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Abstract

Peer education involves peers offering credible and reliable information about sensitive life issues through the means of an informal peer group setting (Topping & Ehly, 1998). The purpose of this instrumental case study was to examine the processes of peer education through the exploration of two teams within a young adult tobacco control initiative, Leave the Pack Behind (LTPB). This qualitative case study examined two peer education teams over an eight-month period. Interviews, focus groups and observations were conducted with 12 participants across two peer education teams. Findings show the complexities of the processes of peer education including a connection between the stages of change and the changing role of the peer educator across stages of the empowerment process. Peer education teams and factors in the macro environment were also found to impact the process of peer education. This study provides a new definition for the process of peer education: peer education is a fluid process of knowledge exchange in which peer educators adopt different styles of facilitation as people move through stages of empowerment and change. This study contributes to the academic literature upon the processes of peer education by providing a definition, a model and an overall understanding through an ecological and empowerment framework. The findings from this study suggest peer educators can be further trained to: use specific peer educational approaches that fit with student smoker's stage of change; better understand their position as a peer educator on the LTPB team; understand the reciprocal relationship between the macro environment and the peer education teams having an effect on one another.
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Chapter One: Introduction

Recent health promotion interventions use peer education and mentoring as a method to reach youth and young adults. Topping and Ehly (1998) define peer education as "peers offering credible and reliable information about sensitive life issues and the opportunity to discuss this in an informal peer group setting” (p. 6). Currently there is not an existing comprehensive theory or model to guide peer education (Campbell & Mzaidume, 2001; Milburn, 1995; Turner & Shepherd, 1999), nor is there definitive literature that provides insight on why and how this method works (Shiner, 1999). The goal of this qualitative study was to contribute to the literature on peer education. The context for the study is peer education that occurs as an aspect of Leave the Pack Behind (LTPB). LTPB is a comprehensive, age-tailored, tobacco control initiative for young adults on post-secondary campuses which seamlessly integrates cessation, protection, prevention and industry denormalization activities. The activities of LTPB aim to promote smoking cessation among occasional and regular smokers, to protect non-smokers from second-hand smoke, and to prevent students from starting to smoke. Since LTPB's inception in 2000, twenty-five post-secondary institutions across Canada now have LTPB teams on their campus. The LTPB teams are comprised of peer educators who disseminate LTPB tobacco-related messages through various activities including walkabouts and booth displays. Peer educators design their own booths based on the LTPB theme of the month (for example "Healthy Living") and set up their displays in heavy traffic areas on campus. Walkabouts are used weekly to talk to meet students at various public spaces around campus to engage in face-to-face discussions about smoking cessation. During walkabouts and booth displays peer educators distribute
resources, learn more about students’ views of smoking on campus, and administer
carbon monoxide tests. In 2003-2004 LTPB peer education teams interacted face-to-face
with nearly one-quarter (40,919) of the 180,000 students on participating campuses
(LTPB, 2004/05). In addition, the www.LeaveThePackBehind.org website attracted
25,000 hits during the school year (LTPB, 2004/05).

Finding effective approaches to smoking cessation and prevention are important,
as tobacco use is the number one preventable risk factor for a number of health problems
in Canada. Smoking is the main risk factor associated with lung cancer, and one of the
factors in heart disease and stroke (cardiovascular disease) and respiratory diseases
(Health Canada, 2005). It is also linked to cancers of the mouth, throat, larynx,
oesophagus, pancreas, kidney and bladder (Health Canada, 2005). Smoking is also
associated with many chronic changes and illnesses, frequent colds, smoker’s cough,
chronic bronchitis, gastric ulcers, increases in heart rate and blood pressure, and
emphysema (Canadian Cancer Society, 2005; Health Canada, 2005; Heart and Stroke
Foundation of Canada, 2005).

Young adults attending college or university are the context in which peer
education is examined in this study. In Ontario, there are 713,800 young adults ages 20-
24 years, and approximately 370,050 (52%) of these young adults attend school (LTPB,
2004/05). Despite the significant health risks, LTPB reports that although there have
been modest reductions in smoking rates among young adults, rates of smoking on
university campuses continues to remain high - about 40% of students smoke cigarettes at
stated that among these young adult students:
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- up to 19% of current smokers began smoking regularly after arriving on campus;
- about 10% of post-secondary smokers had their first cigarette after the age of 19;
- up to 10% of non-smoking students intend to start smoking.

Smoking is not only an individual health issue, but also a social issue. Students are influenced not only by their own motivations and attitudes, but also by societal norms, advertising, policy, and peer influence. Time spent in post-secondary education represents a transitional period in the lives of young adults, and likely their first time away from home. University campuses create a setting in which interventions may target change. LTPB reports that among post-secondary smokers, most want to quit, few make repeated quit attempts, and successful quitting is limited to a minority of students (LTPB, 2004/05). LTPB uses peer education to help young adults quit smoking, decrease the amount of cigarettes they are smoking, and to prevent students from ever smoking.

Recently, peer education has been described as a “method in search of a theory” (Campbell & Mzaidume, 2001, p. 1978; Turner & Shepherd, 1999, p. 235). Shiner (1999) was also concerned that, “although issues related to implementation are considered in the peer education literature they are rarely placed within any conceptual framework and, as a consequence, have not become a core part of the way that we define peer education” (p. 559). It has been argued that peer education suffers from an inadequately specified theoretical base which does not address important social and cultural factors implicit in this approach (Milburn, 1995). Furthermore, this gap undermines our ability to learn from peer education’s successes and failures (Campbell & Mzaidume, 2001; MacPhail & Campbell, 1999). Milburn (1995) suggested a link between social processes, empowerment and peer education when he asked, “peer education aims to tap into what
is known about existing social processes and to harness this power, but to whose ends?
How does this approach relate to other ideas current in health promotion about empowerment?” (p. 408).

The purpose of this instrumental case study was to examine the processes of peer education through the exploration of two teams within the LTPB organization. To contribute to the development of knowledge on peer education qualitative approaches were used to produce detailed information that increased the depth of understanding of the case being studied (Patton, 2002). Yin (2003) defines case study as, “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (p. 13). Qualitative data collection methods (observation, interview, focus groups) were used to gather rich, detailed information regarding the processes of peer education teams. Patton (2002) states qualitative inquiry is highly appropriate for studying processes, as it is able to: (1) describe how people engage with each other; (2) capture different experiences of people in their own words; (3) describe a fluid and dynamic process which cannot be fairly summarized on a single rating scale at one point in time; and (4) consider participants’ perceptions as a key aspect of process.

To examine the social and cultural factors that affect peer education, the original research questions guiding this qualitative study were:

1. How do peer educators understand and implement peer education?
2. What processes underlie the peer education teams?
3. What influences in the macro environment effect the functioning of the peer education teams?

4. What is the relationship between the process of peer education teams and the outcomes achieved?

These research questions directed the inquiry of the processes of peer education. Due to the emergent research design of qualitative research, it was anticipated that additional or revised research questions would emerge throughout the study. Consequently research question #4 was deleted from the study and replaced with the following research question during the data analysis process: How do processes of peer education relate to processes of empowerment?

Findings of this study show the complexities of the processes of peer education including a connection between the stages of change and the changing role of the peer educator across stages of the empowerment process. Peer education teams and factors in the macro environment were found to impact the process of peer education. This study provides a new definition for the process of peer education: peer education is a fluid process of knowledge exchange in which peer educators adopt different styles of facilitation as people move through stages of empowerment and change. This study contributes to the academic literature on the processes of peer education by providing a definition, a model and an overall understanding through an ecological and empowerment framework. The findings from this study suggest peer educators can be further trained to: use specific peer educational approaches that fit with student smoker’s stage of change; better understand their position as a peer educator on the LTPB team; understand the reciprocal relationship between the macro environment and the peer education teams.
Chapter One, provides an introduction to the study. Presented here were the focus of this study on peer education, a rationale for the study, an introduction to the case and the research questions, a summary of important findings, and implications for peer education training. In Chapter Two a review of literature is provided that is framed in ecological theory. A variety of concepts and theories are presented that help to understand LTPB peer education teams and smoking behaviours in young adults at the individual, organization and community levels. Chapter Three describes the qualitative methodology utilized throughout the research process, highlighting the data collection methods and a discussion of trustworthiness in qualitative research. Chapter Four presents a detailed description of the findings from the interviews, focus groups and observations of the peer educators including five themes supported by verbatim quotes from the peer educators. Chapter Five contains a discussion of the findings contextualized with theories and concepts previously discussed in the review of literature. Chapter Five also contains a discussion of the application of this study to LTPB and health promotion in general, the limitations of the research, and suggestions for future research.
Chapter Two: Review of Literature

This chapter provides a review of the literature on peer education and smoking behaviour among young adults. Ecological theory was used to frame the contents of this literature review. Ecological theory proposes that any individual behaviour is supported and influenced by numerous other systems and groups (Wandersman et al., 1996). The theory also proposes that long-term behaviour change requires programs which target multiple levels of influence (Emmons, 2000). Using ecological theory, smoking behaviour was examined at three systems: the micro system (individual), the meso system (group or organization), and the macro system (community). For peer educators, it is important to understand factors in a student's life that may influence post secondary smoking behaviours. For university students, the meso layer, including friends and family is of particular importance during this transitional period.

Ecological theory is also useful in understanding peer education as a smoking intervention among young adults. The literature suggests for peer education interventions to be successful, peer educators must be seen by other students as credible sources of information, they must be role models to their target audience, and they must be able to empower other students to take power over their smoking behaviours (Shiner & Newburn, 1996). In addition, to further develop the literature it was important to understand how peer education as an intervention is influenced by the structure and functioning of peer education teams including leadership, commitment, involvement, and the cohesion of teams. The organizational capacity of the teams was also examined. As an organization grows and acquires more human, physical, financial, and knowledge resources, there is a greater likelihood that implementation of health interventions will
improve as well. Organizational capacity is important to the understanding of this study because the greater the capacity that the peer education teams attain, the greater the techniques of peer education that can be implemented. The broader social and cultural aspects of the environment also affect peer education including, strong or weak tobacco policies, community protective factors, and campus culture.

**Young Adults and Cigarette Smoking**

Recent trends suggest that young adulthood may be an important and largely overlooked period in the development of regular smoking behaviour (Hammond, 2005). Using data from the 2003 Canadian Tobacco Use Monitoring Survey, Hammond found the prevalence of daily smoking rose from 8% among youth to 22% among young adults, and approximately one fifth of smokers tried their first cigarette after the age of 18 years. Young adults were more likely than older smokers to be occasional smokers and reported lower daily consumption (Hammond). Hammond reports that smoking behaviour among young adults is distinct from both youth and older adults and therefore calls for immediate attention from the public health community. According to the 1998 Canadian Campus Survey, 17.1% of students reported daily cigarette smoking and 10.4% reported occasional smoking (Adlaf, Glikzman, Demers & Newton-Taylor, 2003). The 2004 Canadian Tobacco Use Monitoring Survey found similar results. A greater proportion of young adult males (30%) report smoking compared to young adult females (24%) (Statistics Canada, 2004). Ramsay and Hoffman (2004) call for improved smoking cessation and relapse prevention strategies as lifestyle choices and stress management strategies adopted by post secondary students persist into adulthood.
An Ecological Model of Smoking Among Young Adults

The ecological perspective comes from within the ecosystems perspective, which assumes interdependence between an ecosystems health and human health (Dakubo, 2004). Human beings are seen as an integral part of their ecosystems and are in continuous interaction with the changing environmental, social, and economic conditions (Yassi et al., 1999). Through transdisciplinary investigation among relevant stakeholders, the ecosystems approach aims to improve human health through sustainable management of the environment (Dakubo, 2004).

The ecological model (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) is used to provide a comprehensive view of young adults within the context of his/her family, who reside within a more proximate community context and a more distal societal context (Mescheke & Patterson, 2003). The ecological approach to health program planning recognizes that any serious attempt to improve the health status and quality of life of a population must take into account the powerful role played by the ecosystem and its subsystems (Green & Kreuter, 2005). Wilcox (2003) stated that there is evidence that non-random variability in smoking occurs across ecological as well as individual units. Certain schools, neighbourhoods, and communities of various shapes and sizes – even countries – are known as having high rates of smoking while other ecological areas are noted for their lower rates of use (Wilcox, 2003).

An ecological perspective considers and incorporates factors inherent to the student and the student's school, peers, family, and community. It provides a contextual map to understand the different factors that contribute to a student's behaviour, including the broader social, cultural, and historical forces (Abrams, Theberge & Karan, 2005). In
post-secondary education, the broader social context and surroundings are important when trying to understand why some students choose to begin smoking or cannot quit smoking. Peers and friends play an extremely large role in young people's lives and can have a prominent effect on their smoking behaviours.

