

## Latino Fathers: The Relationship Among Machismo, Acculturation, Ethnic Identity, and Paternal Involvement

Jon Glass  
Gannon University

Jesse Owen  
University of Louisville

Paternal involvement with children is associated with better outcomes for children and family functioning. There are, however, few data examining the intersection of cultural norms and paternal involvement. For Latino fathers in the United States, paternal involvement may vary on the basis of cultural and gender norms, acculturation process, and ethnic identity. The current study used self-report surveys to examine the perceptions of 67 Latino fathers regarding their paternal involvement, machismo (i.e., macho and caballerismo), degree of acculturation, and ethnic identity. The bivariate correlations revealed Latino fathers' Latino acculturation, and macho attitudes were significantly associated with paternal involvement, whereas ethnic identity and caballerismo attitudes were not. In the linear regression analysis, only Latino fathers' macho attitudes were negatively associated with paternal involvement after accounting for the variance in the other variables.

*Keywords:* Latino fathers, machismo, ethnic identity, acculturation, paternal involvement

The concept of paternal involvement has a long tradition that transcends cultural boundaries (Pleck, 2004). Over the past 30 years there has been renewed interest in the involvement of fathers in parenting, with increasing attention on racial/ethnic minority fathers (e.g., Cabrera & Garcia-Coll, 2004; Coltrane, Parke, & Adams, 2004; Lamb & Tamis-LeMonda, 2004; Landale & Oropresa, 2001). The tripart framework of paternal involvement—engagement, accessibility, and responsibility (Day & Lamb, 2003; Lamb, 2000)—allows for a nuanced look at how fathers fulfill their familial obligations, and is especially important in that it recognizes that fathers are more than breadwinners (Pleck, 2004). For example, *engagement* refers to the amount of time the father is doing something with the child that promotes development, such as playing, doing homework, or conversing. *Accessibility* describes

how physically available the father is to the child, and *responsibility* describes how the father participates as a day-to-day caregiver. Responsibility generally includes the role of breadwinner, but there are other recognized behaviors in this domain, such as making medical appointments, attending parent-teacher conferences, and shopping for groceries (Lamb, 2000). This expanded responsibility domain, which includes more than simple “breadwinning” (Parsons & Bales, 1955), is especially important in the context of the modern family, in which both the father and mother are often wage earners. While the three domains are theoretically separate, in reality there is a great deal of overlap. For example, a father taking his child to soccer practice would be involved in all three domains simultaneously.

Research has shown that paternal involvement can have a direct influence on a child's well-being, such as improved academic performance, enhanced self-esteem, and diminished depressive symptoms (Cabrera, Tamis-LeMonda, Bradely, Hofferth, & Lamb, 2000; Coltrane et al., 2004; Cummings, DeArth-Pendley, Schudlich, & Smith, 2001; Flouri & Buchanan, 2003; Goodyear, Newcomb, & Allison, 2000; Jones, Beach, &

---

Jon Glass, Psychology Department, Gannon University; Jesse Owen, Education and Counseling Psychology Department, University of Louisville.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jon Glass, Psychology Department, Gannon University, 109 University Square, Erie, PA 16541. E-mail: glass004@gannon.edu

Fincham, 2006). Moreover, paternal involvement can have positive indirect effects on the family by providing more emotional, physical, and financial resources, which can in turn create a facilitative environment that nurtures family subsystems and allows them to prosper (e.g., maternal-child, parental subsystem, and sibling relationships; King, Harris, & Heard, 2004; Lamb & Tamis-LeMonda, 2004; Pleck & Masciadrelli, 2004). Although paternal involvement is related to positive child and family outcomes, there are multiple factors that influence parental involvement, including the father's cultural and social contexts as well as family form (Schmitz, 2005). For example, Latino (Latina) young adults of divorced parents reported lower paternal involvement than did children of intact families. Latino fathers also reported more instrumental involvement (i.e., accessibility and responsibility) than expressive involvement (i.e., engagement; Finley & Schwartz, 2006; Schwartz & Finley, 2005). The current study will specifically focus on how Latino fathers perceive their involvement with their children.

Latinos have become the largest minority population in the United States (U.S. Census, 2004), yet the research on Latino fathers has not kept pace with this growth (e.g., Campos, 2008). The term *Latino* is used in reference to individuals from various cultures from North, Central, and South America, all with unique histories, customs, and experiences in the United States (see Umaña-Taylor & Fine, 2001). There are, however, many shared values across Latino cultures, such as *familismo*, *respeto*, and *educación* (Arciniega, Anderson, Tovar-Blank, & Tracey, 2008; Halgunseth, Ispa, & Rudy, 2006; Schmitz, 2005; Toth & Xu, 1999; Villareal, Blozis, & Widaman, 2005). In the United States, Latino individuals face institutional and personal discrimination, including limited access to quality education, jobs, and social support, and they are overrepresented in lower socioeconomic status (SES) brackets (Cabrera & Garcia-Coll, 2004). Additionally, many Latino fathers are immigrants and face language barriers that inhibit access to resources (Cabrera & Garcia-Coll, 2004). Given the cultural heritage, histories, and norms coupled with the sociopolitical environment in the United States, several scholars have noted that the paternal involvement of Latino men may be shaped by these experiences (Abreu, Goodyear,

Campos, & Newcomb, 2000; Cabrera & Garcia-Coll, 2004; Campos, 2008; Coltrane et al., 2004; Taylor & Behnke, 2005; Umaña-Taylor & Fine, 2001). As such, we focus on Latino fathers' level of acculturation, ethnic identity, and traditional Latino gender norms, or *machismo*.

