

## Role of Parent-child Relationship, Family Conflict in Self-Silencing Behaviour among Young Adults

Amritha Joseph<sup>1\*</sup>

### ABSTRACT

The study examines the role of the Parent-child relationship, family conflict on self-silencing behaviour and how it is expressed in a romantic relationship. Parent-child relationship was studied in terms of maternal responsibility, maternal regard, paternal control, paternal regard and paternal responsibility for the young adults. A t-test was also run to check for significant differences between the male and female sample. The analysis showed that there were no significant differences between male and female self-silencing behaviour. To test the hypothesis that the parent child relationship variables and family conflict has an influence on self-silencing behaviour, a correlation analysis was performed to test for significant relationships between the parent-child relationship variables, family conflict and self silencing. A regression analysis was also run to check for variables that could predict self silencing behaviour. Results have shown that a significant correlation was found between self-silencing behaviour and maternal responsibility, self-silencing and paternal responsibility and self-silencing and paternal control. No correlation was found between family conflict and self-silencing behaviour. In addition, the regression analysis showed that maternal responsibility, paternal responsibility and paternal control were predictors of self silencing behaviour. These findings can help us ease the therapeutic process and better personalise therapy.

**Keywords:** *Self-silencing, parent-child relationship, family conflict*

The relationship between gender and mental health has fascinated health practitioners over the last few decades. Adults who report having a high-quality relationship with their parents during childhood have better overall mental well-being and are at a lower risk of mental illness relative to those who report a poor-quality parental relationship (Mallers et. al., 2010). One such characteristic seen in individuals which can result in the development of psychological disorders is self-silencing. Self-silencing refers to the restriction of self-expression within intimate relationships. It is the product of a gendered society (Jack, 1991).

The phenomenon of self-silencing was noticed in women and hence was thought to be specific to women. However, more recent research has indicated that it can be observed in

<sup>1</sup>Student, Dept. of Psychology, CHRIST (Deemed to be University), Delhi NCR, India

\*Corresponding Author

Received: June 24, 2022; Revision Received: September 28, 2022; Accepted: September 30, 2022

## **Role of Parent-child Relationship, Family Conflict in Self-Silencing Behaviour among Young Adults**

men too. Some studies indicate that men experience higher levels of self-silencing than women. However, self-silencing behaviour in men and women may be expressed in different ways. Jack (1999) suggests that a woman's self-silencing behaviour is culturally enforced as their expressions of discord often have a negative effect on their lives, both financially, physically and in their relationships. However, the self-silencing behaviour has negative effects on the mental health of both males and females.

This strong distinction between male and female self-silence may also be apparent from observations from the psychotherapeutic setting, and this can explain to some degree the large difference in the prevalence of particular psychiatric disorders such as depression. The self silencing theory also draws from the attachment theory (Bowlby, 1982) and Self-in Relation theory (Surrey, 1985). Coser (1956) defines conflict as a struggle over values and claims to scarce status, power, and resources in which the aims of the opponents are to neutralise, injure or eliminate the rival. Studies have shown that women often engaged in self-sabotaging behaviours in order to avoid any form of conflict. Family Conflict can be defined as any active opposition between family members (Marta & Alfieri, 2014). Conflict within the family can cause various mental health problems such as eating disorders. Along with family conflict, the relationship a parent shares with his/her child is also important in the development of various disorders. A positive relationship can serve as a protective factor against these disorders.

Constant suppression of their individual values and views by their spouses resulted in depression, low self-esteem, and loss of "voice." This "loss of voice" coincided with the loss of one's unique sense of self, the distortion of one's identity into someone whom they viewed as socially and culturally appropriate and lack of confidence.

### ***Statement of Relevance***

This study examines the relationship between Parent- child relationship, family conflict on self- silencing behaviour and how it is expressed in a romantic relationship. Research in this area could prove useful for providing help to those who approach therapy for certain disorders such as depression or eating disorders. With more knowledge of the range of factors that contribute to the development of the disorder, the therapist can personalise the services they provide better. Furthermore, studies on the self-silencing phenomenon have majorly focused on the female, white and individualistic populations and results may not be applicable to the Indian context. Hence, it is necessary to examine how these variables work together in a collectivistic nation such as India and with the male population included. Understanding how the dynamics are in the Indian context will help in individualising therapy according to the requirements of the client.

