



























































































































Therefore, by “role modelling” a number of behaviours or options, peer educators are bound to give double messages to their peers (Miller et al.).

Overall, responses from peer educators indicated that peer educators are indeed being equipped with the necessary training and mentoring to become change agents in their communities. SPEs on the most part, perceived changes in knowledge, confidence and attitudes, and reported that they were practising risk-free behaviours to their peers. Further investigation may be needed to assess the concept of role modelling and providing advice to peers.

### **Organisational Functions/Support**

#### **5. Do the peer educators have enough support from the implementing organisations (facilitators) during the course of the programme?**

Peer educator trainers, in this case facilitators, are vital in creating the first level of support for the peer educators, as they are responsible for training, mentoring and supporting them to fulfil their roles as peer educators (Goto et al, 2008; UNICEF, 2004). Although they are key to training the peer educators, must play more of a supportive or advisory role and must be available when needed, also allowing peer educators to be actively involved in their own training and activities, which is participatory action research (Goto et al., 2008).

Results from the evaluation revealed that peer educators in all the sites felt that facilitators were offering the necessary support to the peer educators by being present as for skills training sessions, and available for mentoring sessions they were responsible for providing to the SPEs. They are also expected to be present for all lesson deliveries that the peer educators hold for their peers. Facilitators must also be present or available to assist peer educators when they are planning for their activities, to provide input if needed. Results showed that they were indeed offering the necessary support.



## **Limitations of the study**

On the day of the session with Lower Crossroads, it was discovered that the group from Phandulwazi would also be present for a combined session. However, there was low attendance from Phandulwazi, with only six males attending. This narrowed the sample size intended for the study. The facilitator present attributed the poor attendance to the fact that Phandulwazi students were coming for a combined session with Lower Crossroads, and there was a long distance between the Phandulwazi High School and Lower Crossroads. In this case, there is need to look at the feasibility of combining a session, if some participants will not be able to attend due to distance, and there may be a need to consider holding separate sessions for each site, so that learners are able to attend relevant sessions. It also warrants that Olive Leaf may perhaps need to confirm or ensure that the peer educators that are considered as enrolled are actually attending the necessary training. Due to the time constraints and the scope of the evaluation, this was a limitation, as it was not possible to answer the question of whether all the peer educators listed as enrolled are in fact attending all the necessary sessions. Analysing all the attendance registers for each session in each site, for the period January 2009 to April 2010, could have done this.

Another limitation of this study was that it was largely based on the perceptions of the peer educators, and not the actual measures of behaviour, attitude and behaviour change. This would need to be done by other complex tests such as the Illustrative Questionnaire for Interview-Surveys with Young People (HRP, 2001), a joint initiative of the UNFPA, WHO, UNDP and the World Bank. Such a survey would have a particular section that taps into the attitudes of young people in more depth and focus, and would be more likely produce more robust evidence for attitude change. These methods were not implored in this evaluation, due to scope of the evaluation, which was partly determined by the time frame within which the evaluator was able to conduct the evaluation. The time frame as well as resources did not allow for more in-depth methods as those described above. It is therefore recommended that if GOLD would like to assess attitudes beyond perception level, they consider such internationally accredited methods to assess attitude changes.

As discussed in the Methods chapter, the reliability of the scale was a major limitation in this study, as the items on the questionnaire tool that was used in the evaluation did not meet Cronbach's alpha level of .07. This may have compromised the quality of the responses. However, as mentioned, the evaluator continued to use the questionnaire, as the items were specifically tailored to the evaluation questions that needed to be addressed in this evaluation.

## **Recommendations and conclusion**

This evaluation was a follow-up to the previous evaluation conducted by Gelderblom (2009), and attempted to answer questions about the implementation of the training and the support that senior peer educators in Olive Leaf sites have received. GOLD is to be commended for the training that they have been holding to build the capacity of their implementing partners, of which Olive Leaf is a part. As shown from the results of Gelderbolm's (2009) study, it was concluded that the training received by the IOs was sufficient and relevant, and enabled them to effectively implement the GOLD programme.

