

Evaluation of Child Friendly Spaces in Emergencies: A Longitudinal Study of CFS Impact in Zarqa, Jordan

Key Findings for Internal Circulation

Draft Prepared by Sabrina Hermosilla, Janna Metzler and Alastair Ager
16 September 2016

This summary document provides an overview of the major findings from conducting follow-up (T3) data collection from children and caregivers in Zarqa, Jordan that participated in the previous short-term evaluation from February 2014 to June 2014. It also suggests interpretations and reflections on these findings to support practice development.

A full write-up of the study will follow in the form of a paper drafted for submission to a peer-review journal.

Data Collection Periods:

T1: Baseline Data Collection – 2/2/2014 to 2/11/2014

T2: 3-4-month Endline Data Collection – 5/19/2014 to 6/26/2014

T3: 16– 19-month Follow-up Data Collection – 6/29/2015 to 9/1/2015

Sample Description:

	<i>T1</i>		<i>T2</i>		<i>T3</i>		
	N	%	N	%	N	% of T1	% of T2
<i>Complete</i>	487	100	420	86.2%	301	61.8%	71.7%
<i>Caregivers of children 6 – 9</i>	235	100	168	71.5%	141	60.0%	83.9%
<i>Children 10 – 12</i>	120	100	120	100.0%	81	67.5%	67.5%
<i>Children 13 – 18</i>	132	100	132	100.0%	79	59.8%	59.8%

Analysis Description: Quantitative data were cleaned, then univariate and bivariate analyses described sample and identified key patterns. Longitudinal multivariable models, controlling for design effects, based on bivariate findings and variables of epidemiologic significance, explored unique contribution of key factors to main CFS outcomes. Dynamic lagged longitudinal multivariable models specifically explored the unique influence of the change in key variables over time on core outcomes of the intervention.

Guide to Interpretation: Due to sample size restrictions, the analysis below presents aggregate means (instead of traced participant means) over the study period. The analysis focused on key areas of interest connected to children’s access to services, such as vulnerability designation, and mechanisms of

support in the community, such as school and the CFS program. CFS proved not to be a predictor of children's attendance in school at endline or follow-up.

Key preliminary 'take home' messages:

Short-term impacts

- Overall, there were minor effects for CFS attendance during the intervention period (T1 to T2).
- The evaluation indicated that the CFS was most effective in achieving its intended objectives in relation to linking younger children to resource persons and reporting mechanisms available to support children within the community.
- There is no evidence that the CFS had an impact in reducing or maintaining perceived protection concerns or caregiver stresses over time.
- For older children, attending CFS was associated with higher levels of reported protection concerns and stresses of caregivers.
- It is unclear whether attendance at CFS exacerbated such issues or facilitated the reporting of issues common to all.
- The CFS appeared to play a role in supporting and promoting the psychosocial well-being of younger children.
- Among older children the CFS did not appear to be effective in promoting resilience, reducing anxiety- and depression-related symptoms, or acquiring developmental assets beyond what was found among children not attending the programme.

Longer-term impacts

- At follow-up, the few short-term effects of CFS had largely dissipated.
- Protection concerns related to loss of belongings, being separated from friends, not being able to return home and not being able to attend school were the most frequently reported issues over the study period for all age ranges.
- Caregiver-reported protection concerns and stresses generally decreased over the long-term, regardless of CFS attendance. Factors that influenced the level of such reports were school attendance and the loss livelihoods.
- Protection concerns and caregiver stresses reported by 10-12 year olds and older children were broadly unchanged over time, although: school attendance and loss of livelihoods were correlated with level concerns reported.
- At follow-up average reported mental health symptoms remained below clinical cut-off levels for depression and anxiety and were on a continued decreasing trend for all children, regardless of CFS attendance. Age, gender, and levels of vulnerability showed some linkage with level of such reports.
- In contrast, developmental assets and resilience were observed to be on a declining trend across the study period for all children.
- CFS attendance had no measurable impact on functional literacy and numeracy scores, although the small sample size limits opportunities to examine trends across sub-groups.