As shown in Figure 1, there are three subsystems of the ecosystems framework: micro, meso, and macro (Mescheke & Patterson, 2003). Within each of these systems, there are many factors which may influence a person's behaviour through direct and indirect transactions (Mescheke & Patterson, 2003). For example, when looking at the resiliency of university students and whether or not they choose to smoke, there are many protective factors in a student's ecosystem, such as friends who do not smoke, smoke-free bars and restaurants on and off campus, non-smoking policies, and peer education driven smoking cessation programs or campaigns.

Individual level characteristics cannot fully account for smoking behaviours observed in young adults. Communities and the social environment surrounding young adults include protective factors as well as risk factors. Individual, family, community, and societal systems are embedded in a larger ideological context, called the macro system (Mescheke & Patterson, 2003). Macro systems significantly impact the nature and extent of transactions that occur between micro systems (Mescheke & Patterson, 2003). For example, if smoking is very prominent in a university community, then young people may begin to smoke thinking it is a social norm. Therefore it may be difficult to change their attitudes, intentions and beliefs upon smoking.
Figure 1. An ecological model of smoking as a social issue.

Micro System Theories

At the micro system level, most theories are derived from social psychology and focus on individual behaviour. To date, much of the work of health promotion planners has dealt with micro system interventions (McKenzie & Smeltzer, 1997). Micro system theories focus on changing behaviour. As indicated in Figure 1, the most common individual level theory used in the literature to explain the process of changing health behaviours is the stages of change theory (Prochaska & DiClemente, 1984).
Stages of change theory. The stages of change theory (Prochaska & DiClemente, 1984) proposes that smoking cessation follows a controllable and predictive process. This theory suggests that people go through a series of stages when trying to change or acquire new behaviours (Naidoo & Wills, 2000). There are five stages: precontemplation, contemplation, preparation, action, and maintenance. The five stages will be described with concrete examples in terms of smoking cessation. In the precontemplation stage the person has not considered changing their lifestyle or become aware of any potential risks in their health behaviour (Naidoo & Wills, 2000). In precontemplation, the smoker expresses no intention of stopping in the near future of six months (Weinstein, Rothman & Sutton, 2003). In the contemplation stage, the person is not yet ready to change their behaviour, but may be seeking information to help make that decision (Naidoo & Wills, 2000). At this stage, the individual is aware of the benefits of change. In the contemplation stage, a smoker is thinking of quitting some time in the next six months but not within the next month (Weinstein, Rothman & Sutton, 2003). In the preparation stage, the perceived benefits seem to outweigh the costs and when the change seems possible and worthwhile, the individual may be ready for change and possibly seek extra help and support (Naidoo & Wills, 2000). Preparation indicates the smoker intends to take action within the next month and that the individual reports at least one unsuccessful 24 hour quit attempt in the past year (Weinstein, Rothman & Sutton, 2003). At the action stage, the individual is making the change in his/her behaviour. Here, in the early days of change, positive decisions are required by the individual to do things differently such as having a clear goal, a realistic plan, support and rewards (Naidoo & Wills, 2000). Action involves successfully quitting smoking for any period of time between one day and six
months (Weinstein, Rothman & Sutton, 2003). In the final maintenance stage, the new behaviour is sustained and the individual moves into a healthier lifestyle (Naidoo & Wills, 2000). After quitting smoking for six months, a person is considered to have reached maintenance (Weinstein, Rothman & Sutton, 2003). The stages of change theory is used to understand addictions - where many individuals go through each of the stages but may often relapse (Naidoo & Wills, 2000). Relapse is an event that terminates the action or maintenance phase prompting a cyclical movement back through the initial stages of precontemplation or contemplation (DiClemente et al., 1991).

Meso System Theories

Figure 1 includes three examples of meso system theories which focus on interactions with family and peers. Social learning theory, attachment, and resilience assist in describing broader social influences that affect individual behaviour. Meso system theories are derived from the discipline of sociology. The connections linking one micro system to another are called meso systems (Mescheke & Patterson, 2003). A young adult can experience the impact of linkages where they do not directly participate (Mescheke & Patterson, 2003). Meso systems include the linkages between family members and young adults’ schools, churches, peers, friends, sports teams, and health care providers. These linkages often overlap and create a web surrounding and protecting that person from undesirable behaviour, or conversely, the interconnections could increase the risk of undesirable behaviour, depending upon the nature of the linkages (Mescheke & Patterson, 2003).

Peers can have a significant effect on a young adult’s smoking behaviour. During this transitional period, post-secondary culture decreases parental involvement and
increases peer involvement. Perhaps, the most significant finding by the 1998 Canadian Campus Survey is the influence of living arrangements. Results of the survey showed that students living off campus without family report the highest rate of daily smoking, smoking rates are 1.4 times higher than those living off campus with parents and 1.5 times higher than those living in university housing (Adlaf et al., 2003). Although smoking rates are higher among those living off-campus without family, 15% of those living in university housing report daily smoking (Adlaf et al., 2003). One implication is that tobacco controls must extend beyond university residences to have an effect on overall smoking levels among students (Adlaf et al., 2003).

Social learning theory. Bandura (1977) stated that, “most human behavior is learned observationally through modeling: from observing others, one forms an idea of how new behaviours are performed, and on later occasions this coded information serves as a guide for action” (p. 22). Bandura’s social learning theory rejects the notion that behaviours can be explained solely by a consideration of underlying motivational forces in the form of needs, drives and impulses (Blane & Leonard, 1987). For this reason, general theories of behaviour shifted the focus from internal influences to an examination of the external influences of action (Blane & Leonard, 1987). Social learning theory suggests that subjects need an opportunity to practice modelled behaviour and positive reinforcement if it is to be adopted successfully (Turner & Shepherd, 1999). We learn from models of many kinds – not only live models but from symbolic models, such as those we see on television, read about in books, or play in video games (Crain, 2000).

Social learning theory predicts that young adults model behaviour of those who are closely associated, including parents, friends, siblings and peers. If these important
Peer education 15

people smoke it is a key factor in determining whether the young adult chooses will do so as well. Family and friends have an impact on behaviour through their normative beliefs (i.e. their approval of smoking) (Collins & Ellickson, 2004). Simply put, if student “A” makes ten new friends in university that smoke, and if student “B” makes ten new friends that do not smoke, it is much more likely that student “A” will begin to start smoking compared to student “B”.

Attachment. Attachment theory claims that throughout life, the attachment behavioural system is constantly active (Schuengel & Van Ijzendoorn, 2001). This behavioural system regulates the use of attachment figures as a secure base to use when a person may become frightened or stressed (Schuengel & Van Ijzendoorn, 2001). Trusting the availability of an attachment figure in times of need, the attached person is able to go out and explore the world (Schuengel & Van Ijzendoorn, 2001).

The classic attachment theory presents a monotropic model which views the mother as the first and most important figure in an infant’s life (Lewis, 2005). Bowlby (1969), the forefather of attachment theory ascertains that after a certain age attachment behaviour diminishes both in its intensity and in the frequency with which it is elicited. During adolescence a child’s attachment to his parents grows weaker (Bowlby). One probable reason for this detachment with the mother figure may be due to an increase in curiosity and exploratory behaviour (Bowlby). In adolescence and adulthood a measure of attachment behaviour is commonly directed towards persons outside the family as well as toward groups and institutions other than the family (Bowlby). As a child grows older, children’s peer relationships are included creating a polytropic view of the attachment theory (Lewis, 2005). Lewis (2005) argues that peer relationships provide a more
accurate picture of a child’s socio-emotional context than that of the monotropic attachment model. This suggests that peers are even more important than mothers in the social context during young adulthood.

As discussed by Wade (2001), family attachment (youth’s relationship with their parents), school attachment (closeness and comfort of school felt by students), and peer attachment (closeness and connectedness to friends and peers) all impact youth’s decision making processes about risk taking behaviours. Positive family, school, and peer attachment significantly decreases unhealthy risk taking behaviours in adolescents (Wade, 2001). Although there is limited literature on attachment among university students, the findings from Wade (2001) may be applied to young adulthood.

The period of young adulthood represents a transitional period in a person’s life. For university students this time usually represents increased freedom with little increase in responsibilities. During this time period, risk taking – especially in terms of health risk behaviours – tends to increase (Bachman et al., 2002). According to Arnett (2000), a primary reason many individuals exhibit more risk-taking behaviours during this time period is that they are exploring their identity and are not restrained by social roles such as spouse and parent. Many students move out of their parents’ homes, and into on-campus residence, off-campus housing living alone or with roommates. Peer attachment then replaces family as being the most influential aspect of young adult’s lives. Recent data have suggested that smoke-free residences help protect occasional smokers from becoming regular smokers (Wechsler, Lee & Rigotti, 2001).

West, Sweeting and Ecob (1999) also found a relationship between peer and family attachment and increased young adult smoking. West et al. (1999) found that
participants who had “most” friends who were smokers were three times more likely to become smokers themselves during the young adult period (18-21 years). Furthermore, this study found friends' smoking to be of continuing significance, especially around school-leaving when friendship networks often change remarkably (West et al., 1999). As shown in Figure 1, attachment is a social concept located in the meso layer as peers and friends have an impact on a young adult’s smoking behaviour.

Resilience and protective factors. Resilience has become a popular construct in current developmental science to describe processes by which an individual, a family, or a community system is able to adapt and function well within the context of significant adversity or risk (Alperstein & Raman, 2003; Mescheke & Patterson, 2003). Mescheke and Patterson (2003) suggest that resilience is not a trait of any individual system, but rather a set of processes that can be inferred when the system being considered shows competence in response to significant risk exposure. Conversely, Kim-Cohen, Moffitt, Caspi and Taylor (2004) studied 1,116 twin pairs and found a potential link demonstrating that resilience is partly heritable and that protective processes operate through both genetic and environmental effects.

Masten, Best and Garmezy (1990) described three different groups of resilient individuals. First, high-risk individuals who overcome the odds and actually achieve better than expected outcomes. Second, individuals who adapt well despite ongoing stressful experiences such as divorce or job loss. Third, individuals who recover from a single traumatic experience, such as child maltreatment. Protective factors can also be seen as a contributor to overall resiliency in young adults. Garmezy (1985) suggests three broad sets of variables that function as protective factors: a) personality features such as
self esteem, b) family cohesion and the absence of discord, and c) the availability of support systems that encourage and reinforce the person’s coping efforts. Although the evidence supporting self-esteem is unclear, personal competence has been shown to be inversely related with smoking (Pierce & Shields, 1998). Individual characteristics such as self-esteem can provide a person with social skills to overcome a stressful situation, such as peer pressure. Family and peers such as having close relationships with parents and friends can instil resiliency in young people by providing a credible person for them to talk with about the dangers of smoking and how to respond to peer pressure. A young adult’s community, including available services, also play a role in placing the person at risk or providing them with support to foster resiliency and withstand stress (Pierce & Shields, 1998).

**Macro System Factors**

In the context of ecological theory the macro system includes community level protective factors and risk factors that may affect young adults’ smoking behaviours. For example, access to smoking cessation aids and health clinics can have a direct impact on whether or not a young adult continues to smoke cigarettes. Three factors in the macro environment impact post secondary young adults’ smoking behaviours: university campus culture, community protective and risk factors, and campus smoking policies.

Community level protective factors and community level risk factors can directly and indirectly impact young adults’ smoking behaviours (see Figure 1). Community protective factors safeguard young adults from engaging in smoking behaviours. Examples of community protective factors include: access to health services available, health promotion programs, and access to clinics (McKnight & Kretzmann, 1988).
Examples of community level protective factors for young adults on University campuses include: smoking cessation programs, and access to free or subsidized nicotine replacement therapies (nicotine gum and nicotine patch).

Community risk factors increase young adults' probability of engaging smoking behaviours. Risk factors in a community commonly associated with higher prevalence of smoking include: little or weak public policies, homelessness, high poverty rates, high crime rates, high rates of drinking and driving, high rates of disease/illness, and high rates of drug availability in community (McKnight & Kretzmann, 1988). Examples of community level risk factors for young adults include: selling cigarettes on campus, cigarette advertising on campus, and cigarette company sponsored events on campus.

Each university campus has its own unique culture. Campuses are social spaces in which many students attend school, work, play sports, belong to campus clubs, and live. University students are often immersed in non-academic activities of athletics, campus parties, drinking, fraternities and sororities, and dating (Sperber, 2000). Stated earlier, moving into young adulthood in post secondary education increases the influence of peer attachment and decreases the influence of parental attachment. University culture abounds with opportunities for risk (Dworkin, 2005). University students high in sensation seeking and immersed in college culture are likely to be seduced by the excitement and intensity of risk behaviours (Horvath & Zuckerman, 1993).

