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Introduction

Parent-child relationship in the past produces problems in the present has been a traditional point of view in psychological therapy and clinical psychology since Freud. Parent-child and/or family relationship were seen as pathogenic. However empirical knowledge of what type of family relationships relates to problems and conditions based on the cumulative effect of family relationships from the past to the present day is sparse.

Wakashima el al. (2011) reported on new research methods which comprehensively understands the family based on simultaneous family relationships such as what covariant associations are possessed by marital husband-wife, parent relationships or multi-generational relations, or, as per the narrative, based on the cumulative family relationships from the past to the present. In it, in order to capture the cumulative family relationships, family relationship history graphs (FRHG) was utilized and a research using FRHG was presented. Furthermore Usami et al. (2011) investigated the validity and credibility of FRHG. In the investigation of its validity, the comparison of cohesion of FRHG and the “quality of relationship” of NFRJ98 was conducted. The results showed the father-child/mother-child cohesion of FRHG of ages 3 to 18 has correlations with the NFRJ98 relationship quality of the same ages of 0.92 and 0.76, and it can be said to show results for the transition of cumulative parent-child relationship recalled at the present time to be no different from the transition created by accumulating the results on parent child relationship measured at each age. Based on this FRHG has a fixed validity as a measure of gauging the family relationship from the past to the present. Next we move on to the validity of re-testing. In the consideration of 1-month re-test credibility, the correlation of association from age 3 to 20 is high and in terms of the power, the correlation between age 9 and 20 was high. The 4-month re-test credibility showed a stable correlation above age 15 mostly and the power showed an unstable correlation relationship. In other words, when the validity and credibility were considered, it can be thought that a particularly good option is to utilize relationships as a variable. Also if
the result of the power is considered, it can be supposed that the results from beyond the primary school stage should ideally be used.

From all of the above, the report suggests the direction for the research using FRHG with a focus on the relationship variable during the primary school period onwards. With this in mind, the following four points are considered and reported.

1. Two-person relationship and time period associated with current relationship and the transition of family relationships utilizing FRHG (105 women, 70 men, total 175)

2. Association between current SDS score and the family relationship utilizing FRHG (48 women, 52 men, total 100)

3. Association between current SDS score and the variability of family relationship utilizing FRHG (48 women, 52 men, total 100)

4. Comparison between clinical group and general group of family relationship transition using FRHG

**Method**

**Participants**

FRHG data reported by Wakashima et al. (2011) (October 2009, University and vocational school students targeted. Average age 20.64) excluding those targeted who provided incomplete answers - 75 people (57 women, 18 men), and data from 100 people (48 women, 52 men) from the FRHG implemented through internet survey in February 2013 (University students aged 18 to 28 were targeted. Mean age was 21.74) were analyzed.

SDS was implemented on these 100 people only.

The data of the clinical group was in effect in A counseling facility · B counseling facility from before November 2009 to January 2012. The evaluators of the clinical group were three men and six women. Mean age 41.00. There were two IP people, six mothers and one father. They were all Japanese.

**Measure**

The measures used were FRHG and SDS. (Moreover SDS was only implemented on the 100 people (48 women, 52 men) in the 2013 internet survey data).

It is noted that this research has been audited by the university ethics committee and approval given.

**Results**

The four analyses results are reported below.

Dyadic relationship and time period associated with current relationship and the transition of family relationships of FRHG (105 women, 70 men, total 175)

The results are shown in Figure 1-3 and Table 1-3.

In general family relationships, in the present day, father-child relationship appears to be a little lower. In mother-child relationship, there is a decline during the junior high school period but is relatively stable at other times. Father-mother relationship is also relatively stable. If men and women are studied separately, there is a trend for men to generally give strong acknowledgement to the current relationship.
Although females show a decline toward the mother in the junior high school period there is a perception that there is a strong relationship which is relatively stable. Moreover it appears to be perceived that the relationship with the father declines in the present day. Husband-wife relationship declines a little during the junior and senior high school periods but is perceived, in the present day, to be similar to that in the previous period with a strong relationship.

It is the relationship just prior to the time concerned and other two-party relationships at present day which show the strongest relationship with the current two-party Wakashima et al. (2010) and Usami et al. (2011). However when this is considered, several other characteristics can be seen. Current father-child relationship shows an association with the husband-wife relationship at present or at a time close to the present. The current mother-child relationship shows a strong association with the father-child relationship in the primary school lower years \((r=.61)\). Moreover the father-mother relationship at present also shows a relatively high association with lower primary school years \((r = .53)\), higher primary school years \((r = .56)\) and junior high school period \((r = .50)\).