The focus of this evaluation was the next stage of programme implementation, to assess whether the peer educators were receiving effective training from facilitators, from Olive Leaf. Results clearly indicated that firstly, peer educator profiles (demographics and selection criteria) were aligned to the criteria stipulated by GOLD. Variances in the composition of peer educators in terms of age and gender diversity in the different sites highlighted that there is a need to be cognisant of each unique context in which the programme is being implemented, and to expect different patterns. Although there was general diversity and correctly aligned age groups that formed part of the peer educator groups, some sites had slight variations, such as Phandulwazi High School, which had more peer educators in the 17 – 19 age category. As discussed, a possible reason for this could be to do with the area where these peer educators originate from, which would be an underserved community, where children may be starting school at a later age than is expected. In such instances, it is recommended that GOLD pay attention these differences that may exist among the sites where the programme is being implemented. Corrective action

can then be taken to adjust the mean age requirement, if necessary for a particular site or community of practice.

It was also discovered that there were no major differences in findings between the school-based and the community-based sites. This may not necessarily be because there are no differences, but because essentially, all peer educators in the sample, were recruited in schools, whether they were in the community or school based programme. It is therefore recommended that GOLD look more closely at criteria that would distinguish their community-based programme from the school-based programme. It is also recommended that GOLD re-address the issue of reaching youth out of school, as findings from this sample indicate that all peer educators are attending schools.

A major drawback in this study was that there was a smaller sample size than was expected, and this had to do with the fact that there was poor attendance of peer educators on the days of data collection, as well as high rates of attrition that have prevailed between 2009 and 2010. Incomplete attrition trackers also made it difficult to assess the reasons for high attrition rates, and further investigation into reasons for attrition was recommended. Linked to this issue is the recommendation for further investigation into reasons why there has been higher attrition in the school-based programme. This may warrant measures that will address specific needs that exist uniquely in the school-based programme.

Issues around service delivery and organisational support were essentially based on the perceptions of peer educators on the services and support that they receive from facilitators. There was an overall positive response to questions on these aspects with no negative responses (“disagree” or “strongly disagree”). GOLD is to be commended for ensuring that facilitators feel that generally they are able to effectively carry out their duties as peer educators.

There has been a positive indication of perceived behaviour and attitude change among peer educators, which is an encouraging result. It must be noted however, that when it comes to issues of sexual and other responsible behaviours, evaluators be aware of social desirability factors. Therefore a limitation of this evaluation is that it did not include any measure on social desirability, and thus responses may not be a true reflection of what is really happening, or what behaviours peer educators are conducting. It is therefore further recommended that for GOLD to get deeper insight into actual attitude and behaviour change, they consider more robust investigations, which go beyond perceptions, and are able to delve deeper into attitude and behaviours among youth. There is also need to determine and distinguish between role modelling behaviours and providing advice, as peer educators are reaching out to peers who may have different and varying needs and preferences, particularly when looking at HIV prevention methods.

The evaluation of the GOLD peer education programme implemented by Olive Leaf foundation provides evidence of aligned profiles of current peer educators to GOLD's requirements, in terms of the intended targets and their characteristics. It also indicates that facilitators are highly recommended by the peer educators whom they train and support, and peer educators feel confident about their roles and are well equipped to carry them out among their peers and community members. GOLD is highly commended for the training and support that they continue to render to implementing organisations including facilitators to enable them to effectively implement the GOLD Peer Education Programme. It is hoped that recommendations offered in this evaluation will be used to further strengthen the programme implemented by Olive Leaf, and that peer educators will continue to be strengthened and equipped to be able to effectively carry out their responsibilities as they role model purpose driven and health enhancing behaviours to their peers.

