

# 1 Using a health equity lens to measure patient experiences of 2 care in diverse healthcare settings

3 Annette J. Browne, RN, PhD, FCAHS, FCAN<sup>1\*</sup>¶

4 Colleen Varcoe, RN, PhD, FCAHS, FCAN<sup>1</sup>¶

5 Marilyn Ford-Gilboe, RN, PhD, FCAHS, FAAN<sup>2</sup>¶

6 C. Nadine Wathen, PhD, FCAHS<sup>2</sup>¶

7 Erin Wilson, RN, NP(F), PhD<sup>3&</sup>

8 Vicky Bungay, RN, PhD, FCAN<sup>1&</sup>

9 Nancy Perrin, PhD<sup>4</sup>¶

10

11 <sup>1</sup> School of Nursing, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

12 <sup>2</sup> Arthur Labatt Family School of Nursing, Western University, London, ON, Canada

13 <sup>3</sup> School of Nursing, University of Northern British Columbia, Prince George, BC, Canada

14 <sup>4</sup> Johns Hopkins University School of Nursing, Baltimore, MD, USA

15 \* Corresponding Author: Annette Browne [Annette.browne@ubc.ca](mailto:Annette.browne@ubc.ca)

16 ¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.

17 & These authors also contributed equally to this work.

18 Short title: Measuring Equity-Oriented Care

## 19 Abstract

20 People who are structurally disadvantaged and marginalized often report poor health care  
21 experiences due to intersecting forms of stigma and discrimination. There are many measures of patient  
22 experiences of care, however, few are designed to measure equity-oriented care. In alignment with  
23 ongoing calls to integrate actions in support of health equity, we report on the development and testing  
24 of patient experiences of care measures that explicitly use a health equity and intersectional lens. Our  
25 analysis focuses on two different equity-oriented health care scales. The first was piloted in a primary  
26 health care setting, where patients have an ongoing relationship with providers over time. The second  
27 was piloted in an emergency department, where care is provided on an episodic basis. Item Response  
28 Theory was used to develop the scales and evaluate their psychometric properties. The primary health  
29 care scale, tested with a cohort of 567 patients, showed that providing more equity-oriented health care  
30 predicted improvements in important patient self-report health outcomes over time. The episodic scale,  
31 tested in an emergency department setting with 284 patients, showed evidence of concurrent validity,  
32 based on a high correlation with quality of care. Both scales are brief, easy-to-administer self-report  
33 measures that can support organizations to monitor quality of care using an equity lens. The availability  
34 of both scales enhances the possibility of measuring equity-oriented health care in diverse contexts.  
35 Both scales can shed light on experiences of care using an intersectional lens and equity-oriented lens,  
36 providing a nuanced understanding of quality of care.

## 37 Introduction

38 Greater equity in health and health care is associated with better population health (1, 2).  
39 Achieving these aims requires focusing on those who have the least access to the social determinants of  
40 health and face the greatest barriers to health care, including those who are most structurally

41 disadvantaged and marginalized in our societies. The idea of structural disadvantage recognizes that  
42 inequities are structural because they are embedded in social, economic, and healthcare policies and  
43 practices, and contribute to tangible, negative impacts on health, quality of life and well-being.  
44 Research shows that people who are structurally disadvantaged and marginalized experience poorer  
45 outcomes on many measures of health, and report poorer health care experiences (3-5). There is also a  
46 clear body of evidence showing that people’s health care experiences influence their timely access to  
47 healthcare, and their overall health. Importantly, a growing body of research confirms that people who  
48 have negative health care experiences or anticipate such experiences, including experiences arising from  
49 stigma and discrimination, are deterred from accessing care (3, 6-8). Therefore, measuring patient  
50 experiences of care (PEOC) and using such data to improve care are crucial to promoting equity. In a  
51 program of research and knowledge mobilization known as [EQUIP Healthcare](#), we have been developing  
52 and testing ways to measure patient experiences of equity-oriented health care (EOHC). Grounded in a  
53 critical theoretical conceptualization of health equity, the notion of EOHC explicitly aims to: (a) address  
54 the frequent mismatches between usual approaches to care, and the needs of people most impacted by  
55 health and social inequities, (b) mitigate the impact of multiple, intersecting forms of discrimination,  
56 racism and stigma, and (c) take into account the health effects of social and structural inequities (9).

57 Limited attention has been given to defining what constitutes EOHC from the perspective of  
58 patients, or to developing appropriate and valid ways of measuring such care. A search of the literature  
59 shows that there are few options with regard to equity-nuanced scales to measure quality of care from  
60 the perspective of patients. Scales that attempt to measure PEOC are often limited to comparing care,  
61 or outcomes of care, for specific groups of people using a single variable, typically ethnicity, or in some  
62 jurisdictions, “race”. For example, current measures of patient-centered care, patient outcomes and  
63 experiences of care are mainly assessed through the lens of a single variable (e.g., satisfaction on a 10-  
64 point scale, or access to care with yes/no response options), and are often focused on particular

65 ethnocultural or racialized groups (10, 11). Scales or items developed to measure experiences of care  
66 that strive to use an equity lens often focus primarily on racialized groups (e.g., in the USA, categories  
67 such as Black, Hispanic, etc.), and on groups experiencing financial strain (12, 13). Measures based on  
68 variables defined by population groups can be helpful to gauge how particular groups of people  
69 experience care. However, experiences of care are bound up with numerous factors such as feeling that  
70 one has been treated in a respectful manner (particularly for people who have had past negative  
71 experiences), and that care has been tailored to meet their particular needs and priorities (9, 14, 15). In  
72 this context, a broader approach is needed to measure EOHC.

73           While the limited evidence suggests that measuring equity in care settings is feasible through  
74 patient experience surveys (16), there are few options for measuring PEOC that use an intersectional  
75 perspective (8). Intersectionality offers a perspective for understanding how multiple forms of social  
76 inequity interact, and interrelate to produce relative advantage or disadvantage (17, 18). We have used  
77 an intersectional lens to highlight how inequities are experienced, typically, on the basis of inter-related,  
78 co-constituted factors and conditions -- and not solely on the basis of any one particular category,  
79 variable or group affiliation. For example, patients may perceive (or even anticipate) being inadequately  
80 cared for on the basis of being stigmatized as “drug using”, or because they are presumed to be  
81 overusing the system (i.e., if they have sought help multiples times in a short period), or for myriad  
82 intersecting reasons. In the Canadian context, Indigenous peoples are often subject to stigma related to  
83 substance use, regardless of whether or not they use substances; research shows, for example, that  
84 Indigenous people who come to emergency departments (EDs) and present with symptoms such as  
85 unsteady gait or slurred speech are often assumed to be using alcohol or other substances, and treated  
86 as such, when they may be experiencing a stroke or other serious health issues (3, 4, 19, 20). In many  
87 cases, people avoid seeking care, or leave without being seen, because of fear of being negatively  
88 judged or treated in a dismissive manner (4, 21-23). As we have shown in previous research, people who

89 anticipate poor treatment prepare for health care encounters as carefully as they can and engage with  
90 vigilance and distrust, undoubtedly shaping those encounters (4, 11, 24). The aim in efforts to measure  
91 PEOC through an intersectional equity lens is not to determine the veracity of such experiences. Rather,  
92 the aim is to illuminate how indicators of PEOC tend to be experienced as a constellation of inseparable  
93 and intersecting experiences that are tied to issues of power and structural conditions not amenable to  
94 being measured solely on the basis of any one variable or characteristic (such as ethnicity). The purpose  
95 of this paper is to report on research focused on developing and testing measures of PEOC that explicitly  
96 uses a health equity and intersectional lens. Our analysis focuses on two different equity-oriented health  
97 care scales. The first was piloted in a primary health care (PHC) setting, where patients have an ongoing  
98 relationship with providers over time. The second was piloted in an ED, where care is provided on an  
99 episodic basis.

