

About this sample Method(s) section: This Methods section comes from an empirical research paper published in the *International Quarterly of Community Health Education*:

Pasewaldt, S. E., Baller, S. L., Blackstone, S. R., & Bryan Malenke, L. (2019). Impact of a hand hygiene curriculum and group handwashing station at two primary schools in East Africa. *International Quarterly of Community Health Education* 39(3), 175-187. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272684X18819968>

JMU alumna Stephanie Pasewaldt (class of 2018) conducted the research described in this Methods section as part of her [Honors capstone project](#) in Health Sciences. After graduating, she revised and published her manuscript with the assistance of her project advisor and readers, whom she listed as co-authors. A Method section overview with writing strategies and other resources for writing empirical research papers are available at [this link](#).

Methods

Setting

This study took place at two separate primary schools in East Africa. One school was in Kenya and one school was in Uganda, two countries with a high prevalence of deadly childhood diarrhea and acute respiratory diseases.^{31,32} The Demographic and Health Survey reported 64.4% of children in their survey were treated for diarrhea in Kenya in 2014³¹ and approximately 50% of children in their survey were treated for diarrhea in Uganda in 2016.³² It is reasonable to assume the actual incidence of diarrhea in children in these countries is higher, since the indicator measured only those treated with oral rehydration solution or recommended home fluids.³³

The primary school in Kenya was a private school located in a rural county for students in grades preschool through seven (seventh grade is the last grade before secondary school in Kenya) and had been operating

Some Methods sections begin with an introductory paragraph that gives an overview of the methodology or study design. Others, like this one, launch immediately into the first subsection.

This article uses numerical superscripts to reference sources, as prescribed by the *AMA Manual of Style* and the publishing journal. The reference list for this article is not provided here but can be accessed via the link in the citation above.

In this paragraph, the authors offer a rationale for their research locations. As described previously in the introduction, this study is a response to the high incidence of childhood deaths caused by diseases that can be prevented by handwashing. Here, the researchers demonstrate that they chose locations where such diseases are prevalent in the population they intend to study—a necessary condition for evaluating the effectiveness of any intervention.

Using a “Kenya Site” subheading here (and a “Uganda Site” subheading later) would have been a good way to help readers navigate this section and anticipate the flow of information.

for 3 years at the time of this study. One objective in Kenya's most recent National School Health Strategy Implementation Plan is to implement school-based handwashing campaigns in 5,000 schools,³⁴ an objective this study supports. Prior to this study, the Kenyan school in this study had two pit latrines for its 80 students, who ranged in age from 3 to 15 years. This ratio of number of students to toilets did not meet the standard of Kenya's National School Policy Guidelines of 25:1 for girls and 30:1 for boys.³⁵ In addition, these policy guidelines state schools shall provide students with handwashing facilities that include soap;³⁵ however, this school lacked this resource. Kenya's Ministry of Education further asserts handwashing facilities must be built into the school's latrines or through a stand-alone facility near the latrines.³⁵ At this school, the researcher observed a water jug with a tap in the school's enclosed cooking area but noted it lacked soap. Furthermore, this tap was located many yards away from the latrines and was only utilized by the school's cook. Moreover, out of the seven other primary schools in the district, this school had smaller student enrollment due to its secluded location among many acres of farms. Thus, the majority of students who attend this school are children of nearby farmers of low socioeconomic status. The three primary schools closest in proximity also failed to meet the acceptable ratio of number of students to toilets at the time of this study. Although these other primary schools had handwashing facilities for their students, they were not maintained or functioning adequately, that is, one school's handwashing facility had one

Readers can get lost in long paragraphs. Paragraph breaks work as signposts that help readers recognize shifts in topic, tone, or purpose. Here, the writers missed an opportunity to begin a new paragraph when they broadened the topic and began discussing other schools in the region.

Not all empirical research papers offer this level of detail about the policies, socio-economic factors, and geographic features that characterize the project location. However, given that this article was published in an international journal whose readers may not be familiar with the research setting, this paragraph offers valuable context. This information will also help readers qualify the study results, which could vary in different contexts.

working tap out of five. It is important to note, due to the public status of these other schools, the Kenyan government paid for the installation of the handwashing stations but not their upkeep.

