



## Understanding different methodological approaches to measuring inequity in health care.

<https://arctichealth.org/en/permalink/ahliterature134574>

Author: Yukiko Asada

George Kephart

Author Affiliation: Department of Community Health and Epidemiology, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada.  
yukiko.asada@dal.ca

Source: Int J Health Serv. 2011;41(2):195-207

Date: 2011

Language: English

Publication Type: Article

Keywords: Canada

Health Services - utilization

Health Services Accessibility

Health Services Research - methods

Healthcare Disparities

Humans

Needs Assessment

Quality of Health Care

Abstract: The objectives of this study were to classify different methodological approaches to measuring inequity in health care, identify the strengths and weaknesses of each approach, and suggest directions for future improvement of each approach. The authors classified three approaches to measuring inequity in health care according to: (1) collective expert judgments (clinical standard approach), (2) average health care use based on need (population standard approach), and (3) assessment of health care users or providers (direct approach). The clinical standard approach has strong face validity and immediate policy implication, while lacking global policy implications. The population standard approach offers a global picture of inequity but has weak face validity. The direct approach can reveal private information of health care users and offer opportunity for managing public expectation. Strengths and limitations of these approaches are complementary, suggesting directions for future improvements of each approach. This study will help researchers make a well-informed choice of measurement approach and assist policymakers in resolving some of the problems caused by the diverse findings of studies, partly due to the measurement approaches taken.

PubMed ID: 21563620 [View in PubMed](#) 