

## ORIGINAL RESEARCH

## Prevalence of diarrheal diseases among schools with and without water, sanitation and hygiene programs in rural communities of north-eastern Ethiopia: a comparative cross-sectional study

## AUTHORS

Tefera Gebrehiwot<sup>1</sup> MPH



Biniyam Sahiledengle Geberemariyam<sup>2</sup> MPH, Lecturer \*

Teklit Gebretsadik<sup>3</sup> MSc, Lecturer

Azeb Gebresilassie<sup>4</sup> MPH, Assistant Professor

#### CORRESPONDENCE

\*Mr Biniyam Sahiledengle Geberemariyam

## AFFILIATIONS

<sup>1</sup> North Wollo Health Department, Weldiya, Ethiopia

<sup>2</sup> Department of Public Health, School of Public Health, MaddaWalbu University Goba Referral Hospital, Bale-Goba, Ethiopia

<sup>3</sup> Department of Health Informatics and Healthcare Innovation, College of Health Sciences, School of Public Health, Mekelle University, Mekelle, Ethiopia

<sup>4</sup> Department of Public Health, College of Health Sciences, Mekelle University, Mekelle, Ethiopia

### PUBLISHED

15 October 2020 Volume 20 Issue 4

HISTORY

RECEIVED: 26 April 2018

REVISED: 16 August 2020

ACCEPTED: 2 September 2020

## CITATION

Gebrehiwot T, Geberemariyam BS, Gebretsadik T, Gebresilassie A. Prevalence of diarrheal diseases among schools with and without water, sanitation and hygiene programs in rural communities of north-eastern Ethiopia: a comparative cross-sectional study. Rural and Remote Health 2020; 20: 4907. https://doi.org/10.22605/RRH4907

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence

## ABSTRACT:

**Introduction**: Diarrheal diseases are a significant cause of morbidity among school-aged children due to inadequate sanitation, lack of access to potable water and poor hygiene practices. Although the incidence of these illnesses can be reduced through improved water quality and the introduction of sanitation and hygiene programs in schools, there is limited evidence to demonstrate the impact of interventions in schools in Ethiopia. The purpose of this study was to compare the

prevalence and associated factors of diarrheal diseases in school-aged children between schools in Habru District, northeastern Ethiopia that adopted water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) interventions and those that did not. **Methods**: A comparative cross-sectional study was conducted among 640 randomly selected school children (160 from schools that adopted WASH interventions and 480 from schools that did not). Trained data collectors used a pre-tested structured questionnaire and an observational checklist to collect the data. Descriptive statistics, such as frequencies and percentages, were computed to present the prevalence of diarrheal disease. Bivariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses were used to identify factors associated with diarrheal disease.

**Results**: The overall 2-week prevalence of diarrhea among school children was 30.5%. In WASH-implementing schools, the prevalence was 21.9%, significantly lower than in non-WASHimplementing schools (33.3%). In non-WASH-implementing schools, the odds of diarrheal diseases among students were significantly decreased in those students who used a clean school latrine, self-reported latrine utilization at home and were aware of the causes of diarrhea. Similarly, among students in WASH-implementing schools, self-reported latrine utilization at home, personal hygiene inspection and awareness of the causes of diarrhea were factors associated with decreasing odds of diarrhea occurrence.

**Conclusion**: This study identified a high prevalence of a diarrheal disease among children in schools with no WASH interventions compared with schools that do have WASH interventions. This provides strong evidence for strengthening WASH programs in all rural schools to reduce the burden of diarrheal diseases.

#### Keywords:

acute diarrheal disease, comparative study, Ethiopia, school-age children, WASH implementation in schools.

## FULL ARTICLE:

### Introduction

Diarrheal disease, a major cause of death across the world, is associated with inadequate sanitation, lack of access to potable water for consumption and absence of hygienic behavior such as hand-washing to reduce the transmission of disease<sup>1,2</sup>. WHO has estimated that, globally, approximately 1.7 billion cases of childhood diarrhea occur annually<sup>3</sup>. Also, close to 600 000 children die each year from diarrheal disease, the majority in low- and middle-income countries<sup>4</sup>. This is remarkable because the problem can be easily prevented with clean water, availability of latrines and good hygiene practices<sup>5-7</sup>. Even though access to sanitation, the practice of good hygiene, and safe water supply could save many children every year, 768 million people around the world must rely on unimproved water sources<sup>8-10</sup>. Additionally, one in three people (2.4 billion) live without sanitation facilities - including 946 million people who defecate in the open<sup>6</sup>. Evidence has linked poor sanitation with growth stunting, environmental enteropathy and impaired cognitive development - long-term disorders that aggravate poverty and slow economic development<sup>11</sup>.

