

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Open Access



Sociodemographic correlates of colorectal cancer screening completion among women adherent to mammography screening guidelines by place of birth

Deeonna E. Farr^{1*} , Leslie E. Cofe¹ , Alison T. Brenner^{2,4} , Ronny A. Bell³  and Daniel S. Reuland^{2,4} 

Abstract

Introduction: Colorectal cancer screening rates in the U.S. still fall short of national goals, while screening rates for other cancer sites, such as breast, remain high. Understanding characteristics associated with colorectal cancer screening among different groups of women adherent to breast cancer screening guidelines can shed light on the facilitators of colorectal cancer screening among those already engaged in cancer prevention behaviors. The purpose of this study was to explore which demographic characteristics, healthcare access factors, and cancer-related beliefs were associated with colorectal cancer screening completion among U.S. and foreign-born women adherent to mammography screening recommendations.

Methods: Analyses of the 2015 National Health Interview Survey were conducted in 2019. A sample of 1206 women aged 50–74 who had a mammogram in the past 2 years and were of average risk for colorectal cancer was examined. Logistic regression was used to determine demographic, health service, and health belief characteristics associated with colorectal cancer screening completion.

Results: Fifty-five percent of the sample were adherent to colorectal cancer screening recommendations. Women over the age of 65 (AOR = 1.76, 95% CI 1.06–2.91), with any type of health insurance, and who were bilingual (AOR = 3.84, 95% CI 1.83–8.09) were more likely to complete screening, while foreign-born women (AOR = 0.53, 95% CI 0.34–0.83) were less likely. Cancer-related beliefs did not influence adherence. Stratified analyses by nativity revealed additional associations.

Conclusions: Demographic and health service factors interact to influence colorectal cancer screening among women completing breast cancer screening. Colorectal cancer screening interventions targeting specific under-served groups and financing reforms may enhance women's colorectal cancer screening rates.

Keywords: Female, Early detection of cancer, Colorectal neoplasms, Breast neoplasms, Demography, Mass screening

Background

Despite national efforts to address colorectal cancer (CRC) mortality in the United States (U.S.) by increasing screening rates, many populations have not achieved national CRC screening goals [1–3]. Data indicate that individuals adhering to screening guidelines for one cancer site are likely to be adherent across multiple cancer

*Correspondence: farrd17@ecu.edu

¹ Department of Health Education and Promotion, College of Health and Human Performance, East Carolina University, 2307 Carol G. Belk Building, Mail Stop 529, Greenville, NC 27858, USA

Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



sites. However, CRC test completion rates are among the lowest of all cancers with population-level screening guidelines [3–8]. Among women, CRC screening has been associated with breast cancer (BrCa) screening adherence [1, 4–6, 9–12], but women consistently complete mammography at higher rates [8, 13–15].

While women's BrCa and CRC screening rates differ, similar demographic characteristics (education, income, race) and health service factors (health insurance coverage, lack of a usual source of care, provider recommendations) are associated with non-adherence for both cancer sites [16–19]. Even when controlling for these factors, differences in screening adherence emerge by nativity status [20, 21]. Foreign-born women who are citizens and longer-term residents complete BrCa screening at higher rates and CRC screening at lower rates than their U.S.-born counterparts [20, 21].

In addition to differences between CRC and BrCa screening completion by nativity, CRC has multiple approved testing modalities compared to one for BrCa, and health beliefs such as perceived risk are more consistently associated with CRC screening behavior compared to mammography [22–28]. Together, these factors may explain lower CRC screening rates among women. Yet, few studies use national data to explore which characteristics are associated with differences in women's screening behavior for both cancers [4, 29, 30]. As recommended screening ages in the U.S. almost completely overlap for both cancer sites, understanding facilitators of CRC screening among a national sample of U.S. and foreign-born women completing mammography can yield important insights to shape CRC screening approaches for both populations [22, 31–33]. The purpose of this study was to examine what demographic characteristics, health system factors, and cancer beliefs were associated with CRC screening completion in a national sample of women completing breast cancer screening. Secondly, we sought to examine how these associations with CRC screening adherence varied by place of birth.

Methods

Data source

The National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) is a nationally representative cross-sectional household survey of the U.S. civilian non-institutionalized population, based on a complex multistage clustered sample design. Through in-person interviews, demographic and health information is collected from household members using family, person, and sample adult modules. Additional details about the survey design and sampling methodology are available at <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhis/index.htm>. The 2015 NHIS was used for this analysis as it contains a complete cancer control supplemental module

which includes information on CRC family history and chronic conditions needed to determine respondents' CRC risk. The response rate for 2015 was 55.2% [34].

Participants

The analytic sample consisted of women aged 50–74 years, with the following inclusion criteria: BrCa free, completed a screening mammogram in the past two years, and were of average BrCa risk (no first degree relative with BrCa or ovarian cancer) and CRC risk (no first degree relative with CRC cancer, and no history of polyps or inflammatory bowel disease). The East Carolina University Institutional Review Board exempted this study from review as it was a secondary analysis of publicly available data.

