DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.12996/gmj.2025.4401



Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) Explaining Late Presentation of Breast Cancer in the West Coast of Sabah: A Structural Equation Modelling Approach

Planlı Davranış Teorisi (TPB) Meme Kanserinin Geç Sunumunu Açıklıyor: Yapısal Eşitlik Modelleme Yaklaşımı

Diana Lapai¹, Firdaus Hayati¹, Siti Zubaidah Sharif², M. Tanveer Hossain Parash³, Nik Amin Sahid Nik Lah¹

¹Department of Surgery, Universiti Malaysia Sabah (UMS) Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia ²Clinic of General Surgery, Queen Elizabeth II Hospital, Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia ³Department of Biomedical Sciences, Universiti Malaysia Sabah (UMS) Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia

ABSTRACT

Objective: Early detection potentially reduces mortality rates, yet instances of delayed treatment-seeking after symptom onset have been observed, posing significant risks, as late presentation escalates mortality rates among patients. This study aims to delineate the sociodemographic profile of late-presenting breast cancer patients and investigate the Theory of Planned Behavior's (TPB's) (attitude, subjective norm and perceived behavioural control) on intention to seek medical consultation after breast cancer symptoms, that contributing to delayed presentation.

Methods: This cross-sectional study spanned from January 2022 to December 2022, and 111 eligible participants were selected for inclusion through simple random sampling. Researchers obtained written consent and offered assurances of confidentiality. Ethical approval was granted by the Medical Research and Ethics Committee (MREC) under the Ministry of Health Malaysia (MOH). The questionnaire encompassed socio-demographic data, clinical information, and the TPB constructs. SPSS AMOS version 22 facilitated Structural Equation Modeling for data analysis. Demographic variables and the TPB constructs were integrated into the model.

Results: Participants predominantly fell into the 40-49 and 50-59 age groups (36.9% and 35.1% respectively), were mostly married (78.4%), and had secondary school education (46.8%). The majority belonged to the B40 economic group (78.4%) and resided within 25 km of the hospital (41.4%). Stage II cancer was found to be prevalent during diagnosis (43.2%) and mostly presented 3-6 months after experiencing

ÖZ

Amaç: Erken teşhis, potansiyel olarak ölüm oranlarını azaltabilir; ancak semptomların başlamasından sonra tedavi arayışında gecikmeler gözlemlenmiştir. Bu gecikmeler önemli riskler teşkil eder, çünkü geç başvuru hasta ölümlerini artırmaktadır. Bu çalışma, geç başvuran meme kanseri hastalarının sosyodemografik profilini tanımlamayı ve planlanmış davranış teorisi'nin (PDT) bu gecikmeli başvurular üzerindeki etkisini araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır.

Yöntemler: Kesitsel bu çalışma Ocak 2022 ile Aralık 2022 arasında yürütülmüştür ve basit rastgele örnekleme yöntemiyle 111 uygun katılımcı seçilmiştir. Araştırmacılar yazılı onam almış ve gizlilik güvencesi sağlamıştır. Etik onay, Malezya Sağlık Bakanlığı'na (MOH) bağlı Tıbbi Araştırma ve Etik Komitesi (MREC) tarafından verilmiştir. Anket, sosyodemografik veriler, klinik bilgiler ve PDT yapılarını içermektedir. Veri analizi için SPSS AMOS sürüm 22 kullanılarak Yapısal Eşitlik Modellemesi uygulanmıştır. Demografik değişkenler ve TPB yapıları modele entegre edilmiştir.

Bulgular: Katılımcıların çoğu 40-49 ve 50-59 yaş gruplarındaydı (sırasıyla %36.9 ve %35.1), büyük kısmı evliydi (%78.4) ve lise eğitimi almıştı (%46.8). Katılımcıların çoğu B40 ekonomik grubuna aitti (%78.4) ve hastaneye 25 km mesafede ikamet etmekteydi (%41.4). Tanı konulduğunda genellikle Evre II kanser mevcuttu (%43.2) ve semptomların görülmesinden 3-6 ay sonra başvuru yapılmıştı (%81.1). Yapısal model makul bir uyum gösterdi. Tutum, niyeti anlamlı şekilde etkiledi (β 1=0.844, p<0.001); ardından algılanan davranış kontrolü

Cite this article as: Lapai D, Hayati MFM, SZ, MTH P. Theory of planned behavior (TPB) explaining late presentation of breast cancer in the west coast of Sabah: a structural equation modelling approach. Gazi Med J. 2025;36(3):307-314

Address for Correspondence/Yazışma Adresi: Nik Amin Sahid Nik Lah, Department of Surgery, Universiti Malaysia Sabah (UMS) Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia E-mail / E-posta: nike_opo@ums.edu.my ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0002-9954-9399

Received/Geliş Tarihi: 17.02.2025 Accepted/Kabul Tarihi: 19.05.2025 Publication Date/Yayınlanma Tarihi: 11.07.2025

Copyright 20

^eCopyright 2025 The Author. Published by Galenos Publishing House on behalf of Gazi University Faculty of Medicine. Licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 (CC BY-NC-ND) International License. ^e Telif Hakkı 2025 Yazar. Gazi Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi adına Galenos Yayınevi tarafından yayımlanmaktadır. Creative Commons AttrGayırTicari-Türetilemez 4.0 (CC BY-NC-ND) Uluslararası Lisansi ile lisansilanmaktadır. the symptoms (81.1%). The structural model indicated a reasonable fit. Attitude significantly influenced intention (β 1=0.844, p<0.001), followed by perceived behavioural control (β 2=0.178, p=0.004). Subjective norm did not significantly affect intention (β 2=0.088, p=0.199), suggesting a negative influence on patients' intention to seek medical consultation.

Conclusion: Interventions enhancing subjective norm efficacy are recommended, emphasising partner, family members, peers, physician, and media involvement.

Keywords: Breast cancer, late presentation, theory of planned behaviour

INTRODUCTION

Breast cancer stands as the most prevalent malignancy among women globally, with over two million new cases diagnosed worldwide in 2018 (1). Efforts to control breast cancer incidence encompass prevention, early detection, diagnosis, and treatment. Although early detection potentially reduces mortality, many patients delay seeking treatment after symptom onset, posing significant risks. Late presentation of breast cancer significantly escalates mortality rates among patients (2). Patient delay in seeking medical consultation refers to the interval between symptom awareness and initial medical intervention. Most studies adopt a 3-month threshold to distinguish early from delayed presentation, as delays exceeding 3 months significantly worsen survival rates (3-5). The causes of delay is a result of the interplay with the patient's socio-cultural context, individual characteristics that influence symptom interpretation and decision-making, interaction with the social network and types of support obtained, and aspects of the local health services (6).

