

1 Evaluation of a district-wide sanitation programme in rural Malawi: does it
2 include people living with disabilities?

3

4

5 Katherine Davies^{1*}, Mindy Panulo², Clara MacLeod¹, Jane Wilbur⁴, Tracy Morse³, Kondwani
6 Chidziwisano², Robert Dreibelbis¹

7

8 ¹ Department of Disease Control, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine (LSHTM),
9 London, UK

10 ² Centre for Water, Sanitation, Health, and Appropriate Technology Development
11 (WASHTED), Malawi University of Business and Applied Sciences, Blantyre, Malawi

12 ³ Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK

13 ⁴ Department of Population Health, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine
14 (LSHTM), London, UK

15

16

17 *Corresponding author

18 Email: katherine.davies1@lshtm.ac.uk

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 **Abstract**

28 Community-led total sanitation (CLTS) is embraced as a key strategy to achieve
29 universal sanitation coverage (Sustainable Development Goal 6.2). Although inclusion
30 is identified as a predictor of CLTS success, people living with disabilities are often
31 excluded from community sanitation programmes and there is limited research
32 exploring CLTS participation amongst people living with disabilities. This study aims
33 to explore the extent to which people living with disabilities participated in a CLTS
34 intervention delivered in rural Malawi.

35

36 This cross-sectional study was conducted in the Chiradzulu district of Malawi. A
37 household questionnaire was administered to collect information about CLTS
38 participation. Multivariable logistic regression was performed to compare participation
39 in different CLTS activities between households with (n=80) and without a member
40 with a disability (n=167), and between household members with (n=55) and without a
41 disability (n=226).

42

43 No difference in CLTS participation was observed at the household-level, but there
44 were marked differences in CLTS participation between household members with and
45 without a disability. Household members without a disability reported higher
46 attendance at the triggering session (OR=2.09, 95%CI 1.00–4.37), gave more input in
47 triggering activities (OR=3.72, 95%CI 1.46-9.51), and reported higher participation in
48 the transect walk (OR=4.03, 95%CI 1.52-10.68), community action planning
49 (OR=2.89, 95%CI 1.23-6.79), and follow-up visits (OR=3.37, 95%CI 1.67-6.82)
50 compared to household members with disabilities. There was no difference in the
51 likelihood of being invited to triggering (OR=0.98, 95%CI 0.43–2.22) or participating in

52 community mapping (OR=2.38, 95%CI 0.63-8.99) between household members with
53 and without a disability.

54

55 This study revealed intra-household inequalities in CLTS participation. To improve
56 participation in CLTS interventions, facilitators should be trained on action steps to
57 make CLTS more inclusive. Further research could include an in-depth analysis of
58 predictors of CLTS participation amongst people living with disabilities, including
59 disability types, severity and age.

60

61 **Introduction**

62 Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 6.2 aims to end open defecation and provide
63 access to improved sanitation to all by 2030 paying special attention to those in
64 vulnerable situations, including people living with disabilities [1]. People living with
65 disabilities are described as individuals with long-term impairments which hinder their
66 ability to participate fully and equally in society [2]. The World Health Organisation's
67 (WHO) International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF)
68 framework provides a bio-psycho-social model of disability, viewing disablement as a
69 consequence of external factors in addition to personal impairments [3]. Current
70 qualitative literature highlights physical, social, institutional, and personal barriers that
71 make accessing sanitation facilities more challenging for people living with disabilities
72 [4-10]. Barriers to sanitation access can include infrastructural factors, discrimination
73 or exclusion from participating in community sanitation meetings. The barriers to
74 accessing sanitation mean people living with disabilities often lose their autonomy,
75 resulting in a reported lack of privacy and dignity [4-6, 11]. Inaccessible sanitation

76 facilities are a particular challenge for people living with disabilities who menstruate
77 and people with incontinence who report limiting social interactions due to fear of
78 discrimination or violence [11-15].

79

80 Studies in multiple countries have documented disparities in sanitation access
81 between people with and without disabilities [16-19]. Reported barriers to sanitation
82 access are most marked for people with more complex impairments and where people
83 living with disabilities and their households are among the poorest groups of the
84 population [16-19]. However, the disparity in sanitation access is specific to the
85 individual. Multiple studies have documented little to no differences in sanitation
86 access comparing households with and without a member living with a disability [16-
87 19]. Traditional household-level measures of sanitation access, therefore, may mask
88 important disparities in sanitation access within the household [20].

89

90 Community-led total sanitation (CLTS) is a behaviour change approach that aims to
91 catalyse collective community action to adopt sanitation and end open defecation in
92 rural settings [21]. It has been widely used in low-income countries as a key strategy
93 to meet the Sustainable Development Goal sanitation targets [22]. The focal activity
94 of CLTS is the triggering session, where community members are 'triggered' by
95 feelings of shame and disgust to critically self-assess their sanitation behaviours. The
96 triggering session involves a transect walk (also known as a walk of shame) and a
97 community mapping activity (Fig 1). The triggering session can lead to a commitment
98 to end open defecation and the development of a community action plan to construct
99 latrines using available local resources [21]. Post-triggering activities include

100 household visits to discuss and monitor latrine construction progress against
101 community action plans.

102 **Fig 1. Description of key CLTS activities**

103 There is mixed evidence on CLTS success. While several studies report increased
104 latrine coverage in communities following CLTS [23-26], a systematic review and
105 meta-analysis revealed no statistically significant increase in latrine coverage or usage
106 in households following CLTS interventions [27]. For CLTS to be successful and
107 sustainable, there must be broad and inclusive community participation [28-30].
108 Excluding vulnerable community members, including people living with disabilities,
109 can lead to these members returning to open defecation behaviours due to the
110 construction of inaccessible latrines [31]. To ensure the design and location of
111 sanitation facilities are accessible and usable, people living with disabilities must
112 participate fully across the entire CLTS process [7].

113

114 People living with disabilities are often excluded from participating fully in community
115 programmes, including sanitation programmes [32-34]. Socially excluded groups,
116 including people living with disabilities, are inadequately involved in the design and
117 planning of sanitation projects and frequently feel they are not listened to [35]. Physical
118 barriers to participation for people living with disabilities include inaccessible meeting
119 locations or a lack of provision of assistance (such as visual aids or verbal
120 descriptions), whilst social barriers include stigma and discrimination, leading to the
121 exclusion of people living with disabilities from community events [34, 36]. People
122 living with disabilities are often under-estimated by their communities that think they
123 are incapable of participating in community meetings [37]. This can lead to people
124 living with disabilities feeling inferior or rejected by the community, so they do not feel

125 they can participate in community events. The inclusion of people living with disabilities
126 in community programmes involves action by facilitators to ensure they are able to
127 participate, raising community awareness of the barriers to accessing sanitation, and
128 disseminating information about low-cost adaptations to improve the accessibility of
129 latrines [36, 38, 39].

