Effectiveness of the Promoting Access to Health for Pacific Islander and Southeast Asian Women (PATH for Women) Study: Outreach and Education to Promote Breast and Cervical Cancer Screening

> Jeff Dang, MPH Jacqueline Tran, MPH, DrPH(c) Kimiko Kelly, MPP Mary Anne Foo, MPH

### Acknowledgements

This presentation was supported by Cooperative Agreement Number 5U58DP001006-03 & 5U58DP001006-04 from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Its contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of CDC. Staff that assisted with the data entry:

for Women

Health for Pacific Islander

REACH US

- Angel Avilla
- Kristin Iseri
- Daisy Le
- Linda Le
- Elna Simpson
- Lisa Truong
- David Tran
- Vivian Tran
- Bryan Vu
- Alisi Tulua

Special thanks to Dr. Sora Park Tanjasiri and Dr. Marjorie Kagawa Singer for their helpful review and comments



### Asian American and **Pacific Islander Women**

- AAPIs are one of the fastest growing minority groups in the U.S.
- Largest percentage of AAPI in country



Southeast Asian (SEA)

# **United States Demographics**

• 2000 Census: Southeast Asian populations

Cambodian:	206,052
Laotian:	198,203
Thai:	150,283
Total:	



# **Current Study**

- Evaluated changes among SEA women in response to the intervention for the following outcomes:
  - · Self-reported screening behaviors
  - Knowledge of breast and cervical cancer symptoms
  - Beliefs about cancer risks and causes

### Inclusion criteria

- SEA women at least 45 year old
- Cambodian, Laotian, and Thai



### PATH Study



- "PATH for Women"
- Funded by CDC under the REACH US Initiative
- Focus on underserved AAPI communities SEA and PI women
- Northern and Southern California
- Eliminate inequities in breast and cervical cancer
- Culturally & linguistically tailored interventions

### **Research Design**

- Human Subjects
  - UCLA IRB # G02-07-107-01
  - Consent provided by all participants
- Face to face interviews
  - Bilingual community health workers
  - Performed in language most preferred by the participant

### **Research Design**

- Quasiexperimental Cohort Design
- Two year follow up
  - Baseline conducted from 2002 to 2003
  - Follow up conducted from 2005

### **Two Communities**

### Northern California Southern California

- Control
- InterventionLos Angeles &

**Orange Counties** 

- Sacramento
- San Francisco
- San Mateo
  - Alameda
- Contra Costa
- Monterey
- Santa Clara
- Sutter &
- Solano Counties

### **Intervention Components**

- Outreach and education
  - Brochures in language and in English
  - Community events
  - In person one-on-one
  - Community sites small and large groups
- Patient navigation services
  - Make appointment for screening
  - Provide support and interpretation at the medical encounter
  - Follow-up reminder calls
- Social marketing
  - TV, video, and newspaper advertisements

### Measures

- Sociodemographic characteristics
- Screening behavior
- Mammograms
- Clinical breast exam
- Pap smears
- Knowledge of breast cancer (7 items)
- Knowledge of cervical cancer (7 items)
- Beliefs of breast cancer (10 items)
- Beliefs of cervical cancer (5 items)

### 1

### **Data Analysis**

- Listwise deletion for missing data
- Logistic regression was used for primary outcomes
  - Controlling for significantly different demographic variables (North vs. South)
- Analyses stratified by ethnicity:
  - Analyses stratilied by et
  - Cambodian
  - Laotian
  - Thai

# **Logistic Regression**

- Screening
  - Positive change (Coded as 1) in screening behavior between baseline and follow-up was defined as either:
    - Having <u>never</u> had a screening examination <u>at baseline</u> but having appropriately <u>performed</u> breast self-examination received a breast screening (clinical breast examination or mammogram) <u>at follow-up</u>
       Behavior change
    - Having appropriately <u>performed</u> breast self-examination or received a breast screening <u>at baseline</u> and <u>continuing</u> to do this <u>at follow-up</u>.

16

No change or maintenance

### **Logistic Regression**

- Knowledge and Beliefs
  - Positive change (Coded as 1) in knowledge and beliefs between baseline and follow-up was defined as either:
    - Having <u>a greater</u> scale score at follow up as compared to baseline, or
       Positive change
    - Having <u>the same</u> scale score at follow up as compared to baseline.
      - No change





# **Demographic Characteristics**

• Age

• Mean = 51.0, SD = 11.9

• Years in the U.S.