## 100 Background

101 The program of research and knowledge mobilization known as [EQUIP Health Care](#) provided a  
102 foundation for developing and testing the effectiveness of EOHC interventions by first studying how care  
103 in the PHC sector was effectively provided to structurally disadvantaged and marginalized populations  
104 (25, 26). The process included identifying the key dimensions of EOHC, strategies to guide organizations  
105 in implementing those key dimensions (25, 27), and identification of indicators of such care relevant in  
106 PHC settings (28, 29). Guided by a framework articulating the key dimensions of EOHC and 10 strategies  
107 to support implementation, we then developed an organizational-level, multi-component health equity  
108 intervention referred to as *EQUIP Primary Health Care [PHC]*, and tested it in four Canadian PHC settings  
109 (9, 14, 30). Building on the insights from *EQUIP PHC*, we subsequently tailored and modified the  
110 intervention (referred to as *EQUIP Emergency*) to test it in three Canadian EDs (8, 31). As evidence-  
111 based and theoretically informed interventions, *EQUIP PHC* and *EQUIP Emergency* are designed to  
112 enhance organizational capacity to provide EOHC, particularly for people who experience significant

113 health and social inequities. Throughout we have drawn on intersectionality, which emerged from Black  
114 feminist scholarship (8, 17, 32, 33), and complexity theory to draw attention to health care organizations  
115 as complex adaptive systems whose care processes can be tailored and strategically redirected to  
116 meeting the needs of people in varied contexts (34-36). As the EQUIP program of research evolves, we  
117 are continually refining our understanding of key dimensions of EOHC, which provide the basis for the  
118 EQUIP interventions. For the purposes of *EQUIP PHC* and *EQUIP Emergency*, these key dimensions were  
119 defined as including: (i) trauma- and violence-informed care (TVIC): recognizing and limiting the effects  
120 of trauma and violence, including structural violence, on peoples' lives and care experiences; (ii)  
121 culturally-safe care approaches: reducing power imbalances, systemic racism, and discrimination; and  
122 (iii) harm reduction: preventing harms from substance use stigma, and in the process, promoting  
123 opportunities for well-being in the context of substance use (9). In our subsequent research, our team is  
124 explicitly naming our stance toward cultural safety as "antiracism" and integrating the concept of  
125 "Substance Use Health" as a non-stigmatizing approach that encompasses harm reduction. In the  
126 context of the *EQUIP Health Care* research program, Substance Use Health is used as a lens that frames  
127 substance use in relation to a spectrum that encompasses non-use, beneficial uses, occasional risks or  
128 harms, use that has ongoing or understood harms and consequences, and substance use disorders (37).  
129 It encompasses harm reduction to promote health in relation to using substances. Substance Use Health  
130 is increasingly being integrated as an essential component of health equity actions within organizations  
131 and at the point of care (37, 38).

132 PHC settings and EDs are critical contexts within which issues of equity and inequities must be  
133 addressed, particularly in light of ongoing reductions in community-level primary care services in most  
134 jurisdictions in Canada, with concomitant and increasing pressures on EDs to bridge the gaps in care (4,  
135 8, 21, 39). The literature confirms that people who experience significant health and social inequities

136 face the greatest challenges accessing primary care; consequently, people are increasingly accessing  
137 care in EDs for needs that, if resources were available, could be addressed in the PHC sector (3-5, 20,  
138 40-42). For example, in previously published data from *EQUIP Emergency*, we showed that structurally  
139 disadvantaged groups of people were significantly less likely to have regular primary care access, and  
140 significantly more likely to have repeat ED visits, to present to EDs with health issues that were rated as  
141 lower acuity, and to present with chronic health problems (8). Additionally, as discussed by other  
142 researchers, when patients who are structurally disadvantaged (e.g., because they are precariously  
143 housed and/or living on or near the street, and/or have significant substance use issues, or have major  
144 mental health issues) seek care at the ED, the chances of experiencing negative judgements or  
145 stigmatization are high (43-45). Similarly, data from *EQUIP Emergency* showed that structurally  
146 disadvantaged groups of people reported significantly more discrimination in EDs, and rated their care  
147 more poorly than other groups (8).

148         Throughout the EQUIP program of research, our intention has been to invite people to describe  
149 their experiences of care in ways that assess EOHC. In our *EQUIP PHC* research, we mobilized data to  
150 develop the Equity-Oriented Health Care Scale (abbreviated to EHoCS) (14). The EHoCS was developed in  
151 primary care contexts, in which there is an assumption of an ongoing relationship between patients and  
152 the healthcare setting. Subsequently, for the *EQUIP Emergency* study we modified the scale to capture  
153 experiences of care in a single visit. Since care is provided on an episodic basis, this scale is called the  
154 Experiences of Equity during Episodic Health Care Scale (abbreviated to EEE-HC Scale). In this paper we  
155 first describe development of the original scale development for use in the primary care sector. We then  
156 discuss its ongoing adaptation for use in episodic care contexts such as EDs. We conclude with a  
157 discussion of the implications for measuring patient experiences of EOHC from an intersectional  
158 perspective, particularly in settings where patients have episodic contact across the continuum of care.

## 159 **Scale development: Equity-Oriented Health Care Scale (EHoCS) in *EQUIP*** 160 ***Primary Health Care***

161 Drawing on our evolving conceptualization of the key dimensions of EOHC (9, 30), in the *EQUIP*  
162 *PHC* study, we used conventional scale development approaches combined with item response theory  
163 (IRT) to develop and evaluate the psychometric properties of a brief patient self-report measure of  
164 EOHC, called the EHoCS, for use in PHC and other settings where patients have ongoing contact over  
165 time. The EHoCS taps into aspects of EOHC that can be assessed using patients' self-reports. As noted  
166 above, refinements to the key dimensions of EOHC integrating findings from our ongoing research are  
167 published in Browne et al. (2018) and further refinements are underway; however, the conceptual  
168 grounding of the EHoCS remains unchanged.

### 169 **Item generation, pilot testing and item mapping**

170 An initial pool of 52 items was developed to reflect domains of EOHC that align with the key  
171 dimensions, and would be amenable to patient self-report, drawing on existing research and  
172 measurement tools in the area of patient experiences of care and quality of care (28-30, 46). The five  
173 domains identified included: (1) create a welcoming, comfortable milieu (WCM); (2) promote  
174 accessibility and reduce barriers (ARB); (3) tailor care to individual context, history and experience (TIC);  
175 (4) promote emotional safety and trust (EST); and (5) convey a non-discriminatory posture (NDP). Two  
176 core/anchor items were identified for each domain. For each item, patients were asked to rate how  
177 often in the previous 12 months their PHC providers had engaged in an action reflecting EOHC, on a  
178 5-point scale ranging from "never" to "always." Cognitive interviews were conducted with 5 patients in  
179 one PHC setting to assess the clarity and meaning of each item from the patient's perspective and its  
180 adequacy for measuring EOHC using patient self-reports. Based on this process and team analysis, 32  
181 items, organized in 5 domains, were retained for psychometric testing.