Measures

Respondents were defined as adherent to CRC screening if they reported completion of fecal occult blood testing in the past 12 months, a sigmoidoscopy in the past 5 years, or a colonoscopy within the past 10 years for screening purposes [22, 34]. All response options on the survey questions were closed-ended and treated as categorical. As Medicare covers cancer screening procedures at no cost to its enrollees who are 65 years and older, two age groups were created for analysis based on Medicare eligibility: 50–64 years old and 65 years or older [35]. Race and ethnicity were assessed in a single question, and all education levels above college graduate were collapsed into one category. For marital status, widowed, divorced, and separated were collapsed into one category, and health insurance types not listed as private, Medicaid, or Medicare were labeled as "Other." Both BrCa and CRC perceived risk were collected using single-item assessing whether respondents believed they were more, less, or as likely to be diagnosed with each type of cancer as the general population. All variables in this analysis were selected a priori based on previous literature.

Analysis

Bivariate associations between sociodemographic, health care access, perceived BrCa risk, perceived CRC risk variables, and colorectal cancer screening adherence were examined using chi-square tests. Multivariate logistic regression analyses stratified by nativity were constructed to examine the factors associated with CRC adherence. Statistical tests were 2-sided, and a p value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. Analyses were weighted due to the complex survey sampling methods used in the NHIS and conducted in 2019 using SAS[®] 9.4 [34, 36].

Results

The final analytic sample consisted of 1206 respondents aged 50–74 who had completed BrCa screening according to United States Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) guidelines (see Table 1). Half of the total sample completed CRC screening (55%), and colonoscopy was the most frequently used test (50%). There was a significant difference in CRC screening by place of birth ($p < 0.01$) in that U.S.-born women reported higher screening adherence than their foreign-born counterparts (58% vs. 46%). U.S.-born women reported higher rates of colonoscopy usage compared to foreign-born women (52% vs. 42%). Sociodemographic characteristics of the sample stratified by CRC screening status are included in Additional file 1. After adjusting for sociodemographic factors, foreign-born women were less likely to report screening adherence than U.S.-born women (AOR: 0.53, CI 0.34–0.83) (see Table 2). Also, older age (AOR: 1.76, CI 1.06–2.91), equal Spanish and English fluency compared with English only fluency (AOR: 3.84, CI 1.83–8.09), and having any type of health insurance were associated with screening adherence. In stratified regression models, older age (AOR: 2.70, CI 1.37–5.34), having private, Medicare, or other forms of insurance were associated with colorectal cancer screening among U.S.-born women. Among foreign-born women, Black race (AOR: 3.69, CI 1.22–11.21), health insurance coverage, and bilingual (AOR: 3.03, CI 1.08–8.54) or mostly Spanish fluency (AOR: 3.11, CI 1.03–9.42) were associated with screening adherence.

Discussion

Through this analysis, we examined which factors were associated with CRC screening completion in a sample of women already adherent to screening recommendations for another cancer site (breast). Fifty-five percent of women completing mammography reported a recent CRC screening test. Neither perceived BrCa nor CRC risk were found to influence CRC test completion. Multiple demographic and health service factors were associated with CRC screening adherence, but these factors varied by nativity.

This analysis of NHIS data revealed differences in CRC and BrCa screening behavior similar to research using regional samples or claims data. Other studies demonstrate similar differences, with one examination of women with private insurance and/or Medicaid finding that 70% of women completing at least one mammogram between 2010 and 2015 also completed a CRC screening test [4, 6, 30]. However, this data includes CRC survivors and others at elevated CRC risk whose behavior should not be evaluated using screening guidelines for

average-risk populations [22, 30, 37]. As our analysis was restricted to women of average risk for both cancers, our findings present a more realistic estimate of the difference in adherence rates.

Despite previous research suggesting perceived cancer risk as a correlate of screening adherence, neither BrCa nor CRC risk perceptions were associated with test completion in this sample [23, 25–28]. While perceived risk is the behavioral construct with the most consistent relationship to CRC test completion, evidence from a study by Hay et al. indicates that CRC screening is positively correlated with perceived risk in analyses of prospective data, not cross-sectional data [38]. The cross-sectional nature of the NHIS may explain the lack of association in this sample [38]. Additionally, it's possible that other health beliefs and attitudes not measured in this survey may influence CRC screening in this group. International studies of this topic report lack of perceived benefits of and negative attitudes towards CRC screening procedures as possible barriers to CRC screening among those completing mammography [39, 40]. U.S.-based studies assessing CRC screening behaviors and beliefs of U.S.-born women waiting for mammography procedures found that an endorsement of the perceived benefits of screening and high levels of self-efficacy to be positively associated with CRC adherence [29, 41]. Among those same women high levels of perceived barriers were inversely associated with screening adherence [29, 41]. Given that many of the international studies took place in countries which provide universal healthcare coverage and standardized reminders to complete screening, these attitudes may not function in the same way for US populations where awareness of screening guidelines and financial concerns play an important role.

