

Rhode Island College

Digital Commons @ RIC

Master's Theses, Dissertations, Graduate Research and Major Papers Overview

August 2023

The Effects of Paternal Figures' Parenting Style and Involvement on Masculinity and Coping Styles for Sons

Matthew G. Burns

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.ric.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Burns, Matthew G., "The Effects of Paternal Figures' Parenting Style and Involvement on Masculinity and Coping Styles for Sons" (2023). *Master's Theses, Dissertations, Graduate Research and Major Papers Overview*. 443.

<https://digitalcommons.ric.edu/etd/443>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ RIC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses, Dissertations, Graduate Research and Major Papers Overview by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ RIC. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@ric.edu.

**The Effects of Paternal Figures' Parenting Style and Involvement on Masculinity and
Coping Styles for Sons**

Matthew Burns

Psychology Department, Rhode Island College

Abstract

Of the three parenting styles created by Baumrind (1966), the authoritarian style has been largely associated with fathers due to previously reinforced unhealthy masculine norms. However, there has been a change in masculine behaviors and ideology in which fathers have taken on a more nurturing role (Lin & Billingham, 2014). Specifically, the son's coping style and masculinity will vary greatly depending on the paternal figures' behavior during childhood and further (Addis & Cohane, 2005; Cherry & Gerstein, 2021). One hundred and fifty participants were recruited to take part in this study that is examining paternal gender role conflict and parenting styles on different outcomes for the son. ANOVAs were used to examine the effects of the paternal parenting style on the son's coping style and gender role conflict. Regressions and correlations were used to examine the effects of paternal involvement and gender role conflict of the paternal figure in addition to the son's conflict and coping styles. The results did not support the hypothesis that parenting styles make a difference, but that gender role conflict and paternal engagement did appear to have an impact on the son's gender role conflict and coping style. The implications of how the father-son relationship should be examined in future research are discussed due to the contradicting results compared to the past literature.

The Effects of Paternal Figures' Parenting Style and Involvement on the Son's Masculinity and Coping Style

Men are at a higher risk of depression, anxiety, and suicide than women, but they are less likely to seek help because of the masculine norms and expectations they are socialized to adhere to at an early age (Cole & Ingram, 2019; Conley, 2021; Hobden et al., 2018; Pachankis et al., 2021; Zoorob et al., 2020). This lack of help-seeking could be attributed to the parenting style of their paternal figure, which leads to an insecurity of masculinity due to reinforced social norms and leads to maladaptive coping skills (Cherry & Gerstein, 2021; Feigelman et al., 2021; Hong et al., 2021; Leaper et al., 2019; Lin & Billingham, 2014). According to the social learning theory (Bandura, 1978; Bandura et al., 1961; Liu et al., 2020), peers, paternal figures and/or other authority figures display certain behaviors and in turn the impressionable young person will begin to model them. Specifically, there is a cyclical relationship such that in one generation after another, paternal figures model certain stereotypical masculine behaviors (e.g., being tough) and sons copy this behavior and pass it down to their own children (Pleck, 2010). This modeling of traditional masculinity reinforces poor coping skills because of previously learnt masculine norms, including emotional repression, avoidance, and stoicism which have negative outcomes over time like increased aggression and poorer relationship quality (Baumrind, 1991; Oliffe et al., 2010, 2012; Pachankis et al., 2021; Spendelow, 2015).

Fatherhood and Child Rearing Practices

Children will often have multiple adult caregivers in their life and each caregiver may have their own preferred parenting style, often influenced by what they themselves experienced growing up. Baumrind (1966, 1991) defined parenting styles as a multidimensional process, which consists of a caregiver's warmth and nurturance, expectations of maturity, level of

communication, and style of discipline. There are three parenting styles wherein the child is directly shaped by how the parents interact with them (i.e., authoritarian, permissive, and authoritative). The permissive parent will display a high degree of warmth and care, often indulging the child and do not implement many disciplinary tactics or rules but is not used more by either parent (Almas et al., 2011; Baumrind, 1966; Mongan et al., 2019; Tancred & Greeff, 2015; Villareal & Nelson, 2018). However, mothers are more likely to use the authoritative parenting style since they are consistently more caring, nurturing, and supportive, which creates an emotionally open environment (Baumrind, 1966, 1991; Bean et al., 2003; Gamble et al., 2007; Hoeve et al., 2009; Kuppens & Ceulemans, 2019; Lefkowitz et al., 2006; McKinney et al., 2018; Simons, 2007; Yaffee, 2020). Conversely, fathers have historically used the authoritarian parenting style in which they normally exhibit excessive control and often harsh discipline, which results in them being emotionally distant and restrictive (Baumrind, 1991; Bronte-Tinkew et al., 2010; Feigelman et al., 2021; Killian et al., 2020; Yaffee, 2020). However, the outcome for each child is highly dependent on the parenting style that they experience during childhood, such as the authoritative parenting style has been linked to better mental health, optimal positive externalizing behavior, and more prosocial tendencies (Baumrind, 1966, 1991; Kuppens & Ceulemans, 2019; Lefkowitz et al., 2006; Smetana, 1995). Meanwhile, authoritarian parents have been linked to children becoming more emotionally repressed over time, as well as being more physically aggressive and lacking conflict resolution skills (Baumrind, 1991; Feigelman et al., 2021; Killian et al., 2020; Zarra et al., 2014). Fathers that use the authoritarian parenting style have negative influences on the children's development and can be attributed to their upbringing and previous social norms (Addis & Cohane, 2018; Feigelman et al., 2021; Killian et al., 2020).

Fathers tend to be more emotionally distant, cold, and physically aggressive toward their child due to socialized Western norms taught by older generations (Cherry & Gerstein, 2021; Gamble et al., 2007; McKinney et al., 2018; Petts et al., 2018). These norms are enforced throughout childhood and adulthood with the father and son having a cyclical relationship (Kira et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2020; Pleck, 2010). For example, if the father likes watching physically violent sports and reenacts it with the son, then the son will begin to think that is socially acceptable. Additionally, there is an enforcement of improper emotional regulation, leading to more violent outbursts and maladaptive ways to cope (Cherry & Gerstein, 2021). Children who had authoritarian parents throughout adulthood are more likely to have higher levels of depression, emotional restriction, and suicidal tendencies (Cherry & Gerstein, 2021).

That is not to say that all fathers exhibit this type of behavior since Cherry and Gerstein (2021) discussed the term, “Important father”, which displays both arrays of traits seen in mothers and fathers. These fathers foster an emotionally expressive environment that are linked to both masculine and feminine norms, such as being nurturing and taking on the disciplinary role (Cao & Lin, 2019; Lin & Billingham; Martin et al., 2010; Pleck, 2010). Much like mothers and the authoritative parenting style, the “Important father” creates an emotionally expressive environment for both them and the child (Aikawa & Stewart, 2020; Pleck, 2010). However, not all fathers will use this new idea of an “Important father” because of their previously reinforced emotional restrictiveness (Hong et al., 2021; Lin & Billingham, 2014; Pleck, 2010).

Masculine Norms and Parental Influence

Traditional masculine norms are a socially constructed idea that have a certain set of expectations taught from other men including a paternal or authority figure. These traditional norms reinforce men to be stoic, display aggressive behavior, and to be emotionally restricted or

else they will be viewed as unmasculine (Benito-Gomez et al., 2020; Carlson, 2006; Cherry & Gerstein, 2021; Kerr & Stattin, 2000; Rogers et al., 2020). Additionally, there is a hierarchy in play since men want to be more masculine and to not be mocked by their peers or paternal figures (Cao & Lin, 2019; Konopka et al., 2021; Leaper et al., 2019). These behaviors are socially enforced from an early age with paternal figures shaping the child's idea of masculinity, which transfers into adulthood (Barton & Kirtley, 2012; Benito-Gomez et al., 2020; Carlson, 2006; Cherry & Gerstein, 2021; Kerr & Stattin, 2000). There is a reciprocal relationship proposed by Pleck (2010) in which the father and son will reinforce their ideals by support. For example, if a son likes to play football and the father approves, the son will continue to play (Pleck, 2010). Since the paternal figure's masculinity has a major influence, the type of masculinity that they display will have different outcomes (Cherry & Gerstein, 2019; Hunter et al., 2017; Lund et al., 2019; Pleck, 2010, 2012).

