

Who participates in ‘participatory design’ of WASH infrastructure: a mixed-methods process evaluation

Thea L. Mink¹, Allison P. Salinger¹, Naomi Francis², Becky Batagol^{2,3}, Kerrie Burge², Noor Ilhamsyah^{2,4}, Losalini Malumu^{2,5}, Liza Marzaman^{2,4}, Michaela Prescott⁶, Nur Intan Putri^{2,4}, Sheela S. Sinharoy^{1*}

¹ Hubert Department of Global Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, United States of America

² Monash Sustainable Development Institute, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

³ Faculty of Law, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

⁴ Indonesia Team, Revitalising Informal Settlements and their Environments (RISE), Makassar, Indonesia

⁵ Fiji Team, Revitalising Informal Settlements and their Environments (RISE), Suva, Fiji. ⁶ Faculty of Art, Design and Architecture, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

* Corresponding author

Email: sheela.sinharoy@emory.edu (SS)

1 Abstract

2 Inclusive participation is critical for community-based water, sanitation and hygiene
3 (WASH) interventions, especially in complex environments such as urban informal settlements.
4 We conducted a mixed-methods, theory-driven process evaluation to evaluate participation,
5 barriers to participation, and participant satisfaction within the Revitalising Informal
6 Settlements and their Environments (RISE) trial in Makassar, Indonesia and Suva, Fiji
7 (ACTRN12618000633280; <https://www.anzctr.org.au/>).

8 RISE conducted participatory design activities, including community-level design
9 workshops and household visits, to co-design WASH infrastructure. Household surveys,
10 conducted with women and men after RISE participatory design in Makassar (N=320) and Suva
11 (N=503), captured self-reported participation in RISE activities and satisfaction with influence
12 over RISE decision-making. We used multivariable regression models to assess socio-
13 demographic predictors of participation and satisfaction. Qualitative data were also collected
14 after participatory design and analyzed thematically.

15 Most respondents from Makassar (89%) and Suva (75%) participated in at least one RISE
16 co-design activity. Statistically significant predictors of participation included gender, age, and
17 marital status in Makassar and disability status and education in Suva. Most participants in
18 Makassar (66%) and Suva (70%) were satisfied with their level of influence over RISE decision-
19 making. In Makassar, no significant predictors of satisfaction were identified. In Suva, significant
20 predictors of satisfaction included gender, religion, and marital status, with women wanting
21 *more* influence and religious minorities and unmarried participants wanting *less* influence over

22 decisions. Qualitative data showed that most participants felt satisfied by RISE’s inclusive and
23 participatory design, although some residents reported distrust with RISE and feeling excluded
24 from activities by community representatives.

25 While RISE participatory design activities achieved good reach and satisfaction overall,
26 we identified specific gender and social inequities in participation and influence over decision-
27 making. We recommend that WASH interventions reflect on the quality of their engagement
28 with communities and local organizations in order to identify and appropriately include groups
29 of interest.

30 **1 Introduction**

31 One billion people live in urban informal settlements, which regularly contend with
32 unimproved water and sanitation services (including poor access, quality, and reliability), in
33 addition to insufficient living areas, poor housing durability, and unstable land tenure [1–3].
34 Marginalized groups living in urban informal settlements, like women, the elderly, and people
35 living with disabilities, are often at the intersection of multiple deprivations, experiencing social
36 exclusion in addition to poor water and sanitation conditions [4–9]. Sustainable Development
37 Goal (SDG) 11 includes target 11.1 to, “Ensure access for all to adequate, safe and affordable
38 housing and basic services and upgrade slums” by 2030 [10]. Ensuring basic services is further
39 promoted by SDG 6, which aims to provide access to water and sanitation for all populations,
40 with target 6.2 further specifying, “Paying special attention to the needs of women and girls
41 and those in vulnerable situations”[10]. To achieve these SDGs in complex environments like
42 urban informal settlements, comprehensive water and sanitation interventions are needed
43 [11–13].

44 Community participation is a central part of comprehensive water and sanitation
45 interventions. Participatory approaches are used to tailor interventions to communities’
46 environmental, cultural, and economic landscapes, and preferences [14]. Community
47 participation can contribute to benefits like increased intervention awareness and acceptance,
48 enhanced community ownership, and improved management and sustainability [15].
49 Deliberate inclusion of marginalized people can help ensure that their specific needs are
50 incorporated into water and sanitation programming and confer additional benefits for those

51 involved. For example, inclusive WASH programs have bolstered women’s confidence and
52 community respect as decision-makers [16,17].

53 Revitalising Informal Settlements and their Environments (RISE) is a randomized control
54 trial aiming to reduce environmental contamination and improve human and ecological health
55 through a water-sensitive infrastructure intervention in Suva, Fiji and Makassar, Indonesia [18].
56 In each country, 12 urban informal settlements were selected, of which six settlements were
57 randomly allocated to receive the RISE intervention, with the remaining six control settlements
58 to be offered the intervention at a later date [18]. The RISE intervention includes nature-based
59 and decentralized components (pressure tanks, constructed wetlands, and rainwater tanks) to
60 decrease exposure to fecal contamination [18]. Community engagement activities were a key
61 component of the infrastructure design and planning process for each intervention settlement
62 [13,18]. Participatory design workshops and household visits were organized to reach a diverse
63 population (with a particular focus on marginalized groups and women) and to meaningfully
64 collaborate with participants in intervention decision-making [19,20]. Further information
65 about the RISE program is outlined elsewhere [18,19].

66 Along with the movement towards comprehensive WASH interventions, there are calls
67 for more comprehensive evaluation of such interventions [12,13,21,22]. Process evaluations, in
68 particular, are rarely used to examine WASH interventions [21,23]. Process evaluations can
69 assess if interventions were designed and implemented as planned and help distinguish
70 between intended and delivered program components [23]. Process evaluations also provide
71 context for program development and scaling up [24]. Among the few water and sanitation
72 process evaluations in the literature, only a handful have identified factors that affected

73 participation and assessed participant satisfaction with interventions [6,25–27]. Notably, there
74 is little published literature on process evaluations of the design phase of WASH interventions.

75 Saunders et al.’s process evaluation framework provides a systematic guide to assess
76 the implementation of health interventions [23]. The framework’s process indicators include
77 reach (proportion of target audience that participates) and dose received (extent of participant
78 engagement and satisfaction with an intervention) among others [23,24]. Reach and dose
79 received can help identify whether certain groups are over or under-represented among a
80 population of interest and assess intervention quality and acceptability from the perspective of
81 participants [23,24].

82 We conducted a mixed-methods process evaluation to assess participation and barriers
83 to participation (reach), and participant satisfaction with engagement (dose received) with a
84 focus on gender and social inclusion for RISE participatory design activities. Saunders et al.’s
85 process evaluation framework guided our analysis [23].