182 In *EQUIP PHC*, we tested the EHoCS items with a cohort of patients accessing care in four PHC  
183 clinics in two Canadian provinces over two years (14). As discussed in detail in prior publications, the  
184 cohort included a diverse set of 567 patients from four different PHC clinics mandated to serve people  
185 experiencing major structural disadvantages and marginalization (due to income, geography, education,  
186 racism, ableism, and other forms of stigma and discrimination) (9, 14, 47, 48). The sample was recruited  
187 from patients who had an existing connection with the clinics. We invited patients to comment on their  
188 overall experiences of care involving all staff, versus their impressions of any one particular staff  
189 member, realizing that primary care settings are oriented to providing team-based care.

## 190 Psychometric evaluation of EHoCS

191 Structural validity of the scale was evaluated using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) in MPLUS  
192 (49) to examine the extent to which the items identified within a domain fit with the underlying  
193 construct using Chi Square and 3 fit indices: the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Tucker Lewis Index (TLI)  
194 and Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation (RMSEA). Both CFI and TLI are incremental fit indices  
195 that compare a model with a baseline model (i.e. one with the worst fit); values range from 0 to 1, with  
196 a good fit indicated by values  $\geq .95$  (50), with  $> .90$  acceptable for TLI (51). RMSEA is an absolute fit  
197 index, where a value of 0 equates to an exact fit; values of  $< .05$  are considered *close fit*; between  $.05$   
198 and  $.08$  a *fair fit*; between  $.08$  and  $.10$  is *mediocre fit*; and  $> .10$  a *poor fit*. Fit and modification indices  
199 were inspected to determine whether the model fit could be improved.

200 With 32 items in the model arranged in 5 domains, the Chi-square test for the overall model was  
201 significant (see Table 1). Given our commitment to retain those domains around which the scale is  
202 organized, we then ran separate CFAs using the items in each domain to better understand how they  
203 were contributing to the latent construct, and to potentially identify items that could be deleted. For  
204 each scale, using the modification indices, and considering theory and redundancy between items, we  
205 identified 8 items for deletion (at least one from each domain), resulting in 24 items remaining. Results

206 of a new CFA conducted with these 24 items (organized into the same 5 domains) revealed substantially  
207 improved model fit and supported a good fit between the 5-domain structure of the scale and the item  
208 pool. Within each domain, item factor loadings ranged from .47 to .91. Thus, scores for each domain and  
209 for the overall scale were computed by summing applicable items and dividing by the number of items  
210 on the scale (range 0-4), where higher scores reflect more positive perceptions of EOHC.

211 **Table 1. Fit indices for CFA of the EHoCS**

Model Tested	Fit Statistics			
	<i>Chi Square</i>	<i>CFI</i> <sup>1</sup>	<i>TLI</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>RMSEA</i> <sup>3</sup>
Step 1: 32 items in 5 domains	1964.75*	.881	.870	.08
Step 2: 24 items in 5 domains	749.85*	.934	.932	.06

212

213 Notes: CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; RMSEA = Root Mean Squared Error of  
214 Approximation; \* =  $p < .05$

215 Internal consistency was .92 for the overall scale and .65 to .82 for each domain. However, three  
216 of the 5 domains (ARB, EST, TIC) overlapped more than expected (correlations .92-.96), suggesting that  
217 redundancy remained. For practical uses, the scale was also still quite long (i.e. 24 items). Further, the  
218 distribution of scores was highly skewed with limited variability. Ceiling effects are commonly observed  
219 in patient self-report measures focused on satisfaction with care or quality of care (52). Ceiling effects  
220 occur because many patients rate providers at the top levels possibly because of respect or social  
221 desirability, and are problematic because they tend to disguise important differences in experiences of  
222 care, including when care is sub-optimal and in need of improvement. Thus, while these analyses  
223 supported the validity and reliability of the EHoCS based on conventional psychometric testing, we  
224 recognized that a different approach was needed to further simplify the scale and improve its ability to  
225 capture variation in perceptions of EOHC in order to be useful in research, quality improvement, or  
226 decision-making contexts.

## 227 Improving scale precision and discrimination using IRT

228 To address these issues, we drew on IRT to further reduce the length of the scale while  
229 improving its ability to discriminate between different levels of EOHC (from lowest/least ideal to  
230 highest/most ideal). As an alternative to traditional psychometric testing, IRT is ideally suited to address  
231 issues of redundancy, precision and discrimination. IRT begins from an assumption that items measure a  
232 single domain, but are of varying levels of difficulty (rather than assuming similar difficulty of items as is  
233 the case in classical measurement theory) (53). Here, low difficulty items would be those that providers  
234 do very frequently, while high difficulty items are those behaviors that providers are less likely to do.

235 Using the 24 items retained after the CFA, we used an iterative process to compare the item  
236 characteristic curves generated for each item and IRT parameters in order to select a brief pool of items  
237 that would reflect the range of difficulty across each of the 5 domains (analyses were conducted in  
238 STATA 16.0). In making decisions about which items to retain or delete, we privileged the 2 items from  
239 each scale that had been identified as core items. Results of the IRT analysis for the final 12 items in the  
240 scale are shown in Table 2, with items organized in descending order from least to most difficult. This  
241 item pool includes 9 out of 10 core items and 3 additional items, with ten positively-worded and 2  
242 negatively-worded items. The final scale is shown in Table 2.

243 **Table 2. Item difficulty and rates of item endorsement by participants in IRT analysis**

In the past 12 months, how often did the health care providers here*:	Difficulty	% Endorsed
How often have you felt discriminated against by staff here, including health care providers, receptionists and others?	-1.71	88%
Have a negative attitude toward people using services because of mental health concerns?	-1.61	84%
How often did staff here treat you with courtesy and respect?	-1.12	79%
Try to make you feel as comfortable as possible?	-1.03	81%
How often did the staff here welcome you when you came for care?	-0.95	73%
Encourage you to come and see them or call when you need to?	-0.71	71%

<b>Seem open to talking about sensitive issues, for example, grief, mental health problems, substance use, or abuse experiences?</b>	-0.45	63%
<b>Help you to work on any barriers you have accessing health care (e.g., costs of medication or services, problems with transportation or childcare, problems getting a referral, etc.)?</b>	-0.14	54%
<b>Give you health advice that is suitable for your everyday life?</b>	-0.03	51%
<b>Try to help you to get services that are not offered here (such as social assistance, disability benefits, housing, or parenting support)?</b>	0.21	44%
<b>Ask you about who is important in your life?</b>	0.69	28%
<b>Ask about basic resources that affect your health, such as food, clothing, or shelter?</b>	0.76	27%

244 \*Instructions: These questions ask about your experiences with staff at this service site in the past 12  
 245 months. By staff, we mean anyone who works here including health care providers, reception staff, and  
 246 others.