Multiple sociodemographic characteristics were associated with CRC screening adherence, but the impact of these characteristics varied by nativity. Among U.S.-born women, those aged 65 and older, with Medicare, private or other types of health insurance were more likely to complete CRC screening. Our findings are in conflict with studies of CRC screening only in women, as income, race, education, in addition to age and type of healthcare coverage are known influences on screening adherence [20]. Meanwhile for foreign born women, Black race, having any health insurance and speaking mostly Spanish or being fluent in both Spanish and English was associated with CRC screening completion. Interactions between proxy measures of acculturation, including length of time in the U.S., education level, and language spoken were examined to explain intergroup differences, but the findings were not statistically significant.

Examinations of CRC screening alone report that foreign-born women have lower adherence rates than their

Table 1 Sociodemographic characteristics of women adherent to breast cancer guidelines, by place of birth, NHIS 2015

	Total	Place of birth n (%)		p value
		US-born	Foreign-born	
<i>CRC screening adherent</i>				
Yes	665 (55.52%)	515 (58.26%)	150 (46.46%)	0.0005
No	541 (44.48%)	374 (41.74%)	167 (53.54%)	
<i>Types of CRC screening</i>				
<i>Sigmoidoscopy</i>				
Yes	16 (1.47%)	9 (1.27%)	7 (2.13%)	0.2910
No	1182 (98.53%)	875 (98.73%)	307 (97.87%)	
<i>Colonoscopy</i>				
Yes	602 (50.33%)	470 (52.77%)	132 (42.21%)	0.0015
No	595 (49.67%)	414 (47.23%)	181 (57.49%)	
<i>Fecal occult blood test</i>				
Yes	124 (10.81%)	94 (11.31%)	30 (9.16%)	0.2901
No	1078 (89.19%)	793 (88.69%)	285 (90.84%)	
<i>Personal characteristics</i>				
<i>Age</i>				
50–64	841 (70.98%)	630 (72.37%)	211 (66.39%)	0.056
65+	365 (29.02%)	259 (27.63%)	106 (33.61%)	
<i>Race/ethnicity</i>				
White	607 (58.38%)	571 (70.80%)	36 (17.22%)	< 0.001
Hispanic	245 (16.14%)	65 (5.56%)	180 (51.13%)	
Black	248 (18.03%)	220 (20.76%)	28 (8.99%)	
Asian	106 (7.48%)	33 (2.88%)	73 (22.67%)	
<i>Degree</i>				
No high school degree	193 (12.82%)	67 (6.24%)	126 (34.59%)	< 0.001
High school degree	289 (22.90%)	218 (23.42%)	71 (21.19%)	
Some college/associate degree	364 (30.80%)	311 (34.81%)	53 (17.53%)	
College degree or higher	358 (33.48%)	292 (35.53%)	66 (26.69%)	
<i>Federal poverty level</i>				
≤ 138%	280 (19.48%)	168 (16.22%)	112 (30.27%)	< 0.001
139–200%	126 (9.38%)	83 (8.28%)	43 (13.02%)	
210–400%	328 (26.95%)	243 (27.55%)	85 (24.96%)	
≥ 410%	472 (44.19%)	395 (47.95%)	77 (31.75%)	
<i>Marital status</i>				
Married	593 (53.56%)	428 (53.30%)	165 (54.42%)	0.411
Widowed/divorced/separated	469 (36.81%)	345 (36.51%)	124 (37.81%)	
Single	140 (9.63%)	112 (10.19%)	28 (7.78%)	
<i>Region</i>				
Northeast	218 (18.72%)	134 (15.75%)	84 (28.57%)	< 0.001
North Central/Midwest	204 (18.41%)	172 (20.39%)	32 (11.86%)	
South	439 (40.00%)	353 (43.38%)	86 (28.83%)	
West	345 (22.87%)	230 (20.48%)	115 (30.74%)	
<i>Language spoken</i>				
English	796 (69.65%)	749 (85.41%)	47 (17.54%)	< 0.001
Mostly English	154 (13.44%)	105 (11.75%)	49 (10.02%)	
Only Spanish/other language	137 (9.34%)	6 (0.65%)	131 (38.09%)	
Mostly Spanish	48 (3.05%)	0 (0.00%)	48 (13.14%)	
Spanish and English equally	71 (4.51%)	29 (2.19%)	42 (12.19%)	
<i>Place of birth</i>				

Table 1 (continued)

