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Abstract

Bridging the Gap between Food Insecurity and Subsequent Child Body Mass: Mediating Effects of Dietary Quality and Feeding Styles in Low-Income Hispanic Preschoolers

Nipa Kamdar

May 2018

Background: Low-income Hispanic preschoolers face disproportionately high prevalence of food insecurity (FI) and obesity. Consumption of low-cost, energy-dense foods to compensate for FI leads to excess body-mass. FI parents may adopt feeding styles that contribute to decline in children’s dietary quality. Feeding style describes the amount of demandingness (i.e., control of children’s eating) and responsiveness (i.e., warmth used to express demandingness). FI may indirectly contribute to obesity through dietary quality and feeding style.

Purpose: This study investigated: 1. if dietary quality mediated the relationship between food security status (FSS) at Time 1 (T1) and child body-mass at Time 2 (T2), 2. if feeding demandingness (PFD) and/or responsiveness (PFR) mediated the relationship between FSS at T1 and child dietary quality at T2, 3. explored if gender and/or parental acculturation moderated the mediation.

Method: The current study was a secondary analysis of an observational study (R01 HD06257, PI: Hughes). Hispanic parent-preschooler dyads (n=137) provided data through the 6-item Household Food Security Survey, Healthy Eating Index-2015 (HEI), Caregiver’s Feeding Style Questionnaire, Bidimensional Acculturation Scale, and body-mass-index z-score (BMIz) at two timepoints 18 months apart. Mediation and moderated
mediation analyses were conducted using regression models while controlling co-
variates. Bias-corrected bootstrap confidence intervals estimated indirect effects.

**Outcomes:** FSS\textsubscript{T1} did not indirectly influence child BMI\textsubscript{ZT2} through HEI\textsubscript{T1} (\(ab = -0.00\), bootstrap CI [-0.00, 0.00]). FSS\textsubscript{T1} also did not indirectly influence HEI\textsubscript{T2} through PFD\textsubscript{T1} (\(ab = -0.01\), bootstrap CI [-0.15, 0.03]) or PFR\textsubscript{T1} (\(ab = 0.01\), bootstrap CI [-0.04, 0.15]). However, as FSS\textsubscript{T1} worsened, HEI-2015\textsubscript{T2} improved (\(c = 1.06, 95\% CI [0.43, 1.69]\)). As a co-variate, higher baseline English acculturation\textsubscript{T1} predicted lower HEI-2015\textsubscript{T2} (\(\beta = -3.44, 95\% CI [-5.62, -1.26]\)) and higher BMI\textsubscript{ZT2} (\(\beta = 0.13, 95\% CI [0.05, 0.21]\)); however, it did not have significant conditional effects in moderated mediation models. Gender (\(p_{\text{FSS} \times \text{Gender}} = .04\)) moderated the direct effect of FSS\textsubscript{T1} on BMI\textsubscript{ZT2}; however, effect size (\(\beta = 0.05, 95\% CI [0.002, 0.09]\)) was too small to be clinically relevant.

**Conclusion:** FI did not affect body-mass through dietary quality, nor did it affect dietary quality through PFD or PFR. However, an unexpected positive direct relationship between FI and subsequent dietary quality warrants further exploration.

**Keywords:** Food security, Child obesity, Parenting, Diet
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Summary of Study

This study is a secondary analysis of a parent study that examined the relationship between parenting behaviors and children’s eating behaviors. The parent study was conducted at the Children’s Nutrition Research Center in Houston, TX. The subjects were parents (mostly mothers) and preschooler dyads recruited from Head Start centers in Houston.

The purpose of the current study was to increase our understanding of the relationship between household food insecurity, dietary quality, body mass, and parenting feeding demandingness and responsiveness in low-income Hispanic preschoolers. Food insecurity and child obesity disproportionately affect low-income Hispanic preschoolers. They also share common risk factors. This study tested dietary quality as a potential mechanism through which food insecurity and child obesity were indirectly related. Additionally, parents of preschoolers control their children’s dietary quality. Using Conger’s (2007) Family Stress Model as a theoretical framework, the current study also tested parenting feeding demandingness (i.e., control) and responsiveness (i.e., warmth) as a potential mechanism through which food insecurity and dietary quality were indirectly related. Finally, the study sought to identify if child gender or maternal level of acculturation to US lifestyle influenced the direct and/or indirect pathways. The knowledge gained from this investigation could be applied to building robust interventions and policies directed towards food security and child nutrition.

Immense work went into learning the statistical methods needed to analyze the study aims prior to the proposal defense. Because of this work, there were limited issues
that developed during the course of the study which was heavily rooted in data analysis.

The issues that were encountered included:

1. Miscalculation of Time 1’s Whole Fruit Component score. This error resulted in erroneous dietary quality scores. Once the issue was realized, the necessary corrections were made to the component score and dietary quality. I updated the dataset and repeated the analyses.

2. Pending publication of the evaluation of Healthy Eating Index-2015 (HEI-2015). I wrote to several researchers familiar with HEI and asked their opinion on continuing to use a score that had no published psychometrics. The general consensus was that I should continue to use it. However, I had calculated the Healthy Eating Index-2010 scores. Therefore, I decided to test the aims using this score as sensitivity analysis.

3. Also, during the writing of the manuscript, I grew concern about using the food security score as a continuous variable. The majority of published studies categorize the raw score. Therefore, I reran the aims using food security as a traditional categorical variable as part of sensitivity analyses.

4. Using Dr. Chan’s suggestions, I revised the method used to test potential co-variates. I kept only those co-variates that had significant influence \((p \leq .1)\) in my models.

5. Made corrections with the type of statistical test I used for comparisons. I was using non-parametric t-tests to compare categorical data. This was corrected to Chi-square analyses.

Overall, there were no major changes made to the proposal after its approval.
The dissertation is organized the guidelines for preparation of the doctoral dissertation. The dissertation manuscript contains the final results of the study. This is followed by appendices that include components of the study manual (Appendices A-F), two manuscripts- one published (Appendix G) and one under review (Appendix H). Finally, the dissertation concludes with my curriculum vitae.
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Specific Aims

Low-income Hispanic preschoolers are disproportionately at risk for two major public health issues that have long-lasting health consequences—food insecurity and obesity. Food insecurity, which is inadequate access to food, contributes to poor dietary quality and obesity. Dietary quality is critical for healthy growth and development. Parents have strong influence on preschoolers’ diet, and subsequently, their dietary quality. Food insecurity, child obesity, dietary quality, and parenting feedings styles (PFS) have complex, layered relationships. The knowledge gained from this study could be used to design robust interventions and provide support for food security and child nutrition policy reforms.

Child obesity and food insecurity have overlapping risk factors that include having low-income, being of Hispanic ethnicity, and having a head of household with high school or less education (Coleman-Jensen, Rabbitt, Gregory, & Singh, 2016; Gibbs & Forste, 2014; Ogden, Carroll, Kit, & Flegal, 2014). Hispanic preschoolers have an almost 5-fold increased prevalence of obesity compared to Caucasian preschoolers (Ogden et al., 2014), and one out of four Hispanic families with children is food insecure (Coleman-Jensen et al., 2016). Low-income Hispanic preschoolers are also at risk for low dietary quality (Quandt et al., 2016) which is a determinant for obesity. Low-income Hispanic parents with increased stress tend to have feeding styles that are low in parental control and warmth (Hughes, Power, Liu, Sharp, & Nicklas, 2015; Hurley, Black, Papas, Caulfield, & Caufield, 2008). This style is associated with nutritionally poor diets (Hoerr et al., 2009). Feeding style is a parenting behavior determined by the amount of
demandingness, or control, a parent places on what and how their children eat and the amount of responsiveness, or warmth, by which the parent expresses that demandingness (Hughes, Power, Orlet Fisher, Mueller, & Nicklas, 2005).

While there is evidence of association between: 1. food insecurity and obesity, 2. food insecurity and dietary quality, and 3. parenting feeding style and dietary quality, no study to date has examined how these factors relate to each other overtime in low-income Hispanic preschoolers. Currently, programs and policies often target food insecurity and obesity separately. By identifying potential mediating mechanisms, such as dietary quality and PFS through levels of demandingness and responsiveness, interventions designed to target these mechanisms may subsequently improve long-term health outcomes in this vulnerable population.

The study will use secondary analysis of longitudinal data from a parent study that examined parenting and dietary behaviors in low-income Hispanic preschoolers over 18 months (R01 HD06257, PI: Hughes). It will focus on the direct and indirect pathways that bridge food insecurity with obesity through dietary quality. Because parents have critical influence on preschoolers’ diet, the study will also focus on the direct and indirect pathways that bridge food insecurity with dietary quality through parental levels of demandingness and responsiveness, the domains used to determine PFS.

Based on the family stress model (Conger & Donnellan, 2007), food insecurity is an environmental stress that could sway parents to adopt low levels of parental demandingness and responsiveness which would then lead to poor dietary quality. The central hypothesis of this study is that exposure to food insecurity will overtime directly, and indirectly through poor dietary quality, result in increased child body-mass. The
potential mediators of dietary quality and PFS could be targets for change in interventions to ultimately reduce prevalence of child obesity.

**Aims**

1. To investigate if dietary quality mediates the relationship between food security status (FSS) at Time 1 and body-mass-index (BMI) at Time 2 in low-income Hispanic preschoolers.

   *Hypothesis 1:* Poor dietary quality will mediate the relationship between low FSS at Time 1 and elevated BMI at Time 2 in low-income Hispanic preschoolers.

2. To investigate if parental feeding demandingness and/or responsiveness mediate the relationship between food security status (FSS) at Time 1 and dietary quality at Time 2 in low-income Hispanic preschoolers.

   *Hypothesis 2a:* Low levels of feeding demandingness will mediate the relationship between low FSS at Time 1 and poor dietary quality at Time 2 in low-income Hispanic preschoolers.

   *Hypothesis 2b:* Low levels of feeding responsiveness will mediate the relationship between low FSS at Time 1 and poor dietary quality at Time 2 in low-income Hispanic preschoolers.

3. To explore if factors such as gender and/or acculturation moderate the direct and indirect effects of the mediations being tested in Aim 1 and 2.

The shared risk factors and disproportionally high prevalence of food insecurity and child obesity afflicting low-income Hispanic preschoolers raises suspicion of potential mediators connecting these two issues. Identification of modifiable mediators will
provide alternative approaches to address the problems. Positive changes made at this point of child development have potential for life-long impact.
Proposal Abstract

Background: Low-income Hispanic preschoolers are disproportionately at risk for two public health issues that have long-lasting consequences—food insecurity and obesity. Children living in households that lack access to food may not consume nutritious food. Parents may compensate for the stress of being food insecure by adopting feeding styles that contribute to poor diets. Feeding style is a parenting behavior determined by the amount of demandingness, or control, a parent places on their children’s eating and amount of responsiveness, or warmth, with which a parent expresses that demandingness (Hughes et al., 2005).

Purpose: The primary aims of this study are to investigate: 1. if dietary quality mediates the relationship between food security status (FSS) at Time 1 and child body-mass-index (BMI) at Time 2, 2. if parental levels of feeding demandingness and responsiveness mediate the relationship between FSS at Time 1 and dietary quality at Time 2, 3. explore factors that that moderate the mediation being tested in Aim 1 and 2.

Method: The study will use secondary analysis of longitudinal data from a parent study that examined parenting and dietary behaviors in low-income Hispanic preschoolers (R01 HD06257, PI: Hughes). Analysis will be conducted using a half-longitudinal model for mediation and bootstrap method to test for significance of the indirect effects. Moderation will be tested on the mediation model using regression analysis.

Expected Outcomes: Poor child dietary quality will mediate the relationship between low FSS at Time 1 and elevated child BMI at Time 2 in low-income Hispanic preschoolers. Low levels of parental feeding demandingness and responsiveness will mediate the relationship between low FSS at Time 1 and poor child dietary quality at Time 2 in low-
income Hispanic preschoolers. Gender and acculturation may moderate the mediation effects.

Conclusion: This study will increase understanding of the relationship between food insecurity and weight status in children through identification of potential direct and indirect mediating mechanisms and moderators of the mediation. Findings will be used to improve interventions focused on improving child weight status. Findings can also be used to support food security and child nutrition policy reforms.

**Significance**

Food insecurity and obesity are two public health issues that disproportionately affect low-income Hispanic preschoolers (Coleman-Jensen et al., 2016; Ogden et al., 2016). These children are at risk for additional health disparities as they grow older because of potential long-lasting health and social consequences associated with these issues (Gundersen & Ziliak, 2015; Reilly & Kelly, 2011). Early intervention and targeted policy change may help reduce these disparities.

Despite growing recognition that food insecurity and obesity co-exist (Larson & Story, 2011), many of the interventions and policies address each issue separately. Identification of the factors that mediate food insecurity and obesity will allow for more comprehensive intervention and policy design to achieve better outcomes (Rutten, Yaroch, Patrick, & Story, 2012; Troy et al., 2011).

The conceptual framework guiding this study is presented in Figure 1. The figure also depicts study aims 1 and 2. The solid arrows represent the mediation that will be tested in Aim 1. The dotted arrows represent the mediation that will be tested in Aim 2. Aim 2 is based on the Family Stress Model (FSM). Per the FSM, sources of stress, such
as economic hardship, influence parenting behaviors. The stress/hardship and parenting behavior directly and indirectly affect the child’s well-being (Conger & Donnellan, 2007). A summary of what is known with respect to the associations to be tested is described in this section.

Figure 1. Conceptual Framework with Family Stress Model embedded.

**Food Insecurity and Obesity**

Food insecurity is a concern, or lack, of access to enough food to meet perceived nutritional needs for each member of a household due to restricted financial resources. In the US, one out of every four Hispanic families with children are food insecure (Coleman-Jensen et al., 2016). These children are at greater risk for poor fetal development, iron deficiency anemia, poor school performance, and increased risk of mental health concerns (Gundersen & Ziliak, 2015).

Obesity in children is defined as a body-mass-index greater than the 95th percentile for gender and age (CDC, 2015). It affects 16.7% of Hispanic preschoolers
Obesity increases morbidity through early-onset diabetes, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, and other health issues.

Although evidence of a linear association between food insecurity and obesity is well-established in women, in preschoolers the evidence remains mixed (Larson & Story, 2011). Cross-sectional studies on young Hispanic children have conflicting findings with respect to the correlation between food insecurity and obesity (Hernandez, Reesor, Alonso, Eagleton, & Hughes, 2016; Papas, Trabulsi, Dahl, & Dominick, 2016). Possible explanations for these discrepancies could be due to the cross-sectional design of these studies which limits the tested relationship to a single snapshot.

Longitudinal studies have also had mixed findings. Three longitudinal studies found no association between food insecurity and child obesity (Bhargava, Jolliffe, & Howard, 2008; Rose & Odor, 2006; Winicki, & Jemison, 2003). Four other longitudinal studies; however, did find significant increases in odds of obesity in young children living in food insecure households (Bronte-Tinkle, Sallow, Capps, Horowitz, & McNamara, 2007; Dubois, Farmer, Girard, & Proceri, 2006; Jyoti, Frongillo, & Jones, 2005; Metallinos-Katsaras, Must, & Gorman, 2012). In Bronte-Tinkle’s (2007) study, the positive association between food insecurity and obesity worked indirectly through the mediating effects of parental depression and practices. Her study highlights the need to test for additional potential mediators. Gender may also have a conditional influence on the relationship between food insecurity and obesity as indicated by Jansen (2017) and Jyoti (2005).

Food insecurity and child obesity share a high prevalence, risk factors, and profound consequences in low-income Hispanic preschoolers. Clarification on the co-
existence and possible interdependence of these issues needs to be further examined to help reduce health disparity.

**Food Insecurity and Dietary Quality in Children**

Studies examining the association between food insecurity and dietary intake in children provide evidence that as food security decreases, the dietary quality diminishes as well (Hanson & Connor, 2014; Kaiser et al., 2003; Matheson, Varity, Varady, & Killen, 2002). A recent study examining preschool-aged children of US-based Latino farmworkers, a population vulnerable to food insecurity, found that their dietary quality was below national recommendations (Quandt et al., 2016). Kaiser’s (2002) study on Hispanics also found that children with greater levels of food insecurity were less likely to meet dietary recommendations as suggested by the Food Pyramid. As food security lowered, consumption of low-fat milk decreased and tortillas increased (Kaiser et al., 2002). A study that sampled Hispanic children along the Texas border found that total calories, proteins, and sugars increased as food security decreased and emphasized the need to understand the relationship between food insecurity and dietary intake of children in households with limited resources (Sharkey, Nalty, Johnson, & Dean, 2012).

The studies described above are cross-sectional. A longitudinal assessment of the relationship between food insecurity and dietary quality in low-income Hispanic preschoolers would provide insight on the potential influence exposure to food insecurity has on diets during this critical time of children’s growth and development.

**Parenting Feeding Style and Dietary Intake**

Parents generally have a great deal of control over the types of food they offer their children to eat, especially in young children. Studying parenting behaviors, such as
parental feeding style, increases our understanding of parental influence on children’s diets. Parenting feeding style (PFS) is a concept used to describe the emotional climate in which parents feed their children (Hughes et al., 2005). It is based on the parenting style framework (Darling & Steinberg, 1993).

PFS is measured on two continuous, parent-reported scales: demandingness and responsiveness. Demandingness refers to the amount of control and supervision a parent expresses when feeding his/her child. Responsiveness refers to the amount of warmth with which a parent expresses that demandingness. Cutpoints on the demandingness and responsiveness scales are used to categorize parents into one of four feeding style categories: authoritarian (high demandingness, low responsiveness), authoritative (high demandingness, high responsiveness), indulgent (low demandingness, high responsiveness), and uninvolved style (low demandingness, low responsiveness) (Hughes et al., 2012).

Distinctive styles are associated with different patterns of dietary intake. Authoritative feeding style is associated with greater parental attempt for children to eat dairy, fruit, and vegetables (Patrick & Nicklas, 2005; Patrick, Nicklas, Hughes, & Morales, 2005). Indulgent style is associated with increased intake of foods with low nutrient density (Hennessy, Hughes, Goldberg, Hyatt, & Economos, 2012). Indulgent and uninvolved PFS are also associated with decreased fruit, vegetable, and dairy intake compared to children of parents with an authoritarian PFS (Hoerr et al., 2009). Hispanic parents tend to exhibit an indulgent feeding style (Hughes et al., 2005) which is associated with increased child weight status (Hughes, Power, O’Connor, Orlet Fisher, & Chen, 2016).
Typically, PFS is studied using the four categorical feeding styles previously described. However, changes to levels of demandingness and responsiveness over the course of 18 months—the time between the study’s two timepoints—may not be great enough to reach threshold cutpoints. To capture these subtle shifts in trajectory, PFS will be tested using continuous scale scores for demandingness and responsiveness which is a deviation from how previous studies tested PFS.

**Family Stress Model and Parental Levels of Demandingness and Responsiveness**

Understanding the relationship between food insecurity, PFS, and dietary quality in the context of obesity prevention will allow for a more complete understanding of which factors to target in intervention design. The family stress model (FSM) (Conger & Donnellan, 2007) and previous studies on parenting stress and PFS guide hypothesis testing for the second aim. Please refer to Figure 1 for a depiction of the application of the FSM to this study.

Per FSM, factors such as economic hardship are sources of stress for parents (Conger & Donnellan, 2007). This stress affects parenting behaviors which then affects children’s well-being. Two studies examining parenting stress and PFS found that parents with increased stress levels reflected PFS that were lower in demandingness (Hughes et al., 2016) and responsiveness (Hughes et al., 2016; Hurley et al., 2008).

While there is a gap in studies examining the association between food insecurity and PFS, studies have found that food insecure parents place increased pressure to eat on their children compared to those who are food secure (Conlon et al., 2015; Gross, Mendelsohn, Fierman, Racine, & Messito, 2012). These studies support the idea that food insecurity affects parenting behavior. The proposed study will narrow the gap in
knowledge related to the mediating role of PFS between food insecurity and child’s dietary quality.

**Conditional Factors affecting Relationships between Food Insecurity and Feeding Style, Dietary Quality, and Child Weight Status**

Researchers have controlled for gender and acculturation in numerous studies examining food insecurity, parenting feeding styles, dietary quality, and child weight status. However, fewer studies have tested these variables for moderation despite evidence to suggest that gender and acculturation have some influence on these variables.

A recent study looking at food insecurity and dietary quality found that preschool girls living in household that had an increase in food security also had an improvement in dietary quality (Jansen et al., 2017). However, a similar trend was not observed in boys within the same study. Buscemi (2011) found acculturation to be a significant moderator between food insecurity and child body mass in a study of Latino children in which age and gender were controlled. Other studies have identified that level of acculturation is a predictor of parenting feeding styles (Power, O'Connor, Orlet Fisher, & Hughes, 2015; Tovar et al., 2012).

Although few, these studies suggest the need to further investigate the potential moderating effects of gender and acculturation in the proposed mediation models. Mediation testing of dietary quality between food security status and child body mass and mediation testing of parental feeding style between food security status and dietary quality will increase understanding of the mechanisms at work that influence both outcomes. However, moderation testing will help increase the understanding of in what conditions or for whom these mechanisms work more effectively (Hayes, 2013).
The results of this study will provide information to bridge the gap between food insecurity and subsequent child weight status. If dietary quality is found to mediate the relationship between food security status and child weight status, then it, along with food security, would be targets for interventions focused on healthy child weight status. Similarly, if parental feeding style is found to mediate the relationship between food security status and dietary quality, then it too would need to be factored into interventions. Finally, identification of potential moderators allows for more precise intervention planning and policy reforms.

**Innovation**

To the extent known, this is the first study to examine the effect of food security on dietary quality in low-income Hispanic preschoolers over time. It is also the first study to test dietary quality as a mediator between food security status and child BMI. Additionally, this is the first study to test parenting feeding style as a mediator between food security and dietary quality. Finally, this study will examine PFS through its two domains of demandingness and responsiveness. This approach will allow demandingness and responsiveness to be tested as continuous variables and help identify changes in demandingness and/or responsiveness over time that may be too small to cross predetermined cutpoints (Hughes et al., 2012).

**Approach**

**Research Design and Setting**

The study is a longitudinal design that will use data collected from a previous study (R01 HD062567, PI: Hughes). The primary aim of the parent study was to examine
the bidirectional relationship between parenting behaviors and children’s eating behaviors.

Most of the data that will be used in this study was collected at the USDA/ARS Children’s Nutrition Research Center (CNRC) in Houston, TX. Two of the three 24 dietary-recalls for each timepoint were collected over the phone. Time 1 data collection began in August 2011. The second time wave occurred after 18 months.

**Population, Sample, Sampling Procedures**

At Time 1, data was collected from 187 self-identified Hispanic parent-child dyads. The second time wave occurred 18 months later with 144 parent-child dyads. To minimize attrition, participants were called every 3 months. They also received birthday cards.

The nonprobability sample was recruited through Head Start Centers located in Houston, TX. Rolling recruitment continued until the predetermined sample size was met. Recruitment strategies included distribution of flyers sent home with children and announcements at parent meetings. Research assistants were also present during child drop-off and pick-up times for direct recruitment of parents. Only one child and parent per family were recruited into the study.

For a child to enroll in Texas Head Start, he or she must be a resident of the state. Most children reside in a household that has income at or below the federal poverty level. At the time of the parent study recruitment, an income of \( \leq \$22,350 \) before tax for a family of four was at or below the federal poverty level (Sebelius, 2011).

Sample selection criteria for the parent study included: children being between four and five years of age at time of recruitment. Adults had to be the primary caregiver
of the child when child was not at school. Because children would be eating food
prepared at the research center, children with food allergies were excluded. Children who
were unable to serve themselves or eat without assistance were also excluded.

**Instruments**

Table 1 contains a list of instruments used to operationalize the variables. Details
about the instruments, including psychometrics are also listed in Table 1. All surveys
were available in English and Spanish. The Spanish versions were developed using back-
translation by CNRC staff members who were from Mexico, Central America, and South
America. They all spoke Spanish fluently.

Food security status (FSS) was measured using a paper and pencil version of the
6-item Household Food Security Survey (6-item HFSS). This instrument has robust
evidence of reliability and validity (Blumberg, Bialostosky, Hamilton, & Briefel, 1999;
Harrison, Stormer, Herman, & Winham, 2003). It is also widely used in research
(Marques, Reichenheim, de Moraes, Antunes, & Salles-Costa, 2015).

