

1 Associations between sustainable development goals accelerators and
2 well-being, by household heads' disability status among adolescents in
3 Zambia – a cross-sectional study.

4

5 David Chipanta^{1 2 *}, Janne Estill¹, Heidi Stöckl³, Lucas Hertzog⁴, Elona Toska^{4 5 6},
6 Patrick Chanda⁷, Jason Mwanza⁷, Kelly Kaila⁸, Chisangu Matome⁹, Gelson
7 Tembo^{9,10}, Olivia Keiser¹, Lucie Cluver^{11,12}

8

9 ^{1*}Institute of Global Health, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland.

10 ²Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS)

11 ³Institute for Medical Information Processing, Biometry, and Epidemiology

12 Medical Faculty, Ludwig Maximilians University München, Germany⁴Centre for
13 Social Science Research, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa.

14 ⁵Department of Social Policy and Intervention, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.

15 ⁶Department of Sociology, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa.

16 ⁷Social Work and Sociology, University of Zambia, Lusaka, Zambia.

17 ⁸Disability Inclusion Project Luapula, International Labour Organisation, Lusaka,
18 Zambia.

19 ⁹Palm Associates Limited, Lusaka, Zambia.

20 ¹⁰Economics and Agricultural Sciences, University of Zambia, Lusaka, Zambia.

21 ¹¹Centre for Evidence-Based Intervention, Department of Social Policy and
22 Intervention, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

23 ¹²Department of Psychiatry and Mental Health, University of Cape Town, Cape
24 Town, South Africa

25

26 *Corresponding author: Email: chipanta@hotmail.com; david.chipanta@etu.unige.ch

27

28 E-mail addresses of authors:

29 JE: janne.estill@unige.ch

30 HS: heidi.stoeckl@ibe.med.uni-muenchen.de

31 LH: lucas.hertzog@uct.ac.za

32 ET: Elona.toska@uct.ac.za

33 PC: patrick.chanda@unza.zm ; patrickchanda@ymail.com

34 JM: jasonmwanza2@gmail.com

35 KK: kaira@ilo.org

36 CM: chisangu@palmassociates.org

37 GT: tembogel@gmail.com

38 OK: Olivia.Keiser@unige.ch

39 LC: lucie.cluver@spi.ox.ac.uk

40 **Associations between sustainable development goals accelerators**
41 **and well-being, by household heads' disability status among**
42 **adolescents in Zambia – a cross-sectional study.**

43 **Abstract**

44 **Objectives:**

45 We examined associations between accelerators (interventions impacting two or
46 more SDG targets) and well-being indicators among adolescents in Zambia.

47 **Methods:**

48 We randomly sampled 1,800 households receiving social cash transfers (SCT) in
49 four districts, surveyed adults 16 years and older. Using multivariable logistic
50 regressions, stratified by household heads disability status, we examined
51 associations between accelerators (SCT, life-long learning (LLL), mobile phone
52 access (MPA)) and seven well-being indicators among adolescents 16 to 24 years
53 old. We predicted adolescents' probabilities of reporting indicators using marginal
54 effects models.

55 **Results:**

56 We included 1,725 adolescents, 881(51.1%) girls. MPA was associated with no
57 poverty (adjusted Odds Ratio [aOR] 2.08, $p < 0.001$), informal cash transfers (aOR
58 1.82 $p = 0.004$), seeking mental support (aOR 1.61, $p = 0.020$); SCT with no health
59 access restrictions related to disability (aOR 2.56, $p = 0.004$), lesser odds seeking
60 mental support (aOR 0.53, $p = 0.029$); LLL with informal cash transfers (aOR 3.49,
61 $p < 0.001$), lower school enrolment (aOR 0.70, $p = 0.004$). Adolescents living with
62 disabled household heads reported worse poverty, good health, less suicidal
63 ideation.

64 **Conclusions:**

65 Accelerators - SCT, LLL, MPA - were associated with well-being indicators.
66 Adolescents living with disabled household heads benefited less.

67

68 **Relevance to SDGs:**

69 This paper shows that adopting accelerators can help achieve SDGs-aligned well-
70 being indicators for adolescents living in poverty. However, accelerators may not
71 offset disability-related inequalities. Adolescents living with disabled household
72 heads may require more attention to achieve the SDGs.

73 **SDGs targets:**

74 1.2. no poverty; 1.3.1 social cash transfers, Informal cash transfers; 3. good Health;
75 3.4. no suicidal ideation; 3.4. seeking mental support; 4.1. school enrolment; 10. no
76 health access restrictions related to disability.

77

78 Introduction

79 Adolescents are a crucial population group to attain the Sustainable Development
80 Goals (SDGs). Individuals aged 15 to 24 years comprise 15.5% (1.21 billion) of the
81 global population, reaching 1.29 billion by 2030 [1]. Adolescence is a decisive period
82 to intervene on multiple SDGs. The rapidly developing physical and mental growth,
83 transition into adulthood taking place during adolescence have strong impact on
84 health and well-being in adulthood [2,3]. In sub-Saharan Africa, where the growth of
85 adolescents' population is fast, the potential to improve their well-being is more
86 constrained [1]. The region's adolescents have high rates of mental health
87 conditions, suicide, HIV, and other diseases [4]. A 10-year-old child is six times more
88 likely to die by age 24 in sub-Saharan Africa than in North America or Europe.
89 Globally, suicide is the second leading cause of death among adolescents aged 15 -
90 25 years [4]. Suicidal ideation, defined as a preoccupation with thoughts of killing
91 oneself, and planning of suicide among adolescents aged 13–17 years in low-
92 income and middle-income countries were the highest in Africa [5]. Not being in
93 employment, education, or training (NEET) also negatively impacts adolescents'
94 well-being and successful transition into adulthood [6]. A quarter (25.9%) of
95 adolescent girls and 15.8% of boys in sub-Saharan Africa were NEET in 2019 [7]. Of
96 those employed, the majority (94.9 %) were in informal employment, living in
97 extreme poverty, on less than US\$1.90 a day [7]. Mobile phone use which is among
98 interventions that could improve adolescents' achievements of the SDGs is also
99 limited in the region [8,9].

