

1 **Is family social exclusion associated with child psychomotor and social development**
2 **delay in southeastern Brazil?**

3

4 Clariana Vitória Ramos de Oliveira^{1,3¶}, Cláudia Nery Teixeira Palombo^{2¶}, Joshua Jeong^{3&},
5 Katherine Maria Solís Cordero^{3&}, Elizabeth Fujimori^{4¶}

6

7 ¹ School of Nursing, University of Nevada Las Vegas

8

9 ² School of Nursing, Federal University of Bahia, Salvador, Bahia, Brazil.

10

11 ³ Department of Global Health and Population, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health,
12 Boston, Massachusetts, United States of America.

13

14 ⁴ School of Nursing, University of Costa Rica, San Jose, Costa Rica.

15

16 ⁵ Department of Nursing Public Health, School of Nursing, University of São Paulo, São
17 Paulo, Brazil.

18

19 *Corresponding author: Clariana V. Ramos de Oliveira. E-mail: clarivitoria@gmail.com

20

21 [¶] These authors contributed equally to this work.

22 [&] These authors also contributed equally to this work.

23

24 **Abstract**

25 The early years of life are a crucial period for shaping child development. Children from
26 socially excluded families may have less opportunity to attain their full development. The
27 objective was to identify if family social exclusion is associated with child psychomotor and
28 social development delay in Southeastern Brazil. A cross-sectional study was conducted using
29 data from a sample of 348 children under three years. We measured psychomotor and social
30 development delays. An index was used to evaluate social exclusion. The prevalence of child
31 psychomotor and social developmental delay was 27.6% and 17.2%, respectively. Children in
32 the most social excluded group were more likely to have delayed psychomotor development
33 (OR = 3.4; 95% CI = 1.14; 10.55) and social developmental delay (OR = 3.9; 95% CI = 1.05;
34 9.02) than children in the least social excluded group. The results confirm the association
35 between family social exclusion and child development delay.

36 **Key words:** Child development; Cross-Sectional Study; Social Disadvantage; Social
37 Deprivation; Developing Countries

38

39 Introduction

40 The early years of life are crucial for shaping children's developmental potential across
41 the life course. However, an estimated 250 million children under five years in low- and
42 middle-income countries are at risk of not reaching their full learning, social, and emotional
43 development potential, which has a negative impact on their future [1]. The family's low
44 socioeconomic status position has been associated with a negative impact on the
45 neurocognitive domains including language and executive functioning [2].

46 Recognition of the importance of early childhood development (ECD) can be evidenced
47 by the growth of countries that have adopted multi-sectoral policies to promote ECD and their
48 inclusion among the 2015-2030 Sustainable Development Goals [3]. Over the past three
49 decades, Brazil has shown a substantial improvement in child health indicators with
50 improvements in child survival, however this occurs unequally within country and among the
51 income quintiles [4-5]. Therefore, it is still necessary to overcome the inequalities of the most
52 vulnerable groups to ensure that children achieve healthy and holistic development. In early
53 childhood, biological and social determinants directly affect children's brain, cognitive, social,
54 and emotional development [6]. More specifically, poverty, lack of stimulation, excessive
55 stress, poor caregiver-child relationships, and the surrounding social environment have been
56 identified as significant risk factors for child development [6-7]. Social inequality and adverse
57 early childhood experiences have long-term physiological and epigenetic impact on brain
58 development and cognition [8].

59 Studies conducted in different regions of the world show that ECD is closely related to
60 the family's socioeconomic situation. A study from India, Indonesia, Peru, and Senegal
61 revealed socioeconomic gradients of early child development and specifically found that
62 children under two years from the wealthiest households had higher developmental scores and
63 better growth than children from the poorest households [9]. Research in Iran has found that

64 home affordance, parental education, house space, availability of toys, and attending daycare
65 were associated with children's motor development [10].

66 However, a growing body of research indicates that economic poverty alone does not
67 explain the large disparities in maternal and child health care between rich and poor families.
68 Consequently, it is necessary to develop new methodologies and guidelines that can address
69 social inequality and socioeconomic positions that can link these measures with health [11].
70 Without specific measures to address the family social roots, social inequality in health cannot
71 be addressed [12]. A systematic review found that social excluded families were affected by
72 greater health problems than privileged social families [13] and new approaches to analyze
73 wealth inequalities have been proposed, despite being widely studied [14]. Family social
74 exclusion has been considered by several Latin American researchers [15-17] as specific
75 indicator to understand the health-disease process and analyze social determinants.

76 A study from Australia observed that social exclusion – based on various indicators
77 including poor accommodation, unemployment of mother, no access to a car, difficult financial
78 situation, marital status, low education of mother, small social support network, poor self-
79 reported mother's health, and unplanned pregnancy – had a negative impact on maternal and
80 child health [18]. A study from South Korea found that maternal job strain during the pregnancy
81 is a determinant of infant neurodevelopment delay at 6 and 12 months [19]. In China, a study
82 observed that social inequality was associated with poor neurodevelopment for children under
83 three years in a poor rural area [20]. In Peru, a study highlighted that children between 0 to 5
84 years in rural areas whose mothers had low schooling and lived in households with unsatisfied
85 basic needs had lower developmental scores [21]. Researchers in Colombia showed that
86 children that lived in poor areas had more development problems than children that lived in
87 rich areas [22]. A cohort study in three different cities in Brazil showed a stagnation on

88 reducing rates of child mortality that could be associated with economic decline and increased
89 poverty [5].

