

Oral Health Evaluation in Children with Special needs- A Retrospective Study

Running Title: Oral health among pediatric Special needs patients

¹Kadambari Sriram

Saveetha Dental College and Hospitals, Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences, Saveetha University, Chennai 600077. Email Id- 151501022.sdc@saveetha.com

²Jessy P*

Senior Lecturer, Department of Pedodontics, Saveetha Dental College and Hospitals, Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences, Saveetha University, Chennai 600077
Email Id- jessyp.sdc@saveetha.com

³Santhosh Kumar M P

Reader, Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Saveetha Dental College and Hospitals, Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences, Saveetha University, Chennai 600077, Email Id-
santhoshkumar@saveetha.com

Article Info

Volume 83

Page Number: 2505 - 2516

Publication Issue:

July-August 2020

Article History

Article Received: 06 June 2020

Revised: 29 June 2020

Accepted: 14 July 2020

Publication: 25 July 2020

Abstract

Special needs children primarily refer to children whose physical or intellectual capacities have been affected to a certain degree. Oral diseases can be considered as a public health due to their high rate of prevalence and significant social impact. While oral problems considerably affect the general health status of normal children, children with special needs are at significantly higher risk. There is limited literature regarding the oral health status of children with special needs in the area under study. The aim of the study was to evaluate the oral health among pediatric patients with special needs in a Dental Hospital. A retrospective study was carried out using case records of patients who reported to the Department of Paediatric and Preventive Dentistry from June 2019 to March 2020. A total of 29 children with special needs were included for the study after considering the inclusion criteria. The age, gender, Simplified Oral Hygiene index scores, Gingival index scores, DMFT scores and Plaque index scores were observed from the case records and tabulated on a spreadsheet. The collected data was analysed by SPSS software version 20.0. The level of significance set at $p < 0.05$. Chi-square test was used to compare the gender wise and age wise oral status of the patients. It was observed that significant association between gender and caries incidence ($p < 0.05$). Within the limits of the study, it can be concluded that oral health in special children has a significant association with gender in regard to caries incidence. Males had poor oral hygiene with higher plaque and gingival scores. In regard to age 8 to 12 year and 13 to 17 year children had poor oral hygiene with high plaque and gingival scores. A preventive dentistry program should be undertaken in future involving parents, teachers, and specialized dental teams to look after the oral health needs of the disabled population.

Keywords: Caries incidence, Children, Gingival health, Oral hygiene, Special needs.

INTRODUCTION

Special needs children primarily refer to children whose physical or intellectual capacities have been affected to a certain degree which affects their participation in general situations and requires assistance (Westwood, 2015). Oral health may be defined as a standard of health of the oral and related tissues (Azodo et al., 2010; Smyth et al., 2007). Oral diseases (Govindaraju, Jeevanandan and EMG Subramanian, 2017b) can be considered as a public health due to their high rate of prevalence and significant social impact (Aggnur et al., 2014). While oral problems considerably affect the general health status of normal children, children with special needs are at significantly higher risk.

Children with disabilities deserve the same opportunities for oral health and hygiene as those who are healthy. Unfortunately, oral health care is one of the greatest unattended health needs of the disabled people (Hennequin et al., 2000). The quality of life of such mentally, physically or developmentally disabled children (Gurunathan and Shanmugavel, 2016) may be further compromised by dental diseases (Nair et al., 2018; Somasundaram et al., 2015) and their associated complications (Brown, 2009; Kamolmatyakul, 2012; Ravikumar et al., 2017).

Many of the common oral diseases (Christabel and Gurunathan, 2015; Packiri et al., 2017) known to affect children with special needs include Periodontitis, Dental caries (Jeevanandan, 2017; Jeevanandan and Govindaraju, 2018), Mucosal ulcers, Candidiasis, etc. (Davidovich et al., 2010; Subramanyam et al., 2018). Dental caries and periodontal disease appear earlier in patients with physical and mental disabilities than in non-disabled patients. Not only oral hygiene but also dietary habits have been known to influence dental health (Moynihan, 2002). A significant association has been found between the frequency of

consumption of sweets and high levels of dental caries. Concerned about the disability of their children, parents and caregivers are more likely to allow consumption of sweets by them at smaller intervals between meals.

