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ABSTRACT

Background: Dental caries (tooth decay) is a problem of children’s dental health in the world. Primary school age is a strategic group for the precaution of dental and oral diseases. There is a transition from baby teeth to permanent teeth in the early childhood. Primary school age children do not have good self-care behavior. Therefore, they need parental supervision such as maintenance of dental and oral health. The theory of Health Belief Model (HBM) is used by the community to take positive health action such as precaution of a disease. This study aimed to analyze the caries preventive behavior by using the theory of the Health Belief Model.

Subjects and Method: This study used analytic observational method with cross sectional approach. This study was conducted at 25 Primary Schools, Klaten Regency, in September 2019. This study used stratified proportional random sampling and random sampling techniques of 200 primary school children at 25 primary schools in Klaten Regency as the sampling technique. The dependent variable was caries preventive behavior. The independent variables were perceived susceptibility, perceived severity, perceived benefit, and perceived barrier. This study used questionnaires to collect the data. The data were analyzed by using multilevel analysis on Stata 13.

Results: Caries preventive behavior increased with perceived susceptibility (b=0.89; 95%CI=0.85 to 1.69; p=0.030), perceived severity (b=1.59; 95%CI=2.73 to 0.44; p=0.006), perceived benefit (b=1.05; 95%CI=1.97 to 0.12; p=0.026), and perceived barrier (b=-1.54; 95%CI=-2.84 to 0.25; p=0.019). The variation of caries preventive behavior by 7% was determined by variables at the primary school level. This rate was smaller than the standard size of rule of thumb by 8-10%. Therefore, there was a contextual effect shown from the multilevel analysis, but the result was statistically low.

Conclusion: There is an effect of perceived susceptibility, perceived severity, perceived benefit, and perceived barrier on caries preventive behavior in primary school children. There is a contextual effect of primary school on caries preventive behavior based on the theory of Health Belief Model, but the result was statistically low.

Keywords: multilevel analysis, primary school children, theory of Health Belief Model, precaution of caries.

Correspondence:
Dewi Mustika Ratih, Masters Program in Public Health, Universitas Sebelas Maret. Jl. Ir. Sutami 36A, Surakarta 57126, Central Java. Email: dewiratih1822@gmail.com. Mobile: +625640041822

BACKGROUND
Dental caries is a child’s health problem. Based on data from the World Health Organization (WHO), the incidence of caries in children was 60-90%. Based on studies in European, American and Asian countries, including Indonesia, 90-100% of children under 18 were affected by dental caries. According to the Oral Health Media Center, 60-90% of school-age children and almost all adults around the world had dental problems (WHO, 2017).
The prevalence of active caries in Indonesia increased, from 43.4% (2013) to 57.6% (2018). Central Java Province has dental and oral health problems by 56% (Basic Health Research, 2018).

Dental caries, one of the main public health problems in the world, is a disease of dental hard tissues caused by bacteria. It begins with plaque formation. Besides, it is characterized by the process of demineralization of enamel, dentin, and cementum. Dental caries is one of the dental and oral diseases. Dental caries occurs due to the damage of dental hard tissue which includes enamel, dentin, and cementum (Putri et al., 2012).

Primary school age children (6-12 years) are susceptible and critical age because they are susceptible to dental caries. In addition, the transition from baby teeth to permanent teeth occurs. Primary school age is a strategic group for the precaution of dental and oral diseases. There is a transition from baby teeth to permanent teeth in the early childhood. Primary school age children do not have good self-care behavior. Therefore, they need parental supervision such as maintenance of dental and oral health (Koizer et al., 2011).

The theory of Health Belief Model (HBM) is used to encourage the community to take positive health action such as precaution of dental caries. This theory shows that individuals, in taking precaution of a disease, or to behave healthily are affected by perceived susceptibility, perceived severity, perceived benefit, and perceived barrier. It can affect someone to do healthy behavior (Sulaeman, 2016).

SUBJECTS AND METHOD

1. Study Design
This study used analytic observational method with cross-sectional approach. This study was conducted at 25 Primary Schools, Klaten Regency, in September 2019.