### ***Self-silencing, Family Conflict and Parent- Child Relationships***

The act of self- silencing was first studied in women who had been diagnosed with depression and was hence thought to be behaviours only women engaged in. Since then, many studies have shown that men engage in self-silencing behaviours too. The expression of self-silencing is rooted in the gender norms seen in society. There is a need to fill a gender role marked passivity, body shame, fear and vulnerability, and niceness (Jack & Ali, 2010 as cited by Maji & Dixit, 2020).

Self- silencing is seen as a core behaviour in the maintenance of a relationship. It hence has the ability to affect the quality of the relationship. Sacrifice is an important aspect of any relationship. This self-sacrificing tendency is seen in individuals who self-silence. However,

this form of sacrifice is motivated by avoidance of negative consequences instead of that which is made with an approach motivation to improve the relationship. The former self-sacrifice may lead to less satisfaction in relationships and a loss of love (Gable & Reis, 2001). Studies have indicated that men use self-silencing as a way to withdraw from conflict. Despite men's desires to maintain social dominance, researchers theorise that their self-silencing can be better explained by the cultural expectations for men to be inexpressive (Duarte & Thompson, 1999).

With respect to adolescent romantic relationships studies have shown that (Harper, Dickson, & Welsh, 2006), a high degree of rejection sensitivity raises the probability of self-silencing behaviour. Rejection sensitivity is characterised by persistent vigilance towards rejection and appears to have a developmental history of parental rejection (Downey & Feldman, 1996). Studies have repeatedly demonstrated the relationship a child shares with their parents can have a significant effect on their mental health. Research indicates that the relationship a father shares with his daughter has a significant effect on her body image and eating patterns (Steinhilber et al., 2020). This could be a possible explanation for how self-silencing is linked to the development of eating disorders. The way an individual perceives themselves is largely determined by others' perspectives (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997).

The status and perception towards the relationship are also relevant determinants of self-silencing. Married couples, for instance, are more likely to silence themselves when they perceive their marital relationship to be conflictual (Whiffen, Foot, & Thompson, 2007) than when the relationship is a peaceful one. Studies have shown that family conflict has a significant effect on the child's well-being (Steinhilber et al., 2020).

## **METHODOLOGY**

### ***Participants***

The study consisted of 142 participants (60 male, 82 females), between the ages of 18 to 24. Participants were in a romantic relationship at the time of the study or should have been in a romantic relationship in the past. In addition, participants also had to have both parents and of a heterosexual orientation. Participants were of Indian nationality. Participants also had siblings, and were the elder sibling.

### ***Procedure***

The approval of the IRB was received in June, 2021. Purposive sampling technique was used to obtain the sample since the subjects need to meet particular criteria to be a part of the study. The questionnaires used were put into a google form and circulated on 10th July, 2021, with the help of social media platforms such as WhatsApp and Instagram. The circulated google form targeted Indian young adults lying in the age range of 18-24. The google form contained information in its description about who can take part in the study followed by which a section asked for the consent of the individual to take part in the study. Participants had to respond to three questionnaires.

### ***Measures***

#### ***Demographic Questionnaire***

The demographic questionnaire included questions on personal details, family background and social background of the subject. The personal details regarding the Initials, age, sex, education, Nationality etc. were included. Other details collected included questions on their sexual orientation and birth order.

### ***Parent Child Relationship***

The Parent Adult- Child Questionnaire (PACQ) designed by Peisah et al. in 1999, was used to study the parent child relationship with both the mother and the father. It includes two identical versions of the 13-item scale: one is “the relationship with mother”, PACQM and the other is “the relationship with father”, PACQF. The PACQ includes the dimensions of regard (five items) and responsibility (eight items) for the mother, and the dimensions of control (five items), regard (four items), and responsibility (four items) for the father. Each item is a statement that describes the relationship with the mother or father (e.g., “I look forward to seeing my mother/father”; “I feel responsible for my mother's/father's happiness”), and participants were asked to indicate the extent to each statement generally described themselves using a 4-point scale, where 0, indicates the statement is ‘not true at all’ and 3 indicates that the statement is ‘very true’. The PACQ is a reliable self-report measure of the filial relationship, as shown by Peisah et al. (1999); the study reported for the mother's section, Cronbach's coefficient was 0.87 for regard and 0.82 for responsibility, and for the father's section, Cronbach's coefficient was 0.86 for regard, 0.74 for responsibility, and 0.87 for control.

