

# Effect of Socio-Economic Status on Oral Hygiene and Gingival Health among 15-Year-Old School Children in Jaipur City: A Cross-Sectional Study.

## Abstract

**Background:** Socio-economic status (SES) significantly influences oral health outcomes, particularly among adolescents.

**Aim:** To assess the association between SES, oral hygiene, and gingival health among 15-year-old school children in Jaipur City.

**Methods:** A cross-sectional study was conducted among 400 school children selected from 20 schools using stratified random sampling. SES was assessed using Modified Kuppuswamy Scale (2021). Oral hygiene and gingival status were evaluated using Oral Hygiene Index-Simplified (OHI-S) and Gingival Index (GI). Statistical analysis included ANOVA, Chi-square test, and Pearson correlation ( $p < 0.05$ ).

## Results:

58% of participants had good oral hygiene, while 11.5% had poor hygiene. Moderate gingivitis was most prevalent (37%). Mean OHI-S and GI scores increased significantly with decreasing SES ( $p < 0.001$ ). A strong positive correlation was observed between OHI-S and GI ( $r = 0.742$ ). Private-school students and females demonstrated significantly better oral health outcomes.

**Conclusion:** SES is a strong determinant of oral hygiene and gingival health. Targeted school-based interventions are essential to reduce oral health disparities.

**Keywords:** Socio-economic status, Oral hygiene, Gingival health, Adolescents, OHI-S, Gingival Index

## 1. Introduction

Oral health is an essential component of overall health and well-being, influencing nutrition, communication, and quality of life. According to the World Health Organization, oral diseases affect nearly 3.5 billion people worldwide, making them among the most prevalent non-communicable diseases<sup>1-3</sup>. Despite being largely preventable, conditions such as dental caries and periodontal diseases continue to pose a significant public health challenge, particularly in low- and middle-income countries<sup>2</sup>.

Periodontal diseases, including gingivitis and periodontitis, are highly prevalent among adolescents. Gingivitis, characterized by inflammation of the gingiva without attachment loss, is reversible but can progress to more severe periodontal conditions if left untreated<sup>25-26</sup>. The accumulation of dental plaque is the primary etiological factor, and its impact is influenced by host response, hormonal changes, and environmental factors.

Adolescence represents a critical transitional phase during which oral hygiene practices are established, making it an important target group for preventive interventions<sup>11-12</sup>. However, oral health outcomes are not uniformly distributed across populations.

39 Socio-economic status (SES), a composite indicator of income, education, and occupation,  
40 plays a pivotal role in determining health behaviours and access to healthcare services<sup>1-2</sup>.  
41 The World Health Organization emphasizes that health inequalities arise from the conditions  
42 in which people are born, grow, and live<sup>28</sup>.

43 Individuals from lower socio-economic backgrounds are more likely to experience poor oral  
44 hygiene, increased plaque accumulation, and higher prevalence of gingival diseases<sup>3-4, 14</sup>.  
45 These disparities are often attributed to limited access to dental care, reduced health literacy,  
46 and unhealthy dietary practices<sup>8-10</sup>. Conversely, individuals from higher SES groups  
47 demonstrate better oral hygiene practices, greater utilization of dental services, and improved  
48 oral health outcomes<sup>3</sup>.

49 In India, oral health disparities are further influenced by socio-economic diversity, rapid  
50 urbanization, and unequal distribution of healthcare resources<sup>10, 29</sup>. National data indicate a  
51 high prevalence of gingival and periodontal diseases among adolescents, particularly in lower  
52 socio-economic groups<sup>29</sup>.

53 Jaipur City, the capital of Rajasthan, represents a socio-economically diverse urban  
54 population, making it an ideal setting to study oral health inequalities. However, limited  
55 studies have explored the relationship between SES, oral hygiene, and gingival health among  
56 adolescents in this region<sup>16</sup>.

57 Therefore, the present study was undertaken to assess the effect of socio-economic status on  
58 oral hygiene and gingival health among 15-year-old school children in Jaipur City.

59

## 60 **2. Materials and Methods**

### 61 **Study Design and Population**

62 A descriptive cross-sectional study was conducted among 400 school children aged 15 years  
63 in Jaipur City.

### 64 **Sampling Method**

65 Jaipur was divided into four zones, and 20 schools were selected using simple random  
66 sampling. From each school, 20 students were randomly selected.

