# Correlates of Low-Level Lead Exposure in Urban Children at 2 Years of Age

**David Bellinger, PhD, Alan Leviton, MD, Michael Rabinowitz, PhD, Herbert Needleman, MD, and Christine Waternaux, PhD**

*From the Department of Neurology, Mental Retardation Research Center, Children's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, and the Department of Biostatistics, Harvard School of Public Health, McLean Hospital, Boston, and the Department of Psychiatry, Children's Hospital, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Pittsburgh*

**ABSTRACT.** The blood lead levels of a large number of US preschool children approach the value regarded as the upper limit of normal. To reduce the number of children whose levels increase into the range thought to be toxic, the antecedents and correlates of levels in the 0- to 25-μg/dL range must be identified. In a large longitudinal study of middle and upper-middle class children living in metropolitan Boston, we evaluated how well five sets of variables predicted children's blood lead levels at 2 years of age: environmental lead sources, mouthing activity, home environment/care giving, prior developmental status, and sociodemographic characteristics. A series of bivariate and multivariate analyses indicated that only environmental lead sources and, to a lesser extent, mouthing activity accounted for significant portions of the variance in blood lead levels. Environmental lead sources were not significantly related to the home environment/care-giving variables or to sociodemographic characteristics. The most promising approach for achieving community-wide reductions in children's blood lead levels is reduction in the amount of lead in the proximate environment. *Pediatrics* 1986;77:826–833; *lead exposure, child development, hand-to-mouth activity, home environment.*

The maximum acceptable blood lead level for young children has been lowered three times since 1971.[1–3] As a result, the difference between the average level of general community exposure and the level considered to be the upper limit of the "safe" range has become progressively smaller. At present, the blood lead level of US children 6 months to 5 years of age is 16 μg/dL[4] and is within approximately .5 SD of 25 μg/dL, the current definition of an "elevated" level.[3] Shifting the distribution of population blood lead levels toward lower values would reduce the number of children whose levels increase into the clearly toxic range. If efforts to effect such a change are to be targeted most effectively, the correlates of blood lead levels in the range of 0 to 25 μg/dL must be identified. Recent evidence that blood lead levels below 25 μg/dL are associated with a variety of unfavorable hematologic,[5] electrophysiologic,[6] and cognitive[7,8] outcomes in children provides additional impetus to pursue this issue.

Factors that have been associated with childhood lead toxicity include elevated lead concentrations in various environmental sources,[9,10] maternal psychopathology and inadequate care giving,[11–14] social disadvantage,[15] and abnormal hand-to-mouth activity.[16] The generality of these findings is limited by two characteristics of the studies on which they are based. First, most were conducted on samples of children with clinical lead poisoning or moderate blood lead elevations (ie, >30 μg/dL). The correlates of the lower lead levels more representative of community exposure might not be the same as the correlates of levels that bring children to medical attention. Second, individual studies have tended to focus on one or two specific classes of predictors rather than on a broad range of possibilities. Substantial correlations among antecedents and correlates require that the association between any single risk factor and blood lead level be adjusted for these covariates.

We address these issues in this study and evaluate the contribution of environmental lead concentrations, children's mouthing behavior, maternal care taking, children's developmental status, and family sociodemographic characteristics to the relatively low (ie, <25 μg/dl) blood lead levels of a

Received for publication July 8, 1985; accepted Sept 11, 1985.
Reprint requests to (D.B.) Children's Hospital, Gardner 6, 300 Longwood Ave, Boston, MA 02115.
PEDIATRICS (ISSN 0031 4005). 

sample of 2-year-old children in metropolitan Boston.

## METHOD

Our analyses are based on a sample of 2-year-old children followed from birth in an investigation of the sources and neurobehavioral effects of low-level lead exposure.[8] Three groups of newborns with widely differing levels of prenatal lead exposure were selected for study. We determined that umbilical cord blood lead concentrations less than 3 μg/dL and greater than 10 μg/dL corresponded to the lower and upper deciles, respectively, of the lead levels of infants born at the Brigham and Women's Hospital in Boston. Concentrations between 6 and 7 μg/dL approximated the mean for this population. Infants with concentrations in one of these three ranges were eligible for the study sample if, as neonates, they appeared free from serious medical problems, lived within 12 miles of The Children's Hospital and in an area deemed safe for home visitors, and were born to an English-speaking family expecting to remain in the immediate area for the next several years.

