

SAĞLIK BILIMLERİ ÜNİVERSITESİ HEMŞİRELİK DERGİSİ

University of Health Sciences Journal of Nursing Cilt / Volume 6 • Sayı / Number 2 • Ağustos / August • 2024

Araştırma makalesi / Research article • DOI: 10.48071/sbuhemsirelik.1473596 Investigation of the Relationship Between Breast Cancer Awareness and Health Literacy in Female Textile Workers

Kadın Tekstil İşçilerinde Meme Kanseri Farkındalığı ve Sağlık Okuryazarlığı İlişkisinin Değerlendirilmesi

Ayla Hendekci¹ 💿

Yazarların ORCID numaraları / ORCID IDs of the authors: A.H. 0000-0001-7974-6232

¹Giresun University, Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Nursing, Giresun, Türkiye

Sorumlu yazar / Corresponding author: Ayla Hendekci E-posta: ayla.hendekci@gmail.com

Geliş tarihi / Date of receipt: 25.04.2024 Kabul tarihi / Date of acceptance: 03.05.2024

Atıf / Citation: Hendekci, A. (2024). Investigation of the relationship between breast cancer awareness and health literacy in female textile workers. *UHS Journal of Nursing*, 6(2), 125–132. doi: 10.48071/sbuhemsirelik.1473596

ABSTRACT

Introduction: The level of breast cancer awareness among female may vary depending on their level of health literacy.

Aim: It was aimed to investigate the relationship between breast cancer awareness and health literacy among female textile workers.

Method: This study was a cross-sectional study. The study population consisted of female employed as workers in a textile company. The sample included 360 female workers as participants. The Information Form, the Breast Cancer Awareness Scale, and the Health Literacy Scale are the data collection instruments used in the study. Independent samples t-test, ANOVA, and regression analyses were used to evaluate the data.

Results: The results were that 73.6% of the participants did not perform regular breast self-examination, and 55.3% had information on early diagnosis and treatment. Significant positive correlations were observed between women's breast cancer awareness and the functional (r = 0.135; p = 0.011), interactive (r = 0.145; p = 0.006), and critical (r = 0.156; p = 0.003) sub-scales of health literacy. According regression analysis to the established model, an increase in health literacy scores corresponded to increase breast cancer awareness, explaining 3.9% of the variation.

Conclusion: It was revealed that as the health literacy of working female increases, breast cancer awareness will increase. Therefore, the focus should be on supporting the health literacy of women in the risk group, reaching more women in collective institutions and breast cancer awareness activities.

Keywords: Awareness; breast cancer; female; health literacy; worker.

ÖZ

Giriş: Kadınlarda meme kanseri farkındalığı sağlık okuryazarlığına bağlı olarak değişiklik gösterebilmektedir. Amaç: Kadın tekstil işçilerinde meme kanseri farkındalığı ve sağlık okuryazarlığı ilişkisinin araştırılması amaçlanmıştır.

Yöntem: Çalışma kesitsel türdedir. Çalışmanın evreni, bir tekstil firmasında işçi olarak çalışan kadınlardan oluşmaktadır. Örnekleme dahil edilen kadın işçi sayısı 360'tır. Çalışmada kullanılan veri toplama araçları Bilgi Formu, Meme Kanseri Farkındalık Ölçeği, Sağlık Okuryazarlığı Ölçeği'dir. Verilerin değerlendirmesinde Bağımsız örneklem t testi, ANOVA ve regresyon analizleri kullanılmıştır.

Bulgular: Çalışmaya katılan kadın işçilerin %73.6'sı düzenli olarak kendi kendine meme muayenesi yapmamakta olup %55.3'ü erken teşhis ve tedaviye dair bilgi sahibidir. Kadınların meme kanseri farkındalığı ile sağlık okuryazarlığı fonksiyonel (r = 0.135; p = 0.011), interaktif (r = 0.145; p = 0.006), eleştirel (r = 0.156; p = 0.003) alt boyutları arasında pozitif yönlü anlamlı ilişki vardır. Regresyon analizi sonrası kurulan modele göre, sağlık okuryazarlığı puanındaki artış meme kanseri farkındalığını arttırmakta olup sağlık okuryazarlığı puanı meme kanseri farkındalığı puanını %3.9 düzeyinde açıklamaktadır.

Sonuç: Kadın işçilerde sağlık okuryazarlığı arttıkça meme kanseri farkındalığının da arttığı ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu nedenle risk grubundaki kadınların sağlık okuryazarlığının desteklenmeli, toplu çalışılan kurumlarda daha fazla kadına ulaşılmalı ve meme kanseri farkındalık çalışmalarına odaklanılmalıdır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Farkındalık; işçi; kadın; meme kanseri; sağlık okuryazarlığı.



Bu eser, Creative Commons Atıf-Gayri Ticari 4.0 Uluslararası Lisansı ile lisanslanmıştır.