The type of masculine ideology learned (i.e., traditional, or androgenous) influence how men behave and view themselves and can be known as gender role conflict (O'Neil et al., 1986). Men who have learned unhealthy masculine ideology tend to have poorer mental health because of the reinforced idea of stoicism and emotional repression (Addis & Cohane, 2005; Berke et al., 2018; Leaper et al., 2019; Oliffe et al., 2010; Reilly et al., 2014; Rogers et al., 2020; Ue, 2022). There is a social stigma surrounding mental health with men being more likely to have depression, anxiety, and suicidal thoughts (Conley, 2021; Hobden et al., 2018; Pachankis et al., 2021; Zoorob et al., 2020). However, these men do not seek help due to the possibility of being seen as unmasculine (Cherry & Gerstein, 2021; Feigelman et al., 2021; Leaper et al., 2019; Petts et al., 2018; Triemstra et al., 2017). Men who have lower gender role conflict and those who willingly embrace aspects of femininity, such as emotionality and warmth, are more likely to

have better mental health (Addis & Cohane, 2018; Lefkowitz & Zeldow, 2006; Lin & Billingham, 2014; Petts et al., 2018; Pleck, 2010). They are more likely to have a better mental health state since they do not feel the need to conform to traditional norms and allows them to be emotionally expressive (Lund et al., 2019; Oliffe et al., 2012; Reilly et al., 2014; Rizvi, 2015). There have also been positive associations between non-adherence to traditional norms by these men displaying better conflict resolution, emotional adjustment, and more effective coping skills (Cherry & Gerstein, 2021; Leaper et al., 2019; Rochlen & Mahalik, 2004; Rogers et al., 2020; Spindel, 2015).

Coping Styles and Mental Health for Men

A coping style is any method used to alleviate mental stress, such as humor, denial, seeking professional help, and actively talking out individual stressors. The three coping styles are emotion-focused, problem-focused, and avoidant (Carver et al., 1989). The emotion-focused coping style diminishes mental stress through emotional expression or engaging in problem solving, while the problem-focused coping style eliminates the stressful situation at hand through talking it out or seeking help (Gibbons et al., 2014; Hobden et al., 2019). Lastly, the avoidant coping style focuses on escaping the situation rather than solving the issue at hand, such as humor, denial, or procrastination (Exner et al., 2021; Leaper et al., 2019). Of the three styles, avoidant coping is the most common for men because of previous reinforced hegemonic masculine traits (Carver et al., 1989; Kuppens & Ceulemans, 2019).

Masculine norms and coping styles have been linked to negative behavioral outcomes because of the associated social expectations for men. Those who exhibit traditional masculine traits are more likely to use an avoidant coping style by engaging in risky behaviors, isolation, and ignoring their feelings (Oliffe et al., 2010, 2012, 2020; Pachankis et al., 2021; Spindel, 2015).

2015). Men that use the avoidant coping style are more likely to not seek treatment for mental health or help in general, which leads to a higher risk of suicidal thoughts as well as suicide (Addis & Cohane, 2005; Affleck et al., 2018; Berger et al., 2013; Conley, 2021; Hobden et al., 2018; Pachankis et al., 2021; Zoorob et al., 2020). However, for men that do not display high levels of traditional masculinity, their coping styles tend to be more proactive and lead to a better mental health as they do not feel pressured to conform to others (Zoorob et al., 2021).

Men who do not display traditional masculine norms are more likely to cope more with problem or emotion-focused coping styles. These coping styles have led to a positive influence on their overall mental health, which increases the likelihood for men to seek out professional help, be emotionally expressive, or seek out social support for their respective situations (Gibbons et al., 2014; Munroe et al., 2021). Specifically, men who do not adhere to traditional masculine ideology and use problem or emotion-focused coping create an emotionally unrestrictive environment for those around them, allowing both participants to express their feelings (Cao & Lin, 2019; Cherry & Gerstein, 2021; Pleck, 2010). However, while the literature surrounding both coping styles and men's mental health, there has not been a focus on other factors that could have an impact, such as parenting styles.

Current Study

It has been established that the paternal figures' adherence to traditional masculine norms impacts the son's life as they have a reciprocal relationship (Pleck, 2010). The current study will focus on participants between the ages of 18-27, otherwise known as Generation Z, with the narrowing of this age range being important because this generation is trying to move away from hegemonic masculinity and gender stereotypes (Namy et al., 2015; Zhao et al., 2022). Furthermore, it can also be seen that men who do not adhere to unhealthy masculine traits tend to

have a better mental health state in addition to more proactive coping skills. However, there has not been as much research that examines all items together, which does not consider the complexity of masculinity. The current study aims to examine the relationship between the paternal figures' masculinity and associated parenting style, which leads to different levels of parental involvement and how that impacts the son's adherence to traditional masculine norms and coping styles. To examine all variables, the current hypotheses are presented.

Hypotheses

The paternal figures' parenting style will have a difference;

H₁: Authoritative parenting styles will predict less avoidant coping style use

H₂: Permissive parenting styles will predict less emotion-focused coping style use

H₃: Authoritarian parenting styles will predict greater avoidant coping style use

H₄: An authoritative paternal figure will predict lower gender role conflict scores

H₅: A permissive paternal figure will predict lower gender role conflict scores

H₆: An authoritarian paternal figure will predict greater gender role conflict scores

H₇: Greater gender role conflict of the paternal figure will predict greater gender role conflict in the son

H₈: Greater positive paternal engagement will predict a decrease in gender role conflict scores

H₉: Greater gender role conflict in the paternal figure will predict greater positive paternal engagement

H₁₀: Greater gender role conflict in sons will predict greater avoidant coping style use

Methods

Participants

The current study recruited 158 participants, but while cleaning the data, eight participants were deleted due to time issues, patterns in their responses, and failed attention checks, leaving a total of 150 participants. Overall, the average age was 23, 64% were White, 11% were Black, and 10% were Latino (o, x, a). The most common education level was high school or equivalent, some college, and a bachelor's degree. For a full participant demographic breakdown, see Table 1. Participants were recruited through Prolific (<https://www.prolific.co/>) and were compensated through the website based on the time of the study. All participants had to complete the informed consent to participate in the study.

Procedure

The study was conducted as an online study and took approximately 20 minutes to complete. An informed consent was provided and if they agreed, the participants answered questions about their own and father's masculinity (Gender Role Conflict Scale modified for fathers and sons), their paternal figure's involvement (Fatherhood Scale) and parenting styles (Parental Authority Questionnaire), and their own coping styles (Brief COPE Scale). Afterwards, they answered questions about their demographic information about age, race, and highest completed year of education. All measures of demographic information can be found in the Table 1. All information is confidential and no identifying information was collected. They had the option to opt out of the study at any time if the questions are too personal/sensitive, or do not want to participate anymore. Additionally, the Prolific participants were given a completion code and a link to claim their reward if they decide to opt out at any time. After the participant completed the survey, they were debriefed about the purpose of the study and were sent a link to their reward.

Instruments

Coping Style

Coping style was measured using the Brief COPE Scale (Appendix A; Carver et al., 1989), originally adapted from the 60-item COPE scale (Carver et al., 1989). This 28-item scale has three subscales: problem-focused, emotion-focused, and avoidant coping. Items from this scale include “I’ve been concentrating my efforts on doing something about the situation I’m in.” (Problem-focused), “I’ve been getting emotional support from others.” (Emotion-focused), and “I’ve been making fun of the situation” (Avoidant). The response options are on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1- *I haven’t been doing this at all* to 4- *I’ve been doing this a lot*. Items from each subscale are averaged together to get a final score with higher scores representing increased use of that coping style. There is an overall internal consistency of $\alpha = .868$ and for each subscale it is $\alpha = .661$ for problem-focused, $\alpha = .766$ for emotion-focused, and $\alpha = .754$ for avoidant.

Father and Son’s Adherence to Traditional Masculinity

Masculinity was measured using the 37-item questionnaire Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS, Son and Father version in Appendices B & C, respectively; O’Neil et al., 1986). There are four different subscales measured that are success, power, and completion (SPC), restrictive emotionality (RE), restrictive affectionate behavior between men (RABBM), and conflict between work and family relations (CBWFR). Each of the questions will also be adapted to help the participant reflect on the paternal figures’ point of view and was marked with a “F”. An example for the participants point of view would be “I have difficulty telling others I care about them” (RE) and the paternal figures’ point of view would be “My father has a difficult time telling others he cares about them” (REM). The response options are on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 - *Strongly Disagree* to 6 - *Strongly Agree*. To get a final score, each subscale is

averaged with a higher score meaning more conflict in that category. There is an overall reported internal consistency of $\alpha = .85$ and for each subscale it is $\alpha = .727$ for success, completion, and power, $\alpha = .781$ for restrictive emotionality, $\alpha = .78$ for restrictive affectionate behavior between men, and $\alpha = .68$ for conflict between work and family relations.

Parenting Styles

To categorize parents into the authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting styles (Baumrind, 1966), the 30-item questionnaire Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ; Appendix D; Buri, 1991) was used. Each of the questions were adapted to focus on father figures. Items from this scale include “While I was growing up my father felt that in a well-run home the children should have their way in the family as often as the parents do” (Permissive), “Even if his children didn’t agree with him, my father felt that it was for our own good if we were forced to conform to what he thought was right” (Authoritarian), “As I was growing up, once family policy had been established, my father discussed the reasoning behind the policy with the children in the family” (Authoritative). The response options are on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 - *Strongly Disagree* to 5 - *Strongly Agree*. To get a final score, each score from the three subscales is averaged with higher scores categorizing parents into their respective style. Overall, the scale has an internal consistency of $\alpha = .66$ and for each parenting subscale is $\alpha = .52$ for authoritative, $\alpha = .72$ for authoritarian, and $\alpha = .63$ for permissive.

