

# UC Irvine

## UC Irvine Previously Published Works

### Title

HPV Vaccine Intent among Adult Women Receiving Care at Community Health Centers

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/76z571f9>

### Journal

Journal of Cancer Education, 37(4)

### ISSN

0885-8195

### Authors

Hecht, ML

BeLue, R

Ray, A

et al.

### Publication Date

2022-08-01

### DOI

10.1007/s13187-020-01937-5

### Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Peer reviewed



# HPV Vaccine Intent among Adult Women Receiving Care at Community Health Centers

M. L. Hecht<sup>1</sup> · R. BeLue<sup>2</sup> · A. Ray<sup>3</sup> · S. Hopfer<sup>4</sup> · M. Miller-Day<sup>5</sup> · F. Mckee<sup>6</sup>

Accepted: 1 December 2020 / Published online: 5 January 2021  
© American Association for Cancer Education 2021

## Abstract

Human papillomavirus (HPV) is a disease that exacts substantial costs in human life and public health expenditures. Fortunately, a vaccine exists that can mitigate these costs. This study reports the development and evaluation of the intervention designed to overcome these barriers by using culturally grounded narratives to promote HPV vaccination. Women's Stories (WS) targets women over the age of 18 and was originally successfully validated for use among college students resulting in NCI recognition. WS was adapted for touch pad delivery in Planned Parenthood clinics where a randomized clinical trial was conducted in 8 clinics in 3 cities. Two hundred seventeen women were randomly assigned to treatment and control, completing pretest and posttest surveys. This study examined data from the immediate posttest. An intent to treat analysis was conducted using a generalized linear mixed modeling approach using a multinomial link and accounting for repeated measures by site. Results demonstrate significant short-term effects on vaccine intentions and vaccine self-efficacy. When compared to control group participants, women in the treatment condition more likely to intend to get the shot today/the day of interview ( $p < 0.01$ ), as well as in 1 ( $p < 0.01$ ) and 6 ( $p < 0.01$ ) months and had greater self-efficacy to receive the HPV vaccination ( $B = 0.54$ ;  $p = 0.0002$ ). These results are promising for the potential impact of the intervention in clinical settings as well as providing a model for overcoming lack of awareness and vaccine resistance in other segments of the population.

**Keywords** Human papillomavirus (HPV) vaccine · Narrative intervention · Women's stories

## Introduction

Encouraging vaccination has become an increasingly vital public health concern across a number of domains [1, 2]. This is particularly true when life-threatening diseases such as human papillomavirus (HPV) can be avoided. HPV is the most common sexually transmitted infection (STI) in the USA with a prevalence of 27% among US women aged 14–59 [2]. Infection with HPV is associated with virtually all cervical

cancers as well as many other anogenital, penile, and oropharyngeal cancers [3–5]. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), 19,000 HPV-related cancer cases occur in women annually, 12,710 women are newly diagnosed with costly HPV-related cervical abnormalities, and 4290 women die from cervical cancer [6, 7]. The HPV economic burden in the USA is \$6.5 billion annually [5, 6]. Lower SES and minority groups, including many African American and Latina women, are most negatively impacted by HPV-associated diseases [5, 8].

## HPV Vaccination

Fortunately, the means to address this public health crisis are at hand with the development of 9-valent (HPV) vaccine. Both national and international studies have proven that HPV vaccination is effective in reducing viral prevalence, frequency of abnormal Pap smears, and pre-cancers [9]. However, the vaccine's promise has not been fully realized in terms of public health impact due to low vaccination rates of one or more shots at 39.9% and series completion at 21.5% according to the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) [10]. These

✉ R. BeLue  
rhonda.belue@slu.edu

<sup>1</sup> REAL Prevention LLC, Clifton, NJ, USA  
<sup>2</sup> Health Management and Policy, Saint Louis University, St Louis, MO, USA  
<sup>3</sup> Public Health, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, USA  
<sup>4</sup> Public Health, UC Irvine, Irvine, CA, USA  
<sup>5</sup> Communication Studies, Chapman University, Orange, CA, USA  
<sup>6</sup> St. Andrew Development, Inc., Philadelphia, PA, USA

rates are particularly troubling among 18–26-year-olds since most vaccination efforts target younger people. While it seems obvious that vaccines only work when they are used, despite public health efforts to increase these rates, uptake levels are still lower than desirable due to barriers such as low awareness of the HPV vaccine that prevent more widespread vaccination. Access barriers to preventive care and low awareness magnify the problems among underserved populations. With current vaccine advertising decreasing, little attention is currently being paid to increasing awareness. Finally, having patients return for the 3-shot HPV vaccination series (follow-up shots administered 4 and 6 months later, respectively) is also a serious road block to optimizing HPV immunization benefits particularly for low SES minority groups [11–15].

