How much are households willing to invest in hand hygiene enabling technologies? A randomised pricing experiment in Lusaka, Zambia.

Katherine Davies[1], Katayi Mwila-Kazimbaya[2], Ian Ross[1], Elisabeth Tadiri[1], Jenala Chipungu[1,2], Robert Dreibelbis[1]

[1] Department of Disease Control, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK
[2] Centre for Infectious Disease Research Zambia, Lusaka, Zambia

*Corresponding author: robert.dreibelbis@lshtm.ac.uk

Abstract

Access to a dedicated handwashing facility (HWF) increases the likelihood of HWWS, an effective behaviour in preventing respiratory and diarrheal disease. The cost of a typical bucket with spigot HWF averages US$ 17 worldwide, with households typically bearing the full cost. The ability and willingness of end-users to meet these costs has received little attention in stated preference or revealed preference studies. This two-phased randomised pricing experiment aimed to explore whether people in peri-urban Lusaka, Zambia were willing to invest their own resources in a HWF and to quantify preferences for specific HWF designs. In Phase 1, three HWF were tested, with each of sixty households using two of the three HWFs over separate two-week periods (20 households per HWF combination). There was strong preference for the locally manufactured bucket with a tap and metal stand ("Kalingalinga bucket") (250 ZMW, ~$10), over high-cost (1000 ZMW, ~$38) and low-cost (100 ZMW, ~$4) premanufactured HWFs. In Phase 2, n=160 used the Kalingalinga bucket for two weeks. At the end of the trial period, participants received a fungible 50 ZMW gift (~$2) and a randomly assigned discount voucher (20%, 40%, 60%, 80%; 40 households per group), before deciding whether to purchase the HWF. Ninety-eight percent (39/40) of households offered 80% discount purchased the HWF (effective price: 0 ZMW), compared to 30% (12/40) of households offered 20% discount (effective price: 150 ZMW). Our regression model predicted that 50% of households would purchase at an effective price of 103 ZMW, approximately 40% of the average retail price of 250 ZMW. Despite declining the purchase offer, all households that did not purchase a HWF expressed a positive stated preference valuation (max WTP > 0) for the HWF, suggesting potential latent demand. Findings illustrate the need for financial interventions and innovations which are both affordable and desirable.

Introduction

Promotion of handwashing with soap (HWWS) is a cost-effective public health measure important for the control of infectious diseases, including acute respiratory infection (ARI) and diarrhoeal disease (Ross et al. 2023; Wolf et al. 2022). Despite this, global adherence to hand hygiene practices remains low, particularly in low-resource settings (Freeman et al. 2014; Wolf et al. 2019). Household access to a dedicated handwashing facility (HWF) increases the likelihood of handwashing with soap (Luby et al. 2009; Wolf et al. 2019), and is important to address the psychological barriers preventing handwashing behaviour (White et al. 2020; Ezezika et al. 2023; Caruso et al. 2025). Global monitoring efforts to track progress toward Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 6 targets use the presence of a HWF as the standard indicator for hand hygiene (UNICEF 2013). Estimates indicate approximately 73% of households in sub-Saharan Africa lack access to a HWF with both soap and water (WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP) 2024a).

The cost of handwashing materials and the resources needed to maintain a handwashing station, as well as a household's ability to afford them, are frequently cited as barriers to handwashing with soap globally (Ezezika et al. 2023). A recent analysis estimated the total economic cost to reach universal hand hygiene in the 46 least developed countries was US$ 12.2 – 15.3 billion over a 10-year period, with 13% (roughly US$ 1.5 to 2 billion) allocated for the supply of HWFs (Ross et al. 2021). The costs per household for facilities and supplies includes an initial investment of $17 for a HWF (assumed to be a bucket with spigot lasting 5 years), with an annual expenditure of $17 for soap and $5 for water. These costs are typically borne by households. Market-based programming that works through or supports local markets, are increasingly promoted by bilateral and NGO development organisations to improve WASH services (Osterwalder, Hailegiorgis, and Mebrate 2022; Tafesse and Tidwell 2023). However, the extent to which market-based approaches are appropriate for promoting hand hygiene behaviour is unknown.

The ability and willingness of end-users to meet these costs has received little attention in the literature. Willingness-to-pay (WTP) - defined as the maximum amount a consumer is willing to spend for a service - can be measured through either stated or revealed preference (Breidert, Hahsler, and Reutterer 2006). Stated preference (or stated WTP) is elicited by asking individuals the value they assign to a good or service without actual payment, while revealed preference (or revealed WTP) is estimated from observed purchasing behaviours, in real-world or experimental settings. Multiple studies have found that demand for preventative health goods is highly sensitive to price (Dupas 2014a) and studies investigating demand and WTP for sanitation products and

services often find low WTP in low-income, community settings (Tidwell et al. 2019; Peletz et al. 2017; Peletz et al. 2021; Peletz et al. 2020). A technical brief by World Vision explored voucher redemption rates for a locally designed HWF at different purchase prices (Tafesse and Tidwell 2023). However, to our knowledge, there appear to be few, if any, stated or revealed preference studies in the published literature to elicit WTP for HWFs. This two-phased voucher-based randomised pricing experiment aimed to explore if people in peri-urban Lusaka, Zambia were willing to invest their own resources in a HWF. Specifically, the study explored if people were willing to invest in one of three HWF designs (Phase 1), before quantifying how much they were willing to invest of their own resources in one favoured HWF (Phase 2).

