

# E-Risk Study Concept Paper Form

Response was completed on 20-11-2024 10:24.

Record ID	9
-----------	---

## 1. Collaborating researchers

**Please note:**

Once approved, a formal data use agreement will be required between King's College London and the university or research organisation that employs any collaborator having access to the data if they are not a member of staff, a student or affiliate of King's College London. This needs to be signed by both universities/organisations before data access can be granted.

For projects carried out by a student (e.g., MSc/MA, MPhil/PhD, clinical doctorate), the lead applicant should be the student's supervisor at the same university, and the student should be named as the student collaborator requiring access to the data.

If you have additional collaborators, please name them below and indicate whether they need to have access to the data. It would be common, for instance, for other researchers to see summary results of analyses and act as co-authors on your paper without having access to the data. You will not be permitted to share the dataset except with those indicated in the table as requiring access.

Applicable?	Category	Name	Email address	University/organisation	Needs access to data for analysis?
	<b>Applicant (lead researcher)</b>	Flora Blangis	flora.blangis@kcl.ac.uk	KCL	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
<input type="radio"/> Applicable <input checked="" type="radio"/> Not applicable	<b>Student collaborator (if data is for their dissertation/thesis)</b>				
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Applicable <input type="radio"/> Not applicable	<b>E-Risk Sponsor (if applicant is not an E-Risk investigator)</b>	Helen Fisher	helen.2.fisher@kcl.ac.uk	KCL	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No

<b>Are there additional collaborators to add?</b>	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
---	--

<b>If yes, how many additional collaborators would you like to add?</b>	8 <input type="button" value="v"/>
---	------------------------------------

Category	Name	Email address	University/organisation	Needs access to data for analysis?
<b>Other collaborator #1</b>	Louise Arseneault	louise.arseneault@kcl.ac.uk	KCL	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
<b>Other collaborator #2</b>	Avshalom Caspi	avshalom.caspi@duke.edu	KCL / Duke University	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
<b>Other collaborator #3</b>	Rachel Latham	rachel.latham@kcl.ac.uk	KCL	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
<b>Other collaborator #4</b>	Terrie Moffitt	terrie.moffitt@duke.edu	KCL / Duke University	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
<b>Other collaborator #5</b>	Stefan Sprinckmoller	stefan.sprinckmoller@kcl.ac.uk	KCL	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
<b>Other collaborator #6</b>	Yichang Wang	yichang.wang@kcl.ac.uk	KCL	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
<b>Other collaborator #7</b>	Andrea Danese	andrea.danese@kcl.ac.uk	KCL	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
<b>Other collaborator #8</b>	J. Kathy Xie	kathy.xie@duke.edu	Duke	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No

Applicants: If you would like to continue your application later, please press the "Save and return later" button below. Please copy or write down the Return code provided.

To return later, you may click on "Returning?" on the top right of the screen in the E-Risk Concept Paper Form link, which is the same link that was used to access this

## 2. The project proposal

**Note:** Please provide sufficient detail to enable the committee to review your proposal. Please be as specific as possible about the project aims and analysis methods as once approved this concept paper will be posted publicly and thus will act as a form of pre-registration of your project. Expand boxes as required.