## Purpose

The goal of the current study is to report the development and evaluation of a clinic-based HPV vaccine promotion intervention called Women’s Stories (WS). WS targets 18–26 year-old women who are clients of Planned Parenthood.

## Preliminary Research

Women’s Stories (WS) was designed as a narrative intervention delivered through digital technology in Planned Parenthood waiting rooms [16]. The intervention was adapted from the evidence-based HPV decision narratives, an NCI-accredited research-tested intervention program that was developed for college women as student health centers [17] and almost doubled HPV vaccination rates in the initial RCT [157]. Whereas HPV decision narratives targeted a largely White, 18–22-year-old audience of college students, WS targets an older, health clinic-based (i.e., Planned Parenthood), lower SES, audience that is predominantly African American. As a result, it was determined to model the intervention on the existing one, but to reground it. In addition, while the videos in HPV decision narratives were the sole content of the intervention, the real-world implementation of WS required a “portal” to present the videos that included an introduction and some additional prevention content.

WS is grounded in narrative engagement theory (NET), which describes the qualities of culturally grounded and engaging stories needed to reach low awareness and/or resistant audiences [18, 19]. Narratives achieve these qualities when they are culturally grounded in the target group’s prototypical stories. The vaccine narratives in WS are a vehicle to “re-story” or change the HPV vaccination narrative in order to promote health behavior change and as a result have proven to be an effective message format for delivering a variety of health promotion interventions [20–23]. Women’s Stories targets an older, clinic-based audience that is predominantly African American.

## Intervention Development

NET guided formative research identifying prototypical vaccine decision narratives in formative research that is described in more detail elsewhere [16]. Narrative interviews were conducted with 26 young adult women attending PP clinics and 2 PP staff to obtain pro-vaccine decision narratives and identify perceived barriers to patient vaccination. These interviews were designed to elicit vaccine decision stories as well as identify barriers to vaccination.

Interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim. Data were entered into NVIVO software and coding of emergent themes is conducted by the researchers using qualitative content analysis [24, 25] methods developed in previous studies [26–28]. Analyses started with open coding proceeding in 3 phases: first identifying emergent themes of vaccine acceptance and resistance; second coding for peer, family, and healthcare provider messages that clients receive; and third coding for messages in which HPV vaccination can be integrated with care for other health issues. Comparisons were made between non-initiators, completers, and initiators/noncompleters. The benchmark for success was the reliability among multiple coders on identification of narrative prototypes. Coding resulted in a set of decision themes as well as providing other details for the intervention.

The findings from the formative work were used to develop four culturally grounded WS video docudramas, each approximately 1 min in length. Scripts for these videos were piloted with 12 women, revised, and then shot by an award-winning videographer, Aaron Matthews, of Look Alive Films. One of the videos, the information video, addressed the issue of awareness targeting those who had either never heard of HPV or knew little about it. Based on NET, this provides a cognitive model of how participants should think about HPV in making decision. This video was in the form of a monolog recounting how a woman informed her cousin who knew little about HPV and the vaccine. The other three videos were dialogs presenting behavior modeling of the social processes of decision-making, based on NET, focusing on (a) learning about the real risks and potential consequences of HPV through a conversation between two female friends (kitchen conversation), (b) learning about HPV and cancer risk for men through a conversation between a male and female friend (park bench conversation), and (c) learning about doctors’ strong support for vaccination through a physician strongly endorsing HPV vaccination to a young woman during a well visit when she shares she is considering becoming sexually active. The conversation between a male and female was created because women expressed concern that they are not seen as totally responsible for HPV transmission and prevention. The medical video was created because of the key role that doctors’ recommendations still play [29]. Each narrative ended with reinforcement message of “Be protected” and calls

to action exemplifying the themes: “Ask your doctor about the HPV shot; Talk to your friends about getting vaccinated for HPV.”

