

Accepted Manuscript

How important are the influencing factors to the decision on whether to provide seafood in infant and young child feeding?

Sharon A. Carstairs, Debbi Marais, Leone C.A. Craig, Kirsty Kiezebrink



PII: S0195-6663(17)30722-5

DOI: [10.1016/j.appet.2017.05.034](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2017.05.034)

Reference: APPET 3485

To appear in: *Appetite*

Received Date: 4 July 2016

Revised Date: 8 May 2017

Accepted Date: 17 May 2017

Please cite this article as: Carstairs S.A., Marais D., Craig L.C.A. & Kiezebrink K., How important are the influencing factors to the decision on whether to provide seafood in infant and young child feeding?, *Appetite* (2017), doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2017.05.034.

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

1 **HOW IMPORTANT ARE THE INFLUENCING FACTORS TO THE DECISION ON**
2 **WHETHER TO PROVIDE SEAFOOD IN INFANT AND YOUNG CHILD FEEDING?**

3

4 Sharon A. Carstairs¹, Debbi Marais², Leone CA. Craig³, Kirsty Kiezebrink⁴

5

6 ¹Health Services Research Unit, School of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Aberdeen,
7 Foresterhill Campus, Aberdeen AB25 2ZD, UK.

8 ²Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL.

9 ³Rowett Institute of Nutrition and Health, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen AB25 2ZD, UK.

10 ⁴Division of Applied Health Sciences Postgraduate Education Group, School of Medicine and
11 Dentistry, University of Aberdeen, Foresterhill Campus, Aberdeen AB25 2ZD, UK.

12

13 **Corresponding author:** Sharon A Carstairs email address: sharon.carstairs@abdn.ac.uk

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Abstract

Seafood is recommended as part of a healthy, balanced introductory diet however, consumption rates are low in young children. Research has previously investigated the influences to seafood consumption in consumers and non-consumers however the importance of these factors in mothers' decisions on whether to provide seafood for their child during the early years is unknown. This study aimed to measure the importance of factors that influence mothers' decisions on providing seafood for their child during infant and young child feeding (six months to four years). A mixed method Q methodology and cognitive interview approach was used with 32 mothers in Scotland. Despite a large consensus of opinion between mothers (n=20) on the importance of factors on their decision-making, two viewpoints emerged highlighting an importance placed on food attributes and the infant, and convenience and family-centred. This study is the first to quantify the influences on the decision to provide seafood during early years' feeding and could be used to inform and tailor seafood-based dietary promotions and interventions for parents.

Keywords: seafood, infant feeding, weaning, complementary feeding, influences

1 Introduction

2 Providing a nutritiously balanced and varied diet during the early years is recommended in
3 global infant feeding guidelines (World Health Organization, 2005). Within this healthful diet
4 seafood (edible fish, shellfish, and crustaceans from wild and farmed sources) plays a role,
5 together with meat and alternatives, in providing energy, protein and iron, amongst other
6 nutrients which are required to meet the growing needs of the infant. The most recent UK
7 Diet and Nutrition Survey in Infant and Young Children (DNSIYC) indicates that 34% of
8 seven to nine month old children consumed fish over the recorded period compared to 40%
9 having consumed meat (red e.g. beef and white e.g. poultry) and 12% consuming meat
10 products (Department of Health, 2011), trends which mirror those of older children and
11 adults (Public Health England and Food Standards Agency, 2014). Evidence indicates that
12 taste preferences can be developed during the early years (Birch, 1999; Harris, 2008; Kajiura,
13 Cowart, & Beauchamp, 1992) and there is a suggestion that healthy eating patterns are
14 established during this period (Schwartz, Scholtens, Lalanne, Weenen, & Nicklaus, 2011).
15 The dietary trends evident in UK children are thus of great concern. Failure of the population
16 to meet dietary recommendations to limit red and processed meat consumption (Scientific
17 Advisory Committee on Nutrition, 2010), maintain current levels of white fish consumption
18 and increase consumption of oil-rich fish to one portion per week (Scientific Advisory
19 Committee on Nutrition, 2004) may continue in our youngest population and subsequently
20 into their later life.

21
22 The consumption of seafood has been suggested to be driven more by perceived healthfulness
23 and a moral obligation to provide this food than taste and food preferences (Olsen, 2004).
24 However, a perception that seafood is expensive often acts as a barrier to consumption and to
25 frequent consumption (Bloomingdale et al., 2010; Neale, Nolan-Clark, Probst, Batterhan, &
26 Tapsell, 2012; Olsen, 2004; Verbeke & Vackier, 2005). Furthermore, a lack of confidence
27 and knowledge in preparing and cooking seafood (Leek, Maddock, & Foxall, 2000; Olsen,
28 2004; Verbeke & Vackier, 2005), and the presence of bones and other physical attributes of
29 seafood (Neale et al., 2012; Verbeke & Vackier, 2005) are often perceived as barriers to
30 consumption. Previous research has also revealed that availability and confidence to cook
31 seafood in addition to the preferences of the partner and children, influences provision of
32 seafood to the family (McManus, Burns, Howat, Cooper, & Fielder, 2007). During infant and
33 young child feeding (IYCF) parents commonly receive advice and information on feeding
34 practices (Alder, et al, 2004; Bryant, 1982; Carruth & Skinner, 2001; Hoddinott, Craig,

35 Britten, & McInnes, 2010; Horodynski, et al, 2007; Pridham, 1990). There is a lack of
36 published work investigating the advice parents are provided on the inclusion of seafood for
37 infant feeding, however a study with pregnant women has shown that messages on
38 consuming seafood are often confusing and contradictory (Bloomingdale et al., 2010).

39

40 A large bank of literature has previously investigated the influences on seafood consumption
41 in adult populations (Birch & Lawley, 2012; Birch, Lawley, & Hamblin, 2012; Birch &
42 Lawley, 2014; Bloomingdale et al., 2010; Foxall, Leek, & Maddock, 1998; Leek et al., 2000;
43 McManus et al., 2007; Myrland, Trondsen, Johnston, & Lund, 2000; Neale et al., 2012;
44 Olsen, 2001; Olsen, 2003; Olsen, 2004; Pieniak, Verbeke, & Scholderer, 2010; Pieniak,
45 Verbeke, Scholderer, Brunsø, & Olsen, 2007; Trondsen, Braaten, Lund, & Eggen,
46 2004a; Trondsen, Braaten, Lund, & Eggen, 2004b; Trondsen, Scholderer, Lund, & Eggen,
47 2003; Vardeman & Aldoory, 2008; Verbeke, Sioen, Pieniak, Van Camp, & De Henauw,
48 2005; Verbeke & Vackier, 2005; Verbeke, et al, 2008). An investigation of the influences on
49 mothers' decision to provide seafood to their pre-school age child has additionally been
50 conducted (McManus et al., 2007). However, this study was conducted only in one urban
51 area of Australia using focus group discussions to explore influences to seafood consumption
52 but did not explore the importance mothers give to these differing factors, particularly during
53 the introduction of solid foods (from 6 months of age) and the early years when taste
54 preferences and food acceptance occurs. The findings of this study are, to our knowledge, the
55 first to measure the influences on mothers in providing seafood during early years' feeding
56 and could be used to inform and tailor seafood-based dietary promotions and interventions.

