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Executive Summary

Over 1 billion people still practise open defecation (OD), the riskiest sanitation practice, directly impacting their health, education, productivity and economic status. In terms of Social Norms Theory, OD can be described as a common habitual behaviour, or a ‘custom’: there is usually no societal expectation for people to practice OD, but individuals may have an unconditional preference for OD as it is believed to be an accepted solution to a recognised need.

UNICEF’s ‘Community Approaches to Total Sanitation’ (CATS) aim to completely eliminate OD by changing people’s behaviour and promoting the demand for sanitation across entire communities. This shift in UNICEF’s sanitation programming approach has resulted in rapid and at-scale progress across more than 50 countries. Although CATS was not specifically informed by Social Norms Theory at the time of its development, CATS has since been used as an example of introducing a new social norm. As UNICEF looks to expand the implementation of CATS further, using Social Norms Theory to critically assess the work undertaken to date highlights a number of areas for potential refinement. This paper examines how two key elements of Social Norms Theory, namely Social Network Analysis and the measurement of Social Norms, could be incorporated into CATS programmes to strengthen a number of interdependent activities.

Social Network Analysis

Insufficient attention to preparation as part of the pre-triggering phase has been identified as one reason for low success rates in some countries. Social Network Analysis offers a way to map and analyse the relationships between individuals and between groups, and to think more systematically about key issues of relevance to our programming, such as how information flows within and between reference networks and communities as a whole, and which individuals (opinion leaders) have most influence on what others believe and do.

- Mapping the social networks that exist between villages in a particular district or sub-district could be used to identify central villages that would be well positioned to support a process of organised diffusion of the ODF social expectations. If combined with a baseline measurement of beliefs and social expectations (discussed in section 3.2), this information could also be used to identify which communities should be avoided during the early phases of the programme (due to fragmented community, or if there are beliefs or expectations that support OD in a particular community).

- Using Social Network Analysis at the community level would provide structure for the pre-triggering analysis of community relations and dynamics, and provide valuable information on the different reference networks within a community and key individuals within these. This would enable CATS facilitators to ensure all reference networks are represented in triggering and post-triggering discussions, and to target specific individuals to be part of the ‘core group’ to support information sharing, value deliberations, and community-level monitoring.
Social Network Analysis would also help to identify particularly vulnerable individuals or households within a community, and to provide information on their social position and the social constraints they may face. This may have implications for how to reach them, and what type of additional support they might need to act.

Mapping individuals or families that can act as ‘bridges’ between different reference networks and between communities would allow CATS facilitators to strategically plan around their connections, and facilitate more efficient organised diffusion.

The ‘Ego-Centric Approach’ could be used as a systematic step in the pre-triggering process. Guidance and capacity building would need to focus on data collection and data entry, and on how to analyse and use the information to inform planning and strategic approaches. While data collection should be done by the relevant CATS facilitators as part of the pre-triggering visits, support for data entry and data analysis would need to be provided by district level staff (with technical assistance from UNICEF WASH staff, at least initially).

**Measurement of Social Norms**

Currently, most CATS programmes track whether or not triggered communities have been certified as ODF. There is an assumption that once a community has achieved ODF status and the practice of using a latrine has been adopted by all members of the community, and people will not revert to old practices of open defecation as a new social norm has been created. However, although comprehensive data has not been collected, a number of country programmes have reported some degree of ‘slippage’ or reversion to open defecation after ODF status has been achieved.

Measuring beliefs and social expectations as part of a baseline, or pre-triggering, would help to identify which communities are more or less suitable to start the programme in (see discussion in section 3.1. on combining this with Social Network Analysis).

Monitoring beliefs and social expectations pre- and post-triggering would allow CATS programme staff to monitor the effectiveness of triggering and track whether changes increase in line with expected results.

Monitoring beliefs and social expectations following ODF certification and in sustainability checks would allow programme staff to identify whether or not a social norm has indeed been established (*is there consensus on what people believe others expect them to do*) and is being maintained (*are people conforming to the expected behaviour*) within a particular community or wider geographical area. The analysis would allow programme staff to strategically allocate resources for follow-up activities based on where additional support is needed to solidify the desired changes in behaviours.

