Factors Associated with Caregiver Responsive and Non-Responsive Feeding Styles in Clark County, Nevada

Amanda Castelo Saragosa[1], Sheniz Moonie[2], Christopher Johansen[1], Alyssa N. Crittenden[3,4], Gabriela Buccini[1]

[1]University of Nevada, Las Vegas, School of Public Health, Department of Social and Behavioral Health, 4700 S. Maryland Pkwy. Ste. 335, Las Vegas, NV 89119
[2]University of Nevada, Las Vegas, School of Public Health, Department of Epidemiology, 4700 S. Maryland Pkwy. Ste. 335, Las Vegas, NV 89119
[3]Univeristy of Nevada, Las Vegas, College of Liberal Arts, Department of Anthropology, 4505 S. Maryland Pkwy., Las Vegas, NV 89154
[4]University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Graduate College, 4700 S. Maryland Pkwy. Ste. 200, Las Vegas, NV 89119

Corresponding author: Gabriela Buccini, 4700 S. Maryland Pkwy. Ste. 335, Las Vegas, NV 89119, gabriela.buccini@unlv.edu, 702-895-4674

Short title: Factors Associated with Caregiver Feeding Styles.

This is an Accepted Manuscript for Public Health Nutrition. This peer-reviewed article has been accepted for publication but not yet copyedited or typeset, and so may be subject to change during the production process. The article is considered published and may be cited using its
DOI 10.1017/S1368980025000096

Abstract

Objective: Early childhood obesity (ECO) significantly increased in the United States. ECO interventions lack focus on the prevention of ECO for infants under two. Caregiver's feeding styles (CFS) has shown to affect ECO development, but studies on CFS are limited. This study examined socioecological factors associated with CFS for infants under two in Nevada.

Design: This cross-sectional study utilizing a survey, examined the five CFS-constructs: Responsive (RP), Non-Responsive (NRP) laissez-faire, NRP-pressuring, NRP-restrictive, and NRP-indulgent. Descriptive analysis and logistic regression following a hierarchical modeling approach were used to determine the associations between the CFS-constructs and socioecological factors (e.g., household, maternal mental health, and infant feeding).

Setting: Clark County, Nevada.

Participants: 304 caregivers with infants under two.

Results: NRP feeding styles were associated with low-income households (e.g., NRP-restrictive (AOR=2.60, 95% CI [1.01-6.71])), water insecurity (e.g., NRP-pressuring (AOR=2.46, 95% CI [1.00-6.06]), young mothers (e.g., NRP-laissez-faire (AOR=2.39, 95% CI [1.00-5.84])), lower maternal education (e.g., RP (AOR=0.58, 95% CI [0.33-1.00])), mild risk for depression (e.g., NRP-restrictive (AOR=0.50, 95% CI [0.28-0.90])) and a moderate to severe risk for anxiety (e.g., NRP-pressuring (AOR=0.32, 95% CI [0.14-0.74])). There were no associations between infant feeding factors and RP feeding.

Conclusion: Our study identified socioecological factors associated with dissimilarities in CFS in Nevada. These findings can be used to tailor educational approaches to address disparities in early childhood obesity.

Keywords: Early Childhood Obesity, Responsive Feeding, Infant Feeding Style, Socioecological Factors, Cross Sectional.

1. Introduction

Early childhood obesity (ECO) has tripled over the last 40 years, reaching epidemic levels in the United States (US), with nearly a third of the US children and adolescents being classified as overweight or obese[1-6]. ECO has been shown to cause short and long-term comorbidities, including hypertension, high cholesterol, diabetes, and increased risk for obesity during adulthood[4-8]. Moreover, obesity is considered a form of early childhood malnutrition that can coexist with other forms of malnutrition, such as micronutrient deficiencies[9,10]. ECO is influenced by numerous components, making it a challenge to address[11]. Some factors that affect ECO include a child's built environment, maternal poor nutritional knowledge, obesity, educational attainment, race/ethnicity, water insecurity, and cultural norms about food consumption[1,3,6]. Currently, ECO has low rates of resolution and high rates of worsening or relapse after short-term treatments[7]. This is an issue because obesity that begins in childhood and prolongs through adulthood, becomes more complicated to treat[5,7]. Although there have been many advances in ECO research thus far, there is inadequate evidence on how young children develop obesogenic behaviors, particularly in low socioeconomic families[3]. Therefore, identifying risk factors for ECO and developing public health prevention strategies to address them is critical to preventing adult obesity, increasing prevalence, and obesity-related health risks[1,5]. Additionally, studies have found that ECO begins during a child's first 1,000 days (conception to two years) and is a critical period for prevention; however, data on obesity prevention for infants under two is minimal[12,13]. Therefore, there is a need to focus on obesity prevention for infants under two.

One factor that has sparked interest in ECO prevention is caregivers' feeding styles (CFS), how caregivers maintain or modify their child's eating behaviors and feeding environment[2,4,14]. There are two feeding styles: responsive (RP) and non-responsive (NRP). An RP feeding style is when a parent is attentive to the child's hunger and satiety cues and monitors the quality of the child's diet[2]. An NRP feeding style is the opposite of RP feeding, where parents engage in negative feeding behaviors with their children[14]. For example, a caregiver who exhibits an NRP feeding style could control their child's diet quality or quantity and use food as a soother[2]. RP feeding has been shown to create healthy eating habits and growth and reduce child under-and overnutrition, while NRP feeding has been shown to create overnutrition or obesity[14]. Therefore, assessing factors associated with dissimilarities among CFS may yield

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980025000096 Published online by Cambridge University Press

information on the causes of ECO[15] and could provide public health professionals with new insights into the prevention mechanisms of ECO[2]. Prior studies have exhibited factors associated with CFS, including caregiver time constraints [14], child's weight status[14,16], caregiver weight status[14], income[14,16], caregiver beliefs and perceptions[14], race and ethnicity[14,16,17], caregiver self-efficacy[18], social support[19], education and knowledge[16,19,20], depression[16], household food insecurity[20], and breastfeeding[20]. However, although many of these factors have already been studied, most were conducted in other countries and not in the US and may not be generalizable to the US population[14,16,18-20]. Therefore, this study will analyze similar factors to see how they are associated with CFS in one large urban geographical area in the US.

The Socioecological Model (SEM) is a theoretical framework that helps researchers understand the factors influencing health and behaviors[21]. The SEM focuses on how it is essential to consider factors beyond an individual's immediate context to understand their health and behaviors[21]. The SEM has five levels: intrapersonal (knowledge, behaviors, beliefs, and attitudes), interpersonal (families, friends, social support), institutional (workplaces, schools, and organizations), community (cities, neighborhoods, resources), and policy (federal, state, and local legislation)[21]. This study will utilize the Socioecological Model (SEM) to guide the assessment of the different socio-ecological factors associated with CFS. To our knowledge, no other studies have used the socioecological framework to organize and assess the actors influencing CFS. Thus, this study aimed to analyze the socioecological factors associated with caregivers' RP and NRP feeding styles.

2. Methods

2.1. Study Design: This cross-sectional study utilized a survey to examine the socioecological characteristics of mother-infant dyads on CFS. CFS was classified into five constructs: RP feeding, NRP-laissez-faire feeding, NRP-pressuring feeding, NRP-indulgent feeding, and-NRP restrictive feeding. The study's protocol was approved by the University of Nevada, Las Vegas's Institutional Review Board (Protocol UNLV-2022-372). Participation in this study was voluntary. No personal information was collected, informed consent was obtained at the beginning of each survey, and answers were kept completely anonymous. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement was used to guide the reporting of this study (Appendix A).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980025000096 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2.2. Study Setting: The study was conducted in Clark County, which accounts for 73% of Nevada's population[22]. Per the 2020 State of Nevada Annual Obesity Report, 11.1% of children entering kindergarten were overweight, and 21.3% of those children were obese[23]. Additionally, 11.6% of participants in the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) who were between 2-4 years old in Nevada are considered obese[24].