In the case of males, the characteristic is that
### Table 1. Correlation matrix of dyadic cohesion in all respondents (N=175)

|                | Father-child | Father-child | Father-child | Father-child | Mother-child | Mother-child | Mother-child | Father-mother | Father-mother | Father-mother | Father-mother |
|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| **Father-mother** |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| **CS age**      | 0.93**       | 0.91**       | 0.94**       | 0.91**       | 0.73**       | 0.70**       | 0.67**       | 0.77**       | 0.73**       | 0.61**       | 0.96**       |
| **HSS age**     | 0.76**       | 0.71**       | 0.66**       | 0.70**       | 0.58**       | 0.55**       | 0.51**       | 0.69**       | 0.64**       | 0.50**       | 0.70**       |
| **MSS age**     | 0.52**       | 0.40**       | 0.45**       | 0.47**       | 0.41**       | 0.36**       | 0.35**       | 0.44**       | 0.41**       | 0.33**       | 0.47**       |
| **HG age of E** | 0.76**       | 0.65**       | 0.61**       | 0.58**       | 0.38**       | 0.34**       | 0.32**       | 0.43**       | 0.39**       | 0.31**       | 0.44**       |
| **LG age of E** | 0.78**       | 0.69**       | 0.64**       | 0.60**       | 0.43**       | 0.39**       | 0.37**       | 0.48**       | 0.44**       | 0.35**       | 0.48**       |

**Note.** *p<.05, **p<.01
the present day relationship indicates a relation to all periods and relationship. Furthermore the present day father-child relationship indicates a low relationship to the past mother-child relationship and high relationship with the present day mother-child and father-mother relationship. Present day mother-child relationship relates highly with the whole period/relationship. Present day father-child relationship also relates to overall periods of father-child and mother-child relationship (Figure 2 and Table 2).

In women, the current father-child relationship did not indicate a strong association with time or relationship as a whole, and it can be said to show an association with father-mother relationship close to the present day. The present day mother-child relationship relates to the whole of the time periods and relationships but what can be thought of as particularly important are the father-mother relationship in the initial period and father-child relationship in the lower primary school years ($r=.69$) and higher primary school years ($r=.64$). The present father-mother relationship relates to all periods and relationships (Figure 3 and Table 3).
Table 2. Correlation matrix of dyadic cohesion in male respondents (N=70)