	Total	Place of birth n (%)		p value
		US-born	Foreign-born	
Foreign-born	317 (23.22%)	–	–	–
U.S.-born	889 (76.78%)	–	–	–
Insurance				
Private	614 (55.96%)	468 (57.55%)	146 (50.73%)	< 0.001
Medicaid	111 (7.33%)	70 (6.65%)	41 (9.55%)	
Medicare	158 (12.24%)	109 (11.10%)	49 (16.01%)	
Dual eligible	62 (4.01%)	33 (2.84%)	29 (8.24%)	
Other	199 (16.61%)	172 (18.53%)	27 (8.90%)	
None	59 (3.76%)	34 (2.91%)	25 (6.57%)	
Breast cancer risk				
More likely to get cancer	48 (4.72%)	33 (4.35%)	15 (5.67%)	0.460
Less likely	589 (49.80%)	445 (50.47%)	144 (47.54%)	
About as likely	501 (45.49%)	364 (45.19%)	137 (46.50%)	
CRC risk				
More likely to get cancer	17 (1.03%)	7 (0.57%)	10 (2.56%)	0.008
Less likely	632 (56.55%)	479 (57.62%)	153 (52.95%)	
About as likely	475 (42.42%)	343 (41.80%)	132 (44.49%)	

U.S.-born counterparts regardless of length of time in the U.S. [20].

Studies examining both BrCa and CRC screening among Black immigrant women are limited, and investigations of CRC screening adherence levels in this population report mixed results [17, 20, 42–46]. Similarly, few large studies investigate both BrCa and CRC screening in Latina populations [20, 43, 47]. Our findings are in opposition to most of the CRC screening-only literature, which indicates lower CRC screening rates among Black Americans, primarily Spanish speaking, and bilingual Latina immigrants [47, 48]. In respect to Latinas, our findings are consistent with Costas-Muñiz et al. who found that foreign-born, Spanish-speaking, and bilingual Latinos were more likely to complete colonoscopy compared to U.S.-born or English-speaking Latinos in New York City [49]. The authors concluded that the increased availability of CRC screening in the U.S. compared to participants' home countries may encourage screening behaviors, while medical mistrust and other healthcare experiences may reduce US-born and acculturated foreign-born Latinos' desire to complete screening [49].

Patterns of CRC screening adherence also vary by type of health insurance and with important differences within nativity status. Foreign-born women with any type of health insurance were more likely to complete CRC screening; however, this was not the case among U.S.-born women with Medicaid or who were dual Medicaid–Medicare eligible. Additionally, U.S.-born

women over the age of 65 were more likely to complete CRC screening compared to their younger counterparts, but no age-related differences in CRC adherence were found among foreign-born women. This is likely due to U.S.-born women having access to Medicare after age 65, whereas depending on citizenship and other factors, many foreign-born women are not eligible for Medicare. CRC screening adherence is known to vary by health insurance status, but few studies examine how nativity shapes the types of insurance available and the subsequent impact on screening completion.

In the U.S., financing continues to be a key driver of screening adherence across cancer sites [30, 50, 51]. While screening mammography is a free preventive service, the out-of-pocket costs associated with specific CRC screening modalities, in particular colonoscopy, vary by insurance type [30, 50, 51]. Among women adherent to CRC screening guidelines in our sample, US-born women completed colonoscopy at higher rates than foreign-born women (52.77% vs. 42.21%). Higher colonoscopy rates in this population represent an increased cost burden. Higher CRC screening costs in combination with greater awareness and availability of free and low-cost BrCa screening programs illustrate how variation in policies that dictate promotion and financing of prevention behaviors for specific cancer sites contribute to the difference in women's BrCa and CRC screening rates [15, 52–55].

Table 2 Factors associated with CRC screening adherence among women adherent to breast cancer screening, NHIS 2015

