



LUND UNIVERSITY

Prioritization and resource allocation in health care. The views of older people receiving continuous public care and service.

Werntoft, Elisabet; Rahm Hallberg, Ingalill; Edberg, Anna-Karin

Published in:
Health Expectations

DOI:
[10.1111/j.1369-7625.2006.00426.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1369-7625.2006.00426.x)

2007

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Werntoft, E., Rahm Hallberg, I., & Edberg, A.-K. (2007). Prioritization and resource allocation in health care. The views of older people receiving continuous public care and service. *Health Expectations*, 10(2), 117-128.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1369-7625.2006.00426.x>

Total number of authors:
3

General rights

Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117
221 00 Lund
+46 46-222 00 00



LUND UNIVERSITY
Faculty of Medicine

LU:*research*

Institutional Repository of Lund University

This is an author produced version of a paper published in Health expectations. This paper has been peer-reviewed but does not include the final publisher proof-corrections or journal pagination.

Citation for the published paper:

Werntoft, Elisabet and Hallberg, Ingall R and
Edberg, Anna-Karin.

"Prioritization and resource allocation in health care.
The views of older people receiving continuous
Public care and service"

Health expectations, 2007, Vol: 10, Issue: 2, pp. 117-28.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1369-7625.2006.00426.x>

Access to the published version may
require journal subscription.

Published with permission from: Blackwell Science

Prioritization and resource allocation in health care. The views of older people receiving continuous public care and service

Werntoft, Elisabet¹, RNT, doctoral student, Hallberg, Ingalill R^{1,2}, RNT, PhD, Professor, & Edberg, Anna-Karin^{1,2}, RN, PhD, Assoc Prof

¹Department of Health Sciences, Division of Nursing, Lund University, Sweden

²The Vardal Institute, Lund University, Sweden

Corresponding author:

Elisabet Werntoft

Department of Health Sciences

Lund University

P.O. Box 157

Se-221 00 Lund, Sweden

Tel: +46-46-2221840

Email: elisabet.werntoft@med.lu.se

Fax: +46-46-2221935

ABSTRACT

Objective To describe the views of people, 65 years and over, receiving continuous public care and service, on prioritization and resource allocation in health care, in relation to gender, age, housing, health-related QoL and degree of ADL dependency.

Background How older people receiving continuous public care and service view prioritization and resource allocation in health care is sparsely investigated, although this group most certainly has the experience and also often is the target in discussions concerning prioritization. It is necessary, for democracy and for the development of new models of service delivery, to find out how people receiving long-term care and service view these issues.

Design 146 persons, 34 men (23 %) and 112 women (77 %), aged 66 to 100 years were interviewed face to face, following a structured questionnaire.

Results The respondents thought that the patients' well-being, way of living and family situation should affect prioritization, not age per se. Resource to several health care services were considered to be below required size by a majority of the respondents. The respondents wanted doctors to decide on prioritization at an individual level and wanted higher taxes to finance increasing health care costs. Although the respondents wanted publicly financed health care, a relatively high number of them were willing to pay for treatment.

Conclusions Knowledge of how older people receiving care and service view prioritization and resource allocation has not previously been available, and it seems that their views are in line with the Swedish Parliamentary Priority Commission which suggested that no account should be taken of age when allocating resources within the health care system. The result indicated that the respondents' age, gender and housing, health-related QoL and degree of dependency in ADL had little influence on their views of resource allocation.

Keywords: prioritization, older people, resource allocation, view, public care and service, dependency.

BACKGROUND

Resource allocation and prioritization in health care is not a new issue, but an issue of growing importance since constrained resources have forced policy makers to address it more directly. Reports in the media about individuals who have been denied treatment have played an important role in bringing prioritization into the public domain [1]. Studies concerning prioritization in health care have mainly focused on the opinions of the general public or on older healthy people [2, 3]. As people's views may change when they have experiences of their own, the results of these studies cannot easily be generalised to those older people who receive continuous public care and service. According to Arber and Evandrou [4] the experiences of older people with poor health are sparsely used as expertise in the development of new models of service delivery. It is important to investigate their views as they are the prime care consumers.

Prioritization means “putting first”, implying that something that is important or urgent has priority over what is less important or less urgent. Prioritization thus means opting for one thing and discarding or postponing another. The impact of prioritization will probably increase in the near future since people are living longer, and people aged 65 years and over, now form a much larger share of the population than they did before [5]. Those who use health care services most, for example in a Swedish county, Region Skåne, people aged 85 and over, accounted for 26 % of the contacts with physicians and 45 % of the admissions during 2004 [6]. The debate about age as a criterion for prioritization has been going on for a long time [5, 7, 8], a debate in which older people themselves rarely have been included.

