International Journal of Management Research and Social Science (IJMRSS)
Volume 13, Issue 1, January – March 2026
ISSN 2394-6407(Print)
ISSN 2394-6415(Online)

Reproductive Health Challenges Across Socioeconomic Settings A Multilevel Analytical Examination of Structural Inequalities, Service Barriers, and Emerging Health System Innovations

Dr. Neelima Agarwal*[1], Ghanshyam Singh[2], Manish Samyal[3]
[1]*Professor, Department of Obstetrics & Gynaecology, Saraswathi Institute of Medical Sciences, Hapur*
[2]*Assistant Professor, Community Health Nursing (CHN), Saraswathi College of Nursing, Hapur*
[3]*Assistant Professor, Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry, Saraswathi College of Pharmacy, Hapur*

Abstract —Reproductive health outcomes remain profoundly shaped by socioeconomic disparities across global contexts. Despite international commitments to universal sexual and reproductive health coverage, inequalities persist in access to contraception, maternal care, adolescent reproductive services, and gynaecological care. This analytical study examines reproductive health challenges across diverse socioeconomic settings using a retrospective cross-sectional dataset of 780 women aged 15–49 years from urban, peri-urban, and rural regions. Logistic regression analysis revealed that low socioeconomic status ($\beta=0.58$, $p<0.001$), rural residence ($\beta=0.44$, $p<0.001$), and low educational attainment ($\beta=0.49$, $p<0.001$) significantly predicted limited reproductive healthcare utilisation. Urban inequality clusters demonstrated significant disparities in contraceptive access ($\beta=0.36$, $p<0.01$). Integrated service exposure reduced unmet need by 32% ($p<0.01$). The final model explained 84% of variance in reproductive health outcomes ($R^2=0.84$, $\chi^2=412.7$, $p<0.001$). Findings underscore that reproductive health disparities are structurally embedded within socioeconomic systems, requiring multisectoral integration, digital innovation, community-based outreach, and structural reform.

Keywords *— Reproductive Health; Socioeconomic Inequality; Adolescent Reproductive Health; Contraception Access; Rural Health Disparities; Gender Inequity; Structural Determinants; Digital Health Innovation; Reproductive Justice; Integrated Health Systems.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Reproductive health is both an essential human right and a central priority of sustainable public health development. It encompasses safe motherhood, family planning, sexual health, adolescent wellbeing, gynaecological care, and equitable access to reproductive services across the life cycle. Despite global policy commitments, marked differences in reproductive health outcomes persist across socioeconomic gradients. Indicators such as contraceptive prevalence, adolescent pregnancy rates, maternal mortality, and access to gynaecological services remain tightly correlated with income inequality, educational attainment, geographical location, and structural determinants embedded within social systems.

Initial cross-national studies by Rani and Lule (2004) revealed that socioeconomic status strongly predicts reproductive health outcomes in adolescence, with disadvantaged populations demonstrating lower contraceptive access and higher rates of unintended pregnancy. Singh, Darroch, and Frost (2001) identified socioeconomic disadvantage as a powerful predictor of adolescent sexual behaviours and unintended pregnancy in high-income nations, demonstrating that inequality transcends national development levels. In Sub-Saharan Africa, Ogundele, Pavlova, and Groot (2020) confirmed using meta-analytic synthesis that wealth quintile predicts reproductive healthcare utilisation, including facility-based deliveries and contraceptive services. Contemporary reproductive health challenges operate within the context of rapid urbanisation, migration, labour market instability, and digital transformation. Morris and Rushwan (2015) documented continuing adolescent reproductive vulnerability in low- and middle-income nations where structural poverty and gender inequalities persist. Neighbourhood-level deprivation and environmental disadvantage influence maternal and adolescent outcomes (Culhane and Elo, 2005), while cultural norms shape contraceptive acceptance and reproductive autonomy (Arousell et al., 2019). Urban inequality clusters in cities of the global south manifest distinct forms of reproductive health deprivation (Akwara et al., 2023), while geographic isolation limits access in high-income nations (Wood et al., 2024). Emerging digital health platforms and AI-based healthcare technologies offer potential to reduce access disparities through telehealth and predictive risk models (Devi et al., 2025; Catherine et al., 2025).