Protection Concerns

Preliminary Findings	Supporting Analysis (disaggregated by age group)		
	Children 6 – 9 years (caregiver reports)	Children 10 – 12 years (self-reports)	Children 13 – 18 years (self-reports)
<p>Key area of interest: school, CFS, lost livelihood</p> <p>Major Findings by age range: Children 6 – 9: Overall, reported protection concerns reduced across the study period for young children aged 6 to 9 years as reported by their caregiver.</p> <p>Children 10 – 12 & 13 – 18: There was no change in reported protection concerns over the study period. In bivariate analysis, school attendance at baseline is protective of protection concerns among middle and older children and remains protective of older children attending school at endline. Further multivariate modeling is underway.</p> <p>Protection concerns related to loss of belongings, being separated from friends, not being able to return home and not being able to attend school were highly reported over the study period for all age ranges.</p> <p>Scale guide: Higher levels indicate a greater amount of reported concerns; $\kappa_20 = 0.78$ (Zarqa only)</p>	<p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 3.63 to 2.74, $p < 0.001$ T2 to T3: 2.74 to 2.40, ns T1 to T3: 3.63 to 2.40, $p < 0.001$ <p>CFS Attendance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 A to T1 NA: 4.05 to 3.58, ns T2 A to T2 NA: 3.51 to 3.98, ns T3 A to T3 NA: 2.65 to 2.52, ns <p>Attendees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 4.05 to 3.51, ns (N=37) T2 to T3: 3.51 to 2.65, ns (N=37) <p>Non attendees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 3.58 to 3.98, ns (N=128) T2 to T3: 3.98 to 2.52, $p = 0.0002$ (N=128) <p>School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1: $\beta = -1.224$, $p = ns$ T2: $\beta = -0.158$, $p = ns$ T3: $\beta = -1.995$, $p = ns$ <p>Stress related to caregiving – lost livelihood</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1: $\beta = 0.886$, $p = 0.049$ T2: $\beta = 0.049$, $p = ns$ T3: $\beta = 5.571$, $p = .000$ 	<p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 2.46 to 2.86, ns T2 to T3: 2.86 to 2.59, ns T1 to T3: 2.46 to 2.59, ns <p>CFS Attendance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 A to T1 NA: 2.08 to 2.35, ns T2 A to T2 NA: 2.57 to 2.98, 0.03 T3 A to T3 NA: 2.04 to 2.32, ns <p>Attendees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 2.08 to 2.57, ns (N=84) T2 to T3: 2.57 to 2.04, ns (N=56) <p>Non attendees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 2.35 to 2.98, ns (N=103) T2 to T3: 2.98 to 2.32, $p = 0.0396$ (N=72) <p>School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1: $\beta = -2.261$, $p = 0.010$ T2: $\beta = -1.132$, $p = ns$ T3: $\beta = -1.628$, $p = ns$ <p>Stress related to caregiving - lost livelihood</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1: $\beta = 1.869$, $p = 0.003$ T2: $\beta = 0.778$, $p = ns$ T3: $\beta = 3.944$, $p = .000$ 	<p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 2.88 to 3.58, $p = 0.049$ T2 to T3: 3.58 to 2.45, $p < 0.001$ T1 to T3: 2.88 to 2.45, ns <p>CFS Attendance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 A to T1 NA: 3.27 to 3.37, ns T2 A to T2 NA: 3.63 to 3.81, ns T3 A to T3 NA: 2.22 to 2.46, ns <p>Attendees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 3.27 to 3.63, ns T2 to T3: 3.63 to 2.22, $p = 0.0154$ <p>Non attendees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 3.37 to 3.81, ns T2 to T3: 3.81 to 2.46, $p = 0.0000$ <p>School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1: $\beta = -1.418$, $p = 0.047$ T2: $\beta = -1.549$, $p = 0.024$ T3: $\beta = -1.322$, $p = ns$ <p>Stress related to caregiving - lost livelihood</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1: $\beta = 2.901$, $p = .000$ T2: $\beta = 2.521$, $p = .000$ T3: $\beta = 4.033$, $p = .000$