247

## 248 Format and scoring of the 12-item EHoCS

249 The EHoCS is comprised of 12 items that reflect 5 domains of EOHC. Respondents are asked to  
 250 rate, in the previous 12 months, the extent to which their interactions with health care staff were  
 251 equity-oriented on a 5-point scale ranging from never (0) to always (4). The EHoCS total score is a count  
 252 of the number of items rated by patients as “always” occurring (for 10 positively worded items) and  
 253 “never” occurring (for 2 negatively worded items), with a range of 0 to 12. Scores on the EHoCS provide  
 254 an index of the degree or level of EOHC, from lower to higher. Total scores correlated with measures of  
 255 overall quality of care ( $r = .602$ ) and fit of care with needs ( $r = .599$ ), providing evidence of concurrent  
 256 validity.

257 In the *EQUIP PHC* study, as previously published (14), patients completed structured interviews,  
 258 which included the EHoCS and other self-reported health outcome and quality of life scales, at 4 time  
 259 points (baseline, 12, 18, and 24 months later). As discussed in the prior publication, using path analysis  
 260 techniques, analysis with the EHoCS showed that providing more EOHC predicted improvements in  
 261 important patient health outcomes 18 months later, supporting predictive validity of the EHoCs. These

262 findings suggest that the EHoCS may be useful in measuring the possible benefits of interventions to  
263 enhance EOHC in PHC settings or in monitoring care delivery as part of Continuous Quality Improvement  
264 (CQI).

## 265 **Scale adaption and development of the Experiences of Equity during** 266 **Episodic Health Care scale in *EQUIP Emergency***

267 The construct of EOHC underpinning *EQUIP PHC*, and *EQUIP Emergency*, and the theoretical  
268 approach underlying these studies were consistent (21, 31). Thus, we considered that many of the items  
269 in the EHoCs would be relevant to measuring patient’s self-reported experiences of care. However,  
270 given the different relationship that patients have in relation to accessing care in two different  
271 healthcare contexts -- PHC and EDs -- the response options and time frame needed to be adapted to  
272 reflect their experiences during a single, episodic visit.

## 273 **Item generation, testing and mapping**

274 Using the EHoCS developed for the PHC context, our research team members, who had worked  
275 with the theoretical underpinnings of EOHC for decades (including those with expertise in emergency  
276 care) adapted the items to suit the episodic care setting. Each EHoCS item was reviewed through the  
277 lens of emergency and episodic care. The team also worked with clinical practice leads at two ED sites to  
278 confirm whether the items would work in an episodic context. Two items eliminated from the EHoCS in  
279 the development of the EEE-HC Scale were “ask about basic resources that affect your health” and  
280 “have a negative attitude toward people using services because of mental health concerns”. The former  
281 was judged to be beyond the scope of usual episodic and ED practice, and the latter was too specific,  
282 with discrimination in general being a broader issue, and captured by item #4. A comparison of the  
283 EHoCS and EEE-HC items shows how, for the episodic context, we broadened from primary care specific  
284 issues. We also simplified and streamlined the questions. A review by diverse stakeholders suggested  
285 that using a 5-point scale would require a level of discernment not easily made during an episodic, and

286 often brief, health care encounter; consequently, we changed the response option to a simple yes/no.  
287 Ten adapted items were used with the binary response option for our initial testing in *EQUIP Emergency*,  
288 as shown in Table 3.

289 **Table 3. Original Experiences of Equity during Episodic Health Care (EEE-HC) Scale items**

<b>During this visit, did staff:</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>1.</b> make you feel welcome?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>2.</b> try to make you as comfortable as possible?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>3.</b> treat you with courtesy and respect?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>4.</b> discriminate against you?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>5.</b> seem open to talking about what is important to you?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>6.</b> learn enough about you to give useful advice?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>7.</b> give you advice that is suitable for you?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>8.</b> learn about problems you might have getting services (e.g., costs, transportation, getting a referral, etc.)?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>9.</b> try to help you get services you need?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>10.</b> encourage you to return if you need to?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

290  
291 In the context of *EQUIP Emergency*, and embedded in the larger patient survey, we tested these  
292 10 items at one of our three hospital sites, Surrey Memorial Hospital (SMH), during a wave of patient  
293 surveys (8, 21, 31). Recruitment for the larger *EQUIP Emergency* study began on November 28, 2017  
294 and ended on November 12, 2020. Informed consent was documented on signed consent forms for all  
295 participants.

296 SMH is the largest ED in the Canadian province of British Columbia, and serves diverse suburban  
297 communities, including high proportions of newcomers and refugees, with many who speak a language  
298 other than Canada’s two official languages, English or French, at home (54, 55). In Canada, “newcomers”  
299 is used as a preferred term to indicate people who were not born in Canada; this includes people  
300 classified by the Canadian federal government as immigrants or refugees (56). The hospital also serves a  
301 large urban Indigenous population of 16,300 people, including those who self-identify as First Nations,  
302 Métis or Inuit (57). Due to COVID-19 pandemic restrictions and mandated requirements to halt data  
303 collection, it was not possible to administer the EEE-HC Scale at the two other ED sites involved in the  
304 *EQUIP Emergency* study.

305 Surveys were conducted with 284 patients, during which they were asked about their  
306 experiences of receiving care during their visit to the ED. Research Assistants, trained in equity-oriented  
307 approaches including strategies for working respectfully with people who experience significant  
308 inequities (and are thus often not included in research), conducted the surveys and gathered patients’  
309 feedback on the clarity, meaning and response options to the items. The recruitment efforts resulted in  
310 a sample that was diverse, and was generally representative of the populations served by SMH. This  
311 included representation from people over 65, Indigenous people, people experiencing precarious  
312 housing, people born outside of Canada, and people who found it difficult to live on their income (Table  
313 4). The entire sample is described more fully elsewhere (8).

314 **Table 4. Demographic characteristics of patients completing the EEE-HC Scale (N=284)**  
315

Variable	n (%) of <i>EQUIP Emergency</i> Sample
Age	Range: 18 – 96, Mean: 48.97, SD: 18.529
<b>Age 65 and over</b>	
Under 65	217 (77.2)
Over 65	64 (22.8)

<b>Gender</b>	
Woman	147 (51.9)
Man	135 (47.7)
Non-binary	1 (0.4)
<b>Education</b>	
Didn't complete secondary school / high school	44 (15.7)
Completed secondary school / high school	54 (19.3)
Some or completed post-secondary	182 (65.0)
<b>Born in Canada</b>	
No	137 (48.4)
Yes	146 (51.6)
<b>First language English</b>	
No	116 (42.3)
Yes	158 (57.7)
<b>Speaks English</b>	
Does not currently speak English	15 (5.3)
Currently speaks English	269 (94.7)
<b>Indigenous</b>	
Non-Indigenous	259 (91.5)
Indigenous	24 (8.5)
<b>Living situation</b>	
Precarious housing	12 (4.2)
Stable housing	272 (95.8)
<b>Accessed a shelter in the past year</b>	
No	278 (97.9)
Yes	6 (2.1)
<b>Primary work status</b>	
Employed FT or PT	138 (48.8)
Unemployed	62 (21.9)
Retired	67 (23.7)
Other (includes seasonal, exchange services or student)	16 (5.7)
<b>Receiving social assistance</b>	
Not receiving	268 (94.4)
Receiving	16 (5.6)
<b>Receiving disability benefits</b>	
Not receiving	235 (82.7)
Receiving	49 (17.3)
<b>Difficulty living on income</b>	
Very difficult	47 (16.7)
Somewhat difficult	94 (33.5)
Not very difficult	62 (22.1)
Not at all difficult	78 (27.8)
<b>Experience any discrimination in everyday life</b>	
No	105 (37.0)



