Mother-child bonding, environment, and motor development of babies at risk accompanied by a follow-up

Kellen Yamille dos Santos Chaves 1 https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0674-5890

Mara Marusia Martins Sampaio Campos ² https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6326-8499

Rivianny Arrais Nobre 3 https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8986-2261

¹ Hospital Universitário Walter Cantídio. Universidade Federal do Ceará. Rua Pastor Samuel Munguba. Fortaleza, CE, Brasil. CEP: 60.430-370. E-mail: kellenyamille@yahoo.com.br

² Centro Universitário Christus. Campus Parque Ecológico. Fortaleza, CE, Brasil.

³ Departamento de Saúde Materno-infantil. Universidade Federal do Ceará. Fortaleza, CE, Brasil.

Abstract

Objectives: to identify factors resulting from the correlation between mother-child bonding, environment, and infant motor development (MD).

Methods: a cross-sectional study was conducted with 130 mothers/guardians and their infants at risk from 3 to 12 months of age, accompanied in an outpatient clinic follow-up at a public maternity. The data were collected using a form with socioeconomic data, mother/child routine at the hospital and home environments, and three other instruments validated in Brazil: Protocolo de Avaliação do Vínculo Mãe-Filho (Mother-Child Bonding Evaluation Protocol), Affordances in the Home Environment for Motor Development – Infant Scale, and Escala Motora Infantil de Alberta (Alberta Infant Motor Scale). Pearson's chi-square test, Fisher's exact test, and a significance level of 5% was used for the correlation.

Results: the data showed a predominance of preterm babies (74.5%), low-income families (86.2%), and domestic opportunities below the adequate (93.8%) for good motor development. Regarding the mother-child bonding, 60% of the mothers showed a strong bonding with their children. A total of 62.3% of the children had typical motor development. Concerning the interaction between variables, statistical significance (p<0.05) was observed in the correlation between bonding and typical motor development.

Conclusion: despite the presence of risk factors, motor development was normal in most of the babies in this study, suggesting that the mother-child bonding favored motor development even with environmental and biological adversities.

Key words Child development, Motor skills, Object attachment, Environmental impact



This article is published in Open Access under the Creative Commons Attribution license, which allows use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, without restrictions, as long as the original work is correctly cited. http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1806-93042021000400004

Introduction

The term "baby at risk" defines exposing a child to situations with a greater chance of unfavorable evolution throughout their development. Risk condition may be present in pregnancy (alcohol and/or drug use), at birth (prematurity and low birth weight), or throughout the child's life (low socioeconomic level, low parental education, and domestic violence) and must be promptly recognized by the health team, demanding special and priority care.¹

Among the resulting injuries, alterations on infant motricity stand out, the integration product between the individual's biology, environmental conditions, and the cognitive and affective domains, besides being influenced by the neuronal plasticity characterized in the period. ²⁻⁴ Other aspects have also been pointed out as influencing this process. Among them, the mother-child bonding stands out, the establishment of a secure relationship, theorized by Bowlby,^{5,6} where the presence of the bonding figure increases the quality of exploration and games by the child.^{7,8}

Several current studies,^{7,8} such as one by Ronfani *et al.*,⁹ address the issue of mother-child bonding related to the child's cognitive evolution. Others relate to the influence of the environment to the baby's motor gains. However, the same does not occur correlating to bonding and the environment on the infant motricity.

Based on the above, this research aimed to identify the resulting factors from the correlation between mother-child bonding, environment, and children's motor development (MD) accompanied by a follow up in a public maternity in Fortaleza, Brazil.

Methods

An observational, descriptive, cross-sectional study with a quantitative approach was carried out with 130 mothers or guardians (that is, people playing the "maternal role" in caring for the child, in the complete absence of the biological mother due to death or abandonment), and their babies at risk aged from 3 to 12 months of life, accompanied at an outpatient clinic by a follow-up at the Maternidadeescola Assis Chateaubriand located in Fortaleza/CE, Brazil, in period of May to October 2018. Children with severe neurological damage, peri-intraventricular hemorrhage grades 3 and 4, confirmed or suspected syndromes, malformations, under early stimulation treatment, and mothers/guardians who were unable to express themselves due to mental disorders were excluded.

After the approval by the ethics and research committee at the institution, under the document number 2,627,884, all the data were collected by the main researcher, using a form prepared by the researcher him/herself, containing aspects related to the routine of the mothers and children in the hospital and at home environment, the questionnaire from the Associação Brasileira de Empresas de Pesquisa10 (ABEP) (Brazilian Association of Research Companies) for socioeconomic classification, and three other instruments validated in Brazil: Protocolo de Avaliação do Vínculo Mãe-Filho,11 (The Mother-Child Bonding Assessment Protocol) aims to assess the mother-child bonding, consisting of 13 questions with yes/no answers, addressing maternal experiences since her childhood to events that occurred before, during, and after the pregnancy. In this protocol, "yes" is an indicator of weak bonding, and when added, the final score ranges from 1 to 13. A positive rating for weak attachment is given with number of positive responses ≥ 5 .

For the environmental assessment, the Affordances in the Home Environment for Motor Development - Infant Scale12 was used, in which allows the qualitative and quantitative assessment, through the parents' self-report, the domestic opportunities offered to the child (affordances).13 This instrument has dichotomous questions on a Likerttype scale, arranged in different categories, and descriptive questions, resulting in 35 items divided into 4 dimensions: physical space, variety of stimulation, fine-motor toys, and gross-motor toys. The total score is categorized into 4 descriptions: Less than adequate, Moderately adequate, Adequate, and Excellent. These descriptions of performance, to simplify the final statistical analysis; however, without loss in the results, only two groups were gathered: 1 - Less than/Moderately adequate and 2 -Adequate/Excellent.

The motor development assessment was conducted using the *Escala Motora Infantil de Alberta-AIMS*, (Alberta Infant Motor Scale), an observation instrument14 consisting of 58 items that describe the development of a spontaneous movement and motor skills in prone, supine, lying, and standing position, enabling the identification of children whose motor performance is atypical concerning the normative group.

Data were tabulated in Microsoft Office Excel, and the statistical analyzes were performed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22.0 (USA) and R version 3.3.1. Description of means and standard deviations for quantitative variables and percentage and frequency for qualitative variables were obtained. As for categorical variables, data were displayed in frequency and prevalence rates. The investigation association between the variables used the Pearson's chi-square test and Fisher's exact test, with a significance level of 5%.

Results

Of the 130 children evaluated, 28.4% were born with a corrected gestational age (GA) ≤ 29 weeks, 46.1%with a GA of 30-35 weeks, 25.5% with GA ≥ 36 weeks, and 64.6% remained hospitalized for more than a month. In relation to MD, a total of 62.3% of the babies were typical and only 37.7% were atypical (Table 1).

Regarding maternal characteristics, 86.2% of the population sample studied had low-income based on the ABEP socioeconomic classification criteria,¹⁰ and 93.1% were the babies' biological mothers. As for the schooling level, only 43.1% had graduated from high school. Regarding to professional occupation, 72.3% declared themselves as not having a paying job.