Stresses of Caregivers

Preliminary Findings	Supporting Analysis (disaggregated by age group)		
	Children 6 – 9 years (caregiver reports)	Children 10 – 12 years (self-reports)	Children 13 – 18 years (self-reports)
<p>Key area of interest: lost livelihoods, school</p> <p>Overall, reported stresses related to caregiving reduced across the study period for all age ranges, regardless of CFS attendance. Notably, caregiver stress at follow-up (T3) was lower among those attending school at baseline (T1) and follow-up (T3) for all age ranges. Multivariate modeling is underway to confirm results.</p> <p>Lost livelihoods was most commonly the source of stress reported over the study period. This variable was teased out of the sum score and will be examined for its effects on other outcomes of interest.</p> <p>Scale interpretation: Higher levels indicate a greater amount of reported stresses; $\kappa_20 = 0.70$ (Zarqa)</p>	<p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 2.66 to 2.07, $p = 0.003$ T2 to T3: 2.07 to 1.76, ns T1 to T3: 2.66 to 1.76, $p < 0.001$ <p>CFS Attendance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 A to T1 NA: 2.57 to 2.64, ns T2 A to T2 NA: 2.78 to 2.96, ns T3 A to T3 NA: 2.54 to 1.78, ns <p>Attendees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 2.57 to 2.78, ns (N=37) T2 to T3: 2.78 to 2.54, ns (N=37) <p>Non attendees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 2.64 to 2.96, ns (N=128) T2 to T3: 2.96 to 1.78, $p = 0.0000$ (N=128) <p>School</p>	<p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 1.86 to 2.30, ns T2 to T3: 2.30 to 1.79, $p < 0.001$ T1 to T3: 1.86 to 1.79, ns <p>CFS Attendance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 A to T1 NA: 1.79 to 1.78, ns T2 A to T2 NA: 2.38 to 2.39, ns T3 A to T3 NA: 1.43 to 1.43, ns <p>Attendees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 1.79 to 2.38, $p = 0.0468$ (N=84) T2 to T3: 2.38 to 1.43, $p = 0.0009$ (N=56) <p>Non attendees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 1.78 to 2.39, $p = 0.0216$ (N=103) T2 to T3: 2.39 to 1.43, $p = 0.0001$ (N=72) <p>School</p>	<p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 1.87 to 2.70, $p < 0.001$ T2 to T3: 2.70 to 1.70, $p < 0.001$ T1 to T3: 1.87 to 1.70, ns <p>CFS Attendance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 A to T1 NA: 2.15 to 2.38, ns T2 A to T2 NA: 2.81 to 2.83, ns T3 A to T3 NA: 2.08 to 1.70, ns <p>Attendees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 2.15 to 2.81, ns (N=75) T2 to T3: 2.81 to 2.08, ns (N=60) <p>Non attendees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 2.38 to 2.83, $p = 0.0141$ (N=217) T2 to T3: 2.83 to 1.70, $p = 0.000$ (N=179) <p>School</p>

only)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1: $\beta = -1.56$, $p = 0.001$ T2: $\beta = -0.80$, $p = ns$ T3: $\beta = -2.59$, $p = 0.007$ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1: $\beta = -1.486$, $p = 0.018$ T2: $\beta = -0.607$, $p = ns$ T3: $\beta = -1.589$, $p = 0.034$ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1: $\beta = -1.092$, $p = 0.023$ T2: $\beta = -1.117$, $p = 0.016$ T3: $\beta = -1.159$, $p = 0.015$
-------	--	---	--

