EURASIAN EXPERIMENT JOURNAL OF MEDICINE AND MEDICAL SCIENCES (EEJMMS) ISSN: 2992-4103
©EEJMMS Publications Volume 5 Issue 2 2024

The Impact of Public Health Interventions on Health Behaviors

Mukamana Sandra Gisele

School of Applied Health Sciences Kampala International University Uganda

ABSTRACT

Public health interventions are critical instruments for enhancing population health, avoiding disease, and encouraging beneficial health behaviors. These treatments range from individual-focused educational programs to large-scale policy measures that address environmental and systemic health determinants. Theories such as the Health Belief Model and Social Cognitive Theory give frameworks for understanding and predicting the behavioral changes that result from these interventions. Evidence from a variety of initiatives, including immunization campaigns, smoking cessation strategies, and digital health innovations, demonstrates the success of these approaches in changing health behaviors. However, obstacles such as political opposition, budget allocation, and societal stigmatization restrict the success of these efforts. This study examines the theoretical basis, effectiveness, and limitations of public health interventions, as well as future research opportunities, with a focus on digital health and interdisciplinary methods.

Keywords: Public health interventions, Health behaviors, Health Belief Model, Social Cognitive Theory, Behavior change, Policy interventions.

INTRODUCTION

Public health interventions can be either small or large-scale. These interventions aim to increase the health of the population, prevent diseases, and improve the quality of life. This requires more than just new or better healthcare services. Many of the interventions focus on changes in the environment of people rather than attempting to change individual health behaviors. From an epidemiological perspective, public health policies can be seen as interventions, and if they have had the desired effect, this should also be detectable in population-level health behaviors. Therefore, there has been a strong interest in studying mass interventions, including public health interventions, by looking at changes in health behavior that have happened over relatively short periods [1, 2]. The typical public health interventions include a mix of perspectives on how behavior change can happen. Since the focus of the interventions is on individuals, there are usually some people working on education, such as school teachers. The interventions also likely require support and technical help from community groups and local organizations. Sometimes these interventions also seek to change the public policy environment. The same intervention often will require some or all of the following: healthcare providers and employers give out or make people take health literature; public organizations develop and promote safety standards and regulations; restaurants and schools develop meal standards and stop selling or promoting some types of foods; direct service providers provide more or cheaper screening. Each of the interventions or supports listed above plays a role in behavior change for a community. The following definition of public health demonstrates the importance of including these types of approaches [3, 4].

Theoretical Frameworks in Public Health Interventions

Public health interventions are generally predicated on one or more theoretical frameworks. These theories propose that a change in cognitions or environment will result in a behavior change. A key assumption made by these theories is that cognitions, especially those relating to disease and actions that can be taken to prevent morbidity and early mortality, directly influence behavior. Various psychological theories are used by public health researchers to help explain and predict health behaviors. For example, the Health Belief Model, Social Cognitive Theory, and the Theory of Planned Behavior, to name just a few, are important. Furthermore, the Health Belief Model serves public health well in suggesting ways to remove any related barriers to behavior change. The tenet of knowledge does not influence action is

common in public health [5, 4]. The Health Belief Model is generally the theoretical framework that is the mainstay of many health interventions in public health. The Health Belief Model, along with social cognitive theory, guides the development and implementation of interventions. Interventions in public health are designed so that such a theory will predict behavior. If health researchers hypothesize that receiving an invitation from a physician to receive a flu vaccine will please the participants, then the intervention of a personal invitation will be implemented. Behavioral theories that direct public health interventions have predictive validity in that the interventions have been decided to motivate behavior change in large populations of people irrespective of race, sex, religion, socioeconomic status, or sexuality. These behavioral theories, according to the evidence, can be effective in all sorts of environments, including city, rural, college, or clinical settings. The evidence suggests that some behavioral theories are capable of molding an individual to change certain demographic variables [6, 7].

