

4 Year In-Home Study

Post Visit Ratings sheets.

Annotated for dataset and raw data coding.

Entries in red denote variable names and coding values used in the analysis dataset.
Entries in blue denote variable names and coding used in the cleaned raw data.

This document was created in August 2007 and last updated in April 2024.

Notes:

1. Variable names in the raw data differ from those used in the dataset, for all items.
2. Dataset variables are shown in red. They all have prefix "epv" and suffix "1/2" (see below).
3. Raw data variable names are shown in blue.
4. For many items, the value codes or score values that are used in the dataset are identical to those used in the cleaned raw data. In such cases, the values are shown only once, in red.
5. Where the coding differs between the raw data and the dataset, both sets of values are shown, in blue for raw data and in red for the dataset.
6. For most items in the raw data, a 'missing' response is coded as -99 and 'not applicable' is coded as -77, but in the analysis dataset these are recoded to missing values. This missing-value coding is not shown in this document.
7. Most of the data recorded in these sheets are coded numeric data (e.g. yes/no responses coded 1/0). However a couple of items are entered as free numeric responses in the raw data (where the tester has recorded an uncoded number). There are no free text data in the dataset.
8. The post-visit ratings sheet was completed by each tester, immediately after the visit. The questions relate to the home and the family and are not directly twin-specific. However, there were two testers per family, each tester having carried out the cognitive tests with one of the twins; hence the testers, and their post-visit ratings, are indirectly twin-specific. For this reason, the dataset variables have been double entered in the conventional way in the TEDS dataset. Hence, all dataset variables have names ending in either "1" (for the twin) or "2" (for the cotwin). Raw data variables are not structured or named in this way.
9. This document only shows item variables not derived variables.
10. The layout and formatting of the pages of the booklet have been slightly modified to incorporate the variable names and codes.

Child ID: TwinID. The ID is changed to a de-identified form in the dataset.

Tester: An ID for the tester (now anonymous) is recorded alongside the associated child test score raw data, but is not included in the dataset.

POST VISIT RATINGS

- 1) **What type of home does the family live in?** epvhome1/2 pv1hom
- | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | 1 | council estate/high-rise flat |
| 2 | 2 | private flat/part of a private house |
| 3 | 3 | terrace/semi detached house |
| 4 | 4 | detached house |
| 5 | 5 | other _____ |

In the dataset, the following two items are recoded into number range categories.

- 2) **About how many people live in the home?** pv2peo (free numeric, integer)
epvpeop1/2: 3=3, 4=4, 5=5, 6=6 or more people

- 3) **About how many rooms (excluding bathrooms and toilets) does the house have?**
pv3room (free numeric, integer)
epvroom1/2: 1=4 or fewer, 2=5, 3=6, 4=7 or 8, 5=9 or more rooms

- 4) **How clean was the *inside of the house*?** epvicle1/2 pv4ic1
- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1 | very clean; no bugs, bad smells, clutter etc. |
| 2 | 2 | |
| 3 | 3 | somewhat clean; nothing unhealthy, but some clutter |
| 4 | 4 | |
| 5 | 5 | very dirty; many bugs, bad smells, trash, clutter |

All coded 1=yes, 0=no

- | | | | | |
|-----|--|----------|------------|----------|
| 5) | Did you observe children's books <i>inside the house</i>? | pv5ibk | epviboo1/2 | yes / no |
| 6) | Did you observe age-appropriate toys for the twins <i>inside</i>? | pv6itoy | epvitoy1/2 | yes / no |
| 7) | Did you observe bugs <i>inside</i>? | pv7ibug | epvibug1/2 | yes / no |
| 8) | Did you observe uncomfortable heat/cold <i>inside</i>? | pv8itemp | epvitem1/2 | yes / no |
| 9) | Did you observe alcohol <i>inside</i>? | pv9ialc | epvialc1/2 | yes / no |
| 10) | Did you observe pictures of family/children <i>inside</i>? | pv10ipic | epvipic1/2 | yes / no |

- 11) **How clean was the *outside of the house*?** epvocle1/2 pv11ocl
- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1 | very clean; no bad smells, trash etc. |
| 2 | 2 | |
| 3 | 3 | somewhat clean; nothing unhealthy, but some trash |
| 4 | 4 | |
| 5 | 5 | very dirty; lots of trash, bad smells |

All coded 1=yes, 0=no

- | | | | | |
|-----|--|----------|------------|----------|
| 12) | Did you observe a playground <i>outside the house</i>? | pv12opl | epvopla1/2 | yes / no |
| 13) | Did you observe age-appropriate toys for the twins <i>outside</i>? | pv13otoy | epvotoy1/2 | yes / no |
| 14) | Did you observe broken glass <i>outside</i>? | pv14ogl | * | yes / no |
| 15) | Did you observe alcohol or drug paraphernalia <i>outside</i>? | pv15oalc | * | yes / no |
| 16) | Did you observe busy traffic <i>outside</i>? | pv16otra | epvotra1/2 | yes / no |
| 17) | Did you observe adults/teens observing children <i>outside</i>? | pv17oado | * | yes / no |
| 18) | Did you observe adults/teens hanging out (not family) <i>outside</i>? | pv18oadh | * | yes / no |
| 19) | Did you observe a safe play area (e.g. garden) <i>outside</i>? | pv19osaf | epvosaf1/2 | yes / no |

* Dropped from dataset because of negligible positive responses

- 20) **Was there anything else you saw inside of outside that could be dangerous for the twins?** [epvodan1/2](#) [pv20odan](#)
1 yes / no 0

Items 21, 22, 24, 25 recoded to values 2-5 only in the dataset, because of negligible responses at the most negative level.

- 21) **How warm were the observed parent-child interactions?** [epvwarm1/2](#) [pv21pc](#)
2 1 cold, distant, unfriendly
2 2 reserved
3 3 average
4 4 somewhat warm and positive
5 5 warm, positive, affectionate

- 22) **Based on what the parent and child said and what you observed while in the house, rate the parent-child relationship quality.** [epvrelq1/2](#) [pv22rel](#)
2 1 hostile, very negative
2 2 slightly negative
3 3 average
4 4 good for the most part
5 5 warm, positive, almost ideal

Item 23 recoded as shown to values 1-3 in the dataset, because of low response numbers above the 'not at all' level.

- 23) **How much did the parent yell or raise her/his voice with the child?** [epvyell1/2](#) [pv23yell](#)
1 1 1 not at all
2 2 2 a little
2 3 3 some
3 4 4 more than average
3 5 5 a lot

- 24) **How well did the parent seem to know his/her child?** [epvknow1/2](#) [pv24kno](#)
2 1 not very well
2 2 not as well as most parents
3 3 about as well as most parents
4 4 better than most parents
5 5 very well

- 25) **How much joy did the parent seem to experience in the parenting role?** [epvjoy1/2](#) [pv25joy](#)
2 1 none at all
2 2 a little
3 3 some
4 4 more than average
5 5 a lot

- 26) **Was there any reason to doubt the validity of the mother's responses?** [epvmval1/2](#) [pv26mv](#)
1 yes / no 0
if yes, why? (text responses were not recorded)

- 27) **Was there any reason to doubt the validity of the child's responses?** [epvcval1/2](#) [pv27cv](#)
1 yes / no 0
if yes, why? (text responses were not recorded)