130

131 Achieving universal sanitation coverage, as outlined in the sustainable development
132 goal targets, requires addressing the needs of people living with disabilities, which is
133 dependent on their full and equitable participation in sanitation programmes. People
134 living with disabilities constitute upwards of 16% of the global population [40, 41].
135 Therefore, more information is needed to better understand their participation in
136 community-based interventions. This exploratory study aims to address this gap by
137 exploring the extent to which adults with disabilities (over the age of 18) participated
138 in a CLTS intervention delivered in rural Malawi. Specifically, the study compared
139 CLTS participation between households with and without a member with a disability,
140 and between household members with and without a disability.

141

142 **Methods**

143 **Study Setting**

144 This cross-sectional study was conducted in Malawi. According to the 2018 Population
145 and Housing Census, there are 1,734,250 people aged 5 years or older with at least
146 one type of disability in Malawi, representing about 11.6% of the total population [42].
147 This includes people with limitations in at least one functional domain (seeing, hearing,
148 walking, speaking, intellectual, or self-care) as well as people with Albinism and

149 Epilepsy. According to WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP) estimates
150 from 2022, around 50% of the population in Malawi lacks access to improved
151 sanitation facilities and an estimated 531,000 people (2.61%) practice open
152 defecation, which is largely concentrated in rural, poor areas [43]. This study focused
153 on two Traditional Authorities (TAs) in the Chiradzulu district, situated in the Southern
154 Region of Malawi. The district has a population of approximately 350,000 people and
155 National Statistics Office data from 2018 estimates approximately 11% of the
156 population have a disability [42]. Sanitation coverage in Chiradzulu is below the
157 national average. According to the Chiradzulu District Sector Investment Plan (DSIP),
158 53% (440/831) of villages are certified open defecation free (ODF) [44]. However, only
159 5.9% (49/831) of villages were certified ODF by the National ODF Task Force.

160
161 This study was conducted as part of a larger research and learning collaboration
162 between the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (LSHTM), the Malawi
163 University of Business and Applied Sciences (MUBAS), and the international non-
164 governmental organisation (NGO) World Vision focusing on water, sanitation and
165 hygiene (WASH) programming in Chiradzulu District, Malawi. Since 2022, World
166 Vision Malawi, in partnership with local and regional officials, has implemented the
167 WASH for Everyone project, which aims to reach universal sanitation coverage in the
168 district by the end of 2025. This study focused on the TAs of Mpama and Likoswe
169 where World Vision completed CLTS activities in 2022.

170

171 **Sampling Procedure**

172 Multiple sampling approaches were used in the recruitment of study participants (Fig
173 2). This study was embedded within a larger process evaluation of World Vision's

174 sanitation programmes in TAs Mpama and Likoswe with an estimated sample size of
175 approximately 200 households. Simple random sampling was used to randomly select
176 10 villages from each TA and 10 households per selected village. To explore CLTS
177 participation among people living with disabilities, an additional 50 households with a
178 member living with a disability were sampled purposively. A list of 25 households with
179 a member living with a disability from TA Mpama and TA Likoswe was provided by the
180 Chiradzulu district council social welfare officer. Despite efforts to engage with local
181 organizations of persons with disabilities (OPD) for identification and recruitment, we
182 were unable to secure participation. Therefore, we relied on community health workers
183 (CHWs), locally known as Health Surveillance Assistants (HSAs), and community
184 volunteers to identify households. Purposive sampling was used to sample the
185 additional 25 households to ensure an adequate number of households with a member
186 living with a disability were interviewed within the study timeframe.

187 **Fig 2. Flow diagram outlining the sampling procedure.**

188 **Data Collection**

189 Preliminary questionnaires, consisting primarily of open-ended questions with pre-
190 coded responses, were developed by the study team and translated into the local
191 language (Chichewa). Surveys were piloted in two villages in Chiradzulu district that
192 were not part of the final study sample. A team of four enumerators fluent in Chichewa
193 were recruited for data collection activities. All enumerators had previous experience
194 administering survey questions around sanitation. Prior to data collection,
195 enumerators completed training on questionnaire content, data collection procedures
196 and ethical safeguarding (informed consent, data protection, and disability awareness
197 training).

198

199 Participants were recruited and data was collected between 26 June to 14 July 2023.
200 Surveys were orally administered. Electronic data entry forms were built using Kobo
201 Collect and administered on Android tablets. Data from the tablets was uploaded into
202 a secure, cloud-based server daily. Prior to the survey being administered, an
203 information sheet was read out by the interviewer outlining the study purpose and
204 procedures before informed consent was obtained. No respondents under 18 were
205 interviewed in this study and individuals with cognitive difficulties, where it was not
206 possible to ascertain informed consent under field-based survey conditions, were not
207 asked to participate.

208

209 In each participating household, surveys were completed with two household
210 members. Surveys were first completed with the respondent identified as most
211 responsible for water and sanitation in the household, and were then completed with
212 a household member with a disability (Fig 3). Household members with a disability
213 were identified using the Washing Group Short Set (WG-SS) of questions on
214 functioning, which were administered with the primary household respondent to
215 determine if anyone in the household had a disability [45]. Anyone in the household
216 reported as having 'a lot of difficulty' or 'cannot do at all' in any one of the WG-SS
217 functional domains (vision, hearing, communication, cognition, mobility, and self-care)
218 was defined as having a disability. In most households, the second respondent was
219 the household member living with a disability. However, if the primary respondent was
220 the household member living with a disability, the second respondent recruited from
221 the household was an adult household member without a disability. If the second
222 respondent was not available or not eligible as per the exclusion criteria, only the

223 primary respondent was interviewed but the household was still noted as having a
224 member living with a disability.

225 **Fig 3. Flow diagram outlining data collection procedures.**

226 Surveys with the primary household respondent captured household composition and
227 sociodemographic information as well as latrine access and ownership. Both
228 respondents were asked a series of yes or no questions to assess participation in
229 World Vision's CLTS activities. Respondents were asked if they were invited to
230 triggering, if they attended triggering, if their household was visited, and if they
231 participated in key CLTS activities such as the transect walk, community mapping, and
232 community action planning. Respondents were then asked to report if key activities to
233 improve CLTS inclusivity were conducted by facilitators [38]. Specifically, they were
234 asked if assistance was provided for people living with disabilities, if a squatting
235 exercise was conducted, and if information on low-cost cost technologies to improve
236 latrine accessibility was provided.

237

238 **Data Management and Analysis**

239 Quantitative data from household questionnaires was exported from Kobo Collect to
240 Microsoft Excel for data cleaning, then uploaded to STATA V17.0 for analysis.
241 Analysis was conducted at both the household and individual level. At the household
242 level, responses from the primary household respondents were used to determine
243 household participation. Multiple logistic regression was performed to calculate odds
244 ratios to compare participation in selected elements of CLTS programming between
245 households with and without a member living with a disability. Analyses were adjusted
246 for gender of the primary respondent, income, education, household size and reported

247 time since latrine construction. Analyses were also adjusted for potential clustering at
248 the village level.