Infants were 1 month of age when enrolled in the study. Informed parental consent was obtained at this time. A total of 249 infants were enrolled, 85 with "low" prenatal lead exposure (mean 1.8 μg/dL, SD .6), 88 with "midrange" exposure (mean 6.5, SD .3), and 76 with "high" exposure (mean 14.6, SD 3.0). Data were collected on family characteristics and infant development when the infants were 1, 6, 12, 18, and 24 months of age. In general, the sample consists of white, middle to upper-middle class, intact families with infants at low risk for developmental handicap. Additional data about subject selection and recruitment, and a comparison of the three exposure groups on approximately 120 demographic, pregnancy, delivery, and postnatal/environmental factors are presented elsewhere.[8] The attrition rate was approximately 10% per year during the 2 years of the study, resulting in the loss of 45 cases by the time of the 24-month assessment.

Lead concentrations were measured in a variety of environmental samples (water, air, soil, breast milk/formula, paint, furniture dust, floor dust, windowsill dust) collected in the infants' homes at 1, 6, 18, and 24 months of age. At 6, 12, 18, and 24 months, capillary blood samples were obtained to monitor children's postnatal lead exposure. Details about the methods used to collect and to analyze the lead content of these samples are presented elsewhere.[17]

In this report, we focus on factors associated with the infants' blood lead levels at 24 months of age (pb24). At this age, the mean level was 6.8 μg/dL (SD 6.3). One child had a blood lead level greater than 25 μg/dL and was not included in the analyses. Because the 24-month blood lead levels were skewed toward high values, the natural logarithms of the observed values were used in the analyses.

### Selection of Predictor Variables

We selected 23 variables, grouped into five sets, to include in our analyses of the correlates of low-level lead exposure.

*Set 1: Environmental Lead Sources (Three Variables).* In previous analyses of environmental lead variables,[17] we identified three variables as the best joint predictors of pb24 in this sample: (1) an integrated measure, derived by principal components analysis, of the lead content of dust collected from the floor, furniture, and windowsill of an infant's home, (2) whether or not parents reported carrying out any refinishing activity in the home (sanding, scraping, painting) in the 6 months prior to the 24-month blood collection (coded "no" = 0, "yes" = 1), and (3) whether the blood sample was collected during the period from September to April (coded 0) or the period May to August (coded 1).

*Set 2: Mouthing Activity (Four Variables).* On each occasion that the Bayley Scales of Infant Development[18] were administered, the examiner rated the amount of an infant's thumb/finger sucking and mouthing of toys (items 22 and 24, respectively, on the Infant Behavior Record). We included as predictors the scores assigned at the 18- and 24-month administrations of the Bayley Scales, the ages closest to the age for which blood lead level was predicted. Judgments of mouthing were also obtained from the infant's mother at each of these ages. When the infant was 18 months old, the mother was asked "Does your child mouth toys?" and "Does your child suck his thumb or fingers?" Answers to both questions were coded 0 (no) or 1 (yes). When the infant was 24 months old, the mother was again asked to judge whether her child sucked his or her thumb/fingers. In addition, she was asked whether her child "presently chews on or puts any of the following things into his or her mouth": newspaper, rug, chalk, cigarette stubs, crayons and pencils, dirt, hair, housedust, matches, paint flakes, plastic, paper products, toys, windowsill, or outdoor wood. The number of items to which the mother responded "yes" was totaled and transformed to its natural logarithm.

The eight "mouthing" variables were reduced to two orthogonal composite variables by principal components analysis. The two composites accounted for approximately 47% of the variance in the eight variables. The first composite consisted of the four variables pertaining to children's thumb/finger sucking. The second composite consisted of the four variables pertaining to children's mouthing of toys and other nonself objects.

Gallacher et al[19] have suggested that children's mouthing is associated with elevated blood lead levels only when environmental lead concentrations are high. To explore this hypothesis, interaction terms combining a child's score on the housedust lead composite and his or her score on each of the two mouthing composites were included in the analyses.