*Acculturation* is the ongoing process of change that occurs when two or more cultures come into contact (e.g., Padilla, 2006; Sodowsky & Maestas, 2000). Latino individuals have to balance their unique cultural traditions with those of the majority culture of the United States (Cabrera & Garcia-Coll, 2004). Acculturation is multifaceted in that it recognizes several different approaches utilized by minority individuals (Berry & Sam, 1997). These approaches create a continuum of potential acculturation statuses, ranging from separation to assimilation to biculturalism. *Separation* refers to an exclusive retention of culture of origin, and *assimilation* is rejection of the culture of origin and complete acceptance of the dominant culture. *Biculturalism* describes fluency in both cultures. Crouter, Davis, Updegraff, Delgado, and Fortner (2006) found that reports of workplace racism from Latino fathers who were less acculturated, and thus had greater separation, were more strongly associated with depressive symptoms than that from those who were more acculturated. The acculturation process of Latino men is likely to relate to their attitudes toward fathering (Crouter et al., 2006). The Latino father may define his parental role according to the norms of the Latino culture or the Eurocentric culture of the United States (Coltrane et al., 2004). For example, *familismo* (familism) is common in Latino families. *Familismo* emphasizes the centrality of the family, giving the needs of the family unit precedence over those of the individual (e.g., Halgunseth et al., 2006). Such a focus on the family system may promote emotional connections with other family members and can have an indirect influence on father-child interactions (Arciniega et al., 2008; Coltrane, Parke, & Adams, 2004; Torres, Solberg, & Carlstrom, 2002). Consequently, a Latino father who retains Latino cultural values, such as *familismo*, may exercise more paternal involvement.

Related to acculturation, *ethnic identity* describes the degree to which individuals recognize themselves as part of a particular ethnic

group, as well as the degree to which such belonging is valued (Phinney, 2003). Although ethnic identity and acculturation are closely related, they are separate concepts (Fragoso & Kashubeck, 2000; Umaña-Taylor, Yazedjian, & Bámaca-Gómez, 2004). Ethnic identity development, which may co-occur with the acculturation process, involves personal feelings about being a member of an ethnic group (Phinney, 2003). For example, a Latino father may rely on assimilation and acculturation processes to manage his work relationships, but still have a strong commitment to membership in an ethnic group (Phinney & Ong, 2007).

Beyond ethnic identity and acculturation, it is important to understand how gender norms may influence paternal involvement. Traditionally, researchers have utilized the concept of *machismo* to describe Latino masculine norms, but have focused primarily on negative aspects such as sexism, aggressive attitudes, hypermasculinity, and interpersonal dogmatism (Arciniega et al., 2008; Torres et al., 2002). Some researchers have even interpreted *machismo* as a pathological defense mechanism (Neff, 2001). This characterization, however, has been challenged as being unidimensional and ethnocentric (Arciniega et al., 2008; Torres et al., 2002). Moreover, this traditional view does not account for positive aspects of *machismo*, which include pride in and taking responsibility for the family. By re-evaluating the definition and measurement of *machismo*, researchers are gaining a new perspective on what this construct means for Latino men (Casas, Wagenheim, Banchemo, & Mendoza-Romero, 1994).

As with other views of masculinity (e.g., Mahalik et al., 2003), *machismo* is a multidimensional construct (Torres et al., 2002). Specifically, *caballerismo* (Arciniega et al., 2008) is a dimension of *machismo* defined by egalitarian beliefs, affiliation, positive family relationships, and empathy (Arciniega et al., 2008; Neff, 2001; Torres et al., 2002). Thus, Latino fathers have the cultural expectation to be emotionally involved with their children. For example, the concept of *respeto* (respect), which has been commonly described in Latino families, is characterized by “harmonious interpersonal relationships through respect for self and others” (Halgunseth et al., 2006, p. 1286). A critical aspect of *respeto* is the fundamental belief that each family member has a role, and that each

individual is to be respected for fulfilling that function, which corresponds to the positive aspects of *caballerismo*. Formoso, Gonzales, Barrera, and Dumka (2007) found that strong, collaborative interparental support can bolster the quality of involvement that Latino fathers have with their children.

In contrast to *caballerismo*, *macho* attitudes refer to the traditionally defined negative aspects of *machismo*, such as dominance, hostility, and interpersonal dogmatism (Arciniega et al., 2008). Thus, the *macho* facet of *machismo* is likely to be negatively related to the parental involvement of Latino fathers. For instance, a *macho* attitude might affect the ability to provide *educación*. This requires an emotional father-child relationship, and includes teaching children proper morals and important values, responsibility for actions and conduct, and ways of managing interpersonal relationships (Halgunseth et al., 2006). Currently, no known studies have examined this conceptualization of *machismo* with Latino fathers.