249

250 At the individual-level, multiple logistic regression models estimated odds ratios
251 comparing CLTS programming participation between household members with and
252 without a disability. Individual-level analyses were adjusted for age, sex, and income.
253 Analyses were also adjusted for clustering of individuals within the same household.
254 Further cross tabulations were performed to calculate the proportion of respondents
255 reporting that activities important for inclusive CLTS were conducted by facilitators.
256 Univariate logistic regression was performed to calculate odds ratios to compare
257 reporting between household members with and without a disability.

258

259 **Ethical Considerations**

260 Ethical approval was gained from LSHTM's MSc Research Ethics Committee (Ref
261 28569) and Malawi's National Committee on Research in the Social Sciences and
262 Humanities (NCST/RTT/2/6, P.09/22/673).

263

264 Informed consent was obtained from all participants interviewed and was confirmed
265 by a thumb-print or written signature, depending on literacy status. Where the
266 individual consenting was illiterate, a literate impartial witness signed to confirm that
267 the participant understood and consented to the survey. Individuals with cognitive
268 difficulties, where it was not possible to ascertain informed consent under field-based
269 survey conditions, were not asked to participate. This was up to the discretion of the
270 data collection team who worked closely with caregivers to decide whether
271 participation in the study was appropriate. If it was felt the purpose of the study was

272 not understood by the respondent at any stage, the interview was stopped. If the
273 respondent had a visual impairment and they could not read or write, an impartial
274 witness signed to confirm the participant understood and consented to the survey. If
275 the respondent had a hearing impairment, the information sheets were given to the
276 respondent to read and consent form signed as usual. If the respondent had a hearing
277 impairment and was not literate, the respondent was not asked to participate unless
278 they could sufficiently communicate. Despite efforts to use a sign language interpreter,
279 we were unable to secure participation. We did not rely on family members to interpret
280 due to risks of misinterpretation.

281 **Results**

282 **Respondent Characteristics**

283 A total of 247 households were enrolled, of which 32% (80/247) had a member living
284 with a disability. Most of the lead household respondents interviewed were female
285 (87%; 215/247), married (59%; 145/247), and did not have a disability (90%; 222/247).
286 Pit latrines were the only types of latrines owned by households, with more households
287 owning pit latrines without a slab (53%; 131/247) than with a slab (9%; 22/247). Thirty-
288 eight percent (94/247) of respondents reported that they did not own a latrine.

289
290 A total of 281 individuals were interviewed in the 247 households visited (Fig 4).
291 Approximately 20% (55/281) of individuals interviewed had a disability. Most of the
292 respondents were female (83%; 232/281). Mobility was the most common functional
293 limitation reported (85%; 47/55) followed by self-care (38%; 21/55). Detailed sample
294 characteristics are outlined in Tables 1 and 2.

295

296 **Fig 4. Flow diagram outlining how the number of individuals interviewed was**
297 **reached based on the number of households visited**

298 Table 1. Household-level characteristics stratified by households with and without a member with a disability (n=247)

| Variable | Total (n=247) | | Households with a disabled member (n=80) | | Households with no disabled member (n=167) | |
|------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Household Disability Status | | | | | | |
| Member with a disability | 80 | 32.39% | - | - | - | - |
| No member with a disability | 167 | 67.61% | - | - | - | - |
| Total | 247 | 100.00% | 80 | 100.00% | 167 | 100.00% |
| Lead Respondent Disability Status | | | | | | |
| Disability | 25 | 10.12% | 25 | 31.25% | 0 | 0.00% |
| No disability | 222 | 89.88% | 55 | 68.75% | 167 | 100.00% |
| Total | 247 | 100.00% | 80 | 100.00% | 167 | 100.00% |
| Lead Respondent Gender | | | | | | |
| Male | 32 | 12.96% | 21 | 26.25% | 11 | 6.59% |
| Female | 215 | 87.04% | 59 | 73.75% | 156 | 93.41% |
| Total | 247 | 100.00% | 80 | 100.00% | 167 | 100.00% |
| Lead Respondent Age | | | | | | |
| 18-24 years | 37 | 14.98% | 12 | 15.00% | 25 | 14.97% |
| 25-34 years | 62 | 25.10% | 11 | 13.75% | 51 | 30.54% |
| 35-44 years | 58 | 23.48% | 19 | 23.75% | 39 | 23.35% |
| 45-54 years | 31 | 12.55% | 12 | 15.00% | 19 | 11.38% |
| 55-64 years | 32 | 12.96% | 14 | 17.50% | 18 | 10.78% |
| 65+ years | 27 | 10.93% | 12 | 15.00% | 15 | 8.98% |
| Total | 247 | 100.00% | 80 | 100.00% | 167 | 100.00% |
| Household Size | | | | | | |
| 1-3 people | 89 | 36.03% | 26 | 32.50% | 63 | 37.72% |
| 3-5 people | 90 | 36.44% | 26 | 32.50% | 64 | 38.32% |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------|----------------|-----------|----------------|------------|----------------|
| 6+ people | 68 | 27.53% | 28 | 35.00% | 40 | 23.95% |
| Total | 247 | 100.00% | 80 | 100.00% | 167 | 100.00% |
| Household Monthly Income (Malawi Kwacha) | | | | | | |
| < 20,000 | 126 | 51.01% | 45 | 56.25% | 81 | 48.50% |
| 20,000 – 40,000 | 54 | 21.86% | 19 | 23.75% | 35 | 20.96% |
| 40,000 + | 67 | 27.13% | 16 | 20.00% | 51 | 30.54% |
| Total | 247 | 100.00% | 80 | 100.00% | 167 | 100.00% |
| Lead Respondent Marital Status | | | | | | |
| Single | 33 | 13.36% | 18 | 22.50% | 15 | 8.98% |
| Married | 145 | 58.70% | 43 | 53.75% | 102 | 61.08% |
| Divorced | 39 | 15.79% | 10 | 12.50% | 29 | 17.37% |
| Widowed | 30 | 12.15% | 9 | 11.25% | 21 | 12.57% |
| Total | 247 | 100.00% | 80 | 100.00% | 167 | 100.00% |
| Lead Respondent Education | | | | | | |
| Up to Primary | 187 | 75.71% | 66 | 82.50% | 121 | 72.46% |
| Secondary + | 60 | 24.29% | 14 | 17.50% | 46 | 27.54% |
| Total | 247 | 100.00% | 80 | 100.00% | 167 | 100.00% |
| Lead Respondent Occupation | | | | | | |
| Farming | 80 | 32.39% | 33 | 41.25% | 47 | 28.14% |
| Business | 51 | 20.65% | 14 | 17.50% | 37 | 22.16% |
| Piece works | 71 | 28.74% | 19 | 23.75% | 52 | 31.14% |
| Other | 45 | 18.22% | 14 | 17.50% | 31 | 18.56% |
| Total | 247 | 100.00% | 80 | 100.00% | 167 | 100.00% |
| Household Latrine Ownership | | | | | | |
| Own a latrine | 153 | 61.94% | 54 | 67.50% | 99 | 59.28% |
| Do not own a latrine | 94 | 38.06% | 26 | 32.50% | 68 | 40.72% |
| Total | 247 | 100% | 80 | 100% | 167 | 100% |
| Household Latrine Type | | | | | | |
| Pit latrine with a slab | 22 | 8.91% | 11 | 13.75% | 11 | 6.59% |
| Pit latrine without a slab | 131 | 53.04% | 43 | 53.75% | 88 | 52.69% |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------|----------------|-----------|----------------|------------|----------------|
| No latrine | 94 | 38.06% | 26 | 32.50% | 68 | 40.72% |
| Total | 247 | 100.00% | 80 | 100.00% | 167 | 100.00% |
| Household Latrine Construction Time | | | | | | |
| Before W4E project | 136 | 55.06% | 50 | 62.50% | 86 | 51.50% |
| After W4E project | 17 | 6.88% | 4 | 5.00% | 13 | 7.78% |
| No latrine | 94 | 38.06% | 26 | 32.50% | 68 | 40.72% |
| Total | 247 | 100.00% | 80 | 100.00% | 167 | 100.00% |
| Functional Limitation Type (Disabled Household Member) * | | | | | | |
| Vision | - | - | 4 | 5.00% | - | - |
| Hearing | - | - | 9 | 11.25% | - | - |
| Mobility | - | - | 55 | 68.75% | - | - |
| Cognition | - | - | 5 | 6.25% | - | - |
| Self-care | - | - | 30 | 37.50% | - | - |
| Communication | - | - | 11 | 13.75% | - | - |