2.3. Participants: Inclusion criteria included any mother/caregiver who was 18 and older, who had an infant ages 0-23 months (birth to under two years old), and who resided in Clark County. This study excluded any infant with special needs that prevented them from adopting optimal feeding practices, including infants with specific illnesses/needs (Down syndrome, cleft lip or palate, congenital heart disease, neurological conditions, or cardiac problems).

2.4. Sampling: This study utilized a snowball sampling approach where key stakeholders of the study setting were identified and subsequently asked to share the study with others they know[25]. This study recruited mothers from Baby-friendly hospitals, birth centers, pediatric centers, lactation centers, and WIC centers within Clark County. Additionally, surveys were dispersed through social media platforms (Facebook and Instagram). With the assistance of a statistician, two sample sizes were calculated: the sample needed for the survey and the sample to test our hypothesis that looks at the socioecological factors associated with CFS. The survey sample size was determined using live births in Clark County. According to Southern Nevada Health District Vital Records Statistics, there were 25,493 live births in 2021[26]. Using a 95% confidence interval, a 5% margin of error, and assuming there will be a completion of 50%, we determined a sample size of 379 mother/caregiver-infant dyads. The minimum sample size required to test the study hypothesis was estimated using G*power version 9.0.1. Results from the power analysis indicated that the minimum required sample size to achieve 80% power with a moderate effect size (cohen's $d = 0.5$), at a significance criterion $\alpha = .05$, was n=71 for each feeding style for logistic regression. Thus, the analytical sample consisted of 304 mothers in Clark County with children between 0 and 23 months old, which was deemed sufficient.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980025000096 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2.5. Survey Development: The 2022 Early Responsive Nurturing Care (EARN) survey sections included household and sociodemographic characteristics, maternal perinatal characteristics, infant and dietary characteristics, and caregiver feeding styles as outlined in Figure 1. It included questions from validated instruments detailed in the measurement section. The survey was developed in English and translated into Spanish; both versions were available to participants.

2.6. Measurement

2.6.1 Outcome: Caregiver Feeding Styles: The outcome of this study was CFS collected using the IFSQ (Figure 1). Outcome data, including the five different CFS was collected utilizing the Infant Feeding Style Questionnaire (IFSQ)[(2)]. A self-report instrument that measures mothers' feeding beliefs and behaviors with infants and young children[(2)]. Although the IFSQ includes a substantial number of questions (n=83) **(**Appendix B**)**, it was chosen for this study for many reasons. This questionnaire is very well organized and categorizes the questions into different feeding styles (laissez-faire, pressuring, restrictive, responsive, indulgence)[(2)]. The IFSQ is a valid and reliable instrument for the US population, has been used on infants ages three months-24 months, and includes all RP feeding measures compared to other valid instruments[(4)]. The overall mean scores from each feeding style were calculated to classify whether the participants exhibited the five different feeding styles. If a participant scored above the mean with respect to a specific feeding style, they were classified as exhibiting that style. They were classified as not exhibiting that feeding style if they scored below the mean. The outcome can be classified into five constructs of feeding styles: responsive, laissez-faire, pressuring, indulgent, and restrictive (Appendix C).

A responsive (RP) feeding style is when a caregiver monitors their child's diet quality and is attentive to their hunger and satiety cues[(2)]. For data analysis, the reference category was considered the negative response to RP; thus, the analysis shows the odds ratios to be a non-responsive feeder (vs. a responsive feeder). A NRP-laissez-faire feeding style is when a caregiver does not restrict their child's diet quantity or quality and minimally interacts during feeding[(2)]. A NRP-pressuring feeding style is when a caregiver force-feeds their child because they worry about the amount of food they are consuming while also using food as a soother[(2)]. A NRP-indulgent feeding style is when a caregiver sets no restrictions on the quality and quantity of the child's food[(2)]. Lastly, a NRP-restrictive feeding style is when a caregiver limits the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980025000096 Published online by Cambridge University Press

amount and type of food their child consumes[2]. For data analysis, the reference category was considered the positive response to the NRP.

2.6.2 Covariates: We will be utilizing the SEM as outlined in Figure 1 to guide the assessment of the socioecological factors. This study's covariates were selected using the conceptual hierarchical framework and evidence from previous studies that connect the covariates and the outcomes (classifications found in Appendix D)[14,18,19,27-29]. Variables were categorized based on their associations on other variables and the study outcomes. There were three levels of covariates, including household and sociodemographic characteristics (household characteristics and maternal sociodemographics), maternal perinatal characteristics (pregnancy and prenatal care and maternal mental health), and infant and dietary characteristic (infant characteristics, background, and dietary guidelines) as depicted in Figure 1.

2.5.1. Household and Sociodemographic Characteristics

2.5.1.1. Block 1- Household Characteristics: Household characteristic data was collected using questions related to (a) household income, (b) food security, and (c) water security.

(a) To measure household income, participants were asked to self-report their household income picking from different ranges of income values.

(b) To measure food security, the Hunger Vital Sign (HVS)[30] was used. The HVS is a 2-item screening tool to measure risk for household food insecurity based on the US Household Food Security Survey Model[30]. It is a validated tool for children and adults and was chosen because it is a simple form to identify food insecurity risk[30]. Individuals answered the questions from "never true," sometimes true," or "often true"[30]. If they answered "sometimes true" or "often true" to either of the questions, they were considered at risk for food insecurity[30].

(c) To measure water security, the Household Water Insecurity Access Survey (HWIAS)[29] was used. HWIAS is ann 8-item self-reported questionnaire that measures household water insecurity and was developed based on the household food insecurity access scale[31]. This questionnaire is a valid and reliable instrument in developing countries[31]. Here, we used only the most severe question from the instrument to capture the presence/absence of water insecurity.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980025000096 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We did so to be considerate of the length of the final survey to mitigate the potential research fatigue of participants. The question used was "Within the past 12 months, we worried about not having enough money to afford access to clean water (i.e., drinking water, bathing/washing hands, washing clothes, or any other needs)", and individuals could answer "never true," "sometimes true," or "often true"[31]. If they answered either sometimes or often true, they were classified as at risk for water insecurity[31].

2.5.1.2. Block 2- Maternal Sociodemographics: Maternal sociodemographic data were collected using questions related to (a) maternal age, (b) marital status, (c) maternal race, and (d) maternal education.

(a) Maternal age was measured by asking the participants to self-report the mothers' age selecting from a different set of age ranges.
(b) Marital status was measured by asking the participants to self-report whether they were living with or without a partner.
(c) Maternal race was measured by asking the participants to self-report their race by selecting from a set of race categories. They were also then asked to self-report whether they were from Latina, Hispanic, or Spanish origin. From this, they were separated into non-Hispanic white or Hispanic white.
(d) Maternal education was measured by asking the participants to self-report the higher level of education the mother obtained from a set of education categories.

2.5.2. Maternal Perinatal Characteristics

2.5.2.1. Block 3- Pregnancy and Prenatal Care: Pregnancy and prenatal care data were collected using questions related to (a) prenatal care visits and (b) WIC enrollment.

(a) Prenatal care was measured by asking the participants to self-report whether they visited a primary care doctor or OB/GYN for prenatal care.
(b) WIC enrollment was measured by asking participants to self-report whether they were enrolled in the WIC program.

2.5.2.2. Block 4- Maternal Mental Health: Maternal mental health data were collected using questions related to (a) depression, (b) anxiety, (c) parental burnout, and (d) maternal weight perception.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980025000096 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(a) Maternal depression risk was measured using the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale (EPDS)[32] . The EPDS is a 10-item self-reported instrument determining postpartum depression risk in mothers[32]. It was chosen because it is the most commonly used screening questionnaire for identifying risk for postpartum depression, validated, and translated into different languages, specifically Spanish[32]. Although the EPDS is normally reserved for mothers with infants between 0-12 months, it has been validated to be used on mothers with older children[33]. Prior studies have also used this tool to measure mothers with children up to 24-month postpartum depression risk[34]. The instrument has a mother report how she has felt during the previous seven days[35]. Responses are scored 0, 1, 2, and 3 based on the seriousness of the symptoms[35]. Scoring is as follows: 0-6 "risk for no or minimal depression," 7-13 "mild depression," 14-19 "moderate depression," and 19-30 "severe depression"[35].