100 Urgent government coordinated actions are needed to accelerate the achievement of
101 SDGs for the regions' adolescents, particularly in the context of the Coronavirus
102 Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic [10]. The United Nations Development
103 Programme (UNDP) defines accelerators as interventions or circumstances that
104 positively impacts two or more SDGs targets [11]. Studies on accelerators have
105 shown multiple, large, and favourable changes in adolescents' mental health, the
106 experience of transactional sex, violence, HIV prevention and treatment, and other
107 SDG aligned outcomes from combining and re-arranging existing interventions. For
108 example, social protection including cash transfers, education, safe schools, food
109 security, parenting programmes, role of caregivers, and psychosocial support have
110 been shown to be accelerators [12-14].

111 Disability is a serious threat to achieving the SDGs [15]. More than 1 billion people
112 worldwide are estimated to be living with disabilities. The majority are left behind in
113 several SDGs [15,16]. On the other hand, cash transfer programmes, in general not
114 only include people with disabilities [15], but also often pair the programmes with
115 training (life-long learning) to emphasize or explain programme objectives. The
116 programmes also deliver cash and other services via mobile phones to individuals
117 and households [17]. Social cash transfers (SCT), life-long learning (LLL) and mobile
118 phone access (MPA) could potentially be accelerators and support adolescents in
119 households headed by persons with disabilities. We, therefore, aimed to test whether
120 SCT, LLL and MPA fulfil the definition of accelerator in this study, and how they
121 interact with the household heads' disability status in improving the SDGs aligned
122 well-being indicators for adolescents.

123 **Methods:**

124 ***Data sources and sample***

125 We used the baseline data collected in August to September 2019 for the evaluation
126 of the United Nations Partnership on the Rights of People with Disabilities
127 (UNPRPD) project in Luapula province [18]. The UNPRPD started in January 2019
128 in two Luapula province districts in Zambia and will end in December 2021. It aims to
129 increase HIV and sexual and reproductive health services among girls and women
130 with disabilities receiving SCT in two districts. We also collected data from two
131 districts in the same province not covered by the UNPRPD, but receiving SCT, to
132 provide comparators in the evaluation.

133 Households are eligible to receive the SCT if government authorities identify them as
134 extremely poor through measures of standards of living and satisfying one or more of
135 the following criteria: women-headed; headed by a person aged 65 years or older,
136 have a member with a disability; have adult members who are unable to work or
137 support themselves economically and host orphans and vulnerable children, i.e., any
138 child below 18 years who may be living with HIV, has lost one or both parents to HIV,
139 or from any cause, or lives in a community affected by HIV [19]. Eligible households
140 received ZMK90 (USD12) per month, and ZMK180 (USD24) if they included a
141 person with a disability. The payments were disbursed every two months through a
142 local pay point manager, the post office, or the recipients' bank account [19].

143 ***Sample size calculation***

144 We calculated a minimum sample size of 1,800 households, from 90 community
145 welfare action committees (CWACs) which are political units, and 20 households per
146 CWAC. Our sample size calculation assumed a statistical significance (α) of 0.05,
147 power of 80% and Intra-class Correlation Coefficients (ICCs) (ρ) of 0.01 to 0.08 and
148 intervention effect (δ) of at least 0.20 on HIV prevention services including condom
149 use [20]. We sampled respondents in two stages. In stage one, we sampled CWACs
150 using proportional probability sampling without replacement so CWACs with more
151 households and typically with more services would be more likely to be selected. In
152 stage two, from each CWAC, we sampled 25 households, instead of 20, to allow for
153 non-response.

154 ***Procedures***

155 Trained fieldworkers first obtained and recorded consent from every respondent
156 aged 16 years or older on the electronic tablets (thumbprints for oral, and signatures
157 for written consents). They then administered a questionnaire in the area's local
158 language on the electronic tablets installed with Open Data Kit software to the
159 household head and all household members aged 16 years or older who consented.
160 The survey contains questions on socio-demographic characteristics, self-rated
161 poverty, health and well-being, mental health, school enrolment, disability status,
162 proximity to health facilities, health access restrictions related to disabilities, health
163 services, receipt of SCT offered by the government, non-governmental organizations
164 and individuals, training, and MPA. We derived the questions from piloted and
165 validated tools, including the UNICEF Innocenti tools and Demographic and Health

166 Survey. We translated the questions from English into the local language. We trained
167 the fieldworkers using role plays to ensure understanding and standardized
168 administration of the questionnaire. We stored and electronically transferred the data
169 to a secure server. We analyzed responses only from respondents aged 16 to 24
170 years.

171 The study protocol was reviewed by the University of Zambia Humanities and Social
172 Sciences Research Ethics Committee (IRB Approval No. 2019-April-001) and the
173 ethics committee in the Canton of Geneva (no 2019-00500).

174 ***Measures and variables:***

175 We identified and three potential accelerators: 1) SCT, 2) LLL, and 3) MPA, and
176 seven SDGs aligned indicator target outcomes in the data based on our review of
177 the literature. We defined the accelerators as follows: SCT provided by the
178 government with the question: “During the past 12 months, has the respondent or
179 any household member received money or goods, including food, clothing, livestock,
180 or medicines from any of the following government programmes, social cash
181 transfers and other government transfers?” (Other government transfers combined
182 respondents or their household’s receipt of school uniforms, scholarships, food
183 security pack, school feeding, and farm input subsidy), coded no, yes; LLL,
184 combined participation in government offered training on HIV, disability, gender-
185 based violence, human rights, sexual and reproductive rights, job skills, social
186 protection and economic empowerment derived from the question: “During the past
187 12 months, have you or any of the household members received any training
188 provided by the government on general health, food and nutrition, sexual and
189 reproductive rights, HIV, human rights, and gender-based violence, social protection,
190 job skills, and economic empowerment?” coded yes if the participant responded to
191 have participated in any of the training, otherwise no; MPA with the question “What
192 phone number is used at this house?” (Response options were no phone, phone
193 number)” coded no for no phone, yes for phone number.