### 67 **Inclusion Criteria**

- 68 • 15-year-old students
- 69 • Both genders
- 70 • Consent obtained

### 71 **Exclusion Criteria**

- 72 • Systemic illness affecting periodontal health
- 73 • Undergoing orthodontic treatment

### 74 **Data Collection Tools**

- 75 • **SES:** Modified Kuppuswamy Scale (2021)
- 76 • **Oral Hygiene:** OHI-S (Greene & Vermillion)
- 77 • **Gingival Health:** GI (Löe & Silness)

78 **Statistical Analysis**

79 Data were analyzed using SPSS v26.

- 80 • ANOVA for group comparison
- 81 • Chi-square test for association
- 82 • Pearson correlation for relationship between OHI-S and GI
- 83 Significance level set at  $p < 0.05$

84 **3. Results**

85 **A) Demographic Distribution-(Table-1)**

86 In present study, total 400 participants were enrolled. Out of which, males were 51.3%  
 87 and Females were 48.7%. Ratio of students from both private and government schools  
 88 were 1:1.

89 **Table 1: Distribution of Study Participants by Gender and School Type**

Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	205	51.3
	Female	195	48.7
School Type	Government	200	50.0
	Private	200	50.0
<b>Total</b>	—	<b>400</b>	<b>100</b>

90

91 **B) Socio-Economic Status**

- 92 • Lower middle class: 38.5%
- 93 • Upper middle: 26.3%
- 94 • Upper lower: 21.8%

95 **Table 2: Socio-Economic Status of Participants (Modified Kuppuswamy Scale)**

SES Category	Score Range	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Upper (I)	26–29	28	7.0
Upper Middle (II)	16–25	105	26.3
Lower Middle (III)	11–15	154	38.5
Upper lower (IV)	5–10	87	21.8
Lower (V)	<5	26	6.5
<b>Total</b>	—	<b>400</b>	<b>100</b>

96

97 **C) Oral Hygiene Status**

- 98 • Good: 58%
- 99 • Fair: 30.5%
- 100 • Poor: 11.5%

101

**Table 3: Distribution of Oral Hygiene Status (OHI-S)**

Category	OHI-S Range	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Good	0.0–1.2	232	58.0
Fair	1.3–3.0	122	30.5
Poor	3.1–6.0	46	11.5
<b>Total</b>	—	<b>400</b>	<b>100</b>

102

103 **D) Gingival Health**

- 104 • Healthy: 22.5%

- 105 • Mild gingivitis: 28%
- 106 • Moderate: 37%
- 107 • Severe: 12.5%

108 **Table 4: Distribution of Gingival Index (GI) Scores**

Severity	GI Score Range	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Healthy	0.0	90	22.5
Mild Gingivitis	0.1–1.0	112	28.0
Moderate	1.1–2.0	148	37.0
Severe	>2.0	50	12.5
<b>Total</b>	—	<b>400</b>	<b>100</b>

109

110 **E) Association between SES and Oral Health**

- 111 • Mean OHI-S increased significantly from upper to lower SES
- 112 • Mean GI also increased significantly with decreasing SES
- 113 • **Statistical significance:**  $p < 0.001$

114 **Table 5: Mean OHI-S Scores Across SES Categories**

SES Category	Mean OHI-S	SD	p-value
Upper (I)	0.72	0.25	
Upper Middle (II)	0.95	0.31	
Lower Middle (III)	1.42	0.40	
Upper Lower (IV)	2.05	0.52	

SES Category	Mean OHI-S	SD	p-value
Lower (V)	2.55	0.60	
<b>ANOVA</b>	—	—	<b>&lt;0.001*</b>

115

#### 116 **4. Discussion**

117 The present cross-sectional study evaluated the association between socio-economic status  
 118 (SES), oral hygiene, and gingival health among 15-year-old school children in Jaipur City.  
 119 The findings clearly demonstrate a statistically significant relationship between SES and oral  
 120 health outcomes, reinforcing the concept of a social gradient in oral health.

