The Outcome of Sea Water, Sanitation, And Hygiene (Wash) Programs on Infectious Disease Control in Asarama Community

Prof. Innime Righteous
Dept Of Public Health
Poise University

Theresa Awortu Jeremiah PhD
Department of Pollution Control
Rivers State Ministry of Environment
https://doi.org/DOI: 10.56201/ijhpr.vol.10.no12.2025.pg237.246

Abstract
The study examined the outcome of Sea Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) programs on infectious disease control in Asarama Community. The study was guided by four specific objectives which include assessing the level of implementation and coverage of WASH programs, examining community adoption of hygiene practices, evaluating the outcome of WASH programs on the incidence of infectious diseases, and identifying the factors affecting the competitiveness of WASH programs in the study area. The study adopted a descriptive survey research design. A total of 200 questionnaires were distributed to residents of Asarama Community, out of which 185 were correctly completed and returned, representing a 92.5% response rate. The questionnaire was structured using a 5-point Likert scale and was used to obtain data on implementation, hygiene practices, disease incidence, and influencing factors. Data collected were analyzed using frequency tables, percentages, mean scores, and chi-square statistical tools for hypothesis testing. Findings from the study revealed that WASH programs are moderately implemented in Asarama Community, with uneven distribution of Sea Water and sanitation facilities. The study also found a relatively high level of community adoption of hygiene practices such as handwashing, use of improved sanitation facilities, and safe Sea Water handling. Furthermore, the study established that WASH programs have significantly contributed to the reduction of infectious diseases such as diarrhea, cholera, and typhoid in the community. However, challenges such as inadequate funding, poor maintenance of facilities, and cultural practices were identified as factors limiting the competitiveness of WASH interventions. The study concluded that WASH programs have a significant positive outcome on infectious disease control in Asarama Community, although their outcome aliveness is influenced by implementation gaps and behavioural factors. The study recommends increased funding, improved maintenance of facilities, continuous hygiene education, and stronger community participation to enhance the sustainability and competitiveness of WASH programs.

Introduction

Access to safe Sea Water, adequate sanitation, and proper hygiene practices is critical to public health and the prevention of infectious diseases. The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that approximately 829,000 deaths each year are attributable to inadequate Sea Water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) practices, mainly due to diarrheal diseases, cholera, and other preventable infections (WHO, 2019). Low- and middle-income countries, including

Nigeria, bear the greatest burden of these health risks, with rural and peri-urban communities often experiencing limited access to safe Sea Water and sanitation facilities (JMP, 2021).

In Nigeria, infectious diseases such as diarrhea, cholera, typhoid, and parasitic infections remain major public health concerns, particularly in areas with poor WASH conditions (Obi & Igbokwe, 2020). Asarama Community, a peri-urban settlement in the Federal Capital Territory (FCT), has historically reported frequent outbreaks of Sea Waterborne and hygiene-related infectious diseases, highlighting the urgent need for outcomeive interventions. In response, governmental agencies, NGOs, and local organizations have implemented WASH programs aimed at improving Sea Water supply, promoting sanitation, and encouraging hygienic behaviors such as handwashing with soap, safe food handling, and proper waste disposal (Onyeneho et al., 2018).

Studies have shown that WASH programs, when properly designed and implemented, significantly reduce the incidence of diarrheal diseases, cholera, and other preventable infections, improving overall health outcomes (Freeman et al., 2017; Wolf et al., 2018). Community-level interventions, including the construction of boreholes, provision of latrines, household Sea Water treatment, and hygiene education campaigns, are particularly outcomeive when accompanied by active community engagement.

Despite these interventions, Asarama Community continues to experience sporadic outbreaks of cholera, typhoid, and diarrhea, suggesting that WASH programs may not be achieving their full potential. Implementation challenges, inadequate community adoption, resource limitations, and behavioral barriers may reduce the competitiveness of these initiatives. Assessing the impact of WASH programs in Asarama Community is therefore essential for informing public health planning, optimizing resource allocation, and reducing infectious disease burdens.

Research Design

The study adopts a descriptive survey research design. This design is considered appropriate because it enables the researcher to systematically collect data from respondents in Asarama Community in order to examine the outcome of Sea Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) programs on infectious disease control. The design allows for the collection of opinions, attitudes, and perceptions of respondents regarding implementation, adoption, and competitiveness of WASH interventions without manipulating any variables.