Fatherhood Scale

To measure fatherhood involvement, the 64-item Fatherhood Scale will be used (Appendix E; Dick, 2004). The nine original facets measured are positive engagement, positive paternal emotional responsiveness, negative paternal engagement, the moral father role, the gender role model, the good provider role, the androgenous role, responsible paternal

engagement, and accessible father, but for the purpose of this study the positive engagement subscale will be used (DePriore et al., 2019; Miller et al., 2013; Rizvi, 2015). Response options range from 1 - *Never* to 5 - *Always* and to get a final score the subscale will be averaged with a higher score meaning more positive paternal engagement. Overall, the positive paternal engagement subscale is $\alpha = .69$.

Results

Overall, six ANOVAs were used to analyze hypotheses H₁-H₆, three Pearson correlations were used to analyze hypotheses H₇-H₁₀, and four multiple regressions were used as follow-up analyses. The final sample size was 150 participants.

Paternal Parenting Effects on Son's Gender Role Conflict and Coping Style

Based on the responses about parenting style (PAQ), the fathers of the participants were categorized into one of four categories based on the highest score out of the three subscales. The primary three were authoritative ($n = 31$), authoritarian ($n = 60$), and permissive ($n = 38$). Like Smetana (1995), a fourth group was labeled as undifferentiated ($n = 21$) for fathers that received equal scores on two subscales. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test H₁-H₆. All analyses met the required assumptions. There were no outliers as assessed by boxplot; data was normally distributed for each group, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk test ($p > .05$); and there was homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances ($p = .462-.546$).

Four ANOVAs were run to test for differences between the parenting style of the paternal figure in adult son's GRC subscales (H₄-H₆; i.e., success, completion, and power, restrictive emotionality, restrictive affectionate behavior between men, & conflict between work and family relations). There were no statistical differences were found. Two ANOVAs were run to look at differences in the son's coping style based on the different parenting style groups and no

statistical differences were found. None of the hypotheses were supported. For full means, standard deviations, and effect sizes see Tables 6 to 11.

Paternal Figure's and Son's Gender Role Conflict on Paternal Engagement and Coping Styles

A Pearson's correlation was run to assess the relationships between the paternal figures and son's gender role conflict on paternal engagement, and the son's gender role conflict on coping style. For all of the correlations, preliminary analyses showed the relationships to be linear with all variables normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test ($p > .05$), and there were no outliers. Overall, all correlations were statistically meaningful, positive, and ranged from moderate to strong ($r = .426 - .637$). Specifically, strong correlations were found between paternal figure and the son on success, completion, and power ($r = .551$), restrictive emotionality ($r = .637$), restrictive affectionate ($r = .557$), and conflict between work and family relations ($r = .618$). Positive paternal engagement correlated with paternal figures' success, completion, and power ($r = .375$), restrictive emotionality ($r = .161$), restrictive affectionate behavior between men ($r = .256$), and conflict between work and family relations ($r = .291$). See Table 3 for full correlation coefficients.

Overall, correlations run to assess the relationships between the son's gender role conflict on coping styles were statistically meaningful, positive, and ranged from low to moderate ($r = .203 - .419$), except for restrictive affectionate behavior which was not significant. The problem focused coping subscale had a moderate correlation with the success, completion, and power subscale for the son ($r = .369$), a small correlation with the restrictive emotionality subscale ($r = .186$), and a small correlation with conflict between work and family relations subscale ($r = .221$). The only correlation that was not significant was between the restrictive affectionate

behavior between men subscale ($p = .086$). The emotion focused coping subscale had a moderate correlation on the son's success, completion, and power subscale ($r = .483$), the restrictive emotionality subscale had a low correlation ($r = .290$), the restrictive affectionate behavior between men had a low correlation ($r = .174$), and conflict between work and family relations had a low correlation ($r = .290$). Lastly, avoidant coping had a moderate correlation on the son's success, completion, and power subscale on avoidant coping ($r = .401$), the restrictive emotionality subscale had a moderate correlation ($r = .337$), the restrictive affectionate behavior between men subscale had a low correlation ($r = .203$), and the conflict between work and family relations had a moderate correlation ($r = .419$). See Table 3 for full correlation coefficients.

For all multiple regressions, there was linearity as assessed by partial regression plots and a plot of studentized residuals against the predicted values. There was independence of residuals, as assessed by a Durbin-Watson statistic for each regression. There was homoscedasticity, as assessed by visual inspection of a plot of studentized residuals versus unstandardized predicted values. There was no evidence of multicollinearity, as assessed by tolerance values greater than 0.1. There were no studentized deleted residuals greater than ± 3 standard deviations, no leverage values greater than 0.2, and values for Cook's distance above 1. The assumption of normality was met, as assessed by a Q-Q Plot. Regression coefficients and standard errors can be found in Tables 4 and 5. A multiple regression was run to predict the paternal figures' gender role conflict on paternal engagement. The multiple regression model statistically significantly predicted paternal engagement, $F(4, 145) = 7.461, p < .001, \text{adj. } R^2 = .148$. Only success, completion, and power ($\beta = 0.54$), and restrictive emotionality ($\beta = -0.279$) added statistically significantly to the prediction, $p < .05$.

A multiple regression was run to predict problem-focused coping style scores from the different facets of gender role conflict. The multiple regression model statistically significantly predicted problem-focused coping, $F(4, 145) = 5.827, p < .001, \text{adj. } R^2 = 0.115$. Only success, completion, and power ($\beta = 0.352$) added significantly to the prediction, $p < .001$.

A multiple regression was run to predict emotion-focused coping style scores from the different facets of gender role conflict. The multiple regression model statistically significantly predicted emotion-focused coping, $F(4, 145) = 11.860, p < .001, \text{adj. } R^2 = 0.226$. Only success, completion, and power ($\beta = 0.455$) added significantly to the prediction, $p < .001$.

A multiple regression was run to predict avoidant coping style scores from the different facets of gender role conflict. The multiple regression model statistically significantly predicted avoidant coping, $F(4, 145) = 10.956, p < .001, \text{adj. } R^2 = 0.211$. Success, completion, and power ($\beta = 0.244$), and conflict between work and family relations ($\beta = 0.246$) added significantly to the prediction, $p < .05$. These results supported hypotheses H7-H10.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine how paternal figure parenting styles impact the son's masculinity and coping styles. The results provided evidence to support the idea that the relationship with the paternal figure and their masculinity, specifically the success, completion and power, and conflict between work and family relations subscales, have a positive influence on the sons' masculinity. However, the results show that parenting styles do not make a difference when it comes to the sons' masculinity, which contrasts with previous research (Benito-Gomez et al., 2020; Carlson, 2006; Cherry & Gerstein, 2021; Kerr & Stattin, 2000). The current research implies that the relationship between the son and their paternal figure has a greater impact than the parenting style one uses.

The results do not support that parenting styles make a difference in the son's masculinity. One interpretation of these findings is that parenting styles may have less of an impact on the son's masculinity than previous studies have suggested. According to Cao and Lin (2019), masculinity has changed, specifically in fathers, which might mean that even if a parent is not using the most common and effective style, the son can still develop healthy masculine norms. Additionally, the social context of the son may also contribute to parenting styles not making a difference since the friendships the son develops can influence their masculine norm adherence (Cherry & Gerstein, 2021; Exner et al., 2021; Ue, 2022). Much like Bandura's social learning theory (Bandura, 1978), men will observe their social contexts and model themselves after what they see. Therefore, while parenting styles may not be as impactful, the relationships outside of the family should be monitored as the son gets older.

The results of the present study do not support that parenting styles make a difference in the son's coping style. This finding may be explained by the idea that as the sons grow older, they find their ideal way to healthily cope without the guidance of their parents. While there is most likely a parental influence during childhood and adolescence, the effect as an adult may be less impactful (Leaper et al., 2019). Specifically, emotion-focused and problem-focused coping were the two styles being examined since previous literature suggested that men with lower masculine norm adherence would be more likely to use them. Conversely, men with higher masculine norm adherence would be more likely to use a maladaptive coping style (Konopka et al., 2021; Leaper et al., 2019). However, while there were no parenting style differences, the findings suggest that those who adhere to healthy masculine norms could use any coping style (Nabi et al., 2019). In this case, men may cope how they see fit based on the norms they accept and how valuable they see their own coping style, either that be beneficial or maladaptive.

The results did support that there were associations between the paternal figure's gender role conflict and positive paternal engagement on the son's gender role conflict. This implies that if the paternal figure has higher traditional masculine norms, then the son would too. Additionally, if the paternal figure has higher gender role conflict, then their engagement would increase due to not being restricted to traditional gender norms. This supports the previous research by Cao and Lin (2019) that since masculinity has changed, a paternal figure can now display both masculine and feminine norms without the fear of social stigma. Therefore, paternal figures who are more involved may not be limited to previously reinforced gender norms and can take on a more caretaker-like role (Cherry & Gerstein, 2021). This entails that the paternal figure may display both feminine and masculine norms and may ultimately lead to a more positive parenting experience.