Data on beliefs and social expectations can be collected through the inclusion of appropriate questions in planning KAP or other surveys, or collected independently by CATS facilitators or third party monitors (e.g. when part of sustainability checks). The use of vignettes with individuals or groups (including children) would allow for more in-depth probing on beliefs and expectations in relation to different scenarios, allowing for some measure of causality.
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Using a Social Norms perspective, this case study examines the challenge of eliminating open defecation and the use of Community Approaches to Total Sanitation (CATS) to address this problematic practice. A more detailed analysis of how two key elements of Social Norms Theory, namely Social Network Analysis and the measurement of Social Norms, could be operationally incorporated into CATS programmes to strengthen a number of interdependent activities is presented.

1. Description of the Challenge

By the end of 2011, there were 2.5 billion people who lacked access to an improved sanitation facility. Of these, over 1 billion (15% of the world’s population) still practise open defecation (defined as defecation in fields, forests, bushes, bodies of water or other open spaces). Open defecation (OD) is most widely practised in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa, and it is often the poorest and those in remote areas that are most likely to practice OD: 90% of all open defecation takes place in rural areas; while in many countries, 95% or more of the poorest wealth quintile practice OD.

Figure 1: Global sanitation coverage and open defecation trends in urban and rural areas by population, 1990-2011

Source: JMP Progress on sanitation and drinking-water - 2013 update

Open defecation (OD) is the riskiest sanitation practice, directly impacting health, education, productivity and economic status. Poor sanitation is one of the main causes of diarrhoea (the second leading cause of under-five deaths), and a key cause of worm infestations and undernutrition – resulting in reduced physical growth, weakened physical fitness and impaired cognitive functions, particularly among children under age five. Recent evidence suggests that OD could account for a significant part of the international variation (cross country differences) in child height (Spears 2012). For women and girls, practising OD undermines dignity, and can put them at risk of assault and rape.
1.1. Understanding the practice of OD in terms of Social Norms Theory

Bicchieri (2006) defines a social norm as a *rule of behaviour* that people *prefer* to conform to on the condition that:

- most people in their relevant network conform to it (empirical expectations), AND
- most people in their relevant network believe they ought to conform to it (normative expectations).

While practicing OD meets an individual’s immediate physical ‘need’ and allows them to avoid the cost and inconvenience of building and maintaining a latrine, its practice by even one person is harmful to the health and well-being of the entire community. Where OD is practiced, there is usually no societal ‘expectation’ that this *should be* the case, however there is an ‘acceptance’ of the practice as it is seen as a legitimate solution to a recognised need. People’s empirical expectations, based on what they see happening around them, are that

---

1 The social dilemma created by this tension between an individual’s interests and the interests of the community as a whole is discussed in Bicchieri (2013, Lecture 3: Creating and abandoning norms) and in more detail in Dooley (2010, Final Paper: Creating a new Social Norm – Open Defecation Free Communities).

2 Though Cormancy (2010, Final Paper: A Social Norm Based Analysis of Community Led Total Sanitation) sites a number of examples from West and Central Africa where factual beliefs create social expectations that may support open defecation, including: gasses from latrine holes cause abortion (Ivory Coast), two holes should never face each other (Guinea), one person’s faeces cannot contact another person’s faeces (Togo), fathers and daughter’s-in-law should never share latrines (Mali), and that the use of latrines shortens lifespan (Burkina Faso). Tifow (2011, Final Paper: Applying Social Norms Theory to Achieve ODF: Kenya 2013 Initiative) also sites an example among the Turkana in Samburu district, who believe stopping open defecation may interfere with their food chain.
some people will practice OD and some people will use latrines (see Table 1). In most situations therefore, OD can be described as a common habitual behaviour, or a ‘custom’ (see Figure 2).

1.2. Understanding UNICEF’s approach to eliminating OD in terms of Social Norms Theory

UNICEF’s ‘Community Approaches to Total Sanitation’ (CATS) aim to completely eliminate open defecation by changing people’s behaviour and promoting the demand for sanitation across entire communities. In 2008, UNICEF developed the core principles for CATS based on lessons learned and best practices from a number of emerging community-based sanitation approaches such as Community Led Total Sanitation (CLTS), School Led Total Sanitation (SLTS) and Total Sanitation Approach (TSA). Although CATS was not specifically informed by Social Norms Theory at the time of its development, CATS has since been used as an example of introducing a new social norm.

