

EQUITABLE PROJECT



Richard Vergunst

University of Stellenbosch

25 February 2016

www.equitableproject.org

Full title:

Enabling Universal and Equitable access to health care for vulnerable people in resource poor settings in Africa

A large multi-country study on equitable access to health care for vulnerable populations with a focus on persons with disabilities

- 4 country study
 - Sudan,
 - Malawi,
 - Namibia
 - South Africa

- with 2 European partners (Ireland and Norway)

- South Africa: Despite relative wealth universal and equitable access to health care yet to be attained
- Malawi: Chronic poverty and high disease burden compete for meagre resources
- Namibia: Population is highly dispersed
- Sudan: Large proportion of the population has been displaced

- 4 sites in South Africa:
 - **Gugulethu** – metropolitan/urban and mix of formal and informal housing
 - **Worcester** – small town with a long history of providing services for hearing-impaired and vision-impaired children and adults
 - **Fraserburg** – small Karoo town far from services and surrounded by large farms
 - **Madwaleni** – deep rural area in Eastern Cape near Mthata

5 work packages or phases of work:

- Work package 1: Management of the project
- Work package 2: Analysis of policies
 - extent of mention of vulnerable groups in policy and strategy documents
- Work package 3: Qualitative study
- Work package 4: Quantitative study
- Work package 5: Dissemination of findings

South African EquitAble: Aims and objectives

- Focus on access to primary level of formal public health care
- Considering personal, community, social and policy level factors that influence access to formal public health care
- Reasons for only sometimes or never using public health care in designated facilities
- How do different vulnerability factors affect access? To what extent does disability as a factor influence access relative to other vulnerability factors (e.g. distance from facility, female headed households, etc.)

▶ WORK PACKAGE 2

(Policy Analysis)

Policy analysis: national, regional and international

- ▶ Extent to which vulnerable groups are mentioned in policy and strategy documents
- ▶ Rating:
 - If not mentioned at all = little awareness of needs of vulnerable groups
 - If mentioned but not elaborated = awareness but not addressing specific needs
 - If mentioned and clear implementation suggestions provided = increases chances of issues being addressed on the ground
- ▶ Selected mainly health-related policies
- ▶ Generally found similar results across all countries and regional and international level. Limited mention of vulnerable groups and if mentioned, limited programmatic implications
- ▶ Need to ensure better mention of different vulnerable groups in policies and strategy documents
- ▶ Developed 'Equiframe' = framework for policy analysis related to disability specifically.
- ▶ Available on EquitAble website: www.equitableproject.org

- ▶ Limited Resources
- ▶ Increased Relative Risk For Morbidity
- ▶ Mother Child Mortality
- ▶ Women Headed Household (WHH)
- ▶ Children (With Special Needs)
- ▶ Elderly people
- ▶ Youth
- ▶ Ethnic Minorities
- ▶ Displaced Populations
- ▶ Living Away from Services
- ▶ Suffering from Chronic Illness
- ▶ Disabled persons

▶ WORK PACKAGE 3

(Qualitative Research)

- Qualitative interviews:

- ▶ Purposive sampling and self-identification as disabled.
- ▶ Users, non-users and service providers.
- ▶ Snowballing approach

▶ WORK PACKAGE 4

(Quantitative Research)

Quantitative survey: (2045 households – \pm 500 per site)

- ▶ Asked 8 questions on difficulties
- ▶ A person was counted as 'disabled' if reported by household head as having difficulty (even just 'some difficulty') on 1 or more of the 8 questions; Very inclusive measure of functional status – brings in lots of people who do not identify as disabled.
- ▶ In each household interviewed:
 - One disabled adult or child per household (if there was one)
 - One non-disabled control adult or child in 'disabled' household
 - One randomly selected child or adult in 'non-disabled' households

‘Disabled’ and ‘Non-disabled’ households

		Frequency	%
Gugulethu	non-disabled hh	137	26.4
	disabled hh	382	73.6
	Total	519	100
Worcester	non-disabled hh	117	23.7
	disabled hh	376	76.3
	Total	493	100
Fraserburg	non-disabled hh	283	56.4
	disabled hh	219	43.6
	Total	502	100
Madwaleni	non-disabled hh	161	30.3
	disabled hh	371	69.7
	Total	532	100

Average household size (average people per household):

- ▶ Gugulethu: 2.8 people
- ▶ Worcester: 3.9 people
- ▶ Fraserburg: 4.1 people
- ▶ Madwaleni: 4.2 people

Whether households use the selected facility or not:

	Always	Sometimes	HC + other	Use others	Never use
Gugulethu	37%	57%	< 1%	2.3%	3.3%
Worcester	43%	52%	3%	1.6%	< 1%
Fraserburg	68%	21%	5.4%	4.4%	1.2%
Madwaleni	68%	32%	0%	0%	0%

Reasons for household not using PHC service (%)

	Gugulethu	Worcester	Fraserburg	Madwaleni
Cost	52	38	18	42
No transport	1.5	29	6	9
Not sick enough	9	11	20	9
Waiting times too long	5	9	11	0
Distance from home	1	9	1	6
Type of professional	<1	4	11	1.2
Attitudes of HC worker	24	3	6	1.2
No time to go	4	2	1	6
Old age	1	1	0	8
Disability	0	1	<1	2.3
Opening times not suitable	4	1	3	0
Bad previous experience	2	1	3	0
Gender of health worker	0	1	0	0
Not satisfied with service	2	1	4	0
No services	1	0	5	15
Crime/danger	<1	0	0	2
physical access of clinic	<1	0	0	1.2
Discrimination by H worker	7	0	2	0
language barrier	<1	0	0	0
religious belief	0	0	0	0

Household sources of income (%)

	Wages/ salary	disability grant	Child support grant	OAP	No income	Stable (yes)
Gugulethu	60	11	6	13	4	92
Worcester	61	5	6	13	5	79
Fraserburg	43	9	10	17	2	90
Madwaleni	8	6	25	47	2	83

Needing and receiving health care: Disabled and non-disabled persons

		Years ago	Months ago	Weeks ago	Days ago	Never	DK
Gugulethu	Disabled	16	61	17	4	1	1
	Non-disabled	34	47	11	2	6	<1
Worcester	Disabled	19	43	25	12	<1	<1
	Non-disabled	41	39	14	5	<1	<1
Fraserburg	Disabled	14	29	16	21	20	<1
	Non-disabled	24	39	22	14	1	<1
	Disabled	11	21	12	12	21	2

If needed services, did you receive them? (%)

		Yes	No	Don't remember
Gugulethu	Disabled	95	4	1
	Non-disabled	90	2	7
Worcester	Disabled	96	4	<1
	Non-disabled	96	3	1
Fraserburg	Disabled	82	18	<1
	Non-disabled	91	8	<1
Madwaleni	Disabled	83	16	<1
	Non-disabled	79	21	<1

- **WORK PACKAGE 5**

(Dissemination of findings)

- **Stakeholders meetings** with relevant stakeholders including government, NGOs, academia at local and national levels
- **Presentations** at local, national and international conferences
- **Publications** in reports and journal articles