Understanding Relational Distancing and Rupture

Coercive relational interference and other pathways

Distinguishing protective distancing from relational pressure and difficulties in relationships

Assessment focus
When a previously close and safe relationship deteriorates or someone reduces contact, assessment needs to examine the sequence of events, reported experiences and observed conduct to understand how the distance developed and what maintains it.

Parents, caregivers and practitioners can use the resource to explore why a child, young person or adult family member reduces contact or becomes emotionally distant. The processes described may arise while family members live together, during or after separation, or later in adulthood, with changes developing abruptly or accumulating over time. In the coercive interference column, displaced person refers to the parent, caregiver or family member whose relationship is being undermined or excluded.

People may reduce contact to protect themselves from harmful treatment, respond to coercive relational interference, or manage difficulties involving interpretation, communication and relationship skills. Because several processes may operate together, assessment needs to examine how the relationship changed, whose behaviour contributed to that change and what continues to maintain the distance. The person's decision to withdraw forms part of that enquiry, alongside their experiences and the behaviour of others.

Survival-based rejection

Amanda Sillars developed this resource through her conceptual work within the CCC-PSFV model, including survival-based rejection, coerced alignment, coercive relational interference and child-mediated coercive control. She coined the term survival-based rejection to describe a child's distancing from a parent or caregiver as an adaptation to relational pressure and perceived attachment threat, where maintaining one relationship appears to place care, acceptance or belonging in another at risk. A child may learn that expressing affection, maintaining contact or acknowledging positive memories brings disapproval, guilt, withdrawal of affection or other consequences within an influential relationship. Distancing can then help the child preserve belonging or reduce those consequences, including in circumstances where physical danger is also present. Applying the term requires examination of the child's experiences, relationship history, developmental needs and wider circumstances, because it describes a possible psychological and relational adaptation that cannot be established from rejection alone or used as a diagnosis.

Coercive relational interference

A parent, family member or another influential person may restrict someone's ability to maintain safe relationships through a pattern of coercive relational interference. The conduct may involve obstructing communication, filtering information, shaping interpretations of events, imposing loyalty demands, or making affection and acceptance conditional on distancing from someone else. Child-mediated coercive control describes coercive control exercised wholly or partly through the involvement, positioning or use of a child, with potential consequences for both the child and the person being controlled. A child exposed to these pressures may feel compelled to side with the influential person and distance themselves from another caregiver, a process described as coerced alignment. Survival-based rejection may develop as the child adapts to the consequences of maintaining that other attachment. Assessment should establish the specific conduct, its cumulative effects and what happens when the child expresses mixed feelings, disagrees or changes their views. Research associates interparental coercive control with strained parent–child relationships and other adverse family outcomes (Xyrakis et al., 2024).

Author	Reviewed by	Updated
Amanda Sillars, BPsychSc	Dr Mandy Matthewson, PhD, BA (hons), Clinical Psychologist	15 October 2026

Interpretation and difficulties in relationships

Some relationships deteriorate through cognitive distortions, difficulties regulating emotion, limited relationship skills or problematic communication by either person, including the person who withdraws. Someone may generalise from one disagreement to the entire relationship, infer hostile intentions without sufficient evidence, or treat the strength of a feeling as proof of another person's motives. Accusatory communication, inflexible expectations, difficulty tolerating disagreement and withdrawal used to punish or secure compliance may further obstruct clarification and repair. Research on depression and parent–adolescent relationships supports examining interpretation bias and inflexibility where they may contribute to these difficulties (Everaert et al., 2017; Gadassi-Polack et al., 2025).

One person's behaviour may contribute more substantially to the rupture, so assessment should examine each person's conduct and responses without presuming equal responsibility. Relevant interactions include attempts to clarify misunderstandings, acknowledge contribution or repair harm, alongside any abuse or coercive pressure. Conclusions about cognitive distortions require evidence of how someone interprets specific experiences; distress, disagreement or ending contact cannot establish such distortions, and identifying them does not invalidate every reported experience. Where mental health symptoms or enduring interpersonal difficulties affect the relationship, their contribution also warrants examination (Wilson et al., 2017). A child's developmental limitations and responses to unsafe conditions require consideration in relation to their age and circumstances, while adults retain responsibility for their own harmful conduct.

