



CHAPTER ONE

BEYOND BROCHURES

The Imperative for Primary Prevention

Larry Cohen, Sana Chehimi

Some years ago, a prominent individual suffered a major heart attack right across the street from the local county hospital. Although the initial prognosis was poor, the care provided by the hospital resulted in a quick and near-complete recovery. The county board of supervisors proudly emphasized the hospital's success during its next meeting. In the presence of the media, the supervisors congratulated key health officials on the outstanding care and treatment provided, noting in particular the high quality of the hospital staff, medical equipment, and training. As the proceedings were winding down, one supervisor asked, "But what about prevention? Do we have quality prevention?" Without missing a beat, the health director answered, "Yes." Pointing to a pile of brochures titled *Staying Heart Healthy*, he proclaimed, "We have these!"

This isn't an isolated case. Many aspects of health in the United States, from how resources are allocated to who has access to care, suffer from a lack of focus on prevention. Far too often, prevention is an afterthought (Cowen, 1987). The predominant approach to health and well-being in this country focuses on medical treatment and services—*after the fact*—for the many Americans who are sick and injured each year. Unfortunately, there is a lack of corresponding emphasis on quality community and large-scale prevention efforts in order to avoid those same illnesses and injuries *in the first place*. Furthermore, prevention is often relegated to a message in a brochure or to a few moments during a medical visit. Yet these approaches are not quality prevention efforts—human behavior is complicated, and

awareness of a health risk does not automatically lead to taking protective action (Ghez, 2000).

Effectively addressing the range of health and social problems of the twenty-first century requires a fundamental paradigm shift that generates equity for the most vulnerable members of society and maximizes limited resources: moving from medical treatment *after the fact* to prevention *in the first place* and from targeting *individuals* to a comprehensive *community* focus. The imperative for this shift in thinking is best described by the psychologist and noted prevention advocate George Albee (1983), who noted that “. . . no mass disorder afflicting mankind is ever brought under control or eliminated by attempts at treating the affected individual . . .” (p. 24).

This chapter moves prevention *beyond brochures* by presenting an alternative to the dominant individual-based prevention and treatment model. We begin by defining primary prevention and offering recent and historical examples of prevention successes, demonstrating that prevention is the basis of public health and that prevention works. We then make the case for primary prevention, emphasizing that prevention supports health care infrastructure, is an effective use of health care resources, and assists those most in need by decreasing disparities in health. Finally, we describe the six complementary levels of the *spectrum of prevention*, which provide a multifaceted and sustainable framework for achieving community change.

Primary Prevention: Moving Upstream

In a 2002 speech to the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco, Gloria Steinem observed, “We are still standing on the bank of the river, rescuing people who are drowning. We have not gone to the head of the river to keep them from falling in. That is the 21st century task.” Steinem’s remark refers to a popular analogy, “moving upstream,” that is used to highlight the importance and relevance of primary prevention (Ardell, 1977/1986).

Moving Upstream

While walking along the banks of a river, a passerby notices that someone in the water is drowning. After pulling the person ashore, the rescuer notices another person in the river in need of help. Before long, the river is filled with drowning people, and more rescuers are required to assist the initial rescuer. Unfortunately, some people are not saved, and some victims fall back into the river after they have been pulled ashore. At this time,

one of the rescuers starts walking upstream. “Where are you going?” the other rescuers ask, disconcerted. The upstream rescuer replies, “I’m going upstream to see why so many people keep falling into the river.” As it turns out, the bridge leading across the river upstream has a hole through which people are falling. The upstream rescuer realizes that fixing the hole in the bridge will prevent many people from ever falling into the river in the first place.

The act of “moving upstream” and taking action *before* a problem arises in order to avoid it entirely, rather than treating or alleviating its consequences, is called primary prevention. The term *primary prevention* was coined in the late 1940s by Hugh Leavell and E. Guernsey Clark from the Harvard and Columbia University Schools of Public Health, respectively. Leavell and Clark described primary prevention as “measures applicable to a particular disease or group of diseases in order to intercept the causes of disease before they involve man . . . [in the form of] specific immunizations, attention to personal hygiene, use of environmental sanitation, protection against occupational hazards, protection from accidents, use of specific nutrients, protection from carcinogens, and avoidance of allergens” (Goldston, 1987, p. 3). Although Leavell and Clark’s *definition* is mostly disease-oriented, the applications of primary prevention extend beyond medical problems and include the prevention of other societal concerns, ranging from violence to environmental degradation, that also affect health and well-being. Primary prevention efforts are, by definition, proactive and should generally be aimed at populations, not just individuals. Returning to the upstream analogy, fixing the hole in the bridge will benefit not only those at greatest risk for falling in but everyone who crosses it, the rescuers on the riverbank, and everyone who helps pay for rescue costs.

Leavell and Clark further identified two other degrees of prevention, termed *secondary* and *tertiary prevention*. Secondary prevention consists of a set of measures used for early detection and prompt intervention to control a problem or disease and minimize the consequences, while tertiary prevention focuses on the reduction of further complications of an existing disease or problem, through treatment and rehabilitation (Spasoff, Harris, & Thuriaux, 2001).

Leavell and Clark’s “overarching concept of prevention,” described in Table 1.1 through the example of childhood lead poisoning, actually refers to three distinctive activities that might be better termed “prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation” (Goldston, 1987, p. 3). As noted by Albee (1987, p. 12), “All three forms of preventive intervention are useful and defensible.” However, whereas primary prevention *alone* is not enough to address pervasive health and social problems, it

remains the foremost method that we can employ in order to *eliminate* future health and social problems. Albee goes on to note that “any *reduction in incidence* must rely heavily on proactive efforts with large groups, and such actions involve primary prevention approaches” (p. 12).

Prevention Works: The History of Prevention Efforts

In practice, primary prevention involves policies and actions that fix the metaphorical holes in the bridge that lead to sickness and injury. Primary prevention works to reduce the ailments that would otherwise be treated.

One well-known and very successful modern example of primary prevention is the National Minimum Age Drinking Act of 1984, which required all states to raise the minimum age to purchase alcohol to twenty-one or risk losing major transportation funding. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

TABLE 1.1. RECOGNIZING THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRIMARY, SECONDARY, AND TERTIARY PREVENTION: CHILDHOOD LEAD POISONING.