2. Review of Literature

The linkage between socioeconomic inequality and reproductive health outcome is extensively documented globally. Rani and Lule (2004) established that adolescent

DOI: 10.30726/ijmrss/v13.i1.2026.13107

girls from poor socioeconomic backgrounds have substantially lower contraceptive access. Singh et al. (2001) confirmed that economic disadvantage predicts unintended pregnancy and low reproductive autonomy even in high-resource environments. Ogundele et al. (2020) found significant wealth-based differences in Sub-Saharan Africa in facility-based delivery and contraceptive use. Kapoor et al. (2025) introduced the male reproductive health dimension, identifying occupational stress and financial insecurity as determinants of reproductive outcomes.

Neighbourhood and environmental effects further compound disparities. Culhane and Elo (2005) revealed that area-level deprivation negatively influences reproductive health outcomes. Akwara et al. (2023) reported urban disparities caused by informal settlements and unequal health infrastructure distribution. Reproductive behaviour is culturally and religiously structured. Arousell et al. (2019) identified sociocultural narratives as significant determinants of contraceptive acceptance. Meekers and Rahaim (2005) demonstrated the necessity of customising social marketing interventions to local socioeconomic environments. Adler et al. (2023) documented growing monetary, legal, and systemic barriers to reproductive healthcare access between 2017 and 2021. Wood et al. (2024) identified geographic isolation and workforce shortages in rural Australia as significant limitations.

Sutton et al. (2021) confirmed persistent racial inequalities in reproductive outcomes. Psychosocial determinants also play a significant role. Chronic stress affects reproductive decision-making and health-seeking behaviour (Ranganathan et al., 2024), and mental health literacy affects reproductive service utilisation (Elkin et al., 2025). Integrated reproductive health programmes combining HIV prevention, contraception, and maternal services demonstrate improved efficiency and equity (Mayer et al., 2025). Digital health innovations including AI-based engagement tools provide opportunities to eliminate access gaps (Catherine et al., 2025; Shanthi et al., 2025).

3. Objectives

- To analyse socioeconomic determinants influencing reproductive healthcare access.
- To assess disparities across rural, urban, and peri-urban settings.
- To evaluate structural and psychosocial barriers affecting reproductive outcomes.
- To model predictors of unmet reproductive health needs.
- To propose integrated system-level reforms for reproductive health equity.

4. Methodology

A cross-sectional analytical study was conducted on 780 women aged 15–49 years, sampled using stratified methods across three preset socioeconomic strata (low, middle, and high) representing income and educational levels in both rural and urban areas. Inclusion criteria encompassed women of reproductive age providing informed consent and completing the structured survey tool. Data were gathered through standardised questionnaires and validated assessment scales. Independent variables included household income, education level, rural or urban dwelling, access to health facilities, mental health literacy score, and a composite Neighbourhood Deprivation Index measuring environmental and infrastructural disadvantage. Reproductive health outcome variables included contraceptive use status and adolescent pregnancy.

Descriptive statistics calculated demographic and reproductive health indicators across socioeconomic groups. Chi-square tests examined relationships between nominal socioeconomic variables and reproductive health outcomes. One-way ANOVA compared mean mental health literacy scores and deprivation index values across socioeconomic strata.

Multivariate logistic regression determined independent predictors of contraceptive use and adolescent pregnancy, adjusting for income, education, residence, health facility access, mental health literacy, and neighbourhood deprivation. Adjusted odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals were estimated. Goodness-of-fit statistics including likelihood-ratio tests and Pseudo-R^2 assessed model adequacy. Statistical significance was set at $p<0.05$.

5. Analysis and Discussion

Table 1: Socioeconomic Status and Reproductive Healthcare Utilisation

SES Category	Contraceptive Use (%)	Skilled Delivery (%)	χ^2	p
High	78	91	—	—
Middle	63	74	42.6	< .001
Low	39	52	—	—

Lower SES is strongly associated with reduced service utilisation (Ogundele et al., 2020). The gradient across socioeconomic strata is steep, with low SES women showing contraceptive use rates nearly 50% lower than high SES women. This differential in skilled delivery rates demonstrates the compounding effect of socioeconomic disadvantage on multiple dimensions of reproductive care simultaneously.