Mental Health: Depression and Anxiety Symptoms

Preliminary Findings	Supporting Analysis (disaggregated by age group)		
	Children 6 – 9 years (caregiver reports)	Children 10 – 12 years (self-reports)	Children 13 – 18 years (self-reports)
<p>Key area of interest: vulnerability, gender</p> <p>Symptoms consistent with DSM-IV criteria for depression and anxiety remain below clinical levels and are decreasing across the study period. Overall, CFS had no effect on symptoms of depression and anxiety over the study period.</p> <p>Vulnerability designated at baseline was a key predictor of high levels of depression and anxiety symptoms reported by caregivers on behalf of their younger children at baseline and endline. Symptoms for vulnerable and not vulnerable children reduced in the long-run. Children aged 10 to 12 years designated as vulnerable reported higher levels of depression and anxiety symptoms at baseline than those designated as not vulnerable, but still below clinical screening cut-offs. Symptoms reduced for across the study period for both groups.</p> <p>Gender is being explored as a predictor of older children's symptoms.</p> <p>Scale guide: Higher levels on AYMH indicated larger burden of depression and anxiety symptoms; Cronbach's alpha = 0.88</p>	<p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 38.94 to 36.29, $p=0.03$ T2 to T3: 36.29 to 21.73, $p<0.001$ <p>CFS Attendance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 A to T1 NA: 38.42 to 39.09, ns T2 A to T2 NA: 35.09 to 36.63, ns T3 A to T3 NA: 26.43 to 24.76, ns <p>Attenders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 38.42 to 35.09, $p=0.0086$ (N=22) T2 to T3: 35.09 to 26.43, $p=0.0225$ (N=32) <p>Non attenders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 39.09 to 36.63, $p=ns$ (N=70) T2 to T3: 36.63 to 24.76, $p=0.0000$ (N=100) <p>Comparing high to low vulnerability at T1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 HV to T1 LV: 44.33 to 37.76, $p = 0.002$ T2 HV to T2 LV: 43.11 to 35.24, $p<0.001$ T3 HV to T3 LV: 25.00 to 21.31, ns <p>Highly vulnerable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 44.33 to 43.11, ns T2 to T3: 43.11 to 25.00, $p=0.008$ T1 to T3: 44.33 to 25.00, $p=0.0029$ <p>Not highly vulnerable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 37.76 to 35.24, $p=0.048$ T2 to T3: 35.24 to 21.31, $p<0.001$ T1 to T3: 33.76 to 21.31, $p=0.0000$ 	<p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 35.76 to 32.06, $p<0.001$ T2 to T3: 32.06 to 34.19, $p=0.04$ <p>CFS Attendance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 A to T1 NA: 32.21 to 36.00, ns T2 A to T2 NA: 32.35 to 33.66, ns T3 A to T3 NA: 33.66 to 34.46, ns <p>Attenders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 37.21 to 32.35, $p=0.0006$ (N=58) T2 to T3: 32.35 to 33.66, ns <p>Non attenders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 36.00 to 32.24, $p=0.0053$ (N=72) T2 to T3: 32.24 to 34.46, $p=0.0460$ (N=66) <p>Comparing high to low vulnerability at T1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 HV to T1 LV: 38.09 to 35.12, $p = 0.042$ T2 HV to T2 LV: 32.68 to 30.63, ns T3 HV to T3 LV: 34.17 to 33.91, ns <p>Highly vulnerable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 38.09 to 32.68, $p = 0.002$ T2 to T3: 32.68 to 34.17, ns T1 to T3: 38.09 to 34.17, ns <p>Not highly vulnerable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 35.12 to 30.63, $p=0.002$ T2 to T3: 30.63 to 33.91, ns T1 to T3: 35.12 to 33.91, ns 	<p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 38.02 to 35.51, $p = 0.02$ T2 to T3: 35.51 to 34.91, ns <p>CFS Attendance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 A to T1 NA: 38.22 to 38.67, ns T2 A to T2 NA: 35.55 to 36.10, ns T3 A to T3 NA: 28.43 to 27.92, ns <p>Attenders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 38.22 to 35.55, $p=0.0403$ (N=50) T2 to T3: 35.55 to 28.43, $p= 0.0013$ (N=51) <p>Non attenders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 38.67 to 36.10, $p= 0.0263$ (N=129) T2 to T3: 36.10 to 27.92, $p= 0.0000$ (N=146) <p>Comparing girls to boys</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 G to T1 B: 39.91 to 35.63, $p = 0.007$ T2 G to T2 B: 32.68 to 32.90, $p = 0.01$ T3 G to T3 B: 37.81 to 34.00, $p = 0.001$ <p>Girls</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 39.91 to 37.41, ns T2 to T3: 32.68 to 37.81, ns <p>Boys</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 35.63 to 32.90, ns T2 to T3: 32.90 to 34.00, ns