<b>Title of project</b>	Flourishing in early adulthood among victimised children
<b>Background and rationale for project</b>  <i>(approx. 300 - 1000 words)</i>	<p>Childhood victimisation, which includes physical, sexual, and emotional abuse, neglect, exposure to domestic violence, and bullying by peers, has lifelong adverse effects including functional impairments in adulthood (Jaffee et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2022). The consequences of childhood victimisation affect multiple domains: social and behavioural functioning (e.g., social connections, involvement in crime, violence) (Malvaso et al., 2018; Romano et al., 2015; Wemmers et al., 2018), economic outcomes (e.g., education, employment) (Currie and Widom, 2010; Jaffee et al., 2018; Romano et al., 2015), physical health (e.g., smoking, alcohol consumption, eating disorders) (Chartier et al., 2009), and psychological well-being (e.g., life satisfaction) (Herrenkohl et al., 2012; Su et al., 2019). This is particularly concerning in early adulthood because outcomes during this developmental stage have a major impact on individuals' health, well-being, and prosperity throughout adult life. Nonetheless, some children appear to fare well after experiencing victimisation (Latham et al., 2023; Yule et al., 2019); but do they exceed expectations and truly flourish?</p> <p>Conceptual frameworks of flourishing</p> <p>Flourishing has been conceptualised in various ways by different authors. For example, Su et al. described it as encompassing multiple domains, including feelings of happiness, a sense of accomplishment, and having supportive and rewarding relationships (Su et al., 2014). According to Brown et al., well-being (i.e., the state of being or doing well across socio-economic, physical, and psychological dimensions) and performance (i.e., level of functioning) are key components of this concept (Brown et al., 2017). VanderWeele expanded this composite measure to include a broader range of states and outcomes, defining flourishing as encompassing mental and physical health, happiness and life satisfaction, meaning and purpose, character and virtue, and close social relationships (VanderWeele, 2017; VanderWeele et al., 2019). In the "Measuring National Well-being" programme of the UK Office for National Statistics, Allin et al. introduced a conceptual framework incorporating education and skills into the assessment of well-being (Allin and Hand, 2017). Other frameworks have been proposed for measuring child well-being, potentially relevant to our focus on early adulthood in this study before individuals are fully independent of their parents. These frameworks notably highlighted the importance of cognitive ability in assessing well-being (Lippman et al., 2011; Pollard and Lee, 2003).</p> <p>Relationship between childhood victimisation and flourishing in early adulthood</p> <p>Existing knowledge on flourishing in early adulthood after childhood victimisation is limited. Most studies investigating flourishing in adults who experienced childhood victimisation reported poorer outcomes compared to non-victimised individuals (Armitage et al., 2021; Mitchell et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2022; Zielinski, 2009). However, these studies did not examine whether a subset of victimised individuals could flourish despite their adverse experiences. Moreover, previous research often focused on single domains of functioning, such as psychological well-being (Armitage et al., 2021) or socio-economic outcomes (Zielinski, 2009), without considering whether those who have been victimised can flourish across multiple domains. Moreover, existing research has often focused on single, specific types of childhood victimisation (Armitage et al., 2021), which could be misleading because children often experience more than one type of victimisation (Turner</p>

	<p>et al., 2010). The strength of associations between victimisation and functional outcomes also varies depending on whether prospective or retrospective measures of victimisation are used (Latham et al., 2021) possibly because these different measures result in largely non-overlapping groups of children being classified as exposed to victimisation (Newbury et al., 2018). Many existing studies have also relied on cross-sectional designs and thus cannot establish the temporal order of victimisation and flourishing, which limits the ability to establish causality (Mitchell et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2022; Zielinski, 2009). Additionally, examining potential sex differences in flourishing after childhood victimisation is needed. Epidemiological and neurobiological studies suggest that women are more likely to flourish than men in early adulthood (de la Fuente et al., 2020; Samplin et al., 2013) but whether this occurs for exposure to a range of different types of victimisation and across multiple domains remains unclear.</p>
<p><b>Project aims / objectives</b></p>	<p>This study aims to address the following main question: Among individuals exposed to any type of victimisation in childhood, are some able to flourish when they reach adulthood? Additionally we will explore: Do victimised children flourish across multiple domains of functioning or only in certain ones? Does flourishing vary depending on the type of victimisation experienced, exposure to single versus multiple types of victimisation, and/or by gender?</p> <p>To address these questions, we will use data from the Environmental Risk (E-Risk) Longitudinal Twin Study, a large, nationally representative cohort of same-sex twins born in the UK. This cohort's prospective longitudinal design, with functioning outcomes measured after childhood victimisation, overcomes the limitations of cross-sectional studies. It enables the investigation of associations between exposure to various types of victimisation (including physical abuse, sexual abuse, emotional abuse and neglect, physical neglect, exposure to domestic violence, and bullying by peers), as well as exposure to multiple types (poly-victimisation) and functional outcomes across multiple domains. Some measures of victimisation were also assessed retrospectively allowing us to explore if associations with flourishing are similar (or different) for prospectively and retrospectively measured exposure to childhood victimisation. Moreover, the sample also comprises roughly equal numbers of men and women enabling us to investigate potential sex differences.</p> <p>Drawing on the various conceptual frameworks of flourishing identified, and considering both the age of participants (early adulthood) and the variables available in our study, we will explore functional outcomes at age 18 across four distinct domains: (i) social well-being (i.e., high perception of social status, high perception of social support), (ii) education and cognition (i.e., high educational attainment, perceived ability to get ahead, and high cognitive functioning), (iii) physical health (i.e., high levels of physical activity, good sleep quality, and slower biological aging), and (iv) mental well-being (i.e., high life satisfaction).</p>
<p><b>Brief statement of your hypothesis</b></p>	<p>We hypothesise that: (i) in a longitudinal cohort with prospectively measured victimisation and outcomes, exposure to any type of severe victimisation in childhood will be associated with worse functional outcomes in early adulthood compared to those who have not experienced victimisation. We predict that (ii) these associations will be weaker when victimisation exposure is (partially) defined by retrospective self-reports. Additionally, we hypothesise that (iii) among individuals exposed to any type of severe victimisation in childhood, some can flourish when they reach adulthood, although flourishing may not be uniform across every domain of functioning. Furthermore, we predict that (iv) flourishing among victimised children may vary by the type of victimisation experienced; (v) individuals who have experienced multiple types of victimisation (poly-victimisation) during childhood will be less likely to flourish than those exposed to a single type of victimisation because poly-victimised children generally have poorer outcomes (Mitchell et al., 2020); and (vi) early-adult women who experienced any type of severe childhood victimisation will be more likely to flourish than men.</p>
<p><b>Data analysis methods to be used</b></p>	<p>First, we will test in the whole sample the associations between exposure to any type of victimisation between birth and age 12 (severe rating for physical abuse, sexual abuse, emotional abuse and neglect, physical neglect, exposure to domestic violence, or bullying by peers) and the measures within each domain of functioning at age 18. Analyses will be conducted in Stata using linear regression for continuous variables and ordered logistic</p>