Few health authorities know what values their receivers hold about prioritization in health care since earlier studies have focused mainly on the general public [9-11]. Studies have shown that old age as a criterion was viewed negatively both by younger and middle-aged people as well as by physicians [12, 13]. For instance, Johannesson and Johansson [12]

found that among the 1000 randomly selected adults who were asked about life-saving treatment with regard to age, people were willing to sacrifice five 50-year-olds or thirty-five 70-year-olds to save one 30-year-old person. In that study, the youngest persons were 15 years old, and the mean age was 46.6 (SD 18.5). The view of old age as a lower priority may be related to the relatively young age of the sample of the study. A recent study [14, 15] including older healthy people (n=902, mean age 73, SD 10) showed that the respondents did not want to use age as criterion when making prioritization. Werntoft et al. [15] further showed that most older people (63 %) wanted to pay instead of being on a waiting list for cataract surgery, men and young-old (60–72 years) to a significantly higher degree than women and old-old (78–84 years). Differences in relation to gender and age were found in several items; for example, women responded to a higher degree that most health services needed more resources while men had a more restrained opinion of how to finance health care costs. However, the sample in these studies was healthy and not in need of continuous care and service, and their view was thus based on little or no experience of health care.

Although many people remain fit and independent in ages above 80 years, about 16 % of people aged 65 and over in Sweden receive care and service from the municipality, of whom 54 % are living at home and 46 % are living in special accommodation [16]. It has been shown that people receiving continuous municipal care and service and living in their ordinary home have significantly more hospital admissions than people living in special accommodation [17]. There is thus reason to believe that the experience of prioritization in health care might differ when related to place of living since people receiving continuous public care and service at home also are more frequent visitors to hospitals.

Being dependent on help from others to maintain daily activities has been shown to lead to a lower quality of life (QoL). Hellstrom et al. [18] demonstrated that help with activities of daily living (ADL), from both informal and formal helpers at home, and a higher

number of self-reported diseases predicted low QoL. Another way to focus on how health and disability influence people's life is to measure health-related quality of life (HRQoL). Most of the existing definitions of HRQoL are in line with the WHO definition of health: a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity [19]. Stenzelius et al. [20] found that people who were dependent on help reported significantly lower HRQoL than those who were independent. This was also seen in a study by Thomé et al. [21], where receiving help with activities of daily living from others and high number of complaints was associated with low HRQoL. Thus, HRQoL may be an indicator of severity of dependency as well as of people's physical and mental health situation. Older people's views of prioritization in health care and resource allocation might thus be influenced by aspects such as living conditions, health situation and dependency.

OBJECTIVE

The aim of this study was to describe the views of people, 65 years and over, receiving continuous public care and service, on prioritization and resource allocation in health care, in relation to gender, age, housing, health-related QoL and degree of dependency in ADL.

MATERIAL AND METHOD

The study comprised structured interviews with people aged 65 years and over receiving continuous public care and services who participated in a national, longitudinal, ongoing study, the Swedish National study on Aging and Care (SNAC) [22]. In the care and service part a systematic, longitudinal, individually based collection of data is performed concerning municipal provision of care and services as well as data concerning the older person's functional ability, specific health care problems and living conditions [22].

Setting and participants

The sample consisted of 146 persons, 34 men (23 %) and 112 women (77 %), aged from 66 to 100 years. The mean age of the respondents was 85 years (SD 7), for men 84 years (SD 7) and for women 86 years (SD 7). Fifty-five percent of the respondents were living in special accommodation and 45 % at home (Table 1). The sample was drawn from the care and service part of the GAS study in five municipalities in the southern Sweden. All the participants gave their written informed consent. The inclusion criteria for the current study were that the participants should be 65 years and over, receiving continuous public care and service, not have any cognitive impairment, and be able to understand and speak Swedish. Nurses, working in the municipalities received information about the inclusion criteria and then asked persons whose care and service they were responsible for and who met the inclusion criteria if they would permit an interview in their home. The first author (EW) then contacted them to arrange an appointment. The data were collected during 2 months (year 2003) in two of the municipalities and during 3 months (year 2005) in the other municipalities.

Data collection

A questionnaire was used as an interview guide comprising questions about prioritization and resource allocation, in all 24 questions with fixed response alternatives. In this paper, 21 questions are presented (see tables 2–5). The questions focused on diseases in old age for which there are feasible treatments and diseases related to lifestyle. They were developed from a review of the literature and centred on three ethical principles: *the principle of human dignity*, *the principle of need and solidarity* and *the cost-efficiency principle* [23]. To test the applicability of the questionnaire 54 older persons were asked to participate in a pilot study [24] where the participants' reflections in relation to the questions were tape-recorded. The

results from the pilot study showed that both the construction and content of the questionnaire were well suited for the study group, but revealed a need for questions distinguishing between horizontal (recourse allocation) and vertical (on an individual level) prioritization and about how to finance health care. Questions from previous studies illuminating these aspects were therefore added to the questionnaire [24].