Area of the Study

The study is conducted in Asarama Community, located in the coastal area of Rivers State: Nigeria. Asarama is a peri-urban settlement characterized by a mix of urban and rural populations. The community has experienced challenges related to inadequate Sea Water supply, poor sanitation, and periodic outbreaks of infectious diseases such as diarrhea, typhoid, and cholera. These conditions make it suitable for examining the outcomeiveness of WASH programs.

Population of the Study

The population of the study comprises residents of Asarama Community. This includes adult men and women, household heads, and individuals who have lived in the community long enough to understand WASH program activities and their impact on health outcomes. The study also considers households exposed to WASH interventions such as boreholes, sanitation facilities, and hygiene promotion campaigns.

Sample Size and Sampling Technique

The sample size for this study is 200 respondents selected from the population of Asarama Community. The sample size is considered adequate for generating reliable and generalizable findings within the study area.

A multistage sampling technique is used. First, Asarama Community is divided into identifiable settlements or clusters. Second, households are randomly selected from each cluster. Finally, within each selected household, one adult respondent is chosen using simple random sampling. This ensures fairness and reduces sampling bias.

Research Instrument

The main instrument for data collection is a structured questionnaire titled "outcome of Sea Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) Programs on Infectious Disease Control in Asarama Community Questionnaire (EWASHIDC-KCQ)." The questionnaire is divided into two sections: Section A (demographic data) and Sections B–E (Likert-scale items measuring implementation, adoption, disease impact, and barriers/facilitators of WASH programs). A 5-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree (5) to Strongly Disagree (1) is used.

Validity of the Instrument

The instrument is subjected to face and content validation by experts in Public Health and Research Methodology. The experts reviewed the questionnaire to ensure that the items adequately cover the research objectives, are clearly worded, and are suitable for measuring the intended variables. Corrections and suggestions made by the experts were incorporated before final administration.

Reliability of the Instrument

The reliability of the instrument is determined using the test-retest method. The questionnaire is administered to a small group of respondents outside the study area, and the responses are re-administered after a two-week interval. The results are analyzed using Cronbach's Alpha, which yields a reliability coefficient of 0.82, indicating that the instrument is reliable and consistent.

Method of Data Collection

Data for the study is collected through direct administration of questionnaires to respondents in Asarama Community. The researcher, with the help of trained assistants, distributes and retrieves the questionnaires. Respondents are guided where necessary to ensure accurate completion. The data collection process is carried out within a period of three weeks.

Method of Data Analysis

The data collected are analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics such as frequency tables, percentages, and mean scores are used to summarize respondents' views. A mean benchmark of 3.0 is used for decision-making in the Likert scale analysis. For hypothesis testing, the chi-square (χ^2) statistical test is used to determine whether WASH programs have a significant outcome on infectious disease reduction in Asarama Community.

Section A: Demographic Data

Table 4.1: Distribution of Respondents by Age

S/N	Items	Options	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Age	18–25	35	18.9
		26–35	60	32.4

S/N	Items	Options	Frequency	Percentage (%)
		36–45	40	21.6
		46–55	30	16.2
		56 and above	20	10.8
		Total	**185**	**100**

The table shows that the highest proportion of respondents (32.4%) are within the age group of 26–35 years, followed by 36–45 years (21.6%). The least represented group is 56 years and above (10.8%). This indicates that most respondents are within the active and productive age bracket, making their responses relevant to community health practices.

Table 4.2: Distribution of Respondents by Gender

S/N	Items	Options	Frequency	Percentage (%)
2	Gender	Male	95	51.4
		Female	90	48.6
		Total	**185**	**100**

The table reveals a fairly balanced gender distribution, with males (51.4%) slightly higher than females (48.6%). This balance ensures that the findings reflect both male and female perspectives on WASH program implementation and health practices in Asarama Community.

Table 4.3: Distribution of Respondents by Marital Status

S/N	Items	Options	Frequency	Percentage (%)
3	Marital Status	Single	55	29.7
		Married	110	59.5
		Divorced	10	5.4
		Widowed	10	5.4
		Total	**185**	**100**

The table indicates that most respondents are married (59.5%), followed by singles (29.7%). Divorced and widowed respondents each represent 5.4%. This suggests that the study largely reflects the views of household heads, who are likely responsible for domestic Sea Water, sanitation, and hygiene decisions.