In the CLTS example discussed during the course for example (Dooley, 2013), the preparatory, or pre-triggering phase, starts when programme staff identify suitable communities and begin to establish relationships with the community leaders and members, and to develop an understanding of the different groups and dynamics at play within the community. Through the use of simple, effective (and often shocking) demonstrations known as triggering, facilitators help highlight the link between open defecation and disease. Community dialogue provides an opportunity for existing practices and factual beliefs to be discussed, creating new shared common knowledge. There is coordinated change of beliefs and attitudes as community members collectively realise the implications of their sanitation practices (often creating strong emotions such as disgust), and jointly pledge to change these and build their own toilets using locally available materials. Facilitators (both external and internal, such as ‘natural leaders’ that emerge as enthusiastic early adopters and advocates during the triggering process) monitor and provide follow-up technical and motivational support to the communities to ensure they implement their plans. Open Defecation Free (ODF) status is achieved when all families have completed and are using their own toilets. Some communities establish ‘sanctions’ for individuals or households that do not take action or who are caught practising OD (such as fines or non-admittance to traditional community ceremonies). These community sanctions play an important role in signalling what is now expected from all community members, and the credible threat of sanction can be sufficient to ensure compliance. On average, it takes around 6 months for a triggered community to reach ODF status. Once achieved, public ODF certification ceremonies and celebrations are held to recognise the community’s achievement, and to act as an example to other villages. Because the community actually want their latrines (and have constructed the facilities themselves), they are well maintained and used by all members of the family. In this way, a social norm is established in the community whereby it is unacceptable to practice OD and it is expected that all community members use a latrine (see Table 1).
### Table 1: Comparison of the expectations and beliefs typically found in communities practicing open defecation and communities that are open defecation free

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community with Open Defecation</th>
<th>Open Defecation Free (ODF) Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expectations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Expectations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People expect that some people will practice OD and some people will use latrines.</td>
<td>Usually no normative expectations regarding OD practice: it is accepted as a reasonable solution to a recognised problem <em>[this may continue to apply to situations seen as ‘outside the parameters’ of a newly established ODF norm]</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>Normative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People see that people around them have constructed and are using latrines. People do not see anyone defecating in the open any more.</td>
<td>People believe that everyone expects them to stop practising OD and to use latrines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beliefs</th>
<th>Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factual</td>
<td>Factual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various diverse, local beliefs about what causes diarrhoea and other sanitation-related diseases. It is difficult and/or expensive to build a latrine. It is not possible to build latrines here. Children’s faeces is not harmful. It is good to defecate in the fields /streams as it provides good fertilizer / food for fish.</td>
<td>A (healthy/strong) man doesn’t use a latrine. It feels good to defecate in the river / in the Latrines are dirty and smelly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Normative</td>
<td>Personal Normative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With OD, people (we) were eating their (our) own shit. It is possible to construct a latrine using my own / the communities’ skills and available resources. Some negative factual beliefs may persist in ODF communities, and need to be addressed to ensure these do not undermine the social norm, e.g.: The faeces of men and women cannot be mixed.</td>
<td>I have a responsibility to use a latrine and not to practice OD, for my sake as well as that of the whole community. A respectable/healthy family has/always uses a latrine. Some individuals may not support the normative expectations due to unchanged personal normative beliefs, e.g.: I don’t like using a latrine and so long as most people are using latrines, it doesn’t matter if I don’t.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Critical Evaluation of the Work so far

The shift in UNICEF’s programming approach for sanitation has resulted in rapid and at-scale progress across more than 50 countries. The UNICEF WASH Annual Report for 2012 noted that “Direct UNICEF support through development (non-emergency) programming helped an estimated 10.6 million people gain access to sanitation in 2012, the most ever. This is due to the rapid expansion in CATS programmes, which account for over 85 per cent of these beneficiaries.” Notwithstanding these significant gains, using Social Norms Theory to critically...
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assess the work undertaken in CATS highlights a number of issues for further refinement and strengthening.

