

# **HIV/AIDS Workload and Staff Motivation in Malawi & Zambia: Comparative Effects of Global HIV/AIDS Initiatives (GHIs)**

## *Baseline Study Findings*

*V. Mwapasa,<sup>1 4</sup> P. Ndubani,<sup>2 4</sup> A. Walsh,<sup>3 4</sup> John Kadzandira,<sup>1 4</sup>  
J. Simbaya,<sup>2 4</sup> R. Brugha<sup>3 4</sup>*

- 1. University of Malawi, College of Medicine, Center for Social Research, Malawi.*
- 2. Frontieres Development and Research Group, Zambia*
- 3. Royal College of Surgeons, Division of Populations Sciences, Ireland*
- 4. Global HIV/AIDS Initiative Research Network ([www.ghinet.org](http://www.ghinet.org))*


*Funding: Alliance for Health Policy and System Research (AHPSR),  
Open Society Institute (OSI), Irish Aid and Danida*

# HIV/AIDS in Zambia & Malawi

- Prevalence in 15-49 yr age group
  - Malawi: 11.8% (*MDHS, 2004*)
  - Zambia: 14.3% (*ZDHS, 2007*)
- External funding for HIV/AIDS
  - Global Fund– Largest funding agency in Malawi (77%)
  - PEPFAR– Largest funding agency in Zambia (62%)
- External HIV/AIDS funding: >100% of total health budget

# Scale-Up of HIV/AIDS Services in Malawi & Zambia

Scale Up of HIV/AIDS Services in Malawi  
(2003-06)



## ■ Scale up of HIV/AIDS Services in Zambia

- HTC (2006 to 2007): **21%** increase from 234,430
- PMTCT (2005 to 2007): **2.3-fold** increase from 72,020
- ART (2005 to 2007): **3.8-fold** increase from 39,351

# Human Resources Status in Malawi & Zambia

- HRH: population ratio (*per 100,000 population*)
  - Doctors: Malawi: 2 versus Zambia: 6
  - Nurses: Malawi: 39 versus Zambia: 52
- Availability of HRH
  - Malawi (*% establishments filled*): Doctors: 36%, nurses: 56%,
  - Zambia (*% of requirements*): Doctors: 28%, nurses: 36%
- Average salaries for nurses (*per month*)
  - Malawi: US\$175 versus Zambia: US\$300

# Study Objectives

## ■ Broad

- Assess and compare the effects of increased HIV funding and scale-up of HIV services on human resources for health [HRH] (clinicians, nurses & community health workers) in Malawi and Zambia

## ■ Specific outcomes: Effects on

- rural/urban HRH distribution
- workload
- incentives
- HRH job satisfaction

# Methodology: Study Countries



# Methodology

**Study period:** Dec 2006 to Mar 2007

## Study Sites

Malawi: 51 health facilities (~90% govt)

- Central Hospitals (n=3)
- Mission Referral Hospital (n=1)
- District hospitals (n=7)
- Sub-district facilities (n=40)

Zambia: 39 health facilities (~90% govt)

- 3 districts (2 urban, 1 rural)
- Govt-owned (35), Mission-owned & community based facilities (4)

## Interviews + surveys


- Officers in-charge of health facilities
- Heads of sections (including HR)
- HIV service Coordinators
- Providers of HIV & non-HIV services

## Health Facility record Review

- Inpatient, outpatient stats

# Results: *HRH distribution & trends*

- In Malawi & Zambia HR worse in rural > urban health centres
  - % of health facilities in Malawi: with **no clinician**: 21.0%, **no nurse** 26.3% (n=19)
- Malawi & Zambia experienced a **modest** increase in health workers from 2006 to 2007. However, in Malawi clinicians and nurses **perceived** a decrease in numbers



# Results: *HRH Workload & Incentives*

- Staff experienced increase in **workload**
  - In **Malawi 82- 94%** HIV service providers delivered non-HIV services vs. **60-75% in Zambia**
  - Increase in service outputs outweighed increase in HRH numbers
- In both countries: no shift of staff between non-HIV & HIV programmes
- Lower proportion received **extra financial incentives** to provide HIV services in Malawi (7-11%) than in Zambia (21-55%)
- % of HIV service providers engaging in **income generating activities** outside work similar in Malawi & Zambia (31-38% vs 25-43%, respectively)
- In Malawi, increase in workload created an opportunity for health workers to earn extra income through “locums” – **except in rural facilities**

# Results: *Job Satisfaction*

- **Job satisfaction (JS)** was slightly higher for HIV service providers in Malawi (50-80%) than in Zambia (51-60%).
- Job satisfaction dependent on level of h/facility & type of HIV programme
  - District level JS higher than health centre level
  - ART & HTC programmes higher than PMTCT
  - Reasons:
    - **training opportunities: per diems & time off-work/night duty**
    - **perceived impact of the intervention on patient quality of care**
- Reasons for poor satisfaction
  - **lack of resources to do their job (e.g HIV test kits!!)**
  - Workload
  - Poor incentives and salary

# Discussion / Conclusions (1)

- Modest increase in health worker availability
  - Early evidence that the comprehensive donor-supported HRH programme is having positive results (In Malawi partly funded by GFATM)
- Rural health facilities still under-served in term of poor HRH numbers & staff incentives → will limit scale-up of scale-up of HIV/AIDS services
  - Resource-poor countries need innovative ways of attracting and maintaining HRH in rural areas
- Increased workload but fairly good job satisfaction
  - Integrated health care delivery promoted team work in difficult working environment --> **redistribution of workload**
  - Improved patient outcomes promoted staff morale
  - However, further increase in workload without HRH increase → compromise quality of HIV or non-HIV services.

# Discussion / Conclusions (2)

- **“Locums”** may be a feasible way of increasing HRH remuneration without upsetting other non-health public workers
  - May maximize HRH output & prevent HWs from engaging in non-health IGAs
  - However, it may result in staff burn-out, needs good management to avoid escalating health expenditure
- Need to devise innovative **“on-the-job” & integrated training** to avoid long staff absences during training
  - per diems (currently ~US\$10-20) per day need to be maintained in the absence of massive improvements in remuneration packages to maintain staff morale
- African public sector health workers are rising to the challenge and **“coping – just about !”**. They need more support and better incentives