Investigation Of Teacher Candidates' Family Communication Patterns According To Different Variables (Turkey: Kastamonu University Example)

Bahar Gümrükçü BİLGİCİ
Division of Child Development, Kastamonu Vocational School of Higher Education, Kastamonu University
bgbilgici@kastamonu.edu.tr

Ümit DENİZ
Division of Preschool Education, Department of Primary Education, Faculty of Education, Gazi University
umitdeniz@gazi.edu.tr

Göksal BİLGİCİ
Department of Computer Education and Instructional Technologies, Faculty of Education, Kastamonu University
gbilgici@kastamonu.edu.tr

Abstract
This study aims to investigate the communication patterns of teacher candidates. For this purpose, 577 teacher candidates were examined (420 women, 157 men). A Demographic Information Form and the Revised Family Communication Pattern Instrument were used to collect the required data. Paired-samples t-test was used to investigate whether there was a difference between participants' conversation-orientation and conformity-orientation scores, and independent-samples t-test was used to investigate whether there was a difference in scores across the genders. Further, one-way ANOVA was used to determine whether there was a relationship between the parent's level of education, the region where the teacher candidates grew up in, and the size of these places. Least significant difference (LSD) test was used to follow up on the significant results. The results revealed a significant difference in conversation- and conformity-orientation average scores across the genders. According to these results, female teacher candidates were found to have higher conversation-orientation scores, whereas male candidates were found to have higher conformity-orientation scores. Additionally, it was found that as parents' education level increase, the conversation-orientation in the family communication also increases. In the framework of family communication, it has been determined that the teacher candidates with the highest conversation-orientation scores were from Marmara Region, whereas the teacher candidates with the highest conformity-orientation scores were from Black Sea Region. A positive relationship was found between the region where teacher candidates grew up and the conversation-orientation scores. Moreover, their conformity-orientation scores were found to be negatively related with the size of the place where the teacher candidates grew up.
Keywords: *Family communication patterns, teacher candidates, communication*

Introduction

Wambolt and Reiss (1989) defined the concept of family as "as a group of intimates who generate a sense of home and group identity, complete with strong ties of loyalty and emotion and an experience of history and a future," Although "the perception about the concept of family" continues to be an important unit of demographic and social analyses, it varies according to different groups and communities. In the framework of social norms and values, a family unit may comprise a married couple and their children, two sisters living together, a single mother with her children, a married couple with their children and grandchildren, an unmarried couple, a divorced couple, a remarried couple and their children, or a family network (Tillman et al., 2008). Martha Minow (1998) "argued that it is not important whether a group of people fits to the legal definition of family; instead, what is important is whether this group of people functions as a family." Accordingly, Martha Minow (1998) indicated that there are important questions to understand whether a group of people functions as a family, such as "do they share affection and resources?" and "Do they think of one another as family members and present themselves as such to neighbors and others?"

Although a family carries the general elements of a society, it carries extremely different social, economic, psychological, structural, interactive, and communicative elements as well. Moreover, no family is identical with one another even though a family constitutes the building blocks of society. This unique structure of a family stems from the fact that household rules are established and applied by the family members themselves (Pembecioğlu, 2006). One of the most important instruments for the establishment and application of household rules is communication.

Communication is a concept that cannot be easily defined. Therefore, defining human communication is as much complex as defining the institution of a family. Academicians have made various attempts to define communication, but they concluded that finding "the best" definition of communication is impossible and

unfortunately this is not a desirable conclusion (Fitzpatrick & Ritchie, 1993; Littlejohn & Foss, 2010). In the Oxford Dictionary, 1200 words have been used for defining communication (Adler & Rodman, 2006). According to Cüceloğlu (2012), communication is a process that is both individual and social. In other words, communication is a psychosocial process that establishes a relation between at the least two people. Furthermore, Adler and Rodman (2006) categorized communication as internal communication, interpersonal communication, small group communication, public communication, and mass communication. In addition, they explained the function of communication as fulfilling physical, identity-related, social, and practical needs.