Understanding factors influencing delays is essential for developing effective strategies. Therefore, patient behaviour should be considered in assessing late presentation. An explicit model of human emotions, cognitions, and behaviour is necessary to evaluate psychosocial risk factors (5). Proposed by Ajzen, the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB) has been utilised in numerous health studies, particularly in breast cancer research. According to this theory, an attitude, subjective norm, and perceived behavioural control (PBC) shape behavioural intention, ultimately guiding subsequent actions (7-9). Attitude reflects beliefs toward a specific behaviour, subjective norm involves beliefs regarding approval or disapproval of key referents, and PBC pertains to the extent to which an individual perceives a behaviour as easy or difficult to perform. These variables are crucial in determining patient intention to perform certain behaviours. This study employs the structural equation modelling (SEM) based on the TPB to examine patients' behavioural intention to seek medical consultation after experiencing breast cancer symptoms.

The study seeks to identify sociodemographic data on of latepresenting breast cancer patients and to investigate the impact the of TPB components on the late presentation in of breast cancer patients. geldi (β 2=0.178, p=0.004). Öznel normun niyet üzerinde anlamlı bir etkisi yoktu (β 2=0.088, p=0.199), bu da hastaların tıbbi danışmanlık arama niyeti üzerinde olumsuz bir etkisi olduğunu göstermektedir.

Sonuç: Partner, aile üyeleri, arkadaşlar, hekimler ve medyanın katılımını vurgulayan, öznel normun etkinliğini artıran müdahalelerin önerilmesi gerekmektedir.

Keywords: Meme kanseri, geç başvuru, planlanmış davranış teorisi

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Participant and Procedure

This cross-sectional study was executed from January 2022 to December 2022 in three phases. Initially, patient data regarding late presentation were sourced from hospital breast cancer records. Subsequently, 111 patients who fulfilled the inclusion criteria were selected as participants via random sampling. In the final stage, the researcher or representative conversed with the patients during follow-up visits to the clinic or via phone calls after finalising the patient list. Written consent was obtained from all those listed, and assurances were given regarding patient confidentiality. Ethical approval was secured from the Medical Research and Ethics Committee (MREC) (approval number: NMRR-20-32-52564 (IIR), date: 27.02.2020), Ministry of Health Malaysia (MOH). Approval and data collection has been extended until 2022 due to the pandemic of Covid-19.

Questionnaire Development

The questionnaire comprised three sections: socio-demographic information, clinical data, and the TPB construct questionnaire. The TPB construct questionnaire was adapted from prior studies (10,11). Validation and reliability of the questionnaire was done in accordance with the TPB founders' methodology (12). Content clarity and appropriateness were reviewed by two expert committees experienced in the TPB questionnaire development. Translation and backward translation were conducted by Universiti Malaysia Sabah Translation and Editing Unit and an independent translator. A pilot survey confirmed the instrument's overall reliability, with by Cronbach's alpha >0.8, indicating adequate internal consistency. Additionally, reliability coefficients for attitude, subjective norm, PBC, and intention were 0.977, 0.826, 0.870, and 0.922, respectively. The participants' responses were systematically recorded using a five-point Likert scale to ensure consistency in data collection.

Statistical Analysis

The SEM was conducted using the Analysis of Moment Structure (AMOS) software, version 22, for data analysis. Demographic variables and the TPB constructs were entered into the model and analysed. SEM is widely regarded as the optimal method for simultaneous assessment of overall model fit, individual parameter

estimates, regression coefficients comparisons, and the examination of variances within and across multiple groups (13).

RESULTS

Sample Characteristics

Table 1 presents the sample characteristics. The majority of participants fell into the age groups of 40-49 and 50-59 years, accounting for 36.9% and 35.1%, respectively. Most patients were married (78.4%), and the highest proportion had a secondary school educational level (46.8%), with a significant portion being housewives (48.6%). The majority of patients belonged to the B40 economic status (78.4%), followed by M40 (19.8%) and T20 (1.8%). Approximately 41.4% of patients resided within a distance of less than 25 km from the hospital. The distribution of patients by cancer stage was as follows: stage II (43%), stage III (33%), stage I (16%), and stage IV (8%). About 97% of the patients presented with selfdiscovered symptoms of breast cancer, and the most frequent initial symptom was a breast lump (83%), while few had other symptoms. 20.9% of the patients had a family history of breast cancer. Despite having listed one or more reasons to delay seeking medical consultation, most patients (81%) reported presenting within 3-6 months of discovering their symptoms, 5% reported presenting between 6 months to 1 year, and 14% delayed their presentation for one year or more.

Structural Equation Modelling (SEM)

This study employed the SEM approach to examine the proposed model's relationships, following two-stage model-building process: (i) measurement model, and (ii) structural model. In the proposed model, three constructs (attitude, subjective norm, and PBC were specified as exogenous variables, while the endogenous variable was the patients' intention to seek medical consultation after experiencing breast cancer symptoms.

Evaluation of the Measurement Model

The measurement model was assessed for reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity of the construct measures. According to Hair et al. (13), a good model fit is indicated by a comparative fit index (CFI) above 0.9, a chi-square normalised by degrees of freedom (χ^2 /df) below 3, and a root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA) below 0.08. The obtained model (Table 2) demonstrated a good fit based on the main goodness-of-fit indices: χ^2 /df =1.573, CFI =0.984, GFI =0.914, normed fit index =0.958, and RMSEA =0.072.