194
195 We defined the SDG aligned indicator outcomes as follows: No poverty with the
196 question: “Do you consider your household to be nonpoor, moderately poor, or very
197 poor?” coded very poor, moderately poor; Informal cash transfers with the
198 question: “During the past 12 months, has the respondent or any household
199 members received money or goods, including food, clothing, livestock, or medicines
200 from individuals who are not part of the family or non-governmental organizations?”
201 coded no, yes; Good health with the question: “Have you been sick or injured in the
202 last two weeks?” coded physically sick, not sick; No suicidal ideation with the
203 question: “Did you have thoughts of hurting or killing yourself? coded *yes, no*;
204 Seeking mental support with the question “What health facility or other institutions or
205 persons did you see for any of the identified mental health issues?” coded no did not
206 see; yes saw. Seeking mental support proxied having mental health problems and
207 seeking help to resolve them. School enrolment combined the responses from the
208 question: “Are you currently attending school? (Check relevant choice) nursery/pre-
209 school, other grades full-time, other grades part-time, community school, full-time,
210 correspondence, adult literacy class, tertiary school” coded no, yes. The proportion
211 of adolescents currently in school versus those not in school for 20 to 24-year-olds,
212 coded no, yes; No health access restrictions related to a disability with the

213 question: “Are you limited in accessing health services because of your
214 impairment?” coded limited, not limited.
215

216 We controlled for age (16 to 19, 20 to 24 years), biological sex (male, female),
217 disability status (not disabled, disabled), proximity to health facility (<7 or ≥ 7
218 kilometres), and district (Kawambwa, Nchelenge, Mansa, and Samfya). We
219 assessed household heads’ disability with questions from the Washington Group
220 Short Questions (WGSQ) on disabilities. The WGSQ asks respondents if they have
221 difficulties with seeing, hearing, walking, cognition, self-care, or communicating. For
222 each disability type, the answer options are “no”, “yes – a little”, “yes – a lot”, “cannot
223 at all.” We defined a respondent as disabled in the disability type they answered:
224 “yes – a lot” or “cannot at all” and grouped the disability variables into a composite
225 variable reflecting if the respondent had any of the six types of disability [21].

226 **Analysis**

227 We conducted analyses in three steps. First, we explored the socio-demographic
228 characteristics, hypothesized accelerators and SDGs aligned outcomes by
229 household head's disability status. Second, we tested for associations between each
230 SDG-aligned outcome and hypothesized accelerators simultaneously using the
231 Fishers exact test and reported crude proportions, 95% confidence intervals (CI) and
232 p-values. We adjusted for covariates in multivariable logistic regressions and
233 corrected for multiple hypothesis testing using the Benjamin, Yekutieli, Krieger (BYK)
234 False Discovery Rate Sharpened Qs [22]. We interpreted the FDR adjusted p-value
235 as a p-value of 0.05, resulting in 5% of significant tests being false positives. FDR
236 adjusted p-values result in fewer false positives than non-FDR adjusted p-values.
237 Third, we predicted adolescents' probabilities of experiencing each outcome from no
238 accelerators to cumulative accelerators combinations by household heads' disability
239 status using marginal effects models with the Stata margins command keep other
240 covariates at their mean values. We reported the changes in probabilities for each
241 indicator.

242 As a sensitivity analysis, we calculated adjusted probabilities of experiencing each
243 outcome from multiple-outcome probit models that correlated the error terms of three
244 potential accelerators in each model, using the mvprobit command in Stata 14.1 set
245 at 50 random draws. Each regression regressed one of the seven SDG aligned
246 outcomes for adolescents on the three accelerators controlling for sociodemographic
247 factors. We clustered analyses at the CWAC level and used Stata version 14.1 for
248 analysis.

249 **Results:**

250 The sample comprised 1,725 adolescents from 1,545 households in 90 CWACs.
251 Overall, 881 (51.1%) were girls and 844 (48.9%) boys. The median age in years was
252 19 (interquartile range 17 to 21). Eight per cent (145) of the adolescents lived with
253 household heads with disabilities. Half (75, 51.7%) of household heads with
254 disabilities reported at least “a lot” of difficulties in remembering, 43 (29.6%) in
255 seeing and 14 (9.6%) in self-care. Many socio-demographic characteristics and SDG

256 aligned targets indicators differed significantly between adolescents living with
257 household heads with and without disability; the three hypothesized accelerators did
258 not differ.

259

260 [Insert Table 1 here]

261

262 The three hypothesized accelerators - SCT, LLL and MPA – were significantly
263 associated with no poverty, informal cash transfers, good health, no suicidal ideation,
264 school enrolment and no health access restrictions related to disabilities when we
265 did not control for socio-demographic covariates. However, SCT was associated with
266 lower levels of seeking mental support among adolescents (Table 2A). Adolescents
267 with MPA, reported higher levels of no poverty (39% versus 23.9%, $p < 0.001$),
268 accessing informal cash transfers (26.6% versus 16%, $p < 0.001$), good health (34.5%
269 versus 30.2%, $p = 0.042$), seeking mental support (38.4% versus 26.9%; $p < 0.000$)
270 and school enrolment (48.8% versus 39.7%, $p < 0.001$) than those without MPA.