### ***Family Conflict***

Family conflict was assessed using the conflict items of the Family Environment Scale (FES) developed by Bhatia & Chadha in 1993. The scale consists of 12 ‘conflict’ items. This FES is based on the family environment scale by Moos in 1974. Each item is a statement that reflects situations related to family conflict. The test taker has to rate whether the statement takes place in their own lives often on a 5- point scale, where 1 indicates that they ‘strongly disagree’ with the statement and 5 indicates that they ‘strongly agree’ with the statement. The split-half reliabilities for the subscales were calculated and ranged from 0.48 to 0.92, with an overall test reliability coefficient of 0.95. Both face and content validity have been tested by giving the scale to eighteen experts to evaluate the test items.

### ***Self-Silencing***

Self Silencing was assessed using The Self-Silencing Scale (STSS) developed by Jack and Dill in 1992. The STSS is a 31-item self-report measure. It assesses the degree to which participants engage in self-silencing behaviour within their interpersonal relationships. This measure consists of four subscales, and based on the scores given by the participants a global score and four subscale scores are calculated. The first subscale on the STSS is the Externalized Self-Perception subscale This scale measures the extent to which the participants judge themselves based on external standards. The next subscale is the Care as Self-Sacrifice (CSS) subscale, which measures the extent to which he/she attempts to secure the relationship by putting his/her partner's needs above their own. The third subscale is the Silencing the Self subscale (STS). This subscale assesses the participants' tendency to inhibit self-expression and action in order to secure the relationship and avoid conflict, potential loss and retaliation. The fourth and final subscale is termed the Divided Self (DS) subscale. The DS assesses the extent to which the participant feels a division between the false identity that they present on the outside and their inner self, which results from hiding certain feelings and thoughts in an important relationship. Participants rate their answers on a five point Likert scale that ranges from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. Internal consistency (alpha) for the total STSS scores ranges from .86 to .94. Test retest reliability was also excellent. Construct validity analysis shows that the STSS correlates significantly with level of depression in these nondepressed, mildly depressed, and moderately depressed women measured by the Beck's Depression Inventory (BDI). Each subscale is positively correlated with STSS totals and BDI scores.

**Data Analysis**

An independent samples t test was performed to check for significant differences in self silencing scores between males and females. Tests of normality were run on the data. As the data was not found to be normally distributed, a spearman rho correlation was done for males and females to test for significant relationships between self silencing behaviour, parent-child attachment and family conflict. A multiple regression analysis was performed to assess if any of the variables could predict self silencing behaviour.

**RESULTS**

An independent samples t-test was conducted to check for a significant difference between the self-silencing scores obtained by males and females. There was no significant difference in self-silencing between males (M= 101.8, SD= 14.414) and females (M= 97.27, SD= 16.838);  $t(140) = 1.682, p = .095$ .

**Table 1 Table showing independent samples t test results for males and females**

	<b>t</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Sig. (2-tailed)</b>
Self-Silencing	1.682	140	.095
	1.723	136.512	.087

A spearman rank order correlation analysis was run to find any significant relationships between the self-silencing scores and the scores on the dimensions of the PACQ and scores obtained on the Family Conflict subscale for females.

**Table 2 showing correlation analysis results for female young adults.**

*Correlations*

		Self Silencing	Maternal Regard	Maternal Responsibility	Paternal Regard	Paternal responsibility	Paternal Control	Family Conflict
Spearman's rho	Self Silencing	1.000	.203	.389**	.211	.332**	.198	-.154
	Correlation Coefficient							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.086	.001	.071	.004	.088	.191
	N	75	73	75	74	75	75	74
Maternal Regard	Correlation Coefficient	.203	1.000	.520**	.298**	.261*	-.238*	.171
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.086	.	.000	.008	.019	.033	.132
	N	73	80	79	79	80	80	79
Maternal Responsibility	Correlation Coefficient	.389**	.520**	1.000	.247*	.533**	-.088	-.014
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.	.027	.000	.436	.904
	N	75	79	81	80	81	81	80
Paternal Regard	Correlation Coefficient	.211	.298**	.247*	1.000	.418**	-.373**	.305**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.071	.008	.027	.	.000	.001	.006
	N	74	79	80	81	81	81	79
Paternal responsibility	Correlation Coefficient	.332**	.261*	.533**	.418**	1.000	.000	.009
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.019	.000	.000	.	.998	.939

## Role of Parent-child Relationship, Family Conflict in Self-Silencing Behaviour among Young Adults

	N	75	80	81	81	82	82	80
Paternal Control	Correlation Coefficient	.198	-.238*	-.088	-.373**	.000	1.000	-.509**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.088	.033	.436	.001	.998	.	.000
	N	75	80	81	81	82	82	80
Family Conflict	Correlation Coefficient	-.154	.171	-.014	.305**	.009	-.509**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.191	.132	.904	.006	.939	.000	.
	N	74	79	80	79	80	80	80

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Results of the correlation analysis for females show that there are significant correlations between self silencing and maternal responsibility and paternal responsibility, which are statistically significant at  $r_s = .389$  and  $r_s = .332$  respectively ( $p < .01$ ).