Methods

Study setting and study design

Zambia faces some of the highest levels of poverty and inequality globally. In 2022, an estimated 64% of the population – around 12.6 million people – lived on less than US$ 2.15 per day (Betran et al. 2025). This study was conducted in George and Matero, two peri-urban communities located in Lusaka, Zambia. Lusaka is the capital and largest city in Zambia, with a population of over two million. Nearly 62% of Lusaka's population live in the city's unplanned and informal settlements (peri-urban areas) (Chiwele, Lamson-Hall, and Wani 2022). These communities are characterised by densely populated, informal housing and face recurring cholera outbreaks and other public health challenges linked with inadequate water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) services (Hubbard et al. 2020). Approximately 71% of Zambia's urban population are estimated to lack access to a household HWF with soap and water (WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP) 2024b). These communities were conveniently selected due to the close partnership between the Centre for Infectious Disease Research in Zambia (CIDRZ) and local health facilities.

Our study was completed in two phases – a small pilot experiment to explore if end-users were willing to invest in one of three HWFs and a larger exploratory experiment to quantify how much end-users were willing to invest of their own resources in one favoured HWF. Below, we present the methods and results for each phase sequentially with a combined discussion.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval for Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the study was gained from London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine Research Ethics Committee (Refs: 29842 for Phase 1 and 31268 for Phase 2), and

the University of Zambia Biomedical Research Ethics Committee (Refs: UNZABREC 4329-2023 for Phase 1 and UNZABREC 5775-2024 for Phase 2).

Prior to study activities, an information sheet was read out by the enumerator outlining the purpose and procedures of the study. Informed consent was obtained from all households and was confirmed by a thumb-print or written signature, depending on literacy status. Where the individual consenting was not literate, a literate impartial witness signed to confirm that the participant understood and consented to the study. Households were not informed of the monetary gift at the time of informed consent and were instead advised that options for keeping or purchasing the handwashing facilities would be discussed at the end of the study.

Data Management

Data from both phases of the study, including household characteristics and purchasing decisions, were captured using electronic data entry forms built using Open Data Kit (ODK) (Hartung et al. 2010) and administered on android tablets. Primary respondents were the head of household or a nominated adult (18+) household member present at the time of data collection. Data from the tablets were uploaded into a secure, cloud-based server daily. A team of six research assistants delivered the randomised pricing experiments and collected data (five females, one male), all of whom held a bachelor's degree. Research assistants were fluent in local languages (Nyanja and Bemba) and had previous experience collecting data related to water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH). Prior to data collection, research assistants completed training on data collection procedures, and ethical safeguarding (informed consent and data protection). Prior to data collection, community sensitization meetings were held with local representatives, who communicated the research through established community platforms.

Phase 1: Pilot Randomised Pricing Experiment

Methods - Phase 1

Sampling Procedures

Our pilot experiment was embedded within a qualitative study exploring use and acceptability of different handwashing facilities. A purposive sample of 60 households was selected: 18 large households (5+ members, with at least one child under 5), 18 small households (2-4 members), 12 households with members aged 65 or older, and 12 households with members with a disability. These household categories were used to inform qualitative sampling only; results from the randomised pricing experiment are not stratified by household type. Community Health Workers (CHWs) familiar with communities assisted in identifying households with members aged 65+ or with a member with a disability. Households of varying size were selected using a pre-determined sampling interval across different zones within each community to ensure variation in household characteristics and location.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied at the household level. Inclusion criteria were at least one adult (aged 18 or older) who could consent to the study on behalf of all members of the household. Exclusion criteria were households comprising a single individual, or a household where no adult could provide consent. Households that already owned a similar HWF were also excluded.

Data Collection

Households were recruited and data were collected between 2 May to 10 July 2024. Three HWFs were selected for testing based on a previous ranking exercise of HWFs in the same communities (Mwila-Kazimbaya et al. 2025): the locally manufactured Kalingalinga bucket, the low-cost premanufactured SATO Tap and the relatively high-cost premanufactured Happy Tap (**Error! Reference source not found.**) *(mWater 2021; Revell and Huynh 2018)*. Households were randomly assigned two of the three handwashing facilities, in varying sequences (six possible combinations), over a four-week period. Each household received their first facility for two weeks, followed by their second facility for the remaining two weeks. Assignment of HWFs was proportionally balanced across the four household groups and the two communities. New handwashing facilities were provided to all households.

Table 1. Summary of handwashing facilities included in the study.

Name	Approximate Retail Price	Description
Kalingalinga Bucket	ZMW 250 / 10 USD	A locally manufactured, hand-operated HWF consisting of a 20L bucket with a tap, a small water collection basin, and a supporting frame. It is widely used and well-known in the local setting.
SATO Tap	ZMW 100 / 4 USD	A low-cost, premanufactured HWF featuring a tap mechanism that attaches to a water bottle (0.5-2L) and dispenses water when pressed. It is small and portable, allowing for easy relocation.
Happy Tap	ZMW 1000 or 38 USD	A high-cost, premanufactured, portable handwashing sink with an 18L water storage tank, a tap, and a catchment tray with drainage. Water is dispensed via a lever that can be operated using the elbow.