2. Population and Sample
The population of the study was all primary school children in Klaten Regency. The sample of the study was 200 subjects of the study. This study used stratified proportional random sampling at the second level, namely primary school level. This study also used simple random sampling at the individual level. This technique was chosen because the researcher would choose a sample at each primary school in a simple random. The sample was selected from 25 primary school units in Klaten Regency area. As a result, there were 8 study subjects that were selected.

3. Study Variables
The dependent variable was caries preventive behavior. The independent variables were perceived susceptibility, perceived severity, perceived benefit, and perceived barrier.

4. Operational Definition of Variables
Perceived susceptibility was the positive or negative assessment that the individuals had the risk to prevent caries. This study used questionnaires as the measurement instrument. This study used continuous data scale. The data was converted into a dichotomy to facilitate analysis. Code 0=low value of perceived susceptibility and 1=high value of perceived susceptibility.

Perceived Severity/Seriousness was an individual's subjective perception on how severe the consequences of caries are. The data were collected by questionnaire. This study used continuous data scale. The data was transformed into dichotomous. Code 0=low value of perceived severity and 1=high value of perceived severity.

Perceived Benefit was the individual's perceived conviction on the benefits in conducting caries preventive behavior. The data were collected by questionnaire. This
study used continuous data scale. The data was transformed into. Code 0 for low and 1 for high.

**Perceived Barrier** was the individual's conviction about barriers in changing caries preventive behavior. The data were collected by questionnaire. This study used continuous data scale. The data was transformed into. Code 0=low value of perceived barrier 1=high value of perceived barrier.

**Caries Preventive Behavior** was actions conducted by individuals to prevent caries. The data were collected by questionnaire. Code 0=poor value of caries preventive behavior 1=good value of caries preventive behavior.

5. Data Analysis
The characteristics of the sample of the data related to caries preventive behavior, perceived susceptibility, perceived severity, perceived benefit, and perceived barrier were explained in n, mean, SD, minimum, maximum, and %. Bivariate analysis was conducted by using the Chi-square test. Multivariate analysis was conducted by multilevel multiple logistic regression.

6. Study Ethics
This study was conducted based on the study ethics which consisted of informed consent form, anonymity, confidentiality, and ethical clearance. Ethical clearance was obtained from the Health Research Ethics Committee of Dr. Moewardi Hospital, Surakarta, Indonesia, No: 972/VIII/HREC/-2019.

### RESULTS

1. Sample Characteristics
Sample characteristics was described in Table 1 and Table 2.

#### Table 1. Sample characteristic of continuous data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caries preventive behavior</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>18.62</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived susceptibility</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived severity</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>14.01</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived benefit</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>16.26</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived barrier</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 2. Sample characteristic of categorical data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caries Preventive Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Susceptibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Severity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Benefit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Barrier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that 162 study subjects (81%) had good caries preventive behavior, 102 study subjects (51%) had high perceived susceptibility, 111 study subjects (55.5%)...
had low perceived severity, 139 study subjects (69.5%) had high perceived benefit, and 161 study subjects (80.5%) had high perceived barrier.

2. Bivariante Analysis

The bivariate analysis in this study used Chi Square analysis. Table 3 shows the effect of the theory of Health Belief Model on caries preventive behavior. There was an effect of perceived susceptibility on caries preventive behavior in children. The study subjects with high perceived susceptibility had the possibility to take good caries preventive behavior by 2.03 times compared to low perceived susceptibility (OR= 2.03; 95% CI= 0.98 to 4.22; p=0.052).

There was an effect of perceived severity on caries preventive behavior in the primary school children, but the result was statistically non-significant. The study subjects with high perceived severity had the possibility to take good caries preventive behavior by 0.86 times compared to low perceived severity (OR= 0.86; 95% CI= 0.42 to 1.76; p=0.693).

There was an effect of perceived benefit on caries preventive behavior in the primary school children, but the result was statistically non-significant. The study subjects with high perceived benefit had the possibility to take good caries preventive behavior by 1.06 times compared to low perceived benefit (OR= 1.06; 95% CI=0.49 to 2.28; p=0.872).

