

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	4-iii
4. NON-DIETARY INGESTION FACTORS	4-1
4.1. INTRODUCTION	4-1
4.2. RECOMMENDATIONS	4-2
4.3. NON-DIETARY INGESTION—MOUTHING FREQUENCY STUDIES	4-5
4.3.1. Key Studies of Mouthing Frequency	4-5
4.3.1.1. Zartarian et al. (1997b)—Quantifying Videotaped Activity Patterns: Video Translation Software and Training Technologies/Zartarian et al. (1997a)—Quantified Dermal Activity Data From a Four-Child Pilot Field Study/Zartarian et al. (1998)—Quantified Mouthing Activity Data From a Four-Child Pilot Field Study	4-5
4.3.1.2. Reed et al. (1999)—Quantification of Children’s Hand and Mouthing Activities Through a Videotaping Methodology	4-5
4.3.1.3. Freeman et al. (2001)—Quantitative Analysis of Children’s Micro- Activity Patterns: The Minnesota Children’s Pesticide Exposure Study	4-6
4.3.1.4. Tolve et al. (2002)—Frequency of Mouthing Behavior in Young Children	4-6
4.3.1.5. AuYeung et al. (2004)—Young Children’s Mouthing Behavior: An Observational Study via Videotaping in a Primarily Outdoor Residential Setting	4-7
4.3.1.6. Black et al. (2005)—Children’s Mouthing and Food-Handling Behavior in an Agricultural Community on the U.S./Mexico Border	4-7
4.3.1.7. Xue et al. (2007)—A Meta-Analysis of Children’s Hand-to-Mouth Frequency Data for Estimating Non-Dietary Ingestion Exposure	4-8
4.3.1.8. Beamer et al. (2008)—Quantified Activity Pattern Data From 6 to 27- Month-Old Farm Worker Children for Use in Exposure Assessment	4-9
4.3.1.9. Xue et al. (2010)—A Meta-Analysis of Children’s Object-to-Mouth Frequency Data for Estimating Non-Dietary Ingestion Exposure	4-9
4.3.2. Relevant Studies of Mouthing Frequency	4-10
4.3.2.1. Davis et al. (1995)—Soil Ingestion in Children With Pica: Final Report	4-10
4.3.2.2. Lew and Butterworth (1997)—The Development of Hand-Mouth Coordination in 2- to 5-Month-Old Infants: Similarities With Reaching and Grasping	4-11
4.3.2.3. Tudella et al. (2000)—The Effect of Oral-Gustatory, Tactile-Bucal, and Tactile-Manual Stimulation on the Behavior of the Hands in Newborns	4-11
4.3.2.4. Ko et al. (2007)—Relationships of Video Assessments of Touching and Mouthing Behaviors During Outdoor Play in Urban Residential Yards to Parental Perceptions of Child Behaviors and Blood Lead Levels	4-11
4.3.2.5. Nicas and Best (2008)—A Study Quantifying the Hand-to-Face Contact Rate and Its Potential Application to Predicting Respiratory Tract Infection	4-12
4.4. NON-DIETARY INGESTION—MOUTHING DURATION STUDIES	4-12
4.4.1. Key Mouthing Duration Studies	4-12
4.4.1.1. Juberg et al. (2001)—An Observational Study of Object Mouthing Behavior by Young Children	4-12
4.4.1.2. Greene (2002)—A Mouthing Observation Study of Children Under Six Years of Age	4-13
4.4.1.3. Beamer et al. (2008)—Quantified Activity Pattern Data From 6- to 27- Month-Old Farm Worker Children for Use in Exposure Assessment	4-14

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

4.4.2.	Relevant Mouthing Duration Studies.....	4-14
4.4.2.1.	Barr et al. (1994)—Effects of Intra-Oral Sucrose on Crying, Mouthing, and Hand-Mouth Contact in Newborn and Six-Week- Old Infants.....	4-14
4.4.2.2.	Zartarian et al. (1997b)—Quantifying Videotaped Activity Patterns: Video Translation Software and Training Technologies/Zartarian et al. (1997a)—Quantified Dermal Activity Data From a Four-Child Pilot Field Study/Zartarian et al. (1998)—Quantified Mouthing Activity Data From a Four-Child Pilot Field Study.....	4-15
4.4.2.3.	Groot et al. (1998)—Mouthing Behavior of Young Children: An Observational Study	4-15
4.4.2.4.	Smith and Norris (2003)—Reducing the Risk of Choking Hazards: Mouthing Behavior of Children Aged 1 Month to 5 Years/Norris and Smith (2002)—Research Into the Mouthing Behavior of Children up to 5 Years Old	4-16
4.4.2.5.	AuYeung et al. (2004)—Young Children’s Mouthing Behavior: An Observational Study via Videotaping in a Primarily Outdoor Residential Setting.....	4-17
4.5.	MOUTHING PREVALENCE STUDIES	4-17
4.5.1.	Stanek et al. (1998)—Prevalence of Soil Mouthing/Ingestion Among Healthy Children Aged 1 to 6	4-17
4.5.2.	Warren et al. (2000)—Non-Nutritive Sucking Behaviors in Preschool Children: A Longitudinal Study	4-18
4.6.	REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER 4.....	4-18

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4-1.	Summary of Recommended Values for Mouthing Frequency and Duration.....	4-3
Table 4-2.	Confidence in Mouthing Frequency and Duration Recommendations	4-4
Table 4-3.	New Jersey Children’s Mouthing Frequency (contacts/hour) From Video-Transcription.....	4-21
Table 4-4.	Survey-Reported Percent of 168 Minnesota Children Exhibiting Behavior, by Age	4-21
Table 4-5.	Video-Transcription Median (Mean) Observed Mouthing in 19 Minnesota Children (contacts/hour), by Age	4-21
Table 4-6.	Variability in Objects Mouthed by Washington State Children (contacts/hour).....	4-22
Table 4-7.	Indoor Mouthing Frequency (contacts per contacts/hour), Video-Transcription of 9 Children, by Age	4-23
Table 4-8.	Outdoor Mouthing Frequency (contacts per contacts/hour), Video-Transcription of 38 Children, by Age	4-23
Table 4-9.	Videotaped Mouthing Activity of Texas Children, Median Frequency (Mean ± SD), by Age.....	4-24
Table 4-10.	Indoor Hand-to-Mouth Frequency (contacts/hour) Weibull Distributions From Various Studies, by Age	4-24
Table 4-11.	Outdoor Hand-to-Mouth Frequency (contacts/hour) Weibull Distributions From Various Studies, by Age	4-24
Table 4-12.	Object/Surface-to-Mouth Contact Frequency for Infants and Toddlers (events/hour) (<i>N</i> = 23)	4-25
Table 4-13.	Distributions Mouthing Frequency and Duration for Non-Dietary Objects With Significant Differences (<i>p</i> < 0.05).....	4-26
Table 4-14.	Indoor Object-to-Mouth Frequency (contacts/hour) Weibull Distributions From Various Studies, by Age	4-27
Table 4-15.	Outdoor Object-to-Mouth Frequency (contacts/hour) Weibull Distributions From Various Studies, by Age	4-27
Table 4-16.	Survey-Reported Mouthing Behaviors for 92 Washington State Children	4-28
Table 4-17.	Number of Hand Contacts Observed in Adults During a Continuous 3-Hour Period	4-28
Table 4-18.	Estimated Daily Mean Mouthing Times of New York State Children, for Pacifiers and Other Objects	4-29
Table 4-19.	Percent of Houston-Area and Chicago-Area Children Observed Mouthing, by Category and Child’s Age	4-29
Table 4-20.	Estimates of Mouthing Time for Various Objects for Infants and Toddlers (minutes/hour), by Age	4-30
Table 4-21.	Object/Surface-to-Hands and Mouth Contact Duration for Infants and Toddlers (minutes/hour) (<i>N</i> = 23)	4-32
Table 4-22.	Mouthing Times of Dutch Children Extrapolated to Total Time While Awake, Without Pacifier (minutes/day), by Age.....	4-33
Table 4-23.	Estimated Mean Daily Mouthing Duration by Age Group for Pacifiers, Fingers, Toys, and Other Objects (hours:minutes:seconds)	4-34
Table 4-24.	Outdoor Median Mouthing Duration (seconds/contact), Video-Transcription of 38 Children.....	4-35
Table 4-25.	Indoor Mouthing Duration (minutes/hour), Video-Transcription of Nine Children With	4-35
Table 4-26.	Outdoor Mouthing Duration (minutes/hour), Video-Transcription of 38 Children, by Age	4-36
Table 4-27.	Reported Daily Prevalence of Massachusetts Children’s Non-Food Mouthing/Ingestion Behaviors	4-37

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

4. NON-DIETARY INGESTION FACTORS**4.1. INTRODUCTION**

Adults and children have the potential for exposure to toxic substances through non-dietary ingestion pathways other than soil and dust ingestion (e.g., ingesting pesticide residues that have been transferred from treated surfaces to the hands or objects that are mouthed). Adults mouth objects such as cigarettes, pens and pencils, or their hands. Young children mouth objects, surfaces, or their fingers as they explore their environment. Mouthing behavior includes all activities in which objects, including fingers, are touched by the mouth or put into the mouth—except for eating and drinking—and includes licking, sucking, chewing, and biting (Groot et al., 1998). In addition, the sequence of events can be important, such as when a hand-washing occurs relative to contact with soil and hand-to-mouth contact. Videotaped observations of children's mouthing behavior demonstrate the intermittent nature of hand-to-mouth and object-to-mouth behaviors in terms of the number of contacts recorded per unit of time (Ko et al., 2007).

Adult and children's mouthing behavior can potentially result in ingestion of toxic substances (Lepow et al., 1975). Only one study was located that provided data on mouthing frequency or duration for adults, but Cannella et al. (2006) indicated that adults with developmental disabilities frequently exhibit excessive hand-mouthing behavior. In a large non-random sample of children born in Iowa, parents reported non-nutritive sucking behaviors to be very common in infancy, and to continue for a substantial proportion of children up to the 3rd and 4th birthdays (Warren et al., 2000). Hand-to-mouth behavior has been observed in both preterm and full-term infants (Takaya et al., 2003; Blass et al., 1989; Rochat et al., 1988). Infants are born with a sucking reflex for breast-feeding, and within a few months, they begin to use sucking or mouthing as a means to explore their surroundings. Sucking also becomes a means of comfort when a child is tired or upset. In addition, teething normally causes substantial mouthing behavior (i.e., sucking or chewing) to alleviate discomfort in the gums (Groot et al., 1998).

There are three general approaches to gather data on children's mouthing behavior: real-time hand recording, in which trained observers manually record information (Davis et al., 1995); video-transcription, in which trained videographers tape a child's activities and subsequently extract the pertinent data manually or with computer software (Black et al., 2005; Zartarian et al., 1998, 1997a; Zartarian et al., 1997b); and questionnaire, or survey

response, techniques (Stanek et al., 1998). With real-time hand recording, observations made by trained professionals—rather than parents—may offer the advantage of consistency in interpreting visible behaviors and may be less subjective than observations made by someone who maintains a caregiving relationship to the child. On the other hand, young children's behavior may be influenced by the presence of unfamiliar people (Davis et al., 1995). Groot et al. (1998) indicated that parent observers perceived that deviating from their usual care giving behavior by observing and recording mouthing behavior appeared to have influenced their children's behavior. With video-transcription methodology, an assumption is made that the presence of the videographer or camera does not influence the child's behavior. This assumption may result in minimal biases introduced when filming newborns, or when the camera and videographer are not visible to the child. However, if the children being studied are older than newborns and can see the camera or videographer, biases may be introduced. Ferguson et al. (2006) described apprehension caused by videotaping as well as situations where a child's awareness of the videotaping crew caused “play-acting” to occur, or parents indicated that the child was behaving differently during the taping session, although children tend to ignore the presence of the camera after some time has passed. Another possible source of measurement error may be introduced when children's movements or positions cause their mouthing not to be captured by the camera. Data transcription errors can bias results in either the negative or positive direction. Finally, measurement error can occur if situations arise in which caregivers are absent during videotaping and researchers must stop videotaping and intervene to prevent risky behaviors (Zartarian et al., 1995). Meanwhile, survey response studies rely on responses to questions about a child's mouthing behavior posed to parents or caregivers. Measurement errors from these studies could occur for a number of different reasons, including language/dialect differences between interviewers and respondents, question wording problems and lack of definitions for terms used in questions, differences in respondents' interpretation of questions, and recall/memory effects.

Some researchers express mouthing behavior as the frequency of occurrence (e.g., contacts per hour or contacts per minute). Others describe the duration of specific mouthing events, expressed in units of seconds or minutes. This chapter does not address issues related to contaminant transfer from thumbs, fingers, or objects or surfaces, into the mouth, and subsequent ingestion. Examples of how to use

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

mouth frequency and duration data can be found in a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) Office of Pesticide Programs guidance document for conducting residential exposure assessments (U.S. EPA, 2009). This guidance document provides a standard method for estimating potential dose among toddlers from incidental ingestion of pesticide residues from previously treated turf. This scenario assumes that pesticide residues are transferred to the skin of toddlers playing on treated yards and are subsequently ingested as a result of hand-to-mouth transfer. A second scenario assumes that pesticide residues are transferred to a child's toy and are subsequently ingested as a result of object-to-mouth transfer. Neither scenario includes residues ingested as a result of soil ingestion.

The recommendations for mouthing frequency and duration for children only are provided in the next section, along with a summary of the confidence ratings for these recommendations. The recommended values for children are based on key studies identified by the U.S. EPA for this factor. Although some studies in Sections 4.3.1 and 4.4.1 are classified as key, they were not directly used to provide the recommendations. They are included as key because they were used by Xue et al. (2007) or Xue et al. (2010) in meta-analyses, which are the primary sources of the recommendations provided in this chapter for hand-to-mouth and object-to-mouth frequency, respectively. Following the recommendations, key and relevant studies on mouthing frequency (see Section 4.3) and duration (see Section 4.4) are summarized and the methodologies used in the key and relevant studies are described. Information on the prevalence of mouthing behavior is presented in Section 4.5.