In the data referring to the hospitalization scenario, 96.9% of the mothers/guardians declared having visited the baby, 82.3% visited daily, and only 3.1% did not visit at all. Regarding to the

participation in the hospitalized child's care considered stable (for example, diaper changing and feeding), 82.3% stated that they performed such tasks. As for the domestic environment, 83.8% of the mothers/guardians declared themselves to be the main responsible for the child's care throughout the day, and 61.5% had help from another person, whether a relative or a hired professional (Table 2).

In the analysis of mother-child bonding, a weak bonding was identified in a notable number of mothers/guardians (40%). In this evaluation, it was possible to verify that 91.5% of the mothers/ guardians reported perinatal complications, and 89.2% were separated from their babies for a long period of time after childbirth.

As for other contexts of maternal life, 53.1% considered having had a difficult childhood (affective and economic deprivation). However, 73.1% said they had overcome the difficulties and had no personal dissatisfaction.

In the bivariate correlation analysis of gestational age at birth and environment with MD, no association was observed between the variables in any of the age group analyzed (Tables 3 and 4). A significant association was found in the correlation between mother-child bonding and MD in the three gestational age groups, demonstrating that a strong

Table	1
-------	---

	N=130	%
Corrected gestational age (months)		
3-5	85	65.4
6-8	15	11.5
9-12	30	23.1
Gestational age at birth (weeks)		
≤29	37	28.4
30-35	60	46.1
≥36	33	25.5
Sex		
Male	74	56.9
Female	56	43.1
Length of hospital stay (months)		
1	46	35.4
≥1	84	64.6
Attend daycare		
Yes	0	-
No	130	100.0
Motor development		
Typical	81	62.3
Atypical	49	37.7

Table 2

Characteristics related to mothers/caregivers of children at risk accompanied by a follow up at the Maternity, May to October 2018.