At the end of the four-week period, respondents were asked to state which HWF they preferred using overall, irrespective of price. Households were then presented with a gift of 300 Zambian Kwacha (ZMW), (approximately US$10 in March 2024) and asked to select one of three identical, sealed envelopes containing a voucher of either 25%, 50% or 75% off the estimated retail price. Households were offered the option to either purchase one of the two allocated HWFs at the discounted price (Table 2) or keep the monetary gift. The gift money represented a fungible resource which participants could use for any purpose, while the discount was a restricted resource that could only be used to purchase a HWF. Respondents were given 5 to 10 minutes to allow consultation with other household members. The price reduction was communicated to respondents in absolute value, e.g., “the full price of SATO Tap is ZMW 100, but you can buy it for ZMW 50 with your 50% off discount”.

Table 2. Cost and effective price of each handwashing facility based on discount vouchers and 300 ZMW gift.

Discount Voucher	Happy Tap		SATO Tap		Kalingalinga Bucket	
	Cost (ZMW)	Effective Price (ZMW)	Cost (ZMW)	Effective Price (ZMW)	Cost (ZMW)	Effective Price (ZMW)
Full Retail Price	1000	-	100	-	250	-
25% off	750	+450	75	-225	187.50	-112.5
50% off	500	+200	50	-250	125	-175
75% off	250	-50	25	-275	62.50	-237.5

To purchase the Happy Tap, households who received 25% or 50% off vouchers were required to contribute an additional amount to supplement the gifted funds (**Error! Reference source not found.**). The "effective price" is therefore the out-of-pocket payment after the gift and the discount voucher, and we note negative effective price values for many combinations of facility and voucher. This pilot phase was not designed around effective price considerations, but sought to determine which HWF households were most inclined to invest in.

Data Management and Analysis

Data were exported from ODK then uploaded to R (V4.5.0) for data cleaning and analysis. As this was a small pilot study, only descriptive analyses were used to compare overall preferences in HWF design and pricing experiment outcomes.

Results – Phase 1

A total of 60 households were enrolled in this pilot study, with 30 households from each community. Most respondents were female (88%; 53/60) and lived in a shared plot (75%; 45/60) (Table A in S1 Appendix). Each of the three HWF combinations were allocated to 20 households (10 per community): Kalingalinga bucket + Happy Tap, Kalingalinga bucket + SATO Tap, and Happy Tap + SATO Tap.

Stated preference before price

When respondents were asked which of the two HWFs they had tested they preferred using (without reference to price), the locally manufactured Kalingalinga bucket and high-cost premanufactured Happy Tap were favoured over the low-cost premanufactured SATO Tap (Fig 1) (Table B in S1 Appendix). The Kalingalinga bucket was preferred over the Happy Tap, with 55% of households (11/20) expressing a preference for the Kalingalinga bucket compared to 45% (9/20) for the Happy Tap.

Revealed preference

Sixty-seven percent (40/60) of households chose to purchase a HWF rather than simply keep the gift, with the Kalingalinga bucket being the most purchased option (53%; 32/60) (Table B in S1 Appendix). Purchasing behaviour did not align with stated preferences before price was revealed. Many households who expressed preference for the Happy Tap chose not to purchase any HWF or selected an alternative (Fig 1). The Happy Tap was only purchased by households who received a 75% discount – effectively covering the full cost – suggesting limited willingness to invest personal resources in this option. When the Kalingalinga bucket was offered alongside another HWF, it was consistently the preferred purchase. No households chose to purchase the SATO Tap over the Kalingalinga bucket, and among those offered the Happy Tap and SATO Tap, most did not purchase either.

Although household voucher allocation was random, the resulting distribution was uneven given the small sample size and that each participant was given blinded selection from all 3 vouchers. More households received a 75% discount (45%; 27/60) than a 50% (37%; 22/60) or 25% discount (18%; 11/60). Among households receiving the SATO Tap and Happy tap, voucher allocation was even across discount levels. However, in the other two HWF combinations, a larger proportion of households received higher discounts (Table B in S1 Appendix)


Stated HWF Preference
Discount Category
HWF Purchased
Kalingalinga
Happy Tap
75% off
50% off
25% off
Kalingalinga
Did not purchase
Happy Tap


Stated HWF Preference
Discount Category
HWF Purchased
Kalingalinga
SATO Tap
75% off
50% off
25% off
Kalingalinga
Did not purchase


Stated HWF Preference
Discount Category
HWF Purchased
Happy Tap
SATO Tap
25% off
50% off
75% off
Did not purchase
SATO Tap
Happy Tap

Fig 1. Stated HWF preference before price, discount category and purchasing behaviour by HWF combination group. *Each Sankey diagram represents one group of 20 households who were given each HWF sequentially over two, two-week periods. The diagrams show the flow from households' stated HWF preference irrespective of price (left), to the discount voucher they received (middle), to the HWF they purchased (right). The height of each stratum corresponds to the number of households at each stage.*

Phase 2: Randomised Pricing Experiment - Kalingalinga bucket

Methods – Phase 2

Sampling Procedures

To further explore household willingness to pay for HWFs as a function of effective price, a second randomised pricing experiment was completed. A sample of 160 households were recruited for this study (80 households from each community). Given the exploratory nature of the study, the sample size was selected to allow approximation of a demand curve using descriptive analyses, with 40 households per discount level. This sample size provided 80% power to detect a minimum difference of 29 percentage points in the proportion of households willing to purchase HWFs at difference price points, assuming a significance level of 5%.