86 Our process evaluation had the following research questions:

- 87 1. Who participated in the primary RISE participatory design activities? (reach)
- 88 a. What were the socio-demographic predictors of participation in the RISE
89 participatory design workshops and household visits?
- 90 b. What were the main barriers to participation in RISE activities?
- 91 2. What were participants’ satisfaction with engagement in RISE activities? (dose
92 received)
- 93 a. What were the socio-demographic predictors of satisfaction among
94 participants of RISE participatory design workshops and household visits?

95 b. What were participants' opinions of RISE and engagement?

96 Findings from this process evaluation will help assess the implementation of RISE
97 participatory design activities, as well as facilitate understanding of how process evaluations
98 and participatory design activities can be better implemented in future water and sanitation
99 interventions.

100 **2 Methods**

101 **2.1 Study design**

102 Within the RISE trial, informal settlements in urban areas of Makassar, Indonesia and
103 Suva, Fiji were purposively selected for inclusion based on community willingness and
104 commitment to participate; settlement size, location, and demographics; and environmental
105 and construction-related conditions [18]. Covariate-constrained randomization was then used
106 to allocate settlements to the intervention and control groups [18]. Household-level enrollment
107 and baseline surveys took place in late 2018 in Makassar and mid-2019 in Suva [18].
108 Participatory design activities commenced soon after the baseline surveys in each country and
109 continued through October 2019 in Makassar and November 2020 in Suva. All data collection
110 for this process evaluation was conducted after completion of participatory design and
111 community engagement activities, but before the construction of physical infrastructure in
112 intervention settlements.

113 For the purpose of this process evaluation, we used both quantitative and qualitative
114 methods to assess reach and dose received for the participatory community engagement
115 activities in RISE. We operationalized reach as the proportion of quantitative survey

116 respondents reporting participation in two primary RISE participatory design activities
117 (community-level participatory design workshops and household visits). Dose received was
118 operationalized in the quantitative work as participant-reported satisfaction during the two
119 primary participatory design activities and in the qualitative work as participant opinion of
120 overall RISE activities.

121 **2.2 Quantitative methods**

122 **2.2.a Participants and procedures**

123 This process evaluation used quantitative data from surveys that targeted all
124 households that had previously enrolled and consented to RISE. Two adult survey respondents,
125 one man and one woman, were targeted from each household. The survey tool was translated
126 from English into local languages (Bahasa Indonesia for Makassar and iTaukei and Fijian Hindi
127 for Suva) and then back-translated. The tool was then pilot tested in mock surveys in both
128 countries prior to deployment [28]. In Makassar, trained local enumerator teams collected all
129 survey data by phone because of COVID-19 restrictions. Data collection took place from
130 September 23, 2020 to November 23, 2020 and was done in Bahasa Indonesia; verbal
131 translation into Makassarese and Buginese was conducted with participants as needed. In Suva,
132 local field teams administered surveys in-person from October 27, 2020 to January 28, 2021 in
133 iTaukei and Fijian Hindi as appropriate. All teams collected data on tablets equipped with the
134 SurveyCTO application. Further information on the methods for the quantitative survey design
135 and administration can be found elsewhere [28].

136 The survey tool included sections relating to self-reported participation in various RISE
137 activities and perceived influence in program-related decision-making (see **S1 Table** for survey
138 questions and response options). Participation-related questions asked respondents which RISE
139 activities they participated in and their barriers to participation if they did not participate in any
140 RISE activities. Data from these questions were used to assess ‘reach’ of the RISE activities.
141 Questions on satisfaction asked how much influence respondents and their households felt
142 they had over RISE decision-making, along with how much influence respondents and their
143 households would have preferred. Satisfaction questions were asked regardless of whether the
144 respondent had participated in RISE activities or not. Data from these questions were used to
145 assess ‘dose received.’

146 Respondents’ disability status (including vision, hearing, mobility, cognition, self-care,
147 and communication difficulties) was assessed using the Washington Group on Disability
148 Statistics’ short set of questions on functioning [29]. Other participant socio-demographic data
149 that were used for analysis (gender, age, education level, marital status, ethnicity, religion, and
150 asset ownership) were collected from earlier RISE surveys.

151 **2.2.b Quantitative data analysis**

152 Analysis was conducted separately by country because of differences in intervention
153 timelines and socio-cultural contexts. Two activities (participatory design workshops and
154 household visits) were selected as the primary focus for analysis, because they were the main
155 components of RISE’s participatory design phase in both countries [19,20]. Other RISE activities
156 (e.g., household data collection activities, trial consenting visits, and randomization workshops)
157 were considered secondary activities for the purpose of this analysis.

158 Participation for all RISE activities and for primary participatory design activities was
159 determined by calculating binary (yes/no) response frequencies. We identified gender,
160 education, disability, ethnicity, religion, marital status, age, and asset ownership score *a priori*
161 as possible predictors of participation. Logistic regression models were fit to examine bivariate
162 associations between each predictor and participation in participatory design workshops or,
163 separately, household visits. Predictor variables were selected for inclusion in full models if
164 their coefficient p-value was less than 0.25 [30]. Multivariable logistic regression models were
165 then used to determine associations between socio-demographic predictors and participation
166 in participatory design workshops and, separately, household visits. The full models were
167 adjusted for settlement-level clustering.

168 Frequencies of barriers to participation were calculated for respondents who reported
169 that they did not participate in any RISE activity. Because of the small sample size, we did not
170 conduct any type of inference testing on the sub-sample who did not participate in any RISE
171 activities.

172 Satisfaction with RISE decision-making was determined by comparing participants'
173 experienced level of influence (none, a little, a lot) to participants' preferred level of influence
174 (none, a little, a lot). Those whose experienced and preferred levels of influence matched were
175 categorized as *satisfied* with their program influence. In contrast, those whose experienced and
176 preferred levels of influence did not match were categorized as *discordant*. Logistic regression
177 was used to determine the odds of influence discordance (wanting more influence vs. satisfied
178 and wanting less influence vs. satisfied) over RISE-related decision-making for socio-

179 demographic predictors. The same logistic regression methodology for the participation
180 analysis was applied to this analysis.

181 All quantitative analyses were performed in Stata (version 17.0). We discussed the
182 quantitative results with Makassar and Suva RISE staff during two contextualization workshops
183 to further understand and validate the findings, an equitable authorship process recommended
184 by Sam-Agudu and Abimbola [31].

185 **2.3 Qualitative methods**

186 **2.3.a Participants and procedures**

187 Qualitative data collection included semi-structured in-depth interviews (IDIs) with RISE
188 staff and settlement residents in both countries and focus group discussions (FGDs) with
189 residents in Fiji. Staff were purposively selected to participate in IDIs to maximize variation in
190 country (Fiji, Indonesia, Australia, and the United States), staff role, and gender [20]. IDIs were
191 conducted with a total of 49 RISE staff, over Zoom, between April 17, 2020 and May 11, 2020.

192 In Makassar, 17 semi-structured IDIs with residents took place by phone from
193 November 16, 2020 to December 11, 2020. Residents were purposively selected for IDIs to
194 maximize variation in gender, disability status, and extent of participation in RISE-related
195 activities (determined from the quantitative survey) [20]. Data from all of these IDIs were
196 included in the final analysis. FGDs were not performed in Makassar due to COVID-19
197 conditions [20].