Internal Reliability

Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability were used to assess internal reliability. Internal reliability of a measurement construct is deemed adequate when both Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability values exceed the recommended threshold of 0.70, indicating consistent and reliable measurement of the underlying latent variable. As shown in Table 3, both Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability values exceeded the recommended threshold of 0.70, indicating a high level of internal consistency among the indicators.
 Table 1. Demographic profile and clinical characteristics of the patients (n=111)

ImageFrequeFrequeFrequeFrequeFrequeAgearsAAAAdayarsAAAAAdayarsAAAAAdayarsAAAAAdayarsAAAAAdayarsAAAAAdayarsAAAAAdaradaAAAAAdayarsAAAA<	patients (n=111)			
basicStructureStructure30-39 years1614.440-49 years1636.950-59 years39.0035.160-69 years12.0010.8Marital statusMarried87.0078.4Married100000012.0010.8Divorcee12.0010.810.8EthnicityMariad Status10.810.8Bajau15.1010.810.8Melayu1613.513.5Melayu1613.610.8Melayu1613.613.6Morian Buruei1013.613.6Morian Buruei1010.813.6Marian Buruei1010.813.6Morian Buruei1010.813.6Marian Buruei10.810.813.6Marian Buruei10.810.813.6 <tr< th=""><th></th><th></th><th>Frequency</th><th>Percent</th></tr<>			Frequency	Percent
IndefinitionIndefinitionIndefinitionIndefinitionIndefinitionIndefinitionIndirial statusIndirialIndirialIndirial statusIndirialIndirialIndir	Age	<30 years	3	2.7
NormalSoferingSoferingSoferingSoferingSoferingSoferingSoferingSoferingSoferingSoferingSoferingMarrial statusMarriadSoferingSoferingSingleSoferingSoferingSoferingEthnicityKadazanDusunSoferingSoferingEthnicitySoferingSoferingSoferingBajauSoferingSoferingSoferingMariad SoferingSoferingSoferingSoferingMariad SoferingSoferingSoferingSoferingPortigeSofering <td></td> <td>30-39 years</td> <td>16</td> <td>14.4</td>		30-39 years	16	14.4
Amatrial status60-69 years1210.8Married8778.4Single1210.8Divorce1210.8EthnicityKadazanDusun9135.1Bajau1513.510.8Bajau1213.510.8Melayu1612.410.8Melayu1612.410.8Melayu1612.410.8Melayu1612.410.8Melayu1612.410.8Melayu1010.810.8Melayu1010.810.8Melayu1010.810.8Melayu1010.810.8Melayu1010.810.8Melayu1010.810.8Melayu1010.810.8Melayu10.910.810.8Melayu10.910.810.8Melayu10.910.810.8Melayu10.910.810.8Melayu10.910.810.8Melayu10.910.910.8Melayu10.910.910.8Melayu10.910.910.9Melayu10.910.910.9Melayu10.910.910.9Melayu10.910.910.9Melayu10.910.910.9Melayu10.910.910.9Melayu10.910.910.9<		40-49 years	41	36.9
<table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-container><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container></table-container>		50-59 years	39	35.1
FinanceFinanceFinanceFinanceNorcee1210.8EthnicityKadazanDusun39.035.1Bajau1513.510.8Bajau1210.810.8Bajau1210.810.8Chinese1210.810.8Baunei1210.810.8Pareni1010.110.1Pimary1010.110.1Picondary1010.110.1Picondary1010.110.1Picondary10.110.110.1Piconapation1010.110.1Piconapation1010.110.1Piconapation10010.110.1Piconapation10010.110.1Piconapation10.110.110.1Piconapation10.110.110.1Piconapation10.110.110.1Piconapation10.110.110.1Piconapation10.110.110.1Piconapation10.110.110.1Piconapation10.110.110.1Piconapation10.110.110.1Piconapation10.110.110.1Piconapation10.110.110.1Piconapation10.110.110.1Piconapation10.110.110.1Piconapation10.110.110.1Piconapation10.110.110		60-69 years	12	10.8
IndexIntermediatePivoree1210.8EthnicityKadazanDusun39.035.1Bajau1513.510.8Chinese1210.810.8Brunei1210.810.8PivoreeRonein81.012.0Pireary1010.110.1Pireary1010.110.1Pireary10.010.110.1Pireary10.010.110.1Pireary10.010.110.1Pireary10.010.110.1Pireary10.010.110.1Pireary10.010.110.1Pireary10.010.110.1Pireary10.010.110.1Pireary10.110.110.1Pireary10.110.110.1Pireary10.110.110.1Pireary10.110.110.1Pireary10.110.110.1Pireary10.110.110.1Pireary10.110.110.1Pireary10.110.110.1Pireary10.110.110.1Pireary10.110.110.1Pireary10.110.110.1Pireary10.110.110.1Pireary10.110.110.1Pireary10.110.110.1Pireary10.110.110.1Pireary10	Marital status	Married	87	78.4
EthnicityKineticRadizanDusunSinBajau5135.1Bajau1513.5Chinese1210.8Brunei1214.4Brunei1214.4Brunei1214.4Parenei1012.1Iters1312.1Primary1312.1Brunei1012.1Primary1313.1Pridedardom1313.1Postgraduate13.013.1Postgraduate13.1 <td></td> <td>Single</td> <td>12</td> <td>10.8</td>		Single	12	10.8
National BajauSite of the second ChineseSite of the se		Divorcee	12	10.8