|                  | Father-child | Father-child | Father-child | Father-child | Mother-child | Mother-child | Mother-child | Father-mother | Father-mother | Father-mother | Father-mother |
|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|                  | LG age of E  | HG age of E  | MSS age      | CS age       | LG age of E  | HG age of E  | MSS age      | CS age       | LG age of E  | HG age of E  | MSS age      |
| Father-child     | 0.90**       | 0.58**       | 0.46**       | 0.38**       | 0.67**       | 0.67**       | 0.49**       | 0.41**       | 0.75**       | 0.79**       | 0.63**       |
| HG age of E      | 0.90**       | 0.71**       | 0.60**       | 0.47**       | 0.64**       | 0.68**       | 0.50**       | 0.42**       | 0.78**       | 0.80**       | 0.73**       |
| MSS age          | 0.58**       | 0.71**       | 0.92**       | 0.62**       | 0.30**       | 0.37**       | 0.47**       | 0.47**       | 0.49**       | 0.63**       | 0.72**       |
| CS age           | 0.46**       | 0.80**       | 0.92**       | 0.69**       | 0.21**       | 0.27**       | 0.49**       | 0.61**       | 0.44**       | 0.58**       | 0.67**       |
| Mother-child     | 0.38**       | 0.47**       | 0.62**       | 0.69**       | 0.11**       | 0.16**       | 0.33**       | 0.36**       | 0.60**       | 0.34**       | 0.48**       |
| LG age of E      | 0.67**       | 0.84**       | 0.30**       | 0.21**       | 0.97**       | 0.70**       | 0.56**       | 0.53**       | 0.77**       | 0.67**       | 0.46**       |
| HG age of E      | 0.67**       | 0.88**       | 0.37**       | 0.27**       | 0.16**       | 0.97**       | 0.70**       | 0.61**       | 0.57**       | 0.80**       | 0.71**       |
| MSS age          | 0.45**       | 0.90**       | 0.47**       | 0.45**       | 0.33**       | 0.70**       | 0.79**       | 0.88**       | 0.72**       | 0.58**       | 0.54**       |
| CS age           | 0.41**       | 0.46**       | 0.57**       | 0.61**       | 0.36**       | 0.56**       | 0.61**       | 0.88**       | 0.73**       | 0.52**       | 0.50**       |
| Mother-child     | 0.40**       | 0.42**       | 0.47**       | 0.49**       | 0.60**       | 0.53**       | 0.57**       | 0.72**       | 0.73**       | 0.51**       | 0.57**       |
| LG age of E      | 0.75**       | 0.78**       | 0.49**       | 0.44**       | 0.34**       | 0.77**       | 0.80**       | 0.58**       | 0.52**       | 0.51**       | 0.91**       |
| HG age of E      | 0.75**       | 0.80**       | 0.63**       | 0.56**       | 0.46**       | 0.67**       | 0.71**       | 0.54**       | 0.50**       | 0.57**       | 0.91**       |
| MSS age          | 0.75**       | 0.63**       | 0.72**       | 0.67**       | 0.48**       | 0.49**       | 0.53**       | 0.51**       | 0.95**       | 0.95**       | 0.81**       |
| CS age           | 0.62**       | 0.88**       | 0.68**       | 0.66**       | 0.55**       | 0.41**       | 0.48**       | 0.52**       | 0.86**       | 0.95**       | 0.95**       |
| Note. *: p<.05, **: p<.01
Figure 3. Average of each dyadic cohesion in female respondents ($N=105$)
Table 3. Correlation matrix of dyadic cohesion in female respondents (N=105)

|                   | Father-child | Father-child | Father-child | Father-child | Father-child | Father-child | Father-child | Father-child | Father-mother | Father-mother | Father-mother | Father-mother | Father-mother |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|                   | HG age of E  | HSS age      | MSS age      | CS age       | HG age of E  | HSS age      | MSS age      | CS age       | HG age of E  | HSS age      | MSS age      | CS age       | HG age of E  |
| Father-child      |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| HG age of E       | 0.94**       | 0.80**       | 0.83**       | 0.89**       | 0.92**       | 0.89**       | 0.87**       | 0.97**       |              |              |              |              |              |
| HSS age           | 0.79**       | 0.68**       | 0.39**       | 0.49**       | 0.63**       | 0.39**       | 0.38**       | 0.94**       | 0.87**       |              |              |              |              |
| MSS age           | 0.82**       | 0.39**       | 0.38**       | 0.85**       | 0.39**       | 0.38**       | 0.94**       |              | 0.87**       |              |              |              |              |
| CS age            | 0.57**       | 0.49**       | 0.46**       | 0.86**       | 0.49**       | 0.46**       | 0.97**       |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| Mother-child      |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| HG age of E       | 0.72**       | 0.71**       | 0.52**       | 0.86**       | 0.94**       | 0.72**       | 0.71**       |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| HSS age           | 0.70**       | 0.71**       | 0.50**       | 0.87**       | 0.90**       | 0.70**       | 0.71**       | 0.85**       |              |              |              |              |              |
| MSS age           | 0.71**       | 0.71**       | 0.52**       | 0.88**       | 0.90**       | 0.71**       | 0.71**       |              | 0.87**       |              |              |              |              |
| CS age            | 0.62**       | 0.64**       | 0.38**       | 0.94**       | 0.94**       | 0.62**       | 0.64**       |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| Father-mother     |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| HG age of E       | 0.72**       | 0.70**       | 0.52**       | 0.86**       | 0.94**       | 0.72**       | 0.70**       |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| HSS age           | 0.70**       | 0.71**       | 0.50**       | 0.87**       | 0.90**       | 0.70**       | 0.71**       |              | 0.85**       |              |              |              |              |
| MSS age           | 0.71**       | 0.71**       | 0.52**       | 0.88**       | 0.90**       | 0.71**       | 0.71**       |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| CS age            | 0.62**       | 0.64**       | 0.38**       | 0.94**       | 0.94**       | 0.62**       | 0.64**       |              |              |              |              |              |              |

Note. *: p<.05, **: p<.01
Association between current SDS score and the family relationship utilizing FRHG (48 women, 52 men, total 100)

The results are shown in Table 4-8.