*Set 3: Home Environment/Care-Giving Style (Six Variables).* We included six psychosocial variables judged pertinent to a test of the hypothesis that the blood lead levels of the children in our sample vary inversely with the adequacy of care giving, particularly maternal availability and responsiveness. These included two scale scores from the Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment[20]: Scale I ("Emotional and Verbal Responsivity of the Mother") and Scale V ("Maternal Involvement With the Child" [HOME]). The other four scores were obtained from the Nursing Child Assessment Teaching Scales,[21] administered at 18 months of age: Scale I (the mother's sensitivity to her child's cues), scale III (the extent to which her teaching style fosters a child's social-emotional growth), and scale IV (the extent to which her style fosters a child's cognitive growth). Due to the child's lack of cooperation, these data could not be obtained for 25 mother-infant pairs. To avoid excluding these dyads from the analyses, we constructed a "dummy" variable coding the availability of these data ("no" = 0; "yes" = 1).

*Set 4: Child Developmental Status (One Variable).* Blood lead elevations might be associated with cognitive or emotional handicaps not because lead causes them but because children with these problems engage in behaviors such as pica that produce excess exposure to lead.[22,23] To determine whether developmental status is associated with a child's subsequent blood lead level, we included as a predictor the mean of the Mental Development Index scores achieved at ages 18 and 24 months.

*Set 5: Sociodemographic Factors (Nine Variables).* A variety of family characteristics have been linked to blood lead elevations in children. In contrast to the variables in sets 1, 2, and 3, these variables are more likely to serve as markers of factors that more directly influence children's exposure to lead. The variables included in this set were family social class (Hollingshead's Four-Factor Index), parental marital status (unmarried = 0; married = 1), maternal and paternal education (Hollingshead's weighting), maternal intelligence,[24] number of children in the family, birth order of the index child, and family stress at 18 and 24 months.[25]

## Statistical Methods

Four types of analyses are reported.

*Bivariate Correlations Between the 23 Predictors and pb24.*

*Separate Multiple Regressions of pb24 on the Five Variable Sets.* In these analyses, each set was considered individually, with no adjustment made for the association between infants' blood lead levels and the other variable sets.

*Multiple Regression Analyses of pb24 Involving More Than One Variable Set.* In these analyses, the variable sets were considered sequentially, in the order in which they are described in the previous section. This ranking is based on the relevance of the sets to children's day-to-day exposure to lead. The set pertaining to the lead content of various environmental sources is ranked first because a child living in a relatively lead-free environment is unlikely to accumulate a significant lead burden regardless of how much mouthing he does, how attentive and responsive his mother is, or his family's socioeconomic standing. Similarly, amount of mouthing activity is more likely to be a direct determinant of children's lead exposure than is maternal care-giving style or the children's overall developmental status.

We explored two approaches to the multiple regression analyses in which more than one variable set was considered. (1) Nested regressions. Pb24 was regressed on variable set 1, then variable sets 1 and 2 combined, then sets 1, 2, and 3 combined, and so on until all five sets were included as predictors. At any step in the sequence, all predictors included in the equation competed directly with one another in a simultaneous regression analysis. (2) Hierarchical regressions. This series of analyses resembled the nested regressions except that, at any given step, the contributions of variables entered at an early stage of the analysis were not reevaluated in light of the contributions of variables entered at later stages. Rather, the dependent variable was the portion of pb24 not accounted for by all prior variable sets. For instance, the variance in pb24 not related to variable set 1 was regressed on variable set 2. The residuals from that analysis were regressed on variable set 3, and so on. Thus, at each stage, pb24 was adjusted for all prior variable sets.

*Canonical Correlation Analyses of the Relationships Among Variable Sets.* Specific hypotheses that have been advanced regarding the causal relationships among the different variable sets were considered. For instance, unfavorable care-giving practices (variable set 3) are thought to produce aberrant mouthing behavior in children (variable set 2), making high-dose lead sources (variable set 1) more accessible to a child. Variables introduced first into a regression equation can be assigned variance shared with variables introduced later in the analysis. To appreciate the extent to which such redundancy characterized the five variable sets, we carried out canonical correlation analyses. Our goal in these analyses was to generate hypotheses about the likelihood that the variables in one set mediate the relationship between children's blood lead levels and the variables in another set.

