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Personal hygiene & sanitation behaviors of interest

Why invest in behavior change?
- realize health and associated economic impacts from improved watsan infrastructure
- sustained improvements

Which water & sanitation behaviors to target?
1. Lack of expressed demand for sanitation
   - Increase household investment in improved sanitation
2. Open defecation
   - Stop open defecation; improved sanitation facilities used by all
3. Poor hygiene practices in the home
   - Wash hands with soap at key times
   - Dispose of infant feces safely
   - Storing and using drinking water safely

Sanitation demand & hygiene behavior change – some background

The MOA framework
Motivation, Opportunity and Ability required for individual to voluntarily change behavior

Common ingredients of behavior change approaches
- Raise awareness, change attitudes, transmit knowledge & skills
  - communications campaigns, participatory learning, social (mass, community) mobilization, consumer education, health education
- Link or provide access to products and services if needed for the target behavior, via coordinated supply-side strategies
- Use of incentives and sometimes sanctions

Non-health private benefits of improved hygiene & sanitation

Cultural adaptation and gender analysis
Historical experiences in Europe and the USA

• Sanitary Revolution: 1850 to 1900
  – Major investments in urban public infrastructure (sewers), and creation of municipal sanitary services to collect, clean fecal, liquid, & solid wastes
  – Centrally led by government, funded by public taxes
  – Creation and use of new public health regulation & enforcement powers

• Hygiene Revolution: 1800 to 1950
  – Gradual, evolutionary, decentralized process led by many social and secular groups, many agendas
  – As much about changing cultural, social and moral norms as disease
  – Soap not promoted initially, remained relative luxury due to cost
  – Creation of public baths and public laundry facilities beginning 1850
  – Greatly facilitated by in-home piped water distribution expansion after 1890s

• Soap Revolution: 1890s onward
  – Cheap soap production reduced soap prices
  – Soap taxes removed
  – Commercial soap marketing to change personal hygiene behavior
  – Facilitated by rising incomes, indoor bathrooms and in-home piped water

Successful san & hyg behavior change approaches - Developing Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Which key behaviors?</th>
<th>How many behaviors?</th>
<th>Minimum scale</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Origins &amp; Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHAST</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>many</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>participatory, community-based</td>
<td>1990s Africa many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Health Clubs</td>
<td>any</td>
<td>many</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>participatory, health educ., community-based</td>
<td>2000s Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-led Total Sanitation (CLTS)</td>
<td>stop open defecation; sanit, demand</td>
<td>two</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>participatory, community-based, competitions</td>
<td>2000s Bangladesh India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Social Mobilization</td>
<td>any</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>Regional to National</td>
<td>multi-channel, multi-method individual-, institutional- &amp; community-based</td>
<td>1990s Bangladesh Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Marketing</td>
<td>any</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>multi-channel, multi-partner, marketing, individual-based</td>
<td>1990s Benin Burkina Faso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPPHWS</td>
<td>hand washing w/ soap</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>multi-channel, multi-partner social &amp; soap marketing, individual-based</td>
<td>2000s Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation Marketing</td>
<td>sanitation demand</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>Districts, City</td>
<td>multi-channel, marketing, supply-side, individ’t-based</td>
<td>2000s Benin Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfinance partnering</td>
<td>sanitation demand</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>Districts, City</td>
<td>sanitation marketing + credit, individual-based</td>
<td>2000s many</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
‘PHA’ National Rural Hyg. & Sanitation Promotion Program, Gov. of Benin

- 4 target behaviors
  - sanitation demand, latrine use and cleaning, hand washing, safe drinking water
- Mixed methods
  - Sanitation Marketing, selective PHAST, individual-based, zero hardware subsidy
  - Gov’t extension agents + NGO contractors + trained community volunteers
  - Door-to-door visits
  - Low-cost technologies, facilitated choice, tech advice
  - Trained & certified local private sector supply
- Achievements
  - National scale, highly structured, effective materials, good monitoring, strong supervision
  - Initial +10% increase improved latrine coverage
  - Unmeasured positive multiplier & on-going uptake
- Challenges
  - Relatively slow (18 mo cycle, village-by-village)
  - Potentially costly?
  - Too many behaviors together?
  - Largely single channel, with weak follow-up
  - Cement supply-chain constraints

PHA BENIN - Use of non-health social marketing messages on inconveniences of open defecation & advantages of a latrine
Total Sanitation Campaign – Rural India

- **Target behaviors**
  - Install latrines, sanitation demand, stop open defecation, ‘sanitize’ village