Our technology partner, St. Andrew Development, then created the portal for web-based Women’s Stories intervention with the embedded videos. After pilot testing, it was determined that the best form of delivery was through an interactive, dedicated touch pad secured in a quiet, semi-private location in the waiting room rather than through other media (e.g., kiosks) and locations (e.g., exam rooms) [16]. The initial screen was designed to motivate users to get vaccinated by asking if they wanted to protect their health. It then briefly described HPV and measured awareness. Low awareness responses were first directed to the information video and then to the other 3 videos, while high awareness responses lead to a screen with all 4 videos to choose from. On average, women spent 5 min viewing videos. After viewing a video, women were given the option of viewing other videos and/or swiping a QR code for a text for more information.

WS also was programmed to send out reminder texts to promote vaccination and/or the completion of the 3-shot sequence. Text messaging has been shown to be as effective for health behavior change and reminder systems such as this one increase vaccination rates that otherwise stagnate [30–34]. These reminders included information about clinic locations and hours of operation. Those who indicate they did not vaccinate are asked if they intend to vaccinate; if they indicate yes, they are asked to provide an approximate date of when they will do so. They also receive information about clinic locations and hours of operation. Follow-up questions are incorporated into the 3-month posttest to confirm whether they subsequently received the initial vaccine. For women who indicate they received the 1st shot at that time, text message reminders will then repeat as described above. Texts also provided links to the follow-up posttests.

## Intervention Implementation

One of the key barriers to HPV vaccination is access [12]. This project was designed to overcome this barrier through our partnership with Planned Parenthood of Southwest Pennsylvania (PPSP). PPSP stocked and provided the HPV vaccine to uninsured patients at no cost and to the insured at a discounted cost through a Merck Vaccine Assistance Program. Nationally, PP serves over 2.5 million men and women annually, including multiple minority groups and lower SES populations, and is the largest provider of women’s health services in the USA particularly among minority groups. Over half (52%) of PP services are devoted to STI testing/treatment and cancer screening/prevention. PP, therefore, provides HPV vaccination access to a population that is ethnically diverse, predominantly low SES, seeking related health services, and who historically has had little access to

prophylactic or preventive health. The collaboration with PP reaches a population in need and addresses an important women’s health problem as well as provides the ultimate market for the product. By piloting in PPSP, WS has the potential to reach a broach and underserved population.

## Summary and Hypotheses

Women’s Stories is a narrative intervention delivered through interactive touch pads adapted from the evidence-based HPV decision narratives. The overall goal was to evaluate the effectiveness of an adaptation of this intervention for delivery in Planned Parenthood waiting rooms to ethnically diverse population. In this study, we report the short-term effects on vaccine intentions. We hypothesized that women who receive the Women’s Stories intervention will report greater vaccination *intentions* and greater vaccine *self-efficacy* compared to women in the control condition. Intentions involve participants’ plans to get vaccinated in the near future and reflect the cognitive modeling predicted by NET. Self-efficacy involved the ability to get vaccinated and this reflects the behavior models of NET. Changing intentions and efficacy would indicate that WS was successful in changing the narrative about HPV vaccination for participants. The purpose of this study is to identify the short-term effects of the WS intervention among women aged 18–26 who report as previously being unvaccinated.

## Materials and Methods

### Procedures and Sample

Pre-programmed touch pads were installed in waiting rooms of four PPSP clinics in Philadelphia, St Louis, and Chicago. *One touch pad was installed per waiting room.* They were placed on tables in a quiet corner and tethered to the wall at the request of the clinics to ensure their security. Based on pilot research, signage was developed to direct potential participants to the laptop. When women arrived for their appointment, staff would direct those within the targeted age group (18–26) to the laptops. In order to place the least possible burden on staff, their role was kept to the minimum with informational sheets available to potential participants to explain Women’s Stories and the project. Women who approached the laptop clicked to “awaken” it and were asked a brief set of qualifying questions including, most centrally, their age, vaccine status, and pregnancy status (pregnant women are ineligible of the HPV vaccine). Qualified women were consented, administered a brief pretest, and then randomized to treatment and control groups. In the interest of providing the potentially valuable intervention to PP clients, 63% were randomized to the treatment condition. We utilized an active control, presenting these women with prescribed information

approved by the client using an informational curriculum StA had used in previous work [35].

