



Dynamics of Father-Son Attachment: Exploring Communication Patterns and Influencing Factors

¹**Abdul Rahman**, *Undergraduate Student, MIE-SPPU Institute of Higher Education, Doha-Qatar*

ar7psy@gmail.com

²**Bharti Pathania**, *Assistant Professor, MIE-SPPU Institute of Higher Education, Doha-Qatar*

bpathania675@gmail.com

³**Aastha Govind Shirodker**, *Assistant Professor, MIE-SPPU Institute of Higher Education, Doha-Qatar*

aasthashirodker@gmail.com

Abstract: This study explores how father-son communication patterns influence conflict resolution and independence in young men aged 18–25 years. Using a cross-sectional design with 30 father-son dyads who completed the Revised Family Communication Patterns (RFCP) Questionnaire, the findings indicate that open and honest communication strengthens emotional bonds, fosters autonomy, and mitigates interpersonal conflict. A significant inverse association ($r = -0.5427$, $p < .01$) between fathers' conversation orientation and sons' conformity indicates that open dialogue encourages self-expression. Additionally, active communication correlates with greater psychological resilience and emotional intelligence.

Keywords: *Attachment, Communication, Conformity, Father, Relationship, Son*

1. Introduction

Communication is a fundamental human activity that underpins the formation and maintenance of social bonds, particularly within familial contexts. It serves as a vital mechanism

through which individuals express needs, share emotions, and negotiate relational dynamics, thereby shaping the quality and stability of family relationships (Grotevant & Cooper, 1985; Segrin & Flora, 2018). Within the specific dyad of father and son, effective communication plays a crucial role in fostering emotional closeness, managing conflicts, and supporting identity development, especially during the transitional phase of young adulthood (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002). This period is characterized by significant psychological and social changes as individuals seek independence and establish their self-concept, making the nature of father-son's interactions particularly salient.

Research indicates that the quality of parent-child communication during adolescence has long-lasting effects beyond the immediate family environment, influencing the development of romantic relationships, social competence, and overall life satisfaction in adulthood (Seiffge-Krenke et al., 2007). However, the dynamics of communication can vary across different family dyads, with studies revealing distinct patterns and implications for father-son, father-daughter, mother-son, and mother-daughter relationships (Grotevant & Cooper, 1985). For instance, recent findings suggest that the frequency of political discussions between young adults and their fathers can predict relational closeness and satisfaction, a pattern not observed in mother-child interactions (Schrodt & Scruggs, 2020). Such evidence underscores the unique role of father-son communication in shaping relational outcomes during this developmental stage. Active and open dialogue fosters emotional intimacy, mutual understanding, and conflict resolution skills, which are essential during the transition to adulthood (Schrodt et al., 2008).

Conversely, dysfunctional communication—characterized by avoidance, emotional distancing, or hostility—can undermine attachment security, diminish emotional intelligence, and hinder the development of autonomy (Satir, 2016). Literature on family communication patterns highlights that open, expressive interactions are associated with collaborative conflict management, whereas constrained or hostile communication styles tend to foster avoidance, resentment, or hostility (Dumlao & Botta, 2000). Understanding these patterns within the father-son relationship is particularly important given societal norms around masculinity and emotional expression, which can influence how sons communicate with and perceive their fathers during early adulthood.

While considerable research has emphasized the importance of parent-child communication during adolescence, there remains a paucity of studies specifically examining

father-son relationships during young adulthood, a pivotal stage marked by identity exploration, increased independence, and evolving relational dynamics. Understanding how communication patterns during this period influence conflict management, emotional resilience, and autonomy is essential for developing targeted interventions and fostering healthier familial bonds. This study aims to fill this gap by providing empirical insights into the unique features of father-son communication during early adulthood, with implications for both theory and practice. The findings are expected to inform family therapy approaches, parent education programs, and policies aimed at promoting constructive communication and emotional well-being within families, ultimately supporting positive developmental trajectories for young men and their fathers.

2. Review of Literature

The psychological development of sons is also intricately linked to the quality of the father-son relationship. Emotionally available and supportive fathers play a critical role in fostering higher levels of self-esteem and psychological resilience in their sons. Adolescents who perceived their fathers as supportive were less likely to engage in delinquent behaviors and exhibited higher self-worth. This highlights the protective effect of positive paternal involvement against potential psychological challenges (Dubowitz et al. 2001).