## RESULTS

### Bivariate Correlations Between the Predictors and pb24

In bivariate analyses, only five of the 23 variables were significantly correlated with children's blood lead levels at 24 months of age (Table 1). Higher lead levels were associated with blood samples collected between May and August, refinishing activities in the home within 6 months of sample collection, greater amounts of lead in housedust, greater amounts of thumb/finger sucking, and a greater number of significant life events (eg, pregnancy, change in job or residence, marital separation, major change in the health of a family member) in the period between 12 and 18 months of age.

### Separate Multiple Regression Analyses of pb24 on the Five Variable Sets

Environmental lead (set 1) and mouthing (set 2) were significantly associated with pb24, but home environment/care giving (set 3), child development (set 4), and sociodemographic characteristics (set 5) were not (Table 2). The percentage of variance in pb24 accounted for by environmental lead variables was about four times greater than the percentage accounted for by the set of mouthing variables. Although the parameter estimates for all environmental lead variables were significant, the dust lead composite was the most important. Of the mouthing variables, only the estimate for thumb/finger sucking was significant. Although the home environment/care-giving set was not significantly associated with pb24, the parameter estimate for one constituent, scale 5 of the HOME, was. However, the direction of the association was contrary to expectation, as the children of mothers assigned higher scores on this scale had higher blood lead levels.

### Multiple Regression Analyses of pb24 Involving More Than One Variable Set

*Nested Regressions.* This set of five analyses was restricted to the 165 cases with complete data for all predictors. Variable sets were added one-by-one to the regression equation, beginning with set 1 and proceeding sequentially through set 5 (Table 3). Partial $F$ ratios were calculated for each pair of nested analyses to evaluate whether or not the more complex regression model produced significantly better prediction of pb24. Only when variable set 2 (mouthing activity) was added to variable set 1 (environmental lead) was the $p$ value associated with a partial $F$ ratio less than .10.

The variables in the environmental set accounted for 21.1% of the variance of pb24. The addition of the set of mouthing variables and the set of home environment/care-giving variables each added 4% to 5% to the variance explained. Addition of the Mental Development Index scores and the set of sociodemographic characteristics contributed minimally to the variance explained.

**TABLE 1.** Bivariate (Pearson) Correlations Between Predictor Variables and Blood Lead Level at 2 Years of Age

| Predictor Variable | Correlation | $P$ Value |
|---|---|---|
| Environmental lead | | |
| Month of blood sample collection | .14 | .061 |
| Recent refinishing activity | .23 | .002 |
| Dust lead content | .41 | .0001 |
| Mouthing activity | | |
| Finger/thumb sucking | .23 | .002 |
| Toy mouthing | .05 | .52 |
| Finger/thumb sucking × dust lead content | .02 | .79 |
| Toy mouthing × dust lead content | −.05 | .52 |
| Home environment/care-giving style | | |
| Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment | | |
| Scale 1 | −.07 | .34 |
| Scale 5 | .16 | .027 |
| Nursing Child Assessment Teaching Scales | | |
| Scale 1 | .00 | .99 |
| Scale 3 | .01 | .91 |
| Scale 4 | .02 | .79 |
| Dummy variable* | .02 | .77 |
| Child developmental status: Mental Development Index | .03 | .64 |
| Sociodemographic characteristics | | |
| Family social class | .11 | .14 |
| Maternal education | −.09 | .24 |
| Paternal education | −.11 | .16 |
| Maternal intelligence | .00 | .99 |
| Parental marital status | .07 | .32 |
| No. of children in family | −.05 | .53 |
| Birth order of index child | −.05 | .48 |
| Family stress | | |
| Index child 18 mo of age | .12 | .11 |
| Index child 24 mo of age | −.01 | .92 |

* Dichotomous variable indicating whether or not the Nursing Child Assessment Teaching Scales could be completed for a mother-child pair.