*Domains are not mutually exclusive

299

300

301

302

303

304 Table 2. Individual-level characteristics stratified by individuals with and without a disability (n=281)

| Variable | Total (n=281) | | Individuals with disabilities (n=55) | | Individuals without disabilities (n=226) | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|--------------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------------|----------------|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Disability Status | | | | | | |
| Disability: | 55 | 19.57% | - | - | - | - |
| No disability | 226 | 80.43% | - | - | - | - |
| Total | 281 | 100.00% | 55 | 100.00% | 226 | 100.00% |
| Gender | | | | | | |
| Male | 49 | 17.44% | 31 | 56.36% | 18 | 7.96% |
| Female | 232 | 82.56% | 24 | 43.64% | 208 | 92.04% |
| Total | 281 | 100.00% | 55 | 100.00% | 226 | 100.00% |
| Age | | | | | | |
| 18-24 | 41 | 14.59% | 6 | 10.91% | 35 | 15.49% |
| 25-34 | 66 | 23.49% | 10 | 18.18% | 56 | 24.78% |
| 35-44 | 64 | 22.78% | 8 | 14.55% | 56 | 24.78% |
| 45-54 | 36 | 12.81% | 8 | 14.55% | 28 | 12.39% |
| 55-64 | 39 | 13.88% | 11 | 20.00% | 28 | 12.39% |
| 65+ | 35 | 12.46% | 12 | 21.82% | 23 | 10.18% |
| Total | 281 | 100.00% | 55 | 100.00% | 226 | 100.00% |
| Monthly Income (Malawi Kwacha) | | | | | | |
| < 20,000 | 147 | 52.31% | 35 | 63.64% | 112 | 49.56% |
| 20,000 – 40,000 | 61 | 21.71% | 10 | 18.18% | 51 | 22.57% |
| 40,000 + | 73 | 25.98% | 10 | 18.18% | 63 | 27.88% |
| Total | 281 | 100.00% | 55 | 100.00% | 226 | 100.00% |
| Functional Limitation Type* | | | | | | |
| Vision | - | - | 2 | 3.64% | - | - |
| Hearing | - | - | 3 | 5.45% | - | - |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|---|---|----|--------|---|---|
| Mobility | - | - | 47 | 85.45% | - | - |
| Cognition | - | - | 0 | 0% | - | - |
| Self-care | - | - | 21 | 38.18% | - | - |
| Communication | - | - | 2 | 3.64% | - | - |

305 *Domains are not mutually exclusive

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316 **CLTS Participation**

317 **Household-level analysis:**

318 Sixty-four percent (159/247) of lead respondents reported they were invited to the
319 triggering session and roughly half (55%; 136/247) reported they attended the session.
320 Reported participation in the transect walk (18%; 44/247) and community mapping
321 (17%; 41/247) was lower; while over three-quarters of lead respondents (78%;
322 193/247) reported their household was visited by someone to discuss latrine
323 construction or usage after CLTS events.

324

325 While participation in CLTS was proportionally lower in households with a member
326 living with a disability for most activities, there was no statistical evidence that having
327 a household member with a disability decreased the likelihood of participating in any
328 CLTS activities (Table 3).

329

330 **Table 3. Adjusted odds ratios for the association between having a household**
331 **member with a disability and participation in each element of CLTS (n=247).**

| CLTS Activity | Participation | | Adjusted Odds Ratios | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------------|-----------|
| | N/Total | % | aOR [†] | 95% CI |
| Invited to triggering | | | | |
| Household member with a disability | 51/80 | 63.75% | 1.00 | - |
| No household member with a disability | 108/167 | 64.67% | 0.68 | 0.38-1.24 |
| Total | 159/247 | 64.37% | - | - |
| Attended triggering | | | | |
| Household Member with a disability | 40/80 | 50.00% | 1.00 | - |
| No household member with a disability | 96/167 | 57.49% | 1.03 | 0.57-1.85 |
| Total | 136/247 | 55.06% | - | - |

| Participated in transect walk | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|------|-----------|
| Household Member with a disability | 15/80 | 18.75% | 1.00 | - |
| No household member with a disability | 29/167 | 17.37% | 0.76 | 0.38-1.50 |
| Total | 44/247 | 17.81% | - | - |
| Participated in community mapping | | | | |
| Household Member with a disability | 11/80 | 13.75% | 1.00 | - |
| No household member with a disability | 30/167 | 17.96% | 1.15 | 0.54-2.42 |
| Total | 41/247 | 16.60% | - | - |
| Felt they could give input | | | | |
| Household Member with a disability | 21/80 | 26.25% | 1.00 | - |
| No household member with a disability | 57/167 | 34.13% | 1.65 | 0.88-3.10 |
| Total | 78/247 | 31.58% | - | - |
| Participated in community action planning | | | | |
| Household Member with a disability | 28/80 | 35.00% | 1.00 | - |
| No household member with a disability | 65/167 | 38.92% | 1.08 | 0.61-1.90 |
| Total | 93/247 | 37.65% | - | - |
| Visited by someone to discuss latrine construction/use | | | | |
| Household Member with a disability | 59/80 | 73.75% | 1.00 | - |
| No household member with a disability | 134/167 | 80.24% | 1.53 | 0.79-2.99 |
| Total | 193/247 | 78.14% | - | - |

332 *P<0.05 in the Wald Test

333 †Adjusted for gender of the primary respondent, income, education, household size
334 and reported time since latrine construction, with consideration for clustering at the
335 village level.