**Table 3 Table showing correlation analysis results for male young adults.**

			Self Silencing	Maternal regard	Maternal responsibility	Paternal regard	Paternal responsibility	Paternal control	Family Conflict
Spearman's rho	Self Silencing	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.034	.461**	.163	.417**	.277*	-.202
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.802	.000	.239	.001	.037	.146
		N	57	56	56	54	57	57	53
Maternal regard	Maternal regard	Correlation Coefficient	.034	1.000	.265*	.305*	.235	-.167	.024
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.802	.	.045	.021	.073	.205	.865
		N	56	59	58	57	59	59	53
Maternal responsibility	Maternal responsibility	Correlation Coefficient	.461**	.265*	1.000	.021	.582**	.416**	-.382**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.045	.	.876	.000	.001	.004
		N	56	58	59	56	59	59	54
Paternal regard	Paternal regard	Correlation Coefficient	.163	.305*	.021	1.000	.256	-.009	-.011
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.239	.021	.876	.	.055	.948	.941
		N	54	57	56	57	57	57	52
Paternal responsibility	Paternal responsibility	Correlation Coefficient	.417**	.235	.582**	.256	1.000	.421**	-.154
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.073	.000	.055	.	.001	.267
		N	57	59	59	57	60	60	54

## Role of Parent-child Relationship, Family Conflict in Self-Silencing Behaviour among Young Adults

Paternal control	Correlation Coefficient	.277*	-.167	.416**	-.009	.421**	1.000	-.372**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.037	.205	.001	.948	.001	.	.006
	N	57	59	59	57	60	60	54
Family Conflict	Correlation Coefficient	-.202	.024	-.382**	-.011	-.154	-.372**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.146	.865	.004	.941	.267	.006	.
	N	53	53	54	52	54	54	54

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Results of the correlation analysis for males show that there are significant correlations between self silencing and maternal responsibility and paternal responsibility, which are statistically significant at  $r_s = .461$  and  $r_s = .417$  respectively ( $p < .01$ ). In addition, There was also a significant correlation with Paternal control ( $r_s = .277$ ) at the .05 alpha level.

A multiple linear regression was performed to predict self silencing behaviour based on the parent- child relationship variables and family conflict.

A significant regression equation was found [ $F(6, 135) = 12.938, p < .000$ ], with an  $R^2$  of .365. Results show that Maternal responsibility, paternal responsibility, and paternal control were significant predictors of self silencing behaviour. The fitted regression model was  $70.468 - .153$  (family conflict)  $- .411$  (Maternal regard)  $+ 1.133$  (Maternal Responsibility)  $+ .283$  (Paternal regard)  $+ 1.416$  (Paternal Responsibility)  $+ .741$  (Paternal Control). It was found that Maternal Responsibility significantly predicted self silencing behaviour ( $\beta = .323, p < .001$ ). In addition, Paternal Responsibility ( $\beta = .250$ ), and Paternal Control ( $\beta = .206$ ) also predicted self silencing behaviours significantly ( $p < .05$ )

**Table 4 Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Change	Square Change	F Change	df1	df2
1	.60 <sup>a</sup>	.365	.337	13.000	.365	12.938	6	135	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Paternal control, Paternal Responsibility, Maternal regard, Family Conflict, Paternal Regard, Maternal Responsibility

**Table 5 ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	13119.677	6	2186.613	12.938	.000 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	22815.562	135	169.004		
	Total	35935.239	141			

b. Dependent Variable: Self Silencing

**Table 6**  
*Coefficients<sup>a</sup>*

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	70.468	11.020		6.394	.000
	Family Conflict	-.153	.195	-.067	-.782	.436
	Maternal regard	-.411	.569	-.060	-.721	.472
	Maternal Responsibility	1.133	.330	.323	3.438	.001**
	Paternal Regard	.283	.646	.039	.438	.662
	Paternal Responsibility	1.416	.558	.250	2.538	.012*
	Paternal Control	.741	.306	.206	2.419	.017*

a. Dependent Variable: Self Silencing

Note.  $R^2 = .365$ , \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$

## DISCUSSION

It can be seen that the mean for males in the self-silencing scale is greater than that for females. The results show several significant correlations between self silencing scores and aspects of the parent adult-child relationship for both males and females. There were more significant correlations for males than females. There were no significant correlations between self silencing and Family conflict in males and females.