57

58

59 **Methods**

60 This study employed a mixed method of Q methodology with an accompanying cognitive
61 'think aloud' interview to quantify and put into context the influencing factors viewed by
62 mothers' in the decision on whether to provide seafood into the diet of their young child. This
63 methodology incorporates a Q sort technique which involves rank-ordering of a set of
64 statements, providing participants with a decision-making task whilst allowing the researcher
65 to observe and examine the decision-making process (Brown, 1980b). This mixed method
66 incorporates a practical decision-making task providing a means to explore how each
67 different influencing factor compares within context to others, an aspect lacking from the use
68 of single aspect scales and questionnaires, such as Likert Scales.

69

70 ***Participants/Sample***

71 Mothers were recruited from pre-existing mother and baby/toddler groups identified from
72 internet searches, and from work-place intranet advertisements and further snowballing in the
73 North East of Scotland. Thirty two participant interview sessions were conducted with a
74 sample of mothers with a range of demographics including; - deprivation (measured using the
75 Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) postcode look-up (Scottish Government,
76 2012c)), urban/rural classification (measured by The Scottish Urban/Rural Classification
77 (Scottish Government, 2012a)), fishing/non-fishing communities (indicated from coastal
78 locations and Scottish Sea Fisheries Statistics (Scottish Government, 2015)), and child age.

79

80 It was deemed ethically correct to recruit only mothers who were over the age of 16 years due
81 to classification of any person under this age as a child. Primi- and multiparous mothers of
82 children aged six months (or younger if weaning had already started) and up to and including
83 four years of age were included to incorporate the weaning and early years' period. This age
84 range incorporates the key period when solid foods are introduced to infants, taste
85 preferences and acceptance and neophobia of different foods occurs. Multiparous mothers
86 were asked to think and refer to the feeding of their youngest child during the interview and
87 sorting task. This study recruited mothers only due to the suggestion of significant differences
88 between genders for views on food and health (Beardsworth, Bryman, Keil, Goode, Haslam,
89 & Lancashire, 2002). Furthermore, evidence indicates that despite shared roles in meal
90 planning and preparation, women are more likely to take the primary responsibility for these
91 tasks and are also less likely than fathers to have no responsibility at all (Flagg, Sen, Kilgore,
92 & Locher, 2014).

93

94 **Q set Development**

95 The statements for the sorting task were taken from themes identified through thematic
96 analysis of parenting internet discussion forums (popular parenting websites identified as
97 being used from previous studies (Hoddinott et al., 2010; Skea, Entwistle, Watt, & Russell,
98 2008)) and focus group discussions carried out with mothers (n=29) of young children across
99 six different parent and infant/toddler groups in the North East of Scotland (themes published
100 in Carstairs, Marais, Craig, & Kiezebrink, 2017). Statements were developed from each of
101 the themes identified and piloted to ensure clarity and saturation of themes. Development of

102 the Q set is an extremely important step in Q Methodology and can be achieved through a
103 thorough review of the literature to identify themes however, information gathered during
104 pilot studies, interviews and focus group discussions is often used (Watts & Stenner, 2005).
105 Thirty five statements were originally piloted, the final Q set comprised 33 statements (Table
106 2) which were assigned a code number and typed onto separate cards.

107

108 **Data Collection**

109 The Q sort and interview session (approximately 60 minutes) took place at the home of each
110 participant and was conducted by one researcher (SC) between May and September 2015. A
111 brief demographic questionnaire and informed consent form was obtained for each
112 participating mother prior to the interview session. Instructions on how to complete the task
113 were given by the researcher. Mothers were asked to sort the cards into three categories; -
114 least important to me when choosing to give/not give my child seafood, neutral, and most
115 important to me when choosing to give/not give my child seafood. Mothers were then asked
116 to rank each statement card using a fixed quasi-normal distribution response grid on a scale
117 of -4 (least important) to +4 (most important) (Figure 1). Throughout the sorting and ranking
118 tasks mothers were asked to 'think aloud' to verbalise their decision-making and provide
119 context for the placement of each statement card. Each interview session was audio recorded
120 with the consent of the mother. On completion of the sorting task the researcher recorded the
121 positioning of each statement on a template response grid. The study received ethical
122 approval from the University of Aberdeen College Ethics Review Board (Project no:
123 CERB/2014/9/1094).

124

125

126 **Figure 1:** The response grid.

127 The three coloured areas were used to get participants to group the statements in the first
128 instance into three; "what is important to me"; "what is not important to me"; "not
129 sure/neutral". Following this, participants placed the statements into the response grid
130 squares.

131

132

133 **Data Analysis**

134 Demographic data for the participant sample were analysed using descriptive statistics. The
135 order in which each participant ranked each statement in the Q set was entered into the

136 PQMethod software 2.35 (Schmolck, 2014) for analysis. This analysis includes a by-person
137 factor analysis technique to distinguish a correlation between participants' Q sort rankings
138 (Watts & Stenner, 2005) thus identifying commonality in emergent factors (viewpoints).
139 Viewpoints are then subjected to varimax rotation which maximises the amount of variance
140 explained by the factors. To identify the number of viewpoints to undergo rotation two
141 checks were employed - resultant viewpoints must have an eigenvalue (EV) (a measure of
142 communality) greater than 1.00 to be interpretable (Watts & Stenner, 2005). Secondly, the
143 viewpoint must have a minimum of two Q sorts that load significantly upon it (for this
144 analysis a significant loading at $P < 0.01$ was calculated as 0.449 (details of calculation in
145 (Brown, 1980a)). Q sorts that significantly load on a given viewpoint therefore share a similar
146 sorting pattern and thus it can be assumed, share a distinct opinion of the influences to
147 seafood provision. Distinguishing statements (those significantly different at $P < 0.01$) will be
148 used to determine key statements which differ between viewpoints.

149 The audio recordings for a selection of participants were transcribed verbatim for qualitative
150 analysis. The participants' data selected for transcription was determined by the participants
151 who significantly loaded onto a single viewpoint. Particular focus was placed on the
152 transcripts from the participants who best represented the ideal for each viewpoint i.e. had
153 loadings closest to 1.0. Quotes were selected from discussions on specific statements to
154 illustrate the points made by mothers. The immersion in the qualitative text was conducted by
155 the researcher (SC) to examine the context and reasons behind participants' choices.

156

157 Fischer's exact test was conducted using SPSS software (IBM Corp, 2015) to investigate
158 possible associations between viewpoints and socio-demographic variables. A P-value of
159 < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

160

161

162 **Results**

163 *Participant Demographics*

164 Of the 32 mothers who participated in this study, the mean age of the mothers was 33.7 years
165 (SD = 4.39, range = 26 to 44 years) at the time of interview (Table 1). The mean age of the
166 child was 18.6 months (SD = 11.43, range = 5 to 42 months) and the mean number of
167 children in the household was 1.6 (SD = 0.75, range = 1 to 3). The sample had equal numbers
168 of mothers residing in the least deprived and most deprived areas. Mothers were

169 predominantly seafood eaters (91%; n=29) and also had given seafood to their youngest child
170 (91%; n=29).