<p><b>(approx. 100 - 500 words)</b></p>	<p>regression for ordinal categorical variables. All analyses will account for the non-independence of twin observations using the Huber-White variance estimator (Rogers, 1993) and will be subsequently adjusted for biological sex, intelligence quotient at age 5, family socioeconomic status, and family psychiatric history to take into account these potentially confounding factors. This initial set of analyses will confirm whether exposure to any type of victimisation by age 12 is associated with poorer functional outcomes in this sample. As a sensitivity analysis, we will repeat the analyses using retrospectively assessed types of victimisation (where available) to check whether similar findings are obtained using this method of classifying victimisation exposure. If differences emerge then we will also repeat analyses in Step 2 below using the (partially) retrospectively assessed 'any victimisation' group.</p> <p>Second, in the subsample of children exposed to any severe victimisation, we will investigate whether some victimised children flourish at age 18 by ascertaining the percentage that perform better than other victimised children for the measures within each functional domain. Consistent with previous analyses in this cohort (Kim-Cohen et al., 2004), for continuous variables we will use the standardised residuals obtained from the regressions conducted in Step 1, which indicate the difference between children's actual score on each functional outcome and the score predicted by their exposure to victimisation, and recode these where necessary so that higher scores indicate that they are doing better than expected. Children who have a residual score <math>&gt;0</math> (their actual score is greater than their predicted score) will be classified as 'flourishing' (1) for that measure, while those that score 0 (no difference between actual and predicted score) or <math>&lt;0</math> (actual score is worse than predicted score) will be classified as 'not flourishing' (0). For the only categorical outcome variable, educational attainment, those in the highest category (have obtained 1 or more A levels) will be considered to be flourishing whereas those who have obtained either no qualifications or only secondary school qualifications (GCSEs) will be classified as not flourishing.</p> <p>We will describe the percentage of victimised children who are flourishing for each measure within the four functional domains. Within this victimised subsample, we will then conduct binary logistic regression analyses to explore the association with flourishing for (i) each type of victimisation (e.g., physically abused vs. not), (ii) poly-victimisation (no=only exposed to 1 type of victimisation, yes=exposure to 2 or more types), and (iii) biological sex. All analyses will account for the non-independence of twin observations using the Huber-White variance estimator (Rogers, 1993) and will be subsequently adjusted for biological sex (except where this is the predictor variable), intelligence quotient at age 5, family socioeconomic status, and family psychiatric history to take into account these potentially confounding factors. As a sensitivity analysis, we will repeat these logistic regression analyses using a more extreme definition of flourishing - namely victimised individuals with standardised residuals in the top 25th percentile (consistent with previous analyses in this cohort; Kim-Cohen et al., 2004). These analyses will only be conducted for associations that were statistically significant (at <math>p &lt; 0.05</math>) in the main analyses, where flourishing is defined more broadly.</p>
<p><b>Significance for theory, research methods, or clinical practice</b></p>	<p>This study will extend existing work by improving our understanding of flourishing among young adults exposed to victimisation. This has the potential to bring hope to individuals exposed to victimisation early in life that they can do better than expected and may help inform interventions aimed at enabling children exposed to victimisation to flourish when they reach adulthood.</p>
<p><b>References cited</b></p>	<p>Allin P and Hand DJ (2017) New statistics for old?-measuring the wellbeing of the UK. <i>Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society</i> 180, 3-43.</p> <p>Armitage JM, Wang RAH, Davis OSP, Bowes L and Haworth CMA (2021) Peer victimisation during adolescence and its impact on wellbeing in adulthood: a prospective cohort study. <i>BMC Public Health</i> 21, 148.</p> <p>Brown DJ, Arnold R, Fletcher D and Standage M (2017) Human thriving. <i>European Psychologist</i>.</p>