(b) Maternal anxiety risk was measured using the Generalized Anxiety Disorder Assessment (GAD-7)[36]. The GAD-7 is a 7-item self-reported instrument determining general anxiety disorder risk[36]. This instrument was chosen because it has been proven valid and reliable across many cultures and is available in different languages, including Spanish[36]. The survey asks an individual the severity of their symptoms over the last two weeks, from "not at all," "several days," "more than half the days," and "nearly every day"[37]. Responses are scored 0, 1, 2, and 3 based on the seriousness of the symptom[37]. Scoring is as follows: 0-4 "risk for minimal anxiety," 5-9 "mild anxiety," 10-14 "moderate anxiety," and 15-21 "severe anxiety"[37].

(c) Maternal burnout risk was measured using the he Brief Parental Burnout Scale (BPBS)[38]. The BPBS is a 5-item screening tool to measure an individual's emotional distress, exhaustion, and feelings from being a parent[38]. It was chosen because it is a validated and short tool based on the Parental Burnout Assessment[38]. The parents rate their symptoms from A "daily," B "once or twice a week, or C "more seldom/never"[38]. If a parent answers "A" to at least one question or "B" to at least two questions, they are at risk for parental burnout[38].

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980025000096 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(d) Maternal weight perception was measured by asking the mothers to self-report how they would describe their weight based on a set of weight categories.

2.5.3. Infant and Dietary Characteristics

2.5.3.1. Block 5- Infant Characteristics and Background: Infant characteristic and background data were collected using questions related to (a) pacifier use, (b) infant health insurance, and (c) perception of infants' weight.

(a) Infant age was measured by asking participants to indicate their last child' s age selecting from a different set of age ranges.

(b) Pacifier use was measured by asking the participants if their infant used a pacifier in the last 24 hours.

(c) Infant health insurance was measured by asking participants to indicate what type of medical insurance their infant has from a set of insurance categories.

(d) Perception of infants' weight was measured by asking participants to self-report how they would describe their infants weight based on a set of weight categories.

2.5.3.2. Block 6- Infant Dietary Guidelines A self-reported questionnaire was developed based on the World Health Organization's recommendations on how to assess infant and young child feeding[39]. Caregivers were asked to select all the food groups that the child consumed in the last 24 hours, including breast milk, grains/roots/tubers/plantains, pulses/nuts/seeds, dairy products, flesh foods, eggs, vitamin A rich fruits/vegetables, and other fruits/vegetables[39]. This questionnaire was used to identify whether a caregiver was reaching the infants dietary guidelines, including exclusive breastfeeding <6 months (i.e., an infant was fed with only breastmilk, with no other types of food or drinks or water[39]) and minimum dietary diversity >7 months (i.e. a child (breastfed or non-breastfed) was fed at least five out of eight food groups: (1) breast milk, (2) grains/roots/tubers/plantains, (3) pulses/nuts/seeds, (4) dairy products, (5) flesh foods, (6) eggs, (7) vitamin A rich fruits/vegetables, and (8) other fruits/vegetables[39]) . For analysis, meeting the infant dietary guidelines was classified as "yes" when an infant <6 months reported exclusive breastfeeding or an infant >7 months reported minimum dietary diversity.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980025000096 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2.7. Data Analysis: The survey data were collected via Qualtrics and exported to STATA SE 17 for analysis. First, descriptive analysis was performed for the outcomes and covariates, including the mean, standard deviation, and frequency distribution. Second, bivariate correlations were performed to determine the associations between the outcome and covariates. Covariates were included in a multivariate model when they had an association with a p-value <0.20 in the bivariate analysis. A collinearity test was performed, and no collinearity violations were detected. To identify the associations of CFS and covariates a logistic regression following a hierarchical modeling approach with robust variance was performed to generate the adjusted odds ratios (AOR) and corresponding 95% confidence intervals (95% CI).

Each feeding style was analyzed separately. For each feeding style, the following approach was followed: Model-1 of the analysis included variables from block-1 (household characteristics and infant age) and remained the control for the forthcoming models. Model-2 of the analysis included variables from block-2 (maternal sociodemographics), was adjusted by including model 1, and remained the control for the subsequent models. Model-3 of the analysis included variables from block-3 (pregnancy and prenatal care) and was adjusted by including models 1 and 2, remaining as the control for the following models. Model-4 of the analysis included variables from block-4 (maternal mental health), was adjusted by including the three previous models, and remained the control for the subsequent models. Model-5 of the analysis included variables from block-5 (infant characteristics), was adjusted by including the previous four models, and remained the control for the subsequent models. Lastly, model-6 of the analysis included variables from block-6 (infant feeding) and was adjusted by including variables in the previous five models. A p-value of <0.05 was the criterion for statistical significance at each level to evaluate the association between the covariates and the outcome. All covariates included in the hierarchical modeling approach were maintained in all model levels regardless of the significance attenuating, as these data provide important adjustments to the parameter estimates in the final models.

3. Results

3.1. Descriptive Analysis. A total of 304 mothers in Clark County with infants between 0-23 months old responded to the survey. Mothers (n=304) could be classified into one or more

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980025000096 Published online by Cambridge University Press

feeding styles. Of those who answered the questions for each feeding style 53% were classified as RP feeders (n=153), 47% were classified as NRP-Laissez-Faire feeders (n=138), 43% were classified as NRP-Pressuring feeders (n=126), 36% were classified as NRP-Indulgent feeders (n=93), and 50% of them were classified as NRP-Restrictive feeders (n=149) (Table 1). The majority of the mothers were between the ages 24-35 years (n=196, 65%), middle income (n=201, 66%), lived with their partners (n=282, 93%), Hispanic (n=156, 51%), and had a secondary or college level education (n=222, 73%). Approximately 30% of the respondents were at risk for food insecurity (n=92), and 13% were at risk for water security (n=39). Most of the mothers were not enrolled in WIC (n=244; 80%), and almost all had some type of prenatal care (n=285; 94%). Approximately 23% were at risk for moderate to severe depression (n=67), 23% were at risk for moderate to severe anxiety (n=70), and 81% were at risk for parental burnout (n=245). Additionally, the majority of the mothers believed they were overweight (n=210, 66.1%). Among infants, most were between the ages of 12-23 months (n=131, 43%), did not use pacifiers (n=175, 57.6%), had non-government-provided insurance (n=223, 73%), were perceived by their mother as having normal weight (n=251, 82.5%), and were adequately fed (n=180, 64.3%) (Table 1).

3.2. Bivariate Analysis: NRP feeding was more frequent among mothers between the ages of 25-34 (n=93, 51%), who identified as Hispanic (n=74, 51%), and had a graduate degree (n=43, 56%) compared to their comparison groups. NRP-Laissez-Faire feeding was more frequent among mothers who classified as living in low-income households (n=37, 58%), were at risk for food insecurity (n=50, 56%), and between the ages 18-24 (n=25, 68%), were enrolled in WIC (n=34, 57%), perceived themselves as overweight (n=100, 52%), whose infant used pacifiers (n=69, 55%), and had government insurance (n=47, 60%) compared to their comparison groups. NRP-Pressuring feeding was more frequent among mothers who were classified as living in a low-income household (n=42, 67%), were at risk for food (n=45, 52%) and water (n=25, 66%) insecurity, were living without a partner (n=12, 59%), were Hispanic (n=76, 51%), were enrolled in WIC (n=29, 52%), and whose infant has government insurance (n=40, 54%) and perceived their infant as underweight (n=15, 53%) or overweight (n=16, 64%) compared to their comparison groups. NRP-Indulgent feeding style was more frequent among mothers aged 18-24 (n=18, 56%) than their comparison groups. Lastly, NRP-Restrictive feeding style was more

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980025000096 Published online by Cambridge University Press

frequent among mothers who classified living in a low-income household (n=44, 69%), were at risk for food (n=53, 59%) and water insecurity (n=25, 64%) insecurity, between the ages of 18-24 (n=25, 66%) or 35-44 (n=39, 58%), were Hispanic (n=86, 57%), enrolled in WIC (n=39, 66%), had no to minimal risk (n=65, 56%) or moderate to severe risk (n=34, 51.52%) for depression, if their infant had government insurance (n=44, 56%), and if they perceived their infant as overweight (n=16, 64%) compared to their comparison groups (Table 2).

