177/0013164403258453.
- Gaertner, B. M., Spinrad, T. L., Eisenberg, N., & Greving, K. A. (2012). Parental childrearing attitudes as correlates of father involvement during infancy. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 69*, 962-976. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2007.00424.
- Galinsky, E., Aumann, K., & Bond, J. T. (2011). *Times are changing: Gender and generation at work and at home*. New York: Families and Work Institute. Retrieved 2015, from [www.familiesandwork.org/site/research/reports/Times\\_Are\\_Changing.pdf](http://www.familiesandwork.org/site/research/reports/Times_Are_Changing.pdf).
- Gerson, K. (2010). *The unfinished revolution: How a new generation is reshaping work, family, and gender in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Goldberg, J. S. (2015). Identity and involvement among resident and nonresident fathers. *Journal of Family Issues, 36*, 852-879. doi: 10.1177/0192513X13500963.
- Guzzo, K.B. (2011). New father's experiences with their own fathers and attitudes toward fathering. *Fathering, 9*, 268-290. doi: 10.3149/ft.0903.268.
- Hamilton, C. J. & Mahalik, J. R. (2009). Minority stress, masculinity, and social norms predicting gay men's health risk behaviors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 56*, 132-141. doi: 10.1037/a0014440.
- Hearn, J. & Whitehead, A. (2006). Collateral damage: Men's 'domestic' violence to women seen through men's relations with men. *Probation journal, 53*(1), 38-56. doi: 10.1177/0264550506060864.
- Hofferth, S. L. & Goldscheider, F. (2010). Does change in young men's employment influence fathering? *Family Relations, 59*(4), 479-493. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3729.2010.00617.x.

- Hofferth, S. L., Pleck, J. H., Goldscheider, F., Curtin, S., & Hrapczynski, K. (2013). Family structure and men's motivation for parenthood in the United States. In N. J. Cabrera and C. S. Tamis-Lemonda (Eds.), *Handbook of father involvement: Multidisciplinary perspectives*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (57-80). New York: Routledge.
- Huber, S. & Huber, O. W. (2012). The Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRS). *Religions*, 3, 710-724. doi: 10.3390/rel3030710.
- Jones, J., & Mosher, W. D. (2013). *Fathers' involvement with their children: United States, 2006-2010*. US Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics.
- Killewald, A. (2013). A reconsideration of the fatherhood premium: Marriage, coresidence, biology, and fathers' wages. *American Sociological Review*, 78, 96-116. doi: 10.1177/0003122412469204.
- Klein, R. B. (2013). Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. In Y. Petscher & C. Schatschneider (Eds.), *Applied quantitative analysis in the social sciences* (pp. 171-207). New York: Routledge.
- Lamb, M. E. (2010). How do fathers influence children's development? Let me count the ways. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.). *The Role of the Father in Child Development*, 5<sup>th</sup> edition (pp. 1-26). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Lamb, M. E., Pleck, J. H., Charnov, E. L., & Levine, J. A. (1985). Paternal behavior in humans. *American Zoologist*, 883-894. doi: 10.1093/icb/25.3.883.
- Lee, J. Y., & Lee, S. J. (2016). Caring is masculine: Stay-at-home fathers and masculine identity. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*. doi: 10.1037/men0000079.

- Levant, R. F., Hirsch, L. S., Celentano, E., & Cozza, T. M. (1992). The male role: An investigation of contemporary norms. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*.
- Mahalik, J. R., Locke, B. D., Ludlow, L. H., Diemer, M. A., Scott, R. P. J., Gottfried, M., & Freitas, G. (2003). Development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 4*, 3-25. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.4.1.3.
- Marsiglio, W. (1991). Paternal engagement activities with minor children. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 53*, 973-986. doi: 10.2307/353001.
- Marsiglio, W. (2004). When stepfathers claim stepchildren: A conceptual analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66*, 22-39. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2004.00002.x.
- Marsiglio, W. & Roy, K. (2012). *Nurturing dads: Social initiatives for contemporary fatherhood*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Maurer, T. W., Pleck, J. H., & Rane, T. R. (2003). Methodological considerations in measuring paternal identity. *Fathering, 1*(2), 117. doi: 10.3149/fth.0102.117.
- McGill, B. S. (2014). Navigating new norms of involved fatherhood: Employment, fathering attitudes, and father involvement. *Journal of Family Issues, 35*(8), 1089-1106. doi: 10.1177/0192513X14522247.
- Miller, T. (2011). Falling back into gender? Men's narratives and practices around first-time fatherhood. *Sociology, 45*, 1094-1109. doi: 10.1177/0038038511419180.
- NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (2001). Nonmaternal care and family factors in early development: An overview of the NICHD Study of Early Child Care. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 22*(5), 457-492. doi: 10.1016/S0193-3973(01)00092-2.