Primary prevention

Dramatic reductions in the blood lead levels of U.S. children from 1970 to 1990 were attributed to population-based environmental policies that banned the use of lead in gasoline, paint, drinking-water pipes, food and beverage containers, and other products that created widespread exposure to lead (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2004).

Primary prevention is the only way to reduce the neurocognitive effects of lead poisoning (Lee & Hurwitz, 2002).

Secondary prevention

Lead-level screening programs for at-risk children followed by the treatment of children with high levels and removal of lead paint from households. Screening can prevent recurrent exposures and the exposure of other children to lead by triggering the identification and remediation of sources of lead in children’s environments (New York State Department of Health, 2004).

Tertiary prevention

The treatment, support, and rehabilitation of children with lead poisoning who manifest complications of the disease. Lead chelation of the blood and soft tissues of exposed individuals can reduce morbidity associated with lead poisoning. Chelation can reduce the immediate toxicity associated with acute ingestion of lead but has limited ability to reverse the neurocognitive effects of chronic exposure (Lee & Hurwitz, 2002).

(NHTSA) estimates that as a result of minimum-drinking-age laws, 18,220 lives were saved between 1975 and 1999 (U.S. Department of Transportation, 1999).

This law is far from the first example of primary prevention. In fact, public health has always been founded on prevention. The first public health measures were vast environmental improvements aimed at keeping entire populations healthy. *The Sanitary Conditions of the Labouring Population of Great Britain*, a seminal report published in 1842 by the English civil servant Edwin Chadwick, noted that widespread preventive measures were necessary to preserve the health of England's workforce (Duffy, 1990). Initial public health efforts focused primarily on improving water supplies, refuse and sewage disposal, housing, ventilation, disinfection, and general cleanliness in a community (Vetter & Matthews, 1999). Labor, housing standards, and other health regulations were also developed during this period in an effort to curtail disease and premature death (Duffy, 1990).

What many experts recognize as the seminal event of the prevention movement was a simple but exceptionally effective action taken by John Snow, a physician, during England's 1854 cholera outbreak. Cholera spreads rapidly, causing diarrhea, vomiting, and if untreated, eventual death from dehydration. During the 1854 outbreak, five hundred people from an impoverished section of South London died within a ten-day period as a result of the disease. Many people needed treatment. However, instead of just treating his patients individually, Snow, who is credited with some of the initial investigative work in epidemiology for his work during an earlier cholera outbreak, also decided to "move upstream" and locate the source of the problem (Summers, 1989).

By studying the trends of the particular outbreak, Snow mapped the origin to a specific water pump on Broad Street. He used the information he had collected about the source of cholera to prevent its spread. Instead of warning locals not to drink water from the contaminated pump or attempting to treat the water for drinking, Snow took his initial efforts a step further and had the pump's handle removed to prevent new cases of cholera from the pump (Summers, 1989).

Snow's story illustrates the importance of taking environmental factors into account when diseases or other problems occur in a community, as well as displaying the grace and common sense associated with prevention.

Primary Prevention: Recent Examples and Future Challenges

Actions like Snow's are behind many public health successes. Many injuries have been averted and lives saved by such primary prevention measures. In addition to the minimum-drinking-age law, recent examples of primary prevention include the following:

- *Antismoking legislation.* California's aggressive antitobacco effort under Proposition 99 resulted in thirty-three thousand fewer deaths from cardiovascular disease in the first three years (Kuiper, Nelson, & Schooley, 2005).
- *Routine immunizations.* Combined with disease control programs, routine immunizations have contributed significantly to child survival, averting more than two million deaths a year worldwide as well as countless episodes of illness and disability (UNICEF, 2005).
- *Water fluoridation.* Water fluoridation is effective in reducing dental decay by 20 to 40 percent (American Dental Association, 2005).
- *Motorcycle helmet laws.* Motorcycle helmet laws, enacted in six states (California, Maryland, Nebraska, Oregon, Texas, and Washington) since 1989, have successfully reduced motorcycle fatalities by an average of 27 percent in the first year (NHTSA, 2004).

These examples provide compelling evidence that primary prevention is effective. But despite this evidence, there is resistance to primary prevention. Unfortunately, primary prevention is often treated as if it were a *distraction* from the real and urgent pressure to meet the needs of those who are presently ill.

Why is this the case? One reason is that until prevention efforts succeed, it is generally difficult to conceptualize what prevention "looks like." Meanwhile, the need to provide treatment services to affected individuals is clear. Thus it is easy to understand that someone who experiences domestic violence may need counseling and other supportive services but harder to understand how to change whole populations to prevent occurrences of domestic violence before they begin.

We can learn how to overcome obstacles and to create effective prevention initiatives by studying previous successes. Nearly every prevention effort, including those mentioned in this chapter, was at its initiation viewed as "impossible." The first antismoking advocates routinely heard "You're crazy!" and "That will never work!" as they attempted to pass no-smoking laws for restaurants and public places. Indeed, in light of the powerful tobacco industry and the skepticism of the general public, the passage of no-smoking laws seemed ambitious at best. Today, however, we often take for granted what once seemed impossible. Many (but certainly not all) public spaces are smoke-free, from airplanes to hospitals and increasingly bars and restaurants. (Loftus, 2002).

Another common but unfounded criticism is that the impact of primary prevention is invisible; how can we know if an illness or injury has been *prevented* or simply did not occur? Although prevention is often difficult to quantify on an individual level, when viewed in aggregate at the population level, the significant impact of prevention becomes immediately quantifiable. Consider the impact

mandatory use of seat belts and infant and child safety seats has had in the primary prevention of death and injury from automobile crashes. Between 1978 and 1985, every state, beginning with Tennessee, passed laws requiring safety seats for child passengers (Harvard Injury Control Research Center, 2003–2006). Between 1975 and 2003, mandatory car seat use resulted in the prevention of close to six thousand deaths and injuries in the United States (NHTSA, 2003). Clearly, prevention on the community level has a substantial impact.

