



Published in final edited form as:

Am J Mens Health. 2012 May ; 6(3): 211–217. doi:10.1177/1557988311425853.

Gender differences in cancer screening beliefs, behaviors, and willingness to participate: Implications for health promotion

Jenna L. Davis, MPH,

Health Outcomes & Behavior, H. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center & Research Institute, 12902 Magnolia Drive, Tampa, FL 33612, Telephone: 813-745-6298, Fax: 813-745-6525

Kyrel L. Buchanan, PhD, MPH,

CEO, Sanoa Consulting LLC, Muscle Shoals, Alabama

Ralph V. Katz, DMD, MPH, PhD, and

Department of Epidemiology & Health Promotion, New York University College of Dentistry

B. Lee Green, PhD

Health Outcomes & Behavior, H. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center & Research Institute

Jenna L. Davis: jenna.davis@moffitt.org

Abstract

Men have higher cancer mortality rates for all sites combined compared to women. Cancer screening (CS) participation is important for the early detection of cancer. This study explores gender differences in CS beliefs, behaviors, and willingness to participate. The data were collected from a stratified, random-digit dial survey of adults living in New York, Maryland, and Puerto Rico. Chi-square tests and logistic regressions were computed to analyze gender associations among CS beliefs, behaviors, and willingness variables. Men and women believed cancer screenings were effective, though a higher percentage of men had never had a past CS. Men were less willing to participate in a CS at the present time and in a skin cancer exam; however, when given descriptions of screening conditions, men indicated more willingness to participate. These gender differences highlight the need for health professionals to examine their efforts in providing enhanced CS promotion and education among men.

Keywords

Cancer screening; Gender differences; Health promotion

Introduction

Men have consistently underutilized preventive health care services compared to women (Green & Pope, 1999; Bertakis, Azari, Helms, Callahan, & Robbins, 2000). In 2007, about 21% of adult men did not make health care visits to a doctor's office, emergency department, or utilize home visits compared to only 12% of women (National Center for Health Statistics, 2010). In addition, about 24% of males reported having no usual source of care between the years 2006–2007 compared to 13% of females (National Center for Health Statistics, 2010). Men's underutilization of health services places them at a disadvantage and may be partially caused by the role of masculinity and social norms, which has frequently been documented as contributing to men not using services (Courtenay, 2000; Addis &

Mahalik, 2003). While on the other hand, women have more frequent contact with healthcare professionals in relation to pregnancy, childcare and hormone replacement therapy (Evans, Brotherstone, Miles, & Wardle, 2005). Also, women report more interest in health (Green & Pope, 1999).

Cancer screening (CS) is one way of utilizing preventive health services and it is important for the early detection of cancer. When cancer is detected in later stages and/or has spread into other areas of the body it causes treatment to be difficult (National Cancer Institute, 2010a). Cancer mortality rates for all cancer sites combined are currently higher among men than women (Jemal, Siegel, Xu, & Ward, 2010; Pinkhasov et al., 2010). It is estimated that between 3% and 35% of cancer deaths could have been prevented by early cancer screenings (National Cancer Institute, 2010a). Fortunately, cancer screening rates improved slightly from the years 2005 to 2008 regarding breast cancer (mammography), colorectal cancer, and prostate cancer, but rates are still lower than optimal (Smith et al., 2011). Current studies examining gender differences in cancer screening mainly analyze colorectal CS participation, given that it is the only comparable CS between men and women. Results from studies using national datasets indicate that higher prevalence of colorectal CS participation was reported among men compared to women (Stock, Haug, & Brenner, 2010; Meissner, Breen, Klabunde, Vernon, 2006).

Rather than only analyzing a specific cancer, this study explores gender differences in cancer screening beliefs, behaviors, and willingness to participate in a general sense. Thorough knowledge about gender differences as it relates to these cancer screening variables is lacking in the literature and it is critical to understand how men and women differ regarding several aspects of cancer screenings in order to improve health promotion strategies. Discovering effective strategies to get more men involved in preventive health services may potentially reduce cancer mortality rates. This knowledge has implications for health promotion practices for health professionals, physicians, and community-based organizations.