Household inclusion criteria were at least one adult (aged 18 or older) who consented to the study on behalf of all members of the household. Exclusion criteria were households comprising a single individual, a household where no adult could provide consent, or any household that participated in Phase 1. Households that were already using similar HWFs were also excluded. As in Phase 1, households were recruited using a predetermined sampling interval.

Data Collection

Households were recruited and data were collected between 27 November to 20 December 2024. Based on the results from Phase 1, this simplified randomised pricing experiment was based only on the Kalingalinga bucket. Households were given a Kalingalinga bucket to use for two-weeks. After two weeks, households were re-visited and given a gift of 50 Zambian Kwacha (ZMW) (approx. USD$2 in Nov 2024). Households were randomly assigned, without replacement, to one of four discount vouchers (1:1:1:1): 20%, 40%, 60% or 80% (40 households per discount group) and were

given the option to purchase the Kalingalinga bucket at the discounted price or keep the gift money. Primary respondents were given 5 to 10 minutes to allow consultation with other household members. Purchasing decisions were documented by research assistants in ODK. Table 3 outlines the effective price of the HWF at each discount level.

Table 3: Effective price based on discount vouchers and 50 ZMW gift.

Discount Voucher	Cost to purchase (ZMW)	Effective Price (ZMW)
20%	200	150
40%	150	100
60%	100	50
80%	50	0

After they had made their decision, we asked respondents to state the maximum amount they would have paid for the Kalingalinga bucket. Stated WTP is generally considered a less reliable reflection of preference than revealed WTP (Fifer, Rose, and Greaves 2014), but in this case the participant has just made a revealed preference decision so is in a good position to know their maximum WTP. To ensure internal consistency between stated and revealed preferences, maximum stated WTP values were bounded relative to the discounted price before the gift was applied: respondents who did not purchase a HWF were restricted from stating a maximum WTP above the offered discounted price, while those who did purchase were required to state a WTP greater than or equal to the discounted price they purchased at.

A questionnaire administered with the primary respondent on the first visit addressed socio-demographic characteristics of the household, asset ownership, WASH access and water insecurity. Water insecurity was dichotomised, with households scoring 4/12 or above classified as water insecure (Young et al. 2021). To estimate relative wealth of the study population, a relative wealth index was created using principal component analysis on information on household assets and housing characteristics commonly used in the Demographic and Health Survey (Zambia Statistics Agency 2024). Variables were only included if at least 5% and no more than 95% of households reported ownership to ensure sufficient variation. Twenty-three variables met these criteria and were retained (Table E in S1 Appendix). The first principal component was used to assign each household a score reflective of relative wealth.

Data Analysis

Data were exported from ODK then uploaded to R (V4.5.0) for data cleaning and analysis. Data on purchasing decisions were used to estimate a demand curve of the percentage of households purchasing a HWF at each of the four effective price points. Confidence intervals for purchasing proportions at each price point were calculated using exact binomial tests (binom.test in R).

We used multiple Poisson regression with robust standard errors to examine the association between purchasing decision and effective price. Effective price was modelled as a continuous variable. We adjusted for hypothesised predictors of purchasing behaviour, including household wealth score, and the age and gender of the primary respondent, as well as study site to account for stratification in the voucher randomisation. Other potential predictors including marital status, income, education, employment, household size and water insecurity were tested but were excluded from the final model as they did not affect model estimates or fit.

To estimate the effective price point associated with a 50% predicted probability of purchasing a HWF, we used the fitted multivariable Poisson regression model to generate predicted probabilities across a continuous sequence of effective prices while holding other covariates at median (for continuous) or reference (for categorical) levels.

Results - Phase 2

A total of 160 households were enrolled in this phase of the study, with 80 households from each of the two study communities (George and Matero). Most respondents were women (96%; 154/160), aged between 35-54 (53%; 84/160), and married (66%; 106/160) (Table C in S1 Appendix). Most households resided on shared plots (76%; 121/160) and had six or more members (50%; 80/160). Discount vouchers were evenly distributed, with 40 households assigned to each discount level, except for 40% and 60% discount groups, which included 39 and 41 households, respectively.

Overall, 63% of all households (101/160) purchased a HWF. Purchasing behaviour varied according to the effective price, with uptake increasing as effective price decreased (Fig 2). At the highest price point of 150 ZMW (20% discount), only 30% (12/40) of households purchased a HWF, compared to 98% (39/40) at the lowest effective price point of 0 ZMW (80% discount). Although confidence intervals overlapped between adjacent price points, the highest and lowest price groups were clearly distinct, indicating an inverse relationship between price and demand consistent with a normal good. Price elasticity of demand appears quite high, especially in the middle of the curve, with an

increase in effective price from 50 to 100 ZMW associated with uptake almost halving from 78% to 46%.