The interview also included questions concerning demographic data, HRQoL and need of help with ADL. To measure HRQoL the Short-Form Health Survey (SF-12) [25] was used. SF-12 is a short form of SF 36 [26] that has shown to be useful as a health status instrument in large community-based studies of older people [27]. The instrument consists of two components: physical component summary (PCS) and mental component summary (MCS). PCS covers questions about Physical Functioning, Role-Physical, Bodily Pain and General Health, while MCS covers questions about Vitality, Social Functioning, Role-Emotional and Mental Health. The score in each component summary is standardised to range from 0 (poorest well-being) to 100 (highest well-being), and no overall score can be calculated [25]. Jakobsson [28] showed, in a Swedish sample of 4278 older people living at home as well as in special accommodation (response rate 51 % of 8500), that the mean value for PCS/MCS in the age group 75–105 years was 37.5/50.3.

To assess dependency, information about personal activities of daily living (PADL) and instrumental activities of daily living (IADL) was collected, six PADL items from Katz's ADL Index [29], bathing, dressing, going to the toilet, transfer, continence and feeding, and four IADL items from Hulter Åsberg and Sonn [30]: cleaning, shopping, transportation, and cooking. Each item is graded 0–1, where 0 indicates no dependency and 1 dependency on help from someone to perform the activity. The summarised score for IADL ranges between 0–5 and for PADL between 0–6 [30]. One additional IADL item, laundry, was also used in accordance with Karlsson et al. [31].

The first author and another registered nurse carried out the interviews, which lasted from 30 to 90 minutes, in the respondents' home or in special accommodation. The interviews were tape recorded and transcribed. The qualitative analysis of the transcribed interviews is reported elsewhere [32].

Analyses

Comparison between groups were made using Chi-square for categorical data. For comparisons the sample was divided into: the young-old, 66–84 years, and the oldest, 85–100 years. The median value was used to divide the groups into high and low PCS and MCS in HRQoL. *A multiple logistic analysis regression* (forward, LR) was carried out with preference for wanting to pay for cataract surgery ('1'). The entered independent variables were HRQoL (PCS and MCS), IADL, PADL, housing, sex and age. For the regression analysis IADL was divided into no/minimal/moderate (0–3) and much/total dependency (>4), while PADL was divided into no/minimal dependency (0–2) and slight to total dependency (>3). Also *a multinomial logistic regression analysis* was performed with the independent variables sex, age groups, housing, HRQoL (MCS and PCS), IADL and PADL as covariates. Different prioritization criteria were dependent variables. Confidence intervals (CI) of 95 % were calculated for the odds ratio (OR). Statistical data analysis was performed with the SPSS, version 11.5.

Ethical considerations

There was a risk that the respondents' willingness to participate in the study would be influenced by the fact that they were in a state of dependence on the nurses asking them to participate. The respondents had however earlier agreed to participate in the GAS study, and the advantage of having information from a well-known person was judged to be more ethical

as this group were vulnerable. The inclusion of people in a rather poor health condition could further be criticised. The value of including people that probably have experienced prioritization, however, made the advantages outweigh the disadvantages. Another ethical issue is related to the discomfort that questions about prioritization can arouse. The questionnaire was however used in a structured interview and the respondents were supported to narrate their thoughts in relation to the questions asked. The choice of this procedure was based on previous reports from the literature [24, 33] indicating a need for the respondents to explain their standpoints in relation to each question to avoid discomfort. Permission for the study was obtained from the research ethics committee of Lund University (LU 650-00).

RESULTS

Prioritization in health care

Eighty percentage of the respondents stated that neither young age nor old age should be a reason for prioritization in health care or for life-saving treatment, though this was stated by fewer of the respondents who were dependent in P-ADL (78 %) than respondents who were not (85 %) ($p=0.018$) though (Table 2). Seventy-five percentage of the oldest responded that old age should not affect prioritization at all, whilst this view was less frequent among the young-old respondents (59 %) ($p=.023$). The multinomial logistic regression analysis showed that young-old age group was associated with the view that being old should affect prioritization decision “much” (OR=4.43; 95 % CI 1.28–15.23 $p=0.018$) with “not at all” as reference. When having to choose between three patients who needed a kidney transplant, the youngest patient was prioritised by 92 % of respondents whilst pain was the strongest criteria for prioritization (65 %) when choosing between patients in need of a new hip joint. People living in special accommodation prioritized pain to larger extent (72 % vs 56 %) while people living at home were more likely to prioritize age to a larger extent (33 % vs 16 %) when

choosing between patients for a new hip joint ($p=0.050$). Respondents with low MCS (74 %) also to a gave higher priority to pain than respondents with high MCS (53 %) ($p=0.030$).