Chinese1210.8Chinese1210.8Melayu1614.4Brunei87.2Others2118.9Level of educationNo formal education87.2Primary109.05Secondary5246.8Graduate317.9Postgraduate109.0OccupationHousewife348.6Self-employed847.2Mado213.9Private staff98.1Economic statusB407.2M402219.8Distance from the A52-50 km1313.1Soltation1219.8101-150 km131.17101-150 km11.09.9151 km or more98.1Stages of cancer fuluing detectionI3.3II133.3IV3-6 months303.1Stages of cancer fuluing detectionI3.3II3-6 months903.1II3-6 months903.1Stages of cancer fuluing detection1.13.3II3-6 months903.1II3-6 months903.1II3-6 months3.43.1II3-6 months3.43.1II3-13.13.3II3-13.43.1II3-6 months3.43.1<	Ethnicity	Kadazan Dusun	39	35.1
Melayu1614.4Melayu1614.4Brunei87.2Others2118.9Level of educationNo formal education87.2Primary109.05Secondary5246.8Graduate3127.9Postgraduate109.0OccupationHousewife84Bef-employed87.2Government staff931.9Private staff98.1Economic statusB402219.8M402219.8T20218.1Private staff22.019.8Pistance from the hospital25.5km31.0101-150 km1311.7151 km or more11099151 km or more110.010.0Stages of cancer furing detectionI33.3II3.13.3II3.13.3II3.43.1I1010.03.3ISeronths903.1II3.43.3II3.43.3II3.43.3II3.43.3II3.43.3III3.3III3.3III3.3III3.4IIII<		Bajau	15	13.5
Brunei87.2Brunei87.2Others2118.9Level of educationNo formal education87.2Primary109.0Secondary5246.8Graduate317.9Postgraduate109.0OccupationHousewife87.2Brunei staff93.1Private staff98.1Economic statusB40878.1Private staff2219.8Private staff2219.8Private staff2219.8Private staff2219.8Private staff2219.8Private staff22.919.8Private staff13.011.7Private staff13.011.7Private staff13.011.7Private staff13.011.7Private staff13.111.7Private staff13.011.7Private staff13.011.7Private staff11.011.0Private staff11.011.0Private staff11.011.7Private staff11.011.1Private staff11.011.1Private staff11.011.1Private staff11.111.1Private staff11.111.1Private staff11.111.1Private staff11.111.1Private staff11.111.1Priv		Chinese	12	10.8
Primary12118.9Level of educationNo formal education87.2Primary109.0Secondary5246.8Secondary3127.9Postgraduate3127.9OccupationHousewife5448.6Self-employed87.2Self-employed87.2Private staff9035.9Private staff913.1Postgraduate103.1Private staff913.1Postgraduate22.019.8Private staff22.019.8Postgraduate22.019.8Postgraduate1010.1Postgraduate11.011.7Postgraduate11.011.7Postgraduate11.011.7Postgraduate11.011.7Postgraduate11.011.7Postgraduate11.011.7Postgraduate11.011.7Postgraduate11.011.7Postgraduate11.011.1Postgraduate11.011.1Postgraduate11.111.1Postgraduate11.111.1Postgraduate11.111.1Postgraduate11.111.1Postgraduate11.111.1Postgraduate11.111.1Postgraduate11.111.1Postgraduate11.111.1Postgraduate11.111.1Postgraduat		Melayu	16	14.4
Level of educationNo formal education87.2Primary109.0Secondary5246.8Graduate3127.9Postgraduate109.0OccupationHousewife5448.6Self-employed87.2Government staff40.035.9Private staff98.1Economic statusB408718.1B402219.8T20219.8Pistance from the hospital25.5km32.018.126-50 km3228.851-100 km13.011.7101-150 km13.011.7151 km or more98.1Stages of cancer (during detection)I10.0II13.116.2II113.3IV83.1Time of presentation5-6 months90Stages of cancer (during detection)II3.3IV3-6 months903.1II3-6 months903.1II3-6 months903.1Stage of presentation5-6 months903.1II3-6 months903.1II3-6 months903.1II3-6 months903.1II3-6 months14.03.1II3-6 months14.03.1II3-6 months903.1II3-13.13.1 <td></td> <td>Brunei</td> <td>8</td> <td>7.2</td>		Brunei	8	7.2
International informationInternational informationInternational informationPrimary109.0Secondary5246.8Graduate3127.9Postgraduate109.0OccupationHousewife5448.6Self-employed87.2Government staff40.035.9Private staff98.1Economic statusB408778.4B402219.8T20219.8T20219.826-50 km3228.8Sh100 km1311.7101-150 km1311.7101-150 km11019.9Stages of cancer (during detection)I9.9II1443.2III373.3IV87.2Stage of presentation5-6 months90II3-6 months903.1II3-6 months903.1II3-6 months903.1II3-6 months143.2II3-6 months903.1II3-6 months903.1II3-6 months903.1II3-6 months903.1II3-6 months903.1II3-6 months903.1II3-6 months143.2II3-6 months903.1II3-6 months903.1 <td></td> <td>Others</td> <td>21</td> <td>18.9</td>		Others	21	18.9
<table-row> Secondary 52 46.8 Graduate 31 27.9 Postgraduate 10 9.0 Postgraduate 54.0 86.0 Postgraduate 54.0 86.0 Postgraduate 54.0 86.0 Postgraduate 60 86.0 Postgraduate 60 87.0 Postgraduate 60 87.0 Postgraduate 80 87.0 Postgraduate 90 87.0 Postgraduate 90 87.0 Postgraduate 90 87.0 Postgraduate 80 87.0 Postgraduate 80 87.0 Postgraduate 80 87.0 Postgraduate 90 91.0 Postgraduate 92 93.0 Postgraduate 92 93.0</table-row>	Level of education	No formal education	8	7.2
Normal ParticipationGraduate1127.9Postgraduate109.0Housewife5448.6Self-employed87.2Government staff40.035.9Private staff98.1Economic statusB4087.0Patoman22.019.8Pistance from the hospital22.019.8151400 km21.014.426-50 km32.011.7101-150 km13.011.7101-150 km11.010.010111.011.7101-150 km11.010.0151 km or more9.011.7161 km or more10.011.0Stages of cancer furing detectionI10.2II1131.312.3IV83.312.3IV1013.313.3IV1010.013.3IV1010.013.3IV1010.110.1IV1010.110.1IV1010.110.1IV1010.110.1IV1010.110.1IV1010.110.1IV1010.110.1IV1010.110.1IV1010.110.1IV1010.110.1IV1010.110.1IV1010.110.1IV10 <t< td=""><td></td><td>Primary</td><td>10</td><td>9.0</td></t<>		Primary	10	9.0