- Chartier MJ, Walker JR and Naimark B (2009) Health risk behaviors and mental health problems as mediators of the relationship between childhood abuse and adult health. *American Journal of Public Health* 99, 847-854.
- Currie J and Widom CS (2010) Long-term consequences of child abuse and neglect on adult economic well-being. *Child Maltreatment* 15, 111-120.
- de la Fuente R, Parra A, Sanchez-Queija I and Lizaso I (2020) Flourishing during emerging adulthood from a gender perspective. *Journal of Happiness Studies* 21, 2889-2908.
- Herrenkohl TI, Klika JB, Herrenkohl RC, Russo MJ and Dee T (2012) A prospective investigation of the relationship between child maltreatment and indicators of adult psychological well-being. *Violence and Victims* 27, 764-776.
- Jaffee SR, Ambler A, Merrick M, Goldman-Mellor S, Odgers CL, Fisher HL, Danese A and Arseneault L (2018) Childhood maltreatment predicts poor economic and educational outcomes in the transition to adulthood. *American Journal of Public Health* 108, 1142-1147.
- Kim-Cohen J, Moffitt TE, Caspi A and Taylor A (2004) Genetic and environmental processes in young children's resilience and vulnerability to socioeconomic deprivation. *Child Development* 75, 651-668.
- Latham RM, Newbury JB and Fisher HL (2023) A systematic review of resilience factors for psychosocial outcomes during the transition to adulthood following childhood victimisation. *Trauma Violence & Abuse* 24, 946-965.
- Latham RM, Quilter E, Arseneault L, Danese A, Moffitt TE, Newbury JB and Fisher HL (2021) Childhood maltreatment and poor functional outcomes at the transition to adulthood: A comparison of prospective informant-and retrospective self-reports of maltreatment. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology* 56, 1161-1173.
- Lippman LH, Moore KA and McIntosh H (2011) Positive indicators of child well-being: A conceptual framework, measures, and methodological issues. *Applied Research in Quality of Life* 6, 425-449.
- Malvaso CG, Delfabbro P and Day A (2018) The maltreatment-offending association: A systematic review of the methodological features of prospective and longitudinal studies. *Trauma Violence & Abuse* 19, 20-34.
- Mitchell KJ, Moschella EA, Hamby S and Banyard V (2020) Developmental stage of onset, poly-victimization, and persistence of childhood victimization: impact on adult well-being in a rural community-based study. *Child Maltreatment* 25, 20-31.
- Newbury JB, Arseneault L, Moffitt TE, Caspi A, Danese A, Baldwin JR and Fisher HL (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.
- Pollard EL and Lee PD (2003) Child well-being: A systematic review of the literature. *Social indicators research* 61, 59-78.
- Rogers W (1993) Regression standard errors in clustered samples. *Stata Technical Bulletin* 13, 19.
- Romano E, Babchishin L, Marquis R and Fréchette S (2015) Childhood maltreatment and educational outcomes. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse* 16, 418-437.
- Samplin E, Ikuta T, Malhotra AK, Szeszko PR and DeRosse P (2013) Sex differences in

resilience to childhood maltreatment: effects of trauma history on hippocampal volume, general cognition and subclinical psychosis in healthy adults. *Journal of Psychiatric Research* 47, 1174-1179.