Methods

The data were collected from a disproportionally allocated, stratified, random-digit dial telephone survey of non-institutionalized adults (≥ 18 years of age) living in New York City, New York; Baltimore, Maryland; and San Juan, Puerto Rico. The survey, the Cancer Screening Questionnaire (CSQ), was developed by a multi-disciplinary, multi-university research team within the NYU Oral Cancer RAAHP (Research on Adolescent and Adult Health Promotion) Center, an NIDCR/NIH Oral Health Disparities Center and was conducted in 2003. The CSQ was adapted from a previously validated questionnaire, the Tuskegee Legacy Project Questionnaire, which was designed to assess willingness to participate in biomedical research (Katz et al., 2006). English and Spanish versions of the questionnaire were administered per participant preference. The English version of the questionnaire was pilot-tested among persons residing in US recruitment sites (Baltimore and New York). The Spanish version of the questionnaire was validated through pilot-tests in San Juan, Puerto Rico. The CSQ addresses a range of issues related to the beliefs and willingness to participate in cancer screening examinations in an ethnically diverse sample.

Each of the three cities was sampled independently, and with specific race/ethnic group targets within each city: 300 African Americans (150 in New York City, 150 in Baltimore); 300 Puerto-Rican Hispanics (150 in San Juan, 150 in New York City); and 300 Whites (150 in New York City, 150 in Baltimore). Baltimore, New York, and San Juan were selected as recruitment cities to ensure a wide geographic and racial/ethnic representation. The initial sample allocation across strata (within city) was based on expected yields computed using

exchange incidence data. Sampling weights were produced because of the complex design of the CSQ Study. A more detailed explanation of the study design, as well as justifications of methodological decisions, is described elsewhere (Katz et al., 2008; Kressin et al., 2010). A total of 1,148 participants completed the telephone survey. The original targeted enrollment goal of 300 for each racial/ethnic group was met or exceeded within each city: 355 African Americans, 311 Puerto Rican Hispanics, and 482 non-Hispanic Whites. Response rates (the percentage of completions of residential households dialed) for San Juan, Baltimore, and New York were 58%, 51%, and 45%, respectively with an overall completion rate (percentage of completed interviews once contact was made with the targeted household subject) of 82.6%, which are based on the Council of American Survey Research Organizations rates (CASRO, 1982). The study was approved by the University of Puerto Rico and New York University Institutional Review Boards.

Measures

The variables examined in this study are listed in Table 1. Participants' cancer screening belief was assessed using the variable of how effective cancer screenings are in detecting cancer (all/most of the time detect cancer, some of the time detect cancer, occasionally/rarely detect cancer). Participants' cancer screening behavior was assessed using the variable of whether they had ever had a cancer screening in the past. If they answered "No," a follow-up question was asked at the end of the survey that specifically asked females if they ever had a mammogram or Pap smear, asked males if they ever had a prostate exam, and asked everyone if they ever had a cancer exam of the mouth. Those who answered "No" to the first question and then answered "Yes" to a specific screening were classified as having had a cancer screening in the past. Willingness to participate in a cancer screening was assessed through several questions asking willingness to participate in a regular cancer screening at the present time, willingness to participate in a screening depending on who conducts the screening, willingness to participate in a screening depending on what one is asked to do during the screening, and willingness to participate if the cancer screening was for a particular type of cancer. The willingness to participate variables were dichotomized into Likely (Very likely and Somewhat likely) and Unlikely (Not quite sure, Somewhat unlikely, and Very unlikely). Not quite sure was categorized under Unlikely based on previous research, which is described elsewhere (Katz et al., 2006).