An important influence on smoking behaviour is whether policy that sanctions or restricts smoking on campus exists. There is a significant body of literature pertaining to school smoking policies for elementary and high schools (Corbett, 2001; Evans-Whipp et al., 2004; Health Canada, 1994). However, there is a significant lack of documentation on
the extent and nature of university and college smoking policies (Adlaf et al., 2003). To date, we know little about the tobacco control environment at post-secondary institutions outside the United Stated (Hammond et al., 2005). Without knowledge regarding tobacco control, it is difficult to determine if campus tobacco policies have an effect on student smoking rates.

University tobacco policies are constantly changing and are not uniform across Ontario or Canada (Hammond et al., 2005). It is difficult to access publications of universities on their tobacco policies through their websites. Institutions without smoking policies can be seen as barriers to smoking interventions. Smoking policies facilitate smoking cessation programs as they prevent smoking from taking place in certain places.

A study performed by Hammond et al. (2005) on Canadian post-secondary campuses showed that every university and half of all colleges surveyed had participated in some form of tobacco marketing in the last year. Eighty percent of universities had tobacco advertisements appear in their campus newspaper and 18% of campuses hosted a tobacco sponsored nightclub event (Hammond et al., 2005).

Although several Canadian campuses have introduced tobacco policies, such as bans on tobacco sales, there is a general lack of awareness of tobacco issues among campus decision makers and fundamental public health measures, such as indoor smoke-free policies (Hammond et al., 2005). As well, there is a lack of literature pertaining to policies that prohibit smoking advertisements on campus and sponsorships of campus events by cigarette companies on campus.

Recent research has suggested that smoke-free residences help protect occasional smokers from becoming regular smokers (Wechsler, Lee & Rigotti, 2001). Furthermore,
Adlaf et al. (2003) reported that university campuses represent an environment with potential gains to be made by tobacco control policies.

*An Ecological Model of Peer Education as a Smoking Intervention Among Young Adults*

Working within ecological theory, there are a number of different approaches to health promotion intervention that arise. Figure 2 provides an ecological model of peer education as a smoking intervention among young adults. Micro system interventions include self-help methods such as nicotine replacement therapies (Zyban, the nicotine patch, and Nicorette) and self-help booklets and resources. At the meso system level peer education interventions are found as linkages are created between students and peers. As indicated in Figure 2 peer education relies on peer educators who are credible, strong role models, and a source of empowerment to their target audience (see grey shaded area on Figure 2). Examples of macro system interventions include community level factors such as smoking policies. In the sections that follow, peer education as a health promotion strategy and the structure and functioning of peer education teams are discussed in more detail.

*Peer Education as a Health Promotion Strategy*

There is a lack of a universal definition of peer education. Despite the popularity and common sense appeal of the peer education approach, it continues to be associated with a number of difficulties. Due to the ambiguity of what constitutes peer education, the vocabulary that surrounds peer education has been insufficiently developed (Shiner, 1999). In some instances, peer education refers to peer tutoring in schools, while other examples include more formal types of one-on-one counselling. However, the common
Figure 2. An ecological model of peer education as a smoking intervention among young adults.

characteristic of peer education is a “peer” sharing information with the objective to educate another “peer” on a specific topic.

In the literature, peer education and peer mentoring are often used interchangeably. However, although related, they are distinct in their meaning. Topping
Peer education and Ehly (1998) define peer education as “peers offering credible and reliable information about sensitive life issues and the opportunity to discuss this in an informal peer group setting” (p. 6). In peer mentoring the relationship, as the title implies, is one of equality between members of the peer group (Holbeche, 1996). Peer mentoring is characterized by a one-on-one relationship through positive role modelling, promoting raised aspirations, positive reinforcement, open-ended counselling, and joint problem solving (Topping & Ehly, 1998). Although these terms tend to be used interchangeably, peer education better defines the nature of the interactions in LTPB. Therefore for the purposes of this study, the focus was on peer education as defined by Topping and Ehly (1998).

A peer is an equal; a contemporary; a member of the same age-group or social set (Oxford English Dictionary, 2005). There are different types of peers in peer education including ethnic origin-based peers, sex-based peers, experience-based peers, and age-based peers (Orme & Starkey, 1999). Ethnic origin-based peers are peers from the same ethnic background who convey health education messages; for example, people from Africa educating others in Africa about the dangers of HIV/AIDS. Sex-based peers use either males or females to educate others of the same sex as the peer educator; for example, using female educators to talk to other females about birth control. Experience-based peers are educators that have the same experience background, such as people who are ex-smokers teaching current smokers on ways to quit smoking. Age-based peers, as the name implies is the use of educators of the same age as their target population to connect on issues that are important for that age group. However, some projects use slightly older rather than same-age peers because of the belief that young people will
Peer education view slightly older people as more experienced than their immediate peers (Orme & Starkey, 1999).

Peer education as a method for implementing health promotion programs has subjectively seemed to be very successful (Mathie & Ford, 1998). Peer education has received the most attention as being a proven practice for HIV/AIDS prevention (Coyle, Needle & Normand, 1998; Khoat, West, Valdiserri & Phan, 2003; Ngugi, Wilson, Sebstd, Plummer & Moses, 1996; Pearlman, Camberg, Wallace, Symons & Finison, 2002). In conducting a comprehensive literature review, there were no peer-review journal articles that identified peer education as a proven method for smoking cessation among young adults. However, Farrelly, Niederdeppe and Yarsevich (2003) discussed several different types of youth tobacco prevention mass media campaigns, including youth empowerment groups (similar to peer education groups). Despite the rapid growth in youth empowerment groups, it is not yet clear how they contribute to changes in youth smoking and/or bring about changes in tobacco control (Farrelly et al., 2003). Thus, Farrelly et al. (2003) recommend evaluations of youth empowerment programs not only upon the direct effects of participation in these groups on smoking behaviour but also to evaluate a discussion among peers.

Recently, peer education has been described as a “method in search of a theory” (Campbell & Mzaidume, 2001, p. 1978; Turner & Shepherd, 1999, p. 235). Peer education suffers from an inadequately specified theoretical base which does not address the important social and cultural factors inherent in this approach (Milburn, 1995). This gap undermines our ability to learn from peer education’s successes and failures (Campbell & Mzaidume, 2001; MacPhail & Campbell, 1999). However, Mathie and Ford
Peer education (1998) offer that the theoretical foundations of peer education are said to be social inoculation and social learning theory. McGuire’s (1964) social inoculation model suggested that an individual’s resistance to social pressure (i.e. to start smoking) would be stronger if the individual has already developed arguments with which to counter such pressure (Perry et al., 1989). The social inoculation model is premised on the belief that individuals do not want to engage in unhealthy behaviours, but they lack the negotiating skills to resist social pressure to do so (Mathie & Ford, 1998). It has been argued that peer educators can assist in realistic practice of these counter arrangements (Mathie & Ford, 1998). Social learning theory proposes that to change behaviour, individuals must have the opportunity not only to observe the desired behaviour, but also to have an opportunity to practice this desired behaviour until they feel confident in their ability to model this behaviour effectively (Bandura, 1986). Social learning theory also suggests the use of attractive role models (peer educators) with whom the target audience can identify with is crucial.

In a comprehensive literature review, there was only one study to use peer education as a method for implementing a smoking cessation program targeting the young adult population. The pilot project by Ramsay and Hoffmann (2004) explored the feasibility of training peers to lead cessation and relapse-prevention programs for undergraduates. This pilot study found a quit rate of 88.2%, suggesting that peers were effective facilitators of smoking cessation (Ramsay & Hoffmann, 2004). Furthermore, 63.3% of the initial quitters stayed smoke free, which is another indicator that peers were effective facilitators in the smoking cessation process (Ramsay & Hoffmann, 2004).
Turner and Shepherd (1999) performed an extensive review upon the peer education literature, researching the rationale for adopting peer education initiatives and found ten frequently used justifications: cost effectiveness of peer education methods; peers are credible sources of information; peer education is empowering; it utilizes an already established means of sharing information and advice; peers are more successful than professionals in passing on information because people identify with their peers; peer educators act as positive role models; peer education is beneficial to those acting as peer educators; education presented by peers may be acceptable when other education is not; peer education can be used to educate those who are hard to reach through conventional methods; and peers can reinforce learning through ongoing contact. Based on these ten claims, Turner and Shepherd (1999) searched for a theory to support peer education. Turner and Shepherd (1999) found the theory most closely associated with peer education and the above ten claims was social learning theory.

Based on the social learning theory, peer educators may be credible role models for other young adults because they speak the same language as their peers. Education by a peer is not usually a forced transfer of information. It is natural for one peer to talk to another peer about health education. Peer educators may act to support the empowerment of young adults to take control over their own health. In the intervention layer of the meso system in Figure 2, effective peer educators must be seen by their peers as credible, as role models, and be able to empower other young adults to change their smoking behaviours.
Credibility. For peer educators to be effective they must act as role models to their peers and in turn their peers must view them as credible sources of information (Turner & Shepherd, 1999). Orme and Starkey (1998) note that in terms of peer education and its aims and methods, there is an inadequate consideration of key issues such as what constitutes a peer, particularly a credible peer. Credibility is the ability to be believed by others (Oxford English Dictionary, 2005). Shiner and Newburn (1996) state the concept of credibility can be divided into three key aspects: (1) person-based credibility, particularly relating to age, but also to sex and ethnic origin; (2) experience-based credibility (i.e. the peer educator’s own experience with smoking); and (3) message-based credibility refers to the appropriateness of the message for the people concerned (Shiner & Newburn, 1996). Peer education is likely to be most effective if the peer educators concerned are viewed by the target audience as credible on all three aspects (Shiner & Newburn, 1996).

Shiner and Newburn (1996) also raise the ideas of trust and risk communication as central to the concept of credibility. Trust has been conceptualized as “(a) an expectancy held by an individual or group that the word, promise, verbal or written statement of another party can be relied upon; and (b) a confidence in the motives of the other party in conditions involving risk or a belief of the benevolent intentions of the other party” (Ganesan & Hess, 1997, p. 440). Risk communication is an interactive process of exchange of information and opinion among individuals, groups and institutions. It involves multiple messages about the nature of risk, and other messages, not strictly about risk that express concerns, opinions or reactions to risk messages (Covello, Peters, Wojtecki & Hyde, 2001).
Communication researchers have found that perceived credibility is a critical factor in influencing knowledge, attitude, or behaviour change (McGuire, 1985; McGuire, 1989; Petty & Cacioppo, 1986; McGuire, 1984). Lindsey (1997) agrees with Shiner and Newburn (1996) that trust is central to credibility but also adds that expertise is of utmost importance. Expertise is the peer educator’s command of the subject on how intelligent, competent, and prestigious the educator was considered to be by the target audience (Lindsey). Trustworthiness is the peer educator’s genuineness, intentions, as well as the objectivity, reliability, and likeability of the peer educator (Lindsey). To a lesser degree, attractiveness, dynamism, and charisma of the educator and the educator’s similarity to, or empathy with a group's concerns are also associated with perceived credibility and influence (Lindsey).

**Empowerment.** Recently, an increasingly common approach to tobacco control has been to position youth as leaders in advocacy and prevention activities (Dunn & Pirie, 2005). This approach derives from youth development and empowerment theories, emphasizing the development of positive skills and strength among youth (Dunn & Pirie, 2005). Campbell and Mzaidume (2001) argue that participation in project implementation serves to “empower members of target groupings by placing health-related knowledge in the hands of ordinary people” (p. 1978). Furthermore Israel, Checkoway, Schulz and Zimmerman (1994) believe this experience contributes to an enhanced perceived self-efficacy or empowerment and increases the likelihood that people will engage in health-promoting behaviours.

The understandings of the concept of empowerment vary depending on the discipline in which empowerment is discussed. As a result, there are several definitions
of empowerment. According to Arai (1996), “Empowerment is a process or a framework that describes the changes that occur as an individual, group, or community mobilizes themselves toward increased citizen power” (p. 28). Important to note is that empowerment cannot be given to an individual or group, nor does it develop solely from within the individual (Arai, 1996). More specifically, Arai (1996) explains how “one cannot empower another individual, nor can individuals achieve empowerment on their own, apart from the enabling support of professionals or changes in their environment” (p. 28).

Lord (1991) offers a four-stage process for personal empowerment. Building from this Arai (1996) offers four stages that facilitate an individual’s progression from a state of powerlessness to increased empowerment: awareness, connecting and learning, mobilization, and contribution. It is important to note that one person does not progress through each of the four stages in a linear fashion, nor is there a clear ending point where a person can achieve overall empowerment (Arai).