4.2. RECOMMENDATIONS

The key studies described in Section 4.3 and Section 4.4 were used to develop recommended values for mouthing frequency and duration, respectively, among children. Only one relevant study was located that provided data on mouthing frequency or duration for adults. The recommended hand-to-mouth frequencies are based on data from Xue et al. (2007). Xue et al. (2007) conducted a secondary analysis of data from several of the studies summarized in this chapter, as well as data from unpublished studies. Xue et al. (2007) provided data for the age groups in U.S. EPA's *Guidance on Selecting Age Groups for Monitoring and Assessing Childhood Exposures to Environmental Contaminants* (U.S. EPA, 2005) and categorized the data according to indoor and outdoor contacts. The

recommendations for frequency of object-to-mouth contact are based on data from Xue et al. (2010). Xue et al. (2010) conducted a secondary analysis of data from several of the studies summarized in this chapter, as well as data from an unpublished study. Recommendations for duration of object-to-mouth contacts are based on data from Juberg et al. (2001), Greene (2002), and Beamer et al. (2008). Recommendations on duration of object-to-mouth contacts pre-dated the U.S. EPA's (2005) guidance on age groups. For cases in which age groups of children in the key studies did not correspond exactly to U.S. EPA's recommended age groups, the closest age group was used.

Table 4-1 shows recommended mouthing frequencies, expressed in units of contacts per hour, between either any part of the hand (including fingers and thumbs) and the mouth or between an object or surface and the mouth. Recommendations for hand-to-mouth duration are not provided since the algorithm to estimate exposures from this pathway is not time dependent. Table 4-2 presents the confidence ratings for the recommended values. The overall confidence rating is low for both frequency and duration of hand-to-mouth and object-to-mouth contact.

Age Group	Hand-to-Mouth				Source
	Indoor Frequency (contacts/hour)		Outdoor Frequency (contacts/hour)		
	Mean	95 th percentile	Mean	95 th percentile	
Birth to <1 month	-	-	-	-	Xue et al. (2007)
1 to <3 months	-	-	-	-	
3 to <6 months	28	65	-	-	
6 to <12 months	19	52	15	47	
1 to <2 years	20	63	14	42	
2 to <3 years	13	37	5	20	
3 to <6 years	15	54	9	36	
6 to <11 years	7	21	3	12	
11 to <16 years	-	-	-	-	
16 to <21 years	-	-	-	-	
Age Group	Object-to-Mouth				Source
	Indoor Frequency (contacts/hour)		Outdoor Frequency (contacts/hour)		
	Mean	95 th percentile	Mean	95 th percentile	
Birth to <1 month	-	-	-	-	Xue et al. (2010)
1 to <3 months	-	-	-	-	
3 to <6 months	11	32	-	-	
6 to <12 months	20	38	-	-	
1 to <2 years	14	34	8.8	21	
2 to <3 years	9.9	24	8.1	40	
3 to <6 years	10	39	8.3	30	
6 to <11 years	1.1	3.2	1.9	9.1	
11 to <16 years	-	-	-	-	
16 to <21 years	-	-	-	-	
Age Group	Mean Duration (minutes/hour)		95 th percentile Duration (minutes/hour)		Source
	Mean	95 th percentile	Mean	95 th percentile	
Birth to <1 month	-	-	-	-	Juberg et al. (2001); Greene (2002); Beamer et al. (2008)
1 to <3 months	-	-	-	-	
3 to <6 months	11 ^a	-	26 ^b	-	
6 to <12 months	9 ^c	-	19 ^d	-	
1 to <2 years	7 ^e	-	22 ^e	-	
2 to <3 years	10 ^f	-	11 ^g	-	
3 to <6 years	-	-	-	-	
6 to <11 years	-	-	-	-	
11 to <16 years	-	-	-	-	
16 to <21 years	-	-	-	-	
^a	Mean calculated from Juberg et al. (2001) (0 to 18 months) and Greene (2002) (3 to 12 months).				
^b	Calculated 95 th percentile from Greene (2002) (3 to 12 months).				
^c	Mean calculated from Juberg et al. (2001) (0 to 18 months), Greene (2002) (3 to 12 months), and Beamer et al. (2008) (6 to 13 months).				
^d	Calculated 95 th percentile from Greene (2002) (3 to 12 months) and Beamer et al. (2008) (6 to 13 months).				
^e	Mean and 95 th percentile from Greene (2002) (12 to 24 months).				
^f	Mean calculated from Juberg et al. (2001) (19 to 36 months), Greene (2002) (24 to 36 months), and Beamer et al. (2008) (20 to 26 months).				
^g	Calculated 95 th percentile from Greene (2002) (24 to 36 months) and Beamer et al. (2008) (20 to 26 months).				
-	= No data.				

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

Table 4-2. Confidence in Mouthing Frequency and Duration Recommendations		
General Assessment Factor	Rationale	Rating
Soundness		Low
<i>Adequacy of Approach</i>	The approaches for data collection and analysis used were adequate for providing estimates of children’s mouthing frequencies and durations. Sample sizes were very small relative to the population of interest. Xue et al. (2007) and (2010) meta-analysis of secondary data was considered to be of suitable utility for the purposes for developing recommendations.	
<i>Minimal (or defined) Bias</i>	Bias in either direction likely exists in both frequency and duration estimates; the magnitude of bias is unknown.	
Applicability and Utility		Low
<i>Exposure Factor of Interest</i>	Key studies for older children focused on mouthing behavior while the infant studies were designed to research developmental issues.	
<i>Representativeness</i>	Most key studies were of samples of U.S. children, but, due to the small sample sizes and small number of locations under study, the study subjects may not be representative of the overall U.S. child population.	
<i>Currency</i>	The studies were conducted over a wide range of dates. However, the currency of the data is not expected to affect mouthing behavior recommendations.	
<i>Data Collection Period</i>	Extremely short data collection periods may not represent behaviors over longer time periods.	
Clarity and Completeness		Low
<i>Accessibility</i>	The journal articles are in the public domain, but, in many cases, primary data were unavailable.	
<i>Reproducibility</i>	Data collection methodologies were capable of providing results that were reproducible within a certain range.	
<i>Quality Assurance</i>	Several of the key studies applied and documented quality assurance/quality control measures.	
Variability and Uncertainty		Low
<i>Variability in Population</i>	The key studies characterized inter-individual variability to a limited extent, and they did not characterize intra-individual variability over diurnal or longer term time frames.	
<i>Description of Uncertainty</i>	The study authors typically did not attempt to quantify uncertainties inherent in data collection methodology (such as the influence of observers on behavior), although some described these uncertainties qualitatively. The study authors typically did attempt to quantify uncertainties in data analysis methodologies (if video-transcription methods were used). Uncertainties arising from short data collection periods typically were unaddressed either qualitatively or quantitatively.	
Evaluation and Review		Medium
<i>Peer Review</i>	All key studies appear in peer-review journals.	
<i>Number and Agreement of Studies</i>	Several key studies were available for both frequency and duration, but data were not available for all age groups. The results of studies from different researchers are generally in agreement.	
Overall rating		Low

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

**4.3. NON-DIETARY INGESTION—
MOUTHING FREQUENCY STUDIES****4.3.1. Key Studies of Mouthing Frequency****4.3.1.1. Zartarian et al. (1997b)—*Quantifying Videotaped Activity Patterns: Video Translation Software and Training Technologies*/Zartarian et al. (1997a)—*Quantified Dermal Activity Data From a Four-Child Pilot Field Study*/Zartarian et al. (1998)—*Quantified Mouthing Activity Data From a Four-Child Pilot Field Study***

Zartarian et al. (1998, 1997a; 1997b) conducted a pilot study of the video-transcription methodology to investigate the applicability of using videotaping for gathering information related to children's activities, dermal exposures, and mouthing behaviors. The researchers had conducted studies using the real-time hand recording methodology. These studies demonstrated poor inter-observer reliability and observer fatigue when working for long periods of time. This prompted the investigation into using videotaping with transcription of the children's activities at a point in time after the videotaped observations occurred.

Four Mexican American farm worker children in the Salinas Valley of California each were videotaped with a hand-held video camera during their waking hours, excluding time spent in the bathroom, over one day in September 1993. The boys were 2 years 10 months old and 3 years 9 months old; the girls were 2 years and 5 months old, and 4 years and 2 months old. Time of videotaping was 6.0 hours for the younger girl, 6.6 hours for the older girl, 8.4 hours for the younger boy and 10.1 hours for the older boy. The videotaping gathered information on detailed micro-activity patterns of children to be used to evaluate software for videotaped activities and translation training methods. The researchers reported measures taken to assess inter-observer reliability and several problems with the video-transcription process.

The hourly data showed that non-dietary object mouthing occurred in 30 of the 31 hours of tape time, with one child eating during the hour in which no non-dietary object mouthing occurred. Mean object-to-mouth contacts for the four children were reported to be 11 contacts per hour (median = 9 contacts per hour), with an average per child range of 1 to 29 contacts per hour (Zartarian et al., 1998). Objects mouthed included bedding/towels, clothes, dirt, grass/vegetation, hard surfaces, hard toys, paper/card, plush toy, and skin (Zartarian et al., 1998). Average hand-to-mouth contacts for the four children were 13 contacts per hour [averaging the sum of left hand

and right hand-to-mouth contacts and averaging across children, from Zartarian et al. (1997a)], with the average per child ranging from 9 to 19 contacts per hour.

This study's primary purpose was to develop and evaluate the video-transcription methodology; a secondary purpose was collection of mouthing behavior data. The sample of children studied was very small and not likely to be representative of the national population. As with other video-transcription studies, the presence of non-family-member videographers and a video camera may have influenced the children's behavior.

4.3.1.2. Reed et al. (1999)—*Quantification of Children's Hand and Mouthing Activities Through a Videotaping Methodology*

In this study, Reed et al. (1999) used a video-transcription methodology to quantify the frequency and type of children's hand and mouth contacts, as well as a survey response methodology, and compared the videotaped behaviors with parents' perceptions of those behaviors. Twenty children ages 3 to 6 years old selected randomly at a daycare center in New Brunswick, NJ, and 10 children ages 2 to 5 years old at residences in Newark and Jersey City, NJ who were not selected randomly, were studied (sex not specified). For the video-transcription methodology, inter-observer reliability tests were performed during observer training and at four points during the two years of the study. The researchers compared the results of videotaping the ten children in the residences with their parents' reports of the children's daily activities. Mouthing behaviors studied included hand-to-mouth and hand bringing object-to-mouth.

Table 4-3 presents the video-transcription mouthing contact frequency results. The authors analyzed parents' responses on frequencies of their children's mouthing behaviors and compared those responses with the children's videotaped behaviors, which revealed certain discrepancies: Parents' reported hand-to-mouth contact of "almost never" corresponded to overall somewhat lower videotaped hand-to-mouth frequencies than those of children whose parents reported "sometimes," but there was little correspondence between parents' reports of object-to-mouth frequency and videotaped behavior.

The advantages of this study were that it compared the results of video-transcription with the survey response methodology results and that it described quality assurance steps taken to assure reliability of transcribed videotape data. However, only a small number of children were studied, some

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

were not selected for observation randomly, and the sample of children studied may not be representative of either the locations studied or the national population. Because of the children's ages, the presence of unfamiliar persons following the children with a video camera may influence the video-transcription results. The parents' survey responses also may be influenced by recall/memory effects and other limitations of survey methodologies.

4.3.1.3. Freeman et al. (2001)—Quantitative Analysis of Children's Micro-Activity Patterns: The Minnesota Children's Pesticide Exposure Study

Freeman et al. (2001) conducted a survey response and video-transcription study of some of the respondents in a phased study of children's pesticide exposures in the summer and early fall of 1997. A probability-based sample of 168 families with children ages 3 to <14 years old in urban (Minneapolis/St. Paul) and non-urban (Rice and Goodhue Counties) areas of Minnesota answered questions about children's mouthing of paint chips, food-eating without utensils, eating of food dropped on the floor, mouthing of non-food items, and mouthing of thumbs and fingers. For the survey response portion of the study, parents provided the responses for children ages 3 and 4 years and collaborated with or assisted older children with their responses. Of the 168 families responding to the survey, 102 were available, selected, and agreed to measurements of pesticide exposure. Of these 102 families, 19 agreed to videotaping of the study children's activities for a period of 4 consecutive hours.

Based on the survey responses for 168 children, the 3-year olds had significantly more positive responses for all reported behavior compared to the other age groups. The authors stated that they did not know whether parent reporting of 3-year olds' behavior influenced the responses given. Table 4-4 shows the percentage of children, grouped by age, who were reported to exhibit non-food related mouthing behaviors. Table 4-5 presents the mean and median number of mouthing contacts by age for the 19 videotaped children. Among the four age categories of these children, object-to-mouth activities were significantly greater for the 3- and 4-year olds than any other age group, with a median of 3 and a mean of 6 contacts per hour ($p = 0.002$, Kruskal Wallis test comparison across four age groups). Hand-to-mouth contacts had a median of 3.5 and mean of 4 contacts per hour for the three 3- and 4-year olds observed, median of 2.5 and mean of

8 contacts per hour for the seven 5- and 6-year olds observed, median of 3 and mean of 5 contacts per hour for the four 7- and 8-year olds observed, and median of 2 and mean of 4 for the five 10-, 11-, and 12-year olds observed. Sex differences were observed for some of the activities, with boys spending significantly more time outdoors than girls. Hand-to-mouth and object-to-mouth activities were less frequent outdoors than indoors for both boys and girls.

For the 19 children in the video-transcription portion of the study, inter-observer reliability checks and quality control checks were performed on randomly sampled tapes. For four children's tapes, comparison of the manual video-transcription with a computerized transcription method (Zartarian et al., 1995) also was performed; no significant differences were found in the frequency of events recorded using the two techniques. The frequency of six behaviors (hand-to-mouth, hand-to-object, object-to-mouth, hand-to-smooth surface, hand-to-textured surface, and hand-to-clothing) was recorded. The amount of time each child spent indoors, outdoors, and in contact with soil or grass, as well as whether the child was barefoot was also recorded. For the four children whose tapes were analyzed with the computerized transcription method, which calculates event durations, the authors stated that most hand-to-mouth and object-to-mouth activities were observed during periods of lower physical activity, such as television viewing.