Statistical Analysis

Weighted frequency distributions of sociodemographic variables (race/ethnicity, age, education, income, and city) were computed to show the characteristic distribution of the sample by gender. The Rao-Scott chi-Square test, a design-adjusted version of the Pearson Chi-Square, was employed to calculate bivariate differences between gender and cancer screening beliefs and behavior. Since cancer screening participation is highly based on age, gender differences within each age group were also assessed for past cancer screening behaviors using the Rao-Scott chi-square tests. Separate logistic regression models were computed to predict the relationship between gender and willingness to participate in cancer screenings. Each willingness variable was the dependent variable and gender was the independent variable, adjusting for race/ethnicity, age, education, income and city. Response choices of Don't Know or Refused for all variables were classified as missing. Statistical significance was determined at a p-value of <0.05. SAS version 9.2 (SAS Institute Inc. Cary, North Carolina) was used for all data analyses.

Results

The sociodemographic characteristics by gender are reported in Table 2. Men constituted about 35% of the sample and about half of them were White. There were slightly more

White women, closely followed by African American women, then Hispanic women. A majority of both men and women were aged 30–59 years old. Men had higher levels of education and income than women.

Gender associations with cancer screening beliefs and past CS participation are presented in Table 3. Participants' beliefs about CS effectiveness was not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 4.90$; $p=0.09$). Approximately the same percentage of men and women believed cancer screenings detected cancer all/most of the time (67% vs. 66%, respectively). Rao-Scott chi-square tests resulted in significant associations ($\chi^2=118.3$; $p<.0001$) between gender and past cancer screening participation. Overall, about 41% of men had never had a cancer screening in the past compared to only 5% of women who had never had a screening. Within the age groups of 18–29 year olds and 30–59 year olds, statistically significant results included a higher percentage of men had never had a cancer screening compared to women (shown in Table 3). However, there were no statistically significant differences among men and women ages 60 and older for ever having had a cancer screening.

The odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) of the statistically significant gender associations among the variables measuring CS willingness are reported in Table 4. Men were less willing to participate (OR=0.50; 95% CI: 0.32 – 0.77) when asked a general question about participating in a cancer screening at the present time compared to women. The statistically significant variables assessing willingness to participate in a cancer screening when given specific details (i.e. when told what one has to do during a screening and when told who conducts the screening), all showed men being slightly more willing to participate than women. For example, as shown in Table 4, men were 1.51 (95% CI: 1.02 – 2.23) times more willing to participate in a cancer screening when told the exam would be given by the government compared to women. The variables assessing specific details about what one has to do during the screening revealed being interviewed about smoking habits as the only statistically significant variable (OR=1.56; 95% CI: 1.00 – 2.43). Being screened for skin cancer was the only specific type of cancer that was found to be significant between genders, with men being less willing to participate in a skin cancer screening (OR=0.59; 95% CI: 0.39 – 0.90).

Discussion

This study examined gender associations in beliefs, behaviors, and willingness to participate in cancer screenings to gain insight for improving existing cancer health promotion practices. The findings particularly emphasize the need for better health and CS promotion among men. Despite a majority of men and women believing cancer screenings are effective in detecting cancer, a significant proportion of men had never had a CS. This finding may be explained by the fact that women have more 'ongoing, routine' opportunities to be screened when visiting their primary care doctor (e.g., menstrual problems, pregnancies), whereas men lack these kinds of health events. In addition, men have to deal with the uncertainties of cancer screening benefits and making an informed decision to participate in their most common CS, prostate cancer screening (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2010). It has been found that men who have already undergone a prostate cancer screening are more likely to participate in a colorectal cancer screening (Wong & Coups, 2011; Carlos, Underwood, Fendrick, & Bernstein, 2005). So, the frustration, fears, and feeling overwhelmed with making a decision about being screened for prostate cancer may hinder participation in other screenings.

However, the media may be another contributor to the finding that women participate more in cancer screenings. There is a great deal of cancer awareness for women's cancers and far less coverage on men's cancers in the media (George & Fleming, 2004; Katz et al., 2004). In

a study exploring newspaper cancer stories, it was found that mammography was mentioned significantly higher than PSA or colorectal screenings in mainstream and in ethnic newspapers (Stryker, Emmons, & Viswanath, 2007). Many fundraisers, commercials, and community awareness events about women's cancer issues already exist (i.e., the National Football League routinely shows players wearing pink gear to support breast cancer screening during October for National Breast Cancer Awareness Month) but men's health promotion lacks parallel events of this magnitude and visibility. The Prostate Cancer Foundation is only now petitioning the National Football League to allow their players to wear blue during September, the National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month (Prostate Cancer Foundation, n.d.)

