

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

3

4

5 Katherine Davies<sup>1\*</sup>, Mindy Panulo<sup>2</sup>, Clara MacLeod<sup>1</sup>, Jane Wilbur<sup>4</sup>, Tracy Morse<sup>3</sup>, Kondwani  
6 Chidziwisano<sup>2</sup>, Robert Dreibelbis<sup>1</sup>

7

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

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

12 <sup>3</sup> Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK

13 <sup>4</sup> 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](mailto:katherine.davies1@lshtm.ac.uk)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

## 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	%
<b>Household Disability Status</b>						
Member with a disability	80	32.39%	-	-	-	-
No member with a disability	167	67.61%	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Lead Respondent Disability Status</b>						
Disability	25	10.12%	25	31.25%	0	0.00%
No disability	222	89.88%	55	68.75%	167	100.00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Lead Respondent Gender</b>						
Male	32	12.96%	21	26.25%	11	6.59%
Female	215	87.04%	59	73.75%	156	93.41%
<b>Total</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Lead Respondent Age</b>						
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%
<b>Total</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Household Size</b>						
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%
<b>Total</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Household Monthly Income (Malawi Kwacha)</b>						
< 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%
<b>Total</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Lead Respondent Marital Status</b>						
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%
<b>Total</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Lead Respondent Education</b>						
Up to Primary	187	75.71%	66	82.50%	121	72.46%
Secondary +	60	24.29%	14	17.50%	46	27.54%
<b>Total</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Lead Respondent Occupation</b>						
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%
<b>Total</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Household Latrine Ownership</b>						
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%
<b>Total</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Household Latrine Type</b>						
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%
<b>Total</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Household Latrine Construction Time</b>						
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%
<b>Total</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Functional Limitation Type (Disabled Household Member) *</b>						
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	%
<b>Disability Status</b>						
Disability:	55	19.57%	-	-	-	-
No disability	226	80.43%	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Gender</b>						
Male	49	17.44%	31	56.36%	18	7.96%
Female	232	82.56%	24	43.64%	208	92.04%
<b>Total</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Age</b>						
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%
<b>Total</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Monthly Income (Malawi Kwacha)</b>						
< 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%
<b>Total</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Functional Limitation Type*</b>						
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 <sup>†</sup>	95% CI
<b>Invited to triggering</b>				
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
<b>Total</b>	<b>159/247</b>	<b>64.37%</b>	-	-
<b>Attended triggering</b>				
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
<b>Total</b>	<b>136/247</b>	<b>55.06%</b>	-	-

<b>Participated in transect walk</b>				
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
<b>Total</b>	<b>44/247</b>	<b>17.81%</b>	-	-
<b>Participated in community mapping</b>				
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
<b>Total</b>	<b>41/247</b>	<b>16.60%</b>	-	-
<b>Felt they could give input</b>				
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
<b>Total</b>	<b>78/247</b>	<b>31.58%</b>	-	-
<b>Participated in community action planning</b>				
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
<b>Total</b>	<b>93/247</b>	<b>37.65%</b>	-	-
<b>Visited by someone to discuss latrine construction/use</b>				
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
<b>Total</b>	<b>193/247</b>	<b>78.14%</b>	-	-

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

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

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
<b>Assistance provided for individuals with a disability</b>				
Individuals with disabilities †	4/19	21.05%	1.00	-

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

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-](https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/)  
487 [development-goals/](https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/).
- 488 2. United Nations. Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and  
489 Optional Protocol. New York: 2006.
- 490 3. WHO. Towards a Common Language for Functioning, Disability and Health:  
491 ICF - The International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health. Geneva:  
492 2002.
- 493 4. White S, Kuper H, Itimu-Phiri A, Holm R, Biran A. A Qualitative Study of Barriers  
494 to Accessing Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for Disabled People in Malawi. PLoS One.  
495 2016;11(5):e0155043. Epub 20160512. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0155043. PubMed  
496 PMID: 27171520; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4865162.
- 497 5. Groce N, Bailey N, Lang R, Trani JF, Kett M. Water and sanitation issues for  
498 persons with disabilities in low- and middle-income countries: a literature review and  
499 discussion of implications for global health and international development. Journal of  
500 Water and Health. 2011;9(4):617-27. doi: 10.2166/wh.2011.198.
- 501 6. MacLeod M, Pann M, Cantwell R, Moore S. Issues in access to safe drinking  
502 water and basic hygiene for persons with physical disabilities in rural Cambodia. J  
503 Water Health. 2014;12(4):885-95. doi: 10.2166/wh.2014.009. PubMed PMID:  
504 25473998.
- 505 7. Wilbur J, Jones H, Gosling L, Groce N, Challenger E. Undoing inequity:  
506 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 PMCPMC8640661.
- 607 31. Kouassi HAA, Andrianisa HA, Traoré MB, Sossou SK, Momo Nguematio R,  
608 Yméle 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.

- 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-](https://www.washingtongroup-disability.com/fileadmin/uploads/wg/Washington_Group_Questionnaire_1_-_WG_Short_Set_on_Functioning_October_2022_.pdf)  
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