An advantage to this study is that it included results from two separate methodologies, and included quality assurance steps taken to assure reliability of transcribed videotape data. However, the children in this study may not be representative of all children in the United States. Variation in who provided the survey responses (sometimes parents only, sometimes children with parents) may have influenced the responses given. Children studied using the video-transcription methodology were not chosen randomly from the survey response group. The presence of unfamiliar persons following the children with a video camera may have influenced the video-transcription methodology results.

4.3.1.4. Tolve et al. (2002)—Frequency of Mouthing Behavior in Young Children

Tolve et al. (2002) coded the unpublished Davis et al. (1995) data for location (indoor and outdoor) and activity type (quiet or active) and analyzed the subset of the data that consisted of indoor mouthing behavior during quiet activity (72 children, ranging in age from 11 to 60 months). A total of one hundred

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

eighty-six 15-minute observation periods were included in the study, with the number of observation periods per child ranging from 1 to 6. Tolve et al. (2002) used the Davis et al. (1995) data from which the children were selected randomly based on date of birth through a combination of birth certificate records and random digit dialing of residential telephone numbers.

Results of the data analyses indicated that there was no association between mouthing frequency and sex, but a clear association between mouthing frequency and age was observed. The analysis indicated that children ≤ 24 months had the highest frequency of mouthing behavior (81 events/hour) and that children > 24 months had the lowest (42 events/hour) (see Table 4-6). Both groups of children were observed to mouth toys and hands more frequently than household surfaces or body parts other than hands.

An advantage of this study is that the randomized design may mean that the children studied were relatively representative of young children living in the study area, although they may not be representative of the U.S. population. Due to the ages of the children studied, the observers' use of headphones and manual recording of mouthing behavior on observation sheets may have influenced the children's behavior.

4.3.1.5. AuYeung et al. (2004)—Young Children's Mouthing Behavior: An Observational Study via Videotaping in a Primarily Outdoor Residential Setting

AuYeung et al. (2004) used a video-transcription methodology to study a group of 38 children (20 females and 18 males; ages 1 to 6 years), 37 of whom were selected randomly via a telephone screening survey of a 300 to 400 square mile portion of the San Francisco, CA peninsula, along with one child selected by convenience because of time constraints. Families who lived in a residence with a lawn and whose annual income was $> \$35,000$ were asked to participate. Videotaping took place between August 1998 and May 1999 for approximately two hours per child. Videotaping by one researcher was supplemented with field notes taken by a second researcher who also was present during taping. Most of the videotaping took place during outdoor play, however, data were included for several children (one child < 2 years old and eight children > 2 years old) who had more than 15 minutes of indoor play during their videotaping sessions.

The videotapes were translated into American Standard Code for Information Interchange (ASCII)

computer files using Virtual Timing Device™ software described in Zartarian et al. (1997b). Both frequency and duration (see Section 4.4.2.5 of this chapter) were analyzed. Between 5% and 10% of the data files translated were randomly chosen for quality control checks for inter-observer agreement. Ferguson et al. (2006) described quality control aspects of the study in detail.

For analysis, the mouthing contacts were divided into indoor and outdoor locations and 16 object/surface categories. Mouthing frequency was analyzed by age and sex separately and in combination. Mouthing contacts were defined as contact with the lips, inside of the mouth, and/or the tongue; dietary contacts were ignored. Table 4-7 shows mouthing frequencies for indoor locations. For the one child observed that was ≤ 24 months of age, the total mouthing frequency was 84.8 contacts/hour; for children > 24 months, the median indoor mouthing frequency was 19.5 contacts/hour. Outdoor median mouthing frequencies (see Table 4-8) were very similar for children ≤ 24 months of age (13.9 contacts/hour) and > 24 months (14.6 contacts/hour).

Non-parametric tests, such as the Wilcoxon rank sum test, were used for the data analyses. Both age and sex were found to be associated with differences in mouthing behavior. Girls had significantly higher frequencies of mouthing contacts with the hands and non-dietary objects than boys ($p = 0.01$ and $p = 0.008$, respectively).

This study provides distributions of outdoor mouthing frequencies with a variety of objects and surfaces. Although indoor mouthing data also were included in this study, the results were based on a small number of children ($N = 9$) and a limited amount of indoor play. The sample of children may be representative of certain socioeconomic strata in the study area, but it is not likely to be representative of the national population. Because of the children's ages, the presence of unfamiliar persons following the children with a video camera may have influenced the video-transcription methodology results.

4.3.1.6. Black et al. (2005)—Children's Mouthing and Food-Handling Behavior in an Agricultural Community on the U.S./Mexico Border

Black et al. (2005) studied mouthing behavior of children in a Mexican-American community along the Rio Grande River in Texas, during the spring and summer of 2000, using a survey response and a video-transcription methodology. A companion study

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

of this community (Shalat et al., 2003) identified 870 occupied households during the April 2000 U.S. Census and contacted 643 of these via in-person interview to determine the presence of children under the age of 3 years. Of the 643 contacted, 91 had at least one child under the age of 3 years (Shalat et al., 2003). Of these 91 households, the mouthing and food-handling behavior of 52 children (26 boys and 26 girls) from 29 homes was videotaped, and the children's parents answered questions about children's hygiene, mouthing and food-handling activities (Black et al., 2005). The study was of children ages 7 to 53 months, grouped into four age categories: infants (7 to 12 months), 1-year olds (13 to 24 months), 2-year olds (25 to 36 months), and preschoolers (37 to 53 months).

The survey asked questions about children's ages, sexes, reported hand-washing, mouthing and food-handling behavior ($N = 52$), and activities ($N = 49$). Parental reports of thumb/finger placement in the mouth showed decreases with age. The researchers attempted to videotape each child for 4 hours. The children were followed by the videographers through the house and yard, except for times when they were napping or using the bathroom. Virtual Timing Device™ software, mentioned earlier, was used to analyze the videotapes.

Based on the results of videotaping, most of the children (49 of 52) spent the majority of their time indoors. Of the 39 children who spent time both indoors and outdoors, all three behaviors (hand-to-mouth, object-to-mouth and food handling) were more frequent and longer while the child was indoors. Hand-to-mouth activity was recorded during videotaping for all but one child, a 30 month old girl.

For the four age groups, the mean hourly hand-to-mouth frequency ranged from 11.9 (2-year olds) to 22.1 (preschoolers), and the mean hourly object-to-mouth frequency ranged from 7.8 (2-year olds) to 24.4 (infants). No significant linear trends were seen with age or sex for hand-to-mouth hourly frequency. A significant linear trend was observed for hourly object-to-mouth frequency, which decreased as age increased (adjusted $R^2 = 0.179$; $p = 0.003$). Table 4-9 shows the results of this study.

Because parental survey reports were not strongly correlated with videotaped hand or object mouthing, the authors suggested that future research might include alternative methods of asking about mouthing behavior to improve the correlation of questionnaire data with videotaped observations.

One advantage of this study is that it compared survey responses with videotaped information on mouthing behavior. A limitation is that the sample

was fairly small and was from a limited area (mid-Rio Grande Valley) and is not likely to be representative of the national population. Because of the children's ages, the presence of unfamiliar persons following the children with a video camera may have influenced the video-transcription methodology results.

4.3.1.7. *Xue et al. (2007)—A Meta-Analysis of Children's Hand-to-Mouth Frequency Data for Estimating Non-Dietary Ingestion Exposure*

Xue et al. (2007) gathered hand-to-mouth frequency data from nine available studies representing 429 subjects and more than 2,000 hours of behavior observation (Beamer et al., 2008; Black et al., 2005; Hore, 2003; Greene, 2002; Tulve et al., 2002; Freeman et al., 2001; Leckie et al., 2000; Reed et al., 1999; Zartarian et al., 1998). Two of these studies [i.e., Leckie et al. (2000); Hore (2003)] are unpublished data sets and are not summarized in this chapter. The remaining seven studies are summarized elsewhere in this chapter. Xue et al. (2007) conducted a meta-analysis to study differences in hand-to-mouth behavior. The purpose of the analysis was to

1. examine differences across studies by age [using the new U.S. EPA recommended age groupings (U.S. EPA, 2005)], sex, and indoor/outdoor location;
2. fit variability distributions to the available hand-to-mouth frequency data for use in one-dimensional Monte Carlo exposure assessments;
3. fit uncertainty distributions to the available hand-to-mouth frequency data for use in two-dimensional Monte Carlo exposure assessments; and
4. assess hand-to-mouth frequency data needs using the new U.S. EPA recommended age groupings (U.S. EPA, 2005).

The data were sorted into age groupings. Visual inspection of the data and statistical methods (i.e., method of moments and maximum likelihood estimation) were used, and goodness-of-fit tests were applied to verify the selection among lognormal, Weibull, and normal distributions (Xue et al., 2007). Analyses to study inter- and intra-individual variability of indoor and outdoor hand-to-mouth frequency were conducted. It was found that age and location (indoor vs. outdoor) were important factors

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

contributing to hand-to-mouth frequency, but study and sex were not (Xue et al., 2007). Distributions of hand-to-mouth frequencies were developed for both indoor and outdoor activities. Table 4-10 presents distributions for indoor settings while Table 4-11 presents distributions for outdoor settings. Hand-to-mouth frequencies decreased for both indoor and outdoor activity as age increased, and they were higher indoors than outdoors for all age groups (Xue et al., 2007).

A strength of this study is that it is the first effort to fit hand-to-mouth distributions of children in different locations while using U.S. EPA's recommended age groups. Limitations of the studies used in this meta-analysis apply to the results from the meta-analysis as well; the uncertainty analysis in this study does not account for uncertainties arising out of differences in approaches used in the various studies used in the meta-analysis.

4.3.1.8. Beamer et al. (2008)—Quantified Activity Pattern Data From 6 to 27-Month-Old Farm Worker Children for Use in Exposure Assessment

Beamer et al. (2008) conducted a follow-up to the pilot study performed by Zartarian et al. (1998, 1997a; 1997b), described in Sections 4.3.1.1 and 4.4.2.2. For this study, a convenience sample of 23 children residing in the farm worker community of Salinas Valley, CA, was enrolled. Participants were 6- to 13-month-old infants or 20- to 26-month-old toddlers. Two researchers videotaped each child's activities for a minimum of 4 hours and kept a detailed written log of locations visited and objects and surfaces contacted by the child. A questionnaire was administered to an adult in the household to acquire demographic data, housing and cleaning characteristics, eating patterns, and other information pertinent to the child's potential pesticide exposure.

Table 4-12 presents the distribution of object/surface contact frequency for infants and toddlers in events/hour. The mean hand-to-mouth frequency was 18.4 events/hour. The mean mouthing frequency of non-dietary objects was 29.2 events/hour. Table 4-13 presents the distributions for the mouthing frequency and duration of non-dietary objects, and it highlights the differences between infants and toddlers. Toddlers had higher mouthing frequencies with non-dietary items associated with pica (i.e., paper) while infants had higher mouthing frequencies with other non-dietary objects. In addition, boys had higher mouthing frequencies than girls. The advantage of this study is that it included both infants and toddlers.

Differences between the two age groups, as well as sex differences, could be observed. As with other video-transcription studies, the presence of non-family-member videographers and a video camera may have influenced the children's behavior.

4.3.1.9. Xue et al. (2010)—A Meta-Analysis of Children's Object-to-Mouth Frequency Data for Estimating Non-Dietary Ingestion Exposure

Xue et al. (2010) gathered object-to-mouth frequency data from 7 available studies representing 438 subjects and approximately 1,500 hours of behavior observation. The studies used in this analysis included six published studies that were also individually summarized in this chapter (Beamer et al., 2008; AuYeung et al., 2004; Greene, 2002; Tulve et al., 2002; Freeman et al., 2001; Reed et al., 1999) as well as one unpublished data set (Hore, 2003). These data were used to conduct a meta-analysis to study differences in object-to-mouth behavior. The purpose of the analysis was to

1. "examine differences across studies by age [using the new U.S. EPA recommended age groupings (U.S. EPA, 2005)], sex, and indoor/outdoor location;
2. fit variability distributions to the available object to-mouth frequency data for use in one dimensional Monte Carlo exposure assessments;
3. fit uncertainty distributions to the available object-to-mouth frequency data for use in two dimensional Monte Carlo exposure assessments; and
4. assess object-to-mouth frequency data needs using the new U.S. EPA recommended age groupings (U.S. EPA, 2005)."

The data were sorted into age groupings. Visual inspection of the data and statistical methods (i.e., method of moments and maximum likelihood estimation) were used, and goodness-of-fit tests were applied to verify the selection among lognormal, Weibull, and normal distributions (Xue et al., 2010). Analyses to study inter- and intra-individual variability of indoor and outdoor object-to-mouth frequency were conducted. It was found that age, location (indoor vs. outdoor), and study were important factors contributing to object-to-mouth frequency, but study and sex were not (Xue et al., 2010). Distributions of object-to-mouth frequencies

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

were developed for both indoor and outdoor activities. Table 4-14 presents distributions for indoor settings while Table 4-15 presents distributions for outdoor settings. Object-to-mouth frequencies decreased for both indoor and outdoor activity as age increased (i.e., after age <6 to 12 months for indoor activity; and after <3 to 6 years for outdoor activity), and were higher indoors than outdoors for all age groups (Xue et al., 2010).

A strength of this study is that it is the first effort to fit object-to-mouth distributions of children in different locations while using U.S. EPA's recommended age groups. Limitations of the studies used in this meta-analysis apply to the results from the meta-analysis as well; the uncertainty analysis in this study does not account for uncertainties arising out of differences in approaches used in the various studies used in the meta-analysis.

4.3.2. Relevant Studies of Mouthing Frequency

4.3.2.1. *Davis et al. (1995)—Soil Ingestion in Children With Pica: Final Report*

In 1992, under a Cooperative Agreement with U.S. EPA, the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center conducted a survey response and real-time hand recording study of mouthing behavior data. The study included 92 children (46 males, 46 females) ranging in age from <12 months to 60 months, from Richland, Kennewick, and Pasco, WA. The children were selected randomly based on date of birth through a combination of birth certificate records and random digit dialing of residential telephone numbers. For each child, data were collected in one 7-day period during January to April, 1992. Eligibility included residence within the city limits, residence duration >1 month, and at least one parent or guardian who spoke English. Most of the adults who responded to the survey reported their marital status as being married (90%), their race as Caucasian (89%), their household income in the >\$30,000 range (56%), or their housing status as single-family home occupants (69%).