**TABLE 2.** Multiple Regression of Blood Lead Level at 2 Years of Age on Individual Variable Sets

| Variable Set | Parameter Estimate | SE | *P* | Model *F* | *P* | Model $R^2$ | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Environmental lead | | | | | | | |
| Month of blood sample collection | .24 | .13 | .066 | | | | |
| Recent refinishing activity | .34 | .11 | .002 | 17.53 | .0001 | 22.9 | 181 |
| Dust lead content | .21 | .04 | .0001 | | | | |
| Mouthing activity | | | | | | | |
| Finger/thumb sucking | .11 | .04 | .002 | | | | |
| Toy mouthing | .03 | .05 | .51 | 2.62 | .037 | 5.5 | 185 |
| Finger/thumb sucking × dust lead | −.01 | .03 | .77 | | | | |
| Toy mouthing × dust lead | −.01 | .03 | .85 | | | | |
| Home environment/care-giving style | | | | | | | |
| Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment | | | | | | | |
| Scale 1 | −.05 | .05 | .29 | | | | |
| Scale 5 | .10 | .04 | .017 | | | | |
| Nursing Child Assessment Teaching Scales | | | | | | | |
| Scale 1 | −.04 | .06 | .45 | 1.23 | .29 | 3.9 | 187 |
| Scale 3 | .02 | .05 | .72 | | | | |
| Scale 4 | −.01 | .02 | .78 | | | | |
| Dummy variable | .39 | .57 | .49 | | | | |
| Child developmental status: Mental Development Index | .002 | .004 | .64 | 0.22 | .64 | 0.1 | 188 |
| Sociodemographic characteristics | | | | | | | |
| Family social class | .06 | .06 | .28 | | | | |
| Maternal education | −.02 | .03 | .34 | | | | |
| Paternal education | .003 | .03 | .92 | | | | |
| Maternal intelligence | .004 | .005 | .34 | 0.91 | .52 | 4.7 | 175 |
| Parental marital status | .33 | .38 | .39 | | | | |
| No. of children in family | .02 | .16 | .90 | | | | |
| Birth order of index child | −.05 | .17 | .77 | | | | |
| Family stress | | | | | | | |
| 18 mo | .07 | .05 | .15 | | | | |
| 24 mo | −.06 | .05 | .24 | | | | |

The contribution of month of sampling to the regression equation decreased slightly but progressively as additional sets of variables were added. This raises the possibility that a small part of its predictive value was shared by other variables.

The toy-mouthing variable hovered near the nominal significance level and appears to convey predictive information not possessed by the thumb/finger sucking variable. Among the 16 variables in sets 3, 4, and 5, only HOME scale 5 consistently contributed to the regression equation.

*Hierarchical Regressions.* These analyses, in which pb24 was adjusted for all preceding sets prior to assessing its association with any individual set, suggested the same conclusions as the nested regression analyses. Only set 2, the mouthing variables, produced even a marginally significant improvement in the predictive power of set 1.

## Canonical Correlation Analyses

Many aspects of the relationships among variable sets failed to fit the patterns observed in children with higher blood lead levels. In canonical correlation analysis, variable weights are assigned in such a way that the multiple correlation between sets of variables is maximized. Despite this, neither the association between environmental lead and home environment/care giving nor the association between environmental lead and sociodemographic factors was statistically significant (Table 4). This suggests that the set of environmental lead variables carries minimal information about these psychosocial characteristics.

Children's mouthing activity was not significantly related to either of the variable sets containing features of the psychosocial environment. On the other hand, greater amounts of mouthing were associated with lower mean Mental Development Index scores. The strong relationships among home environment/care giving, child development, and sociodemographic factors are consistent with other studies of the correlates of early infant development.[26]