However, other conditions must be added to the intellectual deficit and impaired motor skills, such as mouth breathing, occlusion abnormalities, bruxism, cariogenic diet, mastication deglutition dysfunction, abnormal tension of orofacial muscles, reduced salivary flow, and effect from medications. Furthermore, these individuals usually belong to low socioeconomic status, which aggravates the situation (Schultz et al., 2001).

Previous literature indicates that periodontal disease is a great concern for children with special needs as compared to dental caries (Govindaraju, Jeevanandan and EMG Subramanian, 2017a; Govindaraju, Jeevanandan and E Subramanian, 2017; Panchal et al., 2019) yet there is no concrete consensus which has been reached. The present study aims to evaluate possible association between gender, age and oral health in pediatric patients with special needs.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Design:

Children with special health care needs below 18 years (3-17 years) were included in the study. Those patients who had other systemic complications were excluded from the study.

Study setting:

It was a retrospective study conducted in a private institution. The study was commenced after approval from the Scientific Review Board of the institution with the ethical approval number- SDC/SIHEC/2020/DIASDATA/0619-0320.

Sampling:

The data were collected from June 2019 to March 2020. A total of 6000 case sheets of patients who visited the Department of Paediatric and Preventive Dentistry of the institution were reviewed and from this 29 were included in the study after considering the exclusion criteria. Cross verification of the data for errors was done through photographic evaluation.

Data Collection:

The data collected included records of patient age, gender, Simplified Oral Hygiene index scores, Gingival index scores, DMFT scores and Plaque index scores. Data was entered in a methodical manner in Microsoft Excel and was imported to SPSS and variables were defined. Incomplete or censored data was excluded from the study.

Statistical analysis:

The statistical analysis was done using SPSS software version 20.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). Chi-square test was used to compare the gender wise and age wise oral status of the patients. The significance level was set at $p < 0.05$

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A total of 29 participants were included in the study of which 41% were female and 59% were male. Males are shown to have poorer oral hygiene scores (34.46%) when compared with females (Table 1, Figure 1). There is however no significant difference between gender and oral hygiene, $p > 0.05$, (Figure 1). Females have been shown to have greater incidence of caries in comparison with males (Figure 2). Significant association was also found between gender and caries incidence, $p < 0.05$, (Figure 2). On analysis the association between Gender and Plaque index was not statistically significant, $p > 0.05$, however higher plaque scores were seen in males than females (Table 1, Figure 3). The association between gingival status and gender

was also found to be statistically not significant with higher gingivitis prevalence seen in males (Table 1, Figure 4). Poor oral hygiene is seen 8-12 years and 13-17 years of age, however the association between age and oral hygiene however was not statistically significant, $p > 0.05$ (Figure 5). Higher plaque scores were seen in 8-12 and 13-17 years of age. Association of age with Plaque index was not statistically significant, $p > 0.05$ (Figure 6). Higher Gingival index scores were seen between 13-17 years of age, however association of age with gingival index was not statistically significant, $p > 0.05$ (Figure 7).

In the present study we have found that there was significant association between gender and caries incidence in children with special care needs. The association between age and oral hygiene as well as caries incidence was not found to be statistically significant. The association between gender and oral hygiene in special children was not found to be significant. The association between age and oral hygiene was not significant in our study which was in contrast with previous study by Kumar et al in special children, which revealed positive correlation between oral hygiene variables and age (Kumar et al., 2008). In our study children the oral health conditions varied with age which was in agreement with previous studies by Alsanabani et al and Nokhostin et al (Alsanabani et al., 2012; Nokhostin et al., 2013) due to less manual dexterity in special children for brushing at younger age groups.

There was no significant association between age and caries incidence. This was in contrast to a study by Kramer et al which claimed association between age and caries incidence (Kramer et al., 2013). Bashirian et al and Shyama et al further found high caries incidence in children between 7-12 years of age which is in consensus with the present findings (Bashirian et al., 2018; Shyama et al., 2001). Significant association between gender and caries incidence was found in the

present study. This result was found to be similar to other studies which have shown that there is significant variation in caries incidence with gender with females having higher caries incidence than males (Ferraro and Vieira, 2010; Vajawat and Deepika, 2012). The greater incidence of caries in females than in males can be attributed to both genetic (Patir et al., 2008) factors as well as hormonal (Lukacs and Largaespada, 2006) factors.