336

337 **Individual-level analysis:**

338 Individual-level regression models found no association between having a disability
339 and being invited to triggering (OR=0.98, 95%CI 0.43–2.22) or participating in
340 community mapping (OR=2.38, 95%CI 0.63-8.99). However, household members
341 without a disability had greater odds of participating in all other aspects of CLTS
342 programming. Household members without a disability reported higher attendance at
343 the triggering session (OR=2.09, 95%CI 1.00–4.37), gave more input in triggering

344 activities (OR=3.72, 95%CI 1.46-9.51), and reported higher participation in the
 345 transect walk (OR=4.03, 95%CI 1.52-10.68), community action planning (OR=2.89,
 346 95%CI 1.23-6.79), and follow-up visits (OR=3.37, 95%CI 1.67-6.82) compared to
 347 household members living with a disability (Table 4).

348

349 **Table 4. Adjusted odds ratios for the association between having a disability**
 350 **and participation in each element of CLTS (n=281)**

| CLTS Activity | Participation | | Adjusted Odds Ratios | |
|--------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------------|------------|
| | N/Total | % | aOR [†] | 95% CI |
| Invited to triggering | | | | |
| Individuals with disabilities | 32/55 | 58.18% | 1.00 | - |
| Individuals without disabilities | 147/226 | 65.04% | 0.98 | 0.43-2.22 |
| Total | 179/281 | 63.70% | - | - |
| Attended triggering | | | | |
| Individuals with disabilities | 19/55 | 34.55% | 1.00 | - |
| Individuals without disabilities | 129/226 | 57.08% | 2.09* | 1.00-4.37 |
| Total | 148/281 | 52.67% | - | - |
| Participated in transect walk | | | | |
| Individuals with disabilities | 4/55 | 7.27% | 1.00 | - |
| Individuals without disabilities | 42/226 | 18.58% | 4.03** | 1.52-10.68 |
| Total | 46/281 | 16.37% | - | - |
| Participated in community mapping | | | | |
| Individuals with disabilities | 3/55 | 5.45% | 1.00 | - |
| Individuals without disabilities | 42/226 | 18.58% | 2.38 | 0.63-8.99 |
| Total | 45/281 | 16.01% | - | - |
| Felt they could give input | | | | |
| Individuals with disabilities | 7/55 | 12.73% | 1.00 | - |
| Individuals without disabilities | 76/226 | 33.63% | 3.72** | 1.46-9.51 |
| Total | 83/281 | 29.54% | - | - |
| Participated in community action planning | | | | |
| Individuals with disabilities | 11/55 | 20.00% | 1.00 | - |
| Individuals without disabilities | 92/226 | 40.71% | 2.89* | 1.23-6.79 |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|--------|-----------|
| Total | 103/281 | 36.65% | - | - |
| Visited by someone to discuss latrine construction/use | | | | |
| Individuals with disabilities | 35/55 | 63.64% | 1.00 | - |
| Individuals without disabilities | 179/226 | 79.20% | 3.37** | 1.67-6.82 |
| Total | 214/281 | 76.16% | - | - |

351 *P<0.05 in the Wald Test

352 **P<0.01 in the Wald Test

353 † Adjusted for age, sex and income with consideration for clustering at the household
354 level.

355

356 **CLTS Inclusivity**

357 Further indicators of interest were investigated to assess the inclusivity of CLTS
358 sessions delivered. Of the 148 individuals who attended the triggering sessions, 20%
359 (29/148) reported that assistance was provided to support the participation of
360 individuals living with a disability and 14% (21/148) reported that a squatting
361 demonstration was given. Only 7% (21/281) of the respondents reported they were
362 provided with information on low-cost technologies to improve access to WASH for
363 people living with disabilities. There were minimal differences in reporting between
364 individuals with and without a disability (Table 5).

365

366 **Table 5. Reported indicators of CLTS inclusivity stratified by individuals with**
367 **and without a disability (n=281).**

| CLTS Inclusivity Indicator | Participation | | Unadjusted Odds Ratios | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|--------|------------------------|--------|
| | N/Total | % | OR | 95% CI |
| Assistance provided for individuals with a disability | | | | |
| Individuals with disabilities † | 4/19 | 21.05% | 1.00 | - |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|------|-----------|
| Individuals without disabilities † | 25/129 | 19.38% | 0.90 | 0.28-2.87 |
| Total Individuals † | 29/148 | 19.59% | - | - |
| Squatting demonstration given | | | | |
| Individuals with disabilities † | 3/19 | 15.79% | 1.00 | - |
| Individuals without disabilities † | 18/129 | 13.95% | 0.86 | 0.23-3.19 |
| Total Individuals † | 21/148 | 14.19% | - | - |
| Low-cost technologies for accessibility provided | | | | |
| Individuals with disabilities | 3/55 | 5.45% | 1.00 | - |
| Individuals without disabilities | 18/226 | 7.96% | 1.50 | 0.42-5.35 |
| Total | 21/281 | 7.47% | - | - |

368 *P<0.05 in the Wald Test

369 † n=148 (individuals who attended triggering only)

370

371 Discussion

372 While participation in CLTS was proportionally lower in households with a member
373 living with a disability for most CLTS activities, there was no statistical evidence that
374 having a household member with a disability decreased the likelihood of participating
375 in any CLTS activities. In contrast, household members living with a disability were
376 far less likely to participate in key CLTS activities compared to household members
377 without a disability, even after adjustment for clustering at the household level.

378

379 Important intrahousehold inequalities in CLTS participation were not captured using
380 household-level measures in this analysis. These findings are consistent with the
381 literature, which found minimal differences in sanitation access at the household-level,
382 but reported differences in sanitation access between individuals with and without a
383 disability [16-19]. Intrahousehold inequalities in sanitation access also exist amongst
384 groups on the basis of gender, age, ethnicity and other social identities [46, 47]. As
385 current global WASH indicators largely rely on national household surveys, with data

386 usually collected from the head of household, it is likely these intrahousehold
387 inequalities are not effectively captured [48]. The literature finds heads of household
388 can over-report sanitation access for people with disabilities [20]. Therefore,
389 interviewing individuals is important to reliably capture the needs of vulnerable and
390 marginalised groups [48].

391

392 The findings from this study indicate the facilitation of the CLTS intervention was not
393 sufficiently inclusive to support the attendance and participation of people with
394 disabilities. Subsequent analysis of important CLTS inclusivity factors revealed that
395 only 20% of individuals reported that assistance was provided to support the
396 participation of individuals living with a disability during triggering. Furthermore, only
397 7% of respondents reported that they were provided with information on low-cost
398 technologies to make latrines more comfortable and safer for people with disabilities.
399 A lack of information regarding latrine accessibility has been identified as a barrier to
400 latrine access for people living with disabilities [49]. Therefore, it is important that
401 existing resources outlining low-cost technologies to make sanitation facilities more
402 accessible are widely shared during CLTS interventions [39, 49]. Information on low-
403 cost technology options could have been provided after triggering during household
404 visits [36], especially as over 70% of households reported that they were visited to
405 discuss latrine construction and usage.