The USDA provides guidelines on how to score the 6-item HFSS (Economic
Research Service, 2012). The final food security status score is calculated by adding the
number of affirmative responses. Raw scores can range from zero to six. Higher scores
indicate less food security. In this study, FSS will be used as a continuous variable. The
USDA’s guidelines provide a scoring system to convert the raw FSS score to an interval-
level scale score (Economic Research Service, 2012).

The Caregiver’s Feeding Styles Questionnaire (CFSQ) was used to operationalize
demandingness and responsiveness. This instrument was developed from research on
low-income minority populations in the US- namely African Americans and Hispanics
(Hughes et al., 2005). The instrument consists of 19 items with 4-point Likert-scale responses. Demandingness score is determined by an average of the responses for all 19 items (parent-centered and child-centered) and can range from one to five. Higher scores represent greater control by parents with respect to their child’s feeding/eating. Responsiveness scores are calculated as a ratio between the mean of seven child-centered questions (item numbers 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 15, and 17) and the demandingness score. Scores will range between .20 to 2.02 with higher scores representing greater parental warmth.

Dietary quality will be measured using the Healthy Eating Index 2015 (HEI-2015). The HEI-2015 measures how closely individuals meet the Dietary Guidelines for Americans (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and U.S. Department of Agriculture, 2015) and may be used in children ≥ 2 years of age (Guenther et al., 2014). Data from three 24-hour dietary recalls will be used to calculate the HEI-2015 scores at each timepoint. Total scores can range from 0 to 100. Higher scores reflect greater adherence to dietary guidelines.

Child’s weight status will be determined using BMI z-scores. Heights and weights used to calculate the BMI z-score were measured using a standard protocol (Lohman, Roche, & Martorell, 1988). Each child was measured twice for height (cm) and weight (kg). The average height and weight measures were used to generate age and gender specific BMI z-scores (Kuczmarski et al., 2002).

Acculturation, a potential covariate to dietary quality and child weight status, was measured using the Bidimensional Acculturation Scale (Marin & Gamba, 1996). This is a 24-item questionnaire that consists of a Hispanic domain (12 items) and non-Hispanic domain (12 items). All answers are on a 4-point Likert scale. Per the developers’
instructions, the respondents receive scores for each of the two domains. Each score is an average of the 12 responses that correspond with the Hispanic and non-Hispanic domains. The final score for each domain ranges between one and four (Marin & Gamba, 1996).

Demographics include child’s gender, number of children living in household, number of household members, parental marriage status, employment status, and education level.

Table 1

*Summary of key variables.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Operationalization</th>
<th>Measurement &amp; Scoring Method</th>
<th>Psychometrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household Food Security Status (FSS)</strong> (Independent variable)</td>
<td>6-item Household Food Security Questionnaire Description of survey: 6-item, parent-report survey, dichotomous responses, time to complete= 5 minutes.</td>
<td>Continuous Raw food security score determined by tally of affirmative responses.</td>
<td>Correctly identified level of food security in 95.6% of all households with children; Face &amp; content validity for Spanish version (Blumberg et al., 1999; Harrison et al., 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parenting Feeding Style Domains: Demandingness Responsiveness</strong> (Mediating variable)</td>
<td>Demandingness score and Responsiveness score from the Caregiver’s Feeding Styles Questionnaire Description of survey: 19 items, parent-report survey, 5-point Likert-scale responses, time to complete= 15 minutes</td>
<td>Continuous Demandingness score= mean of all 19 items Responsiveness score= mean of the seven child-centered ÷ the mean of all 19 items</td>
<td>Demandingness scale test-retest r=.85 Responsiveness Scale test-retest: r=.82 Internal consistency Cronbach alpha=.85 Convergent validity with Child Feeding Questionnaire, F (9,518)=3.17, p&lt;0.001; Parenting Dimensions Inventory, F(27,602)=2.26, p&lt;0.001 (Hughes et al., 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Operationalization</td>
<td>Measurement &amp; Scoring Method</td>
<td>Psychometrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24-hour Dietary Recall</strong></td>
<td>2 weekdays, 1 weekend day 24-hour recalls. Collected using 5-step multipass method and Nutritional Data Software Research (Time 1: version 2012, Time 2: version 2014) developed by the Nutrition Coordinating Center, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Based on systematic review, parent-reported three 24-hour multiple pass recalls that include weekdays and weekends and use is the most accurate method for estimating total energy intake in children ages 4 to 11 (Burrows, 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Dietary Quality</strong></td>
<td>Healthy Eating Index 2015 (HEI 2015) (Epidemiology and Genomics Research Program, 2017a): Calculated based on data from three 24-hour dietary recall Description of index: Consists of 13 dietary subcomponent scores that are summed for an overall dietary score.</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Construct validity: HEI-2010 scores were at or near the maximum levels for the exemplary menus. PCA consistent with 12 dietary components. Internal Consistency: Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.68$ (Epidemiology and Genomics Research Program, 2017b; Guenther et al., 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Operationalization</td>
<td>Measurement &amp; Scoring Method</td>
<td>Psychometrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Body Mass</strong></td>
<td>Body Mass Index z score (BMI z-score) calculated per CDC reference standards: age &amp; gender specific BMI (Kuczmarski et al., 2002)</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Construct validity for children ages 2-5: BMI-for-age=78.3% sensitivity and 88.3% specificity in ability to overweight at 85th percentile (Mei et al., 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dependent variable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Parental Acculturation** | Bidimensional Acculturation Scale (Marin & Gamba, 1996)                          | Continuous                    | Internal consistency: Cronbach’s α=.9 (Hispanic domain), .96 (non-Hispanic domain)  
Validation correlations with generation, age at arrival, residence in US, education, self-identification: .46 to .86 (non-Hispanic domain), -.28 to -.66 (Hispanic domain) (Marin & Gamba, 1996b) |
| (Covariate)            | Description of survey: 24 items, parent-report survey, 4-point Likert-scale responses, time to complete= 15 minutes |                               |                                                                                                                                             |
|                        | Bidimensional Acculturation Scale (Marin & Gamba, 1996)                          | Continuous                    |                                                                                                                                             |
|                        | Description of survey: 24 items, parent-report survey, 4-point Likert-scale responses, time to complete= 15 minutes |                               |                                                                                                                                             |

**Data Collection Procedures**

Data collection at Time 1 and Time 2 followed the same protocols. All data except for two of the three food recalls were completed at the CNRC lab. Trained CNRC staff members who were fluent in Spanish and English obtained data from participants in the language of the participant’s choice. All surveys, including the 6-item HFSS and CFSQ, were given to participants for completion in random order. Participants were compensated $65 at Time 1 and $140 at Time 2.
At each time wave, data were collected over the course of two separate visits to the CNRC. Each visit lasted approximately two hours. Parents completed surveys over the course of these two visits. Transportation or free parking was available for research participants.

Trained staff members of the CNRC measured parents and children’s heights and weights using a stadiometer and electronic self-calibrating digital scale. Children removed their shoes and wore light clothing. Height was recorded to the nearest 0.1cm and weight to 0.1kg. Height and weight measurements were obtained twice and averaged for each participant at each time point.

24-hour dietary recalls will be used to calculate the Healthy Eating Index-2015. Three dietary recalls (two weekdays, one weekend) will be used in the calculation. Recalls were collected by trained research assistants using the 5-step multipass method and Nutrition Data System for Research Software. The method consists of five steps: 1) a quick, uninterrupted list of foods and beverages consumed, 2) query of foods that are often frequently forgotten, 3) time and occasion of food consumption, 4) use of the Food Model Booklet and measuring guides to elicit descriptions of foods and amounts eaten, and 5) a final probe review (Conway, Ingwersen, Vinyard, & Moshfegh, 2003). The first recall was completed at the CNRC in person. The remaining two recalls for each data point were completed by phone. The parent participating in the study provided dietary recall information for their preschoolers as well as themselves.
Data Analysis

The sample size for this study is based on the parent study. At baseline, the sample size was 187 parent-child dyads. At 18-months post-baseline the sample size dropped to 144 parent-child dyads.

IBM SPSS Statistics version 24 will be used to conduct statistical analysis. Bootstrap confidence intervals of the indirect effect that cross through zero will indicate that the indirect effect is not statistically different from zero and, therefore, not significant. Statistical significance for tests that generate a p-value is set at ≥ .05.

The HEI-2015 scores for parent and child will be calculated using three 24-dietary recalls that were collected in the parent study using Nutrition Data Systems for Research (NDSR) software versions 2012 (Time 1) and 2014 (Time 2). Each participant’s food group or nutrient intake will be averaged across the three recalls which is the same method used by Guenther (2014). These averages will be then used to calculate the variables needed to obtain the 13 HEI-2015 component scores. The variables will be calculated per guidelines developed by the Nutrition Coordination Center at the University of Minnesota (2017). Finally, each of the 13 HEI components will be assigned a proportional score based on scoring standards provided by the Epidemiology and Genomics Research Program (Epidemiology and Genomics Research Program, 2017). These 13 component scores will then be summed for each participant’s overall HEI-2015 score.

Descriptive statistics will examine the distributions and variability across the time waves for food security status, child body-mass-index z-scores, child HEI-2015 scores, and parental levels of demandingness and responsiveness. Pearson correlations will
determine if food security status is correlated with child BMI z-scores, child HEI-2015, demandingness, and responsiveness between time waves.

T-tests will determine if there are statically significant differences in participants who remained in the study compared with those lost to attrition. Comparisons will be made using baseline data for: food security status, child HEI-2015, levels of parental demandingness and responsiveness, and child body-mass-index.

Mediation analysis for Aim 1 and 2 will be tested using PROCESS (Hayes, 2013), a path analysis tool that works through SPSS. The half-longitudinal study design will allow testing of an autoregressive model of mediation (Cole & Maxwell, 2003). Total, direct, and indirect effects will be calculated along with bootstrap method for significance of indirect effect. Bootstrapping is a nonparametric test that does not require normal distributions for the product of ab and has more power compared to Sobel test (Preacher & Hayes, 2004). Aim 3 will be tested using PROCESS model 59 (Hayes, 2013).

**Mediation testing for Aim1**

*Hypothesis 1*: Poor dietary quality will mediate the relationship between low FSS at Time 1 and elevated BMI at Time 2 in low-income Hispanic preschoolers. Figure 2 is a visual depiction of the mediation model to test Hypothesis 1.

To meet the assumption that the independent and mediation variables do not interact, an interaction term (FSS₁xHEI₁) will be tested for significance. If this interaction term is significant, the possibility of moderation will need to be considered. Otherwise, using model 4 in PROCESS (Hayes, 2013), x, y, and m will be assigned variables FSS at Time 1, child BMI z-score at Time 2, and child HEI-2015 at Time 1. Because the 6-item HFSS measures food security status over the previous 12 months, it already reflects a
previous time at baseline. Therefore, child HEI at Time 1 will be used as the mediating variable.

Despite the likely high correlation between the BMI z-scores at Time 1 and Time 2, in longitudinal mediation, data from later time points need to be examined while controlling for earlier time points (A. Hayes, personal communication, August 19, 2017). Additional potential covariates will include non-Hispanic acculturation, child gender, number of household member, number of children living in household, parent’s marital, employment, and educational status at Time 1. Each confounder will be tested to see if it is a significant predictor of FSS at Time 1, child HEI at Time 1, and child BMI z-score at Time 2. If the variable is significant for any of these three variables, it will be kept as a confounder in the model.

The product of coefficients for Path a and Path b, as indicated in Figure 2, represents the indirect effect. Using the bootstrap method, a confidence interval will be generated for the indirect effect. If this interval does not contain zero, then the indirect effect will be considered significant and indicate a mediation effect.
**Figure 2. Visual depiction of Hypothesis 1**

**Mediation testing for Aim 2**

**Hypothesis 2a:** Low levels of parental feeding demandingness will mediate the relationship between low FSS at Time 1 and poor dietary quality at Time 2 in low-income Hispanic preschoolers. Figure 3 is a visual depiction of Hypothesis 2a.

Longitudinal mediation will be tested using the same method as in Aim 1. An interaction term for $FSS_{1} \times \text{Demandingness}_{1}$ will be tested for significance. If this test is significant, the possibility of moderation will need to be addressed. Otherwise, model 4 in PROCESS will be used to test for mediation. Variables $x$, $y$, and $m$ will be assigned FSS at Time 1, Child HEI (the measure for dietary quality) at Time 2, and Feeding demandingness at Time 1, respectively.

Child HEI at Time 1 will be treated as a covariate to account for previous effects. Additional potential confounders include non-Hispanic acculturation, child gender, number of household members, number of children in household, parent’s education,
status, employment status, and marital status at Time 1. Each confounder will be tested to see if it is a significant predictor of FSS at Time 1, parental feeding demandingness at Time 1, and child HEI at Time 2. If the variable is significant for any of these variables, it will be kept as a confounder in the model.

PROCESS will run regression models to produce coefficients for Path a and b. The product of these coefficients is the indirect effect. Confidence intervals resulting from bootstrapping will be used to determine if the indirect effect is significantly different from zero and therefore supporting the hypothesis.

Figure 3. Visual depiction of Hypothesis 2a

Hypothesis 2b: Low levels of parental feeding responsiveness will mediate the relationship between low FSS at Time 1 and poor dietary quality at Time 2 in low-income Hispanic preschoolers. Figure 4 is a visual depiction of Hypothesis 2b. Because parental feeding responsiveness and demandingness are not independent of each other, they must be tested for mediation separately. The same steps performed to test Hypothesis 2a will
be used to test Hypothesis 2b. However, the mediating variable will be parental feeding responsiveness.

**Figure 4. Visual depiction of Hypothesis 2b**

**Conditional process analysis of Aim 3**

Aim 3: To explore if factors such as gender and/or acculturation moderate the direct and indirect effects of the mediations being tested in Aim 1 and 2. Figure 5 is a visual depiction of gender moderating the direct and indirect effects being tested in Aim 1. Figure 6 is a visual depiction of gender moderating the direct and indirect effects being tested in Aim 2.

PROCESS model 59 (Hayes, 2013) will be used to test moderation in mediation models. If the interaction terms are significant, this will indicate that gender (or acculturation) moderates the specific relationship (indirect path A, indirect path B, or the direct path).
Study Limitations

This study has several limitations needing acknowledgement. The nonprobability sample recruited from Head Start may limit the generalizability of findings. Low-income
families who choose not to enroll their children in Head Start programs are unrepresented in this study sample. Although about one out of every three children enrolled in Head Start are Hispanic (Child Trends Databank, 2015), a clear statistic on the number of low-income Hispanic children who are not enrolled in Head Start could not be found. Participation in Head Start could also help families access other public health services such as WIC or SNAP, which could affect their food security status and dietary quality. In addition, the parents’ responses on the 6-item HFSS and CFSQ are subject to self-report bias. The 24-hour dietary recall for preschoolers is also dependent on the parent’s awareness of food/beverage consumption and accurate reporting of items. Parents misreport energy intake of their children (Murakami & Livingstone, 2016). Finally, although the study retained 70% of the original sample, those participants who dropped out of the study may have some common characteristics that could have influence on results of the study. Analysis to determine if the participants lost to attrition vary from those who stayed may help to quantify the size of this limitation.

**Human Subjects**

Approval from the Committee of the Protection of Human Subjects at University of Texas Health Science Center has been obtained. This study uses data collected from a parent study (R01 HD06257, PI: Hughes). The parent study has IRB approval from Baylor College of Medicine.

Data needed for this study will consist of responses to the 6-item Household Food Security Questionnaire, Caregiver’s Feeding Styles Questionnaire, Bidimensional Acculturation Scale, 24-hour dietary recalls, and height and weight measurements for the
sample of children and parents. All data has been deidentified for subject protection. This deidentification will also secure participant confidentiality.

This study does not offer any direct benefit to the study participants. However, the findings will contribute to the body of knowledge and help improve interventions that address food insecurity, dietary quality, and obesity prevention in low-income Hispanic preschoolers. Because the data has already been collected, the participants face no additional potential risks from this study.
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**Background:** Low-income Hispanic preschoolers face disproportionately high prevalence of food insecurity (FI) and obesity. Consumption of low-cost, energy-dense foods to compensate for FI leads to excess body-mass. FI parents may adopt feeding styles that contribute to decline in children’s dietary quality. Feeding style describes the amount of demandingness (i.e., control of children’s eating) and responsiveness (i.e., warmth used to express demandingness). FI may indirectly contribute to obesity through dietary quality and feeding style.

**Purpose:** This study investigated: 1. if dietary quality mediated the relationship between food security status (FSS) at Time 1 (T1) and child body-mass at Time 2 (T2), 2. if feeding demandingness (PFD) and/or responsiveness (PFR) mediated the relationship between FSS at T1 and child dietary quality at T2, 3. explored if gender and/or parental acculturation moderated the mediation.

**Method:** The current study was a secondary analysis of an observational study (R01 HD06257, PI: Hughes). Hispanic parent-preschooler dyads (n=137) provided data through the 6-item Household Food Security Survey, Healthy Eating Index-2015 (HEI), Caregiver’s Feeding Style Questionnaire, Bidimensional Acculturation Scale, and body-mass-index z-score (BMIz) at two timepoints 18 months apart. Mediation and moderated mediation analyses were conducted using regression models while controlling covariates. Bias-corrected bootstrap confidence intervals estimated indirect effects.

**Outcomes:** FSS$_{T1}$ did not indirectly influence child BMIz$_{T2}$ through HEI$_{T1}$ ($ab$ = -0.00, bootstrap CI [-0.00, 0.00]). FSS$_{T1}$ also did not indirectly influence HEI$_{T2}$ through PFD$_{T1}$ ($ab$ = -0.01, bootstrap CI [-0.15, 0.03]) or PFR$_{T1}$ ($ab$ = 0.01, bootstrap CI [-0.04, 0.15]).
However, as FSS$_{T1}$ worsened, HEI-2015$_{T2}$ improved ($c = 1.06$, 95% CI [0.43, 1.69]). As a co-variate, higher baseline English acculturation$_{T1}$ predicted lower HEI-2015$_{T2}$ ($\beta = -3.44$, 95% CI [-5.62, -1.26]) and higher BMI$_{T2}$ ($\beta = 0.13$, 95% CI [0.05, 0.21]); however, it did not have significant conditional effects in moderated mediation models. Gender ($p_{FSSxGender} = .04$) moderated the direct effect of FSS$_{T1}$ on BMI$_{T2}$; however, effect size ($\beta = 0.05$, 95% CI [0.002, 0.09]) was too small to be clinically relevant.

**Conclusion:** FI did not affect body-mass through dietary quality, nor did it affect dietary quality through PFD or PFR. However, an unexpected positive direct relationship between FI and subsequent dietary quality warrants further exploration.

**Keywords:** Food security, Child obesity, Parenting, Diet
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Background

Food insecurity and obesity are two public health issues that disproportionately affect low-income Hispanic preschoolers (Coleman-Jensen et al., 2016; Ogden et al., 2016). These children are at risk for additional health disparities as they grow older because of potential long-lasting health and social consequences associated with these issues (Gundersen & Ziliak, 2015; Reilly & Kelly, 2011). Early intervention and targeted policy change may help reduce these disparities.

Despite growing recognition that food insecurity and obesity co-exist (Larson & Story, 2011), many of the interventions and policies address each issue separately. Identification of factors that mediate food insecurity and obesity will allow for more comprehensive intervention and policy design to achieve better outcomes (Rutten, Yaroch, Patrick, & Story, 2012; Troy et al., 2011).

The conceptual framework guiding this study is presented in Figure 1. The figure also depicts study aims 1 and 2. The solid arrows represent the mediation that will be tested in Aim 1. The dotted arrows represent the mediation that will be tested in Aim 2. Aim 2 is based on the Family Stress Model (FSM). Per the FSM, sources of stress, such as economic hardship, influence parenting behaviors. The stress/hardship and parenting behavior directly and indirectly affect the child’s well-being (Conger & Donnellan, 2007). A summary of known information with respect to the associations to be tested is described in this section.
Food Insecurity and Obesity

Food insecurity is a concern, or lack, of access to enough food to meet perceived nutritional needs for each member of a household due to restricted financial resources. In the US, one out of every four Hispanic families with children are food insecure (Coleman-Jensen et al., 2016). These children are at greater risk for poor fetal development, iron deficiency anemia, poor school performance, and increased risk of mental health concerns (Gundersen & Ziliak, 2015).

Obesity in children is defined as a body-mass-index greater than the 95th percentile for gender and age (CDC, 2015). It affects 16.7% of Hispanic preschoolers (Ogden et al., 2014; Skinner, Perrin, & Skelton, 2016). Obesity increases morbidity through early-onset diabetes, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, and other health issues (Pulgaron & Delamater, 2014).

Although evidence of a linear association between food insecurity and obesity is well-established in women, in preschoolers the evidence remains mixed (Larson & Story, 2011). Cross-sectional studies on young Hispanic children have conflicting findings with respect to the correlation between food insecurity and obesity (Hernandez, Reesor, Alonso, Eagleton, & Hughes, 2016; Papas, Trabulsi, Dahl, & Dominick, 2016). Possible explanations for these discrepancies could be due to the cross-sectional design of these studies which limits the tested relationship to a single snapshot.

Longitudinal studies have also had mixed findings. Three longitudinal studies found no association between food insecurity and child obesity (Bhargava, Jolliffe, & Howard, 2008; Rose & Odor, 2006; Winicki, & Jemison, 2003). Four other longitudinal studies; however, did find significant increases in odds of obesity in young children
living in food insecure households (Bronte-Tinkew, Sallow, Capps, Horowitz, & McNamara, 2007; Dubois, Farmer, Girard, & Proceri, 2006; Jyoti, Frongillo, & Jones, 2005; Metallinos-Katsaras, Must, & Gorman, 2012). In Bronte-Tinkew’s (2007) study, the positive association between food insecurity and obesity worked indirectly through the mediating effects of parental depression and feeding practices. Her study highlights the need to test for additional potential mediators. Gender may also have a conditional influence on the relationship between food insecurity and obesity as indicated in studies by Jansen (2017) and Jyoti (2005).

Food insecurity and child obesity share increased prevalence, risk factors, and profound consequences in low-income Hispanic preschoolers. Clarification on the co-existence and possible interdependence of these issues needs to be further examined to help reduce health disparity.

**Food Insecurity and Dietary Quality in Children**

Studies examining the association between food insecurity and dietary intake in children provide evidence that as food security decreases, the dietary quality diminishes as well (Hanson & Connor, 2014; Kaiser et al., 2003; Matheson, Varity, Varady, & Killen, 2002). A recent study examining preschool-aged children of US-based Latino farmworkers, a population vulnerable to food insecurity, found that their dietary quality was below national recommendations (Quandt et al., 2016). Kaiser’s (2002) study on Hispanics also found that children with greater levels of food insecurity were less likely to meet dietary recommendations as suggested by the Food Pyramid. As food security lowered, consumption of low-fat milk decreased and tortillas increased (Kaiser et al., 2002). A study that sampled Hispanic children along the Texas border found that total
calories, proteins, and sugars increased as food security decreased and emphasized the need to understand the relationship between food insecurity and dietary intake of children in households with limited resources (Sharkey, Nalty, Johnson, & Dean, 2012).

The studies described above are cross-sectional. A longitudinal assessment of the relationship between food insecurity and dietary quality in low-income Hispanic preschoolers would provide insight on the potential influence exposure to food insecurity has on diets during this critical time of children’s growth and development.

**Parenting Feeding Style and Dietary Intake**

Parents generally have a great deal of control over the types of food they offer their children to eat, especially in young children. Studying parenting behaviors, such as parental feeding style, increases our understanding of parental influence on children’s diets. Parenting feeding style (PFS) is a concept used to describe the emotional climate in which parents feed their children (Hughes et al., 2005). It is based on the parenting style framework (Darling & Steinberg, 1993).

PFS is measured on two continuous, parent-reported scales: demandingness and responsiveness. Demandingness refers to the amount of control and supervision a parent expresses when feeding his/her child. Responsiveness refers to the amount of warmth with which a parent expresses that demandingness. Cutpoints on the demandingness and responsiveness scales are used to categorize parents into one of four feeding style categories: authoritarian (high demandingness, low responsiveness), authoritative (high demandingness, high responsiveness), indulgent (low demandingness, high responsiveness), and uninvolved style (low demandingness, low responsiveness) (Hughes et al., 2012).
Distinctive styles are associated with different patterns of dietary intake. Authoritative feeding style is associated with greater parental attempt for children to eat dairy, fruit, and vegetables (Patrick & Nicklas, 2005; Patrick, Nicklas, Hughes, & Morales, 2005). Indulgent style is associated with increased intake of foods with low nutrient density (Hennessy, Hughes, Goldberg, Hyatt, & Economos, 2012). Children of parents with indulgent and uninvolved PFS are also associated with decreased fruit, vegetable, and dairy intake compared to children of parents with an authoritarian PFS (Hoerr et al., 2009). Hispanic parents tend to exhibit an indulgent feeding style (Hughes et al., 2005) which is associated with increased child weight status (Hughes, Power, O’Connor, Orlet Fisher, & Chen, 2016).