	CRC screening adherence			
	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR (95% CI) Overall	Adjusted OR (95% CI) US-born	Adjusted OR (95% CI) Foreign-born
<i>Age</i>				
50–64	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
65+	1.82 (1.34–2.47)	1.76 (1.06–2.91)	2.70 (1.37–5.34)	0.57 (0.28–1.16)
<i>Race</i>				
White	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Hispanic	0.73 (0.55–0.98)	1.01 (0.59–1.72)	1.63 (0.79–3.38)	0.82 (0.27–2.50)
Black	0.94 (0.70–1.26)	0.95 (0.50–1.80)	1.10 (0.76–1.59)	3.69 (1.22–11.21)
Asian	0.68 (0.43–1.06)	1.28 (0.73–2.23)	0.65 (0.30–1.41)	1.05 (0.43–2.56)
<i>Degree</i>				
No high school degree	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
High school degree	1.21 (0.84–1.74)	1.07 (0.67–1.74)	1.13 (0.63–2.01)	1.23 (0.54–2.81)
Some college/associated degree	1.44 (1.01–2.06)	1.39 (0.87–2.23)	1.64 (0.92–2.91)	1.22 (0.45–3.34)
College degree	1.67 (1.16–2.34)	1.37 (0.79–2.35)	1.47 (0.76–2.83)	1.52 (0.58–4.03)
<i>Federal poverty level</i>				
≤ 138%	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
139–200%	0.91 (0.59–1.41)	0.80 (0.48–1.33)	0.77 (0.39–1.51)	0.92 (0.40–2.09)
210–400%	1.00 (0.7–1.44)	0.93 (0.60–1.46)	0.92 (0.52–1.64)	0.95 (0.47–1.93)
≥ 410%	1.50 (1.09–2.08)	1.43 (0.88–2.35)	1.55 (0.82–2.93)	1.13 (0.54–2.34)
<i>Insurance</i>				
Private	5.19 (2.44–11.03)	3.84 (1.83–8.09)	3.32 (1.33–8.27)	6.94 (1.42–33.88)
Medicaid	3.45 (1.53–7.77)	2.99 (1.33–6.76)	2.31 (0.82–6.49)	6.91 (1.36–35.13)
Medicare	7.39 (3.29–16.61)	4.15 (1.73–9.94)	2.95 (1.02–8.54)	18.65 (2.85–122.12)
Dual eligible	5.71 (2.15–15.20)	3.48 (1.17–10.33)	2.03 (0.48–8.54)	20.47 (3.36–124.96)
Other	9.16 (4.16–20.15)	5.11 (2.10–12.42)	2.95 (1.02–8.54)	41.51 (5.64–305.55)
None	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
<i>Marital status</i>				
Married	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Widowed/divorced/separated	1.08 (0.84–1.41)	1.08 (0.79–1.48)	1.20 (0.82–1.76)	0.97 (0.54–1.72)
Single	1.15 (0.75–1.77)	1.36 (0.83–2.23)	1.74 (0.97–3.10)	0.77 (0.31–1.96)
<i>Region</i>				
Northeast	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
North Central/Midwest	0.87 (0.55–1.35)	1.01 (0.60–1.70)	1.24 (0.70–2.20)	0.83 (0.33–2.09)
South	0.86 (0.58–1.27)	0.80 (0.52–1.22)	0.82 (0.51–1.320)	0.68 (0.27–1.74)
West	0.86 (0.58–1.28)	0.89 (0.56–1.41)	0.68 (0.41–1.12)	1.38 (0.58–3.28)
<i>Language spoken</i>				
English	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Mostly English	1.07 (0.77–1.50)	1.04 (0.62–1.74)	1.07 (0.73–1.59)	0.91 (0.33–2.46)
Only Spanish/other language	0.55 (0.38–0.80)	1.81 (0.53–1.23)	0.26 (0.04–1.57)	1.37 (0.57–3.29)
Mostly Spanish	0.84 (0.47–1.51)	0.91 (0.57–1.44)	–	3.11 (1.03–9.42)
Spanish and English equally	1.16 (0.73–1.83)	3.84 (1.83–8.09)	–	3.03 (1.08–8.54)
<i>Place of birth</i>				
Foreign-born	0.62 (0.48–0.81)	0.53 (0.34–0.83)	–	–
U.S.-born	Ref	Ref	–	–
<i>Breast cancer risk</i>				
More likely to get cancer	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Less likely	0.72 (0.40–1.32)	0.56 (0.27–1.16)	0.50 (0.21–1.18)	0.72 (0.16–3.26)
About as likely	0.61 (0.33–1.11)	0.56 (0.27–1.16)	0.52 (0.22–1.23)	0.48 (0.13–1.78)
<i>CRC risk</i>				
More likely to get cancer	1.68 (0.61–4.62)	Ref	Ref	Ref
Less likely	1.41 (0.51–3.89)	2.01 (0.70–5.73)	2.70 (0.59–12.31)	1.42 (0.35–5.84)
About as likely	Ref	1.82 (0.62–5.32)	2.05 (0.43–9.80)	2.16 (0.60–7.86)

Table 2 (continued)

Bolded AORs (95% CI) represent significant findings. All analyses were weighted to account for sampling

Our findings were limited in that the NHIS consists of self-reports of screening adherence, a limited set of cancer-related beliefs and attitudes, and the absence of information on providers' CRC screening recommendations. Lastly, the analysis was restricted to 1 year of data collection as the variables needed for CRC risk assessment were not available in the NHIS Cancer Control modules for 2018, 2013, or 2010. However, our analysis has several strengths such as the use of a national data set, the inclusion of standardized psychosocial, demographic, and healthcare access variables, and a focus on individuals of average BrCa and CRC risk).

Conclusion

Examining CRC screening among women completing mammography demonstrates complex relationships between demographic factors, healthcare access, and CRC test choice. Factors such as age, language spoken, and type of health insurance coverage were related to CRC screening adherence. Future studies should seek to clarify how these factors impact CRC screening behaviors in subpopulations, such as non-immigrant and immigrant women, to inform the development of policies to facilitate CRC screening in these groups. As CRC screening is now recommended for younger individuals (45–49 years of age), examining drivers of existing cancer screening behaviors may generate insights for pairing cancer control efforts (such as promoting stool-based CRC screening tests at mammography visits). Additionally, research examining screening behaviors across multiple cancer sites may be enhanced by including a more comprehensive set of cancer beliefs in addition to structural factors.