Su R, Tay L and Diener E (2014) The development and validation of the Comprehensive Inventory of Thriving (CIT) and the Brief Inventory of Thriving (BIT). *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being* 6, 251-279.

Su Y, D'Arcy C, Yuan S and Meng X (2019) How does childhood maltreatment influence ensuing cognitive functioning among people with the exposure of childhood maltreatment? A systematic review of prospective cohort studies. *Journal of Affective Disorders* 252, 278-293.

Turner HA, Finkelhor D and Ormrod R (2010) Poly-victimization in a national sample of children and youth. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 38, 323-330.

VanderWeele TJ (2017) On the promotion of human flourishing. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114, 8148-8156.

VanderWeele TJ, McNeely E and Koh HK (2019) Reimagining health-flourishing. *JAMA* 321, 1667-1668.

Wang L, Yu Z, Chen W, Zhang J and Bettencourt AF (2022) Higher exposure to childhood adversity associates with lower adult flourishing. *BMC Public Health* 22, 612.

Wemmers J-A, Cyr K, Chamberland C, Lessard G, Collin-Vézina D and Clement M-E (2018) From victimization to criminalization: General strain theory and the relationship between poly-victimization and delinquency. *Victims & Offenders* 13, 542-557.

Yule K, Houston J and Grych J (2019) Resilience in children exposed to violence: A meta-analysis of protective factors across ecological contexts. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review* 22, 406-431.

Zielinski DS (2009) Child maltreatment and adult socioeconomic well-being. *Child Abuse and Neglect* 33, 666-678.

**Are there any files you would like to upload to support your concept paper?**

- Yes  
 No

Applicants: If you would like to continue your application later, please press the "Save and return later" button below. Please copy or write down the Return code provided.

To return later, you may click on "Returning?" on the top right of the screen in the E-Risk Concept Paper Form link, which is the same link that was used to access this form: <https://redcap.link/ERiskConceptPaperForm>

### **3. Expected project outcomes**

**Please note:**

*The stated end date must be within 24 months of the date when this form is submitted. This end date will form part of the formal data use agreement and on this date you should delete the dataset. Therefore, it must be a realistic date for completion of the project including all analysis, writing a manuscript, review of the manuscript by all collaborators, submission, revisions, and acceptance of a paper for publication.*

*If you require an extension to the end date of the project, then you should contact Prof Fisher ([helen.2.fisher@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:helen.2.fisher@kcl.ac.uk)) to discuss this. If you have signed a formal data use agreement, you will need to complete a form to request a licence*

extension. In some cases, we may also ask you to complete a new concept paper form if there have been substantial changes to the project or a long period of time has elapsed (e.g., greater than a year since the end date of the original project).

If the objective of the project is not a journal publication, please suggest an end date within 12 months instead of 24 months, and state a measurable, concrete outcome. If the objective of the project is a student dissertation, then the expected end date should be the deadline for submission of the dissertation; dissertation projects will only be accepted on agreement that they are strictly not for publication.

<b>Date form submitted</b>	<input type="text" value="29-10-2024"/> DD-MM-YYYY
<b>End date for the project</b>	<input type="text" value="29-10-2026"/> D-M-Y DD-MM-YYYY
<b>Do you expect to publish your results in a journal?</b>	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
<b>If yes, please provide a provisional list of author names</b>	<b>Flora Blangis, Louise Arseneault, Avshalom Caspi, Andrea Danese, Rachel M. Latham, Terrie E. Moffitt, Stefan Sprinckmoller, Yichang Wang, J. Kathy Xie, Helen L. Fisher</b>
<b>If yes, please provide a provisional list of journals</b>	<b>Lancet Public Health          Trauma Violence &amp; Abuse          Child Maltreatment          Child Abuse &amp; Neglect          Development and Psychopathology</b>

Applicants: If you would like to continue your application later, please press the "Save and return later" button below. Please copy or write down the Return code provided.

To return later, you may click on "Returning?" on the top right of the screen in the E-Risk Concept Paper Form link, which is the same link that was used to access this form: <https://redcap.link/ERiskConceptPaperForm>

## 4. List of variables required

### Please note:

When specifying variables, please be unambiguous. For each variable, specify the name of the measure, twin age, informant, and if you want specific subscales/derived categories (e.g., Depression from interview with twin at age 18; both number of symptoms and DSM-IV diagnosis). Alternatively, for maximum clarity, give actual variable names (e.g., MDESXE18 - MDE Symptom scale - P18 - Elder; DXMDEE18 - Major depressive episode, dsm4 - P18 - Elder).