Protective distancing in response to harm or risk

People may distance themselves to reduce exposure to abuse, neglect, coercive control, persistent boundary violations or other harmful treatment. Assessing the protective function of that distance requires consideration of their reported experiences, available evidence and current risk, including circumstances where harm has occurred without formal substantiation. Someone protecting themselves may remain distressed, hold a strongly negative view of the relationship, struggle to describe events consistently or decline attempts at repair. Those responses need to be examined alongside the wider evidence, with safety decisions addressing identified risks and allowing protective boundaries to remain in place without requiring contact or reconciliation.

Differential assessment caution

Where harm, coercive interference and difficulties in interpretation or communication coexist, assessment needs to examine their respective contributions through specific conduct and risk, including circumstances where supporting evidence is limited or unavailable.

Language note

People commonly use estrangement to describe a relationship involving reduced or absent contact, although the word leaves the reasons for the distance and its protective function unexplained. Assessing the relationship requires examination of the conduct contributing to the rupture and the person's responses to it, including possible coercive relational interference or survival-based rejection. Adult children and other adults may also distance themselves for reasons involving changed values, unmet expectations, relationship difficulties or personal choice (Carr et al., 2015; Gilligan et al., 2015). Exploring those contributing factors can inform understanding of the relationship while respecting an adult's right to decide whether to maintain contact.

Copyright and permitted use

© 2026 Eeny Meeny Miney Mo Foundation Ltd. All rights reserved. The resource may be shared in complete and unaltered form for personal, educational, professional development and non-commercial information purposes with clear acknowledgement of the source. It may not be copied, adapted, sold, rebranded, incorporated into paid training, extracted into another question bank or reproduced commercially without prior written permission.

Differential comparison

When examining a relationship, consider the processes described in each column alongside its history, developmental needs, safety concerns and available evidence. Several processes may coexist, so the comparison can support a formulation, or an evidence-informed explanation of how the rupture developed and is maintained, without providing validated diagnostic criteria or a scoring system.

Assessment dimension	Survival-based rejection Coercive relational interference	Protective distancing Harm or risk	Other relational processes Interpretation and relationship skills
Primary pathway	Examine whether the child distances themselves to reduce attachment threat or consequences imposed for maintaining another relationship, including the conduct that restricts their ability to express affection or remain connected.	Examine whether distancing reduces exposure to harmful treatment or risk by considering the reported experiences, available evidence and the protective function of the person's boundaries.	Examine how interpretations, unmet expectations, problematic communication or difficulties repairing disagreements contribute to the distance, including the behaviour and responses of the person who withdraws.
Coexisting concerns	Where real grievances coexist with interference, examine concerns about the displaced person's conduct alongside the additional pressures imposed by others and their effects on the relationship.	Where harmful treatment coexists with interference or communication difficulties, assess the contribution of each process and consider how they interact in shaping the person's need for protection.	Where relationship difficulties coexist with abuse or pressure, examine how each process contributes to the rupture while assessing the evidence supporting the person's safety concerns.
Basis of reasons	Explore how the child's reasons developed through first-hand experiences, later information and relational consequences, including whether specific or repeated descriptions have been shaped or reinforced by others.	Explore reported events alongside available supporting evidence, taking account of factors that may affect consistency, disclosure or corroboration when assessing the possibility of harmful treatment.	Compare the person's interpretations with specific interactions and available evidence to examine whether overgeneralisation, assumed intentions or conclusions drawn from feelings contribute to their reasons for distancing.
Reported experiences	Use developmentally appropriate, non-leading enquiry to explore what the child directly experienced, what they heard from others and how they arrived at their interpretations of events.	Explore reported experiences in a way that accommodates developmental capacity, communication needs and barriers to disclosure, allowing the person to describe events without requiring a complete or polished chronology.	Explore what happened, how each person interpreted it and how they responded, considering alternative explanations alongside the evidence supporting each description.

