Father’s Masculinity Ideology and Their Adolescent’s Perception of Father’s Love

Syeda Sanober Rizvi

Abstract—The present study was undertaken to explore the relationship between masculinity ideology of fathers and perception of father’s love among adolescents. The Urdu translated versions of the Male Role Norms Inventory Revised (MRNI-R) and the Fatherhood Scale (FS) was used on a Pakistani population. The study was carried out with a sample of 308, consisting of 154 father-adolescent dyads. It was found that responsible paternal engagement had a high negative correlation with masculinity ideology. It was also negatively correlated with extreme self-reliance, aggression, dominance, restrictive emotionality and total MRNI R. No differences were found between perceptions of boys and girls, however it was found that young adolescents perceived their fathers as most involved and engaged as compared to middle and late adolescents. Results also showed that first born perceived their fathers more positively; but this was only true for boys.

Index Terms—Father love, masculinity ideology, paternal engagement, perception.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the past four decades, there has been a considerable rise in researches focusing on fatherhood and its influence on children. Predominantly, a gap was identified in the fatherhood researches regarding father’s relationship with their adolescents, particularly daughters [1]. This is mostly the case in South Asian countries where fathers are considered emotionally distant from their adolescents. A meta-analysis of the trends in the fatherhood literature indicated a close relation between the construct of ‘masculinity’ and ‘fatherhood’.

The concept of fatherhood has evolved in due course of time. The stages of fatherhood are defined as a moral teacher, breadwinner, gender role model, and nurturing father [2]. The prime structure of fatherhood in the twentieth century had at its core, fathers’ active bread winning role in the family [3]. The regular presence of mothers as children’s primary care givers encouraged the hidden assumption that father-child relationships had slight impact on children’s development, and this popular belief was supported by developmental theorists throughout history. But now it is understood that fathers present a different kind of parenting from mothers; and that many fathers have a longing to be more involved with their children to shift beyond the usual breadwinning role.

In gender studies, masculine is contrasted with feminine and fatherhood is understood through the reference of motherhood. So understanding fatherhood implies that fatherhood is perceived as an expression of masculinity, which is related to construction of gender identity. Thus, although fathers are able to care like mothers, childcare performed by fathers is principally different from mothers’ care. It is more of a ‘masculine’ care, which is more playful, physical, less structured and protective [4]. The striking difference between the ‘hegemonic masculinity’ and the ‘ideal man’ should be understood first. The ‘ideal man’ or the ‘unblushing male’ is the imagined or archetype: the man all the women want and who all the men want to be [5]. The forceful aspect of the ideal man and its use by the hegemonic masculinity also affects what can be identified as a global drift within the Western cultures towards ‘softer’ and more involved men, known as a ‘new man’ and a ‘new father’. The bigger accomplishment in accepting the concept of ‘new father’ is in understanding the impact of the masculinity ideals on fatherhood.

Men’s involvement in family life is still limited and there isn’t a remarkable change in fathering yet. Researches indicate that mothers still spend more time with their children than fathers [6]. Researches add that father involvement is not natural, universal or even essential in some cultures and at the same time, these cultures produce cognitively, socially and emotionally competent children [7]. It should be pointed out that new concepts of fatherhood may emerge, yet the varied images of fatherhood co-exist [8].

It should be mentioned that while paternal involvement is a highly desirable fatherhood trait, it does not suggest that fathers need to be indispensable parents. It rather asserts fatherhood to be an important aspect of child development [6]. Fathers play a vital role in providing a substantial amount of nurturance, moral and ethical guidance, emotional and financial support [9]. Having a look at the models of fatherhood, a model proposes to move on to fathers’ multidimensional roles as per their importance [2].

Although adolescents spend more time away from their parents and look up to their friends for cues on how to dress and which parties to go to; mothers and fathers continue to have a strong influence, especially upon their children's beliefs, values, and plans for the future. And although teenagers rely more upon their mothers for emotional support, the relationship with fathers continues to be important. Adolescents rely more upon their fathers for conversation, advice, and just ‘being there’ [10]. Unfortunately, some fathers seem to withdraw from their teenagers. Whether this is due to a man’s concern for instilling independence in his children, or due to changes and stresses he is experiencing in his own life, a reduction in a father's availability and guidance during his children’s adolescence years can have bad consequences. This is especially the case for daughters.
Adolescent girls may find self-esteem in their relationships with mothers, but they find guidance about how to relate to others and how to plan for the future from their fathers [11].