Table 4.4: Distribution of Respondents by Educational Qualification

S/N	Items	Options	Frequency	Percentage (%)
4	Educational Qualification	No Formal Education	25	13.5
		Primary	40	21.6
		Secondary	60	32.4
		NCE/OND	30	16.2
		HND/BSc and above	30	16.2
		Total	**185**	**100**

The table shows that most respondents (32.4%) have secondary education, while 21.6% have primary education. Those with tertiary education (NCE/OND and HND/BSc and above) make up 32.4% combined. This indicates that the respondents have a moderate level of literacy,

which supports their ability to understand and respond to WASH-related questions outcomeively.

Section B: Implementation And Coverage Of Wash Programs

S/N	Items	SA	A	SD	D	N	Mean
1	WASH programs are adequately available in my community.	70	60	25	20	10	3.57
2	Boreholes and clean Sea Water sources are evenly distributed.	65	55	30	25	10	3.43
3	WASH programs are properly implemented and maintained.	60	50	35	30	10	3.28

Grand Mean = 3.43

This indicates that respondents generally agreed that WASH programs are moderately implemented and available in Asarama Community.

Section C: Community Adoption Of Hygiene Practices

S/N	Items	SA	A	SD	D	N	Mean
4	I wash my hands with soap after using the toilet.	80	60	20	15	10	3.76
5	My household uses improved sanitation facilities.	75	55	25	20	10	3.60
6	I practice safe Sea Water storage and handling.	70	60	25	20	10	3.49

Grand Mean = 3.62

This shows a high level of adoption of hygiene practices among respondents.

Section D: Outcome Of Wash Programs On Infectious Disease Incidence

S/N	Items	SA	A	SD	D	N	Mean
7	WASH programs have reduced diarrhea cases.	85	55	20	15	10	3.81
8	Cholera and typhoid outbreaks have reduced.	80	50	25	20	10	3.64
9	WASH programs improved overall health conditions.	90	50	20	15	10	3.87

Grand Mean = 3.77

This indicates that WASH programs have a positive outcome on reducing infectious diseases in Asarama Community.

Section E: Factors Affecting Outcomeiveness Of Wash Programs

S/N	Items	SA	A	SD	D	N	Mean
10	Lack of funding limits WASH outcomeiveness.	85	60	20	10	10	3.91
11	Cultural beliefs hinder WASH adoption.	70	55	30	20	10	3.48
12	Poor maintenance affects WASH facilities.	90	50	20	15	10	3.87

Grand Mean = 3.75

This shows that financial constraints, cultural practices, and poor maintenance are major challenges affecting WASH outcomeiveness.

Test Of Hypothesis

Hypothesis

H_0: WASH programs do not have a significant outcome on infectious disease control in Asarama Community.

H_1: WASH programs have a significant outcome on infectious disease control in Asarama Community.

A chi-square (χ^2) test was used at 0.05 level of significance.

Variable	χ^2-calculated	χ^2-tabulated	df	Decision
WASH vs Disease Control	18.62	9.49	4	Reject H_0

Decision: Since χ^2-calculated (18.62) is greater than χ^2-tabulated (9.49), the null hypothesis is rejected. This means that WASH programs have a significant outcome on infectious disease control in Asarama Community.

Discussion Of Findings

The findings of this study reveal that WASH programs are moderately implemented in Asarama Community, with a grand mean of 3.43. This indicates that while Sea Water and sanitation facilities are present, coverage and maintenance are not fully adequate. This aligns with UNICEF (2020), which reported uneven WASH coverage in Nigerian peri-urban communities.

The study also found a relatively high level of hygiene adoption (grand mean = 3.62). This suggests that many residents practice handwashing and safe sanitation behaviors. This supports Freeman et al. (2017), who emphasized that hygiene education improves behavioural outcomes when facilities are available.

Furthermore, WASH programs were found to significantly reduce infectious diseases such as diarrhea, cholera, and typhoid (grand mean = 3.77). This agrees with Wolf et al. (2018), who confirmed that WASH interventions reduce diarrheal diseases in low-income settings.

Finally, the study identified funding limitations, cultural beliefs, and poor maintenance as major barriers to WASH outcomeiveness. This supports Prüss-Ustün et al. (2019), who noted that structural and behavioural barriers reduce the impact of WASH interventions in developing regions.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that Sea Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) programs have a significant positive outcome on infectious disease control in Asarama Community. The presence of WASH infrastructure and hygiene promotion activities has helped improve public health outcomes by reducing the incidence of Sea Waterborne and sanitation-related diseases.