Differential comparison continued

Assessment dimension	Survival-based rejection Coercive relational interference	Protective distancing Harm or risk	Other relational processes Interpretation and relationship skills
Language and themes	Explore where repeated themes or adult concepts originated and how they developed, using the wider evidence to assess possible influence rather than relying on wording alone.	Explore the meaning of strong labels, adult language or repeated phrases in relation to reported experiences, recognising that such language may also be used when describing genuine harm.	Explore the specific behaviour underlying global labels or repeated accusations and examine how the person formed those interpretations, including their response to clarification or contrary evidence.
Mixed feelings and changing views	Examine whether the child can express mixed feelings, disagreement or changing views without guilt, punishment or withdrawal of acceptance, including what happens after they express warmth toward the displaced person.	Explore the person's feelings alongside their experiences and current risk, recognising that protective distancing may coexist with either mixed feelings or a strongly negative view of the relationship.	Explore whether the person can hold mixed views, consider another perspective or revise an interpretation as information changes, while assessing their concerns without using ambivalence as a test of credibility.
Appraisal of the relationship	Compare changes in the child's descriptions with relationship history and observed conduct to examine whether positive memories or everyday disagreements have been reinterpreted under relational pressure.	Explore how harmful experiences shaped the person's view of the relationship, considering a strongly negative appraisal alongside other evidence when assessing harm and possible interference.	Examine whether particular disappointments have developed into negative judgements about the whole relationship and how the person responds to contrary information, with responsibility assessed through each person's conduct.
Contact and information	Examine who controls contact and information, how obstruction, monitoring, filtering or conditions affect access, and what happens when the child or displaced person attempts to connect.	Assess how contact restrictions address identified safety risks and what protection is needed while reported concerns are examined, including circumstances where allegations have yet to be formally substantiated.	Explore avoidance, blocked communication, expectations and responses to clarification, including whether someone is deciding about their own contact or restricting another person's ability to maintain relationships.
Attachment and distress	Explore whether the child reduces awareness or expression of attachment needs and feelings, a process described as attachment deactivation, and how this relates to relational pressure, relationship history and observed conduct.	Explore how fear, anger or emotional disengagement relates to harmful experiences and current risk, considering the development and function of those responses alongside the wider evidence.	Explore whether emotional disengagement developed through accumulated disappointment, defensiveness or avoidance, considering relationship history alongside evidence of harmful treatment or coercive pressure.

Differential comparison continued

Assessment dimension	Survival-based rejection Coercive relational interference	Protective distancing Harm or risk	Other relational processes Interpretation and relationship skills
Behaviour of influential people	Examine patterns of undermining, information manipulation and contact obstruction, including consequences for affection toward the displaced person and how these behaviours accumulate over time.	Assess harmful conduct and protective responses alongside one another, including whether communication difficulties affect safeguarding decisions or the way safety concerns are expressed.	Examine how accusations, inflexible demands, punitive withdrawal or difficulty acknowledging contribution affect the relationship, including whose conduct drives deterioration and obstructs clarification or repair.
Authority and responsibility	Explore whether a child has become responsible for adult decisions, protecting an adult's emotional wellbeing or enforcing an adult's position, and how these expectations affect their relationships.	Examine how adults carry responsibility for protection and whether the child is expected to investigate, justify or manage adult conduct as part of the safeguarding response.	Examine adult conduct and relationship responsibilities in light of the child's developmental capacity, recognising how limited skills or coping responses may reflect their age and circumstances.
Relationship history	Examine a substantial deterioration in a previously close and safe relationship alongside changes in relational pressure, information, contact and influential relationships to establish how the rupture developed.	Examine harmful experiences across the relationship's history, including later changes in conduct or previously undisclosed harm that may explain distancing after a period of closeness.	Explore how accumulated disappointments, recurring misunderstandings, expectations and attempts at repair shaped the relationship, assessing each person's contribution through specific interactions over time.
Repair attempts	Explore whether renewed connection brings increased pressure, punishment or obstruction and whether the child can engage with the displaced person without relational consequences elsewhere.	Examine whether declining repair continues to serve a protective function, including current risk and accountability for harmful conduct, while respecting boundaries around renewed contact.	Explore responses to clarification, acknowledgement and changed behaviour, considering the reasons for declining repair alongside the person's experiences and their ability to choose whether to reconnect.

