Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis or dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis or dissertation in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known, including display on the world wide web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis or dissertation. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis or dissertation. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis or dissertation.

Signature:

Cheryl Lynn Moore

Date

Regression Analysis of Determinants of Bed Net Use in Southeast Nigeria following Mass Distribution of LLINs: Implications for Social Behavior Change Interventions

By

Cheryl Lynn Moore Master of Public Health

Hubert Department of Global Health

Amy E. Patterson, PhD, MPH Committee Chair

Deborah A. McFarland, PhD, MPH Committee Member Regression Analysis of Determinants of Bed Net Use in Southeast Nigeria following Mass

Distribution of LLINs: Implications for Social Behavior Change Interventions

By

Cheryl Lynn Moore

B.Sc, McMaster University, 2008

Thesis Committee Chair: Amy E. Patterson, PhD

An abstract of A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Rollins School of Public Health of Emory University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Public Health in Hubert Department of Global Health 2013

Abstract

Regression Analysis of Determinants of Bed Net Use in Southeast Nigeria following Mass Distribution of LLINs: Implications for Social Behavior Change Interventions

By Cheryl Lynn Moore

Background: Millions of long-lasting insecticide treated nets (LLINs) have been distributed as part of the global malaria control strategy. LLIN ownership, however, does not necessarily guarantee LLIN use. Thus, even in the ideal setting in which universal coverage with LLINs has been achieved, maximal malaria protection will only be achieved if LLINs are used both correctly and consistently. This study aims to investigate the factors associated with net use, independent of net ownership.

Methods and Findings: A secondary data analysis was performed using data collected from a household survey conducted in southeastern Nigeria in November 2011 following a statewide mass LLIN distribution campaign and, in select locations, a community-based behavior change communications (BCC) intervention. Multivariable logistic regression analyses, controlling for household bed net ownership, were employed to examine the association between individual net use and various demographic, environmental, behavioral and social factors. Our findings indicate that the odds of net use increase among individuals who were exposed to tailored behavior change communications (BCC) in the context of a home visit (OR=17.11; 95% CI 4.45-65.79) or who receive a greater degree of social support from friends and family (ptrend < 0.001). Factors that decrease the odds of net use include: increasing education level (ptrend = 0.020), increasing malaria knowledge level (ptrend = 0.022), and reporting any disadvantage of bed nets (OR=0.39; 95% CI 0.23-0.78).

Conclusion: This study suggests that LLIN use is significantly influenced by social support and exposure to a malaria-related BCC home visit. The malaria community should thus further consider the importance of interpersonal communication and social influences on adoption of net use behaviors when designing future research and interventions.

Regression Analysis of Determinants of Bed Net Use in Southeast Nigeria following Mass Distribution of LLINs: Implications for Social Behavior Change Interventions

By

Cheryl Lynn Moore

B.Sc., McMaster University, 2008

Thesis Committee Chair: Amy Patterson, PhD

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Rollins School of Public Health of Emory University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Public Health in the Hubert Department of Global Health 2013 This research would not have been possible without the support of many people. The author would like to express her very deepest gratitude to Drs. Amy Patterson and Deborah McFarland for providing their invaluable insights, support, and guidance throughout the project. To The Carter Center staff both in Atlanta and Nigeria as well as the Nigerian Ministries of Health for the development, implementation and support of this survey project and for their continued dedication to the control of malaria in Nigeria.

The author would also like to give special thanks to her family and friends for their love and support. Finally, to her best friend and fiancé James Russell, for his amazing ability to provide constant love and encouragement – even from the other side of the world – she will be forever grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page Number
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	
CHAPTER 1: Introduction	
Background of the Problem	
Statement of the Problem	
Purpose of the Study	
Significance Statement	
Definition of Terms	
CHAPTER 2: Review of the Literature	
Intrapersonal Level	
Interpersonal Level	
Net level	
Physical Environment Level	
Community Level	
Environment Level	
Concluding summary	
Relevance to the proposed study	
CHAPTER 3: Manuscript (for submission to PLoS ONE)	
Abstract	
Introduction	
Methods	
Results	
Discussion	
Conclusion	
References	
Figures and Tables	
CHAPTER 4: Extended Methods	
CHAPTER 5: Extended Results	
Extended Tables	
CHAPTER 6: Extended Discussion/Conclusion	67
Discussion	67
Conclusion	
REFERENCES	
APPENDIX A Survey Instrument	75

Background of the Problem

Malaria remains a significant public health issue globally, with an estimated 3.3 billion people at risk in 2011[1]. It is a parasitic vector-borne disease that is both preventable and treatable. However, in 2010 malaria was responsible for an estimated 220 million infections and 600,000 deaths [1]. Of these deaths, more than 90% occurred on the African continent – most of them in children less than age of five [1].

Nigeria accounts for 25% of the African malarial disease burden [2]. Approximately 97% of the country's more than 160 million people are at risk for this disease. With an estimated 110 million clinical cases and 300,000 childhood deaths annually, malaria is Nigeria's most significant public health issue [3]. The public health impact of malaria in Nigeria is staggering, accounting for 25% of infant mortality, 30% of deaths in children under age five and 11% of maternal mortality [3,4]. Not only is malaria a significant public health concern, it also places tremendous burden on the country's health system contributing up to 60% of outpatient visits and 30% of hospital admissions [3,4]. Furthermore, malaria places a heavy social and economic burden on the country, with the combined financial losses due malaria treatment/prevention costs and loss of productive work time estimated at 132 billion Naira annually [5].

In the past two decades, insecticide treated nets have been one of the key components of the global malaria control strategy. Conventional insecticide treated nets (ITNs) were developed in the 1980s and have been shown to reduce malaria episodes by up to 50% in endemic areas [6]. Unfortunately, ITNs must be re-treated with a synthetic

pyrethroid insecticide every six months to maintain optimal effectiveness. The introduction of long-lasting insecticidal nets (LLINs) represents an important advance, since the insecticide on these nets should last three to seven years in the field without the need for insecticide re-treatment [6-8], though recent studies suggest that nets may physically wear out more rapidly than that in actual field settings. Recent research indicates that when LLIN use in a population is high, they effectively reduce vector prevalence in the community and thus provide increased protection not only for the individual user for but the community as a whole [9,10]. This added community protective effect of LLINs combined with evidence of the greater benefits conferred by universal coverage strategies compared to those that target vulnerable groups [11], prompted the WHO to shift its recommendations from a focus on ITN coverage of vulnerable groups (pregnant women and children under age five) to one of universal LLIN coverage targeting all populations at risk for malaria [12,13]. Many countries, including Nigeria, have thus incorporated this strategy into their national malaria control plans. The World Health Organization currently recommends that 1.8 LLINs should be distributed for free or at highly subsidized prices for every 2 persons in malaria affected areas.

The most recent Nigerian Malaria Control Program Strategic Plan (2009-2013) set the ambitious net-related targets of: 80% of households owning at least two ITNs/LLINs by 2010; and 80% of children less than age five and currently pregnant women sleeping under an LLIN by 2010. To address these targets, a countrywide scale up of LLIN coverage was initiated in 2009. Attaining these ambitious goals, however, has proven to be a difficult task. In 2010 only 42% of households in Nigeria owned at least *one* LLIN, 29% of children less than age five and 35.4% of pregnant women were sleeping under an LLIN [3]. Although these figures indicate significant improvement from previous years, significant work remains to reach national coverage targets. However, more than 51 million LLINs have been distributed so far, a major accomplishment, and with completion of the national mass distribution campaign currently scheduled for May 2013, significant improvements in coverage are expected. [14].

Many challenges remain as Nigeria continues to scale up LLIN coverage, including those related to ensuring appropriate net distribution, use and adherence [5]. Recent studies suggest that distribution alone may not be sufficient to guarantee net use [15,16]. For example, one study conducted in Rivers State, Nigeria found that Only one third of those that owned a net slept under them the night prior to the survey [17]. This research is concerning as potential reductions in malaria morbidity and mortality due to LLIN distribution will only be fully realized if the nets owned are correctly and consistently used. Developing a deeper understanding of the factors that influence net use can assist in informing future malaria control programming to ensure that this valuable tool in malaria control provides optimal protective results to at-risk populations.

Statement of the Problem

As countries, like Nigeria, move closer to reaching LLIN coverage targets, ensuring correct and consistent net use should become a more prominent goal of malaria control efforts. Currently there is no recognized best practice for encouraging net use in a net owning population. However, there is a growing body of research exploring the factors influencing net use behaviors in a population so as to inform future behavior change interventions aimed at increasing correct and consistent net use in a population.

There is a growing list of potential determinants of net use described in the current scientific literature. However, for several reasons, programmatic implications of these findings are not always obvious. For one, the direction and magnitude of associations reported in the literature vary significantly by analysis method, geographic location and epidemiological setting. Additionally, many studies have not adequately controlled for net ownership levels in the population they are studying, and since ownership is likely the strongest predictor of net use, the associations reported are likely confounded. Finally, very few studies have adequately examined the social environment in which net use behaviors are adopted, focusing mostly on environmental, demographic, and individual characteristics, while ignoring potentially important social factors that may influence net use behaviors such as the support and encouragement of us from friends and family members, the complexities of power dynamics within the household and influence of culture and community norms. A more complete picture of the factors that influence net use and the relationships that exist between these factors would provide valuable direction for the design of future malaria control efforts aimed at increasing appropriate and consistent net use among malaria affected populations.

Purpose of the Study

This study aims to investigate the determinants of net use, independent of net ownership, in a population of influential adult household members living in a malaria endemic region of Nigeria, following the completion of a mass LLIN distribution campaign and a behavior change communications intervention.

Significance Statement

There is an apparent gap between net ownership and appropriate net use. Elucidation of the factors that influence LLIN use among bed net owners will provide an evidence-base that can be drawn upon in the development of tailored intervention programs aimed at increasing net use in Nigeria thus maximizing the potential benefits LLINs have in reducing the heavy burden of malaria morbidity and mortality.

BCC	Behavior change communications
СНР	Community health promoters
EA	Census enumeration area utilized to select clusters
FMOH	Nigerian Federal Ministry of Health
ITN	Insecticide-treated net
LF	Lymphatic filariasis
LF knowledge	Score presented in tertiles (high, medium, low) measuring respondents' correct biomedical knowledge of LF causes, prevention and treatment
LGA	Local government area
LLIN	Long lasting insecticide-treated net
Malaria knowledge	Score presented in tertiles (high, medium, low) measuring a respondents' correct biomedical knowledge of malaria causes, prevention and treatment
Net care knowledge	Score presented in tertiles (high, medium, low) assessing respondents' correct knowledge of appropriate net care practices
Net density	Number of nets per household member
Net skills and self-efficacy	Score presented in tertiles (high, medium, low) assessing respondents' self-reported confidence in performing net hanging and care activities
NMCP	National Malaria Control Program
SES	Socio-economic status
Social support	Score presented in tertiles (high, medium, low) comprised of survey questions measuring the frequency (always, often, sometimes, rarely, never) of physical assistance and encouragement respondents receive from their spouse, children and friends
SV	Sentinel village
Wealth index	Score presented in quintiles developed using household characteristics

Definition of Terms

CHAPTER 2: Review of the Literature

Malaria is a parasitic vector-borne infectious disease that, despite its entirely preventable and treatable nature, is one of the most significant public health issues worldwide. Nearly half of the world's population is at risk for malaria and the disease infects greater than 200 million annually [1]. In 2010, malaria was responsible for more than 600,000 deaths, mostly in children less than five years of age [1]. Malaria disproportionately affects sub-Saharan African populations with 6 countries (Nigeria, Democratic Republic of the Congo, United Republic of Tanzania, Uganda, Mozambique and Cote d'Ivoire) accounting for nearly half of all malaria cases [1]. In addition to the public health burden of malaria, the economic burden on the African continent is staggering, resulting in annual direct economic costs of USD 12 billion and an estimated 1.3% loss in African GDP growth [1].

In the previous two decades, insecticide treated nets (ITNs) have become a central component of the global malaria control strategy. The evidence of their effectiveness in reducing malaria-related morbidity and mortality has been well established: correct and consistent net use can reduce episodes of malaria by 50% in endemic areas [6]; household ownership of at least one ITN is associated with 23% reduction in mortality for children less than five years of age [18]; and an estimated 635 lives are saved for every one million ITNs distributed [19]. In addition to the benefits experienced by individual net users, it has also been demonstrated that high ITN coverage in a population can have a community-wide effect where even those community members who are not sleeping under an ITN experience increased protection from malaria due to a reduction in local vector prevalence [9,10]. Accordingly, LLIN distribution has been substantially scaled-up

leading to significant increases in ITN ownership in many malaria-endemic countries in the course of the last decade [20-23].

In the case of Nigeria, a country with a population of more than 160 million persons (nearly all at risk for malaria) and limited resources, national scale up of ITN coverage has been challenging. A national mass LLIN distribution campaign was not initiated until 2009 and continues currently with an anticipated completion date of May 2013. Nonetheless, Nigeria has made great achievements in national ITN coverage rates in the last decade. Between 2000 and 2010, the percent of households owning any type of mosquito net increased from 10% to 44% [3]. In 2000 there was no measureable possession of ITNs in the population, but by 2008 more than 70% of all nets were ITNs or LLINs [24]. At the last measurement, in 2010, 42% of the population owned at least one ITN [3]. This number is expected to be higher today as millions of LLINs have been distributed nationally since then. Regardless, there remains significant work ahead in order to achieve the national target of 80% of households owning at least two LLINs [5].

Simply owning an ITN is not sufficient to protect against malaria. To provide maximum benefit to the owner a net must be used correctly and consistently. In recent years, several studies have suggested that a 'gap' may exist between net ownership and use where the proportion of individuals correctly utilizing ITNs is significantly less than the proportion of households owning nets [15-17,25-28]. For example, a 2008 study published by Thwing *et al.* indicated that, in Niger, as few as 33% of the available nets in net-owning households were utilized the night before the survey. This discrepancy highlights the importance of understanding underlying issues affecting net use and serves

as a reminder that one must ask whether individuals are unable or unwilling to use the nets they have or rather is net use low simply because there are no nets available.

If a 'gap' does exist between net ownership and use, closing it will require a better understanding of the underlying reasons for a population's lack of appropriate net use. It becomes important to know not only who is least likely to sleep under an ITN, but also why they are not doing so. This knowledge can then be applied to malaria control programming in the form of tailored intervention strategies aimed at increasing a population's ability and willingness to use nets. Nigeria is currently addressing the issue of lack of access to LLINS through a mass distribution campaign and by finalizing plans to implement continuous routine distributions through childhood vaccination clinics, antenatal care clinics, community-based systems and schools in the future. Ensuring a high level of consistent and appropriate net use in the population after LLIN coverage targets are met may present a substantially more complex task.

The factors that influence an individual's decision to consistently sleep under an ITN, when one is available, have been examined in malaria control and prevention research in numerous geographic and epidemiological settings. This chapter presents a summary of the existing literature exploring the potential determinants of net use that will be used to inform an analysis of the determinants of net use in a Nigerian population that recently participated in a mass LLIN distribution campaign. In the discussion of the literature presented below, potential determinants of net use have been categorized into levels based on ecological models of health behavior [29].

Intrapersonal Level

At the center of the proposed model are the intrapersonal level factors influencing net use. These factors are representative of an individual's personal characteristics and can be further categorized into: (1) Demographic factors including: age, sex, socioeconomic status (SES) and education level; and (2) Psychological factors including: malaria knowledge and perceived malaria risk.

Demographic factors: age, sex, SES, and education level

Age

Numerous studies have reported an association between age and level of net use [25,30-33], however, the degree and direction of association varies significantly between geographic region and other population demographics. One study examining survey data from six sub-Saharan African nations found that children less than age five were more likely to sleep under nets compared to other age groups [25]. Another analysis of data from 15 African countries found that infants were most likely to sleep under ITNs [31]. Interestingly, a more focused analysis of a population in western Kenya found that children less than age five were the least likely age group to sleep under ITNs [30]. Other age groups reported to be less likely to sleep under a net included school-age children and adult males [25,32]. It is also important to note that the methods used to examine the association between age and net use differ substantially between studies, which may account for some of the discrepancies in results. For example, of the five studies referenced above, three employed regression analysis to conclude that age is independently associated with net use [30-32] and two compared the proportion of net use among various age groups to conclude that age is associated with net use [30,33].

Multiple studies have suggested that an individual's sex is associated with ITN use [25,32,33]. Frequently, females are reported to be more likely to sleep under a bed net compared to males [25,32,33]. Occasionally this difference between the sexes is more pronounced in specific age brackets. Baume *et al* analyzed data from national surveys conducted in six sub-Saharan African countries and found that adult males were among the least likely age-gender groups to sleep under an ITN [25]. Alternatively, Eisele *et al* studied the national surveys of 15 countries in sub-Saharan Africa and found no statistically significant association between a child's sex and his/her net use [31].

Socio-economic status

There is conflicting evidence regarding the association between SES and ITN use in the current literature. There is likely a logical overlap in the relationship between SES, ITN use and ITN ownership in that families without the economic means to overcome the financial barriers to purchasing a bed net would be expected to have decreased net ownership, and since net ownership is likely the strongest predictor of net use, there is likely to be a confounding effect of ownership on the relationship between SES and net use. The previously discussed analysis conducted by Eisele *et al* [31] demonstrates this logic. They reported that net ownership was associated with SES, however, once a household owned a net, SES had no further impact on net use. Conversely, there have been some studies that report an association between net use and wealth, though the direction of the association varies [34,35]. For example, Goesch *et al* [34] conducted a cross sectional study of 397 mothers and guardians of young children and found that the children of more affluent mothers were *less* likely to sleep under a bed net. Conversely, an analysis of Ethiopia's Malaria Indicator Survey found that net use was independently associated with increasing wealth [35].

Education level

Several studies have examined the association between education and net use [31,33,36-39]. In some instances, it appears as though having some education is significantly associated with an individual's net use and educated households tend to have more net use in general [37,39]. Additionally, some studies have shown that the children of educated caregivers are more likely to sleep under a bed net than children of non-educated families [38,39]. Alternatively, there have been studies indicating that education is not a significant predictor of ITN use among individuals or their children [31,36]. This discrepancy in findings may be indicative of the challenge in separating determinants of net use from determinants of net ownership. The qualitative study by Ng'ang'a *et al* [33], for example, reports a statistically different proportion of net use among educated and non-educated individuals however it is unclear whether the assessment was conducted among all study participants or only among those who have access to a bed net.

Occupation

Literature suggesting an association between an individual's occupation and his or her ITN use is limited, however what exists provides insight into some of the social and logistical factors affecting net use. Most recently Biadgilign *et al* [40] published results of a multivariable logistic regression analysis of data from 335 households in eastern Ethiopia indicating that farmers (aOR 0.137; 95% CI:0 .04-0.5) and housewives (OR 0.26; 95% CI: 0.08-0.82) were less likely to use ITNs than individuals of other occupations. A qualitative study conducted by Dunn *et al* [41] provides insight into why farmers may be less likely to use ITNs in some regions. The authors conducted interviews with members of a community in southern Tanzania and found that, in order to carry out their farming activities, many adults were required to be away from their households for an extended period of time due to the substantial distance between the farming site and their residence. Study participants reported that the time spent away from home negatively impacted their ability to sleep under an ITN. The study also found that children are less likely to sleep under a net when their parents have occupations requiring them to be away from the home for extended periods of time.

Psychological factors

Malaria risk perception and knowledge

It is reasonable that an individual who does not perceive malaria as a serious risk may not value ITN use. It has been reported that some individuals possess significant apathy towards malaria infection due to the commonality of the disease [42,43]. A limited understanding of the biomedical characteristics of malaria, specifically in regards to its signs and symptoms, has been hypothesized to be a barrier to ITN use [44]. Ng'ang'a *et al* suggest that individuals who define malaria based on its common symptoms may have difficulty accepting that ITNs alone can offer adequate protection, especially when these symptoms do not cease after appropriate use of bed nets [33].

Many individuals lack a basic understanding of malaria and the mechanisms of transmission, prevention and treatment [33,44-46]. Numerous studies conducted in sub-Saharan Africa suggest that misconceptions about the causes of malaria may hinder ITN use [33,44,45]. In some communities, a mosquito bite is considered only one of many

mechanisms of malaria transmission [33,44-46]. In such communities, researchers have observed individuals using methods other than ITNs to prevent malaria, often reserving ITN use for protection from the nuisance of biting mosquitoes [46]. In some circumstances this not an issue – as long as an individual is sleeping under a net, his/her reason for doing so may not matter. However, when mosquito density (an environmental factor) is perceived to be low, these individuals may not use their nets even though they may still be at risk for malaria at this time.