90 Besides poverty, the magnitude of social exclusion indicators in Brazil have not been
91 fully elucidated. Thus, this study is based on the operational model of Trapé (2011), that
92 developed a social exclusion index that accesses differences in social exclusion between
93 families, taking into account different variables, with more precise evaluation for this
94 population. This new index allowed us to investigate the relationship between social exclusion
95 and early child psychomotor and social development in Southeastern Brazil.

96

97 **Materials and methods**

98 **Study design and sample**

99 This cross-sectional study analyzed data from a broader study entitled "Effect of
100 nutritional counseling from Integrated Management of Childhood Illness strategy on eating
101 habits, nutritional status and child development" [23]. The study was conducted in a sample of
102 348 children under three years of age, enrolled at 12 primary health care centers of a
103 municipality with 48,000 inhabitants, located in São Paulo State, in Southeastern Brazil. The
104 municipality is located 70 km west of the State's capital, which is Brazil's financial center, and
105 the Southeastern region is one of the most developed, richest, yet with higher social inequality
106 in the country.

107 For the broader study, the sample size was estimated based on the number of children
108 under three years of age registered at all 12 primary care centers (n=3904), 50% prevalence
109 rate of children with inadequate food practices, 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error,
110 which indicating a necessary sample size of 350 children. Inclusion criteria were: child under
111 3 years of age who resided with their biological mother in the study municipality. In the case

112 of more than one child younger than three years, the youngest child was selected for
113 participation. We excluded non-biological children, twins, children with health problems such
114 as metabolic syndrome, genetic and/or neurological problems, and children with a previous
115 diagnosis of sickle cell anemia. Ethical approval was granted by the Research Ethics
116 Committee of the University of São Paulo, Brazil (Process No. 193468). A informed consent
117 was obtained from all participants and parent/guardian of each participant under 18 years of
118 age.

119

120 **Data collection and variables**

121 **Outcome**

122 ECD was measured using the “Developmental Surveillance Instrument” [24] which was
123 developed by the Ministry of Health in Brazil, based on adaptations of the Denver-II [25] and
124 Gesell [26]. This tool is organized into 11 age groups, which correspond to different
125 developmental stages recommended for consultations of children between 0 and 6 years of age
126 [24, 27]. For each age group, there are four indicators related to the domains maturative,
127 psychomotor, social and cognitive to follow the process of child development [24]. Although
128 it does not provide a diagnosis of child development, this instrument serves as a guide for
129 primary care practitioners to monitor whether children are able or not able to attain basic
130 developmental milestones (e.g. the child lying face down holds the head for 1 second;
131 Recognize when someone is talking to him) and identify children at risk of potential
132 developmental delays. For this study, we focused on children’s psychomotor (refers to the
133 gradual process of refinement and integration of biomechanical skills and principles of
134 movement, so that the result is consistent and effective motor behavior) and social development
135 (that refers to the social interaction of the baby to the mother and others) [24].

136 Children's ability to attain milestones was observed by the interviewers (two nurses,
137 one master student and one doctoral student), and when necessary, the mother was asked about
138 the acquisition of a certain skill. We followed the recommendation of the Ministry of Health
139 [24] to identify children with healthy development according to the child's age (children who
140 attained 90% of the developmental milestones in the domain for the age group) or children
141 presenting developmental delay (children who attained less than 90% of reached milestones
142 development in the domain for the age group).

143

144 **Exposure**

145 The present study used a pre-tested instrument proposed by Trapé (2011) in order to
146 operationalize an index that could measure family social exclusion in Brazil. This index was
147 constructed based upon theories and methods from the field of social determinants of health
148 [28], including the role of work as it relates to family life (consumption based on the capitalist
149 accumulation process). The families were interviewed regarding social inclusion in society.
150 Trapé (2011) initially used a set of 34 empirical variables to represent the concept of social
151 inclusion of families who lived in different social spaces, from a representative sample from a
152 municipality in the Metropolitan Region of São Paulo. The data were analyzed using
153 multivariate statistical analysis and factor analysis to select those variables statistically
154 significant and to establish the cutoff points for the composition of the four social groups (GS)
155 [15]. As a last step, a discriminant linear analysis was performed, which again tested the
156 variables to assess the degree of importance of each one, which generated equations for the
157 construction for the social classification of families. The final variables that better represent
158 social exclusion are presented in the Fig 1. Three family social groups were constructed: least
159 social excluded, moderately excluded, and most excluded [15].

160 **Fig 1.** Family social groups categories.

161

162 **Covariates**

163 Drawing on the available evidence of children presenting developmental delays on the
164 literature, four types of covariates were included in the analysis: (i) whether the family was a
165 beneficiary of “Bolsa Família”, the conditional cash transfer program in Brazil (no or yes), (ii)
166 family sociodemographic characteristics: maternal age (≤ 20 , 20-29, and ≥ 30 years), maternal
167 and paternal education (< 8 and ≥ 8 of former schooling), number of siblings (1, 2 or ≥ 3); (iii)
168 clinical and obstetric history: number of antenatal care visits (< 6 or ≥ 6), type of delivery
169 (vaginal or cesarean section); (iv) child characteristics: child age; birth weight - collected from
170 the child health booklet ($< 2500\text{g}$ and $\geq 2500\text{g}$), hospitalization in the last 12 months (yes or no),
171 breastfeeding (yes or no), and whether child attended day care (yes or no).