Introduction

Among all cancers affecting women, breast cancer is the most common (Panahi et al., 2020). Female are one of the most vulnerable groups from a public health perspective and considered to be at greater risk of developing breast cancer (Erdek, Çavdar, İpek & Okur, 2024). Various factors such as low socioeconomic status, adverse working conditions, limited health literacy (HL), and limited access to healthcare services, in particular, contribute to the increased breast cancer mortality rates worldwide (Güzel & Bayraktar, 2019).

The most important strategy for reducing breast cancer prevalence, its complications, and mortality lies in early diagnosis protocols and increasing public awareness (Wei, Wu & Tung 2021). Increased breast cancer awareness (BCA) facilitates the adoption of riskreducing behaviors and promotes preventive health practices. In addition, there is a positive correlation between overall HL and disease awareness (Ektir & Yılmaz, 2017). As an important social determinant of health, HL is defined as "accessible health education that meets minimum standards across all levels of society" (Gözlü, 2020). Providing planned health education, learning environments, and opportunities to improve HL in communities are preventive measures for BCA. In breast cancer, there are factors that can be modified (lifestyle choices, environmental and occupational exposures, obesity, etc.) and factors that could not (such as age, gender, family history, and ethnicity) (Okan, Kavici, Taşdemir, Temiz & Arslan, 2023). Raising awareness and increasing HL level are among the most significant modifiable factors for positive change. Numerous studies suggest a potential relationship between breast cancer prevention behaviors, awareness, and HL (Panahi et al., 2020; Almoajel, Alshamrani & Alyabsi, 2022; Yang et al., 2022). It should be researched to detect breast cancer at an early stage, to raise public awareness about breast cancer screening, and to what extent individual screenings are consistent. There is still no consensus on this topic in the literature (Liu et al., 2020).

In Turkey, garment and textile companies are the main employers of women, where they are predominantly employed as workers. Collective workplaces are important places for many health assessments and risk analyses. The working environment in such establishments, which employ a significant number of female workers, poses notable health risks to these women, making them particularly disadvantaged in this regard (Kolaç, Sezer Balcı, Şişman, Ataçer & Dinçer, 2018; Çevik & Özkul, 2022). In addition, women lacking HL may exhibit behaviors such as difficulty understanding health-related concepts and insufficient responsibility for their well-being (Panahi et al., 2020; Uçkaç, 2022). For this reason, new studies should be conducted to reveal this relationship.

Aim

This study aimed to investigate the relationship between breast cancer awareness and health literacy among female textile workers.

Research Questions

1. Is there a relationship between breast cancer awareness and health literacy among female textile workers?

2. If there is a relationship between breast cancer awareness and health literacy among female textile workers, to what extent does this correlation exist?

Method

Study Design

This cross-sectional study was conducted between February 15 and March 15, 2024.

Study Setting

The study applied in the female workers in in a private textile company in the Eastern Black Sea.

Study Population and Sample

The study population included female workers in a textile company. The G*Power 3.1 package program was used to calculate the sample size, which resulted in a sample size of 330 with a 95% confidence interval, 5% margin of error, and 95% power to represent the study population. Considering the data loss, the study was completed with 360 female workers with 10% backup. Research inclusion criteria were; (1) being a female 18 years of age or older, (2) being employed as a worker, and (3) having no communication barriers. Individuals who did not meet these criteria were excluded from the study.

Data Collection Tools

Information Form: This form, designed by the researcher, consisted of items on sociodemographic characteristics and questions related to breast cancer (Ektir & Yılmaz, 2017; Liu et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2022; Karabulutlu, Bakır & Demir, 2023).

Breast Cancer Awareness Scale: This scale was developed by Baş (2022). The scale consists of 13 items covering symptoms (11 items), frequency of breast examination (1 item), and awareness of age-related risk (1 item). Covering symptoms are scored as "Yes = 1 point", "No = 0 points", "I Don't Know = 0 points". Symptoms include changes in shape and pain, with a total of 11 items. Frequency of breast examination is scored as "Rarely or Never", at least once every 6 months and at least once a week = 0 points, at least once a month = 1 point. Awareness of agerelated risk is scored as a 30-year-old woman, a 50-year-old woman and women of any age = 0 points, 70-year-old women = 1 point. As the score increases, awareness also increases. The Cronbach's alpha was 0.89 (Baş, 2022). In study, the Cronbach's alpha was calculated as 0.89.

Health Literacy Scale: This scale was developed by Suka et al. (2013). The scale consists of 14 items and its Turkish reliability and validity study was conducted by Türkoğlu and Kılıç (2021). The scale has three sub-scales: Functional HL (5 items), Interactive HL (5 items), and Critical HL (4 items). The five-point Likert scale is scored from Strongly Disagree (1 point) to strongly agree (5 point). As the scale score increases, health literacy increases. The Cronbach's alpha was 0.85 (Suka et al., 2013; Türkoğlu & Kılıç, 2021). In study, the Cronbach's alpha was 0.84.

