

PEDIATRICS

Household Routines and Obesity in US Preschool-Aged Children

Sarah E. Anderson, PhD,

Embargo Release Date: Monday, February 8, 2010 - 12:01am (ET)



Embargo Policy:

Information in this article is embargoed for release until the date indicated above. Interviews may be conducted prior to the embargo release date, but nothing may be aired or published.

If you are a media representative and have questions about the embargo, upcoming press events, or other matters, please contact AAP Communications staff at 847-434-7877, or via e-mail at commun@aap.org

Household Routines and Obesity in US Preschool-Aged Children



WHAT'S KNOWN ON THIS SUBJECT: Many studies have shown an association between the amount of television-viewing and obesity; evidence is accumulating to link insufficient sleep to obesity, and some studies have shown an inverse association between frequency of family meals and obesity.



WHAT THIS STUDY ADDS: Preschool-aged children exposed to 3 household routines of regularly eating dinner as a family, obtaining adequate nighttime sleep, and having limited screen-viewing time had an ~40% lower prevalence of obesity than children exposed to none of these routines.

abstract

OBJECTIVE: To determine the association between the prevalence of obesity in preschool-aged children and exposure to 3 household routines: regularly eating the evening meal as a family, obtaining adequate sleep, and limiting screen-viewing time.

METHODS: We conducted a cross-sectional analysis of a nationally representative sample of ~8550 four-year-old US children who were assessed in 2005 in the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Birth Cohort. Height and weight were measured. We assessed the association of childhood obesity (BMI \geq 95th percentile) with 3 household routines: regularly eating the evening meal as a family (>5 nights per week); obtaining adequate nighttime sleep on weekdays (≥ 10.5 hours per night); and having limited screen-viewing (television, video, digital video disk) time on weekdays (≤ 2 hours/day). Analyses were adjusted for the child's race/ethnicity, maternal obesity, maternal education, household income, and living in a single-parent household.

RESULTS: Eighteen percent of children were obese, 14.5% were exposed to all 3 routines, and 12.4% were exposed to none of the routines. The prevalence of obesity was 14.3% (95% confidence interval [CI]: 11.3%–17.2%) among children exposed to all 3 routines and 24.5% (95% CI: 20.1%–28.9%) among those exposed to none of the routines. After adjusting for covariates, the odds of obesity associated with exposure to all 3, any 2, or only 1 routine (compared with none) were 0.63 (95% CI: 0.46–0.87), 0.64 (95% CI: 0.47–0.85), and 0.84 (95% CI: 0.63–1.12), respectively.

CONCLUSIONS: US preschool-aged children exposed to the 3 household routines of regularly eating the evening meal as a family, obtaining adequate nighttime sleep, and having limited screen-viewing time had an ~40% lower prevalence of obesity than those exposed to none of these routines. These household routines may be promising targets for obesity-prevention efforts in early childhood. *Pediatrics* 2010;125:420–428

AUTHORS: Sarah E. Anderson, PhD^a and Robert C. Whitaker, MD, MPH^b

^aDivision of Epidemiology, Ohio State University College of Public Health, Columbus, Ohio; and ^bDepartments of Public Health and Pediatrics, Center for Obesity Research and Education, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

KEY WORDS

obesity, BMI, Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, birth cohort, sleep, television, preschool children, eating behavior, growth and development

ABBREVIATIONS

ECLS-B—Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, birth cohort
NCES—National Center for Education Statistics
CI—confidence interval
OR—odds ratio

www.pediatrics.org/cgi/doi/10.1542/peds.2009-0417

doi:10.1542/peds.2009-0417

Accepted for publication Sep 2, 2009

Address correspondence to Sarah E. Anderson, PhD, Ohio State University, Division of Epidemiology, College of Public Health, B216 Starling Loving Hall, 320 W 10th Ave, Columbus, OH. E-mail: sanderson@cph.osu.edu

PEDIATRICS (ISSN Numbers: Print, 0031-4005; Online, 1098-4275).

Copyright © 2010 by the American Academy of Pediatrics

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE: *The authors have indicated they have no financial relationships relevant to this article to disclose.*

Despite interest in halting the childhood obesity epidemic through prevention efforts begun early in life,^{1,2} little is known about what approaches in early childhood are both acceptable to families and effective.^{3,4} An increasing number of young children are in child care settings,⁵ but preschool-aged children still spend the majority of their waking hours under the care of their parents,⁶ who have a large influence over many of the environmental factors that affect a child's risk of obesity.⁷

Although parents have great potential to prevent childhood obesity, engaging them in this effort is challenging. Mothers may not perceive that their overweight preschool-aged children are overweight^{8–10} and often feel that clinical counseling about children's weight criticizes their parenting abilities.^{11,12} Furthermore, during the preschool years, parents are often less concerned about their children's physical health than about their development.¹³ As a consequence, many parents may be more interested in learning how they can help their children succeed in school and get along with others than about how to help their children maintain a healthy weight. Given this clinical context and the lack of experimental evidence to support specific obesity-prevention strategies in early childhood, a potential approach is to encourage parents to adopt household routines that satisfy the following criteria: the routines (1) may offer protection against the development of childhood obesity, (2) may offer non-weight-related benefits, such as promoting children's social, emotional, and/or cognitive development, and (3) are unlikely to cause harm.¹⁴

Three of the most studied household routines that meet these criteria are regularly eating family meals, obtaining adequate sleep, and limiting screen-viewing time. Interventions to

reduce television-viewing time in preschool-aged children have been implemented successfully,^{15,16} and such interventions have been demonstrated to have beneficial effects on children's BMI;^{16–18} observational studies have shown that higher BMI in children is associated with insufficient sleep^{19–24} and a lower frequency of family meals.^{25,26} In addition to their potential to prevent obesity, each of these routines has been associated with non-weight-related benefits to children's well-being.^{27–29} However, we are aware of no studies that have examined the association between the combination of these routines and obesity in preschool-aged children.