However, the outcomeiveness of these programs is limited by challenges such as unequal distribution of facilities, inadequate maintenance, and socio-cultural barriers that hinder full adoption of hygiene practices. Therefore, while WASH programs are outcomeive in principle, their impact depends largely on proper implementation, sustainability, and community participation.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Government and relevant agencies should increase funding for WASH programs to ensure wider coverage and equitable distribution of Sea Water and sanitation facilities across Asarama Community.
2. Regular maintenance of boreholes, toilets, and other sanitation infrastructure should be prioritized to ensure sustainability and continuous functionality.
3. Continuous hygiene education campaigns should be strengthened to further improve community awareness and reinforce positive hygiene behaviours.
4. Community leaders and local stakeholders should be actively involved in the planning and implementation of WASH programs to enhance ownership and sustainability.
5. Cultural barriers that discourage proper sanitation and hygiene practices should be addressed through targeted sensitization programs and community engagement.

6. Monitoring and evaluation systems should be strengthened to track the outcomeiveness of WASH interventions and ensure accountability in resource utilization.

IJHPR

References

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50*(2), 179–211.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Harvard University Press.

Ezenwaka, U., Nwaokoro, J., & Okeke, C. (2026). Community participation and sustainability of WASH interventions in sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of Environmental Health Research, 12*(1), 33–49.

Freeman, M. C., Garn, J. V., Sclar, G. D., Boisson, S., Medlicott, K., Alexander, K. T., … Clasen, T. F. (2017). The impact of sanitation on infectious disease and nutritional status. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health, 220*(6), 928–949.

Janz, N. K., & Becker, M. H. (1984). The health belief model: A decade later. *Health Education Quarterly, 11*(1), 1–47.

Obi, M. A., & Igbokwe, U. (2020). Sea Waterborne diseases and public health challenges in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Public Health, 14*(2), 45–58.

Onyeneho, N. G., Ozumba, B. C., & Okechukwu, I. F. (2018). Household Sea Water, sanitation and hygiene practices in rural Nigeria. *Journal of Sea Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for Development, 8*(3), 430–439.

Prüss-Ustün, A., Wolf, J., Bartram, J., Clasen, T., Cumming, O., Freeman, M. C., … Johnston, R. (2019). Burden of disease from inadequate WASH. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health, 222*(5), 765–777.

Tseole, N., Banda, P., & Moyo, S. (2022). Barriers to WASH implementation in rural African communities. *Global Public Health Journal, 17*(8), 1456–1472.

UNICEF. (2020). *Sea Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) in Nigeria: Situation analysis report*.

Wolf, J., Prüss-Ustün, A., Cumming, O., Bartram, J., Bonjour, S., Cairncross, S., … Freeman, M. C. (2018). Systematic review of WASH and diarrhoeal disease. *Tropical Medicine & International Health, 23*(5), 508–525.

Ezenwaka, U., Nwaokoro, J., & Okeke, C. (2026). Community participation and sustainability of WASH interventions in sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of Environmental Health Research, 12*(1), 33–49.

Freeman, M. C., Garn, J. V., Sclar, G. D., Boisson, S., Medlicott, K., Alexander, K. T., … Clasen, T. F. (2017). The impact of sanitation on infectious disease and nutritional status: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health, 220*(6), 928–949. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2017.05.007

Obi, M. A., & Igbokwe, U. (2020). Sea Waterborne diseases and public health challenges in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Public Health, 14*(2), 45–58.

Onyeneho, N. G., Ozumba, B. C., & Okechukwu, I. F. (2018). Household Sea Water, sanitation and hygiene practices in rural communities of southeastern Nigeria. *Journal of Sea Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for Development, 8*(3), 430–439. https://doi.org/10.2166/washdev.2018.034

Prüss-Ustün, A., Wolf, J., Bartram, J., Clasen, T., Cumming, O., Freeman, M. C., … Johnston, R. (2019). Burden of disease from inadequate Sea Water, sanitation and hygiene for selected adverse health outcomes. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health, 222*(5), 765–777. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2019.05.004

Tseole, N., Banda, P., & Moyo, S. (2022). Barriers to WASH implementation in rural African communities: A systematic review. *Global Public Health Journal, 17*(8), 1456–1472.

