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INTRODUCTION
Breast disease is the commonest growth of urban Indian ladies and the second commonest in the provincial ladies. Attributable to the absence of attention to this infection and without a breast growth screening program, the larger part of breast diseases is analysed at a generally propelled stage. The nature of consideration accessible for breast tumour patients shifts generally as indicated by where the patient is dealt with. Most by far of breast malignancy patients experience insufficient and wrong treatment because of absence of astounding framework and some of the time abilities, or more all budgetary assets. The ongoing accentuation on wellbeing instruction, early finding of malignancies, and more open offices for growth treatment are relied upon to realize the genuinely necessary change in breast tumor care in India. Malignancy starts when solid cells change and develop wild, framing a mass or sheet of cells called a tumor. A tumor can be harmful or benevolent. A destructive tumor is threatening, which means it can develop and spread to different parts of the body. A considerate tumor implies the tumor can develop however won't spread

Objectives of the study

- To assess the pre-test knowledge score regarding Breast cancer and its preventive measure among women in reproductive age group.
- To assess the effectiveness of self-instructional module on knowledge regarding Breast cancer and its preventive measure among women in reproductive age group.
- To find out the association between pre-test knowledge score with selected demographic variables.


## Hypothesis

RHO- There will be no significant difference between pretestand post-test knowledge score regarding Breast cancer and its preventive measure
RH1- There will be significant difference between pre-test and post-test knowledge score regarding Breast cancer and its preventive measure.
Rh2- There will be significant association between pre-test knowledge score with selected demographic variables.

## Methodology

A quantitative evaluative approach was used for the study. The samples were recruited by non-probability purposive sampling technique. The total number of subjects was 60 women. Main study was conducted in the selected area of Indore, according to inclusive and exclusive criteria. Informed consent from the women was obtained prior to data collection process. Post test was conducted after seven days. Data were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics (Paired \& Unpaired 't' test, Chi-square test).

## RESULT

1. Frequency distribution of women of reproductive according to Demographic variables -

- There was 9 ( $15.0 \%$ ) woman in the age group 18-23 years, 20 (33.3\%) women were in the age group $24-29$ years, 22 (36.7\%) women were in the age group 30-35 years and 9 (15.0\%) women were in the age group $36-41$ years.

Majority of the women were in the age group 30-35 years.

- There was 13 ( $21.7 \%$ ) women had never attended the school, 27 ( $45.0 \%$ ) women had done their primary education, 20 (33.3\%) women had done her higher secondary education and none of the women had done graduation and other higher qualification. Majority of the women had done their primary education.
- 25 ( $41.7 \%$ ) women were homemakers, 32 ( $53.3 \%$ ) women were doing private jobs and only 3 ( $5.0 \%$ ) woman was doing a government job. Majority of the women were doing private jobs.
- 41 ( $68.3 \%$ ) women were married, 15 ( $25.0 \%$ ) women were unmarried and $4(6.7 \%)$ women were divorced. Majority of the women were married.
- 23 (38.3\%) women belonged to the nuclear family, while 37 ( $61.7 \%$ ) women were from joint families. Majority of the women were from joint families.
- 5 ( $8.3 \%$ ) women were having a monthly family income of less than Rs. 10000, 29 (48.3\%) women were having $\alpha$ monthly family income between Rs. 10001-15000,26 (43.3.0\%) women were having a monthly family income of Rs. 15001-20000 and none of the women were having a monthly family income of Rs. 20001 and above. Majority of the women were having a monthly family income between Rs. 10001-15000.
- $21(35.0 \%)$ women were non-vegetarians and 39 ( $65.0 \%$ ) women were vegetarians. Majority of the women were vegetarians.

Table - 01 Shows frequency and Percentage distribution of women in various Demographic variables -

| Demographic Variables | Experimental Group |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Frequency (N) | Percent (\%) |
| Age <br> a. 18-23 years <br> b. 24-29 years <br> c. 30-35 years <br> d. 36-4l years | $\begin{array}{\|l} 9 \\ 20 \\ 22 \\ 9 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} 15.0 \\ 33.3 \\ 36.7 \\ 15.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Educational Qualification <br> a. Never attend the school <br> b. Primary Education <br> c. High Secondary Education <br> d. Graduation and above | $\begin{array}{\|l} 13 \\ 27 \\ 20 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} 21.7 \\ 45.0 \\ 33.3 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Occupation <br> a. Home Maker <br> b. Private <br> c. Government | $\begin{array}{\|l} 25 \\ 32 \\ 3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41.7 \\ & 53.3 \\ & 5.0 \end{aligned}$ |
| Marital Status <br> a. Married <br> b. Un married <br> c. Divorced | $\begin{array}{\|l} 41 \\ 15 \\ 4 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 68.3 \\ & 25.0 \\ & 6.7 \end{aligned}$ |
| Type of the Family <br> a. Nuclear family <br> b. Joint Family | $\begin{aligned} & 23 \\ & 37 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38.3 \\ & 61.7 \end{aligned}$ |
| Family income Per Month (Rs.) <br> a. Less than 10000 <br> b. Rs. 10001-15000 <br> c. Rs. 15001-20000 <br> d. More than Rs. 20001 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 29 \\ & 26 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.3 \\ & 48.3 \\ & 43.3 \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ |


| Dietary pattern |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| a. Vegetarian | 21 | 35.0 |
| b. Non-vegetarian | 39 | 65.0 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 |

2. Comparison of the Pre - test and Post- Test Knowledge score
The mean pre-test knowledge score was $6.85 \pm 2.13$ and in the post-test, it was $20.17 \pm 2.79$. The difference was found to be statistically significant ( $\mathrm{t}=-29.590, \mathrm{df}=59, \mathrm{p}$ value $=0.001$, Significant), showing a higher post-test score in comparison to the pre-test the obtained value is higher than table value.

Table value is $t=-29.590, \mathrm{df}=59, \mathrm{p}$ value $=0.001$, Significant so the study found is significant. Thus, the intervention was helpful in improving the knowledge score of the women of reproductive age group.

Table - 02 Comparison of the Pre - test and Post- Test Knowledge score

| S. <br> No. | Knowledge <br> Score | Mean $\pm$ SD | 't' value | P value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| l. | Pre - test | $6.85 \pm 2.13$ | $-29.590, \mathrm{df}=59$ | $0.001^{*}$ |
| 2. | Post - test | $20.17 \pm 2.79$ |  |  |
| t ' value $=3.46$ |  |  |  |  |

COMPARISON OF PRETEST AND POSTTEST KNOWLEDGE SCORE


Fig - 01 Bar diagram showing comparison of preintervention and post-intervention Knowledge Scores

## CONCLUSION

Thus after the analysis and interpretation of the data, we can conclude that the hypothesis, Hl , "there will be significant difference between the mean post-test knowledge score of the women regarding Breast cancer and its preventive measures infraction will be significantly higher than mean pre-test knowledge scores at the level of $p<0.01$ " is being accepted.

Also, the hypothesis, H2, "it was found out that age, gender, education, status, experience and source of information socio demographic variable found to be significant. And rest of the socio demographic variable such as gender and salary found to be significant at the level of $p=0.001$." not significant"

The analysis shows that there were a statistically significant in gaining knowledge regarding Breast cancer and its preventive measures among women in reproductive age group at selected urban area of Indore. Thus, the intervention "self-instructional module" was effective.
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