172

173 **Statistical analysis**

174 To determine the relationship between exposures and ECD domain outcomes we used
175 one-way ANOVA and χ^2 tests. The association between children presenting developmental
176 delays and its possible determinants was initially examined using univariate analysis and then
177 following with hierarchical multiple logistic regressions using STATA software version 14.1.
178 The hierarchical multiple regression blocks were tested to estimate the association between the
179 exposure (family social groups) upon including additional relevant covariates in each model.
180 We considered two dependent variables: children with psychomotor and social developmental
181 delays. In the dimension of societal structural processes, we considered in block 1 the
182 relationship between family social group and child development outcomes. In the dimension
183 of processes in the child's immediate environment, we added to the block 2 maternal
184 characteristics: mother age, maternal occupation, number of siblings and Bolsa Família.
185 Moreover, in block 3 we added obstetric and prenatal characteristic: number of antenatal care

186 appointments and type of delivery. In the dimension of the child's individual processes, we
 187 added child characteristics such as child age, gender, birth weight, hospitalization in the last 12
 188 months, breastfeeding, and day care attendance. The magnitude of the association between
 189 dependent and independent variables was estimated by the odds ratio (OR) and their respective
 190 95% confidence intervals and p-value <0.05. The hierarchical logistic regressions were
 191 performed according to the theoretical model defined a priori (Fig 2).

192

193 **Fig 2.** Conceptual model for the analysis of the child development.

194

195 **Results**

196 The sample comprised of 358 children under 3 years of age. The average child age was
 197 27.4 months and 54.6% were female. In the sample, 27.6% of children presented with
 198 psychomotor developmental delay and 17.2% children presented with social developmental
 199 delays. Study population characteristics are presented in Table 1.

200 **Table 1.** Family social groups, family and child characteristics, according to psychomotor and
 201 social development in children under 3 years old (n = 358). Municipality of São Paulo State,
 202 Brazil, 2013.

203

Variables	Total N (%)	Psychomotor development		P- value	Social development		P- value
		Delay N (%)	Adequate N (%)		Delay N (%)	Adequate N (%)	
Family social groups				0.02			0.04
Least social excluded	69(19.8)	11(11.5)	58(23.0)		8(13.3)	61(21.2)	
Moderately social excluded	142(40.8)	39(40.6)	103(40.9)		20(33.3)	122(42.4)	
Most social excluded	137(39.4)	46(47.9)	91(36.1)		32(53.4)	105(36.4)	
Bolsa Família cash transfer program				0.04			0.23
No	275(79.0)	69(71.9)	206(81.7)		44(73.3)	231(80.2)	
Yes	73(21.0)	27(28.1)	46(18.3)		16(26.7)	57(19.8)	
Mother age, y (N=345)				0.17			0.74
<20	43(12.8)	9(10.2)	34(13.8)		6(10.5)	37(13.3)	
20-29	174(51.9)	41(46.6)	133(53.8)		32(56.2)	142(51.1)	
≥30	118(35.3)	38(43.2)	80(32.4)		19(33.3)	99(35.6)	
Maternal education, y (N=345)				0.13			0.38
<8	77(22.4)	26(27.9)	51(20.3)		16(26.7)	61(21.5)	

≥8	267(77.6)	67(72.1)	200(79.7)		44(73.3)	223(78.5)	
Paternal education, y (N=345)				0.66			0.40
<8	71(24.5)	20(26.3)	51(23.8)		14(29.2)	57(23.5)	
≥8	219(75.5)	56(73.7)	163(76.2)		34(70.8)	185(76.5)	
Maternal occupation				0.85			0.58
Unpaid	212(61.5)	57(60.6)	155(61.8)		35(58.3)	177(62.1)	
Paid	133(38.5)	37(39.4)	96(38.2)		25(41.7)	108(37.9)	
Number of siblings				0.02			0.28
1	147(42.2)	36(37.5)	111(44.1)		21(35.0)	126(43.7)	
2	106(30.5)	24(25.0)	82(32.5)		18(30.0)	88(30.6)	
≥3	95(27.3)	36(37.5)	59(23.4)		21(35.0)	74(25.7)	
Number of antenatal care visits *				0.23			0.40
<6	33(9.6)	12(12.6)	21(8.4)		4(6.67)	29(10.2)	
≥6	312(90.4)	83(87.4)	229(91.6)		56(93.3)	256(89.8)	
Type of delivery (345)				0.19			0.41
Vaginal	163(47.3)	39(41.5)	124(49.4)		25(42.4)	138(48.3)	
Cesarean section	182(52.7)	55(58.5)	127(50.6)		34(57.6)	148(51.7)	
Gender				0.05			0.61
Female	158(45.4)	44(45.8)	146(57.9)		29(48.3)	129(44.8)	
Male	190(54.6)	52(54.2)	106(42.1)		31(51.7)	159(55.2)	
Child age (months)				0.05			<0.001
<12	128(36.9)	27(28.4)	101(40.1)		8(13.3)	120(41.8)	
≥12	219(63.1)	68(71.6)	151(59.9)		52(86.7)	167(58.2)	
Birth weight				0.10			0.22
<2500g	42(12.1)	16(16.7)	26(10.3)		10(16.7)	32(11.1)	
≥2500g	306(87.9)	80(83.3)	226(89.7)		50(83.3)	256(88.9)	
Hospitalization in the last 12 months (N=345)				0.48			0.001
No	305(88.4)	83(86.5)	222(89.2)		45(76.3)	260(90.9)	
Yes	40(11.6)	13(13.5)	27(10.8)		14(23.7)	26(9.1)	
Breastfeeding				0.05			<0.001
No	160(45.9)	52(54.2)	108(42.8)		41(68.3)	119(41.3)	
Yes	188(54.1)	44(45.8)	144(57.2)		19(31.7)	169(58.7)	
Child attend day care (N=345)				0.18			0.39
No	46(13.3)	87(90.6)	214(85.3)		50(83.3)	251(87.5)	
Yes	86.7)	9(9.4)	37(14.7)		10(16.7)	36(12.5)	

