

Observation and comparison of mealtime behaviours in a sample of children with avoidant/restrictive food intake disorders and a control sample of children with typical development

Victoria K. Aldridge^{1,2*}, Terence M. Dovey³, Nicole el Hawi³, Antonie Martiniuc³, Clarissa I. Martin⁴ & Caroline Meyer^{5,6}

¹Faculty of Health and Life Sciences
De Montfort University
Leicester
LE1 9BH

²Institute of Child Health,
University College London
30 Guilford Street
London
WC1N 1EH, UK

³Marie Jahoda Building
Brunel University
Kingston Lane
Uxbridge
Middlesex
UB8 3PH, UK

⁴Midlands Psychology
The Hayes
19 Newport Road
Stafford
Staffordshire,
ST16 1BA, UK

⁵WMG
University of Warwick
Coventry
Warwickshire
CV4 7AL, UK

⁶Coventry and Warwickshire Partnership NHS Trust
Coventry, UK.

* Author for Correspondence (vicki.aldridge@dmu.ac.uk)

This is the pre-peer reviewed version of the article: ‘Observation and comparison of mealtime behaviours in a sample of children with avoidant/restrictive food intake disorders and a control sample of children with typical development’, which has been published in final form in the Infant Mental Health Journal (<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10970355>) at DOI: 10.1002/imhj.21722. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

Objectives: Despite widespread use of behavioural observations to evaluate child feeding behaviours in research and clinical practice, few studies have attempted to comprehensively characterise mealtimes or identify features that differentiate children with disordered feeding from those without; these were the aims of the current study.

Methods: Mealtime observations were conducted for 18 children with Avoidant Restrictive Food Intake Disorder (ARFID) and 21 typically developing children. Observations were coded inductively, and then associations between disorder and observed mealtime actions were examined controlling for confounding factors.

Results: Almost all behaviours and actions were observed across both clinical and non-clinical mealtimes, and many did not differ in frequency between children with and without ARFID. However, significant differences between groups were observed in the frequencies of behaviours relating to food intake, visual and physical engagement with food and feeding, and movement during mealtimes.

Conclusions: The observation of comparable behaviours across clinical and non-clinical groups suggests that eating behaviours exist on a continuum from 'normal' to 'abnormal', with behaviours differing in frequency rather than type. The notable differences in behaviour frequency in this study suggest that identification of children with disordered feeding behaviour should focus on the child's engagement with food and restlessness during mealtimes. Reliance on emotional and escape-maintained behaviours will lead to under-recognition of families in need of clinical support with feeding.

Key Words: Behavioural Observation, Child Feeding, Eating Behaviours, Avoidant/Restriction Food Intake Disorder

Introduction

Avoidant Restrictive Food Intake Disorder (ARFID) in childhood has, in the past, been studied using relatively simplistic characterisations of disorder (e.g., organic versus nonorganic aetiology). However, contemporary literature substantiates the complex and ambiguous nature of food avoidance and the numerous physical, social/emotional, and behavioural factors that are intimately associated with both disordered and typical feeding development (Dovey, Isherwood, Aldridge & Martin, 2010; Douglas, 1995; Silverman, 2010; Field, Garland, & Williams, 2003). This complexity has resulted in a lack of consistency in identifying and managing/treating ARFID within clinical and scientific communities.

Recent updates to official diagnostic criteria, including the re-labelling of feeding disorder as Avoidant/Restrictive Food Intake Disorder (ARFID) in the DSM 5 (2013) reflect the breadth and heterogeneity of the condition. Furthermore, the ARFID title underlines the relevance and importance of the child's approaches to food/eating (avoidant/restrictive) as well as what the child eats. Despite improved awareness and understanding of complex feeding disorders, there remains widespread under-diagnosis of children with disordered feeding as a result of inappropriate past diagnostic criteria pertaining to weight loss/poor growth (Bryant-Waugh et al., 2010).

Poor intake, including number of food bites or volume of food eaten and associated avoidant behaviour towards food and/or mealtimes (Arvedson, 2008; Binnendyk & Lucyshyn, 2009; Casey et al, 2009; VanDalen & Penrod, 2010; Woods, 2010) have been consistently observed in home and laboratory studies. This suggests that reduced food intake is a key characteristic of disordered feeding behaviour in childhood, and indeed an ARFID diagnosis will be unequivocal in children requiring supplementary or total tube-feeding in the absence of physical cause. However, a great many additional psychological, social, and emotional factors have also been associated with disordered child feeding (Berlin et al., 2009; Black, 1999; Bryant-Waugh et al., 2010; Chatoor, Hirsch, Ganiban, Persinger, & Hamburger, 1998; Piazza, 2008; Sanchez & Castillo-Duran, 2004; Stein, Whoolly, & McPherson, 1999). This suggests that neglecting other factors in favour of physical attributes omits a population of

children with disordered feeding from assessment and treatment, simply because they are managing, at that time, to maintain weight/growth, often via alternative, undesirable methods such as excessive milk intake or high calorie-low nutrient diets.

The purpose of the current study was to identify mealtime characteristics, via behavioural observations, that delineate ARFID feeding behaviour from normative feeding behaviour. Behavioural observation is a cornerstone of clinical assessment and diagnosis for ARFID, and the prevalence of studies utilising observational methodologies highlight their value in assessing and quantifying feeding behaviours within research (e.g., Ammaniti et al, 2004; 2010; Chatoor et al, 1998; Cooper et al, 2004; De Moor et al., 2005; Farrow & Blissett, 2006; Greer, Gulotta, Masler, & Laud, 2008; Harris, 2009; Ramsay et al, 1993; Stein et al, 1999; Whelan & Cooper, 2000; Woods, 2010). However, continued under-identification of ARFID suggests that existing observational methods based on quantifying pre-defined criteria, or on valuable but variable clinical experience ('clinical eye'), are not sufficient for screening or diagnosis of all relevant cases.

