SURAIYA SYED MOHAMED
INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH
BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH,
MoH, MALAYSIA

SUSTAINABILITY OF COMBI AS

COMMUNITY
BASED
INTERVENTION
IN DENGUE
CONTROL

Introduction
Research Q's
Methodology
Key Findings

Challenges
Lesson Learned
Recommendations

RESEARCH HIGHLIGHT

Methodology for planning sustained actions in communication and social mobilization (Lloyd LS 2006)

COMBI

Social
Communication
+
Social Mobilization

Changes in behavior!

COMBI was expanded to all other states in Malaysia. As of 31 Dec 2010 - 1,625 locality implemented COMBI in Malaysia (MoH)

COMBI was piloted in JB, Johore, Malaysia (2001).

This pilot project was basically successful in behaviour change in dengue control.

Pilot project in Johor (Mohd Raili et al. 2004) Pilot project in Selangor (S Rozhan et al.2006) Expansion of COMBI as a community-based

intervention in dengue control is proven to be effective i.e. shortterm success but the sustainability of **COMBI** in longterm remains an issue

Factors that determine the success and failure of COMBI in a locality.

Challenges in sustaining COMBI and the solution to overcome these challenges.

Research Questions

Conceptual Framework

Study Designs & Population

Study Sites & Samples Recruitment

Instruments & Analysis

Methodology

Conceptual
Framework (US Agency
for International Development
1988).

Sustainability maintenance of
activities and results
after external
financing and support
has been withdrawn

Five integrated actions in COMBI which comprises of advocacy, social mobilization, publicity, interpersonal communication and point-of service promotion

Assessing sustainability are clustered into 3 key categories;

 maintenance of health benefits from the initial project
 continued delivery of community activities
 long term capacity building in the community

Conceptual Framework

(Shediac-Rizkallah_& Bone 1998)

Mix-method designs (Qualitative and Quantitative)

IDIs - coordinators & chairmen FGDs- members (committees and promoters) FFIs -community

Study Designs & Population

STUDY sites STATE Tmn Malihah II Sarawak Kg Bako Johore **Pasir Gudang** Kg. Melayu Majidee **Kg.Kandis Bachok** Kelantan Kg.Baru Nelayan **Tumpat Penang** Kg. Binjai Kg. Baru Sg. Ara Selangor **Tmn Setia Klang** Sg.Ramal Dalam Negeri Tmn Tunku Jaafar Sembilan **Tmn Enstek**

Study Sites

10 COMBI coordinators

14 COMBI chairmen

13 sessions of FGDs

N=489 FFIs

Samples Recruitment

interview guide based on themes -IDIs and FGDs was facilitated by computer software package, NVivo version 8.0.

Semi-structured

Set of questionnaire

– FFIs responses
were analyzed
using SPSS version
19.0.

Instruments & Analysis

COMBI has succeeded in increasing the communities

 knowledge on dengue and skills on source reduction activities

Key Findings:
Health Benefits

COMBI have succeeded in controlling dengue

DF incidences were decreased after implementing COMBI and much easier task to control dengue outbreak in the localities

Key Findings: Health Benefits

Communities had an indifferent attitude about eliminating Aedes breeding sites.

Some are conscious about eliminating Aedes sites but the majority is not.

Key Findings: Health Benefits

Majority of the communities are not active partners in the control actions control efforts.

They had transferred the responsibility to the health sector, local council and COMBI members while a small minority of the communities taking responsibilities of their own health.

Challenges

Publicity on large scale at local localities was only at initial stage and recently when COMBI was reactivated.

Smaller scale publicity was still carried out in active localities after the discontinuation of financial support from health department.

Key Findings: Publicity

Gotong-royong was widely used compared to COMBI.

Printed materials
(banner) which is
more visible were
able to assist
members in carrying
out COMBI activities
as the community
was informed in
advanced

Key Findings: Publicity

Community activities (family day, recreational, sports, competition) that involve the whole family and provide refreshments.

In few localities, involvement from political assembly man was also able to attract the community.

Key Findings:
Publicity Attractions

Discontinuation of COMBI publicity were perceived by the members as discontinuation of COMBI activities.

Thus, the community is no longer concerned about dengue and this might affect source reduction activities.

Challenges

Active localities source reduction at
community levels is
still being conducted
and even garnered
cooperation from the
community.

Inactive localities source reduction
activities are rarely
conducted due to the
lack of participation.