Masculinity ideology refers to beliefs about the importance of men adhering to culturally defined standards for behavior. It differs from masculine gender orientation and is also distinct from gender related beliefs. Masculinity ideology is the individual’s endorsement to and internalization of cultural belief systems about masculinity and male gender, rooted in the structural relationship between the two sexes [12]. Through social processes, masculinity ideology informs and encourages men to conform to the prevailing male role norms by adopting certain socially sanctioned masculine behaviors and avoiding certain behaviors. The seven norms of traditional masculinity ideology are: Avoidance of Femininity, Fear and Hatred of Homosexuals, Self-Reliance, Aggression, Dominance, Non-relational Attitudes toward Sexuality, and Restrictive Emotionality [13].

Pakistan, being a highly heterogeneous society, reveals clear differences between different populations (urban/rural, low/high income and various ethnic groups), some common features that characterize the family life in South Asia can still be outlined. Strong family bonds determine community life. Moreover; family adherence and mutual dependency take precedence on an individual’s needs and goals [14]. Men dominate the family life by handling most of the decision making and setting rules at home. Children are desired and valued by both parents. A man generally marries one woman at a time and considers his wife and children his responsibility and property. Women mostly rely on men in financial terms and the society is highly gender differentiated. Researchers have discussed important differences in urban and rural lives in father roles. Rural fathers are found to spend more time with children, particularly male children by working together in fields, and other means of earning. In cities, urban fathers spend less time with their children due to long working hours. Thus they are more democratic fathers too [3].

While analyzing characteristics of the representation of ‘the man’ in Pakistani culture, masculinity ideology appears at its fullest. The culturally defined Pakistani man is an aggressive, powerful, dominant and successful person, having due interest in heterosexuality and avoiding femininity to adhere to masculinity ideology. Pakistani literature is also full of examples of this kind of manhood ideals. Urdu literature and media in particular portrays the ‘macho’ man.

Research; on the other hand shows that fathers with more gender equality beliefs have a tendency to be more active, responsible, and warm, and to check their children’s behavior more than those fathers with less gender lenient values [3]. Good fathering and careful parental training enables children to grow up into well-adjusted normal people. Unfortunately, the role of a father in traditional Pakistani society is reduced to that of bread winner and financial provider only. With reference to parent-adolescent relationship it was found in one study that Pakistani adolescents feel that their parents don’t understand them. Their relationship with their parents is not friendly and they find it difficult to discuss their problems with their parents [15].

There is lack of research on fathering, and its effects in particular in Pakistan. This may be as a result of neglect; as mothers are considered the major source of affection and perceived as the primary care taker, as opposed to fathers. But with the changing economic situation; with more dual career families and fathers having to play a more active role in child care and upbringing; it becomes necessary to explore and examine the role and effect of fathers on the development of their children.

Researchers, in their analysis of approximately 100 studies on parent-child relationships, reported that children’s perceptions of their father’s acceptance/rejection, affection/indifference was as essential as mother’s love in predicting the social, emotional, and cognitive growth of children and young adults [16].

There is dire need of research on the relationship between masculinity and fatherhood, which clearly establishes a link between fatherhood and male identity. This is somehow amazing because parenting constitutes a large part of men’s lives. It is not understood that how men perceive their own fatherhood, how their children perceive their fatherhood; how other expectations affect modern involved fathering and how this all is related to men perceiving themselves as ‘men’? In the situation where men are not sure of their role as fathers and are simultaneously facing the challenge of new fatherhood, ‘involved fathering’ seems to be related to ‘masculine’ self-image. The objective of the present study is to explore the relationship between masculinity ideology and father’s love as determined by adolescent’s perceptions of their fathers.

II. METHOD

A. Hypotheses

1) Men with more tolerant masculinity ideology will be perceived as more responsibly engaged fathers.
2) Dominant men will be perceived less responsible paternally engaged fathers.
3) Extreme self-reliant men will be perceived more responsible fathers.
4) Aggressive men will score low on responsible paternal engagement.
5) Men scoring high on restrictive emotionality will be scoring low on positive paternal emotional responsiveness.

B. Participants

The sample was collected in the form of father-adolescent dyads (N= 308). This was essential because the men giving responses on masculinity ideology scale had to be compared with their children’s responses on their fatherhood. Fathers were selected who were married (not divorced or widowed), living in intact families and having at least one adolescent child either girl or boy, or both. The fathers in the sample were 130 whereas their adolescents were 154 (95 boys and 59 girls). This is because 24 fathers had 2 to 4 adolescents in the sample. So the total number of fathers remained 130; however, their responses are counted separately for each child as 154 to make the father-adolescent dyad comparison.
possible. In the present study adolescents are described as children whose ages range from 12 to 19 years.

