

Cambodia Sanitation Consumer Demand Behavior Qualitative Study

WaterSHED-Asia

Highlights of Key Findings

Mimi Jenkins, UC Davis Sanitation and Hygiene Technical Lead

Prepared September 2010

Background

An in-depth qualitative analysis was undertaken across three Provinces in rural Cambodia to investigate what consumers living in mostly rural areas believe, feel, value and think about both their current defecation practice and about investing in and using household latrines, including about different existing latrine designs, features, and types of technology. Interviews were conducted with both latrine adopters i.e. respondents who already have invested in and are using household latrines, and non-adopters i.e. respondents who defecated openly outdoors, in order to build an understanding of benefits and motivations driving uptake and constraints and facilitators affecting decisions to install household latrines, ascertaining what different consumers liked and disliked about different home toilet latrine designs and why, as well as investigating how best to communicate to this target population the benefits of home sanitation and the choices available to them. These households, as consumers and daily users of sanitation facilities, are at the center of developing a sanitation marketing program which aims to promote increased latrine uptake and usage in this target population by developing desirable latrine designs and targeting promotional material and messages, as well as providing appropriate technologies and support systems in order to facilitate adoption and maintenance of sanitation behavior change.

Study Overview and Purpose

- Qualitative consumer methods
- 2-hour in-depth open-ended interviews with household decision-maker (male or female)
- Multi-province sample (semi-national perspective)
- Themes explored:
 - Motivational drivers for initial acquisition & upgrading
 - Constraints & facilitators
 - Latrine type and feature preferences, & why
 - Usage behavior
 - O&M behavior, including water access & pit emptying
 - Patterns of similarity & difference
- Data analysis: mainly qualitative, + semi-quantitative for trends, patterns

Sampling Strategy

- Semi-national, comparative across 3 provinces
 - Kampong Speu, Svay Rieng, Kampong Cham
 - Avoid known hardware subsidy areas
- Four village typologies, with & without CLTS
 - 1) Dense & diverse urban bedroom (n=2)
 - 2) Large ag-based market center (n=2)

- 3) Small remote (n=4)
- 4) In-between 2 and 3 (n=6)
- 14 villages total (4 CLTS)

Selection of households w/in a village

- Adopters (non-subsidized), stratified by technology & wealth
- Non-adopters, stratified by wealth

Expected Programmatic Outputs

- Inputs for san mark development:
 - Material and messages for 4 Ps of marketing
 - Inputs to on-going product, service development
 - Correct/safe & consistent usage
 - Market segments, segment strategies
 - CLTS vs non-CLTS villages
- Timeline of activities:
 - May 2010: interviews completed, KS prelim analysis done
 - Aug 2010: SR & KC preliminary analyses done
 - Sep 2010: KS, SR, & KC final integrated analysis
 - Oct 2010: Draft results report
 - Mar 2011: Final study report
- Clients & audience:
 - LA / WTO primary
 - WatSan and San Mark community in Camb., subregion
 - Marketing comms, consumer educ. & product developers

Motivation Category	Sub-Theme	Frequency %
Personal & family comfort & amenities	Convenience, comfort, amenities	98
	Ease of use	84
	Ease of use, women	65
	Privacy (emphasis on daughters, women)	56
	Ease of use, children	40
	Anal cleansing w/ water	45
	Ease of use, elderly	35
Social norms & interactions	Shame/ embarrassment from lack of facilities	91
	Relatives, visitors & guests (needs, hospitality)	62
	Neighbors	38
	Negative judgement (bad, improper behavior)	36
Safety	Night-time	75
	Fear of insects, snakes, worms	51
	Thieves/gangsters/crime	42
Health-related	Smell	76
	'Hygiene and Sanitation' ~ cleanliness, order	73
	Flies	56
	Animals digging up, eating, spreading feces	56
	Environmental contamination	13

A Few Preliminary Observations – Motivational Drivers

- ‘Make daily life easier’: near universal & dominates
 - Increased convenience, comfort, ease, privacy, protection and amenities for self/family from water-based sanitation over OD
 - Dry san does poor job of delivering these desired benefits
 - Design preferences driven by amenities, ease, and comfort needs
 - Men, equally or more likely to be sensitive to ease of use for children and for women/daughters
- Social norms and social relations v. important driver and trigger
 - All themes appear stronger in non-CLTS villages
 - Negative judgement of OD (bad behavior, lack of morals, improper) more frequently by non-adopters, women, no educ, non-CLTS
- ‘Health’, good ‘hygiene’ and ‘sanitation’: high frequency, but...
 - Linked directly, strongly to bad smell (polluting, bad air ~ miasmas) associated with OD and dry latrines
 - Dry sanitation not perceived as hygienic
 - Notions of cleanliness, neatness and order
 - Anal cleansing with water, fecal disposal in water, perceived as culturally cleaner, more hygienic
 - Reduced environmental contamination benefits - adopters & men only

No observable differences across 3 provinces Differences by village type ... to explore...

Preliminary Observations - Other Themes

- Design preferences
 - Durability (cabin, pit, floor, roof, etc)
 - Easy to clean, keep clean (i.e., surfaces)
 - Full privacy & protection (solid walls, door, roof)
 - No sight or smell of feces
 - Water tank - anal cleansing, hand wash, bathing, and flushing
 - Sources of technology & design options: word of mouth and masons
- Constraints, Facilitators, Triggers
 - High perceived cash cost
 - Saving is difficult, unanticipated competing cash needs
 - Strong fear of taking formal loan w/o income to payback
 - Willing to borrow informally from others
 - Gifts from adult son or daughter with salary income
 - Materials, products easily accessible
- Latrine O&M
 - No awareness, services for safe pit emptying & disposal
 - Empty pit as soon as full: DIY or informal payment to haul
 - Awareness of the nutrient value of the waste motivates disposal site
- Effective communication channels
 - Village meetings, NGO education sessions, TV, word of mouth, ‘see it’ at relative or friend’s house