The survey asked questions about thumb-sucking and frequency questions about pacifier use, placing fingers, hands and feet in the mouth, and mouthing of furniture, railings, window sills, floor, dirt, sand, grass, rocks, mud, clothes, toys, crayons, pens, and other items. Table 4-16 shows the survey responses for the 92 study children. For most of the children in the study, the mouthing behavior real-time hand recording data were collected simultaneously by parents and by trained observers who described and quantified the mouthing behavior of the children in their home environment. The observers recorded

mouth and tongue contacts with hands, other body parts, natural objects, surfaces, and toys every 15 seconds during 15-minute observation periods spread over 4 days. Parents and trained observers wore headphones that indicated elapsed time (Davis et al., 1995). If all attempted observation periods were successful, each child would have a total of sixteen 15-minute observation periods with sixty 15-second intervals per 15-minute observation period, or nine hundred sixty 15-second intervals in all. The number of successful intervals of observation ranged from 0 to 840 per child. Comparisons of the inter-observer reliability between the trained observers and parents showed

“a high degree of correlation between the overall degree of both mouth and tongue activity recorded by parents and observers. For total mouth activity, there was a significant correlation between the rankings obtained according to parents and observers, and parents were able to identify the same individuals as observers as being most and least oral in 60% of the cases” (Davis et al., 1995).

One advantage of this study is the simultaneous observations by both, parents and trained observers, that allow comparisons regarding the consistency of the recorded observations. The random nature in which the population was selected may provide a representative population of the study area, within certain limitations, but not of the national population. In addition, this study was considered relevant because the data were not analyzed for deriving estimates of mouthing contact. These data were analyzed by Tulve et al. (2002) (see Section 4.3.1.4). Simultaneous collection of food, medication, fecal, and urine samples that occurred as part of the overall study (not described in this summary) may have contributed a degree of deviation from normal routines within the households during the 7 days of data collection and may have influenced children's usual behaviors. Wearing of headphones by parents and trained observers during mouthing observations, presence of non-family-member observers, and parents' roles as observers as well as caregivers also may have influenced the results; the authors state “Having the child play naturally while being observed was challenging. Usually the first day of observation was the most difficult in this respect, and by the third or fourth day of observation the child generally paid little attention to the observers.”

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

4.3.2.2. Lew and Butterworth (1997)—*The Development of Hand-Mouth Coordination in 2- to 5-Month-Old Infants: Similarities With Reaching and Grasping*

Lew and Butterworth (1997) studied 14 infants (10 males, 4 females; mostly first-borns) in Stirling, United Kingdom, in 1990 using a video-transcription methodology. Attempts were made to study each infant within 1 week of the infant's 2-, 3-, 4-, and 5-month birthdays. After becoming accustomed to the testing laboratory, and with their mothers present, infants were placed in semi-reclining seats and filmed during an experimental protocol in which researchers placed various objects into the infants' hands. Infants were observed for two baseline periods of 2 minutes each. The researchers coded all contacts to the face and mouth that occurred during baseline periods (prior to and after the object handling period) as well as contacts occurring during the object handling period. Hand-to-mouth contacts included contacts that landed directly in or on the mouth as well as those in which the hand landed on the face first and then moved to the mouth. The researchers assessed inter-observer agreement using a rater not involved with the study, for a random proportion (approximately 10%) of the movements documented during the object handling period, and reported inter-observer agreement of 0.90 using Cohen's kappa for the location of contacts. The frequency of contacts ranged between zero and one contact per minute.

The advantages of this study were that use of video cameras could be expected to have minimal effect on infant behavior for infants of these ages, and the researchers performed tests of inter-observer reliability. A disadvantage is that the study included baseline observation periods of only 2 minutes' duration, during which spontaneous hand-to-mouth movements could be observed. The extent to which these infants' behavior is representative of other infants of these ages is unknown.

4.3.2.3. Tudella et al. (2000)—*The Effect of Oral-Gustatory, Tactile-Buccal, and Tactile-Manual Stimulation on the Behavior of the Hands in Newborns*

Tudella et al. (2000) studied the frequency of hand-to-mouth contact, as well as other behaviors, in 24 full-term Brazilian newborns (10 to 14 days old) using a video-transcription methodology. Infants were in an alert state, in their homes in silent and previously heated rooms in a supine position and had been fed between 1 and 1 1/2 hours before testing. Infants were studied for a 4-minute baseline period without stimuli before experimental stimuli were

administered. Results from the four-minute baseline period, without stimuli, indicated that the mean frequency of hand-to-mouth contact (defined as right hand or left hand touching the lips or entering the buccal cavity, either with or without rhythmic jaw movements) was almost 3 right hand contacts and slightly more than 1.5 left hand contacts, for a total hand-to-mouth contact frequency of about 4 contacts in the 4-minute period. The researchers performed inter-observer reliability tests on the videotape data and reported an inter-coder Index of Concordance of 93%.

The advantages of this study were that use of video cameras could be expected to have virtually no effect on newborns' behavior, and inter-observer reliability tests were performed. However, the study data may not represent newborn hand-to-mouth contact during non-alert periods such as sleep. The extent to which these infants' behavior is representative of other full-term 10- to 14-day-old infants' behavior is unknown.

4.3.2.4. Ko et al. (2007)—*Relationships of Video Assessments of Touching and Mouthing Behaviors During Outdoor Play in Urban Residential Yards to Parental Perceptions of Child Behaviors and Blood Lead Levels*

Ko et al. (2007) compared parent survey responses with results from a video-transcription study of children's mouthing behavior in outdoor settings, as part of a study of relationships between children's mouthing behavior and other variables with blood lead levels. A convenience sample of 37 children (51% males, 49% females) 14 to 69 months old was recruited via an urban health center and direct contacts in the surrounding area, apparently in Chicago, IL. Participating children were primarily Hispanic (89%). The mouth area was defined as within 1 inch of the mouth, including the lips. Items passing beyond the lips were defined as in the mouth. Placement of an object or food item in the mouth along with part of the hand was counted as both hand and food or hand and object in mouth. Mouthing behaviors included hand-to-mouth area both with and without food, hand-in-mouth with or without food, and object-in-mouth including food, drinks, toys, or other objects.

Survey responses for the 37 children who also were videotaped included parents reporting children's inserting hand, toys, or objects in mouth when playing outside, and inserting dirt, stones, or sticks in mouth. Video-transcription results of outdoor play for these 37 children indicated 0 to 27 hand-in-mouth and 3 to 69 object-in-mouth touches per hour for the

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

13 children reported to frequently insert hand, toys, or objects in mouth when playing outside; 0 to 67 hand-in-mouth, and 7 to 40 object-in-mouth touches per hour for the 10 children reported to “sometimes” perform this behavior; 0 to 30 hand-in-mouth and 0 to 125 object in mouth touches per hour for the 12 children reported to “hardly ever” perform this behavior, and 1 to 8 hand-in-mouth and 3 to 6 object-in-mouth touches per hour for the 2 children reported to “never” perform this behavior.

Videotaping was attempted for 2 hours per child over two or more play sessions, with videographers trying to avoid interacting with the children. Children played with their usual toys and partners, and no instructions were given to parents regarding their supervision of the children’s play. The authors stated that during some portion of the videotape time, children’s hands and mouths were out of camera view. Videotape transcription was performed manually, according to a modified version of the protocol used in the Reed et al. (1999) study. Inter-observer reliability between three video-transcribers was checked with seven 30-minute video segments.

One strength of this study is its comparison of survey responses with results from the video-transcription methodology. A limitation is that the non-randomly selected sample of children studied is unlikely to be representative of the national population. Comparing results from this study with results from other video-transcription studies may be problematic because of inclusion of food handling with hand-to-mouth and object-to-mouth frequency counts. Due to the children’s ages, their behavior may have differed from normal patterns because of the presence of strangers who videotaped them.

4.3.2.5. Nicas and Best (2008)—A Study Quantifying the Hand-to-Face Contact Rate and Its Potential Application to Predicting Respiratory Tract Infection

Nicas and Best (2008) conducted an observational study on adults (five women and five men; ages not specified), in which individuals were videotaped while performing office-type work for a 3-hour period. The videotapes were viewed by the investigators, who counted the number of hand-to-face touches the subjects made while they worked on a laptop computer, read, or wrote. Following the observations, the sample mean and standard deviation were computed for the number of times each subject touched his or her eyes, nostrils, and lips. For the three combinations of touch frequencies (i.e., lips-eyes, lips-nostrils,

eyes-nostrils), Spearman rank correlation coefficients were computed and tests of the hypothesis that the rank correlation coefficients exceeded zero were performed.

Table 4-17 shows the frequency of hand-to-face contacts with the eyes, nostrils, and lips of the subjects, and the sum of these counts. There was considerable inter-individual variability among the subjects. During the 3-hour continuous study period, the total number of hand contacts with the eyes, lips and nostrils ranged from 3 to 104 for individual subjects, with a mean of 47. The mean per hour contact rate was 15.7. There was a positive correlation between the number of hand contacts with lips and eyes and with lips and nostrils (subjects who touched their lips frequently also touched their eyes and nostrils frequently). The Spearman rank correlation coefficients for contacts between different facial targets were 0.76 for the lips and eyes; 0.66 for the lips and nostrils, and 0.44 for the eyes and nostrils.

The study’s primary purpose was to quantify hand-to-face contacts in order to determine the application of this contact rate in predicting respiratory tract infection. The authors developed an algebraic model for estimating the dose of pathogens transferred to target facial membranes during a defined exposure period. The advantage of this study is that it determined the frequency of hand-to-face contacts for adults. A limitation of the study is that there were very few subjects (five women and five men) who may not have been representative of the U.S. population. In addition, as with other video-transcription studies, the presence of videographers and a video camera may have influenced the subjects’ behaviors.

4.4. NON-DIETARY INGESTION—MOUTHING DURATION STUDIES

4.4.1. Key Mouthing Duration Studies

4.4.1.1. Juberg et al. (2001)—An Observational Study of Object Mouthing Behavior by Young Children

Juberg et al. (2001) studied 385 children ages 0 to 36 months in western New York State, with parents collecting real-time hand-recording mouthing behavior data, primarily in the children’s own home environments. The study consisted of an initial pilot study conducted in February 1998, a second phase conducted in April 1998, and a third phase conducted at an unspecified later time. The study’s sample was drawn from families identified in a child play research center database or whose children attended a child care facility in the same general area; some

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

geographic variation within the local area was obtained by selecting families with different zip codes in the different study phases. The pilot phase had 30 children who participated out of 150 surveys distributed; the second phase had 187 children out of approximately 300 surveys distributed, and the third phase had 168 participants out of 300 surveys distributed.

Parents were asked to observe their child's mouthing of objects only; hand-to-mouth behavior was not included. Data were collected on a single day (pilot and second phases) or 5 days (third phase); parents recorded the insertion of objects into the mouth by noting the "time in" and "time out" and the researchers summed the recorded data to tabulate total times spent mouthing the various objects during the days of observation. Thus, the study data were presented as minutes per day of object mouthing time. Mouthed items were classified as pacifiers, teething rings, plastic toys, or other objects.

Table 4-18 shows the results of the combined pilot and second phase data. For both age groups, mouthing time for pacifiers greatly exceeded mouthing time for non-pacifiers, with the difference more acute for the older age group than for the younger age group. Histograms of the observed data show a peak in the low end of the distribution (0 to 100 minutes per day) and a rapid decline at longer durations.

A third phase of the study focused on children between the ages of 3 and 18 months and included only non-pacifier objects. Subjects were observed for 5 non-consecutive days over a 2-month period. A total of 168 participants returned surveys for at least one day, providing a total of 793 person-days of data. The data yielded a mean non-pacifier object mouthing duration of 36 minutes per day; the mean was the same when calculated on the basis of 793 person-days of data as on the basis of 168 daily average mouthing times.

One advantage of this study is the large sample size (385 children); however, the children apparently were not selected randomly, although some effort was made to obtain local geographic variation among study participants. There is no description of the socioeconomic status or racial and ethnic identities of the study participants. The authors do not describe the methodology parents used to record mouthing event durations (e.g., using stopwatches, analog or digital clocks, or guesses). The authors stated that using mouthing event duration units of minutes rather than seconds may have yielded observations rounded to the nearest minute.

4.4.1.2. Greene (2002)—A Mouthing Observation Study of Children Under Six Years of Age

The U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission conducted a survey response and real-time hand recording study between December 1999 and February 2001 to quantify the cumulative time per day that young children spend awake, not eating, and mouthing objects. "Mouthing" was defined as children sucking, chewing, or otherwise putting an object on their lips or into their mouth. Participants were recruited via a random digit dialing telephone survey in urban and nearby rural areas of Houston, TX and Chicago, IL. Of the 115,289 households surveyed, 1,745 households had a child under the age of 6 years and were willing to participate. In the initial phase of the study, 491 children ages 3 to 81 months participated. Parents were instructed to use watches with second hands or to count seconds to estimate mouthing event durations. Parents also were to record mouthing frequency and types of objects mouthed. Parents collected data in four separate, non-consecutive 15-minute observation periods. Initially, parents were called back by the researchers and asked to provide their data over the telephone. Of the 491 children, 43 children (8.8%) had at least one 15-minute observation period with mouthing event durations recorded as exceeding 15 minutes. Due to this data quality problem, the researchers excluded the parent observation data from further analysis.

In a second phase, trained observers used stopwatches to record the mouthing behaviors and mouthing event durations of the subset of 109 of these children ages 3 to 36 months and an additional 60 children (total in second phase, 169), on 2 hours of each of 2 days. The observations were done at different times of the day at the child's home and/or child care facility. Table 4-19 shows the prevalence of observed mouthing among the 169 children in the second phase. All children were observed to mouth during the 4 hours of observation time; 99% mouthed parts of their anatomy. Pacifiers were mouthed by 27% in an age-declining pattern ranging from 47% of children less than 12 months old to 10% of the 2- to <3-year olds.