In the first stage of awareness, individuals respond to a catalyst such as new information or they are acting out on anger (Arai, 1996; Lord, 1991). The second stage, connecting and learning, offers individuals supportive relationships and knowledge exchange through connecting with others (Arai). In mobilization, the third stage, an individual is able to organize skills, knowledge and resources and act on the expanded choices and opportunities presented to them (Arai). In the last stage of contribution an individual is able to integrate knowledge and skills into their personal reality and structure of their everyday lives (Arai). The process of empowerment is a cumulative
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process; an individual continuously builds on information gained from the previous stage(s).

Current understandings of empowerment tend to focus on the emotional or motivational dimensions of empowerment, conceptualizing it in terms of a subjective sense of confidence, in addition to the objective ability or potency to act, given structural constraints (Campbell & MacPhail, 2002). A more cognitive or intellectual dimension of empowerment includes focusing on people’s intellectual analyses of their circumstances (Campbell & MacPhail, 2002). Disempowered people, who have little control over important aspects of their lives, are less likely to feel that they can take control over their health, and are less likely to engage in health-enhancing behaviours (Bandura, 1996). When looking at empowerment, the social learning theory views peer education as it is more likely for a person to put into practice socially learned behaviour if they think that it is effective (Turner & Shepherd, 1999). For example, young people may be likely to listen to their peer educators if they feel empowered by what they are saying and it comes from a peer with whom they can relate. Arai (1997) offers insight into the changing roles of the facilitator in the empowerment process (see Table 1). In peer education, the facilitators in the empowerment process are the peer educators.

Role modelling. The concept of role modelling is central to social learning theory (Turner & Shepherd, 1999). Peer modelling is “the provision of a competent exemplar of desirable learning behaviour by a member or members of a group with the intention that others in the group will imitate it” (Topping & Ehly, 1998, p.6). Peer modelling can have strong social, attitudinal and behavioural effects because peers can model enthusiasm and cooperation (Topping & Ehly, 1998). They can show that changing behaviours, for
Table 1. The changing roles of the facilitator in the empowerment process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages of Empowerment</th>
<th>What is Happening? (Individual Action)</th>
<th>Individual Outcomes</th>
<th>Roles of Facilitators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Experiencing powerlessness | - social isolation  
- lack of control  
- unresponsive community support services | - prolonged dependency  
- inability to influence | - respond to cues of readiness for change  
(anger, feelings of frustration, statements)  
- stimulate awareness through a visioning process  
- provide individuals with new information or contexts |
| Awareness | - respond to new information  
- involvement in a crisis or life transition  
- respond to a change in context | - becomes aware of a desire for change  
- may express anger or frustration with their current situation  
- begins to develop new directions for themselves | |
| Connecting and Learning | - develop support relationships with people  
- connect with resources (financial, technical, vocational)  
- expand choices and opportunities | - decreased isolation  
- increased self-esteem  
- increased sense of control  
- improved self-concept  
- expanding social network | - provide moral or practical support  
- promote mentoring  
- provide a facilitating or linking role  
- act as an information source |
| Mobilization/Action | - engage in new activities  
- self-expression  
- involvement in new social groups | - increased feelings of competence  
- increased sphere of participation  
- expansion of outcomes in the stage of connecting and learning | - support the individual’s participation in activities and social groups  
- encourage |
| Contribution | - sense of being accepted as an active, contributing member of community | - feeling of belonging and acceptance  
- incorporation of outcomes from previous stages into one’s overall self-concept | - encourage growth, continue to support only if needed |
example quitting smoking, is actually possible to do. The role of the peer educator is to serve as a positive role model and to provide social information rather than simply providing facts (Turner & Shepherd, 1999). Peer educators can enhance the relevance of smoking cessation programs by modelling appropriate behaviours.

Reinforcement is the idea that peers can reinforce learning through ongoing contact with the peers in which they can constantly reintegrate positive behaviours such as being positive role models (Turner & Shepherd, 1999). Since young adults spend a great deal of time socializing, reinforcement seems particularly noteworthy in respect to the positive outcomes associated with peer education, because socializing is a naturally occurring and ongoing process.

Macro System Theories Related to Peer Education as a Health Promotion Strategy

Effective health promotion interventions should focus on comprehensive strategies involving multiple interventions (Giesbrecht & Douglas, 1990; Merzel & D’Afflittl, 2003). There has been a strong movement toward community-based programs with strategies that target the whole community and not just the individual (Giesbrecht & Douglas, 1990; Merzel & D’Afflittl, 2003). For example, Jackson et al. (2003) used a comprehensive community based strategy when they worked with four Toronto, Ontario neighbourhoods to develop community capacity. This project examined the assets of each community to build upon strengths so that the community could work towards achieving their own goals and dreams.

Community capacity affects peer education as an intervention strategy as the positive assets of a university campus facilitate peer education to be implemented in a more effective manner (see Macro Layer in Figure 2). The more assets including the
physical, human, physical and intellectual resources that a university campus has, the more resources can be applied to the health intervention for successful implementation.

Community capacity. Community capacity building is a process that increases the assets and attributes of which communities are able to draw upon in order to improve the lives of residents (including but not restricted to their health) (Gibbon, Labonte, & Laverack, 2002). Labonte and Laverack (2001) defined capacity building as the ‘increase in community groups’ abilities to define, assess, analyse, and act on health (or any other concerns of importance to their members’” (p. 114). The capacity of a group is also dependent on the resource opportunities or constraints (ecological, political, and environmental), and the conditions in which people and groups live (Gibbon et al., 2002). In this case the community is the campus environment where the peer education initiative is implemented.

McKnight and Kretzmann (1988) differentiate between the primary and secondary building blocks of communities. Primary building blocks include the assets and capacities located inside the community, which are largely under the community’s control (McKnight & Kretzmann, 1988). The key to building community capacity, is to locate all of the available assets and to begin connecting them with one another in ways that multiply their power and effectiveness (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1996).

Potential building blocks include resources originating outside the community, controlled by outsiders (McKnight & Kretzmann, 1988). These potential building blocks include major public assets, which ambitious communities might begin to divert to community building purposes (McKnight & Kretzmann, 1988). In this case some
examples are governmental grants and funding sources outside of the community of the campus.

*The Structure and Functioning of Peer Education Teams*

To understand the underlying processes of peer education, structures such as organizational formations will be examined. Important areas of literature for understanding team functioning include but are not limited to: leadership, commitment, involvement and overall team cohesion. These concepts provide insight into how the teams actually function as a working group on a daily basis and how these concepts may affect peer education. Figure 3 focuses on the peer education team intervention layer which occurs within the meso system level. Here team characteristics such as cohesion, commitment, demographics, involvement, and leadership are included to indicate their importance within the ecological model of interventions addressing smoking young adults.

*Leadership*

Leadership can be defined as “a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal” (Northouse, 2001, p. 3). According to Northouse (2001), leadership is not a trait or characteristic but an interactive occurrence between leader and followers. The leader affects and is affected by followers making leadership not a unidirectional linear event but an interactive process (Northouse). Influence is another important component of leadership because if there is no influence then leadership does not exist (Northouse). By extension, leadership must occur in groups; the group provides the context for leadership to occur (Northouse). Finally, leadership requires guiding a group of individuals towards a common goal (Northouse).
Figure 3. A revised ecological model of interventions to address smoking young adults.

There are two types of leadership, formal and informal. Formal leaders can be viewed as those who have been prescribed by the organization or group (Loughead & Hardy, 2005). Informal leadership roles develop on the basis of interactions these individuals have with others (Loughead & Hardy, 2005).

Recently the focus of leadership has shifted from traditional models to new leadership theories with an emphasis on transformational leadership (Bass, 1985). Bass’
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(1995) definition of transformational leadership has four dimensions:

1. Charisma – The leaders provide vision and a sense of mission, instils pride, faith and respect; excites, arouses and aspires their subordinates.
2. Individual consideration – The leader provides coaching and teaching; delegates projects to stimulate learning experiences; provides feedback, and treats each follower as an individual.
4. Inspiration – The leader acts as a model for subordinates; behaves in ways that motivate and inspire followers by providing meaning and challenge; communicates a vision.

Bass (1985) asserted that transformational leadership would result in followers performing beyond expected levels of performance as a consequence of the leader’s influence. Studies show that transformational leaders were shown to have subordinates who report greater satisfaction and more often exert extra effort, and to have higher performing work groups and receive higher rating of effectiveness and performance (Bass, 1985; Bryman, 1992). Furthermore, there was also a relationship found between transformational leadership and group empowerment. Ozaralli (2003) found that transformational leadership contributes to the prediction of subordinates’ self-reported empowerment and that the more a team’s members experience team empowerment, the more effective the team will be.

Commitment and Involvement

Most of the literature pertaining to commitment and involvement comes from business and management disciplines. Witt, Hochwater, Hilton and Hillman (1999) define commitment as an effective involvement with the organization, as well as an assessment of the costs and benefits involved in remaining or leaving an organization.
More specifically, attitudinal commitment is one’s psychological attachment or bond to the organization (Park & Henkin, 2005). Traditionally, employee involvement has been conceptualized as the process of developing “a feeling of psychological ownership among organizational members” (Harvey & Brown, 1996, p. 227).

Organizational commitment is positively related to job performance and organizational effectiveness, and negatively associated with employee absenteeism and turnover (Park & Henkin, 2005). Research perspectives on commitment commonly focus on commitment to the organization, but Park and Henkin (2005) suggest the need to study commitment to groups to which an employee may feel attached. This suggests employees have a closer bond to the team in which they work rather than the larger organization for which their team works. Therefore Park and Henkin (2005) indicate that members of the team have a larger effect on individual employee commitment compared to the overall organization.

Cohesion

Previous research has identified cohesion as a requisite for team effectiveness (Hackman & Morris, 1975; Lott & Lott, 1961; Miesing & Preble, 1985; Summers, Coffelt & Horton, 1988). Cohesion is defined as “a dynamic process which is reflected in the tendency for a group to stick together and remain united in the pursuit of its goals and objectives” (Carron, 1982, p. 124). Members of more cohesive teams are more likely to become involved in team activities and work for team success, and less likely to exhibit absenteeism and turnover (Zander, 1982). In highly cohesive teams, less energy is required to maintain intra-team relationships, and more energy can be devoted toward performance (Wolfe & Box, 1988); in this case peer education.
Team-mates tend to be related to one another by bonds of reciprocal dependence and familiarity (Goffman, 1959). Thus, teams form a unique cohesion to which all members learn to adhere. Each group of people has unique characteristics, and therefore no team is identical. Goffman (1959) explains that:

when members of a team have different formal statuses and range in a social establishment, then we can see that the mutual dependence created by membership in the team is likely to cut across structural or social cleavages in the establishment and thus provide a source of cohesion for the establishment (p. 82).

Barrick, Stewart, Neubert and Mount (1998) researched 51 work teams who participated in a study examining relationships among team composition (ability and personality), team process (social cohesion), and team outcomes (team viability and team performance). The study focused on intragroup processes - the interactions that take place among peer educators, communication patterns, personal disclosure and conflict - and efforts toward leadership and other forms of influence (Barrick et al., 1998). The study assessed how member characteristics (ability and personality) of functioning work teams relate to differences in team effectiveness (Barrick et al., 1998). Results indicate that extraversion and emotional stability were associated with team viability through social cohesion (Barrick et al., 1998).

Organizational Capacity

Team success is a function of peer educators’ talents, available resources and processes that peer educators employ to interact with each other to accomplish a goal (Park & Henkin, 2005). Organizational capacity, specifically in health organizations examines the relationship of how health organizations work together with people to build their capacity to create health environments and communities. This relationship is
important as health organizations usually present major resources to the specific communities that are building capacity. These resources include: financial (funding), human (Health Educators, researchers), technological (health equipment), and physical (health centres). In this study the organization is LTPB. Here organizational capacity includes the relationship between campus organizations, for example: campus health services, student health associations and groups, peer education teams, and health educators. The LTPB organization helps to build community capacity at the university campus level. Organizational capacity and the combined efforts of health organizations within the campus context can have an influence on peer education as a health intervention (see Figure 3).

Summary of Chapter Two

In this chapter, ecological theory was introduced and used to frame understanding of the broader social and cultural aspects of the environment that impact on peer education and the smoking behaviours of university aged young adults. Chapter Two provided an overview of the literature associated with this current study including: ecological theory (micro, meso and macro system theories), peer education (credibility, empowerment, role modelling), and the structure and functioning of peer education teams (leadership, commitment and involvement, cohesion, and organizational capacity).