Abbreviations

CRC: Colorectal cancer; U.S.: United States; BrCa: Breast cancer; NHIS: National health interview survey; USPSTF: United States preventive services task force.

Supplementary Information

The online version contains supplementary material available at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12905-022-01694-1>.

Additional file 1. Supplemental Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristics of women adherent to breast cancer guidelines, by colorectal cancer screening status, NHIS 2015.

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Author contributions

DEF and LEC conceptualized the manuscript. LEC conducted the analysis. DEF drafted the initial manuscript. RAB, ATB, and DSR provided feedback on the analysis and manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

DEF, RAB, ATB, DSR received salary support from Grant # UG3CA233251 from the National Cancer Institute during the development of this manuscript. The study design and conclusions are solely the responsibility of the authors and does not represent the official views of the National Cancer Institute.

Availability data and materials

All datasets supporting the conclusions of this manuscript are available through the National Health Interview Survey: <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhis/index.htm>.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Data come from a publicly available dataset, the National Health Interview Survey. Secondary analyses of these data were exempted from review by the East Carolina University Medical and Center Institutional Review Board under protocol # UMCIRB 18-002786. Details of the initial ethics approval for the National Health Interview Survey are available here: <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhis/index.htm>.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors have no competing interests to declare.

Author details

¹Department of Health Education and Promotion, College of Health and Human Performance, East Carolina University, 2307 Carol G. Belk Building, Mail Stop 529, Greenville, NC 27858, USA. ²Department of Medicine, Department of General Medicine and Clinical Epidemiology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27599, USA. ³Department of Social Sciences and Health Policy, Division of Public Health Sciences, Wake Forest School of Medicine, Medical Center Boulevard, Winston-Salem, NC 27157, USA. ⁴Lineberger Comprehensive Cancer Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27599, USA.

Received: 29 September 2021 Accepted: 31 March 2022

Published online: 21 April 2022

References

- Joseph DA, King JB, Dowling NF, Thomas CC, Richardson LC. Vital signs: colorectal cancer screening test use—United States, 2018. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020;69(10):253–9.
- Shapiro JA, Soman AV, Berkowitz Z, Fedewa SA, Sabatino SA, de Moor JS, et al. Screening for Colorectal Cancer in the United States: Correlates and Time Trends by Type of Test. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2021.; <https://doi.org/10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-20-1809>.
- White A, Thompson TD, White MC, Sabatino SA, de Moor J, Doria-Rose PV, et al. Cancer screening test use—United States, 2015. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2017;66(8):201–6.
- Wirth MD, Brandt HM, Dolinger H, Hardin JW, Sharpe PA, Eberth JM. Examining connections between screening for breast, cervical and prostate cancer and colorectal cancer screening. *Colorectal Cancer.* 2014;3(3):253–63.