## Hypotheses

The current study examined how the acculturation process, ethnic identity, and *machismo* of Latino fathers is related to their parental involvement, after controlling for demographic variables including age, number of children, and relationship status. Specifically, we posited that the Latino acculturation of Latino fathers will be positively associated with their paternal involvement, whereas their American acculturation will be negatively associated with their paternal involvement (Hypothesis 1). Additionally, the ethnic identity of Latino fathers (Hypothesis 2), and *caballerismo* attitudes (Hypothesis 3) will be positively associated with paternal involvement. Conversely, the *macho* attitudes of Latino fathers will be negatively related to their parental involvement (Hypothesis 4).

## Method

### Participants

Seventy Latino fathers participated in this study. The average age was 41 years old, with a range from 23 to 66 years old. The majority reported their nationality as either Mexican

(24%) or Puerto Rican (36%), although many other countries were represented, including the mainland United States, Honduras, Cuba, Brazil, Ecuador, El Salvador, and Peru. Socioeconomically, the sample was heterogeneous: Participants' annual income ranged from less than \$10,000 to over \$71,000, with a median of \$21,000 to \$30,000. Participants lived in the United States an average of 21 years, with a range from 6 months to 50 years. The median number of children was two, and the median number of children living with each participant was one. Seventy fathers participated, but only 67 provided sufficient data for analysis; 3 participants were excluded from analyses, because they did not complete the dependent variable measure or failed to complete two or more independent variable measures.

### Procedures

Participants were recruited via community agencies, a local employer, and Internet sources. Participants were given the opportunity to complete the measures online or to receive a paper version. Paper versions of the survey were distributed to 26 employees of a local business or a community resource agency. Participants were informed verbally and in writing that their participation was voluntary. Furthermore, the authors and the employer made significant efforts to clarify that other than allowing access to employees, the employer had no involvement in the study, nor would participation, or lack thereof, impact employment. Forty-one Latino fathers participated via the Internet. These men were recruited from a variety of social networking sites such as Facebook, as well as sites created specifically for Latino individuals. For example, the chief editor of the Hispanic Marketing and Public Relations Website allowed the authors to post a link to the study on that Website. Because of the use of the Internet as a collection point, it is not possible to estimate how many potential participants were contacted. The invitations to participate were distributed in both English and Spanish. All participants were eligible to enter a raffle for \$100.00.

All measures were translated and back-translated by native Spanish speakers using methods suggested by cross-cultural psychologists (Brislin, 1986; Marín & Marín, 1991). This method has been used in recent studies,

supporting its validity in cross-cultural research with Latinos (Martinez, Ainsworth, & Elder, 2008; Salas-Provance, Erickson, & Reed, 2002). Initially, a professional translator translated all materials (informed consent and measures) into standard Spanish to avoid dialect problems. This version was also proofread by another native speaker from a different country of origin prior to the next step. In the second step a volunteer, whose first language is Spanish, translated the materials back into English without seeing the source document. The first author then compared the back-translated English version with the original English version, and found four items that were semantically different from the original source. These linguistic discrepancies were resolved by repeating the back-translation process, this time being translated by a university Spanish professor, whose first language is Spanish, and back-translated by the same volunteer translator as in Step 2. After this second round of back-translation, there were no further semantic differences.

### Measures

**Abbreviated Multidimensional Acculturation Scale—ZABB—20 (AMAS—ZABB—20; Zea, Reisen, Poppen, Bianchi, & Echeverry, 2007).** The AMAS—ZABB—20 is a multidimensional acculturation scale that has been used with Latino samples, and served as the operational definition for acculturation in this study. The 20 items are rated on a 4-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree/not at all*) to 4 (*strongly agree/extremely well*). There are two subscales, each consisting of 10 parallel items, allowing participants to rate their level of both Latino and U.S. acculturation. An example item for the Latino acculturation subscale is, "How well do you know Latino or Latina American political leaders?" An example item for the U.S. acculturation subscale is, "How well do you know U.S.—American political leaders?" For each subscale, the items were averaged to create a mean score for U.S. and Latino acculturation, respectively. The shortened version was recently derived from the larger 42-item AMAS—ZABB (Zea, Asner-Self, Birman, & Buki, 2003; Zea et al., 2007). Evidence for both divergent and discriminant validity was supported by correlations with the Bicultural Involvement Questionnaire—B and the Multigroup Ethnic Identity

Measure (Phinney, 2003; Zea et al., 2003). In the present study, the Cronbach alphas for Latino and U.S. acculturation were .83 and .90, respectively.

**Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure—Revised (MEIM–R; Phinney & Ong, 2007).** The MEIM–R assesses ethnic identity on the basis of two factors: exploration and commitment. *Exploration* consists of behaviors that are focused on learning more about one’s ethnic heritage, such as reading history of the ethnic group, learning the language, or meeting other people from the same group. *Commitment* describes the degree to which an individual values ethnic group membership. There are a total of six items, three for exploration and three for commitment. On the basis of the high correlation between exploration and commitment ( $r = .71$ ), the present study used the total scale score. The items are rated on a 5-point scale, with 5 (*strongly agree*) and 1 (*strongly disagree*) as anchors, with higher scores indicating stronger ethnic identity. In the present study, Cronbach’s alpha was .90.