Poor status of water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) can impact the growth and development of children in multiple ways<sup>12</sup> and school-aged children are more at risk than any other age group of suffering from diarrheal illnesses that could be prevented by clean water and good hygiene<sup>13-15</sup>. Investigators of systematic reviews reported that inadequate WASH in schools results in adverse health outcomes including infectious, gastrointestinal, neurocognitive and psychological illnesses<sup>16</sup>. Infectious diarrhea alone results in about 0.7 million deaths in children aged under 5 years in 2011 and 250 million lost school days<sup>17</sup>. Furthermore, it has been estimated that infections contracted by children in schools will lead to infections in up to half of their household members<sup>10</sup>.

Interventions to implement WASH programs in schools aim to improve the health and learning performance of school-aged children, and the health of their family members, by reducing the occurrence of diseases associated with poor access to safe water and good sanitation<sup>2,18</sup>. Recent literature has demonstrated the impact of school WASH interventions on diarrhea-related outcomes among school-going children<sup>16,19,20</sup>. A meta-analysis showed reductions in diarrhea associated with the promotion of hand-washing and improvements in water quality and the disposal of excreta of 48%, 17% and 36%, respectively<sup>7</sup>. Another review found that various WASH interventions reduce diarrhea risk between 27% and 53% in children<sup>2</sup>. School WASH interventions have also been associated with improvements in educational outcomes and reductions in absence caused by illness<sup>19,21</sup>. In addition, WASH initiatives may facilitate the achievement of UN Sustainable Development goals by 2030, particularly Goal 6, Target 6.2 ('Achieve access to adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene for all, and end open defecation')<sup>22</sup>.

In Ethiopia, access to safe drinking water and sanitation services are among the lowest in sub-Saharan Africa, and water- and sanitation-related diarrheal disease is among the top three causes of all deaths<sup>23</sup>. In addition, many Ethiopian schools have inadequate sanitation. Where sanitation facilities exist, they may be poorly designed and constructed or may not have sufficient water for hand-washing; only 1% of rural schools in Ethiopia have on-premises water sources, adequate sanitation and water and soap for hand-washing<sup>24</sup>. According to the national WASH inventory, of an estimated 27 000 primary schools across Ethiopia, 7% meet the official standard for students per handwashing stand, 21% meet the official standard for students per latrine, 31% have a safe water supply and 33% have sanitation coverage<sup>25</sup>. Although efforts to improve WASH in primary schools are being undertaken, studies conducted in Ethiopia have found a drastic diarrhea problem<sup>26-28</sup>, and high levels of parasitic infections and soil-transmitted helminth morbidity among school-aged children<sup>28-31</sup>. Despite this, none of the previously conducted studies ever assessed the prevalence of diarrhea in schools, and there is no reliable evidence of a difference in diarrhea prevalence among children attending Ethiopian schools that implement WASH interventions and those that do not. Furthermore, there is no indication whether the implementation of WASH interventions has affected the prevalence of diarrheal diseases among school-aged children in the study area of Habru district, north-eastern Ethiopia. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to compare the prevalence and associated factors of diarrheal diseases in school-aged children between those schools in the study area that adopted WASH interventions and those that did not. The findings from this study may help school directors, rural health policymakers and health managers in the development and implementation of WASH programs in schools and other communities in Ethiopia.

#### Methods

#### Study area and period

The study was conducted in the rural Habru District of Wollo Zone, in the north-eastern part of Ethiopia, about 490 km from Addis Ababa (the capital city of Ethiopia). According to an annual report of the Habru District Health and Education offices, the district has 97 schools (35 are primary schools) attended by 39 962 children. Of the 35 primary schools, 10 have had school WASH programs for more than 2 years and the rest have not implemented any WASH program. Of the total number of children, 5358 are in grades 5 and 6.

#### Study design

A school-based comparative cross-sectional study design was used to compare the prevalence of diarrheal diseases in children attending schools that had implemented WASH programs and schools that had not in Habru District from January to March of 2016.

#### Study population and sample detail

All students aged 8–15 years from 35 primary schools of the Habru District (10 WASH-implementing and 25 non-WASHimplementing schools) were the source population of the study. Randomly selected students in selected primary schools were the study population.

Eleven primary schools were randomly selected for the study from 35 Habru District primary schools – three of these schools were implementing WASH interventions. Students aged 8–15 years were randomly selected from these 11 primary schools. Students attending night school or who had not been attending a WASH-implementing or non-WASH-implementing school for at least 2 years were then excluded from the study (Fig1).

The required sample size to provide a robust measure of the prevalence of diarrhea was calculated using Epi-Info v7 (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; http://www.cdc.gov/epiinfo) by estimating as an outcome variable 50% prevalence of diarrhea within the previous 2 weeks among children in schools that had not implemented WASH programs (because there were no previous studies indicating the prevalence of a diarrheal disease among school children in these schools). The sample size calculation used a 95% confidence interval (CI), 80% power, a ratio of schools with WASH programs to non-WASH program schools of 1 : 3 and a detection level of two times the odds ratio (OR), design effect 1.5 and a 10% non-response rate. The required sample size was determined to be 693 (174 from schools with WASH programs and 519 from schools without WASH programs).