5. Reiter PL, Linnan LA. Cancer screening behaviors of African American women enrolled in a community-based cancer prevention trial. *J Womens Health*. 2011;20(3):429–38.
6. Katz ML, Reiter PL, Young GS, Pennell ML, Tatum CM, Paskett ED. Adherence to multiple cancer screening tests among women living in Appalachia Ohio. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*. 2015;24(10):1489–94.
7. Shapiro JA, Seeff Laura C, Nadel Marion R. Colorectal cancer-screening tests and associated health behaviors. *Am J Prev Med*. 2001;21(2):132–7.
8. McCowan C, McSkimming P, Papworth R, Kotzur M, McConnachie A, Macdonald S, et al. Comparing uptake across breast, cervical and bowel screening at an individual level: a retrospective cohort study. *Br J Cancer*. 2019;121(8):710–4.
9. Carlos RC, Fendrick AM, Patterson SK, Bernstein SJ. Associations in breast and colon cancer screening behavior in women. *Acad Radiol*. 2005;12(4):451–8.
10. Gonzalez P, Castaneda SF, Mills PJ, Talavera GA, Elder JP, Gallo LC. Determinants of breast, cervical and colorectal cancer screening adherence in Mexican–American women. *J Community Health*. 2012;37(2):421–33.
11. Guerrero-Preston R, Chan C, Vlahov D, Mitchell MK, Johnson SB, Freeman H. Previous cancer screening behavior as predictor of endoscopic colon cancer screening among women aged 50 and over, in NYC 2002. *J Community Health*. 2008;33(1):10–21.
12. Taksler GB, Keating NL, Rothberg MB. Implications of false-positive results for future cancer screenings: implications of false-positive results. *Cancer*. 2018;124(11):2390–8.
13. de Moor JS, Cohen RA, Shapiro JA, Nadel MR, Sabatino SA, Yabroff KR, et al. Colorectal cancer screening in the United States: trends from 2008 to 2015 and variation by health insurance coverage. *Prev Med*. 2018;112:199–206.
14. National Center for Health Statistics. Health, United States, 2017: with special feature on mortality. Hyattsville: National Center for Health Statistics; 2018.
15. Gorina Y, Elgaddal N. Patterns of mammography, pap smear, and colorectal cancer screening services among women aged 45 and over [Internet]. National Center for Health Statistics; 2021 Jun [cited 2021 Aug 5] p. 1–17. (National Health Statistics Reports). Report No.: 157. Available from: <https://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/105533>
16. Goding Sauer A, Siegel RL, Jemal A, Fedewa SA. Current prevalence of major cancer risk factors and screening test use in the United States: disparities by education and race/ethnicity. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomark Prev*. 2019;28(4):629–42.
17. Klabunde CN, Cronin KA, Breen N, Waldron WR, Amba AH, Nadel MR. Trends in colorectal cancer test use among vulnerable populations in the United States. *Cancer Epidemiol Prev Biomark*. 2011;20(8):1611–21.
18. Hall IJ. Patterns and trends in cancer screening in the United States. *Prev Chronic Dis*. 2018 [cited 2018 Oct 18];15. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/pccd/issues/2018/17_0465.htm.
19. Laiyemo AO, Adebogun AO, Doubeni CA, Ricks-Santi L, McDonald-Pinkett S, Young PE, et al. Influence of provider discussion and specific recommendation on colorectal cancer screening uptake among U.S. adults. *Prev Med*. 2014;67:1–5.
20. Miranda PY, Yao N, Snipes SA, BeLue R, Lengerich E, Hillemeier MM. Citizenship, length of stay, and screening for breast, cervical, and colorectal cancer in women, 2000–2010. *Cancer Causes Control*. 2017;28(6):589–98.
21. Elewonibi BR, Thierry AD, Miranda PY. Examining mammography use by breast cancer risk, race, nativity, and socioeconomic status. *J Immigr Minor Health N Y*. 2018;20(1):59–65.
22. US Preventive Services Task Force, Bibbins-Domingo K, Grossman DC, Curry SJ, Davidson KW, Epling JW, et al. Screening for colorectal cancer: US preventive services task force recommendation statement. *JAMA*. 2016 Jun 15 [cited 2016 Jun 18]; Available from: <http://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2016.5989>
23. Kiviniemi MT, Bennett A, Zaiter M, Marshall JR. Individual-level factors in colorectal cancer screening: a review of the literature on the relation of individual-level health behavior constructs and screening behavior. *Psychooncology*. 2011;20(10):1023–33.
24. Siu AL, on behalf of the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Screening for breast cancer: U.S. Preventive services task force recommendation statement. *Ann Intern Med*. 2016;164(4):279.
25. Tanner-Smith EE, Brown TN. Evaluating the health belief model: a critical review of studies predicting mammographic and pap screening. *Soc Theory Health*. 2010;8(1):95–125.
26. Farr DE, Brandt HM, Friedman DB, Adams SA, Armstead CA, Fulton JK, et al. False-positive mammography and mammography screening intentions among black women: the influence of emotions and coping strategies. *Ethn Health*. 2020;25(4):580–97.
27. Orom H, Kiviniemi MT, Shavers VL, Ross L, Underwood W. Perceived risk for breast cancer and its relationship to mammography in Blacks, Hispanics, and Whites. *J Behav Med*. 2013;36(5):466–76.
28. Atkinson TM, Salz T, Touza KK, Li Y, Hay JL. Does colorectal cancer risk perception predict screening behavior? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Behav Med N Y*. 2015;38(6):837–50.
29. Stockwell DH, Woo P, Jacobson BC, Remily R, Syngal S, Wolf J, et al. Determinants of colorectal cancer screening in women undergoing mammography. *Am J Gastroenterol N Y*. 2003;98(8):1875–80.
30. Bonafede MM, Miller JD, Pohlman SK, Troeger KA, Sprague BL, Herschorn SD, et al. Breast, cervical, and colorectal cancer screening: patterns among women with Medicaid and commercial insurance. *Am J Prev Med*. 2019;57(3):394–402.
31. Lin J, Perdue LA, Henrikson NB, Bean SI, Blasi PR, Kaiser Permanente Research Affiliates Evidence-based Practice Center. Screening for colorectal cancer: an evidence update for the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US); 2020 Oct. Report No.: 202.
32. US Preventive Services Task Force, Davidson KW, Barry MJ, Mangione CM, Cabana M, Caughey AB, et al. Screening for colorectal cancer: US preventive services task force recommendation statement. *JAMA*. 2021;325(19):1965.
33. Wolf AMD, Fonham ETH, Church TR, Flowers CR, Guerra CE, LaMonte SJ, et al. Colorectal cancer screening for average-risk adults: 2018 guideline update from the American Cancer Society. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2018;68(4):250–81.
34. National Center for Health Statistics. Survey description, national health interview survey, 2015. Hyattsville: National Center for Health Statistics; 2016.
35. U.S. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Preventive and screening services [Internet]. [cited 2022 Feb 24]. Available from: <https://www.medicare.gov/coverage/preventive-screening-services>.
36. SAS Institute Inc. SAS 9.4 software. Cary: SAS Institute Inc; 2012.
37. Becker EA, Griffith DM, West BT, Janz NK, Resnicow K, Morris AM. Potential biases introduced by conflating screening and diagnostic testing in colorectal cancer screening surveillance. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomark Prev*. 2015;24(12):1850–4.
38. Hay JL, Ramos M, Li Y, Holland S, Brennessel D, Kemeny MM. Deliberative and intuitive risk perceptions as predictors of colorectal cancer screening over time. *J Behav Med N Y*. 2016;39(1):65–74.
39. Lo SH, Waller J, Wardle J, von Wagner C. Comparing barriers to colorectal cancer screening with barriers to breast and cervical screening: a population-based survey of screening-age women in Great Britain. *J Med Screen*. 2013;20(2):73–9.
40. Kotzur M, McCowan C, Macdonald S, Wyke S, Gattling L, Campbell C, et al. Why colorectal screening fails to achieve the uptake rates of breast and cervical cancer screening: a comparative qualitative study. *BMJ Qual Saf*. 2020;29(6):482–90.
41. Hay JL, Ford JS, Klein D, Primavera LH, Buckley TR, Stein TR, et al. Adherence to colorectal cancer screening in mammography-adherent older women. *J Behav Med*. 2003;26(6):553–76.
42. Shahidi NC, Homayoon B, Cheung WY. Factors associated with suboptimal colorectal cancer screening in US immigrants. *Am J Clin Oncol*. 2013;36(4):381–7.
43. Cofie LE, Hirth JM, Cuevas AG, Farr D. A national study of gender and racial differences in colorectal cancer screening among foreign-born older adults living in the US. *J Behav Med*. 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10865-019-00107-3>.
44. Hurtado-de-Mendoza A, Song M, Kigen O, Jennings Y, Nwabukwu I, Sheppard VB. Addressing cancer control needs of African-born immigrants in the US: a systematic literature review. *Prev Med*. 2014;1(67):89–99.
45. Consedine NS, Tuck NL, Ragin CR, Spencer BA. Beyond the black box: a systematic review of breast, prostate, colorectal, and cervical screening

