

Implementation factors enhancing the effectiveness of CLTS on latrine coverage in communities of rural Ghana

Hans-Joachim Mosler
Miriam Harter
Jonathan Lilje

Environmental Social Sciences
Environmental & Health Psychology

Missing research on implementation factors

USAID (2018): the *“success of CLTS programs is likely to be a function of the implementation modality, as well as both physical environmental and contextual factors. While such factors are cited frequently as crucial, they are not usually well defined.”*

USAID. An Examination of CLTS’s Contributions toward Universal Sanitation. Washington, DC.: 2018

Hypothesis on implementation factors

Latrine coverage on community level is higher

1. the higher participation in the triggering event
2. the more the facilitators are liked
3. the higher conviction and motivation after the triggering event is
4. stronger feelings of shame and disgust
5. the higher the number of selected natural leaders
6. the higher the number of follow-up visits
7. the provision of subsidies
8. the time since the triggering event

➔ The goal is to identify the individual contributions of these factors towards the success of CLTS in terms of latrine coverage on community level

Methodology

- Two districts in Northern Ghana: Sawla-Tuna-Kalba district and Bole district
- Questionnaire for the follow-up survey included questions on the perception of the performed interventions
- Data was aggregated on the community level → data represents the average response from all participants within one community as an aggregated measure
- Latrine coverage: Respondents were asked whether their household owns a latrine - verified by visual inspection by the enumerator. Outcome measure: represents the proportion of households within the community sample having a latrine ranging from 0 – 100% coverage
- Full information of 1877 households across 94 communities were available

Measures

Data from household interviews:

- Level of being **convinced and motivated** to build a latrine
- Level of **shame and disgust** evoked during the CLTS meeting
- Liking of the **meeting and the facilitators**
- **Number of follow-up visits experienced**
- Asking participants whether **they were promised anything in return** for latrine construction by the facilitators or (borehole and construction materials for reduced prices)

Data from the monitoring forms of Global Communities at community level:

- Participation in the activity (**Percentage of respondents attending the triggering event**)
- **Time since triggering** event in months was measured
- **Number of natural leaders** (both female and male combined)

Results

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N	Correlation with outcome	Sign.
% latrine coverage	67.99	31.30	94		
time since triggering	6.16	2.29	94	.054	.303
% attendance at meeting	83.36	14.34	94	.47	.000
number of natural leaders	5.46	2.59	94	.13	.106
% of incentive promised	56.51	25.51	94	.56	.000
convinced & motivated	4.64	.278	94	.39	.000
ashamed & disgusted	2.08	.46	94	.13	.112
Liked meeting & facilitators	4.71	.31	94	.17	.056
number of follow-up visits	2.09	1.00	94	.60	.000

Linear regression model of predictors of community latrine coverage

Variables in the model	B	Std. Error	Beta	Sign.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
(Constant)	-20.93	53.07		.694	-126.44	84.58
time since triggering	-1.96	1.13	-0.14	.086	-4.21	0.29
% attendance at meeting	0.43	0.20	0.20	.035	0.03	0.83
number of natural leaders	2.50	0.90	0.21	.007	0.71	4.28
% of incentive promised	0.47	0.12	0.38	.000	0.24	0.70
convinced & motivated	5.55	10.80	0.05	.609	-15.93	27.02
ashamed & disgusted	-1.99	5.38	-0.03	.712	-12.70	8.71
Liking of meeting & facilitators	-4.44	8.65	-0.04	.609	-21.63	12.75
number of follow-up visits	11.74	3.27	0.37	.001	5.24	18.25

Results

Latrine coverage increases by

- 12% with every single follow-up visit to the community
- 2.5% with every additional natural leader identified
- 0.5% from every person more out of 100 who attends the meeting
- 0.5% from every person to whom an incentive is being promised during the meeting.

For CLTS to be successful it seems important that

- **as many as possible members of a community participate** in the triggering meeting
 - ➔ good preparation of the meeting to assure that all people in the community know of the meeting and that for them it looks attractive (Effect of the number of people not big perhaps the social influence of these attendees is more important)
- promoters of CLTS should also try to pledge **as many natural leaders as possible**
 - ➔ facilitators could also be trained in gaining natural leaders, persuasion training with the aim of eliciting hidden aspirations and skills in community members.
- **2 – 3 follow-up visits** are performed to push a community towards ODF.
- **incentives were promised**
 - ➔ As long as no false promises are given and the toilets are used, this is a strategy one can think of.

Conclusions

For CLTS to be successful it might be not important

➤ **the performance of the facilitators**

➔ nearly all facilitators performed quite well, the attendees liked them and they were convincing and motivating. The implementing organization (Global Communities) trained the facilitators very well.

➤ **the elicited emotions through CLTS**

➔ intensiveness of the emotions shame and disgust was quite low because facilitators might like to avoid such strong reactions due to taboos and cultural impropriety.