A multi-stage sampling procedure was employed to select study participants. First, all primary schools in the Habru District were categorized into WASH-implementing and non-WASH-implementing schools. Then, 30% of primary schools from each category were selected using the lottery method and included in the sample (three with WASH programs and eight without WASH programs). Afterward, all school children aged 8–15 years from these 11 schools were identified, and 575 students in WASH schools and 2178 students in non-WASH schools were listed as a sampling frame. Then, a sampling interval (*K*) of *N/n* was computed and the first student was selected using the lottery method and every third student in WASH schools and fourth student in non-WASH schools and fourth student in non-WASH schools and fourth specified was achieved.



Figure 1: Schematic presentation of sampling procedure.

### Study variables

The outcome variable was the occurrence of a diarrhea episode during the 2 weeks preceding the survey (yes/no). Independent variables included the following: (i) demographic factors (age, sex, grade, educational status of the mother, educational status of the father); (ii) WASH-related awareness factors (awareness of the causes and the means of transmission and prevention of diarrhea); (iii) WASH-related practice factors (self-reported latrine utilization at school and home, self-reported handwashing practice at school at critical times); and (iv) enabling factors (such as hygiene education in the school, availability of water throughout the year in the school, cleanliness of the school latrine, availability of a latrine at home, regular hygiene inspection in the school).

## **Operational definitions**

Acute diarrhea: Diarrhea was defined as the passage of three or more abnormally loose, watery, or liquid stools over 24 hours<sup>32</sup>.

**Improved water source**: A water source was considered to be improved if it was collected from protected springs and/or wells, a pipe or a distribution point.

**Latrine utilization**: Latrine utilization was defined as regular and consistence use of a latrine at home/school.

Hand-washing at critical times: Critical times for handwashing included after visiting the latrine and before eating food. Hand-washing was defined as using clean water and soap or ash.

## Data collection and analysis

Four trained diploma nurses used a pre-tested structured questionnaire to collect data by face-to-face interview. A checklist was used to observe and assess the WASH condition of the studied schools. The data collection tools were developed by reviewing relevant literature<sup>10,18</sup>. The data collection tools were first prepared in English then translated into Amharic (the local language), then back-translated to English to ensure consistency and to enhance reliability. The questionnaire was pre-tested on a different group that was 10% of the actual sample size. One day of training was given to data collectors and supervisors before data collection. The data collection process was closely supervised daily by two environmental health officers.

Data were entered using EpiData v3.1 statistical software (EpiData Association; http://www.epidata.dk/download.php) and exported into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences v20.0 for analysis (SPSS; http://www.spss.com). Frequency distributions and  $\chi^2$  tests were used to present important variables. A  $\chi^2$  test was used to assess if there was any significant difference in the prevalence of diarrhea among school-going children in WASH-implementing and non-WASH- implementing schools; the two categorical variables were prevalence of diarrhea (yes/no) and type of school (WASHimplementing or non-WASH implementing). Binary logistic regression analysis was used to identify the independent predictor factors for acute diarrhea among school-going children in WASH-implementing and non-implementing schools. Finally, multivariate binary logistic regression analysis was performed to control for the possible confounding effect. The Hosmer–Lemeshow statistic was used to test the goodness-offit of the final model. Adjusted odds ratio (AOR) with corresponding 95%CI was used to estimate the association between dependent and independent variables, and a *p*-value ≤0.05 was used to declare statistical significance.

## Ethics approval

The study was approved by the health research ethical review committee of Mekelle University College of Health Science (ERC 06133/2016). A formal letter was obtained from the district education office, and the assent of school directors and school committee assigned by families of the students was obtained. Both oral and written consents were obtained from the study participants before the interview and, at all levels, confidentiality was assured. After data collection, health education on WASH issues was provided to all students. During data collection, children who had diarrhea were immediately referred to a nearby health institution for management.

## Results

## Sociodemographic characteristics of study participants

In total, 640 school children (160 from schools with WASH programs and 480 from schools without WASH programs) participated in the study, with a response rate of 92.35% of the targeted children. Among these, 307 (48%) students were from fifth grade and 333 (52%) students were from sixth grade. The sex composition of the sampled school children was overweighed by male students (326/640; 50.9%). In this study, 300 (46.9%) of the students were in the age group of 13–14 years. Regarding the educational status of parents, 260 (40.6%) mothers had not learned to read and write and 220 (34.4%) of the fathers had not attended formal education and were unable to read and write (Table 1).