Differential comparison continued

Assessment dimension	Survival-based rejection Coercive relational interference	Protective distancing Harm or risk	Other relational processes Interpretation and relationship skills
External information	Trace how information entered schools, services or family networks to identify independent observations and distinguish them from repeated transmission of the same allegation or interpretation.	Consider independent observations, disclosures and relevant records while examining barriers to reporting or obtaining institutional findings that may explain gaps in the available evidence.	Explore whether others receive selective descriptions or reinforce untested interpretations, tracing the original sources to establish how much agreement rests on independent information.
What maintains the distance	Explore how continuing relational consequences, restricted access and information control affect the child's ability to acknowledge attachment, express changing views or consider renewed connection.	Explore whether continuing risk, unresolved harmful conduct or the lasting effects of earlier experiences maintain the person's need for protective boundaries after immediate exposure has ended.	Explore how avoidance, inflexible interpretations, incompatible expectations, communication failures and unresolved grievances maintain the distance, including whether those processes differ from what originally caused the rupture.
Evidence and corroboration	Examine messages, access patterns and observations for evidence of coercive conduct and its effects, considering the child's refusal alongside the wider relationship history and circumstances.	Assess disclosures, records, observations and risk indicators together to establish the protection required, including where harmful experiences have yet to be formally substantiated.	Examine specific exchanges and behaviour over time to establish whether cognitive distortions or difficulties in relationship skills contribute to the rupture, with reduced contact considered alongside other evidence.
Processes to examine	Examine evidence of attachment threat, loyalty pressure, information control, attachment deactivation and adultified responsibility for decisions or emotions that belong to adults, explaining how any identified process contributes to the child's response.	Examine how exposure to harmful treatment, anticipated risk and protective avoidance may explain the distance, specifying the evidence supporting each proposed process and what remains to be established.	Examine how cognitive distortions, difficulties managing emotional responses, expectations, communication or repair skills may contribute to the rupture, treating each proposed explanation as a hypothesis requiring evidence from the relationship.

When explaining the rupture, practitioners should show how the available evidence supports the proposed processes, consider plausible alternatives and distinguish how the distance developed from what now maintains it. Distress, hostility, repeated descriptions, difficulty expressing mixed feelings or refusal of contact require examination alongside the wider pattern of behaviour and circumstances. Where information is incomplete, the formulation should specify what remains to be established while safety measures continue to address identified risks.

Suggested citation

Sillars, A.N. (2026). Understanding relational distancing and rupture: Coercive relational interference and other pathways. Eeny Meeny Miney Mo Foundation Ltd.

Conceptual development and use of research

The proposed pathways and comparisons bring together Amanda Sillars' conceptual development within the CCC-PSFV model and published research on related processes. Coercive relational interference and child-mediated coercive control are terms introduced in this work to describe conduct and its operation through relationships. Survival-based rejection describes a proposed child adaptation to relational pressure and perceived attachment threat, while coerced alignment describes the process through which a child is pressured or constrained to side with an influential person.

The cited studies inform particular discussions where they are referenced. The organisation of these ideas into pathways and comparison dimensions reflects Sillars' conceptual synthesis and development. The six studies do not collectively test or validate the CCC-PSFV model, the terminology introduced here or the comparison tables. Established psychological concepts are also applied within the proposed explanations; evidence concerning those concepts does not by itself establish the proposed application. Any assessment requires evidence specific to the people involved, including their experiences, relationship history, developmental needs, conduct and safety concerns.

References

Carr, K., Holman, A., Abetz, J., Kellas, J. K., & Vagnoni, E. (2015). Giving voice to the silence of family estrangement: Comparing reasons of estranged parents and adult children in a nonmatched sample. Journal of Family Communication, 15(2), 130–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/15267431.2015.1013106

Everaert, J., Podina, I. R., & Koster, E. H. W. (2017). A comprehensive meta-analysis of interpretation biases in depression. Clinical Psychology Review, 58, 33–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2017.09.005

Gadassi-Polack, R., Zabag, R., Bronstein, M. V., Joormann, J., & Everaert, J. (2025). Biased and inflexible interpretations of social situations predict depressive symptoms and relational outcomes in parent-adolescent dyads. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 193, 104840. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2025.104840

Gilligan, M., Suitor, J. J., & Pillemer, K. (2015). Estrangement between mothers and adult children: The role of norms and values. Journal of Marriage and Family, 77(4), 908–920. https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12207

Wilson, S., Stroud, C. B., & Durbin, C. E. (2017). Interpersonal dysfunction in personality disorders: A meta-analytic review. Psychological Bulletin, 143(7), 677–734. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000101

Xyrakis, N., Aquilina, B., McNiece, E., Tran, T., Waddell, C., Suomi, A., & Pasalich, D. (2024). Interparental coercive control and child and family outcomes: A systematic review. Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 25(1), 22–40. https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380221139243

Note: Carr et al. (2015) compared explanations from separate groups of parents and adult children, so their findings cannot establish differences within the same family or determine whose explanation was accurate. Gilligan et al. (2015) examined later-life relationships using mothers' reports and cross-sectional data, which limits conclusions about causation and the perspectives of adult children. Both studies inform the discussion of reported reasons and value differences, with conclusions about an individual relationship requiring evidence specific to that family.