Over the previous three years of the Advances in Social Norms course, a number of case studies have examined how Social Norms Theory can be used to strengthen the implementation of community-based approaches to sanitation in particular country contexts, including Eritrea, The Gambia, Ghana, Kenya, Mongolia, South Sudan; as well as looking at how the CATS example can provide lessons for other areas of WASH programme, such as the promotion of hand-washing with soap and sanitation marketing.

In order not to repeat what has been covered in these case studies, this paper will examine in more detail how two key elements of Social Norms Theory, namely Social Network Analysis and the measurement of Social Norms, could be operationally incorporated into CATS programmes to strengthen a number of interdependent activities. The discussion of the CATS process below therefore focuses on describing only those weaknesses that could be addressed through Social Network Analysis and measurement of Social Norms.

2.1. Pre-triggering

As presented during the course (Dooley, 2013), in principle CATS facilitators should spend time during the pre-triggering period to begin to build up relationships with community leaders and community members. Through this process, the facilitator can begin to build their understanding of community demographics, community structures (both formal and informal), as well as social and power dynamics. However, evaluations from a number of countries have identified that insufficient attention to this component is a common determinant of poor performance, and this may partly be due to the fairly ‘unstructured’ nature of what is expected. The pre-triggering section of the CLTS Handbook (Kar & Chambers, 2008) for example, focuses mostly on identifying favourable and unfavourable conditions for village selection; and recommends that pre-triggering visits be used to establish dates/time/place for meetings, explain the objectives, and exploring the village to get a sense of conditions. The UNICEF CATS Field Note (2009) and CATS 101 (2011) do not provide any further guidance on this phase. In many countries where CATS is being implemented through Government partners, such as Community Health Workers (CHWs), the facilitators may already be familiar with the conditions in the community and have established relationships with community leaders and members. However, in some cases, the CATS facilitators may have developed preconceptions about beliefs, relationships, networks and so forth that may or may not be correct.

- As part of the planning process, Social Network Analysis could contribute to selecting which villages would be most appropriate to start working in.

---

3 Based on factors relating to programme policy environment; sanitation condition and practices; hydro-geological conditions; and social and cultural conditions, including incidence of diarrhoeal disease, size and cohesion of community, tradition of joint action.
Social Network Analysis could provide facilitators with a more systematic way to analyse the reference networks in the community, and to identify key influencers within these, as part of the pre-triggering process.

2.2. Triggering

The *triggering* phase of CATS is crucial. It is through the process of collective community engagement with the triggering tools and the subsequent community deliberations that a coordinated decision to change practices can be reached and new normative expectations created. However, maintaining the community-led focus and quality of the triggering process has been one of the major challenges encountered when institutionalising CATS in national programmes and moving to at-scale implementation. Officials appointed to lead the CATS process have often worked on previous top-down sanitation programmes and it can be difficult for them to adjust their attitudes and skills to facilitate community-led deliberations. In addition to providing on-going training and skills development for CATS facilitators, a successful strategy that has evolved in some countries has been to use those ‘natural leaders’ with good facilitation skills to support the triggering process in neighbouring villages. This approach is now being formally introduced into guidelines in some countries - in Cross River State in Nigeria for example, the strategy for scaling up CLTS includes: “Human resource mobilization, especially with regard to identification of natural leaders who were instrumental to progress made in previous communities” (UNICEF Nigeria, 2012).

An additional challenge for CATS facilitators is to ensure that the entire community is engaged in the triggering process. If the pre-triggering preparation has not been adequate, triggering events may be poorly timed (for example, coinciding with farming activities) or not well coordinated in advance (for example, people not receiving information about the meeting), resulting in low participation. Even if the participating group decide to take action, they may not be able to convince others to join; and if a public commitment for action is made *on behalf of* the whole community, people may feel they are being coerced and the legitimacy of the proposed new practice may be undermined.

Social Network Analysis will help to identify the different groups and reference networks within the community, and to identify individuals that can act as ‘bridges’ between different reference networks and between communities. Steps can then be taken to ensure that all are engaged in the triggering and post-triggering processes.