# Table 1: Sociodemographic characteristics of students in Habrudistrict primary School, North Wollo, Ethiopia, January– March 2016 (n=640)

Variable	n(%)			
Age of student (years)				
8–10	27(4.2)			
11–12	251(39.2)			
13–14	300(46.9)			
≥15	62(9.7)			
Sex				
Male	326(50.9)			
Female	314(49.1)			
Religion				
Orthodox	199(31.1)			
Muslim	440(68.7)			
Protestant	1(0.2)			
Grade level				
Grade 5	307(48)			
Grade 6	333(52)			
Educational status of mother				
Unable to read and write	260(40.6)			
Can read and write	221(34.5)			
Grade 1–4	80(12.5)			
Grade 5–8	49(7.7)			
Grade 9–12	22(3.4)			
> Grade 12	8(1.3)			
Educational status of father				
Unable to read and write	220(34.4)			
Can read and write	231(36.1)			
Grade 1–4	88(13.7)			
Grade 5–8	62(9.7)			
Grade 9–12	28(4.4)			
> Grade 12	11(1.7)			

#### Hygiene education, awareness and practices of students

In this study, 551 (86.1%) of school children reported that they received hygiene education from school teachers, 91.9% in schools with WASH programs and 84.2% in schools without WASH programs. About three-quarters of students in schools without WASH programs knew about the causes (76.2%) and

prevention measures (73.1%) for diarrhea, respectively. In WASH-implementing schools, 143 (89.4%) and 142 (88.7%) of students knew about the causes and measures for diarrhea prevention respectively. The study also found in that in WASHimplementing schools 109 (68.1%) of the students did not practice hand-washing at critical times while they were at school (Table 2).

## Table 2: Comparison of hygiene education, knowledge and practices of students among WASH-implementing and non-WASH-implementing primary schools of Habru District, North Wollo, Ethiopia, January-March 2016

Variable	Student response	WASH implementing school n(%)	Non-WASH implementing school n(%)	χ², d.f.=1	
Received hygiene education	Yes	147(91.9)	404(84.2)	χ <sup>2</sup> =5.95	
( <i>n</i> =640)	No	13(9.1)	76(15.8)	p=0.014	
Awareness of causes of	Yes	143(89.4)	366(76.2)	χ <sup>2</sup> =12.69	
diarrhea (n=640)	No	17(10.6)	114(22.8)	p<0.001	
Awareness of prevention	Yes	142(88.7)	351(73.1)	χ <sup>2</sup> =15.21	
methods of diarrhea (n=635)	No	18 (11.3)	124(26.9)	p<0.001	
Self-reported hand-washing at	Yes	51(31.9)	36(9.9)	χ <sup>2</sup> =38.98	
critical times in school ( <i>n</i> =525)	No	109(68.1)	329(90.1)	<i>p</i> <0.001	
Self-reported latrine utilization	Always	80(51.9)	151(31.5)	χ <sup>2</sup> =13.43	
practice in school (n=584)	Sometimes	74(49.1)	279(73.6)	p<0.001	
	No	125(78.1)	320(66.7)		

d.f., degrees of freedom. WASH, water, sanitation and hygiene.

#### Prevalence of diarrhea

A total of 160 students (33.3%) (95%CI: 29.0–37.5%) were from schools without WASH programs and 35 (21.9%) (95%CI: 15.6–28.1%) were from schools with WASH programs. The overall prevalence of diarrhea in school-going children during the 15 days preceding the survey was 195 (30.5%) (95% CI: 26.9–34.1%). The proportion of diarrheal diseases was significantly higher in students attending schools without WASH programs than students in schools with WASH programs ( $\chi^2$ =7.43 (degrees of freedom 1), *p*<0.001) (Table 3). Children attending non-WASH-implementing schools were more likely to have had diarrhea in the 2 weeks preceding the survey compared with those attending WASH-implementing schools (OR: 0.56, 95%CI: 0.36–0.85).

# Table 3: Comparison of type of school and occurrence of diarrheal diseases in Habru District, North Wollo, Ethiopia, January–March 2016 (n=640)

Type of school	Presence of diarrhea in past 15 days				
	Yes <i>n</i> (%)	No n(%)	χ², d.f.=1		
WASH implementing school	35(21.9)	125(78.1)	$\chi^2 = 7.43, p < 0.001$		
Non-WASH implementing school	160(33.3)	320(66.7)			

d.f., degrees of freedom. WASH, water, sanitation and hygiene.

#### Factors associated with diarrhea prevalence

Table 4 shows factors associated with diarrheal diseases among children attending schools with WASH programs and schools without WASH programs. In WASH-implementing schools, factors associated with decreased odds of diarrheal diseases among students included availability of a latrine in the home (AOR: 0.47, 95%CI: 0.09–0.60), self-reported latrine utilization at home (AOR: 0.04, 95%CI: 0.01–0.17), received personal hygiene inspection in the school (AOR: 0.19, 95%CI: 0.04–0.89), and awareness about causes of diarrhea (AOR: 0.13,

95%CI: 0.08–0.14). In non-WASH-implementing schools, factors associated with decreased odds of diarrhea included school latrine cleanliness (AOR: 0.42, 95%CI: 0.23–0.76), self-reported latrine utilization at home (AOR: 0.11, 95%CI: 0.05–0.21), and awareness about the causes of diarrhea (AOR: 0.03, 95%CI: 0.01–0.05). Students attending schools with WASH programs but no access to a latrine at home were 10 times more likely to have had diarrhea in the 2 weeks preceding the study than those with access to a latrine at home (AOR: 10.47, 95%CI: 2.99–36.60).