**TABLE 3.** Nested Multiple Regression Analyses of Blood Lead Level at 2 Years of Age*

| Variable Set | Variable Sets Included in the Regression Equation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | | | 1 + 2 | | | 1 + 2 + 3 | | | 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 | | | 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 | | |
| | PE* | SE** | *P* | PE | SE | *P* | PE | SE | *P* | PE | SE | *P* | PE | SE | *P* |
| Environmental lead | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Month of sample collection | .29 | .13 | .027 | .25 | .13 | .063 | .21 | .14 | .12 | .21 | .14 | .12 | .20 | .14 | .16 |
| Recent refinishing activity | .35 | .11 | .002 | .40 | .11 | .0006 | .41 | .12 | .0005 | .41 | .12 | .0005 | .40 | .12 | .0015 |
| Dust lead content | .18 | .04 | .0001 | .17 | .04 | .0001 | .17 | .04 | .0001 | .17 | .04 | .0001 | .17 | .04 | .0001 |
| Mouthing activity | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Finger/thumb sucking | | | | .09 | .04 | .0175 | .08 | .04 | .042 | .08 | .04 | .044 | .09 | .04 | .031 |
| Toy mouthing | | | | .07 | .04 | .12 | .08 | .04 | .064 | .08 | .04 | .068 | .07 | .05 | .12 |
| Finger/thumb sucking × dust lead | | | | .01 | .02 | .71 | .01 | .02 | .64 | .01 | .02 | .66 | .01 | .03 | .66 |
| Toy mouthing × dust lead | | | | .03 | .03 | .34 | .02 | .03 | .39 | .02 | .03 | .40 | .02 | .03 | .40 |
| Home environment/care giving | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Scale 1 | | | | | | | −.05 | .04 | .23 | −.05 | .04 | .26 | −.04 | .05 | .36 |
| Scale 5 | | | | | | | .11 | .04 | .009 | .11 | .04 | .010 | .11 | .05 | .015 |
| Nursing Child Assessment Teaching Scales | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Scale 1 | | | | | | | −.03 | .06 | .56 | −.03 | .06 | .58 | −.03 | .06 | .58 |
| Scale 3 | | | | | | | −.04 | .05 | .43 | −.04 | .05 | .43 | −.03 | .05 | .49 |
| Scale 4 | | | | | | | .01 | .02 | .62 | .01 | .02 | .61 | .01 | .02 | .57 |
| Dummy variable | | | | | | | .56 | .57 | .33 | .55 | .59 | .35 | .49 | .65 | .45 |
| Child developmental status: Mental Development Index | | | | | | | | | | −.00 | .00 | .87 | −.00 | .00 | .88 |
| Sociodemographic characteristics | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Family social class | | | | | | | | | | | | | −.03 | .06 | .65 |
| Maternal education | | | | | | | | | | | | | −.02 | .02 | .40 |
| Paternal education | | | | | | | | | | | | | −.01 | .03 | .65 |
| Maternal intelligence | | | | | | | | | | | | | .00 | .01 | .40 |
| Parental marital status | | | | | | | | | | | | | .14 | .36 | .69 |
| No. of children in family | | | | | | | | | | | | | .14 | .16 | .39 |
| Birth order of index child | | | | | | | | | | | | | −.13 | .16 | .43 |
| Family stress: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 mo | | | | | | | | | | | | | .00 | .05 | .93 |
| 24 mo | | | | | | | | | | | | | −.01 | .05 | .79 |
| Model $R^2$ | 21.1 | | | 25.4 | | | 30.2 | | | 30.2 | | | 31.6 | | |

* Abbreviations are: PE, parameter estimate; SE, standard error of the parameter estimate.

**TABLE 4.** Adjusted Canonical Correlations Between Variable Sets*

| | Mouthing Activity | Home Environment/ Care-giving Style | Child Developmental Status | Sociodemographic Characteristics |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Environmental lead | .24 (.025) | .12 (.50) | .03 (.31) | .14 (.36) |
| Mouthing activity | | .12 (.24) | .17 (.023) | .23 (.21) |
| Home environment/care giving | | | .45 (.0001) | .51 (.001) |
| Child developmental status | | | | .42 (.0001) |

* Correlation between first canonical variables constructed for each variable set. For all variable set pairs, the correlation between the second canonical variables was not statistically significant. Results in parentheses are *P* values.

## DISCUSSION

Childhood lead poisoning tends to occur in the following setting: a young child who engages in excessive oral activity, an overburdened mother who is unable to provide adequate care, and old urban housing with accessible leaded surfaces in poor repair.[27] Our data suggest that only some of these factors are useful predictors of children's blood lead levels that are relatively high but still within the range presently considered as "safe" (<25 μg/dL). The amount of lead in the proximate environment, particularly in housedust, emerged as the most important predictor. Recent refinishing activity, which might increase the likelihood of the respiratory uptake or the ingestion of lead from the disturbed surfaces, was also associated with higher child blood lead levels.[28]

Pica typically refers to excessive mouthing or ingestion of nonfood items and is almost always present in cases of lead poisoning. For no child in our sample was mouthing behavior so extreme as to warrant application of this clinical term. Nevertheless, even variations within the normal range of mouthing activity were associated with children's blood lead levels. The mouthing activity most strongly related to blood lead level was thumb/finger sucking, although the contribution of toy mouthing approached statistical significance. The interaction factors combining housedust lead content and mouthing activity were not significant predictors, even when dust lead content, a strong predictor of pb24 as a single factor item, was not in the regression equation. Thumb/finger sucking appears to provide information even when dust lead content is in the equation. We interpret these findings as evidence of a dust lead content effect, regardless of a child's tendency to engage in hand-to-mouth activity. Similarly, increased amount of such activity is associated with higher blood lead levels even when dust lead levels are relatively low.