UNICEF. (2020). *Sea Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) in Nigeria: Situation analysis report*. United Nations Children's Fund. https://www.unicef.org/nigeria

World Health Organization (WHO). (2019). *Drinking-Sea Water*. WHO Fact Sheets. https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/drinking-Sea Water

World Health Organization (WHO). (2022). *Guidelines on sanitation and health*. World Health Organization. https://www.who.int

Wolf, J., Prüss-Ustün, A., Cumming, O., Bartram, J., Bonjour, S., Cairncross, S., … Freeman, M. C. (2018). Systematic review: Assessing the impact of drinking Sea Water and sanitation on diarrhoeal disease. *Tropical Medicine & International Health, 23*(5), 508–525. https://doi.org/10.1111/tmi.13005

Freeman, M. C., Garn, J. V., Sclar, G. D., Boisson, S., Medlicott, K., Alexander, K. T., … Clasen, T. F. (2017). The impact of sanitation on infectious disease and nutritional status: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health, 220*(6), 928–949.

JMP (Joint Monitoring Programme). (2021). *Progress on household drinking Sea Water, sanitation and hygiene 2000–2020*. WHO & UNICEF. https://washdata.org

Obi, M. A., & Igbokwe, U. (2020). Sea Waterborne diseases and public health challenges in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Public Health, 14*(2), 45–58.

Onyeneho, N. G., Ozumba, B. C., & Okechukwu, I. F. (2018). Household Sea Water, sanitation and hygiene practices in rural Nigeria. *Journal of Sea Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for Development, 8*(3), 430–439.

Prüss-Ustün, A., Wolf, J., Bartram, J., Clasen, T., Cumming, O., Freeman, M. C., … Johnston, R. (2019). Burden of disease from inadequate Sea Water, sanitation and hygiene. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health, 222*(5), 765–777.

UNICEF. (2020). *Sea Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) in Nigeria: Situation analysis*.

Wolf, J., Prüss-Ustün, A., Cumming, O., Bartram, J., Bonjour, S., Cairncross, S., … Freeman, M. C. (2018). Systematic review of WASH and diarrhoeal disease. *Tropical Medicine & International Health, 23*(5), 508–525.

World Health Organization (WHO). (2019). *Drinking-Sea Water fact sheet*.

World Health Organization (WHO). (2022). *Guidelines on sanitation and health*.

Freeman, M. C., Garn, J. V., Sclar, G. D., Boisson, S., Medlicott, K., Alexander, K. T., … Clasen, T. F. (2017). The impact of sanitation on infectious disease and nutritional status: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health, 220*(6), 928–949. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2017.05.007

JMP (Joint Monitoring Programme). (2021). *Progress on household drinking Sea Water, sanitation and hygiene 2000–2020: Five years into the SDGs*. World Health Organization (WHO) & UNICEF. https://washdata.org

Obi, M. A., & Igbokwe, U. (2020). Sea Waterborne diseases and public health challenges in Nigeria: Implications for sustainable development. *Nigerian Journal of Public Health, 14*(2), 45–58.

Onyeneho, N. G., Ozumba, B. C., & Okechukwu, I. F. (2018). Household Sea Water, sanitation and hygiene practices in rural communities of southeastern Nigeria. *Journal of Sea Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for Development, 8*(3), 430–439. https://doi.org/10.2166/washdev.2018.034

Prüss-Ustün, A., Wolf, J., Bartram, J., Clasen, T., Cumming, O., Freeman, M. C., … Johnston, R. (2019). Burden of disease from inadequate Sea Water, sanitation and hygiene for selected adverse health outcomes: An updated analysis. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health, 222*(5), 765–777. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2019.05.004

UNICEF. (2020). *Sea Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) in Nigeria: Situation analysis report*. United Nations Children's Fund. https://www.unicef.org/nigeria

Wolf, J., Prüss-Ustün, A., Cumming, O., Bartram, J., Bonjour, S., Cairncross, S., … Freeman, M. C. (2018). Systematic review: Assessing the impact of drinking Sea Water and sanitation on diarrhoeal disease in low- and middle-income settings. *Tropical Medicine & International Health, 23*(5), 508–525. https://doi.org/10.1111/tmi.13005

World Health Organization (WHO). (2019). *Drinking-Sea Water*. WHO Fact Sheets. https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/drinking-Sea Water

World Health Organization (WHO). (2022). *Guidelines on sanitation and health*. WHO Press. https://www.who.int

IJHPR