Fig 2. Demand curve showing the proportion of households purchasing a HWF at each effective price point. *The points represent the proportion of households in each effective price sub-group purchasing a HWF, and the shaded ribbon indicates 95% confidence intervals, calculated using exact binomial tests.*

Multiple Poisson regression found a negative association between effective price and purchasing behaviour. After adjustment for respondent age and gender, household wealth, and study site, each 1 ZMW increase in effective price was associated with a 1% decrease in the probability of purchase (adjusted risk ratio = 0.99, 95%CI 0.99-0.99). Full regression results are available in Table D of S1 Appendix. Using the predicted probabilities from the model, we estimated that 50% of households would purchase a Kalingalinga bucket at an effective price of 103 ZMW, holding other covariates at median or reference levels (Fig A in Appendix S1).

Stated WTP was higher among households that chose to purchase the HWF (adopters) compared to those who did not (non-adopters) (Fig 3). The median stated WTP among adopters was 150 ZMW (IQR = 100), compared to 100 ZMW (IQR = 50) among non-adopters. The highest stated WTP among non-adopters was 150 ZMW. Despite declining the purchase offer, all non-adopters expressed a positive valuation (max WTP > 0) for the HWF. Very few households provided a maximum stated WTP at or above the retail price.



Fig 3. Empirical Cumulative Distribution Function (CDF) plot of maximum stated WTP for the Kalingaligna bucket, by purchasing behaviour. *The figure shows the empirical CDF of the maximum amount households reported they would be willing to pay for the Kalingalinga bucket, stratified by whether they chose to purchase the product or not. The retail price of the Kalingalinga bucket (250 ZMW) is indicated by a vertical dashed line. Median WTP values for each group are shown as labels alongside the horizonal line at 0.5. Vertical jumps in the lines indicate clustering of responses at certain price points, resulting from discount group allocation and limits on stated maximum WTP according to purchasing behaviour and discount group.*

Discussion

Achieving universal hand hygiene requires investment, yet the cost of a HWF is typically borne by households (Ross et al. 2021) and little is known about household's ability or willingness to cover these costs. Our study explored purchasing preferences and revealed willingness to pay (WTP) for HWFs in peri-urban Lusaka, Zambia helping to address this critical data gap. In Phase 1, households showed a strong preference for the locally manufactured Kalingalinga bucket (250 ZMW, ~$10), over higher- and lower-cost premanufactured alternatives. In Phase 2, which focused exclusively on the Kalingalinga bucket, demand was found to be price-sensitive, and our regression model predicted a 50% purchasing probability at an effective price of 103 ZMW (~$4). Although retail price was not directly tested, extrapolation suggests uptake would be less than 10% at that price, highlighting a significant affordability gap.

In Phase 1, household preferences were shaped by both design and price. In the absence of cost, households favoured HWFs that resembled a sink, such as the Happy Tap or Kalingalinga bucket, consistent with findings from Tanzania and Zambia (Brial et al. 2023; Mwila-Kazimbaya et al. 2025). With over 40% of households in urban Zambia relying on water sources that are not piped into their or a neighbour's dwelling (Zambia Statistics Agency 2019), it is unsurprising that households prefer HWFs that integrate hygiene with broader domestic utility, such as cleaning produce or face-washing. Like multi-purpose prevention technologies in sexual and reproductive health (Karim et al. 2014), HWFs designed for multiple uses may similarly promote greater acceptability, uptake and sustained use. In our study, affordability strongly influenced purchasing, with the lower-cost Kalingalinga bucket favoured over the more expensive Happy Tap. The SATO Tap, despite being cheapest option, was rarely purchased, suggesting design limitations can outweigh affordability in decision-making (Mwila-Kazimbaya et al. 2025). These findings highlight the need to balance affordability with design and highlight the urgent need for further innovation in HWF design and production that can meet both the financial resources and needs of multiple end users.

In Phase 2, the inverse relationship between HWF price and uptake aligns with revealed preferences for sanitation which demonstrate similar price sensitivity (Peletz et al. 2017; Peletz et al. 2021; Peletz et al. 2020). Development economics literature identifies price as a key barrier to the adoption of health-improving technologies (Bates et al. 2012; Spears 2014) and affordability is frequently cited as a barrier to handwashing in community settings (Ezezika et al. 2023). Overall uptake of HWFs in our study was high. Over 60% of households purchased a HWF, substantially higher than uptake observed in a randomized pricing experiment for HWFs at WASH Business Centres in Ethiopia

(Tafesse and Tidwell 2023). The high uptake demonstrates the strong value households place on having a HWF with running water at home. Even non-adopters expressed positive valuations (max WTP > 0), suggesting latent demand could be unlocked through programming focussed on making HWFs more affordable through pricing, financing, and delivery innovations.

