

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Corresponding author

Email: katherine.davies1@lshtm.ac.uk

Abstract

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

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

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

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

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

Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

Fig 1. Description of key CLTS activities

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

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

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

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

Methods

Study Setting

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

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

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

Sampling Procedure

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

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

Fig 2. Flow diagram outlining the sampling procedure.

Data Collection

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

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

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

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

Fig 3. Flow diagram outlining data collection procedures.

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

Data Management and Analysis

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

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

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

Ethical Considerations

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

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

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

Results

Respondent Characteristics

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

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

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

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%	-	-

*Domains are not mutually exclusive

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

CLTS Participation

Household-level analysis:

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

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

Table 3. Adjusted odds ratios for the association between having a household 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

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

Table 4. Adjusted odds ratios for the association between having a disability 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%	-	-

*P<0.05 in the Wald Test

**P<0.01 in the Wald Test

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

CLTS Inclusivity

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

Table 5. Reported indicators of CLTS inclusivity stratified by individuals with 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%	-	-

*P<0.05 in the Wald Test

[†] n=148 (individuals who attended triggering only)

Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

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

Study Limitations

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

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

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

References

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

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

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

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

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

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

12. Wilbur J, Kayastha S, Mahon T, Torondel B, Hameed S, Sigdel A, et al. Qualitative study exploring the barriers to menstrual hygiene management faced by 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

24. Okolimong CD, Ndejjo R, Mugambe RK, Halage AA. Effect of a Community-
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 PMCPMC8640661.
- 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: PMCPMC8073105.
- 627 36. Wilbur J, Jones H. Disability: Making CLTS Fully Inclusive. Brighton: IDS, 2014.

37. Daniel D, Nastiti A, Surbakti HY, Dwipayanti NMU. Access to inclusive sanitation and participation in sanitation programs for people with disabilities in Indonesia. Sci Rep. 2023;13(1):4310. Epub 20230315. doi: 10.1038/s41598-023-30586-z. PubMed PMID: 36922602; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPCMC10017721.
38. WSSCC. Equality and Non-Discrimination Handbook for CLTS Facilitators. Geneva, Switzerland: WSSCC, 2019.
39. Jones H, Wilbur J. Compendium of accessible WASH technologies. London: Water Aid, 2014.
40. WHO and World Bank. World Report on Disability: World Health Organisation. 2011.
41. WHO. Global report on health equity for persons with disabilities. Geneva: 2022.
42. National Statistics Office. 2018 Malawi Population and Housing Census. 2019 [14 August 2023]. Available from: [https://malawi.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/resource-pdf/2018%20Malawi%20Population%20and%20Housing%20Census%20Main%20Report%20\(1\).pdf](https://malawi.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/resource-pdf/2018%20Malawi%20Population%20and%20Housing%20Census%20Main%20Report%20(1).pdf).
43. WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP). Sanitation. Available from: <https://washdata.org/monitoring/sanitation>.
44. Chiradzulu District Council. District Water and Sanitation Strategic Investment Plan (2018-2023). 2018 [15 August 2023]. Available from: https://www.washagendaforchange.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/district_strategic_investment_plan_in_chiradzulu_-_nov_2018.pdf.
45. Washing Group on Disability Statistics. Washing Group - Short Set on Functioning (WG-SS). Luxembourg, Europe: CDC; 2022 [06 April 2023]. Available

from: https://www.washingtongroup-disability.com/fileadmin/uploads/wg/Washington_Group_Questionnaire_1_-_WG_Short_Set_on_Functioning_October_2022.pdf.

46. Kayser GL, Rao N, Jose R, Raj A. Water, sanitation and hygiene: measuring gender equality and empowerment. Bull World Health Organ. 2019;97(6):438-40. Epub 20190514. doi: 10.2471/blt.18.223305. PubMed PMID: 31210683; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6560376.

47. Macura B, Foggitt E, Liera C, Soto A, Orlando A, Del Duca L, et al. Systematic mapping of gender equality and social inclusion in WASH interventions: knowledge clusters and gaps. BMJ Glob Health. 2023;8(1). doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2022-010850. PubMed PMID: 36693669; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC69884933.

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

49. Getahun A, Kassie GG, Bunare TS. Latrine access and factors associated with it among people with physical disability in Kombolcha Town, Northeast Ethiopia: A mixed cross-sectional study. PLoS One. 2022;17(6):e0270395. Epub 20220624. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0270395. PubMed PMID: 35749427; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC9231769.

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

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




Figure 1




Figure 2

Primary household respondent answers survey questions:

- Demographic information
- Latrine ownership
- CLTS participation

Primary household respondent answers
WG-SS of questions on functioning on
behalf of the household

Household member reported as
having “No difficulty” or “Some
difficulty” performing functions.

No secondary
respondent interviewed.

Household member reported as
having “A lot of difficulty” or “Cannot
do at all” performing functions.

Primary respondent
does not have a
disability.

CLTS participation questions
asked to household member
with a disability.

Primary respondent
has a disability.

CLTS participation questions
asked to household member
without a disability.

Figure 3




Figure 4