198 In Suva, FGDs were facilitated from November 18-24, 2021 and were composed of one
199 women's group and one men's group per intervention site. Community liaisons suggested

200 potential participants based on who had attended the most participatory design and
201 engagement activities [20]. The final analysis includes data from six FGDs: the men’s and
202 women’s FGD from three of the settlements (total of 48 participants); these were selected by
203 the Fiji data collection team based on the depth of the participants’ responses [20].

204 Additionally in Suva, 25 semi-structured IDIs were conducted from November 29, 2021
205 to December 7, 2021. The sampling frame consisted of residents who had been identified by
206 FGD participants as potentially marginalized within their communities [20]. Data from 12 of the
207 Fiji IDIs were selected: one man and one woman from each of the settlements (bar one where
208 only women were interviewed).

209 In Makassar, semi-structured IDI and FGD guides were translated from English to Bahasa
210 Indonesia and independently back-translated; questions were verbally translated into
211 Makassarese or Buginese as needed. In Fiji, the English guides were translated verbally into
212 iTaukei or Fiji Hindi based on participant preference. The IDI and FGD guides focused on RISE
213 engagement and participation, in addition to community needs and resources, and were based
214 in part on the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR) [20,32].

215 Further information on the qualitative methods can be found elsewhere [20,28].

216 **2.3.b Qualitative data analysis**

217 The qualitative data for this study was analyzed thematically in MAXQDA (VERBI
218 Software, 2021). The codebook was drafted based on the CFIR (which had been contextualized
219 for the RISE program context) and then refined through a memoing process until intercoder
220 agreement (checked qualitatively and quantitatively) was reached among three researchers

221 [33,34]. The ‘full’ codebook was used for staff data and a smaller ‘subset’ of the codebook was
222 used for resident data [20].

223 The coded segments (which corresponded to the CFIR constructs) were exported and
224 organized by participant group. The coded segments were then thematically analyzed for
225 barriers to participation and satisfaction with RISE engagement. As with the quantitative
226 results, the qualitative findings were discussed during contextualization workshops with RISE
227 staff as an additional validation step.

228 **3 Ethics and informed consent**

229 The data analyzed in this study were collected in accordance with relevant guidelines
230 and regulations as part of the RISE trial, which is registered with the Australian and New
231 Zealand Clinical Trials Registry (ACTRN12618000633280; <https://www.anzctr.org.au/>). Ethics
232 approval for the RISE trial and this sub-study were obtained from the Monash University
233 Human Research Ethics Committee (Melbourne, Australia; project IDs 35903 and 22726)
234 effective as of November 2, 2022, Universitas Hasanuddin (Makassar, Indonesia; protocols
235 UH18020110 and UH20050235), and Fiji National University (Suva, Fiji; protocol 137.19).
236 Additional approval for this study was obtained from the University of the South Pacific. The
237 parent study included Emory University researchers in IRB applications prior to data collection.
238 Heads of households provided written informed consent for participation of their household
239 members in the RISE trial at baseline, which took place in late 2018 in Makassar and mid-2019
240 in Suva [18]. RISE staff provided written informed consent for participation in IDIs.

241 4 Results

242 For the quantitative survey, the analytic sample consisted of 320 surveys (185 with
243 women and 135 with men) from five sites in Makassar and 503 surveys (254 with women and
244 249 with men) from six sites in Suva. In both cities, a majority of participants had a secondary
245 education or higher, were married, and were of the predominant ethnicity and religion.
246 Additional socio-demographic characteristics of quantitative survey participants are shown in
247 **Table 1**. The characteristics of qualitative participants are included in **S2 Table**.

248 **Table 1. Socio-demographic characteristics of Makassar and Suva survey respondents**

	Makassar (n=320)	Suva (n=503)
Variables	n %	n %
Gender		
Women	185 57.8%	254 50.5%
Men	135 42.2%	249 49.5%
Total	320 100.0%	503 100.0%
Education		
Primary & below	137 43.2%	78 17.4%
Secondary & above	180 56.8%	371 82.6%
Total	317 100.0%	449 100.0%
Disability		
No	305 95.3%	493 98.2%
Yes	15 4.7%	9 1.8%
Total	320 100.0%	502 100.0%
Ethnicity		
Other	80 25.2%	103 21.8%
Makassarese iTaukei	237 74.8%	369 78.2%
Total	317 100.0%	472 100.0%
Marital status		

Other	44 13.9%	128 27.1%
Married	273 86.1%	344 72.9%
Total	317 100.0%	472 100.0%
Religion		
Other	26 8.2%	74 15.7%
Muslim Christian	291 91.8%	396 84.3%
Total	317 100.0%	470 100.0%
Age	n mean (SD)	n mean (SD)
	320 39.5 (12.2)	502 42.2 (14.3)

249

250 4.1 Who participated in RISE activities? (reach)

251 Of the 319 survey respondents in Makassar for whom we had participation data, 283
 252 (89%) participated in at least one RISE activity (including primary and secondary participatory
 253 activities). Among the 260 respondents who participated in at least one primary participatory
 254 activity, 200 (77%) participated in both community workshops and household visits, 31 (12%)
 255 participated in just household visits, and 29 (11%) participated in just community workshops.

256 Of the 500 Suva respondents for whom we had participation data, 375 (75%) participated in at
 257 least one RISE activity. Among the 301 respondents who participated in at least one primary
 258 participatory activity, 196 (65%) participated in both participatory design workshops and
 259 household visits, 99 (33%) participated in just participatory design workshops, and 6 (2%)
 260 participated in just household visits.

261 Socio-demographic characteristics varied by country and participatory activity, and are
 262 outlined in **S3 Table**.

263 4.2 What were the predictors of participation in RISE participatory 264 activities? (reach)

265 For Makassar participatory design workshops, women were 2.6 times more likely
266 compared to men (95% confidence interval (CI): 1.8, 3.8) and married respondents were 2.1
267 times more likely compared to respondents with other marital statuses (95% CI: 1.3, 3.4) to
268 report participating. For every one year increase in age in years, the adjusted odds of
269 participation increased by 3% (95% CI: 1.0, 1.0). Ethnicity was not a significant predictor of
270 participation in Makassar participatory design workshops (**Table 2**).

271 For Makassar household visits, women were 3.6 times more likely compared to men
272 (95% CI: 1.4, 9.5) to report participating. For every one year increase in age in years, the
273 adjusted odds of participation increased by 5% (95% CI: 1.0, 1.1) (**Table 2**). Marital status was
274 not a significant predictor of participation in Makassar household visits.

275 For Suva participatory design workshops, respondents living with disabilities were 92%
276 less likely to report participating compared to respondents without disabilities (95% CI: 0.0, 0.8)
277 (**Table 2**).