Yes	179 (63.0)
<b>Overall health</b>	
Poor	47 (16.6)
Fair	64 (22.6)
Good	96 (33.9)
Very good	46 (16.3)
Excellent	26 (9.2)
<b>ED visits in the last 6 months</b>	Range: 1 – 180, Mean: 2.93, SD: 11.273
One visit	793 (48.7)
More than one visit	834 (51.3)
<b>Have usual primary care home</b>	
No	159 (58.7)
Yes	112 (41.3)

316

317           The sample collected at SMH included 48.4% of respondents reporting they were not born in  
318 Canada, and 42.3% of respondents reporting a first language other than English. In addition, 50.2% of  
319 the respondents reported at least somewhat or very difficult financial strain as measured by the  
320 Financial Strain Index (Table 4) (58). Consistent with research that indicates that patients in Canadian  
321 healthcare settings tend to rate ED care favorably, overall (8, 40, 59), ratings of quality of care in our  
322 sample were high, with an average of 8.11 (SD 2.14) on a scale of 0-10, as measured by an item from the  
323 British Columbia Emergency Department Patient Experiences of Care scale (8, 21, 31, 60). As reported  
324 elsewhere, in an effort to understand experiences of care in a more nuanced way, and in light of  
325 deepening health care inequities in Canada (20, 61, 62), the larger *EQUIP Emergency* survey also sought  
326 to understand patients' experiences of discrimination, both in their everyday life and during their ED  
327 visit (8, 21, 31). In the study sample, using the Everyday Discrimination Scale (63), 63% reported  
328 experiencing some form of discrimination in their everyday lives, however, on a scale of 0 – 45, the  
329 mean was relatively low at 8.36 (SD 9.421). Similar to trends seen in the larger study, structurally  
330 disadvantaged groups of people reported significantly more discrimination in the SMH ED.

### 331 Pyschometrics: EEE-HC Scale

332 The EEE-HC Scale items reflected the key dimensions of EOHC as discussed above. Patients were  
333 asked during their visit whether their interactions with health care staff were equity-oriented, using a  
334 binary response scale: yes (1) or no (0). The EEE-HC total score is a count of the number of items rated  
335 by patients as “yes” (1) for all items except “discriminated against you” which received 1 point in the  
336 count for “no” responses, with a range of 0 to 9. Scores on the EEE-HC Scale provide an index of the  
337 degree or level of episodic EOHC, from lower to higher.

338 IRT with a two-parameter (difficulty and discrimination) model was used to examine the item  
339 characteristics of the 10-items in the EEE-HC Scale. To test concurrent validity of the EEE-HC Scale,  
340 correlations of the total EEE-HC score and quality of care and t-tests of differences in EEE-HC total scores  
341 by individual characteristics (age, gender, financial situation, identity as Indigenous or non-Indigenous,  
342 and employment status) were conducted. All analyses were conducted in STATA 15.0.

343 In the IRT analysis of the 10 items of the EEE-HC Scale, one item (“Encourage you to return, if  
344 you need to”) had a discrimination score of 0.99. Discrimination scores close to 1.0 indicate that the  
345 item does not differentiate between people with varying degrees of the underlying concept. This item’s  
346 poor discrimination is likely related to the fact that the item does not apply to all people in the context  
347 of care provided in EDs, and so was dropped and the 2-parameter model was re-estimated. Table 5  
348 shows the nine-item EEE-HC Scale, and provides the final model with difficulty, discrimination, and  
349 percent of people endorsing each item. As difficulty scores for items decrease, more participants  
350 responded “yes” with respect to that item.

351 **Table 5. Item difficulty and discrimination parameters from the IRT model and frequency each item**  
352 **was endorsed**

	Difficulty	% Responding Yes
1. discriminate against you?	-1.79	8.8%

2. treat you with courtesy and respect?	-1.44	93.3%
3. make you feel welcome?	-1.43	89.9%
4. try to make you as comfortable as possible?	-1.09	81.9%
5. give you advice that is suitable for you?	-0.96	80.7%
6. seem open to talking about what is important to you?	-0.81	77.3%
7. learn enough about you to give useful advice?	-0.81	76.1%
8. try to help you get services you need?	-0.69	68.1%
9. learn about problems you might have getting services (e.g., costs, transportation, getting a referral, etc.)?	0.45	39.1%

353  
 354 Total scores on the EEE-HC Scale ranged from 0 to 9, with a median of 7.5. Cronbach’s alpha for  
 355 the 9 items was 0.82. Evidence of concurrent validity, based on a high correlation with quality of care  
 356 was strong ( $r=0.61$ ). Table 6 summarizes the differences in EEE-HC scores by participant characteristics.  
 357 Greater financial strain was associated with lower EEE-HC scores. Those with lower EEE-HC scores were  
 358 more likely to identify as Indigenous, to have a recent shelter stay, have English as their first language  
 359 and be unemployed. Scores did not vary by age or gender. The lower scores among people who have  
 360 English as their first language can be explained, in part, by research showing that newcomers whose first  
 361 language is not English tend to rate their satisfaction with care quite highly, reflecting appreciation for  
 362 access to care that may be much less accessible in their countries of origin (64-67). The lower EEE-HC  
 363 scores experienced by Indigenous peoples are not surprising in the Canadian context, and reflect  
 364 ongoing research demonstrating the extent to which high proportions of Indigenous people face  
 365 multiple forms of discrimination and stigma when accessing health care, impacting their experience of  
 366 care (3, 4, 6, 55, 68).

367 **Table 6. Differences in EEE-HC total score by participant characteristics**

	Mean (SD)	p-value
<b>Living situation</b>		
Precarious	6.00 (2.93)	.141
Stable	7.02 (2.21)	

<b>Financial Strain</b>		
At least somewhat difficult	6.66 (2.44)	.028
Not very/not at all difficult	7.28 (1.99)	
<b>Age</b>		
Under 65	6.92 (2.28)	.614
65 or older	7.10 (2.16)	
<b>Gender</b>		
Female	7.00 (2.11)	.911
Male	6.97 (2.38)	
<b>First Language</b>		
Not English	7.29 (1.94)	.044
English	6.70 (2.45)	
<b>Indigenous</b>		
No	7.14 (2.06)	<.001
Yes	5.10 (3.22)	
<b>Shelter in Last 6 months</b>		
No	7.02 (2.20)	.029
Yes	5.00 (3.35)	
<b>Employment</b>		
Employed	7.05 (2.16)	.034
Unemployed	6.37 (2.72)	
Retired	7.45 (1.86)	

368

369 Respondents with a first language other than English had significantly higher EEE-HC scores  
370 compared to those who had English as their first language spoken (Table 6). The context of SMH is such  
371 that it serves a high proportion of newcomers and people with a mother tongue other than English  
372 (49.4%), relative to other regions in the province (69). Research shows that once newcomers are able to  
373 access care, they tend to rate their care received in Canada highly and report high levels of trust in their  
374 providers (64-67). Thus, this pattern of higher EEE-HC scores among people with a first language other  
375 than English aligns with published literature illustrating overall high ratings of care among newcomer  
376 groups, for many of whom English is not their first language (55, 69).