406

407 The literature exploring participation in community programmes identifies a number of
408 physical, social, institutional, and personal barriers to participation for people living
409 with disabilities [4, 34, 36, 37, 50]. The limited capacity of facilitators to deliver inclusive
410 CLTS programmes can contribute to the reported barriers to CLTS participation [7, 33,

411 37]. Capacity development of government bodies and stakeholders is necessary to
412 ensure they can effectively facilitate the involvement of people living with disabilities
413 in CLTS activities [36, 37]. Training facilitators on action steps to make CLTS more
414 inclusive can improve the inclusivity of CLTS interventions delivered and promote
415 higher participation of people living with disabilities [51, 52]. However, limited
416 improvements to latrine accessibility have been observed following inclusive CLTS,
417 with latrine safety and accessibility remaining sub-optimal for people living with
418 disabilities 18-months after an inclusive CLTS intervention [53]. Despite this, the
419 inclusive CLTS approach represents an important step in promoting the inclusion of
420 people living with disabilities in CLTS activities.

421

422 **Study Limitations**

423 Purposive sampling techniques required for this study mean results may not be
424 generalizable beyond populations with similar characteristics as those included in our
425 study. Despite efforts to engage with local organizations of persons with disabilities
426 (OPD) for identification and recruitment, we were unable to secure participation and
427 relied on the district council social welfare officer. Therefore, possible respondents
428 may have been missed. Furthermore, we did not include individuals with cognitive
429 disabilities, so their experiences are not included. As the disability assessment
430 questions were answered by the lead household member and not validated by the
431 individuals with disabilities, there could be misclassification of disability status as
432 household heads commonly under-report disability status [54]. Finally, the results
433 could be affected by recall bias if recall of CLTS participation differs between people
434 with or without a disability. However, the binary nature of the CLTS participation
435 questions means this is unlikely.

436

437 As this study was quantitative in nature, some key findings could not be evaluated or
438 explored in further detail. Therefore, conducting further qualitative studies would allow
439 aspects such as barriers to participation to be researched in further depth. Further
440 research using a larger and more representative sample of the disabled population
441 would improve the generalisability of the research to the wider population. This
442 research could include more people with cognitive disabilities and children. Partnering
443 with OPDs would be important to support disability inclusion. A larger sample size
444 would also enable a more in-depth analysis of the predictors of CLTS participation
445 amongst people living with a disability, including disability types, disability severity, and
446 age. This research would be useful to ascertain why participation is lower amongst
447 people living with disabilities.

448

449 **Conclusion**

450 This study aimed to fill a gap in the sanitation and disability literature by investigating
451 the participation of people living with disabilities in a CLTS intervention in rural Malawi.
452 This cross-sectional study was conducted using household questionnaires to compare
453 CLTS participation between households with and without a member living with a
454 disability and between household members with and without a disability. Whilst no
455 difference in CLTS participation was observed at the household-level, CLTS
456 participation was lower for household members living with a disability compared to
457 household members without a disability. Whilst there was no difference in the
458 likelihood of being invited to participate in CLTS, the likelihood of attending and

459 participating in key CLTS activities was lower amongst household members living with
460 a disability.

461

462 Equitable participation in CLTS is crucial to predict the success and sustainability of
463 CLTS outcomes. Therefore, to improve the participation of people living with
464 disabilities, it is recommended that implementors should train facilitators on action
465 steps to make CLTS more inclusive. Further research could use a larger and more
466 representative sample to enable a more in-depth analysis of the predictors of CLTS
467 participation or could include a qualitative analysis of the barriers to CLTS participation
468 for people living with disabilities.

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484 **References**

- 485 1. The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 2015 [19 July
486 2023]. Available from: [https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-
488 development-goals/](https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-
487 development-goals/).
- 489 2. United Nations. Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and
490 Optional Protocol. New York: 2006.
- 491 3. WHO. Towards a Common Language for Functioning, Disability and Health:
492 ICF - The International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health. Geneva:
493 2002.
- 494 4. White S, Kuper H, Itimu-Phiri A, Holm R, Biran A. A Qualitative Study of Barriers
495 to Accessing Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for Disabled People in Malawi. PLoS One.
496 2016;11(5):e0155043. Epub 20160512. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0155043. PubMed
497 PMID: 27171520; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4865162.
- 498 5. Groce N, Bailey N, Lang R, Trani JF, Kett M. Water and sanitation issues for
499 persons with disabilities in low- and middle-income countries: a literature review and
500 discussion of implications for global health and international development. Journal of
501 Water and Health. 2011;9(4):617-27. doi: 10.2166/wh.2011.198.
- 502 6. MacLeod M, Pann M, Cantwell R, Moore S. Issues in access to safe drinking
503 water and basic hygiene for persons with physical disabilities in rural Cambodia. J
504 Water Health. 2014;12(4):885-95. doi: 10.2166/wh.2014.009. PubMed PMID:
505 25473998.
- 506 7. Wilbur J, Jones H, Gosling L, Groce N, Challenger E. Undoing inequity:
507 Inclusive water, sanitation and hygiene programmes that deliver for all in Uganda and

507 Zambia. 36th WEDC International Conference: Delivering Water, Sanitation and
508 Hygiene Services in an Uncertain Environment. 2013.

509 8. Erhard L, Degabriele J, Naughton D, Freeman MC. Policy and provision of
510 WASH in schools for children with disabilities: A case study in Malawi and Uganda.
511 *Global Public Health*. 2013;8(9):1000-13. doi: 10.1080/17441692.2013.838284.

512 9. Wilbur J, Scherer N, Mactaggart I, Shrestha G, Mahon T, Torondel B, et al. Are
513 Nepal's water, sanitation and hygiene and menstrual hygiene policies and supporting
514 documents inclusive of disability? A policy analysis. *Int J Equity Health*.
515 2021;20(1):157. Epub 20210708. doi: 10.1186/s12939-021-01463-w. PubMed PMID:
516 34238285; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC8268379.

517 10. Scherer N, Mactaggart I, Huggett C, Pheng P, Rahman MU, Biran A, et al. The
518 Inclusion of Rights of People with Disabilities and Women and Girls in Water,
519 Sanitation, and Hygiene Policy Documents and Programs of Bangladesh and
520 Cambodia: Content Analysis Using EquiFrame. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*.
521 2021;18(10). Epub 20210511. doi: 10.3390/ijerph18105087. PubMed PMID:
522 34064939; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC8151976.

523 11. Wilbur J, Morrison C, Iakavai J, Shem J, Poilapa R, Bambery L, et al. "The
524 weather is not good": exploring the menstrual health experiences of menstruators with
525 and without disabilities in Vanuatu. *Lancet Reg Health West Pac*. 2022;18:100325.
526 Epub 20211123. doi: 10.1016/j.lanwpc.2021.100325. PubMed PMID: 35024657;
527 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC8661049.