278 For Suva household visits, people who completed secondary education or above were
279 1.7 times more likely to participate compared to those who completed primary education or
280 below (95% CI: 1.2, 2.5). Disability was not a significant predictor of participation in Suva
281 household visits (**Table 2**).

282 **Table 2. Parameter estimates from multivariable logistic regression models of socio-** 283 **demographic predictors of participation in Makassar and Suva**

Table 2. Socio-demographic predictors of participation in Makassar and Suva

Variable	Odds Ratio (OR)	[95% CI]	p value
Predictors of participation in Makassar participatory design workshops (N=317)			
Gender: (women vs. men)	2.61	1.78 3.83	<.001
Marital status: (married vs. other status)	2.14	1.34 3.42	0.002
Ethnicity: (Makassarese vs. minority ethnic groups)	1.85	1.00 3.43	0.052
Age	1.03	1.02 1.03	<.001
Predictors of participation in Makassar household visits (N=317)			
Gender: (women vs. men)	3.59	1.35 9.54	0.010
Marital status: (married vs. other status)	3.09	0.86 11.12	0.084
Age	1.05	1.00 1.09	0.035
Predictors of participation in Suva participatory design workshops (N=499)			
Disability: (disability vs. no disability)	0.08	0.01 0.82	0.033
Predictors of participation in Suva household visits (N=447)			
Education: (secondary or above vs. primary or below)	1.70	1.16 2.51	0.007
Disability	0.18	0.02 1.62	0.127

Makassar missing observations: 1 (0.31%) missing for participation in participatory design workshops, 2 (0.63%) missing for both ethnicity and marital status, 1 (0.31%) missing for participation in household visits. Suva missing observations: 3 (0.60%) missing from participation in participatory design workshops, 1 (0.20%) missing from disability, 3 (0.60%) missing from participation in household visits, 52 (10.14%) missing from education.

All models controlled for settlement-level clustering.

284 **4.3 What were the main barriers to participation in RISE activities?**
 285 **(reach)**

286 Of the 36 Makassar respondents and 125 Suva respondents who did not participate in any RISE
287 activity, the majority reported that they were too busy with work, housework, or school to
288 participate (81% in Makassar, 86% in Suva) (**Table 3**).

289 **Table 3. Barriers to participation in any RISE activities**

Reported barriers	Makassar		Suva	
	n	%	n	%
Too busy with work, housework, or school	29	80.6%	107	85.7%
Did not want to participate	2	5.6%	9	7.2%
Not invited by RISE	2	5.6%	6	4.8%
Could not participate without assistance	0	0.0%	1	0.8%
Other	3	8.3%	2	1.6%
Total	36	100.0%	125	100.0%

290

291 **4.3.a Barriers related to RISE program delivery**

292 The qualitative data indicated that participants had a variety of challenges for
293 participation in RISE activities. Around half of the Makassar resident participants (with high and
294 low participation, with and without disabilities, and both genders) suggested that either their
295 own low participation or that of others was because of a clash of RISE activities with other
296 commitments, including looking after other people's children so they could participate instead
297 and being occupied with studying or other activities. Another reason for low participation or
298 engagement in Makassar was that the RISE activities were too long.

299 *There were some activities I wasn't involved in because I didn't have the time. However,*
300 *my wife was involved and represented me. They also shared about the discussion with*
301 *me. (IDI, Man, Settlement 5).*

302 Both Suva and Makassar residents said that some people did not participate because
303 either they did not understand the purpose of RISE; or they were afraid their homes would be
304 demolished by RISE; or they would be evicted. In Suva, some participants explained that some
305 residents did not trust RISE because of a history of problematic development practices from
306 other organizations:

307 *There are those who did not attend. They doubted RISE's project. This is because of the*
308 *former work of other NGOs that came into this community; [it] was all about false*
309 *promises. (FGD, Man, Settlement 1).*

310 **4.3.b Barriers related to gender and social inclusion**

311 In addition to program-related barriers, participants also reported participation issues
312 relating to their identities and social dynamics, including gender, disability, and poverty. Several
313 participants noted that conflicting work responsibilities prevented men from participating in
314 RISE group activities. Those participants reported that more men would participate if activities
315 were held in the evenings or on weekends.

316 *I usually came to represent my family because my husband was working. (IDI, Woman,*
317 *Settlement 6)*

318 In both Makassar and Fiji, it was also observed by the local program staff that more
319 women than men participated in the larger scale formal activities, such as community
320 workshops, and RISE was therefore thought of (especially in Makassar) as a 'women's program'.
321 In both countries, it was thought that this perception was because RISE is a program about child
322 health and water, which are usually more the domains of women than of men in Indonesia and
323 Fiji. Additionally in Makassar, it was observed by some program staff and residents that this

324 programmatic perception was also because many of the RISE staff who designed and led the
325 activities were women. In Fiji, it was reported that the participatory design workshops
326 conflicted with men’s relaxation time in evenings, which was in contrast to the expectations
327 that men would participate more during evenings.

328 In both Makassar and Suva, some of the residents with mobility impairments said that
329 their disability was why they had not participated in the community workshops to the extent
330 they would have liked.

331 *Actually, I want to go, ma’am but it is just my sore legs. So, we can’t participate if we*
332 *have problems. (IDI, Woman, Settlement 6)*

333 *No, I did not attend because I am old. I only send my kids to attend this workshop. If I*
334 *were physically fit I would really love to be part of the workshop. (IDI, Woman,*
335 *Settlement 1)*

336 In both countries, around half of the participants reported sending a family member to
337 represent them if they were unable to attend (in Suva, RISE required that each household select
338 one member to represent them at participatory design workshops due to COVID-19); the
339 majority of participants who said this had a disability. While most were satisfied with this
340 arrangement, there was one Suva resident for whom this was not satisfactory because she lived
341 alone (IDI, Woman, Settlement 2).

342 One man living with a disability explained that a lot of RISE communication took place
343 via cell phone, but those who could not afford one relied on the research team for information.
344 A woman with a disability felt that those who were poor such as herself and those who lived

345 near the edge of town (near the sea where the water table was too high for a septic tank) might
346 miss out on the benefits of RISE:

347 *Most people here work as fishermen. Sometimes some are lucky and sometimes some*
348 *are not. We do not get the same income. Also, we live surrounded by water, so we can't*
349 *dig [for a septic tank]. (IDI, Woman, Settlement 7)*

350 **4.4 What was the level of satisfaction among participants of primary** 351 **RISE participatory design activities? (dose received)**

352 In Makassar, when comparing preferred and experienced levels of influence among
353 participants of at least one RISE participatory design activity, 161 (66%) of 245 were satisfied
354 with their level of influence, 51 (21%) would have preferred more influence, and 33 (13%)
355 would have preferred less influence (**S4 Table**). Among Suva participants of at least one RISE
356 participatory design activity, 207 (70%) of 297 were satisfied with their level of influence, 27
357 (9%) would have preferred more influence, and 63 (21%) would have preferred less influence
358 (**S5 Table**).