The aim of the current study was to use an inductive method for coding behavioural observations of child mealtimes to build on existing research (Hoffmann, 1992; Sanders, Patel, Le Grice, & Shepherd, 1993, and Chatoor, Ganiban, Harrison and Hirsch, 2001) by identifying a range of mealtime characteristics for ARFID children that was unconstrained by prior beliefs or expectations. Furthermore, the objective was to identify how the feeding behaviours and characteristics of children with ARFID compare and contrast to those of typically developing children, in the absence of overt physical indicators of disorder such as tube-feeding or significant growth faltering. It was believed that the inductive approach to coding would identify additional, subtle behavioural characteristics that differentiate children with ARFID from children without ARFID.

Method

Participants

Parents of children under the age of seven years were recruited into the current study.

Parent of children in the typically developing (non-clinical) group (N=21) were recruited

through nurseries and play groups. Families who were seeking or receiving healthcare, clinical input, or professional consultation for a child feeding issue were excluded from the non-clinical group. Participants were recruited into the clinical group (N=19) if their child had a diagnosis of ARFID. Diagnoses were confirmed by two paediatric psychologists, who saw the children separately, and used the DSM-V criteria for ARFID. Recordings of ARFID mealtimes were collected at the point of referral and prior to the first consultation with the clinical psychologist by a trained assistant psychologist as part the assessment procedure. Procedures for collecting and using video footage were explained to parents by the clinician (clinical group) or investigator (non-clinical), and parents were given the choice to participate. One parent in the clinical group withdrew from the study post data collection, leaving a final sample of 39 children, ranging in age from 18 to 72 months (Median=32 months; IQR=25-44). The non-clinical group (N=21) included twelve girls (57%) and nine boys, with a median age of 32 months (IQR=25-38; range 18-72 months). The clinical group (N=18) comprised 7 girls (38.9%) and 11 boys; median age 36 months (IQR=24.75-55; range 18-70 months). It was not possible to match children on a one-to-one basis; however, the two groups did not differ significantly in terms of age ($U=216.5$, $p=0.44$), gender ($\chi^2(1, 39)=1.3$, $p=0.26$), or meal duration ($U=175$, $p=0.71$), and these factors were controlled for in all analyses to avoid confounding due to any minor differences.

Procedure

Volunteers were contacted by the lead investigator to organise the video observation, and all observations were made in the child's home. Parents were informed that the video should feature a typical mealtime; it should be at the child's normal main mealtime (either midday or evening meal), with foods chosen by the parent/child as normal, and in the typical manner and context. On the day of the observation parents completed a consent form and a small number of demographic questions, then recording equipment was positioned according to advice from parents regarding the child's typical mealtime seating arrangement. When parents had fully prepared the child's meal the video camera was started and the researcher left for the entirety of the meal. The objective was to minimise disruption to the normal family

mealtime and minimise the child's awareness of the recording equipment as much as possible. At the end of the meal, as determined and terminated by the parent, the recording equipment was stopped. Parents were then debriefed and given an opportunity to ask questions of the researcher. Only those mealtimes considered and reported by parents as a 'typical' experience were included in the analysis.

Behaviour/action coding

In the current study, behaviours of interest were not predetermined as they have been in past observational studies (e.g., Sanders et al., 1993). Instead, an inductive approach was taken to observation coding. The aim of an inductive approach over more traditional deductive coding was to examine the full range of actions and behaviours that occurred during a child's mealtime, without preconception or predetermination about what was important (Thomas, 2006). The aim was to provide a rich body of data from which the mealtime characteristics of children with and without ARFID could be examined and contrasted. In the current study all physical actions or movements were coded and recorded using shorthand descriptions (e.g., 'lkf' - looks at food, 'enf' - engages with a non-food/non-mealtime item). This approach was designed to reduce the chance of observer selection or interpretation when recording actions.

An adapted coding approach was used in the current study, based upon Partial Interval Recording (PIR) (Cone & Foster, 1982; Harrop, Daniels & Foulkes, 1990; Klesges et al., 1983). PIR, which has been used by a number of other researchers in the field (e.g., Klesges et al., 1983; Stark et al., 2000), involves splitting observations into short intervals and reporting all observed behaviours during each interval. Typically, this method involves coding the presence or absence of predetermined behaviours of interest within each interval. Because criticisms concerning estimates of behaviour frequency have been levelled at PIR when larger intervals such as 30-60 seconds are used, or if multiple occurrences of the same behaviour happen within a single interval (Harrop et al., 1990), a five second interval was adopted in the current study. Furthermore, all behaviours occurring in each interval, including repetitions of the same action, were recorded.

Each interval was viewed multiple times to ensure accuracy and completeness of recording. Descriptors for all actions were entered into the coding matrix in a serial manner to allow examination of the distribution of actions across a meal duration, though certain actions could occur simultaneously (e.g., *looks at food*, *touches cutlery*, and *talk* could all occur at the same time). It was not possible for the primary investigator to be blinded when coding observations, however observations were also coded by two additional researchers who were blind to group assignment, to assess reliability among the actions recorded. The first double-coder coded all 39 videos, while the second coded a random subset of 15 (38%) videos. Second coders were instructed to record all observed actions and to avoid behaviour interpretation (e.g., intention beyond the physical action or function of the behaviour). It was found, when assessing double coding, that certain discrete actions were overlooked by individual double coders; however, 'good' (ICC 0.60 – 0.74) or, in the majority of cases, 'excellent' (ICC >0.75) reliability was evidenced (by two-way random effects ICC models for absolute agreement) between all of the actions coded by the primary coder and at least one other coder across the range of outcomes scores included in the current paper (see table 1).

To avoid coding bias, no processing, sorting, or summarising of codes was undertaken until all mealtime observations had been fully coded. After coding, the number of unique codes was identified across observations, and the frequency of each code was ascertained and recorded for each observation. This approach permitted comprehensive comparison between children with and without ARFID, making it possible to assess where differences existed between groups, and whether such differences related to the type or frequency/rate of behaviours.