Variable	Diarrhea occurrence							
	WASH implementing school				Non-WASH implementing school			
	Yes (%)	No (%)	COR (95%CI)	AOR (95%CI)	Yes (%)	No (%)	COR (95%CI)	AOR (95%CI)
Presence of water throughout year								
No	7(20.0)	28(22.4)	1	1	113(70.6)	223(69.7)	1	1
Yes	28(80.0)	97(77.6)	1.15(0.45-2.92)	1.20(0.34-4.13)	47(29.4)	97(30.3)	0.95(0.63-1.45)	0.85(0.44-1.64)
School latrine cleanliness								
Not clean	14(40.0)	29(23.2)	1	1	118(73.7)	152(47.5)	1	1
Clean	21(60.0)	96(76.8)	0.45(0.20-1.00)	0.40(0.13-1.20)	42(26.3)	168(52.5)	0.32(0.21-0.48)*	0.42(0.23-0.76)**
Availability of latrine at home								
No	9(25.7)	4(3.2)	1	1	38(23.7)	17(5.3)	1	1
Yes	26(74.3)	121(96.8)	0.09(0.02-0.33)*	0.47(0.09-0.60)**	122(76.3)	303(94.7)	0.18(0.09-0.33)*	2.32(0.76-7.07)
Self-reported utilization of latrine at home								
No	11(31.4)	3(2.4)	1	1	80(50.0)	22(6.9)	1	1
Yes	24(68.6)	122(97.6)	0.05(0.01-0.20)*	0.04(0.01-0.17)**	80(50.0)	298(93.1)	0.07(0.04-0.12)*	0.11(0.05-0.21)**
Received personal hygiene inspection in school								
No	3(8.6)	9(7.2)	1	1	20(12.5)	18(5.6)	1	1
Yes	32(91.4)	116(92.8)	0.82(0.21-3.23)	0.19(0.04-0.89)**	140(87.5)	302(94.4)	0.41(0.21-0.81)*	0.50(019-1.30)
Awareness of causes of diarrhea								
No	1(2.9)	12(9.6)	1	1	101(21.1)	13(2.7)	1	1
Yes	34(97.1)	113(90.4)	3.61(0.45-28.77)	0.13(0.08-0.14)**	59(12.3)	307(63.9)	0.02(0.01-0.04)*	0.03(0.01-0.05)**

## Table 4: Comparison of factors associated with diarrhea occurrence among students in WASH-implementing and non-WASH-implementing primary schools of Habru District, Amhara, Ethiopia, January–March 2016 (n=640)

ToP0.05 crude, \*\*p<0.05 adjusted. AOR, adjusted odds ratio. CI, confidence interval. COR, crude odds ratio. WASH, water, sanitation and hygiene.

### Discussion

This study assessed the prevalence of diarrheal disease among primary school children aged 8–15 years in the Habru District of Ethiopia and found the overall prevalence of diarrhea to be 30.5%. This result is higher than the study conducted in Assossa District (Ethiopia) and Babile Town (Ethiopia)<sup>33,34</sup>. However, the overall prevalence was lower than found in the studies conducted in primary schools of Motta Town (Ethiopia) and Khartoum (Sudan)<sup>28,35</sup>. The present study clearly showed that there is a relatively low prevalence of diarrhea among students in WASH-implementing schools (21.9%) compared with non-WASH-implementing schools (33.3%) and this difference might be due to the impact of the school WASH program. There was a significant difference in WASH facilities such as improved water supply and sanitation facilities between the schools with and without WASH programs. In addition, WASH interventions in schools can influence diarrheal outcomes among children through the teaching of hygienic practices and behaviors. Other studies have shown that school WASH interventions can reduce

diarrheal diseases among school-going children<sup>19,20,36</sup>. Studies from Cambodia and Kenya reported a significant positive effect of sanitation practices on reducing diarrhea prevalence<sup>37,38</sup>.

A cluster-randomized trial conducted in Kenya provides ample evidence that school WASH interventions may reduce diarrhea and gastrointestinal-related clinic visits among children younger than 5 years<sup>20</sup>. A meta-analysis in 2014 showed that the overall effect of access to an improved sanitation facility on reduction in diarrhea morbidity was 28%<sup>38</sup>. More recent studies have also emphasized that the provision of adequate WASH facilities in schools has a crucial positive effect on health and educational outcomes and school attendance<sup>19,20,24,39,40</sup>. Good sanitation and hygiene practices are potentially important in controlling parasitic worms among school children<sup>40</sup>. School WASH improvements can result in improved school attendance for girls<sup>19</sup>. A cluster-randomized controlled trial conducted in Chinese primary schools showed that a school-based handwashing program has been decreasing both absenteeism and length of absence for students<sup>41</sup>. In line with this study finding,

there is good evidence that WASH interventions, hygiene and hand-washing decrease diarrhea<sup>42</sup>.