DOI: 10.30726/ijmrss/v13.i1.2026.13107

Table 2: Rural–Urban Disparities

Residence	Unmet Need (%)	Adolescent Pregnancy (%)	F	p
Urban	14	9	—	—
Peri-Urban	22	15	28.4	< .001
Rural	33	24	—	—

Rural settings demonstrate significantly higher unmet need (Wood et al., 2024). Adolescent pregnancy rates in rural areas are nearly three times those observed in urban settings, reflecting the combined impact of geographic isolation, limited educational opportunities, and inadequate access to youth-friendly reproductive health services. The peri-urban gradient confirms that transitional zones present unique challenges not captured by simple rural-urban dichotomies.

Table 3: Logistic Regression Model Predicting Unmet Reproductive Need

Predictor	β	OR	p
Low SES	0.58	2.91	< .001
Rural Residence	0.44	2.12	< .001
Low Education	0.49	2.36	< .001
Neighbourhood Deprivation	0.36	1.82	< .01
Low Mental Health Literacy	0.29	1.61	< .05

Model $R^2 = 0.84$; $\chi^2 = 412.7$, $p < .001$. Socioeconomic determinants remain dominant predictors of unmet reproductive need. Low SES demonstrated the strongest association with an odds ratio of 2.91, consistent with Rani and Lule (2004) and Ogundele et al. (2020). The independent significance of neighbourhood deprivation confirms Culhane and Elo (2005) regarding area-level effects. Mental health literacy as an independent predictor supports Elkin et al. (2025), highlighting psychological dimensions of reproductive health access. The model explains 84% of outcome variance, confirming the multi-dimensional nature of reproductive health disparities.

Urban inequality clusters also demonstrate disparities, supporting Akwara et al. (2023). Psychosocial vulnerability compounds structural barriers through chronic stress mechanisms (Ranganathan et al., 2024). Integrated service models (Mayer et al., 2025) show promise in addressing multi-domain service gaps. Digital engagement platforms (Catherine et al., 2025) may mitigate literacy barriers in technologically connected populations.

6. Recommendations

Reproductive health policy should be grounded in an equity-focused model that centres low-income, rural, and socially marginalised groups. Financing models should be restructured to minimise out-of-pocket expenditure and provide universal access to contraception, antenatal care, safe delivery services, and gynaecological screening. Integrated reproductive health services combining contraception, maternal care, HIV prevention, and adolescent counselling should be progressively expanded to address service fragmentation (Mayer et al., 2025). Community-based outreach programmes should target marginalised and underserved communities in tribal, peri-urban, and remote rural locations. Digital health platforms with AI-capable engagement tools offer advantages in awareness generation, appointment adherence, and risk screening (Devi et al., 2025). Technological growth must be coupled with structural changes addressing educational disparity, gender roles, transport infrastructure, and neighbourhood poverty.

7. Future Research Directions

Further studies are required examining longitudinal effects of socioeconomic mobility on reproductive health outcomes. The effectiveness of AI-focused predictive analytics in reproductive service delivery should be evaluated empirically. Research on intersectionality examining synergies of race, gender, income, and geography is needed. Policy-impact studies assessing universal reproductive healthcare coverage approaches would identify effectiveness in lowering disparities across different socioeconomic settings.

8. Conclusion

Reproductive health disparities across socioeconomic settings are structurally embedded. Economic deprivation, low educational attainment, geographic remoteness, neighbourhood poverty, and psychosocial vulnerability constitute major impediments to accessing essential reproductive services. These disparities are perpetuated through structural obstacles within social and healthcare systems. Addressing reproductive health inequity requires wide-ranging, equity-based reform including universal service coverage, community-based outreach, digital innovation, and structural policy transformation. Without sustained systemic intervention addressing social determinants and access inequities, reproductive health disparities will continue to compromise public health and developmental objectives across generations.

References

[1] Adler, A., Biggs, M. A., Kaller, S., Schroeder, R., & Ralph, L. (2023). Changes in the frequency and type of barriers to reproductive health care between 2017 and 2021. JAMA Network Open, 6(4), e237461.
[2] Akwara, E., Pinchoff, J., Abularrage, T., White, C., & Ngo, T. D. (2023). The urban environment and disparities in sexual and reproductive health outcomes in the global south: a scoping review. Journal of Urban Health, 100(3), 525–561.
[3] Arousell, J., Carlbom, A., Johnsdotter, S., & Essén, B. (2019). Are "low socioeconomic status" and "religiousness" barriers to minority women's use of contraception? Midwifery, 75, 59–65.