359 **4.5 What were the socio-demographic predictors of satisfaction** 360 **among participants of primary RISE participatory design activities?** 361 **(dose received)**

362 For Makassar participatory design participants, there were no significant predictors of
363 influence discordance (either wanting more or less influence) over the primary participatory
364 design process. For Suva participatory design participants, women were 3.3 times more likely to

365 say that they wanted *more* influence than they experienced compared to men (95% CI: 1.2, 8.8)
366 (Table 4).

367 **Table 4. Parameter estimate from multivariable logistic regression model of socio-**
368 **demographic predictor of wanting *more* influence among Suva participatory design**
369 **participants (N=235)**

Variable	OR	[95 % CI]	p value
Gender: women (vs. men)	3.30	1.24 8.81	0.017

Controlled for settlement-level clustering

370
371 Religious minorities were 2.6 times more likely to want *less* influence compared to
372 Christian religious majority respondents (95% CI: 1.3, 5.1). Unmarried people (including single,
373 divorced, or widowed) were 1.8 times more likely to want *less* influence compared to married
374 people (95% CI: 1.2, 2.9) (Table 5).

375 **Table 5. Parameter estimates from multivariable logistic regression model of socio-**
376 **demographic predictors of wanting *less* influence among Suva participatory design**
377 **participants (N=260)**

Variable	OR	[95 % CI]	p value
Religion: religious minorities (vs. Christian majority)	2.60	1.33 5.08	0.005
Marital status: married (vs. other status)	0.55	0.35 0.86	0.009

Controlled for settlement-level clustering

378
379 **4.6 What were participants' opinions of RISE and engagement? (dose**
380 **received)**

381 There were varied opinions of the RISE program among the Makassar and Suva
382 residents. In one Suva settlement, a resident explained that while she was happy with RISE,
383 others there were experiencing participant fatigue with RISE: ‘They are tired of seeing [RISE] in
384 their settlements’ (IDI, Woman, Settlement 1). However, almost all of the other Suva residents
385 were positive about RISE:

386 *What RISE is currently doing, I am 100 percent thankful for.* (IDI, Woman, Settlement 4)

387 Most of the participant groups cited the participatory and inclusive nature of the RISE
388 program as being a mechanism that set it apart from other interventions that aim to improve
389 life in informal settlements.

390 Most of the Makassar residents indicated that the RISE program was the first, in their
391 experience, to directly include all residents in its activities:

392 *It is different because the RISE team involves the whole community.* (IDI, Woman,
393 Settlement 6)

394 Residents in both countries pointed out that RISE was more inclusive than other
395 programs they had experienced because there was no fee to participate whereas in other
396 programs, in Makassar for example, the ‘community had to pay if they wanted to attend’ (IDI,
397 Woman, Settlement 8). For the participants from at least one of the settlements in Suva, RISE
398 was compared to another program that had requested each household invest money but never
399 delivered the promised outputs:

400 *RISE brings in blessings from the outside but [the other program] takes away what we*
401 *already have. This is the difference.* (FGD, Man, Settlement 1)

402 There were mixed feelings about the level of engagement among the Suva participants.

403 In one settlement, the men’s FGD felt that consultation had been made with the settlement
404 leaders, but not with the residents:

405 *They design it, they come, they present and they go, there has been no consultation. [...]*

406 *They did not take our opinion but I might be wrong, they might have taken it from the*

407 *heads, from the committee members. (FGD, Man, Settlement 3)*

408 In another Suva settlement, a young woman in a focus group explained that the youth
409 there did not feel like their voices had been heard, including in the participatory design, but this
410 was because ‘the Chairman of the Committee thinks we are too young in age and experience to
411 have our opinions heard.’ (FGD, Woman, Settlement 1)

412 However, in other Suva settlements, the residents felt like they had been sufficiently
413 consulted.

414 *We all agreed about what they introduced during our community meeting. Their agenda*

415 *was communicated and taken into our community meeting for people to agree on what*

416 *was being introduced. (FGD, Man, Settlement 4)*

417 Some of the Makassar, Australia, and USA-based staff explained that because the RISE
418 program targeted households rather than individuals for participation in the activities, intra-
419 household dynamics and power structures may have prevented individual household members
420 from participating equitably in decision-making. For example, normally, decision-making power
421 fell to whoever owned the land (which could be women or men), because RISE required
422 landowner approval to build infrastructure on household land. However, at other times, men or
423 older residents had a greater influence over decision-making.

424 **5 Discussion**

425 In this mixed-methods process evaluation, we examined socio-demographic predictors
426 of participation (reach) in community- and household-level participatory design activities within
427 the context of the RISE intervention in Makassar, Indonesia and Suva, Fiji. We further assessed
428 community members' level of satisfaction (dose received) with the participatory design
429 activities and identified predictors of satisfaction. In Makassar and Suva, we observed that
430 certain groups were disproportionately more likely to participate in both community- and
431 household-level activities. In both countries, the majority of participants were satisfied with
432 their level of influence in the RISE program, though some nuance around participant fatigue,
433 distrust, and decision-making power was revealed in the qualitative data. In Makassar,
434 satisfaction did not vary by demographic characteristics. In Suva, we observed that women
435 were more likely than men to want *more* influence; in contrast, religious minorities were more
436 likely than the Christian religious majority to want *less* influence and unmarried people were
437 more likely than married people to want *less* influence. This process evaluation highlights the
438 successes and challenges of the intervention's participatory design phase and provides an
439 example of how programs that aim for an inclusive participatory approach can evaluate their
440 success in engaging diverse community members.

441 **5.1 Intervention reach**

442 Most groups of interest were reached through primary participatory activities, and
443 household visits provided advantages to reach certain residents. In Makassar, women had high
444 participation and were even more likely to report being reached through household visits than

445 through community-level engagement. In Suva, household visits appeared to be more inclusive
446 of people living with disabilities than community-level workshops, although this interpretation
447 may be limited by sample size. These household-level findings build on a qualitative analysis of
448 RISE's key mechanisms for achieving the gender and socially inclusive participatory approach
449 for engaging diverse people, where household visits were reported to engage those who could
450 not participate in the larger community venues due to socio-demographic characteristics,
451 marginalization, or time conflicts [20]. In other studies, household visits have been observed to
452 be an important activity to reach caregivers and female participants [6,26].

453 The findings indicate that household visits had both benefits and consequences for
454 inclusion. While both participants and RISE staff reported that household visits were an
455 important activity to reach groups of interest, RISE staff noted that hierarchical intra-household
456 dynamics, along with project requirements for landowner approval of final decisions related to
457 infrastructure, may have limited who was involved in decision-making. Additionally, Makassar
458 RISE staff said that men had *higher* participation in household visits than what was observed in
459 the quantitative results, because even if men were not present for participatory design
460 activities, they still typically made the final design decisions for their households (although this
461 varied by who the landowner was). This aligns with a systematic review of women's
462 empowerment and water and sanitation, which identified that women often have been
463 excluded from household-level decision-making for water and sanitation infrastructure [11].
464 Strategies to mitigate inequitable intra-household dynamics that limit decision-making power
465 can include collecting participant-level data to inform infrastructure design, or engaging with
466 informal or established groups, like women's and savings groups or disabled people's

467 organizations, to better include participants [20,28]. Additionally, given that land-ownership
468 had a large influence on who made final RISE household infrastructure decisions, interventions
469 operating on private household land need to acknowledge this power dynamic and facilitate
470 shared decision-making within households.