Evidence-Based Public Health Interventions and Their Effectiveness

Public health interventions to change health behaviors are effective. A population-level public health intervention utilizes social and environmental approaches for reducing health risk and promoting health. Vaccine programs, many regulatory health policies, systems of care, various types of mass media campaigns, and other health education outreach programs are evidence-based. The gold standard used in public health today is to develop a new health intervention with evidence that comes from research and to use evidence gained through evaluation of its effectiveness to guide future planning. There are currently hundreds of health impact evaluations that provide baseline data for interventions or important knowledge about public health practices in communities [8, 9]. The evidence that various interventions are effective is accumulating, and evaluations continue to provide direction to project stakeholders on how to shape policies and allocate funding in future projects. We do have evaluations of public health interventions that show they are effective in changing behaviors. State or local public health agencies might consider or are currently establishing local ordinances or regulations to affect behaviors for healthier communities, such as smoke-free ordinances or safe injection zone policies. The Changing Body Composition community-based health program is effective with the medically vulnerable populations identified in this diabetes prevention program. Mobile health applications in health care are accepted, and patients are compliant [4, 10]. The effectiveness of novel intervention research projects is in progress to aid populations with physical activity guidelines and those who use nutritional supplements. It is important to draw upon evaluation data and self-reflection to create more effective practices and policies. Technology innovations include a mobile cell phone with software for diabetes management, focused website resources for physical activity, and supplemental nutritional materials provided in a wellness center of a community hospital, among other projects. By addressing research in health interventions to practice change, we target new regions where efforts need to go to create policies that are better for the population's health. There is more work to be done in using effective practices and in conducting translation research that uses evaluation results or case study results to impact practice. Public policies can change community health behaviors through regulatory, legal, policy, or legislative means. The public health interventions that work is listed and discussed within this text. The practical examples discussed below can illustrate different approaches to evaluate gains in public health caused by public health activity [11, 12]. This study aims to describe and analyze public health interventions, practices, and policies that are generally used but have been evaluated to show community change. Measuring change and intervention effectiveness can include behavior change and healthier children and adults with reduced behaviors that are illness-prone. With the reversed outcomes due to positive public health changes, future dollars are saved by the communities that make better dietary choices and move more. Public health interventions can require thousands of research participants with health risk behaviors that may be confined to their communities to measure the outcomes of change. The communities also actively engage in the research and often take part in the community advisory board that defines the research and evaluation agenda. According to the evaluations, many of these effective practices have also reversed increases in heart attack, insulin resistance, stroke, diabetes, obesity, hypertension, and glucose intolerance as encountered in real-world prevention programs [13, 14].

Challenges And Limitations in Implementing Public Health Interventions

Challenges and Limitations Available evidence suggests that there are systemic limitations to implementing public health interventions to change health-related behaviors. These interventions incur significant costs, and financial limitations often make it difficult to implement them at scale. For the most part, the opposition to these interventions is not based on a lack of evidence of effectiveness, but on political and moral grounds. For example, smoking is the leading cause of preventable morbidity and mortality in the world, and yet many countries, particularly those that are tobacco-growing nations, refuse to implement restrictions on public smoking or do not provide funding for smoking cessation

programs. Another issue is resource allocation, notably the prioritization of clients, diseases, and health-related systems at the expense of others. This has become a significant issue since the global economic crisis that started in 2008. A further limitation was the difficulty in engaging populations most at risk in intervention programs. This has been particularly the case in the HIV/AIDS arena where high-risk groups such as men who have sex with men or sex workers, people who use drugs, or street children were stigmatized and therefore difficult to reach through public health education [15, 16]. Many public health interventions face a dilemma in that their evaluation may itself compound the problem that the interventions seek to alleviate, for example, through reinforcing stigma and discrimination. In addition, ethically and practically meaningful evaluation of public health and community-based interventions is complicated by the fact that a particular intervention may be acting within an environment where a range of other initiatives also deliberately or inadvertently seek to influence, for example, individual sexual behavior, and may also face similar evaluation problems. Currently, there is a need to reorient public health strategies towards addressing the full range of health-related and social needs that confront communities at a local level, rather than simply advocating externally determined health-related answers to specific local health problems. Identifying the strategies that will be necessary to achieve this aim requires a clear understanding of the values, ideas, priorities, and health risks of particular localities. Better awareness of the limitations of public health and health promotion approaches will allow public health workers to develop a greater willingness to rigorously critique public health and health promotion strategies to make them more effective and relevant to the health needs of diverse populations [17, 18].