Postgraduate 10 9.0 Postgraduate 10 9.0 Housewife 54 48.6 Self-employed 8 7.2 Government staff 40.0 35.9 Private staff 9 8.1 Economic status B40 87 78.4 M40 22 19.8 12.6 Distance from the hospital <25 km		Secondary	52	46.8
OccupationHousewife5448.6Self-employed87.2Government staff40.035.9Private staff98.1Economic statusB408778.4M402219.8T2021.8Vactor22.5 km46.014.426-50 km32.028.851-100 km1311.7101-150 km11.09.9151 km or more9.08.1Total110.010.0Stages of cancer (during detection)I10.2IIAffect3.3IV3.43.3IV83.1Time of presentation3-6 months90Affect7.011.0Affect7.2Affect3.63.1Affect3.63.3IV83.1Affect3.63.1Affect3.63.1Affect3.63.3Affect3.63.1Affect3.63.1Affect3.63.1Affect3.63.1Affect3.63.1Affect3.63.1Affect3.63.1Affect3.63.1Affect3.63.1Affect3.13.1Affect3.13.1Affect3.13.1Affect3.13.1Affect3.13.1 </td <td></td> <td>Graduate</td> <td>31</td> <td>27.9</td>		Graduate	31	27.9
Self-employed87.2Government staff4035.9Private staff98.1Economic statusB408778.4M402219.8T2021.8Distance from the hospital<25 km		Postgraduate	10	9.0
Government staff4035.9Private staff98.1Economic statusB408778.4B402219.8120T2021.841.4Distance from the hospital26.50 km3228.826.50 km3228.811.7101-150 km1311.79.9151 km or more98.1151 km or more98.1151 km or more110.0100.0FrequenceIn10.2Stages of cancer (during detection)I3.3II133.33.3IV87.2Time of presentation3-6 months908.154 privation10-610.01.111 privation10.01.11.111 privation1.11.11.111 privation1.11.11.111 privation1.11.11.111 privation1.11.11.111 privation1.11.11.111 privation1.11.11.112 privation1.11.11.114 privation1.11.11.115 privation1.11.11.115 privation1.11.11.116 privation1.11.11.117 privation1.11.11.118 privation1.11.11.119 privation1.11.11.1	Occupation	Housewife	54	48.6
Private staff 9 8.1 Economic status B40 87 78.4 M40 22 19.8 T20 2 1.8 Distance from the hospital <25 km		Self-employed	8	7.2
Economic status B40 87 78.4 M40 22 19.8 T20 2 1.8 Distance from the hospital <25 km		Government staff	40	35.9
N402219.3T2021.825 km46.041.426-50 km32.028.851-100 km131.7101-150 km11.09.9151 km or more98.1151 km or more100.010.0151 km or more101.010.0151 km or more101.010.0101 km101.010.0101 km101.0101.0101 km101.0101.0101 km101.0101.0101 km101.0101.0101 km101.0101.0101 km101.0101.0101 km101.0101.0101 km101.0101.0101 km101.0101.0		Private staff	9	8.1
T20 2 1.8 Distance from the hospital <25 km	Economic status	B40	87	78.4
Distance from the hospital <25 km		M40	22	19.8
hospital26-50 km3228.851-100 km1311.7101-150 km119.9151 km or more98.1Total10010.0FrequencyStages of cancer (during detection)1I110.2II1843.2II3733.3IV87.2Time of presentation3-6 months908.151 year1412.6		T20	2	1.8
20-50 km 52 20.8 51-100 km 13 11.7 101-150 km 11 9.9 151 km or more 9 8.1 Total 110 100.0 Stages of cancer (during detection) I 100.0 II 110 100.0 III 48 43.2 III 37 33.3 IV 8 7.2 Time of presentation 3–6 months 90 81.1 6 months-1 year 14 6.3 > 1 year 14 12.6		<25 km	46	41.4
101-150 km 11 9.9 151 km or more 9 8.1 Total 100.0 100.0 Frequency Percent (during detection) I 100.0 II 100.0 100.0 II Frequency Percent II 48 43.2 III 37 33.3 IV 8 7.2 Time of presentation 3-6 months 90 81.1 6 months-1 year 14 2.6	Distance from the	26-50 km	32	28.8
151 km or more98.1Total10010.0FrequencePercentStages of cancer (during detection)19I111II4843.2III3733.3IV87.2Time of presentation3-6 months9081.16 months-1 year146.3> 1 year1412.6		51-100 km	13	11.7
Total110100.0FrequencyFrequencyPercentStages of cancer (during detection)II		101-150 km	11	9.9
FrequencyPercentStages of cancer (during detection)I16.2II48.043.2III37.033.3IV84.07.2Time of presentation3-6 months90.081.16 months-1 year7.26.3> 1 year14.012.6		151 km or more	9	8.1
Stages of cancer (during detection) I 18 16.2 II 48 43.2 III 37 33.3 IV 8 7.2 Time of presentation 3–6 months 90 81.1 6 months–1 year 7 6.3 > 1 year 14 12.6		Total	110	100.0
(during detection) II 48 43.2 III 37 33.3 IV 8 7.2 Time of presentation 3–6 months 90 81.1 6 months–1 year 7 6.3 > 1 year 14 12.6			Frequency	Percent
III 37 33.3 IV 8 7.2 Time of presentation 3–6 months 90 81.1 6 months–1 year 7 6.3 > 1 year 14 12.6		I	18	16.2
IV 8 7.2 Time of presentation 3–6 months 90 81.1 6 months–1 year 7 6.3 > 1 year 14 12.6		П	48	43.2
Time of presentation 3–6 months 90 81.1 6 months–1 year 7 6.3 > 1 year 14 12.6		Ш	37	33.3
6 months-1 year 7 6.3 > 1 year 14 12.6		IV	8	7.2
> 1 year 14 12.6	Time of presentation	3–6 months	90	81.1
,		6 months-1 year	7	6.3
Total 111 100.0		> 1 year	14	12.6
		Total	111	100.0