After the intervention, women completed a brief posttest. If women were called to their appointment prior to completion of these activities, they could return to the touch pad afterwards if they had time and it was available; if not, they could sign in from a remote location and complete the process. Participants were sent text messages containing links to posttest 3 and 6 months post intervention. To incentivize participation, they received \$20 after they completed the pretest, viewed the WS intervention (or control content), and completed the immediate posttest, and then an additional \$20 each for the 3- and 6-month posttests, for a total of up to \$60. Incentives were in the form of an Amazon e-gift card.

Like many community-based interventions, obstacles emerged that required adaptation. The evolving cultural and political climate surrounding family planning, in general, and Planned Parenthood, in particular, placed incredible stress on the clinics and their staff. Rapid, out of the ordinary changes in the PPSP administration in Philadelphia including research staff also proved problematic. As a result, we recruited 4 additional clinics, two in St. Louis and two in Chicago, to complete the data collection. All the clinics shared similar demographic profiles (e.g., between 27 and 35% of women clients had public insurance and served women approximately 27–28 years of age). Clinic procedures were also similar and included wellness exams and reproductive healthcare and birth control services. An institutional review board approval was obtained from all participating institutions.

A total of 217 women completed the pretest, intervention or control, and immediate posttest. The majority (50%) of WS participants were Black/African American, followed by approximately 20% Latina and 10% White. The majority

(53%) of WS participants reported being single and over a third (36%) reported being in a relationship. Over half of WS participants reported receiving a recent Pap smear (39% in the control group and 66% in the treatment group,  $p < 0.05$ ). Eighty-eight percent of women reported being sexually active (80% control group and 89% treatment group;  $t < 0.05$ ). Of the women who had reported receiving a Pap smear ( $n = 114$ ), 42 % indicated that they have had an abnormal test result and 16 % reported being told that they have had genital warts (8% control and 20% treatment;  $p < 0.05$ ). Only 18 % of women reported that they knew a lot about HPV. See Table 1 for more detail on demographics and descriptors.

### Measurement

Self-report surveys were administered at pretest/baseline, immediate posttest, 3-month posttest, and 6-month posttest. For purposes of this study, we utilized the pretest and immediate posttest data. Below, we discuss the variables included in these analyses.

### Outcomes of Interest

The primary short-term outcome variables were HPV vaccination intentions and self-efficacy.

### HPV Vaccination Intentions

The intentions measure was adapted from Wegwarth et al. [36] to measure the likelihood of vaccinating for HPV. Instead of a single, overall intention item, we asked about intention to vaccinate the same day the survey was completed, the next month, and in the next 6 months.

**Table 1** Participant demographic information

Participant demographics ( $N=217$ ) %( $n$ )	Total	Control $N=81$	Treatment $N=136$
Race/ethnicity ( $p = 0.1$ )			
African American or Black	44.8% (97)	36% (30)	48% (65)
Asian or Pacific Islander	5.0% (11)	8% (6)	4% (5)
European American or White	13% (28)	22% (18)	10% (14)
Hispanic or Latino	25% (55)	22% (18)	27% (38)
Other/American Indian or Alaskan Native (< 1%)	11% (24)	11% (9)	10% (14)
What is your relationship status?			
Divorced	1.6% (3)	2% (1)	1.5% (2)
In a relationship	36% (78)	34% (28)	37% (50)
Legally separated	1% (2)	3.6% (3)	0% (0)
Married	8% (17)	5.3% (4)	10% (14)
Single	53% (116)	54% (45)	52% (70)
Widowed	< 1% (1)	1.8% (1)	0% (0)

## HPV Vaccination Self-Efficacy

The vaccine self-efficacy measure was 3 items adapted from Kahn for HPV vaccination [37]. These were measured by self-report of the ability to get vaccinated for HPV.

## Covariables

### Demographics

Women were asked their race/ethnicity and relationship status.

## Sexual Health and HPV Knowledge

Women were asked several questions regarding their sexual health and HPV knowledge including “How much do you know about HPV?”, “Are you currently sexually active?”, “Have you ever had a Pap smear?”, and “Have you ever been told you’ve had an abnormal Pap smear or HPV?” (Table 1).

### HPV Vaccine Hesitancy

The vaccine hesitation scale was adapted from Larson et al. [38]. The scale proved moderately reliable (Cronbach’s alpha was 0.79).