3.3. Multivariate Logistic Regression Analysis: Figure 2 organizes the multivariate logistic regression across SEM. In model 1, living in a low-income household was associated with NRP-Pressuring (AOR= 4.16, 95% CI [1.54-11.6]) and NRP-Restrictive (AOR= 2.60 [1.01-6.71]) feeding styles, and having risk for water insecurity was associated with NRP-Pressuring feeding style (AOR= 2.46 [1.00-6.06]). In model 2, mothers aged 18-24 were associated with NRP-Laissez-Faire (AOR= 2.39, 95% CI [1.00-5.84]) and NRP-Indulgent (AOR= 3.66, 95% CI [1.45-9.25]) feeding styles, and mother's aged 25-34 were associated with an NRP-Restrictive (AOR=0.54, 95% CI [0.29-0.98]) feeding style. Also, mothers with a secondary or college education were associated with NRP feeding (AOR=0.58, 95% CI [0.33-1.00]) in model 2. In model 3, a mother having no prenatal care was associated with NRP-Pressuring (AOR= 0.06, 95% CI [0.01-0.52]) and NRP-Indulgent (AOR= 0.21, 95% CI [0.04-1.00]) feeding styles, and not being enrolled in WIC was associated with a NRP-Pressuring feeding style(AOR= 2.47, 95% CI [1.00-6.15]). In model 4, NRP-Restrictive feeding style was associated with mothers at risk for mild depression (AOR= 0.50, 95% CI [0.28-0.90]), and NRP-Pressuring feeding style was associated with mothers at risk for moderate to severe risk for anxiety (AOR=0.32, 95% CI [0.14-0.74]). Lastly, in model 5, NRP-Restrictive feeding style was associated with an infant who had non-government insurance (AOR= 2.78, 95% CI [1.13-6.82]), and NRP feeding was associated with an infant who was perceived as normal weight (AOR= 2.49, 95% CI [1.02-6.06]) (Table 3).

4. Discussion

Our study identified socioecological factors associated with CFS within three socioecological levels: household and sociodemographic characteristics, maternal perinatal characteristics, and infant and dietary characteristics (Figure 2). At the household and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980025000096 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sociodemographic characteristics level, household characteristics and maternal sociodemographic factors were associated with NRP feeding styles. At the maternal perinatal characteristics level, pregnancy and prenatal care, and maternal mental health factors were associated with NRP feeding styles. Lastly, at the infant and dietary characteristics level, infant characteristics and background factors were associated with NRP feeding styles. . Furthermore, no associations were found between CFS and meeting infant dietary guidelines. To our knowledge, this is the first study in Nevada focusing on CFS as a predictor of ECO. This is especially important in the context of urban areas in Nevada because of the high prevalence of ECO. Our study provides insights into socioecological factors that cause dissimilarities in CFS that could be potentially used to tailor educational and intervention approaches to address disparities in ECO.

Concerning household characteristics, mothers in lower-income households were more likely to be NRP feeders. This is consistent with previous findings that suggest that mothers living in low-income households are more worried about their infants' hunger and are less likely to identify hunger and satiety cues[17], thus increasing the likelihood of NRP feeding behaviors. Additionally, if a mother is at risk for water insecurity, it increases the likelihood of being an NRP feeder. Individuals are at risk for water insecurity if they lack water availability, accessibility, use, and stability[40]. As far as we know, our study is one of the first to study the association between water insecurity and NRP feeding. This is important because, due to climate changes, water availability may be lower at higher costs, thus generating stress on the caregivers' because they are competing financially with other priorities. This, in turn, may impact a caregiver's ability to practice RP feeding due to time and opportunity costs associated with water insecurity[40]. Water security should continue to be monitored because Nevada is a part of the US Southwest region that is currently going through drought and water shortages[41]. This is heightened for Clark County, as it is in the middle of a desert with a limited water supply. Therefore, this finding is important, especially in Clark County, Nevada, and may be useful in identifying ways to support families better in this region.

In our study, young mothers (aged 18-24) were more likely to be NRP feeders than adult mothers. Not many studies have focused on maternal age and feeding styles[22-25,30-33,36,38]. However, past research observed that mothers who have gained experience over time were more confident in feeding responsively[16]. This suggests that young mothers may have less practice

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980025000096 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and understanding of RP feeding than adult mothers, so they may be more likely to feed non-responsively. Secondly, consistent with previous research, our results suggest that mothers with higher education are less likely to practice NRP feeding styles. Prior studies have shown that maternal education is strongly associated with adequate eating behaviors and RP feeding styles[20]. Mothers with higher incomes and education were found to believe in their infant's ability to recognize their hunger and satiety cues[16]. It is plausible to assume that mothers with higher education levels have more access to knowledge on feeding practices and, therefore, are more aware of their infant's cues.

Surprisingly, mothers had lower odds of being NRP feeders when they did not receive prenatal care. There is a lack of studies focused on prenatal care and its impact on RP feeding styles; therefore, there are no viable explanations for why we observed this association. However, there may be no difference between the prenatal and non-prenatal groups, as we do not know if RP feeding is even discussed during visits. Other studies on infant feeding explained that prenatal visits tend to emphasize breastfeeding practices, complementary feeding, and adequate nutrition but not feeding styles[42]. We found that when a mother was not enrolled in WIC, they had a higher probability of being a NRP feeder. Not only is WIC a nutritional supplementation program that provides nutrition education and food benefits, but it has also been uncovered that WIC staff have the resources to educate mothers on identifying and responding to their infant's hunger and satiety cues[29]. Therefore, mothers enrolled in WIC might obtain more RP feeding advice than mothers who are not, causing non-enrollees to be more likely to be NRP feeders.

We found that a mild risk for depression and a moderate to severe risk for anxiety decreased the likelihood of a mother being an NRP feeder. This is inconsistent with previous findings because they have shown that depression and anxiety increase the probability of an NRP feeding style[20]. Skewed results may explain these differences due to the stigma associated with mental health[20]. However, the negative emotional response from mental health may cause mothers to reduce their capacity for interaction and engagement to feed responsively and their capacity to feed non-responsively[16].

In relation to infant characteristics, a mother had a higher potential to be an NRP feeder if their infant had non-government insurance. No other studies have investigated the relationship between infant insurance and CFS. However, individuals with non-government insurance (e.g., private insurance) have been shown to have higher access to high-quality care and higher

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980025000096 Published online by Cambridge University Press

diagnoses for allergies and dietary restrictions[43,44]. Therefore, it is likely that increased access to care and testing may also increase caregivers' knowledge of their infant's allergies and dietary restrictions, thus causing them to present more NRP feeding styles. Our study found that mothers were more likely to be NRP feeders if they perceived their infant as having normal weight. This is inconsistent with previous studies that suggested mothers who are more worried about their infant's weight are more likely to be NRP feeders[14]. A probable explanation for this finding is that mothers who perceive their children as having normal weight may not care about how they feed their infants, thus causing them not to practice RP feeding styles.

Contrary to what was expected, there were no independent associations between meeting infant dietary guidelines and RP feeding. Corroborating our findings, previous studies investigating this association explained that although caregivers meet their infants dietary guidelines, they may lack the skills to feed responsively[20]. Barriers these studies mentioned to RP feeding included balancing milk consumption recommendations and infant feeding cues, recognizing and responding to their infant's cues, and a mother's ability to soothe without food[20]. Although there were no significant associations, further studies should be conducted to understand the relationship between RP feeding and infant feeding because prior studies have observed that RP feeding helps infants develop healthy dietary habits and learn to self-regulate[28].