When choosing between patients to have cataract surgery, a healthy 80-year-old patient was prioritised before a younger patient with dementia (64 % vs 13 %) (Table 2). The multinomial logistic regression analysis showed that belonging to the oldest age group was significantly associated with prioritizing a 60-year-old with dementia should have the cataract surgery (OR=3.66; 95 % CI 1.01–13.30 $p=0.048$) with an 80-year-old healthy person as reference.

When choosing between patients for treatment the patient's importance for family support was the strongest criterion (65 %) while the patient's age was the most important factor for 28 % of the respondents (Table 3). When choosing between patients with lifestyle-related or self-inflicted diseases, a patient who was an alcoholic was prioritised for treatment by 6 %, a smoker by 20 %, a woman who had gone through several abortions by 31 % and a football player by 43 % of the respondents (Table 2). The smoker was prioritised by 17 % of the women and 32 % of the men and the football player by the 47 % of the women and 32 % of the men but these differences were not statistically significant..

The two alternatives that most respondents stated should affect prioritization “much” were the severity of the disease (78 %) and the prognoses of the disease (60 %) (Table 4). Women more than men ($p=0.035$) and respondents with high MCS more than respondents with low MCS ($p=0.026$) thought that the prognosis of the disease should affect prioritization. Indicators that the respondents thought should have low impact on prioritization were wealth (91 %), when the disease was self-inflicted (76 %), being in an institution (70 %) and age (67 %) (Table 4).

According to 91 % of the respondents the doctors should decide on prioritization between patients, while 72 % also thought that doctors should decide on resource allocation. Significant differences were seen related to housing, as 68 % of the respondents living at

home wanted the doctors to decide on resource allocation compared with 76 % of the respondents living in special accommodation ($p<0.001$) (Table 3). Significant differences were also seen in relation to HRQoL, with 58 % of the respondents with low PCS wanting the doctors as decision makers in resource allocation compared to 82 % of the respondents with high PCS ($p<0.001$).

Financing the increasing health care costs

Seventy-three percentage of the respondents stated that patients should be effectively treated regardless of the expense, 78 % of the young-old and 62 % of the oldest ($p=0.044$), and only 11 % thought a cheaper but less efficient treatment should be used before a better one. Respondents with high PCS (57 %) more than respondents with low PCS (32 %) thought that if patient have caused the disease themselves they should pay for treatment ($p=0.012$) (Table 5).

The level of resources allocated to psychiatric care were considered to be below that required by 67 % of the respondents, by women (76 %) to a significantly higher extent than by men (41 %) ($p=0.010$). Other services that were felt to be receiving too few resources were health education, according to 60 %, dental service, 59 %, hospital care, 56 %, and end-of-life care by 51 % (Table 4). Sixty-eight percentage of the respondents with low PCS thought that elder care got too little resources compared to 44 % of the respondents with high PCS ($p=0.010$). The only service that the respondents thought received sufficient resources was child care. Health-care administration was considered to have too little resources by 40 % of respondents, fewer men (25 %) than women (44 %) ($p=0.018$) and fewer respondents living at home (31 %) than in special accommodation (49 %) ($p=0.037$).

To finance the increasing health care costs, 8 % of the respondents considered reduction of the public expenses, 4 % higher patient fees and 8 % private health insurance as

alternatives, while increases in general taxes and taxes on alcohol and tobacco were chosen by 35 % and 45 % respectively (Table 6). On the other hand, 48 % of the respondents were willing to pay to avoid being on a waiting list for 18 months in order to have cataract surgery, 58 % of the respondents in the young-old age group and 39 % in the oldest age group ($p=0.027$). The multiple logistic regression showed that factors most significantly associated with willingness-to-pay (WTP) €100 for cataract surgery were belonging to the youngest age group (66–84 years) (OR=2.22; 95 % CI 1.1–4.48 $p=0.020$). Neither gender, housing, high or low PCS and MCS, nor the degree of dependency in PADL or IADL was associated with WTP. Gender and HRQoL had no influence on the view of resource allocation, while the multinomial logistic regression analysis showed that “agreement” with the statement “no more expenditure cuts can be performed in health care” was associated with having much or total dependency in ADL (OR=6.32; 95 % CI 1.52–26.20 $p=0.011$) and with living in special accommodation (OR=3.77; 95 % CI 1.20–11.86 $p=0.023$) with “disagreement” as reference.

DISCUSSION

In this study it was revealed that, according to the respondents, the way a patient should be prioritised depended on the circumstances of the patient rather than on the patient’s age. This is in line with the recommendations of the Swedish Parliamentary Priority Commission, who suggested that no account should be taken of age when allocating resources within the health care system [23]. For example, in this study, pain was seen as a stronger criterion than age and so was health, when physical or mental disability was added to younger age. Dolan and Show [2] found, through focus group interviews, that the general public (aged >18 years) in the UK wished to take account of a number of patient characteristics when allocating donor kidneys such as the patient’s age, being a parent or if the disease was self-inflicted. In this study too, the patient’s importance for family support was taken into account by 65 % of the

respondents and only few respondents gave priority to patients with diseases caused by alcohol or tobacco abuse. It thus seems that the patients' well-being, way of living and also family situation are regarded as being important in prioritization, by younger people in general as well as by older people.