Studies emphasize that the father-son attachment is important in shaping young men's identities and influencing their decision-making processes. Pleck (2010) discusses how paternal involvement has evolved, with modern fathers being more engaged in emotional and practical aspects of their sons' lives. Fathers who adjust their parenting styles to be more supportive and less authoritative during young adulthood are more likely to maintain close and healthy relationships with their sons. The quality of the father-son attachment also influences academic achievement, with supportive paternal relationships linked to higher educational attainment (McBride et al., 2005).

Studies have shown that during young adulthood, open communication and emotional support from fathers are crucial in fostering healthy independence (Nelson et al., 2013). Moreover, positive father-son relationships during emerging adulthood have been linked to better psychological adjustment and life satisfaction (Finley & Schwartz, 2007). Research also indicates that fathers who adapt their parenting style to be more egalitarian and supportive during this transition facilitate their sons' successful navigation into adult roles (Seiffge-Krenke, 2009).

Additionally, the quality of the father-son relationship during this stage can influence career development and decision-making processes, as paternal support has been linked to higher career self-efficacy in young men (Whiston & Keller, 2004).

Social development is another domain profoundly influenced by father-son dynamics. Fathers often serve as role models for social behaviors, teaching sons how to interact with others and navigate social contexts. Harris et al. (1998) highlighted that paternal involvement during adolescence is positively associated with better social competence in young adulthood, underscoring the role of fathers in equipping their sons with essential skills for building and maintaining social relationships.

Moreover, the presence of a nurturing father can mitigate the adverse effects associated with socioeconomic disadvantages. Cabrera et al. (2007) found that father engagement in low-income families was linked to better cognitive and emotional outcomes in children, highlighting the critical role fathers play in mitigating environmental stressors. This finding is particularly significant as it demonstrates the father's role in fostering resilience in challenging circumstances.

Neuroscientific research provides further insight into the father-son bond. Studies have shown that fatherhood induces structural changes in the brain, particularly in regions associated with empathy and caregiving. Abraham et al. (2014) discovered that fathers who were actively involved in childcare exhibited increased neural activity in areas related to parental motivation and empathy. This biological adaptation underscores the deep-seated nature of paternal caregiving.

Furthermore, the quality of the father-son relationship has been linked to long-term mental health outcomes. Flouri and Buchanan (2003) found that father involvement at 16 years of age was associated with lower levels of psychological distress in adulthood. This longitudinal perspective highlights the enduring impact of paternal engagement on mental health across the lifespan.

In addition to these individual benefits, father involvement has societal implications. Children with engaged fathers are less likely to engage in criminal activities and more likely to contribute positively to their communities. A study by Bronte-Tinkew et al. (2006) and Lamb & Lewis (2010) found that father involvement was inversely related to adolescent delinquency, emphasizing the role of fathers in promoting societal well-being.

2.1 Family Communication Patterns

The concept of Family Communication Patterns was first introduced by Chaffee, McLeod, and Wackman (1973) as a framework for examining the structure of family communication. Beliefs and perceptions of family members about the family's communication patterns can be dissimilar, however, family members live jointly in the same family (Ritchie, 1991)

From the various studies on this topic, Family communication patterns are first to understanding the relational dynamics in families. According to Koerner and Fitzpatrick (2002), these patterns reflect both the content and relational parts of communication that control family roles and identity formation. The Family Communication Patterns (FCP) model frameworks two important dimensions—conversation orientation and conformity orientation—which together describe the interaction style between family members (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002). Families high in conversation orientation tend to promote open discussions, whereas those high in conformity orientation give importance to hierarchical order and parental authority (Fitzpatrick & Ritchie, 1994).

Family communication patterns are shaped over time through the sharing of norms, history, and beliefs among family members. These shared visions provide cognitive and social working models for family members, influencing normative instructions and behaviors within the family. The patterns notably impact the lives of children, influencing their personality characteristics, social behaviors, and communication styles.

Schrodt et al. (2008) highlights that these patterns impact relational fulfilment and emotional intimacy, highlighting how parental confirmation and affectionate communication predict positive family results. Additionally, Noller and Feeney (2004) claim that the quality of parent-child communication is closely connected to children's emotional well-being and social competence, making communication patterns a dynamic area of study.