##### 121 **4.1 Overall Oral Hygiene and Gingival Status**

122 In the present study, 58% of participants exhibited good oral hygiene, while 30.5% had fair  
 123 and 11.5% had poor oral hygiene. These findings are comparable to those reported by Mishra  
 124 et al.<sup>14</sup>, who observed that approximately half of the study population maintained good oral  
 125 hygiene, with a substantial proportion falling into the fair and poor categories.

126 With respect to gingival health, moderate gingivitis was the most prevalent condition (37%),  
 127 followed by mild gingivitis (28%), while only 22.5% of students had healthy gingiva. These  
 128 results are consistent with findings from Sharma et al.<sup>23</sup>, who reported a high prevalence of  
 129 gingival inflammation among schoolchildren, indicating that gingivitis remains a common  
 130 condition in adolescence.

131 However, when compared to the National Oral Health Survey of India<sup>29</sup>, which reported  
 132 gingivitis prevalence exceeding 80% in similar age groups, the present study suggests a  
 133 relatively improved oral health scenario in urban Jaipur. This improvement may be attributed  
 134 to increased awareness, better access to dental care, and exposure to oral health education in  
 135 urban settings.

136

---

##### 137 **4.2 Socio-Economic Status and Oral Hygiene**

138 A key finding of the present study was the statistically significant inverse relationship  
 139 between SES and oral hygiene status ( $p < 0.001$ ). Mean OHI-S scores increased progressively  
 140 from upper SES (0.72) to lower SES groups (2.55), indicating worsening oral hygiene with  
 141 decreasing socio-economic status.

142 These findings are in strong agreement with studies conducted by Lambert et al.<sup>3</sup> and  
 143 Malhotra et al.<sup>15</sup>, both of whom reported that lower socio-economic groups exhibited  
 144 significantly higher plaque accumulation and poorer oral hygiene. Similarly, Locker et al.<sup>2</sup>  
 145 emphasized that socio-economic disparities are a major determinant of oral health  
 146 inequalities, independent of individual-level factors.

147 The observed gradient can be explained by differences in health behaviour, access to oral  
148 hygiene aids, and awareness. Children from higher SES families are more likely to use  
149 fluoridated toothpaste, brush twice daily, and attend regular dental check-ups, whereas lower  
150 SES groups often lack these resources<sup>8-10</sup>.

151

---

### 152 **4.3 Socio-Economic Status and Gingival Health**

153 The present study also demonstrated a highly significant association between SES and  
154 gingival health ( $p < 0.001$ ). Mean Gingival Index (GI) scores increased from 0.68 in the  
155 upper SES group to 2.26 in the lower SES group, indicating a marked increase in gingival  
156 inflammation among economically disadvantaged children.

157 This finding is consistent with studies by Mejia et al.<sup>4</sup> and Kumari et al.<sup>20</sup>, which reported that  
158 individuals from lower socio-economic backgrounds are at higher risk of periodontal  
159 diseases. The association between SES and gingival health can be attributed to poor plaque  
160 control, inadequate oral hygiene practices, and limited access to preventive dental services.

161 Additionally, parental education and occupation—key components of SES—play a  
162 significant role in shaping children's oral health behaviour. Lower parental education is often  
163 associated with poor awareness regarding oral hygiene practices and delayed dental visits<sup>12</sup>.

164

---

### 165 **4.4 Correlation Between Oral Hygiene and Gingival Health**

166 A strong positive correlation ( $r = 0.742$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) was observed between OHI-S and GI  
167 scores in the present study. This indicates that as plaque and calculus accumulation increase,  
168 gingival inflammation also worsens.

169 This finding is in accordance with the classical studies by Greene and Vermillion<sup>25</sup> and Loe  
170 and Silness<sup>26</sup>, which established dental plaque as the primary etiological factor in gingivitis.  
171 Similar correlations have been reported in multiple epidemiological studies, confirming that  
172 effective plaque control is essential for maintaining gingival health.

173 The strength of correlation observed in this study further emphasizes the need for preventive  
174 strategies focusing on oral hygiene practices, particularly among lower socio-economic  
175 groups.

176

---

### 177 **4.5 Gender Differences**

178 The present study revealed that females had significantly better oral hygiene (mean OHI-S =  
179 1.15) and gingival health (mean GI = 1.16) compared to males ( $p < 0.05$ ).