**Machismo Measure (MM; Arciniega et al., 2008).** The MM consists of 10 items that measure traditional *machismo* and 10 that assess *caballerismo*, rated on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*very strongly disagree*) to 7 (*very strongly agree*). Example items include “Real men never let down their guard” (traditional *machismo*) and “Men should respect their elders” (*caballerismo*). Previous studies have found that the MM subscales are generally independent of each other ( $r = .11$ ). Although this instrument is a measure of attitudes, it is correlated with behavior. For example, the *macho* scale has been significantly related to number of arrests, number of fights, and alcohol use, and the *caballerismo* scale was significantly related to positive problem solving and ethnic identity (Arciniega et al., 2008). Thus, although the MM does not measure behavior, it does offer some predictive validity. There was no significant relationship between the two subscales in the present study ( $r = -.19$ ), and Cronbach alphas for the *macho* and *caballerismo* subscales were .89 and .80, respectively.

**Inventory of Father Involvement (IFI; Bradford, Hawkins, Palkovitz, Christiansen, & Day, 2002).** Paternal involvement was defined by the IFI, a 26-item measure that assesses a father’s involvement in terms of affective,

cognitive, and behavioral aspects. Related to Lamb’s (2000) tripart definition of paternal involvement, the IFI has items that reflect responsibility (e.g., “Accepting financial responsibility for children you have fathered”), engagement (e.g., “Spending time just talking with your children when they want to talk about something”), and accessibility (e.g., “Attending events your child participates in”). Participants are instructed to rate how well they have done on each item over the past 12 months, on a 7-point scale, ranging from 0 (*very poor*) to 6 (*excellent*). Reports of more paternal involvement have been related to fewer behavioral/emotional problems for their children (Flouri, 2004). Additionally, support for the reliability of the IFI has been noted in previous studies (i.e., Cronbach alphas = .95 and .97; Bradford et al., 2002; Flouri, 2004). In the present study, the Cronbach’s alpha was .98.

## Results

### Preliminary Analyses

Surveys for this study were collected in both paper-and-pencil ( $n = 26$ ) and Web-based formats ( $n = 41$ ), so we conducted  $t$  tests to examine whether scores on the variables differed on the basis of the format. Although there were no statistically significant differences between fathers who completed the measures via paper and pencil and the Web for Latino acculturation,  $t(64) = -2.0$ ,  $p = .07$ ,  $d = -0.44$ , ethnic identity,  $t(65) = -1.51$ ,  $p = .14$ ,  $d = -0.38$ , the *macho* scale,  $t(65) = 1.11$ ,  $p = .27$ ,  $d = 2.69$ , or the *caballerismo* scale,  $t(65) = -0.28$ ,  $p = .79$ ,  $d = -0.07$ , the effect sizes revealed that there may be some meaningful differences between the groups. Furthermore, Web-based participants had statistically significantly higher U.S. American acculturation scores,  $t(64) = 3.78$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 0.99$ , than did paper-and-pencil participants. On the IFI, fathers who completed the paper-and-pencil version scored statistically significantly higher than did the fathers who completed the Web-based version,  $t(65) = -3.16$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $d = 0.75$ . In addition, fathers who completed the Web-based survey reported higher income than did fathers who completed the paper-and-pencil surveys ( $r = -.34$ ). Latino fathers’ number of total children and the number of the

children in the home were not significantly correlated to IFI scores ( $ps > .05$ ). Given these differences, we included the format in which participants' completed the study as a control variable. Additionally, the variables were generally normally distributed; however, the *caballerismo* scale was not (Kurtosis = 7.74). Simply, these scores exhibited a ceiling effect, wherein the majority of participants reported high levels of *caballerismo*. Typically, measures with restricted variability hamper the ability to detect an effect (see the Discussion section). Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics for the variables in the current study.

### Primary Analyses

To examine the hypotheses that Latino acculturation, ethnic identity, and *caballerismo* would all be positively associated with their paternal involvement, and that *macho* scores would be negatively related, we conducted bivariate correlations and a linear regression model. The results of the bivariate correlations (seen in Table 2) revealed no significant relationships between ethnic identity or *caballerismo* and paternal involvement. However, Latino fathers' *macho* scores were negatively associated with their paternal involvement, suggesting that Latino fathers with higher *macho* scores rated themselves as being less involved with their children. Additionally, Latino fathers who reported being more acculturated to the traditional Latino culture also reported being more involved with their children.