Kinship with the baby Biological mother 121 93.1 Others 9 6.9 Socioeconomic classification 0.4 35.4 D-E 66 50.8 Biological mother 17 13.0 A1.42 17 13.0 Schooling 27 20.8 Complete primary school 27 20.8 Complete high school 22 16.9 Complete high school 22 16.9 Complete high school 11 8.5 Does the mother have a paying job? 7 7.2 Yes 36 27.7 No 94 7.2.3 Does the mother visit the baby in the hospital? 7 5.4 Yes 36 27.7 No 9.4 7.2.3 Does the mother visit the baby in the hospital? 7 5.4 3.1 17 Yes 126 96.9 9 3.1 17 Present 12 9.2 1.2 1.2 9.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 H		N=130	%
Biological mother12193.1Others90.9Scolectoromic classification90.9Def4655.8Def100.8Cl-2100.8Stolectoromic classification10.8Stolectoromic classification270.8Cl-20.90.90.9At A2100.80.9Complete primary school2016.9Incomplete high school643.1Incomplete high school643.1Incomplete high er ducation18.5Complete high er ducation627.7No9.47.27Does the mother have a paying job778.6Yes12696.9No43.1Prequency of hospital visits to the baby10782.3Prequency of hospital visits to the baby10782.3A Stimes per week76.4No visits77.4No visits77.4Maternal participation in the care of the hospitalized baby10782.3Absent12713.010.0Morning and afternoon, or evening)1310.0Mother-child bonding56.36.0Weak26.56.910.0No63.57.610.0No63.110.010.0Morning and afternoon, or evening)1310.0No63.5<	Kinship with the baby		
Others96.9Socieoronmic classification5Socieoronmic classification5C1-26650.8B1-B210.8A1-A210.8Schooling86.2Incomplete primary school86.2Complete primary school86.2Complete highe reducation64.5Complete highe reducation64.5Complete highe reducation64.5Complete highe reducation64.5Does the mother have a paying job?73.6Yes129.29.2No21.29.2No129.29.2No129.29.2No129.29.2No129.29.2No129.29.2No129.29.2No1310.19.2No149.29.2No1510.29.2No169.29.2No179.29.2No1013.1Freesent109.2Absent129.2No1310.1Morring and afternoon1310.1No149.29.2No149.29.2No1515.19.2No169.29.2No169.29.2	Biological mother	121	93.1
Socioeconomic classificationDE469.64C1-C2669.68B1-B21713.0A1-A2170.8Schooling720.8Incomplete primary school2720.8Complete primary school86.2Incomplete high school64.5Complete high school564.5Complete high school64.5Complete high school72.8Complete high school64.5Complete high school72.8Complete high school72.8Complete high school77.8Does the mother have a paying job?77.8Yes769.67.7No43.1Frequency of hospital visits to the baby129.6No43.17.8Frequency of hospital visits to the baby178.3Jues per week129.2No visits1078.3Absent2317.7How many hours does the mother/caregiver take care of the baby throughout the day?10Hother-child bonding1310.8Strong686.2Only 1 shift (morning, afternoon, or evening)1310.8Nother-child bonding186.2Personal dissatisfaction186.2Yes695.3.1No57.9.1No1015.9No1015.9 <td>Others</td> <td>9</td> <td>6.9</td>	Others	9	6.9
D-E4635.4C1-C26650.8B1-B21713.0A1-A210.8Schooling2720.8Incomplete primary school286.2Incomplete primary school286.3Complete primary school2643.1Incomplete high school5643.1Incomplete higher education108.5Complete higher education118.5Does the mother have a paying job?77.6Yes362.7.7No362.7.7No362.7.7No362.7.7No362.7.7No362.7.7No362.7.7No362.7.7No362.7.7No362.7.7No362.7.7No362.7.7No362.7.7No375.8No375.8No375.8No375.8No383.1Frequency of hospital visits to the baby120No visits375.4No visits386.2Only 1 shift (morning, afternoon, or evening)13No386.2Only 1 shift (morning, afternoon, or evening)16No386.2Only 1 shift (morning, afternoon, or evening)17No362.6.9No	Socioeconomic classification		
C1-C26650.8B1-B21713.0A1-A2713.0Schooling2720.8Complete primary school2720.8Complete primary school2216.9Complete high school2216.9Complete high school5643.1Incomplete high er ducation64.5Complete high er ducation64.5Does the mother have a paying job?78.6Yes3627.7No3754No3754No3627.7No3754No visits3754No visits3867.2No visits3867.2No visits3867.2No3928.2Morning and afternoon8 <t< td=""><td>D-E</td><td>46</td><td>35.4</td></t<>	D-E	46	35.4
B1-B21713.0A1-A20.8Schooling2720.8Incomplete primary school286.2Incomplete high school86.2Incomplete high school5643.1Incomplete higher education64.5Complete higher education64.5Complete higher education7627.7No9472.3Does the mother have a paying job777Yes12696.9No12696.9No12696.9No12696.2Jost the mother visit the baby in the hospital?7Yes12692.3Jost the sperweek75.4No visits10782.33-5 times per week75.4No visits10782.3Absent10782.3Absent10782.3Absent10782.3Absent10782.3Absent10782.3Absent10883.8Morning and afternoon, or evening)10983.8Morning and sternoon, or evening)7860.0Weak2040.0Personal disatisfaction44.5Yes1045.9No108.5No108.5No108.5No108.5Absent1084.5Morning and sternoon, or evening)11	C1-C2	66	50.8
A1-A210.8Schooing720.8Incomplete primary school86.2Complete high school2216.9Complete high school64.5Complete high education64.5Complete higher education64.5Does the mother have a paying job?77.0Ves362.7.7No362.7.7No362.7.7No362.7.7No362.7.7No362.7.7No366.6.9No43.1Frequency of hospital visits to the baby1078.2.33-5 times per week129.21-2 times per week129.21-2 times per week178.2.33-5 times per week1078.2.3Absent2017.1How many hours does the mother/caregiver take care of the baby throughout the day8.3.6Morning and afternoon, or evening)1310.0Mother-child bonding24.0.2Morning and afternoon, or evening)3512.6No352.6.93.1No352.6.9No352.6.9No352.6.9No352.6.9No352.6.9No352.6.9No352.6.9No352.6.9No352.6.9No352.6.	B1-B2	17	13.0
Schooling2720.8Complete primary school2016.9Complete high school2016.9Complete high school5643.1Incomplete higher education108.5Complete higher education118.5Does the mother have a paying job777Yes362.7.7No947.3Does the mother have a paying job778.6Yes362.7.7No947.3Does the mother visit the baby in the hospital?78.6Yes129.29.2No43.17Frequery of hospital visits to the baby78.3Jost per week129.29.21.2 times per week75.4No visits1078.3.3Absent2010.2How many hours does the mother/caregiver take care of the baby throughout the day?10.0Morning and afternoon108.3.8Morning and afternoon, or evening)1310.0Mother-child bonding5240.0Strong5326.9No957.3.1Ves632.6.9No108.5No108.5No118.5Morning and afternoon, or evening)1310.0Weak5240.0Uright (unternal childhood (emotional, socioeconomic deprivation)14Yes1310.0 </td <td>A1-A2</td> <td>1</td> <td>0.8</td>	A1-A2	1	0.8
Incomplete primary school2720.8Complete primary school86.2Incomplete high school5643.1Incomplete high school5643.1Incomplete high er ducation64.5Complete higher education64.5Does the mother have a paying job?77.3Yes362.7.7No362.7.7No369.6.9Does the mother visit the baby in the hospital?7Yes12696.9No43.1Frequency of hospital visits to the baby1078.2.3Jast limes per week129.21.2 times per week129.21.2 times per week129.2No visits43.1Maternal participation in the care of the hospitalized baby1078.2.3Absent2317.7How many hours does the mother/caregiver take care of the baby throughout the day?1078.3.8Morning and afternoon86.20.1Ohy 1 shift (morning, afternoon, or evening)1310.0Mother-child bonding7860.03.1Ves6953.1No6.2No1573.173.1Personal disatisfaction104.5Yes1310.010Ves352.6.9No614.5Personal disatisfaction118.5No1310.010<	Schooling		
Complete primary school86.2Incomplete high school2216.9Complete high school43.1Incomplete higher education64.5Complete higher education304.5Does the mother have a paying job?3627.7No3627.7No3627.7No3627.7No3627.7No3627.7No3627.7No3627.7No3627.7No3636.7Present12696.9No visits to the baby10782.33-5 times per week129.21-2 times per week129.21-2 times per week129.2No visits43.1Maternal participation in the care of the hospitalized baby7Present1310.0Morning and afternoon86.2Only 1 shift (morning, afternoon, or evening)1310.0Moter-child bonding783.1Veeak5240.010Perioral disatisfaction144.5Yes155.27.3Perioral disatisfaction199.5No118.5No118.5No1410.8Perioral disatisfaction1410.8Yes169.57.3No1410.810.8No </td <td>Incomplete primary school</td> <td>27</td> <td>20.8</td>	Incomplete primary school	27	20.8
Incomplete high school 22 16.9 Complete high school 36 43.1 Incomplete higher education 11 8.5 Complete higher education 11 8.5 Does the mother have a paying job? 36 27.7 No 94 72.3 Does the mother visit the baby in the hospital? 36 27.7 No 94 72.3 Does the mother visit the baby in the hospital? 36 36.1 Yes 12 92.2 3.1 Frequency of hospital visits to the baby 7 8.3 Joiny 17 8.3 36.1 Joiny is the proveek 7 8.4 36.1 No visits 40 31.1 36.1 Haternal participation in the care of the hospitalized baby 7 8.4 Morning and afternoon 8 6.2 Only 1 shift (morning, afternoon, or evening) 13 30.0 Difficult maternal childhood (emotional, socioeconomic deprivation) 35 36.2 No 51	Complete primary school	8	6.2