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

171 **Table 1:** Descriptive statistics of parent and child characteristics

Characteristic	Mean	Standard Deviation
Mother's age (years) (n=32)	33.7	4.39
Child's age (months) (n=33 ^a)	18.6	11.43
Children in household	1.6	0.75
	N	%
Child's gender ^a		
Male	19	58
Female	14	42
Married/Co-habiting	29	91
Working (part or full-time)	17	53
Area of Residence		
Most deprived (SIMD quintiles 1-3)	16	50
Least deprived (SIMD quintiles 4-5)	16	50
Urban	18	56
Rural	14	44
Fishing/coastal	14	44
Non-fishing/coastal	18	56
Consume seafood		
Mother	29	91
Child	29	91

172 ^aOne pair of twins in study

173

174

175 ***Q Methodology Factor Analysis***

176 The results of the Q methodology factor analysis identified two significant factors
 177 (viewpoints) (eigenvalues greater than 1.0 and two mothers' Q sorts significantly loaded onto
 178 viewpoint). Factor 1 explained 25% of the study variance with eleven participants
 179 significantly associated with this viewpoint. Factor 2 explained 19% of the study variance

180 and nine participants were significantly associated with this viewpoint. Six participants
181 significantly loaded on both factors and a further six did not significantly load on either factor
182 thus were excluded from further analysis. A high correlation score (0.563 which is greater
183 than the 0.449 significance calculated for this analysis) was evident between the two
184 viewpoints and with six participant's significantly loading on both factors it was evident that
185 the two viewpoints were alternative manifestations of the same view (Watts & Stenner,
186 2012). This is further evidenced by the number of consensus statements between the two
187 viewpoints (described later in Table 2).

188

189 Factor arrays are presented in Table 2 showing the ranking of each statement in 'ideal'
190 viewpoints. In the following sections descriptions of each viewpoint use the ranking position
191 of distinguishing statements (statements which are significantly different ($P < 0.01$) between
192 the viewpoints calculated using z-scores) i.e. +3.

193 **Table 2:** Factor arrays for viewpoints identify significantly distinguishing statements
 194 between viewpoints and consensus statements.

Statement	Viewpoint 1	Viewpoint 2
	Rank	
I believe my child doesn't like it	-1	-2
Consensus Statement*		
It's healthy good for them	4	4
The quality of it	3	3
I want them to try it	3	3
I know how to cook it	2	2
The taste	2	2
I cook it within a day or two of buying it	1	1
I know what to but for my kid(s)	1	0
It's what I like	0	1
It's habit, I normally give them it	0	0
The time of the day	0	-1
Eating out of special occasion	-1	-1
I bulk cook it and reheat it later	-2	-1
The day of the week	-3	-2
It's traditional	-2	-3
Media tells me to give them it	-3	-2
Distinguishing statements †		
Viewpoint 1		
It's safe to give them it	3	1
The cost	2	-3
It's filling	2	-2
It's available	1	0
The texture	1	0
Health professionals tell me to give them it	0	-1
I had it as a child	0	-1
Viewpoint 2		
I want to have just one family meal	-1	3
It is quick to make	0	2
It takes little effort/easy to make	1	2
It's what my partner likes	-3	1
It's what my other children like	-4	0
The environment	0	1
The smell	-1	0
The look of it	-1	0
My family tell me to give them it	-2	-3
My friends give their kid(s) it	-2	-4

195 * denotes statements with no significant difference between factors at $P > 0.05$ † denotes a
 196 significant difference between factors at $P < 0.01$

197

198 **Shared viewpoints**

199

200 Although it has been shown that the two viewpoints have key distinctions from each other,
201 there was a consensus with mothers from both viewpoints for some statements (Table 3). The
202 importance of taste (+2) was important in their decision on whether to give seafood to their
203 child however, this was not the most important aspect for mothers in this study.

204

205 **Health**

206 The majority of mothers placed a high importance on the health aspects of giving seafood to
207 their young child (+4) often relating it to the nutrients that seafood provides:

208 *“it's healthy or good for them' would probably be at the top for the white fish and the*
209 *prawns. I think of it as a source of protein really and I know that there are some omega 3*
210 *fatty acids in it that they don't necessarily get from anything else but to be honest I'm not sure*
211 *that the fish that I give them has actually got very much of that in it because it is usually just*
212 *white fish and prawns. I think it is more the fact that it is a source of protein really, that I*
213 *think of” [P06, age 33, urban, fishing, 30 months]*

214

215 For the majority of mothers, the importance of health outweighed other practicalities of
216 providing seafood to their child:

217 *“It's a battle between that you know, you want them to have a balanced diet, it's got to be*
218 *good for them, but then it's easy and effortless to make. So it's a balance of being, knowing*
219 *what you should be giving them versus in real life how you fit it in and get things done. So I*
220 *think for me it's got... healthy has got to be the first one because it's good for them and I*
221 *want them to have a bit of everything, so making sure they have some seafood at least a*
222 *couple of times a week is very important”. [P09, age 36, rural, fishing, 16 months]*

223

224 In addition, mothers shared the consensus that they wanted their child to try seafood (+3),
225 highlighting a desire to avoid fussiness:

226 *“Just so they're not restricted as they get older and so that when they go out with friends or*
227 *they go to school or whatever, they're not, “Oh, I don't eat that and I don't eat this” and it*
228 *doesn't become a big problem. I'd like them to have just tried everything or as much as they*
229 *can”. [P15, age 34, rural, non-fishing, 7 months]*

230

231

232 **Quality**

233 The quality of seafood was an important aspect (+3) for the mothers and this was often
234 considered in respect to the transparency of what they are eating:

235 *“I don’t really want to be giving her stuff that I don’t know what’s in it, so yeah. [talking*
236 *about fish fingers] you don’t know quite what’s going on there, a bit like a chicken nugget.*
237 *Whereas if you get a frozen fish that looks like a fish, then it is a fish and there’s not much*
238 *else in there”*. [P12, age 31, rural, non-fishing, 12 months]

239

240

241 **Media Advice**

242 The unimportance of the media (-3 and -2) as a source of information on the inclusion of
243 seafood during infant and young child feeding (Table 3) was apparent, with mothers often
244 indicating distrust of the media:

245 *“with media you never know where the source of information is coming from, you never know*
246 *if it's been [pause] even if they say it's research, you never know what the point of it is. Are*
247 *they trying to sell a product or have they got an ulterior motive, so I don’t tend to listen to the*
248 *media in terms of that”*. [P04, age 33, rural, non-fishing, 36 months]

249

250 **Knowledge and skills**

251 Mothers ranked the knowledge of how to cook seafood (+2) as important, with some
252 indicating a lack of confidence resulting in avoiding cooking seafood for safety concerns and
253 others limiting the type of seafood they provide to their child:

254 *“I'm thinking food poisoning if I don't know how to cook it and so I wouldn't try and give*
255 *them it just in case”* [P28, age 34, urban, non-fishing, 12 months]

256

257 *“I give him like fish fingers, like, fish bites and fish goujons we eat but it’s always*
258 *frozen...just cos I don't know how to cook it. I mean tuna steak looks so tasty but I just*
259 *wouldn’t have a clue about how to cook it. I get nervous, I'm intimidated by cooking it”*.