Next, we conducted a linear hierarchical regression with paternal involvement as the criterion variable; the predictor variables at Step 1 included participant age, number of children, income, relationship status, and response format (see Table 3). The model was not significant at

this step,  $F(5, 61) = 2.03, p = .09, R^2 = .17$ . Response format was the only variable significantly associated with paternal involvement at this step. In Step 2, we added ethnic identity, *caballerismo*, *machismo*, U.S. American acculturation, and Latino acculturation. The model was significant,  $F_{\text{change}}(10, 56) = 2.47, p = .05$ , total  $R^2 = .20$ , when these variables were added. The only variables significantly associated with paternal involvement in Step 2 were response format and the *macho* subscale. Latino fathers who endorsed more *macho* attitudes also reported less paternal involvement, after we controlled the variance in the other variables.

In follow-up analyses, we examined whether the format moderated the association between the predictor variables and paternal involvement. However, none of the interaction effects were significant ( $ps > .05$ ). However, detecting significant interaction effects are challenging with small sample sizes. Thus, we also conducted separate regressions for those who completed the study via the Internet or paper-and-pencil format. Latino fathers who completed the study via the Internet had significant associations between parental involvement and *macho* attitudes ( $B = -0.40, SE = .12, \beta = -.20, p < .01$ ) as well as U.S. acculturation ( $B = 0.96, SE = .31, \beta = .61, p < .01$ ). None of the predictors were significantly associated with parental involvement for participants who completed the study via paper-and-pencil format.

### Discussion

The role of fathers in child development has been the focus of study for three decades (e.g., Lewis & Lamb, 2003), and there is still much to learn about how cultural and gender norms impact paternal involvement (Cabrera & Garcia-Coll, 2004). Of the several cultural and gender norms tested in the current study, only Latino fathers' *macho* attitudes demonstrated a negative relationship with paternal involvement (a medium-sized effect, accounting for 15% of the variance in paternal involvement), after controlling for the variance of other cross-cultural measures. The *macho* dimension of *machismo*, or traditional Latino masculine gender norms, is the stereotypical, generally negative view of Latino men that has dominated popular and social literature, which portrays them as aggressive, domineering, and antifeminine. Although

Table 1  
Summary of Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	Standard deviation	Scale range
Ethnic identity	3.80	1.00	1–5
<i>Macho</i>	2.50	1.27	1–7
<i>Caballerismo</i>	6.10	0.90	1–7
U.S. American acculturation	3.06	0.70	1–4
Latino acculturation	3.40	0.47	1–4
Total father involvement	5.30	0.90	0–6

Table 2  
*Bivariate Correlations for Macho, Caballerismo, Acculturation, Ethnic Identity, and Fatherhood Involvement*

Variable	1	2	3	4	5
1. Ethnic identity	—				
2. <i>Macho</i>	-.29*	—			
3. <i>Caballerismo</i>	.15	-.18	—		
4. U.S. acculturation	.05	.07	-.03	—	
5. Latino acculturation	.47**	-.37**	.20	-.12	—
6. Fatherhood involvement	.17	-.45**	.09	.04	.28*

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

the correlational nature of this study makes it impossible to infer causality, this finding suggests that Latino fathers' *macho* attitudes may be related to emotional, interpersonal, and physical distance from their children. For instance, *macho* attitudes may be a type of a defense mechanism (Cervantes, 2006; Neff, 2001) that reflects an intrapsychic conflict. In this case, *macho* attitudes could be related to underlying anger and frustration that come with being a racial/ethnic minority in a racist society. For Latino fathers, such frustration may be expressed through *macho* attitudes, which could be a source of disconnect with their children.

Interestingly, Latino fathers' *caballerismo* attitudes were not significantly associated with their reports of paternal involvement. The *caballerismo* dimension, a relatively new con-

struct, describes the more prosocial features of Latino masculinity: family orientation, emotional awareness of self and others, and strong ethnic identity. Our findings suggest that Latino fathers' *macho* attitudes (i.e., rigid, aggressive, and domineering attitudes) are likely to be an indicator of lower paternal involvement, whereas the positive, emotionally connected attitudes of *caballerismo* offer no such prediction of higher involvement. However, this interpretation should be tempered because Latino fathers' *caballerismo* attitudes were quite high and not normally distributed, suggesting a ceiling effect. The lack of variability in these scores limited our ability to detect an effect. Indeed, Latino fathers had higher *caballerismo* than *macho* attitudes. Moreover, the *macho* subscale was negatively correlated with Latino acculturation, suggesting that fathers who are well versed in Latino culture do not describe themselves as *macho*. Collectively, these results support the contention that the *macho* dimension alone is insufficient to describe Latino men. However, given the concerns about the *caballerismo* subscale, future research is needed to determine whether these scores are influenced by social desirability or other factors.