Typically, PFS is studied using the four categorical feeding styles previously described. However, changes to levels of demandingness and responsiveness over the course of 18 months - the time between the study’s two timepoints - may not be great enough to reach threshold cutpoints. To capture these subtle shifts in trajectory, PFS will be tested using continuous scale scores for demandingness and responsiveness which is a deviation from previous studies in which PFS is a categorical variable.

**Family Stress Model and Parental Levels of Demandingness and Responsiveness**

Understanding the relationship between food insecurity, PFS, and dietary quality in the context of obesity prevention will allow for a more complete understanding of which factors to target in intervention design. The family stress model (FSM) (Conger & Donnellan, 2007) and previous studies on parenting stress and PFS guide hypothesis testing for the second aim. Please refer to Figure 1 for a depiction of the application of the FSM to this study.
Per FSM, factors such as economic hardship are sources of stress for parents (Conger & Donnellan, 2007). This stress affects parenting behaviors which then affects children’s well-being. Two studies examining parenting stress and PFS found that parents with increased stress levels reflected PFS that were lower in demandingness (Hughes et al., 2016) and responsiveness (Hughes et al., 2016; Hurley et al., 2008).

While there is a gap in studies examining the association between food insecurity and PFS, studies have found that food insecure parents place increased pressure to eat on their children compared to those who are food secure (Conlon et al., 2015; Gross, Mendelsohn, Fierman, Racine, & Messito, 2012). These studies support the idea that food insecurity affects parenting behavior. The proposed study will narrow the gap in knowledge related to the mediating role of PFS between food insecurity and child’s dietary quality.

**Conditional Factors Affecting Relationships between Food Insecurity and Feeding Style, Dietary Quality, and Child Weight Status**

Researchers have controlled for gender and acculturation in numerous studies examining food insecurity, parenting feeding styles, dietary quality, and child weight status. However, fewer studies have tested these variables for moderation despite evidence to suggest that gender and acculturation have some influence on these variables.

A recent study looking at food insecurity and dietary quality found that preschool girls living in households that had an increase in food security also had an improvement in dietary quality (Jansen et al., 2017). However, a similar trend was not observed in boys within the same study. Buscemi (2011) found acculturation to be a significant moderator between food insecurity and child body mass in a study of Latino children in which age
and gender were controlled. Other studies have identified that level of acculturation is a predictor of parenting feeding styles (Power, O'Connor, Orlet Fisher, & Hughes, 2015; Tovar et al., 2012).

Although few, these studies suggest the need to further investigate the potential moderating effects of gender and acculturation in the proposed mediation models. Mediation testing of dietary quality between food security status and child body mass and mediation testing of parental feeding style between food security status and dietary quality will increase understanding of the mechanisms that influence both outcomes. However, moderation testing will help increase the understanding of in what conditions or for whom these mechanisms work more effectively (Hayes, 2013).

This study aims to: 1. investigate if dietary quality mediates the relationship between food security status (FSS) at Time 1 and child body-mass-index (BMI) at Time 2, 2. investigate if parental levels of feeding demandingness and/or responsiveness mediate the relationship between FSS at Time 1 and dietary quality at Time 2, 3. explore factors that that moderate the mediation being tested in Aim 1 and 2. I hypothesize that poor dietary quality will mediate the relationship between low FSS at Time 1 and elevated BMI at Time 2 in low-income Hispanic preschoolers. Low levels of feeding demandingness and/or responsiveness will mediate the relationship between low FSS at Time 1 and poor dietary quality at Time 2 in low-income Hispanic preschoolers. Gender and/or acculturation to US lifestyles will moderate the direct and indirect effects in the mediation models tested in Aim 1 and 2.
Innovation

To the extent known, this is the first study to test dietary quality as a mediator between food security status and child BMI. Additionally, this is the first study to test parenting feeding style as a mediator between food security and dietary quality. It is also the first study to test if gender and acculturation moderate the relationships in a mediation model. Finally, this study examines PFS through its two domains of demandingness (PFD) and responsiveness (PFR). This approach will allow demandingness and responsiveness to be tested as continuous variables and help identify changes in demandingness and/or responsiveness over time that may be too small to cross pre-determined cutpoints (Hughes et al., 2012).

Method

Research Design and Setting

The study is a longitudinal, observational design that will use data collected from a previous study (R01 HD062567, PI: Hughes). The parent study examined the bidirectional relationship between Hispanic mothers’ parenting behaviors and Hispanic preschoolers’ eating behaviors. Findings from the parent study include: 1. indulgent feeding styles (low demandingness, high responsiveness) predicts subsequent increase in child body mass (Hughes, Power, O’Connor, Orlet Fisher, & Chen, 2016), 2. Increased acculturation to US lifestyles is associated with indulgent feeding style (Power, O’Connor, Orlet Fisher, & Hughes, 2015).

Data in the parent study was collected at three timepoints. Data collection at baseline and 18 months post-baseline used the same protocol and measured the same variables. However, data collected at the third timepoint, approximately three years post-
baseline, was limited to a few select variables. The current study is using data from the first two timepoints only. Data was collected at the USDA/ARS Children’s Nutrition Research Center (CNRC) in Houston, TX. Two of the three 24 dietary-recalls for each timepoint were collected over the phone. Time 1 data collection began in August 2011. Data collection at the second timepoint occurred after 18 months.

**Population, Sample, Sampling Procedures**

At Time 1, researchers collected data from 187 self-identified Hispanic parent-child dyads. At Time 2, 144 parent-child dyads returned for data collection. To minimize attrition, participants were called every 3 months. They also received birthday cards.

The nonprobability sample was recruited through Head Start Centers located in Houston, TX. Rolling recruitment continued until the predetermined sample size was met. Recruitment strategies included distribution of flyers sent home with children and announcements at parent meetings. Research assistants were also present during child drop-off and pick-up times for direct recruitment of parents. Only one child and parent per family were recruited into the study.

For a child to enroll in Texas Head Start, he or she had to be a resident of the state and reside in a household that had income at or below the federal poverty level. At the time of the parent study recruitment, an income of ≤ $22,350 before tax for a family of four was at or below the federal poverty level (Sebelius, 2011).

Sample selection criteria for the parent study included: children being between four and five years of age at time of recruitment. Adults had to be the primary caregiver of the child when child was not at school. Because children would be eating food
prepared at the research center, children with food allergies were excluded. Children who were unable to serve themselves or eat without assistance were also excluded.

**Human Subjects**

Approval from the Committee of the Protection of Human Subjects at University of Texas Health Science Center was obtained prior to start of this study. The parent study (R01 HD06257, PI: Hughes) had Institutional Review Board approval from Baylor College of Medicine. All data was deidentified for subject protection.

**Instruments**

Table 1 contains a list of instruments used to operationalize the variables. Details about the instruments, including psychometrics are also listed in Table 1. All surveys were available in English and Spanish. The Spanish versions were developed using back-translation by CNRC staff members who were from Mexico, Central America, and South America. They all spoke Spanish fluently.

Food security status (FSS) was measured using a paper and pencil version of the 6-item Household Food Security Survey (6-item HFSS). This instrument has robust evidence of reliability and validity (Blumberg, Bialostosky, Hamilton, & Briefel, 1999; Harrison, Stormer, Herman, & Winham, 2003). It is also widely used in research (Marques, Reichenheim, de Moraes, Antunes, & Salles-Costa, 2015).

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) provides guidelines on how to score the 6-item HFSS (Economic Research Service, 2012). The final food security status score was calculated by adding the number of affirmative responses. Raw scores ranged from zero to six. Higher scores indicate less food security. The USDA’s guidelines provide a scoring system to convert the raw FSS score to an interval-level
scale score (Economic Research Service, 2012). These interval-level scores were used in analysis.

The Caregiver’s Feeding Styles Questionnaire (CFSQ) was used to operationalize demandingness and responsiveness. This instrument was developed from research on low-income minority populations in the US- namely African Americans and Hispanics (Hughes et al., 2005). The instrument consists of 19 items with 4-point Likert-scale responses. Demandingness (PFD) score is determined by an average of the responses for all 19 items (parent-centered and child-centered) and range from one to five. Higher scores represent greater control by parents with respect to their child’s feeding/eating. Responsiveness (PFR) scores are calculated as a ratio between the mean of seven child-centered questions (item numbers 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 15, and 17) and the demandingness score. Scores could range between .20 to 2.02 with higher scores representing greater parental warmth.

Dietary quality was measured using the Healthy Eating Index 2015 (HEI). HEI measures how closely individuals meet the Dietary Guidelines for Americans (USDA, 2015). Total scores ranged from 0 to 100. Higher scores reflect greater adherence to dietary guidelines. The HEI-2010, the predecessor of HEI-2015, is validated for use in children ≥ 2 years of age (Guenther et al., 2014).

HEI scores for parent and child were calculated using three 24-dietary recalls that were collected in the parent study using Nutrition Data Systems for Research (NDSR) software versions 2012 (Time 1) and 2014 (Time 2). Each participant’s food group or nutrient intake was averaged across the three recalls which is the same method used by Guenther (2014). These averages were then used to calculate the variables needed to
obtain the 13 HEI component scores. The variables were calculated per guidelines
developed by the Nutrition Coordination Center at the University of Minnesota (2017).
Finally, each of the 13 HEI components were assigned a proportional score based on
scoring standards provided by the Epidemiology and Genomics Research Program
(Epidemiology and Genomics Research Program, 2017). These 13 component scores
were summed for each participant’s overall HEI-2015 score.

Child’s body mass was determined by using BMI z-scores. Heights and weights
were measured using a standard protocol (Lohman, Roche, & Martorell, 1988). Each
child was measured twice for height (cm) and weight (kg). The average height and weight
measures were used to generate age and gender specific BMI z-scores (Kuczmarski et al.,
2002).

Acculturation, a potential covariate to dietary quality and child weight status, was
measured using the Bidimensional Acculturation Scale (Marin & Gamba, 1996). This is a
24-item questionnaire that consists of a Hispanic domain (12 items) and English domain
(12 items). All answers are on a 4-point Likert scale. Per the developers’ instructions, the
respondents received a score for each domain by averaging the 12 responses that
corresponded with the Hispanic and non-Hispanic domains. The final score for each
domain could range between one and four (Marin & Gamba, 1996).

Demographics included child’s gender, number of children living in household,
number of household members, maternal marriage status, employment status, and
education level.
Data Collection Procedures

Data collection at Time 1 and Time 2 followed the same protocols. All data except for two of the three food recalls were completed at the CNRC lab. Trained CNRC staff members who were fluent in Spanish and English obtained data from participants in the language of the participant’s choice. All surveys, including the 6-item HFSS and CFSQ, were given to participants for completion in random order. Participants were compensated $65 at Time 1 and $140 at Time 2.

At each time wave, data were collected over the course of two separate visits to the CNRC. Each visit lasted approximately two hours. Parents completed surveys over the course of these two visits. Transportation or free parking was available for research participants.

Trained staff members of the CNRC measured parents and children’s heights and weights using a stadiometer and electronic self-calibrating digital scale. Children removed their shoes and wore light clothing. Height was recorded to the nearest 0.1cm and weight to 0.1kg.

Three 24-hour dietary recalls (two weekdays, one weekend) were collected by trained research assistants using the 5-step multipass method and Nutrition Data System for Research Software. The method consists of five steps: 1) a quick, uninterrupted list of foods and beverages consumed, 2) query of foods that are often frequently forgotten, 3) time and occasion of food consumption, 4) use of the Food Model Booklet and measuring guides to elicit descriptions of foods and amounts eaten, and 5) a final probe review (Conway, Ingwersen, Vinyard, & Moshfegh, 2003). The first recall was completed at the
CNRC in person. The remaining two recalls for each data point were completed by phone. The participating parents provided the dietary recall information.

**Data Analysis**

At baseline, the sample size was 187 parent-child dyads. At Time 2, 137 parent-child dyads had a second measure for household food security status (FSS), child HEI-2015 (HEI), and child BMI z-scores (BMIz). Due to missing data the analytic sample for the mediation models was 127.

Microsoft excel (2016) was used to calculate FSS, HEI, PFD, PFR, and English and Hispanic acculturation scores. The BMI Group Calculator-Metric, a Microsoft excel macro provided by the CDC, was used to calculate BMI percentiles for children (CDC, 2015). BMIz scores were provided by the parent study’s research team. IBM SPSS Statistics version 24 was used to conduct statistical analyses.

Descriptive statistics examined the distributions and variability for FSS, BMIz, HEI, PFD, PFR, and demographics at both time points. T-tests and Chi-square analyses determined if there were statistically significant differences in baseline participants and those who returned for Time 2 data collection. Comparisons were made using baseline data for: FSS, HEI, PFD, PFR, BMIz, and demographics.

Mediation was tested using PROCESS model 4 (Hayes, 2013). PROCESS is a path analysis macro that works through SPSS. PROCESS calculated a 95% confidence interval for the direct effect and 95% bias-corrected bootstrapped confidence interval using 10,000 repetitions for indirect effect for each mediation model. Bootstrapping is a nonparametric test that does not require normal distributions for the product of \( ab \) and has more power compared to Sobel test (Preacher & Hayes, 2004). For Aim 1, \( x, y, \) and \( m \)
were assigned variables $FSS_{T1}$, $BMIz_{T2}$, and $HEI_{T1}$, respectively. For Aim 2, $x$, $y$, and $m$ were assigned $FSS_{T1}$, $HEI_{T2}$, and $PFD_{T1}$ or $PFR_{T1}$, respectively. To more closely analyze the coefficients for the direct effects in Aim 2, multivariate linear regression was tested in which $x = FSS_{T1}$ and $y = HEI_{T2}$. The significant covariates were $HEI_{T1}$ and English acculturation $T1$. (Please note that the variables’ numerical subscripts indicate the data collection time point.)

To test Aim 3 (moderated mediation), a total of six models were tested using PROCESS model 59 (Hayes, 2013). Table 2 lists the key variables tested in each model. PROCESS calculated a 95% confidence interval for conditional direct effects and 95% bias-corrected bootstrap confidence interval using 10,000 iterations for conditional indirect effects using a “pick-a-point” approach to determine under which conditions moderation existed. To more closely analyze the moderation of gender on the direct effect in Aim 3 model 1a, PROCESS model 1 was used. In model 1, $x = FSS_{T1}$, $y = BMIz_{T2}$, $m = $ gender, and significant co-variates ($BMIz_{T1}$ and English acculturation $T1$).

A priori criteria

Significance for t-tests and Chi-square analyses was set at $p \leq .05$. In Aim 1 and 2, mediation was present if the confidence interval for the direct effect and the bootstrap confidence interval for the indirect effect did not cross over zero. In Aim 3, if the interaction term had a p-value $\leq .05$ then moderation for path a, b, and/or c’ was present. The conditional direct effect of X on Y at the values of the moderator was significant if the 95% confidence interval did not contain 0. For a conditional indirect effect of X on Y at the values of the moderator to be significant, the 95% bias-corrected bootstrap confidence interval must not contain zero.
According to Fritz and MacKinnon (2007), a sample size of 126 can detect medium to large effect sizes for indirect paths, with power of .8, when using the bias-corrected bootstrap test of mediation. These effect sizes are clinically relevant.

When constructing models for analysis in Aim 1, 2, and 3, the following baseline variables were considered potential co-variates: child gender, number of household members and children, maternal Hispanic and English acculturation, marital status, maternal employment status, and maternal education level. The initial mediation models contained all potential co-variates. The co-variate with the greatest p-value > .1 in the model predicting the dependent variable was removed. This process of removing co-variates was repeated for Aim 1 and 2 until only those co-variates with a p-value ≤ .1 were retained in the final model. Because the mediation models were using longitudinal data with two timepoints, the previous levels of the dependent variables in each model (i.e., BMIz_{T1} in Aim 1 and HEI_{T1} in Aim 2) were controlled as recommended by Cole and Maxwell (2003). Controlling for previous levels of the dependent variable reduces over- or underestimation of mediation effects (Selig & Preacher, 2009). Because the 6-item HFSS measures FSS over the previous 12 months, it already reflected a previous time at baseline. Therefore, the mediating variables from Time 1 were used as opposed to variables from Time 2.

**Missing Data**

No cases were removed from the dataset. All HEI scores were considered plausible. If a case had missing data, SPSS excluded it from analysis for that specific test.

The only variable for which data was imputed was for the Bi-dimensional Acculturation Scale. Seven participants were missing ≤ 2 responses. The missing
responses were assigned a value of zero, which was not a possible answer choice in the acculturation scale. Even after this imputation, 17 participants had missing acculturation scores. At baseline, six participants have no HEI score and two had no PFD and PFR scores. Only 1 case was missing data for FSS.

**Results**

**Sample Characteristics**

At Time 1, there were 187 mother-child participant dyads. Of these, 137 mother-child dyads returned for Time 2 data collection. Returning participants were defined as having values for $FSS_{T2}$, $BMIz_{T2}$, and $HEI_{T2}$. Girls accounted for 47.8% of children sampled. All children were Hispanic or Latino. Nearly all (99.5%) of mothers identified themselves as Hispanic or Latino. At Time 1 and 2 the average age of the children was 4.8 and 6.3 years, respectively. The median number of household members was five and the median number of children per household was three. At Time 1, 56.5% of participant households had some level of food insecurity (marginal, low, or very low). Table 3 lists additional sample characteristics at baseline. At Time 1 and 2, HEI, BMIz, PFD, and PFR had normal distributions.

**Group comparisons**

There were no significant differences in FSS, HEI, PFD, PFR, BMIz, household size and number of children, maternal marital/employment/education status between the participants who returned for Time 2 data collection and those who did not return. The returning group did have higher Hispanic acculturation ($M = 3.64$, $SD = 0.51$) compared to the group that did not return ($M = 3.44$, $SD = 0.66$) ($t (167) = 2.02$, $p = 0.05$). The
returning group also had lower English acculturation \((M = 2.20, SD = 0.88)\) compared to
the non-returning group \((M = 2.53, SD = 0.96)\) \((t (167) = -2.07, p = .04)\).

Because this is a longitudinal study, change between Time 1 and Time 2 (18
months) was assessed. FSS, HEI, BMI\(_z\) had no significant change over time. However,
PFD had statistically significant decrease (less controlling) from Time 1 \((M = 3.07, SD =
0.59)\) to Time 2 \((M = 2.81, SD = 0.62)\) \((t (135) = 5.67, p = .00)\). PFR had a statistically
significant increase (more warmth) from Time 1 to Time 2 \((M_{difference} = 0.03, SD = 0.16)\)
\((t (135) = -2.34, p = .02)\). There was also an expected increase in English acculturation
\((M_{difference} = 0.07, SD = 0.32)\) \((t (124) = -2.53, p = .013)\) although Hispanic acculturation
level remained stable \((M_{difference} = .00, SD = .34)\) \((t (123) = .00, p = 1.00)\). Employment
from T1 to T2 increased by 8.7%.

**Findings for Aim 1**

In Aim 1, the hypothesis was that child dietary quality at Time 1 would mediate
the relationship between FSS at Time 1 and child BMI at Time 2. The findings for this
aim did not support the hypothesis. There was no significant association between direct
effect of FSS\(_T1\) on BMI\(_z\)\(_T2\) \((c' = 0.01, 95\% CI [-0.02, 0.03])\). The indirect effect of FSS\(_T1\)
on BMI\(_z\)\(_T2\) through HEI\(_T1\) was statically not different from zero \((ab = -0.00, 95\% bias-
controlled bootstrap CI [-0.00, 0.00])\). Only co-variates BMI\(_z\)\(_T1\) \((\beta = 0.84, 95\% CI [0.78,
0.90])\) and English acculturation\(_T1\) \((\beta = 0.13, 95\% CI [0.05, 0.21])\) were significant
predictors of BMI\(_z\)\(_T2\) in the model. Figure 2 reflects the mediation model with the
unstandardized coefficients for paths \(a, b, c'\), and the significant covariates.
Findings for Aim 2

Aim 2 focused on if the parenting feeding style domains of demandingness (PFD) and/or responsiveness (PFR) mediated the relationship between FSS at Time 1 and HEI at Time 2. The two domains were tested in separate mediation models to maintain the assumption of independence. However, the findings for both mediation models were similar in that the indirect pathway for PFD ($ab = -0.01$, 95% bias-corrected bootstrap CI [-0.15, 0.03]) and PFR ($ab = 0.01$, 95% bias-corrected bootstrap CI [-0.04, 0.15]) were not significantly different from zero. However, the direct path between FSS at Time 1 and HEI at Time 2 was significant in both mediation models. In the PFD mediation model, the direct path ($c'$) had an effect of 1.07 (95% CI [0.44, 1.70]). In the PFR mediation model, the direct path ($c'$) was similar with an effect of 1.05 (95% CI [0.42, 1.68]). Figure 3 reflects the PFD mediation model with the unstandardized coefficients for paths $a$, $b$, $c'$, and the significant covariates. The mediation model with PFR reflects similar direct association between FSS$_T1$ and cHEI$_T2$ and is available on request. A parsimonious model that tested the effect of FSS$_T1$ on HEI$_T2$ while controlling for English acculturation $T1$ and HEI$_{T1}$, resulted in a model in which FSS$_{T1}$ explained 8.3% of the variance for HEI$_{T2}$.

Findings for Aim 3

Aim 3 was to test if gender and/or maternal acculturation to US lifestyles produced any conditional effects on the indirect and direct pathways tested in Aims 1 and 2. Because Aim 1 and 2 had no significant mediation, it was logically expected that there would be no moderation of the mediation. However, to be thorough and complete the analysis as described earlier, the 6 models described in the analysis section were tested.
The results for each test are available on request. All pathways were nonsignificant with the exception of gender moderating the direct path ($c'$) between FSS$_{T1}$ and BMI$_{ZT2}$. The interaction term FSS$_{T1}$*Gender ($\beta=0.05$, 95% CI [0.002, 0.093]) is significant for the direct effect of FSS$_{T1}$ on BMI$_{ZT2}$. Figure 4 is a parsimonious model ($R^2_{change} = 0.0041$, $F (1,124) = 3.98$, $p = .05$) to more closely examine the conditional effect of gender on the direct relationship between FSS$_{T1}$ and BMI$_{ZT2}$ while controlling for English acculturation$_{T1}$ and BMI$_{ZT1}$. Figure 5 is a graphical representation of the conditional effects of gender on the relationship between FSS$_{T1}$ and BMI$_{ZT2}$.

**Sensitivity Analyses & Findings**

Three different type of sensitivity analyses were performed. Because at the time of analysis the validity testing for HEI-2015 had not been released, Aims 1, 2, and 3 model 1a were tested using HEI-2010 scores. Food security status is commonly categorized as high/marginal, low, or very low food security. However, in this study, food security raw scores were converted to interval-level measures. To compare the results between interval-level and categorical-level, Aims 1, 2, and 3 model 1a were tested using categorical food security scores. The original set of co-variates did not include maternal body-mass and dietary quality. Therefore, Aim 1 was retested controlling for maternal body-mass at Time 1. Aim 2 was retested controlling for maternal dietary quality at Time 1. Relationships for all sensitivity analyses were similar to those reported earlier in this manuscript. Detailed results are available on request.

**Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to expand our understanding of how food insecurity affects body mass through dietary quality in low-income Hispanic preschoolers (Aim 1).
Keeping in mind the importance of the parents’ role in children’s diets, the study also sought to understand how food insecurity affects dietary quality through parenting feeding styles (Aim 2). The final aim of the study focused on examining if gender and/or maternal acculturation to US lifestyle moderated the relationships tested in Aims 1 and 2. To my knowledge, this was the first study to test these relationships using longitudinal data in low-income Hispanic preschoolers.

We learned that baseline food insecurity did not affect: 1. subsequent body mass through dietary quality 2. subsequent dietary quality through feeding demandingness or responsiveness in low-income Hispanic preschoolers. Girls who live in food insecure households were at greater risk for increased subsequent body mass; however, the overall effect of food security status on body mass was small. We also learned that, while food insecurity had no cross-sectional relationship with dietary quality, exposure to household food insecurity had a protective effect on subsequent dietary quality.