Numerous studies identifying knowledge as a key factor associated with ITN use present descriptive data pertaining to self-reported reasons for non-net use [33,42,43,45,47]. Additionally, a large proportion of studies have taken a more quantitative approach to examining this factor [36,40,48]. The results of this research, however, demonstrate that different types of knowledge may have opposing effects on net use. One study used logistic regression analysis to examine the association between knowledge and net use in a population of pregnant women in Nigeria and found that, while knowledge that ITNs prevent malaria is positively associated with net use, knowledge of the causes of malaria, that malaria is harmful during pregnancy and of the risks associated with malaria during pregnancy are not significantly associated with net use [36]. Deressa *et al* also found that awareness that ITNs are used to kill mosquitoes was independently associated with net use [48]. Biadgilign et al [40] reported that knowledge of the cause of malaria is significantly associated with net ownership, but not with net use, however individuals who reported having heard malaria-related information in the previous six months are more likely to use a bed net than individuals who have not. This association with ownership and not use may be due to the fact that information is

often disseminated during ITN distribution; individuals may have the knowledge because they received a net and not the other way around. Several studies have also found that individuals who know that malaria is transmitted by mosquitoes are no more likely to use bed nets than individuals who lack this knowledge [49-51].

Skills and self-efficacy

Individuals who experience difficulties hanging or taking down an ITN often have reduced net use [30,33,46]. Several additional studies have suggested that a lack of net care practices and net hanging skills may also contribute to decreased net use [43,47,49,52,53]. This finding may be the result of a lack of knowledge of appropriate methods of net hanging and use practices or may be indicative of issues with the design of the net itself or with housing structures that make it difficult to hang a net every night. This highlights interconnectedness of the different levels of factors influencing net use and highlights the importance of targeting multiple levels with future interventions.

Interpersonal Level

Household size and composition

At the interpersonal level, the most commonly reported predictors of net use in the literature are household size and composition [31,32,35,39,41,53]. Studies demonstrate that as the number of individuals in a household increases, a reduction in net use is observed. This result is likely due to inadequate household access to ITNs rather than issues specifically related to net non-use. Elsewhere, it has been demonstrated that household net use increases as the number of children under five in the household increases [38]. This finding may be indicative of confounding by net ownership since many ITN distribution campaigns have targeted households with children under age five – thus households with multiple children under five will have comparatively more ITNs. *Sleeping arrangements*

It has also been reported that the number, arrangement and type of sleeping spaces in a household are associated with net use [25,33,53,54]. For example, a study conducted in Western Kenya found that the net use of household members who slept on a bed in a designated bedroom was significantly higher than those without beds sleeping in nonbedrooms [54]. Using regression modeling, the same study reported that, although there was no association between net use and bed availability in the overall sample, when they limited their analysis to only those households with enough nets to cover all household members, bed availability and numbers of rooms were significantly associated with net use. This result suggests that a lack of access to a bed and the requirement to use nondesignated sleeping spaces may significantly impact net use

Social support

Rickard *et al* hypothesized that ITN use could be improved in a community by increasing social pressure and support [49]. Self-evaluation of their intervention suggests that their hypothesis may be correct. Beyond this study, the evidence in the malaria literature indicating an association between social support and ITN use is scanty. The relationship between social support and overall health and wellbeing, however, has been described in theory [55,56] and there is substantial empirical evidence showing its influence in the adoption of other health behaviors requiring consistent maintenance such as: smoking cessation [57], weight loss [58], and medical regimen adherence [59].

Therefore, it is probable that social support impacts ITN use behaviors and should be considered in future studies on the determinants of net use.

Net level

Physical characteristics of nets

Physical characteristics of ITNs can influence an individual's decision or ability to use them regularly and appropriately. Preferences for certain net type, color and shape may be an important factor determining net use behaviors [24,33,60,61]. For example: results from an ethnographic household survey conducted in Central Kenya found that 63% of the population preferred rectangular-shaped over conical-shaped nets because they accommodate comparatively more people [33]. This preference likely reflects the fact that, in many contexts, social, structural and environmental factors make it necessary for multiple household members to share same sleeping space. In this same study, it was found that 51% of respondents preferred green colored nets reportedly because this color of net was less likely to look dirty. Many of the households in the sample used firewood for cooking and lighting which was said to produce a lot of smoke that made 'bright colored' nets appear dirty. In another study conducted in Burkina Faso [46], individuals living in smaller homes where sleeping spaces are converted for alternate use in the daytime found large and bulky nets undesirable, not only because of the difficulty associated with set-up and take down, but also because of concerns that these nets present a fire risk in households where open flames are used for cooking indoors.

Condition of ITNs

The condition of a net has also been shown to be associated with its use [15,30,62,63]. In one qualitative study, participants commonly reported that they did not

use ITNs due a belief that the ITN is no longer effective or that it is in poor condition (i.e. has holes or looks dirty) [43]. Similarly, Ngondi *et al*'s analysis of Ethiopian MIS data found that net age and damage level were independent predictors of non-use [35]. A net with fewer holes is more likely to be used (not to mention more effective) and households with a greater proportion of older nets have less overall net use compared to households with a greater proportion of new nets [32].

Physical Environment Level

Household structure and construction materials

Housing characteristics have also been found to influence a family's mosquito control efforts. Keating *et al* [64] reported that, in a coastal community in Kenya, household wall type was associated with a household's mosquito control methods (including ITN use). Household living in structures with 'mud-wood-coral walls' (aOR 0.394; 95% CI: 0.236-0.659) or walls made of mud blocks with plaster (aOR 0.466; 95% CI: 0.250-0.867) were less likely to use multiple mosquito control measures than households living in dwellings with cement walls. It is difficult, however, to interpret these results with respect to net use alone as the authors used a scored value as their dependent variable that was equal to 1 if the household reported ITN use and at least one additional mosquito control measure and 0 if not. Furthermore, this result is likely highly reflective of SES where households with cement walls generally have more disposable income and may be more able to afford these additional methods.

Community Level

Cultural beliefs and practices

Cultural beliefs and practices can have a substantial impact on a community's acceptance of ITN practices [41,62,65-67]. A focus group discussion among men in Kenya revealed that, in at least one community, "a white net symbolises [*sic*] death" and thus when individuals in the community were presented with a free white ITN, many had the belief that sleeping under it 'invites death in the family' [62]. Certain 'special events' and ceremonies – funerals in particular – have an impact on net use as well [41]. In-depth interviews of individuals in a Tanzanian community discovered that during funeral ceremonies individuals will sleep outside and the cultural norm forbids the use of bed nets out of reverence for the deceased [41]. Populations of Vanuatu were described to have decreased net use due to all night dancing rituals that were held out of doors [65]. Additionally, the women in this community slept in separate huts when menstruating and a net was not always available for them to use [65].

Social norms

Some routine daily activities such as socializing, queuing for water, collecting fuel and watching television, commonly take place outside at dawn and dusk and place individuals at risk during these times [41]. Interestingly, some of these activities were closely linked to sex, which may explain some of the previously described relationship observed between sex and net use [41]. Temporary, periodic or infrequent conditions have been found to inhibit even frequent users from sleeping under nets [41,64,68-70]. Net use can be disrupted when individuals return home from work or socializing late at night and do not wish to disturb other family members by setting up their bed net [30] or when individuals must sleep in the fields during planting or harvest season [41]. Other conditions resulting in disruption of regular net use include traveling, disruption of the usual sleeping arrangements, net unavailability due to washing, extreme fatigue, labor pains, illness and forgetfulness [41,64,68-70].

Environment Level

Season/climate

It has been demonstrated by several studies that nets are used more often during the rainy season [28,37], likely due to the increased mosquito density and malaria prevalence that accompanies this season. Nocturnal temperatures have also been demonstrated to have an effect on ITN use. In some regions, individuals report that heat discomfort is a significant barrier to consistent net use [33,47,53]. Interestingly the reverse has also been reported where individuals value the warmth a net provides and are thus motivated to use nets during cooler seasons [30,33].

Perceived mosquito density

Perceived mosquito density and nuisance biting are also frequently reported reasons for increased net use and conversely, perceived low mosquito density has been shown to be associated with decreases in net use [33,37,43,44,53,71].

Urban/rural residence

When location of residence is found to be significantly associated with net use, residing in an urban setting is more commonly associated with increased net use compared to residing in rural areas [32,36,38,39]. For example, this has been observed in populations in Ethiopia where women in urban areas are more likely to sleep under a net [39], Equatorial Guinea where there is higher net use among children under age five if

they live in urban areas [38] and in Nigeria where urban residence is independently associated with net use among pregnant women [36]. Not all literature examined found an association between urban/rural residence and net use. The aforementioned study by Eisele *et al* reported that urban/rural residency is not significantly associated in any of the 15 African countries they investigated [31].

Concluding summary

As outlined here, there are numerous inter-connected factors that potentially influence net use on a variety of levels including: intrapersonal level factors such as: age, sex, SES, education level, occupation, knowledge, beliefs and risk perceptions of malaria and net use/care skills and self-efficacy; interpersonal factors such as: family size and composition, intra-household sleeping arrangements and social support; net level factors such as: the physical characteristics of the nets themselves including their size, shape, color, cost, and the perceived and actual condition of nets; physical environment level factors such as: household structure and construction materials; community level factors such as: cultural beliefs and practices and social norms; and environmental level factors such as: season, climate and urban/rural residence.

Historically, the majority of research on determinants of net use has focused on interpersonal and environmental level factors and it is only in more recent years that the malaria research community has begun to investigate the more nuanced interpersonal and community level factors discussed here. The vast majority of studies employed qualitative methods or descriptive statistics that compare proportions of net use between population groups, and relatively few studies have utilized statistical regression modeling to investigate the association between these potential factors and net use. The direction and magnitude of reported associations can vary significantly between studies, depending on analysis method, geographic location and epidemiological setting utilized.

Relevance to the proposed study

The proposed analysis will focus on furthering the understanding of the relationship between net use and some of the more commonly studied intrapersonal level demographic and psychological factors as well as a variety of less studied determinants including net use self-efficacy, social support and social norms. The analysis will employ regression modeling as this is a method that has not been frequently utilized in previous research. A net ownership control variable will be included in the multivariable model to address the need for differentiating between net use and net ownership highlighted in the literature presented.

Regression Analysis of Determinants of Bed Net Use in Southeast Nigeria following Mass Distribution of LLINs: Implications for Social Behavior Change Interventions

Contribution of Student

For this manuscript, the student conducted all statistical analyses presented, created all figures and tables and wrote the manuscript with editorial assistance from Amy E. Patterson and Deborah A. McFarland.

Abstract

Background: Millions of long-lasting insecticide treated nets (LLINs) have been distributed as part of the global malaria control strategy. LLIN ownership, however, does not necessarily guarantee LLIN use. Thus, even in the ideal setting in which universal coverage with LLINs has been achieved, maximal malaria protection will only be achieved if LLINs are used both correctly and consistently. This study aims to investigate the factors associated with net use, independent of net ownership.

Methods and Findings: A secondary data analysis was performed using data collected from a household survey conducted in southeastern Nigeria in November 2011 following a statewide mass LLIN distribution campaign and, in select locations, a community-based behavior change communications (BCC) intervention. Multivariable logistic regression analyses, controlling for household bed net ownership, were employed to examine the association between individual net use and various demographic, environmental, behavioral and social factors. Our findings indicate that the odds of net use increase among individuals who were exposed to tailored behavior change communications (BCC) in the context of a home visit (OR=17.11; 95% CI 4.45-65.79) or who receive a greater degree of social support from friends and family (ptrend < 0.001). Factors that decrease the odds of net use include: increasing education level (ptrend = 0.020), increasing malaria knowledge level (ptrend = 0.022), and reporting any disadvantage of bed nets (OR=0.39; 95% CI 0.23-0.78).

Conclusion: This study suggests that LLIN use is significantly influenced by social support and exposure to a malaria-related BCC home visit. The malaria community should thus further consider the importance of interpersonal communication and social influences on adoption of net use behaviors when designing future research and interventions.

Introduction

In 2010, malaria was responsible for approximately 220 million infections and 600,000 deaths, greater than 90% of which occurred on the African continent – mostly in children less than five years of age [1]. Insecticide-treated nets (ITNs) have been shown to reduce the incidence of malaria episodes by 50% in endemic areas [2] and have accordingly become one of the key strategies employed in the global malaria response [3]. Millions of free and highly subsidized ITNs and long-lasting insecticide treated nets (LLINs) have been distributed in the last decade [4-8] resulting in substantial increases in ITN ownership in many malaria-endemic countries [9-12]. Several studies have suggested that ITN ownership is not necessarily equivalent to ITN use [5,13-18]. This presents a significant obstacle to realizing the maximum potential benefits of ITNs for malaria-related morbidity and mortality since ITNs are maximally protective only when utilized correctly and consistently [7,9,19-21].

Previous studies have explored this apparent difference between net ownership and use. The list of potential determinants of ITN use identified in the current literature includes: demographic characteristics [12,13,19,22-28]; an individual's knowledge, beliefs and risk perceptions related to malaria and bed nets [19,29-38]; dwelling construction, family size/composition and sleeping arrangements [13,19,25,28,30,34,39-41]; physical characteristics of bed nets [25,30,31]; environmental factors [25,30,34,42]; and community and cultural characteristics [28,31,37,39]. However, programmatic implications of these findings are not always obvious given that the direction and magnitude of reported associations vary significantly by analysis method, geographic location and epidemiological setting. This paper will explore the determinants of net use through analysis of a household survey conducted in the specific context of southeastern Nigeria and discuss their implications for programmatic interventions to increase LLIN use.

Nigeria alone contributes 25% of the African malaria burden [43]. With nearly all of the country's 160 million people at risk, and an estimated 110 million cases a year, malaria is Nigeria's most significant public health issue [44]. Since the first national strategic plan for malaria control was introduced in 2006, ITNs, and more recently LLINs, have comprised the central component of the national malaria control efforts [45-47]. In 2000, only 10% of households owned any type of mosquito net. However by 2010, this figure increased to 44% [48]. At the national level significant work remains to achieve the target of 80% household LLIN coverage [47].

There is no standard method in the literature to control for variations in net possession levels when investigating determinants of net use. Various studies have addressed this issue by limiting their analysis to households owning at least one net. A limitation to this approach is that it does not account for household size – one net may be sufficient for a household of two but inadequate for a family of five. Perhaps a more rigorous approach to this issue is to also control for household net density (number of nets per household member).

The analysis presented here contributes to the growing body of work on determinants of net use by exploring which characteristics are most strongly associated with net use among an adult population in a malaria-endemic region that has recently completed a statewide mass LLIN distribution campaign, while controlling for the confounding effects of household net density.

Methods

The Carter Center, in collaboration with the Nigerian Federal Ministry of Health (FMOH), conducted annual malaria cluster surveys in four local government areas (LGAs) of Ebonyi and Imo states (Figure 1) from 2007 to 2011 in the context of a Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF)-funded study examining the use of community-wide LLIN distributions to interrupt lymphatic filariasis (LF) transmission [49]. This paper presents the results from a secondary analysis of the 2011 survey data collected in Ebonyi state in order to examine determinants of net use following a mass LLIN distribution campaign and, in select areas, a behavior change communication intervention. Imo State did not complete its mass campaign prior to the 2011 survey and thus was excluded from these analyses.

Ebonyi occupies an area of approximately 5,935 square kilometers and nearly all of its 1.7 million inhabitants are at risk of malaria. *Anopheles* mosquitoes belonging to the *Anopheles gambiae* complex are the most commonly reported malaria and LF vector species in the area [50], which allows for simultaneous targeting of malaria and LF transmission through LLIN distribution. The region has two distinct seasons – rainy from April to October and dry from November to March. The dominant species of malaria parasite, *Plasmodium falciparum*, is transmitted perennially, although malaria episodes usually peak towards the end of the rainy season [50]. The majority of the region lies below 200 meters above sea level thus elevation is likely to have little effect on malaria transmission. The people of Ebonyi are predominantly Christian, of Igbo ethnicity and participate in agricultural-based livelihood activities [44].

LLIN distribution

Between January and March 2011 a total of 997,492 LLINs were distributed in Ebonyi state by the National Malaria Control Program (NMCP) and its partners, including The Carter Center, through a statewide mass LLIN distribution campaign that employed a two-nets-per-household strategy. Prior to this, The Carter Center, in collaboration with the Ebonyi State Ministry of Health, distributed 250,000 LLINs in the LGAs included in the BMGF-funded LF study between 2008 and 2010.

Behavior change communication intervention

A community-based behavior change communications (BCC) intervention to increase the correct and consistent use of LLINs was designed by The Carter Center and implemented through partnership with the Ebonyi State MOH. The intervention was piloted from July to November 2011 within six sentinel villages (SVs) where monthly entomological monitoring was conducted as part of the larger LF study. Community health promoters (CHPs), selected by their community leaders, carried out the intervention at the household and community level. BCC intervention activities included: 1) monthly home visits by CHPs to conduct tailored behavior change communication and monitor LLIN use and care; 2) mobilization of community and religious leaders to support and promote malaria control interventions; and 3) organization of community events including: net washing and mending days; workshops to build portable net hanging frames; and malaria-related performances and demonstrations.

Household sample selection

A complete list of census enumeration areas (EAs) was utilized to systematically select 14 clusters from each study LGA in Ebonyi State. An additional 30 clusters were systematically selected form the six sentinel villages where the BCC intervention was conducted to allow for comparative analysis. It was assumed *a priori* that all EAs were of approximately equal size. If an EA contained too many households to survey in one day, it was segmented using an algorithm based on the number of households in the EA described in UNICEF MICS sampling protocol [51]. The survey team visited all 955 households in 58 selected clusters.

Survey instrument

The survey instrument (Appendix I), developed by The Carter Center, included questions on malaria and anemia prevalence, net ownership and net use, as well as household and sleeping space characteristics, and demographics. In addition, a more extensive knowledge, attitudes and practices module than is generally included in

standard Malaria Indicator Survey and Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey questionnaires (henceforth referred to as 'extended KAP module') was administered to a selection of adult household members. This module was informed by social behavioral theory [52-55] and, in addition to questions concerning knowledge and attitudes, examined malariarelated social support, social norms, self-efficacy, exposure to information and communications, and temporal/seasonal variation in net use (data not presented). Data were collected from heads of households and their spouses to obtain the perspective of those who likely have the greatest influence over household net use, as well as to capture both male and female perspectives. After obtaining consent, trained survey staff interviewed either the head of household or his spouse (in male-headed households), alternating from one dwelling to the next. In every third household visited, the extended KAP module was administered to both the head of household and his spouse. In cases where neither the head of household nor his spouse was available, an alternate adult male or female family member was selected. In households in which there were multiple wives, each wife was considered the head of her household.

Data entry

Household survey data were collected in paper format, double entered by trained data entry staff using Access and subsequently converted to Epi Info 7 [56] to check data for entry accuracy using the Data Compare procedures. Data were cleaned in Access and then converted for analysis in SAS 9.3 (SAS Institute Inc.).

Statistical analysis

Relevant descriptive statistics were calculated to examine the characteristics of the sample population. Proportions and means of population characteristics were
estimated, adjusting for clustering effects and sampling weights. A net density variable was calculated by dividing the total number of nets in a household by the number of resident household members. Principal components analyses, conducted using the methods of Der and Everitt [57], were utilized in the development of several variables including: household wealth index [58]; net care knowledge score; net use skills and self-efficacy score; malaria-related social norms and rumors score; LF knowledge score; malaria knowledge score created using five variables examining respondents' correct knowledge of causes, symptoms and prevention methods; social support score created from six survey questions investigating the frequency (never, rarely, sometimes, often, always) of net hanging assistance and encouragement respondents received from their spouse, children and friends.

Only respondents to the extended KAP module residing in Ebonyi State and living in households owning at least one net were included in the analysis of determinants of net use. Figure 2 presents a flow chart depicting the male and female modified KAP survey module respondents (henceforth referred to as 'respondents') included in this analysis. To assess determinants of net use among respondents, potential explanatory factors with a bivariate association with net use (as measured by self-reported net use last night) at significance p < 0.25, according to the procedures of Heeringa *et al* [59], were selected as candidates for main effects in a multivariable logistic regression model. Regression analysis, assuming missing values were not missing completely at random, was employed to provide more conservative variance estimates. Explanatory factors were removed individually from the model in order of least significance. Independently associated factors at significance p < 0.05 (*p*trend < 0.05 for categorical variables with multiple levels) were retained in the final model. To control for the potential confounding effects of differences in net ownership, the continuous net density variable was retained in the final multivariable model. Odds ratios, 95% confidence intervals and their corresponding p-values were calculated adjusting for the cluster survey design and sampling strategy.

Ethical approval

The Imo and Ebonyi State Ministries of Health, Imo State University and the Emory University Institutional Review Board approved the comprehensive protocol, including consent forms (Emory IRB Protocol # 5533).

Results

Household net ownership and use

Table 1 presents weighted estimates of net ownership and use indicators. An estimated 72.19% (95% confidence interval [CI] 60.30%-84.09%) of households in Ebonyi own at least one bed net and 60.38% (95% CI 48.44%-72.31%) own at least two. An average household owns 1.52 (95% CI 1.24-1.81) nets, equating to a net density of approximately 0.57 (95% CI 0.52-0.62) nets per person. Greater than 99% (95% CI 99.26%-100%) of all bed nets owned are LLINs and 80.08% (95% CI 74.65%-85.51%) were used the night prior to the survey. Among households owning at least one net, 74.10% (95% CI 68.57%-79.63%) of individuals slept under an LLIN the night prior to the survey. Children less than five years of age in these households had the highest proportion of net use (79.92%; 95% CI 72.87%-86.97%) and adolescents 15-19 years of age had the lowest (63.64%; 95% CI 53.90%-73.39%).