With respect to the variable of paternal control in the father- child relationship, there was no significant relationship with self silencing scores for females, however, a significant relationship was found for males. For all individuals, the amount of control a parent has over their lives reduces with time. The difference in results for males and females goes in line with the findings of a study by Thompson et al. (2001), which showed that scores for males on the divided self aspect of self silencing, that is the belief that they should adopt a compliant facade despite harbouring feelings of anger, was associated with paternal warmth. This was especially true for men who perceived their fathers as cold and rejecting.

For the variable of Paternal regard, there was no significant relationship found with self silencing scores for males or females. This finding differs from previous findings. Previous research has however shown that a significant proportion of variances in self silencing behaviour among female young adults has been explained by paternal attachment (communication, trust and warmth)(McLaurin, 1998).

For the variable of Paternal and maternal responsibility, a significant relationship was found for both males and females. Studies have shown that the responsibility of a caregiver usually falls to a daughter when a parent is unwell (Brody, 1981) and that women may hence have a higher rate of psychological morbidity when compared to males (Schofield et al., 1995).

For the variable of maternal regard, no significant correlation was found with self silencing scores for males or females. Early studies have however found that a good maternal



## **Role of Parent-child Relationship, Family Conflict in Self-Silencing Behaviour among Young Adults**

attachment served as a protective factor against loss of self in females (Curtis, 1997 as cited in McLaurin, 1998). This difference in findings could possibly be attributed to cultural differences.

The study hypothesised that Family conflict would have a significant relationship with self-silencing scores. However, this was not the case for males or females. Multiple Regression Analysis was also run on the data for males and females with self-silencing behaviour as the dependent variable. The results suggest that maternal responsibility, paternal responsibility and paternal control were significant predictors of self silencing behaviour in young adults. The regression analysis was performed as an exploration to find if the topic could be further explored in research. Since there is a significant relationship between self silencing and maternal responsibility, paternal responsibility and paternal control, this relationship could be further explored qualitatively.

The study was conducted only on Indian young adults who have been in heterosexual relationships. The study could be further conducted on other ethnicities and relationships of individuals who are of non binary gender identity and those who have other sexual identities. The study is a correlational study and hence it cannot be determined if the parent-child and family conflict is the reason for self-silencing behaviour. The self-silencing questionnaire is administered to those who are currently in a romantic relationship or have been in the past. There may be differences in what the individual reports now and experienced in the past. This may interfere with the results. Studies on self-silencing have not been conducted in the Indian context. Studies done so far have been restricted to western individualistic cultures. Hence, understanding how the dynamics are in the Indian context will help in individualising therapy according to the requirements of the client. Hence, this study explored the relationship between these variables and how it is expressed in a romantic relationship.

To further research in this area, statistical analysis can be used to check for a significant difference between the scores obtained by males and females. The study can be conducted in other cultures and qualitative methods of research can also be explored to expand knowledge regarding why these factors have an effect on self silencing behaviour.

### **CONCLUSION**

The study aimed to assess the role of the parent child relationship and family conflict on self silencing behaviour in male and female young adults belonging to the Indian population. In order to assess the parent-child relationship, it was studied in terms of maternal regard, maternal responsibility for the relationship with the mother and paternal regard, paternal responsibility and paternal control for the relationship with the father. Analysis showed that there was no significant difference between males and females in self silencing behaviour. The correlation analysis done for males and females separately show various significant correlations which show us that some aspects of the parent child relationship can have a role to play in self silencing behaviour experienced. The data was further subjected to multiple regression analysis which showed that the variable of maternal responsibility does predict self silencing behaviour. Further research can focus on overcoming the limitations mentioned and how these findings can be applied practically in the field of psychological therapy.