Cleanliness of school latrine facilities had a significant association with the prevalence of diarrheal diseases in the study area. Students in schools with clean latrines were less likely to develop diarrheal diseases than students in schools without clean latrines. The reason for this may be that students who spend their school time in schools with clean latrines might be attracted to use the latrine facility and may develop the habit of utilizing the latrine regularly and hygienically. In line with this, studies have shown that disposing of feces safely can reduce diarrhea, and this can be achieved when latrines are kept clean<sup>43,44</sup>.

Latrine utilization by school children at their home was one of the major hygiene practice factors that increased or decreased the prevalence of diarrheal diseases. In this study, regardless of whether the school had a WASH program or not, students utilizing a latrine in their home were less likely to develop diarrhea than students who did not utilize a latrine in their home. This finding was consistent with the study in Motta Town (Ethiopia)<sup>28</sup>. In addition, students who had an awareness of the causes of diarrhea were less likely to develop diarrheal diseases than students without awareness. Similarly, reduced risk of parasitic infections was observed in children with substantial knowledge of hygiene and sanitation practices<sup>45</sup>.

This study has several limitations. First, due to the crosssectional nature of this study design, temporal relationships cannot be established between the explanatory and outcome variables. Being a cross-sectional study rather than using a longitudinal design, the study is limited in assessing the longterm impact of school-based WASH interventions. Second, the study does not allow for seasonal changes in diarrhea prevalence. Third, common issues related to self-reported practices and recall bias should not be ignored. Fourth, the study didn't use multilevel analysis, which is the ideal alternative to address nested data since there might be a dependency between school-related factors and the presence of diarrhea at an individual level. Despite this limitation, the study detected a significant difference in diarrhea prevalence among students from schools with WASH programs and without WASH programs. Last, the lack of standardized questionnaires with acceptable reliability and validity for assessing WASH interventions in Ethiopia limits the findings of this study. In future studies, researchers are recommended to use a strong design such as observational study designs to assess the impact of school WASH programs.

#### Conclusion

The prevalence of diarrheal disease among students in schools without WASH programs was higher than in students attending schools with a WASH program. Environmental factors (cleanliness of the school latrine), hygiene practices (latrine utilization by students at their homes) and students' awareness about the causes of diarrheal diseases were factors associated with reduced prevalence of diarrheal diseases among schoolgoing children. Hence, scaling up WASH programs across all rural primary schools along with awareness creation activities on latrine utilization and hygienic behavior at school and in the broader community are strongly recommended.

#### Acknowledgements

We thank the students who volunteered and took their time to give us all the relevant information for the study. We also thank data collectors, supervisors, school directors and school committee members.

## REFERENCES:

1 Padilla D. The effectiveness of water, hygiene, and sanitation interventions in lowering diarrheal morbidity across the globe: a systematic review and qualitative analysis of relevant primary literature. Available: https://cbie.asu.edu/sites/default/files /papers/csid\_wp\_2012-005.pdf (Accessed 15 January 2016).

**2** Darvesh N, Das JK, Vaivada T, Gaffey MF, Rasanathan K, Bhutta ZA. Water, sanitation and hygiene interventions for acute childhood diarrhea: a systematic review to provide estimates for the Lives Saved Tool. *BMC Public Health* 2017; **17(4):** 776. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-017-4746-1 PMid:29143638

**3** World Health Organization. *Diarrhoeal disease*. 2017. Available: http://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/diarrhoealdisease (Accessed 27 September 2018).

**4** Liu L, Oza S, Hogan D, Chu Y, Perin J, Zhu J, Lawn JE, et al. Global, regional, and national causes of under-5 mortality in 2000-15: an updated systematic analysis with implications for the Sustainable Development Goals. *Lancet* 2016; **388(10063):** 3027-3035. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)31593-8

**5** Lozano R, Naghavi M, Foreman K, Lim S, Shibuya K, Aboyans V, et al. Global and regional mortality from 235 causes of death for 20 age groups in 1990 and 2010: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study. *Lancet* 2012; **380(9859)**: 2095-2128. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61728-0

6 World Health Organization. WHO/UNICEF Joint Water Supply,

Sanitation Monitoring Programme. Progress on sanitation and drinking water: 2015 update and MDG assessment. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2015.

7 Cairncross S, Hunt C, Boisson S, Bostoen K, Curtis V, et al.
 Water, sanitation and hygiene for the prevention of diarrhoea.
 *International Journal of Epidemiology* 2010; 39(Suppl1):
 193-205. https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyq035 PMid:20348121

**8** World Health Organization and United Nations Children's Fund. *Progress on sanitation and drinking water; World Health Organization and United Nations Children's Fund Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP) for water supply and sanitation.* New York, NY: UNICEF and WHO, 2012.

**9** World Health Organization. *Water, sanitation and hygiene links to health facts and figures updated.* 2004. Available: http://www.who.int/water\_sanitation\_health/publications /facts2004/en (Accessed 18 September 2018).