No significant association was found between oral hygiene and periodontal health based on gender. Shapira et al found no statistically significant association between oral hygiene and gender in their study (Shapira et al., 1989). However contrary to our study, Subramaniyam et al and Katge et al found higher microbial load in the biofilm and poorer periodontal health in children with special needs and a statistically significant difference with gender. (Shivakumar et al., 2018) (Katge et al., 2015; Subramaniam and Gupta, 2013)

The reason for this can be attributed to the fact that the oral hygiene maintenance of special children depends more on the maintenance procedures carried out by the caregivers than on the individual (Oredugba and Akindayomi, 2008; Tesini and Fenton, 1994). Age group of patients with special needs does not appear to be a major determinant for oral hygiene and caries incidence. Gender also significantly impacts caries incidence with regards to the current study. The limitations of the study include the fact that it is a single centre study with limited size and homogeneity of the sample. Future scope of the study includes expanding the sample size as well as implementation of awareness programs, modification of toothbrushes for people with poor manual dexterity and alternate treatment methods (Govindaraju and Gurunathan, 2017; *International Journal of Pharmaceutical Research*, 2018).

CONCLUSION

Within the limits of the study, it can be concluded that oral health in special children has a strong association with gender in regard to caries incidence. Males had poor oral hygiene with higher plaque and gingival scores. In regard to age 8 to 12 year and 13 to 17 year children had poor oral hygiene with high plaque and gingival scores. Though there was no significant difference in regard to other indices, the poor oral status was noticed among all age groups and gender. Knowledge on oral hygiene also should be implemented in early age for special children along with optimum dental care. Follow up also should be done by dental practitioners in order to monitor their oral status. A preventive dentistry program should be undertaken in future involving parents, teachers, and specialized dental teams to look after the oral health needs of the disabled population.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Nil

AUTHORS CONTRIBUTION

Kadambari Sriram contributed to the acquisition of data, analysis, literature collection, and in drafting the article and revising it critically for important intellectual content. Jessy P contributed in conception, study design, interpretation of data, formatting, manuscript preparation, supervision and guidance. Santhosh Kumar contributed to the editing, supervision and final approval of the submitted version of the manuscript.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Aggnur M, Garg S, Veerasha K, et al. (2014) Oral