Lapai et al. Explaining Late Presentation of Breast Cancer Based on Theory of Planned Behaviour

Table 2. Goodness-of-fit for a structural model

	χ2	df	χ2/df	CFI	GFI	NFI	RMSEA	PNFI	PCFI
Recommended values*	N/A	N/A	<3	>0.9	>0.9	>0.9	<0.08	>0.5	>0.5
Model values	58.209	37	1.573	0.984	0.914	0.958	0.072	0.644	0.662

*Suki, 2014, χ^2 /df, degrees of freedom.

CFI: Comparative Fit Index, GFI: Goodness-of-Fit Index, NFI: Normed Fit Index, RMSEA: Root mean square error of approximation, PNFI: Parsimony-Adjusted Normed Fit Index, PCFI: Parsimony-Adjusted Comparative Fit Index



Figure 1. Theory of planned behavior Ajzen (7).

Convergent Validity

Convergent validity was assessed through standardised loading items, composite reliability, and average variances extracted (AVE). Convergent validity is established when standardised loadings and composite reliabilities exceed 0.700, and the AVE is greater than 0.500. Table 3 demonstrated that both standardised loadings and composite reliabilities exceed 0.700, Moreover, the AVE was above 0.500 in all instances, confirming successful convergent validity.

Discriminant Validity

Discriminant validity was assessed by comparing the shared variance between constructs with the square root of the AVE for each construct. Discriminant validity is established when the square root of the AVE for each construct exceeds the corresponding inter-construct correlations (shared variances). The correlation matrix revealed that the square root of the AVE for each construct was greater than the absolute value of its correlation with other constructs, thereby confirming satisfactory discriminant validity (Table 4). Since correlation coefficients were all below 0.700, multicollinearity was not a concern in this study.

Evaluation of Structural Model

The structural model underwent evaluation by scrutinising fit indices and the estimates of explained variance. Based on the assessment of the measurement model, this model demonstrated a reasonable fit. Table 5 and Figure 2 presents the standardised path coefficient of the structural model. The association between attitude and patients' intention to seek medical consultation after experiencing breast cancer symptom(s) is presented in Q1. The SEM approach revealed a positive influence of attitude on patients' intention to seek medical consultation after breast cancer symptoms (β 1=0.844, p<0.001). The subsequent inquiry, Q2, hypothesised that PBC positively impacts patients' intention to seek medical consultation after experiencing breast cancer symptoms. The analysis found a positive and significant impact of PBC on patients' intention (p=0.004, with β 2 =0.178). Furthermore, the examination of the impact of subjective norm on patients' intention to seek medical consultation after experiencing breast cancer symptoms is proposed in Q3. However, with a standardised path coefficient (β 2) of 0.088 and a p-value of 0.199, subjective norm emerged as having an insignificant influence on patients' intention to seek medical consultation after detecting breast cancer symptoms. Consequently, Q3 appeared to have a negative influence on patients, leading to delays in their intentions to seek medical consultations after observing breast cancer symptoms.

DISCUSSION

This study investigated the behavioural intention of patients to seek medical consultation after experiencing symptoms of breast cancer using the TPB model. It elucidated how various psychosocial factors, such as the TPB constructs of attitude, subjective norm, and PBC, impact patients' intention to seek medical consultation after becoming aware of breast cancer symptoms.

In this investigation, attitude emerged as the most influential predictor of patients' intention to seek medical consultation after breast cancer symptoms, followed by PBC. The findings of this study validated the positive correlation between attitude and patients' intentions to seek medical consultation after breast cancer symptoms. These results are consistent with studies conducted by. Sun et al. (14), Wang et al. (10), and Fajriah et al. (15) have highlighted attitude as a contributing factor to women's participation in breast cancer screening programmes. However, Khazir et al. (16) found no predictive relationship between attitude and intention.

Lapai et al. Explaining Late Presentation of Breast Cancer Based on Theory of Planned Behaviour

 Table 3. Probable factors influencing intention of the breast cancer patients to seek medical consultation after breast cancer symptom (s) (n=110)

Table 5. Probable factors influencing intention of the breast cancer patients to seek medic			er symptom (s)(11-110)
Item	Standardized loadings	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability	Average variance extracted
Attitude		0.977	0.975	0.908
attd2: Having early breast check-up is worth doing	0.919			
attd3: Having early breast check-up will detect lumps / abnormalities if I have any	0.974			
attd4: Having early breast check-up will lead to an early diagnosis of breast cancer if I have it	0.997			
attd5: Having early breast check-up will lead to an early treatment if I have breast cancer	0.919			
Subjective norm		0.826	0.826	0.704
Sn8: Most people who are important to me think I should have my breast check-up	0.836			
Sn9: If the important people around me had a breast cancer check-up, I would also carry out a check-up.	0.842			
Perceived behavioural control		0.870	0.871	0.772
PBC8: I believe I can solve the family commitment problem to get breast check-up in any healthcare facilities	0.902			
PBC9: I believe I can solve the work commitment problem to get breast check-up in any healthcare facilities	0.855			
Intention		0.922	0.922	0.798
Intent2: I have been paying attention to breast cancer check-up information	0.913			
Intent3: I am willing to promote breast cancer-related knowledge	0.887			
Intent4: I am willing to mobilize others to participate in breast cancer check-up if they have symptom(s)	0.880			



Figure 2. Final structural model of intention of patients to seek medical consultation after breast symptom (n=110) *PBC: Perceived behavioural control*

Lapai et al. Explaining Late Presentation of Breast Cancer Based on Theory of Planned Behaviour

Table 4. Correlations between the possible in				
	Attitude	Subjective norm	Perceived behavioural control	Intention
Attitude	0.953			
Subjective norm	0.444**	0.839		
Perceived behavioural control	-0.117	0.049	0.879	
Intention	0.813**	0.438**	0.089	0.893

Table 4. Correlations between the possible factors (n=111)

**Significant at p<0.01 level, bolded numbers represent the square root of average variances extracted (AVE).

Table 5. Relationships of late pro	resenter patients' intention to seek medica	I consultation after breast cancer symptoms

	Path			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	Р
Q_1	Attitude	\rightarrow	Intention	0.844	0.076	10.958	<0.001
Q ₂	Perceived behavioral control	\rightarrow	Intention	0.178	0.058	2.888	0.004
Q ₃	Subjective norm	\rightarrow	Intention	0.088	0.069	1.283	0.199

**significant at α=0.05

Similarly, perceived behavioral control exhibited a significant relationship with patients' intention to seek medical consultation after breast cancer symptoms, aligning with the findings of Rezabeigi-Khazir et al. (17) and Wang et al. (10), Rezabeigi-Davarani et al. (18), which suggested that perceived behavioral control predicts intentions and actions. However, Peyman et al. (19) found perceived behavioral control to be the weakest predictor of breast cancer screening, possibly due to variations in research settings, subjects, or data collection tools.

Contrary to attitude and PBC, subjective norm did not significantly influence patients' intention to seek medical consultation after experiencing breast cancer symptoms in this study. This suggests that individuals, important to the patients (partners, family, peers, physicians, and media), may have negatively influenced them, leading to delays in seeking medical consultations after noticing breast cancer symptoms. Despite patients' strong inclination to seek medical consultation for their breast cancer symptoms, as indicated by the positive significance of attitude and PBC, they were hindered by a lack of support, from their surroundings hindered them. This finding resonates with Keshavarzi (20), where subjective norm did not predict mammography screening intent and behaviour. However, it contradicts studies by Dezham (16) and Hatefnia (21), which showed a positive relationship between subjective norm and mammography screening intention and behaviour. Sun et al. (15), Wang et al. (10), and Jensen et al. (22) also concluded that subjective norm is the strongest predictor of screening intention.