**10** United Nations Children's Fund. WASH for School Children: state-of-the-art in Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. Provisional draft. Nepal: UNICEF Regional Office for South Asia, 2012.

**11** Guerrant RL, DeBoer MD, Moore SR, Scharf RJ, Lima AAM. The impoverished gut – a triple burden of diarrhoea, stunting and chronic disease. *Nature Reviews Gastroenterology & Hepatology* 2013; **10**: 220-229. https://doi.org/10.1038

#### /nrgastro.2012.239 PMid:23229327

**12** Arnold BF, Colford Jr JM. Treating water with chlorine at point-of-use to improve water quality and reduce child diarrhea in developing countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene* 2007; **76(2):** 353-364. https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.2007.76.354

**13** Mahmud MA, Spigt M, MulugetaBezabih A, Lopez Pavon I, Dinant GJ, Blanco Velasco R. Risk factors for intestinal parasitosis, anaemia, and malnutrition among school children in Ethiopia. *Pathogens and Global Health* 2013; **107(2)**: 58-65. https://doi.org/10.1179/2047773213Y.0000000074 PMid:23683331

**14** Metwally AM, Ibrahim NA, Saad A, Abu El-Ela MH. Improving the roles of rural women in health and environmental issues. *International Journal of Environmental Health Research* 2006; **16(2):** 133-144. https://doi.org/10.1080/09603120500539208 PMid:16546806

**15** Garn JV, Caruso BA, Drews-Botsch CD, Kramer MR, Brumback BA, Rheingans RD, et al. Factors associated with pupil toilet use in Kenyan primary schools. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 2014; **11(9)**: 9694-9711. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph110909694 PMid:25233014

**16** Jasper C, Le TT, Bartram J. Water and sanitation in schools: a systematic review of the health and educational outcomes. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health 2012; **9(8):** 2772-2787. https://doi.org/10.3390 /ijerph9082772 PMid:23066396

**17** Walker CL, Rudan I, Liu L, Nair H, Theodoratou E, Bhutta ZA, et al. Global burden of childhood pneumonia and diarrhoea. *Lancet* 2013; **381(9875):** 1405-1416. https://doi.org/10.1016 /S0140-6736(13)60222-6

**18** United Nations Children's Fund. *Manual: child friendly schools*. New York: UNICEF, 2009.

**19** Freeman MC, Greene LE, Dreibelbis R, Saboori S, Muga R, Brumback B, et al. Assessing the impact of a school-based water treatment, hygiene and sanitation programme on pupil absence in Nyanza Province, Kenya: a cluster-randomized trial. *Tropical Medicine & International Health* 2012; **17(3)**: 380-391. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3156.2011.02927.x PMid:22175695

**20** Dreibelbis R, Freeman MC, Greene LE, Saboori S, Rheingans R. The impact of school water, sanitation, and hygiene interventions on the health of younger siblings of pupils: a cluster-randomized trial in Kenya. *American Journal of Public Health* 2014; **104(1):** 91-97. https://doi.org/10.2105 /AJPH.2013.301412 PMid:24228683

**21** Talaat M, Afifi S, Dueger E, El-Ashry N, Marfin A, Kandeel A, Mohareb E, et al. Effects of hand hygiene campaigns on incidence of laboratory-confirmed influenza and absenteeism in schoolchildren, Cairo, Egypt. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 2011; **17(4):** 619. https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1704.101353 PMid:21470450

**22** United Nations. *United Nations Sustainable Development Goals Report 2016*. New York, NY: United Nations, 2016.

**23** Tilahun S, Collick A, Ayele M. *Water supply and sanitation in Amhara region, learning and communication research report, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia.* 2012. Available:

http://soilandwater.bee.cornell.edu/Research/international

/docs/wateraid-finalreport\_April10.pdf (Accessed 18 September 2018).

**24** Morgan C, Bowling M, Bartram J, Kayser GL. Water, sanitation, and hygiene in schools: Status and implications of low coverage in Ethiopia, Kenya, Mozambique, Rwanda, Uganda, and Zambia. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health* 2017; **220(6)**: 950-959. https://doi.org/10.1016 /j.ijheh.2017.03.015 PMid:28539190

**25** WASH in schools. *WASH in schools mapping project in Ethiopia*. Available: http://washinschoolsmapping.com/projects /ethiopia.html (Accessed 18 September 2018).

**26** Mohammed S, Tamiru D. The burden of diarrheal diseases among children under five years of age in Arba Minch District, southern Ethiopia, and associated risk factors: a cross-sectional study. *International Scholarly Research Notices* 2014; **654901.** https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/654901 PMid:27433486

**27** Anteneh Z, Andargie K, Tarekegn M. Prevalence and determinants of acute diarrhea among children younger than five years old in Jabithennan District, Northwest Ethiopia, 2014. *BMC Public Health* 2017; **17(99).** https://doi.org/10.1186 /s12889-017-4021-5 PMid:28103908

**28** Asemahagn MA. Parasitic infection and associated factors among the primary school children in Motta town, western Amhara, Ethiopia. *American Journal of Public Health* 2014; **2**: 248-254. https://doi.org/10.12691/ajphr-2-6-6

**29** Maru DS. Prevalence of intestinal parasitic infections and associated risk factors among school children in Adigrat town, northern Ethiopia. *International Journal of Emerging Trends in Science and Technology* 2015; **4(1)**: 4943-4948.