Acculturation and ethnic identity, the other cross-cultural factors examined in the study, were not significantly associated with paternal involvement over and above *macho* attitudes. Specifically, Latino fathers' ethnic identity was not significantly associated with paternal involvement in any of the analyses, because it only accounted for 1.0% of the variance in paternal involvement. Ethnic identity could be related to other father-child interactions, such as exploring ethnicity together, which were not

Table 3  
*Summary Linear Regression Predicting Fatherhood Involvement*

Variable	<i>B</i> (standard error)	$\beta$	<i>sr</i>
Step 1			
Age	.00 (.01)	.01	.01
Number of children	-.06 (.10)	-.09	-.0
Income	.08 (.05)	.21	.21
Relationship status	.11 (.13)	.11	.12
Format	.78* (.26)	.42	.39
Step 2			
Ethnic identity	-.09 (.14)	-.10	-.10
<i>Macho</i>	-.28* (.10)	-.39	-.39
<i>Caballerismo</i>	.00 (.13)	.00	.00
U.S. acculturation	.29 (.22)	.22	.19
Latino acculturation	.25 (.29)	.13	.13

Note. The results are shown for the final model; *sr* = partial correlations and is a measure of effect size; .10 = small effect; .30 = medium effect; and .50 = large effect. \*  $p < .01$ .

measured in this study. Latino acculturation was significantly related to paternal involvement in bivariate correlations, suggesting that participants who retain the values and behaviors of their culture of origin also see themselves as highly involved in a general sense. However, after controlling for the other variables in the study—in particular, *macho* attitudes—Latino acculturation was not significantly associated with paternal involvement (i.e., only accounting for 1.7% of the variance in paternal involvement). In context, Latino acculturation does have a relationship with paternal involvement, but that relationship overlaps aspects of *macho* attitudes. The positive relationship between Latino acculturation and paternal involvement is likely to be overshadowed in families with fathers high in *macho* attitudes. Other researchers (e.g., Gottman, 1999) have suggested a similar pattern between positive and negative family interactions, signifying negative interactions have a more powerful effect than positive interactions can overcome.

An unexpected finding emerged on the basis of the format (i.e., paper and pencil or Web). Latino fathers who completed the measures via paper and pencil had lower income and U.S. American acculturation than did Web-based participants, but had higher IFI scores than did fathers who completed the measures via the Internet. Income and U.S. acculturation, however, were not significantly related to IFI scores. Although this study was not specifically designed to study relationships between income, acculturation, and response format, one hypothesis is that the computer-based response represents an acculturation factor not measured by the AMAS-ZABB or yearly income. Potentially, fathers who chose the paper-and-pencil version did not have ready access to a computer, which may speak to a general lack of access to resources. At the same time, it should be made clear that there is nothing to indicate why some participants chose to respond via a Web-based format. Thus, there are a number of potential reasons participants chose each format; that is, it is possible that the relationship between acculturation and format choice is spurious.

Additionally, in our follow-up analyses, participants who completed the measures via the Internet had a positive relationship between U.S. acculturation and paternal involvement (as well as the negative association between *macho*

attitudes and paternal involvement). However, there were no significant associations between any of the cross-cultural measures and paternal involvement for fathers who completed the paper-and-pencil measures. Aside from small sample size issues that can complicate such analyses, these results may suggest that the format of the study might have accessed two different subsamples of Latino fathers. Future research might expand on this finding by investigating this relationship.

### Limitations

This study has several limitations that are important to consider during interpretation. First, the sample size was relatively small. Although participants were from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds and geographic locations, a larger sample would have allowed for analysis between groups on the basis of income, current geographic location, and culture of origin. Second, the sample was not randomly selected from the population at large; thus sampling bias is a potential threat to validity. Third, all measures in this study, including the IFI, were self-report. As such, participants may have rated themselves on the basis of an ideal rather than real behavior. Future studies could include ratings from fathers' children and their partners. Fourth, we investigated cultural factors that are common themes in the Latino literature; however, it is unclear whether our results would generalize to other fathers of other racial/ethnic groups. Fifth, our convenience sampling did not allow for us to calculate a response rate because it was unknown how many individuals received the survey. Finally, the study was cross-sectional, which makes it impossible to infer causality for the associations between the variables.

### Implications for Clinical Practice and Future Research

There are several implications that can be drawn from the current study. The relationship between *machismo*, Latino acculturation, and ethnic identity offers an important perspective on the cultural framework of Latino fathers. Latino acculturation and ethnic identity are positively related to each other, while both are

negatively related to the *macho* attitudes, suggesting that men who identify with Latino culture and value their ethnic group membership are less likely to endorse *macho* attitudes. This is especially important because it refutes popular negative representations of Latino men (Sparacho & Spodek, 2008). Moreover, these relationships suggest that *macho* attitudes may not reflect their connection to their cultural heritage or ethnic identity. Cervantes (2006) suggested that *macho* attitudes may be related to being a member of a disempowered group, and thus be the expression of underlying anger. Therefore, it may be important to conceptualize the origin of *macho* attitudes in the larger societal context (see Smedley & Smedley, 2005).

This study raises several questions for future research. First, it is unclear how contextual factors, such as racism and discrimination, relate to the *macho* attitudes and paternal involvement. For example, a father who is faced with discrimination may internalize the implicit message, express more *macho* attitudes, and begin to be less involved with his children (see Crouter et al., 2006). Second, larger samples may help determine how or whether *caballerismo* is related to paternal involvement. For example, although Latino fathers may not view *caballerismo* as being related to involvement, other family members may report that it is connected. Additionally, *caballerismo* is a relatively new construct, and the current study found limited support for the relationship among Latino fathers' endorsement of *caballerismo* attitudes and other cultural constructs. Finally, research examining specific interactions between Latino fathers and their children or family could increase our understanding of specific ways that Latino fathers promote cultural values, such as *familismo*, *educación*, and *respeto*.