Subjective norm is influenced by significant individuals in one's life, such as spouses, relatives, friends, health experts, and the media. One reason subjective norm did not significantly affect intention may be the lack of understanding among spouses regarding breast cancer symptoms. Men often lack clarity about breast cancer and its symptoms, leading them to pay less attention to their spouse's complaints. In a study by Khakbazan et al. (24), only 14% of women received encouragement from their husbands to seek medical consultation after experiencing breast cancer symptoms, while 31% received no encouragement from anyone.

Apart from spouses, insufficient encouragement from family members and friends may also contribute to delays in seeking medical consultations after experiencing breast cancer symptoms. Family members and friends should offer psychological support and emotional comfort to alleviate barriers to intention. Molina (24) indicated that advice from friends and family members increased the intention to undergo mammography screening. In this study, most patients were housewives with no active income, but with family commitments. Thus, increased support and encouragement from families and friends could give patients more time and courage to seek medical consultation for their symptoms. A lack of encouragement from family members and healthcare providers significantly affects women's decisions regarding breast cancer screening programmes. There is a correlation between lower levels of social support and the lack of participation in breast cancer screening (23). Stronger social support networks contribute to the development of more positive attitudes toward preventive healthcare.

Another factor noted in the study by Bonsu and Ncama (25), Moodley et al. (26), Kohler et al. (27) and Khakbazan et al. (23) is the absence of family history having breast cancer. As explained, subjective norm can be divided into injunctive normative belief and descriptive normative belief (28). An injunctive normative belief is the approves or disapproves of next of kin of the women to performing the behaviour while descriptive normative belief are beliefs as to whether important others themselves perform the behaviour. If the women having a family history of breast cancer, they are likely to experienced seeing their own family to seek medical consultation for breast symptoms, therefore this will increase women awareness of their increase susceptibility to breast cancer (29). In this study, only around 20.9% of the patients had a family history of breast cancer and only few of them (6%) having close friends that had breast cancer.

In addition to spouses, family members, and friends, health experts also play a significant role in influencing the subjective norm. In the study by Vahedin Shahrodi et al. (30), physicians and healthcare staff were the most informative sources regarding breast cancer and screening methods. Emphasis on the importance of breast examinations and relevant knowledge by experts and primary care physicians is crucial. Intervention by community health workers and local volunteers can help alleviate women's discomfort and shyness about breast healthcare. Limited access to doctors, healthcare workers, educational resources, diagnosis, and treatment processes contributes to women's low awareness about clinical examinations and their importance. Women often neglect breast examinations until they experience severe symptoms, highlighting poor awareness about clinical examination execution and importance of clinical examinations. Most patients detected breast cancer at stage II (44%) and stage III (34%) and sought medical consultation only after experiencing multiple breast cancer symptoms.

In the study by Sun et al. (14), past experiences influence women's behaviours towards breast cancer screening. Women who had been screened before were more likely to get advice from physicians regarding breast cancer prevention Wu et al. (31). In this study, since the subjective norms found to be negatively linked with intentions, it is assumed that most women had never been screened before. This might suggest that poor communication between health care provider and the community lead to late presentation. Thus, collaboration between healthcare providers and relatives or community is essential to enhance the positive influence of subjective norm.

Subjective norms as media influence might publicize the harm of breast cancer and increase check-up intention, but it could also increase the exposure of screening process Sun et al. (14). Media can therefore give negative effects on subjective norm. Thus, patients may feel more embarrassed, especially with the male physician's involvement. Therefore, given our research findings, more intervention approaches should be taken to improve the efficacy of media influence such as television, brochures or leaflets, newspapers or magazines, and broadcast. Sun et al. (14) reported that advocacy and education has positive impact on subjective norms. Community that constantly exposed to the regular intervals of announcements or reminders of screening behaviours, and consequently, their emotions will be aroused and they will increasingly engage in the behaviours.

Study Limitations

This study marks an inaugural exploration into the inclination of late presenting breast cancer patients in Sabah to seek medical consultation after experiencing breast cancer symptoms. The TPB and SEM analytical models were employed for the purpose. This research provides valuable insight into the factors influencing delayed medical consultation, emphasizing that late presentation of breast cancer can vary based on psychosocial influences and is not solely determined by demographic or clinical factors.

Despite the substantial findings, the study encountered certain limitations. It was conducted with a limited number of participants for SEM analysis, relied on patients' recollections for recording dates, potentially introducing recall bias, and also relied on self-reporting for the questionnaire. Additionally, the absence of questions regarding negative intentions hindered the assessment of the direct impact of subjective norm on behavioural intention. However, these limitations do not undermine the overall significance of the study but rather offer suggestions for future research. To enhance data validity, it is recommended to incorporate interviews as a complement to the questionnaire, rather than solely relying on selfreported questionnaires. Moreover, combining the TPB model with other models such as the prototype willingness model could amplify explanatory power and offer a superior fit to the data compared to a single model. Furthermore, it is advisable to compare the model with other health education and health promotion models to enrich understanding and applicability.

CONCLUSION

In this study, subjective norm was seen to have a negative influence on the intentions of patients to seek medical consultation after experiencing cancer symptoms for the first time, while the patient's attitude and PBC was noted to have a positive influence on their intention to seek medical consultation after observing symptoms. Therefore, based on our research findings, additional intervention approaches should be implemented to enhance the efficacy of subjective norm influences on the public, such as awareness among partners, family members, peers, physicians, and various media. Thus, policies and programmes that encourage and mobilise the public to take preventive measures with regard to their own health should reasonably include education through the subjective norm.

Ethics

Ethics Committee Approval: Ethical approval was secured from the Medical Research and Ethics Committee (MREC) (approval number: NMRR-20-32-52564 (IIR), date: 27.02.2020), Ministry of Health Malaysia (MOH).

Informed Consent: Written consent was obtained from all those listed, and assurances were given regarding patient confidentiality.

Footnotes

Authorship Contributions

Surgical and Medical Practices: F.H., S.Z.S., N.A.S.N.K., Concept: F.H., S.Z.S., N.A.S.N.K., Design: S.Z.S., N.A.S.N.L., Data Collection or Processing: Analysis or Interpretation: D.L., M.T.H.P., Literature Search: D.L., Writing: D.L.,

Conflict of Interest: No conflict of interest was declared by the authors.

Financial Disclosure: The authors declared that this study received no financial support.

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to express their gratitude to all the research assistants who contributed to data collection. Special thanks are extended to the reviewers and editors for their valuable feedback.