**Table 2** HPV knowledge and vaccine-related measures by treatment versus control group

Participant HPV and sexual health information	Total (n = 217)	Control (n = 81)	Treatment (n = 136)
Have you ever had a Pap smear? ( $p = 0.01$ )	53% (115)	39% (32)	66% (90)
Yes	37% (80)	46% (37)	31% (42)
No	10% (22)	15% (12)	3% (4)
Unsure			
Are you or have you been sexually active in the past 3 months? $p = 0.08$	87% (189)	80% (65)	89% (121)
Yes			
Have you ever had an abnormal Pap smear screening test? Among those who have had a Pap smear ( $n = 114$ ) $p = 0.3$	42% (90)	32% (26)	46% (63)
Yes	49% (105)	55% (45)	47% (64)
No	9% (22)	13% (10)	7% (9)
Unsure			
Have you ever been told you have human papillomavirus (HPV) or genital warts? $P < 0.05$	16% (35)	8% (7)	20% (27)
Yes	77% (167)	80% (65)	74% (100)
No	8% (15)	11% (9)	6% (9)
Unsure			
How much do you know about HPV (human papillomavirus)?	6% (13)	5% (4)	7% (9)
I have never heard of HPV $p = 0.2$	41% (88)	52% (41)	34% (46)
Not much	35% (75)	28% (24)	35% (48)
A little	18% (40)	14% (12)	25% (33)
A lot			
Vaccine efficacy score	30.1 (6.6)	30.7 (6.1)	29.8 (6.8)
Outcome measures-vaccine intentions			
How sure are you that you can get the HPV vaccine, which is 3 shots? $P = 0.4$	27% (59)	30% (24)	26% (35)
Not at all sure/slightly sure#	18% (39)	20% (16)	17% (23)
Moderately sure	18% (39)	21% (17)	16% (22)
Somewhat sure	37% (80)	29% (24)	41% (56)
Extremely sure			
How likely are you to get the HPV vaccine today? $P = 0.014$	36% (78)	46% (37)	32% (43)
Very unlikely/unlikely	24% (52)	21% (17)	26% (35)
Neither likely nor unlikely	30% (65)	32% (27)	29% (39)
Likely	10% (22)	0%	14% (19)
Very likely			
How likely are you to get the HPV vaccine next month? $p = 0.006$	24% (52)	30% (24)	22% (30)
Very unlikely/unlikely#	17% (37)	18% (15)	16% (22)
Neither likely nor unlikely	40% (87)	48% (39)	37% (50)
Likely	19% (41)	4% (3)	25% (34)
Very likely			
How likely are you to get the HPV vaccine next 6 months? $p = 0.00016$	13% (28)	20% (16)	10% (14)
Very unlikely/unlikely#	14% (30)	16% (13)	13% (18)
Neither likely nor unlikely	45% (98)	55% (45)	40% (54)
Likely	28% (61)	9% (7)	36% (50)
Very likely			

Participants read the statement and tell us how much they agree or disagree with it (Strongly agree to disagree). “Vaccines hurt a lot, I am not afraid of vaccines,” “Needles do not bother me,” “I know someone who has had a bad reaction to the HPV vaccine,” “I trust the information my doctor gives me about the HPV vaccine,” “I can talk to my doctor about my concerns about shots,” “I don’t think I will get a sexually transmitted disease (STD) or genital warts,” “I do not think I will get a sexually transmitted disease (STD) or genital warts,” “I don’t think I will get a sexually transmitted disease (STD) or genital warts.” “I am afraid of getting shots,” “I don’t want to get vaccines,” “I don’t want to be injected with vaccines.” Scores ranged from 5 to 50. The scale proved moderately reliable (Cronbach’s alpha was 0.79).

### Analytic Approach

#### Randomization

Women were randomized via the WS touch pad tablets. Of the 217 participants, 81 (37%) women were randomly assigned to the control group and 136 to the treatment group (63%).

#### Descriptive Statistics

Bivariate statistics were employed to assess the relationship between group assignment and all measures. Specifically, Chi-square tests were used to examine the relationship between demographics, vaccine hesitancy, vaccine knowledge, sexual health behavior, and the outcomes (intentions and self-efficacy).

#### Statistical Modeling

An intent to treat analysis was conducted to identify the effect of the HPV narrative intervention on intention and ability to obtain the HPV vaccination. A generalized linear mixed modeling approach (GLMM) using a multinomial link (SAS proc. GENMOD) and accounting for repeated measures by

site was used to confirm the treatment effect. All data was analyzed in SAS. All GLMM models controlled for variables that were not balanced during the randomization process. These variables include race/ethnicity, and recent receipt of a Pap smear. (Table 3).