2.3. Post-Triggering

During the post-triggering phase, CATS facilitators support the community to develop a community action plan and provide technical guidance on latrine construction as needed. A number of evaluations have found that insufficient support during the post-triggering process contributes to poor success rates in achieving ODF status. As CATS programmes scale-up, resource constraints (in terms of human resources, transport and funds) can result in insufficient support being provided during this phase.
Where there is suitable follow-up, CATS facilitators will normally work with the authorities (official and traditional) as well as with formal or informal community representatives, such as ‘natural leaders’ (highly motivated individuals who volunteer to take a lead in improving the sanitation situation in the community). In many countries, responsibility for follow-up on the action plan is delegated to existing groups, such as the Village Development Committees or WASH Committees. These structures may not always be fully representative of different groups and may not always be able to influence all of the various reference networks within a community.

2.4. Certification and Celebration

Once a community reaches ODF status and is ready to be certified, traditional and political leaders from neighbouring communities are often invited to attend the certification celebration. This provides ‘witnesses’ to the community’s achievement and intention to remain ODF (thereby reinforcing normative expectations), as well as providing an opportunity for diffusion of the new script (when one wants to go, one goes to the latrine) to those neighbouring communities. As some countries are scaling-up, sub-district and district level ODF celebrations are often also held, and local and national media are increasingly being used to raise awareness about success and the momentum for change.

- **Social Network Analysis could be used to identify additional key influential members from neighbouring communities that should be invited, as well as individuals who might act as ‘bridges’ between the new ODF community and surrounding villages.**

2.5. Monitoring

Currently, at the national level, most CATS programmes track whether or not triggered communities have been certified as ODF, and how many people are living in those communities. To be certified as ODF, communities have to first carry out a self-assessment and ensure the community meets the specific indicators identified under the national criteria (see examples in Annex 1). The community can then contact the responsible authority (either Government or NGO) for a verification visit. Although there is some variation across countries, communities usually need to remain ODF for a minimum period (ranging from 1 to 6 months), and to receive two separate visits from government authorities to verify ODF status before they can receive the final certification (Thomas and Bevan, 2013). There are very few examples of countries that have established systems for post-certification monitoring to formally revoke ODF status if there is any slippage. There is an assumption that if the community has managed to maintain ODF status for the minimum period, then the practice of using a latrine has been adopted by all members of the community, and people will not revert to old practices of open defecation. It is assumed that a new social norm has been created.

---

4. In some cases, national databases also track the number of latrines constructed.

5. Ethiopia being one example – see the recently developed ‘Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia CLTSH Verification and Certification Protocol, Ministry of Health, January 2012.'
However, a number of country programmes have reported some degree of ‘slippage’ or reversion to open defecation after ODF status has been achieved. Although comprehensive data on this issue has not been collected, a recent review of available ODF sustainability studies found slippage rates varying from 1% to 29% across ten programmes in Africa and Asia (UNICEF EAPRO, 2013). Sustainability checks carried out in Mozambique found around 10% of communities lost their ODF status over a three year period (UNICEF/MFA Netherlands, 2011). In a review of its community-led total sanitation programme, WaterAid (2009) found evidence of ‘widespread non-compliance in the form of now-hidden open defecation’ in Nepal. Reasons given for slippage often highlight technical (quality of construction) or environmental (hydro-geological conditions) issues, though it is unclear to what extent these are ‘excuses’ for reverting to a preferred individual behaviour (which would indicate that a social norm has not been successfully established). For example, when comparing ‘high-performing’ and ‘low-performing’ villages, WaterAid (2009) found that where latrines had collapsed due to heavy rains, households in ‘high-performing villages’ used various coping strategies (such as sharing with neighbours) and did not revert to open defecation.

- Including measurements of beliefs and social expectations in baselines assessments will allow for subsequent results monitoring.
- Comparisons with measurements taken post-triggering would provide evidence of whether the triggering has been successful in changing personal factual beliefs and in creating new normative expectations.
- Comparisons with measurements taken following ODF certification and in sustainability checks would provide evidence of whether there has been a harmonisation of personal normative beliefs, empirical expectations and normative expectations. This would provide evidence of whether a social norm has been established, and if so, how ‘secure’ the norm is.

3. Changes in Practice

3.1. Use of Social Network Analysis

As noted in Section 2, incorporating Social Network Analysis into CATS could contribute to strengthening programming in a number of ways:

- Mapping the social networks that exist between villages in a particular district or sub-district could be used to identify central villages that would be well positioned to support a process of organised diffusion of the ODF social expectations. Combined with the baseline measurement of beliefs and social expectations (discussed further in section 3.2), this information could also be used to identify which communities should be avoided during the early phases of the programme (due to fragmented community, or if there are beliefs or expectations that support OD in a particular community).