- Nicholson, J. S., Howard, K. S., & Borkowski, J. G. (2008). Mental models for parenting: Correlates of metaparenting among fathers of young children. *Fathering, 6*, 39-61. doi: 10.3149/fth.0601.39.
- Parker, K. & Livingston, G. (2017). Six facts about American fathers. Pew Research Center, Washington, D.C.
- Pasley, K., Petren, R. E., & Fish, J. N. (2014). Use of identity theory to inform fathering scholarship. *Journal of Family Theory and Review, 6*, 298-318. doi: 10.1111/jftr.12052.
- Pew Research Center. (2016). *Internet/Broadband Fact Sheet*. Retrieved from [www.pewinternet.org](http://www.pewinternet.org).
- Pew Research Center. (2013). *Social and demographic trends: Americans' time at paid work, housework, and childcare, 1965 to 2011*. Retrieved from [www.pewsocialtrends.org](http://www.pewsocialtrends.org).
- Pleck, J. H. (2010). Fatherhood and masculinity. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development, 5<sup>th</sup> edition* (pp. 27-57). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Pleck, J. H. (2012). Integrating father involvement in parenting research. *Parenting, 12*, 243-253. doi: 10.1080/15295192.2012.683365.
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods, 40*, 879-891. Doi: 10.3758/BRM.40.3.879.
- Rane, T. R., & McBride, B. A. (2000). Identity theory as a guide to understanding fathers' involvement with their children. *Journal of Family Issues, 21*, 347-366. doi: 10.1177/019251300021003004.
- Risman, B. J. (2004). Gender as a social structure: Theory wrestling with activism. *Gender and Society, 18*, 429-450. doi: 10.1177/0891243204265349.

- Saez, P. A., Casado, A., & Wade, J. C. (2010). Factors influencing masculinity ideology among Latino men. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, *17*, 116-128. doi: 10.3149/jms.1702.116.
- Sarkadi, A., Kristiansson, R., Oberklaid, F., & Bremberg, S. (2008). Fathers' involvement and children's developmental outcomes: A systematic review of longitudinal studies. *Acta Paediatrica*, *97*, 153-158. doi: 10.1111/j.1651-2227.2007.00572.x.
- Shafer, K., Fielding, B., Menet, E., & Holmes, E. K. (In Press). The combined influence of masculinity and depression on father involvement with adolescents. *Journal of Family Issues*.
- Smith, S. M., Roster, C. A., Linda, L. G., and Gerald, S. A., (2016). A multi-group analysis of online survey respondent data quality: Comparing a regular USA consumer panel to MTurk samples. *Journal of Business Research*, *69*(8), 3139-48. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.12.002.
- Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Finkelhor, D., Moore, D. W., & Runyan, D. (1998). Identification of child maltreatment with the Parent-Child Conflict Tactics Scales: Development and psychometric data for a national sample of American parents. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *22*, 249-270. doi: 10.1016/S0145-2134(97)00174-9.
- Stryker, S. (1968). Identity salience and role performance: The relevance of symbolic interaction theory for family research. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *30*, 558-564. doi: 10.2307/349494.
- Stykes, J. B. (2015). What matters most? Money, relationships, and visions of masculinity as key correlates of father involvement. *Fathering*, *13*, 60-79. doi: 10.3149/fth.1301.60.