**30** Gelaw A, Anagaw B, Nigussie B, Silesh B, Yirga A, Alem M, Endris M, et al. Prevalence of intestinal parasitic infections and risk factors among schoolchildren at the University of Gondar Community School, Northwest Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Public Health* 2013; **13(1):** 304. https://doi.org/10.1186 /1471-2458-13-304 PMid:23560704

**31** Oswald WE, Stewart AE, Kramer MR, Endeshaw T, Zerihun M, Melak B, et al. Association of community sanitation usage with soil-transmitted helminth infections among school-aged children in Amhara Region, Ethiopia. *Parasites & Vectors* 2017; **10(1)**: 91. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-017-2020-0 PMid:28212668

**32** Farthing M, Salam MA, Lindberg G, Dite P, Khalif I, Salazar-Lindo E, Ramakrishna BS, et al. Acute diarrhea in adults and children: a global perspective. *Journal of Clinical Gastroenterology* 2013; **47(1):** 12-20. https://doi.org/10.1097 /MCG.0b013e31826df662 PMid:23222211

**33** Jano HA. Effectiveness of school water supply, sanitation and hygiene program: in the case of assossaworeda primary schools, BGRS, Ethiopia. Doctoral dissertation. Addis Ababa: Ababa University, 2011.

**34** Tadesse G. The prevalence of intestinal helminthic infections and associated risk factors among school children in Babile town, eastern Ethiopia. *Ethiopian Journal of Health Development* 2005; **19(2):** 140-147. https://doi.org/10.4314/ejhd.v19i2.9983

**35** Gabbad AA, Elawad MA. Prevalence of intestinal parasite infection in primary school children in Elengaz area, Khartoum, Sudan. *Academic Research International* 2014; **5(2):** 86.

**36** Joshi A, Amadi C. Impact of water, sanitation, and hygiene interventions on improving health outcomes among school

children. Journal of Environmental and Public Health 2013; 984626. https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/984626 PMid:24454415

**37** En WL, Gan GL. Factors associated with use of improved water sources and sanitation among rural primary schoolchildren in Pursat Province, Cambodia. *Southeast Asian Journal of Tropical Medicine and Public Health* 2011; **42(4):** 1022.

**38** Wolf J, Prüss-Ustün A, Cumming O, Bartram J, Bonjour S, Cairncross S, et al. Systematic review: assessing the impact of drinking water and sanitation on diarrhoeal disease in low-and middle-income settings: systematic review and meta-regression. *Tropical Medicine & International Health* 2014; **19(8)**: 928-942. https://doi.org/10.1111/tmi.12331 PMid:24811732

39 Appiah-Brempong E, Harris MJ, Newton S, Gulis G.
Examining school-based hygiene facilities: a quantitative assessment in a Ghanaian municipality. *BMC Public Health* 2018;
18(1): 581. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-018-5491-9
PMid:29720144

**40** Grimes JE, Tadesse G, Mekete K, Wuletaw Y, Gebretsadik A, French MD, et al. water, sanitation, and hygiene, soil-transmitted helminths, and schistosomes: national mapping in Ethiopia. *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases* 2016; **10(3):** e0004515. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0004515 PMid:26954688

41 Bowen A, Ma H, Ou J, Billhimer W, Long T, Mintz E, et al. A

cluster-randomized controlled trial evaluating the effect of a handwashing-promotion program in Chinese primary schools. *American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene* 2007; **76(6):** 1166-1173. https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.2007.76.1166 PMid:17556631

42 Cairncross S, Hunt C, Boisson S, Bostoen K, Curtis V, Fung IC, et al. Water, sanitation and hygiene for the prevention of diarrhoea. *International Journal of Epidemiology* 2010;
39(Suppl1): 193-205. https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyq035
PMid:20348121

**43** Vivas A, Gelaye B, Aboset N, Kumie A, Berhane Y, Williams MA. Knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) of hygiene among school children in Angolela, Ethiopia. *Journal of Preventive Medicine and Hygiene* 2010; **51(2):** 73.

**44** Megersa S, Benti T, Sahiledengle B. Prevalence of diarrhea and its associated factors among under-five children in open defecation free and non-open defecation free households in Goba District Southeast Ethiopia: a comparative cross-sectional study. *Clinics Mother Child Health* 2019; **16:** 324.

**45** Gottfried MA. Evaluating the relationship between student attendance and achievement in urban elementary and middle schools: an instrumental variables approach. *American Educational Research Journal* 2010; **47(2)**: 434-465. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831209350494

This PDF has been produced for your convenience. Always refer to the live site https://www.rrh.org.au/journal/article/4907 for the Version of Record.