- Health Status, Treatment Needs and Knowledge, Attitude and Practice of Health Care Workers of Ambala, India - A Cross-sectional Study. *Annals of medical and health sciences research* 4(5): 676–681.
2. Alsanabani AA, Ismail NM, Ismail AR, et al. (2012) Periodontal status and its relationship with sociodemographic factors among special needs children in schools of Kota Bharu, Kelantan, Malaysia. *International Medical Journal* 19(1). researchgate.net: 61–64.
 3. Azodo CC, Ehizele AO, Umoh A, et al. (2010) Perceived oral health status and treatment needs of dental auxiliaries. *The Libyan journal of medicine* 5. DOI: 10.3402/ljm.v5i0.4859.
 4. Bashirian S, Seyedzadeh-Sabounchi S, Shirahmadi S, et al. (2018) Socio-demographic determinants as predictors of oral hygiene status and gingivitis in schoolchildren aged 7-12 years old: A cross-sectional study. *PloS one* 13(12): e0208886.
 5. Brown A (2009) Caries prevalence and treatment needs of healthy and medically compromised children at a tertiary care institution in Saudi Arabia. *Eastern Mediterranean health journal = La revue de sante de la Mediterranee orientale = al-Majallah al-sihhiyah li-sharq al-mutawassit* 15(2): 378–386.
 6. Christabel SL and Gurunathan D (2015) Prevalence of type of frenal attachment and morphology of frenum in children, Chennai, Tamil Nadu. *World J Dent* 6(4): 203–207.
 7. Davidovich E, Aframian DJ, Shapira J, et al. (2010) A comparison of the sialochemistry, oral pH, and oral health status of Down syndrome children to healthy children. *International journal of paediatric dentistry / the British Paedodontic Society [and] the International Association of Dentistry for Children* 20(4): 235–241.
 8. Ferraro M and Vieira AR (2010) Explaining gender differences in caries: a multifactorial approach to a multifactorial disease. *International journal of dentistry* 2010: 649643.
 9. Govindaraju L and Gurunathan D (2017) Effectiveness of Chewable Tooth Brush in Children-A Prospective Clinical Study. *Journal of clinical and diagnostic research: JCDR* 11(3): ZC31–ZC34.
 10. Govindaraju L, Jeevanandan G and Subramanian E (2017) Clinical Evaluation of Quality of Obturation and Instrumentation Time using Two Modified Rotary File Systems with Manual Instrumentation in Primary Teeth. *Journal of clinical and diagnostic research: JCDR* 11(9): ZC55–ZC58.
 11. Govindaraju L, Jeevanandan G and Subramanian EMG (2017a) Comparison of quality of obturation and instrumentation time using hand files and two rotary file systems in primary molars: A single-blinded randomized controlled trial. *European journal of dentistry* 11(3): 376–379.
 12. Govindaraju L, Jeevanandan G and Subramanian EMG (2017b) Knowledge and practice of rotary instrumentation in primary teeth among indian dentists: A questionnaire survey. *Journal of International Oral Health* 9(2). Medknow Publications and Media Pvt. Ltd.: 45.
 13. Gurunathan D and Shanmugaavel AK (2016) Dental neglect among children in Chennai. *Journal of the Indian Society of Pedodontics and Preventive Dentistry* 34(4): 364–369.
 14. Hennequin M, Faulks D and Roux D (2000) Accuracy of estimation of dental treatment need in special care patients. *Journal of dentistry* 28(2): 131–136.
 15. *International Journal of Pharmaceutical Research* (2018) Fluoride, Fluoridated Toothpaste Efficacy And Its Safety In Children - Review. 10(04). DOI: 10.31838/ijpr/2018.10.04.017.
 16. Jeevanandan G (2017) Kedo-S Paediatric Rotary Files for Root Canal Preparation in Primary Teeth - Case Report. *Journal of clinical and diagnostic research: JCDR* 11(3): ZR03–ZR05.

17. Jeevanandan G and Govindaraju L (2018) Clinical comparison of Kedo-S paediatric rotary files vs manual instrumentation for root canal preparation in primary molars: a double blinded randomised clinical trial. *European archives of paediatric dentistry: official journal of the European Academy of Paediatric Dentistry* 19(4): 273–278.
18. Kamolmatyakul S (2012) Oral Health Knowledge, Attitude and Practices of Parents/Caregivers. *Oral Health Care - Prosthodontics, Periodontology, Biology, Research and Systemic Conditions*. DOI: 10.5772/32290.
19. Katge F, Rusawat B, Shitoot A, et al. (2015) DMFT index assessment, plaque pH, and microbiological analysis in children with special health care needs, India. *Journal of International Society of Preventive & Community Dentistry* 5(5): 383–388.
20. Kramer PF, Feldens CA, Ferreira SH, et al. (2013) Exploring the impact of oral diseases and disorders on quality of life of preschool children. *Community dentistry and oral epidemiology* 41(4): 327–335.
21. Kumar S, Dagli RJ, Mathur A, et al. (2008) Oral hygiene status in relation to sociodemographic factors of children and adults who are hearing impaired, attending a special school. *Special care in dentistry: official publication of the American Association of Hospital Dentists, the Academy of Dentistry for the Handicapped, and the American Society for Geriatric Dentistry* 28(6): 258–264.
22. Lukacs JR and Largaespada LL (2006) Explaining sex differences in dental caries prevalence: Saliva, hormones, and ‘life-history’ etiologies. *American Journal of Human Biology: The Official Journal of the Human Biology Association* 18(4). Wiley Online Library: 540–555.
23. Moynihan PJ (2002) Dietary advice in dental practice. *British dental journal* 193(10): 563–568.
24. Nair M, Jeevanandan G, Vignesh R, et al. (2018) Comparative evaluation of post-operative pain after pulpectomy with k-files, kedo-s files and mtwo files in deciduous molars -a randomized clinical trial. *Brazilian Dental Science* 21(4): 411–417.
25. Nokhostin MR, Siahkamari A and Akbarzadeh BAR (2013) Evaluation of oral and dental health of 6-12 year-old students in Kermanshah city. *IRANIAN SOUTH MEDICAL JOURNAL (ISMJ)*. Available at: <https://www.sid.ir/en/Journal/ViewPaper.aspx?ID=312132>.
26. Oredugba FA and Akindayomi Y (2008) Oral health status and treatment needs of children and young adults attending a day centre for individuals with special health care needs. *BMC oral health* 8: 30.
27. Packiri S, Gurunathan D and Selvarasu K (2017) Management of Paediatric Oral Ranula: A Systematic Review. *Journal of clinical and diagnostic research: JCDR* 11(9): ZE06–ZE09.
28. Panchal V, Jeevanandan G and Subramanian E (2019) Comparison of instrumentation time and obturation quality between hand K-file, H-files, and rotary Kedo-S in root canal treatment of primary teeth: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of the Indian Society of Pedodontics and Preventive Dentistry* 37(1): 75–79.
29. Patir A, Seymen F, Yildirim M, et al. (2008) Enamel formation genes are associated with high caries experience in Turkish children. *Caries research* 42(5): 394–400.
30. Ravikumar D, Jeevanandan G and Subramanian EMG (2017) Evaluation of knowledge among general dentists in treatment of traumatic injuries in primary teeth: A cross-sectional questionnaire study. *European journal of dentistry* 11(2): 232–237.
31. Schultz ST, Shenkin JD and Horowitz AM (2001) Parental perceptions of unmet dental need and cost barriers to care for developmentally disabled children. *Pediatric dentistry* 23(4): 321–325.
32. Shapira J, Mann J, Tamari I, et al. (1989) Oral