Our study has strengths and limitations to consider when interpreting our findings. This study was cross-sectional; therefore, we cannot infer causation. Despite this, a strength is that our study provides a baseline of specific factors that are associated with RP and NRP feeding styles, which future researchers can use to create hypotheses for further studies. Second, this study utilized self-reported measures, such as maternal mental health and caregivers' feeding practices and beliefs, causing self-reported bias. However, a strength is that the questions used for these measures are from valid and reliable instruments. Third, this study utilized a snowball convenience sample of mothers and caregivers with infants under two years old across Clark County, Nevada. While most of the sample was recruited through paid social media advertisements, to ensure diverse sociodemographic representation the survey was advertised at birth, pediatric offices, pediatric dentist, and lactation centers within Clark County. As a result, our convenience sample has similar demographic characteristics (e.g. household income, marital status, ethnicity, and education) to Clark County's available data[45]. Fourth, this study is limited

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980025000096 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to the mothers and caregivers of one large urban geographical area in the United States. However, since Clark County is the largest urban area in the state of Nevada and with a very diverse sociodemographic population, findings may be generalized to similar urban areas in high income countries.

The use of the HWIAS survey can be considered a limitation due to not being validated in the US or other high-income countries; however, neither is any other water insecurity survey[46]. Regardless, water security has become a global concern and it has been becoming more prevalent in the US[40,41,46,47]. Therefore, measuring water insecurity, even with a question that is not validated, is essential to uncover problems that would otherwise stay invisible[49]. For example, water insecurity increases an individual's expenses on water bottles and treatment devices, as they lack trust in tap water quality[47], which can affect the economic stability of the family, that in turn, corroborating our findings can lower the odds of RP feeding. Sixth, there may be some temporality issues with some of the survey questions (e.g., food and water insecurity) due to measuring risk in the last 12 months. Lastly, we opted to classify our RP and NRP outcomes as binary rather than continuous variables after conducting sensitivity analysis and finding similar results (data not shown). Our option to use binary variables relies on our hypothesis to identify the association between socioecological factors and each CFS. We acknowledge that this will reduce the variation of the outcomes and is less informative than using continuous variables, but the goal of the study was to not understand the different dimensions of the feeding styles, but to understand the predominant feeding styles of an individual (knowing other feeding styles play a role) and what factors are causing those feeding styles. We are less interested in how much of that feeding style they possess over another. Additionally, the way the survey was developed, the feeding styles were not mutually exclusive, which brought the limitation of a measurement issue. Although limited to countries other than the US, a few similar studies have looked at the factors influencing CFS[14, 16-20].

Our study identified socioecological factors associated with dissimilarities in CFS in Nevada that can contribute to disparities in ECO development, which is a public health crisis. This study is innovative because it identified factors that other studies have not. For example, associations between maternal age, infant insurance, water insecurity, prenatal care, WIC enrollment, and a caregivers' feeding style. Prior studies have found that RP and NRP feeding styles influence ECO, with RP feeding nurturing healthy eating and growth and NRP feeding

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980025000096 Published online by Cambridge University Press

creating overnutrition and obesity[14]. Therefore, longitudinal studies investigating the mechanisms through which RP feeding can improve ECO should be conducted. These longitudinal studies should consider clarifying the role of cofounders influencing RP feeding found in our study, such as water insecurity, anxiety, and depression, and looking at current prenatal care counseling on responsive care. There is an opportunity for policies and interventions to include in their programmatic activities informational or educational resources to support responsive feeding. In addition, further qualitative investigation should explore how caregivers could overcome barriers to RP feeding skills, which would provide new insight into prevention mechanisms for ECO and could inform guidelines for educating caregivers about infant feeding styles and behaviors as a way of ECO prevention.

5. Conclusion

Socioecological factors, including household, maternal sociodemographic, infant characteristics, pregnancy and prenatal care, and maternal mental health, were associated with caregivers' NRP feeding styles in a diverse sample of caregiver-infant dyads living in urban areas in Nevada. These findings can be used to inform educational approaches to support responsive feeding to prevent ECO, a public health crisis in the US.

Financial Support: Amanda Castelo Saragosa received a scholarship from the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) Award Number 1 T52HP46756-01-00 awarded to the School of Public Health, University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), to help fund this study.

Conflict of Interest: None

Authorship: ACS and GB developed the concept and design of the study. ACS collected and managed the data and conducted the formal analysis supervised by GB and SM. SM, CJ, and AC contributed to the conceptualization of the study. ACS wrote the original draft of the manuscript. GB, SM, CJ, and AC critically revised and edited the manuscript. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

Ethical Standards Disclosure: This study was conducted according to the guidelines laid down in the Declaration of Helsinki, and all procedures involving research study participants were approved by the University of Nevada, Las Vegas's Institutional Review Board (Protocol UNLV-2022-372). Written informed consent was obtained from all subjects.

References

1. Anderson, P. M., Butcher, K. F., & Schanzenbach, D. W. (2019). Understanding recent trends in childhood obesity in the United States. *Economics & Human Biology*, *34*, 16–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ehb.2019.02.002
2. Thompson, A. L., Mendez, M. A., Borja, J. B., et al. (2009). Development and validation of the Infant Feeding Style Questionnaire. *Appetite*, *53*(2), 210–221. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2009.06.010
3. Williams, A. S., Ge, B., Petroski, G., et al. (2018). Socioeconomic Status and Other Factors Associated with Childhood Obesity. *The Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine*, *31*(4), 514–521. https://doi.org/10.3122/jabfm.2018.04.170261
4. Heller, R. L., & Mobley, A. R. (2019). Instruments assessing parental responsive feeding in children ages birth to 5 years: A systematic review. *Appetite*, *138*, 23–51. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2019.03.006
5. Sanyaolu, A., Okorie, C., Qi, X., et al. (2019). Childhood and Adolescent Obesity in the United States: A Public Health Concern. *Global Pediatric Health*, *6*, 2333794X1989130. https://doi.org/10.1177/2333794X19891305
6. Morales Camacho, W. J., Molina Díaz, J. M., Plata Ortiz, S., et al. (2019). Childhood obesity: Aetiology, comorbidities, and treatment. *Diabetes/Metabolism Research and Reviews*, *35*(8), e3203. https://doi.org/10.1002/dmrr.3203
7. Morandi, A., Tommasi, M., Soffiati, F., et al. (2020). Correction: Prevention of obesity in toddlers (PROBIT): a randomised clinical trial of responsive feeding promotion from birth to 24 months. *International Journal of Obesity*, *44*(10), Article 10. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41366-020-00651-y
8. Strauss, W. J., Nagaraja, J., Landgraf, A. J., et al. (2018). The longitudinal relationship between community programmes and policies to prevent childhood obesity and BMI in children: The Healthy Communities Study. *Pediatric Obesity*, *13*(S1), 82–92. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijpo.12266

9. Perez-Escamilla, R., Bermudez, O., Buccini, G. S., et al. (2018). Nutrition disparities and the global burden of malnutrition. *BMJ*, *361*, k2252. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.k2252
10. Vassilakou, T. (2021). Childhood Malnutrition: Time for Action. *Children*, *8*(2), Article 2. https://doi.org/10.3390/children8020103
11. Browne, N. T., Hodges, E. A., Small, L., et al. (2022). Childhood obesity within the lens of racism. *Pediatric Obesity*, *17*(5), e12878. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijpo.12878
12. Volger, S., Rigassio Radler, D., & Rothpletz-Puglia, P. (2019). Correction: Early childhood obesity prevention efforts through a life course health development perspective: A scoping review. *PLOS ONE*, *14*(1), e0211288. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0211288
13. Skouteris, H., Bergmeier, H. J., Berns, S. D., et al. (2021). Reframing the early childhood obesity prevention narrative through an equitable nurturing approach. *Maternal & Child Nutrition*, *17*(1), e13094. https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.13094
14. Harbron, J., & Booley, S. (2013). Responsive feeding: Establishing healthy eating behaviour early on in life. *South African Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, *26*, S141–S149.
15. Gross, R. S., Mendelsohn, A. L., Fierman, A. H., et al. (2014). Maternal Infant Feeding Behaviors and Disparities in Early Child Obesity. *Childhood Obesity*, *10*(2), 145–152. https://doi.org/10.1089/chi.2013.0140
16. Redsell, S. A., Slater, V., Rose, J., et al. (2021). Barriers and enablers to caregivers' responsive feeding behaviour: A systematic review to inform childhood obesity prevention. *Obesity Reviews*, *22*(7), e13228. https://doi.org/10.1111/obr.13228
17. von Ash, T., Alikhani, A., Lebron, C., et al. (n.d.). Racial/ethnic differences in maternal feeding practices and beliefs at 6 months postpartum. *Public Health Nutrition*, *25*(12), 3445–3454. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980021005073
18. Holley, C. E., & Haycraft, E. (2022). Mothers' perceptions of self-efficacy and satisfaction with parenting are related to their use of controlling and positive food parenting practices. *Maternal & Child Nutrition*, *18*(1),e13272. https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.13272
19. Sandow, A., Tice, M., Pérez-Escamilla, R., et al.(2020). Facilitators of Responsive Feeding/Parenting Knowledge and Practices Among Parents in the Central Region of Ghana. *Current Developments in Nutrition*, *4*, nzaa054_141. https://doi.org/10.1093/cdn/nzaa054_141
20. Coleta, H., Schincaglia, R. M., Gubert, M. B., et al. (2022). Factors associated with infant feeding styles in the Federal District, Brazil. *Appetite*, *179*, 106290. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2022.106290