Lack of men's health promotion is evident even within national government agencies. The National Institutes for Health currently has the Office of Research on Women's Health and the Department of Health and Human Services has the Office on Women's Health (National Institute of Health, n.d.; U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, 2010). Unfortunately, neither agency has a counterpart men's health office. Though, there is now a proposed legislative bill to finally create the Office of Men's Health within the Department of Health & Human Services (Men's Health Policy Center, 2010). This bill comes nearly 20 years after the Office of Women's Health was first created. In addition, the National Cancer Institute estimated in 2009 funding for breast cancer research was nearly twice as high as funding for prostate cancer research (National Cancer Institute, 2010b). These examples provide clear evidence, at the national agency level, of the degree to which men's health promotion lags behind women's health promotion.

Another main finding of our study was that men were less willing than women to participate when asked a general question about participating in a CS at the present time, but when given various descriptions of screening conditions (i.e. who conducts the screening, and what one has to do during the screening), they were slightly more willing to participate than women. In other words, when told more specific details about the cancer screening, men seemed to be more willing to participate compared to being asked about getting a cancer screening at the present time with no specific details. Even though each of the screening-specific variables in and of themselves may not hold any implications; the very fact that men were slightly more willing to participate in these specific-screening events strongly suggests that men are susceptible to participate in a variety of cancer screening events when given more information about the screening. In light of this opportunity to promote cancer screening in men, health educators, physicians, and community-based organizations should make a concerted effort to educate men on the exact screening procedures, how cancer is detected, and what to expect during the screening. Men seem to be eager for sufficient explanations about health exams in order to have a good experience during the exam and to learn more about making a decision for participating (Dubé, Fuller, Rosen, Fagan, & O'Donnell, 2005). This has the potential to result in increasing men's self-efficacy in participating in cancer screenings, partly because they will have increased knowledge due to these campaigns, and partly because they have given evidence of their willingness to participate in cancer screenings.

Men were identified as less likely to want to participate in a skin cancer screening than women. This finding is consistent with previous findings (Weinstock et al., 1999; Janda et al., 2004). One way to detect skin cancer is self-examination; however, men are less likely to self-examine than women (Evans et al., 2005). Therefore, this provides another opportunity to educate men about the detection of skin cancer and what certain signs/symptoms they should be looking for on their skin. Some evidence shows that a screening service may be effective in conjunction with educational campaigns in facilitating early detection of skin cancers (Koh et al., 1996). This is very important because the patient has more intimate

knowledge of their skin and has more frequent opportunities to inspect their skin. Also, it has been found that having the assistance of a partner or spouse is a predictor for skin self-examination (Weinstock et al., 2004). Increasing knowledge about skin self-examination could lead to men detecting signs of cancer earlier, and it could amplify the voice of the women in their lives as they will also get educated about the self-examination benefits for their men and will help to urge them to practice it.

Limitations of this study include some typical methodological limitations associated with the chosen study design. Individuals were excluded if they did not have a telephone land line and the data were self-reported which may have introduced recall and reporting error. Other variables that could affect cancer screening participation that were not collected are health insurance status and family history of cancer. Another limitation is that the data used are nearly nine years old; however, these results can inform cancer screening promotion, which is still a relevant issue today. Finally, no questions were asked about testicular cancer screening. Including testicular cancer exams as a follow-up question for past CS behaviors might have more accurately reflected young men's CS past behaviors, especially since testicular cancer affects younger men more than older men (Altekruse et al., 2009).

Future efforts in cancer screening promotion need to be redirected and specifically targeted towards the appropriate populations. In addition, future research should explore how health education on specific cancer screening tests and procedures increases self-efficacy and control. This increase in self-efficacy may increase CS participation rates among men. Another recommendation for future research is to replicate this study with other large urban samples regarding willingness to participate in cancer screenings. This study highlights the need to increase awareness and promotion of men's health, especially in regards to cancer screening and prevention. More precisely, the results indicate that men appear to be both susceptible and ready to respond to cancer screening promotional efforts, creating an opportunity for health professionals to have an impact on cancer survival in men if they proceed to provide men with more explanations and education about cancer screenings.