The association between current SDS score and family relationship utilizing FRHG was considered. Moreover, classifications were made into the high group, middle group and low group based on the SDS score and correlation analysis with the FRHG relationship score was conducted. As a result, association was seen with FRHG relationship score only in the SDS high group.

Firstly, in the SDS high group (all target population) a significant link was shown between the present day SDS score and father-mother relationship during junior and senior high school periods.

Next, although there are fewer participants, among the men, a significant link was seen between present day SDS score and father-child relationship during the later years of primary school.

Moreover, the present SDS score and father-mother relationship during senior high school period showed a significant association.

Next, among the females, there was a significant association between the present SDS score and father-child relationship during senior high school period.

Moreover, the present day SDS score and father-mother relationship at junior high school period showed a significant association.

Table 4. Correlation coefficient between father-mother cohesion in each age and SDS points at present (high SDS participants : N=11).

|        | LG age of E | HG age of E | MSS age | HSS age | CS age |
|--------|-------------|-------------|---------|---------|--------|
| SDS    | -0.36       | -0.54       | -0.78** | -0.78** | -0.56  |

Note: *:p<.05, **:p<.01

Table 5. Correlation coefficient between father-child cohesion in each age and SDS points at present (high SDS male participants : N=5).

|        | LG age of E | HG age of E | MSS age | HSS age | CS age |
|--------|-------------|-------------|---------|---------|--------|
| SDS    | -0.67       | -0.91*      | -0.55   | -0.87   | -0.10  |

Note: *:p<.05, **:p<.01
Table 6. Correlation coefficient between father-mother cohesion in each age 
and SDS points at present (high SDS male participants : N=5).

|         | LG age of E | HG age of E | MSS age | HSS age | CS age |
|---------|-------------|-------------|---------|---------|--------|
| SDS     | -0.29       | -0.57       | -0.84   | -0.91*  | -0.81  |

Note. *:p<.05, **:p<.01

Table 7. Correlation coefficient between father-child cohesion in each age 
and SDS points at present (high SDS female participants : N=6).

|         | LG age of E | HG age of E | MSS age | HSS age | CS age |
|---------|-------------|-------------|---------|---------|--------|
| SDS     | 0.22        | 0.09        | -0.75   | -0.82*  | -0.63  |

Note. *:p<.05, **:p<.01

Table 8. Correlation coefficient between father-mother cohesion in each age 
and SDS points at present (high SDS female participants : N=6).

|         | LG age of E | HG age of E | MSS age | HSS age | CS age |
|---------|-------------|-------------|---------|---------|--------|
| SDS     | -0.42       | -0.50       | -0.82*  | -0.78   | -0.42  |

Note. *:p<.05, **:p<.01
Association between current SDS score and the variability of family relationship utilizing FRHG (48 women, 52 men, total 100)

Next, the relationship between the variability of family relationships and the current SDS score was investigated. The results are shown in Table 9-10. The variability of family relationships was calculated, as per Usami et al. (2011), as (the score at each point) – (score immediately prior). The results are as below.

Significant relationship was seen only among the men. The decline of father-mother relationship from the senior high school period to the present day showed a weak association to the present day SDS score. Furthermore, although not significant, the decline of the mother-child relationship from primary school lower years to higher years show the relation of r=-.24 in men and r=-.22 in women. In future it is desired that a similar analysis be conducted with additional data supplemented.
Table 9. Correlations between variability of dyadic cohesion and SDS in male respondents ($N=51$).

| Variability of father-child cohesion (LG age of E to HG age of E) | Variability of father-child cohesion (HG age of E to MSS age) | Variability of father-child cohesion (MSS age to HSS age) | Variability of father-child cohesion (HSS age to CS age) | Variability of mother-child cohesion (LG age of E to HG age of E) | Variability of mother-child cohesion (HG age of E to MSS age) | Variability of mother-child cohesion (MSS age to HSS age) | Variability of mother-child cohesion (HSS age to CS age) | SDS |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 0.12                                                          | 0.03                                                        | 0.08                                                     | -0.11                                                    | -0.24                                                         | 0.07                                                        | 0.11                                                     | -0.11                                                    | -0.12| 0.08| -0.08| -0.30* |

