



Health Literacy and Colorectal Cancer Screening Decision Making Among African Americans



Erin K. Tagai, MPH, Cheryl L. Holt, PhD, & Sherie Lou Z. Santos, MPH, CHES
University of Maryland, College Park, School of Public Health

Introduction

- African Americans are disproportionately impacted by colorectal cancer (CRC) incidence and mortality.¹
- African Americans are screened for CRC at lower rates than Whites.¹
- CRC screening tests have different pros and cons that can make the decision making process complex.²
- Informed decision making:
 - Helps individuals increase the quality of their decision
 - Has been linked to increased CRC screening completion.²
- Factors related to CRC screening completion include decisional conflict, decision self-efficacy, and stage of decision making.²
- Health literacy has been linked to greater CRC screening knowledge and CRC screening completion.³
 - However, research investigating the link between health literacy and CRC screening decision making is limited.

Purpose: Examine the relationship between health literacy and components of the decision making process for CRC screening among a population of African Americans.

Methods

Participants

- The study was conducted in the context of Project HEAL (Health through Early Awareness and Learning), a church-based cancer early detection intervention.
 - Participants attended a 3-workshop series covering breast, prostate, and colorectal cancer early detection.
- Participants were eligible for the present study if they (a) self-identified as African American, (b) were between the ages of 50 and 75, and (c) had no personal history of breast, prostate, or colorectal cancer.

Data Collection

- Baseline survey:** paper-and-pencil survey administered at Project HEAL baseline
 - Assessed demographics, CRC knowledge, and CRC screening behavior
- 14-month follow-up survey:** administered via paper-and-pencil (mailed to participants), online (Qualtrics), or via phone interview
 - Assessed main study variables:
 - Health literacy
 - Decisional conflict
 - Decision self-efficacy
 - Stage of decision making

Methods continued

Measures

- Health literacy:** Mean calculated from 5 items modified from STOFHLA and REALM ($\alpha = .74$)⁴
 - Greater score indicates greater health literacy
- Decisional conflict:** Total score calculated from a 10-item scale ($\alpha = .93$)⁵
 - Lower score indicates lower decisional conflict
- Decision self-efficacy:** Total score calculated from 11-item scale ($\alpha = .92$)⁵
 - Greater score indicates greater health literacy
- Stage of decision making:** Single item with greater score indicating increased readiness to engage in decision making⁵

Data Analysis

- Linear regression performed separately for each dependent variable controlling for potential covariates

Results

Participant demographics (N = 101)

Characteristic	n (%) or mean (SD)
Age	60.7 (6.9)
Gender	
Female	70 (69.3%)
Male	31 (30.7%)
Education ^a	
< High school diploma	9 (9.0%)
High school diploma	25 (25.0%)
Some college	37 (37.0%)
College degree	29 (29.0%)
Employment	
Employed full-time	42 (41.6%)
Retired	33 (32.7%)
Other	26 (25.7%)
Health Insurance	
Private	42 (41.6%)
Medicare/Medicaid	10 (9.9%)
Other	41 (40.6%)
None	8 (7.9%)
CRC knowledge (max score = 8)	6.5 (1.8)
Ever had fecal occult blood test (FOBT)	41 (40.6%)
Ever had sigmoidoscopy	28 (27.7%)
Ever had colonoscopy	69 (68.3%)
Health literacy (max score = 5)	4.2 (0.72)
Decisional conflict (max score = 100) ^a	19.0 (26.23)
Decision self-efficacy (max score = 100) ^a	84.3 (18.7)
Stage of decision making (max score = 6) ^b	4.2 (1.9)

^an = 100
^bn = 99

Results continued

Linear regression of decision making variables on covariate and health literacy

	Decisional Conflict (n = 100)			Decision Self-Efficacy (n = 100)			Stage of Decision Making (n = 99)		
	B	SE B	β	B	SE B	β	B	SE B	β
Age	-0.16	0.49	-.04	0.16	0.33	.06	0.02	0.04	.06
Gender	-8.75	5.40	-.16	4.89	3.58	.12	-0.50	0.42	-.13
Education	-6.30	2.94	-.23*	2.19	1.92	.11	0.20	0.23	.10
Employment ^a									
Retired	-5.20	6.76	-.09	3.70	4.47	.09	-0.20	0.52	-.05
Other	10.24	6.21	.17	1.62	4.11	.04	-0.17	0.48	-.04
Health insurance ^b									
Medicare/Medicaid	-9.15	8.86	-.11	5.37	5.87	.09	0.95	0.69	.16
Other	-0.17	5.73	-.003	-0.83	3.79	-.02	0.28	0.44	.07
None	-0.15	9.3	-.002	-7.56	6.17	-.11	-0.85	0.72	-.22
CRC knowledge	-0.49	1.40	-.03	-0.76	0.93	-.07	-0.08	0.11	-.08
Ever had FOBT	-3.98	4.94	-.07	-2.28	3.29	-.06	0.03	0.39	-.01
Ever had sigmoidoscopy	-4.60	5.76	-.08	-2.28	3.83	-.05	0.26	0.45	.06
Ever had colonoscopy	-0.57	5.44	-.01	-3.99	3.71	-.10	-0.46	0.42	-.12
Health literacy	-10.88	3.89	-.30**	15.62	2.54	.60***	1.00	0.30	.37**

^aReference group for employment: "full-time employment"

^bReference group for health insurance: "private health insurance"

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Conclusions

- Findings suggest health literacy significantly associated with decision making for CRC screening in this sample of church-attending African Americans.
 - Greater health literacy significantly related to lower decisional conflict
 - Greater health literacy significantly related to:
 - Greater decision self-efficacy
 - Greater readiness to engage in decision making
- Greater educational attainment significantly related to lower decisional conflict
- Future research should further investigate:
 - The relationship between health literacy and decision-making
 - The inclusion of health literacy in decision-making tools for CRC screening

References

- American Cancer Society. *Colorectal cancer facts & figures 2014-2016*. Atlanta, GA: American Cancer Society; 2014.
- O'Connor AM, Tugwell P, Wells GA, et al. (1998). A decision aid for women considering hormone therapy after menopause: Decision support framework and evaluation. *Patient Educ Couns*. 1998;33(3):267-279.
- Guerra CE, Dominguez F, Shea JA. Literacy and knowledge, attitudes, and behavior about colorectal cancer screening. *J Health Comm*. 2005;10(7):651-663.
- Chew LD., Bradley KA, Boyko EJ. Brief questions to identify patients with inadequate health literacy. *Fam Med*. 2004;36(8):588-594.
- O'Connor AM. Patient decision aids: Evaluation measures. *Ottawa Hospital Research Institute*. <http://decisionaid.ohri.ca/eval.html>. Published Sept 23, 2014. Accessed October 11, 2015.