Table 4-20 provides the average mouthing time by object category and age in minutes per hour. The average mouthing time for all objects ranged from 5.3 to 10.5 minutes per hour, with the highest mouthing time corresponding to children <1 year of age and the lowest to the 2 to <3 years of age category. Among the objects mouthed, pacifiers represented about one third of the total mouthing time, with 3.4 minutes per hour for the youngest children, 2.6 minutes per hour for the children

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

between 1 and 2 years and 1.8 minutes per hour for children 2 to <3 years old. The next largest single item category was anatomy. In this category, children under 1 year of age spent 2.4 minutes per hour mouthing fingers and thumbs; this behavior declined with age to 1.2 minutes per hour for children 2 to <3 years old.

Of the 169 children in the second phase, data were usable on the time awake and not eating (or “exposure time”) for only 109; data for the remaining 60 children were missing. Thus, in order to develop extrapolated estimates of daily mouthing time for the 109 children, from the 2 hours of observation per day for two days, the researchers developed a statistical model that accounted for the children’s demographic characteristics, that estimated exposure times for the 60 children with missing data, and then computed statistics for the extrapolated daily mouthing times for all 169 children, using a “bootstrap” procedure. Using this method, the estimated mean daily mouthing time of objects other than pacifiers ranged from 37 minutes/day to 70 minutes/day with the lowest number corresponding to the 2 to <3-year-old children and the largest number corresponding to the 3 to <12-month-old children.

The 551 child participants were 55% males, 45% females. The study’s sample was drawn in an attempt to duplicate the overall U.S. demographic characteristics with respect to race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status and urban/suburban/rural settings. The sample families’ reported annual incomes were generally higher than those of the overall U.S. population.

This study’s strength was that it consisted of a randomly selected sample of children from both urban and non-urban areas in two different geographic areas within the United States. However, the observers’ presence and use of a stopwatch to time mouthing durations may have affected the children’s behavior.

4.4.1.3. *Beamer et al. (2008)—Quantified Activity Pattern Data From 6- to 27-Month-Old Farm Worker Children for Use in Exposure Assessment*

Beamer et al. (2008) conducted a follow-up to the pilot study performed by Zartarian et al. (1998, 1997a; 1997b), described in Sections 4.3.1.1 and 4.4.2.2. For this study, a convenience sample of 23 children residing in the farm worker community of Salinas Valley, CA was enrolled. Participants were 6- to 13-month-old infants or 20- to 26-month-old toddlers. Two researchers videotaped each child’s activities for a minimum of 4 hours, and kept a

detailed written log of locations visited and objects and surfaces contacted by the child. A questionnaire was administered to an adult in the household to acquire demographic data, housing and cleaning characteristics, eating patterns, and other information pertinent to the child’s potential pesticide exposure.

Table 4-21 presents the object/surface hourly contact duration in minutes/hour. The mean hourly mouthing duration for hands and non-dietary objects was 1.4 and 3.5 minutes/hour, respectively. Infants had higher hourly mouthing duration with toys and all non-dietary objects than toddlers. Girls had higher contact durations than boys.

The advantage of this study is that it included both infants and toddlers. Differences between the two age groups, as well as sex differences, could be observed. As with other video-transcription studies, the presence of non-family-member videographers and a video camera may have influenced the children’s behavior.

4.4.2. Relevant Mouthing Duration Studies

4.4.2.1. *Barr et al. (1994)—Effects of Intra-Oral Sucrose on Crying, Mouthing, and Hand-Mouth Contact in Newborn and Six-Week-Old Infants*

Barr et al. (1994) studied hand-to-mouth contact, as well as other behaviors, in 15 newborn (eight males, seven females) and fifteen 5- to 7-week old (eight males, seven females) full-term Canadian infants using a video-transcription methodology. The newborns were 2- to 3-days old, were in a quiet, temperature-controlled room at the hospital, were in a supine position and had been fed between 2 1/2 and 3 1/2 hours before testing. Barr et al. (1994) analyzed a 1-minute baseline period, with no experimental stimuli, immediately before a sustained crying episode lasting 15 seconds. For the newborns, reported durations of hand-to-mouth contact during 10-second intervals of the 1-minute baseline period were in the range of 0 to 2%. The 5- to 7-week old infants apparently were studied at primary care pediatric facilities when they were in bassinets inclined at an angle of 10 degrees. For these slightly older infants, the baseline periods analyzed were less than 20 seconds in length, but Barr et al. (1994) reported similarly low mean percentages of the 10-second intervals (approximately 1% of the time with hand-to-mouth contact). Hand-to-mouth contact was defined as “any part of the hand touching the lips and/or the inside of the mouth.” The researchers performed inter-observer reliability tests on the videotape data and reported a mean inter-observer reliability of 0.78 by Cohen’s kappa.

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

The advantages of this study were that use of video cameras could be expected to have virtually no effect on newborns' or five to seven week old infants' behavior, and that inter-observer reliability tests were performed. The study data did not represent newborn or 5- to 7-week-old infant hand-to-mouth contact during periods in which infants of these ages were in a sleeping or other non-alert state, and data may only represent behavior immediately prior to a state of distress (sustained crying episode). The extent to which these infants' behavior is representative of other full-term infants of these ages is unknown.

4.4.2.2. Zartarian et al. (1997b)—Quantifying Videotaped Activity Patterns: Video Translation Software and Training Technologies/Zartarian et al. (1997a)—Quantified Dermal Activity Data From a Four-Child Pilot Field Study/Zartarian et al. (1998)—Quantified Mouthing Activity Data From a Four-Child Pilot Field Study

As described in Section 4.3.1.1, Zartarian et al. (1998, 1997a; 1997b) conducted a pilot study of the video-transcription methodology to investigate the applicability of using videotaping for gathering information related to children's activities, dermal exposures and mouthing behaviors. The researchers had conducted studies using the real-time hand recording methodology. These studies demonstrated poor inter-observer reliability and observer fatigue when attempted for long periods of time. This prompted the investigation into using videotaping with transcription of the children's activities at a point in time after the videotaped observations occurred.

Four Mexican-American farm worker children in the Salinas Valley of California each were videotaped with a hand-held videocamera during their waking hours, excluding time spent in the bathroom, over 1 day in September 1993. The boys were 2 years 10 months old and 3 years 9 months old; the girls were 2 years 5 months old and 4 years 2 months old. Time of videotaping was 6.0 hours for the younger girl, 6.6 hours for the older girl, 8.4 hours for the younger boy and 10.1 hours for the older boy. The videotaping gathered information on detailed micro-activity patterns of children to be used to evaluate software for videotaped activities and translation training methods.

The four children mouthed non-dietary objects an average of 4.35% (range 1.41 to 7.67%) of the total observation time, excluding the time during which the children were out of the camera's view (Zartarian et al., 1998). Objects mouthed included

bedding/towels, clothes, dirt, grass/vegetation, hard surfaces, hard toys, paper/card, plush toy, and skin (Zartarian et al., 1998). Frequency distributions for the four children's non-dietary object contact durations were reported to be similar in shape. Reported hand-to-mouth contact presumably is a subset of the object-to-mouth contacts described in Zartarian et al. (1997b), and is described in Zartarian et al. (1997a). The four children mouthed their hands an average of 2.35% (range 1.0 to 4.4%) of observation time (Zartarian et al., 1997a). The researchers reported measures taken to assess inter-observer reliability and several problems with the video-transcription process.

This study's primary purpose was to develop and evaluate the video-transcription methodology; a secondary purpose was collection of mouthing behavior data. The sample of children studied was very small and not likely to be representative of the national population. Thus, U.S. EPA did not judge it to be suitable for consideration as a key study of children's mouthing behavior. As with other video-transcription studies, the presence of non-family member videographers and a video camera may have influenced the children's behavior.

4.4.2.3. Groot et al. (1998)—Mouthing Behavior of Young Children: An Observational Study

In this study, Groot et al. (1998) examined the mouthing behavior of 42 Dutch children (21 boys and 21 girls) between the ages of 3 and 36 months in late July and August 1998. Parent observations were made of children in 36 families. Parents were asked to observe their children 10 times per day for 15-minute intervals (i.e., 150 minutes total per day) for two days and measure mouthing times with a stopwatch. In this study, *mouthing* was defined as "all activities in which objects are touched by mouth or put into the mouth except for eating and drinking. This term includes licking as well as sucking, chewing and biting."

For the study, a distinction was made between toys meant for mouthing (e.g., pacifiers, teething rings) and those not meant for mouthing. Inter- and intra-observer reliability was measured by trained observers who co-observed a portion of observation periods in three families and who co-observed and repeatedly observed some video transcriptions made of one child. Another quality assurance procedure performed for the extrapolated total mouthing time data was to select 12 times per hour randomly during the entire waking period of four children during 1 day, in which the researchers recorded activities and total mouthing times.

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

Although the sample size was relatively small, the results provided estimates of mouthing times, other than pacifier use, during 1 day. The results were extrapolated to the entire day based on the 150 minutes of observation per day, and the mean value for each child for the 2 days of observations was interpreted as the estimate for that child. Table 4-22 shows summary statistics. The standard deviation in all four age categories except the 3- to 6-month old children exceeded the estimated mean. The 3 to 6 month children ($N = 5$) were estimated to have mean non-pacifier mouthing durations of 36.9 minutes per day, with toys as the most frequently mouthed product category, while the 6 to 12 month children ($N = 14$) were estimated to have 44 minutes per day (fingers most frequently mouthed). The 12- to 18-month olds' ($N = 12$) estimated mean non-pacifier mouthing time was 16.4 minutes per day, with fingers most frequently mouthed, and 18- to 36-month olds' ($N = 11$) estimated mean non-pacifier mouthing time was 9.3 minutes per day (fingers most frequently mouthed).

One strength of this study is that the researchers recognized that observing children might affect their behavior and emphasized to the parents the importance of making observations under conditions that were as normal as possible. In spite of these efforts, many parents perceived that their children's behavior was affected by being observed and that observation interfered with caregiving responsibilities such as comforting children when they were upset. Other limitations included a small sample size that was not representative of the Dutch population and that also may not be representative of U.S. children. Technical problems with the stopwatches affected at least 14 of 36 parents' data.

4.4.2.4. *Smith and Norris (2003)—Reducing the Risk of Choking Hazards: Mouthing Behavior of Children Aged 1 Month to 5 Years/Norris and Smith (2002)—Research Into the Mouthing Behavior of Children up to 5 Years Old*

Smith and Norris (2003) conducted a real-time hand recording study of mouthing behavior among 236 children (111 males, 125 females) in the United Kingdom (exact locations not specified) who were from 1 month to 5 years old. Children were observed at home by parents, who used stopwatches to record the time that mouthing began, the type of mouthing, the type of object being mouthed, and the time that mouthing ceased. Children were observed for a total of 5 hours over a 2-week period; the observation time

consisted of twenty 15-minute periods spread over different times and days during the child's waking hours. Parents also recorded the times each child was awake and not eating meals so that the researchers could extrapolate estimates of total daily mouthing time from the shorter observation periods. Mouthing was defined as licking/lip touching, sucking/trying to bite and biting or chewing, with a description of each category, together with pictures, given to parents as guidance for what to record.

Table 4-23 shows the results of the study. While no overall pattern could be found in the different age groups tested, a Kruskal-Wallis test on the data for all items mouthed indicated that there was a significant difference between the age groups. Across all age groups and types of items, licking and sucking accounted for 64% of all mouthing behavior. Pacifiers and fingers exhibited less variety on mouthing behavior (principally sucking), while other items had a higher frequency of licking, biting, or other mouthing.

The researchers randomly selected 25 of the 236 children for a single 15-minute observation of each child (total observation time across all children: 375 minutes), to compare the mouthing frequency and duration data obtained according to the real-time hand recording and the video-transcription methodologies, as well as the reliability of parent observations versus those made by trained professionals. For this group of 25 children, the total number of mouthing behavior events recorded by video (160) exceeded those recorded by parents (114) and trained observers (110). Similarly, the total duration recorded by video (24 minutes and 15 seconds) exceeded that recorded by observers (parents and trained observers both recorded identical totals of 19 minutes and 44 seconds). The mean and standard deviation of observed mouthing time were both lower when recorded by video versus real-time hand recording. The maximum observed mouthing time also was lower (6 minutes and 7 seconds by video vs. 9 minutes and 43 seconds for both parents and trained observers).

The strengths of this study were its comparison of three types of observation (i.e., parents, trained observers, and videotaping), and its detailed reporting of mouthing behaviors by type, object/item mouthed, and age group. However, the children studied may not be representative of U.S. children. In addition, the study design or approach made the data less applicable for exposure assessment purposes (e.g., data on mouthing behavior that was intended to be used in reducing the risk of choking hazards).

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

4.4.2.5. AuYeung et al. (2004)—Young Children’s Mouthing Behavior: An Observational Study via Videotaping in a Primarily Outdoor Residential Setting

As described in Section 4.3.1.5, AuYeung et al. (2004) used a video-transcription methodology to study a group of 38 children (20 females and 18 males; ages 1 to 6 years), 37 of whom were selected randomly via a telephone screening survey of a 300- to 400-square-mile portion of the San Francisco, CA peninsula, along with one child selected by convenience because of time constraints. Families who lived in a residence with a lawn and whose annual income was >\$35,000 were asked to participate. Videotaping took place between August 1998 and May 1999 for approximately 2 hours per child. Videotaping by one researcher was supplemented with field notes taken by a second researcher who was also present during taping. Most of the videotaping took place during outdoor play, however, data were included for several children (one child <2 years old and 8 children >2 years old) who had more than 15 minutes of indoor play during their videotaping sessions.

The videotapes were translated into ASCII computer files using VirtualTimingDevice™ software described in Zartarian et al. (1997b). Both frequency (see Section 4.3.1.5 of this chapter) and duration were analyzed. Between 5 and 10% of the translated data files were randomly chosen for quality control checks for inter-observer agreement. Ferguson et al. (2006) described quality control aspects of the study in detail.

For analysis, the mouthing contacts were divided into indoor and outdoor locations and 16 object/surface categories. Mouthing durations were analyzed by age and sex separately and in combination. *Mouthing contacts* were defined as contact with the lips, inside of the mouth, and/or the tongue; dietary contacts were ignored. Table 4-24 shows mouthing durations (outdoor locations). For the children in all age groups, the median duration of each mouthing contact was 1 to 2 seconds, confirming the observations of other researchers that children’s mouthing contacts are of very short duration. For the one child observed that was ≤24 months, the total indoor mouthing duration was 11.1 minutes/hour; for children >24 months, the median indoor mouthing duration was 0.9 minutes/hour (see Table 4-25). For outdoor environments, median contact durations for these age groups decreased to 0.8 and 0.6 minutes/hour, respectively (see Table 4-26).