Ethical Considerations

Before conducting this research, the necessary permissions were obtained from the textile company. Approval was obtained from the Ethics Committee of Giresun University (Date: 07.02.2024 and No: 02/17), and participants were informed about the study and their informed consent was obtained. In addition, permission to use the scale was obtained from the authors.

Data Collection

Data collection was conducted face-to-face using the "Information Form", the "Breast Cancer Awareness Scale" and the "Health Literacy Scale". Given the shift schedules of the female workers, data collection was conducted in two sessions by the same researcher. The reason for data collection in two sessions was that women workers worked in two shifts. Participants completed the data collection instruments in an average of 25 minutes.

Data Analysis

The study data were analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences Version 22.0 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA) and G*Power 3.1 software packages.

Table 1: Distribution of Demographic Characteristics amongthe Participants (n = 360)

Age Under 25 years old 54 15.0 26-30 years old 53 14.7 31-35 years old 65 18.1 36-40 years old 81 22.5 41-45 years old 68 18.9 Over 45 years old 68 18.9 Over 45 years old 39 10.8 Education status V V Primary school graduate 129 35.8 Secondary school graduate 94 26.1 High school graduate 24 6.7 Marital status V 24 6.7 Married 282 78.3 3 Single 78 21.7 5 Smoking status V 24.4 6.7 Yes 95 26.4 6.7 6 No 265 73.6 6 7.7 Smoking status V 26.5 73.6 6 Primic disease status V 29.8 82.8 Medication use status V 20.6 6.7 No		n	%
26-30 years old 53 14.7 31-35 years old 65 18.1 36-40 years old 81 22.5 41-45 years old 68 18.9 Over 45 years old 68 18.9 Over 45 years old 39 10.8 Education status 94 26.1 Primary school graduate 94 26.1 High school graduate 94 26.1 High school graduate 24 6.7 Martial status 24 6.7 Married 282 78.3 Single 78 21.7 Smoking status 95 26.4 No 265 73.6 Chronic disease status 298 82.8 Medication use status 298 82.8	Age		
31-35 years old 65 18.1 36-40 years old 81 22.5 41-45 years old 68 18.9 Over 45 years old 39 10.8 Education status 39 10.8 Primary school graduate 129 35.8 Secondary school graduate 94 26.1 High school graduate 113 31.4 University graduate 24 6.7 Marital status 282 78.3 Single 78 21.7 Smoking status 265 73.6 Yes 95 26.4 No 265 73.6 Chronic disease status 298 82.8 Medication use status 298 82.8 Medication use status 74 20.6	Under 25 years old	54	15.0
36-40 years old 81 22.5 41-45 years old 68 18.9 Over 45 years old 39 10.8 Education status 9 26.1 Primary school graduate 94 26.1 High school graduate 94 26.1 High school graduate 94 26.1 High school graduate 24 6.7 Marrial status 24 6.7 Married 282 78.3 Single 78 21.7 Smoking status 265 73.6 Chronic disease status 295 26.4 No 265 73.6 Kes 62 17.2 No 298 82.8 Medication use status 298 82.8 Medication use status 74 20.6	26-30 years old	53	14.7
41-45 years old 68 18.9 Over 45 years old 39 10.8 Education status 99 35.8 Education status 129 35.8 Secondary school graduate 94 26.1 High school graduate 113 31.4 University graduate 24 6.7 Marital status 24 6.7 Married 282 78.3 Single 78 21.7 Smoking status 24 6.7 Yes 95 26.4 No 265 73.6 Chronic disease status 2 78.3 Yes 62 17.2 No 298 82.8 Medication use status 2 26.6 Yes 62 17.2 No 298 82.8 Medication use status 2 2 Yes 74 20.6	31-35 years old	65	18.1
No. is years old3910.8Over 45 years old3910.8Education status12935.8Primary school graduate9426.1High school graduate9426.1High school graduate11331.4University graduate246.7Marital status28278.3Single7821.7Smoking status117Yes9526.4No26573.6Chronic disease status17.2No29882.8Medication use status17.2Yes7420.6	36-40 years old	81	22.5
Education status Primary school graduate 129 35.8 Secondary school graduate 94 26.1 High school graduate 113 31.4 University graduate 24 6.7 Marital status 24 6.7 Married 282 78.3 Single 78 21.7 Smoking status 95 26.4 No 265 73.6 Chronic disease status 298 82.8 No 298 82.8 Medication use status 294 20.6	41-45 years old	68	18.9
Primary school graduate12935.8Secondary school graduate9426.1High school graduate11331.4University graduate246.7Marital status246.7Married28278.3Single7821.7Smoking status9526.4No26573.6Chronic disease status2Yes6217.2No29882.8Medication use status74Yes74	Over 45 years old	39	10.8
Secondary school graduate9426.1High school graduate11331.4University graduate246.7Marital status246.7Married28278.3Single7821.7Smoking status9526.4No26573.6Chronic disease status29882.8Medication use status29882.8Yes7420.6	Education status		
High school graduate11331.4High school graduate11331.4University graduate246.7Marital status28278.3Single28278.3Single7821.7Smoking status7821.7Yes9526.4No26573.6Chronic disease status72Yes6217.2No29882.8Medication use status74Yes7420.6	Primary school graduate	129	35.8
University graduate246.7Marital statusMarried28278.3Single7821.7Smoking statusYes9526.4No26573.6Chronic disease statusYes6217.2No29882.8Medication use statusYes7420.6	Secondary school graduate	94	26.1
Marital statusMarried28278.3Single7821.7Smoking status7821.7Yes9526.4No26573.6Chronic disease status74Yes6217.2No29882.8Medication use status74Yes7420.6	High school graduate	113	31.4
Married 282 78.3 Single 78 21.7 Smoking status Yes 95 26.4 No 265 73.6 Chronic disease status Yes 62 17.2 No 298 82.8 Medication use status Yes 74 20.6	University graduate	24	6.7
Single7821.7Smoking status9526.4No26573.6Chronic disease status17.2Yes6217.2No29882.8Medication use status17.2Yes7420.6	Marital status		
Smoking statusYes9526.4No26573.6Chronic disease status26573.6Yes6217.2No29882.8Medication use status7420.6	Married	282	78.3
Yes 95 26.4 No 265 73.6 Chronic disease status 73.6 73.6 Yes 62 17.2 No 298 82.8 Medication use status 74 20.6	Single	78	21.7
No26573.6Chronic disease status26273.7Yes6217.2No29882.8Medication use status298Yes7420.6	Smoking status		
Chronic disease status100740Yes6217.2No29882.8Medication use status74	Yes	95	26.4
Yes 62 17.2 No 298 82.8 Medication use status Yes 74 20.6	No	265	73.6
No 298 82.8 Medication use status Yes 74 20.6	Chronic disease status		
Medication use status21.0Yes7420.6	Yes	62	17.2
Yes 74 20.6	No	298	82.8
	Medication use status		
No 286 79.4	Yes	74	20.6
	No	286	79.4