Family communication can be defined as the communication between spouses, between mother and her child or children, between father and his child or children, between children and parents, and between siblings (Şahin & Aral, 2012). We can specify the duties for constructing an effective family communication as accepting and listening to the individual who is being communicated with, developing empathy toward the individual who is being communicated with, being honest, and using "I language" in the communication.

The traditional aspect of families is gradually diminishing, and different family styles are developing due to the increase in the number of lone-parent families, stepfamilies, and adoption (Galvin et al., 2015). Different variables are used to classify families. Two mass media specialists, McLeod and Chaffee (1972), at Wisconsin University, developed a new model by classifying families according to their communications. According to this model, there are two models of family communication patterns—socio-oriented and concept-oriented. While concept-orientation explains how the arguments between parents and children affect children's information processing mechanisms, socio-orientation explains how parents use authority to persuade their children to interpret their social environments (Horstman et al., 2018). Regarding this, McLeod and Chaffee suggested that the use of these two strategies by parents varies systematically and predictably to establish an agreement and constructing a social reality with each other. This process aims to predict diverse ways of the socialization of children in processing and interpreting the information in media messages. Some families prefer concept-orientation over socio-orientation; others may prefer vice versa (Koerner & Schrodt, 2014). McLeod and Chafee underlined how mass media and families process or interpret television shows and other media messages. Their studies about the concept- and socio-orientation of families are still widely used in media-effect studies (Koerner & Schrodt, 2014).

Ritchie and Fitzpatrick (1990) again addressed family communication patterns for more general purposes. They renamed "concept-orientation" as "conversation-orientation" in order to reflect the degree of encouragement of interactions about different subjects among family members. Conversation-orientation is about the subjects discussed in a family, sharing of expectations, how decisions are made, open discussions, and how freely opinions are discussed (Horstman et al., 2018). Further, socio-orientation was renamed as "conformity-orientation" in order to better explain how family members approach to the conflicts in common beliefs, values, child obedience, and conformity. Families with high conformity-orientations encourage family members for independence by promoting shared values and beliefs (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002).

Koerner and Fitzpatrick (2004) divided the institution of family according to communication patterns into four categories—consensual, pluralist, protective, and non-interventionist—according to the high or low levels of conversation- and conformity-orientation of families.

It should be assumed that, although family communication patterns are affected by culture, there are fundamental and universal communication behavior patterns that do not stem from culture and therefore are independent from the western culture as such in the many other family communication theories (Koerner & Schrodt, 2014). The universal applicability of this theory is supported by its successful applications in cultures different from western cultures such as the Chinese (Zhang, 2007), Iranian (Koroshnia & Latifian, 2008; Hashemi et al., 2015), Japanese (Shearman & Dumlao, 2008), Malay (Omar, Mustaffa, & Nordin, 2007), and Indonesian cultures (Pramono et al., 2017).

Studies on family communication have a long history; some of the most influential works were done on this subject during World War II, and these works are influencing thoughts of present-day academicians. In recent years, there have been exciting developments happened in the domain of family communication, which fundamentally restructured the way of thinking about functional and dysfunctional family interaction. Lately, academicians, therapist, clergymen, and communication students have started understanding that subjects such as divorce, child abuse, domestic violence, and mental health problems were actually communication problems. Accordingly, by understanding the patterns, functions, and processes of family communication, people hope to start taking steps for understanding the reasons behind these problems and maybe for preventing them in the future (Segrin & Flora, 2005).

Method
Objective
This study investigates teacher candidates' family communication patterns in Turkey according to various variables in order to understand which types of families these Turkish teacher candidates are coming from. Additionally, the study aims to shed a little light on the similarities or discrepancies between Turkish family structures and family structures of other cultures. The research questions of the study are listed below.

Q1. Is there a difference between the family communication patterns and the conversation- and conformity-orientation of teacher candidates?

Q2. Is there a gender difference between the family communication patterns and the conversation- and conformity-orientation of teacher candidates?

Q3. Do the family communication patterns and conversation- and conformity-orientation of teacher candidates vary according to their fathers' education levels?

Q4. Do the family communication patterns and conversation- and conformity-orientation of teacher candidates vary according to their mothers' education levels?

Q5. Do the family communication patterns and conversation- and conformity-orientation of teacher candidates vary according to the geographical region where they grew up?