2.2 Openness in Communication

In parent-child relationships, openness is particularly important as it facilitates a reciprocal exchange of thoughts and emotions that contribute to healthy relational development. In father-son relationships, where societal norms might emphasize emotional restraint or less frequent emotional expression, fostering openness can break down barriers and enhance relationship satisfaction (Kuczynski & Parkin, 2007). Open communication helps mitigate conflicts and leads to a better understanding of each other's perspectives and needs (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002).

The father's role in promoting open dialogue cannot be overstated. A study by Schwartz et al. (2012) revealed that adolescents who perceived their fathers as approachable were more likely to seek their guidance during conflicts, leading to more effective resolution strategies. This accessibility fosters a safe environment for sons to express concerns and explore solutions collaboratively.

Research shows that young adults who perceive open and transparent communication with their parents report higher levels of well-being and relationship satisfaction (Archbell & Coplan, 2021). Fathers who encourage emotional openness with their sons are better able to foster an environment where issues can be discussed without fear of judgment. This kind of communication helps sons feel validated and understood, which is essential for their emotional development and confidence as they undertake more adult responsibilities.

However, Gudykunst et al. (1996) highlights that restricted communication, where certain topics are avoided, or emotional sharing is limited, can hinder the development of a healthy father-son relationship. When communication is not open, conflicts may be left unresolved, leading to a buildup of tension over time (Schrodt et al., 2008). Archbell & Coplan (2021) found that restricted communication in parent-young adult relationships often results in higher levels of conflict and dissatisfaction, suggesting that communication openness is a key factor in maintaining relationship quality during this life stage.

2.3 Conformity and Conversation Orientation in Families

Two key dimensions of family communication patterns are conversation orientation and conformity orientation (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002). Conversation orientation refers to the degree to which a family encourages open dialogue about a wide range of topics, where each member feels free to express their views. High conversation orientation in father-son relationships tends to ease emotional closeness, autonomy, and mutual understanding (Noller & Bagi, 1985). In contrast, conformity orientation reflects the extent to which a family prioritize shared beliefs, attitudes, and values, expecting agreement and obedience to parental authority. High conformity orientation can lead to greater parental control and potentially suppress independent expression in young adults (Koerner & Schrodt, 2014).

Conformity and conversation orientations significantly shape the interaction patterns within families. Families high in conformity foster obedience, respect for authority, and value homogeneity of beliefs (Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1991). Although this orientation can ensure unity

and discipline, it may stifle open dialogue, especially in father-son relationships where hierarchical expectations dominate (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002). Conversely, high conversation orientation promotes shared meaning, emotional expression, and critical thinking (Olson & Gorall, 2003). Families that value conversation allow children to voice their thoughts and feelings, fostering autonomy and relational satisfaction (Schrodt et al., 2008). However, balancing these orientations is essential, as extreme emphasis on either may lead to dysfunctional communication patterns (Fitzpatrick & Ritchie, 1994).

An optimal family communication pattern balances conformity and conversation, guaranteeing respect for hierarchy while inspiring open dialogue (Fitzpatrick & Ritchie, 1994). Families considered as "consensual" successfully integrate both orientations, nurturing emotional security and clear value systems (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002). Such families encourage children to express their opinions within respectful limits, supporting both autonomy and cohesion in the child. Subsequently, "pluralistic" families highlight conversation and value individual perspectives, promoting independence and critical thinking (Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990). "Protective" families prioritize conformity while lessening conversation, often leading to obedience but less emotional sharing, whereas "laissez-faire" families display low levels of both conversation and conformity, resulting in detached and emotionally distant relationships (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002). Integrating both conversation and conformity supports relational adaptableness and resilience, important for navigating life changes and external stressors (Olson & Gorall, 2003).

The interplay of these orientations shapes the overall communication environment within the family and influences various outcomes, also how families manage disagreements and resolve conflicts. In relationships where high conversation orientation is paired with low conformity orientation, young adult sons are more likely to engage in assertive, respectful discussions, feel valued, and develop higher self-esteem (Schrodt et al., 2008). Equally, in families with high conformity and low conversation, sons may feel stressed to conform, leading to suppressed emotions, resentment, or eventual withdrawal from the father-son relationship (Colaner et al., 2017).