## Results

### Assessment of Treatment Effect

#### Vaccine Intentions

The intervention had a significant effect on vaccine intentions. Women in the WS treatment condition are reported that they are more likely to get the shot today/the day of interview ( $p < 0.01$ ), as well as in 1 ( $p < 0.01$ ) and 6 ( $p < 0.01$ ) months than those in the control condition (Table 2).

#### Vaccine Self-Efficacy

Approximately 41% of women who received the WS intervention reported that they were extremely confident they could get all three HPV vaccinations compared to just 29% in the control group ( $p < 0.001$ ). The GLMM analysis identified an increase in women’s perceived ability to receive the HPV vaccination among the WS group versus the control with a  $B = 0.54$  ( $p = 0.0002$ ). All GLMM models controlled for variables that were not balanced during the randomization process. These variables include race/ethnicity and recent receipt of a Pap smear. (Table 3).

## Discussion

The goal of this study was to examine the short-term effects of a digital, narrative-based HPV vaccination promotion intervention, Women’s Stories (WS), in a health clinic setting. WS was adapted from the evidence-based HPV decision

**Table 3** Parameter estimates from generalized linear model—multinomial link for each outcome controlling for relevant measures\*

Estimate (se)	P value
How sure are you that you can get the HPV vaccine, which is 3 shots?	
Treatment versus control	0.56 (0.14) 0.0002
How likely are you to get the HPV vaccine today?	
Treatment versus control	0.98 (0.15) < 0.0001
How likely are you to get the HPV vaccine next month?	
Treatment versus control	0.84 (0.15) < 0.0001
How likely are you to get the HPV vaccine next 6 months?	
Treatment versus control	1.13 (0.56) < 0.0001

\*Measures not balanced by randomization

narrative intervention that targeted college student women [15]. WS was redesigned for Planned Parenthood clients using narrative interviews and a laptop-based delivery system in waiting rooms. WS proved effective in promoting intentions to get the HPV vaccine as well as improving the perceived self-efficacy or ability to vaccinate, constructs that have proven predictive of actual vaccination in previous research [20, 39].

Planned Parenthood clinics serve a variety of women, many of whom would not receive care were it not for these clinics. We implemented the IRB-approved intervention in a manner consistent with their clinic practices that could be integrated almost seamlessly into everyday routines. The fact that WS demonstrated short-term effectiveness in this setting is very promising.

This study also represents another in a line of research demonstrating the efficacy of the narrative approach to health promotion interventions. While we did not directly assess narrative engagement theory construct, NET guided formative research and intervention design [18, 19, 24]. We believe that narratives provide a vehicle for delivering culturally grounded materials if they are developed with these processes. In addition, narrative message forms, in general, are more effective particularly with low awareness and/or resistant audiences [38–340]. The women who are targets for HPV vaccine promotion in our study report low levels of awareness and the anti-vax movement pervades all strata of society, complicating interventions such as WS.

Pragmatically, the success of WS has important implications for public health. The HPV vaccine has demonstrated effectiveness across an increasingly wide age range and for both men and women [21–23]. Recent research demonstrates efficacy of the two-shot sequence for younger children and recently suggests that even one shot is efficacious [40]. Thus, the promise of widespread public health benefit is great if we can overcome barriers to vaccination. The Women Stories intervention is brief and easy to implement. Implementation of WS now demonstrates that the vaccine's promise can be fulfilled.

These findings are not without limitations. At this point, there are only short-term findings based on the immediate posttest. While, as noted, vaccine intentions and self-efficacy or belief in one's ability to obtain the vaccine tend to be predictive, effects on actual vaccination are more convincing.

## Conclusion

Women's Stories continues to demonstrate efficacy as an HPV vaccine promotion intervention. Partnerships with organizations like Planned Parenthood hold promise for great public health impact if dissemination of the vaccine can be

increased. Future research should provide other implementation approaches for clinics that increase the versatility of WS as well as focus on longer-term findings derived from medical records. It also will be important to examine the causal mechanisms underlying program effects. Finally, given the effectiveness of the intervention, attention to processes for dissemination should be considered.

**Authors' Contributions** Design of the work: Hecht, Wray, Hopfer, and Miller-Day.

Data collection: McKee and Ray.

Data analysis and interpretation: BeLue.

Drafting the article: BeLue and Hecht.