528 12. Wilbur J, Kayastha S, Mahon T, Torondel B, Hameed S, Sigdel A, et al.
529 Qualitative study exploring the barriers to menstrual hygiene management faced by
530 adolescents and young people with a disability, and their carers in the Kavrepalanchok

531 district, Nepal. BMC Public Health. 2021;21(1):476. doi: 10.1186/s12889-021-10439-
532 y.

533 13. Wilbur J, Poilapa R, Morrison C. Menstrual Health Experiences of People with
534 Intellectual Disabilities and Their Caregivers during Vanuatu's Humanitarian
535 Responses: A Qualitative Study. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2022;19(21). Epub
536 20221105. doi: 10.3390/ijerph192114540. PubMed PMID: 36361421; PubMed Central
537 PMCID: PMCPMC9653728.

538 14. Ansari Z, White S. Managing incontinence in low-and middle income-countries:
539 A qualitative case study from Pakistan. PLoS One. 2022;17(7):e0271617. Epub
540 20220715. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0271617. PubMed PMID: 35839232; PubMed
541 Central PMCID: PMCPMC9286225.

542 15. Wilbur J, Morrison C, Bambery L, Tanguay J, Baker S, Sheppard P, et al. "I'm
543 scared to talk about it": exploring experiences of incontinence for people with and
544 without disabilities in Vanuatu, using mixed methods. Lancet Reg Health West Pac.
545 2021;14:100237. Epub 20210806. doi: 10.1016/j.lanwpc.2021.100237. PubMed
546 PMID: 34528002; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8355917.

547 16. Banks LM, White S, Biran A, Wilbur J, Neupane S, Neupane S, et al. Are current
548 approaches for measuring access to clean water and sanitation inclusive of people
549 with disabilities? Comparison of individual- and household-level access between
550 people with and without disabilities in the Tanahun district of Nepal. PLOS ONE.
551 2019;14(10):e0223557. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0223557.

552 17. Mactaggart I, Baker S, Bambery L, Iakavai J, Kim MJ, Morrison C, et al. Water,
553 women and disability: Using mixed-methods to support inclusive WASH programme
554 design in Vanuatu. Lancet Reg Health West Pac. 2021;8:100109. Epub 20210302.

555 doi: 10.1016/j.lanwpc.2021.100109. PubMed PMID: 34327430; PubMed Central
556 PMCID: PMCPMC8315363.

557 18. Kuper H, Mactaggart I, White S, Dionicio C, Cañas R, Naber J, et al. Exploring
558 the links between water, sanitation and hygiene and disability; Results from a case-
559 control study in Guatemala. PLOS ONE. 2018;13(6):e0197360. doi:
560 10.1371/journal.pone.0197360.

561 19. Mactaggart I, Schmidt W-P, Bostoen K, Chunga J, Danquah L, Halder AK, et al.
562 Access to water and sanitation among people with disabilities: results from cross-
563 sectional surveys in Bangladesh, Cameroon, India and Malawi. BMJ Open.
564 2018;8(6):e020077. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-020077.

565 20. Danquah LO, Wilbur J, editors. Intra-household access to WASH in Uganda
566 and Zambia: do variations exist?2016.

567 21. Chambers R, Kar K. Handbook on Community-Led Total Sanitation. Brighton:
568 IDS, 2008.

569 22. Zuin V, Delaire C, Peletz R, Cock-Esteb A, Khush R, Albert J. Policy Diffusion
570 in the Rural Sanitation Sector: Lessons from Community-Led Total Sanitation (CLTS).
571 World Development. 2019;124:104643. doi:
572 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.104643>.

573 23. Alemu F, Kumie A, Medhin G, Gasana J. The role of psychological factors in
574 predicting latrine ownership and consistent latrine use in rural Ethiopia: a cross-
575 sectional study. BMC Public Health. 2018;18(1):229. doi: 10.1186/s12889-018-5143-
576 0.

577 24. Okolimong CD, Ndejjo R, Mugambe RK, Halage AA. Effect of a Community-
578 Led Total Sanitation Intervention on Sanitation and Hygiene in Pallisa District, Uganda.

579 Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2020;103(4):1735-41. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.19-0911. PubMed
580 PMID: 32830641; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7543862.

581 25. Harter M, Inauen J, Mosler H-J. How does Community-Led Total Sanitation
582 (CLTS) promote latrine construction, and can it be improved? A cluster-randomized
583 controlled trial in Ghana. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2019;245:112705. doi:
584 10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.112705.

585 26. Pickering AJ, Djebbari H, Lopez C, Coulibaly M, Alzua ML. Effect of a
586 community-led sanitation intervention on child diarrhoea and child growth in rural Mali:
587 a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2015;3(11):e701-11. doi:
588 10.1016/s2214-109x(15)00144-8. PubMed PMID: 26475017.

589 27. Garn JV, Sclar GD, Freeman MC, Penakalapati G, Alexander KT, Brooks P, et
590 al. The impact of sanitation interventions on latrine coverage and latrine use: A
591 systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Hygiene and
592 Environmental Health*. 2017;220(2, Part B):329-40. doi:
593 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2016.10.001>.

594 28. Chambers R. Going to Scale with Community-Led Total Sanitation: Reflections
595 on Experience, Issues and Ways Forward. *IDS Practice Papers*. 2009;2009(1):01-50.
596 doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2040-0225.2009.00001_2.x.

597 29. Harter M, Mosch S, Mosler HJ. How does Community-Led Total Sanitation
598 (CLTS) affect latrine ownership? A quantitative case study from Mozambique. *BMC
599 Public Health*. 2018;18(1):387. Epub 20180321. doi: 10.1186/s12889-018-5287-y.
600 PubMed PMID: 29562899; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5861600.

601 30. Nelson S, Drabarek D, Jenkins A, Negin J, Abimbola S. How community
602 participation in water and sanitation interventions impacts human health, WASH
603 infrastructure and service longevity in low-income and middle-income countries: a

604 realist review. *BMJ Open*. 2021;11(12):e053320. Epub 20211202. doi:
605 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-053320. PubMed PMID: 34857572; PubMed Central PMCID:
606 PMC8640661.

607 31. Kouassi HAA, Andrianisa HA, Traoré MB, Sossou SK, Momo Nguematio R,
608 Ymélé SSS, et al. Review of the slippage factors from open defecation-free (ODF)
609 status towards open defecation (OD) after the Community-Led Total Sanitation (CLTS)
610 approach implementation. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health*.
611 2023;250:114160. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2023.114160>.

612 32. Verdonschot MML, De Witte LP, Reichrath E, Buntinx WHE, Curfs LMG.
613 Community participation of people with an intellectual disability: a review of empirical
614 findings. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*. 2009;53(4):303-18. doi:
615 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2788.2008.01144.x>.

616 33. House S, Cavill S, Ferron S. Equality and non-discrimination (EQND) in
617 sanitation programmes at scale part 1 of 2. Brighton: IDS, 2017.