271 After adjusting for age, gender, household heads' disability status, distance from the
272 nearest health facility and district, all hypothesized accelerators remained associated
273 with two or more SDG-aligned outcomes (Table 2B). Good health and no suicidal
274 ideation were no longer associated with any hypothesized accelerator. Having
275 access to a mobile phone was associated with higher odds of no poverty, accessing
276 informal cash transfers, seeking mental support and school enrolment. SCT were
277 associated with higher odds of informal cash transfers, no health access restrictions
278 related to disability but lower odds of seeking mental support. LLL was associated
279 with increased odds of accessing informal cash transfers but lower odds of school
280 enrolment.

281 [Insert Tables 2A and 2B here]

282

283 Figure 1 shows the changes in probabilities of experiencing each of the seven SDG-
284 aligned outcomes from potential accelerators compared to no accelerators: 1) SCT
285 alone, 2) SCT plus LLL, 3) SCT plus MPA, 4) SCT, plus LLL and MPA. Results are
286 stratified by disability status of the household head. Potential accelerators were
287 associated with an absolute increase of at least 0.02 in the probability of SDG
288 aligned targets indicators. However, the probability of seeking mental support was
289 decreased by SCT alone, SCT plus LLL, and SCT plus MPA. The probability of
290 school enrolment was also decreased by SCT plus LLL.

291 Adolescents with household heads with disabilities had lower probabilities of
292 reporting no poverty, accessing informal cash transfers, good health and no suicidal
293 ideation from no potential accelerators than their counterparts without household
294 heads with disabilities. They further reported lower probability changes from potential
295 accelerators in no poverty, accessing informal cash transfers, good health, and no
296 health access restrictions related to disability. The probability increase in no suicidal
297 ideation from potential accelerators was higher among adolescents living with

298 household heads with disabilities. Changes in seeking mental support and school
299 enrolment did not differ by the disability status of the household head. The greatest
300 probability changes from receiving no potential accelerators to receiving potential
301 accelerators were in accessing informal cash transfers (Figure 1).

302

303 [Insert Figure 1 here]

304

305 Synergies – combinations – of potential accelerators were associated with changes
306 in the probabilities of experiencing levels of SDG-aligned targets indicators outcomes
307 for adolescents living with household heads with and without disabilities. A
308 combination of all potential accelerators - SCT, LLL and MPA – was associated with
309 a 0.15 and 0.11 probability increase in levels of no poverty for adolescents living with
310 household heads without and with disabilities; 0.37 and 0.30 probability increase in
311 levels of accessing informal cash transfers and 0.14 and 0.13 of experiencing no
312 health access restrictions related to a disability, respectively (Figure 2).

313

314 [Insert Figure 2 here]

315

316 The sensitivity analysis results between the models we used and the models that
317 account for correlations between the error terms of the potential accelerators were
318 equivalent. However, the p-values were lower in the outcome models accounting for
319 the correlation between potential accelerators (Supplementary Table 1).

320 **Discussion**

321 This study examined associations between potential accelerators - SCT, LLL, and
322 MPA - and SDG aligned well-being indicator targets - 1.2 no poverty; 1.3.1 SCT,
323 Informal cash transfers; 3.0 good Health; 3.4 no suicidal ideation, seeking mental
324 support; 4.1 school enrolment; and 10.0 no health access restrictions related to
325 disability - among adolescents. We found high potential for improving vulnerable
326 adolescents' SDG-aligned well-being by combining SCT, LLL and MPA
327 interventions. Our findings fit within an emerging body of evidence confirming that
328 SCT, LLL and MPA are accelerators for adolescents [8,10,13]. It further found that
329 adolescents benefited unequally depending on their household heads' disability
330 status and that combining existing interventions may not overcome inequalities
331 arising out of the disability of the household head.

332 Several studies conducted in Zambia and elsewhere confirm our results that SCT
333 were associated with multiple SDG aligned target outcomes such as higher levels of
334 informal cash transfers, no health access restrictions related to disability, and lower
335 levels of seeking mental support. Studies conducted in Zambia show that SCT
336 reduced relative poverty, increased women's satisfaction regarding their children's
337 well-being, and schooling among school-going adolescents [23,24]. SCT also
338 increased material well-being (children's material needs met), food insecurity, and

339 asset ownership [25]. In sub-Saharan Africa and elsewhere, SCT have been shown to
340 increase psychological well-being, and decrease relative and absolute poverty
341 [26,27]. In our study, receiving SCT alone was associated with a substantial
342 decrease in seeking mental support. Combining SCT with LLL or MPA was
343 associated with more reductions in seeking mental support. This result suggests that
344 households' lack of money, LLL opportunities, and MPA may have necessitated
345 respondents to seek mental support. Providing SCT, LLL and MPA interventions
346 may be vital for addressing the mental support needs of adolescents living in
347 poverty.

348 However, in our study SCT were not associated with good health; neither were MPA
349 and LLL. This result fits within a body of evidence showing that cash transfers have
350 positive, complex, and mixed effects on health. A review of 56 studies from low and
351 middle-income countries found that cash transfers increased dietary diversity,
352 access and utilization of health services but had little impact on children's
353 anthropometric measures [26]. In high-income countries, self-rated health, chronic
354 health conditions, and mortality for cash transfer recipients were worse than among
355 non-recipients. On the contrary, in the United States, cash transfers were associated
356 with improved self-rated health [28]. One reason why SCT, MPA, and LLL in our
357 study were not associated with good health could be that physical illnesses among
358 our sample was widespread. Two-thirds (67.8%, n=1169) of adolescents reported
359 physical illnesses. Another is that malaria is endemic in the study area [29]. SCT,
360 MPA and LLL alone might have been insufficient to resolve these illnesses.
361 Innovative prevention and treatment of malaria, and other illnesses, combined with
362 SCT, MPA, and LLL, should be implemented.