180 These findings are consistent with studies by Harikiran et al.<sup>11</sup> and Kuppuswamy et al.<sup>12</sup>,  
181 which reported that females tend to exhibit better oral hygiene practices and greater health  
182 awareness. This difference may be attributed to increased aesthetic concern, better  
183 compliance with health instructions, and more disciplined hygiene habits among females.

184 In contrast, males often demonstrate neglect towards oral hygiene and lower utilization of  
185 dental services, contributing to poorer outcomes.

186

#### 187 **4.6 School Type as a Proxy for Socio-Economic Status**

188 The study also found that students from private schools had significantly better oral hygiene  
189 and gingival health compared to those from government schools ( $p < 0.001$ ).

190 This observation aligns with findings from Taani et al.<sup>8</sup> and Mahesh et al.<sup>10</sup>, who reported that  
191 children attending public schools (typically representing lower SES) exhibited higher levels  
192 of plaque accumulation and gingival inflammation.

193 Private school students generally belong to higher socio-economic backgrounds, which  
194 provides them with better access to oral hygiene resources, regular dental care, and health  
195 education. Additionally, private schools often conduct periodic health check-ups and  
196 awareness programs, further contributing to improved oral health outcomes.

197

#### 198 **4.7 Public Health Interpretation**

199 The findings of the present study strongly support the World Health Organization, which  
200 emphasizes that health inequalities arise from socio-economic disparities.

201 The consistent gradient observed across SES categories highlights that oral health is not  
202 merely a biological phenomenon but is significantly influenced by social, economic, and  
203 behavioural factors. These disparities are preventable and can be addressed through targeted  
204 public health interventions.

205

#### 206 **4.8 Implications for Prevention**

207 The results suggest that improving oral health among adolescents requires a multi-level  
208 approach:

- 209 • **Individual level:** Promotion of proper brushing techniques and oral hygiene practices
- 210 • **School level:** Implementation of structured oral health education programs
- 211 • **Community level:** Awareness campaigns targeting parents and caregivers
- 212 • **Policy level:** Inclusion of oral health in national health programs

213 Interventions such as school-based dental education and provision of affordable oral hygiene  
214 aids have been shown to significantly improve oral health outcomes, particularly in low SES  
215 populations<sup>17</sup>.

#### 216 **Conclusion**

217 This study confirms that socio-economic status is a significant determinant of oral hygiene  
218 and gingival health among adolescents.

219 Lower SES groups are at higher risk for poor oral hygiene and gingival disease. Addressing  
220 these disparities requires school-based preventive programs, community awareness, and  
221 policy-level interventions

222 In summary, the present study confirms a strong and statistically significant association  
223 between socio-economic status and oral hygiene as well as gingival health among  
224 adolescents. The findings are consistent with both national and international literature and  
225 highlight the persistent inequalities in oral health.

226 Addressing these disparities requires integrated efforts involving education, access to care,  
227 and policy-level interventions aimed at improving oral health equity.

228

### 229 **Limitations:**

- 230 • Cross-sectional design
- 231 • Self-reported behaviour
- 232 • Urban-only population

### 233 **References**

- 234 1. Locker D. Deprivation and oral health: a review. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol.*  
235 2000;28(3):161–9.
- 236 2. Locker D, Ford J, Leake JL. Area-based measures as indicators of socio-economic  
237 status in dental research. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol.* 1996;24(5):290–8.
- 238 3. Lambert M, Vanobbergen J, Martens L, Declerck D. Socio-economic inequalities in  
239 oral health among Belgian children. *Eur J Paediatr Dent.* 2016;17(4):291–8.
- 240 4. Mejia GC, Jamieson LM, Ha DH, Spencer AJ. Greater inequalities in dental caries  
241 among disadvantaged populations. *Community Dent Health.* 2018;35(3):142–8.
- 242 5. Theristopoulos A, et al. Socio-economic determinants of oral health in Greek  
243 schoolchildren. *Int J Paediatr Dent.* 2024;34(2):123–31.
- 244 6. Zornitsa L, et al. Gingival health status among adolescents and its association with  
245 socio-economic factors. *J Oral Health Dent Res.* 2024;11(1):21–9.
- 246 7. Timis T, et al. Oral hygiene habits and socio-economic differences among  
247 adolescents. *Int J Adolesc Med Health.* 2005;17(4):285–92.
- 248 8. Taani DQ. Relationship of socio-economic background to oral hygiene, gingival  
249 status, and dental caries in children. *Int Dent J.* 2002;52(2):98–103.
- 250 9. Azimi S, et al. Oral health status and treatment needs among Afghan children. *BMC*  
251 *Oral Health.* 2023;23(1):219.
- 252 10. Mahesh K, Joseph T, Varma RB, Jayanthi M. Oral health status of school children in  
253 Chennai. *Indian J Dent Res.* 2005;16(2):56–61.