471 **5.2 Barriers to participation**

472 For residents who did not report participating in any RISE design activity, timing conflicts
473 were the most common barrier to participation. Other assessments of WASH program delivery
474 found similar challenges with scheduling community-level events [6]. Adapting to when diverse
475 groups of people are available, not just when the most people can attend, is an approach to
476 include a broader array of perspectives in participatory design [35]. Residents also discussed
477 barriers to participation relating to social exclusion, like mobility disability. Assessing workshop
478 facilities for accessibility and designing appropriate communication methods are steps that
479 programs can use to accommodate participants living with disabilities. In addition, a review of
480 disability measures recommended using multiple, valid disability self-assessments (like the
481 Washington Group measure and the Katz's Activities of Daily Living Index) to measure people's
482 functionality [36]. These results further highlight the value of assessing social and structural
483 barriers before and during implementation of participatory design processes.

484 **5.3 Participant satisfaction and influence (dose received)**

485 The qualitative dose received findings suggest that participants were generally satisfied
486 with RISE's participatory approach, including deliberately involving all residents and fee-free
487 participation. Residents also distinguished RISE from earlier external projects that did not

488 deliver expected outcomes, which echoes a structural distrust with development work [27,37].
489 Indeed, some residents reported not trusting RISE because they did not understand the
490 project's purpose. A similar feeling of distrust was found by a study on the effect of RISE
491 participatory design on social capital, which identified that over half of Suva intervention
492 communities experienced conflict with RISE over COVID-19-related food distributions and the
493 representativeness of RISE liaison committees [28]. These findings highlight the critical
494 importance of trust-building in community development projects, including discussing
495 community priorities and expectations. Additional approaches to build trust with communities
496 include adapting to community needs and establishing regular contact with participants, both
497 of which require programs to allocate sufficient time and resources [20].

498 While most participants in both countries were satisfied with their level of influence
499 over decision-making, the quantitative results also suggest that social dynamics around gender,
500 religion, and marital status affected participant satisfaction. Women in Suva were more likely to
501 report wanting *more* influence over RISE compared to men, despite having comparable
502 participation. Patriarchal gender norms may also be reflected in this discrepancy, as RISE staff
503 observed that most women tended to follow the decisions of husbands or male heads of
504 households across Suva communities [38,39]. Informal engagement channels also may have
505 had a role with this satisfaction finding: after the formal participatory design workshops ended,
506 RISE staff socialized with primarily men during *kava* drinking sessions, an important tradition in
507 Fiji, that was a key time for further discussion of RISE. Women who attended the participatory
508 design workshops, but did not attend the *kava* sessions because of other evening
509 responsibilities, may have felt less influential as a result. Inequitable decision-making also has

510 been reported in water and sanitation design and planning, where women and other socially
511 excluded groups felt like their voices were not heard during intervention meetings, despite
512 being considered key informants by practitioners [4].

513 In contrast to those who wanted more influence, religious minorities in Suva were more
514 likely to report wanting *less* influence over RISE compared to the Christian religious majority.
515 Hindu participants, in particular, may have wanted to avoid conflict during RISE decision-making
516 because of inter-ethnic tension between Indo-Fijians (majority Hindu) and iTaukei indigenous
517 Fijians (majority Christian) that has evolved since the British colonization of Fiji [40,41]. Salinger
518 et al.'s study on RISE participatory design and social capital found similar tensions in ethnically
519 heterogeneous Suva settlements, where some iTaukei residents were critical of a perceived lack
520 of Indo-Fijian participation [28]. Importantly, RISE staff noted that Indo-Fijian engagement
521 increased with additional, intentional outreach. This finding further supports Francis et al.'s
522 recommendation of having a diverse team to engage diverse participants during participatory
523 design [20]. Given how social dynamics can affect participants' decision-making, assessing
524 participant influence can be particularly relevant for participatory design processes to see if
525 approaches are promoting inclusive community engagement and how such processes may be
526 improved.

527 Participant-reported influence is an important addition to Saunders et al.'s framework
528 definition of dose received, which is the extent of community satisfaction and the extent to
529 which participants engage with intervention components [23]. In practice, WASH process
530 evaluations have also conceptualized dose received as participants' acceptability and
531 awareness of intervention activities [25–27]. Further, a systematic review of health promotion

532 studies found that dose received has been used to assess attendance, completion of activities,
533 and use of materials among other applications [42]. Our process evaluation expanded Saunders
534 et al.'s definition of dose received beyond attendance or awareness of an intervention to
535 measure participants' self-reported influence over decision-making. Doing so helped capture
536 community members' engagement with RISE participatory design activities beyond broad
537 satisfaction or intervention receipt. The integration of qualitative approaches helped us to
538 further understand participants' opinions of RISE from their own perspective.

539 **5.4 Implications for programs and policy**

540 Our process evaluation findings have implications for future programming with
541 participatory design, including the upcoming tranche of RISE control group settlements. First,
542 our results further support the importance of understanding existing community and intra-
543 household dynamics in order to support inclusion and equitable decision-making [28].
544 Approaches include fostering partnerships with existing community groups, collecting
545 individual-level data for design options, and fostering shared household decision-making [20].
546 While final decisions may still rest with a landowner or head of household, these recommended
547 approaches may be valuable for bringing additional voices and perspectives into decision-
548 making processes. Similarly, it is recommended that programs spend time and resources before
549 starting participatory design processes to understand whether and how diverse community
550 members would like to participate, as people will have varying degrees of interest in
551 engagement [35]. During the design process, it is advised that implementers be cognizant of
552 informal engagement methods and who may be included and excluded from those spaces.

553 Lastly, mixed-methods, framework-guided process evaluations are valuable to assess how
554 participatory design is implemented, with both quantitative and qualitative data assessing
555 reach and satisfaction.

556 **6 Strengths & limitations**

557 This process evaluation has a number of strengths. The research was nested within the
558 larger RISE randomized control trial in intervention settlements. Given this, survey enumerators
559 had prior experience with RISE data collection methods and with community members, and
560 household contact information was available in Makassar from earlier phone surveys. In
561 addition to data collector experience, many community members also had familiarity with RISE
562 enumerators prior to data collection. Qualitative data collection sought the emic perspective
563 from participants with varied socio-demographic characteristics across study locations and
564 intentionally included people who were marginalized [20]. Finally, the research was able to
565 build on rich findings from additional studies about RISE’s participatory design phase.