References

1. Addis ME, Mahalik JR. Men, masculinity, and the contexts of help seeking. *American Psychologist*. 2003; 58(1):5–14. [PubMed: 12674814]
2. Altekruse, SF.; Kosary, CL.; Krapcho, M.; Neyman, N.; Aminou, R.; Waldron, W., et al., editors. SEER Cancer Statistics Review, 1975–2007. 2009. Retrieved from http://seer.cancer.gov/csr/1975_2007/
3. Bertakis KD, Azari R, Helms LJ, Callahan EJ, Robbins JA. Gender differences in the utilization of health care services. *Journal of Family Practice*. 2000; 49(2):147–52. [PubMed: 10718692]
4. Carlos RC, Underwood W, Fendrick AM, Bernstein SJ. Behavioral associations between prostate and colon cancer screenings. *Journal of the American College of Surgeons*. 2005; 200(2):216–223. [PubMed: 15664097]
5. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Informed decision making: How to make a personal health care choice. 2010. Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/cancer/prostate/informed_decision_making.htm
6. Council of American Survey Research Organizations (CASRO). Report of the CASRO Completion Rates Task Force. New York, NY: Audits and Surveys Co Inc; 1982.
7. Courtenay WH. Constructions of masculinity and their influence on men's well-being: A theory of gender and health. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2000; 50(10):1385–1401. [PubMed: 10741575]
8. Dubé CE, Fuller BK, Rosen RK, Fagan M, O'Donnell J. Men's experiences of physical exams and cancer screening tests: A qualitative study. *Preventive Medicine*. 2005; 40(6):628–635. [PubMed: 15850858]
9. Evans REC, Brotherstone H, Miles A, Wardle J. Gender differences in early detection of cancer. *Journal of Men's Health & Gender*. 2005; 2(2):209–217.