Codes and outcome scores

In total, 99 unique behaviour/action codes were recorded by the primary coder during video coding, which related to what the child was doing with their hands, face, and body, what the child was touching and engaging/interacting with, and where the child was looking throughout the meal. Of the 99 unique codes, 84 were observed in at least one non-clinical observation, and 98 were observed in at least 1 clinical video. The code that was unique to

the non-clinical group ('engages with someone else' food') was only observed in one video. Of the 15 codes that were unique to the clinical group, 'avoids looking at food' was observed in 8 observations, and 'lean' and 'toy in mouth' were observed in 3, but the remaining 12 codes were observed in ≤ 2 of the cases in that group. Overall, 23 codes were relatively uncommon and only observed in two or fewer mealtimes in either group.

During coding quantification and data entry it was evident that many individual codes presented only very subtle topographical differences in action, or the same actions labelled with different codes (e.g., lean and reach). This meant that some individual codes were recorded in very few observations, despite the fundamental action being common to most or all observations. Therefore, topographically similar behavioural codes were clustered to form practically and statistically more robust behavioural categories for analysis (e.g., cough, choke, gag - grouped under a 'respiratory' category). Codes observed for at least 50% of children in at least one group (53 codes) were identified; these codes were grouped together if appropriate, and other topographically similar codes from the total list were added where relevant. This process resulted in the pooling of approximately 80 codes into 30 outcome scores (presented in table 1), according to similarity of codes and nature of the action. Codes not taken forward for analysis were typically both uncommon and infrequent actions (e.g., puts rubbish in bin, snatch, and yawn), which were observed at a very low frequency and in very few observations. All scores except 'refuse/avoid food' were found to be reliable among raters; all reliable scores were used as behavioural outcomes for analysis.

Statistical analyses

Outcome data displayed a variety of distributions within the two groups. However, in most instances mild skew in the outcome did not appear to adversely affect summary statistics; therefore, means and standard deviations are presented for rates and frequencies of observed behaviours in the current paper. Rates were established by dividing total behaviour frequency by meal duration for each child; this information was used to determine which behaviours were frequent and infrequent in each group, and whether this pattern differed across groups. Simple linear regression analysis was used to produce unadjusted

estimates of difference between groups for each outcome variable. Multiple linear regression was then carried out to assess whether clinical and non-clinical groups differed significantly in the frequency of any mealtime behaviour outcomes, whilst controlling for confounding between groups. Child age (months), child sex (girl/boy), meal duration (minutes), and meal choice (midday or evening meal) were considered to have the potential to influence the types and rates of behaviours observed during a child's mealtime, and so these variables were adjusted for in all regression models. Model fit and residual distributions were assessed for each regression model and these fell within acceptable parameters unless otherwise stated.

Table 1.

Categories and subcategories of actions observed during mealtime observations and their composite codes.

Category	Behaviour Outcome Score	Included Action Codes
All Eating/Intake	1 Bites	Bites of food
	2 Parent Fed Bites	Bites fed by the parent
	3 Drinks	Drink
	4 Chewing	Chewing
	5 Licking	Lick food, lick cutlery, lick lips
All Engagement Food/Drink	6 Active Engagement Food/Drink	touching, moving, preparing food/drink
	7 Passive Engagement	Touching but no movement/attention
	8 Touch/Engage with Cutlery	Touch or use cutlery
Looking at Food Related	9 Looking at Food	Look at food (own or others')
	10 Looks at Others' Food	Look at someone else's food
	11 Look at Cutlery	Look at cutlery
	12 Look at Hands	Look at hands
Not Looking at Food	13 Not Looking at Food	Looking at parent or sibling, TV or other non-specified, look at hands, eyes closed, glance
All Small Movements	14 Sitting Movements	Lean, fidget, clap, arms up, move body away, reach, slouch, kneel, reposition, move, mess about, move body away, thumbs up, engage with

		something else
	15 Touch Head/Face	touch face, hands on head
	16 Wipe Hands/Face	wipe hands, wipe face
Standing Movements	17 Stand Movements	Stand, walk, run, dance, out of shot, escape
Laugh	18 Laugh	Laugh
Upset	19 Upset	Screw up face, whine, cry
Communication	20 Talk	Talking
	21 Non-Verbal Communication	Shake head, nod head
Respiratory	22 Respiratory	Cough, choke, sneeze, blow
Disengagement Total	23 Toy/Object in Mouth	Putting non-food/mealtime object in mouth
	24 Engages with Non-Food/Non-Mealtime Item	Play/interact/engage with object or person unrelated to the food, drink, or mealtime
	25 Disengage from Food/Meal	Put food, cutlery, or drink down
	26 Give Meal Objects to Parent	Give food, plate, cutlery, or drink to parent
Lose/Drop Food Total	27 Drop Food Intentionally	Spit out food, intentionally drop food, intentionally remove food from mouth
	28 Lose Food Unintentionally	Unintentionally drop food, lose food from mouth
	29 Food Expulsion	Spit out or intentionally remove food from mouth
Refuse/Avoid	30 Refuse/Avoid Food	Refuse bite, push food away, delay bite

Results

Behaviour frequencies and rates

Across all behaviour outcomes only 'toy/object in mouth' was unique to one group (clinical); all others, including food refusal, were observed in both study groups at varying frequencies. Because toy/object in mouth was not observed at all in the non-clinical group, it is not included in inferential statistical analyses. To account for variability in meal duration and

provide information about behaviour incidence, rates were also calculated for each outcome to show rate of behaviour per minute. Rates of ≥ 1 represent a behaviour occurring one or more times per minute, and rates < 0.1 represent behaviours occurring less than once in 10 minutes. Group summaries for behaviour frequencies and rates are presented in table 2.