- health status and dental needs of an autistic population of children and young adults. *Special care in dentistry: official publication of the American Association of Hospital Dentists, the Academy of Dentistry for the Handicapped, and the American Society for Geriatric Dentistry* 9(2): 38–41.
33. Shivakumar KM, Patil S, Kadashetti V, et al. (2018) Oral Health Status and Dental Treatment Needs of 5-12-year-old Children with Disabilities Attending Special Schools in Western Maharashtra, India. *International journal of applied & basic medical research* 8(1): 24–29.
 34. Shyama M, Al-Mutawa SA and Morris RE (2001) Dental caries experience of disabled children and young adults. *Community dental health*. researchgate.net. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Maddi-Shyama/publication/314371487_Dental_caries_experience_of_disable_children_and_young_adults_in_Kuwait/links/57b2c03208ae0101f17b38aa/Dental-caries-experience-of-disable-children-and-young-adults-in-Kuwait.pdf.
 35. Smyth E, Caamano F and Fernández-Riveiro P (2007) Oral health knowledge, attitudes and practice in 12-year-old schoolchildren. *Medicina oral, patologia oral y cirugia bucal* 12(8): E614–20.
 36. Somasundaram S, Ravi K, Rajapandian K, et al. (2015) Fluoride Content of Bottled Drinking Water in Chennai, Tamilnadu. *Journal of clinical and diagnostic research: JCDR* 9(10): ZC32–4.
 37. Subramaniam P and Gupta T (2013) Efficacy of a herbal mouthrinse on oral microbial load in Down syndrome children. *Int J Herb Med* 1(4): 50–54.
 38. Subramanyam D, Gurunathan D, Gaayathri R, et al. (2018) Comparative evaluation of salivary malondialdehyde levels as a marker of lipid peroxidation in early childhood caries. *European journal of dentistry* 12(1): 67–70.
 39. Tesini DA and Fenton SJ (1994) Oral health needs of persons with physical or mental disabilities. *Dental clinics of North America* 38(3): 483–498.
 40. Vajawat M and Deepika PC (2012) Comparative Evaluation of Gender Related Differences in the Caries Rate and Periodontal Diseases in Autistics and Unaffected Individuals. *Journal of Advanced Oral Research* 3(2). SAGE Publications India: 7–10.
 41. Westwood P (2015) *Commonsense Methods for Children with Special Educational Needs*. Routledge.