204

205 The majority of children presenting psychomotor and social developmental delays
 206 belonged to the most social excluded families, based on results from the chi-square test which
 207 showed differences in psychomotor and social developmental delay between the family social
 208 groups. Not being enrolled in the “Bolsa Família” cash transfer showed association with
 209 psychomotor developmental delay (P-value=0.04). The number of siblings was associated with
 210 social development delay (P-value=0.02). Have been hospitalized in the last 12 months and not
 211 breastfed were associated with social development delay (P-value <0.001) (Table 1).

212

213 Table 2 shows the results from the four hierarchical multiple logistic regression models
 214 for the associations between all variables and psychomotor development delay. Children in the

215 most excluded social groups had a greater odds of psychomotor development delay (OR=3.4,
 216 95% CI=1.14; 10.55) compared to those of the least vulnerable groups. Also, children who
 217 were hospitalized in the last 12 months had a greater odds of presenting psychomotor
 218 development delay (OR= 2.64, 95% C=1.10; 6.31) than children who were not hospitalized in
 219 the past 12 months. Children who were breastfed were 0.53 times less likely (95% CI: 0.23;
 220 0.98) to have psychomotor development delay than children who were not breastfed.

221

222 **Table 2.** Predictors of psychomotor development delay in children under 3 years old (n =
 223 358). Municipality of the São Paulo State, Brazil, 2013.

<i>Variables</i>	Block 1		Block 2		Block 3		block 4	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Family social groups								
Least vulnerable	1		1		1		1	
Moderately vulnerable	1.99	0.89;4.45	2.60	0.99;6.83	2.46	0.92;6.53	2.91	0.96;8.75
Most vulnerable	2.46	1.10;5.48	3.03	1.13;8.11	2.85	1.05;7.69	3.47	1.14;10.55
Bolsa Familia cash transfer program								
No	1		1		1		1	
Yes	1.68	0.95;3.00	2.00	0.98;4.07	2.00	0.97;4.15	1.54	0.70;3.38
Mother age, y*								
<20			1		1		1	
20-29			2.46	0.78;7.79	2.43	0.76;7.72	2.76	0.82;9.30
≥39			2.59	0.77;8.65	2.54	0.75;8.56	2.19	0.59;8.07
Maternal education, y*								
<8			1		1		1	
≥8			1.19	0.54;2.61	1.28	0.56;2.88	1.54	0.60;3.93
Paternal education, y*								
<8			1		1		1	
≥8			0.94	0.45;1.94	0.85	0.41;1.78	0.79	0.35;1.77
Maternal occupation*								
No			1		1		1	
Yes			0.86	0.46;1.60	0.88	0.47;1.65	0.89	0.45;1.79
Number of siblings								
1			1		1		1	
2			1.30	0.64;2.65	1.29	0.63;2.62	1.56	0.71;3.45
≥3			1.36	0.63;2.93	1.23	0.55;2.72	1.22	0.50;2.94
Number of antenatal care appointments *								
<6					1		1	
≥6					0.86	0.31;2.35	0.65	0.21;2.00
Type of delivery *								
Vaginal					1		1	
Cesarean section					1.01	0.55;1.88	1.92	0.46;1.83
Child age* (months)								
<12							1	
≥12							2.14	0.91;5.01
Gender								
Female							1	
Male							0.49	0.24;0.99
Birth weight								
<2500g							1	

≥2500g	0.89	0.33;2.35
Hospitalization in the last 12 months*		
No	1	
Yes	2.64	1.10;6.31
Breastfeeding		
No	1	
Yes	0.47	0.23;0.98
Day care*		
No	1	
Yes	0.66	0.23;1.87

*Variables with missing data <10%

224

225 Table 3 shows the results from the hierarchical multiple logistic regression for the
 226 associations with children's social development delay. Children in the moderately social
 227 excluded group (OR=3.20; 95% CI=1.10; 9.31) and in the most social excluded group had a
 228 greater odds of social developmental delay (OR=3.09; 95% CI=1.05; 9.02) comparing those of
 229 least social excluded groups. We found no statistical association with the other variables.