The high uptake observed may partly reflect features of our study design. The two-week trial period allowed households to test the HWF without knowing they would later be offered the opportunity to purchase it. Diffusion of innovation theory suggests that trialability – the ability to experiment with an innovation on a limited basis - is positively associated with adoption (Rogers 2003). The opportunity to trial the HWF may therefore have contributed to the high adoption observed. In addition, doorstep delivery of HWFs – rather than voucher redemption used in comparable studies (Peletz et al. 2017; Peletz et al. 2021; Peletz et al. 2020) – likely increased convenience and reduced barriers to uptake. Finally, the short decision window (five minutes), and awareness that field staff were waiting for a response may have introduced social desirability pressures and limited the kind of deliberation that would typically occur in real world purchasing contexts.

Closing the affordability gap requires strategies beyond market-driven approaches. Demand-driven interventions such as social marketing, if not paired with mechanisms to alleviate financial barriers, risk widening inequities and marginalising the poorest households (Langford and Panter-Brick 2013; Parvez et al. 2021). Targeted subsidies or other financing mechanisms can reduce barriers (Dupas 2014a) and evidence from sanitation programming suggests financial support outperforms information or education campaigns in increasing adoption (Gautam et al. 2025). Poverty-targeted subsidies have successfully increased household toilet uptake among low-income households while avoiding market distortions for non-poor households (Nicoletti et al. 2022; Guiteras, Levinsohn, and Mobarak 2015; Hoo et al. 2022). However, because sanitation has public good characteristics and can generate positive externalities while handwashing infrastructure primarily constitutes a private good, comparisons of subsidy effectiveness across these sectors are limited. Evidence from other preventative health interventions suggests that subsidies can promote sustained adoption. For example, Dupas and colleagues found that one-off subsidies for antimalarial bed nets increased long-term uptake by enabling learning about their benefits, without generating negative price anchoring (Dupas 2014b). However, they note that such effects may not generalise to other products that differ in durability or familiarity. Therefore, while subsidies have proven effective in sanitation and other health prevention contexts, further research is needed to determine their effectiveness in promoting improved HWF uptake and handwashing behaviour.

This study has several strengths. First, we combined revealed and stated preference methods to elicit WTP. Although stated WTP is considered a less reliable reflection of preference than revealed WTP (Fifer, Rose, and Greaves 2014), using both methods together provides a comprehensive understanding of household demand and WTP. Second, the phased approach enabled us to assess willingness to invest in three HWF options, providing insights into household preferences and informing a more focused subsequent phase centred on the most popular technology. We acknowledge the limitations of this study. First, voucher allocation in Phase 1 was uneven, inflating purchase numbers and preventing definitive comparisons across HWF combinations. Second, the experimental setting in Phase 2 is not reflective of real-world conditions. Households used HWFs before purchasing and the product was delivered to their home, creating a more convenient scenario than typical market conditions. Social desirability bias may have also influenced decisions, potentially inflating uptake. In addition, households were only given five minutes to make their decision, which does not reflect the longer deliberation time typical in real-world settings. Third, due to the exploratory nature of the research, sample sizes were small, limiting statistical comparisons and limiting our exploration on determinants of purchasing behaviour. However, we were able to draw meaningful conclusions about the relationship between effective price and purchasing. Finally, findings may not be generalisable beyond populations with similar characteristics, where HWF preferences and valuations could differ

Conclusion

At current market prices, broad uptake of HWFs above 100 ZMW (~$4) in peri-urban communities in Lusaka is unlikely. Observed price elasticity of demand suggests that demand-driven strategies to promote handwashing, such as social marketing, risk widening inequities if not paired with mechanisms to alleviate the financial burden on low-income households. Achieving universal hand hygiene will therefore require interventions that address affordability barriers to ensure all households can access essential infrastructure. Preferences observed in this study reflect trade-offs between design and cost, highlighting the need for innovations that are both affordable and desirable. Moreover, innovations in the promotion and distribution of HWFs could unlock latent demand and expand coverage. Further research should assess how subsidies influence HWF adoption and handwashing behaviour and explore wider household determinants of HWF purchasing behaviour.

References

Bates, Mary Ann, Rachel Glennerster, Kamilla Gumede, and Esther Duflo. 2012. 'The Price is Wrong', *Field Actions Science Reports. The journal of field actions*.

Betran, M. F. F, L. M. Cardona, L. Gayoso, C. A. Hoy, and Martinez P. V. 2025. "Zambia - Poverty and Equity Assessment : Turning Things Around After a Lost Decade (English). ." In. Washington, D.C. : World Bank Group.

Breidert, Christoph, Michael Hahsler, and Thomas Reutterer. 2006. 'A review of methods for measuring willingness-to-pay', *Innovative marketing*, 2.

Brial, Edward, Robert Aunger, Winnie Costancia Muangi, and Weston Baxter. 2023. 'Development of a novel hand cleansing product for low-income contexts: The case of tab soap', *PLOS ONE*, 18: e0283741.

Caruso, Bethany A., Jedidiah S. Snyder, Lilly A. O'Brien, Erin LaFon, Kennedy Files, Dewan Muhammad Shoaib, Sridevi K. Prasad, Hannah K. Rogers, Oliver Cumming, Joanna Esteves Mills, Bruce Gordon, Marlene K. Wolfe, and Matthew C. Freeman. 2025. 'Behavioural factors influencing hand hygiene practices across domestic, institutional and public community settings: a systematic review and qualitative meta-synthesis', *BMJ Global Health*, 10: e018927.