The purpose of Aim 1 was to investigate if dietary quality mediates the relationship between food security status at Time 1 (FSS\textsubscript{T1}) and body-mass-index at Time 2 (BMI\textsubscript{zT2}) in low-income Hispanic preschoolers. As mentioned in the literature review, studies examining the association between food security status and child body mass have been mixed. Metallinos-Katsaras’ (2012) longitudinal study on a racially/ethnically diverse group of low-income preschoolers found an increase in odds for obesity in children living in persistently food insecure homes. A recent study of Headstart students in Michigan also found that preschool girls in households that went from food secure to food insecure over the course of 12 months had an increase in BMI\textsubscript{z} (Jansen et al., 2017). However, two other cross-sectional studies with largely Hispanic preschool samples
found no association between food insecurity and BMI scores (Kaiser et al., 2002; Trapp et al., 2015). These conflicting findings within the same age- and income-group suggests that cultural differences in relation to food insecurity may be a factor to further investigate.

Possible explanations for the lack of association between food insecurity and BMIz in this sample of low-income Hispanic preschoolers attending Headstart and living in an urban environment such as Houston could be that:

1. Mothers protect children from the effects of food insecurity (Hanson & Connor, 2014; Nalty, Sharkey, & Dean, 2013).

2. Headstart buffers the effects of food insecurity through their nutritional programs.

   Headstart includes a nutrition program to provide young children and families with nutritious foods and nutrition education. Many families participating in Headstart also have access to other programs such as WIC (USDA, 2017).

   Overall, Headstart participants have healthier eating patterns compared to non-Headstart participants (Lee, Zhai, Han, Brooks-Gunn, & Waldfogel, 2013). The present study had an average HEI score of 61 which is above the national average HEI score (~52) for children ages 4 to 11 (Banfield, Liu, Davis, Chang, & Frazier-Wood, 2016) but comparable with the average HEI score (~60) of Headstart students sampled in Michigan (Jansen et al., 2017).

3. Physical activity may mitigate the effects of poor diet on their body mass.

   However, a systematic review concluded that preschoolers lack recommended levels of physical activity (Tucker, 2008).
The purpose of Aim 2 was to investigate if parenting feeding demandingness (PFD_{T1}) and responsiveness (PFR_{T1}) at Time 1 mediate the relationship between food security status (FSS_{T1}) at Time 1 and dietary quality (HEI_{T2}) at Time 2 in low-income Hispanic preschoolers. There was no significant mediation. Because this was the first study to test the relationship between FSS_{T1} and PFD_{T1} and PFR_{T1}, there are no direct comparisons that can be made with other studies. However, previous studies have found associations between food insecurity and parenting control practices such as pressuring a child to eat and monitoring of food intake (Kamdar, 2016). One possible explanation for why parenting practices - which refer to short-term parenting behaviors to address an immediate need - are associated with food security status could be that parenting practices are reactionary behaviors. In contrast, parenting feeding styles reflect a stable parenting behavior that may be influenced by factors such as culture. Indeed, acculturation was a predictor of feeding styles in this sample (Power, O'Connor, Orlet Fisher, & Hughes, 2015).

Interestingly, lower baseline household food security was associated with higher dietary quality 18 months later. Most studies that have examined the relationship between food security and diet have found: 1. low food security was associated with low dietary quality (Jansen et al., 2017; Kaiser et al., 2002; Nackers & Appelhans, 2013) or 2. no association between food security and diet (Bhattacharya, Currie, & Haider, 2004; Knol, Haughton, & Fitzhugh, 2004; Trapp et al., 2015). The presence of a longitudinal association in the absence of a cross-sectional association raises questions as to what occurs during the 18-month time lag that leads to a shift in the relationship from no
association to “protective” association. Potential explanations for the longitudinal association will be discussed in the section for future research.

The purpose of Aim 3 was to explore if factors such as gender and acculturation moderate the direct and indirect effects of the mediations being tested in Aim 1 and 2. Gender and acculturation are commonly treated as covariates in studies examining similar relationships as those tested in Aims 1 and 2. However, fewer studies have tested them for conditional effects. While maternal English acculturation was a predictor for BMIzT2, PFD T1, PFR T1, and HEIT2, it did not moderate the direct or indirect relationships tested in Aims 1 and 2. Previous research has found positive associations between acculturation to US lifestyles and increased body mass in Hispanics (Ayala, 2008). Dave (2012) found that increased household food insecurity and acculturation was associated with decreased fruit and vegetable consumption in Hispanic children ages 5-12. In Buscemi’s (2011) study, acculturation moderated the relationship between food security and child body mass percentile in Latino children; however, the directionality of the moderation is not clear.

There was a positive association between food insecurity and child body mass for girls but not boys. A similar effect was found in two separate studies (Jansen et al., 2017; Speirs, Fiese, & STRONG Kids Research Team, 2016). However, these studies had predominately non-Hispanic samples and larger effect sizes. While the present study found a statistical association, the effect size was very small and suggests that both genders have similar needs in this population.
Limitations

The nonprobability sample recruitment from Head Start limits the generalizability of findings. Low-income families who choose not to enroll their children in Head Start programs are not represented in this sample. Although about one out of every three children enrolled in Head Start are Hispanic (Child Trends Databank, 2015), a clear statistic on the number of low-income Hispanic children who are not enrolled in Head Start could not found. Participation in Head Start could also help families access other public health services such as WIC or SNAP, which could affect their food security status and dietary quality. In the present study, data on participation in a nutrition assistance program was not available to control as a potential co-variate. In addition, the parents’ responses on the 6-item HFSS and CFSQ are subject to self-report bias. The 24-hour dietary recall for preschoolers is also dependent on the parent’s awareness of food/beverage consumption and accurate reporting of items. Although the method used to collect dietary recall data is considered the most accurate method, there is room for misreporting (Burrows, 2010). Mothers accurately reported their preschooler’s intake only about 64% of the time (Baranowski, Sprague, Baranowski, & Harrison, 1991). Finally, it is unclear if the time lag of 18 months is appropriate to test for effects of food security status on child dietary quality and body mass. Other studies examining the same variables have used time lags of 6 months (Metallinos-Katsaras et al., 2012; Rose & Bodor, 2006), 12 months (Jansen et al., 2017), and 24 months (Bhargava, Jolliffe, & Howard, 2008). The children in this study were in Headstart at baseline; however, by Time 2, most of them had graduated out of the program. It is unclear if this transition influenced the findings.
Strengths

A primary strength in the present mediation study is the longitudinal design. Two timepoints enable testing of the mediation effects with more rigor than a cross-sectional design (Cole & Maxwell, 2003; Selig & Preacher, 2009). The longitudinal design allows for control of prior levels of the dependent variable which subsequently reduces possible over-inflation of estimates. The longitudinal design also allows for the effects to unfold over time (Selig & Preacher, 2009). The homogeneity of the sample being recruited from Headstart controls for additional resources that are accessible to Headstart families. Finally, although the study lost ~30% of the original sample, those participants who dropped out were similar to the analytic sample for food security status, child dietary quality, child body-mass, PFD, and PFR, and most demographic characteristics.

Future research

This study has led to additional questions such as why does dietary quality not predict child body mass? Child nutrition is central to many of the interventions to curb child obesity. However, in this study, dietary quality in low-income Hispanic preschoolers was unrelated to subsequent body-mass. Are there other factors that override this logical association in this population? If so, what are they?

Additionally, finding that as food security decreased, the children had improvement to later dietary quality raises curiosity. What impacts does exposure to food insecurity early in childhood have on children and their parents to explain the longitudinal association? Are mothers adopting protective coping strategies to deal with food insecurity that have lasting benefits? If so, what are these protective strategies?
What role does Head Start have in the improved child dietary quality seen in households with low-baseline food security?

Finally, the lack of association between food insecurity and child body mass and subsequent lack of mediation by dietary quality and PFD/PFR may be related to limitations in the operationalization of food security. As currently measured, food security exclusively focuses on financial limitations for access to food. However, there are other resources that could hinder access to food beyond finances for low-income families. These include time, transportation, cooking skills and equipment, and nutritional literacy. Access to foods that are culturally familiar may also be a limitation to food security. We need a measure of food security that reaches beyond financial security.

Conclusion

This is the first study to test variables known to be predictive of either dietary quality and/or child body mass in longitudinal moderated mediation models. The lack of significant relationships indicates that these relationships are more complex than a series of linear connections. Studies with a mixed methods approach could advance our understanding for why relationships do (and do not) exist.

This study also identified factors that were protective of child dietary quality. While we should not encourage low financial food security or inhibit acculturation to US lifestyles, we should investigate why these factors were protective of child dietary quality. This information will help us in finding innovative paths to reducing the prevalence of child obesity in a young, vulnerable, and rapidly-expanding population.
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Figure 1. Conceptual Framework with Family Stress Model Embedded.
Table 1

*Operationalization of Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Operationalization</th>
<th>Measurement &amp; Scoring Method</th>
<th>Psychometrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household Food Security Status (FSS)</strong></td>
<td>6-item Household Food Security Questionnaire</td>
<td>Continuous Raw food security score determined by tally of affirmative responses.</td>
<td>Correctly identified level of food security in 95.6% of all households with children; Face &amp; content validity for Spanish version (Blumberg et al., 1999; Harrison et al., 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parenting Feeding Style Domains:</strong> <strong>Demandingness</strong> <strong>Responsiveness</strong></td>
<td>Demandingness score and Responsiveness score from the Caregiver’s Feeding Styles Questionnaire</td>
<td>Continuous Demandingness score= mean of all 19 items Responsiveness score= mean of the seven child-centered ÷ the mean of all 19 items (Hoerr et al., 2009; Hughes et al., 2005)</td>
<td>Demandingness scale test-retest r=.85 Responsiveness Scale test-retest: r=.82 Internal consistency Cronbach alpha=.85 Convergent validity with Child Feeding Questionnaire, F(9,518) =3.17, p&lt;0.001; Parenting Dimensions Inventory, F(27,602) =2.26, p&lt;0.001 (Hughes et al., 2005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1
Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Operationalization</th>
<th>Measurement &amp; Scoring Method</th>
<th>Psychometrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>24-hour Dietary Recall</strong></td>
<td>2 weekdays, 1 weekend day 24-hour recalls. Collected using 5-step multipass method and Nutritional Data Software Research (Time 1: version 2012, Time 2: version 2014) developed by the Nutrition Coordinating Center, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Based on systematic review, parent-reported three 24-hour multiple pass recalls that include weekdays and weekends and use is the most accurate method for estimating total energy intake in children ages 4 to 11 (Burrows, 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Dietary Quality</strong></td>
<td>Healthy Eating Index 2015 (HEI 2015) (Epidemiology and Genomics Research Program, 2017): Calculated based on data from three 24-hour dietary recall Description of index: Consists of 13 dietary subcomponent scores that are summed for an overall dietary score.</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Construct validity: HEI-2010 scores were at or near the maximum levels for the exemplary menus. PCA consistent with 12 dietary components. Internal Consistency: Cronbach’s $\alpha=0.68$ (Epidemiology and Genomics Research Program, 2017; Guenther et al., 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Operationalization</td>
<td>Measurement &amp; Scoring Method</td>
<td>Psychometrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Body Mass</strong></td>
<td>Body Mass Index z-score (BMI z-score) calculated per CDC reference standards: age &amp; gender specific BMI (Kuczmarski et al., 2002)</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Construct validity for children ages 2-5: BMI-for-age= 78.3% sensitivity and 88.3% specificity in ability to overweight at 85th percentile (Mei et al., 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parental Acculturation</strong></td>
<td>Bidimensional Acculturation Scale (Marin &amp; Gamba, 1996) Description of survey: 24 items, parent-report survey, 4-point Likert-scale responses, time to complete= 15 minutes</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Internal consistency: Cronbach’s α=.9 (Hispanic domain), .96 (non-Hispanic domain) Validity correlations with generation, age at arrival, residence in US, education, self-identification: .46 to.86 (non-Hispanic domain), -.28 to -.66 (Hispanic domain) (Marin &amp; Gamba, 1996)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Models tested in Aim 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Mediating Variable</th>
<th>Moderating Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1a</td>
<td>FSS&lt;sub&gt;T1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>BMI&lt;sub&gt;T2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>HEI&lt;sub&gt;T1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1b</td>
<td>FSS&lt;sub&gt;T1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>BMI&lt;sub&gt;T2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>HEI&lt;sub&gt;T1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>English acculturation&lt;sub&gt;T1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2a</td>
<td>FSS&lt;sub&gt;T1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>HEI&lt;sub&gt;T2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>PFD&lt;sub&gt;T1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2b</td>
<td>FSS&lt;sub&gt;T1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>HEI&lt;sub&gt;T2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>PFD&lt;sub&gt;T1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>English acculturation&lt;sub&gt;T1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3a</td>
<td>FSS&lt;sub&gt;T1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>HEI&lt;sub&gt;T2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>PFR&lt;sub&gt;T1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3b</td>
<td>FSS&lt;sub&gt;T1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>HEI&lt;sub&gt;T2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>PFR&lt;sub&gt;T1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>English acculturation&lt;sub&gt;T1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* FSS= Food security status, BMI<sub>z</sub>= Body-mass-index z-score, HEI= Healthy Eating Index, PFD= Parenting feeding demandingness, PFR= Parenting feeding responsiveness, Numerical subscript indicates data collection time point.
### Table 3

*Sample Characteristics at Time 1 (N=187)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>n (%) or mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Security Status</strong></td>
<td>High or marginal food security</td>
<td>104 (55.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low food security</td>
<td>48 (25.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very low food security</td>
<td>34 (18.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Healthy Eating Index-2015</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60.93 (9.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Body Mass Index Categories</strong></td>
<td>Underweight (&lt; 5th Percentile)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normal (&lt;85th Percentile)</td>
<td>98 (52.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overweight (85-94th Percentile)</td>
<td>39 (20.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obese (≥ 85th Percentile)</td>
<td>48 (25.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parenting Feeding Demandingness</strong></td>
<td>- Potential Range 1-5</td>
<td>3.06 (0.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parenting Feeding Responsiveness</strong></td>
<td>- Potential Range (0.20-2.02)</td>
<td>1.23 (0.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maternal Hispanic Acculturation</strong></td>
<td>- Potential Range (1-4)</td>
<td>3.59 (0.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maternal English Acculturation</strong></td>
<td>- Potential Range (1-4)</td>
<td>2.28 (0.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>110 (58.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>27 (14.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced/Separated/Widowed</td>
<td>28 (15.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>20 (10.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Status</strong></td>
<td>Some high school or less</td>
<td>74 (39.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school/GED</td>
<td>46 (24.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical school/ Some college</td>
<td>53 (28.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>13 (7.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not employed</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>143 (76.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *Most common response to “other” marital status was ‘union libre’ which is living together without being legally married.*
Figure 2. Aim 1 mediation model with co-variates. Subscript indicates time wave at which given measure was obtained. Numbers in bold with ** indicates that 95% confidence interval that does not include zero. Paths are labeled with unstandardized OLS coefficients (standard error).
**Figure 3.** Aim 2 Parenting feeding demandingness mediation model with significant covariates. Subscript indicates time wave at which given measure was obtained. Numbers in bold with ‘*’ indicates that 95% confidence interval that does not include zero. Paths are labeled with unstandardized OLS coefficients (standard error).
Figure 4. Conditional effects of gender on mediation model tested in Aim 1. Only unstandardized OLS coefficient for FSS1*Gender interaction term and conditional effects for boys and girls are labeled. Standard error is in parentheses. All other pathways and moderation were nonsignificant.
Figure 5. Interaction of Gender on the Direct Effect of FSS\textsubscript{1} on cBMI\textsubscript{z2}
Appendix A

Human Protection Approval Letters
Dr. Nipa Kamdar  
UT-H - SN - Nursing Systems  

July 25, 2017

HSC-SN-17-0658 - Bridging the Gap between Food Insecurity and Subsequent Child Weight Status: Mediating Effects of Dietary Quality and Feeding Styles

The above named project is determined to qualify for exempt status according to 45 CFR 46.101(b)

CATEGORY #4: Research, involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

CHANGES: Should you choose to make any changes to the protocol that would involve the inclusion of human subjects or identified data from humans, please submit the change via iRIS to the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects for review.

INFORMED CONSENT DETERMINATION:  
Waiver of Consent Granted

INFORMED CONSENT: When Informed consent is required, it must be obtained by the PI or designee(s), using the format and procedures approved by the CPHS. The PI is responsible to instruct the designee in the methods approved by the CPHS for the consent process. The individual obtaining informed consent must also sign the consent document. Please note that only copies of the stamped approved informed consent form can be used when obtaining consent.

HEALTH INSURANCE PORTABILITY and ACCOUNTABILITY ACT (HIPAA):  
Exempt from HIPAA-De-identified data set.

STUDY CLOSURES: Upon completion of your project, submission of a study closure report is required. The study closure report should be submitted once all data has been collected and analyzed.

Should you have any questions, please contact the Office of Research Support Committees at 713-500-7943.
NOTICE OF APPROVAL TO IMPLEMENT REQUESTED CHANGES

September 29, 2017

HSC-SN-17-0658 - Bridging the Gap between Food Insecurity and Subsequent Child Weight Status: Mediating Effects of Dietary Quality and Feeding Styles
PI: Dr. Nipa Kamdar

Reference Number: 158168

PROVISIONS: Unless otherwise noted, this approval relates to the research to be conducted under the above referenced title and/or to any associated materials considered at this meeting, e.g. study documents, informed consent, etc.

APPROVED: By Expedited Review and Approval

CHANGE APPROVED: Addition of Aim 3 - use of gender and acculturation

REVIEW DATE: September 29, 2017

APPROVAL DATE: September 29, 2017

CHAIRPERSON: L. Maximilian Buja, MD

Upon receipt of this letter, and subject to any provisions noted above, you may now implement the changes approved.

CHANGES: The principal investigator (PI) must receive approval from the CPHS before initiating any changes, including those required by the sponsor, which would affect human subjects, e.g. changes in methods or procedures, numbers or kinds of human subjects, or revisions to the informed consent document or procedures. The addition of co-investigators must also receive approval from the CPHS. ALL PROTOCOL REVISIONS MUST BE SUBMITTED TO THE SPONSOR OF THE RESEARCH.

UNANTICIPATED RISK OR HARM, OR ADVERSE DRUG REACTIONS: The PI will immediately inform the CPHS of any unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others, of any serious harm to subjects, and of any adverse drug reactions.

RECORDS: The PI will maintain adequate records, including signed consent documents if required, in a manner that ensures subject confidentiality.
Appendix B

Study Procedures
Procedures for Data Access

Note: To access the share drive, you will need to use a computer connected to Baylor College of Medicine’s intranet.

1. To access Family Interactions Nutrition Study (FINS) data, need permission from Dr. Sheryl Hughes, PI of FINS.

2. Once have permission for use of FINS data, FINS share drive that contains the SPSS file entitled *FINS Combined Dataset T1-3*. This dataset contains raw data for responses to Food Security Status Survey, Caregiver Feeding Style Questionnaire, Demographics, and Bi-Dimensional Acculturation Scale. **All data is deidentified.**

3. Access SPSS file entitled *FINS BMI 3 Timepoints*. This dataset contains the BMI z-scores for child participants.

4. For Time 1 HEI score calculation access Excel spreadsheets entitled: *FINS T1 Food Group Master Value* and *Master Base Nutritional Data by Food*.

5. For Time 2 HEI score calculation access Excel spreadsheets entitled: *FINS Serving Count Totals File* and *FINS Intake Properties Totals File*. 
Procedures for Data Management

Note:
- FINS dataset has over a thousand variables. This study only needs a fraction of those. To simplify scoring of the variables of study interest and data analysis, it is advised to create a smaller file that only has the raw data that is needed for this study.
- Excel software is used to calculate the scores because it is easier to write logic statements that are needed to calculate values. However, the same process may be achievable on SPSS.
- **IMPORTANT:** When importing variables, ensure that it is being matched by Participant ID.

1. Because all data is deidentified, you can create a new folder for the study on your own drive. Save the required data files for this study within this folder. **DO NOT MAKE CHANGES TO ORGINAL FILES IN FINS SHARE DRIVE.**

2. Create *Variables of Interest* Excel file: Using *FINS Combined Dataset T1-3*, create a new Excel spreadsheet that contains raw data of interest:
   - Participant ID,
   - Time 1 (T1) & Time 2 (T2) demographic responses for questions 1, 2, 6, 18, 19, &20,
   - T1 & T2 acculturation responses,
   - T1 & T2 feeding style responses,
   - T1 &T2 food security survey responses

3. Create *T1 HEI* Excel file: This file will consist of 3 sheets.
   - Sheet 1 contains data from *FINS T1 Food Group Master Value.*
   - *Sheet 2 contains data from Master Base Nutritional Data by Food.*
   - Sheet 3 is where your calculations for each step of the process will be saved by Participant ID.

4. Create *T2 HEI* Excel file: This file will consist of 3 sheets.
   - Sheet 1 contains data from *FINS Serving Count Totals File.*
   - Sheet 2 contains data from *FINS Intake Properties Totals File.*
   - Sheet 3 is where your calculations for each step of the process will be saved by Participant ID.

5. As each variable is calculated, import the variable to the *Variables of Interest* excel file. *Be sure that data is being imported by matching Participant IDs. Do not simply copy and paste the variables into a new column.*
Procedures to Calculate Food Security Status

1. Open Variables of Interest. Create a new sheet for calculating Food Security Status at T1 and T2.

2. Use the instructions found in Coding Responses and Assessing Households’ Food Security Status (located in Section E) to calculate food security status at T1 and T2.

3. Score the responses either 0, 1, or 2 per instructions.

4. Tally the scores per participant.

5. Reassign the numerical score for food security with the corresponding interval scale score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of affirmatives</th>
<th>Scale score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   (Table from U.S. Household Food Security Module: Six-Item Short Form Economic Research Service (USDA, 2012). The full document is located in Section E.)

6. Quality checks: select 10 participants with scores ranging between 1 and 6. Hand calculate the food security score and compare with the Excel calculated score.
Procedures to Calculate Parental Feeding Demandingness

1. Open *Variables of Interest*.

2. Demandingness is scored per instructions provided by Hughes (2005). To calculate Demandingness, average the responses for all 19 items on the Caregiver Feeding Style Questionnaire.

3. Quality checks: select 10 participants. Hand calculate and compare with the Excel calculated score.
Procedures to Calculate Parental Feeding Responsiveness

1. Open *Variables of Interest*.

2. Responsiveness is scored per instructions provided by Hughes (2005). To calculate Responsiveness, average the responses for Caregiver Feeding Style questions 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 15, and 17. Then divide this number by the Demandingness score.

3. Quality checks: select 10 participants. Hand calculate and compare with the Excel calculated score.
Procedures to calculate Hispanic and English Acculturation

1. Open Variables of Interest. Create a new sheet for calculating Hispanic and English acculturation at T1 and T2.

2. Because zero is not an option, all missing data was given a value of zero if the participant failed to answer one of the 24 acculturation questions. If more than one question was unanswered, then no score was calculated for the participant.

3. Per Marin & Gamba (1996) (Marin & Gamba, 1996), Hispanic acculturation is calculated by averaging the 12 questions that pertain to the Hispanic domain. In this dataset these questions are 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24.

4. The English acculturation score is calculated by averaging the responses to questions 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18.

Procedures to calculate Health Eating Index (HEI)-2015

1. To calculate HEI at Time 1, use Excel file entitled T1 HEI.

2. To calculate HEI at Time 2, use Excel file entitled T2 HEI.

3. Open the Master Base Nutritional Data sheet in T1 HEI. Review the column for energy. If it has value “#null” value AND the correlating food item column indicates “taco” or “sandwich”, replace “#null” with 0 value. (In the Nutrition Data Systems for Research (NDSR) program, if a person reports eating a food item such as taco or sandwich, the food item is broken into its components. Therefore, taco and sandwich have no nutritional value, but its components do. Time 2 data does not have this issue.)

4. The HEI-2015 scores for parent and child will be calculated using three 24-dietary recalls that were collected in the parent study using NDSR software. Average each participant’s food group or nutrient intake across the three recalls which is the same method used by Guenther (2014).

5. Perform quality check by randomly selected 4 participants. Double check to make sure that the averages are being correctly calculated.

6. These averages will be then used to calculate the variables needed to obtain the 13 HEI-2015 component scores. The variables will be calculated per the Nutrition Data Systems for Research (NDSR) instructions located in Section E.