566 Several limitations also exist for this process evaluation. This study assessed the formal
567 participatory design phase, but the participatory design process has since continued throughout
568 infrastructure construction. As the process evaluation was a secondary analysis of the
569 quantitative and qualitative data, analysis was limited to two process indicators. During
570 quantitative data collection, sampling bias may have occurred, as those who participated in
571 participatory design activities may have been more likely to respond to this study’s survey.
572 Recall bias also may have occurred, as the Makassar survey was administered 11-13 months
573 after the end of RISE’s participatory design phase. While gender inclusion was a key research

574 interest, the qualitative data collection did not specifically recruit those who were non-binary
575 or transgender [20]. Data collection overall was only conducted with adults, which is a
576 limitation given that qualitative data from Suva indicated that some youth felt excluded from
577 the participatory process.

578 **7 Conclusion**

579 This mixed-methods process evaluation found that RISE participatory design workshops
580 and household visits achieved good reach and dose received. The study also identified gender
581 and social inequities in design participation and influence over decision-making. We encourage
582 future WASH participatory design processes to develop meaningful engagement with
583 communities and local organizations to better involve people of interest. Process evaluations
584 are recommended to further understand and promote community engagement during and
585 following participatory design.

586 Acknowledgements

587 We are grateful to all RISE project participants for sharing their time and participation in
588 the research. We would like to thank Fiona Barker, Data Manager and Chief Investigator on the
589 RISE trial, for the management of all quantitative data used in our study; Karin Leder, Director
590 of Research on the RISE trial; Soropepli Ramacake of the University of the South Pacific for
591 assisting with data collection coordination in Fiji; Isoa Vakarewa for his project administration in
592 Fiji; Ruzka Taruc for her project administration in Indonesia; and Arantxa Bonifaz Rosas of
593 Emory University for her review of transcripts. We are thankful to our research partners at the
594 University of the South Pacific including Litea Meo-Sewabu for research coordination and
595 supervision; Camari Koto, Sunia Baikeirewa, and Malakai Waqa for qualitative data collection in
596 Suva; and Natasha Khan for translations. We thank Inoke Droya, Jese Cabenalevu, Misila
597 Nasolo, Saliman Bibi, Maraia Luveniyali, and Evelyn Chand, the volunteers who shared their
598 time as data collectors and transcribers in Suva. We thank Sudirman Nasir, our research partner
599 at Universitas Hasanuddin, and Rafika Ramli, Amanda Pricella Putri, Betrin Natasya, and Rachma
600 Rahim, who contributed to the study as transcribers and translators in Makassar. We would
601 also like to thank the following contributors for their assistance with interpretation of study
602 results: Fitriyanty Awaluddin, Adrianto Hidayat, Raniyah Muhammed, Savu Nofoimuli, Bulou
603 Ratulevu, Autiko Tela, Josaia Thaggard, and Iliesa Wise. This study was completed as part of the
604 Revitalising Informal Settlements and their Environments (RISE) program ([https://www.rise-](https://www.rise-program.org/)
605 [program.org/](https://www.rise-program.org/)) on behalf of the RISE Consortium (<https://doi.org/10.26180/ctjf-vf69>).

606 References

- 607 1. Lewis EW, Siyambango N, Lendelvo S. Assessment of accessibility of safe drinking water: A case study of the
608 Goreangab informal settlement, Windhoek, Namibia. *Water Pract Technol.* 2018 Dec 1;13(4):871–8.
- 609 2. Schrecongost A, Wong K. Unsettled: Water and sanitation in urban settlement communities in the Pacific
610 [Internet]. World Bank; 2015. Available from:
611 [https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/pt/603081468197054598/pdf/101065-WP-v2-PUBLIC-](https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/pt/603081468197054598/pdf/101065-WP-v2-PUBLIC-Box393257B-full-report.pdf)
612 [Box393257B-full-report.pdf](https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/pt/603081468197054598/pdf/101065-WP-v2-PUBLIC-Box393257B-full-report.pdf)
- 613 3. United Nations-Habitat. SDG indicator metadata [Internet]. 2021. Available from:
614 <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/metadata/files/Metadata-11-01-01.pdf>
- 615 4. Assefa GM, Sherif S, Sluijs J, Kuijpers M, Chaka T, Solomon A, et al. Gender equality and social inclusion in
616 relation to water, sanitation and hygiene in the Oromia region of Ethiopia. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.*
617 2021 Apr 17;18(8):4281.
- 618 5. Jones H, Fisher R, Reed R. Water and sanitation for all in low-income countries. *Proc Inst Civ Eng Munic Eng.*
619 2012;165(3):167–74.
- 620 6. Routray P, Torondel B, Jenkins MW, Clasen T, Schmidt WP. Processes and challenges of community
621 mobilisation for latrine promotion under Nirmal Bharat Abhiyan in rural Odisha, India. *BMC Public Health.*
622 2017 May 16;17(1):453.
- 623 7. Tinoco M, Cortobius M, Grajales MD, Kjellén M. Water co-operation between cultures: partnerships with
624 indigenous peoples for sustainable water and sanitation services. *Aquat Procedia.* 2014;2:55–62.
- 625 8. Wali N, Georgeou N, Simmons O, Gautam MS, Gurung S. Women and WASH in Nepal: a scoping review of
626 existing literature. *Water Int.* 2020 Apr 2;45(3):222–45.
- 627 9. White S, Kuper H, Itimu-Phiri A, Holm R, Biran A. A qualitative study of barriers to accessing water, sanitation
628 and hygiene for disabled people in Malawi. *PLOS ONE.* 2016 May 12;11(5):e0155043.
- 629 10. United Nations. Sustainable Development Goals [Internet]. 2015. Available from: <https://sdgs.un.org/goals>
- 630 11. Caruso BA, Conrad A, Patrick M, Owens A, Kviten K, Zarella O, et al. Water, sanitation, and women’s