Table 2: Distribution of Breast Cancer Knowledge amongthe Participants (n = 360)

	n	%
Presence of cancer in the family		
Yes	144	40.0
No	216	60.0
Breast self-examination		
l do it regularly	104	28.9
l don't do it regularly	256	71.1
Mammography status (over 40 years old)		
Yes	41	38.3
No	66	61.7
Breast examination status		
Yes	95	26.4
No	265	73.6
Problems with the breasts		
Yes	54	15.0
No	306	85.0
Knowledge of early diagnosis and treatment		
Yes	199	55.3
No	161	44.7
Source of information on breast cancer		
Physicians and nurses	151	75.9
Family and close circle	16	8.0
Social media	20	10.1
Conferences and seminars	12	6.0

A significance level of p < 0.05 was considered for all statistical tests. Descriptive statistics, including mean, median, and percentage distribution, were used to characterize the data, while Pearson correlation and Linear regression analyses were performed to assess the level of impact of the parameters.

Results

In the study, the mean age of the participants was 35.37 ± 8.24 (min: 18, max: 55) years. Among workers, 35.8% had completed primary school and 78.3% were married. Of the participants, 73.6% were non-smokers, 82.8% had no chronic diseases, and 79.4% were not currently taking any medications (Table 1).

Of the participants, 79.7% reported no family history of cancer, 73.6% did not engage in regular breast self-examination, 61.7% had not undergone mammography (over the age of 40), 85.0% had no history of breast-related problems, 55.3% had information on early diagnosis and treatment, and 75.9% obtained this information from physicians and nurses (Table 2).

In the study, BCA scale in those taking medication have a significantly higher mean score than those not taking medication (t = 2.025; p = 0.044). In addition, participants with a family history of cancer have a statistically higher mean score on the BCA scale than