Complete high e aducation 56 43.1 Incomplete higher education 6 4.5 Complete higher education 10 8.5 Does the mother have a paying job? 77 No 96 27.7 No 96 27.7 No 96 27.7 No 96 27.7 No 96 27.7 No 96 20.7 No 96 27.7 No 96 20.7 No 96 27.7 No 96 20.7 20.7 20.7 20.7 No 96 20.7 20.7 20.7 20.7 No 97.7 100 82.3 20.7 20.7 Stimes per week 12 9.2 20.2	Incomplete high school	22	16.9
Incomplete higher education64,5Complete higher education318,5Does the mother have a paying job?3627,7No3672,3Does the mother visit the baby in the hospital?3666,9No43,131Frequency of hospital visits to the baby1078,333-5 times per week129,21-2 times per week75,4No visits75,4No visits1078,33Absent1078,33Absent1078,33Absent1078,33Absent1078,33Absent1078,33Maternal participation in the care of the hospitalized baby109Maternal participation, afternoon86,2Only 1 shift (morning, afternoon, or evening)10983,8Morning and afternoon86,2Only 1 shift (morning, afternoon, or evening)31100Difficult maternal childhood (emotional, socioeconomic deprivation)1083,1Yes526,953,1No138,510,9No1199,1510,9No1410,8Morter-baby separation for a long period of time14Yes1616,82,10No1410,8Morter-baby separation for a long period of time14Yes166,751,5	Complete high school	56	43.1
Complete higher education18.5Does the mother have a paying job?3627.7Yes3627.7No947.23Does the mother visit the baby in the hospital?786.69Yes12696.91No43.1Frequency of hospital visits to the baby10782.33-5 times per week129.21-2 times per week75.4No visits43.1Maternal participation in the care of the hospitalized baby10782.3Present2017.7How many hours does the mother/caregiver take care of the baby throughout the day?10783.8Morning and afternoon86.2Only 1 shift (morning, afternoon, or evening)1310.0Mother-child bonding10083.110.0Strong7863.020Ves6325.240.0Difficult maternal childhood (emotional, socioeconomic deprivation)1445.9Personal dissatisfaction1991.510.0No1085.976.910.0No1991.576.976.9No1991.576.976.9No1991.576.976.9No1991.576.976.9No1991.576.976.9No1991.576.976.9No1991.576.976.9No<	Incomplete higher education	6	4,5
Does the mother have a paying job? 36 7.7.7 No 36 7.7.3 No 34 7.2.3 Does the mother visit the baby in the hospital? 126 96.9 No 36 96.9 No 126 96.9 No 127 92.0 Jaily 107 82.3 3-5 times per week 12 92.0 No visits 7 5.4 No visits 30 10.0 Maternal participation in the care of the hospitalized baby 107 82.3 Absent 23 12.7 How many hours does the mother/caregiver take care of the baby throughout the day? 107 82.3 Morning and afternoon 8 6.2 0.0 10.0 Morter-child bonding 109 83.8 6.0 10.0 10.0 Weak 52 40.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0	Complete higher education	11	8.5
Yes 36 27.7 No 94 72.3 Does the mother visit the baby in the hospital?	Does the mother have a paying job?		
No 94 72.3 Does the mother visit the baby in the hospital? 96.9 96.9 No 126 96.9 No 126 96.9 No 107 82.3 Frequency of hospital visits to the baby 107 82.3 3-5 times per week 12 9.2 1-2 times per week 12 9.2 No visits 4 3.1 Maternal participation in the care of the hospitalized baby 107 82.3 Absent 23 17.2 How may hours does the mother/caregiver take care of the baby throughout the day? 109 83.8 Morning and afternoon 8 6.2 0.0 Only 1 shift (morning, afternoon, or evening) 13 10.0 Mother-child bonding 23 10.0 Ufficult maternal childhood (emotional, socioeconomic deprivation) 12 65.3 No 69 53.1 60.0 Weak 25 26.9 73.1 Personal dissatisfaction 119 91.5 <tr< td=""><td>Yes</td><td>36</td><td>27.7</td></tr<>	Yes	36	27.7
Does the mother visit the baby in the hospital? 126 96.9 No 126 96.9 No 126 96.9 Dealy 107 82.3 3-5 times per week 12 9.2 1-2 times per week 12 9.2 No visits 4 3.7 Maternal participation in the care of the hospitalized baby 107 82.3 Absent 107 82.3 Absent 107 82.3 Moving and afternoon 8 6.2 Only 1 shift (morning, afternoon, or evening) 13 109 Mother-child bonding 109 83.8 Veak 52 40.0 Veak 52 40.0 Veak 52 40.0 Ves 13 40.9 No 61 46.9 Ves 52 52.6 No 53 72.6 No 55 72.6 No 55 72.6 N	No	94	72.3
Yes 126 96.9 No 4 3.1 Frequency of hospital visits to the baby 12 9.2 Daily 107 82.3 3-5 times per week 12 9.2 1-2 times per week 7 5.4 No visits 4 0.1 Maternal participation in the care of the hospitalized baby 107 82.3 Maternal participation in the care of the hospitalized baby 107 82.3 More many hours does the mother/caregiver take care of the baby throughout the day? 109 83.8 Moring and afternoon 109 83.8 60.0 No ther-child bonding 100 100 100 Strong 78 60.0 100 Difficult maternal childhood (emotional, socioeconomic deprivation) 13 10.0 Vesi 69 53.1 60 No 69 53.1 60 No 10 95 7.1 Vesi 13 10.0 10 No 13 <t< td=""><td>Does the mother visit the baby in the hospital?</td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Does the mother visit the baby in the hospital?		
No 4 3.1 Frequency of hospital visits to the baby 00 82.3 Jaily 107 82.3 Ja 5t times per week 12 9.2 1-2 times per week 12 9.2 No visits 4 3.1 Maternal participation in the care of the hospitalized baby 107 82.3 Absent 107 82.3 Absent 107 82.3 Absent 107 82.3 Morning and afternoon 8 6.2 Only 1 shift (morning, afternoon, or evening) 13 100 Mother-child bonding 3 60.0 Strong 78 60.0 Weak 52 40.0 Difficult maternal childhood (emotional, socioeconomic deprivation) 46.9 Personal disatisfaction 78 60.0 Yes 69 53.1 No 95 73.1 Perinatal complication 11 8.5 No 19 91.5 No </td <td>Yes</td> <td>126</td> <td>96.9</td>	Yes	126	96.9
Frequency of hospital visits to the baby 107 82.3 Jaily 107 82.3 Jaistimes per week 12 9.2 1-2 times per week 7 5.4 No visits 4 3.1 Maternal participation in the care of the hospitalized baby 107 82.3 Maternal participation in the care of the hospitalized baby 107 82.3 Maternal participation in the care of the hospitalized baby 107 82.3 Morning and stremoon 107 83.8 Morning and afternoon 8 6.2 Only 1 shift (morning, afternoon, or evening) 13 10.0 Moter-child bonding 100 83.8 Strong 78 60.0 Weak 52 40.0 Difficult maternal childhood (emotional, socioeconomic deprivation) 14 46.9 Personal dissatisfaction 19 95.3 31.1 No 35 26.9 35.1 35.1 No 35 26.9 35.1 35.1 35.1 35.1	No	4	3.1
Daily 107 82.3 3-5 times per week 12 9.2 1-2 times per week 7 5.4 No visits 4 3.1 Maternal participation in the care of the hospitalized baby 107 82.3 Present 107 82.3 17.7 How many hours does the mother/caregiver take care of the baby throughout the day? 109 83.8 Morning and afternoon 8 6.2 0.1 Only 1 shift (morning, afternoon, or evening) 13 10.0 10 Mother-child bonding 5 40.0 2 40.0 Difficult maternal childhood (emotional, socioeconomic deprivation) 13 10.0 10 Veak 52 40.0 2 40.0 Difficult maternal childhood (emotional, socioeconomic deprivation) 1 46.9 46.9 Personal dissatisfaction 7 5 5 46.9 Personal dissatisfaction 11 8.5 5 No 11 8.5 5 No 11	Frequency of hospital visits to the baby		
3-5 times per week 12 9.2 1-2 times per week 7 5.4 No visits 4 0.1 Maternal participation in the care of the hospitalized baby 107 82.3 Present 107 82.3 Absent 23 17.7 How many hours does the mother/caregiver take care of the baby throughout the day? 109 83.8 Morning and afternoon, or evening) 13 10.0 Mother-child bonding 100 80.0 Veak 52 40.0 Difficult maternal childhood (emotional, socioeconomic deprivation) 10 46.9 Personal dissatisfaction 11 46.9 Yes 69 53.1 No 61 46.9 Personal dissatisfaction 11 46.9 Yes 35 26.9 No 35 26.9 No 11 8.5 Mono 13 40.9 Presonal dissatisfaction 11 8.5 No 19 9.15 No 10 8.5 <	Daily	107	82.3
1-2 times per week 7 5.4 No visits 4 3.1 Maternal participation in the care of the hospitalized baby 7 82.3 Present 107 82.3 Absent 23 17.7 How many hours does the mother/caregiver take care of the baby throughout the day? 109 83.8 Morning and afternoon 8 6.2 Only 1 shift (morning, afternoon, or evening) 13 10.0 Mother-child bonding 8 6.0 Weak 52 40.0 Difficult maternal childhood (emotional, socioeconomic deprivation) 8 6.1 Yes 69 53.1 No 61 46.9 Personal dissatisfaction 95 73.1 Yes 35 26.9 No 95 73.1 Perinatal complication 11 8.5 Mother-baby separation for a long period of time 11 8.5 Mother-baby separation for a long period of time 11 8.5 Mother baby separation for a long period of	3-5 times per week	12	9.2