By default, the dataset will usually include twin and family IDs, the "random" and "true" twin order variables, the cohort the twin is from (1994 or 1995), twin sex, ethnicity and zygosity variables, and family socioeconomic status at age 5. These routine background variables are listed in the table below. If you require further background variables, please specify them in your list.

Access to some parts of the dataset are restricted, namely identifiable data (e.g., postcodes, video recordings, individual-level genotypic and epigenetic data) which will not be shared outside King's College London, and linked administrative data which is only accessible via the UK Longitudinal Linkage Collaboration's Trusted Research Environment (this requires a separate formal data access agreement).

### Background variables that will be included by default:

Variable name	Description
FAMILYID	Unique family identifier



ATWINID	Twin A ID (ex chkdg)
BTWINID	Twin B ID (ex chkdg)
RORDERP5	Random Twin Order
TORDER	True Twin Order
RISKS	Sample Groups
COHORT	Cohort
SAMPSEX	Sex of Twins
ZYGOSITY	Zygosity
SETHNIC	Ethnicity of Twins
SESWQ35	Social Class Composite

<p><b>Please select the variables that will be requested</b></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Age 5 variables <input type="checkbox"/> Age 7 variables <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Age 10 variables <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Age 12 variables <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Age 18 variables <input type="checkbox"/> Age 26 variables <input type="checkbox"/> Age 30* variables
--	--

<b>Age 5 variables</b>	<b>IQE5 Pro-rated IQ score - Elder</b>
------------------------	--

<b>Age 10 variables</b>	<b>ExpV_DV510 Exposure to domestic violence, 5 to 10, 012 coding (from HonaLee)</b>
-------------------------	---

<b>Age 12 variables</b>	<b>eanseve12 Severity of Emotional abuse/neglect of Elder twin, thru age 12, 2014</b> <b>pabsevtye12 Physical abuse by 12, severity, Elder</b> <b>pnseveritye12 Physical neglect by 12, severity, Elder</b> <b>sasevtye12 Sexual abuse by 12, severity, Elder</b> <b>bullseve12 Bullying victim to Age 12 - Elder</b> <b>EX_SVE12 Exposed to severe victimization (0/1), 5-12, E-Twin</b> <b>polyve512c Extent of Polyvictim (Truncated @3), 5-12, E-Twin</b> <b>FHANYPM12 Proportion of family members with valid data with any psychiatric disorder</b>
-------------------------	--

<b>Age 18 variables</b>	<b>CTQPNCCE18 Physical Neglect CTQ +/- P18 - Elder</b> <b>CTQPACCE18 Physical Abuse CTQ +/- P18 - Elder</b> <b>CTQENCCE18 Emotional Neglect CTQ +/- P18 - Elder</b> <b>CTQEACCE18 Emotional Abuse CTQ +/- P18 - Elder</b> <b>CTQSACCE18 Sexual Abuse CTQ +/- P18 - Elder</b> <b>EDUCACHVE18 Highest educational achievement (based on QCF) - P18 - Elder</b> <b>SICOUNTRYE18 Subjective social status ladder task - elder</b> <b>SSUPPORTE18 Social Support scale - P18 - Elder</b> <b>OPTIME18 Optimism Scale - P18 - Elder</b> <b>RVPAPRE18 RVP A-prime - P18 - Elder</b> <b>RVPMLTE18 RVP Mean Latency - P18 - Elder</b> <b>SWMSTAE18 SWM Strategy - P18 - Elder</b> <b>SWMTEAE18 SWM Total errors - P18 - Elder</b> <b>SWMMLRE18 SWM Mean time to last response - P18 - Elder</b> <b>SSPSPLE18 SSP Span length - P18 - Elder</b> <b>SSPRSLE18 SSP Span length [reverse] - P18 - Elder</b> <b>PHYACTE18 Physical activity (overall) - P18 - Elder</b> <b>PSQIE18 PSQI - Global Score - P18 - Elder</b> <b>????? Biological age - P18 - Elder (standardised DunedinPACE values)</b> <b>totlifsate18 Total Life satisfaction score</b>
-------------------------	--