C. Instruments

1) Male role norms inventory revised (MRNI-R)

The MRNI-R by [13] assesses "traditional" masculinity ideology. MRNI-R consists of 53 items with 7 subscales. The items, presented in a random sequence, consist of normative statements to which respondents indicate the degree of their agreement or disagreement on 7-point Likert-type scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). The subscales are: Avoidance of Femininity, Extreme Self Reliance, Aggression, Dominance, Restrictive Emotionality, Non-Relational Attitudes toward Sexuality, and Fear and Hatred of Homosexuals. There are a total of 53 items, with a score range of 53–371. The Urdu MRNI-R translated version was used in the present study [17]. The alpha reliability coefficients of the translated Urdu version of the scale were: Avoidance of Femininity (α =.63), Self-Reliance (α =.64), Aggression (α =.65), Dominance (α =.62), Restrictive Emotionality (α =.64), non-relational attitudes towards sexuality (α =.65), fear and hatred towards homosexuality (α =.64), and total MRNI-R (α =.66) [17].

2) Fatherhood scale (FS)

The Fatherhood Scale [18] consists of 64 items with 9 subscales. The items, presented in a random sequence,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>AOF</th>
<th>ESR</th>
<th>AGG</th>
<th>DOM</th>
<th>ATTSEX</th>
<th>REM</th>
<th>HOMO</th>
<th>MRNI-R Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. PE</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PPER</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. RPE</td>
<td>-.04**</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: MRNI-R = Male Role Norm Inventory Revised; AOF = Avoidance of Femininity; ESR = Extreme Self Reliance; AGG = Aggression; DOM = Dominance; REM = Restrictive Emotionality; ATTSEX = Non-Relational Attitudes toward Sexuality; HOMO = Fear and Hatred of Homosexuals; PE = Positive Engagement; PPER = Positive Paternal Emotional Responsiveness; RPE = Responsible Paternal Engagement.

For determining reliability of MRNI-R and its subscales, alpha coefficients were calculated. Correlation analysis was run to see the internal consistency of the scale. The subscales were in high positive correlation with each other and total MRNI R, ranging from .29 to .79 at p < .01 level. However, Fear and Hatred of Homosexuals was non-significant with Extreme Self Reliance. Inter scale correlations between the three subscales of FS used ranged from .53 to .61 at p < .01 level.

Table I reveals the correlation matrix between the total and subscales of MRNI-R and subscales of FS. The Responsible Paternal Engagement (FS subscale) was found to be negatively related to all the subscales of MRNI-R. All these relationships were found to be statistically significant except that with Fear and Hatred of Homosexuals subscale. None of the other relationships was statistically significant.
The age group of adolescents was divided into three categories; Early adolescence (12 – 13 yrs) (n = 73), Middle Adolescence (14 – 15 yrs) (n = 51), and Late Adolescence (16 – 19 yrs) (n = 30).

Table II shows the results of One Way Analysis of Variance for the subscales of FS with respect to three adolescent levels. The results indicate significant differences in Positive Engagement, Positive Paternal Emotional Responsiveness, Responsible Paternal Engagement. This means that early adolescents perceive their fathers to be more engaged in these fathering roles as compared to the middle adolescents, while the middle adolescents perceive their fathers to be more involved than late adolescents.

### TABLE III: MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND F VALUES FOR GIRLS’ AGE ON FS (N = 59)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS</th>
<th>Early Adolescence (12 to 13 years) (n = 35)</th>
<th>Middle Adolescence (14 to 15 years) (n = 14)</th>
<th>Late Adolescence (16 to 19 years) (n = 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>M = 18.31, SD = 3.506, F = 1.386, p = .259</td>
<td>M = 16.88, SD = 3.754, F = 2.451, p = .041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPER</td>
<td>M = 56.28, SD = 7.16, F = 2.242, p = .116</td>
<td>M = 6.438, SD = 51.44, F = 6.735, p = .028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPE</td>
<td>M = 29.26, SD = 7.81, F = 3.390, p = .035</td>
<td>M = 7.547, SD = 22.13, F = 3.90, p = .041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between groups df = 2; Within group df = 36; Groups total df = 58

Note: PE = Positive Engagement; PPER = Positive Paternal Emotional Responsiveness; RPE = Responsible Paternal Engagement.

Table III shows the results of One Way Analysis of Variance for the subscales of FS with respect to three adolescent levels of girls. The results indicate significant differences in positive paternal engagement. This means that early adolescent girls perceive their fathers to be more engaged in these fathering roles as compared to the middle adolescent girls, while the late adolescent girls perceive their fathers least involved among the three groups, scoring quite low in comparison.