No visits 4 3.1 Maternal participation in the care of the hospitalized baby 7 82.3 Present 107 82.3 Absent 23 17.7 How many hours does the mother/caregiver take care of the baby throughout the day 10 83.8 Morning and afternoon 8 6.2 Only 1 shift (morning, afternoon, or evening) 13 10.0 Mother-child bonding 52 40.0 Strong 78 60.0 Weak 52 40.0 Difficult maternal childhood (emotional, socioeconomic deprivation) 4 4 Yes 69 53.1 No 69 53.1 Personal dissatisfaction 7 4 Yes 35 26.9 No 95 73.1 Perinatal complication 95 73.1 Yes 119 91.5 No 119 91.5 No 110 85.2 No 110 85.2	1-2 times per week	7	5.4
Maternal participation in the care of the hospitalized baby 107 82.3 Present 107 82.3 Absent 23 17.7 How many hours does the mother/caregiver take care of the baby throughout the day 109 83.8 Morning and afternoon 80 6.2 Only 1 shift (morning, afternoon, or evening) 13 10.0 Mother-child bonding 52 40.0 Strong 78 60.0 Weak 52 40.0 Difficult maternal childhood (emotional, socioeconomic deprivation) 13 43.1 No 69 53.1 60.0 No 69 53.1 60.0 Personal dissatisfaction 78 60.9 63.1 Yes 69 53.1 60.0 63 63.1 No 5 26.9 73.1 70.0 73.1 70.0 73.1 Perinatal complication 19 9.15 73.1 75.1 70.0 73.1 75.1 70.0 73.1 75.1	No visits	4	3.1
Present 107 82.3 Absent 23 17.7 How many hours does the mother/caregiver take care of the baby throughout the day? 109 83.8 All day 109 83.8 Morning and afternoon 8 6.2 Only 1 shift (morning, afternoon, or evening) 13 100 Mother-child bonding 3 60.0 Weak 52 40.0 Difficult maternal childhood (emotional, socioeconomic deprivation) 46.9 Yes 69 53.1 No 61 46.9 Personal dissatisfaction 7 7 Yes 35 26.9 No 95 7.3.1 Personal dissatisfaction 19 91.5 No 10 85.2 No 16 89.2	Maternal participation in the care of the hospitalized baby		
Absent 23 17.7 How many hours does the mother/caregiver take care of the baby throughout the day? 109 83.8 All day 109 83.8 Morning and afternoon 8 6.2 Only 1 shift (morning, afternoon, or evening) 13 10.0 Mother-child bonding 13 10.0 Mother-child bonding 5 40.0 Weak 52 40.0 Difficult maternal childhood (emotional, socioeconomic deprivation) 7 53.1 No 61 46.9 Personal dissatisfaction 7 56.9 No 35 26.9 No 95 73.1 Personal dissatisfaction 7 7 Yes 35 26.9 No 95 73.1 Perinatal complication 11 8.5 Mother-baby separation for a long period of time 7 7 Yes 114 10.8 10 Mother-baby separation for a long period of time 14 10.8	Present	107	82.3
How many hours does the mother/caregiver take care of the baby throughout the day 109 \$3.8 All day 109 \$3.8 Morning and afternoon 8 6.2 Only 1 shift (morning, afternoon, or evening) 13 10.0 Mother-child bonding 13 10.0 Mother-child bonding 52 40.0 Weak 52 40.0 Difficult maternal childhood (emotional, socioeconomic deprivation) 78 63.1 Yes 69 53.1 No 61 45.0 Personal dissatisfaction 61 45.0 Yes 35 26.9 No 11 8.5 Mother-chaby separation for a long period of time 11 Yes 116 89.2 No 14 10.8 Emotional problems during pregnancy (depression, anxiety) 11 85.5 No	Absent	23	17.7
All day 109 83.8 Morning and afternoon 8 6.2 Only 1 shift (morning, afternoon, or evening) 13 10.0 Mother-child bonding 13 10.0 Strong 78 60.0 Weak 52 40.0 Difficult maternal childhood (emotional, socioeconomic deprivation) 78 53.1 Yes 69 53.1 No 61 46.9 Personal dissatisfaction 35 26.9 No 95 73.1 Perinatal complication 11 8.5 Mother-baby separation for a long period of time 11 8.5 Mother-baby separation for a long period of time 11 8.9.2 No 14 10.8 Emotional problems during pregnancy (depression, anxiety) 14 10.8 Yes 63 48.5 5 No 16 89.2 5 Mother-baby separation for a long period of time 14 10.8 Yes 63 48.5 5 No 16 53.5 5	How many hours does the mother/caregiver take care of the baby throughout	the day?	
Morning and afternoon 8 6.2 Only 1 shift (morning, afternoon, or evening) 13 10.0 Mother-child bonding 13 10.0 Motner-child bonding 78 60.0 Weak 52 40.0 Difficult maternal childhood (emotional, socioeconomic deprivation) 78 69 53.1 No 69 53.1 46.9 Personal dissatisfaction 14 46.9 Yes 35 26.9 No 35 26.9 No 95 73.1 Perinatal complication 11 8.5 Yes 119 91.5 No 11 8.5 Mother-baby separation for a long period of time 11 8.5 Yes 116 89.2 10 No 14 10.8 10 Emotional problems during pregnancy (depression, anxiety) 14 10.8 Yes 63 48.5 67 No 63 48.5 50	All day	109	83.8
Only 1 shift (morning, afternoon, or evening) 13 10.0 Mother-child bonding 5 60.0 Strong 78 60.0 Weak 52 40.0 Difficult maternal childhood (emotional, socioeconomic deprivation) 52 40.0 Yes 69 53.1 61 46.9 Personal dissatisfaction 52 26.9 61 46.9 Yes 35 26.9 63 73.1 Personal dissatisfaction 35 26.9 73.1 Perinatal complication 11 8.5 61 89.2 No 11 8.5 61 89.2 No 116 89.2 63 63 48.5 No 14 10.8 10.8 10.8 10.8 10.8 Emotional problems during pregnancy (depression, anxiety) 116 89.2 10.8 10.8 10.8 10.8 10.8 10.8 10.8 10.8 10.8 10.8 10.8 10.8 10.8	Morning and afternoon	8	6.2
Mother-child bonding 78 60.0 Strong 78 60.0 Weak 52 40.0 Difficult maternal childhood (emotional, socioeconomic deprivation) 69 53.1 Yes 69 53.1 No 61 46.9 Personal dissatisfaction 35 26.9 Yes 35 26.9 No 119 91.5 No 119 91.5 No 11 85.9 No 14 10.8 Emotional problems during pregnancy (depression, anxiety) 14 10.8 Yes 63 48.5 51.5	Only 1 shift (morning, afternoon, or evening)	13	10.0
Strong 78 60.0 Weak 52 40.0 Difficult maternal childhood (emotional, socioeconomic deprivation) 52 40.0 Yes 69 53.1 61 46.9 Personal dissatisfaction 51 46.9 53 63 6	Mother-child bonding		
Weak5240.0Difficult maternal childhood (emotional, socioeconomic deprivation)6953.1Yes6953.1No6146.9Personal dissatisfaction73.1Yes3526.9No9573.1Perinatal complication118.5Yes118.5Mother-baby separation for a long period of time118.5Yes11689.2No1410.8Emotional problems during pregnancy (depression, anxiety)74.51.5	Strong	78	60.0
Difficult maternal childhood (emotional, socioeconomic deprivation)Yes6953.1No6146.9Personal dissatisfaction3526.9No9573.1Perinatal complication9573.1Yes11991.5No118.5Mother-baby separation for a long period of time11689.2Yes11689.2No1410.8Emotional problems during pregnancy (depression, anxiety)6348.5No6751.5	Weak	52	40.0
Yes 69 53.1 No 61 46.9 Personal dissatisfaction 35 26.9 Yes 35 26.9 No 95 73.1 Perinatal complication 35 26.9 Yes 35 26.9 No 95 73.1 Perinatal complication 110 8.5 No 11 8.5 Mother-baby separation for a long period of time 116 89.2 No 14 10.8 Emotional problems during pregnancy (depression, anxiety) 2 48.5 No 63 48.5 No 67 51.5	Difficult maternal childhood (emotional, socioeconomic deprivation)		
No 61 46.9 Personal dissatisfaction	Yes	69	53.1
Personal dissatisfactionYes3526.9No9573.1Perinatal complication11991.5Yes11991.5No118.5Mother-baby separation for a long period of time11689.2Yes11689.2No1410.8Emotional problems during pregnancy (depression, anxiety)6348.5No6751.5	No	61	46.9
Yes3526.9No9573.1Perinatal complication11991.5Yes11991.5No118.5Mother-baby separation for a long period of time11689.2Yes11689.2No1410.8Emotional problems during pregnancy (depression, anxiety)6348.5No6751.5	Personal dissatisfaction		
No9573.1Perinatal complication11991.5Yes11991.5No118.5Mother-baby separation for a long period of time11689.2Yes11689.2No1410.8Emotional problems during pregnancy (depression, anxiety)5348.5No6751.5	Yes	35	26.9
Perinatal complicationYes11991.5No118.5Mother-baby separation for a long period of timeYes11689.2No1410.8Emotional problems during pregnancy (depression, anxiety)Yes6348.5No6751.5	No	95	73.1
Yes11991.5No118.5Mother-baby separation for a long period of timeYes11689.2No1410.8Emotional problems during pregnancy (depression, anxiety)Yes6348.5No6751.5	Perinatal complication		
No118.5Mother-baby separation for a long period of timeYes11689.2No1410.8Emotional problems during pregnancy (depression, anxiety)Yes6348.5No6751.5	Yes	119	91.5
Mother-baby separation for a long period of timeYes11689.2No1410.8Emotional problems during pregnancy (depression, anxiety)Yes6348.5No6751.5	No	11	8.5
Yes11689.2No1410.8Emotional problems during pregnancy (depression, anxiety)	Mother-baby separation for a long period of time		
No1410.8Emotional problems during pregnancy (depression, anxiety)5348.5Yes6348.5No6751.5	Yes	116	89.2
Emotional problems during pregnancy (depression, anxiety)6348.5Yes6348.5No6751.5	No	14	10.8
Yes 63 48.5 No 67 51.5	Emotional problems during pregnancy (depression, anxiety)		
No 67 51.5	Yes	63	48.5
	No	67	51.5