- Terhanian, G., Bremer, J., Olmsted, J., & Guo, J. (2016). A process for developing an optimal model for reducing bias in nonprobability samples. *Journal of Advertising Research, 56*(1), 14-24. doi: 10.2501/JAR-2016-009.
- Tourangeau, R., Conrad, F., & Couper, M. (2013). *The science of web surveys*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Townsend, N. W. (2002). *The package deal: Marriage, work, and fatherhood in men's lives*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Vogel, D. L., Heimerdinger-Edwards, S. R., Hammer, J. H., & Hubbard, A. (2011). "Boys don't cry": Examination of the links between endorsement for masculine norms, self-stigma, and help-seeking attitudes for men from diverse backgrounds. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 58*, 368-382. doi: 10.1037/a0023688.
- Weinberg, J. D., Freese, J., & McElhattan, D. (2014). Comparing data characteristics and results of an online factorial survey between a population-based and a crowdsourced-recruited sample. *Sociological Science, 1*, 292-310. doi: 10.15195/v1.a19.
- Wilcox, W. B. (2004). *Soft patriarchs, new men: How Christianity shapes fathers and husbands*. University of Chicago Press.
- Yang, K., & Banamah, A. (2014). Quota sampling as an alternative to probability sampling? An experimental study. *Sociological Research Online, 19*, 1-11. doi: 10.5153/sro.3199.

Table 1. Summary Statistics

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>
<u>Dependent Variables</u>				
Engagement (ages 2-8)	4.18	0.83	1	6
Engagement (ages 9-18)	3.45	0.76	1	5
Monitoring (ages 9-18)	3.29	0.53	1	4
Harsh Discipline (ages 2-8)	2.37	0.45	1	4
Harsh Discipline (ages 9-18)	1.34	0.52	1	4
Warmth (ages 2-8)	4.04	0.59	1	5
Warmth (ages 9-18)	3.31	0.53	1	5
Emotional Support (ages 9-18)	3.90	0.76	1	5
Masculinity	28.55	6.61	0	66
New Fatherhood Ideal	4.02	0.53	1	5
<u>Controls</u>				
Age	39.64	10.20	18	81
White*	0.72	-	0	1
Black	0.10	-	0	1
Latino	0.11	-	0	1
Other Race	0.07	-	0	1
Education	3.34	0.98	1	5
Income	4.59	1.72	1	8
Unemployed	0.15	-	0	1
Works Part-Time	0.08	-	0	1
Works Full-Time*	0.69	-	0	1
Works more than Full Time	0.08	-	0	1
Religiosity	3.24	1.08	1	5
Married to Birth Mother*	0.64	-	0	1
Cohabiting with Birth Mother	0.13	-	0	1
Residing with Other Partner	0.04	-	0	1
Single Father	0.12	-	0	1
Nonresident Father	0.07	-	0	1
Stepfather	0.11	-	0	1
Number of Other Children	1.16	1.13	0	4
Focal Child Age	8.56	4.83	2	18
Focal Child is Male	0.58	-	0	1
Own Father Involvement	3.41	1.15	1	5
Prenatal Involvement	7.69	3.23	0	10
U.S. Native	0.94	-	0	1
Urban*	0.27	-	0	1
Rural	0.20	-	0	1
Suburban	0.53	-	0	1
Northeast	0.20	-	0	1
Midwest*	0.24	-	0	1
South	0.37	-	0	1
West	0.19	-	0	1

N = 2194 (1151 for outcomes involving children ages 2-8; 1043 for outcomes involving children ages 9-18)

\*Used as reference category

Table 2. Results from OLS Regression Models Predicting Fathers' Adherence to the New Fatherhood Ideal

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE b</i>
Masculinity	-0.39	0.00***
<u>Controls</u>		
Age	0.10	0.00***
Black	0.04	0.04
Latino	0.01	0.03
Other Race	0.02	0.04
Education	-0.04	0.01
Income	-0.02	0.01
Unemployed	0.02	0.03
Works Part-Time	-0.07	0.04**
Works more than Full Time	0.03	0.04
Religiosity	0.01	0.01
Cohabiting with Birth Mother	-0.01	0.03
Residing with Other Partner	0.02	0.05
Single Father	0.01	0.03
Nonresident Father	0.03	0.04
Stepfather	0.08	0.04***
Number of Other Children	0.00	0.01
Focal Child Age	-0.08	0.00**
Focal Child is Male	-0.09	0.02***
Own Father Involvement	0.06	0.01**
Prenatal Involvement	0.19	0.00***
U.S. Native	0.03	0.05
Rural	0.07	0.03**
Suburban	0.06	0.02**
Northeast	-0.01	0.03
South	0.01	0.03
West	-0.03	0.03
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.24	

N = 2194. Standardized coefficients are presented.