**Funding** This journal article was supported by the Grant or Cooperative Agreement Number, 5 R44DP006291–03, funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Its contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or the Department of Health and Human Services.

**Data Availability** Data is available by request.

## Compliance with Ethical Standards

**Competing Interests** The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this article.

**Ethics Approval** The study was approved by the IRB of the lead author and second authors' institutions.

**Consent to Participate** Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

## References

- Boersma P, Black LI (2020) Human papillomavirus vaccination among adults aged 18–26, 2013–2018. National Center for Health Statistics, Atlanta
- Dunne EF, Unger ER, Sternberg M, McQuillan G, Swan DC, Patel SS, Markowitz LE (2007) Prevalence of HPV infection among females in the United States. *J Am Med Assoc* 297:813–819
- Munoz N, Castellsague X (2006) Berrington de Gonzalez a, Gissmann L. chapter 1: HPV in the etiology of human cancer. *Vaccine*. 24(S3):S3/1–S3/10
- Howlader N, Noone AM, Krapcho M, Neyman N, Aminou R, Altekruse SF, Kosary CL, Ruhl J, Tatalovich Z, Cho H, Mariotto A, Eisner MP, Lewis DR, Chen HS, Feuer EJ, Cronin KA (2012) SEER Cancer Statistics Review (CSR) 1975–2009. Available from: [http://seer.cancer.gov/csr/1975\\_2009\\_pops09/](http://seer.cancer.gov/csr/1975_2009_pops09/)
- Human papillomavirus (2007) IARC monographs on the evaluation of carcinogenic risks to humans. 90:16–36
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2019). Human papillomavirus vaccine information statements. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/hcp/vis/vis-statements/hpv.html>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2019). Human papillomavirus. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/hpv/parents/vaccine.html>