For future evaluations, it is recommended that larger scale evaluations be conducted, which will focus on all the community based programmes that are being implemented in one other IO in South Africa, as well as in Zambia. This will ensure that the different cultures and contexts are

explored, in order to assess whether there needs to be an adaptation of the programme in the different countries, depending on the patterns observed in programme implementation. It is also recommended that future evaluations be conducted on outcomes from the peer education programmes, in terms of influence on peers and behaviour change and health-enhancing behaviours, using more rigorous and robust methods and tools, which will allow for credible interpretations.

University of Cape Town

## References

- Agha, S. (2002). An evaluation of the effectiveness of a peer sexual health intervention among secondary-school students in Zambia. *AIDS Education Prevention, 14*(4), 269-281.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Prentice Hall: Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Borgia, P., Marinacci, C., Schifano, P., & Perucci, C. A. (2005). Is peer education the best approach for HIV prevention in schools? Findings from a randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 36*(6), 508-516.
- Brack, A.B., Millard, M., & Shah, K. (2008). Are peer educators really peers? *Journal of American College Health, 56*(5), 566-568.
- Campbell, C., & McPhail, C. (2002). Peer education, gender and the development of critical consciousness: participatory HIV prevention by South African Youth. *Social Science and Medicine, 55*, 331-345.
- Cartagena, R. G., Veugelers, P. J., Kipp, W., Magigav, K., & Laing, L. M. (2006). Effectiveness of an HIV prevention program for secondary school students in Mongolia. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 39*(6), 925 e9-955 e16.
- Caron, F., Godin, G., Otis, J., & Lambert, L. D. (2004). Evaluation of a theoretically based AIDS/STD peer education program on postponing sexual intercourse and on condom use among adolescents attending high school. *Health Education Research, 19*(2), 185-197.
- Chen, H-T. (2005). *Practical program evaluation. Assessing and improving planning, implementation, and effectiveness*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Damon, W. (1984). Peer education: the untapped potential. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 5*(4), 331-343.

- Ebreo, A., Feist-Price, S., Siewe, Y., & Zimmerman, R.S. (2002). Effects of Peer Education of Peer Educators in a School-Based HIV Prevention Programme: Where Should Peer Education Research Go From Here? *Health Education and Behavior*, 29(4), 411-423.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research*. MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Fongkaew, W., Fongkaew, K., & Suchaxaya, P. (2007). Early adolescent peer leader development in HIV prevention using youth-adult partnership with schools approach. *The Journal of the Association of Nurses in AIDS Care*, 18(2), 60-71.
- Gelderblom, C. (2009). *A Theory-based Evaluation of a Purveyor type Programme*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town.
- GOLD. (2009) *An Initial Exploration of GOLD Programme Outcomes, November 2009*. Cape Town: GOLD Peer Education Development Agency.
- GOLD. (2009). *Community Based Programme Implementation Guide, Version 2.1 2009-2010: A peer education model for implementing organisations*. Cape Town: GOLD Peer Education Development Agency.
- GOLD. (2009). *School Based Programme Implementation Guide, Version 2 2009-2010: A peer education model for implementing organisations*. Cape Town: GOLD Peer Education Development Agency.
- Goto, K., Tiffany, J., Pelto, G., & Pelletier, D. (2008). Use of q methodology to analyze divergent perspectives on participatory action research as a strategy for HIV/AIDS prevention among Caribbean youth. *AIDS Education & Prevention*, 20(4), 301-311.
- Kelly, J.A. (2004). Popular opinion leaders and HIV prevention: resolving discrepant findings, and implications for the development of effective community programmes. *AIDS Care*, 16(2), 139-150.