\**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01. \*\*\**p* < .001

Table 3. Results from OLS Regression Models Predicting Fathers' Instrumental Engagement with Children Aged 2-8

Variable	Engagement				Harsh Discipline			
	1		2		3		4	
	$\beta$	SE b	$\beta$	SE b	$\beta$	SE b	$\beta$	SE b
Masculinity	-0.11	0.00***	-0.07	0.00**	0.35	0.00***	0.29	0.00***
New Fatherhood Ideal			0.07	0.05*			-0.16	0.03***
<u>Controls</u>								
Age	-0.15	0.00***	-0.16	0.00***	-0.14	0.00**	-0.12	0.00**
Black	-0.02	0.09	-0.02	0.08	0.07	0.05**	0.07	0.05**
Latino	0.01	0.07	0.01	0.07	-0.01	0.05	-0.01	0.05
Other Race	-0.01	0.09	-0.01	0.09	-0.01	0.06	-0.01	0.06
Education	-0.06	0.03	-0.06	0.03	0.00	0.02	-0.00	0.02
Income	0.10	0.02**	0.10	0.02**	0.04	0.01	0.04	0.01
Unemployed	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.07	-0.01	0.05	-0.01	0.05
Works Part-Time	0.06	0.08*	0.06	0.08*	0.04	0.05	0.03	0.05
Works more than Full Time	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.09	-0.03	0.06	-0.02	0.06
Religiosity	0.24	0.02***	0.24	0.02***	0.12	0.01***	0.13	0.01***
Cohabiting with Birth Mother	0.03	0.07	0.03	0.07	0.07	0.05**	0.07	0.05**
Residing with Other Partner	-0.00	0.16	-0.01	0.16	0.02	0.10	0.02	0.10
Single Father	0.00	0.09	0.00	0.09	0.04	0.06	0.04	0.06
Nonresident Father	-0.10	0.10***	-0.11	0.10***	-0.01	0.07	-0.01	0.07
Stepfather	0.12	0.11***	0.11	0.11**	-0.09	0.06**	-0.07	0.06*
Number of Other Children	-0.07	0.02*	-0.06	0.02*	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02
Focal Child Age	-0.10	0.01***	-0.10	0.01***	-0.07	0.00	-0.08	0.01
Focal Child is Male	-0.02	0.05	-0.01	0.05	0.10	0.04**	0.09	0.04*
Own Father Involvement	0.11	0.02***	0.10	0.02***	0.06	0.01*	0.07	0.01**
Prenatal Involvement	0.20	0.01***	0.18	0.01***	-0.13	0.01***	-0.10	0.01**
U.S. Native	0.04	0.11	0.04	0.11	-0.03	0.07	-0.02	0.07
Rural	-0.06	0.07	-0.06	0.07	-0.04	0.05	-0.03	0.05
Suburban	-0.06	0.06	-0.06	0.06	-0.11	0.04***	-0.10	0.04**
Northeast	0.01	0.07	0.01	0.07	0.03	0.06	0.02	0.06
South	-0.00	0.06	-0.00	0.06	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.04
West	-0.04	0.07	-0.04	0.07	0.01	0.06	0.00	0.06
$R^2$	0.21		0.21		0.27		0.29	

N = 1151. Standardized coefficients are presented. \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$

Table 4. Results from OLS Regression Models Predicting Fathers' Instrumental Engagement with Children Aged 9-18