Note. *: $p<.05$, **: $p<.01$

Table 10. Correlations between variability of dyadic cohesion and SDS in female respondents ($N=49$)

| Variability of father-child cohesion (LG age of E to HG age of E) | Variability of father-child cohesion (HG age of E to MSS age) | Variability of father-child cohesion (MSS age to HSS age) | Variability of father-child cohesion (HSS age to CS age) | Variability of mother-child cohesion (LG age of E to HG age of E) | Variability of mother-child cohesion (HG age of E to MSS age) | Variability of mother-child cohesion (MSS age to HSS age) | Variability of mother-child cohesion (HSS age to CS age) | SDS |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 0.08                                                          | 0.17                                                        | -0.09                                                    | -0.04                                                    | -0.22                                                         | 0.09                                                        | 0.09                                                     | -0.08                                                    | -0.09| 0.06| -0.11| -0.02 |

Note. *: $p<.05$, **: $p<.01$
Comparison between clinical group and non-clinical group (general group) of family relationship transition using FRHG (data contains 6 women, 3 men, total 9 people)

This is a comparison between the clinical group and non-clinical group (general group) of the transitions of the family relationship utilizing FRHG. The breakdown of the targeted population is: school truancy 7, depression 1, relationship with family 1. The results are shown in Table 11-19 and Figure 4-6.

In the clinical group relative to the non-clinical group, father-child relationships were acknowledged to decline because of occurrence of issues or else to decrease or have decreased by beyond the senior high school period.

Mother-child relationship is lower or perceived to be lower on the whole in the clinical group compared with the non-clinical group.

Father-mother relationship also drastically declines or is perceived to decline from the occurrence of issues or over the time period from senior high school to the present day.
Table 11. Average of father-child cohesion in clinical and non clinical groups.

|                | LG age of E | HG age of E | MSS age | HSS age | CS age |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------|---------|--------|
| Non-clinical   | 5.27        | 5.46        | 5.38    | 5.46    | 4.64   |
| Clinical group | 7.50        | 6.67        | 6.33    | 3.92    | 3.25   |

Table 12. Standard deviation of father-child cohesion in clinical and non clinical groups.

|                | LG age of E | HG age of E | MSS age | HSS age | CS age |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------|---------|--------|
| Non-clinical   | 3.31        | 2.99        | 2.66    | 2.78    | 2.81   |
| Clinical group | 2.48        | 2.86        | 2.75    | 0.92    | 0.66   |

Table 13. Number of respondents on each time points.

|                | LG age of E | HG age of E | MSS age | HSS age | CS age |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------|---------|--------|
| Non-clinical   | 185         | 185         | 183     | 183     | 181    |
| Clinical group | 8           | 8           | 8       | 4       | 3      |
Figure 5. Average of mother-child cohesion in clinical and non clinical groups.

Table 14. Average of mother-child cohesion in clinical and non clinical groups.

|                | LG age of E | HG age of E | MSS age | HSS age | CS age |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------|---------|--------|
| Non-clinical group | 5.46        | 5.46        | 5.28    | 5.51    | 5.70   |
| Clinical group   | 8.48        | 7.89        | 7.04    | 6.00    | 4.88   |

Table 15. Standard deviation of mother-child cohesion in clinical and non clinical groups.

|                | LG age of E | HG age of E | MSS age | HSS age | CS age |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------|---------|--------|
| Non-clinical group | 3.74        | 3.44        | 3.14    | 3.26    | 3.40   |
| Clinical group   | 1.54        | 1.99        | 1.94    | 1.78    | 3.18   |

Table 16. Number of respondents on each time points.

|                | LG age of E | HG age of E | MSS age | HSS age | CS age |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|---------|---------|--------|
| Non-clinical group | 185         | 185         | 184     | 184     | 184    |
| Clinical group   | 9           | 9           | 9       | 5       | 5      |
Figure 6. Average of father-mother cohesion in clinical and non clinical groups.