Chiwele, Dennis, Patrick Lamson-Hall, and Shahrukh Wani. 2022. '"Informal Settlements in Lusaka". International Growth Centre and the UN-Habitat.'.

Dupas, P. 2014a. 'Getting essential health products to their end users: subsidize, but how much?', *Science*, 345: 1279-81.

———. 2014b. 'SHORT-RUN SUBSIDIES AND LONG-RUN ADOPTION OF NEW HEALTH PRODUCTS: EVIDENCE FROM A FIELD EXPERIMENT', *Econometrica*, 82: 197-228.

Ezezika, Obidimma, Jennifer Heng, Kishif Fatima, Ayman Mohamed, and Kathryn Barrett. 2023. 'What are the barriers and facilitators to community handwashing with water and soap? A systematic review', *PLOS Global Public Health*, 3: e0001720.

Fifer, Simon, John Rose, and Stephen Greaves. 2014. 'Hypothetical bias in Stated Choice Experiments: Is it a problem? And if so, how do we deal with it?', *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 61: 164-77.

Freeman, Matthew C., Meredith E. Stocks, Oliver Cumming, Aurelie Jeandron, Julian P. T. Higgins, Jennyfer Wolf, Annette Prüss-Ustün, Sophie Bonjour, Paul R. Hunter, Lorna Fewtrell, and Valerie Curtis. 2014. 'Systematic review: Hygiene and health: systematic review of handwashing practices worldwide and update of health effects', *Tropical Medicine & International Health*, 19: 906-16.

Gautam, Sanghmitra, Michael Gechter, Raymond P. Guiteras, and Ahmed Mushfiq Mobarak. 2025. 'To use financial incentives or not? Insights from experiments in encouraging sanitation investments in four countries', *World Development*, 187: 106791.

Guiteras, Raymond, James Levinsohn, and Ahmed Mushfiq Mobarak. 2015. 'Encouraging sanitation investment in the developing world: A cluster-randomized trial', *Science*, 348: 903-06.

Hartung, Carl, Adam Lerer, Yaw Anokwa, Clint Tseng, Waylon Brunette, and Gaetano Borriello. 2010. "Open data kit: tools to build information services for developing regions." In *Proceedings of the 4th ACM/IEEE International Conference on Information and Communication Technologies and Development*, Article 18. London, United Kingdom: Association for Computing Machinery.

Hoo, Yi Rong, George Joseph, Rafael Rivera, Susanna Smets, Hanh Nguyen, Per Ljung, Sreymom Um, Georgia Davis, and Jeff Albert. 2022. 'Strategic complements: Poverty-targeted subsidy programs show additive benefits on household toilet purchases in rural Cambodia when coupled with sanitation marketing', *PLOS ONE*, 17: e0269980.

Hubbard, Sydney C., Martin I. Meltzer, Sunkyung Kim, Warren Malambo, Andrew T. Thornton, Manjunath B. Shankar, Bishwa B. Adhikari, Seonghye Jeon, Valerie D. Bampoe, Lauren C. Cunningham, Jennifer L. Murphy, Gordana Derado, Eric D. Mintz, Florence Kabinga Mwale, Elizabeth Chizema-Kawesha, and Joan M. Brunkard. 2020. 'Household illness and associated

water and sanitation factors in peri-urban Lusaka, Zambia, 2016–2017', *npj Clean Water*, 3: 26.

Karim, S. A., C. Baxter, J. Frohlich, and Q. A. Karim. 2014. 'The need for multipurpose prevention technologies in sub-Saharan Africa', *Bjog*, 121: 27-34.

Langford, Rebecca, and Catherine Panter-Brick. 2013. 'A health equity critique of social marketing: Where interventions have impact but insufficient reach', *Social Science & Medicine*, 83: 133-41.

Luby, S. P., A. K. Halder, C. Tronchet, S. Akhter, A. Bhuiya, and R. B. Johnston. 2009. 'Household characteristics associated with handwashing with soap in rural Bangladesh', *Am J Trop Med Hyg*, 81: 882-7.

mWater 2021. "SATO Tap rapid evolution report." In.

Mwila-Kazimbaya, Katayi, Katherine Davies, Mwamba M. Mwenge, Elisabeth Tadiri, Jenala Chipungu, and Robert Dreibelbis. 2025. 'Understanding end-user preferences for hand hygiene enabling technologies: A mixed-methods study in peri-urban Lusaka, Zambia', *PLOS Water*, 4: e0000410.

Nicoletti, Chris, Greg Lestikow, Toeur Veasna, Alicia May, Reimar Macaranas, Daniel Hudner, and James Harper. 2022. 'Increasing latrine sales among poor households in rural Cambodia using targeted subsidies: a randomized control trial', *Journal of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for Development*, 12: 782-91.

Osterwalder, L, B Hailegiorgis, and E Mebrate. 2022. "USAID Transform WASH business models." In. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Parvez, S. M., M. J. Rahman, R. Azad, M. Rahman, L. Unicomb, S. Ashraf, M. H. Mondol, F. Jahan, P. J. Winch, and S. P. Luby. 2021. 'Achieving equitable uptake of handwashing and sanitation by addressing both supply and demand-based constraints: findings from a randomized controlled trial in rural Bangladesh', *Int J Equity Health*, 20: 16.