As shown in table 2, there was relative similarity in behaviour rate between groups for many of the observed behaviour outcomes, wherein the behaviours were comparably, low-, moderate-, or high-rate. However, for 10 outcomes the rate of behaviour in one group was more than twice that of the other group. Group discrepancy is of less practical significance for low-rate behaviours such as food expulsion or respiratory outcomes for which, even at the highest rates, the behaviours occur less than once every ten minutes. However, for higher rate behaviours (e.g., those occurring more than once every 2 minutes) such disparity represents notable differences in the mealtime behaviour profiles of children with and without ARFID. Four behavioural outcomes demonstrated a large imbalance between groups despite occurring at high rates in both groups; child-led bites occurred at less than half the rate (rate ratio = 0.47) in the clinical group relative to the non-clinical group, whilst touching or engaging with cutlery (2.40), sitting movements (2.05), and engaging with non-food/non-mealtime items (2.38), showed more than twice the incidence in the clinical group compared to the non-clinical group. Three behaviours ('looking at others' food', 'parent fed bites', and 'upset') were demonstrated at low rates in the non-clinical group but higher rates in the clinical group. Regression analysis was used to further investigate the clinical significance of observed differences, with particular focus on higher rate behaviours in one or both groups.

Models of observed mealtime behaviours

A series of multiple linear regression models were used to compare clinical and non-clinical child mealtime behaviour frequencies for each of the 28 mealtime behaviour outcomes observed across both study groups. Each model was controlled for child age and sex, meal duration, and meal choice (midday vs. evening meal). Adjusted and unadjusted estimates of group difference are presented in table 3; full details of significance, confidence intervals, and model fit are presented for adjusted estimates.

Table 2.

Group summaries (means (standard deviation)) to summarise observed behaviour outcome frequencies and rates per minute between clinical ($n=18$) and non-clinical ($n=21$) children.

	Non-Clinical		Clinical		Rate Ratio
	Frequency	Rate/min	Frequency	Rate/min	C/NC
Bites**	96.19 (44.86)	4.98 (2.23)	40.89 (22.82)	2.32 (1.40)	0.47^b
Parent Fed Bites ^a	1.24 (2.34)	0.06 (0.10)	9.56 (14.01)	0.54 (0.94)	9.00^b
Drinks	5.76 (7.61)	0.33 (0.50)	5.94 (11.95)	0.25 (0.36)	0.76
Chewing**	178.62 (50.55)	9.19 (2.19)	120.56 (78.07)	6.61 (3.45)	0.72
Licking	9.19 (14.20)	0.48 (0.82)	16.06 (15.65)	0.87 (0.83)	1.81
Active Engagement F/D**	134.43 (54.42)	6.97 (2.42)	70.94 (52.40)	3.84 (2.25)	0.55
Passive Engagement F/D**	30.57 (29.08)	1.50 (1.34)	23.56 (33.04)	1.17 (1.46)	0.78
Touch/Engage with Cutlery**	37.00 (47.26)	1.76 (2.18)	80.78 (61.34)	4.23 (2.98)	2.40^b
Looking at Food**	167.29 (66.93)	8.65 (2.86)	125.33 (83.58)	7.00 (4.10)	0.81
Looks at Others' Food ^a	3.76 (7.16)	0.17 (0.29)	13.39 (24.06)	0.71 (1.24)	4.18^b
Look at Cutlery	11.00 (20.02)	0.49 (0.80)	17.78 (22.05)	0.96 (1.19)	1.96
Look at Hands	5.62 (6.89)	0.29 (0.34)	7.83 (7.47)	0.39 (0.27)	1.34
Not Looking at Food**	257.05 (96.03)	13.00 (3.81)	312.39 (154.29)	16.21 (4.25)	1.25

Sitting Movements**	67.71 (72.35)	3.21 (2.64)	122.56 (81.68)	6.57 (2.95)	2.05^b
Touch Head/Face**	19.19 (22.22)	0.94 (0.97)	17.78 (11.68)	0.98 (0.61)	1.04
Wipe Hands/Face**	13.43 (16.88)	0.63 (0.68)	10.33 (7.88)	0.54 (0.43)	0.86
Standing Movements**	18.29 (41.80)	0.77 (1.40)	21.56 (41.05)	1.15 (1.73)	1.49
Laugh	1.14 (3.29)	0.06 (0.16)	2.33 (6.59)	0.08 (0.22)	1.33
Upset ^a	0.90 (2.28)	0.04 (0.10)	7.61 (9.46)	0.47 (0.68)	11.75^b
Talk**	50.19 (35.13)	2.58 (1.69)	65.28 (58.04)	3.60 (2.64)	1.40
Non-Verbal Communication	2.86 (3.89)	0.15 (0.21)	9.22 (9.24)	0.48 (0.39)	3.20^b
Respiratory	0.14 (0.65)	0.01 (0.03)	1.56 (3.24)	0.08 (0.16)	8.00^b
Toy/Object in Mouth	0.00 (---)	0.00 (---)	2.78 (7.14)	0.14 (0.37)	--- ^c
Engage w/Non-Food/Mealtime**	19.43 (19.43)	0.99 (1.02)	47.61 (44.88)	2.36 (2.17)	2.38^b
Disengage from Food/Meal	8.76 (9.42)	0.43 (0.41)	8.06 (8.47)	0.40 (0.35)	0.93
Give Meal Objects to Parent	3.05 (5.32)	0.17 (0.28)	3.00 (3.96)	0.16 (0.19)	0.94
Drop Food Intentionally	1.48 (3.03)	0.06 (0.13)	1.83 (3.31)	0.10 (0.17)	1.67
Lose Food Unintentionally	4.33 (4.37)	0.21 (0.20)	3.50 (3.29)	0.17 (0.16)	0.81
Food Expulsion	0.95 (1.83)	0.04 (0.09)	1.72 (3.34)	0.09 (0.18)	2.25^b

***Behaviour rate >once per two minutes in each group (i.e., high rate behaviour); ^anotable discrepancy in rate between groups; ^bRate ratio between groups >2; ^cRate is not compared between groups for 'Toy/Object in Mouth' due to zero variance in the non-clinical group*

Table 3.