The primary school in Uganda was a public school located in an urban county for students in grades preschool through eight (eighth grade is the last grade before secondary school in Uganda), and it had been operating for 5 years at the time of this study. Uganda's Ministry of Health focuses on adopting high levels of personal hygiene as a core sanitation improvement strategy.³⁶ To promote personal hygiene, the Ministry calls for the creation of programs increasing handwashing behavior by 50%,³⁶ a strategy this study supports. Prior to this study, the Ugandan school in this study had four pit latrines for its 205 students, who ranged in age from 3 to 15 years. This ratio of number of students to toilets did not meet the requirements of Uganda's Ministry of Education and Sports Guidelines of 40 students per one toilet at primary schools.³⁷ In contrast to Kenya, Uganda does not currently have national standards regarding handwashing facilities.³⁸ Thus, there is low investment from the Ugandan government into WASH infrastructure at schools.³⁸ The school in this study is one of 24 primary schools in its district and smaller in student enrollment compared to nearby schools, since the school is part of a small Ugandan organization for very low socioeconomic children. The three closest private schools also did not meet the acceptable ratio of number of students to toilets at the time of this study, but they had handwashing

Some journals require researchers to disclose sources of funding, and many scholars have argued that disclosure of funding is an ethical practice. In the case of this study, it makes sense to share this information in the Setting subsection because it may have factored into the decision to do the project in this location.

It may have been more effective to place this crucial information earlier (both in this paragraph and the last). In its current placement, it splits up government and policy information, disrupting the flow. In general, it's a good idea to group information by topic and to avoid having to circle back when possible.

Notice how the order of information in this paragraph mirrors the previous one. It describes the school's location, the grade levels it serves, and national policies related to handwashing. It then describes the hygiene facilities at the school, offers more political/regulatory context, and provides geographic context. Structuring information in this way helps readers to navigate and to make comparisons.

facilities, which lacked soap and functional taps. Due to lack of funding, the school in this study, like the majority of public schools in Uganda,³⁹ did not have handwashing facilities for students.

Remember that the purpose of the Methods section is to demonstrate the integrity of the methods so that the study's results are seen as valid, reliable, and trustworthy. The information in this sentence does just that—showing that the project location was chosen based on demonstrated needs and that the needs assessment was conducted in an ethical way.

A year prior to this study, the researcher conducted a needs assessment at each school, which was approved through the referent university's institutional review board. Despite differences in the two school's context, the needs assessment identified similar issues at each school. A lack of hygiene education and the absence of handwashing facilities at each school were found to be factors contributing to poor sanitation habits among the schools' students. Through the needs assessment, it was further reported common causes of student absences at the school in Kenya were due to diarrhea, typhoid, schistosomiasis, and absences due to having to help parents work at home. Similarly, the most common causes of student absence at the school in Uganda were due to diarrhea, typhoid, trachoma, and absences due to home-life issues, such as helping parents or caring for ill siblings. The similar extent of issues may be attributed to the low socioeconomic demographic of students at each school, the schools' small enrollments, and the fact both schools have not been operating many years.

Readers might prefer this information at the beginning of the "Setting" subsection for several reasons:

- Chronologically, the needs assessment happened prior to project implementation.
- This information serves the same purpose as the information in the first paragraph of the section (demonstrating that the problem the study intends to address exists at these sites).
- This paragraph broadly deals with both sites, as opposed to narrowly focusing on one, and broad-to-narrow is a typical organizational strategy in scholarly writing.

While some journals prefer this title, this subsection is more commonly called "Participants."

Recruitment Strategy and Study Population

The two schools in this study were selected based on convenience, as the researcher had established relationships with the leadership at the schools in previous years. The decision to implement the study at two

This information, while valuable, belongs in the previous subsection, as it deals with setting rather than with recruitment of participants.

schools, as opposed to one, was executed in order to evaluate the impact of the handwashing program in a both a rural and urban primary school context. The entire school population was invited to participate in the handwashing program; however, based on purposive sampling, only students in certain grades (and thereby literacy levels) were recruited to participate in pre and postevaluations of the program. The researcher asked each school's administration to designate what grades of students be invited to participate in the study, based on their abilities to understand and speak English, since the study was carried out in English. Grade was asked for, rather than age, since ages ranged by grade depending on when the individual student first enrolled in school. The researcher first introduced the program and study objectives to the designated grades' teachers and students. Then, the researcher and teachers discussed the study with each student's parent(s)/guardian(s), as they came to pick their child up from school. Very few students declined to participate. Out of the 39 students in the designated grades of 3 to 8 in Kenya, 38 of these students participated in the study ($n = 38$). Out of the 65 students in the designated grades of 4 to 7 in Uganda, 57 of these students participated in the study ($n = 57$). The total sample size was $n = 95$. Gender distribution of the sample was approximately even (50.5% male; 49.5% female). The study's 95 participants were evaluated pre- and postintervention, and each schools' principals participated in a follow-up evaluation. Table 1

It's common practice to report not only participant numbers but also participation rates (or response rates for questionnaires). The higher the participation rate (and the number of participants), the more likely that the participant sample is representative and that the study results are generalizable. This information affirms the quality of this study's dataset.