- Kirby, D., Obasi, A., & Laris, B. A. (2006). The effectiveness of sex education and HIV education interventions in schools in developing countries. *World Health Organisation Technical Report Series*, 938, 103-150.
- Knibbs, S., & Price, N. (2009). Peer education in sexual and reproductive health programming: a Cambodian case study. *Development in Practice*, 19(1), 39-50.
- Mahat, G., Scoloveno, M. A., De Leon, T., & Frenkel, J. (2008). Preliminary evidence of an adolescent HIV/AIDS peer education program. *Journal of Pediatric Nursing*, 23(5), 358-363.
- Medley, A., Kennedy, C., O'Reilly, K., & Sweat, M. (2009). Effectiveness of Peer Education Interventions for HIV Prevention in Developing Countries: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *AIDS Education and Prevention*, 21(3), 181-206.
- Miller, A.N., Mutungi, M., Facchini, E., Barasa, B., Ondieki, W., & Warria, C. (2008). An outcome assessment of an ABC-Based HIV peer education intervention among Kenyan university students. *Journal of Health Communication*, 13, 345-356.
- Mitchell, K., Nyakake, M., & Oling, J. (2007). How effective are street youth peer educators? Lessons learned from an HIV/AIDS prevention programme in Urban Uganda. *Health Education*, 107(4), 364-376.
- Norton, B., & Mutonyi, H. (2007). 'Talk what others think you can't talk': HIV/AIDS clubs as peer education in Ugandan schools. *Compare*, 37(4), 479-492.
- Parkin, S., & McKegany, N. (2000). The Rise and Rise of Peer Education Approaches. *Drugs: education, prevention and policy*, 7(3), 293-310.
- Pattman, R., & Cockerill, M. (2007). Christian women and men from Durban: peer sex educators in the making. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 11(4), 501-517.



Price, N., & Knibbs, S. (2009). How effective is peer education in addressing young people's sexual and reproductive health needs in developing countries? *Children and Society*, 23, 291-302.

Rogers, E. M. (1983). *Diffusion of Innovations*. New York: The Free Press (3rd edition).

Rossi, P.H., Lipsey, M.W., & Freeman, H.E. (2004). *Evaluation: A systematic approach (7<sup>th</sup> ed)*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

Smith, M. U., & DiClemente, R. J. (2000). Stand: A peer educator training curriculum for sexual risk reduction in the rural south. Students together against negative decisions. *Preventative Medicine*, 30(6), 441-449.

UNAIDS. (1999). Peer Education and HIV/AIDS: Concepts, Uses and Challenges, Best Practice Collection. Geneva: UNAIDS.

UNICEF. (2004). Life Skills. Retrieved from [http://www.unicef.org/lifeskills/index\\_12078.html](http://www.unicef.org/lifeskills/index_12078.html)

UNFPA. (2005). State of World Population: Youth and HIV/AIDS Fact Sheet. Retrieved 24 February 2010, from [www.unfpa.org/swp/2005/presskit/factsheets/facts\\_youth.htm](http://www.unfpa.org/swp/2005/presskit/factsheets/facts_youth.htm)

Visser, M.J. (2007). HIV/AIDS prevention through peer education and support in secondary schools in South Africa. *Journal of Social Aspects of HIV/AIDS*, 4(3), 678-694.

Warwick, I., & Aggleton, P. (2004). Building on Experience: a formative evaluation of a peer education sexual health project in South Africa. *London Review of Education*, 2(2), 137-153.

## Appendices

### Appendix A: Peer educator Questionnaire

|   |
|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>QUESTIONNAIRE</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>FOR RESEARCH ON</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>THE GOLD PEER EDUCATION PROGRAMME</b></p> |
|---|

Dear Peer Educator

As part of my Masters research at the University of Cape Town, I would like to investigate your thoughts, opinions and experiences about the peer education training that you received from Olive Leaf.

I would appreciate if you could fill out the following questionnaire based on this training. You do not have to fill in your name, so all of your responses are anonymous. The completion of this questionnaire is voluntary.

The questionnaire will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. It has three sections with a total of 28 questions. The questionnaire is printed on both sides of the paper (5 pages to complete).

Thank you very much for agreeing to participate and for your cooperation.