230

231 **Table 3.** Predictors of social development delay in children between under 3 years old (n =
 232 358). Municipality of São Paulo State, Brazil, 2013.

<i>Variables</i>	Block 1		Block 2		Block 3		Block 4	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Family social groups								
Least vulnerable	1		1		1		1	
Moderately vulnerable	1.78	0.79; 4.00	2.54	0.96;6.68	2.39	0.89;6.41	3.20	1.10;9.31
Most vulnerable	2.15	0.96;4.81	2.72	1.0;7.29	2.79	1.03;7.59	3.09	1.05;9.02
Bolsa Família cash transfer program								
No	1		1		1		1	
Yes	1.53	0.84;2.78	2.01	0.98;4.08	2.01	0.97;4.17	1.16	0.52;2.56
Mother age, y*								
<20			1		1		1	
20-29			1.33	0.49;3.65	1.28	0.46;3.53	1.00	0.33;3.03
≥39			1.71	0.59;4.95	1.80	0.62;5.27	1.33	0.41;4.35
Maternal education, y*								
<8			1		1		1	
≥8			0.99	0.45;2.17	1.08	0.48;2.41	1.03	0.41;2.58
Paternal education, y*								
<8			1		1		1	
≥8			1.09	0.52;2.28	0.99	0.47;2.08	1,15	0.50;2.62
Maternal occupation*								
No			1		1		1	
Yes			0.96	0.52;1.78	0.98	0.52;1.83	1,07	0.53;2.16
Number siblings								
1			1		1		1	
2			0.81	0.39;1.67	0.80	0.38;1.65	0.87	0.39;1.96
≥3			1.10	0.52;2.33	0.98	0.45;2.14	1.04	0.43;2.50
Number of antenatal care appointments *								
<6					1		1	
≥6					0.64	0.24;1.68	0.50	0.16;1.55

Type of delivery *				
Vaginal	1		1	
Cesarean section	1.09	0.59;2.02	1.03	0.51;2.09
Child age* (months)				
<12			1	
≥12			2.14	0.91;5.01
Gender				
Female			1	
Male			1.29	0.64;2.59
Birth weight				
<2500g			1	
≥2500g			0.88	0.34;2.26
Hospitalization in the last 12 months*				
No			1	
Yes			1.62	0.66;3.96
Breastfeeding				
No			1	
Yes			0.93	0.45;1.91
Day care*				
No			1	
Yes			1.55	0.53;4.49

*Variables with some loss less than 10%

233

234 Discussion

235 In the present study, we explored the association between family social exclusion and
 236 early child psychomotor and social delay, using a new social inequality index to measure family
 237 social exclusion. Our results confirm that children from families that belonged to the most
 238 excluded social groups had a greater odds of presenting psychomotor and social delay, which
 239 confirms our hypothesis. Previous studies have similarly shown associations between family
 240 social determinants and ECD delays using a variety of different measures of social exclusion
 241 and child development [19-22].

242 The majority of prior studies have focused only on socioeconomic characteristics
 243 without including variables to measure social exclusion. For instance, a community-based
 244 cross-sectional study in South-West Ethiopia [29] observed that children in extreme poverty
 245 performed more poorly than the reference children in all the developmental domains comparing
 246 with children from the richest group. The authors explained that differences in the
 247 developmental outcomes between the two groups might be related because of the adverse early

248 experiences and the socioeconomic inequality of children in extreme poverty [29]. Another
249 study using data from Cambodia, China, Mongolia, Papua New Guinea, Timor-Leste, and
250 Vanuatu found that poor socioeconomic gradients were directly related to lower levels of
251 children's social-emotional, cognitive and language development and emergent literacy [30].
252 A comprehensive review also showed that poverty and food insecurity could detrimentally
253 affect the development of young children aged from birth to 3 years [31].

254 Our findings are also consistent with prior studies in Brazil regarding the social
255 determinants of ECD. Biscegli et al. (2007) found that of the 37% of children with suspected
256 development delay, the majority belonged to families with low income. De Paiva et al. (2010)
257 verified a high prevalence of children with language development delays in families of the
258 lower quartile of the socioeconomic index. Veleza et al. (2011) identified that the highest
259 proportion of children with psychomotor development delay belonged to lower-income
260 families.

261 These associations can be explained by the fact that the quality of housing, sanitation,
262 hygiene, and food conditions are poorer in socially disadvantaged families, contributing to the
263 increase of diseases and inadequate ECD [6]. Also, a study evaluating child development
264 among employed and unemployed parents revealed the negative influence of parent's
265 unemployment status on ECD [33]. Indeed, analysis between economics and developmental
266 psychology suggested that job loss can affect mental health academic performance and increase
267 income inequality, particularly among African-American students and those from the poorest
268 families [35].

269 Our study also confirms another documented correlate of ECD. More specifically,
270 breastfed children had a lower chance of present a delayed psychomotor development
271 compared with children who were not breastfed after controlling for other variables.