Q6. Do the family communication patterns and conversation- and conformity-orientation of teacher candidates vary according to the size of the region where they grew up?

The Research Design
To investigate the family communication patterns of teacher candidates, a survey was conducted. Survey research provides a quantitative definition of tendencies, attitudes, or opinions by investigating a sample of a population. It contains cross-sectional or longitudinal studies that employ questionnaires or structured interviews to collect data by representing a population with a sample (Fowler, 2009).

Population and Sample
The population of this study comprised 577 teacher candidates studying at Kastamonu University's Faculty of Education. The sample size of the study was 17.4 % of the population. Teacher candidates voluntarily participated in the present study. Turkey is divided into seven geographical regions. The city of Kastamonu is located in northern Turkey; namely, in the Black Sea Region. There were 420 female (72.8%) and 157 male (27.2%) participants. Participants were students of mathematics teaching (66, 11.4%), science teaching (47, 8.1%), Turkish language teaching (81, 14.0%), computer and instructional technologies teaching (80, 13.9%), psychological counseling guidance (45, 7.8%), preschool teaching (96, 16.6%), primary-school teaching (76, 13.2%), social sciences teaching (73, 12.7%), and art teaching (13, 2.3%). Participants' ages were between 18 and 35 years, and the mean age was 20.16.

Data collection
To collect data, legal permissions were obtained from the Deanship of Kastamonu University's Faculty of Education. A Demographic Form and the Revised Family Communication Pattern Instrument (RFCPI) developed by Ritchie and Fitzpatrick (1990) were utilized. The participants voluntarily filled the surveys on computers under the supervision of the experimenter.

Materials
The materials used in the research were a Demographic Form and the RFCPI.

Demographic Information Form
To determine the demographic profile of the teacher candidates, a demographic information form comprising 13 questions was used. The questions were about age, sex, grade, program, high-school type, parent's level of education, number of siblings, birth order among siblings, family type, geographical location and the size of region where the participant grew up, and the number of divorced first-degree relatives.

Rfcpi
The RFCPI is a five-point Likert-type scale that contains 26 items. The scoring is ranked between "I strongly disagree" (1) and "I strongly agree" (5). In the scale, there are two sub-dimensions—"conversation-orientation"

and "conformity-orientation." By using the scores from these two sub-dimensions, family communication patterns were determined.

As presented in Figure 1, the families with high scores on both the sub-dimensions are defined as consensual; families with high conversation-orientation and low conformity-orientation scores are defined as pluralist; families with low conversation-orientation and high conformity-orientation scores are defined as protective; and families with low scores on both the sub-dimensions are defined as non-interventionist. The original scale was translated under the supervision of two linguists and then the data was collected. Ritchie and Fitzpatrick (1990) gave the internal reliability value (Cronbach alpha) for conversation-orientation as 0.84 and for conformity-orientation as 0.76. In the present study, Cronbach alpha values were found to be 0.89 and 0.84, respectively. Per these findings, it was concluded that the adapted version of the scale was reliable to measure family communication patterns.

Analysis
Parametrical statistical methods were preferred to analyze the data. Paired-samples t-test was used to investigate whether there was a significant difference between conversation- and conformity-orientation scores, and independent-samples t-test was used to test whether participants significantly differed according to gender. One-way ANOVA was used to investigate the relationship between parents' education levels, region in which they grew up, and the size of this region. Lastly, least significant difference (LSD) test was used to follow up on the significant results.

Result And Discussion
In this section, findings regarding teacher candidates' conversation- and conformity-orientation scores in their family communication patterns, considering gender, father's education, mother's education, region in which they grew up, and the type of this region are presented in tables and discussed.

Table 1: Results of the paired-samples t-test on conversation- and conformity-orientation scores of the teacher candidates.