## 377 Discussion & implications for both scales

378 We have systematically used an equity lens to study people's experiences of care, and from that  
379 identified the key dimensions of EOHC, and derived items to measure experiences that align with those

380 key dimensions (9, 14). Consequently, we have developed two scales, one for use in settings where the  
381 care relationship is ongoing, such as primary care, and another for use in settings where care is episodic,  
382 such as EDs or walk-in clinics.

383         There continue to be strong calls to integrate attention to equity in health care provision, and  
384 emerging evidence of positive impacts for patients, providers and organizations. However, without  
385 access to brief and reliable ways of measuring whether equity-enhancing innovations have intended  
386 impacts, and for whom, organizations will continue to face significant challenges justifying and funding  
387 such initiatives. Both the EHoCs and EEE-HC Scale are brief, easy-to-administer patient self-report scales  
388 that can support organizations to effectively monitor quality of care using an intersectional equity lens.  
389 Embedding such scales in CQI processes, and tracking responses over time, may support, shift or expand  
390 the ways in which quality of care is conceptualized, enhanced, defined and measured. For example, in a  
391 recent CQI initiative at a primary care clinic serving women experiencing major social disadvantages and  
392 marginalization, items from the EHoCs were used to tap into women’s perspectives regarding the quality  
393 of care received (70). The analysis of women’s responses was particularly useful in highlighting those  
394 aspects of care that women rated most highly (e.g., promoting emotional safety and trust), and helping  
395 clinicians identify domains of EOHC they seemed to excel in supporting, and those aspects of care  
396 needing further improvement. While the EHoCS was developed for use in PHC care settings, it may be  
397 appropriate in settings where care is provided by individual providers, for example, physicians or nurse  
398 practitioners, where the goal is to provide care over time with a roster of patients.

399         Given that the items in both scales focus on experiences of care in varied settings, we have also  
400 explored the use of these measures beyond health care services. For example, in a study assessing the  
401 addition of TVIC as a key dimension of EOHC in educational contexts, we added relevant items from the  
402 EHoCs to the Attitudes Related to Trauma Informed Care Scale (ARTIC), a pre-existing scale assessing  
403 trauma-informed practice (71, 72). Indeed, as found in a recent scoping review (73), a key limitation of

404 measures to assess EOHC concepts, such as TVIC, is that they rarely include items focused on stigma,  
405 racism and discrimination as structural or systemic influences on care experiences. We therefore  
406 encourage the testing and use of the EHoCS and the EEE-HC Scale as measures of EOHC beyond health  
407 care settings.

408 In view of ongoing claw-backs in Canadian primary care sectors (and in other international  
409 jurisdictions), diminishing opportunities for care based on a continuing relationship with a primary care  
410 provider or agency, and increasing shifts toward episodic health care delivery, the availability of both  
411 scales makes it possible to measure EOHC in a wide range of contexts. These ways of describing PEOC  
412 will be important for research, for quality improvement and monitoring, and potentially, for informing  
413 ongoing health care reforms. Both scales have the capacity to shed light on experiences of care using an  
414 intersectional lens – providing a more nuanced understanding of EOHC -- versus focusing on a single  
415 dimension. Use of these scales can be helpful in highlighting how peoples’ intersecting social locations  
416 impact their experiences of care. For example, the EEE-HC Scale allowed us to examine those aspects of  
417 care that people valued most highly in EDs (8). Bringing a health equity lens to analyses of PEOC is  
418 especially important to inform strategies and recommendations to enhance care. Further testing will  
419 enable ongoing refinements to both scales, and provide important insights regarding their acceptability,  
420 feasibility, reliability and validation in diverse settings.

## 421 **Acknowledgements**

422 We extend our gratitude to the many patients, staff and organizations with whom we have collaborated  
423 on research in the primary health care and emergency department sectors. Thank you to Cheyanne  
424 Stones for working so ably with our research teams. Nadine Wathen was supported by a SSHRC (Tier 1)  
425 Canada Research Chair.

## 426 References

- 427 1. Mate K. On the quintuple aim: Why expand beyond the triple aim? 2022 [Available from:  
428 [http://www.ihl.org/communities/blogs/on-the-quintuple-aim-why-expand-beyond-the-triple-](http://www.ihl.org/communities/blogs/on-the-quintuple-aim-why-expand-beyond-the-triple-aim)  
429 [aim](http://www.ihl.org/communities/blogs/on-the-quintuple-aim-why-expand-beyond-the-triple-aim).  
430 2. Nundy S, Cooper LA, Mate KS. The quintuple aim for health care improvement: A new  
431 imperative to advance health equity. JAMA. 2022;327(6):521-2.  
432 3. McLane P, Bill L, Barnabe C. First Nations members' emergency department experiences in  
433 Alberta: A qualitative study. CJEM. 2021;23(1):63-74.  
434 4. Browne AJ, Smye VL, Rodney P, Tang SY, Mussell B, O'Neil JD. Access to primary care from the  
435 perspective of Aboriginal patients at an urban emergency department. Qual Health Res.  
436 2011;21(3):333-48.  
437 5. Gilmer C, Buccieri K. Homeless patients associate clinician bias with suboptimal care for mental  
438 illness, addictions, and chronic pain. J Prim Care Community Health.  
439 2020;11:2150132720910289-.  
440 6. McLane P, Barnabe C, Mackey L, Bill L, Rittenbach K, Holroyd BR, et al. First Nations status and  
441 emergency department triage scores in Alberta: A retrospective cohort study. Can Med Assoc J.  
442 2022;17(194):E37-45.  
443 7. Ford-Gilboe M, Varcoe C, Scott-Storey K, Perrin N, Wuest J, Wathen CN, et al. Longitudinal  
444 impacts of an online safety and health intervention for women experiencing intimate partner  
445 violence: Randomized controlled trial. BMC Public Health. 2020;20(1):1-17.  
446 8. Varcoe C, Browne AJ, Bungay V, Perrin N, Wilson E, Wathen CN, et al. Through an equity lens:  
447 Illuminating the relationships among social inequities, stigma and discrimination, and patient  
448 experiences of emergency health care. Int J Health Serv. 2022;52(2):246-60.