Non-parametric tests, such as the Wilcoxon rank sum test, were used for the data analyses. Both age and sex were found to be associated with differences in mouthing behavior. Girls’ hand-to-mouth contact durations were significantly shorter than for boys ($p = 0.04$).

This study provides distributions of outdoor mouthing durations with various objects and surfaces. Although indoor mouthing data were also included in this study, the results were based on a small number of children ($N = 9$) and a limited amount of indoor play. The sample of children may be representative of certain socioeconomic strata in the study area, but is not likely to be representative of the national population. Because of the children’s ages, the presence of unfamiliar persons following the children with a video camera may have influenced the video-transcription methodology results.

4.5. MOUTHING PREVALENCE STUDIES**4.5.1. Stanek et al. (1998)—Prevalence of Soil Mouthing/Ingestion Among Healthy Children Aged 1 to 6**

Stanek et al. (1998) characterized the prevalence of mouthing behavior among healthy children based on a survey response study of parents or guardians of 533 children (289 females, 244 males) ages 1 to 6 years old. Study participants were attendees at scheduled well-child visits at three clinics in western Massachusetts in August through October, 1992. Participants were questioned about the frequency of 28 mouthing behaviors of the children over the preceding month in addition to exposure time (e.g., time outdoors, play in sand or dirt) and children’s characteristics (e.g., teething).

Table 4-27 presents the prevalence of reported non-food ingestion/mouthing behaviors by child’s age as the percentage of children whose parents reported the behavior in the preceding month. The table includes a column of data for the 3 to <6 year age category; this column was calculated by U.S. EPA as a weighted mean value of the individual data for 3-, 4-, and 5-year olds in order to conform to the standardized age categories used in this handbook. Among all the age groups, 1-year olds had the highest reported daily sucking of fingers/thumb; the proportion dropped for 2-year olds, but rose slightly for 3- and 4-year olds and declined again after age 4. A similar pattern was reported for more than weekly finger/thumb sucking, while more than monthly finger/thumb sucking showed a very slight increase for 6-year olds. Reported pacifier use was highest for 1-year olds and declined with age for daily and more than weekly use; for more than

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

monthly use of a pacifier several 6-year olds were reported to use pacifiers, which altered the age-declining pattern for the daily and more than weekly reported pacifier use. A pattern similar to pacifier use existed with reported mouthing of teething toys, with highest reported use for 1-year olds, a decline with age until age 6 when reported use for daily, more than weekly, and more than monthly use of teething toys increased.

The authors developed an outdoor mouthing rate for each child as the sum of rates for responses to four questions on mouthing specific outdoor objects. Survey responses were converted to mouthing rates per week, using values of 0, 0.25, 1, and 7 for responses of never, monthly, weekly, and daily ingestion. Reported outdoor soil mouthing behavior prevalence was found to be higher than reported indoor dust mouthing prevalence, but both behaviors had the highest reported prevalence among 1-year old children and decreased for children 2 years and older. The investigators conducted principal component analyses on responses to four questions relating to ingestion/mouthing of outdoor objects in an attempt to characterize variability. Outdoor ingestion/mouthing rates constructed from the survey responses were that children 1-year old were reported to mouth or ingest outdoor objects 4.73 times per week while 2- to 6-year olds were reported to mouth or ingest outdoor objects 0.44 times per week. The authors developed regression models to identify factors related to high outdoor mouthing rates. The authors found that children who were reported to play in sand or dirt had higher outdoor object ingestion/mouthing rates.

A strength of this study is that it was a large sample obtained in an area with urban and semi-urban residents within various socioeconomic categories and with varying racial and ethnic identities. However, difficulties with parents' recall of past events may have caused either over-estimates or under-estimates of the behaviors studied.

4.5.2. Warren et al. (2000)—Non-Nutritive Sucking Behaviors in Preschool Children: A Longitudinal Study

Warren et al. (2000) conducted a survey response study of a non-random cohort of children born in certain Iowa hospitals from early 1992 to early 1995 as part of a study of children's fluoride exposure. For this longitudinal study of children's non-nutritive sucking behaviors, 1,374 mothers were recruited at the time of their newborns' birth, and more than 600 were active in the study until the children were at least 3 years old. Survey questions

on non-nutritive sucking behaviors were administered to the mothers when the children were 6 weeks, and 3, 6, 9, 12, 16, and 24 months old, and then yearly after age 24 months. Questions were posed regarding the child's sucking behavior during the previous 3 to 12 months.

The authors reported that nearly all children sucked non-nutritive items, including pacifiers, thumbs or other fingers, and/or other objects, at some point in their early years. The parent-reported sucking behavior prevalence peaked at 91% for 3 month old children. At 2 years of age, a majority (53%) retained a sucking habit, while 29% retained the habit at age 3 years and 21% at age 4 years. Parent-reported pacifier use was 28% for 1-year olds, 25% for 2-year olds, and 10% for 3-year olds. The authors cautioned against generalizing the results to other children because of study design limitations.

Strengths of this study were its longitudinal design and the large sample size. A limitation is that the non-random selection of original study participants and the self-selected nature of the cohort of survey respondents who participated over time means that the results may not be representative of other U.S. children of these ages.

4.6. REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER 4

- AuYeung, W; Canales, R; Beamer, P; Ferguson, AC; Leckie, JO. (2004). Young children's mouthing behavior: An observational study via videotaping in a primarily outdoor residential setting. *J Child Health* 2: 271-295.
- Barr, RG; Quek, VSH; Cousineau, D; Oberlander, TF; Brian, JA; Young, SN. (1994). Effects of intra-oral sucrose on crying, mouthing and hand-mouth contact in newborn and six-week-old infants. *Dev Med Child Neurol* 36: 608-618.
- Beamer, P; Key, ME; Ferguson, AC; Canales, RA; Auyeung, W; Leckie, JO. (2008). Quantified activity pattern data from 6 to 27-month-old farmworker children for use in exposure assessment. *Environ Res* 108: 239-246. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2008.07.007>.
- Black, K; Shalat, SL; Freeman, NCG; Jimenez, M; Donnelly, KC; Calvin, JA. (2005). Children's mouthing and food-handling behavior in an agricultural community on the US/Mexico border. *J Expo Anal Environ Epidemiol* 15: 244-251. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/sj.jea.7500398>.

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

- Blass, EM; Fillion, TJ; Rochat, P; Hoffmeyer, LB; Metzger, MA. (1989). Sensorimotor and motivational determinants of hand-mouth coordination in 1-3-day-old human infants. *Dev Psychol* 25: 963-975. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037//0012-1649.25.6.963>.
- Cannella, HI; O'Reilly, MF; Lancioni, GE. (2006). Treatment of hand mouthing in individuals with severe to profound developmental disabilities: A review of the literature. *Res Dev Disabil* 27: 529-544. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2005.06.004>.
- Davis, S; Myers, PA; Kohler, E; Wiggins, C. (1995). Soil ingestion in children with pica: Final report. (U.S. EPA Cooperative Agreement CR 816334-01). Seattle, WA: Fred Hutchison Cancer Research Center.
- Ferguson, AC; Canales, RA; Beamer, P; Auyeung, W; Key, M; Munninghoff, A; Lee, KT; Robertson, A; Leckie, JO. (2006). Video methods in the quantification of children's exposures. *J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol* 16: 287-298. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/sj.jea.7500459>.
- Freeman, NCG; Jimenez, M; Reed, KJ; Gurunathan, S; Edwards, RD; Roy, A; Adgate, JL; Pellizzari, ED; Quackenboss, J; Sexton, K; Lioy, PJ. (2001). Quantitative analysis of children's microactivity patterns: the Minnesota children's pesticide exposure study. *J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol* 11: 501-509.
- Greene, MA. (2002). Mouthing times for children from the observational study. Bethesda, MD: U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.
- Groot, ME; Lekkerkerk, MC; Steenbekkers, LPA. (1998). Mouthing behavior of young children: An observational study. Wageningen, the Netherlands: Agricultural University.
- Hore, P. (2003) Pesticide accumulation patterns for child accessible surfaces and objects and urinary excretion by children for two weeks after a professional crack and crevice application. (Doctoral Dissertation). Rutgers University and the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey, Newark, NJ.
- Juberg, DR; Alfano, K; Coughlin, RJ; Thompson, KM. (2001). An observational study of object mouthing behavior by young children. *Pediatrics* 107: 135-142.
- Ko, S; Schaefer, PD; Vicario, CM; Binns, HJ; Safer Yards, P. (2007). Relationships of video assessments of touching and mouthing behaviors during outdoor play in urban residential yards to parental perceptions of child behaviors and blood lead levels. *J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol* 17: 47-57. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/sj.jes.7500519>.
- Leckie, JO; Naylor, KA; Canales, RA; Ferguson, AC; Cabrera, NL; Hurtado, AL; Lee, K; Lin, AY; Ramirez, JD; VM, V. (2000). Quantifying children's microlevel activity data from existing videotapes. (Reference No. U2F112OT-RT. 2000). Washington, DC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.
- Lepow, ML; Bruckman, L; Gillette, M; Markowitz, S; Robino, R; Kapish, J. (1975). Investigations into sources of lead in the environment of urban children. *Environ Res* 10: 415-426.
- Lew, AR; Butterworth, G. (1997). The development of hand-mouth coordination in 2-to 5-month-old infants: Similarities with reaching and grasping. *Infant Behav Dev* 20: 59-69.
- Nicas, M; Best, D. (2008). A study quantifying the hand-to-face contact rate and its potential application to predicting respiratory tract infection. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene (Online)* 5: 347-352. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15459620802003896>.
- Norris, B; Smith, S. (2002). Research into the mouthing behaviour of children up to 5 years old. London, England: Consumer and Competition Policy Directorate, Department of Trade and Industry.
- Reed, KJ; Jimenez, M; Freeman, NC; Lioy, PJ. (1999). Quantification of children's hand and mouthing activities through a videotaping methodology. *J Expo Anal Environ Epidemiol* 9: 513-520.
- Rochat, P; Blass, EM; Hoffmeyer, LB. (1988). Oropharyngeal control of hand-mouth coordination in newborn infants. *Dev Psychol* 24: 459-463. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037//0012-1649.24.4.459>.
- Shalat, SL; Donnelly, KC; Freeman, NCG; Calvin, JA; Ramesh, S; Jimenez, M; Black, K; Coutinho, C; Needham, LL; Barr, DB; Ramirez, J. (2003). Nondietary ingestion of pesticides by children in an agricultural community on the US/Mexico border: preliminary results. *J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol* 13: 42-50. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/sj.jea.7500249>.

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

- Smith, SA; Norris, B. (2003). Reducing the risk of choking hazards: mouthing behaviour of children aged 1 month to 5 years. *Inj Contr Saf Promot* 10: 145-154. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1076/icsp.10.3.145.1456>
- Stanek, EJ, III; Calabrese, EJ; Mundt, K; Pekow, P; Yeatts, KB. (1998). Prevalence of soil mouthing/ingestion among healthy children aged 1 to 6. *Journal of Soil Contamination* 7: 227-242.
- Takaya, R; Yukuo, K; Bos, AF; Einspieler, C. (2003). Preterm to early postterm changes in the development of hand-mouth contact and other motor patterns. *Early Hum Dev* 75 Suppl: S193-S202.
- Tudella, E; Oishi, J; Puglia Bergamasco, NH. (2000). The effect of oral-gustatory, tactile-bucal, and tactile-manual stimulation on the behavior of the hands in newborns. *Dev Psychobiol* 37: 82-89. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/1098-2302\(200009\)37:2<82::AID-DEV3>3.0.CO;2-B](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/1098-2302(200009)37:2<82::AID-DEV3>3.0.CO;2-B).
- Tulve, NS; Suggs, JC; McCurdy, T; Cohen Hubal, EA; Moya, J. (2002). Frequency of mouthing behavior in young children. *J Expo Anal Environ Epidemiol* 12: 259-264. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/sj.jea.7500225>.
- U.S. EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). (2005). Guidance on selecting age groups for monitoring and assessing childhood exposures to environmental contaminants (final). (EPA/630/P-03/003F). Washington, DC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Risk Assessment Forum. <http://www.epa.gov/raf/publications/guidance-on-selecting-age-groups.htm>.
- U.S. EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). (2009). Draft technical guidelines: Standard operating procedures for residential pesticide exposure assessment: Submitted to the FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel for review and comment, October 6-9, 2009. <http://www.biospotvictims.org/EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0516-0002.pdf>.
- Warren, JJ; Levy, SM; Nowak, AJ; Tang, S. (2000). Non-nutritive sucking behaviors in preschool children: a longitudinal study. *Pediatr Dent* 22: 187-191.
- Xue, J; Zartarian, V; Moya, J; Freeman, N; Beamer, P; Black, K; Tulve, N; Shalat, S. (2007). A meta-analysis of children's hand-to-mouth frequency data for estimating nondietary ingestion exposure. *Risk Anal* 27: 411-420. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2007.00893.x>.
- Xue, J; Zartarian, V; Tulve, N; Moya, J; Freeman, N; Auyeung, W; Beamer, P. (2010). A meta-analysis of children's object-to-mouth frequency data for estimating non-dietary ingestion exposure. *J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol* 20: 536-545. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/jes.2009.42>.
- Zartarian, VG; Ferguson, AC; Leckie, JO. (1997a). Quantified dermal activity data from a four-child pilot field study. *J Expo Anal Environ Epidemiol* 7: 543-552.
- Zartarian, VG; Ferguson, AC; Leckie, JO. (1998). Quantified mouthing activity data from a four-child pilot field study. *J Expo Anal Environ Epidemiol* 8: 543-553.
- Zartarian, VG; Ferguson, AC; Ong, CG; Leckie, JO. (1997b). Quantifying videotaped activity patterns: video translation software and training methodologies. *J Expo Anal Environ Epidemiol* 7: 535-542.
- Zartarian, VG; Streicker, J; Rivera, A; Cornejo, CS; Molina, S; Valadez, OF; Leckie, JO. (1995). A pilot study to collect micro-activity data of two- to four-year-old farm labor children in Salinas Valley, California. *J Expo Anal Environ Epidemiol* 5: 21-34.