363 Contrary to views that cash transfers and other public transfers reduce informal
364 transfers [30], our study found the opposite result; SCT were associated with
365 increased receipt of informal cash transfers. This result is supported by evidence
366 [31,32]. One explanation for our study's finding is that the process of receiving SCT
367 may have identified households who were in need of financial and material support,
368 linked them to support, strengthened trust of each other, increased social inclusion
369 and solidarity [31-33]. Another explanation is that our study did not include pensions
370 and social security transfers analyzed in the study that found contradictory findings
371 to our study results [30]. Pensions and social security transfers, derived from
372 mandatory savings employees make during employment, tend to be larger than
373 SCT. In addition, pensions and social security transfers recipients may be wealthier,
374 making them less likely to be perceived as in need of informal cash transfers [31].

375 The positive associations found in our study between MPA and no poverty, informal
376 cash transfers, and school enrolment are also supported by evidence [8,34]. Access
377 to mobile phones can promote adolescents' wellbeing, expand their social networks
378 and personal growth opportunities [8]. Social protection and cash transfers are being
379 delivered via mobile phones, alongside electronic vouchers, bank accounts and
380 other payment systems to adults in households [35]. Mobile phones use also
381 enables access to vital services [8,34]. Informal financial transfers make the bulk of
382 financial transactions transferred via mobile phones in sub-Saharan Africa [36]. The
383 negative association found in our study between MPA and seeking mental support

384 suggests that lack of mobile phone access may be mentally distressing for
385 adolescents. One main reason is that they may miss out on informal cash transfers
386 and other services to improve their well-being [8,34,36]. Providing mobile phones to
387 households who do not have them, is being done and can help improve adolescents
388 access to social protection, cash transfers and mental support [35].

389 In our study, LLL's associations - increase in informal cash transfers, and reductions
390 in odds of seeking mental support and school enrollment – are limited than those of
391 SCT and MPA, but no less critical. LLL re-enforces and complements the objectives
392 of social protection and cash transfer programmes. LLL may bring participants
393 together, potentially increasing their social networks - addressing the needs to seek
394 mental support - and informal cash transfers. LLL is unlikely to have pulled
395 adolescents out of school. Two-thirds of adolescents were already not attending
396 school. LLL and the skills it provides can be beneficial to these adolescents [37].

397 Adolescents did not evenly benefit from SCT alone, with LLL, MPA or LLL and MPA,
398 although they benefited from these accelerators. Adolescents living with household
399 heads with disabilities reported lower benefits from these accelerators in no poverty,
400 informal cash transfers, good health, and no disability health access restrictions than
401 those living with household heads without disabilities. Previous studies, including a
402 systematic review, support this finding showing that living with a household member
403 with a disability had high cost and poverty implications for the household [38,39].
404 These studies concluded that households must spend as much as 26% more
405 resources to obtain an equivalent standard of living compared to those without
406 disabilities [38,39]. Adolescents in our sample living with household heads with
407 disabilities reported themselves poorer, may have had much more diminished
408 resources and saddled with caregiving responsibilities adversely affecting their well-
409 being than their peers living with household heads without disabilities. However,
410 adolescents living with household heads with disabilities reported greater benefits
411 from accelerators in no suicidal ideation. Their probabilities of reporting no suicidal
412 ideation from no accelerators were lower compared to their peers without household
413 heads with disabilities. This result suggests that household heads' disability status
414 may have mitigated suicidal ideation among adolescents. Such adolescents might
415 have benefited from parental supervision during caregiving which is known to be
416 protective against suicidal behaviour [40]. However, this study did not look at the role
417 of the household head's disability status on adolescents' suicidal ideation. Overall,
418 accelerators appear to impact adolescents' well-being. However, adolescents living
419 with household heads with disabilities were doing worse than their peers living with
420 household heads without disabilities before and after the accelerators. New
421 interventions focused at households may be required. These could include attention
422 to adolescents and parents' relationships, increased psychosocial, mental and
423 financial support to offset adolescents' household's disabilities-related inequalities
424 [38].

425 ***Limitations***

426 It is important to note that association does not imply causal relationships. In this
427 study we could not attribute causation due to the study's cross-sectional nature, and

428 neither could we generalize the results outside the study area and population group.
429 However, many countries in sub-Saharan Africa are implementing similar
430 programmes and could find our results useful in their contexts. We performed a
431 complete sample analysis due to the low prevalence of disability in our sample,
432 which might have missed nuanced differences experienced by adolescent girls
433 compared to boys. The prevalence of disability in our sample was low limiting our
434 ability for further analysis by type of disability. We did not have variables on
435 occupational type of the household head, and others which could affect household
436 dynamics including adolescents' well-being. We did not input the missing data
437 because it was less than 5%. However, we show that adopting accelerators can help
438 achieve SDGs-aligned well-being indicators for adolescents living in poverty.

439 **Conclusion**

440 Our study found multiple and substantial benefits from accelerators – SCT, LLL and
441 MPA – delivered individually and in combinations, on SDG aligned well-being among
442 adolescents living in poverty. Adolescents living with household heads with
443 disabilities benefited less. New interventions maybe necessary to correct disability-
444 related inequalities between households. More research is needed to understand
445 combinations of interventions that improve the well-being of adolescents living with
446 household members who are disabled.

447

448 **Funding**

449 The authors declare that this study received funding from United Kingdom Research
450 in Innovation (UKRI) Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF) Accelerating
451 Achievement for Africa's Adolescents Hub (Principle Investigator Prof. Lucie Cluver).
452 The funder was not involved in the study design, collection, analysis, interpretation of
453 data, the writing of this article or the decision to submit it for publication.