- **Mixed methods**
  - IEC, CLTS, targeted hold hardware subsidies
  - Awareness raising, community mobilization
  - Financial incentives, competition & prestigious awards added in 2004
  - NGO or private sector supply

- **Achievements**
  - National-scale policy & funding, local implementation
  - Incentive program highly effective in mobilizing community, local govt leadership
  - Dramatic increases in latrine uptake & ‘Open Defecation Free & Sanitized’ status after 2004

- **Challenges**
  - Sustaining ODF sanitized status
  - Distortions of financial incentives
  - Independent verification and on-going monitoring
  - Lack of attention to hand washing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indian States</th>
<th>2001 Rural Households</th>
<th>Rural Coverage 2001</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bihar</td>
<td>12.7 M</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chhattisgarh</td>
<td>3.4 M</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haryana</td>
<td>2.6 M</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karnataka</td>
<td>6.7 M</td>
<td>18 %</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripura</td>
<td>0.5 M</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharashtra</td>
<td>&lt;to fill&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural India Overall</td>
<td>&lt;to fill&gt;</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic Sanitation Program, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso

- **Target behavior**
  - Sanitation demand for improved household facilities

- **Method**
  - Social marketing, limited infrastructure subsidy (30% of solution costs), individual approach
  - Wide range of technology choice, price, standardized items
  - Trained NGO contractors –social intermediation & promotion
  - Trained certified private sector providers of goods & services

- **Achievements**
  - Highly sustainable since 1992, despite subsidy
  - Dedicated water services cross-subsidy funding
  - Structured market for on-site sanitation goods and services
  - Improved latrine coverage from 5% to 55%

- **Challenges**
  - Preference for lowest cost (low service level) latrine option may limit health impacts
  - Lack of attention to hand washing
Costs, Impacts, Reaching Poorest

- Systematic approach for comparative cost evaluation lacking
- Limited indicative data:
  - Hygiene promotion: EUR 1.27 to 7 per individual beneficiary (4 larger projects)
  - Sanitation demand creation: USD 6 to 144 per household beneficiary (6 larger projects)
- Impacts vary widely – increases of 10 to 50+ percentage points, caveats
- Lack of systematic disaggregated analysis on poorest
  - Reaching poorest and vulnerable groups has been difficult
  - Different informational, behavioral and risk orientation of such groups may require separate specifically targeted and adapted programs
- How to effectively target infrastructure subsidies to reach poorest for household sanitation (Topic 2)

Challenges, Questions and Scale-up

1. Targeting single vs. multiple behaviors simultaneously?
2. Implementing “at scale” vs. scaling up “village-based” approaches
3. Importance of face-to-face and multiple over single channels of communication
4. Value of broad-based social & political mass mobilization, regardless of selected behavior change method
5. Power of non-health messages about private benefits to motivate change
6. Integration with school sanitation and hygiene programs
Challenges, Questions and Scale-up

7. Critical ingredients:
   – Formative research & pilot testing of communications materials, channels, cultural and gender aspects
   – Highly trained & dedicated extension workers (gov’t &/or NGO) and community volunteers for face-to-face, individual household & community interaction
   – Regular on-going monitoring and supervision, accountability
   – Access to attractive, affordable range of products and services for sanitation demand creation

8. Better monitoring & evaluation of communications effectiveness, disaggregated impacts, systematic costing information

9. Long, gradual process => programmatic commitment of resources to renew, update campaigns

10. Importance of government champions in scale-up

A Few Summary Points

- Proven successful approaches and large scale examples exist
- Adapt and combine elements of different approaches to match local context, antecedent conditions, needs
- Value of partnering with private sector (soap companies, sanitation goods & services, microfinance services)
- Opportunities & challenges of financial incentives and sanctions
- Sanitation demand creation requires active linkages with access to improved choice of products and services
Proposed Recommendations

1. Fund large-scale national social marketing / social mobilization campaigns to change open defecation norms
2. Fund microfinance partnering and demand creation programs for household sanitation
3. Fund financial incentives and awards for local government and communities, in sanitation and hygiene programs
4. Fund expansion & renewal of PPPHW campaigns; explore investment in complementary development & marketing of household hand washing devices
5. Include sufficient attention to and funding for:
   • Independently managed complementary behavior change software programs in WatSan infrastructure investment projects
   • School WatSan facility improvements and behavior change programs in school construction investment projects
   • M&E and costing data collection & analyses at project inception to improve effectiveness of behavior change investments