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

Table 4-3. New Jersey Children’s Mouthing Frequency (contacts/hour) From Video-Transcription

Category	Minimum	Mean	Median	90 th Percentile	Maximum
Hand to mouth	0.4	9.5	8.5	20.1	25.7
Object to mouth	0	16.3	3.6	77.1	86.2

Source: Reed et al. (1999).

Table 4-4. Survey-Reported Percent of 168 Minnesota Children Exhibiting Behavior, by Age

Age Group (years)	Thumbs/Fingers in Mouth	Toes in Mouth	Non-Food Items in Mouth
3	71	29	71
4	63	0	31
5	33	-	20
6	30	-	29
7	28	-	28
8	33	-	40
9	43	-	38
10	38	-	38
11	33	-	48
12	33	-	17

- = No data.

Source: Freeman et al. (2001).

Table 4-5. Video-Transcription Median (Mean) Observed Mouthing in 19 Minnesota Children (contacts/hour), by Age

Age Group (years)	<i>N</i>	Object-to-Mouth ^a	Hand-to-Mouth
3 to 4	3	3 (6)	3.5 (4)
5 to 6	7	0 (1)	2.5 (8)
7 to 8	4	0 (1)	3 (5)
10 to 12	5	0 (1)	2 (4)

^a Kruskal Wallis test comparison across four age groups, *p* = 0.002.
N = Number of observations.

Source: Freeman et al. (2001).

Table 4-6. Variability in Objects Mouthed by Washington State Children (contacts/hour)

Variable	All Subjects				≤24 Months				>24 Months			
	N ^a	Mean ^b	Median	95% CI ^c	N ^a	Mean ^b	Median	95% CI ^c	N ^a	Mean ^b	Median	95% CI ^c
Mouth to body	186	8	2	2–3	69	10	4	3–6	117	7	1	0.8–1.3
Mouth to hand	186	16	11	9–14	69	18	12	9–16	117	16	9	7–12
Mouth to surface	186	4	1	0.8–1.2	69	7	5	3–8	117	2	1	0.9–1.1
Mouth to toy	186	27	18	14–23	69	45	39	31–48	117	17	9	7–12
Total events	186	56	44	36–52	69	81	73	60–88	117	42	31	25–39
^a Number of observations. ^b Arithmetic mean. ^c The 95% confidence intervals (CI) apply to median. Values were calculated in logs and converted to original units.												
Source: Tolve et al. (2002).												

Table 4-7. Indoor Mouthing Frequency (contacts per contacts/hour), Video-Transcription of 9 Children, by Age

Age Group	<i>N</i>	Statistic	Hand	Total Non-Dietary ^a
13 to 84 months	9	Mean	20.5	29.6
		Median	14.8	22.1
		Range	2.5–70.4	3.2–82.2
≤24 months	1	-	73.5	84.8
>24 months	8	Mean	13.9	22.7
		Median	13.3	19.5
		Range	2.2–34.1	2.8–51.3

^a Object/surface categories mouthed indoors included: clothes/towels, hands, metal, paper/wrapper, plastic, skin, toys, and wood.
N = Number of subjects.

Source: AuYeung et al. (2004).

Table 4-8. Outdoor Mouthing Frequency (contacts per contacts/hour), Video-Transcription of 38 Children, by Age

Age Group	<i>N</i>	Statistic	Hand	Total Non-Dietary ^a
13 to 84 months	38	Mean	11.7	18.3
		5 th percentile	0.4	0.8
		25 th percentile	4.4	9.2
		50 th percentile	8.4	14.5
		75 th percentile	14.8	22.4
		95 th percentile	31.5	51.7
		99 th percentile	47.6	56.6
≤24 months	8	Mean	13.0	20.4
		Median	7.0	13.9
		Range	1.3–47.7	6.2–56.4
>24 months	30	Mean	11.3	17.7
		5 th percentile	0.2	0.6
		25 th percentile	4.7	7.6
		50 th percentile	8.6	14.6
		75 th percentile	14.8	22.4
		95 th percentile	27.7	43.8
		99 th percentile	39.5	53.0

^a Object/surface categories mouthed outdoors included: animal, clothes/towels, fabric, hands, metal, non-dietary water, paper/wrapper, plastic, skin, toys, vegetation/grass, and wood.
N = Number of subjects.

Source: AuYeung et al. (2004).

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

Table 4-9. Videotaped Mouthing Activity of Texas Children, Median Frequency (Mean ± SD), by Age

Age	N	Hand-to-Mouth (contact/hour)	Object-to-Mouth (contact/hour)
		Median (Mean ± SD) Frequency	Median (Mean ± SD) Frequency
7 to 12 months	13	14 (19.8 ± 14.5)	18.1 (24.4 ± 11.6)
13 to 24 months	12	13.3 (15.8 ± 8.7)	8.4 (9.8 ± 6.3)
25 to 36 months	18	9.9 (11.9 ± 9.3)	5.5 (7.8 ± 5.8)
37 to 53 months	9	19.4 (22.1 ± 22.1)	8.4 (10.1 ± 12.4)

N = Number of subjects.
SD = Standard deviation.

Source: Black et al. (2005).

Table 4-10. Indoor Hand-to-Mouth Frequency (contacts/hour) Weibull Distributions From Various Studies, by Age

Age Group	Weibull Scale Parameter	Weibull Shape Parameter	Chi-Square	N	Mean	SD	Percentile				
							5	25	50	75	95
3 to <6 months	1.28	30.19	fail	23	28.0	21.7	3.0	8.0	23.0	48.0	65.0
6 to <12 months	1.02	19.01	pass	119	18.9	17.4	1.0	6.6	14.0	26.4	52.0
1 to <2 years	0.91	18.79	fail	245	19.6	19.6	0.1	6.0	14.0	27.0	63.0
2 to <3 years	0.76	11.04	fail	161	12.7	14.2	0.1	2.9	9.0	17.0	37.0
3 to <6 years	0.75	12.59	pass	169	14.7	18.4	0.1	3.7	9.0	20.0	54.0
6 to <11 years	1.36	7.34	pass	14	6.7	5.5	1.7	2.4	5.7	10.2	20.6

N = Number of subjects.
SD = Standard deviation.

Source: Xue et al. (2007).

Table 4-11. Outdoor Hand-to-Mouth Frequency (contacts/hour) Weibull Distributions From Various Studies, by Age

Age Group	Weibull Scale Parameter	Weibull Shape Parameter	Chi-Square	N	Mean	SD	Percentile				
							5	25	50	75	95
6 to <12 months	1.39	15.98	pass	10	14.5	12.3	2.4	7.6	11.6	16.0	46.7
1 to <2 years	0.98	13.76	pass	32	13.9	13.6	1.1	4.2	8.0	19.2	42.2
2 to <3 years	0.56	3.41	fail	46	5.3	8.1	0.1	0.1	2.6	7.0	20.0
3 to <6 years	0.55	5.53	fail	55	8.5	10.7	0.1	0.1	5.6	11.0	36.0
6 to <11 years	0.49	1.47	fail	15	2.9	4.3	0.1	0.1	0.5	4.7	11.9

N = Number of subjects.
SD = Standard deviation.

Source: Xue et al. (2007).

Table 4-12. Object/Surface-to-Mouth Contact Frequency for Infants and Toddlers (events/hour) (N = 23)

Object/Surface	Range	Mean	Percentiles					
			5 th	25 th	50 th	75 th	95 th	99 th
Animal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Body	0.0–5.0	1.5	0.0	0.4	0.8	2.4	4.0	4.8
Clothes/towel	0.3–13.6	5.4	1.1	2.6	3.6	6.9	13.2	13.5
Fabric	0.0–5.7	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.3	2.2	3.3	5.2
Floor	0.0–1.3	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	1.0	1.2
Food	2.3–68.3	28.9	11.1	17.8	28.2	34.8	53.7	65.2
Footwear	0.0–8.9	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.7	8.3
Hand/mouth	2.0–62.1	18.4	6.6	10.0	15.2	22.8	44.7	58.6
Metal	0.0–2.1	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	1.3	1.9
Non-dietary water	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paper/wrapper	0.0–13.6	2.1	0.0	0.3	0.8	2.1	7.2	12.2
Plastic	0.0–14.3	2.0	0.0	0.4	1.4	2.3	5.1	12.3
Rock/brick	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Toy	0.3–48.4	14.7	1.9	6.8	12.5	20.6	34.9	45.6
Vegetation	0.0–18.2	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.2
Wood	0.0–3.9	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	1.8	3.4
Non-dietary object ^a	6.2–82.3	29.2	8.1	15.9	27.2	38.0	64.0	78.8
All objects/surfaces	244–1459	76.5	28.7	58.7	77.4	94.5	123.1	141.2
^a	All object designations except for food and hand/mouth represent non-dietary objects.							
-	No mouth contact with these objects/surfaces occurred.							

Source: Beamer et al. (2008).

Table 4-13. Distributions Mouthing Frequency and Duration for Non-Dietary Objects With Significant Differences ($p < 0.05$) Between Infants and Toddlers

Object/Surface	Infant (6 to 13 months) Mouthing Frequency (contacts/hour)										Infant (6 to 13 months) Mouthing Duration (minutes/hour)							
	<i>N</i>	Range	Mean	5 th	25 th	50 th	75 th	95 th	99 th		Range	Mean	5 th	25 th	50 th	75 th	95 th	99 th
Clothes/towel	13	2–13.3	6.8	2.7	4.8	6.3	7.2	12.7	12.1		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paper/wrapper	13	0.0–7.2	1.1	0.0	0.2	0.7	0.8	4.3	6.6		0.0–0.7	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.6
Toy	13	6.5–48.4	21.1	7.3	14.4	20.2	25.5	40.8	46.9		0.7–17.9	3.6	0.8	1.2	1.7	2.8	11.6	16.6
Non-dietary object/surface	13	14–82.3	37.8	20.0	28.3	35.2	38.6	72.8	64.0		1.1–18.4	4.5	1.2	2.2	2.8	4.1	12.6	17.2
	Toddler (20–26 months) Mouthing Frequency (contacts/hour)										Toddler (20–26 months) Mouthing Duration (minutes/hour)							
	<i>N</i>	Range	Mean	5 th	25 th	50 th	75 th	95 th	99 th		Range	Mean	5 th	25 th	50 th	75 th	95 th	99 th
Clothes/towel	10	0.3–13.6	3.5	0.6	2.0	2.6	3.6	9.1	12.7		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paper/wrapper	10	0.3–12.6	6.3	1.0	2.8	5.4	9.6	12.5	12.6		0.0–0.8	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.6	0.7
Toy	10	0.3–13.6	3.5	0.6	2.0	2.6	3.6	9.1	12.7		0.0–6.8	1.5	0.1	0.2	0.5	0.7	6.1	6.6
Other non-dietary object/surface ^a	10	6.2–41.2	18.0	7.0	9.4	15.9	22.0	35.2	40.5		0.3–6.9	2.1	0.4	0.7	1.3	1.8	6.3	6.7

^a Excludes “clothes/towel,” “paper/wrapper,” and “toys;” includes all other non-dietary objects/surfaces shown in Table 4-12.
- No significant difference between infants and toddlers for this object/surface category.

Source: Beamer et al. (2008) supplemental data.

Table 4-14. Indoor Object-to-Mouth Frequency (contacts/hour) Weibull Distributions From Various Studies, by Age

Age Group	Weibull Scale Parameter	Weibull Shape Parameter	Chi-Square	N	Mean	SD	Percentile				
							5 th	25 th	50 th	75 th	95 th
3 to <6 months	9.83	0.74	pass	19	11.2	10.0	0.1	1.7	9.3	17.3	31.8
6 to <12 months	22.72	1.66	pass	82	20.3	12.5	3.3	11.3	19.0	28.0	37.9
1 to <2 years	15.54	1.39	pass	137	14.2	10.2	2.0	6.5	12.3	19.0	34.0
2 to <3 years	10.75	1.36	pass	95	9.9	7.0	1.7	4.2	8.7	14.5	24.4
3 to <6 years	6.90	0.58	pass	167	10.1	14.8	0.1	1.0	5.0	13.0	39.0
6 to <11 years	1.04	0.85	pass	14	1.1	1.1	0.1	0.1	0.9	1.985	3.2

N = Number of subjects.
SD = Standard deviation.

Source: Xue et al. (2010).

Table 4-15. Outdoor Object-to-Mouth Frequency (contacts/hour) Weibull Distributions From Various Studies, by Age

Age Group (years)	Weibull Scale Parameter	Weibull Shape Parameter	Chi-Square	N	Mean	SD	Percentile				
							5 th	25 th	50 th	75 th	95 th
1 to <2	8.58	0.93	pass	21	8.8	8.8	0.1	3.8	6.0	10.8	21.3
2 to <3	6.15	0.64	pass	29	8.1	10.5	0.1	1.5	4.6	11.0	40.0
3 to <6	5.38	0.55	pass	53	8.3	12.4	0.1	0.1	5.0	10.6	30.3
6 to <11	1.10	0.55	fail	29	1.9	2.8	0.1	0.1	0.8	2.0	9.1

N = Number of subjects.
SD = Standard deviation.

Source: Xue et al. (2010).

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

Table 4-16. Survey-Reported Mouthing Behaviors for 92 Washington State Children

Behavior	Never		Seldom		Occasionally		Frequently		Always		Unknown	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Hand/foot in mouth	4	4	27	30	23	25	31	34	4	4	3	3
Pacifier	74	81	6	7	2	2	9	10	1	1	0	0
Mouth on object	14	15	30	33	25	27	19	21	1	1	3	3
Non-food in mouth	5	5	25	27	33	36	24	26	5	5	0	0
Eat dirt/sand	37	40	39	43	11	12	4	4	1	1	0	0

N = Number of subjects.

Source: Davis et al. (1995).