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470 References

1. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA). World Population Prospects 2019: Highlights. New York: United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs; 2019. Report No.: (ST/ESA/SER.A/423)..
2. Sawyer SM, Peter SA, Dakshitha W, George P. The age of adolescence. *The Lancet Child and Adolescent Health*. 2018 March; 2(3): 223-228.
3. World Health Organization (WHO). Guidelines on mental health promotive and preventive interventions for adolescents: helping adolescents thrive. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2020. Report No.: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.
4. World Health Organization (WHO). Adolescent and young adult health. [Online].; 2021 [cited 2021 February 5. Available from: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/adolescents-health-risks-and-solutions>.
5. Uddin R, Burton NW, Maple M, Khan SR, Khan A. Suicidal ideation, suicide planning, and suicide attempts among adolescents in 59 low-income and middle-income countries: a population-based study. *Lancet Child Adolescent Health*. 2019 Apr; 3(4)(doi: 10.1016/S2352-4642(18)30403-6.); 223-233..
6. Dickens L, Marx P. NEET as an Outcome for Care Leavers in South Africa: The Case of Girls and Boys Town. *Emerging Adulthood*. 2020; 8(1 <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167696818805891>): 64-72.
7. International Labour Organisation (ILO). Global Employment Trends for Youth 2020: Technology and the future of jobs. Geneva: International Labour Organisation, International Labour Office; 2020.
8. Porter G, Hampshire K, Lannoy AD, Bango A, Munthali A, Robson E, et al. Youth Livelihoods in the Cellphone Era: Perspectives from Urban Africa. *Journal of International Development*. 2018 January; 30(DOI: 10.1002/jid.3340): 539–558.
9. International Telecommunication Union (ITU). Mobile-cellular Subscriptions Declining in 2020. [Online].; 2021 [cited 2021 February 2. Available from: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Statistics/Pages/ff2020interactive.aspx>.
10. Desmond C, Sherr L, Cluver L. Covid-19: accelerating recovery. *Vulnerable Children and Youth Studies*. 2020. May;(DOI: 10.1080/17450128.2020.1766731).
11. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). SDG Accelerator and Bottleneck Assessment tool. New York: United Nations Development Programme, Sustainable Development Cluster,

UNDP Bureau for Policy; 2017.

12. Cluver LD, Orkin FM, Meinck F, Yakubovich AR, Sherr L. Can Social Protection Improve Sustainable Development Goals for Adolescent Health? PLoS ONE. 2016 October; (e0164808.doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0164808): 11(10).
13. Cluver LD, Orkin FM, Campeau L, Toska E, Webb D, Carlqvist A, et al. Improving lives by accelerating progress towards the UN Sustainable Development Goals for adolescents living with HIV: a prospective cohort study. Lancet Child Adolescence. 2019 April; 3([https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642\(19\)30033-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642(19)30033-1)): 245–54.
14. Cluver LD, Rudgard WE, Toska E, Zhou S, Campeau L, Shenderovich Y, et al. Violence prevention accelerators for children and adolescents in South Africa: A path analysis using two pooled cohorts. PLoS Medicine. 2020 November; e1003383(<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003383>): 17(11).
15. Nations U. Disability and Development Report. Realizing the Sustainable Development Goals by, for and with persons with disabilities 2018. New York: United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs ; 2019. Report No.: 9789210479035(PDF).
16. WHO, World Health Organization. WHO global disability action plan 2014-2021. Better health for all people with disability. Geneva: WHO, World Health Organization; 2015. Report No.: ISBN 978 92 4 150961 9.
17. Devereux S, Vincent K. Using Technology to Deliver Social Protection: Exploring Opportunities and Risks. In <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27806713>, editor. Development in Practice 20, no. 3.; 2010. p. 367-79.
18. United Nations Partnership on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. <http://unprpd.org/our-programmes/78>. [Online].; 2020 [cited 2020 August 2020 10. Available from: <http://unprpd.org/our-programmes/78>.
19. Ministry of Community Development and Social Service, Government of the Republic of Zambia. Social Cash Transfers, Investing investing in People's lives, transforming communities, Social Cash Transfer Guidelines. Guidelines. Lusaka: Ministry of Community Development and Social Service; 2018.
20. Handa S, Hoop Td, Morey M, Seidenfeld D. ICC Values in International Development: Evidence across Many Domains in subSaharan Africa..
21. Washington Group on Disability Statistics. The Data Collection Tools Developed by the Washington Group on Disability Statistics and their Recommended Use. Hyattsville: United Nations Statistical Commission, Washington Group on Disability Statistics; 23 October 2017.
22. Anderson ML. Multiple Inference and Gender Differences in the Effects of Early Intervention: A Reevaluation of the Abecedarian, Perry Preschool, and Early Training Projects. Journal of the American Statistical Association. 2008; 103(484 <https://doi.org/10.1198/016214508000000841>): 1481-1495.
23. Sudhanshu H, Luisa N, David S, Gelson T, Benjamin D. Can unconditional cash transfers raise