Estimate and p-value for the unadjusted mean difference (clinical – non-clinical), adjusted^a mean difference coefficient, p-values, and 95% confidence interval, and overall regression model fit (R^2), for 29 child behaviour outcomes.

Behaviour Outcome	Unadjusted mean difference (<i>B</i>)	<i>p</i>	Adjusted mean difference* (<i>Beta</i>)	<i>p</i>	95% CI for Beta	Adj R^2
Bites^b	-55.30	<0.01*	-57.04	<0.01*	-81.78, -32.29	0.43
Parent Fed Bites^b	8.32	0.01	11.64	<0.01	5.21, 18.07	0.26
Drinks	0.18	0.95	0.59	0.87	-6.42, 7.60	<0.01
Chewing	-58.06	0.01	-59.10	<0.01	-96.33, -21.87	0.46
Licking	6.87	0.16	6.74	0.22	-4.28, 17.77	<0.01
Active Engagement F/D	-63.48	<0.01	-71.50	<0.01*	-105.19, -37.81	0.42
Passive Engagement F/D	-7.02	0.49	-3.21	0.76	-24.72, 18.30	0.05
Touch/Engage with Cutlery ^b	43.78	0.02	29.23	0.11	-6.42, 64.87	0.26
Looking at Food	-41.95	0.09	-61.87	0.01	-108.17, -15.57	0.30
Looks at Others' Food ^b	9.63	0.09	4.90	0.41	-6.96, 16.77	0.12
Look at Cutlery	6.78	0.32	4.59	0.47	-8.14, 17.32	0.29
Look at Hands	2.21	0.34	3.05	0.21	-1.80, 7.91	0.11
Not Looking at Food	55.34	0.18	60.50	0.03	7.03, 113.98	0.66
Sitting Movements^b	54.84	0.03	59.70	0.02	12.50, 106.90	0.34
Touch Head/Face	-1.41	0.81	-1.54	0.81	-14.35, 11.27	0.01

Wipe Hands/Face	-3.10	0.48	-3.89	0.40	-13.12, 5.34	0.08
Standing Movements	3.27	0.81	4.61	0.75	-24.76, 33.98	<0.01
Laugh	1.19	0.47	0.70	0.70	-2.99, 4.39	<0.01
Upset^b	6.71	<0.01	5.05	0.04	0.37, 9.72	0.22
Talk	15.09	0.33	8.55	0.58	-22.45, 39.53	0.16
Non-Verbal Communication^b	6.37	<0.01	4.88	0.03	0.63, 9.13	0.38
Respiratory^b	1.41	0.06	1.77	0.03	0.19, 3.35	0.10
Engage w/Non-Food/Mealtime^b	28.18	0.01	34.55	<0.01	12.73, 56.37	0.29
Disengage from Food/Meal	-0.71	0.81	-2.46	0.39	-8.19, 3.27	0.19
Give Meal Objects to Parent	-0.05	0.98	0.75	0.65	-2.62, 4.13	<0.01
Lose Food Intentionally	0.36	0.73	0.85	0.45	-1.43, 3.12	<0.01
Lose Food Unintentionally	-0.83	0.51	-0.55	0.68	-3.24, 2.15	0.07
Food Expulsion ^b	0.77	0.37	1.56	0.10	-0.31, 3.43	0.02

^aAll regression models were adjusted for child age and sex, meal duration, and meal choice (midday/evening); * $p < 0.001$, ^bshowed substantial group difference in rate (rate ratio >2)

Children in the non-clinical group were found to display significantly higher levels of behaviours that indicate direct and intentional interaction with food and the mealtime; these included the number of bites eaten and the amount of chewing, as well as the amount of active physical engagement with food and looking at food. In each case, the model, including group difference, explained at least 30% of the variance in the outcome behaviour. In contrast, children in the clinical group demonstrated significantly higher levels of behaviours that are suggestive of poor engagement and participation in feeding. This included significantly more frequent parent feeding of bites, not looking at food, sitting movements, and engagement with other, non-food/mealtime objects. Clinical children also displayed significantly more indications of upset, non-verbal communication, and respiratory actions than non-clinical children but at far lower frequencies. In contrast to the bivariate indications in table 2, no significant differences were shown between groups for food expulsion, looking at someone else' food, or touching and engaging with cutlery, once confounding influences were controlled for.

Discussion

The current study examines the mealtime behaviours of children with and without ARFID. The aim was to identify mealtime behaviours associated with ARFID, and to demonstrate how the mealtime characteristics of children with ARFID differ from typically developing children. Children in the non-clinical group were differentiated from the clinical group by significantly greater active and productive engagement with food. This was demonstrated by an increase in physical and visual engagement and a resulting increase in bites and chewing, relative to the clinical group. In direct contrast, children in the clinical group were differentiated from the non-clinical children by significantly greater engagement with non-food and non-mealtime items both physically and visually, a greater reliance on parents for productive bite taking, and a far greater incidence of small movements whilst seated during the mealtime. Though the effect sizes were smaller and underlying frequencies were much lower, clinical children also showed a significantly greater amount of non-verbal communication, and a great number of respiratory actions and signs of upset. Despite the

relatively small samples included in the current study, the majority of models and coefficients demonstrated definitively significant or non-significant results. The only exception to this was the outcome 'Touch/Engage with Cutlery'; despite a significant model ($F(5, 33)=3.72$, $p=0.009$), no covariates were significant at 0.05. However, the wide and highly imbalanced confidence interval for *which meal* ($B=34.96$, 95% CI: -2.21, 72.13) suggests a possible difference in the use of cutlery at midday and evening meals.