Variables		Breast Cancer Awareness	Test Statistic	P	Health Literacy	Test Statistic	р
		Mean ± SD			Mean ± SD		
Age	Under 25 years old	0.57 ± 0.57			46.13 ± 7.24		
	26-30 years old	0.49 ± 0.72			47.64 ± 7.30		
	31-35 years old	0.51 ± 0.59	0.374‡	0.866	44.17 ± 8.67	1.721‡	0.129
	36-40 years old	0.54 ± 0.59			44.31 ± 9.40		
	41-45 years old	0.63 ± 0.73			43.59 ± 10.21		
	Over 45 years old	0.56 ± 0.75			45.03 ± 8.34		
Education status	Secondary school graduate	0.46 ± 0.60			43.01 ± 10.3		
	High school graduate	0.58 ± 0.61	1.799‡	0.147	46.35 ± 7.12	3.659‡	0.013*
	University graduate	0.79 ± 0.88			48.13 ± 6.71		
Marital status	Married	0.54 ± 0.65			44.93 ± 8.79	0.245†	0.806
	Single	0.60 ± 0.67	0.761†	0.447	0.447		
					45.21 ± 8.84		
Smoking status	Yes	0.64 ± 0.71	1.558†	0.120	44.03 ± 9.78	1.239†	0.216
	No	0.52 ± 0.63	1.0001	0.120	45.33 ± 8.40	1.207	0.210
Chronic disease status	Yes	0.44 ± 0.59			42.29 ± 9.60		
	No	0.58 ± 0.66	1.558†	0.120	45.55 ± 8.52	2.681†	0.008*
Medication use status	Yes	0.69 ± 0.79			43.77 ± 9.57	1.34†	0.181
	No	0.52 ± 0.61	2.025†	0.044*	45.30 ± 8.56		
Presence of cancer in the family			3.239†	0.001*		0.460†	0.646
	Yes	0.69 ± 0.66			45.25 ± 9.08		
	No	0.46 ± 0.63	0.2071		44.81 ± 8.61		
Breast self- examination	l do it regularly	0.77 ± 0.74	4.097†	0.001*	43.60 ± 9.55	1.924†	0.055
	I don't do it regularly	0.46 ± 0.59			45.55 ± 8.41		
Mammography status	Yes	0.66 ± 0.73			44.49 ± 8.61		
(Over 40 years old)	No	0.58 ± 0.75	0.563†	0.574	43.88 ± 10.16	0.319† 6	0.750
Breast examination	Vec	0 42 - 0 40	1.189†	.189† 0.235	44.86 ± 9.07	0.162†	0.871
status	Yes No	0.62 ± 0.69 0.53 ± 0.64					
	NU	0.J3 ± 0.04			45.03 ± 8.70		
Problems with breasts	Yes	0.57 ± 0.63	0.0/01		46.54 ± 8.49	1 /04+	0 141
	No	0.55 ± 0.66	0.260†	0.795	44.72 ± 8.82	1.406†	0.161
Knowledge of early diagnosis and treatment	Yes	0.66 ± 0.67		† 0.001*	46.15 ± 7.89	2.816†	0.005*
			3.632†				

Table 3: Comparison of Scale Scores by Demographic Characteristics and Breast Cancer Knowledge (n = 360)

SD: Standard Deviation; * p < 0.05; \ddagger One way ANOVA Test; \ddagger Independent Samples *t* Test.

SBÜHD Sağlık Bilimleri Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Dergisi / University of Health Sciences Journal of Nursing • Cilt/Volume: 6, Sayı/Number: 2, 2024

Table 4: Relationships Between Breast Cancer Awarenessand Health Literacy and Sub-Scale Scores (n = 360)

Variables	Breast Cancer Awareness Scale			
	r	р		
Functional Health Literacy	0.135†	0.011*		
Interactive Health Literacy	0.145†	0.006*		
Critical Health Literacy	0.156†	0.003*		
Health Literacy Scale	0.197 †	0.001*		

†r: Pearson correlation coefficient; *p < 0.05.

those without such a history (t = 3.239; p = 0.001). In addition, participants who regularly perform breast self-examinations have a significantly higher mean BCA score than those who do not (t = 4.097; p < 0.001). Likewise, participants with knowledge about early diagnosis and treatment have a significantly higher mean score on the BCA scale than those without such knowledge (t = 3.632; p < 0.001). According to the mean HL scores, the mean HL scores of primary and secondary schools graduates participants were statistically lower than those of high school and university graduates (F = 3.659; p = 0.013). Participants with chronic diseases have a statistically lower HL mean score than those without such conditions (t = 2.681; p = 0.008). Conversely, participants with information about early diagnosis and treatment have a significantly higher mean score than those without such information (t = 2.816; p = 0.005) (Table 3). A statistically significant positive correlation is observed between BCA and HL across the functional, interactive, and critical sub-scales (p < 0.05) (Table 4).

When evaluating the impact of HL scores on BCA scores through linear regression analysis, the established models demonstrated statistical significance (F = 14.493; p < 0.001). The Durbin-Watson value was found to be 1.926. According to the model, a one-unit increase in HL score increases BCA score by 0.015 points. The model indicates that HL scores explain 3.9% of the variance in BCA scores (Table 5).

Discussion

Female workers face increased disadvantages in their work life. This exposes them to increased health risks. Cancer is a major public health concern and breast cancer is affecting women worldwide (Baş, 2022; Çevik & Özkul, 2022). This study highlights the relationship between BCA and HL among female workers. The study indicated that participants who take medications have higher mean BCA scores than others. In the review of various studies, it was found that the relationship between BCA and taking medications has not been studied, but broader societal access to information about various diseases, taking medications for a present condition, and advances in diagnostic and treatment options may collectively contribute to increased awareness of breast cancer, which is a global health problem. Existing literature also supports this case (Akram, Iqbal, Daniyal & Khan 2017; Agbokey et al., 2019).