260 [P24, age33, urban, non-fishing, 36 months]

261

262 **Viewpoint 1: Food attributes & infant-centred**

263 Of the eleven participants sharing viewpoint one, the mothers median age was 33 years (IQR
264 31-35 years). The median age of the child was 17 months (IQR 9-24 months). Mothers

265 predominantly had only one child (82%) and 82% cohabited. This first viewpoint is depicted
266 by food attributes and their impact on the young child and also an unimportance of other
267 members of the household compared with viewpoint 2. Food attributes including the texture
268 of seafood (+1) and also the availability of seafood (+1) were significantly distinguishing
269 (Table 2) aspects impacting on the provision of seafood:

270 *"It's less chewy. She can break it down better with six teeth. So yeah, I'd say it was easier*
271 *for her to eat and gum to death than trying to chew on a bit of actual red meat or chicken."*
272 [P12, age 31, rural, non-fishing, 12 months]

273
274 *"Like, well, it's not the supermarket, he's not getting it! So yes, I guess that that is*
275 *important. It has to be available in my supermarket."* [P13, age 26, rural, non-fishing, 24
276 months]

277

278 **Safety**

279 Mothers who shared this viewpoint placed greatest significance on the importance of the
280 safety of seafood in giving this food to their young child (+3). The issues raised by the
281 mothers often included the risk of food poisoning and choking due to bones but also due to
282 the mercury and contaminant levels derived in seafood:

283 *"I suppose it is a wee bit important to me at the moment yeah, I'm more...it's the choking*
284 *hazard...I don't know what fish has bones in it and what doesn't"* [P27, age 34, urban,
285 fishing, 5 months]

286

287 *"That's funny, because before I would definitely give it to them without a doubt, but since I*
288 *found out about the restrictions that really worried me. But the worrying one is to do with the*
289 *girl's fertility that would be the one [pause] I wouldn't want to affect their fertility by giving*
290 *them a lot of fish."* [P16, age 25, rural, non-fishing, 22 months]

291

292 **Value for money**

293 An additional attribute of seafood that mothers with this viewpoint shared was the cost of
294 providing seafood (+2):

295 *"Well, because we will give him fish fingers because that's one of the easier options if you*
296 *have less time, those are cheap so we keep those in the freezer, but that's not something*
297 *(partner) and I would have, so in that respect yes, but when we're trying to give him some of*
298 *the similar stuff to what we have, like salmon fillets and whatever, yes, he probably doesn't*

299 *get it as much because we don't eat it a much because it is expensive. I think actually fish is a*
300 *bit more expensive than the other meats” [P13, age 26, rural, non-fishing, 24 months]*

301

302 A need for the meal to be filling (+2) was also considered and combined with cost these
303 aspects were interrelated for some mothers where the value for money was considered:

304 *“I do think about it. And I maybe should spend more on food and that is one thing that*
305 *slightly puts me off fish as well because it is more expensive, or it seems to be more expensive*
306 *anyway. Whether it's just, if you spend £4 on chicken you get maybe one and a half or two*
307 *meals out of it whereas if you spend £4 on salmon you'd eat them in one meal and it would be*
308 *a light meal and you're hungry again later on in the evening. So for the same price you seem*
309 *to get less food for it with regards to fish” [P02, age 30, rural, non-fishing, 18 months]*

310

311 **Family Preferences**

312 However, it was the unimportance of family members' preferences, such as older siblings (-
313 4) that also exemplified this viewpoint, more so than the partner's preference (-3). Many
314 mothers discussed the fact that they often provided separate meals for weaning their youngest
315 child:

316 *“I think I probably did her [infant] on quite an individual basis when I was weaning her so I*
317 *don't, I suppose I didn't really take account of what [other child's name] was liking or not*
318 *liking if it meant making a separate meal then that's kind of what I did” [P04, age 33, rural,*
319 *non-fishing, 36 months]*

320

321 **Health Professionals Advice**

322 Despite ranking the advice from health professionals as neutral, mothers of this first
323 viewpoint felt advice from this source was more important to their decision-making than
324 those sharing viewpoint 2, comparing this advice to that from other sources:

325 *“Yes, I'm more influenced by health professionals than the media, definitely so he's got a 27-*
326 *month check at the end of the month so if they've got an opinion on me giving him seafood,*
327 *then it's something I would take on board” [P13, age 26, rural, non-fishing, 24 months]*

328

329 Some mothers even referred to the written material provided by their health visitor, citing
330 information:

331 *“I look at my books and things from them [reading from her booklet] yeah I mean like here it*
332 *says "are there any foods I shouldn't give?" and it's like "foods before they're one" and*

333 *they've got shark, marling, swordfish, who gives their babies that anyway?"* [P27, age 34,
334 urban, fishing, 5 months]

335

336 **Viewpoint 2: Convenience & family-centred**

337 Nine mothers shared this second, alternative viewpoint. The median age of the mothers was
338 33 years (IQR 31-39 years) whilst the youngest child was aged 16 months (IQR 8.5-24
339 months). More than half the mothers of this viewpoint (55%) had more than one child and all
340 co-habited (100%).

341

342 ***Shared family meal***

343 Of importance to mothers of this viewpoint, was having one family meal (+3) (Table 2) with
344 some highlighting an importance to cook only one meal:

345 *"If you don't like it then it's a bit tough in this house, if you don't like it you just move on and*
346 *miss that bit, I'm not making anything else and they just get pudding or whatever."* [P09, age
347 36, rural, fishing, 16 months]

348

349 and others referring to a learning experience and the social aspect of eating together:

350 *"I think a lot of it was kind of, not wanting to encourage fussiness, in my mind I think of*
351 *servicing one meal as teaching children sometimes that they just have to be grateful for what*
352 *they get. I quite like the idea that it maybe makes it more of a family occasion if you're all*
353 *eating the same food rather than all doing separate things. There's just something about*
354 *that. I think it is more important to me because we don't spend the day together, you know*
355 *that when we do it is something that we all do."* [P06, age 33, urban, fishing, 30 months]

356

357 ***Family Preferences***

358 Although the mother's own preference (+1) was not a significantly distinguishing aspect,
359 mothers of this viewpoint ranked their husband/partner's preferences towards seafood (+1) as
360 fairly important, often resulting in the infrequent consumption and offering of seafood to their
361 child:

362 *"fish is something we eat very rarely in this house because my husband and I don't, it's not*
363 *that we don't like it, it's just not our favourite and we don't eat it that much so if we ate it a lot*
364 *the kids would eat it more."* [P05, 34, urban, fishing, 36 months]

365

366 But for others, some importance was placed on providing foods which conformed to their
367 own intakes:

368 “So yes, that’s, I guess, a reason that we do give it to him because then his diet’s in line with
369 ours.” [P10, aged 32, urban, fishing, 9 months]