## REFERENCES

- Besser, A., Flett, G. L., & Davis, R. A. (2003). Self-criticism, dependency, silencing the self, and loneliness: A test of a mediational model. *Personality and Individual Differences, 35*(8), 1735–1752. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(02)00403-8
- Bowlby, J. (1982). Attachment and loss: Retrospect and prospect. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 52*, 664–678
- Brody E. M. (1981). "Women in the middle" and family help to older people. *The Gerontologist, 21*(5), 471–480. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/21.5.471>
- Coser, L. A. (1956). *The functions of social conflict*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Dixson, M., Bermes, E., & Fair, S. (2014). An instrument to investigate expectations about and experiences of the parent-child relationship: the parent-child relationship schema scale. *Social Sciences, 3*(1), 84-114.
- Downey, G., & Feldman, S. I. (1996). Implications of rejection sensitivity for intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 1327–1343.
- Duarte, L. M., & Thompson, J. M. (1999). Sex differences in self-silencing. *Psychological Reports, 85*, 145–161.
- Gable, S. L., & Reis, H. T. (2001). Appetitive and aversive social interaction. In J. Harvey & A. Wenzel (Eds.), *Close romantic relationships: Maintenance and enhancement* (pp. 169– 194). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Fishman, K. H. (1992). Exploring the self-in-relation theory: women's idealized relationships-of-choice and psychological health.
- Frank, J. B., & Thomas, C. D. (2003). Externalized self-perceptions, self-silencing, and the prediction of eating pathology *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement, 35*(3), 219.
- Fredrickson, B. L., & Roberts, T. A. (1997). Objectification theory: Toward understanding women's lived experiences and mental health risks. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*, 173–206.
- Furman, W. & Wehner, E. A. (1997). Adolescent romantic relationships: A developmental perspective. In S. Shulman & W. A. Collins (Eds.), *New direction for child development*, no. 78. *Romantic relationships in adolescence: Developmental perspectives* (pp. 21-36). San Francisco: Josey-Bass.
- Harper, M. S., Dickson, J. W., & Welsh, D. P. (2006). Self Silencing and rejection sensitivity in adolescent romantic relationships. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 35*, 435–443.
- Jack, D. C., & Ali, A. (2010). *Silencing the self across cultures: Depression and gender in the social world*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- Jack, D. C & Dill, D (1991). *Silencing the self: Women and depression*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement, 35*(3), 219.
- Jack, D. C., & Dill, D. (1992). The silencing the self scale: Schemas of intimacy associated with depression in women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 16*, 97- 106. DOI: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.1992.tb00242.x
- Kurtiş, T. (2010). *Self-silencing and well-being among Turkish women* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas).
- Maji, S., & Dixit, S. (2019). Self-silencing and women's health: A review. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 65*(1), 3-13.
- Mallers, M. H., Charles, S. T., Neupert, S. D., & Almeida, D. M. (2010). Perceptions of childhood relationships with mother and father: daily emotional and stressor experiences in adulthood. *Developmental psychology, 46*(6), 1651–1661. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021020>

## Role of Parent-child Relationship, Family Conflict in Self-Silencing Behaviour among Young Adults

- Marta E., Alfieri S. (2014) Family Conflicts. In: Michalos A.C. Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research. Springer, Dordrecht. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5\\_997](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5_997)
- McLaurin, J. (1998). (thesis). *Paternal attachment and loss of self in late adolescent females*. Retrieved February 14, 2022, from <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2782&context=etd-project>
- Schofield, H. L., Bloch, S., Nankervis, J., Murphy, B., Singh, B. S., & Herrman, H. E. (1999). Health and well-being of women family carers: a comparative study with a generic focus. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, 23(6), 585-589.
- Surrey, J. L. (1985). The “self-in-relation”: A theory of women’s development. Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College, Stone Center for Developmental Services and Studies
- Steinhilber, K. M., Ray, S., Harkins, D. A., & Sienkiewicz, M. E. (2020). Father–daughter relationship dynamics & daughters’ body image, eating patterns, and empowerment: An exploratory study. *Women & Health*, 60(10), 1083–1094. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03630242.2020.1801554>
- Thompson, J. M., Whiffen, V. E., & Aube, J. A. (2001). Does Self-Silencing Link Perceptions of Care from Parents and Partners with Depressive Symptoms? *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 18(4), 503–516. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407501184004>
- Whiffen, V. E., Foot, M. L., & Thompson, J. M. (2007). Self Silencing mediates the link between marital conflict and depression. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 24, 993–1006.

### **Acknowledgement**

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

### **Conflict of Interest**

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

**How to cite this article:** Amritha, J. (2022). Role of Parent-child Relationship, Family Conflict in Self-Silencing Behaviour among Young Adults. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 10(3), 1868-1878. DIP:18.01.193.20221003, DOI:10.25215/1003.193