Conflict is an inevitable part of dynamic family relationships, arising from differing interests, developmental needs, and perspectives. Particularly during young adulthood, sons are establishing independence, career goals, romantic relationships, and personal identities, which

may not always align with their fathers' expectations or traditional family values (Birditt et al., 2010). The way families manage these conflicts significantly impacts the emotional and relational well-being of their members. Conflict management styles vary, ranging from collaborative approaches that seek to satisfy all parties to avoidance strategies that minimize direct engagement with the conflict (Thomas, 1976).

Family communication patterns critically influence the conflict resolution styles adopted by fathers and sons. For instance, high conversation orientation promotes collaborative conflict management, where open dialogue and mutual understanding are emphasized (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2006). In such environments, fathers are more likely to validate their sons' perspectives, even when disagreements arise. This validation fosters trust, emotional security, and long-term relational satisfaction (Scharf & Mayseless, 2008). On the other hand, in high conformity-oriented families, conflicts may be managed through avoidance or authoritarian strategies, where the father's authority is prioritized over the son's independent viewpoint (Grych, 2002). Over time, such conflict management styles can contribute to emotional distancing, decreased relational quality, and even long-term estrangement.

The emotional expressiveness between fathers and sons plays a vital role in how conflict and communication patterns are internalized. Cultural expectations around masculinity often dictate restrained emotional expression among men, which can inhibit deeper conversations about feelings, vulnerabilities, and relational issues (Levant et al., 2009). Fathers who adhere strictly to traditional masculine norms may struggle to engage in open, emotionally expressive communication with their sons, resulting in a relationship that is functionally close but emotionally distant (Morman & Floyd, 2000).

Despite these challenges, research suggests that when fathers model empathetic communication and emotional openness, their sons are more likely to replicate these behaviors in both familial and external relationships (Pleck, 2010). Modeling healthy communication not only benefits the father-son dyad but also equips young adult sons with critical interpersonal skills needed for friendships, romantic relationships, and professional interactions (Ackard et al., 2006).

The longitudinal impact of father-son communication patterns cannot be overstated. Early established patterns of openness, mutual respect, and emotional validation often persist into adulthood, affecting relational dynamics well beyond the family unit (Amato & Afifi, 2006). Conversely, maladaptive patterns rooted in high conformity and emotional suppression can lead

to long-term relational dysfunction, psychological distress, and difficulty forming intimate relationships outside the family (Borelli et al., 2011).

Technology has also changed the nature of father-son communication in young adulthood. Digital communication, including texting and video calls, can supplement face-to-face interactions and help maintain relational closeness despite physical distance (Coyne et al., 2011). However, digital communication cannot entirely replace the depth and nuance of in-person emotional exchanges, particularly during conflict resolution. Effective father-son communication thus requires balancing technological convenience with intentional, emotionally meaningful interactions.

In conclusion, the communication dynamics between fathers and young adult sons are complex and multifaceted, shaped by family communication patterns, cultural expectations, and conflict management styles. Conversation and conformity orientations set the stage for how openness, emotional expressiveness, and conflict resolution are negotiated within the relationship. Fathers who foster open dialogue, model empathetic communication, and support their sons' autonomy contribute significantly to their sons' emotional well-being and relational competence. Given the enduring impact of these patterns, intentional efforts to enhance communication quality in father-son relationships are critical for promoting healthy development and family cohesion across the lifespan.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Objectives

- a) To examine the communication patterns between fathers and sons.
- b) To examine the relationship between communication patterns and conflict resolution skills between fathers and sons.

3.2 Hypothesis

The quality of father-son communication is hypothesized to be positively associated with the son's development of effective conflict-resolution skills.

3.3 Research Design

A quantitative, cross-sectional design was employed to explore the association between father-son communication quality and conflict-resolution skills in young adult sons.

3.4 Sample

The study included 30 father–son dyads. Sons were in the age range of 18 to 25 years, reflecting the emerging adulthood stage. The data collection process was facilitated by using Google Forms, which served as the primary instrument for gathering respondent information.

3.5 Instrumentation

The Revised Family Communication Patterns (RFCP) Questionnaire (Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990) was used to evaluate perceived father–son communication. It measures two dimensions:

- a) *Conversation Orientation*: Encouragement of open dialogue.
- b) *Conformity Orientation*: Emphasis on uniformity and obedience.