8. Musselwhite LW, Oliveira CM, Kwaramba T et al (2016) Racial/ethnic disparities in cervical cancer screening and outcomes. *Acta Cytol* 60(6):518–526. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000452240>
9. Lukács A, Máté Z, Farkas N et al (2020) The quadrivalent HPV vaccine is protective against genital warts: a meta-analysis. *BMC Public Health* 20(1):691. **Published 2020 May 28.** <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-08753-y>
10. Boersma P, Black LI (2020) Human papillomavirus vaccination among adults aged 18–26, 2013–2018. NCHS Data Brief, no 354. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics
11. Hopfer S, Wright ME, Pellman H, Wasserman R, Fiks AG (2019) HPV vaccine recommendation profiles among a national network of pediatric practitioners: understanding contributors to parental vaccine hesitancy and acceptance. *Human Vaccine & Immunotherapeutics*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21645515.2018.1560771>
12. Dempsey A, Cohn L, Vanessa D, Mack R (2011) Worsening disparities in HPV vaccine utilization among 19–26 year old women. *Vaccine*. 29(3):528–534
13. Brown M (2013) Overall HPV vaccination rates stagnant: series completion dipping. American Academy of Family Practitioners (AAFP); [updated 2013; cited 2013 November 8]; Available from: <http://www.aafp.org/news-now/health-of-the-public/20130802hpv-vaccine-rates.html>
14. Dorell CG, Yankey D, Santibanez TA, Markowitz L (2011) Human papillomavirus vaccination series initiation and completion, 2008–2009. *Pediatrics*. 128:830–839
15. Neubrand TPL, Breitkopf CR, Rupp R, Breitkopf D, Rosenthal SL (2009) Factors associated with completion of the human papillomavirus vaccine series. *Clin Pediatr* 48:966–969
16. Hopfer, S., Ray, A. E., Hecht, M. L., Miller-Day, M., Belue, R., Zimet, G., Evans, W. D., McKee, F. X. (2018) Taking an HPV vaccine research tested intervention to scale in a clinical setting, translational behavioral medicine, 8:5, 745–752. <https://doi.org/10.1093/tbm/ibx066>
17. Hopfer S (2012) Effects of a narrative HPV vaccine intervention aimed at reaching college women: a randomized controlled trial. *Prev Sci* 13:173–182. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s1121-011-0254-1>
18. Miller-Day M, Hecht ML, Krieger JL, Pettigrew J, Shin Y, Graham J (2015) Teacher narratives and student engagement: testing narrative engagement theory in drug prevention education. *J Lang Soc Psychol* 34(6):604–620. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X15586429>
19. Krieger JL, Coveleski S, Hecht ML et al (2013) From kids, through kids, to kids: examining the social influence strategies used by adolescents to promote prevention among peers. *Health Commun* 28(7):683–695. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2012.762827>
20. Gerend MA, Shepherd JE (2012) Predicting human papillomavirus vaccine uptake in young adult women: comparing the health belief de Oliveira CM, Fregnani JHTG, Villa LL (2019) HPV vaccine: updates and highlights. *Acta Cytol* 63(2):159–168. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000497617>
21. Stanley M (2014) HPV vaccination in boys and men. *Hum Vaccin Immunother* 10(7):2109–2111. <https://doi.org/10.4161/hv.2913739>
22. Brotherton JM, Budd A, Rompotis C et al (2019) Is one dose of human papillomavirus vaccine as effective as three?: a national cohort analysis. *Papillomavirus Res* 8:100177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pvr.2019.100177>
23. Squire C (2009) Experience-centered and culturally-oriented approaches to narrative. In: Andrews M, Squire C, Tamboukou M (eds) *Doing narrative research*. Sage, London, UK
24. Strauss A, Corbin J (1998) *Basics of qualitative research*. Sage, Thousand Oaks
25. Hecht ML, Miller-Day M (2009) Drug resistance strategies project: using narrative theory to enhance adolescents' communication competence. In: Cissna K, Frey L (eds) *Handbook of applied communication: exemplary programs*. Routledge, New York
26. Hopfer S, Clippard JR (2010) College women's HPV vaccine decision narratives. *Qual Health Res* 21:262–277
27. Miller-Day M (2008) Translational performances: toward relevant, engaging, and empowering social science. *Forum: qualitative social research*. 9(2):Art. 54
28. Gargano LM, Herbert NL, Sales JM, Morfaw C, Rask K (2013) Impact of a physician recommendation and parental immunization attitudes on receipt or intention to receive adolescent vaccines. *Human Vaccine Immunotherapeutics* 9:2627–2633
29. Cole-Lewis H, Kershaw T (2010) Text messaging as a tool for behavior change in disease prevention and management. *Epidemiol Rev* 32:56–69
30. Krishna S, Boren SA, Balas EA (2009) Healthcare via cell phones: a systematic review. *Telemedicine and e-Health* 15:231–240
31. Jordan ET, Ray E, Johnson P, Evans WD (2011) Using text messaging to improve maternal and newborn health. *Nursing for women's health* 15:206–212
32. Fishbach S (2012) New study shows how mobile reminders can help HIV+patients. *Mobile Commons*. Brooklyn, NY
33. Kharbanda EO, Stockwell MS, Fox HW, Rickert VI (2009) Text4Health: a qualitative evaluation of parental readiness for text message immunization reminders. *Am J Public Health* 99:2176–2178
34. McAfee ([http://standrew.com/AHRQ/AHRQ\\_Innovation\\_Profile\\_Kiosk.pdf](http://standrew.com/AHRQ/AHRQ_Innovation_Profile_Kiosk.pdf))
35. Wegwarth O, Kurzenhäuser-Carstens S, Gigerenzer G (2014) Overcoming the knowledge–behavior gap: the effect of evidence-based HPV vaccination leaflets on understanding, intention, and actual vaccination decision. *Vaccine* 32(12):1388–1393
36. Kahn JA, Rosenthal SL, Jin Y, Huang B, Namakydoust A, Zimet GD (2008) Rates of human papillomavirus vaccination, attitudes about vaccination, and human papillomavirus prevalence in young women. *Obstet Gynecol* 111(5):1103–1110. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AOG.0b013e31817051fa>
37. Larson HJ, Jarrett C, Schulz WS et al (2015) Measuring vaccine hesitancy: the development of a survey tool. *Vaccine* 33(34):4165–4175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2015.04.037>
38. Corace KM, Srigley JA, Hargadon DP, Yu D, MacDonal TK, Fabrigar LR, Garber GE (2016) Using behavior change frameworks to improve healthcare worker influenza vaccination rates: a systematic review. *Vaccine* 34(28):3235–3242. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2016.04.071>
39. Gilca V, Sauvageau C, Panicker G, De Serres G, Ouakki M, Unger ER (2018) Immunogenicity and safety of a mixed vaccination schedule with one dose of nonavalent and one dose of bivalent HPV vaccine versus two doses of nonavalent vaccine - a randomized clinical trial. *Vaccine* 36(46):7017–7024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2018.09.05>

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.