- 449 9. Browne AJ, Varcoe C, Ford-Gilboe M, Wathen CN, Smye V, Jackson BE, et al. Disruption as  
450 opportunity: Impacts of an organizational health equity intervention in primary care clinics. *Int J*  
451 *Equity Health*. 2018;17(1):154.
- 452 10. Shariff-Marco S, Breen N, Landrine H, Reeve BB, Krieger N, Gee GC, et al. Measuring everyday  
453 racial/ethnic discrimination in health surveys. *Du Bois Rev*. 2011;8(1):159-77.
- 454 11. Browne AJ, Varcoe C, Wong ST, Smye VL, Khan KB. Can ethnicity data collected at an  
455 organizational level be useful in addressing health and healthcare inequities? *Ethn Health*.  
456 2013;19(2):240-54.
- 457 12. Moreno MR, Sherrets B, Roberts DJ, Azar K. Health equity and quantifying the patient  
458 experience: A case study. *Patient Exp J*. 2021;8(2):94-9.
- 459 13. Agniel D, Martino SC, Burkhart Q, Hambarsoomian K, Orr N, Beckett MK, et al. Incentivizing  
460 excellent care to at-risk groups with a health equity summary score. *J Gen Intern Med*.  
461 2021;36(7):1847-57.
- 462 14. Ford-Gilboe M, Wathen CN, Varcoe C, Herbert C, Jackson BE, Lavoie JG, et al. How equity-  
463 oriented health care affects health: Key mechanisms and implications for primary health care  
464 practice and policy. *Milbank Q*. 2018;96(4):635-71.
- 465 15. Browne AJ, Varcoe C. Taking action at the organizational level: Creating a context for  
466 implementing trauma- and violence-informed care in health care and other sectors. In: Wathen  
467 C, Varcoe C, editors. *Implementing trauma- and violence-informed care: A handbook for health*  
468 *& social services*: University of Toronto Press; 2022. p. TBA.
- 469 16. Chiu H, Batara N, Stenstrom R, Carley L, Jones C, Cuthbertson L, et al. Feasibility of using  
470 emergency department patient experience surveys as a proxy for equity of care. *Patient Exp J*.  
471 2014;1(2):78-86.



- 472 17. Patricia Hill Collins. Intersectionality as critical social theory. Durham, NC: Duke University Press;  
473 2019.
- 474 18. Collins PH. Black feminist thought: 30th anniversary edition: Knowledge, consciousness, and the  
475 politics of empowerment: Routledge; 2022.
- 476 19. McCallum MJL, Perry A. Structures of indifference: An Indigenous life and death in a Canadian  
477 city. Winnipeg, MB: University of Manitoba Press; 2018.
- 478 20. Public Health Agency of Canada. Addressing stigma: Towards a more inclusive health system.  
479 The Chief Public Health Officer's report on the state of public health in Canada. 2019. Report  
480 No.: 6139572991.
- 481 21. Varcoe C, Browne AJ, Perrin N, Wilson E, Bungay V, Byres D, et al. EQUIP emergency: Can  
482 interventions to reduce racism, discrimination and stigma in EDs improve outcomes? BMC  
483 Health Serv Res. 2022;22(1):1113.
- 484 22. Browne AJ, Lavoie JG, McCallum MJL, Canoe CB. Addressing anti-Indigenous racism in Canadian  
485 health systems: Multi-tiered approaches are required. Canadian journal of public health = Revue  
486 canadienne de sante publique. 2022;113(2):222-6.
- 487 23. Greenwood M. An open invitation to address anti-Indigenous systemic racism. Lancet.  
488 2021;397(10293):2458-9.
- 489 24. Varcoe C, Browne AJ, Wong ST, Smye VL. Harms and benefits: Collecting ethnicity data in a  
490 clinical context. Soc Sci Med. 2009;68(9):1659-66.
- 491 25. Browne AJ, Varcoe C, Wong S, Littlejohn D, Smye VL, Lavoie J, et al. Closing the health equity  
492 gap: Evidence-based strategies for primary healthcare organizations. Int J Equity Health.  
493 2012;11(15).
- 494 26. Browne AJ, Varcoe C, Fridkin A. Addressing trauma, violence and pain: Research on health  
495 services for women at the intersections of history and economics. In: Hankivsky O, editor. Health

- 496 Inequities in Canada: Intersectional Frameworks and Practices. Vancouver: UBC Press; 2011. p.  
497 295-311.
- 498 27. Browne AJ, Varcoe C, Lavoie J, Smye V, Wong S, Krause M, et al. Enhancing health care equity  
499 with Indigenous populations: Evidence-based strategies from an ethnographic study. BMC  
500 Health Serv Res. 2016;16(544):1-17.
- 501 28. Wong S, Browne AJ, Varcoe C, Lavoie J, Fridkin A, Smye VL, et al. Development of Health Equity  
502 Indicators in Primary Health Care Organizations Using a modified Delphi. PLoS ONE. 2014.
- 503 29. Wong ST, Browne AJ, Varcoe C, Lavoie JG, Smye VL, Godwin O, et al. Enhancing measurement of  
504 primary health care indicators using an equity lens: An ethnographic study. Int J Equity Health.  
505 2011;10(38).
- 506 30. Browne AJ, Varcoe C, Ford-Gilboe M, Wathen CN, on behalf of the EQUIP Research Team. EQUIP  
507 Healthcare: An overview of a multi-component intervention to enhance equity-oriented care in  
508 primary health care settings. Int J Equity Health. 2015;14(152).
- 509 31. Varcoe C, Bungay V, Browne AJ, Wilson E, Wathen CN, Kolar K, et al. EQUIP Emergency: Study  
510 protocol for an organizational intervention to promote equity in health care. BMC Health Serv  
511 Res. 2019;19(1):687.
- 512 32. Brewer RM. Theorizing race, class and gender: The new scholarship of Black feminist  
513 intellectuals and Black women's labour. In: James SM, Busia APA, editors. Theorizing black  
514 feminisms: The visionary pragmatism for Black women. London: Routledge; 1993. p. 13-30.
- 515 33. Crenshaw KW. Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against  
516 women of color. In: Fineman MA, Mykitiuk R, editors. The Public Nature of Private Violence.  
517 New York: Routledge; 1994. p. 93-118.
- 518 34. Hawe P. Lessons from complex interventions to improve health. Annu Rev Public Health.  
519 2015;36(1):307-23.

- 520 35. Patton MQ. Developmental evaluation: Applying complexity concepts to enhance innovation  
521 and use. New York, NY: Guilford Press; 2011.
- 522 36. Greenhalgh T, Papoutsi C. Studying complexity in health services research: desperately seeking  
523 an overdue paradigm shift. BMC Med. 2018;16(1):95.
- 524 37. Community Addictions Peer Support Association. Understanding Substance Use Health: A  
525 matter of equity 2021 [Available from: [https://capsa.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/CAPSA-](https://capsa.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/CAPSA-Substance-Use-Health-EN-1.pdf)  
526 [Substance-Use-Health-EN-1.pdf](https://capsa.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/CAPSA-Substance-Use-Health-EN-1.pdf).
- 527 38. EQUIP Health Care. Substance Use Health 2022 [Available from:  
528 <https://equiphealthcare.ca/resources/equity-essentials/substance-use-health/>.
- 529 39. Emergency Department (ED) Visits: Volumes and Median Length of Stay by Triage Level, Visit  
530 Disposition, and Main Problem [Internet]. Canadian Institute for Health Information. 2014.  
531 Available from: <http://apps.cihi.ca/MicroStrategy/asp/Main.aspx>.
- 532 40. Purkey E, Davison C, MacKenzie M, Beckett T, Korpala D, Soucie K, et al. Experience of emergency  
533 department use among persons with a history of adverse childhood experiences. BMC Health  
534 Serv Res. 2020;20(1):455-.
- 535 41. National Collaborating Centre for Indigenous Health. Access to health services as a social  
536 determinant of First nations, Inuit and Métis health Prince George, BC: National Collaborating  
537 Centre for Aboriginal Health; 2019 [Available from:  
538 <https://www.nccih.ca/docs/determinants/FS-AccessHealthServicesSDOH-2019-EN.pdf>.
- 539 42. Shah TI, Clark AF, Seabrook JA, Sibbald S, Gilliland JA. Geographic accessibility to primary care  
540 providers: Comparing rural and urban areas in Southwestern Ontario. Can Geogr. 2020;64(1):65-  
541 78.