### TABLE IV: MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND F VALUES FOR BOYS’ AGE ON FS (N = 95)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS</th>
<th>Early Adolescence (12 to 13 years) (n = 38)</th>
<th>Middle Adolescence (14 to 15 years) (n = 37)</th>
<th>Late Adolescence (16 to 19 years) (n = 20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RPE</td>
<td>M = 29.35, SD = 5.776, F = 6.373, p = .003</td>
<td>M = 29.51, SD = 5.015, F = 6.557, p = .037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between groups df = 2; Within group df = 92; Groups total df = 94

Note. PE = Positive Engagement; PPER = Positive Paternal Emotional Responsiveness; RPE = Responsible Paternal Engagement.

Table IV shows the results of One Way Analysis of Variance for the subscales of FS with respect to three adolescent levels of boys. The means of early adolescents are the highest. The results indicate significant differences in Positive Engagement and Responsible Paternal Engagement. This means that early adolescent boys perceive their fathers to be more positively engaged, and better at other paternal roles as compared to the middle adolescent boys, while the middle adolescent boys think their fathers are more involved than the late adolescent boys, who score considerably low as compared to the other two groups. The birth order was probed from adolescents to find out how it affects their perception of father’s love. One way analysis of variance was computed.

### TABLE V: MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND F VALUES FOR BIRTH ORDER OF ADOLESCENTS ON FS (N = 154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FS</th>
<th>First Born (n = 54)</th>
<th>Middle Born (n = 68)</th>
<th>Last Born (n = 32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>M = 19.47, SD = 2.876, F = 4.847, p = .009</td>
<td>M = 17.61, SD = 3.783, F = 3.019</td>
<td>M = 18.13, SD = 3.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPE</td>
<td>M = 29.17, SD = 6.009, F = .490, p = .490</td>
<td>M = 27.03, SD = 7.492, F = 5.845</td>
<td>M = 27.87, SD = 5.845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between groups df = 2; Within group df = 151; Groups total df = 153

Note: PE = Positive Engagement; PPER = Positive Paternal Emotional Responsiveness; RPE = Responsible Paternal Engagement.

Table V reveals the differences on the birth order of adolescents. The mean scores of first born adolescents are the
highest. The results indicate significant differences in Positive Engagement and Responsible Paternal Engagement. This means that interestingly first born adolescents perceive their fathers love them the most, followed by the last born adolescents and the middle born adolescents perceive their father’s love to be greater involved in comparison with the other two.

Table VI reveals the differences on the birth order of adolescent boys on FS. The first born adolescent boys score the highest means. As indicated by Table 18, the first born adolescent boys perceive their father’s love to be greater, followed by the last born adolescent boys and the middle born adolescent boys perceive their fathers as least involved in comparison with the other two, here indicated only by the Positive Engagement subscale. Analysis of birth order of girls revealed non-significant differences.

III. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The present study aimed to establish a relationship between the constructs of fatherhood and masculinity ideology which it did. There were facets of masculinity ideology and fatherhood which were expected to be interrelated and were measured through various subscales.

Alpha coefficients indicate the scale was found to be internally consistent (ranging from .62 - .66). Research supports that the MRNI R has low reliabilities when translated in other languages particularly in cross-national studies: Although most of these studies used correct methods of back-translation and attempts were made not only to translate the word but the concept (e.g., “shiny new bicycle” was substituted for “shiny new car” in the China studies) it is likely that unintended alterations in meaning and social desirability when English words are translated into other languages, which can add to non-random but unknown variations in item endorsement and low reliabilities [13].

It was hypothesized that men with more tolerant masculinity ideology would be perceived as more responsibly engaged fathers. This hypothesis was verified as men with tolerant masculinity ideology scored low on MRNI-R subscales and high on FS subscales. Therefore, a man who believes in masculinity ideals will be emotionally closer to his children, would listen to them more and would feel more responsibility towards them in matters other than involving finances and discipline. Responsible Paternal Engagement subscale of FS was found to have highly negative correlation with all the subscales of MRNI R (except Fear and Hatred of Homosexuals). Higher masculinity scores lead to less responsible fatherhood. Restrictive Emotionality is surprisingly highly correlated with responsible engagement, indicating that, the more a man restricts and balances his emotions, the more responsible he is as a father. However, the total MRNI-R score is highly correlated with responsible paternal engagement, showing that the overall masculine men are less responsibly engaged fathers. Fear and Hatred of homosexuals is an area not openly discussed in Pakistan and it is not surprising that it was found to be unrelated to fatherhood. Similarly, Restrictive Emotionality is not significant in any of fatherhood scales, meaning that morality or gender role of a father remains the same, irrespective of whether he is emotionally restricted or responsive.