There was an effect of perceived barrier on caries preventive behavior in children. The study subjects with high perceived barrier had the possibility to take good caries preventive behavior by 2.3 times compared to low perceived severity (OR= 2.3; CI95%=1.03 to 5.13; p=0.037).

Table 3. The chi-square test of the effect of the heath belief model theory on caries preventive behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Caries Preventive Behavior</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>CI 95%</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Limit</td>
<td>Lower Limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Susceptibility</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Severity</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Benefit</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Barrier</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Multivariate Analysis

The multivariate analysis in this study used multilevel multiple logistic regression method with Stata 13. Multivariate analysis explained the effect of more than 1 independent variable on 1 dependent variable.

Table 4 shows that caries preventive behavior increased with perceived susceptibility (b=0.89; 95% CI=0.85 to 1.69; p=
0.030), perceived severity (b=1.59; 95%CI=2.73 to 0.44; p=0.006), perceived benefit (b=1.05; 95%CI=1.97 to 0.12; p=0.026), and perceived barrier (b=1.54; 95%CI=-2.84 to 0.25; p=0.019).

Table 4. The result of the multivariate analysis of the effect of heath belief model theory on caries preventive behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient (b)</th>
<th>(95%) CI</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived susceptibility (high)</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived severity (high)</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived benefit (high)</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived barrier (high)</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Variation (Constant)</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

1. Perceived susceptibility on caries preventive behavior among primary school children

The result showed that there was an effect of perceived susceptibility on caries preventive behavior in primary school children. The primary school children who had high perceived susceptibility had a logodd of 0.89 units higher to do caries preventive behavior than low perceived susceptibility (b=0.89; 95%CI=0.85 to 1.69; p=0.030).

The primary school children who realized that they were susceptible or at risk of a disease would make an effort to prevent caries by taking caries preventive behavior. Based on the theory of Health Belief Model developed by Rusenstock (1994), the assumption that a person was transmitted to a disease would make themselves aware of taking preventive action and protection. A person who considers himself susceptible to a condition or serious problem will take action to protect themselves (Murti, 2018).

Based on a study conducted by Puri (2016), there was an effect between perceived susceptibility and the completeness of immunization status. Mothers who felt that their children were vulnerable to a disease and realize that it could be prevented by immunization would take precaution with vaccines and vice versa.

Based on another study conducted by Wakhida (2017), there was an effect of perceived susceptibility on the use of VCT (Voluntary Counseling and Testing). Pregnant women with high perceived susceptibility about HIV/AIDS would increase the use of VCT.

Based on a study conducted by Solhi (2017), there was an effect of perceived susceptibility on dental and oral health education for 12-year-old children.

Based on a study conducted by Indrian (2014), there was a correlation
between perceived susceptibility and health services in the theory of Health Belief Model. The conclusion of Indrian’s study is if the susceptibility of a disease increases, the health services in the theory of Health Belief Model will increase.

2. Perceived severity on caries preventive behavior among primary school children
There was an effect of perceived severity on caries preventive behavior in the primary school children. The primary school children who had high perceived severity had a logodd of 1.59 units higher to do caries preventive behavior than low perceived severity ($b=1.59; 95\% CI= 2.73 to 0.44; p=0.006$).

The result of this study is in line with a study conducted by Wigati (2016) that there was an effect between perceived benefit and the use of VCT. Pregnant women who had high perceived benefit of HIV/AIDS would use the VCT test.

Based on a study conducted by Ningrum (2016), there was an effect between perceived severity and cadre performance on tuberculosis case control. Cadres who had high perceived benefit would do the job in controlling tuberculosis cases better than cadres who had low perceived benefit.

Based on another study conducted by Solhi (2017), there was an effect of perceived severity on dental and oral health education for 12-year-old children.

Based on a study conducted by Wigati (2016), there was an effect of perceived benefit and the implementation of an IVA test. Women who increasingly feel the perceived benefit of an action to avoid a disease will prefer to do the action.

The theory of Health Belief Model, Rusenstock (1982) states that individuals that believe a behavior is beneficial to themselves and the environment will prefer to do the behavior. However, if the benefit obtained is not appropriate, the behavior will not occur. The example of perceived benefit for primary school children is taking caries preventive behavior in order to prevent caries. This study showed that the primary school age children would take caries preventive behavior if it was beneficial to prevent dental caries and vice versa.