By using data collected in 2005 on a nationally representative sample of US 4-year-old children, we examined the prevalence and cross-sectional association between obesity and a combination of 3 household routines: regularly eating the evening meal (dinner) as a family; obtaining an adequate amount of nighttime sleep; and limiting screen-viewing time (television/video/DVD).

METHODS

Sample and Study Design

We analyzed data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Birth Cohort (ECLS-B), a study conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to examine the learning environments, health, and development of young US children.³⁰ The NCES ethics review board approved the data collection, for which parents provided written, informed consent. The Ohio State University is licensed with the NCES for analysis of ECLS-B restricted-use data. NCES guidelines require reporting unweighted sample sizes by rounding to the nearest 50; therefore, all reported sample sizes are approximations.

The ECLS-B was designed to contain a nationally representative sample of children born in the United States in

2001. The design was described in detail elsewhere³¹ and is summarized briefly here. The sample was developed by using a clustered list-frame design with birth certificate data from the National Center for Health Statistics. Children were excluded if they were born to mothers younger than 15 years of age or if they died or were adopted before 9 months of age. From a sample of 14 000 births, the final study cohort of 10 700 children was formed when the children were 9 months of age. The cohort was assessed in the home when children were 9 months, 2 years, and 4 years old (preschool wave of data collection). The assessments consisted of a computer-assisted personal interview with the child's mother (or, in ~5% of the cases, the father or other guardian) and direct measurements and observations of children.³⁰ During preschool data collection, 8750 children were assessed. Our analysis excluded 200 of these children for whom height and/or weight data were missing, leaving a final analytic sample of 8550. To address the differences in survey response rates according to sociodemographic characteristics, nonresponse weights were calculated by the NCES.^{30,32}

We report on the cross-sectional association between childhood obesity and the presence of 3 household routines (eating dinner regularly as a family, obtaining adequate nighttime sleep, and limiting screen-viewing time) based on the data collected in 2005 when the children were ~4 years old.

Obesity

Children's height and weight were measured in the home by using a standardized protocol for which interviewers were trained and certified. With children dressed in light clothing and without shoes, height was measured with a portable stadiometer, and

weight was measured with a digital scale (both instruments from Seca [Hanover, MD]). Measurements were taken twice, and the average value of each pair of measurements was used in the analysis.³⁰ BMI (kg/m^2) was calculated and converted into percentiles for age and gender on the basis of the 2000 US growth reference.³³ All children whose BMI was ≥ 95 th percentile were defined as obese.^{1,2}

Household Routines

The 3 routines were selected because each could potentially help children achieve or maintain a healthy weight while providing other benefits for their well-being.¹⁴ Mothers reported the number of days at least some of the family ate the evening meal together in a typical week. According to definitions used by others^{27,34,35} and the response distribution for this question, we categorized children as having the routine of eating dinner regularly as a family if they did so 6 or 7 times per week.

Mothers reported the typical time that the child went to sleep and woke up on weekdays. From this information, we calculated the child's weekday nighttime sleep duration. The 50th and 75th percentiles in our data were 10.5 and 11 hours, respectively. According to this distribution and the literature examining associations between sleep duration and obesity,^{20–24} we categorized children as having the routine of adequate nighttime sleep if they had 10.5 hours or more of nighttime sleep. Mothers were asked "On a typical weekday, that is, Monday through Friday, about how many hours of television does [child] watch at home per day?" For this question, mothers were instructed not to include the time spent watching videos or DVDs, which was assessed in a separate, but similarly worded, question. We combined data from both questions to compute weekday hours of screen-viewing time,

and we categorized children as having the routine of limited screen-viewing time if they watched 2 hours or less per day.^{36,37} For households that reported that they did not own a television or did not watch television ($< 3\%$), we categorized them as having the routine of limited screen-viewing time as long as they did not report watching > 2 hours per day of videos and/or DVDs.

Covariates

At the 9-month interview, mothers were asked to designate the child's race and ethnicity by using the same categories as those used in the US Census.³⁸ From these data, we established 4 mutually exclusive racial/ethnic groups³⁹: non-Hispanic white, non-Hispanic black, Hispanic, and other.

At each wave of data collection, mothers' weights were measured with the same protocol used for the children. Mothers self-reported their height during the 9-month assessment. We calculated maternal BMI using the measured weight at the preschool wave or, if it was missing (700 mothers), the measured weight at the previous wave. Mothers with a BMI of ≥ 30 kg/m^2 were categorized as obese.⁴⁰

At the preschool interview, mothers reported their educational attainment, household size, and household income. Children were designated as living in a single-parent household if they were living with only their biological mother or biological father. Household income was reported in designated categories, with $\sim 40\%$ of households reporting their income to the nearest thousand dollars.³⁰ If household income was reported, it was calculated as the exact income; if it was not reported, it was calculated as the midpoint of the income category reported. On the basis of household income and household size relative to the income at the 2005 US poverty threshold,³⁰ we

placed children into 1 of 5 income-to-poverty ratio categories: < 0.50 , 0.50 to 0.99, 1.00 to 1.85, 1.86 to 3.00, and > 3.00 .