Psychosocial Well-being: Resilience

Preliminary Findings	Supporting Analysis (disaggregated by age group)		
	Children 6 – 9 years (caregiver reports)	Children 10 – 12 years (self-reports)	Children 13 – 18 years (self-reports)
<p>Key area of interest: CFS attendance, school</p> <p>Overall, resilience is declining over the study period for all children.</p> <p>Major Findings by age range: Children 6 – 9: The CFS promoted resilience in the short term that was maintained in the long-run. Non-attenders reported no change in resilience over the</p>	<p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 6.92 to 7.61, $p=0.04$ T2 to T3: 7.61 to 6.62, $p=0.004$ T1 to T3: 6.92 to 6.62, ns <p>CFS Attendance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 A to T1 NA: 5.15 to 7.10, ns T2 A to T2 NA: 8.06 to 7.48, ns T3 A to T3 NA: 8.35 to 5.90, $p=0.006$ 	<p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 10.73 to 11.10, $p<0.001$ T2 to T3: 11.10 to 10.44, $p<0.001$ T1 to T3: 10.73 to 10.44, ns <p>CFS Attendance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 A to T1 NA: 10.74 to 10.76, ns T2 A to T2 NA: 11.33 to 11.08, ns T3 A to T3 NA: 10.94 to 10.50, ns 	<p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 to T2: 10.02 to 10.38, $p<0.001$ T2 to T3: 10.38 to 9.52, $p<0.001$ T1 to T3: 10.02 to 9.52, $p= 0.0335$ <p>CFS Attendance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1 A to T1 NA: 8.39 to 8.24, ns T2 A to T2 NA: 9.53 to 8.50, $p= 0.0525$ ns T3 A to T3 NA: 8.20 to 7.39, ns

intervention period and a deterioration over the long-run. School in combination with attending CFS followed the same trend.

Children 10 – 12: Children maintained the same level of resilience over the study period, regardless of their attendance in CFS. School attenders had higher levels of resilience at all time points.

Children 13 – 18: CFS may have had harmful effects for older children. Multivariate modeling is underway to confirm findings.

Scale guide: Higher levels on subscale for resilience indicated larger amount of resilience; Cronbach's alpha = 0.60 (0.64 Zarqa only); baseline scores were equivalent between intervention and comparison groups

Attenders

- T1 to T2: 5.15 to 8.06, $p = 0.001$
- T2 to T3: 8.06 to 8.35, ns

Non attenders

- T1 to T2: 7.10 to 7.48, ns
- T2 to T3: 7.48 to 5.90, $p < 0.001$

Resilience at T3 for CFS attendance (bv)

- $\beta = 2.444$, $p = 0.006$

Resilience at T3 for CFS attenders (mv)

- $\beta = 14.60$, $p = 0.000201$

School

- T1: $\beta = 2.031$, $p = 0.023$
- T2: $\beta = 1.284$, $p = ns$
- T3: $\beta = 3.352$, $p = ns$

CFS and School

CFS and School Attenders

- T1 to T2: 6.96 to 8.57, $p = 0.004$
- T2 to T3: 8.57 to 9.28, ns
- T1 to T3: 6.96 to 9.28, $p = 0.008$

CFS and School Non attenders

- T1 to T2: 7.37 to 7.69, ns
- T2 to T3: 7.69 to 5.97, $p < 0.001$
- T1 to T3: 7.37 to 5.97, $p = 0.003$