The Case for Primary Prevention

Primary prevention offers the hope of eliminating unnecessary illness, injury, and even death. Nearly 50 percent of annual deaths in the United States—and the impaired quality of life that frequently precedes them—are preventable in part because they are attributable to external environmental or behavioral factors (McGinnis & Foege, 1993; Mokdad, Marks, Stroup, & Gerberding, 2004).

A focus on primary prevention can reverse this current trend by converting some of the resources used to treat injuries and illnesses into efforts that effectively prevent them in the first place.

According to the noted public health expert Henrik Blum (1981), medical care and interventions “play key restorative or ameliorating roles. But they are predominantly applied only after disease occurs and therefore are often too late and at a great price” (p. 43). Despite the widely held belief in the United States that the state of being healthy is derived primarily from health care, Blum notes that in reality, there are four major determinants of health: environment, heredity, lifestyle, and health care services. Of these four, Blum found that “by far the most potent and omnipresent set of forces is the one labeled ‘environmental,’ while behavior and lifestyle are the second most powerful force” (p. 43).

Health Care Needs Prevention

“America’s health care system is in crisis precisely because we systematically neglect wellness and prevention,” noted U.S. Senator Tom Harkin (2005). Although they are often viewed as an after-the-fact add-on to treatment, primary prevention strategies are a natural complement to medical care and treatment. As the capacity of the U.S. health care system approaches a breaking point (Cooper, Getzen, McKee, & Prakash, 2002; see Exhibit 1.1), prevention becomes even more critical. A systematic investment in prevention lessens the burden on the health care system, translating into higher-quality care and treatment services for those truly in need.

EXHIBIT 1.1. A SNAPSHOT OF THE U.S. HEALTH CARE SYSTEM.

High costs, poor access to health care services, and fundamental inadequacies in the provision of services contribute to poorer health outcomes for the nation.

High Costs for Health Care

- In the United States, per capita spending for health care in 2002 was \$5,267—a full 53 percent more than in any other country (Anderson, Hussey, Frogner, & Waters, 2005).
- In 2003, the United States spent 15.3 percent of its gross domestic product (GDP) on health care. Projected spending may reach 18.7 percent of GDP by 2013 and 32 percent of GDP by 2030 (Borger et al., 2006).
- In 2004, employer health insurance premiums increased by 11.2 percent—nearly four times the rate of inflation (Kaiser Family Foundation & Health Research and Educational Trust, 2004).
- Only 2 percent of annual health care spending in the United States goes toward the prevention of chronic diseases (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2003).

Poor Access to Health Care Services

- In 2005, some 41.2 million persons (14.2 percent of the U.S. population) were uninsured, and 51.3 million persons (17.6 percent) had been uninsured for at least part of that year (Cohen & Martinez, 2005).
- Individuals with little or no health insurance coverage are more likely to visit emergency rooms and to use emergency rooms as their usual source of health care (McCaig & Burt, 2005). As the number of emergency room visits has increased, the number of emergency departments has decreased dramatically (Barlett & Steele, 2004).
- Poor access to services is likely to worsen as the population ages, rates of chronic disease increase, corporations continue to reduce their contributions to health care (Abelson, 2005), and the number of primary care health professionals dwindles.

Inadequate Quality of Care

- Among thirteen developed nations, the United States ranks second to last on sixteen health indicators and last in infant mortality (Starfield, 2000).
 - Patients in the United States receive the recommended care for health conditions only about half the time (McGlynn et al., 2003).
 - Two-thirds of emergency department directors in the United States report shortages of on-call specialists. In addition, thirty states are experiencing nursing shortages, with the number expected to increase to forty-four states by 2020 (American College of Emergency Physicians, 2004).
 - Medical errors and hospital-acquired infections cause more deaths than AIDS, breast cancer, firearms, diabetes, and auto accidents combined; recent estimates place the number of annual deaths attributable to medical error at 195,000 and the number attributable to hospital infections at 103,000 (American College of Emergency Physicians, 2004).
-

Primary Prevention Helps Those Most at Risk

“All members of a community are affected by the health status of its least healthy members” (Institute of Medicine, 2002, p. 37). The burden of illness and lack of access to care in the United States is not borne equally across the population. Both frequency of illness and quality of care are often a reflection of socioeconomic status, ethnicity, and race (Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2000). According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), “The demographic changes that are anticipated over the next decade magnify the importance of addressing disparities in health status” (2006). Groups currently experiencing poorer health status are expected to grow as a proportion of the total U.S. population; therefore, the future health of America as a whole will be influenced substantially by our success in improving the health of these groups, since we are all cared for by the same system and so share limited resources. A national focus on disparities in health status is particularly important as major changes unfold in the way in which health care is delivered and financed.

African Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans, Alaska Natives, and Pacific Islanders consistently face higher rates of morbidity and mortality, and compelling evidence indicates that race and ethnicity correlate with persistent and often increasing health disparities compared to the U.S. population as a whole. Research has now shown that after adjusting for individual risk factors, differences remain in health outcomes among various communities (PolicyLink, 2002). Primary prevention can serve to eliminate underlying health disparities through its upstream population focus; as Albee (1996) notes, “Logically, prevention programs should include efforts at achieving social equality for all” (p. 1131). For example, improving access to healthy foods in order to prevent the onset of diabetes due to poor nutrition for at-risk individuals in a community would result in positive health benefits for other community members as well.

Primary Prevention Is a Good Investment

The CDC has pointed out, “If we are serious about improving the health and quality of life of Americans *and* keeping our health care budget under control . . . we cannot afford to ignore the power of prevention” (2003, p. 6).

Health care is among the most expensive commitments of government, businesses, and individuals combined. A targeted investment in prevention not only decreases the financial burden on the health care system but also staves off unnecessary and rising medical costs. According to the U.S. Preventive Services Task Forces’ *Guide to Clinical Preventive Services* (1996), primary prevention is generally considered the most cost-effective way to provide effective health care, due to its

role in alleviating the unnecessary suffering and high costs of specialized care associated with disease. A primary prevention approach also helps defer the social costs associated with illness and injury that arise from lost productivity and expenditures for disability, workers' compensation, and public benefit programs (see Exhibit 1.2).

