

1 **Using Appreciative Inquiry, Community Theatre and**
2 **Collaborative Engagement to improve Environmental**
3 **Sanitation Habits of People in Ibarapa, Oyo State, Nigeria**

4
5 **Abstract**

6 *The poor state of environmental sanitation in Ibarapa East Local Government area of Oyo State*
7 *was worrisome. A three-phase intervention measures adopted for this study were appreciative*
8 *inquiry questionnaire, awareness creation with community theatre and collaborative*
9 *engagements with a review of the intervention measures that lasted for six months. Simple*
10 *percentages and t-test statistics were used to analyse the questionnaire items. The post-field*
11 *intervention results on the effect of the community theatre and collaborative intervention*
12 *measures on environmental sanitation habits proved significant with $t_{(2.145)} = 5.276, P < 0.05$ and*
13 *$t_{(2.145)} = 4.031, P < 0.05$ respectively. It was therefore recommended that while appreciative*
14 *inquiry is desirable to re-awaken peoples' sense of situation analysis on environmental*
15 *sanitation, the community theatre is needed to fire their imagination and thought in the right*
16 *direction while collaborative engagements using participant models would motivate the people*
17 *into action.*

18 **Key words:** Appreciative Inquiry, Community Theatre, Collaborative Engagement,
19 Environmental Sanitation Habits.

20 **Introduction**

21 It is generally observed that one of the pervasive challenges facing most poverty ridden
22 nations of the world is environmental abuse. Nigeria is ranked as 134 out of 178 nations in
23 environmental friendliness ranking in the world with a score of 39.20% in 2014 and 3.73% ten –
24 year change [13]. The commonest environmental abuse in Nigeria and elsewhere is
25 environmental pollution through poor environmental sanitation habits. This is noticeable in
26 communities comprising of Eruwa, Lanlate, Maya, Agasa, Akolu, Apanpa, Okele, Owewe and
27 Obaseeku in Ibarapa East Local Government Area of Oyo State, Nigeria. According to

28 Ogundele[25], the outcrops, bushes and rivers near residential areas in the communities were
29 greatly abused by turning them into dumpsites for refuse and human excreta.
30 Ogundele's findings further revealed that 56% of the sewage in the communities were disposed
31 into the bush around residential areas. More of the findings revealed that there was "laissez –
32 faire" attitude on the part of the people towards dumping of refuse with 28.25% burning their
33 waste within their residential environment, 26.68% disposing their waste in unkempt
34 dumpsites/landfills while 45.07% disposing theirs indiscriminately in both drainage/open space
35 and streams/rivers (Ogundele, 2014: 12).

36 Although the attendant consequences of these unwholesome lackadaisical attitude in
37 environmental abuse has not been well documented but Ogundele reported that wide outbreak of
38 diseases like typhoid fever, dysentery, diarrhea, cholera, yaws etc. had been recorded in the
39 recent past. Nevertheless, his findings revealed that poor environmental sanitation attitude is
40 apparent in the communities due to lack of peoples' mobilization, consultation and involvement
41 in environmental sanitation and waste management programmes. This is why the application of
42 appreciative inquiry, community theatre and collaborative engagements were necessary to
43 positively change the attitude/ habits of the people of Ibarapa East Local Government Area of
44 Oyo State towards good and sustainable environmental sanitation.

45 **Objectives of the Project**

46 Consequently, the objectives of this project were:

- 47 • To use appreciative inquiry to increase the awareness of the people of Ibarapa East Local
48 Government Area of Oyo State on poor environmental sanitation in their locality.
- 49 • To stage community theatre on the need to change the peoples' attitude towards good
50 environmental hygiene in the communities.

- 51 • To use collaborative engagements to promote good sanitation habits in order to achieve
52 2030 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of:
53 (a) ensuring healthy living and well-being,
54 (b) ensuring sustainable management of sanitation for all, and
55 (c) make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable [36], in
56 Ibarapa East Local Government Area of Oyo State.

57 **Hypotheses**

- 58 1. There is no significant difference between the pre and post-attitude of the people of
59 Ibarapa towards environmental sanitation.
60 2. There is no significant difference between the pre and post-impact of community theatre
61 on Ibarapa peoples' environment habits.
62 3. There is no significant difference between pre and post-impact of collaborative
63 engagements on Ibarapa peoples' environmental habits.