It was clearly stated by participants that the doctor should be the one to decide in priorities. However, significantly fewer of those with a low PCS, who probably have most frequent contact with doctors, wanted the doctors to make decisions on a horizontal level, compared to participants with a high PCS. It might be that they have found that their needs have not been met in contact with doctors.

Willingness to pay for treatment varied by age. In this study, fewer of the oldest compared with the young-old preferred to pay instead of staying on a waiting list to receive treatment. The financial situation of the participants, however, did not differ between the age groups. It could be that older age implies a more restrictive view of spending money than younger age. People born at the beginning of the last century experienced hard times when growing up and raising families, which in turn might influence their WTP [4]. On the other hand, a high proportion of the respondents, in this study as well as in an earlier study [15], were prepared to pay higher taxes to cover health care. This is in some way contradictory as they were also willing to pay directly for treatment. However, a lower proportion of the respondents in this study wanted to pay to avoid a waiting list than in the previously described study [15] including people without continuous care and service (48 % vs 63 %). One reason for this could be that people receiving public care and service are in a worse financial situation than people not receiving this service [34]. Thus, not only older age, but also being in need of care and service influence the WTP for treatment.

The result showed that the respondents wanted more resources allocated to health care. Those having much or total dependency in ADL and those living in special

accommodation, who are probably the most experienced health care consumers, thought that “no more expenditure cuts can be made in health care”. This could be seen in the light of the results of Sundstrom et al. [35], who found that total spending on aged people in Sweden has stagnated, that institutional care is shrinking in both absolute and relative terms, and that public home help for older people in the community is decreasing even more. This is in contrast to the ethical principles of need and solidarity, meaning that most of the resources of care should be given to those who are most in need, devoting special consideration to the needs of the weakest, for example, children, people with dementia, and others who have difficulty in communicating with others [23]. The knowledge of how older people who receive care and service view prioritization and resource allocation has not been available until now, and this knowledge could be a valuable contribution to the debate about prioritization in health care.

Although the sample of this study is unique in that it is rare that older people are asked about their view, the sample may not be entirely representative of older people receiving continuous public care and service in Sweden as people having cognitive impairment and not being able to understand and speak Swedish were not included. Further, the representation of women in this study was slightly higher than in the population receiving municipal care and service in Sweden. When generalizing the findings it is also important to consider the Swedish context of the publicly financed health care.

CONCLUSIONS

Patients’ well-being, way of living and family situation are factors that older people think should be considered in prioritization. Although the respondents wanted publicly financed health care, a relatively high number of them were willing to pay for treatment. Resources allocated to several health services were considered to be below required size, and especially

respondents with low PCS thought that elder care received too little resources, indicating that public home help for older people in the community is insufficient. The result also indicated that the respondents' age, gender and housing had little influence on their views of resource allocation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are most grateful to the older persons for their participation in this study, and to the nurses involved for their support and co-operation with data collection. We are also grateful to Per Nyberg for help with statistical analysis of data, to Alan Crozier for revising the language, and to the Vardal Foundation for Health Care Sciences and Allergy Research no E2003 022/E2005 003, and the Swedish Council for Working Life and Social Research, for financial support.

The Swedish National Study on Aging and Care, SNAC, (www.snac.org) is financially supported by the Ministry of Health and Social Affairs, Sweden, the participating county councils, municipalities and university departments.