Putting Primary Prevention into Practice

Communities are addressing increasingly complex social and health problems, from HIV to violence to diabetes. Practitioners face the challenge of devising new services and programs *in response* to these issues, yet the commitment to preventing them in the first place lags. Prevention initiatives and efforts often focus on

EXHIBIT 1.2. PRIMARY PREVENTION: A LESSON IN RESPONSIBLE SPENDING.

The cost of after-the-fact treatment and services is generally far greater than the cost of prevention for a number of social and physical ailments (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2003):

- Between 1990 and 1998, the California Tobacco Control Program saved an estimated \$8.4 billion in overall smoking-related costs and more than \$3.0 billion in smoking-related health care costs (Lindblom, 2005).
 - Removing the lead from all pre-1950 homes today would yield \$48 billion in net benefits (Messonnier, Corso, Teutsch, Haddix, & Harris, 1999).
 - Fortifying cereals with folic acid reduces neural tube defects by 50 percent and saves \$4 million a year (Messonnier et al., 1999).
 - Every dollar spent on the measles-mumps-rubella vaccine saves \$16.34 in direct medical costs (Messonnier et al., 1999).
 - Every dollar spent on the chickenpox vaccine saves \$5.40 in direct medical costs (Messonnier et al., 1999).
 - Every dollar spent on the Women, Infants and Children (WIC) Program reduces the costs associated with low-birthweight babies by \$2.91 (Messonnier et al., 1999).
 - For each dollar spent on the Safer Choice Program (a school-based program focused on the prevention of HIV, other STDs, and teen pregnancy), about \$2.65 is saved on medical and social costs (Messonnier et al., 1999).
 - For every dollar spent on preconception care programs for women with diabetes, \$1.86 can be saved by preventing birth defects among their offspring (Messonnier et al., 1999).
 - Each dollar spent on optimal water fluoridation results in up to \$80 in reduced dental expenses (Messonnier et al., 1999).
-

changing individual behaviors alone while ignoring the societal context surrounding them. An effective prevention strategy to respond to these challenges must target not just individual behaviors but also the environment in which they occur. Primary prevention requires a shift from a focus on programs to a focus on more far-reaching prevention initiatives and from a focus on the individual to a focus on the environment.

Far more than simply air, water, and soil, the term *environment* refers to the broad social and environmental context in which everyday life takes place. As Lori Dorfman, Lawrence Wallack, and Katie Woodruff point out in Chapter Six, “Personal choices are always made in the context of a larger environment. Prevention can address both ends of the spectrum. In fact, many health and social problems are related to conditions outside the immediate individual’s control. A focus limited to personal behavior change ultimately fails us as a society because it narrows the possible solutions inappropriately.”

The importance of an integrated, multifaceted approach to prevention is also recognized by the Institute of Medicine, which concluded in its 2000 report *Promoting Health*, “It is unreasonable to expect that people will change their behavior easily when so many forces in the social, cultural, and physical environment conspire against such change (Institute of Medicine, 2001, p. 4). In recognizing this fact, it is essential that a successful prevention initiative be comprehensive. That is to say that it must address the environmental as well as individual factors that influence health in a community.

How do we craft comprehensive solutions? The Spectrum of Prevention¹ offers a systematic framework for developing effective and sustainable primary prevention programs (see Figure 1.1). The six levels of the spectrum allow practitioners to move beyond the common “brochures as prevention” approach by defining a variety of areas in which prevention can be implemented. The levels of the spectrum are complementary. When used together, each level reinforces the others, leading to greater effectiveness. According to Ottoson and Green (2005), “One of the lessons of successful efforts in community-based health information has been that activities must be coordinated and mutually supportive across levels and channels of influence, from individual to family to institutions to whole communities. This is the lesson of an ecological understanding of complex, interacting, community program components and the causal chains by which they affect outcomes” (p. 53).

To illustrate, let’s use the example of breastfeeding. Breastfeeding is beneficial for boosting an infant’s immune system and is also considered one of the best forms of nutrition for infants (Reynolds, 2001).

A century ago, nearly 100 percent of babies were breastfed. Despite slight increases in recent years, today only 17 percent of women adhere to the recommended guidelines of breastfeeding a child for a full six months after birth (Wolf, 2003). Rates have declined dramatically over the past century for a number of

FIGURE 1.1. THE SPECTRUM OF PREVENTION.

Influencing policy and legislation
Changing organizational practices
Fostering coalitions and networks
Educating providers
Promoting community education
Strengthening individual knowledge and skills

reasons, including lack of accommodations for working mothers who are breastfeeding, social mores about the acceptability of breastfeeding in public, and the development and marketing of baby formulas as a primary source of infant nutrition (Wolf, 2003). Recently, however, as more evidence becomes available to clinicians, breastfeeding is again being promoted in order to improve the public's health.

The cultural context surrounding breastfeeding, however, is still a significant barrier in the United States. As sociologist Joan Retsinas noted, "While it is known that breastfeeding is better, our society is not structured to facilitate that choice" (quoted in Wright, 2001, p. 1). Groups like the Women, Infants and Children's (WIC) Program funded by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to improve birth outcomes and early childhood health have prioritized breastfeeding for low-income women and children through nutritional support programs (Ahluwalia & Tessaro, 2000).

Making progress requires more than simply helping mothers with the skills to successfully breastfeed. Creating and maintaining widespread social norms for breastfeeding is critical. This requires activities along each level of the spectrum of prevention.

The first level of the spectrum, *strengthening individual knowledge and skills*, emphasizes enhancing individual skills that are essential in healthy behaviors. Clinical services are one common opportunity for delivering these skills, though there are many avenues of importance. Individual skill building is essential to the success of breastfeeding for new mothers. Women need support both before and after their child is born in order to successfully initiate and maintain breastfeeding. Often an ob-gyn, presenting expectant parents with information on the benefits of breastfeeding for themselves and their infants, can be an early influencer on the decision to breastfeed. In-hospital support, round-the-clock hotlines, and lactation counselors help troubleshoot the challenges a mother encounters and motivate her to continue in her breastfeeding commitment.

The second level of the spectrum, *promoting community education*, entails reaching people with information and resources in order to promote their health and safety. Typically, many health education initiatives focus on developing brochures, holding health fairs, and conducting community forums and events. Such one-time exposures can be a valuable element of a broader campaign but often don't have a big impact. We need to understand that nowadays, the mass media are the primary sources of education for almost everyone. Although there have been creative efforts to use the media to improve health, the massive expenditures of corporations far overshadow public health efforts in the mass media. As Ivan Juzang (2002) of MEE Productions points out, word of mouth can be a powerful and effective tool. It's the best advertising money can't buy. Creating positive word of mouth allows your prevention message to live on, even after a formal campaign is over, as community members take ownership of the message and begin to initiate their own activities that support it.

Educating a larger community about the benefits of breastfeeding is a step toward creating community environments in which breastfeeding is both encouraged and viewed as normal. Posters have been used in health care settings to signal the value of breastfeeding. One example of a large-scale community media campaign is the one coordinated by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the Ad Council (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Women's Health, 2001).

Locally, the news media can provide rich—and free—opportunities to emphasize public health. A great example was the Berkeley, California, Public Health Department's event to enter the *Guinness Book of World Records* by bringing together the largest number of breastfeeding mothers in history (BBC News, 2002).

Advocates also cite corporate advertising as one of the roadblocks in encouraging social change toward increased breastfeeding. Manufacturers often idealize the use of formula for infant nutrition by touting convenience; Derrick Jelliffe coined the term *commerciogenic malnutrition* to describe the impact of industry marketing practices on infant health (Baby Milk Action, n.d.). A resulting boycott, and the media attention it engendered, created large-scale awareness that the decline in breastfeeding was not simply a matter of unfettered individual choice.

The third level of the spectrum is *educating providers*. Because health care providers are a trusted source of health-related information, they are a key group to reach with strategies for prevention. Similarly, teachers and public safety officials are often identified as key groups to reach with new information and methods. The notion of who is a provider should be approached more broadly, however, and extends beyond the "usual suspects" to include faith leaders; postal workers and other public servants; business, union, and community leaders; and cashiers—anyone who is in a position to share information or influence the opinions of others.

Because of their prominence with expectant mothers, a first place to start is with ob-gyn and pediatric staff. Maternity staff have been trained that a good practice is to encourage breastfeeding within a half hour of birth. In California, Riverside County's nutrition services department has created a "marketing team" modeled on pharmaceutical company representatives that visit prenatal and pediatric care providers to supply them with educational materials, displays, take-away cards, and training to ensure that they have the resources necessary to help their patients choose to breastfeed their babies and continue to do so. An additional approach is the involvement of business leaders, who can assist mothers in transitioning back into the workplace. Training includes helping business leaders understand their role when mothers return to work and how to set up facilities that allow breastfeeding in the workplace. Another innovative model of provider education, developed in some African American communities, involves sharing information about the benefits of breastfeeding between beauty shop employees and their clients, who in turn share it with their neighbors (Best Start Social Marketing, 2003).

Level four of the spectrum, *fostering coalitions and networks*, focuses on collaboration and community organizing. Fostering collaborative approaches brings together the participants necessary to ensure an initiative's success and increase the "critical mass" behind a community effort. Coalitions and expanded partnerships are vital in successful public health movements including breastfeeding promotion. The metaphor of a jigsaw puzzle is appropriate, with each piece having value but taking on a greater significance when all the pieces are put together in the right way. Collaboration is not an outcome per se, like the other levels of the spectrum, but rather a tool used to achieve an objective. Often the best way to ensure a comprehensive strategy is to build a diverse coalition.

Collaborations may take place at several levels: at the community level—including grassroots partners working together such as in community organizing; at the organizational level—including nonprofits working together to coordinate the efforts of business, faith, or other interest groups; and at the governmental level, with different sectors of government linking with one another. Typical partnerships include elements of all three. In health fields, interdisciplinary and intergovernmental partnerships are probably less common than community-based organizations and grassroots efforts, which hold enormous promise for advancing the work of primary prevention (Cohen, Baer, & Satterwhite, 2002). Often the best way to ensure a comprehensive strategy is to build a diverse coalition. Eight Steps to Effective Coalition Building (Cohen et al., 2002) is a framework that guides advocates and practitioners through the process of coalition building, from deciding whether or not a coalition is appropriate to selecting the best membership and conducting ongoing evaluation.

An important objective of coalition building is to identify and work toward goals that can have greater impact on the community overall than any coalition participant might achieve alone. A key part of leadership, then, is finding an interest common to most or all groups and facilitating work toward achieving vital shared goals.

Returning to our example, collaboration between organizations and the fostering of coalitions are vital in the promotion of breastfeeding. To effect not only individual behavior change but social norm change as well, leadership is needed from health experts, grassroots advocates, social service workers, politicians, business groups, and the media. On the international level, a broad collaboration of community members around the world led to the effective challenge of corporations promoting infant formula (“Challenging Corporate Abuses,” 1993). At the local level, building on public knowledge of the importance of breastfeeding and engaging the business and medical community led to changes in the organizational practices of businesses and hospitals.

The fifth level of the spectrum, *changing organizational practices*, deals with organizational change from a systems perspective. Reshaping the general practices of key organizations can affect both health and norms. Such change reaches the members, clients, and employees of the company as well as the surrounding community and serves as a model for all. Changing organizational practices is more easily achievable in many cases than policy change and can become the testing ground for policy. Government and health institutions are key places to make change because of their role as standard setters. Other critical arenas include media, business, sports, faith organizations, and schools. Nearly everyone belongs to or works in an organization, so this approach gives collaborators an immediate place to initiate change surrounding a particular issue.

Two key areas for organizational practice change that support breastfeeding are the Baby-Friendly Hospital Initiative and workplace policies around maternity leave and lactation support. As part of the Baby-Friendly Hospital Initiative, participating hospitals provide an optimal environment for the mother to learn the skills of breastfeeding, including allowing mothers to keep their newborns in the same room rather than in the hospital nursery, and encourage initiating breastfeeding within a half hour after birth. These hospitals stop the standard practice of sending mothers home with discharge packs that include artificial baby formula. This initiative has resulted in significant increases in breastfeeding initiation rates (Phillip et al., 2001).

For mothers who work, breastfeeding can be difficult unless their employers adopt policies that facilitate breastfeeding. Such organizational policies include allowing enough maternity leave to solidly establish breastfeeding and designing environments that make it easier for mothers to pump and store breast milk while

at work. Media portrayals of breastfeeding as normal, as opposed to portraying breasts as almost entirely sexualized, could also facilitate breastfeeding.

The sixth level of the spectrum has the potential for achieving the broadest impact across a community: *influencing policy and legislation*. Policy is the set of rules that guide the activities of government or quasi-governmental organizations. Policy thus sets the foundation or framework for action. By mandating what is expected and required, sound policies can lead to widespread behavior change on a communitywide scale that may ultimately become the social norm. Over the course of the past several years, major health improvements have occurred as a result of policy change, including a reduction in diseases associated with cigarette smoking, a decrease in workplace and roadway accidents due to dramatically greater use of safety equipment, and reductions in lead poisoning.

Although policy is frequently thought of as either state or federal, evidence indicates that highly effective prevention policy can be developed on the community level and that local policy development is integral to the success of prevention programs (Holder et al., 1997). As a result, sound policies can lead to widespread behavior change on a communitywide scale. As noted by the Municipal Research and Services Center of Washington (2000), “Policy making is often undervalued and misunderstood, yet it is the central role of the city, town, and county legislative bodies.”

Using our breastfeeding example, policies that support breastfeeding mothers include laws mandating maternity leave and requiring workplaces to make accommodations for employees who breastfeed. Additional legislation at the state level can help modify the existing structure of a system in order to promote the healthier choice for a mother and her newborn infant. A California policy proposed in 2004 would have provided comprehensive education about infant feeding options to new mothers and would have banned the marketing of infant formulas in California hospitals. However, despite widespread support, the bill failed to receive adequate votes for passage.

Local, state, and federal policies are still needed to protect a woman’s right to breastfeed in public and to encourage and achieve adequate nutrition for our society’s children in their earliest years of life. Although many barriers exist, the sixth level of the spectrum is an essential piece to achieving such social change.

One reason the spectrum can be a powerful tool for prevention is that it is helpful in designing efforts that change norms. Norms shape behavior and are key determinants of whether our behaviors will be healthy or not. More than habits, often based in culture and tradition, norms are regularities in behavior to which people generally conform (Ullmann-Margalit, 1990).

Typically, the tipping factor for normative change requires efforts at the broadest levels of the spectrum, *changing organizational practices* or policies, because such actions change the community environment. (The other elements of the

spectrum are usually important also, contributing to and building on this momentum for change.) As Schlegel (1997) points out, policy change can trigger norm change by altering what is considered acceptable behavior, encouraging people to think actively about their own behavior, and providing relevant information and a supportive environment to promote change. The emergence of new social norms occurs when enough individuals have made the choice to change their current behavior.

Norm change regarding smoking behaviors is probably the most frequently cited example of this tipping factor and makes the importance of interplay between elements of the spectrum visible. After the surgeon general's report in 1964 that smoking harms health and numerous reports of research implying that secondhand smoke was risky (*promoting community education*), local communities formed coalitions to shape policy in restaurants, public places, and workplaces (*influencing policy*). The ensuing policy controversy received media attention (not only explaining the law but also why smoking is risky) (*promoting community education*), and the newfound attention led to more requests for training for health and civic leaders (*educating providers*). Doctors started to change their practices—more offered stop-smoking clinics and warned patients about the dangers of smoking (*strengthening individual knowledge and skills*). Once passed, the implementation of the policy required *changing organizational practices* to comply with the policy. This led to training, conducted by coalition partners, of government employees, restaurateurs, and business owners. This spurred an increase in people wanting to quit, and quit-smoking clinics became busier. As the number and extent of policies grew, momentum built for further changes. “What’s next?” asked policymakers and enterprising reporters. And the process started again—banning vending machines, boosting tobacco taxes, and forbidding smoking in bars and public recreation areas. Individual choice still exists, and people still behave according to their own personal preferences. What has changed is society’s perception about what is acceptable smoking behavior. This shift in the social norms changes the preference and improves the health of millions.

A well-designed strategy, while seizing opportunities that may arise, always considers a variety of levels of the spectrum. Also, data and evaluation are key. They are not levels of the spectrum because they are not outcome-related activities per se, but they are critical in informing and enhancing the spectrum strategy.

Building a Prevention Movement

Former U.S. Surgeon General David Satcher (2006) once explained, “There is still a big gap between what we know and what we do, and that gap is lethal. When it comes to the health of our communities, we must never be guilty of low

aim.” We cannot afford to aim low because our own well-being and that of our friends, families, and communities is at stake. We are getting seriously injured and ill unnecessarily far too often. When seeking care to address these ills, we are not served optimally by the health care system. This is especially the case for those most in need, but increasingly for all of us, the system does not perform adequately.

Prevention is necessary to address this situation. Through high-quality prevention, we can create community environments that foster good health. Prevention is our best hope for reducing unnecessary demand on the health care system. Healthy environments also provide optimal support for people who are injured or ill to heal and recover their health. Chronic disease among members of the American population is on the rise, new communicable disease threats have appeared, and Surgeon General Richard Carmona has predicted that due to chronic diseases related to poor eating habits and physical inactivity, this may be the first generation of children whose life expectancies will be lower than those of their parents (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2004). Effective prevention strategies are needed to reverse these alarming trends.

Some people say that the easy problems have been solved. In fact, until they were solved, none of them were easy. But in retrospect, we can understand the key elements that made past problems solvable. The problems we face today are in fact made easier by what we have learned through earlier prevention efforts. Applying these lessons to emerging health concerns is vital as public health leaders help communities flourish in the current century.

Note

1. The Spectrum of Prevention was originally developed by Larry Cohen in 1983 while working as director of prevention programs at the Contra Costa County Health Department. It is based on the work of Marshall Swift (1975) in preventing developmental disabilities.

References

- Abelson, R. (2005, May 6). States and employers duel over health care. *New York Times*, p. C1.
- Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. (2000, February). *Fact sheet: Addressing racial and ethnic disparities in health care* (AHRQ Publication No. 00-PO41). Rockville, MD: Author. Retrieved July 27, 2006, from <http://www.ahrq.gov/research/disparit.htm>
- Ahluwalia, I. B., & Tessaro, L. M. (2000). Georgia's breastfeeding promotion program for low-income women. *Pediatrics*, *105*, E85. Retrieved July 27, 2006, from <http://www.pediatrics.org/cgi/content/full/105/6/e85>
- Albee, G. W. (1983). Psychopathology, prevention, and the just society. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, *4*, 5–40.

- Albee, G. W. (1987). The rationale and need for primary prevention. In S. E. Goldston & California Department of Mental Health (Eds.), *Concepts of primary prevention: A framework for program development*. Sacramento: California Department of Mental Health, Office of Prevention.
- Albee, G. W. (1996). Revolutions and counterrevolutions in prevention. *American Psychologist*, *51*, 1130–1133.
- American College of Emergency Physicians. (2004, September). *On-call specialist coverage in U.S. emergency departments: ACEP survey of emergency department directors*. Irving, TX: Author.
- American Dental Association. (2005). *Fluoridation facts*. Chicago: Author. Retrieved July 11, 2006, from <http://64.233.187.104/search?q=cache:gGT-gOwjmqgJ:www.ada.org/public/topics/fluoride/facts/+fluoridation+facts&hl=en&gl=us&ct=clnk&cd=1>
- Anderson, G. F., Hussey, P. S., Frogner, B. C., & Waters, H. R. (2005, July). Health spending in the United States and the rest of the industrialized world. *Health Affairs*, *24*, 903–914.
- Ardell, D. B. (1986). *High level wellness: An alternative to doctors, drugs, and disease* (10th anniv. ed.). Berkeley, CA: Ten Speed Press. (Original work published 1977)
- Baby Milk Action. (n.d.) *Briefing paper: History of the campaign*. Retrieved July 28, 2006, from <http://www.babymilkaction.org/pages/history.html>
- Barlett, D. L., & Steele, J. B. (2004). *Critical condition: How health care in America became big business—and bad medicine*. New York: Doubleday.
- BBC News, World Edition. (2002, August 4). U.S. Breaks breastfeeding record. Retrieved July 28, 2006, from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/2171092.stm>
- Best Start Social Marketing. (2003, December). *Using loving support to build a breastfeeding-friendly community: Follow-up report to Indiana WIC Program*. Retrieved July 29, 2006, from <http://www.indianaperinatal.org/files/education/EMPR1003.pdf>
- Blum, H. L. (1981). Social perspective on risk reduction. *Family and Community Health*, *3*, 41–50.
- Borger, C., Smith, S., Truffer, C., Keehan, S., Sisko, A., Poisal, J., & Clemens, M. K. (2006). Health spending projections through 2015: Changes on the horizon. *Health Affairs*, *25*, W61–W73.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2003). *The power of prevention: Reducing the health and economic burden of chronic disease*. Atlanta, GA: Author. Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/publications/PowerOfPrevention/pdfs/power_of_prevention.pdf
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2004). Preventing lead exposure in young children: A housing-based approach to primary prevention of lead poisoning. Atlanta, GA: Author.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Office of Minority Health. (2006). *Eliminating racial and ethnic health disparities*. Atlanta, GA: Author. Retrieved July 11, 2006, from <http://www.cdc.gov/omh/AboutUs/disparities.htm>
- Challenging corporate abuses: An interview with Elaine Lamy. *Multinational Monitor*, *15*(7–8). (1993, August). Retrieved July 28, 2006, from http://multinationalmonitor.org/hyper/issues/1993/08/mm0893_08.html
- Cohen, L., Baer, N., & Satterwhite, P. (2002). Eight steps to effective coalition building. In M. E. Wurzbach (Ed.), *Community health education and promotion: A guide to program design and evaluation* (2nd ed., pp. 144–161). Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen.
- Cohen, R. A., & Martinez, M. E. (2005). *Health insurance coverage: Estimates from the National Health Interview Survey*. Retrieved June 1, 2006, from <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhis.htm>
- Cooper, R. A., Getzen, T. E., McKee, H. J., & Prakash, L. (2002). Economic and demographic trends signal an impending physician shortage. *Health Affairs*, *21*, 140–154.

- Cowen, E. L. (1987). Research on primary prevention interventions: Programs and applications. In S. E. Goldston (Eds.), *Concepts of primary prevention: A framework for program development* (pp. 33–50). Sacramento: California Department of Mental Health.
- Duffy, J. (1990). *The sanitarians: A history of American public health*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Ghez, M. (2000). Getting the message out: Using media to change social norms on abuse. In C. M. Renzetti, J. L. Edleson, & R. K. Bergen (Eds.), *Sourcebook on violence against women* (pp. 417–438). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Goldston, S. E. (Ed.). (1987). *Concepts of primary prevention: A framework for program development*. Sacramento: California Department of Mental Health.
- Harkin, T. (2005, February 17). Remarks at the annual conference of the American College of Preventive Medicine, Washington, DC.
- Harvard Injury Control Research Center. (2003–2006). Child safety seats. In *Success stories in injury prevention*. Boston: Author. Retrieved July 11, 2006, from <http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/hicrc/success.html>
- Holder, H. D., Saltz, R. F., Grube, J. W., Treno, A. J., Reynolds, R. I., Voas, R. B., et al. (1997). Summing up: Lessons from a comprehensive community prevention trial. *Addiction*, 92, 293–302.
- Institute of Medicine. (2001). *Promoting health: Intervention strategies from social and behavioral research* (B. D. Smedley & L. S. Syme, Eds.). Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Institute of Medicine. (2002). *Unequal treatment: Confronting racial and ethnic disparities in health care* (B. D. Smedley, A. Y. Stith, & A. R. Nelson, Eds.). Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Juzang, I. (2002, November 20–22). Presentation at the Preventing Obesity in the Hip-Hop Generation Workshop sponsored by the California Adolescent Nutrition and Fitness Program (CANFit) and Motivational Educational Entertainment (MEE) Productions, San Diego, CA.
- Kaiser Family Foundation & Health Research and Educational Trust. (2004, September 9). *Employer health benefits: 2004 annual survey*. Menlo Park, CA: Author. Retrieved July 29, 2006, from www.kff.org/insurance/7148/upload/2004-Employer-Health-Benefits-Survey-Full-Report.pdf
- Kuiper, N. M., Nelson, D. E., & Schooley, M. (2005). *Evidence of effectiveness: A summary of state tobacco control program evaluation literature*. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Office on Smoking and Health. Retrieved July 11, 2006, from http://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/sustainingstates/pdf/lit_Review.pdf
- Lee, D. A., & Hurwitz, R. L. (2002). Childhood lead poisoning: Exposure and prevention. In B. D. Rose (Ed.), *UpToDate* [CD-ROM]. Wellesley, MA: UpToDate.
- Lindblom, E. (2005, February 24). *Comprehensive statewide tobacco prevention programs save money*. Washington, DC: Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids.
- Loftus, M. J. (2002, Spring). Making smoking history. *Public Health*. Retrieved November 13, 2006, from http://www.whsc.emory.edu/_pubs/ph/spring02/smoking.html
- McCraig, L. F., & Burt, C. W. (2005, May). *National hospital ambulatory medical care survey: 2003 emergency department summary*. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics.
- McGinnis, J. M., & Foegen, W. H. (1993). Actual causes of death in the United States. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 270, 2207–2212.
- McGlynn, E. A., Asch, S. M., Adams, J., Keesey, J., Hicks, J., DeCristofaro, J., et al. (2003). The quality of health care delivered to adults in the United States. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 348, 2635–2645.

- Messonnier, M. L., Corso, P. S., Teutsch, S. M., Haddix, A. C., & Harris, J. R. (1999, April). An ounce of prevention: What are the returns?—A handbook. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *16*, 248–263.
- Mokdad, A. H., Marks, J. S., Stroup, D. F., & Gerberding, J. L. (2004, March 10). Actual causes of death in the United States, 2000. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, *291*, 1238–1245.
- Municipal Research and Services Center of Washington. (2000, September). *Policy making introduction*. Retrieved July 27, 2006, from <http://www.mrsc.org/Subjects/Governance/legislative/intro.aspx>
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (2003). *Traffic safety facts, 2003* (DOT HS 809 775). Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved July 11, 2006, from <http://www.nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/pdf/nrd-30/NCSA/TSFAnn/2003HTMLTSF/TSF2003.htm>
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (2004, January). *State legislative fact sheet: Motorcycle helmet use laws*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved July 11, 2006, from <http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov/people/injury/new-fact-sheet03/MotorcycleHelmet.pdf>
- New York State Department of Health. (2004, June). *Eliminating childhood lead poisoning in New York State by 2010*. Albany: Author.
- Ottoson, J., & Green, L. (2005). Community outreach: From measuring the difference to making a difference with health information. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, *93*, S49–S56.
- Phillip, B. L., Merewood, A., Miller, L. W., Chawla, N., Murphy-Smith, M. M., Gomes, J. S., et al. (2001). Baby-Friendly Hospital Initiative improves breastfeeding initiation rates in a U.S. hospital setting. *Pediatrics*, *108*, 677–681.
- PolicyLink. (2002). *Reducing health disparities through a focus on communities*. Oakland, CA: Author. Retrieved July 29, 2006, from <http://www.policylink.org/Research/HealthDisparities>
- Reynolds, A. (2001). Breastfeeding and brain development. *Pediatric Clinics of North America*, *28*, 159–171.
- Satcher, D. (2006, April 7). Keynote address at the opening of the California Endowment's Center for Healthy Communities, Los Angeles.
- Schlegel, A. (1997). Response to Ensminger & Knight. *Current Anthropology*, *38*, 18–19.
- Spasoff, J. M., Harris, S. S., & Thuriaux, M. C. (Eds.). (2001). *A dictionary of epidemiology* (4th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Starfield, B. (2000, July 26). Is U.S. health really the best in the world? *Journal of the American Medical Association*, *284*, 483–485.
- Steinem, G. (2002, February 13). *A 21st century feminism*. Paper presented at the Commonwealth Club of California. Retrieved July 29, 2006, from <http://www.commonwealthclub.org/archive/02/02-02steinem-intro.html>
- Summers, J. (1989). Broad Street pump outbreak. In *Soho: A history of London's most colourful neighborhood* (pp. 113–117). London: Bloomsbury.
- Swift, M. S. (1975). *Alternative teaching strategies, helping behaviorally troubled children achieve: A guide for teachers and psychologists*. Champaign, IL: Research Press.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Women's Health. (2001). *Health and Human Services blueprint for action on breastfeeding*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2003). *Prevention makes common "cents."* Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Surgeon General. (March 2, 2004). Testimony on the growing epidemic of childhood obesity. Retrieved on July 28, 2006, from <http://www.surgeongeneral.gov/news/testimony/childobesity03022004.htm>

- U.S. Department of Transportation. (1999, December). Fact sheet: Minimum drinking age laws. In *Community how-to guide on . . . public policy* (app. 7). Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved July 29, 2006, from http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov/people/injury/alcohol/Community_Guides_HTML/PDFs/Public_App7.pdf
- U.S. Preventive Task Force. (1996). *Guide to clinical preventive services* (2nd ed.). Rockville, MD: Author.
- Ullmann-Margalit, E. (1990). Revision of norms. *Ethics, 100*, 756–767.
- UNICEF. (2005, September). A report card on immunization, number 3. In *Progress for children*. New York: Author. Retrieved June 18, 2006, from http://www.unicef.org/progressforchildren/2005n3/PFC3_English2005.pdf
- Vetter, N., & Matthews, I. (1999). *Epidemiology and public health medicine*. London: Harcourt.
- Wolf, J. H. (2003). Low breastfeeding rates and public health in the United States. *American Journal of Public Health, 93*, 2000–2010.
- Wright, A. L. (2001). The rise of breastfeeding in the United States. *Pediatric Clinics of North America, 48*, 1–12.