618 34. Wilbur J, Pheng P, Has R, Nguon SK, Banks LM, Huggett C, et al. A qualitative
619 cross-sectional study exploring the implementation of disability-inclusive WASH policy
620 commitments in Svay Reing and Kampong Chhnang Provinces, Cambodia. *Frontiers*
621 *in Water*. 2022;4. doi: 10.3389/frwa.2022.963405.

622 35. Assefa GM, Sherif S, Sluijs J, Kuijpers M, Chaka T, Solomon A, et al. Gender
623 Equality and Social Inclusion in Relation to Water, Sanitation and Hygiene in the
624 Oromia Region of Ethiopia. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(8). Epub
625 20210417. doi: 10.3390/ijerph18084281. PubMed PMID: 33920729; PubMed Central
626 PMCID: PMC8073105.

627 36. Wilbur J, Jones H. Disability: Making CLTS Fully Inclusive. Brighton: IDS, 2014.

- 628 37. Daniel D, Nastiti A, Surbakti HY, Dwipayanti NMU. Access to inclusive sanitation
629 and participation in sanitation programs for people with disabilities in Indonesia. Sci
630 Rep. 2023;13(1):4310. Epub 20230315. doi: 10.1038/s41598-023-30586-z. PubMed
631 PMID: 36922602; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC10017721.
- 632 38. WSSCC. Equality and Non-Discrimination Handbook for CLTS Facilitators.
633 Geneva, Switzerland: WSSCC, 2019.
- 634 39. Jones H, Wilbur J. Compendium of accessible WASH technologies. London:
635 Water Aid, 2014.
- 636 40. WHO and World Bank. World Report on Disability: World Health Organisation.
637 2011.
- 638 41. WHO. Global report on health equity for persons with disabilities. Geneva:
639 2022.
- 640 42. National Statistics Office. 2018 Malawi Population and Housing Census. 2019
641 [14 August 2023]. Available from: [https://malawi.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/resource-](https://malawi.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/resource-pdf/2018%20Malawi%20Population%20and%20Housing%20Census%20Main%20Report%20(1).pdf)
642 [pdf/2018%20Malawi%20Population%20and%20Housing%20Census%20Main%20R](https://malawi.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/resource-pdf/2018%20Malawi%20Population%20and%20Housing%20Census%20Main%20Report%20(1).pdf)
643 [eport%20\(1\).pdf](https://malawi.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/resource-pdf/2018%20Malawi%20Population%20and%20Housing%20Census%20Main%20Report%20(1).pdf).
- 644 43. WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP). Sanitation. Available from:
645 <https://washdata.org/monitoring/sanitation>.
- 646 44. Chiradzulu District Council. District Water and Sanitation Strategic Investment
647 Plan (2018-2023). 2018 [15 August 2023]. Available from:
648 [https://www.washagendaforchange.org/wp-](https://www.washagendaforchange.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/district_strategic_investment_plan_in_chiradzulu_-_nov_2018.pdf)
649 [content/uploads/2020/04/district_strategic_investment_plan_in_chiradzulu -](https://www.washagendaforchange.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/district_strategic_investment_plan_in_chiradzulu_-_nov_2018.pdf)
650 [_nov_2018.pdf](https://www.washagendaforchange.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/district_strategic_investment_plan_in_chiradzulu_-_nov_2018.pdf).
- 651 45. Washing Group on Disability Statistics. Washing Group - Short Set on
652 Functioning (WG-SS). Luxembourg, Europe: CDC; 2022 [06 April 2023]. Available

653 from: <https://www.washingtongroup->
654 [disability.com/fileadmin/uploads/wg/Washington_Group_Questionnaire_1 -](https://www.washingtongroup-disability.com/fileadmin/uploads/wg/Washington_Group_Questionnaire_1_-_WG_Short_Set_on_Functioning_October_2022.pdf)
655 [_WG_Short_Set_on_Functioning_October_2022 .pdf.](https://www.washingtongroup-disability.com/fileadmin/uploads/wg/Washington_Group_Questionnaire_1_-_WG_Short_Set_on_Functioning_October_2022.pdf)

656 46. Kayser GL, Rao N, Jose R, Raj A. Water, sanitation and hygiene: measuring
657 gender equality and empowerment. *Bull World Health Organ.* 2019;97(6):438-40.
658 Epub 20190514. doi: 10.2471/blt.18.223305. PubMed PMID: 31210683; PubMed
659 Central PMCID: PMCPMC6560376.

660 47. Macura B, Foggitt E, Liera C, Soto A, Orlando A, Del Duca L, et al. Systematic
661 mapping of gender equality and social inclusion in WASH interventions: knowledge
662 clusters and gaps. *BMJ Glob Health.* 2023;8(1). doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2022-010850.
663 PubMed PMID: 36693669; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC9884933.

664 48. Willetts J, MacArthur J, Carrard N. Gender and water, sanitation, and hygiene:
665 Three opportunities to build from recent reporting on global progress, 2000–2022.
666 *PLOS Medicine.* 2023;20(10):e1004297. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1004297.

667 49. Getahun A, Kassie GG, Bunare TS. Latrine access and factors associated with
668 it among people with physical disability in Kombolcha Town, Northeast Ethiopia: A
669 mixed cross-sectional study. *PLoS One.* 2022;17(6):e0270395. Epub 20220624. doi:
670 10.1371/journal.pone.0270395. PubMed PMID: 35749427; PubMed Central PMCID:
671 PMCPMC9231769.

672 50. Verdonschot MML, De Witte LP, Reichrath E, Buntinx WHE, Curfs LMG. Impact
673 of environmental factors on community participation of persons with an intellectual
674 disability: a systematic review. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research.*
675 2009;53(1):54-64. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2788.2008.01128.x>.

- 676 51. Jones H, Singini W, Holm R, White S. CLTS plus: making CLTS ever more
677 inclusive. Briefing Paper Presented at 39th WEDC International Conference; Kumasi,
678 Ghana2016.
- 679 52. Biran A, Danquah L, Chunga J, Schmidt WP, Holm R, Itimu-Phiri A, et al. A
680 Cluster-Randomized Trial to Evaluate the Impact of an Inclusive, Community-Led Total
681 Sanitation Intervention on Sanitation Access for People with Disabilities in Malawi. *Am*
682 *J Trop Med Hyg.* 2018;98(4):984-94. Epub 20180201. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.17-0435.
683 PubMed PMID: 29405106; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5928815.
- 684 53. Kayoka C, Itimu-Phiri A, Biran A, Holm RH. Lasting results: A qualitative
685 assessment of efforts to make community-led total sanitation more inclusive of the
686 needs of people with disabilities in Rumphu District, Malawi. *Disability and Health*
687 *Journal.* 2019;12(4):718-21. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dhjo.2019.05.007>.
- 688 54. Elkasabi M. Differences in Proxy-Reported and Self-Reported Disability in the
689 Demographic and Health Surveys. *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology.*
690 2020;9(2):335-51. doi: 10.1093/jssam/smaa041.

691




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4