Data Analysis

We applied the survey sample weights, which included adjustments for nonresponse and planned oversampling, making the reported results representative of US children born in 2001. Standard errors (SEs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were estimated by using the survey procedures in SAS (version 9.1; SAS Institute, Inc, Cary, NC) that accounted for the complex sample design.⁴¹

We estimated the percentage of children exposed to each of the 3 household routines and also created a variable to indicate the number of routines to which a child was exposed (0–3). We compared the prevalence of obesity in children exposed and not exposed to each of the 3 household routines and exposed to different numbers of routines (0–3). Statistical significance for these comparisons was based on an α level of .05 using Rao-Scott likelihood ratio χ^2 tests.⁴¹

We used logistic regression models to estimate the odds of obesity associated with exposure to each routine, presenting unadjusted odds ratios (ORs) and ORs that were adjusted for the other 2 routines and for the covariates. We also used logistic regression models to estimate the odds of obesity associated with exposure to all 3, 2, or only 1 of these household routines relative to exposure to none of the routines.

Finally, we examined whether the association between childhood obesity and the number of household routines differed according to (1) maternal obesity status, (2) racial/ethnic group, (3) maternal education level, (4) household income, or (5) single-parent status. We conducted stratified analyses

by developing separate logistic regression models for different strata of these 5 covariates (eg, mother obese, mother not obese). In each model, the number of routines (the primary predictor variable) was included as a continuous variable, and preschooler obesity was the dependent variable. By using the models adjusted for the other covariates, we calculated the predicted prevalence of preschool obesity in households with none of the routines and in households with all 3 of the routines.

RESULTS

The prevalence of obesity among the children was 18.4%. More than half (56.6%) had a family dinner 6 or 7 evenings per week, 57.5% were reported to sleep at least 10.5 hours per week-night, and 40.4% had their screen-viewing time limited to 2 hours each weekday. Children were assessed at a mean age of 52.3 (SE: 0.07) months, and mothers had a mean age of 31.9 (SE: 0.15) years. Fifty-one percent of children were male, 54.0% were non-Hispanic white, 44.1% had a mother with a high school education or less, and 21.6% lived in a single-parent household (Table 1).

The prevalence of obesity and the prevalence of exposure to all 3 routines were significantly associated with racial/ethnic group, maternal obesity, maternal education, household income-to-poverty ratio, and being in a single-parent household (Table 2).

Each of the household routines was associated with a significantly lower prevalence of obesity (Table 3). The odds of obesity were between 23% and 25% lower when children were exposed to a given routine (Table 3). Adjusting for the other 2 routines did not appreciably change these estimates, suggesting the independent association of each routine with obesity. Additional adjustment for sociodemo-

TABLE 1 Sociodemographic Characteristics Among Preschool-Aged Children in ECLS-B

| Characteristic | Unweighted, <i>n</i> ^a | Prevalence, % ^b |
|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Racial/ethnic group | | |
| Non-Hispanic white | 3750 | 54.0 |
| Non-Hispanic black | 1450 | 15.6 |
| Hispanic | 1550 | 24.1 |
| Other | 1800 | 6.3 |
| Maternal obesity ^c | | |
| Maternal BMI < 30 kg/m ² | 5700 | 68.4 |
| Maternal BMI ≥ 30 kg/m ² | 2500 | 31.6 |
| Maternal education ^d | | |
| Bachelor's degree or higher | 2500 | 26.2 |
| Some college/vocational or technical degree | 2450 | 29.7 |
| High school diploma/general equivalency diploma | 2300 | 28.8 |
| Less than high school | 1200 | 15.3 |
| Household income-to-poverty ratio ^e | | |
| >3.00 | 2400 | 27.5 |
| 1.86–3.00 | 2200 | 25.7 |
| 1.00–1.85 | 1850 | 22.0 |
| 0.50–0.99 | 1200 | 14.8 |
| <0.50 | 900 | 10.0 |
| Single-parent household | | |
| No | 6750 | 78.4 |
| Yes | 1800 | 21.6 |

^a Sample sizes are unweighted, and each cell has been rounded to the nearest 50 to conform to NCES guidelines.

^b Prevalence weighted with ECLS-B survey sample weights to be representative of US children born in 2001 and assessed in 2005.

^c Fewer than 350 children without information on maternal BMI were excluded.

^d Fewer than 100 children without information on maternal education were excluded.

^e Fewer than 50 children without information on household income-to-poverty ratio were excluded.

graphic covariates did not change the estimate of the association between obesity and regularly eating a family dinner, but it attenuated the estimates for adequate nighttime sleep and limited screen-viewing time (Table 3).

Approximately 1 in 7 children (14.5%) had all 3 household routines, and 1 in 8 (12.4%) had none of the routines (Table 4). Having a greater number of household routines was related to a lower prevalence of child obesity (Table 4). Among children exposed to all 3 household routines, the prevalence of obesity was 14.3% (95% CI: 11.3%–17.2%) compared with 24.5% (95% CI: 20.1%–28.9%) among those children exposed to none of the household routines. After adjustment for covariates, the OR of obesity was 0.63 (95% CI: 0.46–0.87) for those exposed to all 3 routines compared with those exposed to none, and it was 0.64 (95% CI: 0.47–0.85) for those exposed to any 2 routines compared with none (Table 4).