- Mean = 17.3, SD = 7.1
- Site
  - North (Control), n = 222, 39.4%
  - South (Intervention), n = 341, 60.6%
  - Total, n = 563, 100.0%

Demographic Characteristics

Education

- None, n = 330, 44.8%
- Elementary to HS, n = 57, 7.7%
- College/Vocational, n = 59, 8.0%
- ESL/Adult School, n = 249, 33.8%
- Employment
  - Not employed, n = 317, 56.5%

# Demographic Characteristics

- Ability to pay for necessities
  - Difficult, n = 439, 79.2%
- Medical insurance
  - Yes, n = 430, 76.8%
- Marital Status
  - Married, n = 310, 55.3%

2

### Screening outcomes for Cambodian sample

North         South           n (%)         n (%)         OR         95% Cl         p           Aammogram         39 (86.7)         62 (62.6)         0.22         0.08, 0.62         004.           Dinical treast Exam         30 (58.8)         84 (84.8)         2.47         1.05, 5.80         0.38           Pap Smear         44 (97.8)         85 (87.6)         0.12         0.01, 0.97         .047		Positive	Change		Effect	
n (%)         n (%)         OR         95% Cl         p           Aammogram         39 (86.7)         62 (62.6)         0.22         0.08, 0.62         0.04           Dinical treast Exam         30 (58.8)         84 (84.8)         2.47         1.05, 5.80         0.38           Pap Smear         44 (97.8)         85 (87.6)         0.12         0.01, 0.97         .047		North	South			
Mammogram         39 (86.7)         62 (62.6)         0.22         0.08, 0.62         .004           Dinical reast Exam         30 (58.8)         84 (84.8)         2.47         1.05, 5.80         038           Pap Smear         44 (97.8)         85 (87.6)         0.12         0.01, 0.97         .047		n (%)	n (%)	OR	95% CI	
Zimical reast Exam         30 (58.8)         84 (84.8)         2.47         1.05, 5.60         0.38           'ap Smear         44 (97.8)         85 (87.6)         0.12         0.01, 0.97         .047	Mammogram	39 (86.7)	62 (62.6)	0.22	0.08, 0.62	.004
Pap Smear 44 (97.8) 85 (87.6) 0.12 0.01, 0.97 .047	Clinical Breast Exam	30 (58.8)	84 (84.8)	2.47	1.05, 5.80	.038
	Pap Smear	44 (97.8)	85 (87.6)	0.12	0.01, 0.97	.047

	Mainter Positive	nance or Change		Group Effect	
	North	South			
	n (%)	n (%)	OR	95% CI	p
Knowledge of breast cancer	30 (57.7)	87 (87.9)	3.87	1.61, 9.31	.003
Knowledge of cervical cancer	21 (38.2)	37 (36.6)	0.75	0.35, 1.60	.456

	Mainte Positive	nance or Change		Group Effect	
	North	South			
	n (%)	n (%)	OR	95% CI	р
Beliefs of preast cancer	18 (33.3)	35 (35.4)	0.84	0.38, 1.84	.659
Beliefs of cervical cancer	11 (20.4)	76 (76.8)	11.23	4.69, 26.87	.001

Screening outcomes for Laotian sample

	Mainter Positive	nance or Change		Group Effect	
	North	South			
	n (%)	n (%)	OR	95% CI	
Mammogram	54 (66.7)	103 (80.5)	2.02	0.97, 4.18	.059
Clinical Breast Exam	43 (55.8)	108 (85.0)	3.58	1.71, 7.47	.001
Pop Smoor	65 (84.4)	108 (87.1)	0.99	0.38. 2.62	.988



# Knowledge of breast and cervical cancer for Laotian sample

Knowledge of breast cancer

Knowledge of cervical cancer

# <section-header>

Screening outcomes for Thai sample

	Mainter Positive	ntenance or itive Change		Group Effect	
	North	South			
	n (%)	n (%)	OR	95% CI	
Mammogram	56 (71.8)	98 (89.1)	3.21	0.95, 10.78	.060
Clinical Breast Exam	69 (87.3)	96 (86.5)	0.80	0.23, 2.81	.725
D 0	66 (90.4)	103 (93.6)	3 17	0 56 17 80	190

nowledg	e of br	east an	d ce	rvical ca	ncer fo
	1	Thai sa	mple		
	Mainte Positive	nance or e Change		Group Effect	
	North	South			
	n (%)	n (%)	OR	95% CI	p
Knowledge of breast cancer	60 (74.1)	63 (57.3)	0.26	0.11, 0.64	.003
Knowledge of	53 (64.6)	74 (66.1)	1.04	0.46, 2.36	.920