The micro, meso and macro systems of the ecological perspective will be revisited along with the findings in the discussion contained in Chapter Five. The review of literature presented here in Chapter Two was also used to frame aspects of the data collection methods in Chapter Three including the questions for the interviews and focus groups and the observation protocols.
Chapter Three: Methodology

The purpose of this instrumental case study was to examine the processes of peer education teams. Outcome studies of LTPB indicate that LTPB is successful at educating post-secondary students as well as aiding students in quitting, decreasing, and preventing them from smoking (Travis, 2003; Wilson, Lawrance, Strath & Travis, 2004). It is important to perform a process evaluation study upon peer education teams in LTPB to understand the processes that may lead to this success; therefore, the goal of this study was to provide insight into the processes of peer education teams through the development of a model or theory.

Research Questions

This instrumental case study examined two peer education teams to provide insight into the processes of peer education. Therefore the initial research questions that guided this study are as follows:

1. What are the processes underlying the peer education teams?
   1 a. How does leadership occur in the peer education teams?
   1 b. What is the nature of commitment and involvement in the peer education teams?
   1 c. What is the organizational structure of the peer education teams?
   1 d. What is the nature of cohesion in the peer education teams?
   1 e. How do the demographics of each team effect the processes of peer education?
2. How is peer education carried out by the peer education teams?

3. What influences in the ecological environment effect the functioning of peer education teams?
   3a. How does campus culture effect peer education teams?
   3b. How do the policies and procedures of the universities effect peer education teams?
   3c. How does funding and administratve support from the universities effect peer education teams?

4. What is the relationship between the process of peer education teams and the outcomes achieved?

In keeping with the emergent nature of qualitative research, these questions changed as data analysis unfolded and understanding of peer education deepened. The fourth research question was eliminated and a new question was added as the focus of the study was clearly about processes that exist within peer education and not outcomes. The following are the final research questions guiding this study:

1. How do peer educators understand and implement peer education?

2. What processes underlie the peer education teams?

3. What influences in the macro environment effect the functioning of the peer education teams?

4. How do processes of peer education relate to processes of empowerment?

**Research Design**

This study was designed as an instrumental case study, where a particular case was examined to provide insight into an issue or to refine theory (Stake, 1998).
Researchers may study a number of cases jointly to inquire into the phenomenon. Cases are chosen because it is believed that understanding them will lead to better understanding and better theorizing (Stake, 1998). To illuminate the phenomenon of peer education the case chosen was the peer education team in LTPB. Two examples of peer education teams were examined, one at Ryerson University and one at McMaster University.

Many qualitative researchers use the case study approach as a guide to their methodology for their study. The case study is not actually a data-gathering technique but a methodological approach that incorporates a number of data-gathering measures (Yin, 1998). The case is expected to be something that functions and operates, and the study is the observation of operations where there is something to be described and interpreted (Stake, 1998).

In an instrumental case study, the case is of secondary interest, it plays a supportive role, and it facilitates our understanding of something else (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). The “something else” in this instance is the processes of peer education. The case is looked at in-depth, with the purpose of answering the research questions of the study. For case studies, theory development as part of the research design phase is essential, whether the ensuing case study’s purpose is to develop or test new theory (Yin, 2003). The scientific benefit of the case study method lies in its ability to open the door for discoveries such as theory development (Shaughnessy & Zechmeister, 1999).

Site and Sampling

The research was carried out at two university campuses in Ontario (Ryerson University and McMaster University). A purposeful sampling approach was used to
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identify these sites. The logic and power of this approach lies in selecting information-rich cases to study in depth, "from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the inquiry" (Patton, 2002, p. 230). At the time this study was conducted there were 13 post-secondary institutions that hosted LTPB peer education teams. The goal in selecting sites was to find two sites that were representative of LTPB teams in general. These campuses were chosen through the following exclusion criteria:

- The focus was on university students therefore the three colleges were omitted from the list.

- University of Guelph and Queen’s University had switched to volunteers implementing the program instead of paid employees, therefore these two universities were omitted.

- At University of Toronto to obtain ethics, a faculty member from that institution must sign approval, which was not possible for this study; therefore this university was omitted from the list of possible candidates.

- Brock University is a unique site as it is the location of the Head Office of LTPB. Therefore Brock was also eliminated from the list of possible choices.

- University of Windsor, Nipissing University and the University of Ottawa were removed. Their locations would be too far for the researcher to travel.

- The LTPB team at the University of Waterloo was deleted as it is highly unique; their program has been in existence for one year and it is the location of a LTPB co-director.
The two remaining campuses, McMaster and Ryerson, were then selected for study. These two universities were similar in team size and composition. Both Ryerson and McMaster are located in large cities (Toronto and Hamilton, respectively) and have student populations that are similar in size (20,000 and 17,691 respectively). The layout of Ryerson’s campus differs from that of McMaster. There are major roads and businesses which separate campus buildings and classrooms at Ryerson, whereas McMaster is a much more self-contained university. Ryerson has many students that live in the greater Toronto area who commute to school daily, while McMaster has fewer commuters and more students who live in residence or off-campus but are still in close proximity to the university. Ryerson has five faculties while McMaster has six faculties, including a medical school. Both schools are comparable in the size of faculties, the only difference being McMaster has a medical school and a hospital on campus. McMaster also has a medical clinic open to students, while Ryerson does not. In addition, these two universities are not too far in distance to travel to multiple times throughout the seven-month data collection phase.

The researcher met with two of the LTPB Co-Directors and the LTPB Research Coordinator in mid-August and presented them with an overview of the projected study. The researcher then obtained access to the names of the Campus Program Coordinator and Team Leader for both the Ryerson and McMaster LTPB teams. The Campus Program Coordinator plans LTPB activities and co-ordinates the campus team. The Team Leader guides and works side-by-side with members of the student-staff communication team.
Participant recruitment started at LTPB's annual Campus Program Coordinator and Team Leader Orientation held at Brock University on August 21-23, 2005. During this Orientation the researcher met with the Campus Program Coordinators of Ryerson and McMaster and provided an overview of the study, timelines for data collection and discussed the time commitment required for the study. The researcher then asked them for verbal commitment to participate in the study. Both of the Campus Program Coordinators agreed to participate and the researcher explained to them that they would be in contact again once ethics clearance was obtained from Brock University.

The researcher met with five members of the McMaster team (one member was absent) on September 19, 2005 and four members of the Ryerson team (the Team Leader had recently quit and one member was absent) on September 21, 2005 to discuss the objectives of the study, time commitment involved and to obtain consent from individual team members to participate. For most of the peer educators consent was obtained at this point of first contact. The peer educators who were absent signed their consent form on the day of their first interview. Since the Ryerson Team Leader quit in early September, the Ryerson team had to hire a new peer educator. This new peer educator signed the consent form at the first focus group. There was one peer educator from McMaster who originally did not sign the consent form at the point of first contact on September 19, 2005. However, this participant was present at the first focus group and consent was obtained before commencing. In total, 12 peer educators participated in the focus group and observation aspects of the study. At the first meeting with both McMaster and Ryerson the researcher asked the Campus Program Coordinator and the Team Leader at each university to participate in the interview process. After they agreed to participate in
the study, the researcher also asked the remaining peer educators to participate in a lottery to decide which other two peer educators will be involved in the interviews. At each university one member voiced their reluctance to participate in the interviews. The researcher then continued with picking random names to decide who would be the remaining two peer educators involved in the interviews until four members from each team had been chosen.

**Phases of Data Collection**

Data collection in case study research usually involves all three strategies of interviewing, observing, and analyzing documents (Merriam, 1998). As the focus of this study was on processes of peer education, interviews, focus groups, and observations were used. Triangulation strengthens a study by combining methods (Patton, 2002). Qualitative data collection methods in this study were used to understand the individual peer educators, the relationships among peer educators, and the impact of the macro environment on the peer education teams.

Data collection began with an observation at a LTPB training conference in May 2005 and then formally began with interviews at each university campus in September 2005 and the final focus group was held in March 2006. Eight peer educators in total were involved in three one-on-one interviews. Twelve peer educators in total were involved in two focus groups. There were four observations. The first two observations were used for the researcher to gain background knowledge and understanding of peer education within the LTPB organization. Twelve peer educators were involved in the remaining two observations. Table 2 shows the timeline of data collection for this study.
Table 2. Timelines of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTPB Timeline</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Contest</th>
<th>Post-Contest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>May 2005</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>XO</td>
<td>XO</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: X = RYERSON, O = McMaster

Table 3 indicates which data collection strategy was used to investigate each initial research question. Table 3 was organized before data collection began to ensure that each research question would be addressed through the various data collection techniques.

Table 3. Research questions and data collection techniques.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Focus Groups</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.c</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.d</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.e</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.b</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.c</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>results of I-III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviews

Interviews were conducted to gather data on the peer educators’ feelings, thoughts, and intentions about peer education and their experiences on the team (Patton,
2002). The content of the interview questions centred upon three aspects of the processes of peer education: individual peer educators, peer educators and their team environment, and peer educators and their macro environment. In the semi-structured interview, a number of pre-determined questions and/or special topics were asked. Questions were asked in a specific order and there was freedom to probe far beyond the answers to the interviewer's prepared and standardized questions. Following Berg (1995), four types of questions were included in the interview guide:

1. Essential questions concerning the central focus of the study and geared toward eliciting specific desired information. These essential questions are derived from the research questions.

2. Extra questions that are roughly equivalent to essential questions but worded slightly differently, and included to check the reliability of responses.

3. “Throw-away” rapport building questions used at the beginning, or found throughout the interview to set the pace or allow a change in focus of the interview. These types of questions can also be used as an opportunity to “cool out” following the discussion of sensitive information, or at the end of the interview to allow the interviewee to “cool down”.

4. Probing questions that enable the interviewer to draw out more complete stories from subjects. These types of questions may be set out in advance or may emerge during the course of the interview.

The interview guide used at the pilot interview was developed using Berg’s (1995) four types of questions and the study’s research questions. The original interview guide consisted of 16 questions. A pilot interview was conducted with the Campus
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Program Coordinator of Brock University’s LTPB team on August 9, 2005. At the end of the pilot interview, the researcher asked the Campus Program Coordinator for constructive criticism on the content of the interview questions as well as the researcher’s interview skills. The researcher revised the interview guide changing the order of questions to improve the flow and organization of the interview. The researcher also removed two questions and added six questions.

Three rounds of semi-structured face-to-face interviews were conducted with four peer education team members (Campus Program Coordinator, Team Leader and two peer educators) conducted on both campuses between September 2005 and February 2006. The three rounds of interviews were purposely placed at intervals throughout the seven-month data collection phase, such that each interview would increasingly provide more insight into the peer education process. An Interview Guide (see Appendix D) was used at each of the three interviews. A brief questionnaire (Appendix E) was also given to peer educators after they were interviewed the first time. The questionnaire gathered demographic information on age, gender, smoking status, ethnic origin, and personal traits.

In keeping with the emergent research design, the second and third interview questions were based on information obtained from peer educators through previous interview(s), observations and a focus group. Also of particular note, the researcher learned from the literature and first interview the importance of commitment, involvement and leadership. Peer educators were asked at all three interviews to comment on the increasing or decreasing levels of commitment and involvement. Peer educators were also asked at every interview to comment on either their own leadership
or the leadership styles and capabilities of the Campus Program Coordinator and Team Leader. Table 4 summarizes the interview schedule as well as interview characteristics. Characteristics include LTPB timeline, date of interviews, length of interviews and noteworthy topics and themes explored in the interviews.

**Focus Groups**

Data collected from focus groups shed light upon important team topics such as leadership, commitment involvement, team goals and challenges, and how the LTPB messages are received by the students on campus. The focus group also provided important data upon the influences from the broader ecological environment such as support from the university, which had an impact on the peer education teams. A focus group interview is an interview with a small group of people on a specific topic (Patton, 2002). Commonly a series of different focus groups will be conducted to obtain a variety of perspectives and increase.