REFERENCES

1. Ham C. Priority setting in health care: learning from international experience. *Health Policy* 1997, **42**(1):49-66.
2. Dolan P, Shaw R. A note on a discussion group study of public preferences regarding priorities in the allocation of donor kidneys. *Health Policy* 2004, **68**(1):31-36.
3. Lees A, Scott N, Scott SN, MacDonald S, Campbell C. Deciding how NHS money is spent: a survey of general public and medical views. *Health Expect* 2002, **5**(1):47-54.
4. Arber S, Evandrou M. *Ageing, Independence and the Life Course*. 2nd edition. London: Published with the British Society of Gerontology; 1997.
5. Williams A. The rationing debate. Rationing health care by age: The case for. *BMJ* 1997, **314**:820-825.
6. National Board of Health and Welfare. *Care and Service to the elderly from an economic perspective. (In Swedish: Äldres vård och omsorg ur ett kostnadsperspektiv)*. Stockholm: Socialstyrelsen, 2006.
7. Callahan D. Health care struggle between young and old. *Society* 1991, **28**(6):29-31.
8. Daniels N. *Just health care*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press; 1985.
9. Bowie C, Richardson A, Sykes W. Consulting the public about health service priorities. *BMJ* 1995, **311**(7013):1155-1158.
10. Cookson R, Dolan P. Public views on health care rationing: a group discussion study. *Health Policy* 1999, **49**(1-2):63-74.
11. Rosen P, Karlberg I. Opinions of Swedish citizens, health-care politicians, administrators and doctors on rationing and health-care financing. *Health Expectations* 2002, **5**(2):148-155.
12. Johannesson M, Johansson PO. The economics of ageing: on the attitude of Swedish people to the distribution of health care resources between the young and the old. *Health Policy* 1996, **37**(3):153-161.
13. Ryyanen OP, Myllykangas M, Kinnunen J, Takala J. Doctors' willingness to refer elderly patients for elective surgery. *Family Practice* 1997, **14**(3):216-219.
14. Werntoft E, Hallberg IR, Elmståhl S, Edberg A-K. Older people's views of priorities in health care. *Aging Clinical and Experimental Research* 2005, **17**, 402-411.
15. Werntoft E, Hallberg IR, Elmståhl S, Edberg A-K. Older people's views of how to finance increasing health care costs. *Ageing & Society* 2006, **26**:497-514.

16. Socialstyrelsen. *Health in Sweden – Sweden's Public Health Report*. Stockholm: Socialstyrelsen; 2001.
17. Hallberg IR, Karlsson S, Wedtergren A, Dozet A, Littman T, Elmståhl S, Ekström H, Edberg AK. *Municipal care and care from county council for older people. (In Swedish: Kommunal och regional vård till ålder. En delstudie i SNAC, Rapport 1)*. Lund: Lund University, 2002.
18. Hellstrom Y, Andersson M, Hallberg IR. Quality of life among older people in Sweden receiving help from informal and/or formal helpers at home or in special accommodation. *Health & social care in the community* 2004, **12**(6):504-516.
19. Bowling A. *Measuring health. A review of life measurement scales*. Buckingham: Open University Press; 1998.
20. Stenzelius K, Westergren A, Thorneman G, Hallberg IR. Patterns of health complaints among people 75+ in relation to quality of life and need of help. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics* 2005, **40**(1):85-102.
21. Thome B, Dykes AK, Hallberg IR. Quality of life in old people with and without cancer. *Quality of Life Research* 2004, **13**(6):1067-1080.
22. Jakobsson U, Hallberg IR. Mortality among elderly receiving long-term care: A longitudinal cohort study. *Aging Clinical and Experimental Research* 2006, Accepted.
23. SOU. *Priorities in health care. Ethics, economy, implementation. Final report by The Swedish Parliamentary Priorities Commission. (Vårdens svåra val)*. Stockholm: Socialdepartementet; 1995.
24. Werntoft, E., Edberg, A. K., Rooke, L., Hermeren, G., Elmstahl, S. & Hallberg, I. R. (2005) Older people's views of prioritization in health care. The applicability of an interview study. *J Clin Nurs*, 14 Suppl 2, 64–74.
25. Ware J, Kosinski M, Kelle SD. A 12-Item Short-Form Health Survey: construction of scales and preliminary tests of reliability and validity. *Medical Care* 1996, **34**(3):220-233.
26. Ware JE, Jr., Sherbourne, C, D. The MOS 36 item Short-Form Health Survey (SF 36) Conceptual Framework and Item Selection. *Medical Care* 1992, **30**;6:473-481.
27. Pettit T, Livingston G, Manela M, Kitchen G, Katona C, Bowling A. Validation and normative data of health status measures in older people: the Islington study. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry* 2001, **16**(11):1061-1070.
28. Jakobsson U. Using the 12-item Short Form health survey (SF-12) to measure quality of life among older people. *Accepted for publication in Aging Clinical and Experimental Research*.

29. Katz S, Ford AB, Moskowitz RW, Jackson BA, Jaffe MW. Studies of Illness in the Aged. The Index of ADL: A Standardized Measure of Biological and Psychosocial Function. *Jama* 1963, **185**:914-919.
30. Hulter Åsberg K, Sonn U. The cumulative structure of personal and instrumental ADL. A study of elderly people in a health service district. *Scandinavian journal of Rehabilitation Medicine* 1989, **21**(4):171-177.
31. Karlsson S., Ekström H., Westergren A., Edberg A-K., Elmståhl S., Hallberg IR. *Analysis and development of systems for registration of dependency and care for older people in municipal care. (In Swedish: Analys och utveckling av system för registrering av vårdbehov och vårdinsatser till äldre i kommunal vård och omsorg. In En delstudie i SNAC, Rapport 2)* Lund: Lund University, 2003.
32. Werntoft, E., Hallberg, I. R. & Edberg, A.-K. (2007) Older people's reasoning about age related prioritization in health care. *Nursing Ethics*. Accepted for publication.
33. Ryyanen OP, Myllykangas M, Kinnunen J, Takala J. Attitudes to health care prioritization methods and criteria among nurses, doctors, politicians and the general public. *Social Science & Medicine*, 1999, **49**(11):1529-1539.
34. Szebehely M, Fritzell J, Lundberg O. Funktionshinder och välfärd. In *SOU 2001:56*. Stockholm: Socialdepartementet; 2001.
35. Sundstrom G, Johansson L, Hassing LB. The shifting balance of long-term care in Sweden. *Gerontologist* 2002, **42**(3):350-355.