North South n (%) n (%) OR 95% CI p		Effect		Change	Positive	
n (%) n (%) OR 95% CI p				South	North	
	p	95% CI	OR	n (%)	n (%)	
Beliefs of 65 (80.2) 105 (94.6) 1.57 0.46, 5.35 .470 breast cancer	.470	0.46, 5.35	1.57	105 (94.6)	65 (80.2)	Beliefs of breast cancer
Beliefs of 51 (63.8) 83 (74.8) 3.41 1.39, 8.36 .007 cervical cancer	.007	1.39, 8.36	3.41	83 (74.8)	51 (63.8)	Beliefs of cervical cancer



### Conclusions

Cambodian •Changes in CBE •Changes in knowledge of breast cancer •Changes in beliefs of cervical cancer

Laotian •Changes in CBE •Changes in knowledge of breast cancer •Changes in beliefs of breast cancer

<u>Thai</u> •Changes in beliefs of cervical cancer

Overall •Differential results were found across the different ethnic groups •Knowledge and beliefs were more mutable than behaviors •Few changes in Thai group

### Limitations

- Quasi-experimental design
  - Demographic differences between communities included as covariates
- Convenience sample
  - Limits generalizability
- Self-reported data
  - Eliciting socially desirable responses

### Lessons Learned

- Used culturally specific assessments taken from previous studies
  - Need for the rigorous validation of culturally specific questionnaires
  - Need to translate general measures in different languages



### Lessons Learned

- In language and English datasets needed to be entered and merged carefully
  - Need for a systematic process for linking and unifying datasets
- Used simple questions to save time
  - Have you ever had a mammogram?
  - If yes, when was the last time you had a
    - mammogram?A lot of missing data due to patient refusal and
    - interviewer error with these types of skip patterns
  - Need to frequency scales

### Lessons Learned

- Collected a large amount of data
  - Interviews took ~1-2 hours to complete
  - Information overload
  - Future studies will be more focused
  - Reduce the burden on participants
- Evaluation conducted at baseline and 2 years follow up
  - Future studies should include additional time points, as well as evaluations more proximal to exposure to the intervention

### **Study Implications**

•Previous results indicate a need to increase awareness and information about cancer detection and prevention among underrepresented SEA and PI women

•Cultural sensitivity is crucial in understanding cancer related behaviors

Contextual factors are important

•Culturally tailored interventions are important for increasing knowledge and awareness regarding breast and cervical cancer



### **Future Directions**

•More research on SEA women

•Reorganization of ethnic diversity within the Asian communities

•Currently studying Vietnamese, Samoan, and Tongan women



# Acknowledgements



### THANK YOU

Sourm our koun -*Cambodian/Khmer* 

Khawp jai – Laotian

Khap-khun-krup - Thai

### Presenter Disclosures Jeff Dang, MPH

The following personal financial relationships with commercial interests relevant to this presentation existed during the past 12 months:

Allergan Medical Inc. – Psychometric Consultant

Development and Validation of the Eyelash Satisfaction Questionnaire (ESQ) Burgess, S. Hansen, J. E., Cole, J. C., & Dang, J. (2009, October). Validation and Cross-National Equivalence of the Eyelash Satisfaction Questionnaire (ESQ). Presented at the International Society of Pharmacoeconomic Outcomes (ISPOR). Paris, France.

Dang, J., Hansen, J., & Burgess, S. E. (2009, October). Validation and Assessment of Measurement Invariance of the Eyelash Satisfaction Questionnaire (ESQ) in US Cancer Patients. Poster presented at the International Society of Pharmacoeconomic Outcomes (ISPOR). Paris, France.

Dang, J., Wang, E., Cole, J. C., Ahluwalia, G., & Burgess, S. M. (2009). Re-evaluation of minimal important difference of the CAP Domain of the Eyelash Satisfaction Questionnaire. 2009 International Society for Quality of Life Research meeting abstracts. The QLR Journal, A-70, Abstract #1429

### **Presenter Disclosures**

Jacqueline H. Tran, MPH, DrPH(c) The following personal financial relationships with commercial interests relevant to this presentation existed during the past 12 months:



### **Contact Information**

Jeff Dang, MPH President and Senior Research Scientist Consulting Measurement Group, Inc.