Table 4. Interview schedule and interview characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round #</th>
<th>LTPB timeline</th>
<th>Date of interviews</th>
<th>Interview length</th>
<th>Topics &amp; Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Beginning of implementation phase</td>
<td>McMaster: Sept. 30, 2005 Ryerson: Oct. 5, 2005</td>
<td>25-60 minutes</td>
<td>Participant’s role, definitions of peer education, characteristics of the team, commitment, involvement, campus culture, success and challenges, support from university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Near the end of implementation phase</td>
<td>Ryerson: Nov. 22, 2005 McMaster: Dec. 7 &amp; 19, 2005</td>
<td>20-45 minutes</td>
<td>Experiences of peer education, leadership, commitment, involvement, gender issues, team culture, support from newspaper, university, tobacco policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>During the contest</td>
<td>McMaster: Feb. 7, 2005 Ryerson: Feb. 9, 2006</td>
<td>20-55 minutes</td>
<td>Team goals, successes and challenges; contest recruitment; commitment, involvement, and leadership; scheduling; support; most and least rewarding experiences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
confidence in whatever patterns emerges (Patton). The objective of a focus group is to gather high quality data in a social context where people can consider their own views in the context of the views of others (Patton). Interactions among peer educators enhance data quality because peer educators tend to provide checks and balances on each other, which weeds out false or extreme views (Kreuger & Casey, 2000). This is also known as "intersubjectivity" where ordinary descriptions of reality are shared by peer educators. In a group setting, peer educators are able to obtain feedback on their views of reality; they can respond to other or differing views; and the researcher can vicariously experience reality in the same manner as the peer educators through interaction and unstructured interviewing (Frey & Fontana, 1991). Considerations of intersubjectivity were important since the focus of this study was on teams, their functioning, and ultimately how this affected the process of peer education. Focus groups allowed the researcher into peer educators' experiences of everyday team roles providing important data that may have been missed through one-to-one interviews. Accounts of reality formation are more likely to be stimulated and to be expressed in greater depth when shared in a group interview format (Frey & Fontana). Focus group data help to reveal "variations in peer educators' perspectives, attitudes and a ready means... for distinguishing between shared and variable perspectives" (Frey & Fontana, 1991, p. 178). The participants, "by speech and gesture, will naturally correct each others' rendering or reality" (Frey & Fontana, 1991, p. 178). In addition, focus groups enable insight into seeing and hearing how the peer education team acts together and how they view their team.

A pilot focus group was held with the Brock LTPB team on October 28, 2005. This focus group was audio-recorded. At the end of the focus group, the researcher asked
the team for constructive criticism of the focus group questions and the researcher’s focus group moderating skills. Many of the peer educators voiced their enthusiasm with being involved in the focus group. Furthermore, many of the peer educators discussed they had never thought of how important the team was in the peer education process.

After the first round of interviews was completed in September, the information collected from the interviews was used to develop questions for the pilot focus group with the Brock University LTPB team. From the pilot focus group questions were added and deleted to the final focus group guide. The focus group guides for both groups are attached (Appendix F). All members of each team (Ryerson & McMaster) were involved in audio-recorded focus groups. Two focus groups were conducted with each team.

The researcher facilitated the focus groups following a semi-structured group interview format. Questions in the focus group were prepared ahead of time. A flipchart was used during the focus group. Each question in the focus group was written on flipchart paper. This helped the peer educators to stay focused on the questions posed. At Ryerson’s first focus group (November 1, 2005) the researcher was also the flipchart recorder. There was no flipchart recorder at the Ryerson focus group because the researcher could not find anyone willing to travel to Toronto with her for several hours out of the day. At the McMaster focus group (November 10, 2005) a Brock graduate student was the recorder for the group interview. Having another person to record the conversations in point form made the focus group run quicker and smoother compared to the Ryerson focus group.

Questions in the first round of focus groups centred upon the team - defining terms such as commitment, involvement and leadership. The team also provided concrete
examples of commitment, involvement and leadership among peer educators on their team. The team then discussed successes and challenges of their team. The team also discussed how their university supports their team financially, administratively, and in general (the impact of the macro environment). The researcher informed the teams before the focus group began that she would like everyone to try to answer each question, so that one person is not excluded from the conversation, and other people do not dominate the conversation. During the focus groups, the researcher allowed conversation to flow freely. The researcher only interjected if the peer educators were talking about topics unrelated to the questions of the focus group.

The first focus groups conducted with each team lasted for approximately two hours and all six peer educators of each team were present and participated in the focus group. The researcher also made observational notes of the culture of the team (behaviours and beliefs specific to the peer education team) and how the peer educators acted towards one another. At the end of the first focus group, the two peer educators who were not involved in the interview process filled out the same questionnaire (Appendix E) that the interview peer educators filled out at their first interview.

The second focus group was performed as a member check. A formal member check involves obtaining the original participants' viewpoints concerning the accuracy of the results (Guba & Lincoln, 1981). The second focus group was used as an opportunity to ensure the trustworthiness of the interpretation of the processes of peer education. However, a few questions were asked in the beginning of the focus group related to successes and challenges of the contest and Smoke Free Day. During the member check the researcher reported the preliminary findings of the study to the peer educators. The
Preliminary findings were written on a flipchart and peer educators were given a handout. After each theme, peer educators were asked if they thought the researcher’s findings were truthful of their experiences, as well as if there was any data to add or delete. Peer educators were also given a written member check questionnaire to complete individually and at their discretion. Out of twelve peer educators, two member check questionnaires were completed and submitted to the researcher. The purpose of member checks will be discussed more in detail in the section on trustworthiness in qualitative research.

Observations

Observational data represent a first-hand encounter with the phenomenon of interest rather than a second-hand account of the world obtained in an interview (Merriam, 1998). On-site investigation of the case involves observing what is going on, talking informally, and formally with people (Merriam, 1998). Since observational analysis takes the reader into the setting that was observed, data will have great depth and detail (Patton, 2002). The descriptions must be factual, accurate, and thorough and must weed out unimportant observations and report findings which provide meaning and insight into the phenomena. In this study, overt disclosure of the researcher’s role and intent of the study was apparent to the peer educators.

An Observational Protocol was used to guide the observations and to ensure that each observation was carried out in the same manner and that nothing was overlooked (see Table 5). The Brock LTPB team was used for a pilot observation. The researcher observed the Brock LTPB team conducting a booth display on September 6, 2005. The pilot observation allowed the researcher to refine the observational protocol as well as practice observational techniques (see Table 5).
Table 5. Observational protocol.

| Date/Time: School: | Number of observation: 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th  
Indicate all who are present (names and positions): |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Take 10 minutes to describe and draw the physical environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe the content of the intervention</td>
<td>Document the time when peer educators implement actual activities and disseminate messages to students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document the interactions</td>
<td>Interactions between peer educators and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human &amp; Social Environment</td>
<td>The ways in which all peer educators interact and behave toward each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation Activities</td>
<td>What goes on in the life of the team? How are peer educators approaching students (passive, aggressive)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native language of the program</td>
<td>Different organizations have their own language or jargon to describe the problems they deal with in their work; capturing the precise language of all peer educators is an important way to record how staff and peer educators understand their experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal communication</td>
<td>Nonverbal cues about what is happening: the way all peer educators dress, express opinions, physically space themselves during booth displays, etc., and arrange themselves in their physical setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notable non-occurrences</td>
<td>Determining what is not occurring although the expectation is that it should be occurring as planned by the project team, or noting the absence of some particular activity/factor that is noteworthy and would serve as added information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the course of the seven-month data collection phase, there were four instances where observations took place. The first two observations were LTPB weekend training sessions where the researcher observed: the training of peer educators, roles of different positions on the team, and LTPB organizational structures and procedures. Two formal observations were performed on each team to gain direct insight into important team processes (team meeting and contest recruitment). Table 6 summarizes the dates of observations at each LTPB team and includes the focus of each observation.
Table 6. Dates and focus of the four observations at each LTPB team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LTPB training session #1</th>
<th>LTPB training session #2</th>
<th>LTPB team meeting</th>
<th>Contest recruitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus of observation</td>
<td>Researcher becoming familiar with LTPB program and peer educator roles.</td>
<td>Researcher becoming familiar with LTPB program and peer educator roles.</td>
<td>Leadership, culture of the team, friendship on the team, commitment.</td>
<td>Peer education approaches, booth displays.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each team was formally observed conducting a team meeting (see Table 6) to provide insight into how each team functions as a group. This observation also shed light into the leadership capabilities of the Campus Program Coordinator and Team Leader, the cohesion and the culture of the team.

An observation was also performed on each team while they were conducting a booth display for their annual “Let’s Make A Deal!” contest. At this point, the researcher was quite familiar with the peer educators. By developing a rapport with peer educators, the researcher was able to observe peer educators’ behaviours, peer education methods, and overall team cohesion. Booth displays are particularly important to this study because they were the site where peer educators’ interactions and peer education techniques with other students were observed.

**Data Management**

Each interview and focus group was transcribed verbatim by the researcher. All peer educators were assigned pseudonyms to ensure confidentiality. Only the researcher had a master list which connected the peer educators’ real names with their pseudonym.
The assigned pseudonyms were used when reporting the findings. A master list of peer educators and the related pseudonyms were stored in a separate and secure location.

All on-paper observational data as well as the flipchart paper data from the focus groups were kept in a filing cabinet, which was only accessible to the researcher. The electronic observational data and the interview and focus group data were entered into NVivo and therefore were only viewed and managed by the researcher and her advisor.

Qualitative Data Analysis

Analysis of the data was conducted using a grounded theory approach. Grounded theory methods consist of systematic inductive guidelines for collecting and analyzing data to build middle-range theoretical frameworks that explain the collected data (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). Grounded theory intensively analyzes data, “often sentence by sentence, or phrase by phrase - of the field note, interview, or other document; through ‘constant comparison’ where data are extensively collected and coded,” thus producing a well-constructed theory (Strauss, 1987, p. 22). In grounded theory, the focus of analysis is not merely on collecting or ordering “a mass of data, but on organizing ideas which have emerged from analysis of the data” (Strauss, 1987, p. 22). In grounded theory, data collection, analysis, and theory stand in reciprocal relationship with each other (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). One does not begin with a theory and then set out to prove it, rather one begins with an area of study and what is relevant to that area is allowed to emerge (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). After all the data had been collected and analyzed, a grounded theory emerged to provide understanding of the processes of peer education.

In keeping with the emergent and inductive nature of qualitative research, data analysis was performed throughout the study to enhance the following phases of data
collection. For example, the first round of individual interviews performed were
analyzed, and therefore questions were added to the first focus group guide. As well, observations took place throughout the phases of data collection, and this enabled the researcher to ask peer educators to discuss these observations at subsequent interviews and focus groups. For example, the day that the contest recruitment observation at McMaster took place was the same day that a negative opinion article was printed in their school newspaper. The researcher had a chance to obtain a copy of the newspaper and read the article for herself. At the third round of interviews the researcher was then able to ask the McMaster peer educators several questions around the negative article which was printed in the paper. This gave the researcher the chance to talk openly and freely about sensitive and specific topics that would not have been talked about if the researcher had not been at McMaster and read the article.

There are three phases of coding: open, axial and selective coding. All three phases of coding were utilized for analysis in this study. Coding is an essential procedure of data analysis. Data analysis of this study began with open coding, which is the initial coding performed that is unrestricted coding of the data (Strauss, 1987). Open coding is done by examining field notes, interviews, and other documents very closely, line-by-line, or even word-by-word. As Strauss (1987) described, as analysis emerges through open coding, “the analyst moves to the next words, next lines, the process snowballs, with the quick surfacing of information bearing on the questions and hypotheses, and sometimes even possible cross-cutting of dimensions” (p. 28). In open coding, every interpretation is considered. “The analyst learns to play the game of believing everything and believing nothing – at this point – leaving herself/himself as open as the coding
itself” (Strauss, 1987, p. 28). Categories and themes began to emerge during this open coding process.

Axial coding is the essential next step of open coding because it consists of intense analysis done around one category at a time, in terms of the paradigm items (conditions, consequences, etc.) (Strauss, 1987). This results in cumulating knowledge about particular relationships within and between categories. Axial coding is the second step of data analysis, where categories and subcategories begin to become narrowed down into the core categories.

In the last stage, selective coding pertains to coding systematically andconcertedly for the core categories (Strauss, 1987). Here the researcher only incorporated codes that were important to the core categories. During selective coding, the analytic memos become more focused and aid in achieving the theory’s integration (Strauss, 1987).

Open coding was performed on all of the data and original themes emerged. The researcher wrote a first draft of the research findings. The researcher's advisor reviewed and edited the initial first draft. Then themes were collapsed into more common themes (axial coding). After more revisions and drafts, final themes and tree diagrams were used to present the findings. In the process of selective coding two different types of diagrams were used. The first diagramming method used in this study was the simple task of flow-charting. Flow charts visualize an order of elements through time or in a process (Lofland & Lofland, 1995). Figure 5 in Chapter Four visually displays the overall process of peer education found in this study. This diagram was designed, re-designed several times and finally simplified into the final flow chart seen at the beginning of Chapter Four.
The qualitative data analysis software program, NVivo 1.2 was used to sort, arrange, and develop codes and themes throughout each of the three phases of coding. NVivo 1.2 organizes raw data and links them with ‘databites’ where researchers make codes and analytical notes, and then edit and rework ideas as the study progresses (Walsh, 2003). Through the use of NVivo, one can quickly trace the progression of an idea from its earliest stages (Walsh, 2003). Researchers can link and compare within and across documents (observational notes, answers to questions in interviews and focus groups, etc.), and the results can be saved, printed, or undone at will (Walsh, 2003). As well, since it is electronic, it is a safe and reliable place to store data since it can be locked with a password and backed-up on a server.