Table 17. Average of father-mother cohesion in clinical and non clinical groups.

|                  | LG age of E | HG age of E | MSS age | HSS age | CS age |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|---------|---------|--------|
| Non-clinical group | 5.39        | 5.43        | 5.30    | 5.26    | 5.31   |
| Clinical group    | 6.96        | 5.42        | 5.04    | 4.08    | 3.33   |

Table 18. Standard deviation of father-mother cohesion in clinical and non clinical groups.

|                  | LG age of E | HG age of E | MSS age | HSS age | CS age |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|---------|---------|--------|
| Non-clinical group | 3.22        | 3.04        | 2.78    | 2.79    | 3.02   |
| Clinical group    | 2.70        | 3.28        | 3.08    | 2.91    | 2.08   |

Table 19. Number of respondents on each time points.

|                  | LG age of E | HG age of E | MSS age | HSS age | CS age |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|---------|---------|--------|
| Non-clinical group | 181         | 181         | 178     | 178     | 175    |
| Clinical group    | 8           | 8           | 8       | 4       | 3      |
Discussion

This research is a challenging research utilizing FRHG which is a method capturing the cumulative family relationships from the past to the present day. In it the following four points were considered.

First is two-person relationship and time period associated with the current relationship and the transition of family relationships utilizing FRHG.

Second is association between current SDS score and the family relationship utilizing FRHG.

Third is association between current SDS score and the variability of family relationship utilizing FRHG.

Fourth is comparison between clinical group and non-clinical group (general group) of family relationship transition utilizing FRHG.

This report indicates a method approaching a clinical research utilizing FRHG, and the results actually shown here are not complete. It is of utmost importance to present the method of use of FRHG and the methodology of the research. Moreover the development of FRHG allows the family system to be captured from the cumulative family relationships. The family system theory tends to reserve the time concept including the past and the present, and there was a strong tendency to understand the family system based on synchronic family relationships. FRHG is also applied in researches of self-decisions and family caregiving of the elderly (for example Hiraizumi et al., 2011; Wakashima et al., 2011b).

In this review the following has been understood. Firstly, as far as first point is concerned, the fact that it is the period immediately prior to or else a different 2-party relationship at present day which relates most with the present day 2-party relationship is similar to Wakashima et al. (2011) and Usami et al. (2011), but if the associations were studied in considering these several characteristics were observed. For example, in men, the father-child relationship relates to a different present dyad relationship, and in the case of women, the father-child relationship has a moderate relationship with father-mother relationship in the time period close to the present. Moreover in the case of mother-child relationship, on the one hand among men there is an association as a whole to other two-party relationships and each time period, among women there is association with father-mother relationship in the initial period or father-child relationship in the lower higher primary school years, hence, showing a difference in the cumulative family relationships among men and women or else a difference in its perception.

Next in second point, the association between FRHG and SDS was considered. For this the SDS scores were divided into the high group • middle group • low group and the correlation of each with FRHG were analyzed. As a result, an association with FRHG was seen only in the SDS high group. For example, a significant association was shown, in men, with the father-child relationship in the higher primary school years, and in women, with the
father-child relationship in the senior high school period and father-mother relationship in the junior high school period. The association between the variability of third point and SDS score was also shown. Among men, the decline of father-mother relationship from senior high school period to the present day showed a weak association with the present day SDS score. Moreover, although this was not significant, the decline of mother-child relationship from lower primary school years to higher years showed an association in men of $r=-.24$ and in women of $r=-.22$.

Above results may not be direct associations. However it suggests re-examination with an increased sample size and using another appropriate measure other than SDS.

Furthermore in fourth point, it was understood that in the clinical group general historical family relationships as considered in first analysis was not drawn and instead quite a severe family relationships can be illustrated. The sample size is small and there are differences in the target population viewpoints so conclusions cannot be drawn but questions can be raised. We suppose any of the following. Is the family relationship constructed as a result of a problem arising, or else should family relationship be perceived negatively. Else there is the supposition family relationship is constructed such that it attracts problems or generates them. Aoki (2007) conducts interview surveys on the association among family members as well as the understanding of truancy by three types of family members (child/mother/father) experiencing truancy from the point of view of life history. Here avoidance consciousness from the mother to the father is seen with the background of mistrust, reticence and avoidance behaviour of the father with work as a reason and increase in the required care by the mother for the truanting child. Hence there are reports that truancy understanding and reinterpretation may make the father late to come on board and results in them not participating in new family strategies. The clever point with Aoki(2007)’s research is that family relationship is not considered as the cause of the problem of truancy but instead researches from the point of view of how family is involved in the problem of truancy. This will no doubt ease the interpretation of the aforementioned optional supposition.
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