When the number of household routines was modeled as a continuous variable, having a greater number of routines was significantly ($P < .0001$) associated with a lower prevalence of preschool obesity (Table 5). After adjustment for covariates, each additional routine was associated with a 17% (95% CI: 9%–24%) reduction in the odds of obesity, and the predicted prevalence of obesity in children exposed to 3 routines was 13.2% compared with 24.0% in those children exposed to none of the routines.

When we examined the association between the number of routines and obesity across strata of the 5 covariates, each additional routine was associated with reduced odds of obesity of between 10% and 24% in multivariate-adjusted models (Table 5). Although in some subgroups this reduction in odds was not statistically significant, these stratified analyses did not suggest that the association between the

TABLE 2 Prevalence of Preschooler Obesity and 3 Household Routines According to Sociodemographic Characteristics

| Characteristic | Prevalence of Obesity, % ^a | Eating Dinner as a Family >5 Times per wk, % | Obtaining ≥10.5 h Sleep per Weekday Night, % | Limiting Screen-Viewing Time to ≤2 h per Weekday, % ^b | Prevalence of All 3 Routines, % |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---------------------------------|
| Racial/ethnic group | | | | | |
| Non-Hispanic white | 15.9 | 59.9 | 62.9 | 46.4 | 18.6 |
| Non-Hispanic black | 20.8 | 46.1 | 42.7 | 31.1 | 6.8 |
| Hispanic | 22.0 | 55.0 | 56.8 | 31.6 | 10.5 |
| Other | 20.9 | 59.4 | 49.9 | 45.4 | 13.2 |
| <i>P</i> ^c | <.0001 | <.0001 | <.0001 | <.0001 | <.0001 |
| Maternal obesity | | | | | |
| Maternal BMI < 30 kg/m ² | 14.7 | 56.8 | 59.8 | 43.0 | 16.0 |
| Maternal BMI ≥ 30 kg/m ² | 26.1 | 56.7 | 52.7 | 34.6 | 11.6 |
| <i>P</i> ^c | <.0001 | 0.95 | <.0001 | <.0001 | <.0001 |
| Maternal education | | | | | |
| Bachelor's degree or higher | 13.5 | 59.1 | 62.6 | 59.9 | 24.6 |
| Some college/vocational or technical degree | 18.1 | 56.8 | 56.8 | 38.9 | 13.1 |
| High school diploma/general equivalency diploma | 20.4 | 54.8 | 54.6 | 31.4 | 9.5 |
| Less than high school | 24.5 | 55.5 | 56.1 | 27.3 | 9.5 |
| <i>P</i> ^c | <.0001 | 0.23 | 0.0003 | <.0001 | <.0001 |
| Household income-to-poverty ratio | | | | | |
| >3.00 | 15.4 | 57.8 | 63.5 | 56.8 | 23.0 |
| 1.86–3.00 | 16.3 | 57.2 | 58.5 | 43.0 | 15.7 |
| 1.00–1.85 | 21.6 | 56.7 | 52.2 | 30.5 | 8.3 |
| 0.50–0.99 | 22.5 | 53.4 | 54.3 | 28.1 | 9.8 |
| <0.50 | 19.2 | 56.2 | 54.6 | 28.7 | 8.4 |
| <i>P</i> ^c | <.0001 | 0.50 | <.0001 | <.0001 | <.0001 |
| Single-parent household | | | | | |
| No | 17.6 | 58.6 | 60.0 | 42.3 | 16.1 |
| Yes | 21.5 | 49.1 | 48.2 | 33.4 | 8.4 |
| <i>P</i> ^c | 0.024 | <.0001 | <.0001 | <.0001 | <.0001 |

^a Obesity was defined as ≥95th percentile of BMI for age and gender.
^b Screen-viewing time included time spent watching television, videos, and DVDs.
^c Rao-Scott likelihood ratio χ^2 *P* for group difference in prevalence.

TABLE 3 Association Between Household Routines and Preschooler Obesity

| Routine | Prevalence of Obesity, % ^a | | | OR (95% CI) ^b | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | Has Routine | Lacks Routine | <i>P</i> ^c | Unadjusted | Adjusted for 2 Other Routines | Multivariate Adjusted ^d |
| Eating dinner as a family >5 evenings per wk | 16.5 | 20.9 | .0007 | 0.75 (0.64–0.89) | 0.77 (0.65–0.91) | 0.77 (0.65–0.92) |
| Obtaining ≥10.5 h of sleep per weekday night | 16.8 | 20.7 | .004 | 0.77 (0.65–0.92) | 0.78 (0.66–0.93) | 0.86 (0.71–1.03) |
| Limiting screen-viewing time to ≤2 h per weekday ^e | 16.1 | 20.0 | .002 | 0.77 (0.64–0.91) | 0.78 (0.65–0.93) | 0.85 (0.71–1.03) |

^a Obesity was defined as ≥95th percentile of BMI for age and gender.
^b OR and 95% CI for obesity among those with the routine compared with those without the routine.
^c Rao-Scott likelihood ratio χ^2 *P* for group difference in prevalence.
^d Adjusted for the presence of the other 2 household routines in addition to the following variables: child age, gender, racial/ethnic group, household income-to-poverty ratio, single-parent household, maternal education, maternal BMI, and maternal age.
^e Screen-viewing time included time spent watching television, videos, and DVDs.

number of routines and obesity differed meaningfully across levels of any given covariate. In addition, there were no statistically significant interactions in regression models that formally tested for an interaction between the number of

routines and a given covariate (data not shown).