The follow up analyses also highlight that success, completion and power, and restrictive emotionality subscales were able to predict paternal engagement. However, the other two subscales, restrictive affectionate behavior between men and conflict with work and family relations, were not significant predictors. This suggests that if paternal figure is not as involved, the son may work more or be more restrictive when it comes to emotions with other men. As Konopka et al. (2021) suggested, as masculinity threat increases, there is an increase in negative attitudes towards people in the LGBTQ+ community. As a result of the paternal figure not being directly available or involved, men may not have a stable relationship and role model with another man, which could increase their stigma toward same sex relationships. Additionally, these results suggest that the less the paternal figure is engaged with the son, they may work more as a result of the lack of a relationship.

The results also provided evidence that the paternal figure's gender role conflict is significantly associated with the son's gender role conflict, even though there were no parenting style differences. This implies that the paternal figures' gender role conflict matters have more of an impact on the son than parenting styles do. This supports the previous research by Cao and Lin (2019) that masculinity has changed and means that current day paternal figures may not feel the need to adhere to traditional gender norms as previous literature has suggested (Cherry & Gerstein, 2021; Lund et al., 2019). This also means that men may not feel the need to be cold and emotionally distant towards others and instead can provide an emotionally expressive and warm environment. Petts et al. (2018) suggested that new fathers have a balance of fatherhood involvement and traditional masculine norms. However, the results in the current study show that fathers do not need to adhere to those norms and can focus on being involved and creating a relationship with the son. As suggested before, the quality of the relationship between the paternal figure and son seems to be more important than the parenting style utilized and should be examined further in future studies.

Finally, we obtained evidence that the son's gender role conflict was able to predict their coping style. Much like Pleck's (2010) model in which the father and son influence each other, the paternal figures' gender role conflict was able to significantly predict the sons' gender role conflict. According to Leaper et al. (2019), men who have more adherence to traditional masculine norms may be less likely to seek out help, but this was not supported in the current study. The results showed that the men who had higher gender role conflict were more likely to use any of the three coping styles. This contradicts the previous literature (e.g., Cao & Lin, 2019; Cherry & Gerstein, 2021; Pleck, 2010) that suggests that men who are higher in gender role conflict will tend to use the emotion or problem focused coping, not avoidant coping. These

results are important to highlight because they show that gender role conflict can predict specific outcomes in the son and in turn their coping styles.

Limitations and Future Directions

While the study contributes to the current literature on the topic, it is not without limitations. One such limitation is the categorization of the parenting styles. While it is based off Baumrind's (1966) work, having only three categories for parenting styles is narrow and does not allow for a combination of two styles. This lack of combination of styles does not provide the most accurate depiction of parenting styles, but future research could address this by including more scales. Additionally, the sample size and criteria for inclusion should also be noted. As seen in Tables 6 to 11, the effect sizes are relatively low, meaning that the sample size may not be large enough to find a statistical difference and should be expanded in future research. The aim of the study was to examine people in Generation Z but is limiting since it is one perspective of masculinity and can be vastly different from other generations. Therefore, age should be examined in the future as each generation has different perspectives of masculinity, which could aid in understanding how they view modern parenting styles and possibly mediate that effect. To expand on this, future research could include a bigger sample size to have extra inclusionary criteria that would allow for different generational perspectives.

Another limitation of the study is the lack of cultural consideration as previous research shows that different parts of the world differ in parenting styles. In future research, culture and religion should be taken into account when examining parenting styles. Additionally, since masculinity can be socially and contextually dependent, this should be studied in future research as different relationships and situations can influence how the son views masculine norms (Lund et al., 2019). Additionally, while the current research only examined the parenting style of the

paternal figure, the maternal figure could also have an influence on the son's masculinity due to past literature suggesting that a caring and open environment allows for more expression (Lin & Billingham, 2014). In future research, this could be expanded by having the son answer questions about the maternal and paternal figure to see if there is a difference in parenting styles and how that impacts their masculine norms instead of examining a single relationship.

Conclusion

Despite these limitations, the current research can still be seen as a step toward new research regarding family relationships and different outcomes for the son. While the previous research had pointed towards the parenting style making a difference in the son's outcomes (Baumrind, 1991; Cherry & Gerstein, 2021; Lin & Billingham, 2014), the current study does not focus on developmental outcomes. However, the coping style of the son seems to be impacted the most by the paternal figure and their engagement with the son rather than the overall parenting style they most commonly use. While the parenting styles did not have the predicted impact as the literature suggested, the current results should not be discounted entirely as there are a multitude of implications that could be expanded on in future research. Furthermore, the current study has presented a unique opportunity to see how traditional or androgenous masculine norms have shaped the current generation of people and parents alike. This would be valuable as a resource for new fathers since it emphasizes that the relationship between paternal figure and son has an impact on coping styles.

References

- Addis, M. E., & Cohane, G. H. (2005). Social scientific paradigms of masculinity and their implications for research and practice in men's mental health. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 61*(6), 633–647. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1002/jclp.20099>
- Affleck, W., Thamothersampillai, U., Jeyakumar, J., & Whitley, R. (2018). "If one does not fulfill his duties, he must not be a man": Masculinity, mental health and resilience amongst Sri Lankan Tamil refugee men in Canada. *Culture, Medicine, and Psychiatry: An International Journal of Cross-Cultural Health Research, 42*(4), 840–861. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1007/s11013-018-9592-9>
- Aikawa, M., & Stewart, A. L. (2020). Men's parenting as an intergroup phenomenon: The influence of group dominance, sexism, and beliefs about children on fathering attitudes. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities, 21*(1), 69–80. <https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000213>
- Almas, A. N., Grusec, J. E., & Tackett, J. L. (2011). Children's disclosure and secrecy: Links to maternal parenting characteristics and children's coping skills. *Social Development, 20*(3), 624–643. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9507.2010.00602.x>
- Bandura, A. (1978). Social learning theory of aggression. *Journal of Communication, 28*(3), 12-29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1978.tb01621.x>
- Bandura, A., Ross, D., & Ross, S. A. (1961). Transmission of aggression through imitation of aggressive models. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 63*(3), 575–582. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1037/h0045925>
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. *Child development, 887-907*. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.2307/1126611>

- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *11*(1), 56–95. [https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/0272431691111004](https://doi.org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/0272431691111004)
- Baumstarck, K., Alessandrini, M., Hamidou, Z., Auquier, P., Leroy, T., & Boyer, L. (2017). Assessment of coping: A new French four-factor structure of the brief COPE inventory. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*, *15*(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-016-0581-9>
- Barton, A. L., & Kirtley, M. S. (2012). Gender differences in the relationships among parenting styles and college student mental health. *Journal of American College Health*, *60*(1), 21–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2011.555933>
- Bean, R. A., Bush, K. R., McKenry, P. C., & Wilson, S. M. (2003). The impact of parental support, behavioral control, and psychological control on the academic achievement and self-esteem of african american and european american adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *18*(5), 523-541. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558403255070>
- Benito-Gomez, M., Williams, K. N., McCurdy, A., & Fletcher, A. C. (2020). Autonomy-supportive parenting in adolescence: Cultural variability in the contemporary United States. *Journal of Family Theory and Review* *12*(1), 7-26. DOI:[10.1111/jftr.12362](https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12362)
- Berger, J. L., Addis, M. E., Green, J. D., Mackowiak, C., & Goldberg, V. (2013). Men’s reactions to mental health labels, forms of help-seeking, and sources of help-seeking advice. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *14*(4), 433–443. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1037/a0030175>

- Berke, D. S., Reidy, D., & Zeichner, A. (2018). Masculinity, emotion regulation, and psychopathology: A critical review and integrated model. *Clinical Psychology Review* 1(1), DOI:10.1016/j.cpr.2018.01.004
- Bronte-Tinkew, J., Horowitz, A., & Carrano, J. (2010). Aggravation and stress in parenting: Associations with coparenting and father engagement among resident fathers. *Journal of Family Issues* 31(4), 525-555. DOI: 10.1177/0192513X09340147
- Buri, J. R. (1991). Parental Authority Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 57(1), 110–119. https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa5701_13
- Carlson, M. J., (2006). Family structure, father involvement, and adolescent behavioral outcomes. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 68(1), 137-154. doi/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00239.x
- Cao, S., & Lin, X. (2019). Masculinizing fatherhood: Negotiation of Yang and Jiao among young fathers in China. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 28(8), 937–947. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/09589236.2019.1625312>
- Carver, C. S., Scheier, M. F., & Weintraub, J. K. (1989). Assessing coping strategies: a theoretically based approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56(2), 267. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.56.2.267>
- Cherry, K. E., & Gerstein, E. D. (2021). Fathering and masculine norms: Implications for the socialization of children’s emotion regulation. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 13(2), 149–163. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/jftr.12411>
- Cole, B. P., & Ingram, P. B. (2020). Where do I turn for help? Gender role conflict, self-stigma, and college men’s help-seeking for depression. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities*, 21(3), 441–452. <https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000245.supp>

