

Concept Paper Form

Provisional Paper Title: Why do first- and third-person measures of childhood maltreatment differ? A qualitative study of contextual factors and interviewers' impressions
Proposing Author: Oonagh Coleman
Author's Email: oonagh.coleman@kcl.ac.uk
P.I. Sponsor: Andrea Danese
Today's Date: 3/25/2022

Please describe your proposal in 2-3 pages with sufficient detail for helpful review.

Objective of the study and its significance:

The measurement of childhood maltreatment relies on information from a variety of different sources depending on whether it is obtained prospectively or retrospectively. Prospective measures are typically derived from parental or official reports, which capture third-person perspectives, whilst retrospective measures are most commonly assessed using self-reports, which capture the first-person perspective (Baldwin et al., 2019). In contrast to previous assumptions, first- and third-person perspectives identify largely different groups of individuals and cannot therefore be used interchangeably (Baldwin et al., 2019). These groups have different risk for psychopathology. It has been found that risk of psychopathology is minimal in individuals with third-person measures of maltreatment but no corresponding first-person reports, while the risk linked to first-person retrospective reports is high, whether or not this subjective appraisal is consistent with third-person measures (Danese & Widom, 2020; Newbury et al., 2018; Reuben et al., 2016; Shaffer et al., 2008).

This study seeks to investigate the sources of disagreement between first- and third-person measures of maltreatment. The E-Risk study is uniquely positioned to explore this disagreement through a qualitative analysis of the rich and detailed interviewer impression notes collected at phase 18. There are two key aspects of the interviewers' notes that might shed light on factors underlying the disagreement between reports through a qualitative analysis. The first is contextual factors that might act as barriers to disclosure, and the second is the interviewer's impression of the subject during the assessment

Firstly, the contextual conditions within which the interview took place, and the level of rapport established between the research worker and E-Risk Study members, might act as important barriers to disclosure (Della Femina et al., 1990). The E-Risk interviewer impression notes are uniquely able to give a rich and detailed account of the context of the interview, for example the level of privacy available and whether anyone else was present during the interview that might have hindered the subject from reporting honestly. In addition, the notes provide detailed descriptions of the research worker's impression of the subject's level of engagement and openness, their

willingness or reticence to disclose personal information, and the level of rapport that was established during the interview process. Identification of such factors through a qualitative analysis might offer important insight into the motivational mechanisms underlying the disagreement between first- and third-person accounts of maltreatment.

Secondly, the notes give detailed accounts of the interviewers' impressions of the way in which subjects interpreted and made sense of their past experiences, and how they emotionally responded to questions related to victimization and maltreatment. Individual differences in sensitivity to negative information, propensity to interpret events as threatening or abusive (Clancy & McNally, 2005; Widom & Morris, 1997), and appraisal and coping styles (VanMeter et al., 2020), might lead to contrasting interpretations of the same experience, therefore resulting in conflicting reports when maltreatment is measured through subjective self-report in comparison to more objective third-person measures (Danese & Widom, 2020). Therefore, a qualitative analysis of individual variation in subjective appraisal style might offer insight into differences in reporting of maltreatment due to differences in first-person experiences and interpretations (Danese & Widom, 2020; Smith & Pollak, 2021).

This investigation may provide novel insights on the conceptualization and measurement of childhood maltreatment. Because of the different risk for psychopathology in the groups identified by either measure, better understanding of the sources of measure disagreement may also identify protective and vulnerability factors.

Data analysis methods:

- Each form of maltreatment (physical and sexual abuse, physical neglect, and emotional abuse and neglect) will be dichotomized as none/mild (0) or severe (1) for both prospective and retrospective measures
- Scores on each maltreatment variable will be added together to create a multiple maltreatment score ranging from 0-4 for both prospective and retrospective measures
- Most and least discordant groups will be quantified by subtracting each participant's prospective maltreatment score from their retrospective maltreatment score to create a measure of directional divergence
- This will identify three groups: concordant; most discordant – third-person report only (or greater third-person measures, if using continuous scores); most discordant – first-person report only (or greater first-person measures, if using continuous scores)
- Samples from each group will be selected stratifying by gender and SES. Depending on the size of the groups, word count and the different interviewers might also be included in the sampling strategy
- Thematic analysis of the interviewer impression notes will be conducted between groups using the framework approach (Ritchie et al., 2003):
 - 1) Data familiarization – noting down key ideas and themes
 - 2) Constructing an initial thematic framework
 - 3) Indexing – systematically applying the thematic framework to the entire data set
 - 4) Charting – rearranging the indexed data into thematic matrices
 - 5) Mapping and interpretation
 - 6) Writing up results with quoted extracts to support the discussion

Variables needed at which ages:

- FAMILYID - Unique family identifier
- ATWINID - Twin A ID
- BTWINID - Twin B ID
- RORDERP5 - Random Twin Order
- SAMPSEX - Sex of Twins
- ZYGOSITY – Zygosity