Future Directions and Opportunities for Research

The fast-evolving healthcare landscape presents a host of new and exciting possibilities for public health interventions. One potential arena for interventions is digital health. As digital health technologies are becoming increasingly common and integrated into everyday life, the promise of digital health as a platform for public health intervention is being realized. However, an opportunity exists for scholars to further explore how these tools can help to improve health behaviors. Cross-cutting, interdisciplinary work will be required to do so. Additionally, future work will need to be tailored to accommodate the rapidly growing evidence base for digital health interventions. Finally, policy shifts and changes in funding structures may play a key role in elucidating the composition and direction of the evidence base over the next two decades [19, 20]. There are several potential areas for future research in public health interventions. In particular, interdisciplinary researchers need to develop and test the efficacy of a variety of interventions that can be implemented to address emerging public health concerns. Given that current studies are largely capable, some important focal points for future research may include innovative and pilot studies that do not require complex infrastructural design and deployment. Those studies not currently being conducted in the field include but are not limited to, the design and testing of micro- or meso-level interventions integrated and tested in conjunction with digitally based interventions. There are also possible methodological developments that will be necessary to assess the impact of such innovative interventions. In particular, there is a need for the development and use of more comprehensive, network-based models and evaluations that can elucidate the system-wide effects of interventions that work at various levels. Whether or not such micro- and Meso-level interventions combine with closely examined scalable interventions, they stand to have larger potential effects on population health than any single digital tool. Future studies for this review should also include improved system-based and network evaluations to account for these complex types of human actions and reactions that are less focused on detailed cost-benefit evaluations and more focused on impact evaluations across multiple levels and subsequent potential for change. In addition to the many important study areas listed above, public health scholars should also work on conceptualizing and planning for rapid improvements and customizations of the interventions evaluated. Since epidemiological and etiological factors are frequently evolving, interventions will also need to have the capacity for ongoing evaluation and adaptation [21, 22].

CONCLUSION

Public health interventions have demonstrated significant potential in shaping health behaviors, particularly when they are evidence-based and designed within a solid theoretical framework. From traditional approaches like vaccine programs to novel digital health tools, these interventions have contributed to healthier populations. However, challenges such as political resistance, financial constraints, and the complexity of behavior change across diverse populations must be addressed to optimize their impact. As the healthcare landscape evolves, future interventions will need to embrace interdisciplinary research, digital innovations, and more comprehensive evaluation methods to sustain behavior change and meet emerging public health challenges effectively.