- Conley, D. L. (2021). The impact of structural stigma and other factors on state mental health legislative outcomes during the Trump administration. *Stigma and Health*, 6(4), 476–486. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1037/sah0000331>
- DelPriore, D. J., Shakiba, N., Schlomer, G. L., Hill, S. E., & Ellis, B. J. (2019). The effects of fathers on daughters' expectations for men. *Developmental psychology*, 55(7), 15-23, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/dev0000741>
- Dick, G. L. (2004). The Fatherhood Scale. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 14(2), 80–92. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/1049731503257863>
- Dixon, R. W., Youssef, G. J., Hasking, P., Yücel, M., Jackson, A. C., & Dowling, N. A. (2016). The relationship between gambling attitudes, involvement, and problems in adolescence: Examining the moderating role of coping strategies and parenting styles. *Addictive Behaviors*, 58, 42–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2016.02.011>
- Exner, C. D., Wright, A., Claussen, C., & Truscott, E. (2021). A systematic review of adolescent masculinities and associations with internalizing behavior problems and social support. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 68(1–2), 215–231. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1002/ajcp.12492>
- Feigelman, W., Coleman, D., & Rosen, Z. (2021). Examining the social origins and young adult life trajectories of high traditional masculinity (htm) males: A group at elevated suicide risk. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/sltb.12753>
- Gamble, W. C., Ramakumar, S., & Diaz, A. (2007). Maternal and paternal similarities and differences in parenting: An examination of Mexican-American parents of young

- children. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 22(1), 72–88.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2006.11.004>
- Gibbons, S. W., Shafer, M., Aramanda, L., Hickling, E. J., & Benedek, D. M. (2014). Combat health care providers and resiliency: Adaptive coping mechanisms during and after deployment. *Psychological Services*, 11(2), 192–199. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033165>
- Hobden, B., Turon, H., Bryant, J., Wall, L., Brown, S., & Sanson, F. R. (2019). Oncology patient preferences for depression care: A discrete choice experiment. *Psycho-Oncology*, 28(4), 807–814. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1002/pon.5024>
- Hoeve, M., Dubas, J. S., Eichelsheim, V. I., Van der Laan, P. H., Smeenk, W., & Gerris, J. R. M. (2009). The relationship between parenting and delinquency: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 37(1), 749-775. DOI:10.1007/s10802-009-9310-8
- Hong, J. S., Kim, D. H., deLara, E. W., Wei, H.-S., Prisner, A., & Alexander, N. B. (2021). Parenting style and bullying and victimization: Comparing foreign-born Asian, US-born Asian, and White American adolescents. *Journal of Family Violence*, 36(7), 799–811.
<https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1007/s10896-020-00176-y>
- Hunter, S. C., Riggs, D. W., & Augoustinos, M., (2017). Hegemonic masculinity versus a caring masculinity: Implications for understanding primary caregiving. *Social Personal Psychology Compass* 11(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12307>
- Kerr, M., & Stattin, H. (2000). What parents know, how they know it, and several forms of adolescent adjustment: Further support for a reinterpretation of monitoring. *Developmental Psychology* 36(3), 366-380. DOI: 10.1037//0012-1649.36.3.366
- Killian, R., Müller-Stierlin, A., Söhner, F., Beschoner, P., Gündel, H., Staiger, T., Stiawa, M., Becker, T., Frasch, K., Panzirsch, M., Schmauß, M., & Krumm, S. (2020). Masculinity

- norms and occupational role orientations in men treated for depression. *PLoS ONE*, 15(5). <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0233764>
- Kira, I., Shuwiekh, H., Kucharska, J., & Bujold-Bugeaud, M. (2021). Does favoring male gender hurt or benefit men? The linear and non-linear dynamics of the impact of favoring male gender by family and society on men's mental health in two cultures. *Current Psychology: A Journal for Diverse Perspectives on Diverse Psychological Issues*, 40(2), 563–578. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1007/s12144-018-9970-z>
- Konopka, K., Rajchert, J., Dominiak-Kochanek, M., & Roszak, J. (2021). The role of masculinity threat in homonegativity and transphobia. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 68(5), 802–829. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/00918369.2019.1661728>
- Kuppens, S., & Ceulemans, E. (2019). Parenting styles: A closer look at a well-known concept. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 28(1), 168–181. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-018-1242-x>
- Leaper, C., Farkas, T., & Starr, C. R. (2019). Traditional masculinity, help avoidance, and intrinsic interest in relation to high school students' English and math performance. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities*, 20(4), 603–611. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1037/men0000188>
- Le, T. P., & Iwamoto, D. K. (2022). Racial discrimination, gender role conflict, and depression in college men of color: A longitudinal test of the racist-gender stress model. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities*, 23(1), 4–12. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1037/men0000378>

- Lefkowitz, E. S., & Zeldow, P. B. (2006). Masculinity and Femininity Predict Optimal Mental Health: A Belated Test of the Androgyny Hypothesis. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 87(1), 95–101. https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa8701_08
- Lin, Y.-C., & Billingham, R. E. (2014). Relationship between parenting styles and gender role identity in college students. *Psychological Reports*, 114(1), 250–271. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.2466/21.09.PR0.114k13w4>
- Liu, S., Bamberger, P., Wang, M., Shi, J., & Bacharach, S. B. (2020). When onboarding becomes risky: Extending social learning theory to explain newcomers' adoption of heavy drinking with clients. *Human Relations*, 73(5), 682–710. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726719842653>
- Lund, R., Meriläinen, S., & Tienari, J. (2019). New masculinities in universities? Discourses, ambivalence and potential change. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 26(10), 1376–1397. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/gwao.12383>
- Mahalik, J. R., Locke, B. D., Ludlow, L. H., Diemer, M. A., Scott, R. P. J., Gottfried, M., & Freitas, G. (2003). Development of the conformity to masculine norms inventory. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 4(1), 3–25. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.4.1.3>
- Martin, A., Ryan, R. M., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2010). When fathers' supportiveness matters most: Maternal and paternal parenting and children's school readiness. *Journal of Family Psychology* 24(2), 145-155. DOI: 10.1037/a0018073
- McKinney, C., Stearns, M., & Rogers, M. M. (2018). Perceptions of differential parenting between Southern United States mothers and fathers. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 27(11), 3742–3752. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-018-1204-3>

- Miller, P., Hargreaves, J., Curtis, A., & Zinkiewicz, L. (2013). The association between an abusive father-son relationship, quantity of alcohol consumption, and male-to-male alcohol-related aggression. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*, *37*(9), 1571–1576. doi:10.1111/acer.12114
- Mongan, D., Shannon, C., Hanna, D., Boyd, A., & Mulholland, C. (2019). The association between specific types of childhood adversity and attenuated psychotic symptoms in a community sample. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry*, *13*(2), 281–289. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/eip.12478>
- Munroe, M., Al-Refae, M., Chan, H. W., & Ferrari, M. (2021). Using self-compassion to grow in the face of trauma: The role of positive reframing and problem-focused coping strategies. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/tra0001164>
- Nabi, R. L., Wolfers, L. N., Walter, N., & Qi, L. (2022). Coping with COVID-19 stress: The role of media consumption in emotion- and problem-focused coping. *Psychology of Popular Media*. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1037/ppm0000374>
- Namy, S., Heilman, B., Stich, S., Crownover, J., Leka, B., & Edmeades, J. (2015). Changing what it means to ‘become a man’: Participants’ reflections on a school-based programme to redefine masculinity in the Balkans. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, *17*(Suppl 2), 206–222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2015.1070434>
- Oliffe, J. L., Broom, A., Rossnagel, E., Kelly, M. T., Affleck, W., & Rice, S. M. (2020). Help-seeking prior to male suicide: Bereaved men perspectives. *Social Science & Medicine*, *261*. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113173>

- Oliffe, J. L., Galdas, P. M., Han, C. SE., and Kelly, M. T., (2012), Faux masculinities among college men who experience depression. *Health*, 17(1), 75-92.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1363459312447256>
- Oliffe, J. L., Kelly, M. T. Johnson, J. L., Bottorff, J. L., Gray, R. E., Ogrodniczuk, J. S., Galdas, P. M., (2010), Masculinities and college men's depression: Recursive relationships. *Health Sociology Review*, 19(4), 465-477. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5172/hesr.2010.19.4.465>
- O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B. J., Gable, R. K., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1986). Gender-Role Conflict Scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 14(5-6), 335-350. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00287583>
- Pachankis, J. E., Hatzenbuehler, M. L., Bränström, R., Schmidt, A. J., Berg, R. C., Jonas, K., Pitoňák, M., Baros, S., & Weatherburn, P. (2021). Structural stigma and sexual minority men's depression and suicidality: A multilevel examination of mechanisms and mobility across 48 countries. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 130(7), 713-726. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1037/abn0000693>
- Petts, R. J., Shafer, K. M., & Essig, L. (2018). Does adherence to masculine norms shape fathering behavior? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 80(3), 704-720. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/jomf.12476>
- Pleck, J. H. (2010). Fatherhood and masculinity. *The role of the father in child development*, 5th ed, (pp. 27-57). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Pleck, J. H. (2012). Integrating father involvement in parenting research. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, 12(2-3), 243-253. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/15295192.2012.683365>