Association between potential determinants and LLIN use

Bivariate logistic regression analysis of associations between explanatory factors and net use, among respondents residing in households owning at least one LLIN is presented in Table 2. At the 95% significance level, net use is associated with several factors including: female sex (OR = 1.77; 95% CI 1.16-2.71), behavior change communication intervention (OR=4.43; 95% CI 2.64-7.44), receipt of a malaria-related home visit (OR=16.55; 95% CI 6.02-45.50), increasing net hanging skills and selfefficacy (*p*trend = 0.040), increasing social support (*p*trend = 0.0298) and decreasing malaria knowledge (*p*trend = 0.0079).

Factors with significance between p = 0.05 and p = 0.25 utilized in the multivariable model included: net density (*p*trend = 0.112), education level (*p*trend = 0.1062), describing any disadvantages of bed nets (p = 0.064) and opinion on whether it is safe to hang a net where food is stored (*p*trend = 0.236). Several additional factors were investigated in the bivariate analysis and found not to be significant at the p < 0.25 level and were therefore excluded from the multivariable analysis including: age; wealth index; occupation; knowledge of appropriate net use, care and hanging; and net-related stereotypes, rumors and perceived social norms.

The multivariable logistic regression analysis results are presented in Table 3. Controlling for household net density, net use among respondents in households owning at least one net is associated with two explanatory factors: receiving a malaria related BCC home visit recently (OR=17.11; 95% CI 4.45-65.79) and increasing social support score (*p*trend < 0.001), where individuals with moderate and high social support are, respectively, 4.01 (95% CI 1.97-8.16) and 2.22 (95% CI 1.34-3.70) times as likely to

sleep under an LLIN as individuals with low social support. Additionally, two factors are associated decreased odds of net use including: reporting any disadvantage of mosquito nets (OR=0.39; 95% CI 0.23-0.78) and increasing education level (*p*trend = 0.020), where individuals with primary and secondary or greater education levels were, respectively, 0.43 (95% CI 0.19-0.95) and 0.42 (0.23-0.78) times as likely to use an LLIN as individuals with no education. Level of malaria-related knowledge was also significantly associated with net use (*p*trend = 0.022). Individuals with a moderate level of malaria knowledge were less likely (OR = 0.40; 95% CI 0.19-0.95) to sleep under an LLIN as individuals with low malarial knowledge, however, individuals with high levels of malaria knowledge were similarly likely to sleep under an LLIN (OR = 0.88; 95% CI 0.39-2.02) as those with low knowledge.

Discussion

This study aimed to investigate the factors associated with LLIN use in male and female heads of household, and wives of male heads of household, living in two LGAs in Ebonyi, Nigeria following the completion of a mass LLIN distribution campaign and BCC intervention. Findings indicate that exposure to a malaria-related home visit (a component of The Carter Center's BCC intervention), level of social support from friends and family, reporting any disadvantage of nets, education level and degree of malaria-related knowledge are significantly associated with LLIN use in this population.

The findings presented here highlight several areas that should be investigated further. It is perhaps unsurprising that report of LLIN disadvantages is significantly associated with net non-use. However, elucidation of the specific disadvantages most strongly associated with net non-use may highlight areas of improvement for LLIN design, distributions and communication messages. Previous studies present conflicting evidence of the association between education level and net use [26,33,60-62]. Our results suggest that individuals with higher education are less likely to sleep under a net. While occupation and wealth index were not significantly associated with net use, it is possible that education level is, in some way, demonstrating the effect that socioeconomic status (SES) has on net use in this population. SES may be associated with improved housing conditions, indoor occupational setting and reduced risk perception of malaria due to the decreased financial barriers to other malaria prevention and treatment tools. A more sensitive survey instrument designed to examine this relationship may be able to shed light on the underlying factors of this association. The relationship between malaria knowledge and net use in this population also requires further investigation since the direction of the effect of malaria knowledge on net use is unclear in our results. The variables included in the knowledge score measured a respondent's possession of medically correct knowledge of malaria causes, prevention and treatment. Further investigation into whether individuals believe the facts they report or possess local disease knowledge that runs contrary to the medically correct knowledge measured may assist in understanding this relationship more fully.

This study demonstrates the influence of social support on net use behavior. To our knowledge, this is the first time that such a relationship has been explored in regression analyses of determinants of net use. The relationship between social support and overall health and wellbeing has been described in theory [63,64], and supported by empirical evidence describing its influence on the adoption of other health behaviors that, like LLIN use, require continuous maintenance: smoking cessation [65], weight loss [66],

and medical regimen adherence [67]. The relationship between net use and social support suggests new focus for messages employed in future BCC interventions, though its importance in other contexts should be confirmed. The data suggest that tailored behavior change interventions that include home visits, as described here, or some other form of interpersonal communication, may be more effective than mass communication campaigns that focus on increasing malaria knowledge. Exposure to BCC home visits was the most significantly associated determinant of net use in this study population. Although intervention process data (not presented) indicates that greater than 90% of households in intervention villages received a home visit, only approximately half of respondents in these villages reported receiving such a visit. While over-reporting of performance by CHPs is certainly possible, this may mean that the individuals who participated in the extended KAP module during the survey were not at home at the time of the visit. This information, combined with the lack of observed association between residence in an intervention village and net use, suggests that the influence of the intervention might be limited to those individuals directly exposed, and that there may be limited diffusion of information between household members. Further investigations to better understand why this is could inform modifications to future social behavior change interventions increasing the effect of the intervention on all household members, not only those home during the visit.

Conclusion

Results presented here, specifically in regards to the novel description of the influence of social support and BCC home visits on net use, can be used to inform future interventions and research on determinants of LLIN use in Nigeria and should be

examined in other contexts as well. Additional exploration of the social environment in which net use behaviors are adopted and encouraged should be the focus of future studies and should inform behavior change communication strategies aimed at increasing appropriate and consistent net use in a population once barriers to net ownership have been reduced.

References

- 1. World Health organization (2012) World Malaria Report 2012. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.
- 2. Lengeler C (2004) Insecticide-treated bed nets and curtains for preventing malaria. Cochrane Database Syst Rev.
- 3. Nabarro D (1999) Roll Back Malaria. Parassitologia 41: 501-504.
- 4. Guyatt H, Ochola S (2003) Use of bednets given free to pregnant women in Kenya. Lancet 362: 1549-1550.
- 5. Thwing J, Hochberg N, Vanden Eng J, Issifi S, Eliades MJ, et al. (2008) Insecticide-treated net ownership and usage in Niger after a nationwide integrated campaign. Trop Med Int Health 13: 827-834.
- 6. Grabowsky M, Nobiya T, Ahun M, Donna R, Lengor M, et al. (2005) Distributing insecticidetreated bednets during measles vaccination: a low-cost means of achieving high and equitable coverage. Bull World Health Organ 83: 195-201.
- 7. Grabowsky M, Farrell N, Hawley W, Chimumbwa J, Hoyer S, et al. (2005) Integrating insecticide-treated bednets into a measles vaccination campaign achieves high, rapid and equitable coverage with direct and voucher-based methods. Trop Med Int Health 10: 1151-1160.
- 8. Eisele TP, Macintyre K, Yukich J, Ghebremeskel T (2006) Interpreting household survey data intended to measure insecticide-treated bednet coverage: results from two surveys in Eritrea. Malar J 5: 36.
- 9. Baume CA, Marin MC (2008) Gains in awareness, ownership and use of insecticide-treated nets in Nigeria, Senegal, Uganda and Zambia. Malar J 7: 153.
- 10. Gerstl S, Dunkley S, Mukhtar A, Maes P, De Smet M, et al. (2010) Long-lasting insecticidetreated net usage in eastern Sierra Leone - the success of free distribution. Trop Med Int Health 15: 480-488.
- 11. Hanson K, Marchant T, Nathan R, Mponda H, Jones C, et al. (2009) Household ownership and use of insecticide treated nets among target groups after implementation of a national voucher programme in the United Republic of Tanzania: plausibility study using three annual cross sectional household surveys. BMJ 339: b2434.
- 12. Noor AM, Amin AA, Akhwale WS, Snow RW (2007) Increasing coverage and decreasing inequity in insecticide-treated bed net use among rural Kenyan children. PLoS Med 4: e255.
- 13. Baume CA, Marin MC (2007) Intra-household mosquito net use in Ethiopia, Ghana, Mali, Nigeria, Senegal, and Zambia: Are nets being used? Who in the household uses them? American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene 77: 963-971.
- 14. Githinji S, Herbst S, Kistemann T, Noor AM (2010) Mosquito nets in a rural area of Western Kenya: ownership, use and quality. Malar J 9: 250.
- 15. Korenromp EL, Miller J, Cibulskis RE, Cham MK, Alnwick D, et al. (2003) Monitoring mosquito net coverage for malaria control in Africa: possession vs. use by children under 5 years. Tropical Medicine & International Health 8: 693-703.
- 16. Ndjinga JK, Minakawa N (2010) The importance of education to increase the use of bed nets in villages outside of Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo. Malaria Journal 9.
- 17. Okrah J, Traore C, Pale A, Sommerfeld J, Muller O (2002) Community factors associated with malaria prevention by mosquito nets: an exploratory study in rural Burkina Faso. Tropical Medicine & International Health 7: 240-248.
- Tobin-West CI, Alex-Hart BA (2011) Insecticide treated bednet ownership and utilization in Rivers State, Nigeria before a state-wide net distribution campaign. J Vector Borne Dis 48: 133-137.

- 19. Toe LP, Skovmand O, Dabire KR, Diabate A, Diallo Y, et al. (2009) Decreased motivation in the use of insecticide-treated nets in a malaria endemic area in Burkina Faso. Malar J 8: 175.
- 20. Monasch R, Reinisch A, Steketee RW, Korenromp EL, Alnwick D, et al. (2004) Child coverage with mosquito nets and malaria treatment from population-based surveys in african countries: a baseline for monitoring progress in roll back malaria. Am J Trop Med Hyg 71: 232-238.
- 21. Njau RJ, de Savigny D, Gilson L, Mwageni E, Mosha FW (2009) Implementation of an insecticide-treated net subsidy scheme under a public-private partnership for malaria control in Tanzania--challenges in implementation. Malar J 8: 201.
- 22. Aikins MK, Pickering H, Alonso PL, D'Alessandro U, Lindsay SW, et al. (1993) A malaria control trial using insecticide-treated bed nets and targeted chemoprophylaxis in a rural area of The Gambia, west Africa. 4. Perceptions of the causes of malaria and of its treatment and prevention in the study area. Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg 87 Suppl 2: 25-30.
- 23. MacCormack CP, Snow RW (1986) Gambian cultural preferences in the use of insecticideimpregnated bed nets. Journal of Tropical Medicine & Hygiene 89: 295-302.
- 24. Thomson M, Connor S, Bennett S, D'Alessandro U, Milligan P, et al. (1996) Geographical perspectives on bednet use and malaria transmission in The Gambia, West Africa. Soc Sci Med 43: 101-112.
- 25. Alaii JA, Hawley WA, Kolczak MS, ter Kuile FO, Gimnig JE, et al. (2003) Factors affecting use of permethrin-treated bed nets during a randomized controlled trial in western Kenya. American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene 68: 137-141.
- 26. Eisele TP, Keating J, Littrell M, Larsen D, Macintyre K (2009) Assessment of insecticidetreated bednet use among children and pregnant women across 15 countries using standardized national surveys. American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene 80: 209-214.
- 27. Rashed S, Johnson H, Dongier P, Moreau R, Lee C, et al. (1999) Determinants of the Permethrin Impregnated Bednets (PIB) in the Republic of Benin: the role of women in the acquisition and utilization of PIBs. Social Science & Medicine 49: 993-1005.
- Dunn CE, Le Mare A, Makungu C (2011) Malaria risk behaviours, socio-cultural practices and rural livelihoods in southern Tanzania: Implications for bednet usage. Social Science & Medicine 72: 408-417.
- 29. Adongo PB, Kirkwood B, Kendall C (2005) How local community knowledge about malaria affects insecticide-treated net use in northern Ghana. Trop Med Int Health 10: 366-378.
- 30. Baume CA, Reithinger R, Woldehanna S (2009) Factors associated with use and non-use of mosquito nets owned in Oromia and Amhara regional states, Ethiopia. Malar J 8: 264.
- 31. Chuma J, Okungu V, Ntwiga J, Molyneux C (2010) Towards achieving Abuja targets: identifying and addressing barriers to access and use of insecticides treated nets among the poorest populations in Kenya. BMC Public Health 10: 137.
- 32. Dye TD, Apondi R, Lugada ES, Kahn JG, Smith J, et al. (2010) "Before we used to get sick all the time": perceptions of malaria and use of long-lasting insecticide-treated bed nets (LLINs) in a rural Kenyan community. Malar J 9: 345.
- 33. Hwang J, Graves PM, Jima D, Reithinger R, Kachur SP, et al. (2010) Knowledge of malaria and its association with malaria-related behaviors: Results from the Malaria Indicator Survey, Ethiopia, 2007. Plos One 5.
- 34. Ng'ang'a PN, Jayasinghe G, Kimani V, Shililu J, Kabutha C, et al. (2009) Bed net use and associated factors in a rice farming community in Central Kenya. Malaria Journal 8.
- 35. Nganda RY, Drakeley C, Reyburn H, Marchant T (2004) Knowledge of malaria influences the use of insecticide treated nets but not intermittent presumptive treatment by pregnant women in Tanzania. Malar J 3: 42.

- 36. Cohee L, Mills LA, Kagaayi J, Jacobs I, Galiwango R, et al. (2009) High retention and appropriate use of insecticide-treated nets distributed to HIV-affected households in Rakai, Uganda: results from interviews and home visits. Malaria Journal 8.
- 37. Rickard DG, Dudovitz RN, Wong MD, Jen HC, Osborn RD, et al. (2011) Closing the gap between insecticide treated net ownership and use for the prevention of malaria. Prog Community Health Partnersh 5: 123-131.
- Widmar M, Nagel CJ, Ho DY, Benziger PW, Hennig N (2009) Determining and addressing obstacles to the effective use of long-lasting insecticide-impregnated nets in rural Tanzania. Malar J 8: 315.
- Wiseman V, Scott A, McElroy B, Conteh L, Stevens W (2007) Determinants of bed net use in The Gambia: Implications for malaria control. American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene 76: 830-836.
- 40. Iwashita H, Dida G, Futami K, Sonye G, Kaneko S, et al. (2010) Sleeping arrangement and house structure affect bed net use in villages along Lake Victoria. Malar J 9: 176.
- 41. Keating J, Macintyre K, Mbogo CM, Githure JI, Beier JC (2005) Self-reported malaria and mosquito avoidance in relation to household risk factors in a Kenyan coastal city. J Biosoc Sci 37: 761-771.
- 42. Pulford J, Hetzel MW, Bryant M, Siba PM, Mueller I (2011) Reported reasons for not using a mosquito net when one is available: a review of the published literature. Malaria Journal 10.
- 43. World Health Organization (2010) World Malaria Report 2010. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.
- 44. National Population Commision (NPC) [Nigeria], ICF Macro (2009) Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey 2008. Abuja, Nigeria: National Population Commision and ICF Macro.
- 45. Federal Ministry of Health (FMoH) [Nigeria], National Malaria Control Programme (NMCP) [Nigeria] (2006) A Road Map for Impact on Malaria in Nigeria. A 5-year Strategic Plan: 2006-2010. Abuja, Nigeria: Federal Ministry of Health and National Malaria Control Programme.
- 46. Federal Ministry of Health (FMoH) [Nigeria], National Malaria Control Programme (NMCP) [Nigeria] (2008) Strategic Plan for Malaria Control in Nigeria 2009-2013. Abuja, Nigeria: Federal Ministry of Health and National Malaria Control Programme,.
- Federal Ministry of Health (FMoH) [Nigeria], National Malaria Control Programme (NMCP) [Nigeria]. Nigeria National Malaria Control Programme 2012 Program Update; 2013 March 8, 2013; Atlanta, GA.
- 48. Academy for Educational Development NetMark Project (2009) Nigeria NetMark Household Survey on Insecticide-Treated Nets 2008. Business Interactive Consulting (Nigeria), National Population Commission of Nigeria, Uganda Chartered Healthnet, Makerere University.
- 49. Richards FO, Emukah E, Graves PM, Nkwocha O, Nwankwo L, et al. (Unpublished) Community-wide distribution of long lasting insecticidal nets can halt transmission of lymphatic filariasis in souteast Nigeria.
- 50. Okorie PN, McKenzie FE, Ademowo OG, Bockarie M, Kelly-Hope L (2011) Nigeria Anopheles Vector Database: An Overview of 100 Years' of Reserach. PLoS ONE 6: e28347.
- 51. United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) (2006) Multiple indicator cluster survey manual 2005: Monitoring the situation of children and women.
- 52. Rosenstock IM (1974) The health belief model and preventive health behavior. Health Education & Behavior 2: 354-386.
- 53. Sallis JF, Owen N, Fisher EB (2008) Ecological models of health behavior. Health behavior and health education: Theory, research, and practice 4: 465-486.

- 54. Prochaska JO, Velicer WF (1997) The transtheoretical model of health behavior change. American journal of health promotion 12: 38-48.
- 55. Heaney CA, Israel BA (2008) Social networks and social support. In: Glanz K, Rimer BK, Viswanath K, editors. Health Behavior and Health Education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. pp. 189-210.
- 56. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2013) Epi Info.
- 57. Der G, Everitt BS (2009) A handbook of statistical analyses using SAS. Boca Raton, FL: Chapman & Hall/CRC.
- 58. Vyas S, Kumaranayake L (2006) Constructing socio-economic status indices: how to use principal components analysis. Health Policy Plan 21: 459-468.
- 59. Heeringa SG, West BT, Berglund PA (2010) Applied survey data analysis. FL, USA: Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- 60. Atieli HE, Zhou G, Afrane Y, Lee MC, Mwanzo I, et al. (2011) Insecticide-treated net (ITN) ownership, usage, and malaria transmission in the highlands of western Kenya. Parasit Vectors 4: 113.
- 61. Garcia-Basteiro AL, Schwabe C, Aragon C, Baltazar G, Rehman AM, et al. (2011) Determinants of bed net use in children under five and household bed net ownership on Bioko Island, Equatorial Guinea. Malaria Journal 10.
- 62. Ankomah A, Adebayo SB, Arogundade ED, Anyanti J, Nwokolo E, et al. (2012) Determinants of insecticide-treated net ownership and utilization among pregnant women in Nigeria. BMC Public Health 12: 105.
- 63. Glanz K, Rimer BK, Viswanath K (2008) Health behavior and health education: theory, research, and practice: Jossey-Bass.
- 64. Umberson D, Karas Montez J (2010) Social Relationships and Health: A Flashpoint for Health Policy. Journal of Health & Social Behavior 51: S54-S66.
- 65. Palmer CA, Baucom DH, McBride CM (2000) Couple approaches to smoking cessation.
- 66. Jeffery RW, Epstein LH, Wilson GT, Drewnowski A, Stunkard AJ, et al. (2000) Long-term maintenance of weight loss: current status. Health psychology 19: 5.
- 67. DiMatteo MR (2004) Social support and patient adherence to medical treatment: a metaanalysis. Health psychology 23: 207.

Figures and Tables







Figure 1. Flow chart of KAP survey module analysis sample

Characteristic	n(%) or mean(SD)	Weighted % or mean	or 95%		
Household LLIN ownership					
Proportion of HH with at least one bed net	773(85.79)	72.19	60.30	84.09	
Proportion of HH with at least two bed nets	683(75.80)	60.38	48.44	72.31	
Mean number of nets per HH	1.88(1.06)	1.52	1.24	1.81	
Mean HH net density (nets per person)*†	0.59(0.40)	0.57	0.52	0.62	
Net characteristics					
Proportion of nets that were LLIN(%)	1661(99.94)	99.75	99.26	100.00	
Proportion of nets used last night (%)	1318(81.86)	80.08	74.65	85.51	
Proportion of individuals using net last night*					
All ages	2934(80.98)	74.10	68.57	79.63	
Children under age 5	606(83.59)	79.92	72.87	86.97	
Children age 5-9 years	548(82.28)	75.51	67.99	83.03	
Children age 10-14 years	352(77.19)	69.52	60.98	78.07	
Adolescents age 15-19 years	255(70.83)	63.64	53.90	73.39	
Adults 20-59 years	1001(82.73)	75.23	69.90	80.57	
Persons age≥60 years	164(84.54)	78.50	65.37	91.63	

Table 1. Weighted estimates of LLIN ownership and use in Ebonyi

HH: Household; LLINs: Long-lasting insecticide treated nets; SE: Standard error;

SD: Standard deviation

*Among households owning ≥1 net

+Does not include baby nets

Factors	Total (n)	Net used last night %(SE)	OR	95% CI	<i>p</i> -value	<i>p</i> -value test for trend
Net density	•	-				
<0.05	378	71.11(4.41)	1.00	-	-	0.11
≥0.5 < 1.0	366	80.27(3.75)	1.65	1.03-2.66	0.038	
≥1.0	133	71.90(8.18)	1.04	0.42-2.57	0.93	
Sex			· · · ·			
Male	458	69.64(4.82)	1.00	-	-	
Female	419	80.24(2.73)	1.77	1.16-2.71	0.008	
Education level						
None	414	81.75(3.69)	1.00	-	-	0.11
Primary	284	69.78(5.46)	0.52	0.24-1.09	0.082	
Secondary +*	171	69.15(6.18)	0.50	0.26-0.95	0.036	
BCC Intervention	÷		-			
No	383	74.70(3.25)	1.00	-	-	
Yes	500	92.90(1.33)	4.43	2.64-7.44	<0.0001	
BCC home visit						
No	563	76.47(3.46)	1.00	-	-	
Yes	250	98.18(0.86)	16.55	6.02-45.50	<0.0001	
Malaria knowledge						
Low	310	81.63(3.35)	1.00	-	-	0.008
Moderate	220	63.32(6.26)	0.39	0.21-0.71	0.002	
High	323	77.04(3.94)	0.76	0.43-1.34	0.34	
Skills and self-efficacy	÷		-			
Low	162	74.62(7.17)	1.00	-	-	0.040
Moderate	77	89.11(4.42)	2.78	0.86-8.99	0.09	
High	630	72.35(3.71)	0.89	0.42-1.90	0.76	
Social support			•			
Low	114	63.88(5.88)	1.00	-	-	0.030
Moderate	294	82.90(3.72)	2.74	1.28-5.86	0.009	
High	466	74.82(4.44)	1.68	0.89-3.17	0.109	
Provide any disadvantage of nets						ŗ
No	703	78.10(3.35)	1.00	-	-	
Yes	180	65.44(6.62)	0.53	0.27-1.04	0.06	
It is safe to hang a net where food is stored	•		•			
Agree	227	73.71(6.19)	1.00	-	-	0.24
Neutral	325	79.80(3.88)	1.41	0.77-2.59	0.25	
Disagree	327	70.89(4.01)	0.87	0.43-1.76	0.42	

Table 2. Univariable logistic regression analysis of the association betweenindividual net use and explanatory factors among respondents living in householdsowning at least one net.