- 631 empowerment: A systematic review and qualitative metanalysis. *PLOS Water*. 2022 Jun 7;1(6):e0000026.
- 632 12. Cumming O, Arnold BF, Ban R, Clasen T, Esteves Mills J, Freeman MC, et al. The implications of three major
633 new trials for the effect of water, sanitation and hygiene on childhood diarrhea and stunting: a consensus
634 statement. *BMC Med*. 2019 Aug 28;17(1):173.
- 635 13. French MA, Fiona Barker S, Taruc RR, Ansariadi A, Duffy GA, Saifuddaolah M, et al. A planetary health model
636 for reducing exposure to faecal contamination in urban informal settlements: Baseline findings from
637 Makassar, Indonesia. *Environ Int*. 2021 Oct 1;155:106679.
- 638 14. Nelson S, Drabarek D, Negin J, Abimbola S. How community participation in water and sanitation
639 interventions impacts human health, WASH infrastructure and service longevity in low-income and middle-
640 income countries: a realist review. *BMJ Open*. 2021 Dec;11(12):e053320.
- 641 15. Jiménez A, LeDeunff H, Giné R, Sjödin J, Cronk R, Murad S, et al. The enabling environment for participation
642 in water and sanitation: a conceptual framework. *Water*. 2019 Feb;11(2):308.
- 643 16. Aladuwaka S, Momsen J. Sustainable development, water resources management and women's
644 empowerment: the Wanaraniya Water Project in Sri Lanka. *Gend Dev*. 2010;18(1):43–58.
- 645 17. Willetts J, Halcrow G, Carrard N, Rowland C, Crawford J. Addressing two critical MDGs together: gender in
646 water, sanitation and hygiene initiatives. *Pac Econ Bull*. 2010;25(1):162–76.
- 647 18. Leder K, Openshaw JJ, Allotey P, Ansariadi A, Barker SF, Burge K, et al. Study design, rationale and methods
648 of the Revitalising Informal Settlements and their Environments (RISE) study: a cluster randomised
649 controlled trial to evaluate environmental and human health impacts of a water-sensitive intervention in
650 informal settlements in Indonesia and Fiji. *BMJ Open*. 2021 Jan 1;11(1):e042850.
- 651 19. Asia Development Bank and Revitalising Informal Settlements and their Environments. Co-design of water
652 sensitive settlement upgrading [Internet]. Asian Development Bank and Monash University; 2021. Available
653 from: [https://www.rise-program.org/__data/assets/pdf_file/0010/2603485/RISE_ADB-Knowledge-Products-
654 2_FA4-hires.pdf](https://www.rise-program.org/__data/assets/pdf_file/0010/2603485/RISE_ADB-Knowledge-Products-2_FA4-hires.pdf)
- 655 20. Francis N, Batagol B, Salinger AP, Meo-Sewabu L, Bass AC, Nasir S, et al. Key mechanisms of a gender and
656 socially inclusive community engagement and participatory design approach in the RISE program in

- 657 Makassar, Indonesia and Suva, Fiji. *PLOS Water*. 2023 Nov 3;2(11):e0000186.
- 658 21. Haque SS, Freeman MC. The applications of implementation science in water, sanitation, and hygiene
659 (WASH) research and practice. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2021;129(6):065002.
- 660 22. Pickering AJ, Null C, Winch PJ, Mangwadu G, Arnold BF, Prendergast AJ, et al. The WASH Benefits and SHINE
661 trials: interpretation of WASH intervention effects on linear growth and diarrhoea. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2019
662 Aug 1;7(8):e1139–46.
- 663 23. Saunders RP, Evans MH, Joshi P. Developing a process-evaluation plan for assessing health promotion
664 program implementation: a how-to guide. *Health Promot Pract*. 2005 Apr;6(2):134–47.
- 665 24. Linnan L, Steckler A. *Process Evaluation in Public Health Interventions and Research*. Jossey-Bass Publishers;
666 2002.
- 667 25. Boisson S, Sosai P, Ray S, Routray P, Torondel B, Schmidt WP, et al. Promoting latrine construction and use in
668 rural villages practicing open defecation: process evaluation in connection with a randomised controlled trial
669 in Orissa, India. *BMC Res Notes*. 2014 Aug 1;7(1):486.
- 670 26. Panulo M, Chidziwisano K, Beattie TK, Tilley E, Kambala C, Morse T. Process evaluation of “The Hygienic
671 Family” intervention: a community-based water, sanitation, and hygiene project in rural Malawi. *Int J*
672 *Environ Res Public Health*. 2022 Jan;19(11):6771.
- 673 27. Sclar GD, Routray P, Majorin F, Udaipuria S, Portela G, Koehne WJ, et al. Mixed Methods Process Evaluation
674 of a Sanitation Behavior Change Intervention in Rural Odisha, India. *Glob Implement Res Appl*. 2022 Feb
675 16;2:67–84.
- 676 28. Salinger A, Charles I, Francis N, Batagol B, Meo-Sewabu L, Nasir S, et al. “People are now working together
677 for a common good”: The effect on social capital of participatory design for community-level sanitation
678 infrastructure in urban informal settlements. *World Dev*. 2024 Feb 1;174:106449.
- 679 29. Washington Group. *Census Questions on Disability Endorsed by the Washington Group* [Internet]. 2020.
680 Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/washington_group/WG_Short_Measure_on_Disability.pdf
- 681 30. Bursac Z, Gauss CH, Williams DK, Hosmer DW. Purposeful selection of variables in logistic regression. *Source*
682 *Code Biol Med*. 2008 Dec 16;3(1):17.

- 683 31. Sam-Agudu NA, Abimbola S. Using scientific authorship criteria as a tool for equitable inclusion in global
684 health research. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2021 Oct 1;6(10):e007632.
- 685 32. Damschroder LJ, Aron DC, Keith RE, Kirsh SR, Alexander JA, Lowery JC. Fostering implementation of health
686 services research findings into practice: a consolidated framework for advancing implementation science.
687 *Implement Sci*. 2009 Aug 7;4(1):50.
- 688 33. Guest G, MacQueen K, Name E. *Applied thematic analysis*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications Inc; 2014.
- 689 34. O'Connor C, Joffe H. Intercoder reliability in qualitative research: debates and practical guidelines. *Int J Qual*
690 *Methods*. 2020 Jan 1;19:1609406919899220.
- 691 35. Moschonas D, Bass A, Batagol B, Charles I, Francis N, Habsji H, et al. Reflecting on water & sanitation
692 infrastructure: A toolkit for WASH practitioners on gender and socially inclusive participatory design
693 approaches in urban informal settlements. Monash University, Emory University, Universitas Husanuddin
694 and University of the South Pacific; 2022.
- 695 36. Palmer M, Harley D. Models and measurement in disability: an international review. *Health Policy Plan*. 2012
696 Aug 1;27(5):357–64.
- 697 37. Meki T, Tarai J. How can aid be decolonized and localized in the Pacific? Yielding and wielding power. *Dev*
698 *Policy Rev*. 2023;41(S2):e12732.
- 699 38. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the Pacific Community. Country gender
700 assessment of agriculture and the rural sector in Fiji [Internet]. Suva; 2019. Available from:
701 <https://openknowledge.fao.org/items/bc192084-98fb-4efb-a1dc-8eec1d01dc90>
- 702 39. Leckie J. Women in post-coup Fiji: negotiating work in old and new realities [Internet]. In *Confronting Fiji*
703 *Futures*. 1st ed. Canberra: The Australian National University. AH Akram-Lodhi, editor; 2016. 178–201 p.
704 Available from: <https://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1656/pdf/book.pdf>
- 705 40. McCarthy S. Soldiers, chiefs and church: unstable democracy in Fiji. *Int Polit Sci Rev*. 2011;32(5):563–78.
- 706 41. Norton R. Reconciling ethnicity and nation: contending discourses in Fiji's constitutional reform. *Contemp*
707 *Pac*. 2000;12(1):83–122.
- 708 42. Rowbotham S, Conte K, Hawe P. Variation in the operationalisation of dose in implementation of health

709 promotion interventions: insights and recommendations from a scoping review. *Implement Sci.* 2019 Jun
710 6;14(1):56.