- Reilly, E. D., Rochlen, A. B., & Awad, G. H. (2014). Men's self-compassion and self-esteem: The moderating roles of shame and masculine norm adherence. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 15(1), 22–28. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1037/a0031028>
- Rizvi, S. S. (2015). Father's masculinity ideology and their adolescent's perception of father's love. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 5(1), 14. DOI: 10.7763/IJiet.2015.V5.468
- Rochlen, A. B., & Mahalik, J. R., (2004). Women's perceptions of male partners' gender role conflict as predictors of psychological well-being and relationship satisfaction. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 5(2), 147-157. DOI: 10.1037/1524-9220.5.2.147
- Rogers, A. A., Ha, T., Byon, J., & Thomas, C. (2020). Masculine gender-role adherence indicates conflict resolution patterns in heterosexual adolescent couples: A dyadic, observational study. *Journal of Adolescence*, 79, 112–121. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2020.01.004>
- Simons, L. G., & Conger, R. D. (2007). Linking mother-father differences in parenting to a typology of family parenting styles and adolescent outcomes. *Journal of Family Issues*, 28(2), 212–241. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X06294593>
- Smetana, J. G. (1995). Parenting styles and conceptions parental authority during adolescence. *Society for Research in Child Development*, 66(2), 299-316.
- Spendelov, J. S., (2015), Men's self-reported coping strategies for depression: A systematic review of qualitative studies. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 16(4), 439-447. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038626>
- Tancred, E.-M., & Greeff, A. P. (2015). Mothers' parenting styles and the association with family coping strategies and family adaptation in families of children with ADHD.

Clinical Social Work Journal, 43(4), 442–451. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10615-015-0524-7>

- Triemstra, K. T., Niec, L. N., Peer, S. O., & Christian-Brandt, A. S. (2017). The influence of conventional masculine gender role norms on parental attitudes toward seeking psychological services for children. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 18(4), 311–320. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1037/men0000055>
- Ue, T. (2022). Toxic masculinity and the college scene: John Berardo on Initiation and the anti-establishment thriller. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 31(2), 280–286. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/09589236.2021.1931825>
- Villareal, D. L., & Nelson, J. A. (2018). Parental monitoring and adolescent risk behavior: The moderating role of adolescent internalizing symptoms and gender. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-018-1203-4>
- Yaffee, Y. (2020), Systematic review of the differences between mothers and fathers in parenting styles and practices. *Current Psychology* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-020-01014-6>
- Youngstrom, E. A., Perez Algorta, G., Youngstrom, J. K., Frazier, T. W., & Findling, R. L. (2021). Evaluating and validating GBI mania and depression short forms for self-report of mood symptoms. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 50(5), 579–595. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/15374416.2020.1756301>
- Zarra, N. M., Kiuru, N., Aunola, K., Zarra, N. M., Ahonen, T., Poikkeus, A., Lerkkanen, M., & Nurmi, J. (2014). Social withdrawal in children moderates the association between parenting styles and the children’s own socioemotional development. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 55(11), 1260–1269. <https://doi-org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/jcpp.12251>

Zhao, X., Huang, M., & Hh, Y. (2022). The perception, influence and construction of masculinity for generation Z in China: 12 interview cases of male university students.

Online Conference (p. 50).

Zoorob, D., Shah, S., Saevig, D. L., Murphy, C., Aouthmany, S., & Brickman, K. (2021). Insight into resident burnout, mental wellness, and coping mechanisms early in the COVID-19 pandemic. *PLoS ONE*, *16*(4). <https://doi->

[org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0250104](https://doi-
org.ric.idm.oclc.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0250104)

Appendix A

The Brief COPE Scale (Carver et al., 1989)

The following questions ask how you have sought to cope with a hardship in your life. Read the statements and indicate how much you have been using each coping style. Answer on a scale from 1 = *I haven't been doing this at all* to 4 = *I've been doing this a lot*. Subscales include problem-focused (Items 2, 7, 10, 12, 14, 17, 23, 25), Emotion-Focused Coping (Items 5, 9, 13, 15, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28), Avoidant Coping (Items 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 11, 16, 19).

1. I've been turning to work or other activities to take my mind off things. (AC)
2. I've been concentrating my efforts on doing something about the situation I'm in. (PFC)
3. I've been saying to myself "This isn't real". (AC)
4. I've been using alcohol or other drugs to make myself feel better. (AC)
5. I've been getting emotional support from others. (EFC)
6. I've been giving up trying to deal with it. (AC)
7. I've been taking action to try to make the situation better. (PFC)
8. I've been refusing to believe that it has happened. (AC)
9. I've been saying things to let my unpleasant feelings escape. (EFC)
10. I've been getting help and advice from other people. (PFC)
11. I've been using alcohol or other drugs to help me get through it. (AC)
12. I've been trying to see it in a different light, to make it seem more positive. (PFC)
13. I've been criticizing myself. (EFC)
14. I've been trying to come up with a strategy about what to do. (PFC)
15. I've been getting comfort and understanding from someone. (EFC)

16. I've been giving up the attempt to cope. (AC)
17. I've been looking for something good in what is happening. (PFC)
18. I've been making jokes about it. (EFC)
19. I've been doing something to think about it less, such as going to movies, watching TV, reading, daydreaming, sleeping, or shopping. (AC)
20. I've been accepting the reality of the fact that it has happened. (EFC)
21. I've been expressing my negative feelings. (EFC)
22. I've been trying to find comfort in my religion or spiritual beliefs. (EFC)
23. I've been trying to get advice or help from other people about what. (PFC)
24. I've been learning to live with it. (EFC)
25. I've been thinking hard about what steps to take. (PFC)
26. I've been blaming myself for things that happened. (EFC)
27. I've been praying or meditating. (EFC)
28. I've been making fun of the situation. (EFC)

Appendix B

Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, 1986)

Below is a questionnaire that will ask the participants about their conflict with different types of gender roles. The four subscales are success, power, and competition (1, 5, 8, 12, 14, 18, 21, 23, 24, 28, 32, 34, 37), restrictive emotionality (2, 6, 9, 13, 15, 19, 22, 25, 29, 30), restrictive affectionate behavior between men (3, 7, 10, 16, 20, 26, 33, 35), and conflict between work and family relations (4, 11, 17, 27, 31, 36). The response options range from 1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 6 = *Strongly Agree*.

1. Moving up the career ladder is important to me. (SCP)
2. I have difficulty telling others I care about them. (RE)
3. Verbally expressing my love to another man is difficult for me. (RABBM)
4. I am real torn between my hectic work schedule and caring for my health. (CBWFR)
5. Making money is part of my idea of being a successful man. (SCP)
6. Strong emotions are difficult for me to understand. (RE)
7. Affection with other men makes me tense. (RABBM)
8. I sometimes define my personal value by my career success. (SCP)
9. Expressing feelings makes me feel open to attack by other people. (RE)
10. Expressing my emotions to other men is risky. (RABBM)
11. My career, job, or school affects the quality of my leisure or family life. (CBWFR)
12. I evaluate other people's value by their level of achievement and success. (SCP)
13. Talking about my feelings during sexual relations is difficult for me. (RE)
14. I worry about failing and how it affects my doing well as a man. (SCP)

15. I have difficulty expressing my emotional needs to my partner. (RE)
16. Men who touch other men make me uncomfortable. (RABBM)
17. Finding time to relax is difficult for me. (CBWFR)
18. Doing well all the time is important to me. (SCP)
19. I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings. (RE)
20. Hugging other men is difficult for me. (RABBM)
21. I often feel that I need to be in charge of those around me. (SCP)
22. Telling others of my strong feelings is not part of my sexual behavior. (RE)
23. Competing with others is the best way to succeed. (SCP)
24. Winning is a measure of my value and personal worth. (SCP)
25. I often have trouble finding words that describe how I am feeling. (RE)
26. I am sometimes hesitant to show my affection to men because of how others might perceive me. (RABBM)
27. My needs to work or study keep me from my family or leisure more than I would like.
(CBWFR)
28. I strive to be more successful than others. (SCP)
29. I do not like to show my emotions to other people. (RE)
30. Telling my partner my feelings about him/her during sex is difficult for me. (RE)
31. My work or school often disrupts other parts of my life (home, family, health leisure).
(CBWFR)
32. I am often concerned about how others evaluate my performance at work or school.
(SCP)
33. Being very personal with other men makes me feel uncomfortable. (RABBM)

34. Being smarter or physically stronger than other men is important to me. (SCP)
35. Men who are overly friendly to me make me wonder about their sexual preference (men or women). (RABBM)
36. Overwork and stress caused by a need to achieve on the job or in school, affects/hurts my life. (CBWFR)
37. I like to feel superior to other people. (SCP)

Appendix C

Gender Role Conflict Scale-Modified for Paternal Figures (O'Neil, 1986)

Below is a questionnaire that will ask the participants about their paternal figures' conflict with different types of gender roles. The four subscales are success, power, and competition (1, 5, 8, 12, 14, 18, 21, 23, 24, 28, 32, 34, 37), restrictive emotionality (2, 6, 9, 13, 15, 19, 22, 25, 29, 30), restrictive affectionate behavior between men (3, 7, 10, 16, 20, 26, 33, 35), and conflict between work and family relations (4, 11, 17, 27, 31, 36). The response options range from 1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 6 = *Strongly Agree*.