mother-child bonding predisposed their children to a typical motor development (Table 5).

Discussion

In this present study, the primary questions addressed the babies' biological factors, family's socioeconomic, and relation to the mother-child routine in the hospital and at home environment. According to the results described, with the exception of sex, all other aspects are considered risk factors for infant development. Prematurity is the condition mostly related to delays in acquiring motor skills, especially in the first 12 months of life.

However, from the results presented in Table 3, no statistical significance was observed on the interaction between GA and MD (p=0.532), thus corroborating current research on the subject.^{5,15-17} A similar result was observed in Pereira,¹⁸ study who affirmed that the effects of different risk factors,

Table 3

Analysis on the Gestational Age at Birth versus Motor Development in children at risk accompanied by a follow up at the Maternity, May to October 2018.

	Typical Motor Development	Atypical Motor Development	Total	
≤29 weeks	21	16	37	
	56.8%	43.2%	100.0%	
30-35 weeks	37	23	60	
	61.7%	38.3%	100.0%	
≥36 weeks	23	10	33	
	69.7%	30.3%	100.0%	
Total	81	49	130	
	62.3%	37.7%%	100.0%	

Pearson's chi-square test p = 0,53.

Table 4

Analysis in relation to Environment X Motor Development in children at risk accompanied by a follow up at the Maternity May to October 2018.

	Typical MD			Atypical MD			Total
	≥29w GA	30-35w GA	≥36w GA	≥29w GA	30-35w GA	≥36w GA	
Less than/Moderately adequate	19	35	20	15	23	10	122
Adequate/Excellent environment	90.5% 2	94.6% 2	87% 3	93.8% 1	100.0% 0	100.0% 0	8
	9.5%	5.4%	13%	6.3%	-	-	
	21	37	23	16	23	10	130

GA (Gestational age at birth) \leq 29 weeks: Fisher's exact test, p>0.999; GA = 30-35 weeks: Fisher's exact test, p = 0.519; GA \geq 36 weeks: Fisher's exact test, p = 0.536. MD= Motor development.

Table 5

Analysis in relation to Mother-Child Bonding X Motor Development in children at risk accompanied by a follow-up at the Maternity, May to October 2018.

		Typical MD			Atypical MD		
	≥29w GA	30-35w GA	≥36w GA	≥29w GA	30-35w GA	≥36w GA	
Strong bonding	16	32	17	7	3	3	78
	76.2%	86.5%	73.9%	43.8%	13%	30%	
Weak bonding	5	5	6	9	20	7	52
	23.8%	13.5%	26.1%	56.3%	87%	70%	
	21	37	23	16	23	10	130

GA (Gestational Age at Birth) \leq 29 weeks: Pearson's chi-square test, p=0.044; GA = 30-35 weeks: Pearson's chi-square test, p<0.001; GA \geq 36 weeks: Fisher's exact test, p = 0.026. MD = Motor development.

including the repercussions associated with GA, may vary throughout time, emphasizing the importance of the psychosocial context in this process.