21. Pereira, M. M. C. e, Padez, C. M. P., & Nogueira, H. G. da S. M. (2019). Describing studies on childhood obesity determinants by Socio-Ecological Model level: A scoping review to identify gaps and provide guidance for future research. *International Journal of Obesity*, *43*(10), 1883–1890. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41366-019-0411-3
22. *Southern Nevada Community Health Assessment Report 2020/2021*. Southern Nevada :: Resource Library :: Southern Nevada Community Health Assessment Report 2020/2021. (2022). Retrieved September 9, 2022, from https://www.healthysouthernnevada.org/resourcelibrary/index/view?id=24014963925520251
23. Nevada Division of Public and Behavioral Health. (2021). (rep.). *Annual Obesity Report 2020 State of Nevada Division of Public and Behavioral Health.* Retrieved September 9, 2022, from https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Documents/RTTL_NRS439.521_2021.pdf
24. CDC. (2022, November 8). *Obesity in Low-Income Children*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. https://www.cdc.gov/obesity/data/obesity-among-WIC-enrolled-young-children.html
25. Emerson, R. W. (2015). Convenience Sampling, Random Sampling, and Snowball Sampling: How Does Sampling Affect the Validity of Research? *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness, 109(2),* 164–167.
26. Southern Nevada Health District. (2022, February 15). Vital Records statistics. Southern Nevada Health District. Retrieved September 9, 2022, from https://www.southernnevadahealthdistrict.org/news-info/statistics-surveillance-reports/vital-records-statistics/
27. Pérez-Escamilla, R., Segura-Pérez, S., & Hall Moran, V. (2019). Dietary guidelines for children under 2 years of age in the context of nurturing care. *Maternal & Child Nutrition*, *15*(3), e12855. https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.12855
28. Pérez-Escamilla, R., & Segura-Pérez, S. (2020). Can a pragmatic responsive feeding scale be developed and applied globally? *Maternal & Child Nutrition*, *16*(3), e13004. https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.13004
29. Hudak, K. M., & Benjamin-Neelon, S. E. (2021). Timing of WIC Enrollment and Responsive Feeding among Low-Income Women in the US. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *18*(14), 7695. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18147695
30. The Hunger Vital SignTM. (n.d.). *Children's HealthWatch.* Retrieved November 16, 2023, from https://childrenshealthwatch.org/public-policy/hunger-vital-sign/

31. Cooper-Vince, C. E., Arachy, H., Kakuhikire, B., et al. (2018). Water insecurity and gendered risk for depression in rural Uganda: A hotspot analysis. *BMC Public Health*, *18(1)*, 1143. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-018-6043-z
32. Gibson, J., McKenzie-McHarg, K., Shakespeare, J., et al. (2009). A systematic review of studies validating the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale in antepartum and postpartum women. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, *119*(5), 350–364. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0447.2009.01363.x
33. Cox, J. L., Chapman, G., Murray, D., et al. (1996). Validation of the Edinburgh postnatal depression scale (EPDS) in non-postnatal women. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *39*(3), 185–189. https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-0327(96)00008-0
34. Mayberry, L. J., Horowitz, J. A., & Declercq, E. (2007). Depression Symptom Prevalence and Demographic Risk Factors Among U.S. Women During the First 2 Years Postpartum. *Journal of Obstetric, Gynecologic, & Neonatal Nursing*, *36*(6), 542–549. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1552-6909.2007.00191.x
35. Provincial Health Services Authority (n.d.). *Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale (EPDS)*. Perinatal Services BC. Retrieved September 6, 2022, from http://www.perinatalservicesbc.ca/health-professionals/professional-resources/health-promo/edinburgh-postnatal-depression-scale-(epds)
36. Zhong, Q.-Y., Gelaye, B., Zaslavsky, A. M., et al. (2015). Diagnostic Validity of the Generalized Anxiety Disorder—7 (GAD-7) among Pregnant Women. *PLOS ONE*, *10*(4), e0125096. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0125096
37. *Generalized anxiety disorder assessment (GAD-7)*. CORC Child Outcomes Research Consortium. (n.d.). Retrieved September 6, 2022, from https://www.corc.uk.net/outcome-experience-measures/generalised-anxiety-disorder-assessment-gad-7/
38. Aunola, K., Sorkkila, M., Tolvanen, A., et al. (2021). Development and validation of the Brief Parental Burnout Scale (BPBS). *Psychological Assessment*, *33*(11), 1125–1137. https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0001064
39. Indicators for assessing infant and young child feeding practices: Conclusions of a consensus meeting held 6-8 November 2007 in Washington D.C., USA. (2008). World Health Organization (WHO).
40. Miller, J. D., Workman, C. L., Panchang, S. V., et al. (2021). Water Security and Nutrition: Current Knowledge and Research Opportunities. *Advances in Nutrition*, *12*(6), 2525–2539. https://doi.org/10.1093/advances/nmab075

41. Cheeks, L. H., Stepien, T. L., & Wald, D. M. (2016). Discovering News Frames: Exploring Text, Content, and Concepts in Online News Sources to Address Water Insecurity in the Southwest Region. *2016 IEEE 17th International Conference on Information Reuse and Integration (IRI)*, 454–462. https://doi.org/10.1109/IRI.2016.67
42. Dembiński, Ł., Banaszkiewicz, A., Dereń, K., et al. (2021). Exploring Physicians' Perspectives on the Introduction of Complementary Foods to Infants and Toddlers. *Nutrients*, *13*(10), 3559. https://doi.org/10.3390/nu13103559
43. Sommers, B. D., Blendon, R. J., & Orav, E. J. (2016). Both The 'Private Option' And Traditional Medicaid Expansions Improved Access To Care For Low-Income Adults. *Health Affairs*, *35*(1), 96–105. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2015.0917
44. Stingone, J. A., & Claudio, L. (2008). Disparities in allergy testing and health outcomes among urban children with asthma. *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*, *122*(4), 748–753. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaci.2008.08.001
45. Nevada, S. (n.d.-a). Southern Nevada: Demographics :: County :: Clark. Retrieved October 9, 2023, from https://www.healthysouthernnevada.org/index.php?module=demographicdata&controller=index&action=index
46. Slotnick, M. J., &Leung, C. W. (2023). Water Insecurity Indicators Are Associated with Lower Dietand Beverage Quality in a National Survey of Lower-Income United States Adults.*The Journal of Nutrition*, *153*(11), 3308–3316. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tjnut.2023.08.019
47. Young, S. L., Bethancourt, H. J., Cafiero, C., et al. (2023). Acknowledging, measuring and acting on the importance of water for food and nutrition. *Nature Water*, *1*(10), 825–828. https://doi.org/10.1038/s44221-023-00146-w

Table 1. Descriptive analysis of feeding styles, household characteristics, maternal socio-demographics, prenatal care, maternal mental health, infant characteristics, and infant feeding, 2023.