3. Perceived benefit on caries preventive behavior among primary school children
There was an effect of perceived benefit on caries preventive behavior in the primary school children. The primary school children who had high perceived benefit had a logodd of 10.5 units higher to do caries preventive behavior than low perceived benefit ($b=1.05; 95\% CI= 1.97 to 0.12; p=0.026$).

The result of this study is in line with a study conducted by Wakhida (2016) that there was an effect between perceived benefit and the use of VCT. Pregnant women who had high perceived benefit of HIV/AIDS would use the VCT test.

Based on a study conducted by Ningrum (2016), there was an effect between perceived benefit and cadre performance on tuberculosis case control. Cadres who had high perceived benefit would do the job in controlling tuberculosis cases better than cadres who had low perceived benefit.

Based on another study conducted by Solhi (2017), there was an effect of perceived benefit on dental and oral health education for 12-year-old children.

Based on a study conducted by Wigati (2016), there was an effect of perceived benefit and the implementation of an IVA test. Women who increasingly feel the perceived benefit of an action to avoid a disease will prefer to do the action.

The theory of Health Belief Model, Rusenstock (1982) states that individuals that believe a behavior is beneficial to themselves and the environment will prefer to do the behavior. However, if the benefit obtained is not appropriate, the behavior will not occur. The example of perceived benefit for primary school children is taking caries preventive behavior in order to prevent caries. This study showed that the primary school age children would take caries preventive behavior if it was beneficial to prevent dental caries and vice versa.

4. Perceived barrier on caries preventive behavior among primary school children
There was an effect of perceived barrier on caries preventive behavior in the primary school children. The primary school child-
The result of this study is in line with a study conducted by Puri (2016) that there was an effect between perceived barrier and the completeness of immunization status. Mothers who had perceived barrier in immunizing their babies would not choose to take precaution by immunizing babies and vice versa.

Based on a study conducted by Solhi (2017), there was an effect of perceived severity on dental and oral health education for 12-year-old children.

Based on a study conducted by Wigati (2016), there was an effect of perceived barrier on the implementation of IVA test. Women who had high perceived barrier in conducting a behavior will reduce the possibility to take an IVA tests.

Based on a study conducted by Sutrisini (2016), there was an effect of perceived barrier on the willingness to take an HIV test. Pregnant women who felt barriers in carrying out HIV test would not choose to take precaution by doing HIV test and vice versa.

Based on a study by Heaton (2018), there was an effect of Health Belief Model on perceived barrier. 72% of mothers reported that they had one or more barriers to take oral health care, such as access. There was a significant correlation between barriers to do oral health care and low score of oral health behavior.

The result of this study is in accordance with the theory of Health Belief Model (Rusenstock, 1982) in Ningrum (2016), that precaution of a disease or seeking treatment was affected by perceived barrier that arise in conducting an action. General barriers experienced by a person in determining health actions or utilizing health services are dominated by personal constraints. Perceived barrier is an element that determine whether a behavior change occurs or not.

5. The contextual effect of school

Based on the result of the data analysis, the result of ICC=7%. The variation of caries preventive behavior by 7% was determined by variables at the primary school level. This rate was smaller than the standard size of rule of thumb by 8-10%. Therefore, there was a contextual effect shown from the multilevel analysis, but the result was statistically low.

The result of the study is in line with a study by Anagnostopoulus (2011), that stronger self-efficacy and greater perceived severity of oral disease that were associated with an increase in the frequency of tooth brushing as indicated by the total number of decayed, missing, and dental caries decreased. The contextual value of health belief model of toothbrushing behavior among parents of the students in primary school was low.

Based on a study conducted by Najar-Kolaei (2016), there was a correlation between knowledge, perceived barrier, cues to action, and maternal education and dental and oral health behavior, but the contextual value of integrated services post was low.

Based on another study conducted by Solhi (2019), there was a predictor correlation to the oral health behavior in students in Iran based on a health belief model, but the contextual value of the school was low.
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