DISCUSSION

Our analyses of a large, nationally representative sample of preschool-aged

children assessed in 2005 indicated that there was a lower prevalence of obesity among children who regularly ate the evening meal with their family, obtained adequate sleep, and had limited screen-viewing time. Compared with children exposed to none of these routines, the prevalence of obesity was ~40% lower in those exposed to all 3 routines, even after adjusting for maternal obesity and other sociodemographic characteristics.

The number of routines to which the child was exposed (0–3) was inversely associated with the prevalence of obesity. The prevalence of exposure to these household routines varied according to factors such as the child's race/ethnicity, household income, and maternal obesity, but the association between these routines and a lower

TABLE 4 Association Between the Number of Household Routines and Preschooler Obesity

| No. of Routines ^a | Households With Given No. of Routines, % (95% CI) | Obesity Prevalence, % (95% CI) ^b | OR (95% CI) ^c | |
|------------------------------|---|---|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | | Unadjusted | Multivariate Adjusted ^d |
| All 3 | 14.5 (13.0–15.9) | 14.3 (11.3–17.2) | 0.51 (0.39–0.68) | 0.63 (0.46–0.87) |
| Any 2 | 37.8 (36.4–39.3) | 15.8 (14.1–17.4) | 0.58 (0.44–0.76) | 0.64 (0.47–0.85) |
| Only 1 | 35.3 (33.5–37.1) | 20.9 (18.8–23.0) | 0.81 (0.63–1.06) | 0.84 (0.63–1.12) |
| None | 12.4 (11.4–13.4) | 24.5 (20.1–28.9) | 1.00 (reference) | 1.00 (reference) |

^a The 3 routines were (1) eating dinner as a family >5 times per week, (2) obtaining at least 10.5 hours of sleep per weekday night, and (3) limiting screen-viewing time to 2 hours or less per weekday. Screen-viewing time included time spent watching television, videos, and DVDs.

^b Obesity was defined as ≥95th percentile of BMI for age and gender.

^c OR and 95% CI for obesity associated with 1, 2, or 3 routines compared with none.

^d Adjusted for child age, gender, racial/ethnic group, household income-to-poverty ratio, single-parent household, maternal education, maternal BMI, and maternal age.

TABLE 5 Association Between Number of Household Routines and Preschooler Obesity Stratified by Sociodemographic Covariates

| | OR (95% CI) | | | | Predicted Prevalence of Preschool Obesity, % ^b | |
|--|------------------|--------|------------------------------------|--------|---|-------------------------------|
| | Unadjusted | P | Multivariate Adjusted ^a | P | If All 3 Routines ^c | If Zero Routines ^c |
| | | | | | | |
| All children | 0.78 (0.71–0.85) | <.0001 | 0.83 (0.76–0.91) | <.0001 | 13.2 | 24.0 |
| Maternal BMI | | | | | | |
| <30 kg/m ² | 0.81 (0.72–0.90) | .0002 | 0.87 (0.76–0.99) | .03 | 10.8 | 18.5 |
| ≥30 kg/m ² | 0.79 (0.67–0.94) | .006 | 0.79 (0.66–0.94) | .009 | 21.2 | 34.2 |
| Income-to-poverty ratio | | | | | | |
| >1.85 | 0.76 (0.66–0.87) | <.0001 | 0.82 (0.71–0.95) | .007 | 11.7 | 23.1 |
| 1.00–1.85 | 0.83 (0.69–0.99) | .04 | 0.84 (0.69–1.03) | .10 | 16.6 | 25.2 |
| <1.00 | 0.85 (0.73–0.99) | .04 | 0.84 (0.71–0.99) | .04 | 16.9 | 25.0 |
| Racial/ethnic group | | | | | | |
| Non-Hispanic white | 0.78 (0.67–0.91) | .001 | 0.84 (0.71–0.99) | .04 | 11.5 | 20.5 |
| Non-Hispanic black | 0.77 (0.65–0.90) | .001 | 0.78 (0.65–0.93) | .007 | 15.1 | 25.4 |
| Hispanic | 0.83 (0.70–0.98) | .02 | 0.82 (0.68–0.99) | .04 | 16.6 | 27.0 |
| Other | 0.89 (0.69–1.15) | .38 | 0.90 (0.69–1.18) | .45 | 17.1 | 23.6 |
| Maternal education | | | | | | |
| Bachelor's degree or higher | 0.71 (0.60–0.85) | .0002 | 0.76 (0.62–0.93) | .007 | 10.0 | 23.8 |
| Some college/vocational/technical degree | 0.82 (0.71–0.95) | .01 | 0.85 (0.72–0.99) | .04 | 14.3 | 22.3 |
| High school/general equivalency diploma | 0.84 (0.73–0.96) | .01 | 0.88 (0.76–1.01) | .07 | 16.9 | 24.7 |
| Less than high school | 0.86 (0.68–1.08) | .19 | 0.85 (0.64–1.12) | .25 | 19.9 | 27.2 |
| Single-parent household | | | | | | |
| No | 0.76 (0.68–0.84) | <.0001 | 0.83 (0.74–0.92) | .0009 | 12.5 | 24.2 |
| Yes | 0.89 (0.75–1.07) | .21 | 0.87 (0.73–1.05) | .14 | 18.2 | 23.9 |

^a Adjusted for the following variables while excluding the stratification variable: child age, gender, racial/ethnic group, household income-to-poverty ratio, single-parent household, maternal education, maternal BMI, and maternal age.