The grounded theory approach to qualitative research is often referred to as the “constant comparative method” because of the process of constantly comparing the data to other data and concepts (Schreiber, 2001). A constant comparative analysis is the technique of contrasting data first against itself, then against evolving original data and finally against existent theoretical and conceptual claims (Duchscher & Morgan, 2004). This helps to facilitate the emergence of knowledge that “provides us with relevant predictions, explanations, interpretations and applications” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 1).

Constant comparison was used throughout data analysis in the movement toward the development of theory. For example, peer educators’ different levels of commitment on the team were compared against each other and negative cases surfaced. The constant comparative analysis was also present in the comparison of the data to the literature. In Chapter Two, using existing literature, three models were created as hypotheses for the upcoming research. In Chapter Four, a further model was designed to show the research
findings. Lastly in Chapter Five, a final model was created to explain the research findings. Each of these models built from knowledge created through the qualitative research process. Huberman and Miles (1994) provide an interactive model to show the steps taken in qualitative data analysis (see Figure 4).

![Figure 4. Qualitative Data Analysis: Step by Step (Adapted from Huberman and Miles, 1994, p. 429; Hunter, 2005).](image)

**Trustworthiness in Qualitative Research**

It is important to discuss that one main objective of qualitative research is to be authentic. It is the researcher’s focus to understand and depict the case study authentically in all its complexity while being self-analytical, politically aware, and reflexive in consciousness (Patton, 2002). Lincoln and Guba (1985) have suggested an emphasis on trustworthiness and authenticity by the researcher by being balanced, fair, and conscientious in taking into account the multiple perspectives, multiple interests, and multiple realities that the study will offer. The researcher was always aware throughout
data collection that the purpose of this study is to understand the process, which is the
"what" and "how" of peer education. This was not an outcome study of peer education
and therefore "why" type questions were rarely asked.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) ascertain four criteria to obtain trustworthiness in a
qualitative study: credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability. These four
criteria are the standards for evaluating the rigor of qualitative studies (Ulin, Robinson &
Tolley, 2005). Table 7 summarizes Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) guidelines for establishing
trustworthiness.

Table 7. Summary of Techniques for Establishing Trustworthiness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Area</th>
<th>Quantitative Term</th>
<th>Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>Internal Validity</td>
<td>1. Activities in the field that increase the probability of high credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Prolonged engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Persistent observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Triangulation (sources, methods, and investigators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Peer debriefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Negative case analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Referential adequacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Member checks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferability</td>
<td>External Validity</td>
<td>6. Thick description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalizability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>7.a) Dependability audit, including audit trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmability</td>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>7.b) Confirmability audit, including audit trail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 328.

Credibility can also be used to establish trustworthiness. As indicated in Table 7,
there are five major techniques that can be used to establish credibility in a study. This
study used prolonged engagement, persistent observation, triangulation, peer debriefing,
negative case analysis, referential adequacy and member checks.
In this study, prolonged engagement took place from the beginning of data collection in May 2005 to the end of data collection in March 2006. Persistent observation also occurred, as each campus was formally observed on two occasions. Informal observations also took place during focus groups, interviews, and during other visits to campus. Four kinds of triangulation can also contribute to the credibility of qualitative analysis: methods triangulation, triangulation of sources, analyst triangulation, and theory/perspective triangulation. Methods triangulation deals with checking the consistency of findings generated by different data collection methods (Patton, 2002). This study involved three types of data collection techniques, interviews, focus groups and observations. Triangulation of sources is checking out the consistency of different data sources within the same method (Patton, 2002). This study involved twelve peer educators as sources of information. Analyst triangulation deals with using multiple analysts to review the findings (Patton, 2002). Both the researcher and her academic advisor were involved in data analysis, the researcher’s advisor verified the themes and categories that emerged from the data. In theory/perspective triangulation, you use multiple perspectives or theories to interpret the data (Patton, 2002). This study used a modified grounded theory approach which allowed for theory/perspective triangulation to occur using theory from the literature in Chapter Two to interpret the data (for example, the empowerment literature).

Peer debriefing also took place, in this instance, it was the academic advisor of the researcher who performed the debriefing. This study allowed several opportunities for negative cases to surface because there were twelve peer educators and three types of data collection methods. A single negative case or participant did not surface, meaning
that one person did not have a totally opposing view of the way the team operates.

However there was one individual on each team who lacked commitment, thus having an effect on the rest of the team. This study also used referential adequacy. Put simply, referential adequacy refers to using different or multiple sources, methods or investigators (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Since all interviews and focus groups were tape recorded, they provided the basis for referential adequacy in which the tapes will provide context rich, holistic material that provides background meaning to support data analysis, interpretations, and audit (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

The second focus group served as a member check. The researcher informed the peer educators of preliminary themes that were emerging from the data. Peer educators were asked if the themes and ideas presented were reflective of their experience. As Patton (2002) described, researchers can learn a great deal about the accuracy, completeness, fairness, and perceived validity of their data analysis by having the people described in that analysis react to what is described and concluded.

In qualitative research, transferability is the equivalent to external validity or generalizability in quantitative research. The aim of qualitative research is not to make generalizations about the world, but to produce data that are conceptually representative of people in a specific context (Ulin, Robinson & Tolley, 2005). If a theory is truly transferable, it will serve as a guide for investigating a new sample (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003). Auberbach and Silverstein (2003) discuss transferability when “you try to apply a theoretical construct to the new sample, you should find that the theoretical constructs you developed in one study will help to understand the subjective experiences of the participants in another sample” (p. 87). The rich, thick, descriptive data collected in
this study and used in the presentation of the findings help to increase the transferability
of the study.

Dependability is the equivalent to reliability in quantitative research. Reliability is
the degree to which the finding is independent of accidental circumstances of the research
(Patton, 2002). For qualitative researchers, dependability is whether the research process
is consistent and carried out with careful attention to the rules and conventions of
qualitative methodology (Ulin, Robinson & Tolley, 2005). Dependability is the extent to
which under the same circumstances the same findings would be reached. Lincoln and
that qualitative researchers establish an “audit trail” to verify the rigour of fieldwork and
confirmability of the data collected. In this study, an audit trail was created in this thesis
document by reporting: how and why research questions changed, how models and
figures emerged and were re-worked and why, and how themes emerged and changed as
the researcher moved from open to axial to selective coding.

Patton (2002) described confirmability as “testing ideas, confirming the
importance and meaning of possible patterns, and checking out the viability of emergent
findings with new data and additional cases” (p. 239). This stage of fieldwork requires
the researcher to have integrity when looking for and sampling confirming cases as well
as disconfirming cases (Patton, 2002). Therefore the researcher must always be truthful to
the data, beginning at collecting the data to reporting the data and lastly drawing findings
from the data. In this study, examples of confirmability are the emergent hypotheses,
testing research questions, changing interview questions and constantly revising
conceptual models. Lincoln and Guba (1985) believe qualitative researchers can justify
their findings by establishing confirmability. According to Lincoln and Guba (1985) to confirm findings, the researcher can undergo an audit trail of the analysis, field notes, memos, and journals. Thus the auditor (the researcher’s advisor) may sample entries in the journal (NVivo program file) to ascertain whether they are supported by documents (interview and focus group transcripts or observational notes) (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

*Ethical Considerations*

Informed consent was given by all peer educators involved in the study through the signing of a consent form (Appendix B). Confidentiality issues were addressed by ensuring all peer educators that any information revealed by peer educators holds the expectation of anonymity and confidentiality (this means that all data collected will not be shared with anyone except the researcher and her advisor).

Peer educators were also informed about anonymity. Any information that is distinctive of their character will not be disclosed in any written documents or oral presentations. Due to a small sample size, identifying information such as ethnic backgrounds, gender or position on the LTPB team will not be directly linked with the individual’s pseudonym.

It is important to note that the researcher could not ensure full confidentiality due to the nature of focus groups. Before each focus group began the researcher requested that all information discussed in the focus group remain confidential. Yet the researcher cannot guarantee that the peer educators will not discuss confidential information. The names of the two universities which were the sites for this study (Ryerson & McMaster) will be openly printed in thesis documents, journal articles and conference presentations (peer educators were informed of this and it was also included in the consent form).
The research project did not infringe on the rights of peer educators. All peer educators were informed (in writing and verbally) that they have the right to refuse to participate or to terminate their participation in the interview. All peer educators were informed that the researcher was not affiliated with LTPB and if they chose not to participate in this study there will be no negative implications pertaining to their employment with LTPB.

There were no physical risks to the subject as an outcome of participation in this study. Psychological/emotional risks were minimal; that is, no greater than encountered by the subject in aspects of his/her everyday life. The research did not involve a topic that would potentially cause emotional distress. It is the duty of the researcher to ensure that there is a favourable balance of benefits-harms to the study peer educators. Human research is intended to produce benefits for subjects themselves, for other individuals or society as a whole, or for the advancement of knowledge. Perceived benefits to the peer educators in this study are an increased understanding and awareness of their role and their team’s role in the LTPB organization. Peer educators will benefit by learning what types of things they can improve upon as a group (increased communication skills and commitment) to ensure successful implementation of LTPB activities. This study is also likely to produce an advancement of knowledge in the area of health promotion, as new theory emerged surrounding peer education.

Summary of Chapter Three

This chapter provided an overview of the methods used in this instrumental case study of peer education teams. Data collection procedures included the use of interviews, focus groups and observations. Following data analysis in the grounded theory tradition,
several themes emerged to further understanding of peer education and how it is affected by the processes in peer education teams and the larger environment on university campuses. Findings are presented in the chapter that follows.
Chapter Four: Findings

The purpose of this instrumental case study was to examine the processes of peer education through the exploration of two teams implementing peer education processes on university campuses. The aim of this research was to answer the following research questions:

1. **How do peer educators understand and implement peer education?**
2. **What processes underlie the peer education teams?**
3. **What influences in the macro environment effect the functioning of the peer education teams?**
4. **How do processes of peer education relate to processes of empowerment?**

This findings chapter begins with a *description of the case* which describes the peer education teams and illustrates the activities performed throughout the year. Following this, the five main themes which emerged from the analysis are introduced. These themes appear in Figure 5 and the findings pertaining to each theme are described in depth in the sections that follow.

In response to the first research question - How do peer educators understand and implement peer education? - two main themes emerged which focused on the individual peer educators and how their LTPB messages were disseminated (see Figure 5). *Understanding the peer educator* includes the peer educator’s understanding of the LTPB program, including their understanding of the Stages of Change as well as their thoughts on smoking behaviours of university students. This theme also includes peer educator’s definitions of qualities of peer educators. The second theme, *peer educator’s*
Understanding the Peer Educator
- Motivations of Peer Educators
- Peer Educators' Beliefs about Smoking
- Peer Educators’ Understanding of the Stages of Change
- What Peer Education Means to Peer Educators
- Role as Peer Educator
[Responds to Research Question #1, 4]

Team Dynamics and Processes
- Commitment and Involvement on the Team
- Team Cohesion
- Leadership within the Team
- Collective Vision of the Team
- Decision Making Around Tasks Scheduling
- Team Culture of Friendship
[Responds to Research Question #2]

Peer Educator's Understanding of the Modes of Message Delivery
- Messages Peer Educators are Sending to Students on Campus
- Peer Educators Understanding of Booth Displays and Walk Abouts
[Responds to Research Question #1, 4]

Macro Influences on Peer Education
- Campus Characteristics and Culture
- Campus Tobacco Policies
- University Supports to the Team
- LTPB Head Office
[Responds to Research Question #3]

Outcomes of the Peer Education Process
- Receptivity from Students
- Building Relationships
- Recognition by Students
- Teamwork
- Observables Successes
[Responds to Research Question #4]

Figure 5. Model of the processes of peer education.
understanding of the modes of message delivery describes how peer education is implemented through different activities and events.

The theme, *team dynamics and processes* includes team goals and indicators of success, the functioning and dynamics of the two teams. This meso system theme helps to answer the second research question about the processes which underlie the peer education teams (see Figure 5).

Themes related to the *macro influences on peer education* describe campus characteristics and campus culture, smoking policies, how the university supports the team (finances, administrations), and how the LTPB Head Office influences the work of the teams. This macro system theme answers the third research question, “What influences the macro environment affect the functioning of peer education teams?”

Peer educators also described themes related to the *outcomes of the peer education process* and how these outcomes were influenced by the four previous themes (see Figure 5). This theme corresponds to the fourth research question examining the relationships between the processes of peer education and empowerment processes.