Score	f	$\bar{X}$	d.f.	t	p
Conversation-orientation	577	3.5321	576	15.829	.000*
Conformity-orientation	577	2.8324			

*p < .01

Paired-samples t-test results investigating the difference between conversation- and conformity-orientation scores of teacher candidates were presented in Table 1. The mean conversation-orientation score (3.5321) was significantly higher than the conformity-orientation score (2.8324), t = 15.83, p < .01. Therefore, it may be interpreted that teacher candidates have higher conversation-orientation than conformity-orientation in their family communications. These findings conform with the previous findings of High and Scharp (2015) (3.46 and 2.69), Hashemi et al. (2.94 and 2.03), Koerner and Fitzpatrick (2002), Zhang (2007) (3.18 and 2.69), Huang (1999), Curran and Allen (2017) (3.81 and 3.12), and Koerner and Fitzpatrick (1997) (3.77 and 2.47).

Table 2: T-test results of the Revised Family Communication Pattern Instrument scores according to gender.

Dimension	Gender	f	$\bar{X}$	d.f.	t	p
Conversation-orientation	Female	420	3.60	575	3.771	0.000**
	Male	157	3.38			
Conformity-orientation	Female	420	2.79	575	-2.460	0.014*
	Male	157	2.94			

*p < .05, **p < .01

In Table 2, independent-samples t-test results on RFCPI scores according to gender were presented. These findings suggest that female teacher candidates have significantly higher conversation-orientation mean scores (3.60) p < .01, whereas male teacher candidates have significantly higher conformity-orientation scores (2.94) p < .05. Çakmak and Koçyiğit (2017) indicated a similar result in their research, and their results suggested that female teacher candidates have higher conversation-orientation scores, whereas male teacher candidates have higher conformity-orientation scores. The findings of Çakmak and Koçyiğit (2017) support the point that female teacher candidates have higher conversation-orientation scores and male teacher candidates have higher conformity-orientation scores in their family communication patterns.

Table 3: Results of the one-way ANOVA on the conversation- and conformity-orientation scores of the teacher candidates according to father's level of education.

Conversation-orientation

Father's level of education	f	$\bar{X}$	SD	Source of variation	SS	df	MS	F	p
1. Literate	11	3.109	.952	Between	4.601	4	1.150	2.963	.019*
2. Primary-School Graduate	198	3.445	.623	Within	222.069	572	.388		1-3
3. Secondary-School Graduate	141	3.576	.950	Total	226.670	5676			1-4
									1-5
4. High-School Graduate	132	3.594	.562						2-4
5. Bachelors or higher	95	3.604	.618						2-5

Conformity-orientation									
Father's level of education	f	$\bar{X}$	SD	Source of variation	SS	df	MS	F	p
1. Literate	11	2.686	.845	Between	2.154	4	.539	1.233	.296
2. Primary-School Graduate	198	2.911	.680	Within	249.944	572	.437		
3. Secondary-School Graduate	141	2.788	.687	Total	252.099	5676			
4. High-School Graduate	132	2.777	.584						
5. Bachelors or higher	95	2.823	.662						

*p < .05

The results of the one-way ANOVA on conversation-orientation scores according to father's level of education are presented in Table 3. They show that father's level of education was significantly related to the conversation-orientation scores of teacher candidates (p < .05). However, father's level of education was not significantly related to the conformity-orientation scores of teacher candidates (p > .05). To follow up on the significant results, LSD post-hoc test was used. The results showed that there was difference between literate fathers and primary-school graduate, secondary-school graduate fathers and between primary graduate fathers and high-school and bachelor graduate fathers. Accordingly, it can be concluded that as father's levels of education increases, his conversation-orientation in communication with his children increases.

Table 4: Results of the one-way ANOVA on conversation- and conformity-orientation scores of the teacher candidates according to mother's level of education.

Conversation-orientation									
Mother's level of education	f	$\bar{X}$	SD	Source of variation	SS	df	MS	F	p
1. Literate	74	3.385	.667	Between	7.885	4	1.971	5.154	.000**
2. Primary-School Graduate	290	3.490	.615	Within	218.785	572	.382		1-4
									1-5
3. Secondary-School Graduate	97	3.513	.637	Total	226.670	576			2-4
									3-4
4. High-School Graduate	84	3.780	.550						
5. Bachelors or higher	32	3.532	.627						