Peletz, R., C. MacLeod, J. Kones, E. Samuel, A. Easthope-Frazer, C. Delaire, and R. Khush. 2020. 'When pits fill up: Supply and demand for safe pit-emptying services in Kisumu, Kenya', *PLOS ONE*, 15: e0238003.

Peletz, Rachel, Alicea Cock-Esteb, Dorothea Ysenburg, Salim Haji, Ranjiv Khush, and Pascaline Dupas. 2017. 'Supply and Demand for Improved Sanitation: Results from Randomized Pricing Experiments in Rural Tanzania', *Environmental Science & Technology*, 51: 7138-47.

Peletz, Rachel, Caroline Delaire, Joan Kones, Clara MacLeod, Edinah Samuel, Alicea Easthope-Frazer, and Ranjiv Khush. 2021. 'Will Households Invest in Safe Sanitation? Results from an Experimental Demand Trial in Nakuru, Kenya', *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18: 4462.

Revell, Geoff, and Nhu Ai Huynh. 2018. "HappyTap: aspirational handwashing device commercialization in Vietnam." In.: Loughborough University.

Rogers, E. M. 2003. *Diffusion of Innovations* (Simon and Schuster: New York, NY).

Ross, I., S. Bick, P. Ayieko, R. Dreibelbis, J. Wolf, M. C. Freeman, E. Allen, M. Brauer, and O. Cumming. 2023. 'Effectiveness of handwashing with soap for preventing acute respiratory infections in low-income and middle-income countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis', *Lancet*, 401: 1681-90.

Ross, Ian, Joanna Esteves Mills, Tom Slaymaker, Richard Johnston, Guy Hutton, Robert Dreibelbis, and Maggie Montgomery. 2021. 'Costs of hand hygiene for all in household settings: estimating the price tag for the 46 least developed countries', *BMJ Global Health*, 6: e007361.

Spears, Dean. 2014. 'Decision costs and price sensitivity: Field experimental evidence from India', *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 97: 169-84.

Tafesse, A. , and J.B. Tidwell. 2023. "Water Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) Business Centers promote better household and community WASH services." In.: World Vision.

Tidwell, James B., Fern Terris-Prestholt, Matthew Quaife, and Robert Aunger. 2019. 'Understanding demand for higher quality sanitation in peri-urban Lusaka, Zambia through stated and revealed preference analysis', *Social Science & Medicine*, 232: 139-47.

UNICEF. 2013. "Handwashing Promotion: Monitoring and Evaluation Module." In.

White, Sian, Astrid Hasund Thorseth, Robert Dreibelbis, and Val Curtis. 2020. 'The determinants of handwashing behaviour in domestic settings: An integrative systematic review', *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health*, 227: 113512.

WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP). 2024a. 'Hygiene data: Sub-Saharan Africa', WHO and UNICEF. https://washdata.org/data/household#!/table?geo0=region&geo1=sdg&geo2=Sub-Saharan%20Africa.

———. 2024b. 'Hygiene data: Zambia', WHO and UNICEF. https://washdata.org/data/household#!/table?geo0=country&geo1=ZMB.

Wolf, J., R. Johnston, M. C. Freeman, P. K. Ram, T. Slaymaker, E. Laurenz, and A. Prüss-Ustün. 2019. 'Handwashing with soap after potential faecal contact: global, regional and country estimates', *Int J Epidemiol*, 48: 1204-18.

Wolf, Jennyfer, Sydney Hubbard, Michael Brauer, Argaw Ambelu, Benjamin F. Arnold, Robert Bain, Valerie Bauza, Joe Brown, Bethany A. Caruso, Thomas Clasen, John M. Colford, Jr., Matthew C. Freeman, Bruce Gordon, Richard B. Johnston, Andrew Mertens, Annette Prüss-Ustün, Ian Ross, Jeffrey Stanaway, Jeff T. Zhao, Oliver Cumming, and Sophie Boisson. 2022. 'Effectiveness of interventions to improve drinking water, sanitation, and handwashing with soap on risk of diarrhoeal disease in children in low-income and middle-income settings: a systematic review and meta-analysis', *The Lancet*, 400: 48-59.

Young, S. L., J. D. Miller, E. A. Frongillo, G. O. Boateng, Z. Jamaluddine, and T. B. Neilands. 2021. 'Validity of a Four-Item Household Water Insecurity Experiences Scale for Assessing Water Issues Related to Health and Well-Being', *Am J Trop Med Hyg*, 104: 391-94.

Zambia Statistics Agency, Ministry of Health (MOH) [Zambia], and ICF,. 2024. "Zambia Demographic and Health Survey 2024: Key Indicators Report." In. Lusaka, Zambia, and Rockville, Maryland, USA.

Zambia Statistics Agency, Ministry of Health (MOH) Zambia, and ICF,. 2019. "Zambia Demographic and Health Survey 2018." In. Lusaka, Zambia, and Rockville, Maryland, USA: Zambia Statistics Agency, Ministry of Health, and ICF.