^b Estimated from the multivariate adjusted model.

^c The 3 routines were (1) eating dinner as a family >5 times per week, (2) obtaining at least 10.5 hours of sleep per weekday night, and (3) limiting screen-viewing time to 2 hours or less per weekday. Screen-viewing time included time spent watching television, videos, and DVDs.

prevalence of obesity was not limited to those groups of children at low risk for obesity. For example, the association between the number of household routines and obesity was as strong or stronger among children with obese

mothers as among children of non-obese mothers; it was as strong among those living in households with incomes below the poverty threshold as among those living above that threshold.

Each of the household routines that we studied has been examined separately for its relationship to childhood obesity.^{16,20–26} We have extended the findings of these studies by examining how a combination of these routines are associated with obesity in a recent US cohort of preschool-aged children. However, because the study design was cross-sectional and observational, we cannot conclude that there is a causal link between the adoption of these household routines and lower risk of obesity. We did not account for differences in children's diets or physical activity levels. The prevalence of the 3 household routines was assessed by parent report. These estimates may have been too high because of the tendency of parents to give socially desirable responses; we are unable to determine how such misclassification might affect our conclusions about the association between these routines and obesity. To facilitate the clinical interpretation of our findings, we defined children as being exposed to a particular routine on the basis of cut points for the number of evening meals, hours of sleep, and hours of screen-viewing time. However, more research is required to establish a consensus on where to set these cut points and to determine the feasibility and effectiveness of changing these routines. Finally, we cannot exclude the possibility of nonresponse bias, even when using sample weights adjusted for nonresponse; however, our primary findings were consistent across sociodemographic strata (Table 5).

Variation in the quality and context of household routines, which we could not assess with the data available in the ECLS-B, could potentially alter any beneficial impact of these routines for children. For example, we could not determine which or how many family members were present for the evening meal,⁴² the food served,⁴³ whether the

television was on during the meal,⁴⁴ or the content of the verbal and nonverbal interaction.^{42,45} Similarly, we could not examine the content or advertising in the child's screen-viewing time,^{46,47} whether there was coviewing with a parent, or any dialogue between the child and parent about the content viewed.⁴⁸ Finally, we did not have data about the content or consistency of bedtime routines,⁴⁹ the quality of the child's sleep,⁵⁰ or whether, in some cases, shorter sleep duration was the result of obesity-related breathing difficulties.^{51,52} Screen-viewing time and sleep duration were not assessed for weekend days. In addition, computer time was excluded, and screen-viewing while in child care was not estimated separately.

Future research, including intervention studies, can address some of these noted limitations to our study. For example, it is not clear whether it is these 3 routines themselves, other parenting strategies associated with these routines, or other correlated factors that protect against obesity. It is possible that these 3 routines are most effective when combined with an approach to parenting that is charac-

terized by warmth and responsiveness along with maintaining clear, consistent, and developmentally appropriate expectations for the child's behavior.^{53,54} Given the various socioeconomic constraints faced by families, it will also be important to determine how best to help parents establish and maintain these household routines. One approach might be to first understand the goals that parents have for their children and then to frame these routines as a way to help their children achieve those goals.

Although we cannot make causal inferences from our data, the household routines we studied may be promising behavioral targets for counseling, given their association with obesity and their potential benefits beyond obesity prevention.^{27–29,55} The associations we found with obesity were similar across the routines and are consistent with research on the biopsychosocial mechanisms by which these behaviors might prevent obesity.^{27,56,57}

CONCLUSIONS

Adopting these 3 routines may not be without potential harms for some

children, such as those children who might experience negative social interactions at mealtime⁵⁸ or who are limited in their viewing of cognitively enriching content on screens.^{59–61} However, given the balance of benefits and harms and the scope of the childhood obesity epidemic, it may be prudent to support parents in the adoption of these routines, while concurrently assessing their effectiveness in future studies. With care to avoid harm in particular families, an approach to obesity prevention that emphasizes these household routines might be acceptable to both parents and child health professionals, in part, by achieving goals for child well-being that go beyond maintaining a healthy weight.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was funded by the Economic Research Service, Food Assistance and Nutrition Research Program, US Department of Agriculture, grant 59-5000-8-0128.