Conformity-orientation									
Mother's level of education	f	$\bar{X}$	SD	Source of variation	SS	df	MS	F	p
1. Literate	74	2.882	.683	Between	5.052	4	1.263	2.924	.021*
2. Primary-School Graduate	290	2.901	.676	Within	247.047	572	.432		2-3
									2-4
3. Secondary-School Graduate	97	2.706	.571	Total	252.099	576			
4. High-School Graduate	84	2.732	.655						
5. Bachelors or higher	32	2.832	.662						

*p < .05, **p < .01

The results of the one-way ANOVA on the conversation-orientation scores according to mother's level of education are presented in Table 4. They show that mother's level of education is significantly related to the conversation- (p < .01) and conformity-orientation scores (p < .05) of the teacher candidates. To follow up on the significant results, LSD post-hoc test was used. The results showed that the difference in conversation-orientation was between literate mothers and high-school graduate, bachelor (or higher) graduate mothers and between primary graduate mothers and high school, secondary-school graduate mothers. Additionally, the difference in conformity-orientation was found to be between primary and secondary-school graduate mothers and high-school

graduate mothers. Similar to the results of father's level of education, mother's level of education was positively related to conversation-orientation in communication.

Table 5: Results of the one-way ANOVA on conversation- and conformity-orientation scores of the teacher candidates according to the geographical regions where the candidates grew up.

Conversation-orientation									
Geographical region	f	$\bar{X}$	SD	Source of variation	SS	df	MS	F	p
1. Marmara	89	3.701	.546	Between	7.426	6	1.238	3.218	.004*
2. Aegean	59	3.578	.537	Within	219.244	570	.385		1-4
3. Mediterranean	67	3.513	.623	Total	226.670	576			1-5
4. Eastern Anatolia	33	3.283	.775						1-7
5. Southeastern Anatolia	43	3.366	.697						2-4
6. Central Anatolia	145	3.560	.635						4-6
7. Black Sea	141	3.455	.615						5-6
									6-7

Conformity-orientation									
Geographical region	f	$\bar{X}$	SD	Source of variation	SS	df	MS	F	p
1. Marmara	89	2.670	.698	Between	2.177	6	.363	.827	.549
2. Aegean	59	2.868	.714	Within	249.922	570	.438		
3. Mediterranean	67	2.851	.628	Total	252.099	576			
4. Eastern Anatolia	33	2.788	.771						
5. Southeastern Anatolia	43	2.867	.624						
6. Central Anatolia	145	2.840	.651						
7. Black Sea	141	2.885	.627						

*p < .01

The results of the one-way ANOVA on the conversation- and conformity-orientation scores according to the geographical region where the candidates grew up are presented in Table 5. The results showed that there is a significant relationship between the conversation-orientation scores of the teacher candidates and the geographical region in which they grew up (p < .01). However, there was no significant relationship between conformity-orientation and the geographical region where the teacher candidates grew- up. To follow up on the significant results in conversation-orientation scores, the LSD post-hoc test was used. The results revealed differences between Marmara, Eastern, Southeastern, and Black Sea regions; Aegean and Eastern Anatolia regions; Eastern Anatolia and Central Anatolia regions; Southeastern Anatolia and Central Anatolia regions; and Central Anatolia and Black Sea regions.

Teacher candidates who grew up in Marmara Region had the highest conversation-orientation scores (3.701), while those who grew up in Black Sea Region had the highest conformity-orientation scores (2.885). Further, candidates who grew up in Eastern Anatolia Region had the lowest conversation-orientation score (3.283), whereas those candidates who grew up in Marmara Region had the lowest conformity-orientation scores (2.670).

Table 6: Results of the one-way ANOVA on conversation- and conformity-orientation scores of the teacher candidates according to the size of the region where they grew up.