Notice how the writing is narrative and chronological in nature. By giving step-by-step instructions, the authors make it possible for readers to evaluate the recruitment procedures and to replicate them, if desired.

This is a *callout*—a reference within the text to a table or figure that appears in the paper. Callouts should “tell readers what to look for in that table or figure,” according to the *APA Publication Manual* (p. 197). They should also avoid directional terms like “above” or “below,” as figure locations may shift.

describes the sample of students broken up by school, study participant status, gender, and grade.

Tables and figures are less common in Methods sections than they are in Results sections. However, this table is well deployed. It efficiently conveys demographic information about the participants, sparing readers the hassle of having to read through a long list of numbers.

Table 1

Description of Sample

School location	Population of students in grades not recruited for study	Sample of students in study (m = male; f = female)	Third grade	Fourth grade	Fifth grade	Sixth grade	Seventh grade	Eighth grade
Kenya	N = 47	n = 38 m = 18 f = 20	n = 2	n = 6	n = 6	n = 10	n = 3	n = 11
Uganda	N = 101	n = 57 m = 30 f = 27	NA	n = 15	n = 18	n = 10	n = 14	NA
Both Schools	N = 148	n = 95 m = 48 f = 47	n = 2	n = 21	n = 24	n = 20	n = 17	n = 11

Ethics

This study was approved by the referent University’s Institutional Review Board (No. 17–0537). Written informed consent was obtained from all participants and their legal guardians.

Study Design

This study utilized a one-group pretest–posttest experimental design. The researcher followed identical procedures at each school during a 2-week time period, though structural variations existed between environmental interventions based on the context of each school. The researcher conducted pretest interviews, implemented an educational and an environmental intervention, and then conducted posttest interviews to measure the impact of the two interventions on students’ handwashing knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors. In addition, a follow-up survey was conducted with each school’s principal 6 months after initial implementation. The timeline for pre- and posttest measurements, implementation strategies, and follow-up surveys is found in Table 2.

This section uses headings somewhat unconventionally. While Study Design is a relatively common heading, it tends to appear at the beginning of the Methods section, serving as an introduction of sorts. Also, Instruments, Interventions, and Procedures generally appear as headings on the same level as Study Design—not as subheadings beneath it.

Although they deviate from norms, the headings in this article still follow a logical structure and help readers navigate.

This paragraph serves two important functions:

First, it concisely conveys the study’s “design”—that is, its overall strategy for answering the research question (or in this case, fulfilling the study’s purpose: to examine the short-term impact of a handwashing promotion program that included both an educational and environmental intervention).

Second, it offers a map of the structure of the rest of the “Study Design” subsection.

Table 2

Timeline for Evaluation and Intervention Implementation

School location	Pretest surveys with students conducted	Interventions implemented	Posttest surveys with students conducted	Follow-up survey with principle conducted
Kenya	June 14–June 16, 2017	June 19–June 24, 2017	June 26–June 28, 2017	December 28, 2017
Uganda	July 12–July 14, 2017	July 17–July 22, 2017	July 24–July 26, 2018	January 26, 2018

Pretest/posttest Instruments for Students

The Handwashing Promotion Monitoring and Evaluation Module of United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) provides data measurement tools designed to be adapted for a variety of handwashing promotion programs.⁴⁰ The researcher adapted outcome indicators from this module⁴⁰ to assemble quantitative and open-ended response pre- and posttest surveys bearing in mind the literacy level and English proficiency of the young participants. UNICEF provides complete details of the rationale for the indicator selection and questionnaire development.⁴⁰ All indicators were selected based on their relevance to hand hygiene, and their objective, direct nature.

In-person interviews of the surveys were conducted with each student individually, before and after the interventions were implemented. A translator was available upon student request. The surveys consisted of 12 questions within five subscales measuring students’ knowledge, attitudes, and practices regarding handwashing. Each subscale yielded quantitative data. Three items were open-ended response questions.

Quantitative Subscale Measurements

The Knowledge of the Benefits of Handwashing with Soap Subscale (5 items; coded Yes = 1, No = 0, I don’t know = missing;

The fact that the instruments were based on outcome measures from a trusted child welfare agency boosts their credibility. The authors give a clear rationale here for why they selected the indicators they did.

When describing survey instruments, it is common to explain how the surveys were administered, how many questions they contained, what types of questions were asked, and what themes the questions covered, as the authors do here.

subscale total scores ranged 0 to 5) measured the portion of students who knew the benefits of handwashing with soap. The items assessed knowledge related to illness prevention and the purpose of soap.

The *Knowledge of the Critical Times for Handwashing Subscale* (4 items; coded Yes = 1, No = 0; subscale total scores ranged 0 to 4) measured the portion of students who knew the four critical times for handwashing with soap, as defined by UNICEF²⁶ (after using the toilet, after cleaning babies, before eating, and before preparing/cooking foods). Subscale items assessed students' knowledge of the four most critical times to wash hands and if students knew soap is necessary to use during each critical time.

The *Attitudes and Beliefs Toward Handwashing with Soap Subscale* (4 items; coded Yes = 1, No = 0, I don't know = missing; subscale total scores ranged 0 to 4), measured the portion of students with positive attitudes and beliefs toward handwashing. It assessed attitudes and beliefs about handwashing with soap, including how much an individual valued and enjoyed handwashing. It also measured an individual's perceived self-efficacy to teach others how to properly wash their hands. The

Handwashing Behavior Subscale (singular item; *how many times did you wash your hands yesterday*), measured the frequency of an individual's self-reported handwashing quantity from the previous day. Finally, the *Handwashing Communication subscale* (singular item; coded Yes = 1, No = 0, I don't know = missing), measured the proportion of students who had discussed handwashing with family or friends versus who had not.

One function Methods sections serve is to describe how the data was analyzed. Sometimes "Data Analysis" is its own subsection (and if so, it typically appears at the end of the Methods section). This article, however, provides that information here, describing how qualitative responses were coded and how the subscales were scored.

This giant block of text is visually overwhelming. Readers would be able to sort and digest information more easily if each subscale were addressed in its own paragraph or its own subsection (as in the *Open-ended Items* subsection below).

Open-ended Items

The *Knowledge of the Critical Times for Handwashing, Attitudes and Beliefs Toward Handwashing* and *Handwashing Communication* subscales each had one open-ended response item which allowed the researcher to record an expansion of students' responses not listed in the subscales and permitted students to explain some of their answers.

Subscale: Knowledge of the Critical Times for Handwashing.

Students' responses to what they thought were the most important times to wash hands that were not listed as one of the four critical handwashing times were recorded.

Subscale: Attitudes and Beliefs Toward Handwashing With

Soap. Students were asked to describe how they felt after washing their hands, and responses were categorized as positive, negative, or neutral for the subscale's quantitative score. The student's specific adjectives and descriptions were then recorded.

Subscale: Handwashing Communication. If students said they had talked to their family or friends about handwashing, they were then further asked what topics related to handwashing they discussed and to explain any conversations. Responses were recorded.

Intervention Strategies

The study consisted of two interventions chosen based on best practices and strategies identified in the literature. The interventions were also chosen based on findings from formative data collected in needs

assessments. Influential to planning the interventions was feasibility related to the school's resources, the study's \$5,000.00 budget, and a time frame of 2 weeks for implementation. The researcher developed the interventions based on handwashing promotion theoretical framework and existing resources provided by organizations including UNICEF^{8,9,41} and the Global Handwashing Partnership.²² The educational intervention and the environmental infrastructure intervention together comprised the *Healthy Hygiene Spirit Week* program for students.

Educational Intervention: Hand-hygiene Curriculum. The 6-day hand-hygiene curriculum implemented at each school consisted of various lessons and activities designed to educate students about handwashing and encourage their participation in healthy handwashing behavior. Prior to the program's implementation, the researcher met with teachers to schedule this 45- to 90-minute time block during either a recreational, arts, or break period during the school day. The researcher met with each grade, including both grades with and without students participating in the study, in their classroom for 6 days for approximately 45 minutes to an hour and a half each day, depending on the length of that day's activity, during the preallotted time period.

The researcher implemented preplanned lessons that had been created, and students were given workbooks to supplement lessons and activities. Various education methods including lectures, discussions, worksheets, games, role play, artwork creation, essay challenges, and

This paragraph anticipates and preempts questions that readers might have about the educational intervention. It shows that the intervention was grounded in theory, research, and resources from trusted organizations. It also addresses the limitations that influenced curriculum development (such as the budget and timeframe).

Traditionally, researchers have used the third person (e.g., "the researcher met...") to refer to work they did as part of their research. But to avoid ambiguity, it is becoming more common to use the first-person "I" or "we" for self-reference. However, here, neither "the researcher" or "I" clearly conveys who met with teachers. In cases like this one, the *APA Publication Manual* suggests using the name of the particular researcher (e.g., "The principal investigator, Stephanie Pasewaldt, met with...").

When describing lesson plans, survey instruments, or other aspects of a project's methodology that might take pages to convey in detail, it is common practice to give an overview of themes, approaches, question types, etc., as the authors do here. It's also common practice to provide a limited number of concrete examples (as the authors do with activities) and to refer the readers to appendices for more information when appropriate.

other interactive activities were built into the curriculum. Each day had a different theme, which reflected the curriculum's content, as outlined in Table 3. The curriculum implementation was structured similarly each day throughout the first 5 days of the program: review of previous day's lesson (when applicable), introduction to new lesson, delivery of lesson's main content through various methods (i.e., lecture, visuals, demonstration), one or two short activities to reinforce content, discussion of activity, and identification of how the content built upon previous lessons (when applicable), and finally a question and answer review game between researcher and students. Examples of activities included an *F-diagram*⁴¹ matching game to teach students about germ transmission on day one, *glo-germs*⁴¹ facilitations to teach students about proper handwashing technique on Day 2, creation of handwashing maps to help students observe and identify places to wash their hands at school and at home on Day 3, a paper chain-link creation activity linking handwashing to healthy futures on Day 4, and a handwashing role model pinning ceremony on Day 5.

Table 3

Daily Themes of Hand-Hygiene Curriculum for Educational Intervention

Day 1	Day 2	Day 3	Day 4	Day 5	Day 6
Germ transmission and disease	Proper handwashing technique and importance of soap	Important times to wash hands	Benefits of handwashing	Teaching others about handwashing and sustaining healthy behaviors	Promotion of handwashing in community

During the sixth day, the researcher, students, teachers, and school principal participated in an advocacy march throughout the school's community to promote handwashing. Each school's march lasted for

approximately an hour and a half with breaks along the way to engage with community members. Since both schools only had half days on Saturdays, the sixth day was strategically scheduled on a Saturday to ensure students did not miss a significant amount of class for the march. In days leading up to the march, many students volunteered to work on handwashing promotion posters and handouts during their recess time. The researcher taught students handwashing songs and students made up their own handwashing chants for the march. In addition, during the review segments on days one through five, the researcher prepared students to be able to respond to potential comments and questions from community members inquiring about the march. Students discussed with community members about the purpose of their march, explained the handwashing program their school was participating in, and discussed their new group handwashing station. Students also handed out small flyers listing the four critical handwashing times to observing community members and asked individuals to sign a handwashing pledge that stated the he or she would try his or her best to wash their hands during the four critical times. After the march, students washed their hands as a group before eating lunch. During lunch, the researcher facilitated discussion about their march experience.

Teachers were given copies of the curriculum and encouraged to participate in all lessons. In addition, the researcher met with teachers at each school prior to the start of the program to work on establishing a

In this paragraph (as well as several others within the section), the authors may offer too much detail.

Admittedly, it can be hard to determine exactly how much information readers want or need. However, considering the purpose of the section can help writers determine what to include and what to cut.

If the purpose of this section is to help readers replicate the study's methods or judge the validity and reliability of those methods, some information in this paragraph that doesn't correspond to those purposes (such as why the march was scheduled on a Saturday), could probably be cut.

handwashing/hygiene promotion club, a club later introduced to students on Day 5 as part of the sustainability lesson. It was suggested that teachers begin the hygiene club in the week immediately following the program and for the club to meet either weekly or biweekly. Finally, the researcher left the schools' principal and teachers with fact sheets about handwashing, in addition to all the curriculum's educational materials. Ideas for future WASH activities were also brainstormed, such as participation in Global Handwashing Day.

Environmental Intervention: Group Handwashing Station.

Group handwashing stations were implemented at each school to enable multiple students to wash their hands at the same time. Although the stations were designed to promote group handwashing, individual handwashing could also be practiced at each station.

The stations were constructed a week prior to the curriculum's implementation. To design and construct the stations, the researcher collaborated with the schools' principals and local builders. Each school's station design was based on logistical considerations, including available space and water sources. For instance, the school in Kenya had a large space for the station, whereas the school in Uganda only had a condensed corner for the station. Strategic considerations of the station's location were also taken to promote convenience of use during critical handwashing times.

This information shows a strategic decision-making process—not only providing guidance to those who may wish to replicate this project but also enhancing the credibility of this project's results.

Kenya's Group Handwashing Station. In Kenya, the group handwashing station was built directly in front of the outdoor shelter from which students were served food. It was also approximately 10 yards away from the school's two latrines, which were in the small field directly in front of the classrooms. Due to the station's central location, students had to pass the station to go back and forth between classrooms and latrines. The station was constructed using iron sheets, a PVC pipe, one plastic water tap, and one 250-liter water tank. The tank supplied water to the PVC pipe, which had seven holes drilled into it. The seven holes allowed for up to 14 students to wash their hands at once, because students could stand on both sides of the station and share a tap. The station had two handles to control water flow. One handle controlled water for all seven holes and one handle controlled a singular tap connected directly to the tank. The single tap enabled individual handwashing, during times when group handwashing was not necessary, such as after coming from the bathroom. The station had a large basin with a drain to collect and empty excess water. The basin's water could be drained directly into a cement pit, where it was then reused for other purposes. Four soap bars were tied in fishnet stockings to the pipe.

Uganda's Group Handwashing Station. In Uganda, the group handwashing station was centralized in an L-space shape between classrooms, the four latrines, more classrooms, and the kitchen. The station was built outside attached to a wall directly at the bottom of the

school's latrines' steps, an area located in a corner between classrooms. This corner, also approximately eight yards away from the kitchen, was the location students lined up at to get food.

The station was constructed using cement, plastic pipes, three metal taps, and one 200-liter water tank. The tank was cemented on the top of a two and half foot raised cement base with a raised ledge surrounding the side of the taps. Three taps were connected to one side of the cement structure, and the taps received water from pipes connected to the tank. With three taps, three students could wash their hands at a time as a group; however, each tap could be individually turned on and off for individual handwashing. The ledge surrounding the bottom of the station had a height of six inches to catch extra water, which then flowed into pipes into the ground. Two soap bars were tied in fishnet stockings around the taps.

The Methods section should describe any actions or procedures that could have influenced the results of this study. Here, it's important to acknowledge teacher training, as that could have influenced the results reported by school principals in the impact evaluations.

Station's Operation. Prior to the program's start, the researcher provided teachers with instructions for operation and maintenance of the handwashing stations. In addition, the researcher trained teachers on how and when to facilitate group handwashing. For each day of the program, the researcher asked teachers to organize and monitor group handwashing for their class once a day before eating. On the first day of the program's implementation, the researcher explained to students they would be participating in group handwashing and then demonstrated the proper use of the station for both group and individual handwashing. The researcher

also encouraged students to use the station during other appropriate times, such as after using the latrine, since students at both schools were permitted to use the latrines during class, lunch, and recess. Handwashing station rules were brainstormed with students and teachers during the demonstration and then were subsequently typed (in English and in Swahili/Luganda appropriately), laminated, and hung up on the stations' water tanks on Day 2 to reinforce proper use of the station. Figures 1 and 2 depict the group handwashing stations at each school.

Figure 1

Group Handwashing Station at Kenyan School



Figure 2

Group Handwashing Station at Ugandan School



Impact Evaluations for School Principals

Six months after the interventions were implemented, each school's principal was contacted via e-mail and asked open-ended questions to assess potential long-term impacts of the program. The questions addressed whether students were still participating in group handwashing at the stations and if other activities promoting handwashing or hygiene had been implemented at the school. Principals were encouraged to elaborate on any positive or negative outcomes that they observed.

Readers interested in replicating this project may have appreciated seeing the full question set in an appendix.

NOTE: This Methods section is longer and more detailed than is common in many disciplines. Make sure to review examples of Method sections from sample papers or journal articles in your discipline, as conventions for structure, content, length, and level of detail vary by discipline and among journals.