3.6 Procedure

Participants provided informed consent before independently completing the RFCP questionnaire to minimize response bias.

3.7 Data Analysis

Pearson's product-moment correlation was used to analyze the relationships between communication styles and conflict-resolution abilities. Independent samples t-tests assessed group differences in mean scores.

3.8 Ethical Considerations

The study adhered to ethical research standards:

- a) **Informed Consent**: Participants received study details and signed consent forms.
- b) **Confidentiality**: Data was anonymized and securely stored.
- c) **Voluntary Participation**: Participants could withdraw at any time without consequence.

4. Results and Discussion

Table 1: *Demographic Characteristics of the Sample Population*

Variable	Category	Frequency (n=30)	%
Age (in years)	40s	9	30.3
	50s	20	66.4
	60s	1	3.3
Occupation	IT	10	33.3
	Engineers	9	30.3
	Teachers	2	6.1
	Others	9	30.3
Religion	Hindu	3	9.3
	Muslim	25	84.6

	Christian	2	6.1
Family Type	Nuclear	27	90.7
	Joint	3	9.3

Table 1 delineates the demographic characteristics of the sample (n=30). A significant proportion of participants were in their 50s (66.4%), with employment predominantly in the information technology (33.3%) and engineering (30.3%) sectors. The majority identified with the Muslim faith (84.6%). Most participants were residing in nuclear families (90.7%).

Table 2: *Descriptive Statistics for Conversation and Conformity Orientation Subscales*

Variable	Items	M	SD
Conversation Orientation	15	57.1	7.25
Conformity Orientation	11	33.8	6.44

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics for the Conversation and Conformity Orientation subscales of the Revised Family Communication Patterns (RFCP) Questionnaire. The mean score for Conversation Orientation (M = 57.1, SD = 7.25) indicates a relatively high level of open and expressive communication within father–son dyads.

In contrast, the mean score for Conformity Orientation (M = 33.8, SD = 6.44) suggests a moderate emphasis on obedience and uniformity. The substantial difference between the two means implies that participants perceived their family communication as more oriented toward open dialogue than toward strict adherence to familial norms. This pattern may reflect a relational context that supports autonomy and mutual exchange over hierarchical conformity (Gómez-Vírseda et al., 2020; Mackenzie, 2023).

Table 3: *Correlation Coefficients Between Conversation and Conformity Subscales*

Variable Pair	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	Significance
Fathers' Conversation & Fathers' Conformity Subscales	−0.12	> .05	Not Significant
Sons' Conversation & Sons' Conformity Subscales	−0.37	< .05	Significant
Fathers' Conversation & Sons' Conformity Subscale	−0.54	< .01	Significant

Sons' Conversation & Fathers' Conformity Subscale	−0.06	> .05	Not Significant
--	-------	-------	-----------------

Table 3 displays the correlation coefficients between the Conversation and Conformity Orientation subscales for both fathers and sons. The correlation between fathers' scores on the two subscales was weak and not statistically significant ($r = -0.12$, $p > .05$), indicating little to no association between their levels of open communication and conformity expectations. In contrast, a moderate, statistically significant negative correlation was found between sons' conversation and conformity scores ($r = -0.37$, $p < .05$), suggesting that higher levels of open communication among sons were associated with lower conformity orientation (Gong et al., 2023).

A stronger, statistically significant negative correlation emerged between fathers' conversation scores and sons' conformity scores ($r = -0.54$, $p < .01$), indicating that greater openness in paternal communication was linked to lower conformity expectations perceived by sons (Bacchini et al., 2024; Truhan et al., 2023). The correlation between sons' conversation and fathers' conformity scores was minimal and not significant ($r = -0.06$, $p > .05$), implying no meaningful relationship between these variables.

Table 4: *Independent Samples t-Test Results for Fathers and Sons on Communication Subscales*
($N = 30$ dyads)

Subscale	M (Fathers)	M (Sons)	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Significance
Conversation Orientation	57.4	56.8	0.18	0.85	Not Significant
Conformity Orientation	33.1	34.5	−0.87	0.39	Not Significant

Independent-samples *t*-tests (Table 4) revealed no statistically significant differences between fathers and sons on both the conversation ($p = .85$) and conformity ($p = .39$) subscales. These findings suggest communicative consistency between fathers and sons within the sample.