2390 Crenshaw Blvd., #110 Torrance, CA 90501 Ph: (866) 782-8799 (ext. 6) Fax: (310) 539-1983

E-mail: jdang@webcmg.com Web: www.webcmg.com





12900 Garden Grove Blvd. Suite 214A

Garden Grove, CA 92843 Phone: (714) 636-9095 Fax; (714) 636-8828

Email: jtran@ocapica.org Website: www.ocapica.org





# **Screening Results**

- Breast cancer screening
  - Mammogram
  - Clinical breast exam
- Cervical cancer screening





# Knowledge

- Knowledge of breast cancer symptoms
- Knowledge of cervical cancer risk factors



### Knowledge of breast cancer

- Composite score consisted of 7 items
  - Which of the following are possible signs or symptoms of breast cancer:
    - Breast lump (Yes)
    - Bloody breast discharge (Yes)
    - Puckered breast skin (Yes)
    - Painful breasts (Yes)
    - Changes in breast size from normal size (Yes)
  - A mammogram can find breast cancer in its early stages (Agree)

48

• Trauma to the breast(s) causes cancer (Disagree)

## Knowledge of cervical cancer

### Composite score consisted of 7 items

- A women is more likely to get cancer of the cervix if she began having sex at an early age (Agree)
- A woman is more likely to get cancer of the cervix if she has had many sexual partners (Agree)
- A woman is more likely to get cancer of the cervix if her husband has had many sexual partners (Agree)
- A women is more likely to get cancer of the cervix if she is exposed to cigarette smoke (Disagree)
- A women is more likely to get cancer of the cervix if she has poor personal hygiene (Disagree)
- A women is more likely to get cancer of the cervix if she uses an intrauterine device (Disagree)
- A women is more likely to get cancer of the cervix if she uses birth control pills (Agree)



### Beliefs



- Beliefs of breast cancer symptoms
- · Beliefs of cervical cancer risk factors



### **Beliefs of breast cancer**

- Composite score consisted of 10 items
  - Most women with breast cancer can live a normal lifetime if it is discovered and treated early (Agree)
  - A woman is more likely to get breast cancer if her mother or sister has had it (Agree)
  - A woman is more likely to get breast cancer if she eats a diet high in fat (Agree)
  - A mammogram is only needed if I feel I have symptoms (Disagree)
  - If breast cancer is found early, it can be cured (Agree)
  - Breast cancer can be cured by traditional healers (Disagree)
  - I need a mammogram only when I have a breast lump (Disagree)
  - There is not much that I can do to prevent breast cancer (Disagree)
  - Women can get breast cancer in their lifetime (Agree)
  - Breast cancer is caused by spirits (Disagree)

# **Beliefs of cervical cancer**

- Composite score consisted of 5 items
  - If cancer of the cervix is found early, it can be cured (Agree)
  - A woman does not need to get Pap smears after she reaches menopause (Disagree)
  - A woman does not need to get Pap smears after she stops having children (Disagree)
  - Only women who are sexually active should get Pap smears (Disagree)
  - I'm too busy to get Pap smears (Disagree)

	Nc (n =	orth = 55)	So (n =	uth 101)	Stat	istic	
	n	%	n	%	χ <sup>2</sup>	р	
Age					5.72	.126	
25 to 40		14.8	26	26.5			
41 to 50		38.9		27.6			
51 to 60	14	25.9		17.3			
>60		20.4	28	28.6			
Years in U.S.					1.82	.402	
0 to 10		13.0		16.0			
11 to 20	25	46.3		54.0			
Over 20	22	40.7	30	30.0			
Education					6.44	.168	
None	16	29.1		41.0			
Element.		12.7		21.0			
to HS							
Vocational	3	5.5	2	2.0			
ESL/Adult	27	49.1	33	33.0			
Unknown		2.6		2.0			

	N (n	orth = 55)	Sc (n =	outh : 101)	Stat	istic
	n	%	n	%	Х <sup>2</sup>	p
Employment					2.79	.095
No	43	78.2	66	65.3		
Yes		21.8	35	34.7		
Ability to pay					22.39	.001
for necessities						
Not difficult	10	19.2	59	59.6		
Difficult	42	80.8		40.4		
Insurance					0.59	.443
No		9.3	6	5.9		
Yes	49	90.7	95	94.1		
Marital Status					5.87	.053
Unmarried	27	49.1		50.5		
Married		38.2		46.5		
Living as		12.7	3	3.0		