TABLE 1. Characteristics of the respondents.

	Total	
	%	(n=146)
Gender		
Men	23	(34)
Women	77	(112)
Age		
Mean (SD)	85	(7)
Educational level		
Primary, < 8 year	64	(95)
Secondary, > 8 year	32	(46)
Tertiary, university degree	4	(5)
Marital status		
Married	13	(15)
Widowed	70	(82)
Never married	12	(14)
Divorced	3	(5)
Living situation		
Special accommodation	55	(80)
Ordinary home	45	(66)
Having access to €1500¹		
Yes	64	(45)
No	36	(25)
Economic problem		
Yes	4	(7)
No	96	(67)
SF12 mean		
PCS ²	34	
MCS ³	56	
Katz ADL-index		
P-ADL(0-2 >3)	38/62	
I-ADL(0-3 >4)	32/68	

¹Missing 52 %²Physical component summary³Mental component summary

TABLE 2. Priority settings. The distribution of the older persons' responses. Chi² calculated for differences between groups.

Questions	Total	
	(n)	% (n=146) ¹
Who do you think should be prioritised in health care?²		
Younger patients	8	(11)
Older patients	8	(11)
All age groups	85	(120)
What alternative do you think is most fair?³		
Among people with life-threatening illness, younger patients should have some priority over older people	15	(22)
People should have the same priority with respect to life-saving treatment, unless they are very old	5	(7)
People should have the same priority with respect to life-saving treatment, no matter what their age is	80	(117)
Who should be the one to have a new kidney?		
A 60-year-old woman	92	(112)
A 70-year-old woman	5	(6)
An 80-year-old woman	3	(4)
Who should be the one to have a new hip joint?⁴		
A 60-year-old man with walking difficulties	24	(33)
A 70-year-old man with bad pain	65	(90)
An 80-year-old man using a wheelchair because of his bad hip	11	(16)
Who should be the one to have cataract surgery to improve the eyesight?		
A 60-year-old with dementia	13	(17)
A 70-year-old with coronary disease	23	(29)
An 80-year-old healthy person	64	(83)
Which of the following patients should be first ranked for treatment?		
A patient who smokes, refuses to stop and needs a coronary by-pass operation	20	(25)
A patient who is an alcoholic and needs a liver transplant	6	(7)
A patient who is a football player, injured during training and needs a new knee to be able to continue his sport activity	43	(53)
A patient who because of several abortions is infertile and needs an operation to be able to get pregnant	31	(37)

¹ Missing 0 up to 24

² Significant differences found between respondents with high/low PCS ($p=0.040$)

³ Significant differences found between respondents being independent/dependent in P-ADL ($p=0.018$)

⁴ Significant differences found between respondents with high/low MCS ($p=0.030$) and at ordinary home/ special accommodation ($p=0.050$)

No significant differences were found when comparing independency/dependency in I-ADL, or between age groups.

TABLE 3. Respondents' views on decisions about priorities

Questions	Total	I-ADL	P-ADL	PCS	MCS	Living-Situation	Age
(n)	% (146) ¹	indep/dep	indep/dep	high/low	high/low	home/spec accom	Young-old/ oldest ²
What method or which criterion ought to be used when choosing between patients who should be satisfactorily treated?							
Lottery	3 (4)	<i>p</i> =0.013 0/7	<i>p</i> =0.457 0/6	<i>p</i> =0.048 5/2	<i>p</i> =0.122 2/7	<i>p</i> =0.512 2/5	<i>p</i> =0.303 2/5
The patient's importance in society	3 (4)	3/3	4/3	7/0	3/4	3/3	43
The patient's age	28 (32)	38/15	29/25	34/20	22/36	33/23	35/21
The patient's ability to pay	1 (1)	2/0	0/1	2/0	0/2	2/0	2/0
The patient's importance for family support	65 (75)	57/75	67/65	53/78	73/51	60/69	57/71
Who should make the decisions about prioritization between patients?							
Doctors	91 (130)	<i>p</i> =0.716 91/93	<i>p</i> =0.133 87/94	<i>p</i> =0.170 96/86	<i>p</i> =0.346 90/91	<i>p</i> =0.223 88/94	<i>p</i> =0.353 91
Nurses	0/4 (5)	3/5	8/1	3/5	6/2	2/4	2
Local politicians	1 (1)						0
National politicians	1 (1)					0/1	0
The National Board of Health and Welfare	1 (1)	1/0	2/0	1/2		2/0	2
The public	4 (6)	4/3	4/5	1/8	3/6	8/1	6
Who should make the decisions about prioritization on resource allocation?							
Doctors	72 (99)	<i>p</i> =0.036 74/72	<i>p</i> =0.662 69/74	<i>p</i> <0.001 82/58	<i>p</i> =0.420 70/73	<i>p</i> <0.001 68/76	<i>p</i> =0.068 67
Nurses	5 (7)	6/5	6/5	9/2	6/5	5/6	2
Local politicians	7 (10)	1/15	10/6	3/13	11/5	0/14	12
National politicians	2 (3)	3/2	0/2	3/2	2/3	4/0	2
The National Board of Health and Welfare	7 (9)	10/2	10/5	3/12	9/5	11/2	9
The public	7 (9)	7/5	6/7	0/13	3/10	12/1	9