272 Breastfeeding is associated with numerous benefits for the developing infant in both the short
273 and the long term, including psychological development [36]. A study that examined how
274 breastfeeding during the first 4 months of life affects the mental and psychomotor development
275 of children aged 6 and 12 years showed that children who were breastfed for at least four
276 months had a higher psychomotor development at 6 and 12 months of age [36]. Breastmilk
277 contains adequate amounts of micronutrient and is vital for optimal growth and development.
278 On the other hand, children who have been hospitalized in the last 12 months had a higher
279 change of delayed psychomotor development. Hospitalization negatively affects the child's
280 social environment and routine activities and habits, which may impact development due to
281 stressful procedures and experiences [37].

282 In our study, there was no association between the “Bolsa Família” cash transfer
283 program and child development. However, a recent study showed the importance of “Bolsa
284 Família” as a benefit for low-income families and reducing infant mortality, especially in
285 poorer regions, where the return of the federal health investments in addressing infant mortality
286 is higher [38]. However, other studies have shown the importance of poverty alleviation
287 programs for ECD [9,39]. In Mexico, for example, cash transfer programs have shown
288 significant improvement in height, cognition, and language development [38].

289 This study advances the understanding of child development from the perspective of
290 social inclusion, as it uses a novel indicator developed originally in Latin America to classify
291 family social exclusion. A limitation of the study is that the ECD assessment instrument used
292 in this study, as available in the Child Health Handbook, is widely used by physicians and
293 nurses working in the primary health care setting in Brazil [27] and has proven useful in
294 tracking early changes in child development, reiterating the importance of its use in primary
295 care. However, it is not specific to diagnose changes in the child's development and, therefore,
296 constitutes a limitation in this study. Additionally, we did not have information about father

297 and mother behavior as stimulation, interaction, and mental health that could impact child
298 development.

299

300 **Conclusion**

301 Inequalities begin during pregnancy and in the early years of life. Children who
302 experience adverse experiences from the beginning of life are at a disadvantage to reach their
303 potential development [6]. In this context, families are one of the most crucial and nurturing
304 environments for children. There is a great need to understand how family inequality influences
305 ECD in different contexts worldwide, especially in Brazil, so this study is of great high
306 significance for filling the gap.

307 Social exclusion can affect children's living and learning conditions and their access to
308 nutrition, education, and health. For instance, poorer households may face greater difficulties
309 in providing nutritious food and responsive care for young children. In addition to poverty,
310 social exclusion may limit the availability of educational resources and the utilization of
311 healthcare services for children. Consequently, inequality in socioeconomic resources can
312 result in poor early child development. Furthermore, there is an urgent need to incorporate
313 developmental monitoring into the existing well-child healthcare visits at the primary care level
314 to ensure timely identification and early interventions for children with developmental delays.
315 [40]. Therefore, we suggest that the government and policymakers can provide social and
316 economic support and regular analyses of the families' social inclusion to ensure that the less
317 privileged women and children are effectively reached with essential interventions.

318 **Acknowledgments**

319 We are thankful to all participants and professional health workers involved in this study, to
320 the Municipal Health Secretariat, and the Primary Health Care Units.

321

322 **Reference**

- 323 1. Lu C, Black MM, Richter LM. Risk of poor development in young children in low-
324 income and middle-income countries: an estimation and analysis at the global,
325 regional, and country level. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2016 Dec;4(12):e916-e922. doi:
326 10.1016/S2214-109X(16)30266-2.
- 327 2. Ursache A, Noble KG. Neurocognitive development in socioeconomic context:
328 Multiple mechanisms and implications for measuring socioeconomic status.
329 *Psychophysiology*. 2016 Jan;53(1):71-82. doi: 10.1111/psyp.12547.
- 330 3. Richter LM, Daelmans B, Lombardi J, Heymann J, Boo FL, Behrman JR, et al.
331 Investing in the foundation of sustainable development: pathways to scale up for early
332 childhood development. *Lancet*. 2017 Jan 7;389(10064):103-118. doi:
333 10.1016/S0140-6736(16)31698-1.
- 334 4. Victora CG, Aquino EM, do Carmo Leal M, Monteiro CA, Barros FC, Szwarcwald
335 CL. Maternal and child health in Brazil: progress and challenges. *Lancet*. 2011 May
336 28;377(9780):1863-76. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60138-4.
- 337 5. Carvalho CA, Silva AAMD, Victora C, Goldani M, Bettiol H, Thomaz EBAF, Barros
338 F, Horta BL, Menezes A, Cardoso V, Cavalli RC, Santos I, Batista RFL, Simões VM,
339 Barbieri M, Barros A. Changes in Infant and Neonatal Mortality and Associated
340 Factors in Eight Cohorts from Three Brazilian Cities. *Sci Rep*. 2020 Feb
341 24;10(1):3249. doi: 10.1038/s41598-020-59910-7. Erratum in: *Sci Rep*. 2020 Jun
342 8;10(1):9481.