Conversation-orientation									
Region	f	$\bar{X}$	SD	Source of variation	SS	df	MS	F	p
1.Metropolitan city	62	3.700	.671	G.Arası	3.902	4	.975	2.505	.041*
2. City	248	3.546	.618	G.İçi	222.768	572	.389		1-5
3. County	157	3.538	.622	Toplam	226.670	576			2-5
4. Small town	17	3.502	.685						
5. Village	93	3.381	.627						

Conformity-orientation									
Region	f	$\bar{X}$	SD	Source of variation	SS	df	MS	F	p
1. Metropolitan city	62	2.764	.751	Between	4.738	4	1.185	2.739	.028*
2. City	248	2.774	.656	Within	247.361	572	.532		1-5

3. County	157	2.888	.658	Total	252.099	576		2-5
4. Small town	17	2.594	.621					4-5
5. Village	93	2.984	.662					

*p < .05

One-way ANOVA results on the relationship between the type of orientation (conversation-orientation and conformity-orientation) and the size of the region where they grew up are presented in Table 6. Accordingly, the results showed that both conversation-orientation and conformity-orientation scores of the participants are significantly related with the region in which they grew up (p < .05). To follow up on these results, the LSD post-hoc test was used. The results showed that the significant difference in the conversation-orientation was between village, metropolitan city, and city. Besides, the significant difference in conformity-orientation was between village and metropolitan city and between city and town. The teacher candidates who grew up in a metropolitan city had the highest conversation-orientation scores (3.700), while those who grew up in a village had the highest conformity-orientation scores (2.984). Furthermore, the candidates who grew up in a village had the lowest conversation-orientation scores (3.381). Per these findings, it can be interpreted that individuals who grew up in bigger locations have higher conversation-orientation in their family communication patterns, whereas those who grew up in smaller locations have higher conformity-orientation in their family communication patterns.

Findings And Suggestions

The present study investigated the family communication patterns of teacher candidates in order to understand from what kinds of families the teachers of tomorrow will be coming. The findings of the present study, which was conducted with teacher candidates of Kastamonu University's Faculty of Education, are summarized below. Gender was a significant predictor of the conversation-orientation and conformity-orientation scores. Accordingly, it has been shown that female candidates had higher conversation-orientation scores than male candidates in their family communication patterns, whereas male candidates had higher conformity-orientation scores in their family communication patterns.

Moreover, it has been found that the education levels of fathers affected teacher candidates' conversation-orientations in their family communication patterns. Accordingly, it has been shown that as fathers' education levels improve, the conversation-orientation in family communication increases and that as mothers' levels of education improve (apart from mothers with bachelors or higher level of education), the conversation-orientation increases. In addition, a non-linear relationship between conformity-orientation and mothers' levels of education was found. It has been determined that teacher candidates with primary-school graduate mothers had higher conformity-orientation scores.

Furthermore, it has been found that teacher candidates who grew up in Marmara Region had the highest conversation-orientation scores and those who grew up in Black Sea Region had the highest conformity-orientation. The candidates from Eastern Anatolia Region had the lowest conversation-orientation, whereas those with the lowest conformity-orientation scores were from Marmara Region.

Accordingly, it was found that as the size of the location where the teacher candidates grew up increases, their conformity-orientation decreases. The candidates who grew up in metropolitan cities had the highest conversation-orientation and the lowest conformity-orientation in family communication, and those who grew up in villages had the lowest conversation-orientation. Therefore, it has been found that the family communication patterns of teacher candidates vary according to the size of the region in which they grew up.

Future studies may be conducted with teacher candidates from different universities, so that comparisons can be made. The sample of the present study included only teacher candidates. However, future studies can include students from different disciplines and thus the findings can be compared in terms of family communication patterns. Lastly, future studies can investigate whether family communication affects parental attitudes.

References

Adler, R. B., Rodman, G. R., & Cropley, C. (2006). *Understanding human communication* (Vol. 10). New York NY: Oxford University Press.

Cakmak, V., & Kocyigit, M. (2017). The review of communication pattern within the family through the example of Aksaray Vocational High School of Social Sciences. *Erciyes İletişim Dergisi*, 5(1), 118 – 130.

Curran, T., & Allen, J. (2017). Family Communication Patterns, Self-Esteem, and Depressive Symptoms: The Mediating Role of Direct Personalization of Conflict. *Communication Reports*, 30(2), 80-90.

Cüceloğlu, D. (2012). *Yeniden İnsan İnsana*. 45. Basım, İstanbul: Remzi Kitapevi.

Fitzpatrick, M. A., & Ritchie, L. D. (1993). *Communication theory and the family*. In P. Boss, W. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W. Schumm, & S. Steinmetz (Eds.), Sourcebook of family theories and methods: A contextual approach (pp. 565–585). New York: Plenum.