370

371 **Convenience**

372 The importance of the ease (+2) and quickness (+2) of providing seafood was apparent in
373 these mothers who chose to give both fresh and frozen seafood options:

374 “Yes, that’s important when, I have the two of them. Yes, so I don’t really spend that much
375 time in the kitchen. I just put it in the steamer, two minutes and it’s ready, it’s just steaming
376 there and I can do something in the meantime, it’s ready in half an hour and we can all have
377 it so it’s really quick compared to the meats which you have to either fry or grill or something
378 and it does take more time so I think fish is actually quite quick to make” [P11, age 30, urban,
379 fishing, 12 months]

380

381 **Environment**

382 These mothers additionally placed some importance on the environmental aspects of eating
383 seafood (+1) on their decision-making compared to mothers with the first viewpoint:

384 “Yes, so I do try and buy fish that’s been sustainably farmed and I do look at those things on
385 the packets. I do look at the fish and we try and buy dolphin-friendly tuna and things like that,
386 so yes, that kind of thing does influence me more than my husband.” [P15, age 34, rural, non-
387 fishing, 7 months]

388

389 **Sensory Attributes**

390 Despite low scores and neutral ranking for the importance of the smell (0) and look of
391 seafood (0), these physical, sensory characteristics were significantly more important for
392 mothers of this viewpoint compared to viewpoint one. However, mothers differed in whether
393 these attributes were important to themselves or to their child:

394 “the look of it is probably neutral really because I know that my children have looked at it
395 and thought that it looked like other meats that they like, like chicken, so I suppose it
396 certainly wouldn’t put me off but I’m not sure it positively encourages either.” [P06 age 33,
397 urban, fishing, 30 months]

398 “it’s off putting to me [smell] but he likes it so I put up with it” [P31, age 26, urban, fishing, 8
399 months]

400 Others views and opinions

401 This viewpoint additionally showed that mothers placed the views of other people, such as
402 their friends (-4) and family (-3) as the least important aspects in choosing to give their young
403 child seafood, which was lower than mothers sharing the first viewpoint:

404 *“I think that’s least important. I don’t care that much about really what they say.”* [P11, age
405 30, urban, fishing, 12 months]

406

407

408 Demographic analysis

409 Possibly due to the small sample of mothers who significantly loaded onto the viewpoints
410 identified in this study (n=20), there were no significant relationships between the mothers’
411 viewpoint and demographic characteristics (Table 3). The majority of mothers sharing the
412 first viewpoint (73%) resided in non-fishing, inland communities (p=0.175) and 60%
413 residents in the areas of greatest deprivation (measured as those living in SIMD quintiles 1 to
414 3) (p=1.000). The prevalence of single-child mothers who shared the view food attributes and
415 infant-centred (82%) was also not significantly different to those sharing the view of
416 convenience and family-centred (p=0.160). There was no relationship between the mothers
417 age (p=1.000) or the age of their child (p=1.000) and their viewpoint. Mothers who shared
418 the convenience and family-centred equally came from the least and most deprived areas
419 (p=1.000) with 56% residents in urban locations (p=1.000) whilst 67% came from fishing or
420 coastal communities (p=0.175). There was no significant relationship between mothers
421 viewpoint and whether they consume seafood (p=1.000) or give it to their young child
422 (p=1.000). Despite a lower percentage of mothers (55%) and children (46%) of viewpoint
423 one consuming or giving oil-rich seafood, this relationship was not significant (p≥0.157).

424

425

426 **Table 3:** The relationship between demographic characteristics and viewpoint.

Characteristic		% of Viewpoint		P-Value ^c
		Viewpoint 1 (n=11)	Viewpoint 2 (n=9)	
Mother's Age	26-33yr	54.5	55.6	1.000
	34-44yr	45.5	44.4	
Child's Age	5-12mths	45.5	55.6	1.000
	13-42mths	54.5	44.4	
Child Sex	Female	36.4	37.5	1.000
	Male	63.6	62.5	
Other children in household	Yes	18.2	55.6	0.160
	No	81.8	44.4	
Co-habiting	Yes	81.8	100.0	0.479
	No	18.2	0.0	
Working	Yes	63.6	44.4	0.653
	No	36.4	55.6	
Area of residence	Highest Deprivation ^a	60.0	50.0	1.000
	Lowest Deprivation ^b	40.0	50.0	
	Urban	54.5	55.6	1.000
	Rural	45.5	44.4	
	Fishing/Coastal	27.3	66.7	0.175
	Non-fishing	72.7	33.3	
Mother consumed ^d	Seafood	90.9	100.0	1.000
	Oil-rich seafood	54.5	88.9	
Child given ^d	Seafood	90.9	88.9	1.000
	Oil-rich seafood	45.5	77.8	

427 ^a defined as SIMD quintiles 1-3 ^b defined as SIMD quintiles 4-5 ^c Fischer's Exact Test ^d
 428 consumed seafood from weekly up to monthly basis
 429

429

430

431 **Discussion**

432 This study aimed to investigate the importance of differing influencing factors on mothers'
 433 decisions to provide seafood into the diet of their child during early years' feeding using Q
 434 methodology. The sorting task and 'think aloud' interview revealed that there was an
 435 agreement between mothers on the importance and unimportance of many aspects in driving
 436 their decision on whether to include seafood during early years' feeding. However, two

437 viewpoints emerged in this group of mothers, namely; - food attributes and infant-centred,
438 and convenience and family-centred.

439

440 *Shared Views*

441 The importance of providing a healthy, balanced diet was paramount in mothers of both
442 viewpoints with a desire to try to provide a variety of different foods for their child that were
443 of good quality. The mothers in this study may have felt a moral obligation to provide good,
444 nutritious foods for their young child to give them a healthy start in life in agreement with
445 previous studies (Nielsen, Michaelsen, & Holm, 2014). By providing different foods to try,
446 mothers wished to socialise their child into family mealtimes and hoped to have social eating
447 outside the home without fuss or difficulty, an aspect also found in a study of Danish mothers
448 (Nielsen et al., 2014). This moral obligation evident in our study compliments previous
449 conclusions that seafood consumption is driven more by moral obligation than taste and
450 preferences compared with other foods (Olsen, 2004). However, it is important to consider
451 that mothers of this current study were predominantly seafood consumers who had offered
452 seafood to their child and thus have an acceptance of this food. They may have felt happy in
453 disclosing that they perceived seafood provision to be a moral obligation to be viewed as a
454 “good parent”. Non-seafood consuming parents however may not hold this aspect as
455 important in their decision-making compared to other factors, or wish to disclose feeling a
456 moral obligation that they may be seen to not achieve. Some of our mothers also believed that
457 providing seafood for their young child will encourage them to eat more healthily as a family,
458 an aspect shared by mothers of a previous UK-based study (Hoddinott et al., 2010), thus
459 providing an opportunity for seafood to appear more regularly on the household menu.