## References

- Abreu, J. M., Goodyear, R. K., Campos, A., & Newcomb, M. D. (2000). Ethnic belonging and traditional masculinity ideology among African Americans, European Americans, and Latinos. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 1*, 75–86.
- Arciniega, G. M., Anderson, T. C., Tovar-Blank, Z. G., & Tracey, T. J. (2008). Toward a fuller conceptualization of machismo: Development of a traditional machismo and caballerismo scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 55*, 19–33.
- Berry, J. W., & Sam, D. L. (1997). Acculturation and adaptation. In J. W. Berry, M. H. Segall, & C. Kagitcibasi (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Social behavior and applications* (Vol. 3, pp. 291–326). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bradford, K. P., Hawkins, A., Palkovitz, R., Christiansen, S. L., & Day, R. D. (2002). The inventory of father involvement: A pilot study of a new measure of father involvement. *Journal of Men's Studies, 10*, 183–190.
- Brislin, R. W. (1986). The wording and translation of research instruments. In W. J. Lonner & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Field methods in cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 137–164). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Cabrera, N. J., & Garcia-Coll, C. (2004). Latino fathers: Uncharted territory in need of much exploration. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (4th ed., pp. 98–120). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Cabrera, N. J., Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., Bradley, R. H., Hofferth, S., & Lamb, M. E. (2000). Fatherhood in the twenty-first century. *Child Development, 71*, 127–136.
- Campos, R. (2008). Considerations for studying father involvement in early childhood among Latino families. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 30*, 133–160.
- Casas, J. M., Wagenheim, B. R., Banchemo, R., & Mendoza-Romero, J. (1994). Hispanic masculinity: Myth or psychological schema meriting clinical consideration. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 16*, 315–331.
- Cervantes, J. M. (2006). A new understanding of the macho male image: Exploration of the Mexican-American man. In M. Englar-Carlson & M. A. Stevens (Eds.), *In the room with men: A casebook of therapeutic change* (pp. 197–224). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Coltrane, S., Parke, R. D., & Adams, M. (2004). Complexity of father involvement in low-income Mexican American families. *Family Relations, 53*, 179–189.
- Crouter, A. C., Davis, K. D., Updegraff, K., Delgado, M., & Fortner, M. (2006). Mexican American fathers' occupational conditions: Links to family members' psychological adjustment. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 68*, 843–858.
- Cummings, M. E., DeArth-Pendley, G., Schudlich, T., & Smith, D. A. (2001). Parental depression and family functioning: Toward a process-oriented model of children's adjustment. In S. R. Beach (Ed.), *Marital and family process in depression: A scientific foundation for clinical practice* (pp. 89–110). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- Day, R. D., & Lamb, M. E. (2003). *Conceptualizing and measuring father involvement*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Finley, G. E., & Schwartz, S. J. (2006). Parsons and Bales revisited: Young adult children's characterization of the fathering role. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 7*, 42–55.
- Flouri, E. (2004). Correlates of parents' involvement with their adolescent children in restructured and biological two-parent families: The role of child characteristics. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 28*, 148–156.
- Flouri, E., & Buchanan, A. (2003). What predicts fathers' involvement with their children? A prospective study of intact families. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 21*, 81–98.
- Formoso, D., Gonzales, N. A., Barrera, M., & Dumka, L. A. (2007). Interparental relations, maternal employment, and fathering in Mexican American families. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 69*, 26–39.
- Fragoso, J. M., & Kashubeck, S. (2000). Machismo, gender role conflict, and mental health in Mexican American men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 1*, 87–97.
- Goodyear, R. K., Newcomb, M. D., & Allison, R. D. (2000). Predictors of Latino men's paternity in teen pregnancy: Test of a mediational model of childhood experiences, gender role attitudes, and behaviors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*, 116–128.
- Gottman, J. M. (1999). *The marriage clinic: A scientifically based marital therapy*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Halgunseith, L. C., Ispa, J. M., & Rudy, D. (2006). Parental control in Latino families: An integrated review of the literature. *Child Development, 77*, 1282–1297.
- Jones, D., Beach, S. R., & Fincham, F. D. (2006). Family relationships and depression. In D. Perlmán & A. Vangelisti (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 313–330). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- King, V., Harris, K. M., & Heard, H. E. (2004). Racial and ethnic diversity in nonresident father involvement. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66* (1), 1–21.
- Lamb, M. E. (2000). The history of research on father involvement: An overview. In H. E. Peters, G. W. Peterson, S. K. Steinmetz, & R. D. Day (Eds.), *Fatherhood: Research, intervention, and policies* (pp. 23–58). New York, NY: Haworth Press.
- Lamb, M. E., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. S. (2004). The role of the father. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (4th ed., pp. 1–31). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Landale, N. S., & Oropresa, R. S. (2001). Father involvement in the lives of mainland Puerto Rican children: Contributions of nonresident, cohabiting, and married fathers. *Social Forces, 79*, 945–968.
- Lewis, C., & Lamb, M. E. (2003). Fathers' influence on children's development: The evidence from two parent families. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 18*, 211–228.
- Mahalik, J. R., Locke, B. D., Ludlow, L. H., Diemer, M. A., Scott, R. P., Gottfried, M., & Freitas, G. (2003). Development of the conformity to masculine norms inventory. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 4*, 3–25.
- Marín, G., & Marín, B. V. (1991). *Research with Hispanic populations*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Martinez, S. M., Aisnworth, B. E., & Elder, J. P. (2008). A review of physical activity measures used among US Latinos: Guidelines for developing culturally appropriate measures. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine, 36*, 195–207.
- Neff, J. A. (2001). A confirmatory factor analysis of a measure of "machismo" among Anglo, African Americans, and Mexican American male drinkers. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 23*, 171–188.
- Padilla, A. M. (2006). Bicultural social development. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 28*, 467–497.
- Parsons, T., & Bales, R. F. (1955). *Family, socialization, and interaction process*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Phinney, J. (2003). Ethnic identity and acculturation. In K. M. Chun, P. Balls Organista, & G. Marin (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement, and applied research* (pp. 63–82). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Phinney, J., & Ong, A. D. (2007). Conceptualization and measurement of ethnic identity: Current status and future directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54*, 271–281.
- Pleck, E. H. (2004). Two dimensions of fatherhood: A history of the good dad—bad dad complex. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (4th ed., pp. 32–57). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Pleck, J. H., & Masciadrelli, B. P. (2004). Paternal involvement by U.S. residential fathers: Levels, sources, and consequences. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (4th ed., pp. 223–271). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.
- Salas-Provance, M., Erickson, J., & Reed, J. (2002). Disabilities as viewed by four generations of one Hispanic family. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology, 11*, 151–163.
- Schmitz, M. F. (2005). Cultural and acculturation differences in trajectories of Home Environment Inventory scores for Latino children and families. *Journal of Family Issues, 26*, 568–583.