Laura Tiehen, PhD, provided helpful comments on a draft of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. Barlow SE; Expert Committee. Expert Committee recommendations regarding the prevention, assessment, and treatment of child and adolescent overweight and obesity: summary report. *Pediatrics*. 2007; 120(suppl 4):S164–S192
2. Institute of Medicine, Committee on Prevention of Obesity in Children and Youth. *Preventing Childhood Obesity: Health in the Balance*. Washington, DC: Institute of Medicine; 2005
3. Flynn MAT, McNeil DA, Maloff B, et al. Reducing obesity and related chronic disease risk in children and youth: a synthesis of evidence with best practice recommendations. *Obes Rev*. 2006;7(suppl 1):7–66
4. Bluford DA, Sherry B, Scanlon KS. Interventions to prevent or treat obesity in preschool children: a review of evaluated programs. *Obesity*. 2007;15(6):1356–1372
5. US Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, Maternal and Child Health Bureau. *The Health and Well-being of Children: A Portrait of States and the Nation 2005*. Rockville, MD: US Department of Health and Human Services; 2005. Available at: <ftp://ftp.hrsa.gov/mchb/thechild/pdf/101pages.pdf>. Accessed February 1, 2009
6. Adams G, Capizzano J. The hours that children under five spend in child care: variation across the states. In: *Assessing the New Federalism: An Urban Institute Program to Assess Changing Social Policies*. Vol No. B-8. Washington, DC: Urban Institute; 2000. Available at: www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/anf_b8.pdf. Accessed February 1, 2009
7. Golan M, Crow S. Parents are key players in the prevention and treatment of weight-related problems. *Nutr Rev*. 2004;62(1):39–50
8. Baughcum AE, Chamberlin LA, Deeks CM, Powers SW, Whitaker RC. Maternal perceptions of overweight preschool children. *Pediatrics*. 2000;106(6):1380–1386
9. Campbell MW, Williams J, Hampton A, Wake M. Maternal concern and perceptions of overweight in Australian preschool-aged children. *Med J Aust*. 2006;184(6):274–277
10. Carnell S, Edwards C, Croker H, Boniface D, Wardle J. Parental perceptions of overweight in 3–5 y olds. *Int J Obes (Lond)*. 2005; 29(4):353–355
11. Chamberlin LA, Sherman SN, Jain A, Powers SW, Whitaker RC. The challenge of preventing and treating obesity in low-income, preschool children: perceptions of WIC health care professionals. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. 2002;156(7):662–668
12. Jain A, Sherman SN, Chamberlin LA, Carter Y, Powers SW, Whitaker RC. Why don't low-income mothers worry about their preschoolers being overweight? *Pediatrics*. 2001;107(5):1138–1146