- 254 11. Babu MS, et al. Oral health status and dental caries experience among schoolchildren  
255 in Andhra Pradesh. *J Indian Soc Pedod Prev Dent.* 2011;29(4):357–61.
- 256 12. Harikiran AG, et al. Oral health-related knowledge, attitude, and practice among  
257 school children in Bangalore. *J Dent Educ.* 2008;72(5):676–82.
- 258 13. Kuppuswamy B, et al. Socio-economic status scale modification and its application in  
259 oral health research. *Contemp Clin Dent.* 2014;5(4):452–9.
- 260 14. Mishra P, et al. Association of socio-economic status with oral hygiene among  
261 adolescents. *J Community Health Manag.* 2018;5(3):144–9.
- 262 15. Malhotra S, et al. Effect of socio-economic status on oral hygiene among adolescents  
263 in Lucknow. *Indian J Public Health Res Dev.* 2021;12(3):241–7.
- 264 16. Nagraj A, et al. Oral health knowledge and practices among school children in Jaipur.  
265 *Int J Health Sci Res.* 2023;13(2):89–97.
- 266 17. Sanadhya YK, et al. Effectiveness of oral health education among school children. *J*  
267 *Educ Health Promot.* 2014;3:53.
- 268 18. Pathania V, et al. Oral health awareness and practices among school children in  
269 Himachal Pradesh. *J Int Soc Prev Community Dent.* 2015;5(5):349–54.
- 270 19. Rao R. Periodontal disease prevalence and socio-demographic factors. *J Indian Soc*  
271 *Periodontol.* 2016;20(2):174–80.
- 272 20. Kumari M, et al. Socio-economic factors and periodontal disease: a cross-sectional  
273 study. *J Indian Acad Oral Med Radiol.* 2021;33(1):22–8.
- 274 21. Sharmila JMK, et al. Oral health awareness and practice among school children. *J*  
275 *Pharm Bioallied Sci.* 2020;12(Suppl 1):S342–7.
- 276 22. Aggarwal S, et al. Oral hygiene knowledge and practices among adolescents. *J Oral*  
277 *Biol Craniofac Res.* 2021;11(2):165–70.
- 278 23. Sharma N, et al. Gingivitis prevalence and associated risk factors among children. *J*  
279 *Indian Soc Periodontol.* 2021;25(4):321–8.
- 280 24. Janakiram C, et al. Prevalence of periodontal disease in India: a systematic review and  
281 meta-analysis. *J Clin Periodontol.* 2020;47(3):296–306.
- 282 25. Greene JC, Vermillion JR. The simplified oral hygiene index. *J Am Dent Assoc.*  
283 1964;68(1):7–13.
- 284 26. Löe H, Silness J. Periodontal disease in pregnancy. *Acta Odontol Scand.*  
285 1963;21:533–51.
- 286 27. World Health Organization. Global oral health status report: towards universal health  
287 coverage for oral health. Geneva: WHO; 2022.
- 288 28. World Health Organization. Closing the gap in a generation: health equity through  
289 action on the social determinants of health. Geneva: WHO; 2008.

- 290 29. Dental Council of India. National Oral Health Survey and Fluoride Mapping 2002–  
291 2003. New Delhi: Ministry of Health and Family Welfare; 2004.
- 292 30. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. National Oral Health Programme: operational  
293 guidelines. New Delhi: Government of India; 2015.
- 294 31. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. Ayushman Bharat: comprehensive primary  
295 health care through health and wellness centres. New Delhi: Government of India;  
296 2018.
- 297 32. World Health Organization. Global strategy on oral health. Geneva: WHO; 2022.
- 298

UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR