

Entrenching social norms in Community-led total sanitation for sustainability of open defecation free status: A survey of Suna West Sub-County, Migori County, Kenya

Naomi R. Aluoch¹, Collins O. Asweto², Patrick O. Onyango³

1. School of Public Health, Maseno University
2. School of Nursing, University of Embu
3. School of Physical and Biological Sciences, Maseno University

Corresponding author:

Naomi R. Aluoch; roosenash@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Background: Community-led total sanitation (CLTS) has been used to stir sanitation-related behaviour change and attain open defecation free (ODF) status. CLTS interventions suffer high rates of reversion such that their gains are unsustainable in most contexts including Suna West sub-County, Kenya.

Objective: This study aimed at determining the role of sanitation hygiene practices and social norms on open defecation free status in Suna West Sub County.

Methodology: Survey study design was employed using questionnaire and observation checklist to collect data from 384 households.

Results: Results revealed that 66.1% households had partially reverted to non-ODF status. The sanitation-hygiene practices associated with maintenance of ODF includes: use of treated water (OR=3.17; CI=1.20-8.40; $p=0.020$), use of elevated racks (OR=2.17; CI=1.08-4.37; $p=0.030$), regularly clean latrines (OR=4.88; CI=1.12-21.37; $p=0.035$), pouring of ash over the pit of the latrine (OR=4.25; CI=4.20-8.87; $p<0.001$) and use of dug out pits for waste disposal (OR=4.51; CI=2.09-9.78; $p<0.001$). On social norms, the study found that laws/penalties (OR=0.31; CI=0.21-0.48; $p<0.001$), need to improve things in the family (OR=0.50; CI=0.28-0.92; $P=0.025$), and rewards/incentives (OR=0.21; CI=0.13-0.33; $p<0.001$) would reduce odds of being ODF. Moreover, odds of being ODF was less likely for households with perception that; construction/maintenance materials were expensive (OR=0.52; CI=0.33-0.80; $p=0.003$), most people don't have a latrine (OR=0.40; CI=0.25-0.64; $p<0.001$) and it is okay to defecate in bushes/rivers/dams (OR=0.31; CI=0.19-0.51; $p<0.001$).

Conclusion: This study findings provides evidence of ODF status reversion in previously certified villages. However, household with retained ODF status was enhanced by several sanitation hygiene practices. Interestingly, households that displayed social norms were less likely to be ODF. This reveals that the CLTS process failed to instil social norms around proper sanitation to inspire community collective action thus little influence on sustainable behaviour change. The findings of this study therefore highlight the need to enhance good hygiene sanitation practices, while instilling social norms to inspire community collective action.

KEY WORDS: Community-led total sanitation (CLTS), Open defecation free (ODF),

sanitation hygiene practices, social norms

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

INTRODUCTION

According to the WHO, roughly 842,000 lives are lost in low- and middle-income countries annually as a consequence of inadequate water, hygiene and sanitation (WHO, 2018). Poor sanitation is connected to infections such as diarrhoeal diseases, nematode infections and environmental enteropathy (EE) (UNICEF., 2015c). In Kenya diarrhoea claims the lives of roughly 3,100 children annually and trachoma, schistosomiasis are health problems linked to poor sanitation (Mutambo, 2016). In part the burden of these diseases is attributed to open defecation that exposes a large part of the population to sanitation-related diseases (Njuguna, & Muruka, 2017).

It is in light of such negative impacts of poor sanitation that the Government of Kenya adopted Community-led Total Sanitation (CLTS) as a strategy to improve sanitation. Community-led Total Sanitation was introduced by Plan International Kenya in 2007 and was approved by the then Ministry of Public Health and Sanitation (MOPHS) as a key framework for promoting hygiene and sanitation at the household level. In 2011, MOPHS established CLTS as the national strategy for ensuring rural sanitation and set a national target to reduce open defecation (Crocker, Saywell, & Bartram, 2017).

The results of a study on the sustainability of ODF status in Kenya conducted by UNICEF (2015) revealed that the sustainability of ODF achievements remained a major concern with over 70% of villages that had received partial or full ODF status reverting to non-ODF status. Among the factors that demotivate community members from using a latrine after becoming ODF relates to physical aspects of the latrine (such as lack of privacy and fear of the latrine collapsing) and sharing a latrine with other people (Singh, & Balfour, 2014). In addition, slippage from ODF status has also been linked to collapse or poor structural integrity of latrines as well as unsustainable behaviour change following sanitation-related interventions (UNICEF,

2014). This study investigated association between ODF status with sanitation-hygiene practices and social norms in a previously ODF certified region, Suba West Sub-County, western Kenya.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study site

The study was done in Suna West Sub-County in Migori County which has a population of 117,539 with a density of 406 persons per km². The sub-county, one among eight others, has four wards and is bordered by Kuria West sub-county to the south-east, Nyatike sub-county to the west, Suna East Sub-County to the north-eastern side and Tanzania to the south-west.

Study Design

A cross-sectional study design was used across two wards that were purposively chosen for having attained ODF status in all the villages at least one year to the study. The unit of analysis was the household with the targeted participants being the household heads.

Data Collection Tools

Validated structured questionnaire and observation checklist were used in this study. Observation checklist was used to collect information to corroborate or refute claims made by respondents in questionnaires.

Study Variables

In order to determine the ODF status, re-verification was done using the verification tool focussing on the non-negotiable indicators used during the sub-county verification and third-party certification. In brief, the non-negotiable indicators that the tool focused on were no exposed faecal matter, access to latrine (individual or shared), privacy on superstructure, squat

hole cover and hand washing facility near the latrine. In each household, we focused on the 5 non-negotiables which had to be in every household for it to be assessed as ODF.

Dependent Variables

Dependent variables were measured as follows: access to a latrine - availability of Individual latrine, shared latrine/neighbours; privacy - availability of door or some form of barricade provided for each superstructure; Squat hole cover - provided for every squat hole and in use; hand washing facility - availability of tap/leaky tin near latrine with water inside, soap/ash available; no exposed faeces - no visible faeces within the surrounding of the home.

Independent Variables

For independent variables, the frequency of variables such as treating water (boiling or use of chemicals), covering food using lid over cooking pots when cooking and during storage, using elevated racks to hold utensils off the ground while drying, regular cleaning of latrine, application of ash around & the squat hole of latrine, and using dugout pit for waste disposal were measured using Likert scale: always, most of the time, sometimes, rarely, not at all and scores pooled into two - Yes (always, most of the time, sometimes) and no (rarely, not at all).

While variables such as Care of the family - Empirical & normative expectation regarding health of the family, Shame/disgust/fear/pride Regrettable occurrence/ unpleasant emotion that cause a feeling of resolution, Cultural/social/religious beliefs - Person's belief alignment as pertaining culture, society and religion, Laws/penalties - Rules within a given set up and punishment imposed for breaking the set rules, Need to improve things in the family - Empirical & normative expression of obligation to make things better, Follow ups and support - The subsequent actions following CLTS and material assistance for the same, Rewards/incentives - Some form of payment given in recognition of work done or to stimulate greater output, and Peer pressure - The empirical & normative expectation regarding consistent

latrine use were measured using Likert scale: strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree and scores pooled into two; Yes (agree and strongly agree), No (strongly disagree, disagree, neutral).

Statistical Analysis

Summation for the observed non-negotiable indicators was done to determine the ODF status. Wilcoxon signed-rank test was used to determine if there was a significant difference in ODF status as at the time of the study and verification. Chi-square test of independent was used to determine association between sanitation and hygiene practices, social norms and ODF status and binary logistic regression was done to determine the relationship between sanitation hygiene practices, social norms and ODF status.

Ethical considerations

Ethical approval for the study was granted by the Maseno University Ethics Review Committee; Ref: MSU/DRPI/MUERC/00821/99.

Informed consent

Informed consent was gotten from the participants. They were also informed that taking part in the study was out of free will and that they were free to withdraw from the study at any time.

RESULTS

Socio-demographic characteristics of study participants

Of the 384 participants, 62.8% were females, 73.4% were aged 25-59 years, while 58.6% and 31.8% had primary education and secondary education respectively. On socio-economic status, three-quarter (75.3%) of households had Ksh. 0-5,000 monthly income. A half (53.1%) of the households had 0-5 years old child and 27.1% had at least one member with a disability or

chronic illness. Socio-demographic characteristics of the study participants are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristics of study participants from Suna West Sub-County, Kenya

	Variable	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	143	37.2
	Female	241	62.8
Respondents' Age	18-24 years	58	15.1
	25-59 years	282	73.4
	60 and above	44	11.5
Level of Education	No education	26	6.8
	Primary education	225	58.6
	Secondary education	122	31.8
	Tertiary education	11	2.9
Level of Income	0-5,000	289	75.3
	5,001-10,000	72	18.8
	10,001-20,000	6	1.6
	20,001-30,000	3	0.8
	30,001-40,000	6	1.6
	40,000 and over	8	2.1
Household composition	With persons 0-5 years.	204	53.1
	With persons 6-12 years.	278	72.4
	With persons 13-24 years.	299	77.9
	With persons 25-59 years.	354	92.2
	With persons above 60 years.	72	18.8
	Persons with disability or chronic illness	104	27.1

Open Defecation Free Status

On ODF status, only 33.9 % (n=130) were found to be ODF one year after certification. When the indicators were analysed singly, it was observed that access to latrine and no exposed faeces were at 100%; with 95.3% (n=366) owning individual latrines while the remaining 4.7% (n=18) reporting to use shared latrines, Table 2.

Table 2: Results on ODF indicators

Indicator	Median percentage (%)	P value	No. of villages reporting 100%
Access to latrine	100	1.0	13 (100%)
Squat hole cover present	63	0.002	0 (0%)
Privacy	82.4	0.002	0 (0%)
Hand washing facility	82.4	0.004	2 (15%)
No exposed faeces	100	0.056	8 (61.5%)

Association between sanitation and hygiene practices and open defecation free status

This study found association between sanitation and hygiene practices and ODF status. The results showed that households that treated water, used elevated racks, regularly cleaned their latrines, poured ash over the pit of the latrine and used dug out pits for waste disposal were more likely to be ODF; Table 3.

Table 3: Association between sanitation and hygiene practices and open defecation free status in Suna West Sub-County, Kenya

Characteristic	Use	ODF (n)	NOT ODF (n)	P Value	OR (95%CI)	P value
Treating water	Yes	123	225	0.015	3.17(1.20 - 8.40)	0.020
	No	5	29			
Covering food	Yes	128	250	0.305		
	No	0	4			
Using elevated racks	Yes	117	211	0.027	2.17(1.08 - 4.37)	0.030
	No	11	43			
Regular cleaning of latrine	Yes	128	236	0.026	4.88(1.12 - 21.37)	0.035
	No	2	18			
Pouring of ash	Yes	121	193	<0.001	4.25(2.04 - 8.87)	<0.001
	No	9	61			
Dug out pit for waste disposal	Yes	122	196	<0.001	4.51(2.09 - 9.78)	<0.001
	No	8	58			

Association between social norms and open defecation free status

This study found association in a number of the social norms and ODF status. The social norm variables found to be associated with ODF include Subjection to laws and penalties, need to improve things, follow-ups and support, construction/maintenance expensive, majority

ashamed for not having latrine, and okay to defecate in rivers/bushes/dams as shown in Table

5.

Table 5: Association between social norms and open defecation free status Suna West Sub-County, Kenya

Social Norms		NOT ODF n	ODF n	P value		
Latrine accessible to all	Yes	235	123	0.44		
	No	19	7			
Care for the family	Yes	241	128	0.10		
	No	13	2			
Shame/disgust/fear/pride	Yes	238	122	0.96		
	No	16	8			
Cultural/social/religious beliefs	Yes	217	116	0.30		
	No	37	14			
Subjection to laws and penalties	Yes	187	60	<0.001	0.31(0.20- 0.48)	<0.001
	No	67	70			
Privacy and security	Yes	239	123	0.84		
	No	15	7			
Convenience	Yes	239	130	0.003		
	No	15	0			
Need to improve things	Yes	228	106	0.023	0.50(0.28- 0.92)	0.025
	No	26	24			
Follow-ups and support	Yes	234	115	0.05	0.21(0.13- 0.33)	<0.001
	No	15	15			
Peer pressure	Yes	189	101	0.60		
	No	62	29			
Expectation of rewards/Incentives	Yes	205	60	<0.001		
	No	49	70			
Construction/maintenance expensive	Yes	176	70	<0.001	0.52(0.33- 0.80)	0.003
	No	51	50			
Majority should use latrine	Yes	206	94	0.11		
	No	48	33			
It is acceptable to defecate in the open	Yes	141	81	0.35		
	No	105	49			
Embarrassing to see people defecate in open	Yes	193	91	0.08		
	No	54	39			
Majority ashamed for not having latrine	Yes	203	86	0.05	0.40(0.25- 0.64)	<0.001
	No	49	41			
Okay to defecate in rivers/bushes/dams	Yes	214	84	<0.001	0.31(0.19- 0.51)	<0.001
	No	36	46			

DISCUSSION

Open defecation status

This study found 66.1% reversion one-year post-ODF in a previously ODF-certified region. Similarly, earlier study had shown 70% of villages reverting back to open defecation three years after certification among seven sub-counties featured in the study (UNICEF, 2015). However, low reversion rates have been observed (8%) in Ethiopia and Ghana after one year of CLTS implementation, and (14.5%) in Indonesia after two years of ODF certification (Crocker, Saywell, & Bartram, 2017; Odagiri, et al., 2017). In these studies, latrine presence - latrine status and usage – was used as the measure for sustainability, the possible reasons for recording lower reversion rate. Nevertheless, reversion has been found to be common in villages within sub-Saharan Africa where it has been associated with several factors (UNICEF et al., 2013; Mukherjee, 2012). Moreover, sustainability of ODF achievements has been previously found to be a major challenge in Kenyan communities.

In a study by Tyndale-Boscoe et al. (2013) in Uganda, Kenya, Ethiopia, and Sierra Leone two years after CLTS, a 13% reversion was reported when latrine presence was used to measure sustainability. However, the reversion rate would have drastically increased to 92% had the study used the 5 indicators used during the initial verification process which included functional latrine, means of keeping flies away (water seal or squat hole cover), absence of faecal matter, presence of hand washing facility with soap/ash and evidence of latrine use in the re-verification(Tyndale-Boscoe et al., 2013); a much higher reversion rate like the 66.1% observed in the present study when all the indicators are used to measure sustainability.

While governments and most organisations have been very successful in getting households to build and retain latrines, less success has been achieved in improving sanitation behaviour change which is the major aim of CLTS (Tyndale-Boscoe et al., 2013). Overall, the findings of this study suggest that there is need to harmonise or standardize, across studies, indicators that define ODF status. Furthermore, although the protocol is very clear on the non-negotiable indicators, there is need to re-look at their role in defining ODF status. Doing so will help in defining concepts up front in developing any kind of monitoring tool of post-ODF status.

Association between sanitation hygiene practices and open defecation status

We found a significant association between non-negotiable sanitation hygiene practices and ODF status and demonstrated that households that complied with the sanitation hygiene practices were more likely to be ODF. Odagiri et al. (2017) noted in their study that participants from better performing villages on ODF outcomes reported that messages around sanitation promotion and good hygiene had been constantly promoted through mosques and churches. Further, local groups carried out monitoring after CLTS implementation in an effort to promote hand washing with soap, treating of drinking water, proper food handling, solid and liquid waste management by households.

Maintenance of ODF status in households that poured ash in the pit latrines is not surprising because pouring of ash in the pit latrines manages smell from latrines and therefore encourages consistent latrine use by all members of the household. This finding resonating with previous study by Mukherjee (2016) which reported that smelly and unimproved latrines turned people back to open defecation and in Ethiopia, latrine usage by women was tampered with negatively as a result of perceptions around latrine cleanliness and smell inside (Odagiri, et al., 2017). While the present study found that 21% of households presented no evidence of the use of a hand-washing facility and 46% households did not wash their hands with soap and water

always after using a latrine, in a study done by Tyndale-Boscoe, et al. (2013), there was an overall reversal rate of 17% for signs of use of a handwashing facility and 75% for consistent handwashing with soap and water. Slippage for consistent hand washing with soap and water in Homabay and Kilifi stood at 83% and 67% (Tyndale-Boscoe, et al. 2013). Thus, this study recorded much lower reversal rate on consistent hand washing with soap as compared to previous studies.

Training on hand washing with soap, water treatment, preparing food in a hygienic way and proper storage and solid wastes disposal are standard parts of sanitation program (Magala, & Roberts, 2009). According to Lilje, et al. (2015) in a study done in Chad, the individual perception to treating water was rated high. Respondents thought positively about the issues of water treatment and did not perceive it to be taking much effort, time or cost. This mirrors the findings of this present study, households that treated water were high. Water treatment commodities were available in public health offices and distributed by CHVs at household level during dry seasons, other commodities were offered at health facilities to mothers attending clinics and further, there were chlorine dispensers strategically situated in communal water points.

Association between social norms and open defecation status

The study found association between a given number of beliefs and expectations and ODF status a reflection of the existence of social norms within Suna West sub county. According to Bicchieri, (2017) for conclusion about the existence of social norms to be arrived at, there is need to be empirical expectation, normative expectation and the belief in the existence of sanctions which by itself is an indication of existence of social norms. Further, this study found that the households that exhibited the social norms were less likely to be ODF.

Results of this study found that household that responded that the health of the family motivates them to be ODF were less likely to be ODF. This is in spite of previous studies like that done by UNICEF (2014), that reported that the most prominent motivator towards ODF status was concern for the health of the family. Households believed that stopping open defecation resulted in reduction in diarrheal diseases thus motivating them to stop open defecation. In another study, Moran, (2017) reports that health, even though may not have been a driver for the initial defecation behaviour change, people do continue to make effort to maintain and use latrine because of their health and that of the family

Further, the study found no association between care for the family, latrine accessibility and ODF status a reflection of no prudential personal normative belief and no association was found in privacy/security offered by latrine and even peer pressure and ODF status. In a previous study, provision for privacy for superstructure, pride and the convenience of using of latrines were found to be important drivers for women in respect to building latrines in Indonesia (Odagiri, et al., 2017). This particular study failed to find an association between shame/disgust and whether it was embarrassing to see people defecate in the open and ODF status while previous studies reported that shame/ disgust motivated households into behaviour change (UNICEF, 2014).

This study found that those who perceived that construction and maintenance materials were expensive (factual belief) were less likely to be ODF, this resonates with studies done previously that found that high cost of building, maintenance and repair of latrines were among the reasons for reversion back to non-ODF status (Mukherjee, 2016). In their study, Bongartz et al. (2016) suggested that though CLTS was a zero-subsidy strategy, there was need for incorporation of sanitation marketing to CLTS to help those who can afford make informed choice even though this could pose challenge of interfering with behaviour change process.

Those that said rewards and incentives motivate them to be ODF were found to be less likely to be ODF. This resonates with the findings of a study done in East Java in which households that received some form of subsidy did not become ODF, it was discovered that subsidy was divisive since it was never enough for all households and thus hampered collective action, also, incentives has been found to have the capacity to corrupt intrinsic motivation (Mukherjee, 2016; Bicchieri, & Noah, 2017). In the study done on sustainability by UNICEF (2014), some of the enablers of sustainability were natural leaders working together and post-ODF follow up by CHVs.

Novotný et al. (2017), in their study, concluded that social norms were important instrumentally as sanitation outcomes depended on the level to which social influences were able to shape the perceptions of benefits or risks on sanitation-related awareness in positive ways. Similarly, Odagiri et al. (2017) found that in addition to economic levels and lack of reliable access to water, weaker social norms were significantly associated with the reversion to open defecation practices. When looked at singly, latrine usage and open defecation were sustained meaning the social sanctions played out well. However, in the other areas of hand washing with soap, provision of privacy and use of squat hole cover, there was significant reversion registered meaning the social sanctions weren't applied across all the non-negotiable indicators. Suna West sub county had no deep-rooted social norms neither did the CLTS process inculcate new norms to bring about the overall change in sanitation hygiene practices desired and to sustain it after the pressure of certification was off.

CONCLUSION

There was partial reversion to non-ODF status in households one year after certification of Suna West sub county. This was mainly attributed to 3 major indicators; provision of hand washing facility, squat hole cover and privacy. Moreover, there was sustained ODF status in

households that had good sanitation hygiene practices. Social norms were not embedded on the CLTS process, thus failing to create social norms around sanitation and hygiene practices to enhance community collective action towards ODF status sustainability. Therefore, it is important to enhance good hygiene sanitation practices, while instilling social norms to inspire community collective action.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We acknowledge the people of Suna West Sub-County without whom this research would not have been done.

AUTHORS CONTRIBUTION

N.R.A. conceived the presented idea. N.R.A. developed and performed the study under the supervision of C.O.A. and P.O.O. All authors discussed the results and contributed to the final manuscript.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- Abdi, R. (n.d). Open Defecation Free Sustainability Study in East Timor 2015-2016. Bahgladesh: WaterAid.
- Adeyeye, A. (2011). Gender and Community-Led Total Sanitation: a case study of Ekiti state, Nigeria, Tropical Resources. Bulletin of the Yale Tropical Resources Institute (30), 18-27.
- Alliance., D. W. (2016). Social Sustainability: Seven Steps to Community-Led Total Sanitation. wash-alliance.org.
- Alzua, et al. (2015). Impact Evaluation of Community-Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) in Rural Mali: Final Report. Kati: UNICEF.

- Arandan, S. (2016). Role of Gender on Community-Led Total Sanitation Process in Kanying'ombe Community Health Unit, Rongo Sub County, Kenya. *European International Journal of Science and Technology*, 5(4), 89-98.
- Bartram, J. et al. (2012). Commentary on Community-Led Total Sanitation and Human Rights: Should the Right to Community-wide Health be won at the Cost of Individual Rights? *J Water Health*, 2012(10), 499-50.
- Bicchieri, & Noah. (2017). *Applying Social Norms Theory in CATS Programming*. New York: University of Pennsylvania.
- Bicchieri, Christina, & Penn. (2015). *Why do people do what they do? A social norms manual for Zimbabwe and Swaziland*. Italy: UNICEF office of research.
- Capps, J. Njiru, H. & DeVries, P. (2017). Community-Led Total Sanitation, Open Defecation Free Status and Ebola Virus Disease in Lofa County, Liberia. *J Health Community* 22(sup1), 72-80.
- Cavill, S. Chambers, R. & Vernon, N. (2015). *Sustainability and CLTS: Stock Taking, Frontiers of CLTS: Innovations and Insights 4*. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.
- Chambers, R. & Myers, J. (2016). *Norms, Knowledge and Usage, Frontiers of CLTS: Innovations and INsights*. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.
- Chambers, R. (2015). *An Open Letter in Response To the World Development Report 2015*, CLTS website. communityledtotalsanitation.org.
- Clansen, T. et al. (2010). Interventions to Improve Disposal of Human Excreta for Preventing Diarrhoea. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*(Cd007180).
- Cohen, L. Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research Methods in Education* (5 ed.). London: Routledge Falmer.
- Crocker, Saywell, & Bartram. (2017). Sustainability of Community-Led Total Sanitation Outcomes: Evidence from Ethiopia and Ghana. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental health*, 220(2017), 551-557.
- DFID. (2013). *Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Evidence Paper*. London: DFID.
- Dutch Wash Alliance. (2016). *Social Sustainability: Seven Steps to Community-Led Total Sanitation*. Wash Alliance.org.
- Emerson, et al. (2004). Role of Flies and Provision of Latrines in Trachoma Control: Cluster-Randomised Controlled Trial. *Lancet*, 2204(363), 1093-1098.
- Fisher, A. et al. (1991). *Handbook for Family Planning Operations Research Designs*, (2,Ed.). New York: Population Council.
- Gaya, et al. (2015). *Using Social Norms Theory to Strengthen CLTS in Southern Madagascar*. Madagascar: UNICEF.

- Gizaw, & Addisu. (2020). Evidence of Households' Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) Performance Improvement Following a WASH Education Program in Rural Dembiya, Northwest Ethiopia. *Environmental Health Insights*, 1-7.
- Hanchett, S. (2016). Sanitation in Bagladesh: Revolution, Evolution and New Challenges. In V. & Bongartz, *Sustainable Sabitation for All: Experiences, Challenges and Innovation*. Rugby: Practical Action Publishing.
- Harter, M., Mosch, S. & Mosler, H. (2018). How does Community-Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) affect latrine ownership? A quantitative case study from Mozambique. *BMC Public Health*.
- Heimlich, J., & Android, N. (2008). Understanding Behavior to Understand Behavior Change: A Literature Review. *Environmental Education Research*, 14, 215-237.
- IRSP. (2012). World Toilet Day. Fansa: communityledtotalsanitation.org.
- Kar, & Chambers. (2008). *Handbook on Community-Led Total Sanitation*. LONDON: Plan International.
- Kar, & Chambers,. (2011). *Triggering: An Extract from the handbook on Community-Led Total Sanitation*. Brighton: University of Sussex.
- Kar, K. (2005). *Practical Guide to Triggering community-Led Total Sanitation (CLTS)*. Brighton: University of Sussex.
- LaPelle, N. et al. (2006). *Am J Public Health*, 96(8), 1366-1369.
- Lilje, J., Kessely, H. & Mosler, H. (2015). Factors Determining Water Treatment Behavior for the Prevention of Cholera in Chad. *The American Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, 57-65.
- Magala, & Roberts. (2009). *Evaluation of Strategy For Scaling Up Community-Led Toatl Sanitation in Ghana*. Accra: UNICEF.
- Mahbub, A. (2011). Exploring the Social Dynamics of CLTS in Bagladesh: The Inclusion of Children, Women and Vulnerable People. In Mehta & Movik, *Shit Matters: The Potential of Community-Led Total Sanitation*. Rugby: Practical Action Publisheing.
- Mara, Lane, Scott, & Trouba,. (2010). Sanitation and Health. *PLoS med*, 7(11), 363.
- Migori County Bills. (2019). *The Migori County Environmental Health and Sanitation Bill, 2019*. Nairobi: Government Printers.
- Migori County Government. (2018). *Migori Municipality Integrated Development Plan 2018-2022*.
- Ministry of Health. (2014). *A Practitioner's Guide for ODF Certification in Kenya*. Nairobi: Ministry of Health.
- Ministry Of Health. (2016). *Kenya Environmental Sanitation and Hygiene Policy 2030*. Nairobi: Kenya Gazette.