Age 5

- SESWQ35 - Social class composite

Age 5 - 12

- HARME512 - Child Harm between 5-12
- PHYSICALE512 - Physical abuse between 5-12
- SEXUALE512 - Sexual abuse between 5-12
- EABUSEE512 - Emotional abuse between 5-12
- ENEGLECTE512 - Emotional neglect between 5-12
- PNEGLECTE512 - Physical neglect between 5-12
- 'Any maltreatment' variable used in Newbury et al. 2018
- 'Multiple maltreatment' variable used in Newbury et al, 2018

Age 18

- CTQ_PAE18 CTQ - physical abuse score reported at 18
- CTQ_SAE18 CTQ - sexual abuse score reported at 18
- CTQ_PNE18 CTQ - physical neglect score reported at 18
- Combined 'emotional abuse and emotional neglect' variable used in Newbury et al, 2018
- 'Any maltreatment' variable used in Newbury et al, 2018
- 'Multiple maltreatment' variable used in Newbury et al, 2018
- INTVWRE18 – Interviewer identifier at 18
- NOTWDCNT18 – word count for interviewer impression notes at 18

Qualitative data:

- Interview impression notes at age 18
- Notes from victimization section at age 18

References cited:

- Baldwin, J. R., Reuben, A., Newbury, J. B., & Danese, A. (2019). Agreement Between Prospective and Retrospective Measures of Childhood Maltreatment: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry*, 76(6), 584-593.
- Clancy, S. A., & McNally, R. J. (2005). Who needs repression? *Scientific Review of Mental Health Practice*, 4(2).
- Danese, A., & Widom, C. S. (2020). Objective and subjective experiences of child maltreatment and their relationships with psychopathology. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 4(8), 811-818.

- Della Femina, D., Yeager, C., & Lewis, D. O. (1990). Child Abuse: Adolescent Records vs. Adult Recall. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 14*, 227-231.
- Newbury, J. B., Arseneault, L., Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Danese, A., Baldwin, J. R., & Fisher, H. L. (2018). Measuring childhood maltreatment to predict early-adult psychopathology: Comparison of prospective informant-reports and retrospective self-reports. *Journal of Psychiatric Research, 96*, 57-64.
- Reuben, A., Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Belsky, D. W., Harrington, H., Schroeder, F., Hogan, S., Ramrakha, S., Poulton, R., & Danese, A. (2016). Lest we forget: comparing retrospective and prospective assessments of adverse childhood experiences in the prediction of adult health. *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry, 57*(10), 1103-1112.
- Ritchie, J., Spencer, L., & O'Connor, W. (2003). Carrying out qualitative analysis. *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers, 2003*, 219-262.
- Shaffer, A., Huston, L., & Egeland, B. (2008). Identification of child maltreatment using prospective and self-report methodologies: A comparison of maltreatment incidence and relation to later psychopathology. *Child abuse & neglect, 32*(7), 682-692.
- Smith, K. E., & Pollak, S. D. (2021). Social relationships and children's perceptions of adversity. *Child Development Perspectives, 15*(4), 228-234.
- VanMeter, F., Handley, E. D., & Cicchetti, D. (2020). The role of coping strategies in the pathway between child maltreatment and internalizing and externalizing behaviors. *Child abuse & neglect, 101*, Article 104323.
- Widom, C. S., & Morris, S. (1997). Accuracy of adult recollections of childhood victimization .2. Childhood sexual abuse. *Psychological Assessment, 9*(1), 34-46.

Data Security Agreement

Provisional Paper Title: Why do first- and third-person measures of childhood maltreatment differ? A qualitative study of contextual factors and interviewers' impressions
Proposing Author: Oonagh Coleman
Today's Date: 3/25/2022

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I am current on Human Subjects Training (CITI (www.citiprogram.org) or equivalent)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	My project is covered by the Duke ethics committee OR I have /will obtain ethical approval from my home institution.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I will treat all data as "restricted" and store in a secure fashion. My computer or laptop is: a) encrypted (recommended programs are FileVault2 for Macs, and Bitlocker for Windows machines) b) password-protected c) configured to lock-out after 15 minutes of inactivity AND d) has an antivirus client installed as well as being patched regularly.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I will not "sync" the data to a mobile device.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In the event that my laptop with data on it is lost, stolen or hacked, I will immediately contact Moffitt or Caspi.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I will not share the data with anyone, including my students or other collaborators not specifically listed on this concept paper.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I will not post data online or submit the data file to a journal for them to post. <i>Some journals are now requesting the data file as part of the manuscript submission process. Study participants have not given informed consent for unrestricted open access, so we have a managed-access process. Speak to Temi or Avshalom for strategies for achieving compliance with data-sharing policies of journals.</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I will delete all data files from my computer after the project is complete. Collaborators and trainees may not take a data file away from the office. This data remains the property of the Study and cannot be used for further analyses without an approved concept paper for new analyses.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I have read the Data Use Guidelines and agree to follow the instructions.

Signature: 