In the current study the average level of BCA among participants with a family history of cancer exceeds that of participants without a family history. This result was predictable because when an immediate family member was diagnosed with cancer, individuals become directly involved in the process and consequently increase their awareness. There are some discrepancies between the various studies conducted on this topic. A study among women in the Philippines found that individuals with a diagnosed relative or who underwent routine breast cancer screening did not develop adequate awareness (Wu & Lee, 2019). Yet, a study of college students found high BCA, and knowledge level in individuals who underwent screening (Islam et al., 2022). It can be stated that women with family members diagnosed with cancer come from different segments of society, resulting in different levels of perspectives on breast cancer.

In addition, the average level of BCA among women who regularly perform breast self-examinations exceeds that of women who do not perform such examinations. The literature review has included conflicting results that some studies indicated a lower percentage of women who regularly perform breast self-examination, which

Dependent variable	Argument	⁺ß	[‡] t	* P	۶F	Model (p [°])	[∥] R²
Describ Commentation	Constant	-0.106	0.604	0.547	17,000	0.001*	0.020
Breast Cancer Awareness	Health Literacy	0.015	3.807	0.001*	14.493	0.001*	0.039

+ß: Unstandardized Regression Coefficient; ‡t Test in Independent Groups; §F: Simple Linear Regression Measurement Value; *p < 0.05; ||R²: Linear Regression Analysis.

correlated with a lower level of awareness (Asadi, Shahsavari, Khosravizadeh & Nourmohammadi, 2018), while others suggested that participants who performed breast self-examination had a higher level of knowledge and awareness (Osei-Afriyie et al., 2021). Therefore, it could be stated that performing breast self-examination had the potential to increase awareness levels and consequently promote positive health behaviors regarding early detection.

The mean score of BCA among participants with information about early diagnosis and treatment exceeds that of those without such information. Research shows that women who perform breast selfexamination and possess knowledge about early diagnosis and treatment tend to have higher levels of education and awareness (Sayed et al., 2016; Wu & Lee, 2019). This result was similar to the literature; there is a need to expand planned activities aimed at increasing women's understanding of early diagnosis and treatment.

The study indicated that women with primary and secondary education have lower mean HL scores than women with high school and university education. Health literacy is a multidimensional concept. It is mainly associated with socio-demographic characteristics and educational level (Gözlü, 2020). Studies in the relevant literature have shown that health literacy decreases with lower levels of education (Svendsen et al., 2020) and increases with higher levels of education (Singu, Acharya, Challagundla, & Byrareddy, 2020). This is also valid for our study. Health literacy leads to the emergence of several health-promoting conscious behaviors, including accessing, understanding, evaluating, and using health information in everyday life. Therefore, efforts should be made to support these female workers in their health promotion efforts.

In addition, participants with chronic conditions have lower average HL mean scores than those without such conditions. It is known that people with high health literacy manage chronic diseases better (Gözlü, 2020). This result of the study was supported by studies examining the relationship between different chronic conditions and HL (Svendsen et al., 2020; Fischer, Watson, Tolisano & Riley, 2021). In addition, the literature highlights the importance of HL not only in the management of chronic diseases but also in the management of infectious diseases (Akalu, Ayelign & Molla, 2020; McCaffery et al., 2020).

The mean HL score of the women who have knowledge about early diagnosis and treatment exceeds that of those who do not. A review of the literature reveals supportive studies, albeit with varying conclusions different from this finding. These studies associate insufficient health literacy with negative health behaviors, lack of knowledge, and poor health outcomes (Svendsen et al., 2020; Meherali, Punjani & Mevawala, 2020). Therefore, it is expected that individuals with positive health behaviors should have higher HL since they have knowledge about early diagnosis and treatment.

In addition, a positive correlation was found between BCA and HL, as well as its functional, interactive, and critical sub-scales. In addition, an increase in HL scores increases BCA scores, and according to the established model, health literacy scores explain 3.9% of the variance in breast cancer awareness scores. These findings

are consistent with the research questions and are supported by existing literature (Almoajel, Alshamrani & Alyabsi, 2022; Wang et al., 2022). It can be inferred that improving health literacy skills would correspondingly improve awareness, thereby improving screening practices, breast cancer prevention efforts, and personal health responsibility.

Study Limitations

The study relied on self-reports from female workers. Therefore, the findings can only be generalized to the sample and its counterparts.

Conclusions

This study indicate that the majority of female workers had no family history of cancer, did not have any breast-related problems in their lifetime, and more than half had information about early diagnosis, and treatment, primarily obtained from physicians and nurses. In addition, individuals who took medications had a family history of cancer, performed regular breast self-examination, and had information about early diagnosis and treatment had higher levels of BCA. Conversely, those who were primary or secondary school graduates, and those who had chronic diseases had lower HL, while those with information about early diagnosis and treatment had higher health literacy. Moreover, a positive relationship was observed between BCA and HL sub-scales, and according to the established model, HL scores explained BCA scores.