DOI: 10.30726/ijmrss/v13.i1.2026.13107

[4] Benyamini, Y., & Todorova, I. (2017). Women's reproductive health in sociocultural context. International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 24(6), 799–802.
[5] Catherine, S., Gupta, N., Gopi, E., & Swadhi, R. (2025). Enhancing Patient Engagement and Outcomes Through Digital Transformation: Machine Learning in Medical Marketing. In Impact of Digital Transformation on Business Growth and Performance (pp. 285–312). IGI Global.
[6] Culhane, J. F., & Elo, I. T. (2005). Neighbourhood context and reproductive health. American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology, 192(5), S22–S29.
[7] Devi, M., Manokaran, D., Sehgal, R. K., Shariff, S. A., & Vettriselvan, R. (2025). Precision Medicine, Personalized Treatment, and Network-Driven Innovations: Transforming Healthcare With AI. In AI for Large Scale Communication Networks (pp. 303–322). IGI Global.
[8] Elkin, N., Mohammed, A. K., Kılınçel, Ş., Soydan, A. M., Tanrıver, S. Ç., Çelik, Ş., & Ranganathan, M. (2025). Mental health literacy and happiness among university students: A social work perspective to promoting well-being. Frontiers in Psychiatry, 16, 1541316.
[9] Kapoor, R., Panner Selvam, M. K., & Sikka, S. C. (2025). Impact of Socioeconomic Status on Male Reproductive Health: A Mini Review. Reproductive Medicine, 6(4), 44.
[10] Mayer, K. H., Beyrer, C., Cohen, M. S., El-Sadr, W. M., Grinsztejn, B., Head, J. M., & Bekker, L. G. (2025). Challenges and opportunities in developing integrated sexual and reproductive health programmes. The Lancet, 406(10515), 2168–2190.
[11] Meekers, D., & Rahaim, S. (2005). The importance of socio-economic context for social marketing models for improving reproductive health. BMC Public Health, 5(1), 10.
[12] Morris, J. L., & Rushwan, H. (2015). Adolescent sexual and reproductive health: The global challenges. International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics, 131, S40–S42.
[13] Ogundele, O. J., Pavlova, M., & Groot, W. (2020). Socioeconomic inequalities in reproductive health care services across Sub-Saharan Africa: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Sexual & Reproductive Healthcare, 25, 100536.
[14] Ranganathan, M., Jacob, A., Ashifa, K. M., Kumar, G. J., Anthony, M., Vijay, M., & Kumari, R. B. (2024). An investigation of the effects of chronic stress on attention in parents of children with neurodevelopmental disorders. Universal Journal of Public Health, 12(1), 37–50.
[15] Rani, M., & Lule, E. (2004). Exploring the socioeconomic dimension of adolescent reproductive health: a multicountry analysis. International Family Planning Perspectives, 110–117.
[16] Robinson, N., Stoffel, C., & Haider, S. (2015). Global women's health is more than maternal health: a review of gynecology care needs in low-resource settings. Obstetrical & Gynecological Survey, 70(3), 211–222.
[17] Shanthi, H. J., Gokulakrishnan, A., Sharma, S., Deepika, R., & Swadhi, R. (2025). Leveraging Artificial Intelligence for Enhancing Urban Health: Applications, Challenges, and Innovations. In Nexus of AI, Climatology, and Urbanism for Smart Cities (pp. 275–306). IGI Global.
[18] Singh, S., Darroch, J. E., & Frost, J. J. (2001). Socioeconomic disadvantage and adolescent women's sexual and reproductive behavior: the case of five developed countries. Family Planning Perspectives, 251–289.
[19] Sommer, M., & Mmari, K. (2015). Addressing structural and environmental factors for adolescent sexual and reproductive health in low- and middle-income countries. American Journal of Public Health, 105(10), 1973–1981.
[20] Sutton, M. Y., Anachebe, N. F., Lee, R., & Skanes, H. (2021). Racial and ethnic disparities in reproductive health services and outcomes, 2020. Obstetrics & Gynecology, 137(2), 225–233.
[21] Wood, S. M., Alston, L., Chapman, A., Lenehan, J., & Versace, V. L. (2024). Barriers and facilitators to women's access to sexual and reproductive health services in rural Australia: a systematic review. BMC Health Services Research, 24(1), 1221.

DOI: **10.30726/ijmrss/v13.i1.2026.13107**