Of the factors related to the socioeconomic context, most of the population studied has a lowincome. Ronfani *et al.*⁹ observed that socioeconomic status can affect the infant neural development through various mediators, such as prenatal factors, parenting care, cognitive stimulation, nutrition, stress, toxins, and drug exposure.

As well as the socioeconomic aspect, maternal schooling also proved to be essential for adequate infant development, reflecting on the way the mother raises a child, in her understanding of the development stages and the appropriate stimuli at each stage.^{15,19} In a research carried out by Morais *et al.*,¹⁹ the authors observed that highly educated mothers were more concerned with stimulating the infant development.

Most of the environments evaluated were considered inadequate to favoring the child's MD, corresponding to the socioeconomic level found. This result is consistent with that obtained in a research carried out by Pizzo *et al.*²⁰ and Gomes,²¹ which evidenced the influenced factor on socioeconomic aspects on the availability of materials to stimulate children's motricity. For low-income families, access to toys is not a priority, and the lack of experience with these possibilities can negatively effect on acquiring new skills.

None of the children in this study attended daycare until the time of the assessment, restricting their opportunities to receive stimuli rather than at their home environment, which could be considered limiting since studies by Santos *et al.*²² and Morais

et al.,²³ reveal that attendance at good quality daycare centers is related to higher cognitive performance in children, this dimension is closely related to motricity.

In a bivariate analysis between environment and MD, the results did not show statistical significance. Such result may have been caused by the homogeneity of the investigated sample concerning the environmental opportunities offered and the socioeconomic aspects, not allowing the establishment of comparisons that would allow the intended analysis. Nonetheless, these data show that the inadequate environment did not prevent most evaluated children from developing in a typical way, raising the question of which variables would favor an adequate infant MD, despite their socioeconomic, environmental, and biological difficulties.

In the analysis of the mother-child bonding, more than half (53.1%) of the evaluated mothers declared to have had a difficult childhood, 48.5% reported emotional problems during pregnancy, and 89.2% experienced prolonged separation from their babies after birth. The above findings indicate the presence of several risk factors for the formation of a healthy mother-child bonding.

Madigan *et al.*²⁴ showed that maternal adverse experiences at childhood are associated with difficulty attuning to their children's cues and presenting psychological or emotional unavailability to the necessity of their offspring According to Cavalcante *et al.*,²⁵ mothers with low socioeconomic and schooling levels may present a higher incidence of negative patterns regarding to the ability to respond to the child's demands, with greater verbal negativity, low affective warmth, and less involvement, thus being less supportive to the child's activities .

In relation to perinatal complications, Santos *et al.*²² and Vulcão²⁶ showed that the separation of the mother and her newborn represents a crisis, harming the process of bonding formation. This aspect is noteworthy when it is observed that 89.2% of the mothers evaluated in this study, were separated from their babies for a long period of time.

However, other dimensions showed results that favored the formation of a mother-child bonding. There are issues related to whether they wanted to get pregnant or not, as for the majority declared that they to get pregnant, this is relevant according to Pontes,²⁷ which portrays the desire to get pregnant and the acceptance of the pregnancy as important factors for the formation of a harmonious motherchild bonding.

Other scenarios that also interfere in the motherchild bonding formation were explored using the questionnaire created by the main researcher. When asked about visiting their babies, most mothers/guardians declared that they used to visit the hospital daily and participated in the baby's caring routines. Such factors are suggested as favoring the continuity of the bonding, hampered by the circumstances mentioned above.^{23,26,28} In this context, in the general assessment of mother-child bonding, 60% of the participants had a strong mother-child bonding.

Pereira¹⁸ highlights parental practices in child care are understood as the quantity and quality of biological and psychological care for the offspring, profoundly influenced in their development. In contrast, low parental commitment has a negative impact on child development. Such examples of parental unavailability are not reported in the results of this study.

The bivariate analysis correlating the motherchild bonding and MD resulted in a significant association (p<0.05) in all age groups at birth, showing that a strong mother-child bonding predisposed their children to typical motor development.

In the correlation between environment (affordances) and MD, the results did not show statistical significance (p>0.999), and this may be due to the homogeneity of the studied population concerning the environmental opportunities offered to the children and the socioeconomic aspects in not allowing to establish comparisons that would enable the intended analysis.

Thus, the data found in this research suggest that the variable mother-child bonding is relevant to MD, surpassing even the environmental issue.

Recent studies corroborate to this hypothesis, as

Sacanni *et al.*,¹⁵ research evaluating children aged 0-18 months. The interactive activities of the babies with their parents, such as interactions involving toys, were significantly associated (p<0.05) with MD. The same result was found in the study by Miquelote *et al.*²⁹

Saur *et al.*³⁰ carried out a study to investigate whether children with secure and insecure attachment patterns differ in cognitive, linguistic, and motor performance. It was observed that those with secure attachment patterns were more competent in the assessed domains than those with insecure patterns.

Overall, these results show that the home environment and the interaction between mother and child are important factors on the infant development. The next logical step of this study is to examine the long-term effect of environmental factors and the mother-child bonding on infant MD through longitudinal research since the crosssectional nature of this study did not allow inferences of causality. This will also help us to overcome the limitations related to the socioeconomic homogeneity of the studied population.

Thus, the data presented suggest that, despite the biological, socioeconomic, and environmental risk factors present in the studied population, the context of these variables did not prevent most babies from having a typical DM. This result was justified by the analysis in relation to the variations between the mother-child bonding and motricity, which found that mothers are strongly linked to their children in favoring their MD. The importance of this relationship is to highlight the inadequate opportunities observed in most of the environments studied, a variable that is already recognized in the literature as fundamental for MD.

Given the above results, measures emphasizing the importance of the link between the mother/guardian and her offspring are needed. An adequate home environment, taken from the period of hospitalization and continued in the follow-up clinics, can contribute to favoring MD in babies at risk.

Such actions should focus not only on the children's family but also the health team that accompanies them, offering theoretical subsidies that support the approach of babies at risk and their families, especially concerning the issue of infant motor development and its relationship with the environment and mother-child bonding.

Authors' contribution

Chaves KYS and Nobre RA contributed to the study design. MMMS and Chaves KYS performed the data collection and analysis. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript and are publicly responsible for the content of the article.