Key Findings:
Source Reduction
Activities in DF control

Challenges

In most of the communities perceived gotong-royong as the responsibilities

of health
department and
local authorities

Therefore, certain areas are neglected such as no man's land and public areas

Key Findings: Monitoring Activities

House visits,
giving feedback
during meetings and
handing reports on
COMBI activities to
health department or
local council

COMBI members and chairmen felt that the monitoring activities should be the responsibilities of the coordinator

Key Findings: Monitoring Activities

Inactive localities there were
coordinators that
rarely go to the
community and join
community activities

Active localities - one PHA to one locality was assigned to monitor closely the COMBI activities by the community.

1 PHA 1 COMBI

Coordinator should monitored COMBI activities assisted by members and should avoid causing difficulty to the communities.

Continuous involvement of coordinator is important in getting the support from the communities

Challenges

Key Findings:
Community Leaders

COMBI chairmen were committed and self-empowered but lack the skills to empower the community.

Obstacles that refrain COMBI chairmen from being active - migration, holding various portfolios, opposing political views and feeling unappreciated.

Key Findings : Coordinators Leadership Coordinator - interest and liking in community work resulted in committed and less committed coordinators, which could be associated with active and

coordinators, which could be associated with active and inactive localities and the sustainability of COMBI in those localities.

Leaders did not manage the concept of 'bottom-up community participation'.

Hindrance to the sustainability of COMBI - Changes in administration which referring to health department and political structure in the community

Challenges

Key Findings:
Members
Participation

Active localities - they were empowered; identify problem, analyze situations, planning, implementing and assessing activities.

Applied strategic comm & beh. change approach Inactive localities - they were very much dependent on the MoH instructions for actions which reflected lack of empowerment.

Key Findings:
Communities
Participation

Active localities
which were mostly
suburban, the
communities'
involvements were
better because of

their bonding with COMBI members and felt obliged to participate. The communities were cooperative and had showed interest in source reduction

Inactive localities
which were mostly
urban, the majority of
the communities
were not
corporative, difficult
to accept change
and have no interest
in the subject

Key Findings:
Communities
Participation

Some communities were relatively easy to work with, while others were more difficult

Informants viewed dengue as a disease of interest but only when there were cases in the community

Challenges

In the active locality, the multi-level commitment was very much higher compared to the non-active locality.

However, commitment from corporate agencies were lacking and need to be explored.

Challenges:
Advocacy /Multilevel
Commitment

Lesson Learned: Training Proper training on COMBI - skills on mobilizing the community at all stages is extremely important and also

should be conducted from time to time because of the turnover among the coordinators, chairmen and members.

Lesson Learned: Leadership Efforts led by "program champions" have substantial prospects for initial success, but shared authority and responsibility among

several or many offer better prospects for long-term success (Elder J. 2005).

Apprentices among members should be appointed in order to sustain the continuity of COMBI

Lesson Learned: Publicity

Publicity on COMBI should be emphasized and creatively inserted through community program, which could be more meaningful and should be led by community leaders with good communication skills. It is conceivable that the regular repetition of COMBI message and publicity is necessary to 'keep the flame alive' in the community_(Rozhan 2006).

Monitoring activities by the members and coordinators must meet a mutual understanding and agreed upon by both parties. Continuous monitoring is extremely important to achieve sustainability.

Lesson Learned:
Monitoring

Lesson Learned: Partnerships

Community need to be involved actively in dengue control and to strengthen partnerships between the community, health staff especially Vector **Control Unit and Health Education Unit** who involved directly in COMBI, others government agencies and corporate bodies.

Dengue and COMBI education should be continuous and early education is substantial

Committed and dedicated leaders, updated knowledge and skills, continuous publicity on COMBI and designated budget are important to sustain COMBI.

Recommendation from Informants

Recommendation from Informants

Recognition is important as identification to COMBI members and make them proud hence motivate them and others to join COMBI.

Priority services in medical, icon or spokesperson for COMBI, study visits, top ratings for outstanding COMBI members.

Members should be trained on participatory methods. This includes self-funding and built networking with other agencies.

Strengthen COMMUNITY skills

Recommendation from Research Team

Capacity to plan, administer, implement and monitor at all levels. Experience in behavioural change, communication and social mobilization.

Strengthen STAFF skills

Recommendation from Research Team

1. Absence of early and active planning

- 2. Many programs see their funds withdrawn before activities have reached full fruition
- 3. Programs that were abruptly or inappropriately terminated

Points to ponder

(Goodman & Steckler, 1987/88)