- Ministry of Health. (2013). Protocol for Implementing CLTS in Kenya. Nairobi: Ministry of Health.
- Ministry of Health. (2016). National ODF Kenya 2020 Campaign framework: 2016/17-2019/20. Nairobi: Ministry of Health.
- Moran, H. (2017). ODF Sustainability in Timor-Leste. Tomor-Leste: Australian Aid.
- Moskal, B., & Leydens, J. (2000). Scoring Rubric Development: Validity and Reliability. Practical assessment, Research and Evaluation, 7(10).
- Mukherjee. (2016). Building Environment to Support Sustainability of Improved Sanitation Behaviours at Scale: Levers of Change in East Asia. In Bongartz Vernon & Fox, Sustainable Sanitation for All: Experiences, Challenges and Innovations. Rugby: Practical Action Publishing.
- Mukherjee, N. (2012). Achieving and Sustaining Open Defecation Free Communities. East Java: Action Research.
- Mutambo, A. (2016, August 28). Kenya Spends Sh57bn to Deal with Ailments Related to Poor Sanitation. Daily Nation.
- Myers, J. (2016). The Long-term Safe Management of Rural Shit. In Bongartz Vernon & Fox, Sustainable Sanitation for All: Experience, Challenges and Innovation. Rugby: Practical Action Publishing.
- Ncube F. et al., (2019). Factors associated with food handling practices in the food service sector. J Environ Health Science & Engineering, 1243-1255.
- NEMA. (2014). National Solid Waste Management Strategy. Nairobi: National Environmental Management Authority.
- Nisbet, E., & Gick, M. (2008). Can Health Psychology Help the Planet? Applying Theory and Models Health to Environmental Actions. Canadian Psychology, 49, 296-303.
- Njuguna, & Muruka. (2017). Open Defecation in Newly Created Kenyan Counties: A Situational Analysis. J Health Care Poor Underserved, 28(1), 71-78.
- Noufal, M. et al. (2020). Determinants of Household Solid Waste Generation and Composition in Homs City, Syria. Environmental and Public Health.
- Novotny', et al. (2015). The Role of Perceived Social Norms in Rural Sanitation: An Explorative Study from Infrastructure-Restricted settings of South Ethiopia. MPDI.
- Novotny, J. et al. (2017). The Role of Perceived social Norms in Rural Sanitation: An Explorative Study from Infrastructure-Restricted Settings of South Ethiopia. Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health, 14(7).
- Odagiri, et al. (2017). Enabling Factors for Sustaining Open Defecation free Communities in Rural Indonesia: A Cross-Sectional Study. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 14(1572), 1-20.
- Ogendo K. N. et al. (2016). Assessment of Community Led Total Sanitation Uptake in Rural Kenya. East African Medical Journal.

- Orodho, A. J. (2009). *Elements of Education and Social Science Research Methods* (2 Ed.). Nairobi: Kenyatta University.
- Oxford Economics. (2016). *The True Cost of Poor Sanitation*. Oxford: Oxford Economics.
- Phelan, C. & Wren, J.,. (2006). *Eploring Reliability in Academic Assessment*.
[https://chfasoa.uni.edu/reliability and invalidity.htm](https://chfasoa.uni.edu/reliability%20and%20invalidity.htm).
- Prochaska, J. & Di Clement, C.,. (1982). Transtheoretical therapy: Toward a more integrative model of change. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice*, 19 (3), 276-288.
- Program Water and Sanitation. (2012a). *Economic Impacts of poor Sanitation in Africa*. Retrieved from INTAFRICA Resources: <http://siteresources.worldbank.org>
- Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., Nicholls, C., & Ormston, R. (2013). *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*. SAGE.
- Robinson A. & Gnilo. (2016b). Promoting choice: smart finance for rural sanitation development. In B. P. al., *Sustainable Sanitation for All: Eperiences, Challenges and Innovations*.
- Robinson, A & Gnilo, M. (2016a). Beyond ODF: A phased approach to rural sanitation development. *Sustainable Sanitation for All: Experiences, Challenges and Innovations*, 153-166.
- Sah, et al. (2009). *Community Led Total Sanitation (CLTS): Addressing the Challenges of Scale and Sustainability in rural Africa*. *Desalination*, 000, 1-8.
- Sarah, L. (2016). *Certification of Open Defecation Free Status: Emerging Lessons from Kenya*. In V. & Bongartz, *Sustainable Sanitation for All*. Rugby: Practical Action Publishing.
- Shulman, et al. (2017). the state of the Field of Social Norms Research. *International Journal of Communication.*, 1192-1213.
- Sigler, S., Mahmoudi, L., & Graham, P. (2014). Analysis of Behavioral change Techniques in Community Led Total Sanitation Programs. *Health Promotion Internantional*, 30(1), 16-28.
- Simiyu, et al. (2020). Barriers and opportunities for cleanliness of shared sanitation facilities in low-income settlements in Kenya. *BMC Public Health*.
- Singh, & Balfour. (2014). *Sustainability of ODF Practices in Kenya*. Nairobi: UNICEF KENYA.
- Sonego I. L. (2017). *Explaining latrine cleanliness: habitual latrine cleaning, psychosocial factors, contextual factors and general hygiene practice*. Zurich: Zurich Open Repository and Archive.
- Sullivan, M. G. (2013). *Analizing and Interpreting Data From Likert-Type Scales* . *Graduate Medical Education*, 541-542.