References

- Brasil. Ministério da Saúde. Política Nacional de Atenção Integral à Saúde da Criança: orientações para implementação [Internet]. Brasília, DF; 2018. [acesso 2018 outubro]. Disponível em http://www.saude.pr.gov.br/arquivos/File/Politica_Nacional
 - _de_Atencao_Integral_a_Saude_da_Crianca_PNAISC.pdf
- Zago JTC, Pinto PAF, Leite HR, Santos JN, Morais RLS. Associação entre o desenvolvimento neuropsicomotor e fatores de risco biológico e ambientais em crianças na primeira infância. Rev CEFAC. 2017; 19 (3): 320-9.
- Pereira KRG, Valentini NC,Saccani R. Brazilian infant motor and cognitive development: Longitudinal influence of risk factors Infant development and risk factors. Pediatr Int (USA). 2016; 58 (12): 1297-1306.
- Chiquetti SEM, Carvalho ACF, Zanela A, Valentin NC. Fatores de Risco e Desenvolvimento Motor de Bebês Pequenos Para Idade Gestacional (PIG) a Termo e Pré-Termo. Rev Varia Scientia – Ciênc Saúde. 2018; 4 (1): 110-8.
- Machado D, Pereira KRG, Valentini NC, Müller AB. Desenvolvimento motor, cognição e linguagem em lactentes. Sci Med (Espanha). 2017; 27 (4): 4-11.
- Bowlby J. Formação e rompimento dos laços afetivos. 3 ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2006.
- Saur BA. Relação Entre Vínculo de Apego, Cognição e Desenvolvimento de Crianças Nascidas Pré-Termo [Dissertação]. Curitiba: Hospital de Clínicas da Universidade Federal do Paraná; 2016. Disponível em https://acervodigital.ufpr.br/bitstream/handle/1884/45959/ R%20-%20D%20-

%20BARBARA%20SAUR.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

- Brazelton TB. O desenvolvimento do apego: uma família em formação. 1 ed.Porto Alegre: Artes Medicas, 1988
- Ronfani L, Brumatti LV, Mariuz M, Tognin V, Bin M, Ferluga V, Knowles A, Montico M, Barbone F. The Complex Interaction between Home Environment, Socioeconomic Status, Maternal IQ and Early Child Neurocognitive Development: A Multivariate Analysis of Data Collected in a Newborn Cohort Study. PLOS ONE (USA). 2015; 10 (5): 1-13.
- ABEP (Associação Brasileira de Empresas de Pesquisa). Critério de Classificação Econômica Brasil. 2014 [Internet]. [acesso 2018 outubro]. Disponível em: http://www.abep.org/Servicos/Download.aspx?id=12.
- Nóbrega FJ. Vínculo Mãe-filho. 3. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Revinter, 2005.
- 12. Rodrigues LP, Gabbard CP. Assessing Motor Affordances in the Home Environment: Development and validation of

the AHEMD (Affordances in the Home Environment for Motor Development). Saarbrucken: VDM Verlag, 2009.

- Caçola P, Gabbard C, Santos DC, Batistela AC. Development of the Affordances in the Home Environment for Motor Development – Infant Scale. Pediatrics International (Rockville Pike). 2011; 53 (6): 820-25.
- Valentini NC, Saccani R. Brazilian Validation of the Alberta Infant Motor Scale. Phys Ther. 2011; 92 (3): 440-7.
- Saccani R, Valentini NC, Pereira KR, Müller AB, Gabbard C. Associations of biological factors and a affordances in the home with infant motor development. Pediatrics International (USA). 2013; 55: 197-203.
- 16. Ribeiro CC.A influência da idade gestacional nas habilidades do desenvolvimento infantil e a qualidade da interação na díade mãe bebê ao longo do primeiro ano de vida. [Tese]. São Paulo: Universidade de São Paulo; 2017.
- Panceri C, Pereira KRGP, Valentini NC. A intervenção motora como fator de prevenção de atrasos no desenvolvimento motor e cognitivo de bebês durante o período de internação hospitalar. Cad Bras Ter Ocup. (São Carlos). 2017; 25 (3): 469-79.
- 18. Pereira KRG Relações entre os fatores individuais e ambientais familiares no desenvolvimento motor e cognitivo dos bebês: um estudo longitudinal [Dissertação]. Porto Alegre: Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul; 2013. Disponível em http://hdl.handle.net/10183/93380
- Morais RLS, Carvalho AM. Magalhães LC. O contexto ambiental e o desenvolvimento na primeira infância: estudos Brasileiros. J. Phys Educ. (Maringá). 2016; 27 (1).
- 20. Pizzo GC, Contreira AR, Rocha FF, Nascimento Júnior JRA, Vieira LF. Análise das affordances do ambiente domiciliar de crianças pré-escolares: um estudo em função da renda familiar. Cad Educ Fís Esp. 2015; 13 (1): 79-89.
- 21. Gomes JAM. Percepção materna de vínculo, crenças e práticas em situação de vulnerabilidade social [Dissertação]. Fortaleza: Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade Federal do Ceará; 2018. Disponível em: http://www.repositorio.ufc.br/handle/riufc/36669
- 22. Santos DSS, Teixeira EC. Vínculo Mão-Bebê no Contexto da Unidade de Terapia Intensiva Neonatal: Revisão Bibliográfica. Rev Bras Saúde Funcional. 2017; 1 (2): 8-19.
- 23. Morais RLS. Desenvolvimento Cognitivo e Motor de Crianças nos Primeiros Anos de Vida e Qualidade do Contexto Ambiental: Uma Análise Relacional [Tese]. Belo Horizonte: Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais; 2013. Disponível em http://www.bibliotecadigital.ufmg.br/ dspace/handle/1843/BUBD-9E3F22

- 24. Madigan S, Wade M,Plamondon A, Maguire JL, Jenkins JM.Maternal Adverse Childhood Experience and Infant Health: Biomedical and Psychosocial Risks as Intermediary Mechanisms. J. Pediatr. 2017; 187: 282-89.
- 25. Cavalcante MCV, Lamy Filho F, Franca AKTC, Lamy ZC. Relação mãe-filho e fatores associados: análise hierarquizada de base populacional em uma capital do Brasil-Estudo BRISA. Ciênc Saúde Coletiva. 2017; 22 (5): 1683-93.
- 26. Vulcão JMSC. Grupos de Apoio às Mães de Recémnascidos Internados em Unidade de Terapia Intensiva Neonatal: Vínculos e Desafios. [TCC]. Florianópolis: Programa de Pós-graduação em Enfermagem. Linhas de Cuidado em Saúde Materna, Neonatal e do Lactante -Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina; 2014. Disponível em https://repositorio.ufsc.br/xmlui/handle/123456789/ 172747
- 27. Pontes KDS. De menina à mãe: relações entre história de vida materna e vínculo afetivo mãe-filho [Dissertação]. Manaus: Universidade Federal do Amazonas; 2012. Disponível em http://tede.ufam.edu.br/handle/tede/3943
- 28. Ribeiro ACB, Aguiar C, Silva DP, Corredeira KEV. Prejuizo no Vínculo Mãe-Filho e Possíveis Consequências. Revisão Sistemática [TCC]. Anápolis: Centro Universitário de Anápolis; 2018. Disponível em http://repositorio.aee.edu.br/bitstream/aee/292/1/1%20%28 2%29.pdf
- 29. Miquelote AF, Santos DC, Caçola PM, Montebelo MI, Gabbard C. Effect of the home environment on motor and cognitive behavior of infants. Infant Behav Dev (USA). 2012; 35 (3): 329-34.
- Saur BA, Bruck I, Antoniuk SA, Riechi TIJS. Relação entre vínculo de apego e desenvolvimento cognitivo, linguístico e motor. Psico (Porto Alegre). 2018; 49 (3): 257-65.

Received on December 17, 2020 Final version presented on April 12, 2021 Approved on August 23, 2021