460

461 Mothers additionally shared the view that advice from media sources was the least important
462 influence to their decision on providing seafood. Many mothers felt a lack of trust towards
463 media as a source of information and mentioned ulterior motives by industry and food
464 manufacturers, mirroring previous accounts by mothers on healthy eating information
465 (O’Key & Hugh-Jones, 2010). The unimportance mothers placed on information and advice
466 gained was partly explained by a perception of mixed messages on when and what seafood
467 you can give your child that mothers received between different sources; findings which
468 support those of a previous study with pregnant women (Bloomingdale et al., 2010). Our
469 sample of mothers stated they relied on their own instincts when deciding to give seafood
470 which may be a result of mothers’ decision to ignore these confusing mixed messages. The

471 confidence in their own choices apparent in this group of mothers may be indicative of their
472 familiarity with eating seafood (Birch & Lawley, 2014) but may also be due to educational
473 biases, a measure not recorded in this study. However, we should consider that mothers who
474 do not consume seafood may not feel as confident with filtering the information and advice
475 they receive on seafood and place a greater importance of this factor in their decision-
476 making. The unimportance of advice from others on seafood provision held by these mothers
477 opposes findings from infant feeding studies where advice from the maternal grandmother
478 and encouragement from friends on the timing of weaning are sought (Alder, Williams,
479 Anderson, Forsyth, du ve Florey, & van der Velde, 2004). This insignificance of external
480 information sources on seafood inclusion could be suggested to be due to previous weaning
481 experiences of older children (Hoddinott et al., 2010) or possibly due to mothers choosing to
482 ignore these perceived mixed messages. Furthermore, the mother's education and socio-
483 economic status may also play a role however, no statistical relationship was found in this
484 study between multiparous mothers, level of deprivation and this second viewpoint, possibly
485 due to the small sample size. The preferences of the partner were deemed important for
486 mothers sharing the convenience and family-centred viewpoint indicating that the influence
487 of the significant other may play a role more than advice from other family members out-with
488 the household (Hoddinott et al., 2010).

489

490 *Convenience and family-centred*

491 The idealism of providing a healthy diet for the child often competes with everyday
492 practicalities of feeding (Hoddinott, Craig, Britten, & McInnes, 2012) and mothers of the
493 second viewpoint held a great importance on providing one family meal. These mothers may
494 in part wish to prepare and cook just one meal which the infant can share to incorporate them
495 into the family (Hoddinott et al., 2010) and a shared eating experience however, family
496 preferences and time constraints may play an interrelated role. Interestingly mothers
497 expressing this view did not perceive the cost of seafood as central to their decision-making
498 unlike their counterparts who deemed this as important. Previous findings have shown that
499 seafood is often perceived as expensive and may act as a barrier to consumption
500 (Bloomingdale et al., 2010; McManus et al., 2007; Neale et al., 2012; Verbeke & Vackier,
501 2005) however, mothers sharing the second viewpoint did not perceive cost as a barrier as
502 many had found affordable seafood options and others did not perceive this as any more
503 expensive than other protein-rich types. Furthermore, the majority of mothers were seafood-
504 eaters and described providing a taste of seafood for their child from their own plate, limiting

505 individually prepared meals for the young child. The greater importance of family food
506 preferences evident in the convenience and family-centred viewpoint compliments the
507 importance and desire to have a family meal and can often impact on the frequency of
508 seafood meals appearing on the household menu (McManus et al., 2007; Myrland et al.,
509 2000; Verbeke & Vackier, 2005).

510

511 *Food attributes and infant-centred*

512 The importance of safety for mothers who shared the food-attributes and infant-centred
513 viewpoint shows a concern by these mothers of aspects such as texture, risk of choking, the
514 risk of food poisoning, allergic reactions, and toxicological contamination. Balancing the
515 benefits of seafood with these risks has been an area of debate (Nesheim & Yaktine, 2007).
516 The framing of seafood messages may play an important role in mothers' decision-making
517 and a prominence of the associated risks of harm may overshadow health benefits (Rothman
518 & Salovey, 1997). It was expected that mothers who shared the viewpoint of food attributes
519 and infant-centred would be primiparous, providing an individual meal for the weaning child
520 compared to convenience and family-centred mothers who may be impacted more by
521 competing priorities and preferences of older children (Robinson et al., 2007). A greater
522 percentage of mothers sharing the food attribute and infant-centred view had only one child
523 however, no statistical difference was found between mothers of each viewpoint, again
524 possibly due to the final sample size being too small to detect any differences rather than no
525 differences being found. It was expected that mothers of children within the weaning
526 developmental stage (6-12mths) would hold the viewpoint of food attributes and infant-
527 centred as this is the stage of introducing solid foods and when parents may be more hesitant
528 and conscious towards the safety of food and how their child responds to foods. However
529 possibly due to the small sample size, the trend towards mothers of this viewpoint having
530 children within this younger age group was not statistically significant. The buying and
531 preparation of separate foods for the weaning infant may provide an opportunity for non-
532 seafood eating mothers to provide a food which does not suit their own preferences and it was
533 often mentioned by mothers that they wished to offer foods that they themselves did not
534 enjoy to widen the child's acceptance of foods, possibly explaining the lesser importance of
535 the mothers preference on the decision on whether to include seafood in our sample.

536

537 *Limitations*

538 The provision of a practical decision-making tool and accompanying ‘think aloud’ interview
539 utilised in this study permitted the researcher to view the decision-making process by mothers
540 and listen to their reasoning. The presence of the researcher could however have influenced
541 the mother to rank and discuss key factors in a manner that they believed was to be expected
542 to be perceived as a ‘good mother’. Nonetheless, completing the Q sorting task in the
543 presence of the researcher was necessary to explain the process of the Q sort and record and
544 probe mothers during the ‘think aloud’ interview.

545

546 Our sample of 32 mothers was deemed sufficient to the design of Q methodology, which
547 requires only a limited number of respondents (Watts & Stenner, 2005), and took into
548 consideration a range of mothers from different areas of residence (urban/rural, fishing/non-
549 fishing), deprivation levels, and with a range of child’s ages. However, the twelve mothers
550 whose views were excluded from the analysis due to insignificant or confounded loading
551 reduced the sample size which may have influenced the lack of relationships found between
552 viewpoints and mothers demographic information. It is a generally held view that those with
553 an interest in the research topic are more likely to volunteer for participation and it was
554 evident that there was a bias to our sample, where mothers were primarily seafood consumers
555 who had given seafood to their child. Future research should be conducted in non-seafood
556 consuming parents to fully understand the decision to provide seafood during the early years.
557 Despite recruiting mothers from a selection of deprivation levels, it must be considered that
558 SIMD scores represent deprivation on an area level and not an individual basis (Scottish
559 Government, 2012b). Thus the range of mothers from socio-economically divergent
560 backgrounds may not have been achieved and results may not be generalizable to other
561 populations. A further limitation of this study was the inclusion of one mother who had a
562 child aged five months of age. This age is below the recommended six months for the
563 introduction of solid foods and thus inclusion of seafood in the diet, on this occasion the
564 mother had begun introducing solid foods and discussed their intentions and plans on
565 providing seafood in their child’s diet. Our sample included a broad range of child age; from
566 weaning to pre-school, however the sample size in this study did not permit the investigation
567 of differences in mothers’ opinions according to the child’s developmental stage therefore,
568 future studies are required to determine any key differences in the importance mothers place
569 on the influences to their decision-making.