- Sutton, S. (2000). a critical review of the transtheoretical model applied to smoking cessation. In P. e. Norman, Understanding and changing health behaviour: from health beliefs to self-regulation. London: Harwood Acade.
- The University of Sherfield. (2018). Observations. Retrieved from <http://www.sherfield.ac.uk/lets/strategy/resources/evaluate/general/methods-collection/observation>
- Thomas. (2016). Strengthening Post-ODF Programming: Reviewing Lessons from Sub-Saharan Africa. Institute of Development Studies., 84-97.
- Tyndale-Boscoe, et al. (2013). ODF Sustainability. Nairobi: Plan International.
- UNICEF. (2014, March). Evaluation of the WASH Sector Strategy 'Community Approaches to Total Sanitation'(CATS). Retrieved from UNICEF Evaluation files: <http://www.unicef.org>
- UNICEF. (2015). Sustainability of ODF Practices in Kenya. Retrieved from <http://www.unicef.org/esa/site/files/2018-09/UNICEF-Kenya>
- UNICEF et al. (2013). Community-Led Total Sanitation in East Asia and Pacific: Progress, Lessons and Directions. Bangkok: UNICEF East Asia.
- UNICEF. (n.d). Protocol for Certification and Verification of Open Defecation Free and Total Sanitation Communities. Nairobi: UNICEF.
- UNICEF. (2015b). Sustainability of ODF Practices in Kenya. Nairobi: UNICEF.
- UNICEF. (2015c). The Impact of Poor Sanitation on Nutrition. New Delhi: UNICEF.
- Venkataramanan, Crocker, Karon, & Bartram. (2017). Community Led Total sanitation: A Mixed-Methods Systematic Review of Evidence and Its Quality. Retrieved from Environmental Health Perspectives, 026001-17: <http://doi.org/10.1289/EHP1965>
- Vernon, N. & Bongartz, P. (2016). Going Beyond Open Defecation Free. In Bongartz P. et al., Sustainable Sanitation for All: Experiences, challenges and Innovations. Rugby: Practical Action Publishing.
- Victoria, C., Adair, L., & Fall, C. (2008). Maternal and Child Undernutrition: Consequences for Adult Health and Human Capital. Lancet, 340-357.
- WASHplus. (2016). Behaviour-centered Approaches to Improve Health Outcomes. Washington: USAID.
- Wasonga, Okowa, & Kioli. (2016). Sociocultural Determinants to Adoption of Safe Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene Practices in Nyakach, Kisumu County, Kenya: A Descriptive Qualitative Study. Hindawi Publishing Cooperation, 5.
- Water and Sanitation Program. (2012a). Economic Impacts of Poor Sanitation. Retrieved from <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTAFRICA/Resources/economic-impacts-of-poor-sanitation>
- WaterAid. (2011). Sanitation Framework.

- Webb, T., Sniehotta, F., & Michie, S. (2010). Using theories of behaviour change to inform interventions for addictive behaviours. *Addiction* (105), 1879-1892.
- Whelan, J. et al. (2014). Cochrane Update: Predicting sustainability of intervention effects in public health evidence: Identifying key elements to provide guidance. *Journal of Public Health* 36(2), 344-351.
- WHO. (2018). Sanitation. Retrieved from fact sheets: <http://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheet>
- WSP. (2014). State of Sanitation In Migori County - Devolution Hub. Nairobi: County Sanitation Profiles.
- WSP. (2012b). Economic Impacts of Poor Sanitation in Africa. Accra: Water and Sanitation Program.
- Yoda, et al. (2014). Domestic waste disposal practice and perceptions of private sector waste management in urban Accra. *BMC Public Health*.