7. Because the data in Time 1 was collected using NDSR version 2012, the Whole Grains Component and Refined Grains Component will be computed using instructions as provided in the Guide to Creating Variables Needed to Calculate Scores for Each Component of the Healthy Eating Index-2010 (NDSR, 2014). Instructions are located in Section E.

8. Quality check by reviewing each logic statement written to calculate the components for accuracy.

9. Finally, each of the 13 HEI components will be assigned a proportional score based on scoring standards provided on Table 1 of the Guide to Creating Variables Needed to Calculate Scores for Each Component of the Healthy Eating Index-2015 (Nutrition Coordination Center, University of Minnesota, 2017). (See Section E for the guide.)

10. These 13 component scores will then be summed for each participant’s HEI score.
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Appendix C

Instruments
DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY

Please fill in your answers in the space provided.

Today’s date: ____________________________

1. Thinking about the place (house, apartment, or other) where the Head Start child lives, how many people live in this place 50% of the time or more? Include yourself and the child in this number. __________

   a. Who are the people that live with the child? (check all that apply)

      □ 1 Mother
      □ 2 Father
      □ 3 Sibling(s)
      □ 4 Grandparent(s)
      □ 5 Domestic Partner
      □ 6 Other(s), please specify: ________________________________

2. How many children under the age of 18 years currently live with you 50% of the time or more? __________

3. How many children do you now have enrolled in Head Start? __________

4. How many children have you had enrolled in Head Start in the past, not counting those who are currently enrolled? __________
The next questions are about the child who is in Head Start.

5. What is the child’s date of birth? ______ / ______ / ________
   Month     Day       Year

6. What is the child’s sex? □ 1 Male   □ 2 Female

7. Was this child born in the United States?
   □ 1 Yes   **If yes, go on to Question 8**
   □ 2 No

   **If no,** please specify his or her country of birth:
   ______________________

   **If no,** how long has he or she lived in the United States?
   ____ years

   **If no,** has he or she made one or more trips to his or her country of
   birth that lasted 2 months or longer?
   □ 1 Yes
   □ 2 No

8. What is the child’s ethnicity? (“X” one answer)
   □ 1 Hispanic or Latino   □ 2 Not Hispanic or Latino

9. To which race do you consider the child to belong?
   □ 1 American Indian or Alaska Native
   □ 2 Asian
   □ 3 Black or African-American
   □ 4 Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
   □ 5 White
   □ 6 Other (please specify): ______________________
The following questions are about you.

10. What is your date of birth? _____ / _____ / ______
    Month      Day            Year

11. What is your sex?
    □ 1 Male                    □ 2 Female

12. What is your relationship to the child?
    □ 1 Mother
    □ 2 Father
    □ 3 Grandmother
    □ 4 Other (please specify): _______________________

13. What is your current height? □  Feet □  Inches

14. What is your current weight? □  Pounds

15. Were you born in the United States?
    □ 1 Yes
    □ 2 No

    If yes, go on to Question 16

    □ 2 No

    If no, please specify your country of birth: _____
    ________________________

    If no, how long have you lived in the United States?
    _____ years

    If no, have you made one or more trips to your country of birth
    that lasted 2 months or longer
    □ 1 Yes                    □ 2 No
16. What is your ethnicity? (“X” one answer)

☐ 1 Hispanic or Latino  ☐ 2 Not Hispanic or Latino

17. What race do you consider yourself to belong?

☐ 1 American Indian or Alaska Native
☐ 2 Asian
☐ 3 Black or African-American
☐ 4 Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
☐ 5 White
☐ 6 Other (please specify): ______________________

18. Are you now married, divorced, widowed, separated, or have you never been married? (“X” one answer)

☐ 1 Married  ☐ 4 Separated
☐ 2 Divorced  ☐ 5 Never married
☐ 3 Widowed  ☐ 6 Other (please specify):

19. Are you currently employed? (“X” one answer)

☐ 1 Yes  ☐ 2 No

If yes, how many hours per week do you usually work? ____________________

20. What is the highest level of education you have completed? (“X” only one answer)

☐ 1 6th grade or less  ☐ 5 Completed Technical School
☐ 2 8th grade or less  ☐ 6 Some College
☐ 3 Attended some High School  ☐ 7 College Graduate
☐ 4 High School Graduate or GED  ☐ 8 Post Graduate Study
21. Do you currently live 50% of the time or more with a spouse or other partner who is employed? (“X” one answer)

[ ] 1 Yes  [ ] 2 No

If yes, how many hours per week do they usually work? [ ]

22. How many computers do you have in your home? [ ]

23. Do you have internet access in your home? [ ] 1 Yes  [ ] 2 No
Encuesta Demográfica

Por favor escriba su respuesta en el espacio dado.

Fecha de hoy: ____________________________

1. Pensando en el hogar (casa, apartamento, u otro lugar) en donde vive el niño quien asiste en Head Start, ¿Cuántas personas viven en este hogar 50% del tiempo o más? Inclúirse a sí mismo y al niño quien asiste en Head Start en esta cuenta.

a. ¿Quiénes son las personas que viven con el niño? (elija todos lo que corresponden)

1. Madre
2. Padre
3. Hermano(s)
4. Abuelo(s)
5. Pareja
6. Otro(s), por favor especifique: ________________________________

2. ¿Cuántos niños menores de 18 años viven actualmente con Ud. 50% del tiempo o más?

3. ¿Cuántos niños tiene Ud. ahora matriculados en Head Start?

4. ¿Cuántos niños ha tenido Ud. matriculados en Head Start en el pasado, sin incluir a los que están matriculados actualmente?
Las próximas preguntas son acerca del niño quien asiste en Head Start.

5. ¿Cuál es la fecha de nacimiento del niño? 
   _______ / _______ / __________  
   Día  Mes  Año

6. ¿Cuál es el sexo del niño?   
   [ ] 1 Varón   [ ] 2 Hembra

7. ¿Nació el niño en los Estados Unidos?  
   [ ] 1 Sí  -- salteé a la pregunta #8  
   [ ] 2 No

   Si su niño no nació en los Estados Unidos, por favor especifique el país de nacimiento de el/ella:
   __________________________________________

   Si su niño no nació en los Estados Unidos, ¿Cuánto hace que su niño vive en los Estados Unidos? __________ años

   Si su niño no nació en los Estados Unidos, ¿Ha viajado el o ella a su país de origen por un tiempo de 2 meses o más?   
   [ ] 1 Sí   [ ] 2 No

8. ¿A qué grupo étnico pertenece el niño? (Elija solo uno)  
   [ ] 1 Hispano o Latino   [ ] 2 No Hispano o Latino

9. ¿A qué raza considera Ud. que pertenece el niño?  
   [ ] 1 Americano Indio, Nativo(a) de Alaska  
   [ ] 2 Asiático  
   [ ] 3 Negro o Africano Americano  
   [ ] 4 Nativo Hawaiano o Isleño Pacifico  
   [ ] 5 Blanco  
   [ ] 6 Otro (por favor especifique): __________________________
Las próximas preguntas son acerca de Ud.

10. ¿Cuál es su fecha de nacimiento? _____ / _____ / _________  
    Día     Mes     Año

11. ¿Cuál es su sexo?  
    □ 1 Varón  □ 2 Hembra

12. ¿Cuál es su relación a el niño?  
    □ 1 Madre  
    □ 2 Padre  
    □ 3 Abuela  
    □ 4 Otro (por favor especifique): ________________________

13. ¿Cuál es su altura actual? _____ pies _____ pulgadas   o, ________ centímetros

14. ¿Cuál es su peso actual? ________ libras   o, ________ kilogramos

15. ¿Nació Ud. en los Estados Unidos?  
    □ 1 Sí -- salteé a la pregunta #16  
    □ 2 No

   Si contesto no, por favor especifique su país de nacimiento: ____________________________

   Si contesto no, ¿Cuánto tiempo ha vivido en los Estados Unidos? ______

   Si contesto no, ¿Ha viajado a su país de origen por un tiempo de 2 meses o más?  
    □ 1 Sí  □ 2 No
16. ¿A qué grupo étnico pertenece Ud.? (Elija solo uno)

☐ 1 Hispánico o Latino ☐ 2 No Hispánico o Latino

17. ¿A qué raza considera Ud. que pertenece?

☐ 1 Americano Indio, o nativo(a) de Alaska
☐ 2 Asiático
☐ 3 Negro o Africano Americano
☐ 4 Nativo Hawaiano o Isleño Pacifico
☐ 5 Blanco
☐ 6 Otro (por favor especifique): ________________________

18. ¿Está ahora casada, divorciada, viuda, separada, o nunca casada? (Elija solo uno)

☐ 1 Casada ☐ 4 Separada
☐ 2 Divorciada ☐ 5 Nunca casada
☐ 3 Viuda ☐ 6 Otro (por favor especifique):

________________________

19. ¿Está empleada actualmente? (Elija solo uno)

☐ 1 Sí ☐ 2 No

Si contestó sí, ¿cuántas horas por semana trabaja usualmente?

________________________ horas por semana
20. ¿Cuál es el nivel más alto de educación que Ud. ha completado? (Elija solo uno)

1. 6º grado o menos
2. 8º grado o menos
3. Asistió a una parte de la escuela superior
4. Graduada de escuela superior ó el GED
5. Escuela Técnica
6. Asistió a Colegio/Universitario
7. Graduada de Colegio/Universitario
8. Estudios de postgrado

21. ¿Actualmente vive 50% del tiempo o más con un esposo o pareja quien está empleado? (Elija solo uno)

1. Sí
2. No

Si contesto sí, ¿Cuántas horas trabaja su esposo/pareja usualmente por semana?

[ ] horas por semana

22. ¿Cuántas computadoras tiene Ud. en su hogar?

[ ]

23. ¿Tiene acceso al internet en su hogar?

1. Sí
2. No
6-item Household Food Security Survey (English)

Please answer whether the statements below were often true, sometimes true, or never true for you and the other members of your household in the last 12 months.

1. The food we bought just didn’t last, and we didn’t have money to get more. In the last 12 months, this was:
   [ ] Often true       [ ] Sometimes true       [ ] Never true

2. We couldn’t afford to eat balanced meals. In the last 12 months, this was:
   [ ] Often true       [ ] Sometimes true       [ ] Never true

3. In the last 12 months, did you or other adults in your household ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn’t enough money for food?
   [ ] Yes, almost every month
   [ ] Yes, some months but not every month
   [ ] Yes, only 1 or 2 months
   [ ] No

4. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn’t enough money for food?
   [ ] Yes       [ ] No

5. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn’t eat because there wasn’t enough money for food?
   [ ] Yes       [ ] No
6-item Household Food Security Survey (Spanish)

Por favor indique si las siguientes situaciones fueron ciertas frecuentemente, a veces, o nunca para Usted y los otros miembros de su casa en los últimos 12 meses.

1. “La comida que compramos no duró mucho y no había dinero para comprar más.” En los últimos 12 meses, esto fue cierto...
   □ Frecuentemente □ A veces □ Nunca

2. “No podíamos permitirnos el lujo de comer una comida balanceada (nutritiva).” En los últimos 12 meses, esto fue cierto...
   □ Frecuentemente □ A veces □ Nunca

3. En los últimos 12 meses, ¿Usted u otro adulto de su familia comió menos o se saltó comidas porque no había suficiente dinero para comprar comida?
   □ Sí, casi cada mes
   □ Sí, algunos meses, pero no todos
   □ Sí, solo en 1 o 2 meses
   □ No

4. En los últimos 12 meses, ¿alguna vez comió menos de lo que pensaba que debería comer porque no había suficiente dinero para la comida?
   □ Sí □ No

5. En los últimos 12 meses, ¿alguna vez tuvo hambre pero no comió porque no había suficiente dinero para la comida?
   □ Sí □ No
Caregiver’s Feeding Styles Questionnaire (English)

These questions deal with YOUR interactions with your preschool child during the dinner meal. Circle the best answer that describes how often these things happen. If you are not certain, make your best guess.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often during the dinner meal do YOU....</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Physically struggle with the child to get him or her to eat (for example, physically putting the child in the chair so he or she will eat).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Promise the child something other than food if he or she eats (for example, “If you eat your beans, we can play ball after dinner”).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Encourage the child to eat by arranging the food to make it more interesting (for example, making smiley faces on the pancakes).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ask the child questions about the food during dinner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tell the child to eat at least a little bit of food on his or her plate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Reason with the child to get him or her to eat (for example, “Milk is good for your health because it will make you strong”).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Say something to show your disapproval of the child for not eating dinner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Allow the child to choose the foods he or she wants to eat for dinner from foods already prepared.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Compliment the child for eating food (for example, “What a good boy! You’re eating your beans”).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Suggest to the child that he or she eats dinner, for example by saying, “Your dinner is getting cold”.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Say to the child “Hurry up and eat your food”.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Warn the child that you will take away something other than food if he or she doesn’t eat (for example, “If you don’t finish your meat, there will be no play time after dinner”).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often during the dinner meal do YOU....</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Tell the child to eat something on the plate (for example, “Eat your beans”).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Warn the child that you will take a food away if the child doesn’t eat (for example, “If you don’t finish your vegetables, you won’t get fruit”).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Say something positive about the food the child is eating during dinner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Spoon-feed the child to get him or her to eat dinner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Help the child to eat dinner (for example, cutting the food into smaller pieces).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Encourage the child to eat something by using food as a reward (for example, “If you finish your vegetables, you will get some fruit”).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Beg the child to eat dinner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cuestionario Sobre los Modos de Alimentar a los Niños

Estas preguntas se tratan de sus interacciones con su niño pre-escolar durante la cena. Circule la respuesta que mejor describe cuan a menudo estas cosas ocurren. Si no esta segura, escoja su mejor alternativa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Durante la cena, cuan a menudo…</th>
<th>Nunca</th>
<th>Rara vez</th>
<th>Algunas veces</th>
<th>Seguido</th>
<th>Siempre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lucha físicamente con el niño(a) para que coma. (Por ejemplo, pone al niño físicamente en la silla.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Le promete al niño(a) algo que no sean alimentos si él o ella come. (Por ejemplo, “si te comes los frijoles, podemos jugar pelota después la cena.”)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anima al niño(a) a comer arreglando los alimentos para que luzcan más interesantes. (Por ejemplo, adorna los panqueques con caras sonrientes.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Le hace preguntas al niño acerca de la comida durante la cena.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Le dice al niño(a) que coma por lo menos un poco de la comida servida en su plato.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Razona con el niño(a) para que coma. (Por ejemplo, “La leche es buena para tu salud porque te ayudará a crecer más fuerte.”)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Critica al niño(a) por no comerse la cena.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Permite que el niño(a) escoja los alimentos que desea comer para la cena de los alimentos que ya fueron preparados.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Felicita al niño(a) por comerse los alimentos. (Por ejemplo, “¡Que niño(a) más bueno(a)! Te estás comiendo tus frijoles.”)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Le sugiere al niño(a) que se coma la cena. (Por ejemplo diciendo, “Tu cena se está enfriando”).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Le dice al niño(a), “Apúrate y come tus alimentos.”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Le advierte al niño(a) que le va a quitar algo que no sean alimentos si no come. (Por ejemplo, “Si no terminas la carne, no podrás jugar después de la cena.”)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Durante la cena, cuan a menudo...</strong></td>
<td>Nunca</td>
<td>Rara vez</td>
<td>Algunas veces</td>
<td>Seguido</td>
<td>Siempre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Le dice al niño(a) que coma algún alimento del plato (Por ejemplo, “Comete los frijoles.”)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Le advierte al niño(a) que le va a quitar algún alimento si no come. (Por ejemplo, “Si no terminas los vegetales, no comerás fruta.”)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Dice algo positivo acerca de la comida que el niño(a) está comiendo durante la cena.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Le da de comer al niño(a) con cuchara para que coma la cena.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Ayuda al niño(a) a comer la cena (por ejemplo, cortando los alimentos en pedazos más pequeños).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Anima al niño(a) a comer algo usando comida como recompensa. (Por ejemplo, “Si terminas los vegetales, te voy a dar frutas.”)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Le ruega al niño(a) que coma la cena.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ACCULTURATION**

*Please select the answer that best applies to you.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Almost never</th>
<th>2 Sometimes</th>
<th>3 Often</th>
<th>4 Almost always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>How often do you speak English?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>How often do you speak in English with your friends?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>How often do you think in English?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>How often do you speak Spanish?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>How often do you speak in Spanish with your friends?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>How often do you think in Spanish?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>How often do you watch television programs in English?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>How often do you listen to radio programs in English?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>How often do you listen to music in English?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>How often do you watch television programs in Spanish?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>How often do you listen to radio programs in Spanish?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>How often do you listen to music in Spanish?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Very poorly</th>
<th>2 Poorly</th>
<th>3 Well</th>
<th>4 Very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>How well do you speak English?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>How well do you read in English?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>How well do you understand television programs in English?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>How well do you understand radio programs in English?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>How well do you write in English?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>How well do you understand music in English?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>How well do you speak Spanish?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>How well do you read in Spanish?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>How well do you understand television programs in Spanish?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>How well do you understand radio programs in Spanish?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>How well do you write in Spanish?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>How well do you understand music in Spanish?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Por favor seleccione la respuesta que mejor se aplica a usted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. ¿Con qué frecuencia habla usted inglés?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Casi nunca</td>
<td>Algunas veces</td>
<td>Frecuentemente</td>
<td>Casi siempre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ¿Con qué frecuencia habla usted inglés con sus amigos?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ¿Con qué frecuencia piensa usted en inglés?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ¿Con qué frecuencia habla usted español?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ¿Con qué frecuencia habla usted español con sus amigos?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ¿Con qué frecuencia piensa usted en español?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ¿Con qué frecuencia ve usted programas de televisión en inglés?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ¿Con qué frecuencia escucha usted programas de radio en inglés?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ¿Con qué frecuencia escucha usted música en inglés?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ¿Con qué frecuencia ve usted programas de televisión en español?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ¿Con qué frecuencia escucha usted programas de radio en español?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. ¿Con qué frecuencia escucha usted música en español?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. ¿Qué tan bien habla usted inglés?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muy mal</td>
<td>No muy bien</td>
<td>Bien</td>
<td>Muy bien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ¿Qué tan bien lee usted inglés?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ¿Qué tan bien entiende usted los programas de televisión en inglés?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ¿Qué tan bien entiende usted los programas de radio en inglés?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ¿Qué tan bien escribe usted en inglés?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ¿Qué tan bien entiende usted música en inglés?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ¿Qué tan bien habla usted español?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ¿Qué tan bien lee usted español?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ¿Qué tan bien entiende usted los programas de televisión en español?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ¿Qué tan bien entiende usted los programas de radio en español?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ¿Qué tan bien escribe usted en español?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. ¿Qué tan bien entiende usted música en español?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Coding/Scoring Instructions
Revision Notes: The food security questions in the 6-item module are essentially unchanged from those in the original module first implemented in 1995 and described previously in this document.

September 2012:
- Added coding specification for “How many days” for 30-day version of AD1a.

July 2008:
- Wording of resource constraint in AD2 was corrected to, “…because there wasn’t enough money for food” to be consistent with the intention of the September 2006 revision.

January 2008:
- Corrected user notes for coding AD1a.

September 2006:
- Minor changes were introduced to standardize wording of the resource constraint in most questions to read, “…because there wasn't enough money for food.”
- Question numbers were changed to be consistent with those in the revised Household Food Security Survey Module.
- User notes following the questionnaire were revised to be consistent with current practice and with new labels for ranges of food security and food insecurity introduced by USDA in 2006.

Overview: The six-item short form of the survey module and the associated Six-Item Food Security Scale were developed by researchers at the National Center for Health Statistics.

Background: The six-item short form of the survey module and the associated Six-Item Food Security Scale were developed by researchers at the National Center for Health Statistics in collaboration with Abt Associates Inc. and documented in “The effectiveness of a short form of the household food security scale,” by S.J. Blumberg, K. Bialostosky, W.L. Hamilton, and R.R. Briefel (published by the American Journal of Public Health, vol. 89, pp. 1231-34, 1999). ERS conducted additional assessment of classification sensitivity, specificity, and bias relative to the 18-item scale.

If respondent burden permits, use of the 18-item U.S. Household Food Security Survey Module or the 10-item U.S. Adult Food Security Survey Module is recommended. However, in surveys that cannot implement one of those measures, the six-item module may provide an acceptable substitute. It has been shown to identify food-insecure households and households with very low food security with reasonably high specificity and sensitivity and minimal bias compared with the 18-item measure. It does not, however, directly ask about children’s food security, and does not measure the most severe range of adult food insecurity, in which children’s food intake is likely to be reduced.
[Begin Six-Item Food Security Module]

Transition into Module:
These next questions are about the food eaten in your household in the last 12 months, since (current month) of last year and whether you were able to afford the food you need.

NOTE: If the placement of these items in the survey makes the transition/introductory sentence unnecessary, add the word “Now” to the beginning of question HH3: “Now I’m going to read you....”

FILL INSTRUCTIONS: Select the appropriate fill from parenthetical choices depending on the number of persons and number of adults in the household.

HH3. I’m going to read you several statements that people have made about their food situation. For these statements, please tell me whether the statement was often true, sometimes true, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months—that is, since last (name of current month).

   The first statement is, “The food that (I/we) bought just didn’t last, and (I/we) didn’t have money to get more.” Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?

   [ ] Often true
   [ ] Sometimes true
   [ ] Never true
   [ ] DK or Refused

HH4. “(I/we) couldn’t afford to eat balanced meals.” Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?

   [ ] Often true
   [ ] Sometimes true
   [ ] Never true
   [ ] DK or Refused
AD1. In the last 12 months, since last (name of current month), did (you/you or other adults in your household) ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?

[ ] Yes
[ ] No (Skip AD1a)
[ ] DK (Skip AD1a)

AD1a. [IF YES ABOVE, ASK] How often did this happen—almost every month, some months but not every month, or in only 1 or 2 months?

[ ] Almost every month
[ ] Some months but not every month
[ ] Only 1 or 2 months
[ ] DK

AD2. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money for food?

[ ] Yes
[ ] No
[ ] DK

AD3. In the last 12 months, were you every hungry but didn't eat because there wasn't enough money for food?

[ ] Yes
[ ] No
[ ] DK

[End of Six-Item Food Security Module]
(1) Coding Responses and Assessing Households’ Food Security Status:

Responses of “often” or “sometimes” on questions HH3 and HH4, and “yes” on AD1, AD2, and AD3 are coded as affirmative (yes). Responses of “almost every month” and “some months but not every month” on AD1a are coded as affirmative (yes). The sum of affirmative responses to the six questions in the module is the household’s raw score on the scale.

Food security status is assigned as follows:
- Raw score 0-1—High or marginal food security (raw score 1 may be considered marginal food security, but a large proportion of households that would be measured as having marginal food security using the household or adult scale will have raw score zero on the six-item scale)
- Raw score 2-4—Low food security
- Raw score 5-6—Very low food security

For some reporting purposes, the food security status of households with raw score 0-1 is described as food secure and the two categories “low food security” and “very low food security” in combination are referred to as food insecure.

For statistical procedures that require an interval-level measure, the following scale scores, based on the Rasch measurement model may be used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of affirmatives</th>
<th>Scale score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (evaluated at 5.5)</td>
<td>8.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, no interval-level score is defined for households that affirm no items. (They are food secure, but the extent to which their food security differs from households that affirm one item is not known.)

(2) Response Options: For interviewer-administered surveys, DK (“don’t know”) and “Refused” are blind responses—that is, they are not presented as response options but marked if volunteered. For self-administered surveys, “don’t know” is presented as a response option.
(3) **Screening:** If it is important to minimize respondent burden, respondents may be screened after question AD1. Households that have responded “never” to HH3 and HH4 and “no” to AD1 may skip over the remaining questions and be assigned raw score zero.

In pilot surveys intended to validate the module in a new cultural, linguistic, or survey context, however, screening should be avoided if possible and all questions should be administered to all respondents.

(4) **30-Day Reference Period:** The questionnaire items may be modified to a 30-day reference period by changing the “last 12-month” references to “last 30 days.” In this case, item AD1a must be changed to read as follows:

AD1a. [IF YES ABOVE, ASK] In the last 30 days, how many days did this happen?

______ days

[ ] DK

Responses of 3 days or more are coded as “affirmative” responses.

(5) **Self Administration:** The six-item module has been used successfully in mail-out, take-home, and on-site self-administered surveys. For self-administration, question AD1a may be presented in one of two ways:

- Indent AD1a below AD1 and direct the respondent to AD1a with an arrow from the “Yes” response box of AD1. In a parenthetical following the “No” response box of AD1, instruct the respondent to skip question AD1 and go to question AD2.