- among native and immigrant African-descent Caribbean populations. *J Immigr Minor Health*. 2015;17(3):905–24.
46. Fang CY, Ragin CC. Addressing disparities in cancer screening among U.S. immigrants: progress and opportunities. *Cancer Prev Res (Phila Pa)*. 2020;13(3):253–60.
 47. Castañeda SF, Gallo LC, Nodora J, Talavera GA, Penedo FJ, Evenson KR, et al. Colorectal cancer screening among Hispanics/Latinos in the HCHS/SOL sociocultural ancillary study. *Prev Med Rep*. 2019;1(15):100947.
 48. Diaz JA, Roberts MB, Goldman RE, Weitzen S, Eaton CB. Effect of language on colorectal cancer screening among Latinos and non-Latinos. *Cancer Epidemiol Prev Biomark*. 2008;17(8):2169–73.
 49. Costas-Muñiz R, Jandorf L, Philip E, Cohen N, Villagra C, Sriphanlop P, et al. Examining the impact of latino nativity, migration, and acculturation factors on colonoscopy screening. *J Community Health*. 2016;41(5):903–9.
 50. Xu MR, Kelly AMB, Kushi LH, Reed ME, Koh HK, Spiegelman D. Impact of the affordable care act on colorectal cancer outcomes: a systematic review. *Am J Prev Med*. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2019.11.018>.
 51. Zhao G, Okoro CA, Li J, Town M. Health insurance status and clinical cancer screenings among U.S. adults. *Am J Prev Med*. 2018;54(1):e11–9.
 52. Lee NC, Wong FL, Jamison PM, Jones SF, Galaska L, Brady KT, et al. Implementation of the national breast and cervical cancer early detection program: the beginning. *Cancer*. 2014;120(S16):2540–8.
 53. Pyenson B, Scammell C, Broulette J. Costs and repeat rates associated with colonoscopy observed in medical claims for commercial and Medicare populations. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2014;14(1):92.
 54. Richman I, Asch SM, Bhattacharya J, Owens DK. Colorectal cancer screening in the era of the affordable care act. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2016;31(3):315–20.
 55. Smith RA, Andrews KS, Brooks D, Fedewa SA, Manassaram-Baptiste D, Saslow D, et al. Cancer screening in the United States, 2019: a review of current American Cancer Society guidelines and current issues in cancer screening. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2019;69(3):184–210.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Ready to submit your research? Choose BMC and benefit from:

- fast, convenient online submission
- thorough peer review by experienced researchers in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- support for research data, including large and complex data types
- gold Open Access which fosters wider collaboration and increased citations
- maximum visibility for your research: over 100M website views per year

At BMC, research is always in progress.

Learn more biomedcentral.com/submissions