- Using Social Network Analysis would provide structure for the pre-triggering analysis of community relations and dynamics, and provide valuable information on the different
reference networks within a community and the key influencers (high-degree nodes) and ‘information channels’ (central nodes) within these.

- This would enable CATS facilitators to ensure all reference networks are represented in triggering and post-triggering discussions, as well as providing information on which individuals could be specifically engaged as part of the ‘core group’ to support information sharing (both pre- and post-triggering, as well as in the longer-term), value deliberations (during the triggering sessions), and monitoring implementation of the community action plan.

- The Social Network Analysis would also help to identify particularly vulnerable individuals or households within a community, as a person’s position in a network can provide information on their social position and the social constraints they may face. This may have implications for how to reach them, and what type of additional support they might need to act.

- Mapping individuals or families that can act as ‘bridges’ between different reference networks and between communities would allow CATS facilitators to strategically plan around their connections, and facilitate more efficient organised diffusion.

**Taking theory to practice**

Social Network Analysis can be used at different levels. Mapping of the social networks across villages at the district or sub-district level (see Figure 3) could be used to identify central villages (shaded blue) that would be well positioned to support a process of organised diffusion of the ODF social expectations. Combined with community level monitoring (see below) and the baseline measurement of beliefs and social expectations (discussed further in section 3.2), this information could also be used to identify which communities should be avoided during the early phases of the programme (for example, if a community is too fragmented, or if there were beliefs or expectations that support OD in a particular community). Once suitable central villages have publicly declared to take action, CATS facilitators can make use of the existing information channels and relationships between villages to disseminate their decision (to reinforce the public commitment) – and eventually once they become ODF, to disseminate news of their success and to support a process of organised diffusion of the ODF social expectations.

Social Network Analysis can also be undertaken at the community level. In any discussion of ‘the community’, care needs to be taken not to assume homogeneity and consensus. CATS guidance stresses that it is important to ensure all different groups within a community are involved in the triggering and post-triggering processes, and to ensure that
there is no exclusion of any particular group. However, even disaggregating the community into different ‘groups’ can sometimes overlook the fact that individuals within those groups may not have the same beliefs or expectations. Social Network Analysis offers a way to map and analyse the relationships between individuals and between groups, and to think more systematically about key issues of relevance to our programming, such as how information flows within and between reference networks and communities as a whole, and which individuals (opinion leaders) have most influence on what others believe and do (Muldoon, 2013).

Take Figure 4 as a representation of a community’s trust network. Person A and B are both high degree nodes (each having three connections), and are therefore both important opinion leaders. Person A is also central (having closer ties to everyone else) and would therefore be important to also involve in information dissemination. Person C is the only person trusted by the small group on the right of the diagram and can therefore be seen as an important ‘bridge’ to this group.

For the CATS programme, the ‘Ego-Centric Approach’ could be used as a systematic step in the pre-triggering process. Although this is the least reliable of the three identified methods – the other two being Full Network Approach and Snowball Approach (Muldoon 2013) – the time and resources needed for the other methods make them too impractical. In the Ego-Centric Approach, you ask an individual to list, for example, who they have contact with; and then ask them who they think the person they have identified would list. If this is repeated a number of times, you can gain a reasonable understanding of the existing networks within a community (see example in Box 1).

**Box 1: Using the ‘Ego-Centric Approach’**
For the purposes of CATS, it would be important to explore information and trust networks, as well as influence networks, for example:

- Ask A: Who do you talk to every day? (A identifies B, C, D)
- Ask A: Who does B talk to every day? (A identifies A, E, F)
- Ask A: Whose opinion do you respect? (A identifies: D, E)
- Ask A: Who do you think should be involved in helping the community reach decisions on important issues? (A identifies D, F, G, H, I)
- Ask A: Who do you think D would want to involve in helping the community reach decisions on important issues? (A identifies F, G, J)
To address reliability issues, care needs to be taken to ensure the sample includes at least 2 or 3 randomly sampled individuals from different groups within the community. This would be particularly important in ‘disrupted’ communities (e.g. where there has been a recent influx of new members or where there has been significant social upheaval in the recent past). In small-medium sized communities, a sample of 10-20 people should be sufficient.