64 **Literature Review**

65 Environmental sanitation refers to good and sustainable living within the environment.
66 Referring to the Federal Republic of Nigeria [12] on Environmental Sanitation (ES) policy, Ikeke
67 [15] submitted that ES can be defined as the principles and practice of effecting healthful and
68 hygienic conditions in the environment to promote public health and welfare, improve quality of
69 life and ensure a sustainable environment.

70 WHO as noted by Ogundele [25], Owoeye and Adedeji [27] observed a strong
71 relationship between health and the environment such that the quality of an environment has
72 great impact on the health status of the individual within the environment. Earlier Nwankwo as
73 cited by Anunonwu et al. [6] has revealed that the objective of ES is to create and maintain an
74 environment that will promote good health and prevent diseases. This is why the global attention
75 on environmental issues for the past two decades according to Owoeye and Adedeji [27] is


76 “Green Agenda” which involves issues like the ozone layer depletion, global warming, and the
77 ‘Brown Agenda’ such as inadequate water supply, sanitation, drainage, solid waste services,
78 poor urban and industrial waste management as well as air pollution.

79 Researchers have proved that the ES problem in Nigeria needs both a change in
80 behaviour and collaborative engagement efforts [21, 25, 5]. Supporting Mansaray, Ajiboye and
81 Adu; Anijaobi-Idem et al. [5] suggested public environmental education and active involvement
82 of people in improving sanitation in Nigeria. Mmom and Mmom [20] noted the need for
83 interventions to reduce peoples’ exposure to diseases by providing a clean environment in which
84 to live well and break the cycle of diseases. Therefore Ikeke [15] calls for environmental
85 reorientation and practical efforts to eliminate dirty environment that has provided breeding
86 ground for mosquitoes, germs and other life-threatening organisms in Nigeria. This also
87 necessitates cross-cutting environmental education for socio-environmental changes to make
88 people develop competencies, values, attitudes and capacities as regards values of environmental
89 respect [28]. This is why Dakwa [10] suggests ‘Education for Sustainable Development’(ESD)
90 to promote multi-stakeholder social learning for sustainable future.

91 Two theories were used to guide the application of appreciative inquiry, community
92 theatre and collaborative engagements in this project. These are Situation Awareness (SA) and
93 Participant Modelling (PM) theories. According to Endsley [11]: Situation awareness is the
94 perception of elements in the environment within a volume of time and space, the
95 comprehension of their meaning, and the projection of their status in the near future. Indeed a
96 person’s perception of the relevant elements in the environment as determined by his/her senses
97 forms the basis for his or her SA. Then action selection and performance will proceed from SA.
98 This process, according to Stanton, Chambers and Piggott [33] follows that a person’s working

99 memory and mental models will draw from knowledge, skills and experience to reflect and
100 project to the world of sustainability. Consequently, as illustrated in figure 1, it is hypothesized
101 that SA is a function of individual's information – processing mechanisms, influenced by innate
102 abilities, experience and training [11].

103 Situation Awareness



112 **Figure 1:** Situation Awareness adapted from Endsley [11]

113 On the other hand, participant **modelling** is a construct drawn from social learning theory.
114 Indeed, Lopes, Fam and Williams [20] attested to the importance of social learning in sustainable
115 sanitation. According to Bandura [8], Participant Modeling (PM) is an observational learning
116 strategy guided by performance – based treatments. In the view of Rosenthal and Bandura [32],
117 P.M. makes individual to acquire new patterns of behaviour and coping strategies through
118 initiation of role models and positive incentives.

119 PRIME [29] identified the process of participant modeling to include the following:

- 120 • A collective review of evidence supporting the intervention. This is known as the
121 debriefing process.

- 122 • Reviewing intervention rationale to include its potential benefits with the implementers.
- 123 • Deciding the order to model the intervention steps using “implementation scenario” in the
- 124 presence of the participants.
- 125 • Gather materials needed for the participant modeling, using written list of target
- 126 intervention steps, items needed to practice and tangible reinforcers.
- 127 • Make demonstration and continue the guided practice until the implementers have
- 128 mastered each intervention step.
- 129 • Allow implementers independent practice with provision for success reinforcement and
- 130 errors correction.
- 131 • Discuss skill generalization, monitor the intervention actions and discuss the feedback.