According to the study, targeted educational initiatives are needed to improve breast cancer awareness in female workers, who are one of the vulnerable groups. Efforts should aim to address gaps related to regular breast self - examination and mammography while providing informative and motivational presentations in workplaces where women are collectively employed. This has the potential to improve health literacy. It is recommended that these educational sessions be provided by public and occupational health nurses and that interactive educational materials be developed, particularly in primary health care facilities.

Ethical Considerations: Permission was obtained from Giresun University Rectorate Social Sciences Ethics Committee (Date: 07.02.2024 and No: 02/17).

Author Contribution: Concept and Design – AH; Data Collection / Literature Review – AH; Analysis and Interpretation of Data – AH; Preparation of the Article – AHC; Approval of the Final Version– AH.

Peer Review: External independent.

Conflicts of Interest: The author reports no conflicts of interest.

Sources of Funding: No financial support was received from any organization for this research.

Acknowledgments: The author thanks all female workers who contributed to the study.

References

- Agbokey, F., Kudzawu, E., Dzodzomenyo, M., Ae-Ngibise, K. A., Owusu-Agyei, S., & Asante, K. P. (2019). Knowledge and health seeking behaviour of breast cancer patients in Ghana. *International Journal of Breast Cancer*, 2019(1), 5239840. doi:10.1155/2019/5239840
- Akalu, Y., Ayelign, B., & Molla, M. D. (2020). Knowledge, attitude and practice towards COVID-19 among chronic disease patients at Addis Zemen Hospital, Northwest Ethiopia. *Infection and Drug Resistance*, 13, 1949-1960. doi: 10.2147/IDR.S258736
- Akram, M., Iqbal, M., Daniyal, M., & Khan, A. U. (2017). Awareness and current knowledge of breast cancer. *Biological Research*, *50*(33), 1-23. doi: 10.1186/s40659-017-0140-9
- Almoajel, A., Alshamrani, S., & Alyabsi, M. (2022). The relationship between e-health literacy and breast cancer literacy among Saudi women. *Frontiers in Public Health*, *6*(10), 841102. doi: 10.3389/ fpubh.2022.841102
- Asadi, A. F., Shahsavari, S., Khosravizadeh, O., & Nourmohammadi, M. (2018). The relationship between knowledge, attitude, and performance in breast cancer with nutritional behaviors and drug use. *Asian Pacific Journal of Environment and Cancer*, 1(1), 27-33. doi: 10.31557/APJEC.2018.1.1.27-33
- Baş, S. (2022). Meme kanseri farkındalık ölçeğinin geçerlilik ve güvenilirliği (Yüksek lisans tezi). Erişim adresi: https://tez.yok.gov.tr/ UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp
- Çevik, C. ve Özkul, B. (2022). Çalışma yaşamında dezavantajlı gruplar ve eşitsizlikler. İzmir Katip Çelebi Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi, 7(3), 611-618.
- Ektir, B., Yılmaz, M. (2017). Breast cancer-related knowledge levels and health literacy in working women. *International Journal of Caring Sciences*, *10*(3), 1658-1668.
- Erdek, F., Çavdar, A., İpek, M. ve Okur, M. A. (2024). Dezavantajlı kadınların eğitimi ve sosyolojik durumları: Gaziemir Halk Eğitimi Merkezi. *Premium e-Journal of Social Science, 8*(38), 151-163. doi: 10.5281/ zenodo.10642726
- Fischer, J. L., Watson, N. L., Tolisano, A. M., & Riley, C. A. (2021). Assessing health literacy in rhinologic patients. *International Forum of Allergy* & *Rhinology*, 11(4), 818-821. doi: 10.1002/alr.22733
- Gözlü, K. (2020). Sağlığın sosyal bir belirleyicisi: Sağlık okuryazarlığı. SDÜ Tıp Fakültesi Dergisi, 27(1), 137-144. doi: 10.17343/sdutfd.569301
- Güzel, N. ve Bayraktar, N. (2019). Kadınların meme kanserinin erken tanısına yönelik farkındalıklarının ve uygulamalarının belirlenmesi. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Fakültesi Dergisi, 6(2), 101-110.
- Islam, M. A., AlShayban, D. M., Nisa, Z. U., Al-Hawaj, G. A. M., Al-Eid, G. H. A., Alenazi, A. M. M., ..., & Haseeb, A. (2022). What is the current state of awareness, knowledge, and attitudes toward breast cancer? A cross-sectional survey among health and non-health college students. *Frontiers in Public Health*, *10*, 838579. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.