1. Moving up the career ladder is important to my father. (SCP)
2. My father has difficulty telling others that he cares about them. (RE)
3. My father verbally expressing his love to another man is difficult for him. (RABBM)
4. My father is real torn between his hectic work schedule and caring for his health.
(CBWFR)
5. Making money is part of his idea of being a successful man. (SCP)
6. Strong emotions are difficult for him to understand. (RE)
7. Affection with other men makes him tense. (RABBM)
8. My father sometimes defines his personal value by his career success. (SCP)
9. Expressing feelings makes him feel open to attack by other people. (RE)
10. Expressing his emotions to other men is risky. (RABBM)
11. My father's career, job, or school affects the quality of his leisure or family life.
(CBWFR)
12. My father evaluates other people's value by their level of achievement and success. (SCP)

13. Talking about his feelings during sexual relations is difficult for him. (RE)
14. My father worries about failing and how it affects his doing well as a man. (SCP)
15. My father has difficulty expressing his emotional needs to his partner. (RE)
16. Men who touch other men make him uncomfortable. (RABBM)
17. Finding time to relax is difficult for him. (CBWFR)
18. Doing well all the time is important to him. (SCP)
19. My father has difficulty expressing his tender feelings. (RE)
20. Hugging other men is difficult for him. (RABBM)
21. My father often feels that he needs to be in charge of those around him. (SCP)
22. Telling others of his strong feelings is not part of his sexual behavior. (RE)
23. My father competing with others is the best way to succeed. (SCP)
24. Winning is a measure of his value and personal worth. (SCP)
25. My father often has trouble finding words that describe how he is feeling. (RE)
26. My father is sometimes hesitant to show his affection to men because of how others might perceive him. (RABBM)
27. My father needs to work or study to keep him from my family or leisure more than he would like. (CBWFR)
28. My father strives to be more successful than others. (SCP)
29. My father does not like to show his emotions to other people. (RE)
30. Telling his partner his feelings about him during sex is difficult for him. (RE)
31. My father's work or school often disrupts other parts of his life (home, family, health leisure). (CBWFR)

32. My father is often concerned about how others evaluate his performance at work or school. (SCP)
33. Being very personal with other men makes him feel uncomfortable. (RABBM)
34. Being smarter or physically stronger than other men is important to him. (SCP)
35. Men who are overly friendly to him make me wonder about their sexual preference (men or women). (RABBM)
36. Overwork and stress caused by a need to achieve on the job or in school, affects/hurts his life. (CBWFR)
37. My father likes to feel superior to other people. (SCP)

Appendix D

The Parental Authority Questionnaire (Buri, 1991)

Below are a number of statements that describe the parenting styles of the participants' fathers. The subscales include authoritative (Items 4, 5, 8, 11, 15, 20, 22, 23, 27 and 30), authoritarian (Items 2, 3, 7, 9, 12, 16, 18, 25, 26, and 29), and permissive (Items 1, 6, 10, 13, 14, 17, 19, 21, 24, and 28). The response options range from 1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strongly Agree*.

1. While I was growing up my father felt that in a well-run home the children should have their way in the family as often as the parents do. (P)
2. Even if his children didn't agree with him, my father felt that it was for our own good if we were forced to conform to what he thought was right. (ATN)
3. Whenever my father told me to do something as I was growing up, he expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions (ATN)
4. As I was growing up, once family policy had been established, my father discussed the reasoning behind the policy with the children in the family. (ATV)
5. My father has always encouraged verbal give-and-take whenever I have felt that family rules and restrictions were unreasonable. (ATV)
6. My father has always felt that what children need is to be free to make up their own minds and to do what they want to do, even if this does not agree with what their parents might want. (P)
7. As I was growing up my father did not allow me to question any decision he had made. (ATN)

8. As I was growing up my father directed the activities and decisions of the children in the family through reasoning and discipline. (ATV)
9. My father has always felt that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to. (ATN)
10. As I was growing up my father did not feel that I needed to obey rules and regulations of behavior simply because someone in authority had established them. (P)
11. As I was growing up I knew what my father expected of me in my family, but I also felt free to discuss those expectations with my father when I felt that they were unreasonable. (ATV)
12. My father felt that wise parents should teach their children early just who is boss in the family. (ATN)
13. As I was growing up, my father seldom gave me expectations and guidelines for my behavior. (P)
14. Most of the time as I was growing up my father did what the children in the family wanted when making family decisions. (P)
15. As the children in my family were growing up, my father consistently gave us direction and guidance in rational and objective ways. (ATV)
16. As I was growing up my father would get very upset if I tried to disagree with him. (ATN)
17. My father feels that most problems in society would be solved if parents would not restrict their children's activities, decisions, and desires as they are growing up. (P)
18. As I was growing up my father let me know what behavior he expected of me, and if I didn't meet those expectations, he punished me. (ATN)

19. As I was growing up my father allowed me to decide most things for myself without a lot of direction from him. (P)
20. As I was growing up my father took the children's opinions into consideration when making family decisions, but he would not decide for something simply because the children wanted it. (ATV)
21. My father did not view himself as responsible for directing and guiding my behavior as I was growing up. (P)
22. My father had clear standards of behavior for the children in our home as I was growing up, but he was willing to adjust those standards to the needs of each of the individual children in the family. (ATV)
23. My father gave me direction for my behavior and activities as I was growing up and he expected me to follow his direction, but he was always willing to listen to my concerns and to discuss that direction with me. (ATV)
24. As I was growing up my father allowed me to form my own point of view on family matters and he generally allowed me to decide for myself what I was going to do. (P)
25. My father has always felt that most problems in society would be solved if we could get parents to strictly and forcibly deal with their children when they don't do what they are supposed to as they are growing up. (ATN)
26. As I was growing up my father often told me exactly what he wanted me to do and how he expected me to do it. (ATN)
27. As I was growing up my father gave me clear direction for my behaviors and activities, but he was also understanding when I disagreed with him. (ATV)

28. As I was growing up my father did not direct the behaviors, activities, and desires of the children in the family. (P)
29. As I was growing up I knew what my father expected of me in the family and he insisted that I conform to those expectations simply out of respect for his authority. (ATN)
30. As I was growing up, if my father made a decision in the family that hurt me, he was willing to discuss that decision with me and to admit it if he had made a mistake. (ATV)

Appendix E

The Fatherhood Scale (Dick, 2004)

The participant will be asked to think about their fathers during their childhood and adolescence and then will rate the question on how well it corresponds to how your father acted around you.

The subscales being measured are positive engagement (Items 3, 9, 10, 39, 49), positive paternal emotional responsiveness (Items 5, 6, 8, 12, 14, 35, 37, 40, 46, 53, 54, 56, 57, 62), negative paternal engagement (Items 11, 13, 15, 20, 25, 27, 41, 44, 45, 58, 59, 63), the moral father role (Items 26, 32, 50, 61), the gender role model (Items 16, 21, 31, 42, 46, 47), the good provider role (Items 17, 19, 29, 36), the androgenous role (Items 4, 23, 24, 28, 34, 52, 64), responsible paternal engagement (Items 1, 7, 18, 22, 33, 48, 51, 60), and the accessible father (Items 2, 30, 38, 55). Response options are from 1 = *Never* to 5 = *Always* and items with a * need to be reverse coded.

1. My father helped me with my homework. (REG)
2. My father talked to me about my personal problems. (AF)
3. My father took me to activities. (PE)
4. My father told me that he loved me. (AR)
5. My father told me that I was a good boy/girl. (PPER)
6. My father is a caring person. (PPER)
7. My father attended school conferences. (REG)
8. During my childhood I felt close to my father. (PPER)
9. During my teen years my father and I did things together. (PE)
10. My father liked to spend time with me. (PE)

11. My father spanked me. (NPE)*
12. I felt close to my father as a teenager. (PPER)
13. My father hit my mother. (NPE)*
14. I know my father cared about me. (PPER)
15. My father was ashamed of me as a child. (NPE)*
16. My dad taught me to fight back. (GRM)
17. My father made sure I had the things I needed like clothing and toys. (GPR)
18. My father read to me as a child. (REG)
19. My father provided well for us financially. (GPR)
20. My father used to say things to hurt my feelings. (NPE)*
21. My father encouraged me to say what I felt. (GRM)
22. My dad showed interest in my schoolwork. (REG)
23. My father hugged me. (AR)
24. My father is a good man. (AR)
25. When I got in trouble my father would punish me physically. (NPE)*
26. My father taught me right from wrong. (MFR)
27. I saw my father beat my mother. (NPE)
28. I saw my father cry. (AR)
29. My father was a good breadwinner for the family. (GPR)
30. My father helped me solve my problems. (AF)
31. I could talk to my father about anything. (GRM)
32. My father went to church with me. (MFR)
33. I remember playing sports with my father. (REG)