Study Variables	Full Sample (N=304)	% (N*)
Caregiver Feeding Style(s)		
Responsive (RP)(n= 287)		
Yes		53.3 (153)
No		46.7 (134)
Non-responsive Laissez-faire (NRP-LF) (n= 293)		
Yes		47.1 (138)
No		52.9 (155)
Non-responsive Pressuring (NRP-PR) (n= 293)		
Yes		43.0 (126)
No		57.0 (167)
Non-responsive Indulgence(NRP-ID) (n= 261)		
Yes		35.6 (93)
No		64.4 (168)
Non-responsive Restrictive (NRP-RS) (n= 296)		
Yes		50.34 (149)
No		49.66 (147)
Block 1		
Infants Age (Constant)		
Under 6 months		33.9 (103)
Between 7 and 11 months		23.0 (70)
Between 12 and 23 months		43.1 (131)
Household Income		
Low Income (less than $49,999)		21.7 (66)
Middle Income ($50,000-$149,999)		66.1 (201)
Upper Income (More than $150,000)		12.2 (37)
Food Security		
Food Secure		69.7 (212)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980025000096 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Food Insecure	30.3 (92)
Water Security	
Water Secure	87.2 (265)
Water Insecure	12.8 (39)
Block 2	
Mother's Age	
18-24	12.5 (38)
25-34	64.5 (196)
35-44	23.0 (70)
Marital Status	
Living without a partner (single, widowed, separated)	7.2 (22)
Living with a partner (married, living together)	92.8 (282)
Non-Hispanic White	
Yes	48.7 (148)
No	51.3 (156)
Mother's Education	
Secondary or college	73.0 (222)
Graduate	26.9 (82)
Block 3	
Any Prenatal Care (PNC) Visits	
Yes	93.8 (285)
No	6.3 (19)
WIC Enrollment	
Yes	19.7 (60)
No	80.3 (244)
Block 4	
Mother's Risk for Depression (n= 292)	
No/Minimal	41.1 (120)
Mild	35.9 (105)
Moderate/Severe	22.9 (67)
Mother's Risk for Anxiety (n=297)	

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980025000096 Published online by Cambridge University Press

No/ Minimal	34.7 (103)
Mild	41.8 (124)
Moderate/ Severe	23.6 (70)
Mother's Risk for Burnout (n=303)	
Burnout risk	80.9 (245)
No burnout	19.1 (58)
Mother's Weight Perception	
Underweight	2.3 (7)
Normal weight	31.6 (96)
Overweight	66.1 (201)
Block 5	
Pacifier Use	
Yes	42.5 (129)
No	57.6 (175)
Infants Insurance (n=303)	
Government	26.4 (80)
Non-Government	73.6 (223)
Perception of Infant's Weight	
Underweight	9.2 (28)
Normal weight	82.6 (251)
Overweight	8.2 (25)
Block 6	
Infant Dietary Guidelines (Exclusive <6 months and Complementary <6 months) (N =280)	
Yes	64.3 (180)
No	35.7 (100)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980025000096 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 2. Bivariate Analysis of feeding styles by household characteristics, maternal socio-demographics, prenatal care, maternal mental health, infant characteristics, and infant feeding, 2023.

	Responsive Feeding		**Non-Responsive Feeding**							
Variables	**Non-Responsive Style (N=287)** N (%)	**P-value**	**Non-Responsive Laissez-faire Style (N=293)** N (%)	**P-value**	**Non-Responsive Pressuring Style (N=293)** N (%)	**P-value**	**Non-Responsive Indulgence Style (N=261)** N (%)	**P-value**	**Non-Responsive Restrictive Style (N=296)** N (%)	**P-value**
Block 1										
Household Income										
Upper-income	17 (47.22)	0.977	12 (32.43)	**0.045***	11 (29.73)	**0.000***	8 (8.60)	0.457	16 (45.71)	**0.004***
Middle-income	86 (46.24)		89 (46.35)		73 (37.82)		64 (35.75)		89 (45.18)	
Low-income	31 (47.69)		37 (57.81)		42 (66.67)		21 (40.38)		44 (68.75)	
Food Security										
Food Secure	87 (44.16)	0.204	88 (43.35)	**0.053***	81 (39.32)	**0.050***	61 (33.70)	0.327	96 (46.60)	**0.052***
Food Insecure	47 (52.22)		50 (55.56)		45 (51.72)		32 (40.00)		53 (58.89)	
Water Security										
Water Secure	116 (46.59)	0.928	117 (45.70)	0.208	101 (39.61)	**0.002***	78 (34.36)	0.268	124 (48.25)	**0.065***
Water Insecure	18 (47.37)		21 (56.76)		25 (65.79)		15 (44.12)		25 (64.10)	
Block 2										
Mother's Age										
35-44	28 (41.79)	**0.108***	27 (38.57)	**0.016***	27 (39.13)	0.245	17 (27.42)	**0.020***	39 (58.21)	**0.019***
25-34	93 (51.10)		86 (46.24)		79 (42.02)		58 (34.73)		85 (44.50)	
18-24	13 (34.21)		25 (67.57)		20 (55.56)		18 (56.25)		25 (65.79)	
Marital Status										
Living with a partner	124 (46.79)	0.904	128 (47.23)	0.872	113 (41.70)	**0.113***	89 (37.08)	**0.098***	137 (50.00)	0.682
Living without a partner	10 (45.45)		10 (45.45)		13 (59.09)		4 (19.05)		12 (54.55)	
Non-Hispanic White										

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980025000096 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Yes	60 (42.55)	**0.167***	61 (43.26)	0.205	50 (34.38)	**0.004***	42 (32.81)	0.351	63 (43.45)	**0.020***
No	74 (50.68)		77 (50.66)		76 (51.35)		51 (38.35)		86 (56.95)	
Mother's Education										
Graduate Degree	43 (55.84)	**0.060***	31 (39.24)	**0.102***	27 (33.33)	**0.039***	26 (36.62)	0.839	36 (45.00)	0.264
Secondary level or college	91 (43.33)		107 (50.00)		99 (46.70)		67 (35.26)		113 (52.31)	
Block 3										
Any Prenatal Care (PNC) Visits										
Yes	126 (47.01)	0.678	132 (48.00)	0.227	125 (45.29)	**0.001***	91 (37.60)	**0.018***	39 (50.18)	0.836
No	8 (42.11)		6 (33.33)		1 (5.88)		2 (10.53)		10 (52.63)	
WIC Enrollment										
Yes	29 (49.15)	0.671	34 (56.67)	**0.096***	29 (51.79)	**0.140***	21 (40.38)	0.424	39 (66.10)	**0.007***
No	105 (46.05)		104 (44.64)		97 (40.93)		72 (34.45)		110 (46.41)	
Block 4										
Mother's Risk for Depression (N=276)										
No/Minimal	56 (48.70)	0.557	56 (47.86)	0.930	56 (48.28)	0.267	33 (32.04)	0.640	65 (55.56)	**0.098***
Mild	42 (42.86)		48 (46.15)		39 (38.61)		34 (37.78)		42 (41.18)	
Moderate/Severe	32 (50.79)		27 (45.00)		25 (38.46)		22 (37.93)		34 (51.52)	
Mother's Risk for Anxiety (N=282) tab										
No/Minimal	47 (47.00)	0.870	47 (46.53)	0.982	47 (46.53)	**0.147***	29 (31.87)	**0.191***	57 (55.58)	0.332
Mild	52 (45.22)		56 (46.28)		55 (46.22)		36 (33.96)		59 (48.76)	
Moderate/ Severe	33 (49.25)		31 (47.69)		22 (32.84)		27 (45.76)		30 (44.78)	
Mother'sRisk for Burnout										
Burnout risk	109 (46.98)	0.838	111 (46.84)	0.853	103 (43.10)	0.968	79 (37.62)	0.202	120 (50.42)	0.951
No burnout	25 (45.45)		27 (48.21)		23 (43.40)		14 (28.00)		29 (50.88)	
Mother's Weight Perception										
Underweight	2 (28.57)	0.423	2 (28.57)	**0.070***	3 (42.86)	0.827	3 (42.86)	0.532	3 (42.86)	0.916
Normal weight	39 (43.33)		36 (38.71)		38 (40.43)		26 (30.95)		47(50.00)	
Overweight	93 (48.95)		100 (51.81)		85 (44.27)		64 (37.65)		99 (50.77)	