- long-term living standards? Evidence from Zambia. *Journal of Development Economics*. 2018 July; 133(doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2018.01.008): 42-65.
24. Hjelma L, Handa S, de Hoop J, Palermo T. Poverty and perceived stress: Evidence from two unconditional cash transfer programs in Zambia. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2017 March; 177(<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.01.023>): 110-117.
 25. Natalia LHS, Peterman A, Seidenfeld D, Tembo G. Does money buy happiness? Evidence from an unconditional cash transfer in Zambia. *SSM - Population Health*. 2018 April; 4(<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2018.02.002>): 225-235.
 26. Bastagli F, Hagen-Zanker J, Harman L, Barca V, Sturge G, Schmidt T, et al. Cash transfers: what does the evidence say? A rigorous review of programme impact and of the role of design and implementation features. London: Overseas Development Institute (ODI); 2016.
 27. Haushofer J, Mudida R, Shapiro JP. The Comparative Impact of Cash Transfers and a Psychotherapy Program on Psychological and Economic Well-being Research NBoE, editor. Cambridge Mass: National Bureau of Economic Research; 2020.
 28. Sun S, Huang J, Hudson DL. Cash Transfers and Health. *Annual Review of Public Health*. 2021 January; 42: 363–80.
 29. Ministry of Health, Government of the Republic of Zambia. Zambia National Malaria Indicator Survey. Lusaka: Ministry of Health, Ministry of Health, Central Statistics Office; 2018.
 30. Nikolov P, Bonci M. Do Public Program Benefits Crowd Out Private Transfers in Developing Countries? A Critical Review of Recent Evidence. *World Development*. 2020 October; 134(104967).
 31. Evans DK, Kosec K. Do Cash Transfers Reduce Trust and Informal Transfers? IFPRI Discussion Paper. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), Development Strategy and Governance Division; 2020. Report No.: 01994.
 32. Martin Evans SHaHS. Informal taxes and transfers in sub-Saharan Africa: A review and analysis of incidence in Rwanda. Working paper. London: Overseas Development Institute (ODI), December; 2020. Report No.: 598.
 33. Asfaw S, Davis B. Can Cash Transfer Programmes Promote Household Resilience? Cross-Country Evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa. In Lipper L. MN,ZD,AS,BG, editor. *Climate Smart Agriculture. Natural Resource Management.*: Springer Cham; 2018. p. 227-250.
 34. Giovanelli A, Ozer EM, Dahl RE. Leveraging Technology to Improve Health in Adolescence: A Developmental Science Perspective. *Journal of Adolescent Health*. 2020 August 2020; 67(2): DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2020.02.020>: S7eS13.
 35. Barca V, Hurrell A, MacAuslan I, Visram A, Willis J. Paying attention to detail: how to transfer cash in cash transfers. *Enterprise Development and Microfinance*. 2003 March; 24(1).
 36. Koomson I, Bukari C, AVillano R. Mobile money adoption and response to idiosyncratic shocks: Empirics from five selected countries in sub-Saharan Africa. *Technological Forecasting and Social*

Change. 2021 167; 167(120728).

37. Ministry of Education. Educational Statistical Bulletin 2017. Statistical Bulletin. Lusaka: Ministry of Education, Republic of Zambia, Directorate of Planning and Information; 2018.
38. Mitra S, Palmer M, Kim H, Mont D, Groce N. Extra costs of living with a disability: A review and agenda for research. *Disability and Health Journal*. 2017 October; 10(4): 475 - 484.
39. Asuman D, Ackah CG, Agyire-Tettey F. Disability and Household Welfare in Ghana: Costs and Correlates. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*. 2020 December;(https://doi.org/10.1007/s10834-020-09741-5).
40. Kushal SA, Amin YM, Reza S, Shawon MSR. Parent-adolescent relationships and their associations with adolescentsuicidal behaviours: Secondary analysis of data from 52 countries usingthe Global School-based Health Survey. *EClinical Medicine*. 2020 December;(doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100691).

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

Table 1: Social demographic characteristics, hypothesized accelerators and SDG-aligned targets by disability status of the household head

Variables	not disabled		disabled		P-value	Total	%
	n=1580	%	n=145	%			
Socio-demographic characteristics							
Age (years)							
16 – 19	951	60.2	67	46.2	0.001	1018	59.0
20 – 24	629	39.8	78	53.8		707	41.0
Sex, Male	787	49.8	57	39.3	0.015	844	48.9
Female	793	50.2	88	60.7		881	51.1
Distance to nearest the health facility (kilometres)							
0 – 6	1291	81.7	121	83.4	0.489	1412	81.9
7 and over	242	15.3	19	13.1		261	15.1
Missing	47	3.0	5	3.4		52	3.0
District					0.339		
Kawambwa	502	31.8	55	37.9		557	32.3
Mansa	311	19.7	22	15.2		333	19.3
Nchelenge	378	23.9	31	21.4		409	23.7
Samfya	389	24.6	37	25.5	426	24.7	
Hypothesized accelerators							
SCT					0.862		
No	157	9.9	15	10.3		172	10.0
Yes	1408	89.1	128	88.3		1536	89.0
Missing	15	0.9	2	1.4	17	1.0	
MPA					0.759		
No	1081	68.4	101	69.7		1182	68.5
Yes	499	31.6	44	30.3	543	31.5	
LLL					0.069		
No	868	54.9	68	46.9		936	54.3
Yes	697	44.1	75	51.7		772	44.8
Missing	15	0.9	2	1.4	17	1.0	

SDG aligned target indicators

SDG 1.2. No poverty	Very poor	1103	69.8	115	79.3		1218	70.6
	Moderately poor	462	29.2	28	19.3	0.012	490	28.4
	Missing	15	0.9	2	1.4		17	1.0
SDG 1.3.1 Informal cash transfers	No	1260	79.7	118	81.4		1378	79.9
	Yes	305	19.3	25	17.2	0.561	330	19.1
	Missing	15	0.9	2	1.4		17	1.0
SDG 3. Good health	Physically sick	1062	67.2	107	73.8		1169	67.8
	Not sick	503	31.8	36	24.8	0.086	539	31.2
	Missing	15	0.9	2	1.4		17	1.0
SDG 3.4. No suicidal ideation	Yes	156	9.9	29	20.0		185	10.7
	No	1404	88.9	114	78.6	0.000	1518	88.0
	Missing	20	1.3	2	1.4		22	1.3
SDG 3.4. Seeking mental support	No	1087	68.8	100	69.0		1187	68.8
	Yes	479	30.3	43	29.7	0.898	522	30.3
	Missing	14	0.9	2	1.4		16	0.9
SDG 4.1. School enrolment	No	901	57.0	89	61.4		990	57.4
	Yes	678	42.9	56	38.6	0.314	734	42.6
SDG 10. No health access restrictions related to disability	Limited	243	15.4	21	14.5		264	15.3
	Not limited	1290	81.6	119	82.1	0.791	1409	81.7
	Missing	47	3.0	5	3.4		52	3.0

p-value is for Fisher's exact test

496

497

498

499

500

501

Table 2A: Crude analysis of associations between hypothesized accelerators and SDG aligned targets