The current study supports past research, which suggests that children with ARFID eat consistently fewer bites of food during their meal than children with no feeding disorder (Arvedson, 2008; Casey et al, 2009; Levy et al, 2009; Woods, 2010). Even when controlling for the significant role of meal duration, ARFID was a strong predictor of differences in the number of bites attempted in the current study. Child-led bites and chewing were significantly lower in frequency, while parent feeding of the child was significantly more common than in non-clinical children, irrespective of child age. Parent feeding may account for the elevated levels of non-verbal communication and upset observed in the clinical group; however, it is important to note that parent behaviour may be in response to escape-maintained behaviours used by the child over time. Therefore, causal conclusions concerning parent feeding and ARFID should be held with caution. The increased non-verbal and distressed behaviours observed in this study support existing literature concerning associations between disordered feeding, emotionality, and negative mealtime behaviours (e.g., Arvedson, 2008; Benoit & Coolbear, 1998; Binnendyk & Lucyshyn, 2009; Burklow & Linscheid, 2004; Chatoor et al., 2001; Piazza et al., 2003). However, these behaviours occurred at low frequencies even in clinical observations. Despite evidence of excessive fluid intake in some cases of ARFID, often as a method of food avoidance (Crist & Napier-Phillips, 2001; Smith & Lifshitz, 1994), frequency of drinks did not differ between groups in the current study. Rate of drinking was generally low for all children, but it was positively associated with meal duration.

The incidences of active engagement with food were considerably higher in the non-clinical group than the avoidant/restrictive group and this included looking at food as well as

physical interactions. Conversely, passive engagement with food (touching but not looking at, moving, or manipulating food) did not differ. The inability of passive engagement to discriminate between groups may suggest that 'avoidance' in ARFID relates fundamentally to food intake rather than any contact with food or mealtimes. This inference is supported in the current study by the observation that the frequency of dynamic standing movements (i.e., standing, walking, leaving the mealtime environment) did not differ significantly between groups. The more widespread fear or avoidance of mealtimes and high rate of escape-maintained behaviours observed in some ARFID cases may reflect specific and identifiable aetiology (e.g., choking phobia, sensory sensitivity). Shifting attention away from food and onto other objects in the environment was observed at a significantly higher frequency in the clinical group compared to the non-clinical group. This finding reinforces existing literature, which suggests that avoidant/restrictive eating disorders may be associated with diminished appetite and motivation to eat (e.g., Berlin, Davies, Lobato & Silverman, 2009; Burcklow & Linscheid, 2004; Byars et al., 2003; Ramsay, Gisel & Boutry, 1993; Rudolph, 1994). It suggests that non-clinical children possess a type/degree of motivation, which is much lower (or absent) in children with ARFID, to actively participate in mealtimes and to maintain interest and momentum in self-feeding. Whilst feeding literature highlights the importance of factors such as appetite regulation and socialisation (Birch, 1999; Stallberg-White & Pliner, 1999) in healthy dietary development, additional research is necessary to establish the nature of motivation in non-clinical children and the possible reasons for its decline in children with ARFID.

Lack of engagement is likely to be more subtle and more difficult to detect, interpret, or change than more overt responses such as food refusal or emotionality. Overt behavioural responses to food may cause parental concern, but these types of cues, on which parents gauge their own actions and responses, are fairly clear. In contrast, poor engagement may have a comparable negative impact on health, nutrition, and general mealtime success, but may be harder for parents to explain and/or demonstrate in a clinical setting, and thus they may be more anxiety provoking for parents. This supports the high levels of parental stress,

anxiety, and deficits to parental self-efficacy observed in parents of children with problematic or disordered feeding (e.g., Feldman, 2004; Greer et al., 2008; Lindberg, Bohlin & Hagekull, 1994; Sanchez & Castillo-Duran, 2004). Such a situation may also lead parents to over-report the overt and more easily described behaviours in the clinical interview, reinforcing the over-reliance on these types of behaviours in clinical identification.

The final characteristic found to notably differ between groups was small movements that took place while the child was seated (i.e., repositioning, fidgeting, leaning, wiping face, putting hands on head, etc.). This category of movements was indicative of body movement, whereas specific actions relating to the child touching their hands, face, or head did not differ between groups. Meal duration was also highly associated with small seated movements, highlighting the fact that clinical and non-clinical children move around at mealtimes and particularly as meal duration is extended. However, the significant group difference in these fidgeting-type actions suggests that, in spite of the high prevalence across all children, those within the clinical group exceeded the rate of movement of their non-clinical peers. This supports existing research that associates significant feeding problems with factors such as poor motivation (e.g., Burklow & Linscheid, 2004; Rudolph, 1994), negative feeding associations (e.g., Chatoor & Ganiban, 2003; Field et al., 2003; Haas, 2010) and temperamental difficulty or regulatory problems (e.g., Berlin et al., 2009; Schmid, Schreier, Meyer & Wolke., 2010; Tauman et al., 2011), which suggest a failure to settle. The frequency and rate of these behaviours in the clinical group were more than twice that of the non-clinical group, suggesting that ARFID children are either generally more active at mealtimes than typically developing children, or instigation of these types of behaviours much earlier in the meal. In either case, this supports research associating problematic feeding with hyperactivity and dysregulation (Aldridge, Dovey, Martin, & Meyer, 2016). Over-activity or particularly rapid instigation of restless movement may therefore offer an important signpost for the identification of clinically important feeding problems. In contrast to smaller-scale movements, the frequency of larger-scale standing or mobile movements (stand, walk, dance, etc.) was not found to differ between clinical and non-clinical groups. This is

somewhat at odds with research that denotes 'escape' as a key characteristic of food avoidance in children with ARFID, and focuses on this behaviour as a central component in feeding interventions. While children's reasons for leaving their seat or position at mealtimes may differ by group (further research would be necessary to examine this possibility), the current data suggests that the number of times this was done, did not.