The developmental environments of the children with higher blood lead levels were not characterized by the care-giving inadequacies and the sociodemographic disadvantage common among children suffering clinical lead intoxication. Children in families experiencing higher levels of stress in the 6 to 12 months preceding blood sampling tended to have higher blood lead levels, but this association was not significant after blood lead levels were adjusted for other variables. The finding that scores indicating greater maternal involvement with the child (scale 5 of the HOME) were significantly associated with higher blood lead values stands in marked contrast to a large literature attesting that the risk of increased lead exposure is higher among children with less favorable care giving. The two variable sets associated with children's blood lead levels, environmental lead sources and mouthing activity, were not significantly related to quality of home-rearing environment or to sociodemographic characteristics. Despite the relative homogeneity of our sample in terms of socioeconomic standing, there was sufficient variability in care-giving quality and sociodemographic status to produce strong associations between these factors and the children's performance on the Bayley Scales. However, these variations were not related to the amount of lead in the children's immediate environments.

Several case-control studies of clinical populations have suggested that developmentally handicapped children are more prone than their peers to acquire toxic levels of lead,[22,23] prompting speculation that this model might account for the increased incidence of higher lead levels among children manifesting more subtle deficit. In our sample, children's Mental Development Index scores failed to predict later blood lead levels, suggesting that developmental scores in the lower portion of the normal range do not increase the likelihood of increased lead exposure, at least within the second year of life.

The mouthing variable set was significantly correlated with the composite variable reflecting developmental scores at 18 and 24 months. Several interpretations are possible. Mouthing could be an indicator of lower developmental scores and, therefore, an expression of immaturity. Another interpretation is that mouthing contributes to less optimal development via a lead effect or some other mechanism. When the interaction terms (dust lead content × thumb/finger sucking; dust lead content × toy mouthing) are excluded, the mouthing variable set is significantly correlated with the sociodemographic set.

Our findings should be considered in light of the characteristics of our subjects and their primary routes of exposure. Not only is our sample relatively homogeneous, but it is skewed to the upper end of the socioeconomic spectrum, consisting largely of families in which mothers are white, married, and relatively well educated. This reflects the catchment of the hospital whose delivery population we sampled, as well as our selection criteria, and the socioeconomic bias in loss-to-follow-up. The predictive power of certain variables may differ across geographic or cultural settings.

In general, the rearing environments of the children in our sample satisfy any reasonable standard of quality. The children's lead exposure may be regarded as a baseline, the more or less inevitable level of exposure that children experience by virtue of residence in a present-day metropolitan environment. Poor care giving or other risk factors associated with poverty might add to this baseline level of exposure, in some cases pushing a child's blood lead level into the clearly toxic range. For children who do become clinically ill, psychosocial intervention, as a component of the overall medical and environmental management plan, may reduce the likelihood of repeated intoxication. However, psychosocial factors appear relatively unimportant as determinants of variations in the levels typical of community exposure. The most promising strategy for achieving community-wide reductions in children's blood lead levels appears to be abatement of the lead sources themselves.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported by grants 08945 and 17407 from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

We thank the parents and children who contributed their time and effort to this project. Molly Nichols (project coordinator), Paula Weiss, Joan Hargrave, and Judy Clouston collected the developmental and psychosocial data, and Michael Burley and Marie Betts collected the environmental data and the blood samples. Karl Larson, Patricia Hadidian, Andrea Klein, and Hollister Finch conducted the lead analyses. Elizabeth Allred assisted with the statistical analyses. Jone Sloman provided helpful comments on the manuscript.