132 In a review of evidence – based literature on participant modeling, Adetoro [3]

133 discovered that collaborative engagement is a product of social learning. According to him,

134 Adamolekun [1] discovered that P.M. allows social learning process to include initial

135 observation of a model, the performance of a graded series of tasks with the assistance of model

136 at a carefully spaced intervals, and a gradual phasing-out of supportive aids, leaving the


137 individual progressively dependent on his or her own efforts. In other words, such strategy would

138 enable the individual to develop “a sense of self-efficacy, the expectation that one can, by one’s

139 personal efforts, master situations and bring about desire outcomes in a group” [1]. These are

140 what Jerkins [16] and Kester [18] called preparation for “pedagogies of engagement” which are


141 to promote community values and practices of sharing, caring and fellowship.



144 **Figure 2:** Participants Modeling adapted from Bandura [8].

145 In order to achieve situation awareness in this project, appreciative inquiry strategy is
146 attractive As a strategy to improve social practice, A.I. involves art and practice of asking
147 questions that strengthen a system’s capacity to **aprehend**, anticipate and heighten positive
148 potential of a group of people to discover, dream, design and deliver solutions to their
149 environmental problems [34].

150 AI according to Cooperrider and Whitney [9], has “4-D” cycle including discovery stage
151 that involves appreciating what the environmental situation is; dreaming stage involving the
152 envisioning of what the environmental situation might be if certain actions had been taken;
153 designing stage which involves dialogue about what the environmental situation should be (co-
154 constructing stage) and destiny stage which involves innovating what will be through
155 empowerment, adjustment and improvisation to execute the proposed design for sustaining
156 hygienic environment (see figure 3).



157
158
159
160
161
162

Figure 3: Appreciative Inquiry “4-D” cycle adapted from Cooperrider and Whitney [9].

163 Community theatre for hygienic attitude on the other hand, is to serve as a dramatic
164 reflection of the appreciative inquiry. This is why theatre is a direct reflection of the yearning of
165 the people in order to find expressions and solutions to life-threatening problems [4]. Theatre
166 also helps to expose moral evils in human attitudes and behaviour by interpreting historical
167 trends and clarifying future needs and conditions [19]. It does this by raising the level of
168 consciousness of the people for community participation drawing extensive inputs from
169 members of the community, the facilitators and other stakeholders in the development initiatives
170 [19]. It is a problem-solving performance oriented process to galvanize a community to action
171 for solving environmental problem. Consequently, this study applied community theatre as one
172 of the strategies to improve the environmental sanitation habit of the people of Ibarapa because
173 “it is he who wears the shoe that can tell where it pinches” [31]. The title of the specific
174 community theatre so acted was on hygiene called ‘Imo-to-to’ and it followed six stages thus:

- 175 1. Script writing by an expert in community theatre.
- 176 2. Participant Actors selection from Ibarapa people with their local dialect.
- 177 3. Script discussion with the participant actors.
- 178 4. Rehearsals of the drama facilitated by the script writer.
- 179 5. Scenario acting in the selected town halls in Lanlate, Eruwa and Maya.
- 180 6. Review of the theatre gains by audience answering the Community Theatre
181 Environmental Sanitation Habit Questionnaires (CTESHQ) e. g.
182 . What are the lessons from this community theatre on environmental sanitation?
183 . Did this drama motivate you to becoming a volunteer in environmental sanitation?
184 . Had this drama motivated you to join an environmental sanitation club?

185

186

187

188 The six stages of the community theatre management can be diagrammatically illustrated thus:

189

190

191

192


193

194

195

196

197



198 **Figures 5:** Community Theatre Management Stages

199 **Source:** Adapted from Komolafe [19].

200

201 Collaborative Engagement however, is a partnering process through which individuals, groups
202 and organizations have the opportunity to become actively involved in a project or programme of
203 activity [2]. According to the United Nations Environment Programme Finance Initiative
204 (UNEP, FI) [37], Collaborative Engagement is a process of collective fresh looking at things
205 with the hope of getting new ideas to test different approaches and skills to engagement in order
206 to get better results. Thus, C.E is widely acknowledged by experts as an increasingly important
207 efficient vehicle for waste disposal and management [2, 23].

208 Radtke [30] opined that the effectiveness of collaborative initiatives depends on civic
209 participation, cross – sector collaborations, trust and commitment, social networking, ownership
210 structures, hands on installation and maintenance by the stakeholders. This civic engagement is
211 based on promotes the idea of green citizenship that environmental friendliness [30].

212 In practical sense however, the Association of Information and Image
213 Management [7] adapted model of Collaborative Engagement (see figure 4) was applied for
214 intervention measures in this project. It involved four cyclical steps thus:

- 215 • Selection of participant models for intervention activities.
- 216 • Motivation of participant models in the intervention activities.
- 217 • Sustainability of the project through constant mobilization efforts of the participant
218 models.
- 219 • Review of Collaborative Engagement activities among all the stakeholders and
220 participant models.

221

222

223

224

225


226

227

228

229

230



231 **Figure 4: Collaborative Engagement Life – Cycle**

232 **Source:** Association of Information and Image Management [7].

233

Methodology

234

Research Design

235

This action research adopted a three phase intervention strategies using appreciative

236

inquiry, community theatre and collaborative engagements in improving peoples' environmental

237 sanitation habit at Lanlate, Eruwa and Maya towns in Ibarapa East Local Government, Oyo
238 State.

239

240 **Area of Study**

241 Lanlate, Eruwa and Maya serve as commercial centres in Ibarapa East Local Government
242 Area of Oyo State lying between longitude 3⁰ 15 and 3⁰ 35' East and latitude 7⁰ 25' and latitude
243 7⁰ 25' North of the equator. They are located in tropical climatic belt with a mean annual
244 temperature of 27^{0C} (an annual range of 8^{0C}) and a yearly rainfall of between 150cms and
245 200cms from April to September every year [34].

246 **Population of Study**

247 According to Ogundiran, Obanisola and Adebisi [26], Eruwa has a population of 30,659;
248 Lanlate 12,996, and Maya 1405 (judging from 2006 population census) with Ibarapa Polytechnic
249 at Eruwa, Emmanuel Alayande College of Education, Oyo Lanlate campus and the five-daily
250 marketing at Maya significantly contributing to the daily increase in the population of the
251 localities (45,060 out of 118,226 people).

252 **Samples and Sampling Techniques**

253 A total samples of 450 adults (including the three kings, fifteen chiefs, one local
254 government chairman, three health officers and three sanitary inspectors) were randomly
255 selected from the three communities (Eruwa, Lanlate and Maya) for the study. They were
256 involved in answering Appreciative Inquiry Questionnaires, participated in community theatre
257 and 15 of them (that were well trained) served as the Participant Models in collaborative
258 engagements. Furthermore, sixteen Research Assistants were engaged for the administration of
259 the questionnaires.

260 **Instrumentation and Validity Test**

261 The questionnaire items on appreciative inquiry, community theatre and collaborative
262 engagements in environmental sanitation were validated by two Geographers and a Social
263 Studies Educator who after their moderations confirmed their face validity. Furthermore, after
264 two weeks of interval on pilot questionnaires' administration on twenty adult members (who
265 were not part of the samples) in the three localities, a correlation index of Pearson $r = 0.67$ was
266 obtained.

267 **The Intervention Actions**

268 The intervention measures which lasted 20 weeks included:

269 **1st Intervention Phase**

270 Using questionnaire on appreciative inquiry adapted from Cooperrider and Whitney [9];
271 Mohr and Watkins [22] to make people become more aware and appreciative of the poor
272 environmental sanitation in Eruwa, Lanlate and Maya areas of Ibarapa, dream the preferred
273 future environment, design the preferred future environment and innovate and improvise ways to
274 create the preferred future environment.

275 **2nd Intervention Phase**

276 Participant Actors were selected for the community theatre, script discussions made,
277 rehearsals of the drama facilitated by the script writer, followed by **scenerio** acting in the selected
278 town halls in Lanlate, Eruwa and Maya with the review of the theatre gains by the audience.

279 **3rd Intervention Phase**

280 Collaborative Engagements as adapted from Association of Information and Image
281 Management [7] was undertaken to motivate the Participant Models to evacuate the existing
282 scattered wastes from their present location to the new dumpsites and clear the blocked
283 drainages. Health Officers were also admonished to follow-up the collaborative engagements in

284 the localities. After 3-months, the Participant Models were engaged in evaluating the project
285 thus:

286 . How would you rate the attitude of the people to environmental sanitation in the community?

287 (a) Very Good (b) Good (c) Average (d) Poor

288 . How would you rate the status of refuse disposal in this community?

289 (a) Very Good (b) Good (c) Average (d) Poor

290 . How would you rate the status of drainage and sewage in this community?

291 (a) Very Good (b) Good (c) Average (d) Poor

292 . How would you rate the peoples' need for appropriate environmental sanitation community
293 theatre?

294 (a) Greatly needed (b) Needed (c) Occasionally needed (d) Not needed

295 . How would you rate the peoples' experience on environmental sanitation community theatre?

296 (a) Very adequate (b) Adequate (c) Partially adequate (d) Not adequate

297 . How would you rate the impact of environmental sanitation community theatre in this
298 environment?

299 (a) Great impact (b) Impact (c) Partial impact (d) Poor impact

300 . How would you rate peoples' current status of collaborative engagements on environmental
301 sanitation?

302 (a) Very Good (b) Good (c) Average (d) Poor

303 . How would you rate the peoples' readiness for collaborative engagements in environmental
304 sanitation?

305 (a) Very ready (b) Ready (c) Occasionally ready (d) Not ready

306 . How would you rate the current impact of collaborative engagements in environmental
307 sanitation in this community?

308 (a) Great impact (b) Impact (c) Partial impact (d) Poor impact

309

310 **Method of Data Analysis**

311 The section A and B of the Appreciative Inquiry Questionnaires on Environmental
312 Sanitation Habit (AIQESH), Community Theatre Environmental Sanitation Habit (CTESH) and
313 Collaborative Engagements in Environmental Sanitation (CEES) were analysed with frequency
314 counts and percentages while items on pre and post attitude of the people to environmental
315 sanitation, impact of the community theatre and impact of the collaborative engagements' ratings
316 on 4-Likert scales by the Participant Models were analysed with t-test statistics.

317 **Test of Hypotheses**

318 **HO₁**: There is no significant difference between the pre and post-attitude of the people of
319 Ibarapa towards environmental sanitation.

320 **Table 1: T-test Analysis on the pre and post –attitude of Ibarapa people on environmental**
321 **sanitation.**

Categories	N	- X	SD	Df	t-cal	crit- value	Decision
Post-Attitude sanitation	15	3.00	0.65	28	5.880	2.048	Sig
Pre-Attitude on sanitation	15	1.53	0.52				

322 $t_{(2,145)} = 5.880, p < 0.05$

323 As can be seen in table 1, there **exists** a significant difference in the pre and post attitude
324 of the people of Ibarapa towards environmental sanitation. This is because the calculated t-score
325 of 5.880 is greater than the critical-value of 2.048 at $P < 0.05$. This **as** rated by the participant

326 models (PM) indicates that as at the end of the experiment, the people gained a positive
 327 attitudinal change score of 1.47.

328 **HO₂**: There is no significant difference between the pre and post-impact of community theatre
 329 on Ibarapa peoples' environmental sanitation habits.

330 **Table 2: T-test Analysis on the pre and post-impact of community theatre on Ibarapa**
 331 **Peoples' Environmental Sanitation Habits.**

Categories	N	\bar{x}	SD	df	t-cal	crit-value	Decision
Post-Community Theatre Impact	15	3.13	0.92	28	5.276	2.048	Sig
Pre- Community Theatre Impact	15	1.60	0.74				

332 $t_{(2,145)} = 5.276, P < 0.05$

333 The result in Table 2 reveals a significant impact of community theatre on Ibarapa
 334 peoples' environmental sanitation habit because the calculated t-value of 5.276 is greater than the
 335 critical-value of 2.048 at $P < 0.05$. Hence, there is a significant difference between the pre and
 336 post environmental sanitation habits of the people based on community theatre engagements.

337 **HO₃**: There is no significant difference in pre and post impact of collaborative engagements on
 338 **Ibarapapeoples'** environmental sanitation habits.

339 **Table 3: T-test Analysis on the Pre and Post impact of collaborative engagement on**
 340 **Ibarapa Peoples' Environmental Sanitation Habits.**

Categories	N	\bar{x}	SD	Df	t-cal	Crit-value	Decision
Post-Collaborative Engagement Habits	15	3.33	0.49	28	4.031	2.048	sig
Pre- Collaborative Engagement Habits	15	2.07	1.10				

341 $\therefore t_{(2,145)} = 4.031, P < 0.05$

342 As can be seen from Table 3, there is a significant difference between the pre and post-
343 impact of collaborative engagements on Ibarapa peoples' environmental sanitation habits
344 because the calculated t-value of 4.031 is greater than the critical-value of 2.048 at $P < 0.05$.
345 Hence, the null hypothesis is hereby rejected.

346 **Discussion**

347 The three research hypotheses that were tested in this project proved significant in
348 outcomes. First, there was a significant difference between the pre and post-attitude of the people
349 towards environmental sanitation. Initially, the people seemed indifferent to their environmental
350 sanitation habits with them raising concern about the locality's environmental sanitation habit
351 (96.7%), noticing drainage blockages (67.8%), noticing littering of ground with refuse (69.7%)
352 and disposing of refuse in public bays with human excreta (74.6%). However, the post-attitude
353 test revealed a positive improvement in the attitude of the people towards environmental
354 sanitation habit with an increased mean score of 1.47 i.e. 3-1.53 (see table 1). This positive
355 attitudinal change is in line with the theory of Kessler [18] that appreciative inquiry usually
356 result in better, more effective, convivial and sustainable environmental system because people
357 will be able "to discover, dream, design and deliver solutions to their environmental problems"
358 [9, 34]. It also aligns with the principle of constructionism where people construct the
359 environment they inhabit [38].

360 The second significant result was on the impact of community theatre on the peoples'
361 environmental sanitation habits. According to the finding, the mean score difference between the
362 pre-community theatre experience and the post-community theatre experience was 1.53 with a t-
363 calculated score of 5.276 (see table 2). This is in line with the submission of Idogho [14] that
364 community theatre is a "direct reflection of the yearning of the people in order to find

365 expressions and solutions to life threatening problems” [4]. It is also for clarifying future needs
366 and conditions [19], calling people to action for better future [14].

367 The third significant outcome was the impact of collaborative engagements such as using
368 the participant models to mobilize the community people to clear the blocked drainages, the
369 littered refuse **garbages** and digging of new dump sites far away in the bush. The mean score
370 difference between the pre – collaborative stage and the post – collaborative stage was 1.26 with
371 a t-test value of 4.031 proving significant at 0.05 level of probability. This result is in line with
372 the findings of Shen and Wu (2005) in the works of Adetola et al [2] that collaborative
373 engagement is an efficient vehicle for waste disposal and management. It is also in tandem with
374 the submission of Radtke [30] that collaborative initiative is a civic engagement that promotes
375 ‘green citizenship and environmental friendliness’.

376 **Recommendations**

377 Judging from the outcomes of this study, it is hereby recommended that:

- 378 - Appreciative Inquiry using series of structured questionnaire items and interview
379 questions is essential to create environmental situation awareness. This would lead to
380 perception of the elements in the environment, comprehension of a poor state of
381 environmental sanitation, projection of a desired future status and a ready – stage for
382 collaborative action.
- 383 - Community theatre is desirous for calling peoples’ attention to an unhygienic
384 environmental sanitation habit with the hope of gingering peoples’ mind to correct the
385 situation. It is also required to call peoples’ attention to the consequences of their poor
386 environmental sanitation habit in order to fashion a better attitude.

- 387 - Collaborative engagement for environmental sanitation should be fashioned along
388 Bandura's social learning theory, using participant models to facilitate the right
389 environmental sanitation behaviour in the community. This is to let the trained
390 environmental sanitation models teach others so that others can also do it well. It is
391 therefore essential that collaborative engagement for environmental sanitation requires a
392 lot of incentives and tools such as provision of motorized refuse bays, shovels, rakes,
393 **diggers** etc. for clearing **garbages** in the community.
- 394 - Some Environmental Sanitation Participant Models (ESPM) are required to be selected
395 and trained from each wards and they are to be attending quarterly meetings with the
396 local government Health Officers in order to build-up a good synergy for good
397 environmental sanitation.
- 398 - Health Officers are admonished to be more alive to their responsibilities of regularly
399 visiting the communities to enforce environmental sanitation compliance. Adequate
400 vehicles with generous allowances should be provided for the health officers in order to
401 motivate them to perform their duties well.
- 402 - Regular advocacy programmes are needed in the communities on good environmental
403 sanitation habits and hygienic living.
- 404 - There is an urgent need for construction of more public toilets since most of the
405 communities are made – up of low – income earners in the rural sector and many of the
406 houses have no toilets. This can be done through public – private partnership as people
407 indicated their willingness to pay for the toilet services. Indigenous and outside
408 philanthropists can also be invited to the communities to donate modern public toilets to
409 be managed for the communities by the environmental sanitation participant models.

410 **Conclusion**

411 There is no doubt that health is wealth and most of the contagious diseases emanate from
412 poor environmental sanitation. However, the use of appreciative inquiry combined with
413 appropriate community theatre and **environmental sanitation collaborative engagements is** a
414 necessity to improve environmental sanitation habits in Nigeria. Indeed, when community people
415 are sensitized to their poor environmental sanitation situation with a reflecting drama, they are
416 most likely to be willing to change their habits positively. Hence, it is essential that all and
417 sundry must be called to action through collaborative initiatives to build a culture of good
418 environmental sanitation in Nigeria.

419 **References**

- 420 1. Adamolekun O. Albert Bandura. Uba, A. (Ed.), Theories of personality. Ibadan:
421 Claverianum press. 1987;196-207
- 422 2. Adetola A, Goulding J, Liyanage C. Collaborative engagement Approaches for delivering
423 sustainable infrastructure projects in the AEC sector: a review. International Journal
424 Construction Supply Chain Management.2011;1: 1-24.
- 425 3. Adetoro RA. Learning together, constructive controversy and learning outcomes of Ogun
426 State junior secondary school students in peace education aspect of social studies. Ph.D.
427 thesis.OlabisiOnabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye, Nigeria.2014.
- 428 4. Akoshoro GO, Kayode J, Husseini S. Theatre development: Opportunities and challenges
429 in a developing world. Journal of Communication.2010;1 (2): 107-112.
- 430 5. Anijaobi-Idem FN, Ukata BN, Bisong, NN. Environmental awareness and school
431 sanitation in Calabar metropolis of Cross Rivers State, Nigeria. Journal of Education and
432 Practice.2015; 6(4): 68-71.
- 433 6. Anunonwu CO, Amadi A, Nwankwo B, Nnadozie NJB, Nnaemeka CO, Kachi SN,
434 Uchechuckwu CO. Evaluation of environmental sanitation in Owerri municipal council
435 of Imo State. Research Journal of Medical Sciences.(2009);3(4): 137 – 140.
- 436 7. Association of Information and Image Management (AIIM) What is collaboration?2015.
437 Available:<http://www.aiim.org/what-is-collaboration>(Retrieved 21/06/2016)
- 438 8. Bandura A. Social learning theory. New York: General learning press;1965.
- 439 9. Cooperrider DL, Whitney DA. Positive revolution in change: appreciative inquiry.In:
440 Cooperrider DL, Sorenson P, Whitney D, Yeager T, editors.Appreciative inquiry:
441 anemerging direction for organization development. 3rded. Champaign, IL: Stipes;2001.

- 442 10. Dakwa S. Environmental education for sustainable development: The case of University
443 of Cape coast. *British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science*. 2016;
444 16(3):1-9
- 445 11. Endsley MR. Situation awareness global assessment technique (SAGAT). Paper
446 presented at the National Aerospace Electronic Conference (NAECON), Dayton, OH;
447 1995.
- 448 12. Federal Republic of Nigeria). National Environmental Sanitation Policy. Abuja: Federal
449 Ministry of Environment; 2005
- 450 13. Hsu A. The 2014 Environmental performance index – who’s on top and bottom?2015.
451 Available: [www.huffingtonpost.com/angel_hsu/the-2014-
452 environmental-pe_b_4797786.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/angel_hsu/the-2014-environmental-pe_b_4797786.html)(Retrieved 19/06/2016).
- 453 14. Idogho JA. Drama/theatre in education and theatre as an academic discipline: a question
454 of nomenclature, techniques and effects. *An international Journal of Arts and
455 Humanities(AFRREV IJAH)*.2013; 2(3): 228-248.
- 456 15. Ikeke MO. Environmental sanitation and human security in Nigeria: an environmental
457 ethnical perspective. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*. 2014;16(6):45-59.
- 458 16. Jerkins T. Learning for transformative and structural change: The CIPE model for
459 community based learning. Paper presented at the International Peace Research
460 Association Conference, Calgary, Alberta, Canada, June 29-July 3; 2006.
- 461 17. Kessler E. *The encyclopedia of management theory*. London: Sage Publications;2013.
- 462 18. Kester K. Peace education: experience and storytelling as living education. *The Peace
463 and Conflict Review*.2007; 2(2):1-9.
- 464 19. Komolafe, AM. The management of theatre for development in Nigeria: a study of
465 selected riverine areas in Ojo local government area of Lagos State, Nigeria. *Journal of
466 arts and contemporary society*. 2012; 4.Available: www.cenresinpub.org/(Retrieved
467 15/11/ 2015).
- 468 20. Lopes MA, Fam D, Williams J. Designing sustainable sanitation: Involving design in
469 innovative, transdisciplinary research. *Design Studies*.2012; 33(3):298-317.
- 470 21. Mmon PC, Mmom CF. Environmental sanitation and public health challenges in a
471 rapidly growing city of the third world: the case of domestic waste and diarrhea incidence
472 in Greater Port-Harcourt Metropolis, Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Medical Sciences*.2011;
473 3(3): 115-120.
- 474 22. Mohr BJ, Watkins JM. *The essentials of appreciative inquiry: a roadmap for creating
475 positive futures*. Watkins, MA: Pegasus Communications, Inc;2002.
- 476 23. Napari NP, Cobbinah BP. Environmental sanitation dilemma in the Tamale metropolis,
477 Ghana. 2014; Available: [waste.org/publications/9997314/environmental-sanitation-
478 dilemma-in-the-Tamale-metropolis-ghana](http://waste.org/publications/9997314/environmental-sanitation-dilemma-in-the-Tamale-metropolis-ghana) (Retrieved 15/02/2017).
- 479 24. Nullmeyer RT, Stella D, Montijo GA, Harden SW. Human factors in Air Force flight
480 mishaps: Implications for chance. *Proceedings of the Interservice/Industry Training,*

- 481 Simulation and Education Conference (paper no. 2260); 2005. Arlington, V.A: National
 482 Training Systems Association.
- 483 25. Ogundele AT. An appraisal of environmental sanitation practice in Ibarapa east local
 484 government area of Oyo State. Paper Presented at the 1st Annual Conference of
 485 Association for Research and Development in Languages, Arts and Social Sciences
 486 Education (ARDLASSE), Emmanuel Alayande College of Education, Lanlate Campus,
 487 8 -11 May, Nigeria; 2014.
- 488 26. Ogundiran OJ, Obanisola OM, Adebisi OM. Population characteristics of Ibarapa region.
 489 In:AdeniranLA. Editor.Ibarapa Region. Lanlate: Dept. of Geography, EACOE, Oyo,
 490 Lanlate Campus Publication.2012; 99 – 110.
- 491 27. Owoeye JO, Adedeji YMD. Poverty, sanitation and public health nexus – implications on
 492 core residential neighbourhood of Akure. Nigeria. International Journal of Developing
 493 Societies. 2013; 2 (3): 96 – 104.
- 494 28. Perez-Jorge D, Marquez-Dominguez Y, Gutierrez-Barroso J, Diaz-Gonzalez C, Marrero-
 495 Morales MS. Environmental education as a key element for values education. British
 496 Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science. 2016; 16(3): 1-8.
- 497 29. PRIME. Participant Modelling. 2011; Available:
 498 www.implmentationscience.uconn.edu/wp_content/.../12/PRIME_ch11.pdf. (Retrieved
 499 21/06/ 2015).
- 500 30. Radtke J. A closer look inside collaborative action: civic engagement and participation in
 501 community energy initiatives. People, Place and Policy;2014 8(3): 235-248.
- 502 31. Rasheed OL. Nigeria and development in the 21st century: The theatre for development as
 503 an alternative.2010; Available:
 504 www.ajol.info/index.php/catjms/article/download/76566/67015. (Retrieved 21/06/2015).
- 505 32. Rosenthal TL, Bandura A. Psychological modeling: theory and practice. In. Garfield SL,
 506 Bergin AE. editors. Handbook of psychotherapy and behaviour change: an empirical
 507 analysis. New York: Wiley;2014.
- 508 33. Stanton NA, Chambers PRG, Piggott J. Situation awareness and safety. Safety
 509 science.2001; 39: 189 – 204.
- 510 34. The centre for appreciative inquiry.What are the benefits of appreciative inquiry?2011.
 511 Available: [www.centreforappreciativeinquiry.net/2011/04/15/benefits-of-appreciative-](http://www.centreforappreciativeinquiry.net/2011/04/15/benefits-of-appreciative-inquiry)
 512 [inquiry](http://www.centreforappreciativeinquiry.net/2011/04/15/benefits-of-appreciative-inquiry) (Retrieved 21/06/ 2015).
- 513 35. Udo RK. Geographical regions of Nigeria. London: Heinemann;1970.
- 514 36. United Nations (UN). Global sustainable development report; 2015. Available:
 515 [http://www.globalsustainabledevelopmentreport/1758GSDR2015Advanceuneditedversio](http://www.globalsustainabledevelopmentreport/1758GSDR2015Advanceuneditedversion.pdf)
 516 [n.pdf](http://www.globalsustainabledevelopmentreport/1758GSDR2015Advanceuneditedversion.pdf). (Retrieved 21/06/2015).
- 517 37. United Nations Environment Programme Finance Initiative (UNEP FI) Introductory
 518 guide to collaborative engagement;2013