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980025000096 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Block 5										
Pacifier Use										
Yes	57 (47.90)	0.730	69 (54.76)	**0.022***	58 (46.77)	0.264	39 (36.45)	0.818	61 (48.41)	0.568
No	77 (45.83)		69 (41.32)		68 (40.24)		54 (35.06)		88 (51.76)	
Infants Insurance (N=286)										
Government	33 (42.31)	0.384	47 (60.26)	**0.007***	40 (54.05)	**0.024***	30 (46.15)	**0.044***	44 (56.41)	**0.199***
Non-Government	100 (48.08)		91 (42.52)		85 (38.99)		63 (32.31)		104 (47.93)	
Perception of Infants Weight										
Underweight	8 (29.63)	**0.169***	13 (46.43)	0.641	15 (53.57)	**0.031***	9 (34.62)	0.911	11 (39.29)	**0.198***
Normal weight	115 (48.63)		112 (46.28)		95 (39.58)		76 (35.35)		122 (50.21)	
Overweight	11 (45.83)		13 (56.52)		16 (64.00)		8 (40.00)		16 (64.00)	
Block 6										
Infant Dietary Guidelines (Exclusive Breastfeeding (<6 months) and Complementary Feeding (>7 months))										
Yes	80 (45.98)	0.628	79 (45.40)	0.421	62 (35.43)	**0.003***	52 (33.55)	0.453	88 (49.72)	0.834
No	39 (42.86)		48 (50.53)		52 (54.17)		33 (38.37)		49 (51.04)	

***P<0.20**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980025000096 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 3. Logistic regression following a hierarchical modeling approach of feeding styles by household characteristics, maternal socio-demographics, prenatal care, maternal mental health, infant characteristics, and infant feeding, adjusted for infant age, 2023.

	Responsive Feeding	**Non-Responsive Feeding**							
Variables	**Non-Responsive Style AOR (95% CI)**	**Non-Responsive Laissez-faire Style AOR (95% CI)**		**Non-Responsive Pressuring Style AOR (95% CI)**		**Non-Responsive Indulgence Style AOR (95% CI)**		**Non-Responsive Restrictive Style AOR (95% CI)**	
Model 1									
Household Income									
Upper-income	-	1		1		-		1	
Middle-income	-	1.55	(0.75-3.32)	1.34	(0.61-2.95)	-		1.00	(0.47-2.10)
Low-income	-	2.11	(0.83–5.36)	***4.16**	**(1.54-11.6)**↑	-		***2.60**	**(1.01-6.71)**↑
Food Security									
Food Secure	-	1		1		-		1	
Food Insecure	-	1.44	(0.81-2.55)	0.73	(0.35-1.49)	-		0.96	(0.48-1.89)
Water Security									
Water Secure	-	-		1		-		1	
Water Insecure	-	-		***2.46**	**(1.00-6.06)**↑	-		1.35	(0.55-3.33)
Model 2									
Mother's Age									
35-44	1	1		-		1		1	
25-34	1.53	(0.85-1.23	(0.69-	-		1.36	(0.70-	***0.54**	**(0.29-**

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980025000096 Published online by Cambridge University Press

	2.76)		2.19)			2.64)	**0.98)↓**	
18-24	0.76	(0.33-	***2.39**	**(1.00--**		***3.66**	**(1.45-**	0.95 (0.39-
	1.74)		**5.84)↑**			**9.24)↑**		2.35)
Marital Status								
Living with a partner	-		-	1		1	-	
Living without a partner	-		-	1.40	(0.45-	0.34	(0.10--	
				3.64)		1.16)		
Non-Hispanic White								
Yes	1		-	1		-	1	
No	1.57	(0.97--		1.54	(0.93--		1.40	(0.84-
	2.55)			2.57)			2.31)	
Mother's Education								
Graduate Degree	1		1	1		-	-	
Secondary level or college	***0.58** **1.00)↓**	**(0.33-**	1.16 2.07)	(0.65-	1.20 2.15)	(0.67--	-	
Model 3								
Any Prenatal Care (PNC) Visits								
Yes	-		-	1		1	-	
No	-		-	***0.06** **0.52)↓**	**(0.01-**	***0.21** **1.00)↓**	**(0.04--**	
WIC Enrollment								
Yes	-		1	1		-	1	
No	-		0.98 2.08)	(0.46-	***2.47** **6.15)↑**	**(1.00--**		0.78 (0.35- 1.75)
Model 4								
Mother's Risk for Depression (N=276)								
No/Minimal	-		-	-		-	1	

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980025000096 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Mild	-	-	-	-	***0.50 (0.28-0.90)↓**	
Moderate/Severe	-	-	-	-	0.72 (0.36-1.44)	
Mother's Risk for Anxiety (N=282)						
No/ Minimal	-	-	1	1	-	
Mild	-	-	0.78 (0.43-1.41)	0.91 (0.48--1.71)		
Moderate/ Severe	-	-	***0.32 (0.14-0.74)↓**	1.72 (0.85--3.47)		
Mother's Risk for Burnout						
Burnout risk	-	-	-	-	-	
No burnout	-	-	-	-	-	
Mother's Weight Perception						
Underweight	-	1	-	-	-	
Normal weight	-	1.54 (0.25--9.20)		-	-	
Overweight	-	2.47 (0.42--14.42)		-	-	
Model 5						
Pacifier Use						
Yes	-	1	-	-	-	
No	-	0.66 (0.39--1.09)		-	-	
Infants Insurance (N=286)						
Government	-	1	1	1	1	
Non-Government	-	0.52 (0.23-1.16)	1.01 (0.34-3.05)	0.60 (0.30-1.18)	***2.78 (1.13-6.82)↑**	
Perception of Infants Weight						
Underweight	1	-	1	-	1	
Normal	***2.49 (1.02--**		0.47 (0.19--		2.08 (0.84-	

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980025000096 Published online by Cambridge University Press

weight	**6.06)↑**			1.15)			5.12)	
Overweight	2.59	(0.77--		1.28	(0.35--		2.92	(0.89-
	8.69)			4.56)			9.55)	
Model 6								
Infant Dietary Guidelines (Exclusive Breastfeeding (<6 months) and Complementary Feeding (>6 months))								
Yes	-	-		1	-		-	
No	-	-		1.74	(0.90--		-	
				3.37)				

Responsive Style: [a]Model 1: adjusted by infant age. [b]Model 2: Model 1 + mother's age, non-Hispanic White, and Education. [c]Model 5: Model 2 + perception of infant's weight. **Laissez-faire Style:** [a]Model 1: adjusted by the age of the infant, household income, and food security. [b]Model 2: Model 1 + mother's age and education. [c]Model 3: Model 2 + WIC enrollment. [d]Model 4: Model 3 + Mother's weight perception. [e]Model 5: Model 4 + pacifier use and infant's insurance. **Pressuring Style:** [a]Model 1: adjusted by the age of the infant, household income, food security, and water security. [b]Model 2: Model 1 + marital status, non-hispanic white, and education. [c]Model 3: Model 2 + any prenatal care and WIC enrollment. [d]Model 4: Model 3 + Mother's risk for anxiety. [e]Model 5: Model 4 + infant's insurance and perception of infant's weight. [f]Model 6: Model 5 + dietary guidelines. **Indulgence Style:** [a]Model 1: adjusted by the age of the infant. [b]Model 2: Model 1 + mother's age and marital status. [c]Model 3: Model 2 + any prenatal care. [d]Model 4: Model 3 + mother's risk for anxiety. [e]Model 5: Model 4 + infant's insurance. **Restrictive Style:** [a]Model 1: adjusted by the age of the infant, household income, food security, and water security. [b]Model 2: Model 1 + mother's age and non-hispanic white. [c]Model 3: Model 2 + WIC enrollment. [d]Model 4: Model 3 + mother's risk for depression. [e]Model 5: Model 4 + infant's insurance. ***P<0.05**

↑ Increasing the likelihood of exhibiting a feeding style, ↓ Decreasing the likelihood of exhibiting a feeding style.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980025000096 Published online by Cambridge University Press