TABLES AND FIGURES

Index	Interpretation	Oral health of Special children based on gender		Statistical Values
		Male n(%)	Female n(%)	
OHI Index	Good	3(10.34%)	3(10.34%)	Pearson Chi-Square value=2.891 ^a
	Fair	1(3.45%)	3(10.34%)	

	Poor	10(34.48%)	5(17.24%)	df=3 p value=0.409
Plaque Index	Excellent	3(10.34%)	3(10.34%)	Pearson Chi-Square value=1.637 ^a df=3 p value=0.651
	Good	2(6.90%)	0(0%)	
	Fair	9(31.03%)	7(24.14%)	
	Poor	3(10.34%)	2(6.90%)	
Gingival Index	Mild gingivitis	14(48.28%)	10(34.48%)	Pearson Chi-Square value=0.005 ^a df=1 p value=0.945
	Moderate gingivitis	3(10.34%)	2(6.90%)	

Table 1: Table depicting the oral health of Special children based on gender; There was no significant association between gender and oral hygiene, plaque index and gingival index scores, however males were observed with poor oral hygiene, higher plaque and gingival index scores than females.




Figure 1: Bar graph depicting gender wise distribution of oral hygiene index scores: where blue denotes good
Published by: The Mattingley Publishing Co., Inc. 2512

oral hygiene, red denotes fair oral hygiene and green denotes poor oral hygiene. X axis denotes both Genders(Female and Male) and Y axis denotes the oral hygiene status(good,fair and poor). Poor oral hygiene is seen in boys when compared to girls..Association of Gender with Oral hygiene index scores found to be statistically not significant(Pearson Chi-Square value=2.891^a,df=3, p value=0.409(p>0.05), not significant)




Figure 2: Bar graph depicting gender wise distribution of Caries experience(DMFT,dmft) : where blue denotes very low caries incidence, red very high caries incidence. X axis denotes both Genders(Female and Male) and Y axis denotes the caries incidence (very low,very high). Higher caries incidence is seen in females when compared to males. Association of Gender with Caries experience(DMFT,dmft) was found to be statistically significant.(Pearson Chi-Square value=4.740^a,df=1, p value=0.029(p<0.05),significant)




Figure 3 : Bar graph depicting gender wise distribution of Plaque index: where blue denotes excellent scores, red denotes good scores, green denotes fair scores and orange denotes poor scores.X axis denotes both Genders(Female and Male) and Y axis denotes the number of patients. Higher plaque scores seen in males than females.Association of Gender with Plaque index was not statistically significant. (Pearson Chi-Square value=1.637^a,df=3, p value=0.651(p>0.05),not significant)




Figure 4 : Bar graph depicting gender wise distribution of Gingival status: where blue denotes mild gingivitis, red denotes moderate gingivitis.X axis denotes both Genders(Female and Male) and Y axis denotes the number of patients. Higher Gingival index scores seen in males than females.Association of Gender with gingival index was not statistically significant. (Pearson Chi-Square value=0.005^a,df=1, p value=0.945(p>0.05),not significant)




Figure 5: Bar graph depicting age wise distribution of oral hygiene index scores: where blue denotes good oral hygiene, red denotes fair oral hygiene and green denotes poor oral hygiene. X axis denotes the age group of patients and Y axis denotes the oral hygiene status by number of patients (good, fair and poor). Poor oral hygiene is seen 8-12 years and 13-17 years of age. Better oral hygiene is seen between 3-7 years of age. Association of age with Oral hygiene index scores found to be statistically not significant (Pearson Chi-Square value=8.509^a, df=6, p value=0.203 (p>0.05), not significant)




Figure 6: Bar graph depicting age distribution of Plaque index: where blue denotes excellent scores, red denotes good scores, green denotes fair scores and orange denotes poor scores. X axis denotes the age groups and Y axis

denotes the number of patients. Higher plaque scores seen in 8-12 and 13-17 years of age. Association of age with Plaque index was not statistically significant. (Pearson Chi-Square value=5.150^a,df=6, p value=0.525(p>0.05), not significant)




Figure 7 : Bar graph depicting age distribution of Gingival status: where blue denotes mild gingivitis, red denotes moderate gingivitis. X axis denotes the age group and Y axis denotes the number of patients. Higher Gingival index scores seen between 13-17 years of age. Association of age with gingival index was not statistically significant. (Pearson Chi-Square value=3.181^a,df=2, p value=0.204(p>0.05),not significant)