- Karabulutlu, Ö., Bakır, N. ve Demir, C. (2023). Mevsimlik tarım işçisi kadınların meme kanseri endişe düzeylerinin meme kanseri önleme davranışlarına etkisi. *Gümüşhane Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, *12*(4), 1647-1654. doi: 10.37989/gumussagbil.1372782
- Kolaç, N., Sezer Balcı, A., Şişman, F. N., Ataçer, B. E. ve Dinçer, S. (2018). Fabrika çalışanlarında sağlıklı yaşam biçimi davranışı ve sağlık algısı. *Bakırköy Tıp Dergisi, 14*(3), 267–274. doi: 10.5350/ BTDMJB.20170328092601
- Liu, N., Li, P., Wang, J., Guo, P. P., Zhang, X. H., Yang, S., ..., & Zhang, W. (2020). Factors influencing breast cancer awareness: A cross-sectional study in China. *Journal of Comparative Effectiveness Research*, 9(10), 679-689. doi: 10.2217/cer-2020-0037
- McCaffery, K. J., Dodd, R. H., Cvejic, E., Ayre, J., Batcup, C., Isautier, J. M., ..., & Wolf, M. S. (2020). Disparities in COVID-19 related knowledge, attitudes, beliefs and behaviours by health literacy. *medRxiv*, 30(4), e30342012. doi: 10.1101/2020.06.03.20121814
- Meherali, S., Punjani, N. S., & Mevawala, A. (2020). Health literacy interventions to improve health outcomes in low-and middle-income countries. *Health Literacy Research and Practice*, 4(4), e251-e266. doi: 10.3928/24748307-20201118-01
- Okan, F., Kavici, S., Taşdemir, S., Temiz, S. ve Arslan, M. (2023). Kadın tekstil işçilerinin meme kanseri önleme davranışlarını etkileyen faktörler. *Halk Sağlığı Hemşireliği Dergisi*, *5*(3), 301-311. doi: 10.54061/ jphn.1253458
- Osei-Afriyie, S., Addae, A. K., Oppong, S., Amu, H., Ampofo, E., & Osei, E. (2021). Breast cancer awareness, risk factors and screening practices among future health professionals in Ghana: A cross-sectional study. *PloS One*, *16*(6), e0253373. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0253373
- Panahi, R., Namdar, P., Siboni, F. S., Fallah, S., Anbari, M., Dehghankar, L., ..., & Shafaei, M. (2020). Association between health literacy and adopting preventive behaviors of breast cancer in Iran. *Journal of Education and Health Promotion*, 9(1), 241. doi: 10.4103/jehp.jehp_313_20
- Sayed, S., Moloo, Z., Ngugi, A., Allidina, A., Ndumia, R., Mutuiri, A., ..., & Dawsey, S. M. (2016). Breast camps for awareness and early diagnosis of breast cancer in countries with limited resources: A multidisciplinary model from Kenya. *The Oncologist*, *21*(9), 1138-1148. doi: 10.1634/theoncologist.2016-0004
- Singu, S., Acharya, A., Challagundla, K., & Byrareddy, S. N. (2020). Impact of social determinants of health on the emerging COVID-19 pandemic in the United States. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 21(8), 564623. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2020.00406
- Suka, M., Odajima, T., Kasai, M., Igarashi, A., Ishikawa, H., Kusama, M., Nakayama T., ..., & Sugimori H. (2013). The 14-item Health Literacy Scale for Japanese Adults (HLS-14). *Environmental Health and Preventive Medicine*, 18(5), 407-415. doi: 10.1007/s12199-013-0340-z.
- Svendsen, M. T., Bak, C. K., Sørensen, K., Pelikan, J., Riddersholm, S. J., Skals, R. K., ..., & Torp-Pedersen, C. (2020). Associations of health literacy with socioeconomic position, health risk behavior, and health status: a large national population-based survey among Danish adults. BMC Public Health, 20(1), 565. doi: 10.1186/s12889-020-08498-8

- Türkoğlu, N. ve Kılıç, D. (2021). Sağlık Okuryazarlığı Ölçeği'nin Türkçeye uyarlanması: geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. Anadolu Hemşirelik ve Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi, 24(1), 25-33. doi: 10.17049/ataunihem.662054
- Uçkaç, K. (2022). Kanser taramalarında sağlık okuryazarlığı ve sağlık hizmetleri. *Turkey Health Literacy Journal*, *3*(2), 96-101.
- Wang, Y. J., Wang, F., Yu, L. X., Xiang, Y. J., Zhou, F., Huang, S. Y., ..., & Liu, L. Y. (2022). Worldwide review with meta-analysis of women's awareness about breast cancer. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 105(7), 1818-1827. doi: 10.1016/j.pec.2021.12.012
- Wei, C. W., Wu, M. L., & Tung, H. H. (2021). Relationships between health literacy and quality of life among survivors with breast cancer. *International Journal of Nursing Practice*, *27*(2), e12922. doi: 10.1111/ijn.12922
- Wu, T. Y., & Lee, J. (2019). Promoting breast cancer awareness and screening practices for early detection in low-resource settings. *European Journal of Breast Health*, 15(1), 18. doi: 10.5152/ejbh.2018.4305
- Yang, S., Li, P., Yu, L., Liu, N., Wang, J., Guo, P., ..., & Zhang, W. (2022). Breast cancer awareness based on health information literacy and influential factors among female nursing students in China. *Journal of Cancer Education*, 37(3), 546-554. doi: 10.1007/s13187-020-01844-9.