10. George A, Fleming P. Factors affecting men's help-seeking in the early detection of prostate cancer: Implications for health promotion. *Journal of Men's Health & Gender*. 2004; 1(4):345–352.
11. Green CA, Pope CR. Gender, psychosocial factors and the use of medical services: A longitudinal analysis. *Social Science & Medicine*. 1999; 48(10):1363–1372. [PubMed: 10369437]
12. Janda M, Youl PH, Lowe JB, Elwood M, Ring IT, Aitken JF. Attitudes and intentions in relation to skin checks for early signs of skin cancer. *Preventive Medicine*. 2004; 39:11–18. [PubMed: 15207981]
13. Jemal A, Siegel R, Xu J, Ward E. Cancer statistics, 2010. *CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians*. 2010; 60:277–300. [PubMed: 20610543]
14. Katz ML, Sheridan S, Pignone M, Lewis C, Battle J, Gollop C, et al. Prostate and colon cancer screening in popular magazines. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2004; 19:843–848. [PubMed: 15242469]
15. Katz RV, Kegeles SS, Kressin NR, Green BL, Wang MQ, James SA, et al. The Tuskegee legacy project: Willingness of minorities to participate in biomedical research. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*. 2006; 17:698–715. [PubMed: 17242525]
16. Katz RV, Claudio C, Kressin NR, Green BL, Wang MQ, Russell SL. Willingness to participate in cancer screenings: Blacks vs Whites vs Puerto Rican Hispanics. *Cancer Control*. 2008; 15(4):334–343. [PubMed: 18813201]
17. Koh HK, Norton LA, Geller AC, Sun T, Rigel DS, Miller DR, et al. Evaluation of the American Academy of Dermatology's National Skin Cancer Early Detection and Screening Program. *Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology*. 1996; 34:971–978. [PubMed: 8647990]
18. Kressin NR, Manze M, Russell SL, Katz RV, Claudio C, Green BL, et al. Self-reported willingness to have cancer screening and the effects of sociodemographic factors. *Journal of the National Medical Association*. 2010; 102:219–227. [PubMed: 20355351]
19. Meissner HI, Breen N, Klabunde CN, Vernon SW. Patterns of colorectal cancer screening uptake among men and women in the United States. *Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention*. 2006; 15(2):389–394.
20. Men's Health Policy Center. Office of Men's Health. 2010. Retrieved from http://www.menshealthpolicy.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=50&Itemid=97
21. National Cancer Institute. PDQ® Cancer Screening Overview. Bethesda, MD: National Cancer Institute; 2010a. Retrieved from <http://cancer.gov/cancertopics/pdq/screening/overview/HealthProfessional>
22. National Cancer Institute. Fact sheet: Cancer research funding. 2010b. Retrieved from <http://www.cancer.gov/cancertopics/factsheet/NCI/research-funding>
23. National Center for Health Statistics. Health, United States, 2009: With special feature on medical technology. Hyattsville, Maryland: U.S. Government Printing Office; 2010.
24. National Institute of Health. The Office of Research on Women's Health. n.d. Retrieved from <http://orwh.od.nih.gov/index.html>
25. Pinkhasov RM, Shteynshlyuger A, Hakimian P, Lindsay GK, Samadi DB, Shabsigh R. Are men shortchanged on health? Perspective on life expectancy, morbidity, and mortality in men and women in the United States. *The International Journal of Clinical Practice*. 2010; 64(4):465–474.
26. Prostate Cancer Foundation. Help football fans see blue. n.d. Retrieved from http://www.pcf.org/site/c.leJRIROrEpH/b.6312461/k.8953/Help_Football_Fans_See_Blue.htm
27. Smith RA, Cokkinides V, Brooks D, Saslow D, Shah M, Brawley OW. Cancer screening in the United States, 2011: A review of current American Cancer Society guidelines and issues in cancer screening. *CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians*. 2011; 61:8–30. [PubMed: 21205832]
28. Stock C, Haug U, Brenner H. Population-based prevalence estimates of history of colonoscopy or sigmoidoscopy: Review and analysis of recent trends. *Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*. 2010; 71:366–381. [PubMed: 19846082]
29. Stryker JE, Emmons KM, Viswanath K. Uncovering differences across the cancer control continuum: A comparison of ethnic and mainstream cancer newspaper stores. *Preventive Medicine*. 2007; 44(1):20–25. [PubMed: 16949141]

30. U.S. Department of Health & Human Services. About the Office on Women's Health. 2010. Retrieved from <http://www.womenshealth.gov/about-us/>
31. Weinstock MA, Martin RA, Risica PM, Berwick M, Lasater T, Rakowski W, et al. Thorough skin examination for the early detection of melanoma. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 1999; 17(3):169–175. [PubMed: 10987631]
32. Weinstock MA, Risica PM, Martin RA, Rakowski W, Smith KJ, Berwick M, et al. Reliability of assessment and circumstances of performance of thorough skin self-examination for the early detection of melanoma in the Check-it-Out Project. *Preventive Medicine*. 2004; 38:761–765. [PubMed: 15193896]
33. Wong YN, Coups EJ. Correlates of colorectal cancer screening adherence among men who have been screened for prostate cancer. *Journal of Cancer Education*. 2011; 26:301–307. [PubMed: 21360029]

Table 1

Variables used to assess cancer screening beliefs, behaviors, and intentions

<i>Cancer Screening Belief</i>	
1	How effective would you say cancer screening exams are in detecting cancer?
<i>Cancer Screening Behavior</i>	
1	Have you ever had a cancer screening exam?
a.	Follow-up question if answered No, have you ever had a.... <i>mammogram; Pap smear; PSA or prostate test; cancer exam of your mouth?</i>
<i>Cancer Screening Intention</i>	
1	How likely are you to agree to have a cancer screening exam at the present time?
2	How likely are you to have each of the following specific types of cancer screening exams for... <i>skin cancer; lung cancer; oral/mouth cancer; stomach cancer; colon cancer; liver cancer; blood cancer; rectal cancer?</i>
3	How likely you would be to participate in a cancer screening exam if it were provided by.... <i>your own physician; your own dentist; a university medical school; a university nursing school; the government; a non-profit foundation; a tobacco company; a drug company; an insurance company?</i>
4	How likely are you to participate in a cancer screening exam if you had to do the following... <i>have a physician examine you; have a dentist examine your mouth, head, and neck; have a nurse examine you; be interviewed about your diet; be interviewed about your smoking habits; be interviewed about your alcohol habits; spit some saliva into a small jar; have x-rays taken; have your mouth or skin gently scraped to collect cells; give a sample of blood; have a skin biopsy?</i>