## REFERENCES

1. Public Health Service: Medical aspects of childhood lead poisoning. *Pediatrics* 1971;3:463–468
2. *Increased Lead Absorption and Lead Poisoning in Young Children: A Statement by the Centers for Disease Control,* US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Atlanta, Centers for Disease Control, 1975
3. *Preventing Lead Poisoning in Young Children: A Statement by the Centers for Disease Control,* US Department of Health and Human Services. Atlanta, Centers for Disease Control, 1985
4. Mahaffey KR, Annest JL, Roberts MS, et al: National estimates of blood lead levels: United States, 1976–1980. *N Engl J Med* 1982;307:573–579
5. Piomelli S, Seaman C, Zullow D, et al: Threshold for lead damage to heme synthesis in urban children. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1982;79:3335–3339
6. Otto D, Benignus V, Muller K, et al: Effects of low to moderate lead exposure on slow cortical potentials in young children: Two year follow-up study. *Neurobehav Toxicol Teratol* 1982;4:733–737
7. Yule W, Lansdown R, Millar I, et al: The relationship between blood lead concentrations, intelligence and attainment in a school population: A pilot study. *Dev Med Child Neurol* 1981;23:567–576
8. Bellinger D, Needleman H, Leviton A, et al: Early sensory-motor development and prenatal exposure to lead. *Neurobehav Toxicol Teratol* 1984;6:387–402
9. Charney E: Lead poisoning in children: The case against household lead dust, in Chisolm J, O'Hara D (eds): *Lead Absorption in Children: Management, Clinical, and Environmental Aspects.* Baltimore, Urban & Schwarzenberg, 1982, pp 79–88
10. Duggan M: Lead in dust as a source of children's body lead, in Rutter M, Jones R (eds): *Lead Versus Health: Sources and Effects of Low Level Lead Exposure.* New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1983, pp 115–139
11. Millican FK, Lourie RS, Layman RS: Emotional factors in the etiology and treatment of lead poisoning. *Am J Dis Child* 1956;91:144–149
12. Milar CR, Schroeder SR, Mushak P, et al: Contributions of the caregiving environment to increased lead burden of children. *Am J Ment Defic* 1980;84:339–344
13. Hunt TJ, Hepner R, Seaton KW: Childhood lead poisoning and inadequate child care. *Am J Dis Child* 1982;136:538–542
14. Dietrich KN, Krafft KM, Pearson DT, et al: Contributions of social and developmental factors to lead exposure during the first year of life. *Pediatrics* 1985;75:1114–1119
15. O'Hara DM: Social factors in the recurrence of increased lead absorption in children, in Chisolm JJ, O'Hara DM (eds): *Lead Absorption in Children: Management, Clinical, and Environmental Aspects.* Baltimore, Urban & Schwarzenberg, 1982, pp 89–101
16. Pueschel S, Cullen S, Howard R, et al: Pathogenetic considerations of pica in lead poisoning. *Int J Psychiatry Med* 1977–1978;8:13–24
17. Rabinowitz MB, Leviton A, Needleman HL, et al: Environmental correlates of infant blood lead levels. *Environ Res* 1985;38:96–107
18. Bayley N: *Bayley Scales of Infant Development.* New York, The Psychological Corporation, 1969
19. Gallacher JE, Elwood PC, Phillips KM, et al: Relation between pica and blood lead in areas of differing lead exposure. *Arch Dis Child* 1984;59:40–44
20. Caldwell BM, Bradley RH: *Administration Manual: Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment.* Little Rock, University of Arkansas at Little Rock, 1978
21. Barnard K: *Administration Manual: The Nursing Child Assessment Teaching Scales.* Seattle, University of Washington, 1978
22. Cohen D, Johnson W, Caparulo B: Pica and elevated blood lead level in autistic and atypical children. *Am J Dis Child* 1976;130:47–48
23. Campbell M, Petti T, Green WH, et al: Some physical parameters of young autistic children. *J Am Acad Child Psychiatry* 1980;19:193–212
24. Dunn L: *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test.* Circle Pines, MN, American Guidance Service, 1965
25. Holmes T, Rahe R: The Social Readjustment Rating Scale. *J Psychosom Res* 1967;11:213–218
26. McCall R: The development of intellectual functioning in infancy and the prediction of later I.Q., in Osofsky J (ed): *Handbook of Infant Development.* New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1979, pp 707–741
27. Chisolm JJ, Kaplan E: Lead poisoning in childhood—Comprehensive management and prevention. *J Pediatr* 1968;73:942–950
28. Rabinowitz M, Leviton A, Bellinger D: Home refinishing, lead paint, and infant blood lead levels. *Am J Public Health* 1985;75:403–404