The strongest negative relationship between fathers' conversation and sons' conformity scores reinforces the hypothesis that supportive father-son communication may play a significant role in promoting sons' independence and emotional regulation (Ratliff et al., 2023). These results align with previous research indicating that open, dialogic communication fosters critical thinking and personal autonomy in young adults (Kerbage et al., 2024; Tang et al., 2024). These findings contribute to the understanding of father-son communication dynamics and their potential impact

on conflict resolution strategies. Further research is needed to explore the generalizability of these results across diverse cultural contexts and family structures.

5. Conclusion

This study provides valuable insights into the role of father–son communication in the development of conflict-resolution skills among young adult males. The results indicate that while fathers' communication styles may not strongly reflect their own conformity expectations, open and supportive dialogue is associated with reduced conformity behaviors in sons. Such communication appears to foster autonomy, emotional competence, and independent approaches to managing conflict.

A key finding was the strong negative relationship between fathers' openness in communication and their sons' tendency toward conformity. This suggests that sons may adopt communication behaviors modeled by their fathers, reinforcing the importance of positive role modeling within the family context. Despite these meaningful observations, certain limitations should be considered. The use of self-report measures may have introduced bias, and the relatively homogenous sample may limit the generalizability of findings. Future research should include more diverse populations and consider incorporating interviews, observational methods, or longitudinal designs to capture evolving communication dynamics more comprehensively.

Further investigation could also explore the long-term impact of father–son communication through longitudinal studies, evaluate the effectiveness of communication-focused intervention programs, and examine the influence of broader contextual factors such as cultural norms, socioeconomic status, and peer relationships. The study emphasizes the potential benefits of open, supportive father–son communication in fostering young men's emotional and social development. Strengthening these family interactions may contribute not only to healthier relationships but also to the development of more resilient, independent individuals.

References

- Abraham, E., Hendler, T., Shapira-Lichter, I., Kanat-Maymon, Y., Zagoory-Sharon, O., & Feldman, R. (2014). Father's brain is sensitive to childcare experiences. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *111*(27), 9792-9797. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1402569111>

- Ackard, D. M., Neumark-Sztainer, D., Story, M., & Perry, C. (2006). Parent–child connectedness and behavioral and emotional health among adolescents. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 30 (1), 59–66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ameprze.2005.09.013>
- Amato, P. R., & Afifi, T. D. (2006). Feeling caught between parents: Adult children's relations with parents and subjective well-being. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68 (1), 222–235. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00243.x>
- Archbell, K. A., & Coplan, R. J. (2021). Too anxious to talk: social anxiety, academic communication, and students' experiences in higher education. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 30(4), 273–286. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10634266211060079>
- Bacchini, D., Cirimele, F., Di Giunta, L., Miranda, M. C., & Pastorelli, C. (2024). Cultural values, parenting and child adjustment in Italy. *International Journal of Psychology : Journal International de Psychologie*, 59(4), 540–549. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.13105>
- Borelli, J. L., Margolin, G., & Rasmussen, H. F. (2011). Parental attachment and conflict behaviors as predictors of conflict resolution in romantic relationships among young adults. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 25 (4), 520–530. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023381>
- Bronte-Tinkew, J., Moore, K. A., & Carrano, J. (2006). The father-child relationship, parenting styles, and adolescent risk behaviors in intact families. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27(6), 850–881. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X05285296>
- Cabrera, N. J., Shannon, J. D., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. (2007). Fathers' influence on their children's cognitive and emotional development: From toddlers to pre-K. *Applied Development Science*, 11(4), 208–213. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888690701762100>
- Chaffee, S. H., McLeod, J. M., & Wackman, D. B. (1973). Family communication patterns and adolescent political participation. University of Wisconsin. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/009365090017004007>
- Colaner, C. W., Horstman, H. K., & Rittenour, C. E. (2017). Negotiating Adoptive and birth
- Coyne, S. M., Stockdale, L., Busby, D., Iverson, B., & Grant, D. M. (2011). “I luv u :)!”: A descriptive study of the media use of individuals in romantic relationships. *Family Relations*, 60 (2), 150–162. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2010.00639.x>