Variable	Engagement				Monitoring				Harsh Discipline			
	1		2		3		4		5		6	
	$\beta$	SE b	$\beta$	SE b	$\beta$	SE b	$\beta$	SE b	$\beta$	SE b	$\beta$	SE b
Masculinity	-0.11	0.00***	0.01	0.00	-0.15	0.00***	-0.01	0.00	0.36	0.00***	0.25	0.00***
New Fatherhood Ideal			0.28	0.05***			0.33	0.03***			-0.26	0.03***
<u>Controls</u>												
Age	-0.05	0.00	-0.08	0.00*	-0.07	0.00*	-0.11	0.00**	-0.22	0.00***	-0.19	0.00***
Black	0.02	0.08	0.01	0.08	-0.01	0.05	-0.02	0.05	0.01	0.05	0.02	0.05
Latino	0.03	0.09	0.03	0.09	-0.03	0.06	-0.03	0.06	-0.01	0.06	-0.01	0.05
Other Race	-0.00	0.11	-0.01	0.10	-0.03	0.07	-0.04	0.06	-0.02	0.06	-0.01	0.06
Education	-0.01	0.03	-0.01	0.03	-0.05	0.02	-0.05	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.02
Income	0.06	0.02	0.06	0.02	0.09	0.01*	0.08	0.01*	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.01
Unemployed	0.08	0.07*	0.08	0.07**	0.07	0.05*	0.07	0.04*	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.04
Works Part-Time	0.00	0.10	0.03	0.09	-0.03	0.06	-0.01	0.06	0.08	0.06**	0.06	0.06*
Works more than Full Time	0.02	0.09	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.05	-0.05	0.05	-0.05	0.05
Religiosity	0.22	0.02***	0.22	0.02***	0.09	0.01**	0.08	0.01**	0.13	0.01***	0.13	0.01***
Cohabiting with Birth Mother	0.03	0.08	0.02	0.08	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.05
Residing with Other Partner	0.06	0.11*	0.06	0.11	0.09	0.07**	0.08	0.07**	0.01	0.07	0.02	0.06
Single Father	0.02	0.07	0.01	0.07	0.02	0.05	0.01	0.04	-0.03	0.04	-0.02	0.04
Nonresident Father	-0.20	0.09***	-0.21	0.08***	-0.19	0.06***	-0.21	0.05***	-0.03	0.05	-0.02	0.05
Stepfather	0.06	0.10	0.05	0.09	-0.03	0.06	-0.04	0.06	0.00	0.06	0.01	0.06
Number of Other Children	-0.07	0.02*	-0.07	0.02*	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	-0.03	0.01	-0.02	0.01
Focal Child Age	-0.09	0.01*	-0.06	0.01	-0.12	0.01***	-0.09	0.01**	0.04	0.01	0.02	0.01
Focal Child is Male	0.04	0.05	0.06	0.05*	0.00	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.08	0.03**	0.05	0.03*
Own Father Involvement	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.10	0.01**	0.09	0.01**	-0.04	0.01	-0.03	0.01
Prenatal Involvement	0.20	0.01***	0.15	0.01***	0.15	0.01***	0.10	0.01*	-0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01
U.S. Native	-0.02	0.11	-0.03	0.10	-0.01	0.07	-0.02	0.06	-0.00	0.06	0.01	0.06
Rural	0.02	0.07	0.00	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.04	-0.07	0.04	-0.05	0.04
Suburban	-0.03	0.06	-0.04	0.06	-0.01	0.04	-0.02	0.04	-0.10	0.04**	-0.09	0.03**
Northeast	0.00	0.07	0.02	0.07	-0.04	0.04	-0.03	0.04	-0.04	0.04	-0.05	0.04
South	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.04	-0.07	0.04*	-0.07	0.04*
West	0.01	0.07	0.03	0.07	-0.05	0.05	-0.02	0.05	-0.07	0.04	-0.09	0.04**
$R^2$	0.19		0.25		0.19		0.26		0.25		0.30	

N = 1043. Standardized coefficients are presented. \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$

Table 5. Results from OLS Regression Models Predicting Fathers' Expressive Engagement