References

- Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Siegel RL, Torre LA, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. CA Cancer J Clin. 2018; 68: 394-424.
- Caplan L. Delay in breast cancer: implications for stage at diagnosis and survival. Front Public Health. 2014; 2: 87.
- 3. Agodirin OS, Aremu I, Rahman GA, Olatoke SA, Akande HJ, Oguntola AS, Romanoff A. Prevalence of themes linked to delayed

presentation of breast cancer in Africa: a meta-analysis of patientreported studies. JCO Glob Oncol. 2020; 6: 731-42.

- Espina C, McKenzie F, dos-Santos-Silva I. Delayed presentation and diagnosis of breast cancer in African women: a systematic review. Ann Epidemiol. 2017 Oct; 27: 659-71.e7.
- Ramirez AJ, Westcombe AM, Burgess CC, Sutton S, Littlejohns P, Richards MA. Factors predicting delayed presentation of symptomatic breast cancer: a systematic review. Lancet. 1999; 353: 1127-31.
- Unger-Saldaña K, Infante-Castañeda CB. Breast cancer delay: a grounded model of help-seeking behaviour. Soc Sci Med. 2011 Apr; 72: 1096-104.
- Ajzen I. From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behavior. In: Kuhl J, Beckmann J (eds). Action control: from cognition to behavior. sssp springer series in social psychology. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag; 1985. pp 11-39.
- Ajzen I. Attitudes, personality, and behavior. U.S. ed. Chicago, IL: Dorsey Press; 1988.
- 9. Ajzen I. The theory of planned behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes. 1991; 50: 179211.
- Wang X, Chen D, Xie T, Zhang W. Predicting women's intentions to screen for breast cancer based on the health belief model and the theory of planned behavior. J Obstet Gynaecol Res. 2019; 45: 2440-2451.
- Rutter DR. Attendance and reattendance for breast cancer screening: a prospective 3-year test of the theory of planned behaviour. Br J Health Psychol. 2000; 5: 113.
- Fishbein M, Ajzen I. Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley; 1975. 480 s. ISBN-13: 978-0201020892
- Hair JF Jr, Sarstedt M, Ringle CM, Mena JA. An assessment of the use of partial least squares structural equation modeling in marketing research. J Acad Mark Sci. 2012; 40: 414-433.
- Sun Y, Yuan J, Liu W, Qin B, Hu Z, Li J, He Y. Predicting rural women's breast cancer screening intention in China: a PLS-SEM approach based on the theory of planned behavior. Front Public Health. 2022; 10: 858788.
- Fajriah AS, Respati SH, Murti B. Theory of planned behavior and health belief model on factors associated with breast self-examination among university students. J Health Promot Behav. 2019; 4: 246–57.
- Dezham S, Roozbahani N, Khorsandi M. Application of theory of planned behavior in predicting screening mammography in housewives over 40 years. Daneshvar Med. 2015; 22: 1–12. Available from: https://www.sid.ir/paper/30406/en
- Khazir Z, Morowatisharifabad MA, Vaezi A, Enjezab B, Yari F, Fallahzadeh H. Perceived behavioral control in mammography: a qualitative study of Iranian women's experiences. Int J Cancer Manag. 2019; 12: e88790.
- Rezabeigi-Davarani E, Khanjani N, Falahi M, Daneshi S, Iranpour A. Breast self-examination and its effective factors based on the

theory of planned behavior among women in Kerman, Iran. J Educ Community Health. 2017; 3: 1-8.

- 19. Peyman N, Amani M, Esmaili H. The relationship between health literacy and constructs of theory of planned behavior and breast cancer screening tests performance among women referred to health care centers in Roshtkhar, 2015. Iranian J Breast Dis. 2016; 9: 60-9.
- Keshavarzi A, Asadi S, Asadollahi A, Mohammadkhah F, Khani Jeihooni A. Tendency to breast cancer screening among rural women in Southern Iran: a structural equation modeling (SEM) analysis of theory of planned behavior. Breast Cancer: Basic Clin Res. 2022;16:11782234221121001.
- Hatefnia E. Survey of factors affecting predicted mammography in employed women aged ≥ 35 years based on the theory of planned behavior. J Health Syst Res. 2013; 9: 1062-70.
- Jensen LF, Pedersen AF, Andersen B, Vedsted P. Social support and non-participation in breast cancer screening: a Danish cohort study. J Public Health. 2016; 38: 335-342.
- Khakbazan Z, Roudsari RL, Taghipour A, Mohammadi E, Pour RO. Appraisal of breast cancer symptoms by Iranian women: entangled cognitive, emotional and socio-cultural responses. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev. 2014; 15: 8135-8142.
- 24. Molina Y, Ornelas IJ, Doty SL, Bishop S, Beresford SA, Coronado GD. Family/friend recommendations and mammography intentions: roles of perceived norms and support. Health Educ Res. 2015; 30: 797-809.
- 25. Bonsu AB, Ncama BP. Recognizing and appraising symptoms of breast cancer as a reason for delayed presentation in Ghanaian women: a qualitative study. PLoS One. 2019; 14: e0208773.
- Moodley J, Cairncross L, Naiker T, Momberg M. Understanding pathways to breast cancer diagnosis among women in the Western Cape Province, South Africa: a qualitative study. BMJ Open. 2016; 6: e009905.
- 27. Kohler RE, Gopal S, Miller AR, Lee CN, Reeve BB, Weiner BJ, Wheeler SB. A framework for improving early detection of breast cancer in sub-Saharan Africa: a qualitative study of help-seeking behaviors among Malawian women. Patient Educ Couns. 2017; 100: 167-73.
- 28. Fishbein M, Ajzen I. Predicting and changing behavior: The reasoned action approach. New York: Psychology Press; 2011.
- 29. Cohen M. Breast cancer early detection, health beliefs, and worries: women with and without family history. Psycho-Oncol. 2006; 15: 873-883.
- 30. Vahedin M, Porhaji F, Esmaeili H. Motivating structures, self-efficacy and cost perceptions influencing breast self-examination: a protective motivation framework. March IJOGI. 2013; 15: 1-9.
- Wu Z, Liu Y, Li X, Song B, Ni C, Lin F. Factors associated with breast cancer screening participation among women in mainland China: a systematic review. BMJ Open. 2019; 9: e028705.