The current study has confirmed some existing features of mealtimes for children with significant feeding problems, and identified novel characteristics that clearly delineate typical and non-typical feeding in children. Furthermore, the results have shown that many of the behaviours thought to define disordered feeding actually feature in the meals of most children, but behaviour frequency differentiates those with disordered feeding from those without. A key finding of this study is that children with feeding problems engage poorly with food and disengage more frequently, though this disengagement infrequently featured emotionality or escape behaviours. Typically developing children are motivated to eat by intrinsic factors such as hunger, enjoyment and intrigue, and extrinsic sensory and social cues, but children in the clinical group appeared to lack the same motivation and desire to engage with food/mealtimes, leading to parent-led strategies for increasing intake. This lack of engagement and readiness to disengage from food/feeding provides an explanation for many of the other factors that differentiate ARFID children from their non-clinical peers. This includes the reduction in the number of food bites attempted, increase in fidgeting and restlessness, and more frequent signs of upset.

Recognition and support for medical conditions is linked to reduced anxiety and increased coping in parents (Garro, 2004; Graungaard & Skov, 2006), and the inverse may be liable for under-recognised parents of children who may be unobtrusively, but persistently, disengaged from mealtimes and feeding, and unmotivated to eat. This suggests an important mechanism behind problematic feeding behaviours and a potential opportunity for targeted intervention. It also offers a potential hypothesis behind the poor levels of identification and early 'intervention' for feeding problems. The key message based on the outcomes of the current study is that practitioners' observations of mealtimes and/or other clinical

assessments of feeding should focus on the level of mealtime engagement and the general restlessness of the target child, rather than focusing only on overt emotional rejection or escape-maintained behaviours. It is these subtle behaviours that are fundamental in identifying the child in need of clinical intervention during a typical mealtime. Focusing on the larger and much less frequent overt refusal behaviours during the assessment process is likely to lead to under-identification and late diagnosis of disordered children.

References

- Aldridge, V. K., Dovey, T. M., Martin, C. I., & Meyer, C. (2016). Relative contributions of parent-perceived child characteristics to variation in child feeding behavior. *Infant Mental Health Journal, 37*(1), 56-65.
- Ammaniti, M., Ambruzzi, A. M., Lucarelli, L., Cimino, S., & D'Olimpio, F. (2004). Malnutrition and dysfunctional mother-child feeding interactions: clinical assessment and research implications. *Journal of the American College of Nutrition, 23*(3), 259-271.
- Ammaniti, M., Lucarelli, L., Cimino, S., D'Olimpio, F., & Chatoor, I. (2010). Maternal psychopathology and child risk factors in infantile anorexia. *International Journal of Eating Disorders, 43*(3), 233-240.
- Arvedson, J. C. (2008). Assessment of pediatric dysphagia and feeding disorders: clinical and instrumental approaches. *Developmental Disabilities Research Reviews, 14*, 118-127.
- Benoit, D., & Coolbear, J. (1998). Post-traumatic feeding disorders in infancy: Behaviors predicting treatment outcome. *Infant Mental Health Journal, 19*(4), 409-421.
- Berlin, K. S., Davies, H., Lobato, D. J., & Silverman, A. H. (2009). A biopsychosocial model of normative and problematic pediatric feeding. *Children's Health Care, 38*(4), 263-282.
- Binnendyk, L., & Lucyshyn, J. M. (2009). A family-centered positive behavior support approach to the amelioration of food refusal behavior: An empirical case study. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 11*(1), 47-62.

- Birch, L. L. (1999). Development of food preferences. *Annual review of nutrition*, 19(1), 41-62.
- Black, M. M. (1999). Commentary: Feeding problems: An ecological perspective. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 24(3), 217-219.
- Bryant-Waugh, R., Markham, L., Kreipe, R. E., & Walsh, B. T. (2010). Feeding and eating disorders in childhood. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 43(2), 98-111.
- Burklow, K. A., & Linscheid, T. (2004). Rapid inpatient behavioral treatment for choking phobia in children. *Children's Health Care*, 33(2), 93-107.
- Byars, K. C., Burklow, K. A., Ferguson, K., O'Flaherty, T., Santoro, K., & Kaul, A. (2003). A multicomponent behavioral program for oral aversion in children dependent on gastrostomy feedings. *Journal of Pediatric Gastroenterology and Nutrition*, 37(4), 473-480.
- Casey, S. D., Perrin, C. J., Lesser, A.D., Perrin, S. H., Casey, C. L., & Reed, G. K. (2009). Using descriptive assessment in the treatment of bite acceptance and food refusal. *Behavior Modification*, 33(5), 537-558.
- Chatoor, I., & Ganiban, J. (2003). Food refusal by infants and young children: Diagnosis and treatment. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, 10, 138-146.
- Chatoor, I., Ganiban, J., Harrison, J., & Hirsch, R. (2001). Observation of Feeding in the Diagnosis of Posttraumatic Feeding Disorder of Infancy. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 40(5), 595-602.
- Chatoor, I., Hirsch, R., Ganiban, J., Persinger, M., & Hamburger, E. (1998). Diagnosing Infantile Anorexia: The Observation of Mother-Infant Interactions, *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 37(9), 959-967.
- Cone, J. D., & Foster, S. L. Direct observation in clinical psychology. In P. Kendall (Ed.), *Research design in clinical psychology*. New York: Wiley, 1982.
- Cooper, P. J., Whelan, E., Woolgar, M., Morrell, J., & Murray, L. (2004). Association between childhood feeding problems and maternal eating disorder: role of the family environment. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 184, 210-215.