- Present the following response options to question AD1 and omit question AD1a:
  - Yes, almost every month
  - Yes, some months but not every month
  - Yes, only 1 or 2 months
  - No

In this case, either of the first two responses is scored as two affirmative responses, while “Yes, only 1 or 2 months” is scored as a single affirmative response.

The two approaches have been found to yield nearly equal results. The latter may be preferred because it usually reduces the proportion of respondents with missing information on how often this behavior occurred.

**User Notes**

(1) **Coding Responses and Assessing Households’ Food Security Status:**
Responses of “often” or “sometimes” on questions HH3 and HH4, and “yes” on AD1, AD2, and AD3 are coded as affirmative (yes). Responses of “almost every month” and “some months but not every month” on AD1a are coded as affirmative (yes). The sum of affirmative responses to the six questions in the module is the household’s raw score on the scale.

Food security status is assigned as follows:
High or marginal food security

- Raw score 0-1—High or marginal food security (raw score 1 may be considered marginal food security, but a large proportion of households that would be measured as having marginal food security using the household or adult scale will have raw score zero on the six-item scale)
- Raw score 2-4—Low food security
- Raw score 5-6—Very low food security

For some reporting purposes, the food security status of households with raw score 0-1 is described as food secure and the two categories “low food security” and “very low food security” in combination are referred to as food insecure.

For statistical procedures that require an interval-level measure, the following scale scores, based on the Rasch measurement model, may be used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of affirmatives</th>
<th>Scale score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(evaluated at 5.5)
Scoring for the Caregiver’s Feeding Styles Questionnaire

We have used both typological and dimensional approaches to scoring the CFSQ. As argued by Laurence Steinberg with general parenting measures, both typological and dimensional approaches have merit and are based on different assumptions. In the typological approach (used for research purposes), the general pattern, organization, and climate of parental feeding is of primary interest. Using that typology with the CFSQ, two scores are derived demandingness and responsiveness. To score demandingness, a total mean score is calculated across all items; to score responsiveness, a ratio of child-centered items over the total score is calculated. However, with the dimensional approach, which can be used as a clinical tool, different aspects of parenting are assessed in order to test specific hypotheses regarding parenting practices and child outcomes. Continuous scores are derived to determine different aspects of feeding such as parent-centered/high control, parent-centered/contingency management, and child-centered feeding practices. In the typological approach, parents are placed into 1 of 4 categories (authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and uninvolved). In the dimensional approach, the parent is given a score for each of 3 subscales (parent-centered/high control, parent-centered/contingency management, child-centered feeding practices).

**Typological Approach** (used primarily for research purposes):

1. Calculate the two scores of demandingness and responsiveness:
   - Demandingness: the mean of the 19 items
     Mean (1+2+3+4+5+6+7+8+9+10+11+12+13+14+15+16+17+18+19)
   - Responsiveness: the mean of 7 items (child-centered) over the total mean
     Mean (3+4+6+8+9+15+17)/Mean(1+2+3+4+5+6+7+8+9+10+11+12+13+14+15+16+17+18+19)

2. Calculate median splits for the sample on two dimensions of demandingness and responsiveness. Categorize the sample participants into high and low categories on demandingness and responsiveness.

3. Participants can be categorized into feeding styles based on their scores on demandingness and responsiveness.
   - Authoritative Feeding Style - high demandingness/high responsiveness
   - Authoritarian Feeding Style - high demandingness/low responsiveness
   - Indulgent Feeding Style - low demandingness/high responsiveness
   - Uninvolved Feeding Style - low demandingness/low responsiveness

**Dimensional Approach** (used as a clinical tool):

- Parent-centered/High Control – Mean (1+16+19)
- Parent-centered/Contingency Management – Mean (2+12+18+14)
- Child-centered – Mean (3+4+6+9+15+17)
Acculturation Subscales

Hispanic Domain

To score: Average the sum of the responses for the following 12 questions.

- Question:
  (4) How often do you speak Spanish?
  (5) How often do you speak in Spanish with your friends?
  (6) How often do you think in Spanish?
  (10) How often do you watch television programs in Spanish?
  (11) How often do you listen to radio programs in Spanish?
  (12) How often do you listen to music in Spanish?
  (19) How well do you speak Spanish?
  (20) How well do you read in Spanish?
  (21) How well do you understand television programs in Spanish?
  (22) How well do you understand radio programs in Spanish?
  (23) How well do you write in Spanish?
  (24) How well do you understand music in Spanish?

Non-Hispanic Domain

To score: Average the sum of the responses for the following 12 questions.

- Question:
  (1) How often do you speak in English?
  (2) How often do you speak in English with your friends?
  (3) How often do you think in English?
  (7) How often do you watch television programs in English?
  (8) How often do you listen to radio programs in English?
  (9) How often do you listen to music in English?
  (13) How well do you speak English?
  (14) How well do you read in English?
  (15) How well do you understand television programs in English?
  (16) How well do you understand radio programs in English?
  (17) How well do you write in English?
  (18) How well do you understand music in English?

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to describe how the variables needed to calculate scores for each component of the Healthy Eating Index-2015 (HEI-2015) may be calculated using data available in NDSR output files. The description provided herein is specific to recall, record, and record-assisted recall record types.

An important note: This document is not appropriate for use with data collected using NDSR 2012 or any earlier version of NDSR. Contact NDSR User Support for assistance if data were collected using these versions of NDSR.

Background on the Healthy Eating Index-2015

The Healthy Eating Index (HEI) is a tool developed by the United States Department of Agriculture and the National Cancer Institute to evaluate the extent to which diets are consistent with the Dietary Guidelines for Americans. Possible index points range from 0-100, with a higher score indicating greater consistency of the diet with the Dietary Guidelines for Americans.

With each release of the new Dietary Guidelines for Americans the HEI is updated. The HEI-2015, which conforms to the 2015-2020 Dietary Guidelines for Americans, includes thirteen dietary components (nine adequacy and four moderation components) that reflect key aspects of diet quality. Table 1 lists the components, the optimal (maximum) number of points, and the criteria for assignment of the lowest and highest possible scores for each component. For more detail regarding scoring assignment see information available online on NCI website.
Calculating a HEI-2015 Score using Data Available in NDSR Output Files

In order to calculate a HEI-2015 score, one must have measures for each of the index components, and these measures must conform (be consistent with) the units of measure included in the index. For example, the total fruits component must be in the unit of ‘total fruit servings in cup equivalents per 1,000 kcal’. The approach we suggest for creating each of the index components using data available in NDSR output files is described as follows:

**Total Fruits Component**

Before a score for the total fruits component of the HEI-2015 may be assigned, one must generate an estimate of ‘total fruit servings in cup equivalents per 1,000 kcal’. The steps for creating this variable are as follows:

1) Calculate ‘total fruits servings in cup equivalents’ by totaling the following fruit subgroups in output file 09 and dividing this total by two: \[ \text{FRU0100 + FRU0200 + FRU0300 + FRU0400 + FRU0500 + FRU0600 + FRU0700] / 2 \].

*The total must be divided by two because fruits servings in the NCC Food Serving Count System are in \( \frac{1}{2} \) cup rather than 1 cup equivalents (see NDSR User Manual Appendix 10 for detailed information about the NCC Food Serving Count System).

2) Divide total daily energy intake (from output file 04) by 1,000, and then divide ‘total fruits servings in cup equivalents’ (variable created in step 1) by the result of this calculation.

**Whole Fruits Component**

Before a score for the whole fruits component of the HEI-2015 may be assigned, one must generate an estimate of ‘whole fruits servings in cup equivalents per 1,000 kcal’. The steps for creating this variable are as follows:

1) Calculate ‘whole fruits servings in cup equivalents’ by totaling the following fruit subgroups in output file 09 and dividing this total by two: \[ \text{FRU0300 + FRU0400 + FRU0500 + FRU0600 + FRU0700} / 2 \].

*The total must be divided by two because fruit servings in the NCC Food Serving Count System are in \( \frac{1}{4} \) cup rather than cup equivalents (see NDSR User Manual Appendix 10 for detailed information about the NCC Food Serving Count System).

2) Divide total daily energy intake (from output file 04) by 1,000, and then divide ‘whole fruits servings in cup equivalents’ (variable created in step 1) by the result of this calculation.
**Total Vegetables Component**

Before a score for the total vegetables component of the HEI-2015 may be assigned, one must generate an estimate of ‘total vegetables servings in cup equivalents per 1,000 kcal’. The steps for creating this variable are as follows:

1) Calculate ‘total vegetables servings in cup equivalents’ by totaling the following vegetable subgroups in output file 09 and dividing this total by two: \[\text{VEG0100 + VEG0200 + VEG0300 + VEG0400 + VEG0800 + VEG0450 + VEG0700 + VEG0600 + VEG0900 + VEG0500}]2*.

*The total must be divided by two because vegetable servings in the NCC Food Serving Count System are in ⅛ cup rather than cup equivalents (see NDSR User Manual Appendix 10 for detailed information about the NCC Food Serving Count System).

2) Divide total daily energy intake (from output file 04) by 1,000, and then divide ‘total vegetables servings in cup equivalents’ (variable created in step 1) by the result of this calculation.

**Greens and Beans Component**

Before a score for the greens and beans component of the HEI-2015 may be assigned, one must generate an estimate of ‘greens and beans in cup equivalents per 1,000 kcal’. The steps for creating this variable are as follows:

1) Calculate ‘greens and beans in cup equivalents’ by totaling the following vegetable subgroups in output file 09 and dividing this total by two: \[\text{VEG0100 + VEG0700}]2.

The total must be divided by two because vegetable servings in the NCC Food Serving Count System are in ⅛ cup rather than cup equivalents (see NDSR User Manual Appendix 10 for detailed information about the NCC Food Serving Count System).

2) Divide total daily energy intake (from output file 04) by 1,000, and then divide ‘greens and beans in cup equivalents’ (variable created in step 1) by the result of this calculation.

**Whole Grains Component**

Before a score for the whole grains component of the HEI-2015 may be assigned, one must generate an estimate of ‘whole grains servings in ounce equivalents per 1,000 kcal’. To generate this estimate:
1) Divide total daily energy intake (from output file 04) by 1,000, and then divide whole grains in ounce equivalents (from output file 04) by the result of this calculation.

**Dairy Component**

Before a score for the dairy component of the HEI-2015 may be assigned, one must generate an estimate of ‘dairy servings in cup equivalents per 1,000 kcal’. The steps for creating this variable are as follows:

1) Calculate ‘dairy servings in cup equivalents’ by totaling the following dairy subgroups in output file 09: DMF0100 + DMR0100 + DML0100 + DMN0100 + DMF0200 + DMR0200 + DML0200 + DML0300 + DML0400 + DCF0100 + DCR0100 + DCL0100 + DCN0100 + DYF0100 + DYR0100 + DYL0100 + DYF0200 + DYR0200 + DYL0200 + DYN0100 + [DOT0100 / 3\*] + DOT0300 + DOT0400 + DOT0500 + DOT0600.

\*DOT0100 (frozen dairy desserts) must be divided by 3 to convert to cup equivalents because 1.5 cups of a frozen dairy dessert is considered to be a cup equivalent in the dairy group, but a \( \frac{1}{2} \) cup of frozen dairy dessert counts as a servings in the NCC Food Serving Count System (see NDSR User Manual Appendix 10 for detailed information about the NCC Food Serving Count System).

2) Divide total daily energy intake (from output file 04) by 1,000, and then divide ‘dairy servings in cup equivalents’ (variable created in step 1) by the result of this calculation.

**Total Protein Foods Component**

Before a score for the total protein foods component of the HEI-2015 may be assigned, one must generate an estimate of ‘total protein foods servings in ounce equivalents per 1,000 kcal’. The steps for creating this variable are as follows:

1) Calculate ‘total protein foods servings in ounce equivalents’ by totaling the following protein subgroups in output file 09: MRF0100 + MRL0100 + MRF0200 + MRL0200 + MRF0300 + MRL0300 + MRF0400 + MRL0400 + MCF0200 + MCL0200 + MRF0500 + MPF0100 + MPL0100 + MPF0200 + MFF0100 + MFL0100 + MFF0200 + MSL0100 + MSF0100 + MCF0100 + MCL0100 + MOF0100 + MOF0200 + MOF0300 + MOF0400 + MOF0500 + MOF0600 + MOF0700 + [VEG0700 x 2\*]

\*VEG0700 must be multiplied by two because \( \frac{1}{4} \) cup legumes and beans are considered an ounce equivalent of protein, but they are in \( \frac{1}{2} \) cup servings in the NCC Food Serving Count System (see NDSR User Manual Appendix 10 for detailed information about the NCC Food Serving Count System).

2) Divide total daily energy intake (from output file 04) by 1,000, and then divide ‘total protein foods servings in ounce equivalents’ (variable created in step 1) by the result of this calculation.
Seafood and Plant Proteins Component

Before a score for the seafood and plant proteins component of the HEI-2015 may be assigned, one must generate an estimate of ‘seafood and plant proteins servings in ounce equivalents per 1,000 kcal’. The steps for creating this variable are as follows:

1) Calculate ‘seafood and plant proteins servings in ounce equivalents’ by totaling the following seafood, nuts, seeds, and soy subgroups in output file 09: MFF0100 + MFL0100 + MFF0200 + MSL0100 + MSF0100 + MOF0500 + MOF0600 + MOF0700 + [VEG0700 x 2*]

*VEG0700 must be multiplied by two because ¼ cup legumes and beans are considered an ounce equivalent of protein, but they are in ½ cup servings in the NCC Food Serving Count System (see NDSR User Manual Appendix 10 for detailed information about the NCC Food Serving Count System).

2) Divide total daily energy intake (from output file 04) by 1,000, and then divide ‘seafood and plant proteins servings in ounce equivalents’ (variable created in step 1) by the result of this calculation.

Fatty Acids Component

Before a score for the fatty acids component of the HEI-2015 may be assigned, one must generate a ratio of polyunsaturated fatty acids (PUFAs) and monounsaturated fatty acids (MUFAs) to saturated fatty acids (SFAs). The step for creating this variable is as follows:

1) Calculate the sum of total PUFAs (from output file 04) and total MUFAs (from output file 04),

2) Divide the sum of total PUFAs and total MUFAs (variable created in step 1) by total SFAs (from output file 04).

Refined Grains Component

Before a score for the refined grains component of the HEI-2015 may be assigned, one must generate an estimate of ‘refined grains servings in ounce equivalents per 1,000 kcal’. To generate this estimate:

1) Divide total daily energy intake (from output file 04) by 1,000, and then divide refined grains in ounce equivalents (from output file 04) by the result of this calculation.

Sodium Component
Before a score for the sodium component of the HEI-2015 may be assigned, one must generate an estimate of ‘sodium intake (grams) per 1,000 kcal’. The steps for creating this variable are as follows:

1) Calculate ‘sodium intake in grams’ by dividing the sodium variable in output file 04 (sodium intake in milligrams) by 1,000.

2) Divide total daily energy intake (from output file 04) by 1,000, and then divide ‘sodium intake in grams’ (variable created in step 1) by the result of this calculation.

**Added Sugars Component**

Before a score for the added sugars component of the HEI-2015 may be assigned, the percent of energy from added sugars must be calculated. The steps for creating this variable are as follows:

1) Using the added sugars (by total sugars) estimate from output file 04, calculate energy from added sugars:

   \[\text{Added sugars (by total sugars) (g)}^* \times 4 \text{ kcal/gram} = \text{kcal from added sugars}\]

2) Using the total daily energy intake estimate from output file 04, complete the following calculation:

   \[\frac{\text{kcal from added sugars}}{\text{total kcal}} \times 100 = \% \text{ energy from added sugars}\]

**Saturated Fat Component**

The variable needed to calculate a score for this component of the index (% of energy from saturated fats) is available in output file 04 (% Calories from SFA).
Table 1: Healthy Eating Index-2015 components and scoring standards¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Optimum Score</th>
<th>Standard for Maximum Score</th>
<th>Standard for Minimum Score of Zero</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Fruits²</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>≥0.8 cup eq/1,000 kcal</td>
<td>No fruit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Fruits³</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>≥0.4 cup eq/1,000 kcal</td>
<td>No whole fruit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Vegetables⁴</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>≥1.1 cup eq/1,000 kcal</td>
<td>No vegetables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greens and Beans⁴</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>≥0.2 cup eq/1,000 kcal</td>
<td>No dark-green vegetables or legumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Grains</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>≥1.5 oz eq/1,000 kcal</td>
<td>No whole grains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy⁵</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>≥1.3 cup eq/1,000 kcal</td>
<td>No dairy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Protein Foods⁶</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>≥2.5 oz eq/1,000 kcal</td>
<td>No protein foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seafood and Plant Proteins⁶,⁷</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>≥0.8 oz eq/1,000 kcal</td>
<td>No seafood or plant proteins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatty Acids⁸</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(PUFAs+MUFAs)/SFAs ≥2.5</td>
<td>(PUFAs+MUFAs)/SFAs ≤1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined Grains</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>≤1.8 oz eq/1,000 kcal</td>
<td>≥4.3 oz eq/1,000 kcal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>≤1.1 gram/1,000 kcal</td>
<td>≥2.0 grams/1,000 kcal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added Sugars</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>≤6.5% of energy</td>
<td>≥26% of energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated Fats</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>≤8% of energy</td>
<td>≥16% of energy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Intakes between the minimum and maximum standards are scored proportionately.

² Includes 100% fruit juice.

³ Includes all forms except juice.

⁴ Includes legumes (beans and peas).

⁵ Includes all milk products, such as fluid milk, yogurt, and cheese, and fortified soy beverages.

⁶ Includes legumes (beans and peas).

⁷ Includes seafood, nuts, seeds, soy products (other than beverages), and legumes (beans and peas).

⁸ Ratio of poly- and monounsaturated fatty acids (PUFAs and MUFAs) to saturated fatty acids (SFAs)
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In the methods section:
In the Methods section of your manuscript please include the following statements.

*The Healthy Eating Index-2015 Score was generated using dietary intake data collected and analyzed with Nutrition Data System for Research software version _____, (date) and an unpublished Guide to Creating Variables Needed to Calculate Scores for Each Component of the Healthy Eating Index-2015 (HEI-2015), (July 2017), both of which were developed by the Nutrition Coordinating Center (NCC), University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.*

In the references section:

Appendix E

Data Analysis Procedures
Note:

- All data analysis will be conducted by principal investigator.
- SPSS will be used to conduct descriptive and inferential statistics.
- *Process* macro will be used to test mediation, moderation, and moderated mediation models.

Apriori criteria:

- t-tests & non-parametric t-test equivalents significance value = $p \leq 0.05$
- co-variates include child gender, maternal Hispanic acculturation, maternal English acculturation, number of members in household, number of children in household, maternal marital status, employment status, & education level. In initial model, all co-variates are included. However, in final model, only co-variates with a $p$-value $\leq .1$ will be retained. The other nonsignificant ($p$-value $\geq .1$) will be dropped
- Previous time period measures of the dependent variable will be controlled in all the mediation, moderation and mediated moderation models
- in mediation testing: direct effect considered significant if confidence interval does not cross over zero, indirect effect considered significant if bootleg confidence interval does not cross over zero
- in moderated mediation testing: interaction term needed to be significant with a $p$-value $\leq .05$. If this is significant, then conditional direct effect of X on Y at the values of the moderator is significant if LLCI and ULCI does not contain 0. For a conditional indirect effect of X on Y at the values of the moderator to be significant, the bootleg LLCI and ULCI must not contain zero.
- To maximize power, most parsimonious models will be tested.
- No cases will be deleted (Potential outlier in BMI z-score, all HEI were considered plausible). However, if missing data for, then case excluded from SPSS analysis for that specific test.

1. To install Process, need to download macro from [http://www.processmacro.org/download.html](http://www.processmacro.org/download.html)

2. Complete descriptive analysis including histograms for all variables of interest first.

3. Create a grouping variable to distinguish participants who returned for data collection at time 2 verses those who did not. To do this, select cases if they are missing a time 2 HEI, Food Security Score, or BMI z-score. Create a grouping variable and assign these cases a value of 1 to define this group as missing for Time 2. A value of zero indicates that the participant was retained at time 2.
4. Using the new grouping variable, run a t-test and nonparametric t-test for Food Security Status, BMI z-score, and HEI to determine if there is a difference between the retained group vs. the non-retained group.

5. Run paired t-test, or nonparametric equivalent, to determine if there is a difference across time for Food Security Status, BMIZ-score, and HEI.

6. Then run models using *Process* macro models 1, 4, and 59 to test Aims 1, 2, and 3.
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Study & Communication Log
### Study Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbally obtained from Dr. Hughes January 2016.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obtained 7/25/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added Aim 3 9/29/17 after reading publication of similar study that found conditional gender effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error &amp; correction&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> As of March 2017.
1: (11/9/2017) Error in calculation of whole fruit timepoint 1 found during frequency checks for total whole fruit. Logic statement to calculate whole fruit was dividing cups of fruit by averaged daily energy intake in place of energy/1000. Whole fruit component logic statement corrected, auto correction of HEI whole fruit component, total cHEI timepoint 1 completed. SPSS datafile merged with corrected cHEI. Incorrect cHEI removed to avoid future error. All analysis redone using corrected cHEI timepoint 1. Corrected analysis in output and annotated analysis folders. Folder labeled “corrected.”
Communication Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Dr. Meininger</th>
<th>Dr. Chan</th>
<th>Dr. Hughes</th>
<th>Kirstin</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/18/2017</td>
<td>Bi-weekly communication for updates on study progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tutorial on HEI calculations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Lisa Harnack for instructions on HEI-2015 calculation using data collected with NDSR software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/7/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review final plans of analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/10, 8/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Email communication with Dr. Andrew Hayes (author of Process, expert in moderated mediation longitudinal analysis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/25/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Received child BMIz-scores for all three timepoints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review error, correction, and available findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Communication Log Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/30/2017</td>
<td>Review findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/10/17</td>
<td>Per Lisa Harnack, HEI</td>
<td>2015 validity study not yet published.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Child Obesity: Analysis of a Population Health Problem

Nipa Kamdar RN, MSN, FNP-BC
University of Texas Health Science Center, Houston
School of Nursing

Abstract
Nearly one out of every three children in the US are either overweight or obese (Ogden et al., 2016) as defined by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC, 2015b). Overweight and obese children are at increased risk for developing serious chronic illnesses such as type two diabetes, hypertension, and depression. Efforts to reduce prevalence of child obesity is a challenge. Understanding the contributing factors is critical to effectively approach the problem with viable solutions. The purpose of this article is to present a model that encompasses direct and indirect contributing factors for child obesity. This model could be used by nurses and other clinicians for hypothesis testing, intervention design, and policy reform.

Child obesity is a serious public health issue associated with multiple chronic diseases (World Health Organization, 2015). In children, overweight is defined as a body-mass-index (BMI) between the 85th and 94th percentile for age and sex, and obesity is defined as a BMI greater than the 95th percentile for age and sex (CDC, 2015). Clinicians and public health experts are trying to reduce the prevalence of children who are overweight or obese.

The basic cause of overweight and obesity is an imbalance in which energy consumption is greater than energy expenditure. However, factors leading to energy imbalance are woven in a complex matrix that involves biology, behavior, culture, environment, and economics operating at the individual, family, and community levels (Public Health Agency of Canada, 2015). Identifying key factors to target is a challenging, but essential, component for finding a sustainable solution to reduce the child obesity epidemic. This article will discuss prevalence, disparities, comorbidity, costs, and contributing factors for child obesity.

Prevalence and Disparities of Child Obesity
According to the World Health Organization (2015), in 2013 an estimated 42 million children under the age of five were overweight globally. In the United States, 31.8% of children ages 2 to 19 are overweight or obese (Ogden, Carroll, Kit, & Flegal, 2014). Over the past three decades, prevalence of child obesity has tripled from 5% in the 1970s to 16.9% in 2010 (Fryar, Carroll, & Ogden, 2012).
The results of 2011-2012 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) indicated improvement in obesity prevalence for preschoolers when compared to 2009-2010 survey results (Ogden, Carroll, Kit, & Flegal, 2012; Ogden et al., 2014). However, the improvement is not consistent across all racial/ethnic groups. In the 2009-2010 NHANES report, non-Hispanic white children ages 2 to 5 had an obesity prevalence of 9.2%. This improved to 3.5% according to 2011-2012 NHANES. In contrast, for Hispanic children ages 2 to 5, there was an increase in prevalence from 16.2% to 16.7%. These statistics demonstrate that child obesity does not affect the population equally.