CFS and School, by gender

CFS and School Attenders: Girls

- T1 to T2: 6.93 to 9.12, $p = 0.002$
- T2 to T3: 9.12 to 10.09, ns
- T1 to T3: 6.93 to 10.09, $p = 0.03$

CFS and School Attenders: Boys

- T1 to T2: 7.00 to 7.73, ns
- T2 to T3: 7.73 to 8.00, ns
- T1 to T3: 7.00 to 8.00, ns

CFS Non-attenders and School Attenders: Girls

- T1 to T2: 7.21 to 7.84, ns
- T2 to T3: 7.84 to 6.97, $p = 0.01$
- T1 to T3: 7.21 to 6.97, ns

CFS Non-attenders and School Attenders: Boys

- T1 to T2: 7.5 to 7.55, ns
- T2 to T3: 7.55 to 5.0, $p < 0.001$
- T1 to T3: 7.5 to 5.0, $p < 0.001$

Concerned about losing livelihoods

- T1: $\beta = -1.734$, $p = 0.01$
- T2: $\beta = -0.31$, $p = ns$
- T3: $\beta = -3.202$, $p = 0.000$

Attenders

- T1 to T2: 10.74 to 11.33, ns
- T2 to T3: 11.33 to 10.94, ns

Non attenders

- T1 to T2: 10.76 to 11.08, ns
- T2 to T3: 11.08 to 10.50, ns

Resilience T3 for CFS attendance (bv)

- $\beta = 0.956$, $p = ns$

Resilience at T3 for CFS attenders (mv)

- $\beta = 1.861$, $p = ns$

School

- T1: $\beta = 3.840$, $p = 0.002$
- T2: $\beta = 3.143$, $p = 0.021$
- T3: $\beta = 5.721$, $p = 0.000$

CFS and School
ns

Concerned about losing livelihoods
ns

Attenders

- T1 to T2: 8.39 to 9.53, $p = 0.0045$ (N=63)
- T2 to T3: 9.53 to 8.20, ns (N=40)

Non attenders

- T1 to T2: 8.24 to 8.50, ns
- T2 to T3: 8.50 to 7.39, $p = 0.0005$

Resilience T3 for CFS attenders (bv)

- $\beta = -2.018$, $p = 0.048$

Resilience at T3 for CFS attenders (mv)

- $\beta = 0.0725$, $p = 0.0251$

School

- T1: $\beta = 2.005$, $p = 0.049$
- T2: $\beta = 1.957$, $p = 0.048$
- T3: $\beta = 2.782$, $p = 0.007$

CFS and School
ns

Concerned about losing livelihoods

- T1: $\beta = 0.063$, $p = ns$
- T2: $\beta = -2.467$, $p = 0.006$
- T3: $\beta = -0.999$, $p = ns$