- 542 43. Glynn BA, Brulé M, Kenny SL, Khoo E-L, Shergill Y, Smyth CE, et al. Understanding the high  
543 frequency use of the emergency department for patients with chronic pain: A mixed-methods  
544 study. *J Healthc Qual.* 2019;41(4):195-211.
- 545 44. Vermeir E, Jackson LA, Marshall EG. Barriers to primary and emergency healthcare for trans  
546 adults. *Culture, Health & Sexuality.* 2018;20(2):232-46.
- 547 45. Wise-harris D, Pauly D, Kahan D, Tan De Bibiana J, Hwang SW, Stergiopoulos V. "Hospital was  
548 the only option": Experiences of frequent emergency department users in mental health. *Adm  
549 Policy Ment Health.* 2017;44(3):405-12.
- 550 46. Haggerty JL. Measurement of primary healthcare attributes from the patient perspective.  
551 *Healthc Policy.* 2011;7:13-20.
- 552 47. Varcoe C, Browne AJ. Integrating understanding of structural and systemic violence into trauma-  
553 and violence-informed care. . In: Wathen N, Varcoe C, editors. *Implementing trauma- and  
554 violence-informed care: A handbook for health and social services* Toronto, ON: University of  
555 Toronto Press; 2023. p. 25-38.
- 556 48. Hansen H, Metz J. Structural competency in the U.S. healthcare crisis: Putting social and policy  
557 interventions into clinical practice. *Journal of Bioethical Inquiry.* 2016;13(2):179-83.
- 558 49. Muthén LK, Muthén BO. *Mplus user's guide: Statistical analysis with latent variables: User's  
559 guide.* Los Angeles: Muthén and Muthén; 2006.
- 560 50. Hu Lt, Bentler PM. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional  
561 criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal.*  
562 1999;6(1):1-55.
- 563 51. Bentler PM, Bonett DG. Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance  
564 structures. *Psychol Bull.* 1980;88(3):588-606.

- 565 52. Salman AA, Kopp BJ, Thomas JE, Ring D, Fatehi A. What are the priming and ceiling effects of one  
566 experience measure on another? *J Patient Exp.* 2020;7(6):1755-9.
- 567 53. Furqan A, Akhtar R, Alam M, Ahmed RA. Comparing Item Response Theory assessment with  
568 Classical Measurement Theory in the setting of medical education for the evaluation of clinical  
569 competency and goals achievement. *The professional medical journal.*27(3):448-54.
- 570 54. Thomas K, Browne AJ, Jiao S, Dooner C, Wright P, Slemmon A, et al. Media framing of emergency  
571 departments: A call to action for nurses and other health care providers. *BMC Nursing*  
572 [Internet]. 2021 2021/07/04; 20(1):[118 p.]. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-021-00606-2)  
573 [021-00606-2](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-021-00606-2).
- 574 55. Statistics Canada. While English and French are still the main languages spoken in Canada, the  
575 country's linguistic diversity continues to grow. Ottawa, ON; 2022.
- 576 56. Statistics Canada. Canada's ethnocultural mosaic, 2006 census: Definitions Ottawa, ON2010  
577 [Available from: [https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2006/as-sa/97-562/note-](https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2006/as-sa/97-562/note-eng.cfm)  
578 [eng.cfm](https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2006/as-sa/97-562/note-eng.cfm).
- 579 57. Surrey Urban Indigenous Leadership Committee. Finding our way home: Research on Indigenous  
580 Homelessness in Surrey. 2022.
- 581 58. Ali J, Avison WR. Employment transitions and psychological distress: the contrasting experiences  
582 of single and married mothers. *J Health Soc Behav.* 1997;38(4):345-62.
- 583 59. Fleury M-J, Grenier G, Farand L. Satisfaction with emergency departments and other mental  
584 health services among patients with mental disorders. *Healthc Policy.* 2019;14(3):43-54.
- 585 60. Population Data BC. Patient centered measurement data - the emergency department 2018  
586 survey 2019 [Available from: <https://www.popdata.bc.ca/data/health/pcm/EDS-2018>.
- 587 61. Public Health Agency of C. From Risk to Resilience: An Equity Approach to Covid-19. The Chief  
588 Public Health Officer's report on the state of public health in Canada. 2020.

- 589 62. Public Health Agency of Canada. A vision to transform Canada's public health system: The Chief  
590 of Public Health Officer's Report on the state of public health in Canada. Ottawa, ON; 2021.
- 591 63. Williams DR, Yu Y, Jackson JS, Anderson NB. Racial differences in physical and mental health:  
592 Socioeconomic status, stress, and discrimination. *J Health Psychol.* 1997;2(3):335-51.
- 593 64. Carter N, Carroll S, Aljbour R, Nair K, Wahoush O. Adult newcomers' perceptions of access to  
594 care and differences in health systems after relocation from Syria. *Conflict and Health.*  
595 2022;16(1):28.
- 596 65. Zghal A, El-Masri M, McMurphy S, Pfaff K. Exploring the impact of health care provider cultural  
597 competence on new immigrant health-related quality of life: A cross-sectional study of Canadian  
598 newcomers. *J Transcult Nurs.* 2021;32(5):508-17.
- 599 66. Lee T-Y, Landy CK, Wahoush O, Khanlou N, Liu Y-C, Li C-C. A descriptive phenomenology study of  
600 newcomers' experience of maternity care services: Chinese women's perspectives. *BMC Health*  
601 *Serv Res.* 2014;14(1):114.
- 602 67. Whitley R, Wang J, Fleury MJ, Liu A, Caron J. Mental health status, health care utilisation, and  
603 service satisfaction among immigrants in Montreal: An epidemiological comparison. *Can J*  
604 *Psychiatry.* 2017;62(8):570-9.
- 605 68. McLane P, Barnabe C, Holroyd BR, Colquhoun A, Bill L, Fitzpatrick KM, et al. First Nations  
606 emergency care in Alberta: descriptive results of a retrospective cohort study. *BMC Health Serv*  
607 *Res.* 2021;21(1):1-13.
- 608 69. Statistics Canada. Census profile. Ottawa; 2022.
- 609 70. Prodan-Bhalla N, Browne AJ. Exploring women's health care experiences through an equity lens:  
610 Findings from a community clinic serving marginalised women. *J Clin Nurs.* 2019;28(19-20):3459-  
611 69.

- 612 71. Rodger S, Bird R, Hibbert K, Johnson AM, Specht J, Wathen CN. Initial teacher education and  
613 trauma and violence informed care in the classroom: Preliminary results from an online teacher  
614 education course. *Psychology in the Schools*. 2020;57(12):1798-814.
- 615 72. Baker CN, Brown SM, Wilcox PD, Overstreet S, Arora P. Development and psychometric  
616 evaluation of the Attitudes Related to Trauma-Informed Care (ARTIC) scale. *School Mental  
617 Health*. 2016;8(1):61-76.
- 618 73. Wathen CN, Schmitt B, MacGregor JCD. Measuring trauma- (and violence-) informed care: A  
619 scoping review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*. 2023;24(1):261-77.
- 620