Table 4-17. Number of Hand Contacts Observed in Adults During a Continuous 3-Hour Period

Subject	Eye	Lip	Nostril	Total
1	0	0	3	3
2	4	2	1	7
3	2	12	4	18
4	1	1	20	22
5	10	22	15	47
6	13	33	8	54
7	17	15	27	59
8	6	31	28	65
9	9	52	30	91
10	12	72	20	104
Mean	7.4	24	16	47
Standard Deviation	5.7	24	11	35

Source: Nicas and Best (2008).

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

Table 4-18. Estimated Daily Mean Mouthing Times of New York State Children, for Pacifiers and Other Objects

Object Type	Age 0 to 18 Months		Age 19 to 36 Months	
	All Children	Only Children Who Mouthed Object ^a	All Children	Only Children Who Mouthed Object ^a
	Minutes/Day	Minutes/Day	Minutes/Day	Minutes/Day
Pacifier	108 (N = 107)	221 (N = 52)	126 (N = 110)	462 (N = 52)
Teether	6 (N = 107)	20 (N = 34)	0 (N = 110)	30 (N = 1)
Plastic toy	17 (N = 107)	28 (N = 66)	2 (N = 110)	11 (N = 21)
Other objects	9 (N = 107)	22 (N = 46)	2 (N = 110)	15 (N = 18)

^a Refers to means calculated for the subset of the sample children who mouthed the object stated (zeroes are eliminated from the calculation of the mean).
 N = Number of children.

Source: Juberg et al. (2001).

Table 4-19. Percent of Houston-Area and Chicago-Area Children Observed Mouthing, by Category and Child's Age

Object Category	All Ages	<1 Year	1 to 2 Years	2 to 3 Years
All objects	100	100	100	100
Pacifier	27	43	27	10
Non-pacifier	100	100	100	100
Soft plastic food content item	28	13	30	41
Anatomy	99	100	97	100
Non-soft plastic toy, teether, and rattle	91	94	91	86
Other items	98	98	97	98

Source: Greene (2002).

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

Table 4-20. Estimates of Mouthing Time for Various Objects for Infants and Toddlers (minutes/hour), by Age

Age Group	Mean (SD)	Median	95 th Percentile	99 th Percentile
All Items^a				
3 to <12 months	10.5 (7.3)	9.6	26.2	39.8
12 to <24 months	7.3 (6.8)	5.5	22.0	28.8
24 to <36 months	5.3 (8.2)	2.4	15.6	47.8
Non-Pacifier^b				
3 to <12 months	7.1 (3.6)	6.9	13.1	14.4
12 to <24 months	4.7 (3.7)	3.6	12.8	18.9
24 to <36 months	3.5 (3.6)	2.3	12.8	15.6
All Soft Plastic Item^c				
3 to <12 months	0.5 (0.6)	0.1	1.8	2.5
12 to <24 months	0.4 (0.4)	0.2	1.3	1.9
24 to <36 months	0.4 (0.6)	0.1	1.6	2.9
Soft Plastic Item Not Food Contact				
3 to <12 months	0.4 (0.6)	0.1	1.8	2.0
12 to <24 months	0.3 (0.4)	0.1	1.1	1.5
24 to <36 months	0.2 (0.4)	0.0	1.3	1.8
Soft Plastic Toy, Teether, and Rattle				
3 to <12 months	0.3 (0.5)	0.1	1.8	2.0
12 to <24 months	0.2 (0.3)	0.0	0.9	1.3
24 to <36 months	0.1 (0.2)	0.0	0.2	1.6
Soft Plastic Toy				
3 to <12 months	0.1 (0.3)	0.0	0.7	1.1
12 to <24 months	0.2 (0.3)	0.0	0.9	1.3
24 to <36 months	0.1 (0.2)	0.0	0.2	1.6
Soft Plastic Teether and Rattle				
3 to <12 months	0.2 (0.4)	0.0	1.0	2.0
12 to <24 months	0.0 (0.1)	0.0	0.1	0.6
24 to <36 months	0.0 (0.1)	0.0	0.0	1.0
Other Soft Plastic Item				
3 to <12 months	0.1 (0.2)	0.0	0.8	1.0
12 to <24 months	0.1 (0.1)	0.0	0.4	0.6
24 to <36 months	0.1 (0.3)	0.0	0.5	1.4
Soft Plastic Food Contact Item				
3 to <12 months	0.0 (0.2)	0.0	0.3	0.9
12 to <24 months	0.1 (0.2)	0.0	0.7	1.2
24 to <36 months	0.2 (0.4)	0.0	1.2	1.9
Anatomy				
3 to <12 months	2.4 (2.8)	1.5	10.1	12.2
12 to <24 months	1.7 (2.7)	0.8	8.3	14.8
24 to <36 months	1.2 (2.3)	0.4	5.1	13.6

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

Table 4-20. Estimates of Mouthing Time for Various Objects for Infants and Toddlers (minutes/hour), by Age (continued)

Age Group	Mean (SD)	Median	95 th Percentile	99 th Percentile
Non-Soft Plastic Toy, Teether, and Rattle				
3 to <12 months	1.8 (1.8)	1.3	6.5	7.7
12 to <24 months	0.6 (0.8)	0.3	1.8	4.6
24 to <36 months	0.2 (0.4)	0.1	0.9	2.3
Other Item				
3 to <12 months	2.5 (2.1)	2.1	7.8	8.1
12 to <24 months	2.1 (2.0)	1.4	6.6	9.0
24 to <36 months	1.7 (2.6)	0.7	7.1	14.3
Pacifier				
3 to <12 months	3.4 (6.9)	0.0	19.5	37.3
12 to <24 months	2.6 (6.5)	0.0	19.9	28.6
24 to <36 months	1.8 (7.9)	0.0	4.8	46.3

^a Object category “all items” is subdivided into pacifiers and non-pacifiers.

^b Object category “non-pacifiers” is subdivided into all soft plastic items, anatomy (which includes hair, skin, fingers and hands), non-soft plastic toys/teethers/rattles, and other items.

^c Object category “all soft plastic items” is subdivided into food contact items, non-food contact items (toys, teethers, and rattles) and other soft plastic.

SD = Standard deviation.

Source: Greene (2002).

Table 4-21. Object/Surface-to-Hands and Mouth Contact Duration for Infants and Toddlers (minutes/hour) (N = 23)

Object/Surface	Range	Mean	Percentiles						
			5 th	25 th	50 th	75 th	95 th	99 th	
Animal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Body	0.0–0.3	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.3
Clothe/towel	0.0–0.9	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.7	0.9	0.9
Fabric	0.0–0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2
Floor	0.0–0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1
Food	0.3–15.0	4.7	0.4	1.8	3.8	6.6	10.9	14.1	14.1
Footwear	0.0–1.4	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	1.1	1.1
Hand/mouth	0.2–5.4	1.4	0.4	0.5	1.2	1.8	3.7	5.0	5.0
Metal	0.0–0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.2
Non-dietary water	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paper/wrapper	0.0–0.8	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.7	0.8	0.8
Plastic	0.0–0.6	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.5	0.6	0.6
Rock/brick	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Toys	0.0–17.9	2.7	0.1	0.6	1.2	2.8	7.4	15.6	15.6
Vegetation	0.0–0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2
Wood	0.0–0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.3
Non-dietary object ^a	0.3–18.4	3.5	0.5	1.2	2.2	3.9	8.5	16.3	16.3
All objects/surfaces	2.2–33.6	9.6	2.4	5.1	8.8	12.0	17.1	30.0	30.0

^a All object designations except for food and hand/mouth represent non-dietary objects.
 - No mouth contact with these objects/surfaces occurred.

Source: Beamer et al. (2008).

Table 4-22. Mouthing Times of Dutch Children Extrapolated to Total Time While Awake, Without Pacifier (minutes/day), by Age

Age Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
3 to 6 months	5	36.9	19.1	14.5	67
6 to 12 months	14	44	44.7	2.4	171.5
12 to 18 months	12	16.4	18.2	0	53.2
18 to 36 months	11	9.3	9.8	0	30.9

Note: The object most mouthed in all age groups was the fingers, except for the 6 to 12 month group, which mostly mouthed toys.

N = Number of children.

SD = Standard deviation.

Source: Groot et al. (1998).

Table 4-23. Estimated Mean Daily Mouthing Duration by Age Group for Pacifiers, Fingers, Toys, and Other Objects (hours:minutes:seconds)												
Item Mouthed	Age Group											
	1 to 3 months	3 to 6 months	6 to 9 months	9 to 12 months	12 to 15 months	15 to 18 months	18 to 21 Months	21 to 24 months	2 years	3 years	4 years	5 years
<i>N</i> =	9	14	15	17	16	14	16	12	39	31	29	24
Dummy (pacifier)	0:47:13	0:27:45	0:14:36	0:41:39	1:00:15	0:25:22	1:09:02	0:25:12	0:32:55	0:48:42	0:16:40	0:00:20
Finger	0:18:22	0:49:03	0:16:54	0:14:07	0:08:24	0:10:07	0:18:40	0:35:34	0:29:43	0:34:42	0:19:26	0:44:06
Toy	0:00:14	0:28:20	0:39:10	0:23:04	0:15:18	0:16:34	0:11:07	0:15:46	0:12:23	0:11:37	0:03:11	0:01:53
Other object	0:05:14	0:12:29	0:24:30	0:16:25	0:12:02	0:23:01	0:19:49	0:12:53	0:21:46	0:15:16	0:10:44	0:10:00
Not recorded	0:00:45	0:00:24	0:00:00	0:00:01	0:00:02	0:00:08	0:00:11	0:14:13	0:02:40	0:00:01	0:00:05	0:02:58
Total (all objects)	1:11:48	1:57:41	1:35:11	1:35:16	1:36:01	0:15:13	1:58:49	1:43:39	1:39:27	1:50:19	0:50:05	0:59:17
<i>N</i> = Number of children in sample.												
Source: Smith and Norris (2003).												

Table 4-24. Outdoor Median Mouthing Duration (seconds/contact), Video-Transcription of 38 Children, by Age

Age Group	<i>N</i>	Statistic	Hand	Total Non-Dietary ^a
13 to 84 months	38	Mean	3.5	3.4
		5 th percentile	0	0
		25 th percentile	1	1
		50 th percentile	1	1
		75 th percentile	2	3
		95 th percentile	12	11
		99 th percentile	41.6	40
≤24 months	8	Mean	9	7
		Median	3	2
		Range	0 to 136	0 to 136
>24 months	30	Mean	2	2.4
		5 th percentile	0	0
		25 th percentile	1	1
		50 th percentile	1	1
		75 th percentile	2	2
		95 th percentile	5	7
		99 th percentile	17.4	24.6

^a Object/surface categories mouthed outdoors included: animal, clothes/towels, fabric, hands, metal, non-dietary water, paper/wrapper, plastic, skin, toys, vegetation/grass, and wood.
N = Number of subjects.

Source: AuYeung et al. (2004).

Table 4-25. Indoor Mouthing Duration (minutes/hour), Video-Transcription of Nine Children With >15 Minutes in View Indoors

Age Group	<i>N</i>	Statistic	Hand	Total Non-Dietary ^a
13 to 84 months	9	Mean	1.8	2.3
		Median	0.7	0.9
		Range	0–10.7	0–11.1
≤24 months	1	Observation	10.7	11.1
>24 months	8	Mean	0.7	1.2
		Median	0.7	0.9
		Range	0–1.9	0–3.7

^a Object/surface categories mouthed indoors included: clothes/towels, hands, metal, paper/wrapper, plastic, skin, toys, and wood.
N = Number of subjects.

Source: AuYeung et al. (2004).

Chapter 4—Non-Dietary Ingestion Factors

Table 4-26. Outdoor Mouthing Duration (minutes/hour), Video-Transcription of 38 Children, by Age				
Age Group	N	Statistic	Hand	Total Non-Dietary ^a
13 to 84 months	38	Mean	0.9	1.2
		5 th percentile	0	0
		25 th percentile	0.1	0.2
		50 th percentile	0.2	0.6
		75 th percentile	0.6	1.2
		95 th percentile	2.6	2.9
		99 th percentile	11.2	11.5
		Range	0–15.5	0–15.8
≤24 months	8	Mean	2.7	3.1
		5 th percentile	0	0.2
		25 th percentile	0.2	0.2
		50 th percentile	0.4	0.8
		75 th percentile	1.5	3.1
		95 th percentile	11.5	11.7
		99 th percentile	14.7	15
		Range	0–15.5	0.2–15.8
>24 months	30	Mean	0.4	0.7
		5 th percentile	0	0
		25 th percentile	0.1	0.2
		Median	0.2	0.6
		75 th percentile	0.4	1
		95 th percentile	1.2	2.1
		99 th percentile	2.2	2.5
		Range	0–2.4	0–2.6

^a Object/surface categories mouthed outdoors included: animal, clothes/towels, fabric, hands, metal, non-dietary water, paper/wrapper, plastic, skin, toys, vegetation/grass, and wood.

N = Number of subjects.

Source: AuYeung et al. (2004).

Object or Substance Mouthed or Ingested	Percent of Children Reported to Mouth/Ingest Daily				
	1 Year <i>N</i> = 171	2 Years <i>N</i> = 70	3 to <6 Years ^a <i>N</i> = 265	6 Years <i>N</i> = 22	All Years <i>N</i> = 528
Grass, leaf, flower	16	0	1	0	6
Twig, stick, woodchip	12	0	0	0	4
Teething toy	44	6	2	9	17
Other toy	63	27	12	5	30
Blanket, cloth	29	11	10	5	16
Shoes, Footwear	20	1	0	0	7
Clothing	25	7	9	14	14
Crib, chair, furniture	13	3	1	0	5
Paper, cardboard, tissue	28	9	5	5	13
Crayon, pencil, eraser	19	17	5	18	12
Toothpaste	52	87	89	82	77
Soap, detergent, shampoo	15	14	2	0	8
Plastic, plastic wrap	7	4	1	0	3
Cigarette butt, tobacco	4	0	1	0	2
Suck finger/thumb	44	21	24	14	30
Suck feet or toe	8	1	0	0	3
Bite nail	2	7	10	14	7
Use pacifier	20	6	2	0	9

^a Weighted mean of 3-, 4-, and 5-year-olds’ data calculated by U.S. EPA to conform to standardized age categories used in this handbook.

Source: Stanek et al. (1998).