- Schwartz, S. J., & Finley, G. E. (2005). Fathering in intact and divorced families: Ethnic differences in retrospective reports. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 67*, 207–215.
- Smedley, A., & Smedley, B. (2005). Race as biology is fiction, racism as a social problem is real. *American Psychologist, 60*, 16–26.
- Sodowsky, G. R., & Maestas, M. V. (2000). Acculturation, ethnic identity, and acculturative stress: Evidence and measurement. In R. H. Dana (Ed.), *Handbook of cross-cultural and multicultural personality assessment* (pp. 131–172). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Sparacho, O. N., & Spodek, B. (2008). Demythologizing the Mexican American father. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 7*, 79–96.
- Taylor, B. A., & Behnke, A. (2005). Fathering across the border: Latino fathers in Mexico and the U.S. *Fathering, 3*, 99–120.
- Torres, J. B., Solberg, S. H., & Carlstorm, A. H. (2002). The myth of sameness among Latino men and their machismo. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 2*, 163–181.
- Toth, J. F., & Xu, X. (1999). Ethnic and cultural diversity in fathers' involvement: A racial/ethnic comparison of African American, Hispanic, and White fathers. *Youth and Society, 31*, 76–99.
- Umaña-Taylor, A. J., & Fine, M. A. (2001). Methodological implications of grouping Latino adolescents into one collective ethnic group. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 23*, 347–362.
- Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Yazedjian, A., & Bámaca-Gómez, M. (2004). Developing the ethnic identity scale using Eriksonian and social identity perspectives. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research, 4*, 9–38.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2004). *U.S. interim projections by age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin*. Available from <http://www.census.gov/ipc/www/usinterimproj/>.
- Villareal, R., Blozis, S. A., & Widaman, K. F. (2005). Factorial invariance of a pan-Hispanic familism scale. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 27*, 409–425.
- Zea, M. C., Asner-Self, K. K., Birman, D., & Buki, L. P. (2003). The abbreviated Multidimensional Acculturation Scale: Empirical validation with two Latino/a samples. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 9*, 107–126.
- Zea, M. C., Reisen, C. A., Poppen, P. J., Bianchi, F. T., & Echeverry, J. J. (2007). Predictors of human immunovirus-positive serostatus among Latino gay men. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 13*, 304–312.

Received December 16, 2009

Revision received August 18, 2010

Accepted August 23, 2010 ■

### Online First Publication

APA-published journal articles are now available Online First in the PsycARTICLES database. Electronic versions of journal articles will be accessible prior to the print publication, expediting access to the latest peer-reviewed research.

All PsycARTICLES institutional customers, individual APA PsycNET® database package subscribers, and individual journal subscribers may now search these records as an added benefit. Online First Publication (OFP) records can be released within as little as 30 days of acceptance and transfer into production, and are marked to indicate the posting status, allowing researchers to quickly and easily discover the latest literature. OFP articles will be the version of record; the articles have gone through the full production cycle except for assignment to an issue and pagination. After a journal issue's print publication, OFP records will be replaced with the final published article to reflect the final status and bibliographic information.