In fact, per 2011-2012 NHANES, Hispanic children have the highest prevalence of overweight and obesity compared to Asian, African American, and Caucasian children in most age groups (Ogden et al., 2014). African American children rank second in prevalence for overweight and obesity. In both groups, more than a third of children are overweight and more than a fifth are obese.

Just as child obesity is not equally distributed among racial/ethnic groups, it is also not equally spread among income groups. According to the 2011/12 National Survey of Children’s Health (NSCH) (2012), 26.6% of children living at 0 to 99% of the federal poverty level (FPL) were obese. As income increases, the prevalence of obesity decreases. Only 9.0% of children living at 400% FPL or higher are obese. A similar trend follows for children who are overweight (The Child and Adolescent Health Measurement Initiative, 2012b).

**Comorbidities of Child Obesity**

The list of illnesses associated with child obesity is extensive. They included joint problems, asthma, sleep apnea, fatty liver disease, gallstones, and gastro-esophageal reflux (Center for Disease Control and Prevention, 2015a; Must, 1996). Children who are severely obese are also at increased risk for genu valgum, slipped capital femoral epiphysis, and tibia vara (Must, 1996).

However, the greatest health threats for children who are overweight or obese exists in cardiometabolic morbidity. A systematic review identified a number of robust studies that found associations between childhood overweight or obesity and adverse cardiovascular effects later in life (Reilly & Kelly, 2011). One of the studies found that 70% of obese children had at least one cardiovascular risk factor such as high blood pressure or high cholesterol, and 39% of obese children had two or more risk factors (Freedman, Mei, Srinivasan, Berenson, & Dietz, 2007).

The incidence of diabetes has increased parallel to the prevalence of obesity (Crothers, Kehle, Bray, & Theodore, 2009). About 15 years ago only 3% of new onset diabetes in adolescents were type 2 diabetes. (D'Adamo & Caprio, 2011). Now about half of new cases are recognized as type 2 diabetes. At the time of type 2 diabetes diagnosis, over 85% of children are either overweight or obese (Pulgarón & Delamater, 2014).

In addition to the physical issues, obesity is associated with a number of psychological health concerns. Obese children are at increased risk for exclusion and bullying (Crothers et al., 2009). They are more likely to have depression, low self-esteem, and
distorted body image (Crothers et al., 2009; Must & Strauss, 1999). In a study of 244 children ages 8 to 17 entering a weight management program, 36.4% were depressed (Morrison, Shin, Tamopolsky, & Taylor, 2015). According to the 2011/12 NSCH, 39% of children with one or more reported emotional, behavioral or developmental issues were overweight or obese (The Child and Adolescent Health Measurement Initiative, 2012a).

Costs of the Problem to Society
Childhood prevention programs come at a significant cost. For example, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation pledged $500 million towards prevention efforts in 2007, and the California Endowment pledged $1 billion towards building health-promoting communities across the state (Finkelstein et al., 2014).

To justify the cost of prevention programs, policymakers need an estimated cost of childhood obesity from health and economic perspectives (Finkelstein, Graham, & Malhotra, 2014). A study in Australia found evidence to support that children who are overweight or obese at four to five years of age have higher prescription and medical care costs over the following five years compared to healthy weight peers (Au, 2012). Researchers estimate $12,660 to $19,000 as the incremental lifetime medical cost of an obese child compared to a healthy weight child (Finkelstein et al., 2014). Additionally, obesity in adolescence is associated with adverse social and economic outcomes such as decreased education attainment and lower income (Reilly et al., 2003).

Contributing Factors for Child Obesity
Obesity is a complex issue with many contributing factors. The primary factors are an imbalance of surplus energy intake and insufficient energy consumption. However, the indirect contributing factors that lead to this energy imbalance ferment from a complex mix of culture, behavior, economics and environment. Figure 1 (page 24) is a model of contributing factors for child overweight and obesity. From left to right, the model depicts how three indirect factors (food industry, parenting, and low socioeconomic neighborhoods) feed into the primary direct factors of increased energy intake and insufficient energy consumption. Research supporting the organization of the model is summarized in Table 1, located in the appendix (on page 35).

Data from the NSCH and Pediatric Nutrition Surveillance System (Center for Disease Control and Prevention, 2015c; The Child and Adolescent Health Measurement Initiative, 2012b) support that children from low income families have increased prevalence of obesity compared to families with higher incomes. Lower income, minority neighborhoods are likely to lack an environment supportive of physical activity (Gordon-Larsen, Nelson, Page, & Popkin, 2006; Moore, Diez Roux, Evenson, McGinn, & Brines, 2008). They are less likely to have recreation facilities and parks which leads to decreased physical activity and increased weight. People living in lower socioeconomic neighborhoods report higher perceptions of unpleasantness of neighborhoods, unattended dogs, neighborhood crime, untrustworthy neighbors, and they were less likely to meet the Center for Disease Control’s recommendations for physical activity (Wilson, Kirtland, Ainsworth, & Addy, 2004). Low-income communities also tend to have greater availability of fast food restaurants (Newman, Howlett, & Burton, 2014). Furthermore, these neighborhoods are less likely to have access to healthy foods
because they lack grocery stores (Treuhaft & Karpyn, 2010). Conversely, individuals with access to healthy food have a lower risk for obesity (Larson, Story, & Nelson, 2009).

The food industry is another significant, indirect contributor to obesity. Energy-dense, nutritionally poor foods and beverages contribute to childhood overweight and obesity (Sonntag, Schneider, Mdege, Ali, & Schmidt, 2015). Food and beverage manufacturers and chain restaurants offer many products that are high in sugar, fat, and salt to satisfy consumer taste preferences (Cornwell & McAlister, 2011). These outlets have lower-priced food and beverage items that appeal to economically disadvantaged consumers.

The food industry also advertises to children who are exposed to many marketing messages, promotional events/display, trade characters, and packaging (Cornwell & McAlister, 2011). Snack, convenience, fast foods, and sweets account for 83% of advertised foods (Harrison & Marske, 2005). Food preferences and habits set in childhood influence food choice over the lifespan (Cornwell & McAlister, 2011).

Parents are another predominant player in factors contributing to obesity in children. Parents have great influence in shaping their children's attitudes and behaviors (Rodenburg, Kremers, Oenema, & van de Mheen, 2014). They generally have the most control over the home and family environment. If parents have poor dietary habits, their children often model similar patterns (Hood et al., 2000). Parenting styles and practices have strong impact over children's obesogenic behaviors (Patrick, Hennessy, McSpadden, & Oh, 2013).
Many elements contribute to child obesity in complex relationships. It is important to note that Figure 1 does not incorporate all the contributing factors for child obesity. Some contributors to child obesity not mentioned in the model are sleep, breastfeeding, and genetics (Center for Disease Control and Prevention, 2015a).

**Recommendations**
Efforts to reduce prevalence of child obesity is a challenge. Understanding the contributing factors is critical to effectively approach the problem with viable solutions. The contributing factors model could serve as a map to assist researchers in identifying relationships between factors and potential gaps in knowledge. It can also be used by public health nurses to develop interventions aimed at reducing prevalence of child obesity. Food industry, parenting, and low socioeconomic neighborhoods are presented in the model because these are three areas that have potential for behavioral intervention, environmental change, and policy reform.

**Summary and Conclusion**
Childhood overweight and obesity is one of the nation’s greatest public health concerns. It affects about one third of children (Ogden et al., 2014). As these children develop comorbidities associated with being overweight or obese, they will endure increased healthcare costs along with other burdens.

While the direct contributing factors for child overweight and obesity are easy to identify, indirect contributing factors originate from more complex interactions of behavior and environment. To stop the domino effect of child obesity, it is essential to untangle and address the many indirect contributing factors.
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Table 1. Evidence Table for Contributors to Child Obesity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Purpose of Study</th>
<th>Research Design</th>
<th>Sample Setting</th>
<th>Method of Investigation</th>
<th>Findings from the Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Celli, Tavendale, Watt, Ketherington, &amp; Palmer, 2010)</td>
<td>To examine the relationship between fat mass and density-associated (TIM) and waist index (BMI) and body mass index (BMI). Also, to explore the role of the FTO variant in energy expenditure and eating behavior.</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Sample: 573 preschool children aged 4 to 10</td>
<td>Participants recruited from Energy Balance Study, the students were evaluated for adiposity, energy expenditure, and eating behavior. Randomized to test meals associated with children carrying the FTO gene variant.</td>
<td>Variable 1: Food energy intake calculated using Food Energy Balance Questionnaire, amount of food consumed at tested meals assessed by weighing the food items before and after eating. Variable 2: Children's eating behavior measured by indirect calorimetry, with the use of a ventilated hood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nikola, Nicolaus, Hardy, &amp; Smith, 2007)</td>
<td>To examine relationship between child's body mass index (BMI) and eating behavior.</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Sample: 498 children ages 4-5</td>
<td>Nutrition professionals completed 3-day diet histories, secondary parent completed questionnaires. Separate statistical analysis performed for mother, father, and combined.</td>
<td>No association between mothers' BMI and child BMI status (p-value &lt; 0.01). Strong association between paternal BMI and child BMI status (p-value &lt; 0.001). Children with permissive and disengaged fathers had increased odds of having higher BMI or 5% and 10%, respectively. Inverse association between parental BMI and child BMI status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rodenburg, Kromhout, &amp; van de Ven, 2014)</td>
<td>To study parental feeding style with child's eating behavior and weight.</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Sample: 1275 Parent-child dyads (Med. children aged 3 to 5 years)</td>
<td>Parents completed questionnaires of feeding style and children's eating habits. BMI assessed at age 3 years.</td>
<td>Parental feeding style was significant predictor of children's eating habits. BMI was higher in children whose parents used a more restrictive feeding style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cornwell &amp; McAllister, 2017)</td>
<td>Study 1: Develop survey measure of taste preference &amp; learn if children's sugar-sweetened (SSS) intake relates to food choices. Study 2: Examine how knowledge of certain food &amp; drink brands are related to palate.</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Sample: 119 children aged 2 to 7 years</td>
<td>Survey conducted at age 2, children were given picture cards to rate their taste preference for specific food items. The 21-item taste preference survey was conducted.</td>
<td>Study 1: Child's SS intake is significantly correlated with child brand knowledge (r = 55, p &lt; 0.01). Fast food and soda brand knowledge is linked to the development of a preference for sugar, fat, and salt in food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Oral, Sami, &amp; Moore, 2014)</td>
<td>To examine energy intake at a meal in normal weight and obese children.</td>
<td>Randomized, crossover design</td>
<td>Sample: 23 normal-weight and 25 obese children, aged 3-18 years</td>
<td>Children were given the same meal once a week over 3 weeks. Each time, the meal was increased in portion size.</td>
<td>Energy intake was significantly higher in obese children than in normal weight children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation</td>
<td>Purpose of Study</td>
<td>Research Design</td>
<td>Method of Investigation</td>
<td>Findings from the Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Newman, Hewitt, &amp; Burton, 2014)</td>
<td>To reassess the impact of fast food availability on childhood obesity</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Hierarchical regression analysis examined direct &amp; interactive effects of predictors on preschool obesity rates. Variable 1: Low-income preschool obesity rate from the Pediatric Nutrition Surveillance System (PNSS)</td>
<td>Higher level of fast food restaurant saturation may lead to increased prevalence of childhood obesity in more economically disadvantaged, urban areas, p &lt; 0.05.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Petruzzelli, Willerford, King, &amp; Reid, 2012)</td>
<td>To examine parental perception of everyday foods and differences between low &amp; high socioeconomic status</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Focus groups with discussion questions organized into 4 topic areas: types of foods &amp; context, influences on food provision, “everyday” &amp; “sometimes” foods, strategies what could be made easier to limit “fast foods”</td>
<td>Common theme: Most parents accept fast food as “everyday” food but not岁时. Both low &amp; high SES rarely mentioned weight status. “Fast foods” come frequent as long as balance with healthy foods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rollins, 2004)</td>
<td>Assess the role of television in the formation of childhood obesity prevention</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>Literature review of relationship between television &amp; childhood obesity</td>
<td>Children who spend the most time with media are more likely to be overweight, marketing in the media may be key mechanism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Zamorski, Jans, Nekol, &amp; Beltman, 2012)</td>
<td>To investigate the effect of which parents’ knowledge &amp; attitudes on nutrition &amp; food reveal young children’s knowledge of healthy foods</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>192 parent &amp; child data from the Health Knowledge &amp; Activity compared using structural equation modeling. Variable 1: Parent questionnaire that measured knowledge and attitudes to food</td>
<td>Parent nutrition knowledge directly predicted children’s nutrition knowledge (p = 0.001). Parents with lower SES had lower nutrition knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nelson, Gordon-Larsen, Song, &amp; Popkin, 2006)</td>
<td>To identify meaningful patterns of sociodemographic and built features in neighborhood environments and to determine the cross-sectional associations between these neighborhood patterns and median physical activity (PA) and weight status.</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>AEPA (adolescent health) &amp; EPAG (adult physical activity)</td>
<td>Six neighborhood patterns identified (rural working class; urban; inner city area; neighborhood characteristics. Variable 1: Neighborhood measures on socioeconomic status, crime, social ties, street connectivity, PA activity facilities. Variable 2: Physically active (or not) or low (&lt;30 min/day) and overweight (BMI &gt; 95).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Daniell, Johnson, Mosser, &amp; Azrael, 2009)</td>
<td>Evaluate the relationship between perceived neighborhood safety and overweight status, &amp; evaluate validity of neighborhood safety perception</td>
<td>Cross-sectional</td>
<td>Students reported their perceptions on neighborhood safety, BMI was calculated using BMI calculator and weight. Chi-square statistics used to compare mean neighborhood safety with the observed associated dimension. Variable 1: Neighborhood safety measured via survey questions</td>
<td>Variables 2: Overweight status measured using BMI. Regression models to estimate the effect of perceived neighborhood safety on overweight-risk. Overweight status more likely to be an risk for overweight or obesity (OR 3.6, 1.46).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation</td>
<td>Purpose of Study</td>
<td>Research Design</td>
<td>Method of Investigation</td>
<td>Variable 1</td>
<td>Variable 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Singh, Logan, Van Dyk, &amp; Salush, 2008)</td>
<td>To examine independent and joint associations between several socioeconomic, demographic, and behavioral characteristics and obesity prevalence</td>
<td>Cross-sectional Sample 4,731 children aged 10-17 years Setting United States</td>
<td>Data from 2001 NHANES were used. Logistic regression analysis was used to estimate odds of obesity and adjusted prevalence.</td>
<td>Variable 1 Socioeconomic measures: age, gender, race/ethnicity, household composition, place of residence, language spoken at home, parental education, poverty status, social capital index, neighborhood safety, school safety</td>
<td>Variable 2 Behavioral measures: physical activity, acculturation, computer use, television watching, sports participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Thomsen, Kawa, Krish, &amp; Bose, 2016)</td>
<td>To determine if food deserts are associated with child obesity</td>
<td>Longitudinal Sample 113,334 school-age students Setting Arkansas</td>
<td>Used fixed effects panel data regression models to estimate the effect of residing in a food desert food store locations (from Dunn and Brookstreet)</td>
<td>Child BMI z-scores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Galvez et al., 2009)</td>
<td>To determine if the presence of convenience stores and fast-food restaurants near a child's home is associated with increased risk for childhood obesity</td>
<td>Cross-sectional Sample 223 G-to-8 year-old boys and girls Setting East Harlem, NY</td>
<td>Calculate odds ratio. Controlled gender, race/ethnicity, and family income.</td>
<td>Variable 1 Food store data on convenience stores, fast-food restaurants, and restaurants collected via walking survey of East Harlem area sales 10029 and 10023 in 2004</td>
<td>Variable 2 Child BMI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H

Ethnic/Racial Comparisons in Strategies Parents Use to Cope with Food Insecurity: A Systematic Review of Published Research

Nipa Kamdar1,2, Cathy L. Rozmus1, Deanna E. Grimes1, Janet C. Melninger1

Abstract
Food insecurity in US affects African Americans, Hispanic, and American Indians disproportionately compared to Caucasians. Ethnicity/race may influence the strategies parents use to reduce the effects of food insecurity. The purpose of this review is to compare coping strategies for food insecurity used by parents of different ethnicities/race as reported in published literature. A systematic search on PubMed and Embase yielded 983 studies, of which 13 studies met inclusion criteria and were reviewed. All groups used public and private assistance, social networks, nutrition related, and financial-related strategies. The limited evidence suggests that there are differences in how parents of different ethnicities/race apply these coping strategies. Current evidence is insufficient to confidently determine the extent of these differences. This review is a starting point for exploration of cultural differences in how parents of various ethnicities/race cope with food insecurity and identifies specific areas for further research.

Keywords: Coping strategies · Food insecurity · Food security · Ethnic comparisons · Racial comparisons

Introduction
Food insecurity as defined by the USDA is present when “food intake of one or more household members was reduced and their eating patterns were disrupted at times during the year because the household lacked money and other resources for food.” [1]. In the US, food insecurity affects one in every six households with children [1]. However, African Americans, Hispanics, and American Indians are disproportionately affected with approximately one out of every four households experiencing food insecurity [1, 2]. In comparison, only 10% of Caucasian households face food insecurity [1].

Food insecurity is associated with several health and social issues. In children, these issues include poor fetal development, iron deficiency anemia, poor school performance, and increased risk of mental health concerns. Food insecure adults are at greater risk for obesity, diabetes, and cardiovascular disease [3].

Many parents adopt strategies to cope with the lack of food. The most commonly used strategies fall into the following categories: use of public and private assistance programs, social networking, nutrition-related, and financial-related strategies [4]. Examples of these strategies include: use of food stamps, food pantries, meal-sharing with extended family, reduced portion sizes, and nonpayment of bills to purchase food.

Although parents can select any strategy to cope with food insecurity, their ethnicity or race may influence which strategies they are more likely to use. According to the sociocultural model, factors such as ethnicity and race influence interactions between individuals and their environment [5]. Research indicates that ethnic and racial differences affect multiple facets of daily life such as parenting feeding practices [6], parenting stress [7], and access to social capital [8].

Awareness of ethnic/racial similarities and differences is critical when designing interventions and creating policies that address strategies for coping with food insecurity. If policies or interventions are not culturally acceptable, the program may fail before it even begins. Therefore, the aim of this study is to provide a systematic review of the racial/
ethic similarities and differences in strategies parents use to cope with food insecurity.

Method

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion criteria permitted studies with quantitative, qualitative, or mixed method designs. Studies had to be conducted in the US, available in English, and published in peer-reviewed journals on or after 1995. 1995 is the year that the Food Security Supplement was added to the Current Population Survey and marks the standardization of measuring food security in the US [9]. At least 75% of the study sample needed to be parents. If a study had a lower percentage of parents, but the findings for households with children were distinct, the study was retained. At least 75% of the study sample had to be either African American, Hispanic, American Indian, or Caucasian. However, if a sample consisted of multiple ethnicities/races and the findings could be separated by ethnicity/race, the study was retained.

Quantitative studies had to include an operational definition for food insecurity that was consistent with the conceptual definition of a concern, or lack, of access to enough food to meet perceived nutritional needs for each member of a household due to restricted financial resources. They also needed to include variable(s) that represented coping strategies. Qualitative studies needed to include participants at risk for food insecurity and have findings related to coping strategies. Mixed method studies had to meet appropriate quantitative or qualitative criteria for food insecurity and coping strategies.

If studies only examined use of government assistance programs such as Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), School Breakfast Program (SBP), or National School Lunch Program (NSLP), then the study was excluded. Inclusion of these studies would pull away from the focus of this systematic review. Other exclusion criteria included publications of reviews, conference abstracts, and editorials.

Identification of Studies

Similar search terms or phrases for food insecurity, coping strategies, and ethnicity/race were used on PubMed and Embase databases to locate studies meeting inclusion criteria. Search terms for food insecurity included PubMed MeSH term “food supply”, Emtree terms “food insecurity”, “food security”, and “hunger”. A title and abstract search of 12 keywords or phrases for food insecurity were used on PubMed and Embase.

PubMed MeSH terms for coping strategies included “charities”, “food assistance”, and “Medicaid”. Emtree terms were “coping strategy questionnaire”, “coping behavior”, and “family coping”. Forty-seven keywords or phrases for coping strategies were used in a title and abstract search on PubMed and Embase.

PubMed MeSH terms for ethnicity/race were “ethnic groups”, “minority groups”, and “emigrants and immigrants”. Emtree terms were “ethnicity”, “Hispanic”, “ethnic group”, “minority group”, “migrant”, and “undocumented immigrant”. Fifteen keywords or phrases for ethnicity/race were used in a title and abstract search on PubMed and Embase. A manual search for peer-reviewed studies that met inclusion criteria was also performed on Google Scholar. Appendix 1, 2 contains the Boolean logic commands used on Pubmed and Embase.

After removing duplicates, the search yielded 983 articles. Of these, 242 articles had titles that appeared to match the review’s aim. Thirty-one of those studies had abstracts that appeared to match the inclusion criteria. After reviewing the full manuscripts, 11 studies met inclusion criteria. Review of the studies’ references yielded an additional two studies. The systematic review consists of 13 studies. The flow diagram (Fig. 1) illustrates the results of the search. It also includes a summary of the number of full manuscripts reviewed that did not meet specific inclusion criteria. Databases search was conducted in February 2017.

Assessment of Study Rigor

Each study went through a quality review using criteria recommended by Whittemore [10] and Walsh and Downe [11]. Specifically, studies were assessed for control of sampling bias (quantitative design) or purposeful recruitment (qualitative design). Data collection was assessed for use of reliable and valid measurements (quantitative design) or clear identification of method and use of trained data collectors (qualitative design). Management of threats to validity by controlling for confounders (quantitative design) or use of bracketing (qualitative design) was also evaluated. Table 1 is a summary of each study’s quality assessment.

Findings

Overview of Studies

Of the 13 studies included in the systematic review, six are quantitative and three are qualitative. Four studies use mixed method design. All quantitative studies are cross-sectional. Two of the mixed method studies [12, 13] conducted interviews at two different time points; however, in the findings and discussion for both studies, there is no indication that data were analyzed in a longitudinal perspective.
Only two studies [14, 15] had mixed ethnic/racial samples with findings for coping strategies that could be differentiated by ethnicity/race. The remaining studies examined food insecure parental coping strategies within the context of a specific ethnicity/race.

Two [16, 17] of these studies had samples that were predominately Caucasian. Three [13, 18, 19] predominately studied African Americans. Two studies [20, 21] had only American Indians. The remaining four studies [12, 22–24] had only Hispanics in the samples. Table 2 provides a summary of each of the studies included in this review.

### Characteristics of Study Samples

All but one study [15] identified their adult sample as parents. Laraia et al. [19] sampled parents of infants. Two studies [12, 23] sampled parents of preschoolers. Bauer [20] sampled parents of kindergartners and Barnidge et al. [18] sampled parents of school-aged children. The remaining studies only specified that the children were 18 years and younger.

In all the studies, more than half of the sampled parents were female. Borre et al. [12] had the lowest percentage of females in the sample at 52.8%. Three studies [13, 15, 19] had samples that were 100% female. Females constituted between 67.8 and 86% of the samples for the remaining studies. Although Kaufman and Karpati [22] interviewed mothers, the author did not share specific characteristics of the study sample.

### Recruitment Location and Study Setting

Recruitment for samples occurred at several different sites. Three studies [12, 18, 20] recruited from Headstart centers or schools. One study recruited from public libraries [14]. Calloway [14] also recruited from food pantries, as did two other studies [17, 18]. Three studies recruited from WIC or another food assistance program [16, 18, 19]. Parker et al. [15] recruited from organizations that serve low-income families but did not classify these organizations. Two studies referred to recruiting from the community [13, 24] but did not share additional details. Only one study [22] neglected to share details on recruitment locations or strategy.