Data collection for the Ego-Centric Approach can be done either through hand-held PDAs or on paper (and later entered into excel for processing). Various software options exist that automatically analyse the excel data, so capacity building on the use of Social Network Capacity building would need to focus on data collection and data entry (both relatively simple) and on how to analyse and use the information to inform planning and strategic approaches. While data collection should be done by the relevant CATS facilitators as part of the pre-triggering visits, support for data entry and data analysis might need to be provided by district level staff (with technical assistance from UNICEF WASH Programme staff), at least initially.

3.2. Measuring Social Norms

As noted in Section 2, incorporating the measurement of social expectations into the CATS monitoring processes could contribute to strengthening programming through:

- Measuring beliefs and social expectations as part of a baseline, or pre-triggering, would help to identify which communities are more or less suitable to start the programme in (see discussion above on combining this analysis with Social Network Analysis).

- Monitoring beliefs and social expectations pre- and post-triggering would allow CATS programme staff to monitor the effectiveness of triggering and track whether changes increase in line with expected results (discussed further below).

- Monitoring beliefs and social expectations following ODF certification and in sustainability checks would allow programme staff to identify whether or not a social norm has indeed been established (is there consensus on what people believe others expect them to do) and is being maintained (are people conforming to the expected behaviour) within a particular community or wider geographical area (discussed further below). The analysis would allow programme staff to strategically allocate resources for follow-up activities based on where additional support is needed to solidify the desired changes in behaviours.

Taking theory to practice

In contrast to Roger’s theory of diffusion (Dooley, 2013), which modelled anticipated changes in beliefs and actions based on behaviour change communications strategies targeting independent / individual decision-making and action (see Figure 5), the model for social norms change recognises the need for ‘coordinated belief change’ and ‘coordinated action’ due to the interdependency of beliefs, social expectations and extra-social factors that affect conditional choices (see Figure 6).
In Figure 6, the impact of the triggering process (represented by the lightning bolt) is clear – a dramatic and community-wide change in beliefs is realised. This collective realisation results in a communal decision to change their sanitation practices and creates a new normative expectation (people believe that everyone expects them to stop practising open defecation and to start using latrines), and agreement on a timetable for action is reached.

Post-triggering monitoring of beliefs and expectations should therefore see a significant change in both personal normative beliefs and normative expectations. If this is not the case, then this provides an immediate indication that the triggering has not been successful\(^6\). During the post-triggering period, there may be some turbulence and increased inconsistency between people’s personal normative beliefs, empirical expectations and normative expectations. This should gradually reduce, and post-ODF certification monitoring and sustainability checks should see increasing harmonisation between these as the norm becomes entrenched.

By measuring whether or not there is consensus across the majority of responders on normative expectations, you can identify the presence of a social norm. By measuring whether or not personal beliefs and empirical expectations are also harmonised with social expectations, you can determine how secure the norm is (the level of conformity), and whether additional measures are need to encourage or enforce compliance.

As noted during the course, care needs to be taken when asking about expectations, particularly post-triggering, as people’s responses may be influenced by what they think the interviewer wishes to hear. While the literature suggests that incentives could be provided to

\(^{6}\) Multiple evaluations have identified similar common reasons for triggering not having the anticipated results. These include: lack of / weak pre-triggering preparation with the community; poor facilitation (including top-down/didactic approaches, rushed/poorly timed scheduling of activities); insufficient follow-up and support to develop and implement action plan; weak monitoring. Quick identification of problems in the triggering process would allow for action to be taken to identify the specific causes, and to revise implementation strategies, ensure facilitator mentoring, etc as necessary.
try to overcome response bias\textsuperscript{7}, this may not be feasible if the monitoring is incorporated into government institutional processes (which would be ideally the case, in particular where CATS is part of the national strategy and programme).

Box 2 provides example questions that could be included in baseline assessments, or as part of the development of the community action planning process, as well as in post-triggering monitoring and ODF sustainability checks. Box 3 discusses the use of vignettes as a way to provide opportunities for open-ended discussions that might provide valuable insights into the existence or not of empirical and normative expectations, as well as of supporting sanctions (positive and/or negative). The use of vignettes would also be suitable for discussion with children.