- Dubowitz, H., Black, M. M., Cox, C. E., & Litrownik, A. J. (2001). Father involvement and children's functioning at age 6 years: A multisite study. *Child Maltreatment*, 6(4), 300-309. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077559501006004003>
- Dumlao, R., & Botta, R. A. (2000). Family communication patterns and the conflict styles young adults use with their fathers. *Communication Quarterly*, 48(2), 174-189. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463370009385589>
- Finley, G. E., & Schwartz, S. J. (2007). Father Involvement and long-term young adult outcomes: The differential contributions of divorce and Gender. *Family Court Review*, 45(4), 573-587. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-1617.2007.00172.x>
- Fitzpatrick, M. A., & Ritchie, L. D. (1994). Communication schemata within the family: Multiple perspectives on family interaction. *Human Communication Research*, 20(3), 275-301. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1994.tb00324.x>
- Flouri, E., & Buchanan, A. (2003). The role of father involvement in children's later mental health. *Journal of Adolescence*, 26(1), 63-78. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-1971\(02\)00116-1PubMed](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-1971(02)00116-1PubMed)
- Gómez-Vírseda, C., Gastmans, C., & De Maeseneer, Y. (2020). Relational autonomy in end-of-life care ethics: a contextualized approach to real-life complexities. *BMC Medical Ethics*, 21(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-020-00495-1>
- Gong, W., Jiang, L. C., Guo, Q., & Shen, F. (2023). The role of family communication patterns in intergenerational COVID-19 discussions and preventive behaviors: a social cognitive approach. *BMC Psychology*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-023-01331-y>
- Grotevant, H. D., & Cooper, C. R. (1985). Patterns of Interaction in Family Relationships and the Development of Identity Exploration in Adolescence. *Child Development*, 56(2), 415-428. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1129730>
- Grych, J. H. (2002). Marital relationships and parenting. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 16 (3), 396-405. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2002-02522-009>
- Gudykunst, W. B., Ting-Toomey, S., & Chua, E. (1996). Culture and interpersonal communication. Sage. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1988-98698-000>

- Harris, K. M., Furstenberg, F. F., & Marmer, J. K. (1998). Paternal involvement with adolescents in intact families: The influence of fathers over the life course. *Demography*, 35(2), 201–216. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3004052>
- Kerbage, H., Elbejjani, M., Bazzi, O., El-Hage, W., Boukhalil, R., Corruble, E., & Purper-Ouakil, D. (2024). ‘We are all children of war’: a qualitative inquiry into parenting following adolescents’ recent traumatic exposure in a multiple crisis setting in Beirut, Lebanon. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/20008066.2024.2382650>
- Kira S. Birditt, Karen L. Fingerman, Steven H. Zarit, Adult Children’s Problems and Successes: Implications for Intergenerational Ambivalence, *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B*, Volume 65B, Issue 2, March 2010, Pages 145–153, <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbp125>
- Koerner, A. F., & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (2002). Toward a theory of family communication. *Communication Theory*, 12(1), 70-91. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2002.tb00260.x>
- Koerner, A. F., & Schrod, P. (2014). An Introduction to the Special Issue on Family Communication Patterns Theory. *Journal of Family Communication*, 14(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15267431.2013.857328>
- Kuczynski, L., & Parkin, C. M. (2007). Agency and Bidirectionality in Socialization: Interactions, Transactions, and Relational Dialectics. In J. E. Grusec & P. D. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of socialization: Theory and research* (pp. 259–283). The Guilford Press. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2006-23344-010>
- Lamb, M. E., & Lewis, C. (2010). The development and significance of father-child relationships in two-parent families. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (5th ed., pp. 94-153). Wiley. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2010-04805-004>
- Levant, R. F., Hall, R. J., Williams, C. M., & Hasan, N. T. (2009). Gender role conflict and psychological distress: The role of social support. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 10(3), 273–282. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013836>