13. Health Resources and Services Administration, Maternal and Child Health Bureau. *Child Health USA 2006*. Rockville, MD: US Department of Health and Human Services; 2006: Available at: http://mchb.hrsa.gov/chusa_06/pages/pdfs.htm. Accessed February 1, 2009
14. Whitaker RC. Obesity prevention in pediatric primary care: four behaviors to target. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. 2003;157(8):725–727
15. Dennison BA, Russo TJ, Burdick PA, Jenkins PL. An intervention to reduce television viewing by preschool children. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. 2004;158(2):170–176
16. Epstein LH, Roemmich JN, Robinson JL, et al. A randomized trial of the effects of reducing television viewing and computer use on body mass index in young children. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. 2008;162(3):239–245
17. Robinson TN. Reducing children's television viewing to prevent obesity: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA*. 1999;282(16):1561–1567
18. Gortmaker SL, Peterson K, Wiecha J, et al. Reducing obesity via a school-based interdisciplinary intervention among youth: Planet Health. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. 1999;153(4):409–418
19. Cappuccio FP, Taggart FM, Kandala NB, et al. Meta-analysis of short sleep duration and obesity in children and adults. *Sleep*. 2008;31(5):619–626
20. Chen X, Beydoun MA, Wang Y. Is sleep duration associated with childhood obesity? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Obesity*. 2008;16(2):265–274
21. Landhuis CE, Poulton R, Welch D, Hancox RJ. Childhood sleep time and long-term risk for obesity: a 32-year prospective birth cohort study. *Pediatrics*. 2008;122(5):955–960
22. Patel SR, Hu FB. Short sleep duration and weight gain: a systematic review. *Obesity*. 2008;16(3):643–653
23. Touchette E, Petit D, Tremblay RE, et al. Associations between sleep duration patterns and overweight/obesity at age 6. *Sleep*. 2008;31(11):1507–1514
24. Reilly JJ, Armstrong J, Dorosty AR, et al. Early life risk factors for obesity in childhood: cohort study. *BMJ*. 2005;330(7504):1357–1359
25. Taveras EM, Rifas-Shiman SL, Berkey CS, et al. Family dinner and adolescent overweight. *Obesity*. 2005;13(5):900–906
26. Veugelers PJ, Fitzgerald AL. Prevalence of and risk factors for childhood overweight and obesity. *CMAJ*. 2005;173(6):607–613
27. Fiese BH, Schwartz M. *Reclaiming the Family Table: Mealtimes and Child Health and Wellbeing*. Available at: www.yaleruddcenter.org/resources/upload/docs/what/reports/reclaimingfamilytable.pdf. Accessed February 1, 2009
28. Mistry KB, Minkovitz CS, Strobino DM, Borzekowski DLG. Children's television exposure and behavioral and social outcomes at 5.5 years: does timing of exposure matter? *Pediatrics*. 2007;120(4):762–769
29. Gregory AM, Van der Ende J, Willis TA, Verhulst FC. Parent-reported sleep problems during development and self-reported anxiety/depression, attention problems, and aggressive behavior later in life. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. 2008;162(4):330–335
30. Snow K, Thalji L, Derecho A, et al. *Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Birth Cohort (ECLS-B), Preschool Year Data File User's Manual (2005–06) (NCES 2008-024)*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, US Department of Education; 2007
31. Bethel J, Green JL, Kalton G, Nord C. *Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Birth Cohort (ECLS-B), Sampling. Volume 2 of the ECLS-B Methodology Report for the 9-Month Data Collection, 2001–02 (NCES 2005-147)*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, US Department of Education; 2005
32. US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. ECLS-B preschool sample and population sizes and ECLS-B preschool response rates. Available at: http://nces.ed.gov/ecls/pdf/Preschool_sample_size.pdf. Accessed May 27, 2009
33. Kuczumski RJ, Ogden CL, Guo SS, et al. 2000 CDC growth charts for the United States: methods and development. *Vital Health Stat 11*. 2002;(246):1–190
34. Videon TM, Manning CK. Influences on adolescent eating patterns: the importance of family meals. *J Adolesc Health*. 2003;32(5):365–373
35. Fulkerson JA, Story M, Mellin A, Leffert N, Neumark-Sztainer D, French SA. Family dinner meal frequency and adolescent development: relationships with developmental assets and high-risk behaviors. *J Adolesc Health*. 2006;39(3):337–345
36. Krebs NF, Jacobson MS; American Academy of Pediatrics, Committee on Nutrition. Prevention of pediatric overweight and obesity. *Pediatrics*. 2003;112(2):424–430
37. American Academy of Pediatrics, Committee on Public Education. Children, adolescents, and television. *Pediatrics*. 2001;107(2):423–426
38. Office of Management and Budget. Standards for maintaining, collecting, and presenting Federal data on race and ethnicity. *Fed Regist*. 1997;62 FR:58781–58790
39. Anderson SE, Whitaker RC. Prevalence of obesity among US preschool children in different racial and ethnic groups. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. 2009;163(4):344–348
40. Clinical guidelines on the identification, evaluation, and treatment of overweight and obesity in adults: the evidence report. National Institutes of Health. *Obes Res*. 1998;6(suppl 2):51S–209S
41. SAS Institute, Inc. *SAS/STAT User's Guide*. Cary, NC: SAS Institute, Inc; 2003
42. Fiese BH, Foley KP, Spagnola M. Routine and ritual elements in family mealtimes: contexts for child well-being and family identity. *New Dir Child Adolesc Dev*. 2006;(111):67–89
43. Gillman MW, Rifas-Shiman SL, Frazier AL, et al. Family dinner and diet quality among older children and adolescents. *Arch Fam Med*. 2000;9(3):235–240
44. Fitzpatrick E, Edmunds LS, Dennison BA. Positive effects of family dinner are undone by television viewing. *J Am Diet Assoc*. 2007;107(4):666–671
45. Mamun AA, Lawlor DA, O'Callaghan MJ, Williams GM, Najman JM. Positive maternal attitude to the family eating together decreases the risk of adolescent overweight. *Obes Res*. 2005;13(8):1422–1430
46. Vandewater EA, Rideout VJ, Wartella EA, Huang X, Lee JH, Shim M. Digital childhood: electronic media and technology use among infants, toddlers, and preschoolers. *Pediatrics*. 2007;119(5). Available at: www.pediatrics.org/cgi/content/full/119/5/e1006
47. Chamberlain LJ, Wang Y, Robinson TN. Does children's screen time predict requests for advertised products?: cross-sectional and prospective analyses. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. 2006;160(4):363–368
48. Warren R. Parental mediation of preschool children's television viewing. *J Broadcast Electron Media*. 2003;47(3):394–417
49. Milan S, Snow S, Belay S. The context of preschool children's sleep: racial/ethnic differences in sleep locations, routines, and concerns. *J Fam Psychol*. 2007;21(1):20–28
50. Al Mamun A, Lawlor DA, Cramb S, O'Callaghan M, Williams G, Najman J. Do childhood sleeping problems predict obesity in young adults? Evidence from a prospective birth cohort study. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2007;166(12):1368–1373
51. Tauman R, Gozal D. Obesity and obstructive sleep apnea in children. *Paediatr Respir Rev*. 2006;7(4):247–259
52. Ievers-Landis CE, Redline S. Pediatric sleep

- apnea: implications of the epidemic of childhood overweight. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.* 2007;175(5):436–441
53. Davidov M, Grusec JE. Untangling the links of parental responsiveness to distress and warmth to child outcomes. *Child Dev.* 2006;77(1):44–58
54. Kitzmann KM, Dalton WT, Buscemi J. Beyond parenting practices: family context and the treatment of pediatric obesity. *Fam Relat.* 2008;57(1):13–23
55. Eisenberg ME, Olson RE, Neumark-Stainer D, Story M, Bearinger LH. Correlations between family meals and psychosocial well-being among adolescents. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med.* 2004;158(8):792–796
56. Prinz P. Sleep, appetite, and obesity: what is the link? *PLoS Med.* 2004;1(3):e61
57. Jordan AB, Robinson TN. Children, television viewing, and weight status: summary and recommendations from an expert panel meeting. *Ann Am Acad Pol Soc Sci.* 2008;615(1):119–132
58. Moens E, Braet C, Soetens B. Observation of family functioning at mealtime: a comparison between families of children with and without overweight. *J Pediatr Psychol.* 2007;32(1):52–63
59. Wright JC, Huston AC, Murphy KC, et al. The relations of early television viewing to school readiness and vocabulary of children from low-income families: the early window project. *Child Dev.* 2001;72(5):1347–1366
60. Baydar N, Kagitcibasi C, Kuntay AC, Goksen F. Effects of an educational television program on preschoolers: variability in benefits. *J Appl Dev Psychol.* 2008;29(5):349–360
61. Rice ML, Huston AC, Truglio R, Wright J. Words from Sesame Street: learning vocabulary while viewing. *Dev Psychol.* 1990;26(3):421–428