The hypothesis “Dominant men would be perceived less responsible paternally engaged fathers” was also verified. More dominant men try to maintain their dominance at home; they keep the family distant and observe a silent discipline to make sure their command is obeyed. By contrast the less dominant men will be more paternally engaged with their adolescents, as the adolescents feel free to communicate and entrust their feelings with the father. It was also confirmed that extreme self-reliant men were not perceived to be more responsible fathers. The extreme self-reliance is self-explanatory; not only being self-reliant but rather overdoing it to extreme levels to prove the myth of masculinity. Men who believe it more, turn out to be less responsibly engaged fathers, whereas the ones who are moderately self-reliant in a realistic manner turn out to be quite responsible at fatherhood.

Aggressive men scored low on responsible paternal engagement. Like dominance, a man who is aggressive, and believes it to be an important facet of masculinity, will compromise his fathering.

It was found that early adolescents perceived their fathers to be most engaged in above mentioned fathering roles as compared to the middle adolescents, while the middle adolescents perceived their fathers to be more involved than late adolescents. In Pakistan, early adolescents is the group, which is newly out of childhood, who have still not entered the critical periods of parental conflict and are cared for and pampered. On the contrary, late adolescents are the group that have crossed puberty, and have to face autonomy and independence issues resulting in parental conflicts. Middle adolescents lie between these two groups and are still children who have not quite begun to feel like adults yet, therefore fewer parental conflicts are encountered.

It is quite logical for early adolescent girls to perceive their father as more responsible as this is the ideal time of father-daughter relationship. After the onset of puberty, identification with the mother begins; girls get detached from fathers, shy away; and find their mothers more appropriate for sharing. Finally at the late adolescence level, girls are closely bonded with their mothers and become distant with fathers as gender differentiation is now at its peak. In case of boys, early adolescents look up to their fathers as role models in a heroic manner. They don’t face any conflict of interest at that stage, and try to copy and follow him. As adolescence years go by, the boys start developing their own personalities and individual priorities resulting in varying conflicts which may last up to adolescence. That is why late adolescent boys perceive their fathers less effective at fatherhood as compared to the other two groups.

Parents’ attitude and behaviors vary from first to last born child. In the current study, the birth order was not controlled because the sample was hardly accessible in Pakistan. Most fathers were apprehensive about allowing their adolescent children to participate in the study due to the two subscales of MRNI-R dealing with sexuality items. Although the fathers were assured that their children would be administered different items and were even shown the FS subscales, however, many fathers still refused.
The results indicated significant differences in Positive Engagement, Gender Role Model and Responsible Paternal Engagement. This indicates that the first born adolescents perceive their fathers better at fatherhood, followed by the last born adolescents. The middle born adolescents perceive their fathers as least involved. It is evident that first and last born are the favorites in most families. Again, the first child is exceptional in the manner that he/she is the one who gets maximum and exclusive care and attention of the parents. Therefore, bonding of first born is long lasting. The last born is the one who is pampered the most, and being the youngest child, enjoys many privileges not granted to the elder children. The middle born receive the care and concern by the parents; however, there is nothing special regarding their standing at home.

Considering the girls’ birth order, no significant mean differences were seen. As discussed above, girls may not be as close to the fathers as they are with their mothers. So the three categories of girls perceive their fathers more or less at the similar stage of engagement. The first born adolescent boys perceive their fathers high at fatherhood, followed by the last born adolescent boys and the middle born adolescent boys perceive their fathers as least involved in comparison with the other two, here indicated only by the positive engagement subscale.

The present investigation has several implications for research and practice. On the research front, the current study has made a few contributions to the existing literature. It also confirmed and extended past research regarding the masculinity ideology and fatherhood. The study concludes that fathers are indeed acknowledged as a great resource for masculinity and parenting ideals in the Western contexts. In case of Pakistan, cultural masculinity and parenting ideals are highly divergent from their Western counterparts. Research needs to shift its focus on adapting models that are culturally and religiously more meaningful. For example, in South Asia mothers are children’s primary caregivers, because both culture and religion promotes sharply outlined gender roles.

Several practical implications of this study also exist for parents and schools. The concept of fatherhood needs to be fully understood, experienced and taught. Though it comes naturally to men when they have kids, tactful fathering is something fathers must learn. A very important implication of the study pertains to the fathers in therapy or simply men when they have kids, tactful fathering is something fathers must learn. A very important implication of the study pertains to the fathers in therapy or simply men when they have kids, tactful fathering is something fathers must learn.

Finally, what are the Pakistani adolescent boys and girls’ masculinity ideals? These questions are left for future research to answer.
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