- Mackenzie, C. (2023). Autonomous agency, we-agency, and social oppression. *The Southern Journal of Philosophy*, 61(2), 373–389. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sjp.12521>
- McBride, B. A., Schoppe-Sullivan, S. J., & Ho, M. H. R. (2005). The mediating role of fathers' school involvement on student achievement. *Applied Developmental Psychology*, 26(2), 201-216. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2004.12.007>
- Morman, M. T., & Floyd, K. (2002). A “changing culture of fatherhood”: Effects on affectionate communication, closeness, and satisfaction in men’s relationships with their fathers and their sons. *Western Journal of Communication*, 66(4), 395–411. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10570310209374746>
- Nelson, L. J., & Padilla-Walker, L. M. (2013). Flourishing and floundering in emerging adult college students. *Emerging Adulthood*, 1(1), 67–78. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167696812470938>
- Noller, P., & Bagi, S. (1985). Parent—adolescent communication. *Journal of Adolescence*, 8(2), 125–144. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-1971\(85\)80042-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-1971(85)80042-7)
- Noller, P., & Feeney, J. A. (2004). Close relationships: Functions, forms, and processes. Psychology Press. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2003-04409-019>
- Olson, D. H., & Gorall, D. M. (2003). Circumplex model of marital and family systems. In F. Walsh (Ed.), *Normal family processes* (pp. 514-548). Guilford Press. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2003-04409-019>
- Organizational behavior: Human behavior at work (pp. 430–437). McGraw-Hill.
- Pleck, J. H. (2010). Paternal involvement: Revised conceptualization and theoretical linkages with child outcomes. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (5th ed., pp. 58–93). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2010-04805-003>
- Ratliff, E. L., Cui, L., Criss, M. M., Jespersen, J. E., Morris, A. S., & Silk, J. S. (2023). Supportive parent-adolescent relationships as a foundation for adolescent emotion regulation and adjustment. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1193449>

- Ritchie, L. D. (1991). Family communication patterns: Measuring intrapersonal perceptions of interpersonal relationships. *Communication Research*, 18(4), 548-565. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009365091018004005>
- Ritchie, L. D., & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (1990). Family communication patterns: Measuring intrapersonal perceptions of interpersonal relationships. *Communication Research*, 17(4), 523–544. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009365090017004007>
- Satir, V. (2016). The new peoplemaking. Science and Behavior Books. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1995-97131-000>
- Scharf, M., & Mayseless, O. (2008). Late adolescent girls' relationships with parents and romantic partner: A longitudinal study. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 32 (6), 536–546. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025408095557>
- Schrodt, P., & Scruggs, X. (2020). Young Adults' Shared Family Identity with Parents as a Function of Family Communication Patterns. *Communication Reports*, 34(1), 14–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08934215.2020.1859573>
- Schrodt, P., Ledbetter, A. M., & Ohrt, J. K. (2008). Parental confirmation and affectionate communication: Implications for satisfaction and closeness in parent–child relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 25(6), 907-923. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407508096698>
- Schwartz, S. H., Cieciuch, J., Vecchione, M., Davidov, E., Fischer, R., Beierlein, C., Ramos, A., Verkasalo, M., Lönnqvist, J.-E., Demirutku, K., Dirilen-Gumus, O., & Konty, M. (2012). Refining the theory of basic individual values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103(4), 663–688. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029393>
- Segrin, C., & Flora, J. (2018). Family communication. In Routledge eBooks.
- Seiffge-Krenke, I., Overbeek, G., & Vermulst, A. (2009). Parent–child relationship trajectories during adolescence: Longitudinal associations with romantic outcomes in emerging adulthood. *Journal of Adolescence*, 33(1), 159–171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2009.04.001>

- Shared Family Identity: A Social Identity Complexity approach. *Western Journal of Communication*, 82(4), 393–415. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10570314.2017.1384564>
- Tang, K.-S., Cooper, G., Rappa, N., Cooper, M., Sims, C., & Nonis, K. (2024). A dialogic approach to transform teaching, learning & assessment with generative AI in secondary education: a proof of concept. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 19(3). <https://doi.org/10.1080/1554480x.2024.2379774>
- Thomas, K. W. (1976). Conflict and conflict management. In J. W. Newstrom & K. Davis (Eds.),
- Truhan, T. E., Sedikides, C., Armour, C., & Papageorgiou, K. A. (2023). A tri-directional examination of adolescent personality, perceived parenting, and economic and parental adversity contexts in influencing adolescent behavioral outcomes. *Journal of Adolescence*, 95(7), 1505–1519. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jad.12223>
- Whiston, S. C., & Keller, B. K. (2004). The influences of the family of origin on career development. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 32(4), 493–568.