¹ Missing 0 up to 9² Young-old: 66-84 years and oldest: 85-100 years

TABLE 4. The respondents' view of how different indicators should affect prioritization, and how resources are allocated (n=146).

Indicators	Respondents' evaluation		
	Much %	Little %	Not at all %
The severity of the disease	78	13	9
The prognosis of the disease	60	25	15
The patient is working	36	25	39
The patient is a child	26	29	45
The patient is old	12	21	67
The patient is middle-aged	11	26	63
The disease is self-inflicted	6	18	76
The patient is institutionalised	7	23	70
The patient is well off	3	6	91
Service	Too little %	Enough %	Too much %
Psychiatric care	67	30	3
Health education	60	39	1
Dental service	59	38	3
Elder care	57	43	0
Hospital care	56	41	3
Primary health care	52	46	2
End-of-life care	51	46	3
Drug addict care	44	33	23
Health care information	44	52	4
Health care administration	40	29	31
Child care	30	58	12

TABLE 5. Responses to statements on health care costs. Chi² calculated for differences between groups.

Question (n)	Total % (146)¹
Expensive examinations or treatments for the elderly should not be subsidised by public money	
Agree	10 (15)
No opinion	35 (49)
Disagree	54 (75)
If patients have caused their disease themselves, they should pay for treatment²	
Agree	44 (61)
No opinion	21 (29)
Disagree	35 (49)
Rich people should pay for their treatment	
Agree	32 (46)
No opinion	24 (34)
Disagree	43 (60)
If a disease has an effective treatment, the patient should be treated regardless of the expense³	
Agree	73 (101)
No opinion	20 (28)
Disagree	7 (10)
No more expenditure cuts can be performed in health care	
Agree	59 (82)
No opinion	24 (34)
Disagree	17 (23)
If two types of treatment exist, the cheaper one should be chosen, even if it is less efficient³	
Agree	11 (15)
No opinion	20 (28)
Disagree	69 (97)
Money is spent on unnecessary things in health care	
Agree	41 (57)
No opinion	39 (54)
Disagree	21 (29)

¹ Missing 0 up to 7

² Significant differences found between respondents with high/low PCS ($p=0.012$)

³ Significant differences found between respondents in different age groups ($p=0.044$)

No significant differences were found when comparing independency/dependency in I-ADL and P-ADL, high/low MCS and between living at ord home/spec accom.

TABLE 6. The respondents' willingness to pay. Chi² calculated for differences between groups.

Questions	Total % (n=146)	Age young/old/oldest ¹
If you need cataract surgery to be able to see, what alternative would you choose?		
Be on a waiting list for 18 months	52 (73)	<i>p</i> =0.027 42/61
Pay €100 out of your own pocket and get the surgery at once	48 (67)	58/39
How should the increasing health care costs be financed?²		
Higher taxes in general	35 (33)	<i>p</i> =0.953 34/35
Higher taxes on alcohol and tobacco	45 (43)	47/45
Reduction of the public expenses	8 (8)	4/4
Higher patient fees	4 (4)	9/6
Private health insurance	8 (7)	6/10
Which of the following treatment alternatives ought to be paid from your own pocket?		
More than one alternative could be chosen.		
Cosmetic surgery e.g. nose, breast or scar reduction	78 (117)	
IVF (in vitro fertilisation)	57 (85)	
Pharmaceutical treatment against impotence or obesity	67 (101)	
Dental service	43 (64)	
Industrial health service	27 (41)	
A new hip joint	7 (10)	
Hearing aids	35 (53)	

¹Young-old: 66-84 years; old-old: oldest-old: 85-100 years

No significant differences were found when comparing independency/dependency in I-ADL and P-ADL, high/low PCS and MCS and between living at ord home/spec accom.