**Box 2: Example questions to incorporate into baseline surveys, post-triggering monitoring and sustainability checks**

To measure empirical expectations and whether they influence behaviour:
- Do you believe other members of the community practice open defecation?
- Do you believe most other members of the community use a latrine?
- If some people in the community continued to / restarted to practice open defecation, what would you do?
- If your latrine pit filled up or if your latrine was damaged, what would you do?

To measure personal normative beliefs:
- Do you think people should use a latrine?
- Do you think it is appropriate for people to practice open defecation?

To measure normative expectations:
- Would the people that are important to you\textsuperscript{8} disapprove of you defecating in the open?
- What would happen if a new family moved into your community and they practiced open defecation?
- What are the advantages of using a latrine? What are the disadvantages?
- What are the advantages of open defecation? What are the disadvantages?
- What do you think most people believe others should do when they need to defecate?

\textsuperscript{7} Bicchieri (2014): By offering a small reward to the person who most accurately predicts what most other people will respond in answer to the survey questions, people have an incentive to tell the interviewer what they really think rather than what they think the interviewer wants to hear.

\textsuperscript{8} Optionally, a pre-survey can be done asking people to identify the three people that matter to them in terms of deciding whether or not to use a latrine. The questions can then be tailored to ask specifically about the opinion of the key influencers identified for that particular community. For example: Do you believe the priest would disapprove of you practicing open defecation? However, research by Fishbein and Ajzen (Reference and explanation provided by G. Mackie) has shown that simply specifying ‘the people that matter to you’ provides near identical results.
Box 3: Use of Vignettes

In addition to asking direct questions through survey tools, to provide opportunities for open-ended discussions that might provide valuable insights into the existence or not of empirical and normative expectations, as well as of supporting sanctions (positive and/or negative), **vignettes** (storyboards/picture cards) could be used to initiate discussions with individuals or groups. This technique can reduce the potential for response bias, and would also be ideal for discussions with children.

For example, adults or children could be shown a picture similar to the one below, and asked:
- Can you tell me what is happening in this picture?
- What can you tell me about the person in the picture?
- What do you think might happen next?
- What would you do if you saw this?

The use of vignettes could also help explore the parameters of any empirical or normative expectations relating to OD and latrine use. For example, whether or not open defecation is still accepted for people that are working outside the immediate geographical space of the village (e.g. on farming land), or whether the safe disposal of children’s faeces is considered important or not. The vignettes should also include positive scenes, such as the one below.

4. Conclusion

CATS programmes have been making significant progress in changing people’s sanitation behaviours and promoting the demand for sanitation across entire communities. Applying Social Norms Theory to critically assess the work undertaken to date highlights a number of areas for potential refinement. In particular, two key elements of Social Norms Theory, namely Social Network Analysis and the measurement of Social Norms, could be incorporated into CATS programmes to strengthen a number of interdependent activities through the pre-triggering, triggering, post-triggering stages, as well as contribute to improved organised diffusion and results-based monitoring. In terms of support from the global level, guidance on how to implement the newly proposed steps within CATS would need to be developed (including for example, sample questionnaires and tools for measurement of social norms). At the country level, offices would need to plan for additional capacity building and technical support to CATS implementers (Government and NGO staff), and some additional funding may be required.
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### Annex 1: National Criteria for ODF Certification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>100% ODF environment</th>
<th>Each household has access to their own latrine</th>
<th>All latrines must be fully functional and clean</th>
<th>Each household has access to hand-washing facilities</th>
<th>Children’s faeces are safely disposed of</th>
<th>Each household has access to a shared latrine</th>
<th>Community understands why excreta must be hygienically contained</th>
<th>WASH committee, Community Action Plan and/or other community M&amp;E structure present</th>
<th>By-laws must exist at the community level</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>The community must be visibly clean (no garbage, flies etc.)</th>
<th>All latrines must have sanitary bins for menstrual hygiene management</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESARO</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCARO</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSA</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAPRO</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>North Sudan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACRO</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNICEF NYHQ WASH, Compiled from CATS Survey, 2012