Five studies focused on rural areas [13, 20, 21, 23, 24] and three focused on urban areas [14, 17, 22]. Barnidge et al. [18] study took place in rural and urban areas. Laraia
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Purpose/design</th>
<th>Recruitment/sampling strategy</th>
<th>Data collection</th>
<th>Threats to validity</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative study: points of assessment</td>
<td>1 = Clearly stated purpose 2 = Design matched purpose 3 = Stated rationale for mixed-method design</td>
<td>1 = Description of recruitment source 2 = Description of recruitment strategy 3 = Stated inclusion/exclusion criteria 4 = Control of sampling bias</td>
<td>1 = Use of reliable and valid Food Security Survey measurement 2 = Use of reliable and valid coping strategy measurement</td>
<td>1 = Control for confounders</td>
<td>1 = Clearly shared findings of descriptive/inferential statistics 2 = Significance value and/or confidence interval share of inferential statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauer et al. [20]</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calloway et al. [14]</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 X 3 4</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larraia et al. [19]</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 X 3 X</td>
<td>1 X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullany et al. [21]</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 X 3 4</td>
<td>1 X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharkey et al. [24]</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 X 3 X</td>
<td>1 X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood et al. [17]</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2 3 X</td>
<td>1 X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative study: points of assessment</td>
<td>1 = Clearly stated purpose 2 = Design matched purpose 3 = Stated methodology 4 = Purposeful sampling 5 = Interview questions shared 6 = Trained data collector 7 = Description of researcher bias</td>
<td>1 = Stated methodology</td>
<td>1 = Interview questions shared</td>
<td>1 = Trained data collector 2 = Bracketing of researcher bias</td>
<td>1 = Elicit approach to data analysis shared 2 = Statement of data saturation 3 = Transparency through shared quotations 4 = Peer debriefing/member check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker et al. [15]</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 X 3 X</td>
<td>X 2 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaufman and Karpuzi [22]</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X 1 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X 3 X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darko et al. [16]</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2 3 X</td>
<td>X 2 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1 X 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed method study: points of assessment</td>
<td>1 = Clearly stated purpose 2 = Description of recruitment source 3 = Description of recruitment strategy 4 = Description of inclusion/exclusion criteria 5 = Control of sampling bias 6 = Use of reliable and valid Food Security Survey measurement 7 = Use of reliable and valid coping strategy measurement 8 = Stated qualitative methodology 9 = Interview questions shared 10 = Trained data collector 11 = If performed inferential statistics, control for confounders if inferential statistics 12 = Bracketing of researcher bias 13 = Peer debriefing/member checking</td>
<td>1 = Use of reliable and valid Food Security Survey measurement 2 = Use of reliable and valid coping strategy measurement 3 = Stated qualitative methodology</td>
<td>1 = If performed inferential statistics, control for confounders if inferential statistics 2 = Bracketing of researcher bias 3 = Peer debriefing/member checking</td>
<td>1 = Clearly shared findings of descriptive/inferential statistics 2 = Significance value and/or confidence interval share of inferential statistics 3 = Elicit approach to data analysis shared 4 = Statement of data saturation 5 = Transparency through shared quotations 6 = Peer debriefing/member check</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnidge et al. [18]</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2 X X</td>
<td>1 X 3 4 5</td>
<td>_ X</td>
<td>1 2 3 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boren et al. [12]</td>
<td>1 X</td>
<td>1 2 3 X</td>
<td>1 X X X</td>
<td>_ X 3</td>
<td>1 2 3 X 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadri et al. [23]</td>
<td>1 X</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 X X X X</td>
<td>_ X</td>
<td>1 X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zekeri [13]</td>
<td>1 X</td>
<td>1 2 X X</td>
<td>1 X X X</td>
<td>_ X</td>
<td>1 X X X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"_" indicates that item does not apply to the study
"X" indicates that item is not addressed in study
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Design sample size</th>
<th>Data gathering method</th>
<th>Coping strategies</th>
<th>Financial-related</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bauer et al. [20]</td>
<td>To examine prevalence and correlates of FI among Lakota children &amp; their families</td>
<td>Cross-sectional N = 432 American Indian 40% FI</td>
<td>Survey Psychometrics (Y/N)</td>
<td>Food Stamp Food Commodities WIC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calloway et al. [14]</td>
<td>To examine relationship between monthly SNAP benefit duration and five primary outcomes variables (FS, three hunger coping behavior scales)</td>
<td>Cross-sectional N = 161 Mixed 80% FI</td>
<td>Hunger-Coping Strategies Scale Psychometrics (Y/N)</td>
<td>% Use by ethnicity/race not available % Use by ethnicity/race not available</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lurain et al. [19]</td>
<td>To identify characteristic associated with household food insecurity</td>
<td>Cross-sectional N = 206 African American 47% FI</td>
<td>Survey Psychometrics (Y/N)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullany et al. [21]</td>
<td>To describe sociodemographic factors, family eating patterns and consumer practices associated with food insecurity among AI families with young children</td>
<td>Cross-sectional N = 42 American Indians 45% FI</td>
<td>Survey Psychometrics (Y/N)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Food bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley et al. [34]</td>
<td>To examine child hunger among Mexican-origin families by: 1. Determining prevalence of child hunger 2. Identifying protective &amp; risk factors associated with hunger</td>
<td>Cross-sectional N = 470 Hispanics 58.7% FI</td>
<td>2009-Colorado Household and Community Food Resource Assessment Psychometrics (Y/N)</td>
<td>SNAP WIC School Breakfast Program School Lunch Program NSLP</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>|                              |                          |                                        |                                        | N/A                                 | N/A              |
|                              |                          |                                        |                                        | Food sourced from neighbor/friend Buying food from neighbor/friend associated | Purchase food from dollar store, mobile food vendor, Pungi* |
| Study                      | Purpose                                                                 | Design sample size | Data gathering method | Coping strategies | Coping strategies | Coping strategies | Coping strategies | Coping strategies | Coping strategies | Coping strategies | Coping strategies |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Wood et al. [17]          | To identify patterns of coping strategies, test relationship of factor scores to risk factors &amp; other characteristics | Cross-Sectional N=100 81% Caucasian 85% FI | 48 item coping strategy survey Psychometrics (Yes/No) | Food Stamps, WIC, Headstart Free/reduced lunch for children | Food intake limitation, preparing and storing food for leaner times | Sold/pawned items for money, extra work/lom | |
| Darko et al. [16]          | To explore food shopping behaviors of low-income household in relation to the ebb and flow of economic resources over the course of a month | Qualitative N=72 75% Caucasian N/A % FI | Focus groups | SNAP, WIC, Free/reduced lunch SNAP dollars surplus for some, insufficient for others | Used local food pantry | N/A | Consumption of carbohydrate-rich, canned, packaged food | Purchase from dollar store | Use coupons | Sale/Price matching/shopping at lowest price stores | Purchase with credit card | Preplan meals &amp; shop with list | Buy in bulk &amp; store for when finances low | “Taking credit” from local banks | Monthly grocery shopping trip at start of month when benefits replenished | |
| Kaufman and Kapper [22]   | To explore how adults and children participate in and perceive food acquisition, exchange, and eating amidst fluctuating and often scarce resources | Qualitative N=12 (families) Hispanic N/A %FI | Ethnographic approach, interviews | SNAP, WIC, other government assistance programs | Food pantries | Food sharing with other family | Grandmother shares meals | Shop with friends, and family to split cost of cheaper, bulk items | Purchase food from bodega | “Taking credit” from local banks | Monthly grocery shopping trip at start of month when benefits replenished | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Design sample size</th>
<th>Data gathering method</th>
<th>Psychometrics</th>
<th>Coping strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker et al. [15] To examine the ethnic differences and similarities in food purchase and consumption behaviors of limited resource women during perceived periods of food shortage</td>
<td>Qualitative N = 64 Mixxd NA % FI Focus groups</td>
<td>A: use of commodity foods AI, AA, C: school feeding program All ethnicities: food stamp program H: relied on food pantries &amp; churches C: used food banks AI: used churches, food pantries A: AA: dropped children at relative’s home for meals AI: relied on extended family (especially mother), especially mother, during food shortages H: had less extended family in the US to depend on for help C: support from friends/neighbors</td>
<td>All ethnicities would eat less, eat cheaper foods, select filling foods if money limited H: women looked for work outside of homes, men would work extra, borrow money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnidge et al. [18] To identify factors that community felt are important for addressing child hunger in summer, rural and urban</td>
<td>Mixed-Method N = 52 African American 60% FI Survey, Focus groups Psychometrics (No) WIC SNAP School breakfast programs School lunch programs Summer food service program Food pantry Rural AA relied more heavily on help from relatives Adults reduce food intake so children may have sufficient Urban AA faced more trade off challenges compared to rural Work more hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borre et al. [12] To determine if FF is linked to obesity among adults and children and how conditions that underlie FS contribute to chronic health conditions</td>
<td>Mixed method N = 36 Hispanic 63.8% FI Interviews, focus groups Used of WIC, Headstart</td>
<td>Used emergency food banks and local churches If legal documents required, assistance/program avoided All depended on social networking to reduce vulnerability important for sharing experiences, knowledge, and resources Consume surplus farm or blanished crop Buy cheapest food, even if not desired, or healthy option Regular work, Careful budgeting Some unaware of preplanning grocery shopping or food budget in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Design/sample size/ethnicity/other</td>
<td>Data gathering method</td>
<td>Coping strategies</td>
<td>Public assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quandt et al. [23]</td>
<td>To provide baseline information on food insecurity among migrant and seasonal Latino farmworkers in NC, characterize levels of FS, describe strategies farmworkers use to cope with FS</td>
<td>Mixed methods N=102 Qualitative n=25 Hispanic 66.4% F (household with children)</td>
<td>Survey, interviews Psychometrics (No)</td>
<td>Food stamps, WIC Migrant head start Free reduced lunch Used private food pantries Food Pantry/Church/Community agencies</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zekori [13]</td>
<td>To examine how food-insecure, poor, single mothers get food for themselves and children</td>
<td>Mixed-methods N=100 86% AA N/A SFI</td>
<td>Survey, interviews Psychometrics (No)</td>
<td>Food stamps Food banks and Churches Eating at Senior Meal Program=</td>
<td>Cash assistance from relatives and friends Cohabiting with relative/friend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ti Oke* is a meal sharing practice in the Lakota community
et al. [19] and Borne et al.'s [12] studies took place in North Carolina; however, it is unclear if these studies were in rural or urban locations. The remaining two studies [15, 16] did not specify their geographical location.

**Food Security Status**

Most of the studies [12, 13, 19–21, 23, 24] cited a version of the USDA's definition for food insecurity and used a version of the USDA Household Food Security Survey (HFSS). Six studies used the 6-item HFSS [13, 14, 17, 19–21]. Three studies [12, 18, 23] used the 18-item HFSS. Only one study [24] used the 12-item Radimer/Cornell measure for food insecurity. All three instruments have undergone psychometric testing that indicate validity and reliability in the racial/ethnic groups being studied [9, 25–27]. The Spanish version of the 6-item HFSS also has evidence of reliability and validity [26]. The remaining three qualitative studies sampled low-income families that described themselves as food insecure or had concerns of food insecurity.

The range of food insecurity was between 34 and 85%. The median percentage of food insecurity was 58.7%. Table 2 has the reported percentage of food insecurity by study.

**Coping Strategies**

Studies used different methods to assess coping strategies. Qualitative studies assessed coping strategies through interview and focus groups. Nine [13, 14, 17–21, 23, 24] of the quantitative and mixed method studies used surveys to measure coping strategies. Only two [14, 17] of those nine studies presented psychometric evidence.

Coping strategies were grouped into five categories: public assistance, private assistance, social networks, nutrition-related, and financial-related strategies.

**Public Assistance**

Nearly all the studies reference a government program as a coping strategy used by parents to ease food insecurity. Seven [13, 16–18, 20, 22, 24] of the 13 studies reported use of food stamps or SNAP. A study examining American Indians reported that 83.3% of families with very low food security were receiving food stamps [20]—the highest prevalence of food stamp use among the different ethnic/racial groups. For Hispanics, the use of food stamps was highly variable with use ranging from 19.4% [23] to 63.4% [24]. Studies involving predominantly African Americans reported use of food stamps ranging from 44 to 50% [13, 18]. In Caucasian-predominant studies, 31–56% of the samples received food stamps [16, 17]. Regardless of their percentage of use, all ethnic/racial groups stressed the inadequacy of the food stamp program in meeting their family's needs [15–17, 20, 22–24].

Hispanics had the greatest use of WIC with approximately 70% of the samples reporting enrollment [23, 24]. Approximately 30–50% of American Indians and Caucasians reported use of WIC [16, 17, 20]. Barnidge et al. [18] reported African Americans' participation in WIC at only 17%; however, that study specified parents of school-aged children and did not necessarily include younger children.

With respect to the school breakfast and lunch programs, the percentage of use appears to be similar among ethnic/racial groups with approximately 55–60% of African Americans, Hispanic, and Caucasian samples participating [16–18, 23, 24]. Neither of the American Indian studies [20, 21] reported on the use of free or reduced school breakfast or lunch programs.

Factors influencing use of government programs varied across ethnic/racial groups. Amongst Hispanics, parents reported immigration status as a barrier to use of food stamps [22, 23]. African Americans mentioned that stigma associated with use of government programs was sufficient to prevent their enrollment [13]. Conversely, in a Hispanic study, stigma was mentioned; however, it was not a barrier to accepting available services [22].

**Private Assistance**

10 of the 13 studies shared findings regarding use of food banks, pantries, or local churches for sources of food. Mullan [21] reported use of food banks by 44% of the sample of American Indians. The two primarily Caucasian studies [16, 17] did not report percentage of sample using private assistance programs; however, both recruited participants from food banks or pantries.

Within the Hispanic and African Americans studies there is discrepancy regarding use of private assistance. Sharkey et al.'s [24] study of Hispanic families living in the colonias along the Texas-Mexico border reported only 1.9% of the sample sourcing food from emergency assistance programs. However, the remaining four studies with Hispanics [12, 15, 22, 23] consistently reported use of food banks, pantries, or churches—although they did not quantify the use of this strategy.

Of the three studies that sampled African Americans, two studies reported use of food banks at 25% [18] and 43% [13]. However, in Parker's [15] study, the African American sample did not list food banks, pantries, or churches as a coping strategy for food insecurity.

**Social Networks**

Each of the four ethnic/racial groups listed food sharing or borrowing from friends and family as a strategy to lessen
food insecurity [15]. African Americans, Hispanics, and
American Indians specifically referenced grandmothers as
being a resource [15, 19, 22]. Hispanic and African American
parents who used social networks significantly reduced
their odds of food insecurity [19, 24]. However, newly
migrated Hispanic families may not have not established
a strong social network [12, 15]. American Indian families
that sought food from friends and family were significantly
more likely to be food insecure (p < 0.001) [20].

Nutrition-Related Strategies

Nutrition-related strategies are tactics that either compro-
mise, or protect, the dietary quality for food insecure fami-
lies. All ethnic/racial groups reported reducing, rationing, or
skipping meals [13–15, 17, 18, 23]. There is no statistically
significant difference in rationing of food among the ethnic/
racial groups [14]. All groups also consumed lower-cost,
carbohydrate-rich diets [15]. Food insecure American Indi-
nians frequently consumed foods purchased from convenience
stores and gas stations [20, 21]. Hispanic parents purchased
food from dollar stores and bodegas [22, 24]. They also
obtained surplus or blighted crops, gardened, and hunted
[12, 23].

Financial-Related Strategies

Trade-off is a strategy in which parents must choose between
paying for food or paying bills or other household expenses
[14]. Although all ethnic/racial groups reported trade-off
decisions, African American parents had statistically sig-
nificant higher scores on trade-off compared to Caucasian
parents [14].

African Americans and Hispanics tried to find additional
work [12, 13, 15, 18, 23].

Caucasians and Hispanics reported using credit to pur-
chase food. However, Caucasians used credit cards [16]
whereas Hispanic families used less formal means of bor-
rrowing money without interest or purchasing food with store
credit [22, 23]. Caucasian [16] and Hispanic [22] parents
also described in-store purchasing strategies, such as cou-
poning, to stretch their food budgets.

Discussion

Summary of Findings

The 13 studies identified in this review examined similarities
and differences in strategies used by African Ameri-
Can, American Indian, Hispanic, and Caucasian parents to
cope with food insecurity. The limited evidence suggests
that although the ethnic/racial groups share common coping
strategies, there are nuances in their application of these
strategies. Table 3 highlights coping strategies for food
insecurity among these groups as reported in the published
literature.

Similarities among the ethnic/racial groups include con-
cerns regarding the adequacy of the food stamp program
in providing households with sufficient food. Parents from
each of the groups also dealt with food insecurity by reduc-
ing, rationing, or skipping meals and consuming low-cost,
carbohydrate-rich diets. These coping strategies could
contribute to negative health outcomes such as malnourishment
and obesity. Food sharing, another common coping strategy,
reduces parent’s ability to determine what their children eat
[22].

Although limited, the evidence suggests that there are dif-
fences in how parents of different ethnicities/race apply the
coping strategies to meet their needs. For example, Hispanic
parents who are undocumented may not be able to, or may
fear, participating in government-sponsored food assistance
programs [22]. They may also be reluctant to patron food
banks that require documentation [12]. In addition, Hispanic
parents depend heavily on social networks as a coping strat-
agy. Grandmothers and familiarity with owners of local
bodegas are examples of this networking [22]. However,
those who are new arrivals to the US may not have a strong
network thus further increasing their vulnerabilities to food
insecurity [12, 15]. The only study to mention gardening
and hunting as a coping strategy was a Hispanic study [23].

Within African American parent groups, stigma with
respect to accepting food stamps was mentioned in one study
[13]. In Parker et al.’s [15] focus group study, they did not
list use of food banks, pantries, or churches as a source of
food although other studies indicate that African Americans
did participate in these program [13, 18]. According to one
of the two studies that did a direct comparison among ethnic/
racial groups, African American parents were significantly
more likely to direct their money towards food in place of
other bills [14].

Studies involving American Indian parents with food
insecurity suggest that they frequently use convenience store
meals to feed their children [20, 21]. The extent of this use
and how it compares to the use of bodegas by Hispanic fami-
lies cannot be determined using current evidence.

Most of the studies in the review did not allow direct
comparison on use of the coping strategies by ethnicity/race.
Therefore, the comparisons are only suggestive and call for
a need for additional study.

Limitations of the Studies

The studies used in this review have several limitations. One
limitation is risk of sampling bias because of recruitment
from Headstart centers, food banks, and WIC offices. The
### Table 3 Coping strategies for food insecurity categorized by ethnicity/race as reported in the published literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping strategies</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grandmother’s support</td>
<td>Grandmother’s support [15]</td>
<td>Grandmother’s support [12, 22-24]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coping strategies used by these individuals may be different from those who are food insecure but do not use these programs. Recruiting from a university setting [16] also is not representative given that most food insecure individuals only have high school education or less [1]. The studies also did not uniformly control for covariates such as acculturation, age of children, and rural versus urban settings. Additionally, statistical analysis of coping strategies was primarily limited to descriptive statistics. Because many of the studies in this review have sampling bias, the results of the descriptive statistics may have limited generalizability.

The most critical limitation in the quantitative studies is lack of reliability and validity for measurements of coping strategies. Only two studies [14, 17] provided psychometric evidence for their coping strategies measurement. The qualitative studies share a similar lack of confidence for credible findings given the lack of clear methodology and analysis.

**Strengths and Weaknesses of the Review**

A strength of this review is the integration of quantitative, qualitative, and mixed method studies. The quantitative designs provided descriptive and some inferential statistics. However, the qualitative designs give additional information to help understand the context in which parents select certain strategies. The use of the Household Food Security Survey as the operational definition for food insecurity in nearly all studies strengthened the review by providing a common ground from which comparisons could be made with respect to food security status. Finally, most studies appear to have collected data between 2002 and 2014. The passage of the 2002 Farm Bill impacted the eligibility of SNAP for legal immigrants [28] and WIC food packages changed in 2014 [29]. Both policy changes could have influenced the strategies parents used for food insecurity; however, because data were collected between these years, the influence these policy changes may have been minimized.

This systematic review focused on African Americans, American Indians, Hispanics, and Caucasians. However, the groups have unequal representation in the total sample size and the number of studies representing their ethnicity/race. Furthermore, the US has other ethnic/racial minorities, such as African, Middle Eastern and Southern Asian groups that may include recent immigrants and refugees who are also vulnerable to food insecurity. Their exclusion from this review because of lack of studies widens the gap in knowledge.
Addition to Current Knowledge

To some extent, all ethnic/racial groups studied in this review used similar coping strategies. Issues such as social stigma, immigration status, use of credit, and accessibility to grocery and convenience stores are factors that appear to influence the choices in coping strategies used by parents of different ethnic/racial groups. Additional research will hopefully clarify to what extent these issues play a role in directing coping strategies used by parents. This knowledge will assist in development of culturally acceptable and practical programs and policies to address food insecurity in vulnerable populations.

A basis for a culturally acceptable program may be through social networking, a coping strategy used by parents in each of the ethnic/racial groups. Community discussions through social networks could help reduce stigma associated with use of government aid for African Americans. Through social networking, a safety net program could be shared with Hispanic families that have immigrated to US so that they may identify sources for meals/food that they would feel safe accessing. Another example of a culturally acceptable program could be an intervention delivered through grandmothers to help African American, American Indian, and Hispanic parents develop skills in budgeting, strategic grocery shopping, and proper storage of food to maximize families’ food resources.

Implications for Future Research

This review uncovers a gap in knowledge with respect to the ability to determine if certain strategies are culturally preferred. Additionally, most of the studies that were used in this systematic review suffered from serious threats to validity with respect to measurements of coping strategies, which weakened the credibility of their findings. Therefore, determining similarities and differences in food insecurity coping strategies by ethnicity/race needs robust studies that: (1) have a specific aim to examine coping strategies, (2) sample representative groups, (3) control for covariates, (4) use valid, reliable quantitative measures or explicit qualitative methods.

Findings from studies in this review also suggest the need to examine how other factors such as geographic location and acculturation affect coping strategies used by parents. Studies also need to include other groups vulnerable to food insecurity such as refugees and immigrants from countries outside of North and Central America.

Families immigrating to the US may have an increased risk for food insecurity [30]; however, they also have a delay in eligibility for programs such as SNAP and decreased social safety nets. Therefore, an awareness of how parents of different cultures apply coping strategies may help in the development of community-based programs that will lessen their risk for food insecurity and its consequences.

Conclusion

Although parents of different ethnic/racial backgrounds use similar strategies to cope with food insecurity, how they use these strategies varies. Current evidence is insufficient to confidently determine the extent of these differences. This review is a starting point for exploration cultural nuances in coping strategies used by food insecure parents of various ethnic/racial backgrounds. The review also lists specific recommendations for further research.

As the US population continues to diversify, identification of the similarities and differences in coping strategies among ethnicities/races using strong research methods will help to develop culturally acceptable policies and programs that may reduce food insecurity and associated negative outcomes.
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Appendix 1

Pubmed Boolean logic command

Search performed 2/6/2017
Search limit from 01/01/1995 through 02/01/2017
Search results 805 articles


AND

Appendix 2

Embuse Boolean logic command
Search performed 2/7/2017
Search limit from 01/01/1995 through 02/01/2017
Search results: 855 articles

(‘Food insecurity’ OR ‘food security’ OR ‘hunger’ OR ‘food supplies’ OR ‘food insecurity’)

AND

(‘Coping Strategy Questionnaire’ OR ‘coping behavior’ OR ‘familial coping’ OR ‘coping ability’ OR ‘coping strategies’ OR ‘buffering’ OR ‘sharing’)

OR

‘Social support’ OR ‘Social Support’ OR ‘Food Aid Program’ OR ‘Food Assistance Program’ OR ‘Food Stamps’ OR ‘SNAP Program’ OR ‘Medicaid’ OR ‘Special Supplemental Nutrition Program’ OR ‘WIC’ OR ‘Food Bank’ OR ‘Soup Kitchen’ OR ‘Sharing’ OR ‘Electricity’ OR ‘Water’ OR ‘Utilities’ OR ‘Network’ OR ‘Social’ OR ‘Steal’ OR ‘Hunger coping’ OR ‘Compromises’ OR ‘Manag’ OR ‘Deal’ OR ‘Hand’)

AND

(‘Ethnicity’ OR ‘Hispanic’ OR ‘ethnicity’ OR ‘minority group’ OR ‘minority’ OR ‘undocumented immigrant’ OR ‘Minority’)

OR

‘African americans’ OR ‘Mexican’ OR ‘Hispanic’ OR ‘Latino’ OR ‘Latina’ OR ‘immigrant’ OR ‘Asian americans’ OR ‘Low-income’ OR ‘low income’)

OR

‘Public Assistance’ OR ‘Medicaid’ OR ‘Supplemental Nutrition Program’ OR ‘SNAP Program’ OR ‘Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program’ OR ‘Food Assistance Program’ OR ‘Food Aid Program’ OR ‘Food Stamp’ OR ‘WIC’}
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