SGD-aligned targets	<i>Hypothesized accelerators, absolute values [proportions], p-value</i>					
	SCT		LLL		MPA	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1.2. No poverty	442 [28.8%],	46 [26.7%]; 0.318	207[26.8%],	281 [30.1%]; 0.074	212[39.0%],	278 [23.9%]; <0.001
1.3.1 Informal cash transfers	323 [21.0%],	7[4.7%]; <0.001	228[29.5%],	102 [10.9%]; <0.001	144[26.6%],	186 [16.0%]; <0.001
3. Good health	489 [31.8%],	50 [29.7%]; 0.258	253[32.8%],	285 [30.5%]; 0.168	187[34.5%],	352 [30.2%]; 0.042
3.4. No suicidal ideation	1381[90.2%],	137 [79.7%]; <0.001	674[87.6%],	843 [90.4%]; 0.044	475[87.6%],	1043 [89.8%]; 0.102
3.4 Seeking mental support	447 [29.1%],	75 [43.6%]; <0.001	278[36.0%],	244 [26.1%]; <0.001	208[38.4%],	314 [26.9%]; <0.001
4.1. School enrolment	662 [43.1%],	65 [37.8%]; 0.103	302[39.1%],	424 [45.4%];0.005	265[48.8%],	469 [39.7%]; <0.001
10. No health restrictions related to disability	1293[85.8%],	116[69.9%]; <0.001	613[82.0%],	795 [86.0%]; 0.014	453[83.9%],	956 [84.4%]; 0.425

Fisher's exact test.

Table 2B: Associations between hypothesized accelerators and SDG aligned targets indicators adjusted for social demographic characteristics

SGD-aligned Targets	Hypothesized Accelerators (Adjusted Odds Ratios, 95% Confidence Intervals, P-value)		
	SCT	LLL	MPA
1.2. No poverty	1.15[0.66 - 1.98], 0.624	0.86[0.59 - 1.23], 0.398	2.08[1.39 - 3.09], 0.001*
1.3.1 Informal transfers	7.68[2.56 - 23.01], 0.000*	3.49[2.24 - 5.45], 0.001*	1.82 [1.21 - 2.74], 0.004*
3. Good health	1.06[0.55 - 2.04], 0.859	1.14[0.85 - 1.54], 0.379	1.27[0.89 - 1.80], 0.184
3.4. No suicidal ideation	1.93[0.93 - 3.99], 0.077	0.95[0.59 - 1.49], 0.809	0.86[0.49 - 1.51], 0.594
3.4 Seeking mental support	0.53[0.29 - 0.94], 0.029*	1.34[0.99 - 1.80], 0.054	1.61[1.08 - 2.40], 0.020*
4.1. School enrolment	1.22[0.87 - 1.72], 0.246	0.70 [0.55 - 0.89], 0.004*	1.65[1.25 - 2.18], 0.001*
10. No disability health access restrictions	2.56[1.35 - 4.88], 0.004*	0.67[0.42 - 1.07], 0.097	0.92[0.58 - 1.45], 0.713

Type of test conducted Wald Test. *Statistically significant ($p < .05$) after multiple hypothesis testing correction with the FDR sharpened Qs. Adjusted for age, gender, household head disability status, distance to the nearest health facility and district.




Figure 1: Levels of probability change in SDG-aligned targets indicators outcomes from 1) SCT alone, 2) SCT plus LLL 3) SCT plus MPA, and 4) SCT plus LLL and MPA, stratified by household heads' disability status – without (blue bars) and with disabilities (Orange bars).




Figure 2: Changes in probability levels of SDG-aligned outcomes for adolescents living with household heads without (A) and with disabilities (B) from synergies of interventions.

Supplementary Table 1: Associations between hypothesized accelerators and SDG aligned targets using probit models

SGD-aligned targets	Hypothesized accelerators, Coefficient [95% CI], P-value		
	SCT	LLL	MPA
1.2. No poverty	0.15 [-0.08 - 0.37], 0.197	-0.14 [-0.27 - -0.01], 0.043	0.44 [0.30 - 0.57], <0.001
1.3.1 Informal cash transfers	0.80 [0.44 - 1.17], <0.001	0.66 [0.51 - 0.81], <0.001	0.35 [0.20 - 0.50], <0.001
3. Good health	0.14 [-0.08 - 0.36], 0.215	0.04 [0-.09 - 0.17], 0.549	0.13 [-0.01 - 0.26], 0.064
3.4. No suicidal ideation	0.44 [0.20 - 0.69], <0.001	-0.17 [-0.33 - -0.01], 0.048	-0.08 [-0.26 - 0.09], 0.342
3.4 Seeking mental support	-0.44 [-0.65 - -0.23], <0.001	0.29 [0.16 - 0.42], <0.001	0.31 [0.18 - 0.45], <0.001
4.1. School enrolment	0.17 [-0.04 - 0.40], 0.117	-0.23 [-0.36 - -0.1], <0.001	0.31 [0.17 - 0.45], <0.001
10. No health restrictions related to disability	0.65 [0.42 - 0.88], <0.001	-0.22 [-0.37 - -0.08], 0.003	-0.02 [-.18 - 0.13], 0.776

Probit models accounting for correlation between error terms. Adjusted for age, gender, household head disability status, distance to the nearest health facility and district