Table 2

Weighted percentages of sociodemographic characteristics by gender (N=1148)

	Men (n=401)	Women (n=747)
Race		
African American	98 (28.7%)	257 (33.2%)
Hispanic	95 (19.0%)	216 (25.2%)
White	208 (52.3%)	274 (41.6%)
Age		
18–29 years old	76 (23.8%)	140 (22.1%)
30–59 years old	242 (55.9%)	437 (51.3%)
60 and older	83 (20.3%)	170 (26.6%)
Education		
Less than high school	61 (10.6%)	121 (13.3%)
High school graduate	93 (23.1%)	219 (30.4%)
Some college	87 (24.6%)	154 (21.3%)
College graduate	97 (25.5%)	155 (22.6%)
Graduate degree or higher	61 (16.2%)	92 (12.4%)
Income		
< \$20,000	98 (19.6%)	229 (28.1%)
\$ 20 – 34,999	76 (22.6%)	170 (26.0%)
\$ 35 – 49,999	52 (14.4%)	103 (17.4%)
\$ 50 – 74,999	63 (19.9%)	86 (14.1%)
\$ 75,000	73 (23.5%)	73 (14.4%)
City		
Baltimore	102 (8.2%)	217 (8.6%)
New York	242 (86.2%)	414 (85.7%)
San Juan	57 (5.6%)	116 (5.7%)

Table 3

Weighted Rao-Scott Chi-Square results by gender

Variable	Percentages	Rao-Scott Chi-Square (P-value)
Cancer screening effectiveness in detecting cancer		
All/Most of the time	Men—224 (67.0%) Women—462 (66.0%)	$\chi^2 = 4.9$; DF=2 (p=0.09)
Some of the time	Men—88 (24.0%) Women—183 (29.0%)	
Occasionally/Rarely	Men—33 (9.0%) Women—46 (5.0%)	
Has ever had a cancer screening		
Yes	Men—240 (59.0%) Women—706 (95.0%)	$\chi^2 = 118.3$; DF=1 (p<.0001)
No	Men—157 (41.0%) Women—34 (5.0%)	
Has ever had a cancer screening (by age group)		
<i>18–29 year olds</i>		
Yes	Men—28 (34.0%) Women—114 (83.0%)	$\chi^2 = 30.7$; DF=1 (p<.0001)
No	Men—46 (66.0%) Women—23 (17.0%)	
<i>30–59 year olds</i>		
Yes	Men—139 (57.0%) Women—428 (98.0%)	$\chi^2 = 109.0$; DF=1 (p<.0001)
No	Men—103 (43.0%) Women—5 (2.0%)	
<i>60 and older</i>		
Yes	Men—73 (95.0%) Women—164 (98.0%)	$\chi^2 = 1.07$; DF=1 (p=0.30)
No	Men—8 (5.0%) Women—6 (2.0%)	

Table 4

Logistic regression results* for statistically significant willingness to participate in cancer screening variables

Variable	Odds Ratio (95% confidence interval)	p-value
Regular cancer screening at the present time	0.50 (0.32 – 0.77)	0.002
Skin cancer exam	0.59 (0.39 – 0.90)	0.015
Exam given by the government	1.51 (1.02 – 2.23)	0.041
Exam given by a drug company	1.53 (1.02 – 2.30)	0.039
Interviewed about smoking habits	1.56 (1.00 – 2.43)	0.047

* Results are modeled for men, with women being the reference category and adjusting for race, age, income, education, and city