570

571 It is important to consider that fathers who hold the primary food provider role in the
572 household may have a different opinion on the importance of the influences. This study was
573 limited to mothers due to possible gender differences in opinions however, future research
574 should consider the role and views of fathers in the decision to provide seafood and should
575 additionally consider the implications of shared custody of children and the impact on food
576 choices. The findings from this research study provides an insight into the importance
577 mothers place on the influences to their decisions on providing seafood during infant and
578 young child feeding. Furthermore, these findings can be used to inform and tailor
579 interventions aimed at increasing and promoting the provision of seafood by parents to meet
580 recommendations based on their views on whether food attributes and the infant are of focus
581 or whether convenience and family-centred focus is more important.

582

583 **Transparency Declaration**

584 The lead author (SC) affirms that this manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent
585 account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted;
586 and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained.

587

588 **Acknowledgements**

589 The authors would like to thank the mothers who volunteered to take part in the Q sort
590 interviews.

591

592 **Conflict of interest**

593 The authors confirm there are no conflicts of interest. The funding for this research study was
594 for a PhD scholarship by the Seafish Authority and Interface Food and Drink Scotland which
595 do not financially benefit from this research or have any influence on the results found and
596 presented here.

597

598 **Sources of funding**

599 This study was funded by the Seafish Authority and Interface Food and Drink Scotland as
600 part of a PhD scholarship for SC.

601

602 **Disclaimer**

603 The authors views expressed in the submitted article are their own and are not an official
604 position of the University of Aberdeen or any of the funding bodies.

605

606 **Contributorship**

607 Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; data collection, analysis,
608 and interpretation of data for the work were conducted by Sharon Carstairs (SC) under the
609 supervision of Dr K Kiezebrink (KK), Dr D Marais (DM) and Dr L Craig (LC). Drafting of
610 the publication was done by SC with the revision for important intellectual content and final
611 approval of the version to be published given by KK, LC and DM. There is agreement
612 between the authors that SC is accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that
613 questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately
614 investigated and resolved.

615

616 **References**

- 617 Alder, E., Williams, F., Anderson, A., Forsyth, S., du ve Florey, C., & van der Velde, P.
618 (2004). What influences the timing of the introduction of solid food to infants? *British*
619 *Journal of Nutrition*, 92(3), 527-531.
- 620 Beardsworth, A., Bryman, A., Keil, T., Goode, J., Haslam, C., & Lancashire, E. (2002).
621 Women, men and food: The significance of gender for nutritional attitudes and choices.
622 *British Food Journal*, 104(7), 470-491.
- 623 Birch LL. (1999). Development of food preferences. *Annual Review of Nutrition*, 19, 41-62.
- 624 Birch, D., & Lawley, M. (2012). Buying seafood: Understanding barriers to purchase across
625 consumption segments. *Food Quality and Preference*, 26(1), 12-21.
- 626 Birch, D., & Lawley, M. (2014). The role of habit, childhood consumption, familiarity, and
627 attitudes across seafood consumption segments in australia. *Journal of Food Products*
628 *Marketing*, 20(1), 98-113.
- 629 Birch, D., Lawley, M., & Hamblin, D. (2012). Drivers and barriers to seafood consumption in
630 Australia. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 29(1), 64-73.
- 631 Bloomingdale, A., Guthrie, L. B., Price, S., Wright, R. O., Platek, D., Haines, J., & Oken, E.
632 (2010). A qualitative study of fish consumption during pregnancy. *The American*
633 *Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 92(5), 1234-1240.
- 634 Brown, S. (1980a). Political subjectivity: Applications of Q methodology in political science.
635 (pp. 222-223). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- 636 Brown, S. (1980b). *Political subjectivity: Applications of Q methodology in political science*.
637 New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- 638 Bryant, C. A. (1982). The impact of kin, friend and neighbor networks on infant feeding
639 practices: Cuban, Puerto Rican and Anglo families in florida. *Social Science &*
640 *Medicine*, 16(20), 1757-1765.
- 641 Carruth, B. R., & Skinner, J. D. (2001). Mothers' sources of information about feeding their
642 children ages 2 months to 54 months. *Journal of Nutrition Education*, 33(3), 143-147.
- 643 Carstairs, S., Marais, D., Craig, L., & Kiezebrink, K. (2017). Factors influencing mothers'
644 decisions on whether to provide seafood during early years' feeding: A qualitative study.
645 *Appetite*, 108(1), 277-287.
- 646 Department of Health. (2011). *Diet and nutrition survey of infants and young children 2011*.
647 London: Department of Health and The Food Standards Agency.

- 648 Flagg, L. A., Sen, B., Kilgore, M., & Locher, J. L. (2014). The influence of gender, age,
649 education and household size on meal preparation and food shopping responsibilities.
650 *Public Health Nutrition*, 17(09), 2061-2070.
- 651 Foxall, G., Leek, S., & Maddock, S. (1998). Cognitive antecedents of consumers' willingness
652 to purchase fish rich in polyunsaturated fatty acids (PUFA). *Appetite*, 31(3), 391-402.
- 653 Harris, G. (2008). Development of taste and food preferences in children. *Current Opinion in*
654 *Clinical Nutrition & Metabolic Care*, 11(3), 315-319.
- 655 Hoddinott, P., Craig, L., Britten, J., & McInnes, R. (2010). *A prospective study exploring the*
656 *early infant feeding experiences of parents and their significant others during the first 6*
657 *months of life: What would make a difference?* Edinburgh: NHS Health Scotland.
- 658 Hoddinott, P., Craig, L. C. A., Britten, J., & McInnes, R. M. (2012). A serial qualitative
659 interview study of infant feeding experiences: Idealism meets realism. *BMJ Open*, 2(2)
- 660 Horodyski, M., Olson, B., Arndt, M. J., Brophy-Herb, H., Shirer, K., & Shemanski, R.
661 (2007). Low-income mothers' decisions regarding when and why to introduce solid
662 foods to their infants: Influencing factors. *Journal of Community Health Nursing*, 24(2),
663 101-118.
- 664 IBM Corp. (2015). *Statistical package for the social sciences* (23.0rd ed.). NY: Armonk.
- 665 Kajjura, H., Cowart, B. J., & Beauchamp, G. K. (1992). Early developmental change in bitter
666 taste responses in human infants. *Developmental Psychobiology*, 25(5), 375-386.
- 667 Leek, S., Maddock, S., & Foxall, G. (2000). Situational determinants of fish consumption. *Br*
668 *Food J*, 102(1), 18-31.
- 669 McManus, A., Burns, S., Howat, P., Cooper, L., & Fielder, L. (2007). Factors influencing the
670 consumption of seafood among young children in Perth: A qualitative study. *BMC*
671 *Public Health*, 7(1), 119.
- 672 Myrland, Ø., Trondsen, T., Johnston, R. S., & Lund, E. (2000). Determinants of seafood
673 consumption in Norway: Lifestyle, revealed preferences, and barriers to consumption.
674 *Food Quality and Preference*, 11(3), 169-188.
- 675 Neale, E. P., Nolan-Clark, D., Probst, Y. C., Batterhan, M. J., & Tapsell, L. C. (2012).
676 Comparing attitudes to fish consumption between clinical trial participants and non-trial
677 individuals. *Nutrition & Dietetics*, 69(2), 124-129.
- 678 Nesheim, M. C., & Yaktine, A. L. (Eds.). (2007). *Seafood choices: Balancing benefits and*
679 *risks* (First ed.). Washington DC: The National Academies Press.