34. My father helped my mom clean the house. (AR)
35. My father comforted me when I was feeling bad. (PPER)
36. My dad was always employed while I was growing up. (GPR)
37. My father made me feel special. (PPER)
38. When I got angry, I used to talk things over with my dad. (AF)
39. My father and I enjoyed time together. (PE)
40. My dad would talk to me about things going on in the world. (PPER)
41. My father was loving toward me. (NPE)*
42. I was abused by my father. (GRM)
43. My father talked to me about sex. (AF)
44. My father used to say grace at mealtime. (AF)
45. When I was a child, my father shouted at me if I did something wrong. (NPE)*
46. I have warm feelings for my father. (PPER)
47. My dad would talk to me about things going on in the world. (GRM)
48. My dad taught me what it was like to be a man. (REG)
49. My dad attended sporting events in which I played. (PE)
50. My father and I had good times together. (MFR)
51. My father instilled important values in me. (REG)
52. My father took me to the doctor. (AR)
53. My father is a kind man. (PPER)
54. My father understood me. (PPER)
55. I told my father I loved him. (AF)
56. My father was around when I needed him. (PPER)

57. My father praised me. (PPER)
58. My father is mean. (NPE)*
59. My father used to get angry and say he didn't like me. (NPE)*
60. My dad attended school activities in which I participated. (REG)
61. My dad talked to me about God. (MFR)
62. My father showed concern when I got hurt. (PPER)
63. I saw my father hit one of my siblings. (NPE)*
64. My dad would cook meals. (AR)

Table 1

<i>Demographics</i>	
<i>Age M (SD)</i>	<i>23.62 (2.728)</i>
	<i>f</i>
<u>Education</u>	
Less than HS	6
High School or Equivalent	30
Some College	44
Associate Degree	11
Bachelor's Degree	48
Master's Degree	5
Doctoral Degree	0
Professional Degree	1
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>	
White	96
Black	17
African American	3
Latino (o, x, a) American	16
Spanish/Hispanic American	11
Asian American (Southeastern Heritage)	7
Asian American (Eastern Heritage)	10
Asian American (Southern Heritage)	11
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1
Native American or Alaska Native	3
Multicultural	1
Other/Self Identify	1

Table 2

Correlations

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. SCP	-							
2. RE	.467**	-						
3. RABBM	.424**	.644**	-					
4. CBWFR	.497**	.542**	.300**	-				
5. SCP-F	.551**	.578**	.426**	.547**	-			
6. RE-F	.453**	.637**	.433**	.535**	.737**	-		
7. RABBM-F	.449**	.617**	.557**	.549**	.803**	.820**	-	
8. CBWFR-F	.498**	.514**	.351**	.618**	.847**	.740**	.787**	-
9. FHS - PPE	.441*	.241**	.326**	0.135	.375**	.161*	.256**	.291**

Note. SCP = Success, Completion, and Power; RE = Restrictive Emotionality; RABBM = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men; CBWFR = Conflict Between Work and Family Relations; SCP-F = Success, Completion, and Power – Father; RE-F = Restrictive Emotionality – Father; RABBM-F = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men – Father; CBWFR-F = Conflict Between Work and Family Relations – Father; FHS - PPE = Fatherhood Scale - Positive Paternal Engagement.

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

Table 3

Correlations

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. SCP	-					
2. RE	.467**	-				
3. RABBM	.424**	.644**	-			
4. CBWFR	.497**	.542**	.300**	-		
5. PF	.369**	.186*	0.141	.221**	-	
6. EF	.483**	.290**	.174*	.290**	.713**	-
7. AC	.401**	.337**	.203*	.419**	.402**	.659**

Note. SCP = Success, Completion, and Power; RE = Restrictive Emotionality, RABBM = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men; CBWFR = Conflict Between Work and Family Relations; PF = Problem-Focused Coping; EF = Emotion-Focused Coping; AC = Avoidant Coping.

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

Table 4

Stepwise Multiple Regression for Overall Positive Paternal Engagement

Positive Paternal Engagement	<i>B</i>	95% CI for <i>B</i>		<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	<i>adj. R</i> ²	p-value
		<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>					
Model						0.171	0.148	<.001
Constant	27.443	21.323	33.563					
SCP-F	0.439	0.186	0.691	0.128	0.54			<.001
RE-F	-0.243	-0.48	-0.006	0.12	-0.279			0.045
RABBM-F	0.063	-0.318	0.444	0.193	0.051			0.744
CBWFR-F	-0.001	-0.479	0.478	0.242	0			0.998

Note. CI = Confidence Interval; SCP-F = Success, Completion, and Power - Father; RE-F = Restrictive Emotionality - Father; RABBM-F = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men - Father; CBWFR-F = Conflict Between Work and Family Relations - Father.

Table 5

Stepwise Multiple Regression for Overall Coping Styles

Overall Coping	<i>B</i>	95% CI for <i>B</i>		<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>R</i> ²	<i>adj. R</i> ²	p-value
		<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>					
Model - Problem-Focused Coping						0.138	0.115	<.001
Constant	10.236	4.411	16.062					
SCP	0.255	0.119	0.39	0.069	0.352			<.001
RE	0.017	-0.172	0.205	0.095	0.02			0.862
RABBM	-0.034	-0.231	0.163	0.1	-0.035			0.733
CBWFR	0.062	-0.201	0.325	0.133	0.046			0.642
Model - Emotion-Focused Coping						0.247	0.226	<.001
Constant	10.658	4.406	16.909					
SCP	0.378	0.233	0.524	0.074	0.455			<.001
RE	0.132	-0.07	0.334	0.102	0.139			0.2
RABBM	-0.127	-0.339	0.084	0.107	-0.115			0.235
CBWFR	0.037	-0.245	0.32	0.143	0.024			0.795
Model - Avoidant Coping						0.232	0.211	<.001
Constant	3.7	-0.788	8.187					
SCP	0.144	0.04	0.249	0.053	0.244			0.007
RE	0.085	-0.06	0.23	0.073	0.126			0.249
RABBM	-0.044	-0.196	0.108	0.077	-0.056			0.567
CBWFR	0.273	0.07	0.475	0.103	0.246			0.009

Note. SCP = Success, Completion, and Power; RE = Restrictive Emotionality; RABBM = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men; CBWFR = Conflict Between Work and Family Relations.

Table 6

Means, Standard Deviations, and One-Way Analysis of Variance in the Son's Gender Role Conflict and Parenting Styles

GRC of Son	Success, Completion and Power		<i>F</i> (3, 146)	η^2
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Parenting Style			0.499	0.01
Authoritative	47.52	9.74		
Authoritarian	47.28	11.9		
Permissive	46.16	10.25		
Undifferentiated	44.1	13.67		

Note. GRC = Gender Role Conflict; ****p* < .001 meaning there is statistical significance; η^2 = Effect size.

Table 7

Means, Standard Deviations, and One-Way Analysis of Variance in the Son's Gender Role Conflict and Parenting Styles

GRC of Son	Restrictive Emotionality		<i>F</i> (3, 146)	η^2
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Parenting Style			0.634	0.013
Authoritative	33.03	8.36		
Authoritarian	33.68	10.48		
Permissive	34.63	9.47		
Undifferentiated	31	11.18		

Note. GRC = Gender Role Conflict; *** $p < .001$ meaning there is statistical significance; η^2 = Effect size..

Table 8

Means, Standard Deviations, and One-Way Analysis of Variance in the Son's Gender Role Conflict and Parenting Styles

GRC of Son	Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men		<i>F</i> (3, 146)	η^2
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Parenting Style			0.407	0.008
Authoritative	25.52	7.98		
Authoritarian	23.9	8.4		
Permissive	25.42	8.69		
Undifferentiated	23.95	9.62		

Note. GRC = Gender Role Conflict; ****p* < .001 meaning there is statistical significance; η^2 = Effect size..

Table 9

Means, Standard Deviations, and One-Way Analysis of Variance in the Son's Gender Role Conflict and Parenting Styles

GRC of Son	Conflict Between Work and Family Relations		<i>F</i> (3, 146)	η^2
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Parenting Style			2.756	0.05
Authoritative	18.45	5.15		
Authoritarian	21.42	5.81		
Permissive	20.45	6.03		
Undifferentiated	18.14	7.136		

Note. GRC = Gender Role Conflict; ****p* < .001 meaning there is statistical significance; η^2 = Effect size..

Table 10

Means, Standard Deviations, and One-Way Analysis of Variance in the Son's Coping Style and Parenting Styles

Coping Style	Avoidant Coping		F(3, 146)	η ²
	M	SD		
Parenting Style			0.785	0.016
Authoritative	16.32	6.22		
Authoritarian	18.02	6.63		
Permissive	18.58	6.78		
Undifferentiated	16.95	7.39		

Note. *** $p < .001$ meaning there is statistical significance;
η² = Effect size..

Table 11

Means, Standard Deviations, and One-Way Analysis of Variance in the Son's Coping Style and Parenting Styles

Coping Style	Emotion-Focused Coping		<i>F</i> (3, 146)	η^2
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Parenting Style			1.097	0.022
Authoritative	32.42	10.05		
Authoritarian	30.58	9.38		
Permissive	29.47	7.67		
Undifferentiated	27.9	11.11		

Note. ****p* < .001 meaning there is statistical significance;
 η^2 = Effect size.