CI: confidence interval; SE: standard error; Net density: number of nets per household member;

BCC: Behavior change communications

*Secondary education or higher

Factors	OR	95% CI	p-value	<i>p</i> -value test for trend
BCC home visit				
No	1.00	-	-	
Yes	17.11	4.45-65.79	<0.0001	
Social support score	·		•	
Low	1.00	-	-	<0.001
Moderate	4.01	1.97-8.16	0.0001	
High	2.22	1.34-3.70	0.002	
Reporting any disadvantage of nets				
No	1.00	-	-	
Yes	0.39	0.23-0.78	0.003	
Education level				•
None	1.00	-	-	0.020
Primary	0.43	0.19-0.95	0.036	
Secondary or more	0.42	0.23-0.78	0.006	
Malaria knowledge score	· · ·			;
Low	1.00	-	-	0.022
Moderate	0.40	0.19-0.85	0.017	
High	0.88	0.39-2.02	0.77	

Table 3. Multivariable logistic regression analysis of association between individualnet us and explanatory factors among respondents living in households owning atleast one net and controlling for net density.

BCC: Behavior change communications

CHAPTER 4: Extended Methods

Due to word restrictions of a manuscript, some details of the methods utilized in this study were excluded from the methods section of Chapter 3. Additional detail on these analyses is provided in this chapter.

Larger LF Study design

The data used for this analysis were collected during the final annual malaria cluster survey conducted in the context of a multi-year longitudinal study that began in January 2007 and was completed in November 2011. The study aimed to demonstrate that LLINs could be used to simultaneously interrupt the transmission of LF and improve malaria control. Both Ebonyi and Imo states were included in the study due to the regional endemicity of malaria, LF and the human filarial parasite *Loa loa*, the presence of which renders the usual LF intervention of ivermectin mass drug administration undesirable due to the risk of serious adverse effects in *Loa loa* infected individuals [72]. LGAs from Ebonyi (Ohaukwu and Abakaliki) and Imo (Ohaji-Egbema and Owerri West) were selected for the study because they had the highest LF prevalence in their respective states. Three sentinel villages within each LGA were selected for monthly entomological monitoring for the duration of the study based on the following criteria: having high baseline LF antigen rates, good road access throughout the year, good security and community willingness to participate in a multi-year longitudinal study.

Principal components analyses

Principal components analyses were conducted using the methods of Der and Everitt [73] and were utilized in the development of seven composite variables including:

- Household wealth index informed by Vyas and Kumaranayake [74], and developed using the following household characteristics: household construction materials, type of sanitation facilities, household water sources, household asset ownership, household fuel materials, number of rooms in the household and the number of household members sharing a sleeping room (Appendix I: Questions Q12, Q13, Q14, Q15, Q16, Q17, Q18, Q19);
- Malaria knowledge tertiles (high, moderate and low) measuring respondents' correct biomedical knowledge of malaria causes, prevention and treatment (Appendix I: Questions M3, M4, M5, M6, M23);
- LF knowledge tertiles (high, moderate and low) measuring respondents correct biomedical knowledge of LF causes, prevention and treatment (Appendix I: Questions F1, F2, F3, F4, F5, F6);
- Net care knowledge tertiles (high, moderate and low) assessing respondents' correct knowledge of appropriate net care practices (Appendix I: Question M8, M9, M10);
- Net skills and self-efficacy tertiles (high, moderate and low) developed using variables capturing a respondents self-reported confidence in performing net hanging and care activities (Appendix I: Questions SSE1, SSE2, SSE3, SSE4, SSE5, SSE6);
- Social support tertiles comprised of questions investigating the frequency of physical assistance and encouragement respondents receive from their spouse, children and friends in regards to net hanging and use (Appendix I: Questions SS1, SS2, SS3, SS4, SS5); and

7. Social norms tertile (positive, neutral, negative) assessing the malaria-related positive and negative social norms (Appendix I: Questions SN1, SN2, SN3, SN4).

In each principal components analysis, variables with very low frequencies (<1%) were excluded due to their limited differentiation capacity. Variables with a high proportion of missing data (>10%) were eliminated to reduce introduction of bias.

BCC Intervention Assessment

In addition to the investigation into determinants of net use described in Chapter 3, a preliminary assessment of the behavior change communications intervention conducted by The Carter Center was performed to evaluate the BCC intervention by comparing areas that did and did not receive it. Descriptive statistics and a two groups comparison were calculated to examine and compare population characteristics between intervention (sentinel) villages and non-intervention villages in Ebonyi state. Differences were assessed at the 5% significance level using either the Rao-Scott Chi-Square test (for categorical variables) or the difference of least squares means (for continuous variables). Additionally, descriptive statistics for the activities that comprised a BCC home visit were compiled in order to assess the extent to which the intervention was implemented as intended. All estimates presented were calculated accounting for sampling design by adjusting for clustering effects and sampling weights.

CHAPTER 5: Extended Results

All results pertaining to the investigation of determinants of net use are presented in Chapter 3. Provided here are the results of the preliminary assessment of the BCC intervention.

BCC comparison descriptive statistics

Table 4 presents the sample characteristics of the BCC intervention and nonintervention sample populations. Demographic and net use data were collected on 2033 individuals from 501 households in the BCC intervention group and 2052 individuals from 494 households in the non-intervention group. The questionnaire was administered to 1020 heads of households and/or their wives; 525 from villages that received the BCC intervention and 495 from non-intervention villages in Ebonyi state.

Table 5 presents a comparison of weighted demographic characteristics between BCC intervention villages and non-intervention villages in Ebonyi state. General demographic and household data including sex, wealth quintile, age, education level of heads of household, household location altitude, and household size did not differ significantly between BCC intervention and non-intervention populations. Statistical evaluation of the differences between the proportions of individuals who identified with specific religions and ethnicities was not possible given the limited variation in responses, however, in both the intervention and non-intervention populations, the vast majority of individuals identified as Christians of Igbo ethnicity. Farming was the predominant occupation in both groups however this proportion was significantly higher (ptrend < 0.001) among the BCC intervention population (74.63%, 95% CI 69.35%- 79.91%) compared to the non-intervention population (58.38%, 95% CI 51.05%-65.72%).

Net ownership and use

Significant differences were found between the intervention and non-intervention populations when comparing net ownership variables (Table 6). The proportion of households owning at least one net was significantly higher (p<0.0001) in the BCC intervention population (94.16%, 95% CI 90.76%-97.55%) compared to the control population (72.03%, 95% CI 59.75%-84.30%). Similarly, the average number of nets per household in the intervention population (2.14, 95% CI 2.02-2.26) was significantly higher (p<0.0001) than the non-intervention population (1.51, 95% CI 1.22-1.81). Average net density in the intervention population was 0.61 (95% CI 0.56-0.67) which is significantly higher (p<0.0001) than the 0.41 (95% CI 0.33-0.50) nets per household member in the non-intervention population.

Among all age groups, the proportion of individuals who slept under a net the night before the survey, was significantly higher in the BCC intervention population (89.15%, 95%CI 85.21%-93.09%) compared to non-intervention population (73.79%, 95% CI 68.05%-79.54%). The age group with the lowest proportion of individual's sleeping under nets was adolescents aged 15-19 in both the intervention population (81.37%, 95% CI 73.07%-89.68%) and the non-intervention population (63.27%, 95% CI 53.19%-73.34%). All other age groups in the intervention population had approximately 90% net use the night before the survey, however, in the non-intervention group, the highest proportion of net use was in in children less than five (79.75%, 95% CI 72.47%-87.03%). No statistical difference was found between BCC intervention and non-

intervention populations in any of the measured net level use indicators including: proportion of nets used last night (p = 0.14), percent of nets used the night before the survey (p = 0.24) and the proportion of nets that were hanging at the appropriate height (p = 0.44).

Table 7 presents the difference in malaria-related knowledge, beliefs, social norms and messaging between BCC intervention and non-intervention populations. No significant difference was observed between the intervention and non-intervention populations in any of the knowledge scores measured (LF, malaria and net care) or in the score measuring positive and negative malaria-related social norms. Both populations also provided similar responses when asked to state malaria prevention methods with the most popular response being use of nets or ITNs, followed by other mosquito prevention techniques such as wearing insect repellant and clearing the yard by trimming bushes and cutting the grass. Least popular responses in both groups included use of preventive medicine and responses that are medically inappropriate actions for malaria prevention such as avoiding certain foods and dirty water.

Net hanging skills and self-efficacy differed significantly (p = 0.03) between the two groups with 69.10% (95% CI 62.50%-75.70%) of heads of household in the intervention population reporting high skills and self-efficacy compared 57.46% (95% CI 48.65%-66.27%) in the non-intervention population. Social support was also significantly higher among the BCC intervention population with 44.48% (95% CI 32.61%-56.36%) of household heads experiencing high social support from friends and family compared to 30.09% (95% CI 16.62%-43.57%) of heads of households in the non-intervention population experiencing high social support.

A greater proportion (p<0.0001) of the BCC intervention household heads (46.71%, 95% CI 39.46%-53.97%) reported having heard or seen malaria information in the past few weeks compared to the non-intervention group (9.83%, 95% CI 5.78%-13.89%). The three messages heard most often by BCC respondents included: the importance of sleeping under an ITN (81.31%; 95% CI 74.06%-88.57%), the causes of malaria (41.06%; 95% CI 33.38%-48.73%) and malaria prevention methods (37.64%; 95% CI 28.80%-46.48%). Comparatively, the three messages heard most often by non-intervention respondents included: importance of sleeping under an ITN (81.31%; 95% CI 28.80%-46.48%). Comparatively, the three messages heard most often by non-intervention respondents included: importance of sleeping under an ITN (71.30%; 95% CI 62.10%-37.90%), the causes of malaria (62.39%; 95% CI 22.72%-55.23%).

Tables 8 and 9 present weighted statistics reflecting the fidelity of implementation of the BCC intervention. Knowledge of receipt of a malaria-related home visit was reported by 53.86% (95% CI 44.47%-63.26%) of heads of households residing in the BCC intervention area. For the majority of households, these visits reportedly occurred less than one month prior to the survey (75.15%, 95% CI 64.23%-86.08%). Of the respondents that reported having a visit, 78.79% (95% CI 69.13%-88.45%) of the heads of households report that home visits were conducted by a peer educator or community volunteer, 21.34% (95% CI 10.97%-31.70%) report they were conducted by a community health officer and less than 4% reported that they were conducted by other individuals such as a doctor, friends, family member, employer or religious leader. Most commonly received information during these visits included: the importance of sleeping under an ITN (58.42%, 95% CI 47.27%-69.57%); the need to hang a net so that it can be

tucked in completely on all sides (53.59%, 95% CI 42.49%-64.68%); and causes of malaria (39.24%, 95% CI 29.43%-49.04%).

Greater than 90% of respondents reported that the person who visited the home: asked to see bed nets; showed them pictures about malaria; demonstrated how to hang a net properly; watched them hang their net; and demonstrated how to wash and mend their nets. A majority of heads of household (86.69%; 95% CI 80.55%-92.84%) reported that the person who visited their home spoke with them about the things that make using a bed net difficult for them and provided suggestions of ways to make it less difficult.

Approximately 60% of household respondents reported that there had been an event in their community where they could: learn how to hang their nets; get together with others to wash or mend their nets; or learned how to make moveable posts to hang their nets with. Existence of a recent malaria-related drama performance in the community was reported by 58.60% (95%CI 52.82%-64.38%) of respondents, 54.60% (95% CI 45.33%-63.88%) reported that their community leaders had talked about the importance of LLINs and just over 50% (50.20%, 95% CI 41.87%-58.53%) reported that their religious leaders had done the same.

Extended Tables

Table 4. Characteristics of sampled households stratified by BCC intervention

Characteristics	BCC Intervention	Non- intervention
Number of clusters	30	28
Number of HHs surveyed	501	494
Number of HHs owning ≥ 1 net	432	342
Number of participants	2033	2052
Sex of participants (%female)	54.82	56.39
Number of participants in HHs owning ≥ 1 net	1968	1655
Total number of nets surveyed	964	734
Number of modified KAP survey module	525	495
Sex of KAP module respondents (%female)	45.38	52.34
Number of KAP module respondents in HH owning \geq 1 net	500	383

	BCC Intervention Group							
Characteristic		Interver	ntion			Non-interv	ention	
Characteristic	Total (n)	Weighted % or mean	95%	% CI	Total (n)	Weighted % or mean	95% CI	p-value
Sex (% female)	2012	55.35	52.11	58.58	2036	57.33	54.47 60.19	0.35
Altitude							· · ·	
<100m	2078	63.69	47.30	80.08	2101	49.96	31.03 68.88	0.26
>100m		36.31	19.92		-	50.04	31.12 68.97	
Wealth quintile	•						· · · ·	
Poorest		33.94	26.61	41.27		28.73	18.36 39.10	
Second		25.34	20.41	30.27		24.65	18.58 30.71	
Middle	1727	28.44	21.73	35.15	1874	24.16	16.91 31.41	0.35
Fourth		8.11	4.82	11.41		15.67	9.90 21.44	
Richest		4.17	0.94	7.40		6.79	1.68 11.90	
Age	-	•		-			· · ·	
<5		18.58	16.87	20.30		20.47	18.37 22.57	
5-9		17.76	16.19	19.33		18.75	16.92 20.57	
10-14	2030	12.71	11.14	14.29	2036	12.20	10.90 13.51	0.23
15-19		9.78	8.33	11.22		9.88	7.94 11.81	
20-59		34.16	32.31	36.01		33.43	31.62 35.24	
60+		7.02	5.74	8.30		5.27	4.00 6.54	
Religion of respondents	•			•				
Christianity		80.17	72.66	87.68		86.89	80.93 92.84	
Islam	509	-	-	-	482	2.27	0.00 5.06	*
Traditional		15.80	8.39	23.20		7.33	2.37 12.30	
No religion		4.04	0.84	7.23		3.51	0.34 6.68	
Ethnicity of HH respondents							· · · · · ·	
Hausa	522	-	-	-		1.72	0.00 5.03	*
Fulani	522	1.34	0.19	2.49		0.54	0.00 1.32	
Igbo		98.66	97.51	99.81	490	97.74	94.38 100.0	
Occupation								
Farmer		74.63	69.35	79.91		58.38	51.05 65.72	
Housewife		4.09	2.44	5.75		12.80	8.27 17.33	
Civil servant	517	4.47	2.60	6.34	491	5.96	2.73 9.18	<0.001
Hand-work (self-employed)	517	7.84	4.88	10.79	491	9.31	5.97 12.65	\0.001
Trader (commerce/sales)		4.78	2.71			5.46	0.77 10.15	
Student		1.45	0.43	2.47		3.59	1.85 5.33	
Other		2.74	1.15	4.32		4.50	2.41 6.60	
Education level								
None		51.79		57.42		45.64	38.64 52.63	
Primary	513	29.26		34.07	489	31.54	25.24 37.83	0.39
Secondary		15.51		19.20		17.34	11.28 23.40	
Post-secondary		3.43	1.78	5.08		5.48	3.01 7.96	

Table 5. Comparison of weighted population demographic estimate between BCC intervention and non-intervention groups

* Insufficient variation in the data; no test statistic calculated

	BCC Intervention Group									
Channe the statts		Intervent	tion			Non-interv	ention		· .	
Characteristic	Total (n)	Weighted % or µ	95%	CI	Total (n)	Weighted % or µ	95% CI		p-value	
Net ownership indicators										
Average HH size	2033	5.22	4.95	5.49	2052	5.43	5.12	5.73	0.31	
Proportion of HH ≥ 1 net	456	94.16	90.76	97.55	445	72.03	59.75	84.30	<0.0001	
Mean number of nets per HH	454	2.14	2.02	2.26	442	1.51	1.22	1.81	<0.001	
Average net density (nets per person	454	0.61	0.56	0.67	442	0.41	0.33	0.50	<0.001	
Net use indicators										
% of nets used last night	932	85.07	81.62	88.51	679	79.96	74.32	85.59	0.14	
% of nets in use*	957	90.15	87.05	93.25	730	86.90	82.28	91.52	0.24	
% of nets hanging properly*	487	96.38	93.58	99.18	365	94.85	92.24	97.46	0.44	
Proportion of participants using net last r	night*									
All ages	1968	89.15	85.21	93.09	1655	73.79	68.05	79.54	< 0.001	
Children under age 5	377	89.11	85.22	93.00	348	79.75	72.47	87.03	0.028	
Children age 5-9 years	357	89.13	84.85	93.40	311	75.32	67.57	83.08	0.004	
Children age 10-14 years	240	88.90	81.54	96.27	216	69.13	60.28	77.98	0.005	
Adolescents age 15-19 years	197	81.37	73.07	89.68	163	63.27	53.19	73.34	0.010	
All adults 20-59 years	673	90.98	87.42	94.54	537	73.53	68.14	78.93	<0.0001	
Persons age≥60 years	122	91.72	87.54	95.90	72	78.13	64.44	91.81	0.038	
Women age 15-49 years	491	90.77	86.79	94.74	386	74.78	68.13	81.42	< 0.001	

Table 6. Comparison of weighted population net ownership and net use estimates between BCC intervention and non-intervention groups

*Among households owning ≥1 net

+Does not include baby nets

 μ = mean; HHs = households

	BCC Intervention Group							
Survey variable		Interventi	on			Non-interve	ention	- - n_value
Survey variable	Total	Weighted 95% Cl		Total	Weighted 95% Cl		– p-value	
	(n)	% or mean	337		(n)	% or mean	3378 CI	
Malaria knowledge score								
Low	510	32.23		40.89	471	39.45	32.74 46.17	0.27
Moderate	510	21.16		27.19	-1/1	23.12	18.52 27.71	0.27
High		46.61	35.69	57.53		37.43	29.18 45.68	
LF knowledge score								
None	516	70.86	62.85	78.88	481	78.14	71.95 84.34	0.17
Any		29.14	21.12	37.15		21.86	15.66 28.05	
Skills and self efficacy score								
Low	677	24.19	18.62	29.75	473	31.96	22.29 41.62	0.03
Moderate	677	6.71	4.70	8.71	473	10.58	5.64 15.52	0.03
High		69.10	62.50	75.70		57.46	48.65 66.27	
Positive social norms score								
Low		44.45	33.11	55.80		46.89	35.51 58.28	0
Moderate	978	14.81	10.95	18.66	469	17.98	11.65 24.31	0.72
High		40.74	26.47	55.02		35.13	20.62 49.63	
Net Care Knowledge Score								
Low		14.15	8.88	19.41		23.77	15.84 31.70	
Moderate	493	73.61		78.99	456	65.47	57.70 73.23	0.10
High		12.24		15.69		10.76	5.71 15.82	
Social Support Score								
Low		14.39	9.71	19.06		42.70	31.27 54.13	
Moderate	519	41.13		50.69	478	27.21	18.31 36.11	<0.001
High		44.48		56.36		30.09	16.62 43.57	
Malaria prevention method		-11.10	52.01	50.50		30.05	10.02 43.37	
Net/ITN		67.25	E0 00	75.66		60.27	52.88 67.67	0.23
Mosquito prevention		25.66		31.31		26.89	20.29 33.49	0.23
Preventive medicine	525	0.56	0.00	1.67	495	2.04	0.55 3.52	0.18
Clean yard	525	11.28		17.06		11.14	7.04 15.24	0.10
Inappropriate response		1.21	0.27	2.15		2.46	0.00 4.93	0.25
			0.27	2.13		20	0.000 1.00	0.20
Advantages of mosquito nets Prevent malaria		92.47	80.62	95.31		79.85	73.12 86.59	<0.000
Prevent LF	525	92.47 4.15	1.01	7.30	495	2.20	0.49 3.92	0.24
Other	525	4.15 7.65	4.06	11.24	495	2.20 9.84	5.58 14.11	0.24
None		6.54	4.00 3.59	9.49		9.84 16.92	10.70 23.14	<0.001
Heard/seen malaria message recently	520	46.71	39.40	53.97	484	9.83	5.78 13.89	<0.000
Content of malaria message								
Nets/ITN/use net every night		81.31		88.57		71.30	62.10 37.90	0.066
Causes of malaria		41.06		48.73		62.39	46.12 78.66	0.003
Prevention of malaria		37.64		46.48		16.46	1.38 31.54	0.026
Net priority to pregant women/CU5		5.76	2.00	9.52		3.53	0.00 10.24	0.62
Care for / wash nets		30.34		38.56		14.10	0.00 31.78	0.24
Seek treatment for fever		3.08	0.91	5.25		8.81	0.00 18.89	0.14
Seek treatment for fever in 24hrs	226	0.40	0.00	1.21	46	-		-
Importance of spraying		1.00	0.00	2.41		-		-
Not plaster walls after spraying		-	-	-		-		-
Environmental sanitation activisites		3.35	0.78	5.92		7.25	0.00 16.21	0.34
Cut bushes/grass		5.76	1.74	9.78		38.98	22.72 55.23	
Bury rubbish/tires/bottles		1.41	0.00	2.97		0.93	0.00 2.84	0.72
Other		-	-	-		-		-
Don't know		1.07	0.00	2.55		5.39	0.00 13.03	0.09

Table 7. Comparison of extended KAP module responses between BCC intervention and non-intervention groups

*Among households owning ≥1 net

	BCC Intervention Group						
Characteristic of home visit	Total (n)	Sample	Weighted %	95	% CI		
Household visit about malaria	493	243	53.86	44.5	63.26		
Who came to talk to household about malaria?		•					
Doctor/Health care worker		9	2.94	0.41	5.48		
Community health officer		62	21.34	10.97	31.70		
Friends		3	0.92	0.00	2.79		
Family member		2	0.61	0.00	1.51		
Employer		9	3.99	0.91	7.06		
Peer educator/community volunteer	243	178	78.79		88.45		
Religious leader	245	4	1.59	0.00	3.27		
Government official/politician		0	-	-	-		
Musician/performer		0	-	-	-		
Traditional healer		0	-	-	_		
Other		1	0.31	0.00	0.93		
other		-	0.51	0.00	0.55		
When did they visit the household?							
Less than 1 month ago		139	75.15	64.23	86.08		
1-6 months ago	168	26	16.36	7.51	25.22		
> 6 months ago	100	3	1.13	0.00	3.01		
Not sure		12	7.36	2.90			
Information received during home visit		•		·			
Causes of malaria		85	39.24	29 43	49.04		
Prevention of malaria		57	26.76		35.82		
Sleep under net		70	30.66		40.60		
Sleep under ITN		111	58.42		69.57		
Sleep under net every night		74	33.39		43.76		
Only use net in rainy season		0	-	-	-		
Give priority to pregnant women and CU5		2	1.17	0.00	2.87		
Hang net so it can be tucked		96	53.59		64.68		
Hang up to air before use		36	19.97		26.96		
Hang outside before use		1	0.39	0.00	1.18		
-		2	0.39	0.00	1.10		
Hang inside before use		31	17.55		23.83		
Washing nets		-	-		25.65		
Re-treating nets	203	0		-			
Mending/repairing nets		14	7.80	1.59	14.02		
Seek treatment for fever		3	1.56	0.00	3.29		
Seek treatment for fever in 24hrs		2	1.17	0.00	2.82		
Free treatment for malaria		2	1.17	0.00	2.80		
ACT/AQ/AA/COARTEM		1	0.78	0.00	2.32		
Importance of spraying		0	-	-	-		
Don't plaster walls after spraying		0	-	-	-		
Cut bushes/grass		19	10.92	3.83	18.01		
Bury trash/tires/bottles		3	1.56	0.00	3.41		
Certain foods can cause malaria		0	-	-	-		
Other		0	-	-	-		
Don't know		2	1.56	0.00	4.63		

Table 8. Process evaluation results of BCC home visit

	BCC Intervention Group							
Characteristic of home visit	Total (n)	Sample	Weighted %	95% CI				
The person who visited the home:								
Asked to see bed nets		183	97.11	94.73	99.48			
Showed pictures about malaria		181	95.79	92.27	99.30			
Demonstrated how to hang net properly	188	182	96.61	94.16	99.06			
Watched respondent hang their net		179	94.55	90.86	98.23			
Demonstrated how to wash nets		172	90.83	86.55	95.10			
Demonstrated how to mend nets		173	92.07	86.95	97.18			
Discussed things that make it difficult to use a net and made suggestions of ways to make it easier		164	86.69	80.55	92.84			
There has been an event in the community where								
People learned how to hang their nets		318	59.81	53.85	65.76			
People came to wash and mend their LLINs	525	317	59.99	53.47	66.52			
People learned how to make moveable posts		316	59.62	53.91	65.33			
Malaria-related drama performance in last 3 months		309	58.60	52.82	64.38			
Community leaders talked about importance of LLINs		303	54.60	45.33	63.88			
Religious leaders talked about importance of LLINs		282	50.20	41.87	58.53			

Table 9. Process evaluation results of BCC home visit (continued)

Discussion

This chapter has been included for discussion of findings, limitations and recommendations that were either too detailed, too speculative or simply beyond the scope of the manuscript presented in Chapter 3.

The BCC intervention assessment described in Chapter 4 had three main aims: 1) Assess the impact of the BCC program through a comparison of intervention and nonintervention populations; 2) Investigate why the intervention had the effect it did; and 3) Determine whether the intervention was carried out as planned. All evidence suggests that the BCC intervention had a significant and positive impact on the target population.

Net ownership in the BCC intervention population was significantly higher than the non-intervention population. As a likely result of this increase in net ownership, approximately 90% of the BCC population reported having slept under an LLIN the night before the survey. The increase in net ownership in the BCC population is likely the direct result of LLIN monitoring data, collected by community health promoters (CHPs), indicating the existence of net shortages early in program implementation and prompting the Ebonyi State Roll Back Malaria Team to conduct a mop-up LLIN distribution campaign where an additional 1094 nets were provided to 554 households.

Given that increases in net ownership are likely the strongest driver of net use, the effects of the program's behavior change components on net use are less discernable in this data. Recall instead the results presented in Chapter 3 where regression analyses indicate that, when the effects of net ownership are held constant (by controlling for net

density), simply residing in a BCC village is not significantly associated with net use, whereas exposure specifically to the BCC home visit is. This result suggests that the BCC intervention had an additional impact on net use beyond generally increasing net ownership levels. The observation that social support (also significantly associated with increased odds of net use) is significantly higher among BCC households is further evidence of the program's positive effect on net use.

Programmatic data (not presented) indicates that greater than 90% of households in the intervention area received monthly home visits from CHPs, however the process evaluation data presented in Table 9 suggests that only approximately half of respondents are aware of such a visit. This discrepancy suggests that there may be inaccuracies in the BCC program record keeping or that knowledge of the intervention is not permeating through to household members not home at the time of the visit (or some combination of the two). Given that exposure to the home visit seems to increase one's odds of net use, the BCC program may be able to amplify its effects on net use in the future by ensuring all households receive the home visit and including all household members in the visit activities.

Conclusion

The results of the BCC assessment are encouraging as they suggest that intervention activities have a significant and positive impact on net ownership and use in the target population. This analysis indicates that the collection and reporting of LLIN monitoring data and the interpersonal communication involved in the home visits – specifically in terms of improving social support within the households – have the greatest impact on net use. Therefore continuation and potential expansion of these activities should be considered in order to increase the already positive and substantial improvements in net use behaviors achieved through this program thus far.

REFERENCES

- 1. World Health organization (2012) World Malaria Report 2012. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.
- 2. World Health Organization (2010) World Malaria Report 2010. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.
- 3. National Population Commision (NPC) [Nigeria], National Malaria Control Programme (NMCP) [Nigeria], ICF International (2012) Nigeria Malaria Indicator Survey 2010. Abuja, Nigeria: National Population Commision, National Malaria Control Programme and ICF International.
- 4. National Population Commision (NPC) [Nigeria], ICF Macro (2009) Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey 2008. Abuja, Nigeria: National Population Commision and ICF Macro.
- Federal Ministry of Health (FMoH) [Nigeria], National Malaria Control Programme (NMCP) [Nigeria] (2008) Strategic Plan for Malaria Control in Nigeria 2009-2013. Abuja, Nigeria: Federal Ministry of Health and National Malaria Control Programme,.
- 6. Lengeler C (2004) Insecticide-treated bed nets and curtains for preventing malaria. Cochrane Database Syst Rev.
- 7. Picard J, Aikins M, Alonso PL, Armstrong Schellenberg JR, Greenwood BM, et al. (1993) A malaria control trial using insecticide-treated bed nets and targeted chemoprophylaxis in a rural area of The Gambia, west Africa. 8. Costeffectiveness of bed net impregnation alone or combined with chemoprophylaxis in preventing mortality and morbidity from malaria in Gambian children. Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg 87 Suppl 2: 53-57.
- 8. Wiseman V, Hawley WA, ter Kuile FO, Phillips-Howard PA, Vulule JM, et al. (2003) The cost-effectiveness of permethrin-treated bed nets in an area of intense malaria transmission in western Kenya. Am J Trop Med Hyg 68: 161-167.
- 9. Howard SC, Omumbo J, Nevill C, Some ES, Donnelly CA, et al. (2000) Evidence for a mass community effect of insecticide-treated bednets on the incidence of malaria on the Kenyan coast. Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg 94: 357-360.
- 10. Killeen GF, Smith TA, Ferguson HM, Mshinda H, Abdulla S, et al. (2007) Preventing childhood malaria in Africa by protecting adults from mosquitoes with insecticide-treated nets. PLoS Med 4: e229.
- 11. Komazawa O, Kaneko S, K'Opiyo J, Kiche I, Wanyua S, et al. (2012) Are Long-Lasting Insecticidal Nets Effective for Preventing Childhood Deaths among Non-Net Users? A Community-Based Cohort Study in Western Kenya. Plos One 7.
- 12. Global Malaria Programme (2007) Long-lasting insecticidal nets for malaria prevention: A manual for malaria programme managers. Global Malaria Programme, World Health Organization.
- 13. WHO (2007) Insecticide treated mosquito nets: a position statement. Geneva: Global Malaria Programme, World Health Organization.
- Federal Ministry of Health (FMoH) [Nigeria], National Malaria Control Programme (NMCP) [Nigeria]. Nigeria National Malaria Control Programme 2012 Program Update; 2013 March 8, 2013; Atlanta, GA.

- Korenromp EL, Miller J, Cibulskis RE, Cham MK, Alnwick D, et al. (2003) Monitoring mosquito net coverage for malaria control in Africa: possession vs. use by children under 5 years. Tropical Medicine & International Health 8: 693-703.
- Okrah J, Traore C, Pale A, Sommerfeld J, Muller O (2002) Community factors associated with malaria prevention by mosquito nets: an exploratory study in rural Burkina Faso. Tropical Medicine & International Health 7: 240-248.
- 17. Tobin-West CI, Alex-Hart BA (2011) Insecticide treated bednet ownership and utilization in Rivers State, Nigeria before a state-wide net distribution campaign. J Vector Borne Dis 48: 133-137.
- 18. Lim SS, Fullman N, Stokes A, Ravishankar N, Masiye F, et al. (2011) Net benefits: a multicountry analysis of observational data examining associations between insecticide-treated mosquito nets and health outcomes. Plos Medicine 8: e1001091.
- 19. Akachi Y, Atun R (2011) Effect of investment in malaria control on child mortality in sub-Saharan Africa in 2002-2008. Plos One 6: e21309.
- 20. Baume CA, Marin MC (2008) Gains in awareness, ownership and use of insecticidetreated nets in Nigeria, Senegal, Uganda and Zambia. Malar J 7: 153.
- 21. Gerstl S, Dunkley S, Mukhtar A, Maes P, De Smet M, et al. (2010) Long-lasting insecticide-treated net usage in eastern Sierra Leone the success of free distribution. Trop Med Int Health 15: 480-488.
- 22. Hanson K, Marchant T, Nathan R, Mponda H, Jones C, et al. (2009) Household ownership and use of insecticide treated nets among target groups after implementation of a national voucher programme in the United Republic of Tanzania: plausibility study using three annual cross sectional household surveys. BMJ 339: b2434.
- 23. Noor AM, Amin AA, Akhwale WS, Snow RW (2007) Increasing coverage and decreasing inequity in insecticide-treated bed net use among rural Kenyan children. PLoS Med 4: e255.
- 24. Academy for Educational Development NetMark Project (2009) Nigeria NetMark Household Survey on Insecticide-Treated Nets 2008. Business Interactive Consulting (Nigeria), National Population Commission of Nigeria, Uganda Chartered Healthnet, Makerere University.
- 25. Baume CA, Marin MC (2007) Intra-household mosquito net use in Ethiopia, Ghana, Mali, Nigeria, Senegal, and Zambia: Are nets being used? Who in the household uses them? American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene 77: 963-971.
- 26. Githinji S, Herbst S, Kistemann T, Noor AM (2010) Mosquito nets in a rural area of Western Kenya: ownership, use and quality. Malar J 9: 250.
- 27. Ndjinga JK, Minakawa N (2010) The importance of education to increase the use of bed nets in villages outside of Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo. Malaria Journal 9.
- 28. Thwing J, Hochberg N, Vanden Eng J, Issifi S, Eliades MJ, et al. (2008) Insecticidetreated net ownership and usage in Niger after a nationwide integrated campaign. Trop Med Int Health 13: 827-834.
- 29. Sallis JF, Owen N, Fisher EB (2008) Ecological models of health behavior. Health behavior and health education: Theory, research, and practice 4: 465-486.

- 30. Alaii JA, Hawley WA, Kolczak MS, ter Kuile FO, Gimnig JE, et al. (2003) Factors affecting use of permethrin-treated bed nets during a randomized controlled trial in western Kenya. American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene 68: 137-141.
- Eisele TP, Keating J, Littrell M, Larsen D, Macintyre K (2009) Assessment of insecticide-treated bednet use among children and pregnant women across 15 countries using standardized national surveys. American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene 80: 209-214.
- 32. Graves PM, Ngondi JM, Hwang J, Getachew A, Gebre T, et al. (2011) Factors associated with mosquito net use by individuals in households owning nets in Ethiopia. Malaria Journal 10.
- 33. Ng'ang'a PN, Jayasinghe G, Kimani V, Shililu J, Kabutha C, et al. (2009) Bed net use and associated factors in a rice farming community in Central Kenya. Malaria Journal 8.
- 34. Goesch JN, Schwarz NG, Decker ML, Oyakhirome S, Borchert LB, et al. (2008) Socio-economic status is inversely related to bed net use in Gabon. Malaria Journal 7.
- 35. Ngondi JM, Graves PM, Gebre T, Mosher AW, Shargie EB, et al. (2011) Which nets are being used: factors associated with mosquito net use in Amhara, Oromia and Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples' Regions of Ethiopia. Malar J 10: 92.
- 36. Ankomah A, Adebayo SB, Arogundade ED, Anyanti J, Nwokolo E, et al. (2012) Determinants of insecticide-treated net ownership and utilization among pregnant women in Nigeria. BMC Public Health 12: 105.
- 37. Atieli HE, Zhou G, Afrane Y, Lee MC, Mwanzo I, et al. (2011) Insecticide-treated net (ITN) ownership, usage, and malaria transmission in the highlands of western Kenya. Parasit Vectors 4: 113.
- 38. Garcia-Basteiro AL, Schwabe C, Aragon C, Baltazar G, Rehman AM, et al. (2011) Determinants of bed net use in children under five and household bed net ownership on Bioko Island, Equatorial Guinea. Malaria Journal 10.
- 39. Hwang J, Graves PM, Jima D, Reithinger R, Kachur SP, et al. (2010) Knowledge of malaria and its association with malaria-related behaviors: Results from the Malaria Indicator Survey, Ethiopia, 2007. Plos One 5.
- 40. Biadgilign S, Reda A, Kedir H (2012) Determinants of ownership and utilization of insecticide-treated bed nets for malaria control in eastern ethiopia. J Trop Med 2012: 235015.
- 41. Dunn CE, Le Mare A, Makungu C (2011) Malaria risk behaviours, socio-cultural practices and rural livelihoods in southern Tanzania: Implications for bednet usage. Social Science & Medicine 72: 408-417.
- 42. Pulford J, Oakiva T, Angwin A, Bryant M, Mueller I, et al. (2012) Indifferent to disease: A qualitative investigation of the reasons why some Papua New Guineans who own mosquito nets choose not to use them. Social Science & Medicine 75: 2283-2290.
- 43. Baume CA, Reithinger R, Woldehanna S (2009) Factors associated with use and nonuse of mosquito nets owned in Oromia and Amhara regional states, Ethiopia. Malar J 8: 264.
- 44. Adongo PB, Kirkwood B, Kendall C (2005) How local community knowledge about malaria affects insecticide-treated net use in northern Ghana. Trop Med Int Health 10: 366-378.
- 45. Dye TD, Apondi R, Lugada ES, Kahn JG, Smith J, et al. (2010) "Before we used to get sick all the time": perceptions of malaria and use of long-lasting insecticide-treated bed nets (LLINs) in a rural Kenyan community. Malar J 9: 345.
- 46. Toe LP, Skovmand O, Dabire KR, Diabate A, Diallo Y, et al. (2009) Decreased motivation in the use of insecticide-treated nets in a malaria endemic area in Burkina Faso. Malar J 8: 175.
- 47. Idowu OA, Sam-Wobo SO, Oluwole AS, Adediran AS (2011) Awareness, possession and use of insecticide-treated nets for prevention of malaria in children under five in Abeokuta, Nigeria. Journal of Paediatrics and Child Health 47: 117-121.
- 48. Deressa W, Fentie G, Girma S, Reithinger R (2011) Ownership and use of insecticide-treated nets in Oromia and Amhara Regional States of Ethiopia two years after a nationwide campaign. Trop Med Int Health.
- 49. Rickard DG, Dudovitz RN, Wong MD, Jen HC, Osborn RD, et al. (2011) Closing the gap between insecticide treated net ownership and use for the prevention of malaria. Prog Community Health Partnersh 5: 123-131.
- 50. Aikins MK, Pickering H, Alonso PL, D'Alessandro U, Lindsay SW, et al. (1993) A malaria control trial using insecticide-treated bed nets and targeted chemoprophylaxis in a rural area of The Gambia, west Africa. 4. Perceptions of the causes of malaria and of its treatment and prevention in the study area. Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg 87 Suppl 2: 25-30.
- 51. Cham MK, D'Alessandro U, Todd J, Bennett S, Fegan G, et al. (1996) Implementing a nationwide insecticide-impregnated bednet programme in The Gambia. Health Policy Plan 11: 292-298.
- 52. Widmar M, Nagel CJ, Ho DY, Benziger PW, Hennig N (2009) Determining and addressing obstacles to the effective use of long-lasting insecticide-impregnated nets in rural Tanzania. Malar J 8: 315.
- 53. Pulford J, Hetzel MW, Bryant M, Siba PM, Mueller I (2011) Reported reasons for not using a mosquito net when one is available: a review of the published literature. Malaria Journal 10.
- 54. Iwashita H, Dida G, Futami K, Sonye G, Kaneko S, et al. (2010) Sleeping arrangement and house structure affect bed net use in villages along Lake Victoria. Malar J 9: 176.
- 55. Glanz K, Rimer BK, Viswanath K (2008) Health behavior and health education: theory, research, and practice: Jossey-Bass.
- 56. Umberson D, Karas Montez J (2010) Social Relationships and Health: A Flashpoint for Health Policy. Journal of Health & Social Behavior 51: S54-S66.
- 57. Palmer CA, Baucom DH, McBride CM (2000) Couple approaches to smoking cessation.
- 58. Jeffery RW, Epstein LH, Wilson GT, Drewnowski A, Stunkard AJ, et al. (2000) Long-term maintenance of weight loss: current status. Health psychology 19: 5.
- 59. DiMatteo MR (2004) Social support and patient adherence to medical treatment: a meta-analysis. Health psychology 23: 207.

- 60. Academy for Educational Development NetMark Project (2006) Uganda NetMark Household Survey on Insecticide-Treated Nets 2006. Uganda Chartered Healthnet.
- 61. Baume CA (2008) Ethiopia bednet utilization study: Why some nets owned are not used. Academy for Educational Development (AED).
- 62. Chuma J, Okungu V, Ntwiga J, Molyneux C (2010) Towards achieving Abuja targets: identifying and addressing barriers to access and use of insecticides treated nets among the poorest populations in Kenya. BMC Public Health 10: 137.
- 63. Batisso E, Habte T, tesfaye G, Getachew D, Tekalegne A, et al. (2012) A stitch in time: a cross-sectional survey looking at long lasting inseticide-treated bet net ownership, utilization and attrition in SNNPR, Ethiopia. Malaria Journal 11.
- 64. Keating J, Macintyre K, Mbogo CM, Githure JI, Beier JC (2005) Self-reported malaria and mosquito avoidance in relation to household risk factors in a Kenyan coastal city. J Biosoc Sci 37: 761-771.
- 65. Atkinson JA, Fitzgerald L, Toaliu H, Taleo G, Tynan A, et al. (2010) Community participation for malaria elimination in Tafea Province, Vanuatu: Part I. Maintaining motivation for prevention practices in the context of disappearing disease. Malar J 9: 93.
- 66. Esse C, Utzinger J, Tschannen AB, Raso G, Pfeiffer C, et al. (2008) Social and cultural aspects of 'malaria' and its control in central Cote d'Ivoire. Malaria Journal 7.
- 67. Harvey SA, Olortegui MP, Leontsini E, Pezo CB, Pezantes LMO, et al. (2008) The whole world will be able to see us: Determining the characteristics of a culturally appropriate bed net among Mestizo communities of the Peruvian Amazon. American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene 79: 834-838.
- 68. Alaii JA, van den Borne HW, Kachur SP, Mwenesi H, Vulule JM, et al. (2003) Perceptions of bed nets and malaria prevention before and after a randomized controlled trial of permethrin-treated bed nets in western Kenya. Am J Trop Med Hyg 68: 142-148.
- 69. Brieger WR, Ekanem OJ, Nwankwo E, Ezike VI, Robinson T, et al. (1996) Social and behavioural baseline for guiding implementation of an efficacy trial of insecticide impregnated bed nets for malaria control at nsukka, Nigeria. Int Q Community Health Educ 16: 47-61.
- 70. Pettifor A, Taylor E, Nku D, Duvall S, Tabala M, et al. (2008) Bed net ownership, use and perceptions among women seeking antenatal care in Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC): opportunities for improved maternal and child health. BMC Public Health 8: 331.
- 71. Moiroux N, Boussari O, Djenontin A, Damien G, Cottrell G, et al. (2012) Dry season determinants of malaria disease and net use in Benin, West Africa. Plos One 7: e30558.
- 72. Ottesen EA (2006) Lymphatic filariasis: Treatment, control and elimination. Adv Parasitol 61: 395-441.
- 73. Der G, Everitt BS (2009) A handbook of statistical analyses using SAS. Boca Raton, FL: Chapman & Hall/CRC.
- 74. Vyas S, Kumaranayake L (2006) Constructing socio-economic status indices: how to use principal components analysis. Health Policy Plan 21: 459-468.

APPENDIX A Survey Instrument

NIGERIA MALARIA CLUSTER SURVEY 2010 -THE CARTER CENTER HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONNAIRE

		IDENTIFICATION					
STATE (1 = EBONY); 2= LOCAL GOVERNMEN	T AREA (1=OHAUKWU		IA)				
WARD							
HEALTH CENTRE	HEALTH CENTRE						
LOCALITY NAME			5 - 19 S. St.				
EA NAME			1.000				
CLUSTER NUMBER							
HOUSEHOLD NUMBE	R						
NAME OF HOUSEHOU	DHEAD		1. N. 1. N				
LATITUDE (N)	OF HOUSEHOLD n) E)						
		INTERVIEWER VIBIT	8				
	1	2	3	FINAL VISIT			
DATE INTERVIEWER'S NAME RESULT (SEE CODES)*	·	·		DAY MONTH YEAR NAME (INITIALS) RESULT CODE			
NEXT VISIT: DATE	- <u> </u>			TOTAL NO. OF			
*RESULT CODES: 1 COMPLETED 2 NO HOUSEHOLD MEMBER AT HOME OR NO COMPETENT RESPONDENT AT HOME AT TIME OF VISIT 3 ENTIRE HOUSEHOLD ABSENT FOR EXTENDED PERIOD OF TIME 4 POSTPONED 5 REFUSED 6 DWELLING VACANT OR ADDRESS NOT A DWELLING 7 DWELLING DESTROYED 8 DWELLING NOT FOUND 9 OTHER (SPECIFY)							
TOTAL NUMBER OF PERSONS IN HOUSEHOLD		HOUSEHOLD O	OF RESPONDENT				
Name	Checker	Editor Ent	ry person 1	Entry person 2			

HOUSEHOLD LISTING

Now we would like some information about the people who usually live in your household or who are staying with you now.

	NOW WE WOULD USE SO		n about tr	in bechie a		y iive in yu			atorying with p	ou now.	
LINE NO.	USUAL RESIDENTS AND VISITORS	RELATION- SHIP TO HEAD OF	SEX	RESI	DENCE	AGE	LLIN USE	OF CHILD-	PREGNANT NOW?	IF HOUSEN	IOLD NUMBER IS TIPLE OF 3
	·	HOUSE- HOLD		· · · · ·				BEARING AGE		CHILDREN ELIGIBLE FOR HB TEST	DATE OF BIRTH
	Please give me the names of the persons who usually live in your household and guests of the household who stayed here last night, starting with the head of the household.	What is the relationship of (NAME) to the head of the household?*	is (NAME) male or female?	Does (NAME) usually live here?	Did (NAME) stay here last night?	How old is (NAME)?	Choose the response that best describes how often (NAME) sleeps under an LLIN?	CIRCLE LINE NUMBER OF ALL WOMEN AGE 15-49	FOR ELIGIBLE WOMEN, ASIC Is (NAME) currently pregnant?	CIROLE LINE NUMBER OF ALL CHEDREN UNDER 10	FOR CHILDREN UNDER TEN: ASK FOR DATE OF BIRTH
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(8)	(7)	(7a)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
			μ° τ	1F3 HD	11-3 HD	BI 1648.3	- direys 7 Vesi al Re Bre 3 Janrahra 4 Resel 8 Heres 20 Dil		1F3 HD-04		DO/MM/YYYY
01			1 2	1 2	1 2			01	1 2	01	''
02			1 2	1 2	1 2			02	1 2	62	
03			1 2	1 2	1 2			03	1 2	03	
04			1 2	1 2	1 2			04	1 2	64	
05			1 2	1 2	1 2			05	1 2	cs	
06			1 2	1 2	1 2			06	1 2	ce	
07	·		1 2	1 2	1 2			07	1 2	67	
80			1 2	1 2	1 2			08	1 2	ce	
09			1 2	1 2	1 2			09	1 2	09	
10			1 2	1 2	1 2			10	1 2	10	

* CODES FOR Q.3 RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD: 01 = HEAD 02 = WIFEHUSBAND 03 = SON OR DAUGHTER

04 = SON-IN-LAW OR DAUGHTER-IN-LAW 09 = OTHER RELATIVE 05 = GRANDCHLD 10 = ADOPTED/FOSTER/STEPCHLD 06 = PARENT 11 = NOT RELATED 07 = PARENT-IN-LAW 98 = DON'T KNOW

LINE NO.	USUAL RESIDENTS AND VISITORS	RELATION- SHIP TO HEAD OF	SEX	RESIG	DENCE	AGE	LUN USE	WOMEN OF CHILD-	PREGNANT NOW?		OLD NUMBER IS TIPLE OF 3
		HOUSE- HOLD						DEARING AGE		CHILDREN ELIGIBLE FOR Hb TEST	DATE OF BIRTH
	Please give me the names of the persons who seusity live in your household and guests of the household who staryed here last night, starting with the head of the household.	What is the relationship of (NAME) to the head of the household?*	is (NAME) male or female?	Does (NAME) usually live here?	Did (NAME) stay here last night?	How old is (NAME)?	Choose the response that best describes how often (NAME) sleeps under an LLIN7	CIRCLE LINE NUMBER OF ALL WOMEN AGE 15-49	FOR ELIGIBLE WOMEN, ASIC Is (NAME) currently pregnant?	CIRCLE LINE NUMBER OF ALL CHILDREN UNDER 10	FOR CHEDREN UNDER TEN: ASIK FOR DATE OF BIRTH
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(7a)	(0)	(9)	(10)	(11)
				11-3 HD	1F3 HD	M 1648.3	- diraya 2 Madadira Bra 3 Jaordira 4 Rasily 8 Haras 20 Dil		1F3 HD-04		DO / MM / YYYY
11			1 2	1 2	1 2			01	1 2	01	
12			1 2	1 2	1 2			02	1 2	62	
13			1 2	1 2	1 2			03	1 2	03	
14			1 2	1 2	1 2			04	1 2	64	
15			1 2	1 2	1 2			05	1 2	cs	
16			1 2	1 2	1 2			06	1 2	ce	
17			1 2	1 2	1 2			07	1. 2	67	
18			1 2	1 2	1 2			08	1 2	ce	
19			1 2	1 2	1 2			09	1 2	09	
20			1 2	1 2	1 2			10	1 2	10	

* CODES FOR Q 3 RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD

 01 = HEAD
 06 = BROTHER OR SISTER

 02 = WIFEHUSBAND
 09 = OTHER RELATIVE

 03 = SON OR
 10 = ADOPTED/FOSTER/STEPCHILD

 DAUGHTER
 11 = NOT RELATIVE

 04 = SON-IN-LAW OR DAUGHTER-IN-LAW
 96 = DON T KNOW

 05 = GRANDCHLD
 06 = PARENT

 07 = PARENT-IN-LAW
 90 = DON T KNOW

	INCRE THAN 20 PERSONS, HEET USED AND WRITE CLUST	ER/ HOU	SEHOLD	UMBER ON CONTINUATIO	N SHE	ст.
Just	to make sure that I have a complete listing:					
1)	Are there any other persons such as small children or infants that we have not lated?	YES	Cl.,	ENTER EACH IN TABLE	NO	
2)	In addition, are there any other people who may not be members of your family, such as domestic servants, lodgers or friends who usually live here?	YES	□.,	ENTER EACH IN TABLE	NO	
3)	Are there any guests or temporary visitors staying here, or anyone else who stayed here last night, who have not been listed?	YES	П.,	ENTER EACH IN TABLE	NO	

NO.	QUESTIONS AND FILTERS	CODING CATEGORIES	SKIP
12	What is the main source of drinking water for members of your household?	PIPED WATER PIPED INTO DWELLING	
13	What kind of toilet facilities does your household use?	FLUSH OR POUR FLUSH TOILET FLUSH TO PIPED SEWER SYSTEM	
		FLUSH TO SEPTIC TANK 12 FLUSH TO PIT LATRINE 13 FLUSH TO SOMEWHERE ELSE 14 FLUSH, DON'T KNOW WHERE 15 PIT LATRINE VENTILATED IMPROVED PIT LATRINE WITH SLAS 21 PIT LATRINE WITH SLAS 22 PIT LATRINE WITH SLAS 22 PIT LATRINE WITH OUT SLAS/ 0PEN PIT COMPOSITING TOILET 31	
		BUCKET TOILET	
14	Does your household have: Electricity? A radio? A television? A fixed telephone? A rehigerator?	YES NO ELECTRICITY 1 2 RADIO 1 2 TELEVISION 1 2 TELEPHONE 1 2 REFRIGERATOR 1 2	ч.
15	What type of fuel does your household mainly use for cooking?	ELECTRICITY	
16	Does any member of your household own: A bicycle? A motorcycle or motor scooter? A car or truck? A mobile phone (handset)?	(SPECIFY) YES NO BICYCLE 1 2 MOTORCYCLE/SCOOTER 1 2 CAR/TRUCK 1 2 MOBILE PHONE 1 2	

NO.	QUESTIONS AND FILTERS	CODING CATEGORIES	SKIP
17		NATURAL FLOOR	
	MAIN MATERIAL OF THE FLOOR.	EARTH/SAND	
	RECORD OBSERVATION.	DUNG	
	RECORD ODDERTATION.	WOOD PLANKS 21	
		PALM/BAMBOO 22	
		FINISHED FLOOR	
		PARQUET OR POLISHED WOOD	
		VINYL, PLASTIC OR ASPHALT	
		STRIPS	
		CERAMIC TILES	
		CEMENT 34 CARPET 35	
		GARPET	
		OTHER 96	
		(SPECIFY)	
		NATURAL WALL	—
18	MAIN MATERIAL OF THE WALLS	No walls	· ·
10	MAIN MATERIAL OF THE WALLS	Cane/trunks/bamboo/reed	
	RECORD OBSERVATION.	RUDIMENTARY WALL	
		Bamboolwood with mud	I
		Stone with mud	
		Uncovered abode	I
		Plywood	I
		Carton	
		FINISHED WALL Cement 31	
		Stone with lime/cement	
		Burnt Bricka 33	
		Cement blocks	
		Covered Adobe 35	
		Wood planks/shingles	
		OTHER 96	
	· ·	(SPECIFY)	
		NATURAL ROOF	
19	MAIN MATERIAL OF THE ROOF	Thatch/Leaf	
		Sticks and mud	
	RECORD OBSERVATION.	RUDIMENTARY ROOF	
		Rustic met/plastic sheet	
		Read/bamboo 22 Wood planks 23	
		FINISHED WALL	
		Corrugated iron	
		Wood	
		Calamine/cement fiber	
		Cement/concrete	
		Roofing shingles	
		071/20	
		OTHER 96 (SPECIFY)	
		(SPECIFY)	<u> </u>
20a	Is the doorway covered by anything when open?	WIRE SCREEN (NOT NET)	
	to the obstract contains of anything miles open	MOSQUITO NET	
		OTHER 8	
		(SPECIFY)	
205	How many windows does house have?	~ ~	
	RECORD OBSERVATION.		
	IF NO WINDOWS WRITE 00		
		Window number:	<u> </u>
21	For each window, mark X for what it is (or can be) covered by	1 2 3 4 5 8	
	a second se	GLASS	1
		SCREENS (not nets)	1
		MOSQUITO NETS	ł
		CURTAINS	1
		SHUTTERS	1
		NOTHING	ł. –
		OTHER	1

NO.	QUEST	ONS AND FILTERS	CODING CATEGO	ORIES	SKIP
22	SLEEPING ROOMS, SALO IF THERE ARE COMMUNITHAN ONE HOUSEHOLD	CLUDING KITCHEN, TOILET,			
23	How many rooms are used INCLUDE ONLY ROOMS (SLEEPING.	for skeeping? WHICH ARE USUALLY USED FOR			
24	How many places are them COUNT THE SLEEPING S INCLUDE THE TOTAL OF INCLUDING THOSE IN AL	PACES		4	
24A 248	under five and/or pregnant	were used by either children under			
25	Has anyone ever sprayed t against mosquitoes?	he interior walls of your dwelling	YES NO		o-28
28		the house last sprayed? THS IF LESS THAN 3 YEARS AGO IH, RECORD 100 MONTHS AGO.	MONTHS AGO	95	
27	Who sprayed the house?		GOVERNMENT WORKER/ PRIVATE COMPANY HOUSEHOLD MEMBER OTHER (SPECIPY) DON'T KNOW	2 3 6	
28	Do you at any time use other protection against mosquitors in your household? If so please say what you used DO NOT PROVIDE ANSWERS MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE PROBE ONCE – "ANYTHING ELSE?"	DROPS 'OTAPIPIA'1 BURNING COILS2 SPRAY CANS	(28A) How effective do you think this method is?	(28B) How often do yos this method?	UAN 1 1 11 2

	NET INFORMATION								
NOW I	WOULD LIKE TO SEE ANY NETS CUR	RRENTLY IN THE HOUSEH	OLD						
29	Does your household have any mosquito nets that can be used while sleeping?	YES		$IF\:NO\to43$					
30	How many mosquito nets or beby nets does your household have?	NUMBER OF NETS (not including baby nets)							
	MAKE SURE YOU ASK ABOUT NETS NOT BEING USED	NUMBER OF BABY NETS	NUMBER OF BABY NETS						
31	ASK RESPONDENT TO SHOW	NET #1	NET #2	NET #3					
	YOU THE NET(S) IN THE HOUSEHOLD.	OBSERVED	OBSERVED 1	OBSERVED					
	IF MORE THAN SIX NETS, USE ADDITIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE(S).	NOT OBSERVED	NOT OBSERVED 2	NOT OBSERVED2					
32	Is this net in use, or still in packet or cupboard?	IN USE 1 IN STORAGE 2 DON'T KNOW	IN USE	IN USE 1 IN STORAGE 2 DON'T KNOW 8					
33	How long ago did your household obtain the mosquito net?	MONTHS AGO	MONTHS AGO	MONTHS AGO					
	PROBE FOR EXACT MONTHS IF	MORE THAN	MORE THAN 3 YEARS AGO95	MORE THAN 3 YEARS AGO					
	LESS THAN 3 YEARS AGO IF LESS THAN 1 MONTH AGO,	3 YEARS AGO							
	RECORD 'DO' MONTHS	NOT SURE	NOT SURE	NOT SURE					
34	OBSERVE OR ASK THE BRAND OF MOSQUITO NET.	'LONG-LASTING' NET PERMANET 11- OLYSET 12-	LONG-LASTING' NET PERMANET	LONG-LASTING' NET PERMANET 11 OLYSET 12					
	IF BRAND IS UNKNOWN, AND YOU CANNOT OBSERVE THE NET,	COAT OF ARMS 13-	COAT OF ARMS 13-	COAT OF ARMS 13-					
	SHOW PICTURES OF TYPICAL NET TYPES/BRANDS TO	UNBRANDED14- (SKIP TO 38)J	UNBRANDED14- (SKIP TO 38)J	UNBRANDED144 (SKIP TO 38)= -J					
	RESPONDENT.	PRETREATED' NET	'PRETREATED' NET	PRETREATED' NET					
	* "Long-lasting" is a factory treated net that does not require any further treatment.	NETMARK	NETMARK	NETMARK					
	 "Pretreated" is a net that has been treated, but requires further treatment after 6-12 months. 	OTHER	OTHER	OTHER31 DON'T KNOW TYPE _ 98					
35	When you got the net, was it already factory-treated with an insecticide to	YES	YES 1	YES					
	kill or repel mosquitoes?	NOT SURE	NOT SURE	NOT SURE					
36	Since you got the mosquito net, was								
20	it ever soaked or dipped in a liquid to	YES	YES 1 NO	YES					
	repel mosquitoes or bugs?	(SKIP TO 38)	(SKIP TO 38)	(SKIP TO S8)					
37	How long ago was the net last	MONTHS AGO	MONTHS AGO	MONTHS AGO					
	soaked or dipped? IF LESS THAN 1 MONTH AGO, RECORD 100 MONTHS.		> 2 YEARS AGO 95	> 2 YEARS AGO 95					
	IF LESS THAN 2 YEARS AGO, RECORD	NOT SURE							
	MONTHS AGO. IF '12 MONTHS AGO' OR '1 YEAR AGO,' PROSE FOR EXACT NO. OF MONTHS.	NOT SURE	NOT SURE	NOT SURE					
38	PLEASE RECORD OR ASK THE GENERAL CONDITION OF THE	GOOD1	GOOD1	GOOD1					
	NET.	FAIR	FAIR	FAIR2 POOR3					
	• HC HC +3 7 HC HC +3 * H4* F1* 4* CRL H 84** FR1 3 • 4 HC +3 * H4* F7 4* CRL H 84** FR1	UNSAFE	UNSAFE	UNSAFE					
	4 - 8 HOLES " HAT EP AT DREN BATTE MT	NOT SEEN	NOT SEEN	NOT SEEN					

NET INFORMATION

		NET #1	NET #2	NET #3
38A	Has this net ever been washed since you got it?	YES >5 TIMES11 1-5 TIMES12 NO, NEVER	YES >5 TIMES11 1-5 TIMES12 NO, NEVER22 (SKIP TO 39)	YES >5 TIMES11 1-5 TIMES12 NO, NEVER
388	How many months ago did you last wish it? IF LESS THAN 1 MONTH AGO, RECORD YO' MONTHS IF LESS THAN 2 YEARS AGO, RECORD MONTHS AGO. IF "12 MONTHS AGO OR 1 YEAR AGO," PROSE FOR EXACT NO. OF MONTHS.	> 2 YEARS AGO95 NOT SURE 98	> 2 YEARS AGO 95 NOT SURE 98	> 2 YEARS AGO95 NOT SURE 98
39	Did anyone sleep under this mosquito net last night?	YES	YES	YES
40	Who slept under this mosquito net last night? RECORD THE RESPECTIVE LINE NUMBER FROM THE HOUSEHOLD SCHEDULE PAGE 2.	NAME	NAME	NAME
41	ARE THERE ANY MORE NETS IN THIS HOUSEHOLD?	GO BACK TO 31 FOR NEXT NET; OR, IF NO MORE NETS, GO TO 42.	GO BACK TO 31 FOR NEXT NET; OR, IF NO MORE NETS, GO TO 42.	GO TO 31 IN THE FIRST COLUMN OF NEXT PAGE; OR, IF NO MORE NETS, GO TO 42 and skip next byo pages.
42	WHAT IS THE HOUSEHOLD NUMBER (SEE FIRST PAGE)?		EXAMINE LIST OF HOUSEHO CONDUCT DEMOGRAPHICH QUESTIONNAIRES WITH HE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD OR B NEED TO CONDUCT BLOOD	AD OF HOUSEHOLD, WIFE OF HOUSEHOLD, WIFE OF HOUSEHOLD, WIFE OF

31	ASK RESPONDENT TO SHOW YOU ANY OTHER NET(S) IN THE	NET #4	NET #5	NET #6
	HOUSEHOLD. IF MORE THAN SIX NETS, USE ADDITIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE(S).	OBSERVED	OBSERVED 1 NOT OBSERVED 2	OBSERVED1 NOT OBSERVED2
32	Is this net in use, or still in pecket or oupboard?	IN USE 1 IN STORAGE 2 DON'T KNOW 8	IN USE	IN USE 1 IN STORAGE 2 DON'T KNOW 8
33	How long ago did your household obtain the mosquito net?	MONTHS AGO	MONTHS AGO	MONTHS AGO
	PROBE FOR EXACT MONTHS IF LESS THAN 3 YEARS AGO	MORE THAN 3 YEARS AGO	MORE THAN 3 YEARS AGO95	MORE THAN S YEARS AGO
	IF LESS THAN 1 MONTH AGO, RECORD '00' MONTHS	NOT SURE	NOT SURE	NOT SURE
34	OBSERVE OR ASK THE BRAND OF MOSQUITO NET. IF BRAND IS UNKNOWN, AND YOU CANNOT OBSERVE THE NET, SHOW PICTURES OF TYPICAL NET TYPES/BRANDS TO RESPONDENT.	'LONG-LASTING' NET PERMANET	'LONG-LASTING' NET PERMANET	'LONG-LASTING' NET PERMANET 11- OLYSET 12- COAT OF ARMS13- UNBRANDED14- (SKIP TO 38)= -J
	 "Long-lasting" is a factory treated net that does not require any further treatment. 	PRETREATED' NET NETMARK	'PRETREATED' NET NETMARK	'PRETREATED' NET NETMARK
	 "Pretreated" is a net that has been treated, but requires further treatment after 6-12 months. 	OTHER	OTHER	OTHER
35	When you got the net, was it already factory-treated with an insecticide to kill or repel mosquitoes?	YES	YES	YES
		NOT SURE8	NOT SURE8	NOT SURE8
38	Since you got the mosquito net, was it ever soaked or dipped in a liquid to repel mosquitoes or bugs?	YES	YES	YES
37	How long ago was the net last soaked or dipped? IF LESS THAN 1 MONTH AGO, RECORD 00 MONTHS. IF LESS THAN 2 YEARS AGD, RECORD MONTHS AGO. IF '12 MONTHS AGO' OR '1 YEAR AGO,' PROBE FOR EXACT NO. OF MONTHS.	MONTHS ADD	MONTHS ADD	MONTHS ADD
38	PLEASE RECORD OR ASK THE GENERAL CONDITION OF THE NET. • NO HOLES > HOLES INT FLAT DRUG HATTERS > HOLES INT FLAT DRUG HATTERS > HOLES INT FLAT DRUG HATTERS > HOLES INT FLAT	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD

		NET #4	NET #4	NET #4
38A	Has this not ever been washed since you got it?	YES >5 TIMES11 1-5 TIMES12 NO, NEVER22 (SKIP TO 39)	YES >5 TIMES11 1-5 TIMES12 NO, NEVER	YES >5 TIMES11 1-5 TIMES12 NO, NEVER
388	How many months ago did you last wash it? IF LESS THAN 1 MONTH AGO, RECORD YO MONTHS. IF LESS THAN 2 YEARS AGO, RECORD MONTHS AGO. IF 12 MONTHS AGO OR 1 YEAR AGO, PROBE FOR EXACT NO. OF MONTHS.	> 2 YEARS AGO 95 NOT SURE 98	> 2 YEARS AGO 95 NOT SURE 98	> 2 YEARS AGO
39	Did anyone sleep under this mosquito net last night?	YES	YES	YES
40	Who slept under this mosquito net last night? RECORD THE RESPECTIVE LINE NUMBER FROM THE HOUSEHOLD SCHEDULE PAGE 2.	NAME	NAME	NAME LINE LINE LINE LINE LINE LINE LINE LIN
41	ARE THERE ANY MORE NETS IN THIS HOUSEHOLD?	GO BACK TO 31 FOR NEXT NET; OR, IF NO MORE NETS, GO TO 42.	GO BACK TO 31 FOR NEXT NET; OR, IF NO MORE NETS, GO TO 42.	GO TO 31 IN THE FIRST COLUMN OF NEW QUESTIONNAIRE; OR, IF NO MORE NETS GO TO 42.
42	WHAT IS THE HOUSEHOLD NUMBER (SEE FIRST PAGE)?		EXAMINE LIST OF HOUSEHO CONDUCT DEMOGRAPHICM QUESTIONNAIRES WITH HE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD OR S NEED TO CONDUCT BLOOD	NOWLEDGEISOURCE AD OF HOUSEHOLD, WIFE O IOTH, AND TO SEE IF YOU

TICK HERE IF CONTINUATION SHEET USED AND WRITE CLUSTER NUMBER & AND WRITE CLUSTER NUMBER & AND WRITE CLUSTER NUMBER ON CONTINUATION SHEET.

CHECK BACK TO PAGE 2 HOUSEHOLD LISTING AND ASK: "Just to make sure i have complete information, **Q**,there anyone else in your household who slept under a net last night but is not listed under a net?"

- Refer to the list of households to determine who will respond to the DEMOGRAPHIC, KNOWLEDGE, MESSAGES AND SOURCE questionnaires. (Head of household, Wife of head of household, or Bath).
- In households where <u>blood tests</u> will be conducted, these questions will be asked of BOTH THE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD AND HIS WIFE.
- In households where <u>no blood tests</u> will be conducted, you will ask the questions of the head
 of household in half of the households and the wife of the head of household in the other
 half, alternating from one household to the next.

RESPONDENT #1 DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

NO.	QUESTIONS AND FILTERS	CODING CATEGORIES	SKIP
D1	Respondent RECORD THE RESPECTIVE LINE NUMBER FROM THE HOUSEHOLD SCHEDULE PAGE 2.		
D2	What is your main occupation?	FARMERI/FISHERMANIANIMAL REARER 1 HOUSEWIFE 2 CIVIL SERVANT 2 GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE 3 NGO 4 TEACHER 5 HEALTH WORKER 6 HAND-WORKISELF-EMPLOYED 8 POTTER 9 BLACKSMITH 10 TRADER (COMMERCE/SALES) 11 COMMERCIAL DRIVER 12 CASUAL WORKERDALY LABOURER 13 DOMESTIC EMPLOYEE 14 GARDENERINICHT WATCHMAN 15 UNPAID HOUSEHOLD HELP 16 UNEMPLOYED 17 OTHER 88 Specify 88	
03	Have you ever attended school?	YES	→ D5
04	What is the highest level of school you attended?	PRIMARY 1 SECONDARY 2 TECHNICALIVOCATIONAL/TRADE or STATE TEACHING CERTIFICATE 3 DIPLOMA 4 DEGREE 5 HIGHER DEGREE 6	

D5	Now I would like you to read this sentence to me: SHOW LITERACY CARD TO RESPONDENT IF RESPONDENT CANNOT READ WHOLE SENTENCE, PROBE: Can you read any part of the sentence to me?	CANNOT READ AT ALL
D6	WHAT IS YOUR ETHNICITY? (one answer only)	HAUSA 1 FULANI 2 IGBO 3 YORUBA 4 NGAS 5 TAROH 6 BEROM 7 JARAWAAFIZERE 8 ANKWAIGOEMAI 9 EGGON 10 MADA 11 ALAGO 12 MOLL 13 GWANDARA 14 MIXED
D7	Which, if any, of these languages can you understand? (MULTIPLE ANSWERS POSSIBLE)	HAUSA
DB	What is your religion?	CHRISTIANITY 1 ISLAM 2 TRADITIONAL RELIGION 3 NO RELIGION 4 OTHER 88 Specify

BEHAVIORS AND BEHAVIORAL INTENTIONS

A1	Is sleeping under an insecticide treated net: Beneficial Neither beneficial nor harmful Harmful	BENEFICIAL 1 NEITHER BENEFICIAL NOR HARMFUL 2 HARMFUL 3
A2	Is sleeping under an insecticide treated net: Pleasant/comfortable Neither pleasant nor unpleasant OR Unpleasant/uncomfortable	PLEASANT/COMFORTABLE

A3	Is sleeping under an insecticide treated net:		
	Very effective protection against malaria Somewhat effective protection against malaria OR Ineffective protection against malaria?	VERY EFFECTIVE	
81	Which of the following statements best describes how often you sleep under a bed net? (Read the response options to the participant and ask him or her to choose the best one.)	I ALWAYS sleep under a bed net	→ B3 → B3 → B3 → B3 → B3 → B2
82	Why don't you ever sleep under a bod not? (Do not read the response options. Choose the ONE response from the list at the right that beat matches what the parson says.)	I don't own a bed net	→ ND1
83	How often do you sleep under a bed net DURING THE DRY SEASON? (Read the response options to the participant and ask him or her to choose the best one.)	ALWAYS	
84	How often do you sleep under a bed net DURING THE RAINY SEASON? (Read the response options to the participent and ask him or her to choose the best one.)	ALWAYS	
85	How often do you sleep under a bed net WHEN IT IS VERY HOT? (Read the response options to the participant and ask him or her to choose the best one.)	ALWAYS	

86	How often do you sleep under a bed net WHEN THERE ARE MANY MOSQUITOES? (Read the response options to the participant and ask him or her to choose the best one.)	ALWAYS
87	How often do you sleep under a bed net WHEN THERE ARE VERY FEW MOSQUITOES? (Read the response options to the participent and ask him or her to choose the best one.)	ALWAYS
88	How often do you sleep under a bed net WHEN YOU ARE TRAVELING? (Read the response options to the participent and ask him or her to choose the best one.)	ALWAYS
89	How often do you sleep under a bed net WHEN YOU ARRIVE HOME LATE AT NIGHT? (Read the response options to the participant and ask him or her to choose the best one.)	ALWAYS
B10	How often do you sleep under a bed net WHEN YOU ARE VERY TIRED? (Read the response options to the participent and ask him or her to choose the best one.)	ALWAYS
811	How often do you sleep under a bed net WHEN YOU ARE SICK? (Read the response options to the participent and ask him or her to choose the best one.)	ALWAYS
812	When your bed net is tom or gets a hole, how likely are you to mend it or to have a tailor mend it? (Read the response options to the participent and ask him or her to choose the best one.)	VERY LIKELY. I mend all holes in my net

B13	How often do you wash your bed net? (Do not read the response options.)	When it gets dirty	
B14	Did you sleep under a bed net last night?	YES1 NO2	→ ND1 → B15
815	Why didn't you aleep under a bed net last night? (Choose only one response.)	There was no net available	

Go to the Next Section.

ND1	How many nets did your household obtain during the mass bed net distribution campaign in Ebonyi State earlier this year (March-April)?		If "0", go to ND2.
			If more than "0", go to ND3.
ND2	Why didn't your household get any bed nets during the campaign?		
		DIDN'T KNOW ABOUT THE CAMPAIGN	
		DIDN'T GET A NET CARD	
		DIDN'T GO TO GET NETS	
		TRIED TO GET NET AND TOLD WE	
		COULDN'T HAVE ONE	
		NO WOMEN IN OUR HOUSEHOLD	
		OTHER 88	
		Specify	

NET DISTRIBUTION AND DURABILITY

ND3	We have found that one year after nets have been distributed, some households that received nets no longer have nets. What might have happened to those nets? DO NOT PROVIDE ANSWERS MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE. Place an "X" in the box next to every response mentioned. PROBE ONCE (Anything else?)	NETS WERE DAMAGED/DESTROYED	
ND4	How long do bed nets last physically (before they are so damaged that they can't be used)?	LESS THAN A YEAR	

GENERAL MALARIA AND FILARIASIS KNOWLEDGE

F1	Have you heard of an illness that causes swollen legs or arms?	YES	→ F4
F2	What is the name of this illness? (NO PROMPT) IF DON'T KNOW, WRITE 'DK'		
F3	What causes it? (NO PROMPT) IF DON'T KNOW, WRITE 'DK'		
F4	Have you heard of an illness that causes swollen testicles?	YES1 NO2	→ M1
F5	What is the name of this illness? (NO PROMPT) IF DON'T KNOW, WRITE 'DK'		
F6	What causes it? (DO NOT PROMPT) IF DON'T KNOW, WRITE "DK"		
M1	What should you do when a child has a fever? DO NOT PROVIDE ANSWERS MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE PROBE ONCE (Anything else?)	BATHE CHILD WITH TEPID/	

M2	If a child gets sick, what signs or symptoms would make you decide to bring the child to the health centerhospital? DO NOT PROVIDE ANSWERS MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE PROBE ONCE (Anything else?)	SEIZURE / CONVULSIONS 1 GOES UNCONSCIOUS 2 ANY FEVER 3 VERY HIGH FEVER 4 STIFF NECK 5 WEAKNESS 8 NOT ACTIVE/NOT PLAYING 7 CHILLS/SHIVERING 8 NOT ABLE TO EAT OR DRINK 9 VOMITING 10 FAINTING 10 FAINTING 11 RESTLESS, WON'T STAY STILL 13 DIARRHOEA 14 IN NO CIRCUMSTANCE WOULD I BRING A 15 CHILD TO THE HOSPITAL OTHER 88 (SPECIFY) 99	
M3	Have you ever heard of an illness called "mataria"? Even if you are conducting the survey in a language other than English, use the English term "mataria" when asking this question.	YES	→мв
184	Can you tell me the main signs or symptoms of "mataria" (in English)? DO NOT PROVIDE ANSWERS MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE PROBE ONCE (Anything else?)	SEIZURE / CONVULSIONS 1 GOES UNCONSCIOUS 2 ANY FEVER 3 VERY HIGH FEVER 4 STIFF NECK 5 WEAKNESS 8 NOT ACTIVE.NOT PLAYING 7 CHILLS/SHIVERING/FEELING COLD 8 REFUSING TO EAT OR DRINK/ 9 NAUSEA/VOMITING 10 FAINTING ALL THE TIME 12 RESTLESS, WON'T STAY STILL 13 DIARRHOEA 14 HEADACHE 15 DIZZINESS 16 BODY ACHE OR JOINT PAIN 17 PALE EYES 18 SALTY TASTING PALMS 19 OTHER 88 (SPECIFY) 09	
м5	In your opinion, what causes "malaria" (in English)? DO NOT PROVIDE ANSWERS MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE PROBE ONCE (Anything else?)	MOSQUITO BITES	

M6	What are all the ways that people can protect		
Mis	What are all the ways that people can protect themselves against "malaria" (in English)?	SLEEP UNDER A MOSQUITO NET1 SLEEP UNDER A TREATED NET (ITN/ LLIN)2	
	DO NOT PROVIDE ANSWERS	USE MOSQUITO REPELLENT	
		MOSQUITO SCREENS / NETS ON WINDOWS6	
	MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE	USE MOSQUITO COILS	
	PROBE ONCE (Anything else?)	CUT THE GRASS AROUND THE HOUSE	
		DON'T DRINK DIRTY WATER	
		DON'T GET SOAKED WITH RAIN	
		TAKE PREVENTIVE MEDICATION	
		(SPECIEV)	
		DON'T KNOW	
M8	How often do nets need to be retreated?	MORE FREQUENTLY THAN EVERY 6 MONTHS1 EVERY 6 TO 12 MONTHS	
M9	Can insecticide treated nets ever be washed? (Will	YES 1	→M10
	insecticide treated nets still be effective against mosquitoes if you wash them?)	NO	→M11
	incorporation in your make a start of	DON'T KNOW	→M11
M10	If yes, how often should nets be washed according to the recommended practice?	ONCE A YEAR 1 TWICE A YEAR 2 NO MORE THAN 4 TIMES A YEAR 3 WHEN THEY ARE DIRTY 4 DON'T KNOW 90	
M11a	What is the appropriate height at which to hang a mosquite net?		
		At a height that allows it to be tucked completely under the mat or mattress	
		Other 2	
		(Specify)	
M11	Have you ever gone to get a free net and been told that you could not have one?	YES	-∋M14
	From what source?		
M12	From What source F	MASS DISTRIBUTION CAMPAIGN	
		HEALTH FACILITY	
		CHURCH/MOSQUE	
		POLITICIAN	
		(SPECIEV)	
		DON'T KNOW	

	THERE WERE NO NETS AVAILABLE	What explanation were you given for the fact that you could not have a net? DO NOT PROVIDE ANSWERS	M13
1	NO EXPLANATION	MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE	
1	OTHER 88	PROBE ONCE (Anything else?)	
	(SPECIFY) DON'T KNOW	PROBE ONCE (Aryoning energy	
2	PROTECT FROM MOSQUITO/INSECT BITES	What are all the ways that you (or other people) use mosquito nets? DO NOT PROVIDE ANSWERS	M14
	KEEP CHILDREN IN BED	MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE	
	PRIVACY	PROBE ONCE (Anything else?)	
0 1 2	PROTECT FROM COLD	IF THEY ONLY LIST USES RELATED TO SLEEPING UNDER NETS, ASK: What do people use nets for other than sleeping under them?	
5	PROTECT ANIMALS FROM INSECTS		
	тоо нот1	What are all the disadvantages of nets?	M15
2	DIFFICULT TO BREATHE 2 POISONOUS 3 SKIN PROBLEMS 4	DO NOT PROVIDE ANSWERS	
5	TOO EXPENSIVE 5 DON'T LAST LONG 6	MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE	
	SMELL .7 TOO SMALUSHORT .8 CONFININGRESTRICTINGHASSLE	PROBE ONCE (Anything else?)	
		If there are not enough nets for everyone in a	M17
2	HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	household, who should be given priority when deciding who can sleep under a net?	
	PREGNANT WOMEN	DO NOT PROVIDE ANSWERS	
	MONEY TO THE HOUSEHOLD	MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE	
	OTHER 88 (SPECIFY)	PROBE ONCE (Anything else?)	
2.1		What is the second and a simulation that is helpe	M19
2	SP/FANSIDAR 2	promoted by the Ministry of Health?	
	CHLOROQUINE/NIVAQUINE		
	OTHER 88		
	(SPECIFY)		
8 5 5 5 5 6 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	OTHER	deciding who can sleep under a net? DO NOT PROVIDE ANSWERS MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE PROBE ONCE (Anything else?) What is the recommended antimalarial that is being	M17 M19

	e give your opinion about the following statements.	. SIY I YOU ADREE, ARE NEUTRAL OF DISADREE.
M20	Treated nets are safe to sleep under.	AGREE 1 NEUTRALIDON'T KNOW 2 DISAGREE 3
M21	Most people in the community sleep under an insecticide-treated bed net every night.	AGREE 1 NEUTRALIDON'T KNOW 2 DISAGREE 3
M22	You can hang a net any place people sleep in your house.	AGREE 1 NEUTRALIDON'T KNOW 2 DISAGREE 3
M23	You can get malaria when a mosquito bites you.	AGREE 1 NEUTRALIDON'T KNOW 2 DISAGREE 3
M24	People are at risk of getting malaria only during the rainy season.	AGREE 1 NEUTRALIDON'T KNOW 2 DISAGREE 3
M25	People can get malaria from eating certain foods.	AGREE 1 NEUTRALIDON'T KNOW 2 DISAGREE 3
M26	It is safe to hang a net in a place where you store food.	AGREE 1 NEUTRAL/DON'T KNOW 2 DISAGREE 3
M27	Cutting bushes and removing stagnant water around your house can help reduce your risk of mataria.	AGREE 1 NEUTRAL/DON'T KNOW 2 DISAGREE 3
M28	Bed nets are old-fashioned.	AGREE 1 NEUTRALIDON'T KNOW 2 DISAGREE 3
M29	Every child with a fever should be treated at a clinic or hospital.	AGREE 1 NEUTRAL/DON'T KNOW 2 DISAGREE 3
M30	You only need to sleep under a mosquito net if you see mosquitoes before you go to bed.	AGREE 1 NEUTRALIDON'T KNOW 2 DISAGREE 3
M31	You can get free malaria treatments at government clinics.	AGREE 1 NEUTRALIDON'T KNOW 2 DISAGREE 3
M32	The amount of money that a family spends to treat malaria in a year is more than the amount of money one can obtain by selling a bed net.	AGREE 1 NEUTRALIDON'T KNOW 2 DISAGREE 3
M33	Pregnant women can get free medicines to prevent materia at a clinic.	AGREE 1 NEUTRALIDON'T KNOW 2 DISAGREE 3
M34	Bed nets are mostly for poor farmers.	AGREE 1 NEUTRALIDON'T KNOW 2 DISAGREE 3
M35	Sleeping under an insecticide treated bed net can protect you from the illness that causes swollen feet or legs.	AGREE 1 NEUTRALIDON'T KNOW 2 DISAGREE 3
M36	Bed nets are a Western plot to reduce African populations.	AGREE
M37	It is possible to hang a bed net over any kind of sleeping space	AGREE 1 NEUTRALIDON'T KNOW 2 DISAGREE 3

M38 In order to be fully protected from mosquitoes whe you are sleeping, your mosquito net must be completely tucked under your mat or mattress, on all sides.	AGREE 1 NEUTRALIDON'T KNOW 2 DISAGREE 3	
---	---	--

SKILLS AND SELF-EFFICACY

SSE1	How confident are you that you can hang a mosquito net over any type of sleeping space?	VERY CONFIDENT
SSE2	How confident are you that you can tuck in a mosquito net property?	VERY CONFIDENT
SSE3	How confident are you that you can use a mosquito net every night?	VERY CONFIDENT
SSE4	How confident are you that you can wash a mosquito net correctly, the correct number of times a year, with the correct scap?	VERY CONFIDENT
SSE5	How confident are you that you can mend your mosquito net if it gets a hole?	VERY CONFIDENT
SSEB	How confident are you that you can make a moveable post for hanging your bed net over any sleeping space out of cement, metal cans and branches or poles?	VERY CONFIDENT

SOCIAL NORMS AND RUMORS

SN1	Most people in the community sleep under an insecticide-treated bed net every night.	AGREE 1 NEUTRALIDON'T KNOW 2 DISAGREE 3
SN2	Most people in my community think that people SHOULD always under insecticide-treated bed nets every night.	
		AGREE 1 NEUTRALIDON'T KNOW 2 DISAGREE 3

SN3	The leaders of my community want people to sleep under insecticide-treated bed nets every night.	AGREE 1 NEUTRALIDON'T KNOW 2 DISAGREE 3
SN4	It is important to my family members that I sleep under a bed not every night.	AGREE 1 NEUTRALIDON'T KNOW 2 DISAGREE 3

SOCIAL SUPPORT

Plass	Please say how often each of the following events occurs.		
881	My spouse helps me to hang the mosquito nets for our household.		
		ALWAYS	
		SOMETIMES	
		RARELY 4	
		NEVER	
		NOT APPLICABLE	
882	My children help to hang the mosquito nets for our household.		
		ALWAYS	
		OFTEN	
		SOMETIMES	
		RARELY	
		NEVER	
		NOT APPLICABLE	
853	My spouse encourages me to sleep inside an LLIN.		
		ALWAYS	
		OFTEN 2	
		SOMETIMES 3	
		RARELY	
		NEVER	
		NOT APPLICABLE	
884	My children encourage me to sleep inside an LLIN.		
		ALWAYS	
		OFTEN 2	
		SOMETIMES	
		RARELY 4	
		NEVER 5	
		NOT APPLICABLE	
885	My friends encourage me to sleep inside an LLIN.		
		ALWAYS1	
		OFTEN	
		SOMETIMES	
		NEVER 5	
		NOT APPLICABLE 90	
		The Treat the second se	

NO.	QUESTIONS AND FILTERS	CODING CATEGORIES	SKIP
81	Have you seen or heard any information about mataria in the past few weeks?	YES 1 NO / DON'T REMEMBER 2	→ 83
82	What was the content of the information about malaria (What did the message talk about?)?	CAUSES OF MALARIA	
	DO NOT PROVIDE ANSWERS MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE	SLEEPING UNDER NET	
	PROBE ONCE (Anything else?)	GIVE PRIORITY TO PREGANT WOMEN/<5 YRS6	
	in the second projecting second	CARING FOR / WASHING NETS	
		IMPORTANCE OF SPRAYING	
		CUT BUSHES/GRASS AROUND YOUR HOUSE	
		OTHER 88 (SPECIFY) 88	
_		DON'T KNOW	<u> </u>
82a	Where did you get this information? Multiple response options possible.	Tetevision/Films 2 Fivers/Handouts/Leaflets 3 Bilboards/Posters 4 Newspapers/Magazines 5 Community Volunteers/Peer Educators/Community Health workers 6	
	and open response options possible.	Music/Drama Groups	
		Community or Religious Leaders 10 Celebrities (athletes, musicians, actors, politicians)11 Friends and family members 12 Other 88 Specify:	
83	Did your household receive any free bed nets during a mass bed net distribution campaign?	YES1 NO2	→ S8
84	Were you there when the bed net was given to your household?	DON'T KNOW / NOT SURE	⇒ 88
	nousend of	NO	→ 88
85	What information did the person who gave you the net provide you with about malaria?	CAUSES OF MALARIA	
		PREVENTION OF MALARIA (general)	
		SLEEP UNDER TREATED NET (ITNILLN)	
	Probe:	YOU ONLY HAVE TO USE NET DURING RAINY SEASON.	
	What did the person tell you about using bed nets?	GIVE PRIORITY TO PREGNANT WOMEN & CHILDREN +5.	
		HANG YOUR NET SO IT CAN BE TUCKED	
	What did the person tell you about taking care of bed nets?		
		HANG OUTSIDE BEFORE USING	1
	What did the person tell you about treatment of mataria?	HANG INSIDE BEFORE USING	
		WASHING NETS	
		RE-TREATING NETS	
	MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE. CHECK ALL	MENDING REPAIRING NETS	
	THAT APPLY.	THE THE PARTY IN THE FOR THE FOR THE PARTY IN THE PARTY INTERPARTY IN THE PARTY IN THE PARTY INTERPARTY INTER	1.1
	THAT APPLY.	SEEK TREATMENT FOR FEVER	

MALARIA MESSAGES

		FREE TREATMENT FOR MALARIA	
		ACT / AQ / AA / COARTEM	
		IMPORTANCE OF SPRAYING	
		DON'T PLASTER WALLS AFTER SPRAYING	
		CUT BUSHES/GRASS	
		BURY TRASHITIRES/BOTTLES	
		CERTAIN FOODS CAN CAUSE MALARIA	
		OTHER	
		(SPECIFY)	
		DON'T KNOW	
88	Has anyone visited your home to talk to members of	611 (S.)	<u> </u>
	your household about malaria?	YES1 NO2	→ 81
	A second		
		DON'T KNOW / NOT SURE	÷ 81
87	Who came to talk to your household about malaria?	DOCTOR/HEALTH CARE WORKER	
	a faith a faith an	COMMUNITY HEALTH OFFICER	
	DO NOT PROVIDE ANSWERS	FRIENDS	
	MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE	FAMILY MEMBER4	
		EMPLOYER	
	PROBE ONCE (Anything else?)	PEER EDUCATOR/COMMUNITY VOLUNTEER	
		(CHP/CDD)	
		GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL/POLITICIAN	
		MUSICIAN/PERFORMER	
		OTHER	
		(SPECIFY)	
		DON'T KNOW	1
88	Were you home when this person came to visit your		-
88	Were you home when this person came to visit your household?	YES1 NO2	⇒ 81
	household? How long ago did this person come to talk to you	YES1 NO2	⇒ 81
	household? How long ago did this person come to talk to you about mataria?	YES1 NO2 MONTHS ADD	÷ 81
	household? How long ago did this person come to talk to you about mataria? IF LESS THAN 1 MONTH AGO, RECORD YOU MONTHS. IF LESS THAN 2 YEARS AGO, RECORD YOU'NE AGO.	YES1 NO2	÷ 81
	household? How long ago did this person come to talk to you about malaria? IF LESS THAN 1 MONTH AGO, RECORD 101 MONTHS.	YES1 NO2 MONTHS ADD	→ 81
	household? How long ago did this person come to talk to you about mataria? IF LESS THAN 1 MONTH AGO, RECORD YO' MONTHS IF LESS THAN 2 YEARS AGO, RECORD WONTHS AGO. IF Y2 MONTHS AGO OR 1 YEAR AGO, PROBE FOR	YES1 NO2 MONTHS ADD2 > 2 YEARS AGO95 NOT SURE98	→ 81
89	household? How long ago did this person come to talk to you about mataria? IF LESS THAN 1 MONTH AGO, RECORD YO' MONTHS. IF LESS THAN 2 YEARS AGO, RECORD WONTHS AGO. IF Y2 MONTHS AGO' OR Y YEAR AGO, PROBE FOR EXACT NO. OF MONTHS.	YES1 NO2 MONTHS AGO2 > 2 YEARS AGO95	÷ 81
50	household? How long ago did this person come to talk to you about mataria? IF LESS THAN 1 MONTH AGO, RECORD 102 MONTHS. IF LESS THAN 2 YEARS AGO, RECORD MONTHS AGO. IF 12 MONTHS AGO OR 1 YEAR AGO, PROBE FOR EXACT NO. OF MONTHS. Was this visit after your household received a free	YES 1 NO 2 MONTHS AGO 0 > 2 YEARS AGO 95 NOT SURE 98 YES 1 NO 2 DIDN'T RECEIVE NET 3	⇒ 81
50	household? How long ago did this person come to talk to you about mataria? IF LESS THAN 1 MONTH AGO, RECORD 102 MONTHS. IF LESS THAN 2 YEARS AGO, RECORD MONTHS AGO. IF 12 MONTHS AGO OR 1 YEAR AGO, PROBE FOR EXACT NO. OF MONTHS. Was this visit after your household received a free	YES1 NO2 MONTHS AGO2 > 2 YEARS AGO95 NOT SURE98 YES1 NO2	÷ 81
S9 S10	household? How long ago did this person come to talk to you about mataria? IF LESS THAN 1 MONTH AGO, RECORD 1021MONTHS. IF LESS THAN 2 YEARS AGO, RECORD MONTHS AGO. IF 122 MONTHS AGO OR 1 YEAR AGO, PROBE FOR EXACT NO. OF MONTHS. Was this visit after your household received a free bed net?	YES 1 NO 2 MONTHS AGO 0 > 2 YEARS AGO 95 NOT SURE 98 YES 1 NO 2 DIDN'T RECEIVE NET 3	→ S1
89	household? How long ago did this person come to talk to you about mataria? IF LESS THAN 1 MONTH AGO, RECORD 102 MONTHS. IF LESS THAN 2 YEARS AGO, RECORD MONTHS AGO. IF 12 MONTHS AGO OR 1 YEAR AGO, PROBE FOR EXACT NO. OF MONTHS. Was this visit after your household received a free	YES 1 NO 2 MONTHS AGO 95 NOT SURE 98 YES 1 NO 2 DIDN'T RECEIVE NET 3 DON'T KNOW / NOT SURE 99	→ 81
S9 S10	household? How long ago did this person come to talk to you about mataria? IF LESS THAN 1 MONTH AGO, RECORD 1021MONTHS. IF LESS THAN 2 YEARS AGO, RECORD MONTHS AGO. IF 122 MONTHS AGO OR 1 YEAR AGO, PROBE FOR EXACT NO. OF MONTHS. Was this visit after your household received a free bed net?	YES 1 NO 2 MONTHS AGO 95 NOT SURE 98 YES 1 NO 2 DIDN'T RECEIVE NET 3 DON'T KNOW / NOT SURE 99 CAUSES OF MALARIA 0	÷ 81
S9 S10	household? How long ago did this person come to talk to you about mataria? IF LESS THAN 1 MONTH AGO, RECORD 1021MONTHS. IF LESS THAN 2 YEARS AGO, RECORD MONTHS AGO. IF 122 MONTHS AGO OR 1 YEAR AGO, PROBE FOR EXACT NO. OF MONTHS. Was this visit after your household received a free bed net?	YES 1 NO 2 MONTHS AGO 0 > 2 YEARS AGO 95 NOT SURE 98 YES 1 NO 2 DIDN'T RECEIVE NET 3 DON'T KNOW / NOT SURE 99 CAUSES OF MALARIA 0 PREVENTION OF MALARIA (general) 0	→ S1
S9 S10	household? How long ago did this person come to talk to you about mataria? IF LESS THAN 1 MONTH AGO, RECORD 1021MONTHS. IF LESS THAN 2 YEARS AGO, RECORD MONTHS AGO. IF 122 MONTHS AGO OR 1 YEAR AGO, PROBE FOR EXACT NO. OF MONTHS. Was this visit after your household received a free bed net?	YES 1 NO 2 MONTHS AGO 0 > 2 YEARS AGO 05 NOT SURE 98 YES 1 NO 2 DIDN'T RECEIVE NET 3 DON'T KNOW / NOT SURE 99 CAUSES OF MALARIA 99 CAUSES OF MALARIA 0 PREVENTION OF MALARIA (general) 0 SLEEP UNDER NET 0	÷ 81
S9 S10	household? How long ago did this person come to talk to you about mataria? IF LESS THAN 1 MONTH AGO, RECORD MONTHS, IF USS THAN 2 YEARS AGO, RECORD MONTHS AGO. IF '12 MONTHS AGO' OR '1 YEAR AGO,' PROBE FOR EXACT NO. OF MONTHS. Was this visit after your household received a free bed net? What did this person say to you about mataria? Probe:	YES 1 NO 2 MONTHS AGO 2 > 2 YEARS AGO 95 NOT SURE 98 YES 1 NO 2 DIDN'T RECEIVE NET 3 DON'T KNOW / NOT SURE 99 CAUSES OF MALARIA 99 CAUSES OF MALARIA 99 SLEEP UNDER NET 0 SLEEP UNDER TREATED NET (ITNULN) 0	÷ 81
S9 S10	household? How long ago did this person come to talk to you about mataria? IF LESS THAN 1 MONTH AGO, RECORD MONTHS, IF USS THAN 2 YEARS AGO, RECORD MONTHS AGO. IF "12 MONTHS AGO" OR "1 YEAR AGO," PROBE FOR EXACT NO. OF MONTHS. Was this visit after your household received a free bed net? What did this person say to you about mataria?	YES 1 ND 2 MONTHS AGO 2 > 2 YEARS AGO 95 NOT SURE 98 YES 1 ND 2 DIDN'T RECEIVE NET 3 DON'T KNOW / NOT SURE 99 CAUSES OF MALARIA 0 PREVENTION OF MALARIA (general) 0 SLEEP UNDER NET 0 SLEEP UNDER TREATED NET (ITNILL N) 0 USE NET EVERY NIGHT 0	÷ 81
89	household? How long ago did this person come to talk to you about materia? IF LESS THAN 1 MONTH AGO, RECORD 100 MONTHS. IF LESS THAN 2 YEARS AGO, RECORD MONTHS AGO. IF 12 MONTHS AGO OR 1 YEAR AGO, PROBE POR EXACT NO. OF MONTHS. Was this visit after your household received a free bed net? What did this person say to you about materia? Probe: What did the person tell you about using bed nets? What did the person tell you about using bed nets?	YES 1 NO 2 MONTHS AGO 2 > 2 YEARS AGO 05 NOT SURE 98 YES 1 NO 2 DIDN'T RECEIVE NET 3 DON'T KNOW / NOT SURE 99 CAUSES OF MALARIA 99 CAUSES OF MALARIA 0 PREVENTION OF MALARIA (general) 0 SLEEP UNDER NET 0 SLEEP UNDER TREATED NET (ITNUL N) 0 USE NET EVERY NIGHT 0 YOU ONLY HAVE TO USE NET DURING RAINY SEASON 0	÷ 81
89	household? How long ago did this person come to talk to you about mataria? IF LESS THAN 1 MONTH AGO, RECORD MONTHS, AGO, IF 122 MONTHS AGO, OR 1 YEAR AGO, PROBE FOR EXACT NO. OF MONTHS. Was this visit after your household received a free bed net? What did this person say to you about mataria? Probe: What did the person tell you about using bed nets?	YES 1 NO 2 MONTHS AGO 2 > 2 YEARS AGO 95 NOT SURE 98 YES 1 NO 2 DIDN'T RECEIVE NET 3 DON'T KNOW / NOT SURE 99 CAUSES OF MALARIA 90 USE NET EVERY NIGHT 0 USE NET EVERY NIGHT 0 YOU ONLY HAVE TO USE NET DURING RAINY SEASON 0 GIVE PRIORITY TO PREGNANT WOMEN & CHILDREN <5	÷ 81
89	household? How long ago did this person come to talk to you about materia? IF LESS THAN 2 YEARS AGO, RECORD YOU MONTHS, IF LESS THAN 2 YEARS AGO, RECORD YOU MONTHS AGO. IF "12 MONTHS AGO" OR "1 YEAR AGO," PROBE FOR EXACT NO. OF MONTHS. Was this visit after your household received a free bed net? What did this person say to you about materia? Probe: What did the person tell you about using bed nets? What did the person tell you about taking care of bed nets?	YES 1 NO 2 MONTHS AGO 2 > 2 YEARS AGO 95 NOT SURE 98 YES 1 NO 2 DIDN'T SURE 98 YES 1 NO 2 DIDN'T RECEIVE NET 3 DON'T KNOW / NOT SURE 99 CAUSES OF MALARIA 99 CAUSES OF MALARIA 99 CAUSES OF MALARIA 90 SLEEP UNDER NET 3 SLEEP UNDER NET 9 USE NET EVERY NIGHT 0 YOU ONLY HAVE TO USE NET DURING RAINY SEASON 0 GIVE PRIORITY TO PREGNANT WOMEN & CHILDREN <5	÷ 81
89	household? How long ago did this person come to talk to you about materia? IF LESS THAN 1 MONTH AGO, RECORD 100 MONTHS. IF LESS THAN 2 YEARS AGO, RECORD MONTHS AGO. IF 12 MONTHS AGO OR 1 YEAR AGO, PROBE POR EXACT NO. OF MONTHS. Was this visit after your household received a free bed net? What did this person say to you about materia? Probe: What did the person tell you about using bed nets? What did the person tell you about using bed nets?	YES 1 NO 2 MONTHS AGO 2 > 2 YEARS AGO 95 NOT SURE 98 YES 1 NO 2 DIDN'T SURE 98 YES 1 NO 2 DIDN'T RECEIVE NET 3 DON'T KNOW / NOT SURE 99 CAUSES OF MALARIA 90 SLEEP UNDER NET 90 SLEEP UNDER NET 90 USE NET EVERY NIGHT 90 USE NET EVERY NIGHT 90 YOU ONLY HAVE TO USE NET DURING RAINY SEASON 90 GIVE PRIORITY TO PREGNANT WOMEN & CHILDREN <5	÷ 81

	MULTIPLE RESPONSES POSSIBLE. CHECK ALL	RE-TREATING NETS
	THAT APPLY.	MENDING REPAIRING NETS
		SEEK TREATMENT FOR FEVER
		SEEK TREATMENT FOR FEVER WITHIN 24 HRS
		FREE TREATMENT FOR MALARIA
		ACT / AQ / AA / COARTEM
		IMPORTANCE OF SPRAYING
		DON'T PLASTER WALLS AFTER SPRAYING
		CUT BUSHES/GRASS
		BURY TRASHTIRES BOTTLES
		CERTAIN FOCOS CAN CAUSE MALARIA
		OTHER
		(SPECIFY)
		DON'T KNOW
812	Did the person who visited your home ask to see	YES
	your bed nets?	NO 2 Don't know/Don't remember 3
813	Old the parton who same to use a barro show on	
315	Did the person who came to your home show you any pictures about malaria or bed nets?	YES1 NO2
		Don't know/Don't remember
S14	Did the person who came to your home show you	YES1
	how to hang a bed net properly?	NO
		Don't know/Don't remember
815	Did the person who came to your home watch you	YES 1
	practice hanging your bed net at the appropriate height?	ND
	negniz	Don't know/Don't remember
818	Did the person who came to you home show you	YES
	how to wash your LLIN properly?	NO 2 Don't know/Don't remember 3
	-	
817	Did the person who came to your home show you how to mend your LLIN property?	YE8
	now a menu jour care property.	NO 2 Don't know/Don't remember 3
818	Did the person who came to your home talk with you	
210	bid the person who came to your home talk with you about the things that make it hand for you to use a bed net every night and give you suggestions of things you could do to make it easier for you to use a bed net every night?	YES1 NO2
		Don't know/Don't remember
819	Has there been an event/gathering in your	WE0
	community where people learned how to hang their bed nets properly?	YES1 NO2
		Don't know/Don't remember
820	Has there been an event/gathering in your	YES1
	community where people came to wash and mend their LLINs together?	NO
_	men crites address t	Don't know/Don't remember
821	Has there been an event/workshop in your	YES
	community where people learned how to make moveable posts, from locally available supplies, for	NO 2 Don't know/Don't remember 3
	hanging LLINs over any sleeping space?	Don't know Don't remember
822	Has there been a drama group performance about	YES1
	malaria in your community in the past three months?	NO
_		Don't know/Don't remember
823	Have your community leaders talked to people about the importance of sleeping under LLINs?	YES
		NO
	1.	Don't know/Don't remember

824	Have religious leaders in your community talked to people about the importance of sleeping under LUNs?	YES 1 NO 2 Don't know/Don't remember 3
825	Where or from whom do <u>most</u> people in your community get their information about mataria? <i>Multiple Responses Possible</i>	Radio 1 Television/Films 2 Flyers/Handouts/Leaflets 3 Bilboards/Posters 4 Newspapers/Magazines 5 Community Volunteers/Peer Educators/Community 6 Music/Drama Groups 7 Traditional Healers 8 Doctors/Nurses/Health Providers 9 Community or Religious Leaders 10 Celebrities (athletes, musicians, actors, politicians)11 11 Friends and family members 12 Other 88 Specify: 88
825	What sources of information about malaria do people trust the most?	Radio 1 Television/Films 2 Flyers/Handouts/Leaflets 3 Bilboards/Posters 4 Newspapers/Magazines 5 Community Volunteers/Peer Educators/Community 6
	Androgene reingbond en Produktive	Music/Drama Groups
828	What sources of information about malaria do people trust the least?	Radio 1 Television/Films 2 Flyers/Handouts/Leaflets 3 Bilboards/Posters 4 Newspapers/Magazines 5 Community Volunteers/Peer Educators/Community
	Multiple Responses Possible	Health workers