- 343 6. Walker SP, Wachs TD, Grantham-McGregor S, Black MM, Nelson CA, Huffman SL,
344 Baker-Henningham H, Chang SM, Hamadani JD, Lozoff B, Gardner JM, Powell CA,
345 Rahman A, Richter L. Inequality in early childhood: risk and protective factors for
346 early child development. *Lancet*. 2011 Oct 8;378(9799):1325-38. doi: 10.1016/S0140-
347 6736(11)60555-2.
- 348 7. McCoy DC, Raver CC, Sharkey P. Children's cognitive performance and selective
349 attention following recent community violence. *J Health Soc Behav*. 2015
350 Mar;56(1):19-36. doi: 10.1177/0022146514567576.
- 351 8. Shonkoff JP, Garner AS; Committee on Psychosocial Aspects of Child and Family
352 Health; Committee on Early Childhood, Adoption, and Dependent Care; Section on
353 Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics. The lifelong effects of early childhood
354 adversity and toxic stress. *Pediatrics*. 2012 Jan;129(1):e232-46. doi:
355 10.1542/peds.2011-2663.
- 356 9. Fernald LC, Hidrobo M. Effect of Ecuador's cash transfer program (Bono de
357 Desarrollo Humano) on child development in infants and toddlers: a randomized
358 effectiveness trial. *Soc Sci Med*. 2011 May;72(9):1437-46. doi:
359 10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.03.005.
- 360 10. Valadi S, Gabbard C, Hooshyari F. Effects of affordances in the home environment
361 on children's personal-social, problem-solving, and communication skills. *Child Care*
362 *Health Dev*. 2020 Jul;46(4):429-435. doi: 10.1111/cch.12756.
- 363 11. Krieger N, Williams DR, Moss NE. Measuring social class in US public health
364 research: concepts, methodologies, and guidelines. *Annu Rev Public Health*.
365 1997;18:341-78. doi: 10.1146/annurev.publhealth.18.1.341.
- 366 12. Shiffman J. Can poor countries surmount high maternal mortality? *Stud Fam Plann*.
367 2000 Dec;31(4):274-89. doi: 10.1111/j.1728-4465.2000.00274.x.


- 368 13. Yonekura TA. Operacionalização do conceito de classe na epidemiologia: uma
369 revisão sistemática. Ph.D. Thesis, The University of São Paulo School of Nursing;
370 2011. doi: 10.11606/D.7.2011.tde-17082011-102618
- 371 14. Barros AJD, Wehrmeister FC, Ferreira LZ, Vidaletti LP, Hosseinpoor AR, Victora
372 CG. Are the poorest poor being left behind? Estimating global inequalities in
373 reproductive, maternal, newborn and child health. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2020 Jan
374 26;5(1):e002229. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2019-002229.
- 375 15. Trapé, C.A. Operacionalização do conceito de classes sociais em epidemiologia
376 crítica: uma proposta de aproximação a partir da categoria de reprodução social. Ph.D.
377 Thesis from University of São Paulo; 2011. doi:10.11606/T.7.2011.tde-13022012-
378 145501.
- 379 16. Salum MJL, Queiroz VM. Operacionalizando o conceito de coletivo na releitura da
380 categoria Reprodução Social. In: Livro de resumos do V Congresso Brasileiro de
381 Saúde Coletiva e do V Congresso Paulista de Saúde Pública: saúde, responsabilidade
382 do Estado contemporâneo; 1997 ago. 25-29; Águas de Lindóia, BR. Rio de Janeiro:
383 ABRASCO; 1997. P. 18-18.
- 384 17. Facchini, L.A. Trabalho materno e ganho de peso infantil. Ph.D. Thesis from Federal
385 University of Pelotas; 1995.
- 386 18. Eastwood J, Jalaludin B, Kemp L, Phung H, Barnett B, Tobin J. Social exclusion,
387 infant behavior, social isolation, and maternal expectations independently predict
388 maternal depressive symptoms. *Brain Behav*. 2013 Jan;3(1):14-23. doi:
389 10.1002/brb3.107.
- 390 19. Kim E, Park H, Hong YC, Ha M, Kim Y, Lee BE, Ha EH. Effect of maternal job
391 strain during pregnancy on infant neurodevelopment by gender at 6 and 12 months:

- 392 Mothers and Children's Environmental Health (MOCEH) study. *Ann Occup Environ*
393 *Med.* 2015 Mar 20;27:8. doi: 10.1186/s40557-015-0059-y.
- 394 20. Zhang C, Zhao C, Liu X, Wei Q, Luo S, Guo S, Zhang J, Wang X, Scherpbier RW.
395 Inequality in early childhood neurodevelopment in six poor rural counties of China: a
396 decomposition analysis. *Int J Equity Health.* 2017 Dec 8;16(1):212. doi:
397 10.1186/s12939-017-0691-y.
- 398 21. Díaz AA, Gallestey JB, Vargas-Machuca R, Velarde RA. Desarrollo infantil en zonas
399 pobres de Perú [Child development in poor areas of Peru]. *Rev Panam Salud Publica.*
400 2017 Jun 8;41:e71. Spanish. doi: 10.26633/RPSP.2017.71.
- 401 22. Rubio-Codina M, Attanasio O, Grantham-McGregor S. Mediating pathways in the
402 socio-economic gradient of child development: Evidence from children 6-42 months
403 in Bogota. *Int J Behav Dev.* 2016 Nov;40(6):483-491. doi:
404 10.1177/0165025415626515.
- 405 23. Palombo CNT, Fujimori E, Toriyama ATM, Duarte LS. Training in nutritional
406 counseling: knowledge assessment and applicability in child's healthcare. *Revista*
407 *Brasileira De Saúde Materno Infantil.* 2018Jan-Mar; 18(1), 67-74. doi: 10.1590/1806-
408 93042018000100003
- 409 24. Brasil. Ministério da Saúde. Secretaria de Atenção à Saúde. Departamento de Ações
410 Programáticas Estratégicas. Acompanhamento do crescimento e desenvolvimento
411 infantil. Brasília: 2002.
- 412 25. Bonner, B., Milling, L., Walker, C.E. Denver developmental screening test. In:
413 Jayser D, Sweetland RC. (Editors). *Test critiques.* v. 1. Test Corporation of America.
414 1984.
- 415 26. Gesell A. *A criança de 0 a 5 anos.* 4ª ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.1996.