Variable	Warmth (Ages 2-8)				Warmth (Ages 9-18)				Emotional Support (Ages 9-18)			
	1		2		3		4		5		6	
	$\beta$	SE b	$\beta$	SE b	$\beta$	SE b	$\beta$	SE b	$\beta$	SE b	$\beta$	SE b
Masculinity	-0.21	0.00***	-0.03	0.00	-0.25	0.00***	-0.05	0.00	-0.30	0.00***	-0.12	0.00***
New Fatherhood Ideal			0.50	0.03***			0.49	0.03***			0.44	0.04***
<u>Controls</u>												
Age	0.02	0.00	-0.02	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-0.06	0.00	0.08	0.00*	0.04	0.00
Black	0.01	0.06	-0.01	0.06	0.01	0.06	-0.01	0.05	-0.00	0.08	-0.01	0.07
Latino	0.03	0.05	0.02	0.05	-0.04	0.06	-0.05	0.06	-0.01	0.08	-0.01	0.07
Other Race	-0.01	0.07	-0.01	0.06	0.00	0.07	-0.01	0.06	0.01	0.10	-0.01	0.09
Education	-0.04	0.02	-0.01	0.02	-0.09	0.02**	-0.08	0.02**	-0.05	0.03	-0.04	0.02
Income	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.09	0.01*	0.09	0.01**	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.01
Unemployed	0.01	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.07	0.03	0.06
Works Part-Time	0.02	0.06	0.05	0.06	-0.09	0.07**	-0.05	0.06*	-0.09	0.09**	-0.05	0.08*
Works more than Full Time	-0.01	0.07	-0.03	0.06	-0.00	0.06	-0.01	0.05	0.03	0.08	0.02	0.07
Religiosity	0.09	0.02**	0.09	0.02***	0.18	0.02***	0.17	0.01***	0.08	0.02**	0.07	0.02**
Cohabiting with Birth Mother	-0.04	0.05	-0.02	0.05	0.02	0.06	0.01	0.05	0.03	0.07	0.02	0.07
Residing with Other Partner	0.03	0.12	0.01	0.11	0.09	0.07**	0.09	0.07**	0.10	0.10**	0.09	0.09**
Single Father	0.01	0.07	0.02	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.03	0.04	0.12	0.07***	0.10	0.06***
Nonresident Father	-0.02	0.08	-0.03	0.07	0.03	0.06	0.01	0.05	-0.04	0.08	-0.06	0.07*
Stepfather	0.11	0.08**	0.05	0.07	-0.06	0.07	-0.08	0.06*	-0.05	0.09	-0.06	0.08
Number of Other Children	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	-0.02	0.02	-0.03	0.01	0.00	0.02	-0.00	0.02
Focal Child Age	-0.15	0.01***	-0.13	0.01***	-0.07	0.01*	-0.03	0.01	-0.12	0.01***	-0.08	0.01**
Focal Child is Male	-0.12	0.04***	-0.07	0.03**	-0.04	0.03	-0.00	0.03	-0.04	0.04	-0.00	0.04
Own Father Involvement	0.05	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.07	0.01*	0.06	0.01*	0.10	0.02**	0.08	0.02**
Prenatal Involvement	0.25	0.01***	0.16	0.01***	0.17	0.01***	0.08	0.01*	0.14	0.01**	0.06	0.01
U.S. Native	-0.02	0.08	-0.03	0.07	0.01	0.07	-0.00	0.06	0.01	0.09	-0.00	0.09
Rural	0.04	0.06	0.00	0.05	0.01	0.05	-0.02	0.04	0.08	0.07*	0.05	0.06
Suburban	0.06	0.04	0.01	0.04	-0.02	0.04	-0.03	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.05
Northeast	0.02	0.05	0.01	0.05	0.00	0.04	0.03	0.04	-0.02	0.07	-0.00	0.06
South	0.03	0.05	0.02	0.04	0.07	0.04*	0.07	0.04*	0.07	0.06	0.07	0.05*
West	-0.03	0.06	-0.04	0.05	-0.03	0.05	0.00	0.04	-0.01	0.07	0.03	0.06
$R^2$	0.19		0.37		0.20		0.38		0.21		0.35	

N = 1151 for models predicting engagement with children ages 2-8; 1043 for models predicting engagement with children ages 9-18. Standardized coefficients are presented. \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .