



The Role of Knowledge in the Acceptance of Organic and Human Waste Recycling: The Case of Rwanda's Food System

MASTER THESIS Stephanie Vogel

Supervisors

Dr. Pius Krütli Dr. Leonhard Späth Dr. Haruna Sekabira

Department of

Environmental Systems Science

Summary

By 2050, the world's population is expected to increase to 9 billion people. The growing population intensifies urbanization, which puts pressure on the current challenges of food insecurity and environmental pollution. In Rwanda, rural migration and the lack of financial capital to apply sufficient fertilizer result in nutrient-deficient agricultural soils which lead to a decrease in food production. Moreover, the rapid urban expansion leads to environmental pollution and human health risks from inadequate sanitation and waste management. The loss of nutrients in the agricultural fields is a consequence of the rapid urban expansion since the food is mainly consumed in the cities. The waste produced from food consumption (organic and human waste) is not managed properly and leads to nutrient accumulation in the urban environment. A circular economy (CE) in Rwanda's food system approaches to counteract the nutrient imbalance in the rural-urban interface. The project RUNRES – Rural-Urban-Nexus: Establishing a nutrient loop to improve city region food system resilience, aims to capture the waste streams in the food value chain (FVC) to keep the nutrients in the system and reuse it in agriculture. Strategies thereof are organic waste recycling (OWR) and human waste recycling (HWR) into fertilizer that returns the nutrients back to the soil. However, these strategies first need to be socially accepted for their successful implementation.

Knowledge is considered a crucial factor that influences acceptance of CE strategies. This master thesis investigates the role of knowledge in the acceptance of OWR and HWR in Rwanda's food system. For this purpose, expert interviews are conducted to qualitatively assess the local circumstances. Furthermore, a survey is performed with 185 respondents including farmers, people from the waste sector as well as public sector to quantitatively measure their knowledge and acceptance regarding OWR and HWR. The results show that these stakeholders are knowledgeable and already accept OWR and HWR in Rwanda's food system. The statistical analyses further show a relationship between knowledge and acceptance of OWR and HWR. Knowledge significantly positively correlates with acceptance, and furthermore, this acceptance is significantly predicted by knowledge.

This research contributes to understand the implementation of OWR and HWR in order to achieve a CE in Rwanda's food system. The findings illustrate that knowledge is essential for acceptance of OWR and HWR in order to implement a CE nutrient cycle in the food system. Thus, practitioners should consider increasing knowledge where acceptance is lacking. This research raises the importance to further identify the role of knowledge in the acceptance of CE strategies among all stakeholders involved in the rural-urban food system. Finally, a step toward a CE in Rwanda's food system is achieved, which reduces waste and pollution by reusing the resources in agriculture in order to improve food security.

Acknowledgments

This master thesis could not have been performed without the assistance, patience and support of many individuals. Especially, I appreciate the collaboration with the RUNRES project, ETH Zurich and the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA) in Kigali.

I would like to extend my gratitude first and foremost to my thesis supervisors Dr. Leonhard Späth and Dr. Pius Krütli from ETH Zurich for mentoring and guiding me over the course of this project. Their competences, constructive advices as well as their honesty made a great contribution to my progress from the beginning.

Furthermore, I would also like to extend my deepest appreciation to IITA in Kigali. My gratitude especially goes to my supervisor Dr. Haruna Sekabira for supporting my project in Rwanda. His advices as well as his trust and believe in my research gave me the possibility to conduct my field work in Rwanda. I would additionally like to thank Speciose Kantengwa for sharing her experiences and contacts that contributed to a successful field research in Kamonyi District; Sandra Gatete and Betty Kigenza for their administrative support as well as their help in organizing my stay and research in Rwanda; Hyacinthe Nyirahabimana for her translation to Kinyarwanda; and Dr. Marc Schut for the possibility to conduct my research at IITA in Kigali.

Special thanks to Emma Uwera and Gilbert Micomyiza for their excellent translation during the survey, their patience and great motivation. Together with Michel they made my field work an exceptional experience and overwhelming success.

My deepest thanks to all the experts that participated in my research for sharing their thoughts and knowledge, and to all respondents of the survey for their great interest and motivation. This research would not have been possible without their great contribution.

I would additionally like to thank my friends Manuel Stamm for the enthusiastic discussions, his patience and feedbacks, and Helen Thut for the detailed feedback and proofreading. Furthermore, many thanks to my family and friends for their support and belief in me. I also really appreciate my friends in Rwanda which gave me lovely insights into their lives and cultures.

Murakoze cyane, Thank you.



Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule Zürich Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich

Declaration of originality

The signed declaration of originality is a component of every semester paper, Bachelor's thesis, Master's thesis and any other degree paper undertaken during the course of studies, including the respective electronic versions.

Lecturers may also require a declaration of originality for other written papers compiled for their courses.

I hereby confirm that I am the sole author of the written work here enclosed and that I have compiled it in my own words. Parts excepted are corrections of form and content by the supervisor.

Title of work (in block letters):

The Role of Knowledge in the Acceptance of Organic and Human Waste Recycling: The Case of Rwanda's Food System

Authored by (in block letters):

For papers written by groups the names of all authors are required.

Name(s): Vogel	First name(s): Stephanie

With my signature I confirm that

- I have committed none of the forms of plagiarism described in the '<u>Citation etiquette</u>' information sheet.
- I have documented all methods, data and processes truthfully.
- I have not manipulated any data.
- I have mentioned all persons who were significant facilitators of the work.

I am aware that the work may be screened electronically for plagiarism.

Place, date	Signature(s)
Zurich, 15.05.2020	U. VOGEL
	U -

For papers written by groups the names of all authors are required. Their signatures collectively guarantee the entire content of the written paper.

Table of Contents

Sı	ummary		i
A	cknowle	edgments	ii
D	eclaratio	on of Originality	iii
T	able of (Contents	iv
L	ist of Fi	gures	vi
L	ist of Ta	bles	vi
A	bbrevia	ions	ix
1	Intro	duction	1
	1.1	Circular Economy	2
	1.2	Organic and Human Waste Recycling	3
	1.3	The Role of Knowledge in the Acceptance	4
	1.3.1 1.3.2	The Concept of Acceptance	
	1.4	Rwanda's Food System	7
	1.5	The RUNRES Project	8
	1.6	Research Aim	9
2	Metl	nods and Procedure	10
	2.1	Research Study Area	11
	2.2	Qualitative Interviews	12
	2.2.1 2.2.2	Interview GuideQualitative Data Analysis	
	2.3	Quantitative Survey	14
	2.3.1	Operationalization of Objective Knowledge	
	2.3.2	Operationalization of Subjective Knowledge	
	2.3.3 2.3.4	Operationalization of Passive Acceptance and Active Acceptance Survey Sample	
	2.3.5	Survey Procedure	
	2.3.6	Quantitative Data Analysis	18
	2.4	Qualitative Assessment on the Relationship of Knowledge and Acceptance	19
3	Resu	ılts	20
	3.1	Evaluating Knowledge about Organic and Human Waste Recycling	20
	3.2	Evaluating Acceptance of Organic and Human Waste Recycling	22
	3.3	The Relationship between Knowledge and Acceptance	24
	3.3.1	Knowledge and Acceptance of Organic Waste Recycling	
	3.3.2 3.3.3	Knowledge and Acceptance of Human Waste Recycling The Essence of the Relationship between Knowledge and Acceptance	

4	Disc	ussic	on	33
4	4.1	The	Role of Knowledge in the Acceptance of Organic and Human Waste Recycling	33
4	1.2	The	Concept of Knowledge	34
4	1.3	The	Concept of Acceptance	36
4	1.4	Circ	ular Economy in the Food System	37
5	Con	clusio	on	39
6	Refe	erenc	es	40
Ap	pendix	κA	Waste Recycling Strategies	45
Ap	pendix	кВ	Acceptance Framework	46
Ap	pendix	к С	Interviewed Experts	47
Ap	pendix	k D	Interview Guide	48
Ap	pendix	Ε	Transcribed Interview Statements	51
E.1		Kno	wledge about Organic Waste Recycling	51
E.2		Kno	wledge about Human Waste Recycling	53
E.3	;	Acc	eptance of Organic Waste Recycling	54
E.4	Ļ	Acc	eptance of Human Waste Recycling	55
E.5	í	The	Role of Knowledge in the Acceptance	56
Ap	pendix	κF	Survey Questionnaire	58
Ap	pendix	ι G	Survey GPS Locations	62
Ap	pendix	кН	Principal Component Analyses (PCA)	63
H.1	l	Orga	anic Waste Recycling	63
H.2	2	Hun	nan Waste Recycling	64
Ap	pendix	Ι	Confidence Analysis of Objective Knowledge	65
I.1		Orga	anic Waste Recycling	65
I.2		Hun	nan Waste Recycling	65
Ap	pendix	κJ	Descriptive Statistics	66
J.1		Orga	anic Waste Recycling	66
J.2		Hun	nan Waste Recycling	67
Ap	pendix	κK	Regression Analysis for the Knowledge Variable	68
K.1	l	Orga	anic Waste Recycling	68
K.2	2	Hun	nan Waste Recycling	69

List of Figures

Figure 1 OWR and HWR as CE strategies in a food system
Figure 2 The concept of acceptance.
Figure 3 The concept of knowledge.
Figure 4 Process flow of the three complementary methods
Figure 5 Map of the research study area
Figure 6 Process flow of the qualitative data arrangement and analysis
Figure 7 Survey of a male farmer at the market in the sector of Gacurabwenge18
Figure 8 Survey of a female waste collector at the market in the sector of Kayenzi18
Figure 9 Comprehensive knowledge-acceptance scheme of OWR and HWR in Rwanda's food system.
Figure 10 A schematic representation of the acceptance framework based on Huijts et al. (2012).
Figure 11 GPS locations of the surveyed respondents
List of Tables
Table 1 Overview of the OK score calculation. 15
Table 2 Items that measured SK. 15
Table 3 Socio-demographic factors of the survey sample. 17
Table 4 Main findings from the expert interviews concerning the components of the content areas that determine knowledge about OWR of the stakeholders. 20
Table 5 Main findings from the expert interviews concerning the components of the content areas that determine knowledge about HWR of the stakeholders. 21
Table 6 Average OK and SK scores of OWR, the standardized score and the Cronbach's or value.
Table 7 Average OK and SK scores of HWR, the standardized score and the Cronbach's or value.
Table 8 Main findings from the expert interviews concerning the characteristics of acceptance of OWR and HWR, respectively.

Table 9 Average PA and AA scores of OWR, the standardized score and the Cronbach value.	
Table 10 Average PA and AA scores of HWR, the standardized score and the Cronbach	ı's α
value	23
Table 11 Main findings from the expert interviews concerning the characteristics behind factor acceptance and knowledge of OWR.	
Table 12 Correlation table (Kendall's τ) between the socio-demographic factors and knowledge and acceptance variables of OWR.	
Table 13 Regression analysis for the dependent variable PA of OWR.	26
Table 14 Regression analysis for the dependent variable AA of OWR.	27
Table 15 Main findings from the expert interviews concerning the characteristics behind factor acceptance and knowledge of HWR.	
Table 16 Correlation table (Kendall's τ) between the socio-demographic factors and knowledge and acceptance variables of HWR	
Table 17 Regression analysis for the dependent variable PA of HWR.	29
Table 18 Regression analysis for the dependent variable AA of HWR.	30
Table 19 Main qualitative findings concerning the characteristics behind the relation between the factor knowledge and acceptance of OWR and HWR.	_
Table 20 Information about the interviewed experts.	47
Table 21 Transcribed interview statements that indicate knowledge about OWR.	51
Table 22 Transcribed interview statements that indicate knowledge about HWR.	53
Table 23 Transcribed interview statements that indicate acceptance of OWR.	54
Table 24 Transcribed interview statements that indicate acceptance of HWR.	55
Table 25 Transcribed interview statements that indicate a relationship between knowledge acceptance of OWR and HWR.	
Table 26 PCA of OK item of OWR.	63
Table 28 PCA of OK items of HWR	64
Table 30 Confidence analysis of the 13 items that measure OK of OWR	65
Table 31 Confidence analysis of the 11 items that measure OK of HWR	65
Table 32 Descriptive statistics of mean OK score of OWR.	66
Table 33 Descriptive statistics of mean SK score of OWR	66

Table 34 Descriptive statistics of mean PA score of OWR.	66
Table 35 Descriptive statistics of mean AA score of OWR	66
Table 36 Descriptive statistics of mean OK score of HWR	67
Table 37 Descriptive statistics of mean SK score of HWR	67
Table 38 Descriptive statistics of mean PA score of HWR	67
Table 39 Descriptive statistics of mean AA score of HWR	67
Table 40 Regression analysis for the dependent variable SK of OWR.	68
Table 41 Regression analysis for the dependent variable OK of HWR.	69
Table 42 Regression analysis for the dependent variable SK of HWR.	70

Abbreviations

AA Active Acceptance

AoT Amount of Trainings in Work Field

CE Circular Economy

FAO Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

FVC Food Value Chain

HW Human Waste

HWR Human Waste Recycling

MEA Millennium Ecosystem Assessment

MINAGRI Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources

OK Objective Knowledge

OW Organic Waste

OWR Organic Waste Recycling

PA Passive Acceptance

PCA Principal Component Analysis

RUNRES Rural-Urban-Nexus: Establishing a nutrient loop to improve city

region food system resilience

RWF Rwandan Francs

SK Subjective Knowledge

UN United Nations

WHO World Health Organization