- 416 27. Freitas ID. Validação interna da ficha de acompanhamento do desenvolvimento infantil
417 - Ministério da Saúde 2002. MSc from University of São Paulo:Faculdade de Medicina;
418 2015. doi:10.11606/D.5.2016.tde-24022016-162148.
- 419 28. Breilh J, Granda E. Investigação da saúde na sociedade: guia pedagógico sobre um
420 novo enfoque do método epidemiológico. São Paulo: Cortez; 1989.
- 421 29. Worku BN, Abessa TG, Wondafrash M, Vanvuchelen M, Bruckers L, Kolsteren P,
422 Granitzer M. The relationship of undernutrition/psychosocial factors and
423 developmental outcomes of children in extreme poverty in Ethiopia. BMC Pediatr.
424 2018 Feb 9;18(1):45. doi: 10.1186/s12887-018-1009-y.
- 425 30. Richards B, Bacon-Shone J, Rao R. Socioeconomic Correlates of Early Child
426 Development: Gradients from Six Countries in the East Asia-Pacific
427 Region. International Journal of Behavioral Development 2018 Nov;42(6): 581–
428 87. doi: 10.1177/0165025418785460.
- 429 31. Chilton M, Chyatte M, Breaux J. The negative effects of poverty & food insecurity on
430 child development. Indian J Med Res. 2007 Oct;126(4):262-72.
- 431 32. Biscegli T, Polis L, Santos L, Vicentin M. Avaliação do estado nutricional e do
432 desenvolvimento neuropsicomotor em crianças freqüentadoras de creche. Rev. Paul.
433 Pediatr. 2007 25 Dez;25(4):337-342. doi: 10.1590/S0103-05822007000400007
- 434 33. Paiva GS, Lima AC, Lima Mde C, Eickmann SH. The effect of poverty on
435 developmental screening scores among infants. Sao Paulo Med J. 2010;128(5):276-
436 83. doi: 10.1590/s1516-31802010000500007.
- 437 34. Velda AA, Soares MC, César-Vaz MR. Fatores associados ao atraso no
438 desenvolvimento em crianças, Rio Grande, Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil [Factors
439 associated with delay in children development, Rio Grande, Rio Grande do Sul,


- 440 Brazil]. *Rev Gaucha Enferm.* 2011 Mar;32(1):79-85. Portuguese. doi: 10.1590/s1983-
441 14472011000100010.
- 442 35. Ananat EO, Gassman-Pines A, Francis DV, Gibson-Davis CM. Linking job loss,
443 inequality, mental health, and education. *Science.* 2017 Jun 16;356(6343):1127-1128.
444 doi: 10.1126/science.aam5347.
- 445 36. Jardí C, Hernández-Martínez C, Canals J, Arija V, Bedmar C, Voltas N, Aranda N.
446 Influence of breastfeeding and iron status on mental and psychomotor development
447 during the first year of life. *Infant Behav Dev.* 2018 Feb;50:300-310. doi:
448 10.1016/j.infbeh.2017.05.009.
- 449 37. Bortolote GS, Brêtas JR. O ambiente estimulador ao desenvolvimento da criança
450 hospitalizada [The stimulating environment for the development of hospitalized
451 children]. *Rev Esc Enferm USP.* 2008 Sep;42(3):422-9. Portuguese. doi:
452 10.1590/s0080-62342008000300002.
- 453 38. Castro MC, Massuda A, Almeida G, Menezes-Filho NA, Andrade MV, de Souza
454 Noronha KVM, Rocha R, Macinko J, Hone T, Tasca R, Giovanella L, Malik AM,
455 Werneck H, Fachini LA, Atun R. Brazil's unified health system: the first 30 years and
456 prospects for the future. *Lancet.* 2019 Jul 27;394(10195):345-356. doi:
457 10.1016/S0140-6736(19)31243-7.
- 458 39. Fernald LC, Gertler PJ, Neufeld LM. Role of cash in conditional cash transfer
459 programmes for child health, growth, and development: an analysis of Mexico's
460 Oportunidades. *Lancet.* 2008 Mar 8;371(9615):828-37. doi: 10.1016/S0140-
461 6736(08)60382-7.
- 462 40. Chan M, Lake A, Hansen K. The early years: silent emergency or unique opportunity?
463 *Lancet.* 2017 Jan 7;389(10064):11-13. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(16)31701-9.
464

Fig 1. Family social groups categories.



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.26.22275658>; this version posted May 27, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Fig 2. Conceptual model for the analysis of the child development.



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.26.22275658>; this version posted May 27, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).