REFERENCES

1. Whitmarsh L, Poortinga W, Capstick S. Behaviour change to address climate change. Current Opinion in Psychology. 2021 Dec 1;42:76-81.
2. Grilli G, Curtis J. Encouraging pro-environmental behaviours: A review of methods and approaches. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews. 2021 Jan 1;135:110039.
3. Das KV, Jones-Harrell C, Fan Y, Ramaswami A, Orlove B, Botchwey N. Understanding subjective well-being: perspectives from psychology and public health. Public Health Reviews. 2020 Dec;41:1-32. springer.com
4. Herlitz L, MacIntyre H, Osborn T, Bonell C. The sustainability of public health interventions in schools: a systematic review. Implementation science. 2020 Dec;15:1-28.
5. de Vocht F, Katikireddi SV, McQuire C, Tilling K, Hickman M, Craig P. Conceptualising natural and quasi experiments in public health. BMC medical research methodology. 2021 Dec;21:1-8. springer.com
6. Halkitis PN. A new public health psychology to mend the chasm between public health and clinical care. American Psychologist. 2020 Dec;75(9):1289.
7. Alam MM, Melhim LK, Ahmad MT, Jemmali M. Public attitude towards COVID-19 vaccination: validation of COVID-vaccination attitude scale (C-VAS). Journal of multidisciplinary healthcare. 2022 Apr 29:941-54. tandfonline.com
8. Bonell C, Michie S, Reicher S, West R, Bear L, Yardley L, Curtis V, Amlôt R, Rubin GJ. Harnessing behavioural science in public health campaigns to maintain 'social distancing'in response to the COVID-19 pandemic: key principles. J Epidemiol Community Health. 2020 Aug 1;74(8):617-9. bmj.com
9. Pan A, Liu L, Wang C, Guo H, Hao X, Wang Q, Huang J, He N, Yu H, Lin X, Wei S. Association of public health interventions with the epidemiology of the COVID-19 outbreak in Wuhan, China. Jama. 2020 May 19;323(19):1915-23. jamanetwork.com
10. McGill E, Er V, Penney T, Egan M, White M, Meier P, Whitehead M, Lock K, de Cuevas RA, Smith R, Savona N. Evaluation of public health interventions from a complex systems perspective: a research methods review. Social science & medicine. 2021 Mar 1;272:113697. sciencedirect.com
11. Goodman CB, Hatch ME, McDonald III BD. State preemption of local laws: Origins and modern trends. Perspectives on Public Management and Governance. 2021 Jun 1;4(2):146-58. osf.io
12. Woolhandler S, Himmelstein DU, Ahmed S, Bailey Z, Bassett MT, Bird M, Bor J, Bor D, Carrasquillo O, Chowkwanyun M, Dickman SL. Public policy and health in the Trump era. The Lancet. 2021 Feb 20;397(10275):705-53. landofsixpeoples.com
13. Sharma A, Mittal S, Aggarwal R, Chauhan MK. Diabetes and cardiovascular disease: inter-relation of risk factors and treatment. Future Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences. 2020 Dec;6:1-9. springer.com
14. Galaviz KI, Suvada K, Merchant R, Dharanendra S, Haw JS, Narayan KV, Ali MK. Interventions for reversing prediabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. American journal of preventive medicine. 2022 Apr 1;62(4):614-25. sciencedirect.com
15. Goh YS, Ow Yong JQ, Chee BQ, Kuek JH, Ho CS. Machine learning in health promotion and behavioral change: scoping review. Journal of Medical Internet Research. 2022 Jun 2;24(6):e35831. jmir.org
16. Osman M, McLachlan S, Fenton N, Neil M, Löfstedt R, Meder B. Learning from behavioural changes that fail. Trends in Cognitive Sciences. 2020 Dec 1;24(12):969-80. ljmu.ac.uk
17. Thornicroft G, Sunkel C, Aliev AA, Baker S, Brohan E, El Chammay R, Davies K, Demissie M, Duncan J, Fekadu W, Gronholm PC. The Lancet Commission on ending stigma and discrimination in mental health. The Lancet. 2022 Oct 22;400(10361):1438-80. [HTML]
18. Earnshaw VA, Watson RJ, Eaton LA, Brousseau NM, Laurenceau JP, Fox AB. Integrating time into stigma and health research. Nature Reviews Psychology. 2022 Apr;1(4):236-47. nature.com
19. Solomon DH, Rudin RS. Digital health technologies: opportunities and challenges in rheumatology. Nature Reviews Rheumatology. 2020 Sep;16(9):525-35.
20. Richardson S, Lawrence K, Schoenthaler AM, Mann D. A framework for digital health equity. NPJ digital medicine. 2022 Aug 18;5(1):119. nature.com

21. Gao X, Li P, Shen J, Sun H. Reviewing assessment of student learning in interdisciplinary STEM education. International Journal of STEM Education. 2020 Dec;7:1-4.
22. Gadke DL, Kratochwill TR, Gettinger M. Incorporating feasibility protocols in intervention research. Journal of School Psychology. 2021 Feb 1;84:1-8.

CITE AS: Mukamana Sandra Gisele (2024). The Impact of Public Health Interventions on Health Behaviors. EURASIAN EXPERIMENT JOURNAL OF MEDICINE AND MEDICAL SCIENCES 5(2):18-22