	Nc (n =	orth = 85)	So (n =	uth 128)	Stat	istic
	n	%			Х <sup>2</sup>	р
Age					6.36	.096
25 to 40	24	28.6	20	15.7		
41 to 50	23	27.4	49	38.6		
51 to 60	19	22.6	34	26.8		
>60	18	21.4	24	18.9		
'ears in U.S.					12.92	.002
0 to 10	6	7.2		4.0		
11 to 20	46	55.4		33.3		
Over 20	31	37.3		62.7		
Education					4.55	.337
None	15	19.0		32.0		
Element. to HS		10.1		10.2		
College/ Vocational		6.3		4.7		
ESL/Adult	46	58.2	60	46.9		
Unknown		6.3	8	6.3		

	N (n	orth = 85)	So (n =	uth 128)	Stat	istic
	n	%	n	%	χ²	p
Employment					1.74	.188
No	56	66.7	96	75.0		
Yes	28	33.3	32	25.0		
Ability to pay					24.13	.001
for necessities						
Not difficult	30	36.1	11	8.7		
Difficult	53	63.9	116	91.3		
Insurance					7.25	.007
No		10.7	33	25.8		
Yes	75	89.3	95	74.2		
Marital Status					2.32	.314
Unmarried	32	37.6	36	28.3		
Married	51	60.0	89	70.1		
Living as		2.4		1.6		

_					
_					

	Nc (n =	orth = 82)	So (n =	uth 112)	Stat	istic
	n	%	n	%	χ²	р
Age					13.25	.004
25 to 40	18	22.0	14	12.5		
41 to 50	38	46.3	33	29.5		
51 to 60		18.3		33.0		
>60		13.4	28	25.0		
rears in U.S.					1.10	.577
0 to 10	27	33.3	29	26.4		
11 to 20	29	35.8	44	40.0		
Over 20	25	30.9		33.6		
Education					43.58	.001
None	11	13.4		45.5		
Element. to HS	14	17.1		0.0		
College/ Vocational	28	34.1	18	16.1		
ESL/Adult	26	31.7	32	28.6		
Unknown	3	3.7	11	9.8		



	N (n	orth = 82)	So (n =	uth 112)	Stat	istic
	n	%	n	%	χ²	ρ
Employment					3.13	
No	18	22.2	38	33.9		
Yes	63	77.8	74	66.1		
Ability to pay					0.01	.909
for necessities						
Not difficult		2.4				
Difficult	80	97.6	108	97.3		
Insurance					21.84	.001
No		20.7	60	54.1		
Yes	65	79.3		45.9		
Marital Status					27.49	.001
Unmarried	20	24.7	55	49.1		
Married	60	74.1	42	37.5		
Living as married		1.2		13.4		

\_

### Conclusions

Screening Outcomes •Expected findings •2.47 greater odds of CBE in intervention group as compared to control group among Combotiums •3.58 greater odds of GBE in intervention group as compared to control group among Localette

### •Unexpected findings

 448 greater odds of menimicarian in control group as compared to intervention group among Cambodians
 Large 95% CI (1.62 – 12.37)
 8.56 greater odds of pap amoat in control group as compared to intervention group among Cambodiate
 Large 95% CI (1.03-71.31) nogram in control group as compared to

•No differences in screening behaviors found among Thais

### Conclusions

Knowledge of breast cancer •Expected Findings •3.87 greater odds of having similar or improved innowledge of homes cancer in invention group as compared to control group among compared to control group among

•2.36 of having similar or improved knowledge of breast cancer in invention group as compared to control group among L

-Unexpected Findings
-3.83 greater odds of having similar or improved knowledge of breast c: in the control group as compared to intervention group among Thais -Large 95% CI (1.57-9.32)

-

n coffe all in

### Conclusions

Knowledge of cervical cancer •No differences found among Cambodians, Laotians, or Thais

Beliefs of breast cancer 3.58 greater odds of similar or positive build would breast cancer in the intervention group as compared to control group among <u>cancer</u> No differences found among Cambodians and Thais

Beliefs of cervical cancer •11.23 greater odds of similar or positive beliefs about cervical cancer in intervention group as compared to control group among Cambodians •3.41 greater odds of similar or positive humbs about cervical cancer in intervention group as compared to control group among Thats •No differences found among Laotians