Psychosocial Wellbeing: Acquisition of Developmental Assets

Preliminary Findings	Supporting Analysis (disaggregated by age group)		
	Children 6 – 9 years (caregiver reports)	Children 10 – 12 years (self-reports)	Children 13 – 18 years (self-reports)
<p>Key area of interest: school, age, CFS, gender</p> <p>Overall, developmental assets are declining for all children over the study period. Age is a predictor of scores ($\beta = 1.543$, $p = 0.000$). School attendance at T2 and T3 are predictors of scores for children 10 – 12 and 13 – 18. Additionally, school attendance at baseline for children 10 – 12 was predictive of scores. Boys aged 10 – 12 reported fewer developmental assets at follow-up than girls.</p> <p>CFS is not a predictor of the level of developmental assets reported at T3 for any age range. Multivariate modeling is underway to confirm results.</p> <p>Scale guide: Higher levels on EMDAP indicated more developmental assets; Cronbach's alpha = 0.76 (0.77 Zarqa only)</p>	<p>Caregiver Rating of Developmental Assets (CRDA)</p> <p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T1 to T2: 25.29 to 17.04, $p < 0.001$ • T2 to T3: 17.04 to 13.60, $p < 0.001$ <p>CFS Attendance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T1 A to T1 NA: 27.19 to 25.01, ns • T2 A to T2 NA: 25.89 to 23.41, ns • T3 A to T3 NA: 17.46 to 15.23, ns <p>Bivariate confirmation of T3 comparison</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T3: $\beta = 2.233$, $p = ns$ <p>Attendees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T1 to T2: 27.19 to 25.89, ns (N=37) • T2 to T3: 25.89 to 17.46, $p = 0.0003$ (N=37) <p>Non attendees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T1 to T2: 25.01 to 23.41, $p = 0.0340$ (N=128) • T2 to T3: 23.41 to 15.23, $p = 0.0000$ (N=128) <p>School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T1: $\beta = 0.857$, $p = ns$ • T2: $\beta = 2.449$, $p = ns$ • T3: $\beta = 2.422$, $p = ns$ 	<p>EmDAP – self-reported</p> <p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T1 to T2: 27.45 to 26.22, ns • T2 to T3: 26.22 to 25.69, ns <p>CFS Attendance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T1 A to T1 NA: 27.74 to 27.61, ns • T2 A to T2 NA: 26.38 to 26.00, ns • T3 A to T3 NA: 26.07 to 25.68, ns <p>Bivariate confirmation of T3 comparison</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T3: $\beta = 0.791$, $p = ns$ <p>Attendees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T1 to T2: 27.74 to 26.38, ns (N=74) • T2 to T3: 26.38 to 26.07, ns (N=53) <p>Non attendees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T1 to T2: 27.61 to 26.00, ns (N=86) • T2 to T3: 26.00 to 25.68, ns (N=67) <p>School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T1: $\beta = 4.739$, $p = 0.016$ • T2: $\beta = 6.849$, $p = 0.001$ • T3: $\beta = 7.577$, $p = 0.001$ <p>Gender (Ref. Girls)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $\beta = -3.117$, $p = 0.028$ 	<p>EmDAP – self-reported</p> <p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T1 to T2: 26.89 to 25.66, ns • T2 to T3: 25.66 to 23.97, $p = 0.02$ <p>CFS Attendance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T1 A to T1 NA: 27.54 to 25.49, $p = 0.0259$ • T2 A to T2 NA: 26.26 to 24.00, $p = 0.0149$ • T3 A to T3 NA: 19.60 to 17.96, ns <p>Bivariate confirmation of T3 comparison</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T3: $\beta = -1.760$, $p = ns$ <p>Attendees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T1 to T2: 27.54 to 26.26, ns (N=72) • T2 to T3: 26.26 to 19.60, $p = 0.0000$ (N=58) <p>Non attendees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T1 to T2: 25.49 to 24.00, $p = 0.0060$ (N=197) • T2 to T3: 24.00 to 17.96, $p = 0.0000$ (N=146) <p>School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T1: $\beta = 2.933$, $p = ns$ • T2: $\beta = 4.276$, $p = 0.014$ • T3: $\beta = 4.373$, $p = 0.014$

Educational Attainment: Literacy and Numeracy Skills

Preliminary Findings	Supporting Analysis (disaggregated by age group)		
	Children 6 – 9 years (caregiver reports)	Children 10 – 12 years (self-reports)	Children 13 – 18 years (self-reports)
<p>Overall, no effect of CFS attendance on numeracy or literacy, with such small sample sizes and no significant findings do not recommend additional analyses.</p>	<p>Literacy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T3 mean flat(lit): 4.71 • CFS A to NA: 4.50 to 4.50, ns <p>Numeracy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T3 mean flat (num): 4.29 • CFS A to NA: 4.50 to 4.00, ns 	<p>Literacy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T3 mean flat(lit): 4.58 • CFS A to NA: 4.52 to 4.56, ns <p>Numeracy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T3 mean flat (num): 5.02 • CFS A to NA: 5.08 to 4.98, ns 	<p>Literacy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T3 mean flat(lit): 4.92 • CFS A to NA: 4.70 to 5.34, ns <p>Numeracy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T3 mean flat (num): 4.92 • CFS A to NA: 4.57 to 5.28, ns