Fowler, F. J. (2009). *Survey research methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Galvin, K. M., Braithwaite, D. O., & Bylund, C. L. (2015). *Family Communication: Cohesion and Change (Subscription)*. USA: Pearson Education.

Hashemi, L., Kooshesh, Z., & Eskandari, H. (2015). *Role of family communication patterns in development of hardiness and academic self-efficacy in adolescents*. In Proceedings of the Multidisciplinary Academic Conference on Education, Teaching and E-learning in Prague, Czech Republic (pp. 1-8).

High, A. C., & Scharp, K. M. (2015). Examining family communication patterns and seeking social support direct and indirect effects through ability and motivation. *Human Communication Research*, 41(4), 459-479.

Horstman, H. K., Schrodt, P., Warner, B., Koerner, A., Maliski, R., Hays, A., & Colaner, C. W. (2018). Expanding the conceptual and empirical boundaries of family communication patterns: The development and validation of an Expanded Conformity Orientation Scale. *Communication Monographs*, 85(2), 157-185.

Huang, L. N. (1999). Family communication patterns and personality characteristics. *Communication Quarterly*, 47(2), 230-243.

Koerner, A. F., & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (1997). Family type and conflict: The impact of conversation orientation and conformity orientation on conflict in the family. *Communication Studies*, 48(1), 59-75.

Koerner, A. F., & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (2002). Toward a theory of family communication. *Communication theory*, 12(1), 70-91.

Koerner, A. F., & Fitzpatrick, M.A. (2004). *Communication in intact families*. Dalam AL. Vangelisti (Ed.), Handbook of family communication (pp. 177–195). Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Koerner, A. F., & Schrodt, P. (2014). An introduction to the special issue on family communication patterns theory. *Journal of Family Communication*, 14(1), 1-15.

Koroshnia, M., & Latifian, M. (2008). An investigation on validity and reliability of revised family communication patterns instrument. *Journal of Family Research*, 3, 855–875.

Littlejohn, S. W., & Foss, K. A. (2010). Theories of human communication. Waveland press.

Mcleod, J., Chaffee, S. (1972). *The Construction of Social Reality*. In J.Tedeshi (Ed.), The Social Influence Process, Chicago: 50-99.

Minow, M. (1998). *Redefining families: Who's in and who's out*. Families in the US: Kinship and domestic politics, 7A20.

Omar, N., Mustaffa, C. S., & Nordin M. Z. (2007). A comparison of family communication and institutional communication of boarding school students and juveniles in Malaysia. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 16, 72–89.

Pembecioğlu, N. (2006). *İletişim ve çocuk. İletişim ortamlarında çocuk ve reklam etkileşimi*. Ankara: Ebabil Yayınları.

Pramono, F., Lubis, D. P., Puspitawati, H., & Susanto, D. (2017). Communication Pattern and Family Typology of High School Adolescents in Bogor-West Java. *Jurnal Komunikasi Ikatan Sarjana Komunikasi Indonesia*, 2(1), 20-26.

Ritchie, L. D., & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (1990). Family communication patterns: Measuring interpersonal perceptions of interpersonal relationships. *Communication Research*, 17, 523–544.

Segrin, C., & Flora, J. (2011). *Family communication*. London: Routledge.

Shearman, S. M., & Dumlao, R. (2008). A cross-cultural comparison of family communication patterns and conflict between young adults and parents. *Journal of Family Communication*, 8, 186–211.

Şahin, S., & Aral, N. (2012). Aile içi iletişim, Communication Within the Family. *Ankara Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, 1(3), 56-66.

Tillman, K. H., & Nam, C. B. (2008). Family structure outcomes of alternative family definitions. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 27(3), 367-384.

Wamboldt, F. S., & Reiss, D. (1989). Defining a family heritage and a new relationship identity: Two central tasks in the making of a marriage. *Family Process*, 28(3), 317-335.

Zhang, Q. (2007). Family communication patterns and conflict styles in Chinese parent-child relationships. *Communication Quarterly*, 55(1), 113-128.