- Crist, W., & Napier-Phillips, A. (2001). Mealtime behaviors of young children: A comparison of normative and clinical data. *Journal of Developmental & Behavioral Pediatrics*, 22(5), 279-286.
- de Moor, J., Didden, R., & Tolboom, J. (2005). Severe feeding problems secondary to anatomical disorders: Effectiveness of behavioural treatment in three school-aged children. *Educational Psychology*, 25(2-3), 325-340.
- Douglas, J. E. (1995). Behavioural eating disorders in young children. *Current Paediatrics*, 5(1), 39-42.
- Dovey, T. M., Isherwood, E., Aldridge, V. K., & Martin, C. (2010). Typology of feeding disorders based on a single assessment system: formulation of a clinical decision-making model. *Infant, Child & Adolescent Nutrition*, 2(1), 45-51.
- Farrow, C., & Blissett, J. (2006). Breast-feeding, maternal feeding practices and mealtime negativity at one year. *Appetite*, 46, 49-56.
- Feldman, R. (2004). Mother-child touch patterns in infant feeding disorders: Relation to maternal, child, and environmental factors. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 43(9), 1089-1097.
- Field, D., Garland, M., & Williams, K. (2003). Correlates of specific childhood feeding problems. *Journal of Pediatrics and Child Health*, 39(4), 299-304.
- Garro, A. (2004). Coping patterns in mothers/caregivers of children with chronic feeding problems. *Journal of Pediatric Health Care*, 18(3), 138-144.
- Graungaard, A. H., & Skov, L. (2006). Why do we need a diagnosis? A qualitative study of parents' experiences, coping and needs, when the newborn child is severely disabled. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, 33(3), 296-307.
- Greer, A. J., Gulotta, C. S., Masler, E.A., & Laud, R. B. (2008). Caregiver stress and outcomes of children with pediatric feeding disorders treated in an intensive interdisciplinary program. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 33(6), 612-620.
- Haas, A. M. (2010). Feeding disorders in food allergic children. *Current Allergy and Asthma Reports*, 10(4), 258-264.

- Harris, G. (2009). Food refusal in the sensory sensitive child. *Paediatrics and Child Health*, 19(9), 435-436.
- Harrop, A., Daniels, M., & Foulkes, C. (1990). The use of momentary time sampling and partial interval recording in behavioural research. *Behavioural Psychotherapy*, 18(02), 121-127.
- Hoffmann, J. M. (1992). A proposed scheme for coding infant initiatives during feeding. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 13(3), 199-205.
- Klesges, R. C., Coates, T. J., Brown, G., Sturgeon-Tillisch, J., Moldenhauer-Klesges, L. M., Holzer, B., ... & Vollmer, J. (1983). Parental influences on children's eating behavior and relative weight. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 16(4), 371-378.
- Levy, Y., Levy, A., Zangen, T., Kornfeld, L., Dalal, I., Samuel, E., Boaz, M., David, N. B., Dunitz, M., & Levine, A. (2009). Diagnostic clues for identification of nonorganic vs organic causes of food refusal and poor feeding. *Journal of Pediatric Gastroenterology and Nutrition*, 48(3), 355-62.
- Lindberg, L., Bohlin, G., Hagekull, B. (1994). Infant Food Refusal and Parental Social Support. *Early Development and Parenting*, 3(3), 153-159.
- Piazza, C. C. (2008). Feeding disorders and behaviour: What have we learned? *Developmental Disabilities Research Reviews*, 14(2), 174-181.
- Piazza, C. C., Fisher, W. W., Brown, K. A., Shore, B. A., Patel, M. R., Katz, R. M., Sevin, B. M., Gulotta, C. S., & Blakely-Smith, A. (2003). Functional analysis of inappropriate mealtime behaviours. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 36(2), 187-204.
- Ramsay, M., Gisel, E. G., & Boutry, M. (1993). Non-organic failure to thrive: Growth failure secondary to feeding-skills disorder. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*, 35(4), 285-297.
- Rudolph, C. D. (1994). Feeding disorders in infants and children. *The Journal of Pediatrics*, 125(6), S116-124.
- Sanchez, S., & Castillo-Duran, C. (2004). Eating behavior disorders in Chilean infants. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 36(3), 348-355.

- Sanders, M. R., Patel, R. K., Le Grice, B., & Shepherd, R. W. (1993). Children with persistent feeding difficulties: an observational analysis of the feeding interactions of problem and non-problem eaters. *Health Psychology, 12*(1), 64-73.
- Schmid, G., Schreier, A., Meyer, R., & Wolke, D. (2010). A prospective study on the persistence of infant crying, sleeping and feeding problems and preschool behaviour. *Acta Paediatrica, 99*(2), 286-290.
- Silverman, A. (2010). Interdisciplinary Care for Feeding Problems in Children. *Nutrition in Clinical Practice, 25*(2), 160-165.
- Smith, M. M., & Lifshitz, F. (1994). Excess fruit juice consumption as a contributing factor in nonorganic failure to thrive. *Pediatrics, 93*(3), 438-443.
- Stallberg-White, C., & Pliner, P. (1999). The effect of flavor principles on willingness to taste novel foods. *Appetite, 33*(2), 209-221.
- Stark, L. J., Jelalian, E., Powers, S. W., Mulvihill, M. M., Opiari, L. C., Bowen, A., ... & Hovell, M. F. (2000). Parent and child mealtime behavior in families of children with cystic fibrosis. *The Journal of Pediatrics, 136*(2), 195-200.
- Stein, A., Whoolly, H., & McPherson, K. (1999). Conflict between mothers with eating disorders and their infants during mealtimes. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 175*, 455-461.
- Tauman, R., Levine, A., Avni, H., Nehama, H., Greenfeld, M., & Sivan, Y. (2011). Coexistence of sleep and feeding disturbances in young children. *Pediatrics, 127*(3), e615-e621.
- Thomas, D. R. (2006). A general approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation data. *American Journal of Evaluation, 27*(2), 237-246.
- VanDalen, K. H., & Penrod, B. (2010). A comparison of simultaneous versus sequential presentation of novel foods in the treatment of food selectivity. *Behavioral Interventions, 25*(3), 191-206.
- Whelan, E., & Cooper, P. J. (2000). The association between childhood feeding problems and maternal eating disorder: A community study. *Psychological Medicine, 30*(1), 69-

77.

Woods, J. N. (2010). Descriptive analyses of pediatric food refusal: The structure of parental attention. *Behavior Modification*, 34(1), 35-56.