Rumbidzai Grace Njovana

(Programme Evaluation Masters Student)

University of Cape Town

**QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUCTIONS:**

The following sections ask you questions about different components of the peer education training. For each question, please rate your level of agreement by putting a cross over the response that best matches your experience. For example

**Example Question: I enjoyed the peer education training**

|                        |               |              |                        |                     |
|------------------------|---------------|--------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 1<br>Strongly disagree | 2<br>Disagree | 3<br>Neutral | <del>4<br/>Agree</del> | 5<br>Strongly agree |
|------------------------|---------------|--------------|------------------------|---------------------|

**SECTION 1: Facilitators' ability to train peer educators**

**1. The facilitators were competent to conduct the peer education training sessions.**

|                        |               |              |            |                     |
|------------------------|---------------|--------------|------------|---------------------|
| 1<br>Strongly disagree | 2<br>Disagree | 3<br>Neutral | 4<br>Agree | 5<br>Strongly agree |
|------------------------|---------------|--------------|------------|---------------------|

**2. The facilitators were knowledgeable in the subject areas they presented.**

|                        |               |              |            |                     |
|------------------------|---------------|--------------|------------|---------------------|
| 1<br>Strongly disagree | 2<br>Disagree | 3<br>Neutral | 4<br>Agree | 5<br>Strongly agree |
|------------------------|---------------|--------------|------------|---------------------|

**SECTION 2: Facilitators' support**

**3. A facilitator was present at all of the skills training sessions I conducted.**

|                        |               |              |            |                     |
|------------------------|---------------|--------------|------------|---------------------|
| 1<br>Strongly disagree | 2<br>Disagree | 3<br>Neutral | 4<br>Agree | 5<br>Strongly agree |
|------------------------|---------------|--------------|------------|---------------------|

**4. A facilitator was present at all of the mentoring sessions.**

|                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree |

**5. A facilitator was always present when I conduct a lesson delivery with my peers.**

|                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree |

**6. A facilitator was always present when I conducted a talk group with my peers.**

|                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree |

**7. A facilitator assists us in the planning of our activities (e.g. community upliftment activities).**

|                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree |

**8. A facilitator is always available for support when I need it.**

|                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree |

### **SECTION 3: Changes as a result of the programme**

**9. Before this programme, I did not know much about HIV/AIDS.**

|                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree |

**10. Being in this programme has increased my knowledge about HIV/AIDS.**

|                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree |

**11. The training taught me what my role as a peer educator is.**

|                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree |

**12. After completing the training, I feel confident to educate my peers about HIV/AIDS.**

|                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree |

**13. After completing the training, I feel my communication skills have increased in order for me to reach out to my peers.**

|                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree |

**14. I feel confident to conduct lesson deliveries to my peers.**

|                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree |

**15. I feel confident enough to conduct talk groups with my peers.**

|                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree |

**16. My own attitudes about sexual behaviours have changed because of the programme**

|                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree |

**17. Due to the training, I am now modelling HIV/AIDS risk-free behaviours to my peers**

|                   |          |         |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree |

**18. Please tick any of the following behaviours that you are modelling to peers due to the training**

- Condom use
- Delaying sexual debut
- Reducing the number of sexual partners
- Abstinence
- Secondary abstinence (I have sex before but made a decision not to have sex anymore)
- Reducing alcohol consumption
- Other  Please specify the behaviours: \_\_\_\_\_

## SECTION 4: Demographics

The following section asks for your demographic details for descriptive purposes only. Please tick in the appropriate box, or fill in where appropriate.

**Gender:** Male  Female

**Race:** Prefer not to answer

**Or**

African  Coloured  White  Indian  Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**Age:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Number of siblings:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Who do you live with?** \_\_\_\_\_

**Do you hold a leadership position in your school, youth group or organisation?**

Yes

No

If yes, please specify the position: \_\_\_\_\_