- 680 Nielsen, A., Michaelsen, K. F., & Holm, L. (2014). Beyond an assumed Mother–Child
681 symbiosis in nutritional guidelines: The everyday reasoning behind complementary
682 feeding decisions. *Child Care in Practice*, 20(3), 329-346.
- 683 O’Key, V., & Hugh-Jones, S. (2010). I don’t need anybody to tell me what I should be
684 doing’. A discursive analysis of maternal accounts of (mis)trust of healthy eating
685 information. *Appetite*, 54(3), 524-532.
- 686 Olsen, S. O. (2001). Consumer involvement in seafood as family meals in Norway: An
687 application of the expectancy-value approach. *Appetite*, 36, 173-186.
- 688 Olsen, S. O. (2003). Understanding the relationship between age and seafood consumption:
689 The mediating role of attitude, health involvement and convenience. *Food Quality and*
690 *Preference*, 14(3), 199-209.
- 691 Olsen, S. O. (2004). Antecedents of seafood consumption behavior. *Journal of Aquatic Food*
692 *Product Technology*, 13(3), 79-91.
- 693 Pieniak, Z., Verbeke, W., & Scholderer, J. (2010). Health-related beliefs and consumer
694 knowledge as determinants of fish consumption. *Journal of Human Nutrition and*
695 *Dietetics*, 23(5), 480-488.
- 696 Pieniak, Z., Verbeke, W., Scholderer, J., Brunso, K., & Olsen, S. O. (2007). European
697 consumers’ use of and trust in information sources about fish. *Food Quality and*
698 *Preference*, 18(8), 1050-1063.
- 699 Pridham, K. F. (1990). Feeding behavior of 6- to 12-month-old infants: Assessment and
700 sources of parental information. *The Journal of Pediatrics*, 117(2, Part 2), S174-S180.
- 701 Public Health England and Food Standards Agency. (2014). *National diet and nutrition*
702 *survey: Results from years 1,2,3 and 4 (combined) of the rolling programme (2008/2009*
703 *- 2011/2012)*. London: Public Health England.
- 704 Robinson, S., Marriott, L., Poole, J., Crozier, S., Borland, S., Lawrence, W., Inskip, H.
705 (2007). Dietary patterns in infancy: The importance of maternal and family influences on
706 feeding practice. *British Journal of Nutrition*, 98(05), 1029-1037.
- 707 Rothman, A., & Salovey, P. (1997). Shaping perceptions to motivate health behaviour: The
708 role of message framing. *Psychological Bulletin*, 121(1), 3-19.
- 709 Schmolck, P. (2014). *PQMethod* (2.35th ed.). Available from
710 <http://schmolck.userweb.mwn.de/qmethod/#PQMethod>: Schmolck, P.
- 711 Schwartz, C., Scholtens, P. A. M. J., Lalanne, A., Weenen, H., & Nicklaus, S. (2011).
712 Development of healthy eating habits early in life. review of recent evidence and
713 selected guidelines. *Appetite*, 57(3), 796-807.

- 714 Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition. (2004). *Advice on fish consumption: Benefits*
715 *and risks*. London: Food Standards Agency and Department of Health, TSO.
- 716 Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition. (2010). *Iron and health report*. London: TSO.
- 717 Scottish Government. (2012a). *Scottish Government Urban/Rural Classification 2011-2012*.
718 Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- 719 Scottish Government. (2012b). *Scottish index of multiple deprivation 2012: General report*.
720 Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- 721 Scottish Government. (2012c). *SIMD 2012 postcode lookup - excel*. Edinburgh: Scottish
722 Government.
- 723 Scottish Government. (2015). *Scottish sea fisheries statistics 2014*. (). Edinburgh: Scottish
724 Government.
- 725 Skea, Z. C., Entwistle, V. A., Watt, I., & Russell, E. (2008). 'Avoiding harm to others'
726 considerations in relation to parental measles, mumps and rubella (MMR) vaccination
727 discussions – an analysis of an online chat forum. *Social Science & Medicine*, 67(9),
728 1382-1390.
- 729 Trondsen, T., Braaten, T., Lund, E., & Eggen, A. (2004a). Consumption of seafood - the
730 influence of overweight and health beliefs. *Food Quality and Pref*, 15, 361-374.
- 731 Trondsen, T., Braaten, T., Lund, E., & Eggen, A. E. (2004b). Health and seafood
732 consumption patterns among women aged 45–69 years. A Norwegian seafood
733 consumption study. *Food Quality and Preference*, 15(2), 117-128.
- 734 Trondsen, T., Scholderer, J., Lund, E., & Eggen, A. E. (2003). Perceived barriers to
735 consumption of fish among Norwegian women. *Appetite*, 41(3), 301-314.
- 736 Vardeman, J. E., & Aldoory, L. (2008). A qualitative study of how women make meaning of
737 contradictory media messages about the risks of eating fish. *Health Communication*,
738 23(3), 282-291.
- 739 Verbeke, W., Sioen, I., Pieniak, Z., Van Camp, J., & De Henauw, S. (2005). Consumer
740 perception versus scientific evidence about health benefits and safety risks from fish
741 consumption. *Public Health Nutrition*, 8(4), 422-429.
- 742 Verbeke, W., & Vackier, I. (2005). Individual determinants of fish consumption: Application
743 of the theory of planned behaviour. *Appetite*, 44(1), 67-82.
- 744 Verbeke, W., Vanhonacker, F., Frewer, L. J., Sioen, I., De Henauw, S., & Van Camp, J.
745 (2008). Communicating risks and benefits from fish consumption: Impact on Belgian
746 consumers' perception and intention to eat fish. *Risk Analysis*, 28(4), 951-967.

- 747 Watts, S., & Stenner, P. (2005). Doing Q methodology: Theory, method and interpretation.
748 *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 2(1), 67-91.
- 749 Watts, S., & Stenner, P. (2012). Doing Q methodological research. theory, method and
750 interpretation. (pp. 141-142). London: SAGE Publications.
- 751 World Health Organization. (2005). *Guiding principles for feeding non-breastfed children 6-*
752 *24 months of age*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- 753

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Least important
to me in choosing
to give/not give
my child seafood



Most important to
me in choosing to
give/not give my
child seafood

-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
				<input type="checkbox"/>				
					<input type="checkbox"/>			
						<input type="checkbox"/>		
							<input type="checkbox"/>	
								<input type="checkbox"/>

ACCEPTED