As indicated in Figure 5, there is a reciprocal relationship between *understanding the peer educator* and *team dynamics and processes* due to the individual peer educator having an effect on the work of the team as well as the team’s influence on the individual peer educator. For example, team members can help to boost each other’s morale having a positive effect on the work of the individual peer educator.

*Understanding the peer educator* also has a reciprocal relationship with the *macro influences on peer education* due to factors inherent within the macro environment (for example, tobacco policies) which can motivate or unmotivate individual peer educators.
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Conversely, the work of individual peer educators can have an impact on factors within the macro environment such as rules, regulations and rally for stricter tobacco policies.

*Team dynamics and processes* also share a reciprocal relationship with *macro influences on peer education*. For example, teams which are highly committed and involved on campus can have an influence on denormalizing social culture of smoking on campus. Equally, support from the campus environment such as finance and administration may impact the work of the team and their morale.

*Peer educator’s understanding of the modes of message delivery* is also connected to *team dynamics and processes* insofar as there is a collective understanding of the messages they are trying to send to students on campus. Working together to send out the LTPB messages also influenced team characteristics such as leadership, cohesion, friendship, commitment and involvement.

There is a reciprocal relationship between the *peer educator’s understanding of the modes of message delivery* and *understanding the peer educator*. For example, while peer educators were performing peer education their roles changed depending on the message they wanted to send to students on campus. With different modes of message delivery (e.g., walk abouts, booth displays) the role of the peer educator changes as does their interaction with the students on campus.

An interrelated connection was also seen between the *macro influences on peer education* and *peer educator’s understanding of the modes of message delivery*. For example, financial and administrative support from the university affected whether or not and to what extent the peer educators were able to disseminate their LTPB messages. As well the argument could be made that peer educators and their LTPB presence on campus
could have affected the culture of the campus if not overall, at least for periods of time (i.e. Smoke Free Day).

Description of the Case

Descriptions and background information of the case (peer education teams), including the LTPB context is provided for better understanding of the results about to be presented in this chapter. This instrumental case study focused on peer education teams. Two LTPB peer education teams at McMaster and Ryerson University were used to illuminate the understanding of the processes of peer education. Each team consisted of six peer educators, including the Campus Program Coordinator, the Team Leader, a Web Specialist, and three communication peer educators. Of the 12 total participants, six were never smokers, four were ex-smokers, one was an ex-social smoker and one was a social smoker. To protect the confidentiality of participants’ data, pseudonyms (e.g. peer educator 1, peer educator 6) are used throughout this document where verbatim quotes are used to provide the voice of the peer educators. For half of the peer educators, this was not their first time being on the LTPB team. Of this study’s 12 peer educators, six were employed as a LTPB peer educator for the first time, five peer educators were returning for a second time and one participant for their third time. This variation served the organization well in terms of leadership and succession. In addition, the team had a variety of backgrounds with respect to smoking, ethnic background, living situation and academic program enrolled in.

The diversity characteristics of the two peer education teams are included in Table 8. The literature stated that peer educators can be successful if they have ethnic-origins, gender and experiences in common with their target audience (Orme & Starkey, 1999).
Table 8. Diversity among Study Participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity Characteristic</th>
<th>McMaster</th>
<th>Ryerson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Range from 21-22 years</td>
<td>Range from 20-24 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Gender                   | Females- 5  
                      Males-1       | Males- 1  
                      Females- 5     |
| Ethnic Background         | Caucasian- 4  
                      Indian- 1  
                      Polish- 1       | Caucasian-2  
                      Serbian-1  
                      Pakistan-1  
                      Polish-1  
                      Laotian-1       |
| Academic program enrolled in | 3rd and 4th year students enrolled in kinesiology, genetics, sociology and English, multimedia and religious studies and life sciences programs | 2nd, 3rd and 4th year students enrolled in business and graphic communications management programs |
| Living situation          | Four members lived off campus with family  
                      Two members lived off campus with roommates | Two members lived off campus with family  
                      Four members lived off campus with roommates |

Table 8 suggests that the Ryerson team was more ethnically diverse compared to the McMaster team, reflecting the differences of diversity in Toronto versus Hamilton. Gender also differed between the two teams (see Table 8). On both teams one person was the opposite gender compared to the rest of the group. In the second round of individual interviews the researcher directly asked the peer educators how they felt either being the ‘odd gendered person’ out, or if the rest of the team mates thought that person was just as close to the rest of the team. Each of the peer educators who were interviewed dispelled any thoughts that the researcher may have had concerning the ‘odd gendered person’ feeling left out.

Both teams had some minor staffing struggles over the course of the year. At the very beginning of the year, Ryerson’s Team Leader unexpectedly quit. A returning peer
educator moved into that position and a new member was then hired for the communication team. He/she was a friend to some of the other peer educators and therefore made a smooth transition onto the team.

Both teams utilized volunteers for extra help during the course of the school year. McMaster had five volunteers and used them more frequently throughout the year while Ryerson had two volunteers who were used to a lesser extent. In addition, Smoke Free Day was such a large event that approximately 10 volunteers were needed to help out the McMaster team and were integral to the team’s success.

Print and Electronic Materials Used by Peer Education Teams

Throughout the year, the communication campaign of each LTPB team utilized mass media channels including print and electronic materials such as:

- Advertisements and articles in school newspapers, bulletins and newsletters.
- Each team’s LTPB website homepage containing information about the LTPB office on campus, peer educators, tobacco policies on campus and in the community, and the contest.
- Three self help booklets, “QUIT” for smokers who want to quit, “SMOKE” for smokers who want to keep smoking, and “U KNOW U WANT 2” for friends of smokers who want to help their friend quit smoking.
- Posters on campus which reflected the theme of the month, such as “Healthy Living” or awareness posters for the annual contest.
- Resources and give aways such as pamphlets, bookmarks, bracelets, stickers, temporary tattoos and stress balls.
Peer Education Techniques Used by Peer Educators

In addition to this media campaign, LTPB utilized peer education techniques to disseminate their tobacco control messages. Peer education included:

- Two booth displays per week staffed by two peer educators for one to three hours at a time. LTPB peer educators designed their own booths based on the LTPB theme of the month (for example “Healthy Living”).
- Walk abouts were used weekly to talk to students face-to-face about smoking cessation, distribute resources, learn more about students’ views of smoking on campus, and to administer carbon monoxide tests.
- Campus awareness campaigns including Smoke Free Day was held on March 6, 2006 in the McMaster Student Union. Over 1,100 Smoke-Free Mac buttons were distributed, 700 pledge forms completed, keynote speaker, Shaine Peters spoke about the deceptive marketing tactics tobacco companies use to target young adults, and campus displays offered resource materials.
- Ryerson used mascots to draw attention to booth displays and LTPB team activities throughout the year.
- “Smokalyzer” test (carbon monoxide) at LTPB events assessed students’ levels of carbon monoxide and provided immediate results concerning the exposure to cigarette smoke.
- “Let’s Make A Deal!” contest was held in January during National Non-Smoking Week. Students registered for the contest in one of four categories:
  - Quit for Good (for smokers to quit completely)
  - Party without the Pack (for social smokers to not smoke while consuming alcohol)
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- Keep the Count (cutting down cigarette smoking by at least half)
- Don’t Start and Win (for non-smokers to continue to be smoke free)

During contest registration, each participant had to sign up a non-smoking “buddy” who signed a contract stating that they would monitor the participant and help them throughout the process. Since the contest consumed a large part of the work the peer educators performed throughout the year, Table 9 provides a timeline for the annual contest showing the activities and preparation that goes into this event.

Table 9. Contest timeline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>September 2005</th>
<th>January 2006</th>
<th>March 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soliciting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contest Begins</td>
<td></td>
<td>☆</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contest Ends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☆</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although this study examined the processes of peer education, outcomes are discussed as outcomes from the peer educators’ point of view. “ Intercept interviews” are outcome evaluations conducted by LTPB teams themselves at the end of the year. The “ intercept interviews” assessed students’ knowledge and awareness of LTPB on each campus. One of the objectives of the LTPB initiative was to reach as many post-
secondary students as possible with the communication campaign with an expectation that 50% of post-secondary students knew about LTPB programs and services. “Intercept interviews” upon the two teams who participated in this study in 2005-2006 indicate McMaster’s overall recognition level on campus was 69% while Ryerson’s recognition level was 40%. The following sections provide detailed descriptions of the five themes which emerged from the study beginning with the first theme, understanding the peer educator.

Understanding the Peer Educator

An important theme that arose from this study focused on understanding the peer educator. As shown in Figure 6 this theme includes motivations of peer educators, peer educators’ beliefs about smoking, what peer education means to peer educators and role as peer educator. This theme corresponds to the first research question – how is peer education understood and implemented?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding the Peer Educator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Motivations of Peer Educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Peer Educator’s Beliefs About Smoking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Peer Educators’ Understanding of the Stages of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What Peer Education Means to Peer Educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Role as Peer Educator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Responds to Research Question # 1, 4]

Figure 6. Understanding the peer educator in the overall model of the processes of peer education.
Motivations of Peer Educators

Motivations peer educators described for being on the team were to benefit themselves, to benefit others, or because they believed in the LTPB cause of smoking cessation (see Table 10).

Table 10. Peer educators’ motivations for being on the LTPB team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit themselves</th>
<th>Benefit others</th>
<th>Believed in the LTPB cause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ For the leadership abilities that they would gain from the position of a peer educator;</td>
<td>▪ To help others quit smoking;</td>
<td>▪ Their significant other quit smoking using the program, therefore this peer educator believed the LTPB program to be successful;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Needed the money or paycheque;</td>
<td>▪ An ex-smoker who was a previous contest winner from the year prior thought they could advocate for the program based on their experience.</td>
<td>▪ Parents are smokers and it was a personal reason for them to join the team, therefore this peer educator believed the LTPB program to be successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ It would look good on their resume;</td>
<td>▪ For a web design position;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ An ex-smoker thought being on the team would help them to continue to stay smoke-free;</td>
<td>▪ Was a volunteer for the program their year prior and enjoyed the program so much they applied for a paid position;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Thought it would be a fun and enjoyable job.</td>
<td>▪ Their significant other quit smoking using the program, therefore this peer educator believed the LTPB program to be successful;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in column 1 of Table 10, some peer educators joined the LTPB team to benefit themselves (e.g. paycheques, leadership abilities). This was found to have an impact on "the way they work and their drives" (Peer educator 1). Peer educator 9 described how motivations differed and how this directly affected work ethic. As peer educator 9 described:

... everyone has a different agenda, I mean you can totally tell who is doing it
because they really enjoy it and you can totally tell who is doing it because they want to have a nice resume in the end, and so that really bases people's commitment and how much time they put in.

Some of the peer educators indicated they joined LTPB to benefit others specifically (see column 2 on Table 10). As peer educator 4 stated his/her reasons for joining the team were to help students on campus quit smoking, "I am a non-smoker so obviously I would like to get people to be non-smokers too cause you know it's healthier for you". In some instances peer educators were motivated by benefits they received, but they later described how their motivations shifted. Peer educator 6 described his/her initial reasons for being on the team and how they have changed since beginning to work for LTPB:

the first reason I applied for this job was because I needed money, and it is, it's a low time commitment, it's a fairly decent wage for students anyway ... but since then I think that its good that it has grown on me a little ... I don't know if I am the most gung-ho about the whole LTPB thing but I definitely care about the cause, I care about people's health and at least the facet that I can help them with.

Several of the peer educators' motivations were linked to their beliefs in the LTPB program (see column 3 on Table 10). As peer educator 2 described:

I would say that everyone who is on the team this year is very passionate about the program. Everyone at some point or another has told me ... I just love what this program is all about ...everyone believed in the program and believed in kind of the values and reasons behind ... LTPB and its really refreshing to know that everyone is here because they want to be involved with the ideals in getting the message out there.

As described in Table 11, the peer educators' endorsement of LTPB was related to personal experiences with family members and partners who smoke or have quit smoking. Peer educators believed in the LTPB cause but were frustrated by constantly having to advocate for the values and principles of LTPB. Peer educator 9 explained how
emotions got involved:

its just tough when you are trying really hard and people just don’t understand you and I mean it becomes emotional, I am not in any way shape or form a crazy anti-smoking advocate, even before I started this I was never ‘I think smoking is the worst thing in the world, I am making it my life’s duty to make sure that people don’t smoke’ but once you are working in a program like this its almost as if you are getting your morals taken apart and I think in any situation that was just a horrible feeling.

Peer Educators’ Beliefs About Smoking

Peer educators discussed their own beliefs on students’ smoking behaviours and also discussed why they thought many post-secondary students smoke. As indicated previously, six of the peer educators classified themselves as “never smokers”, four considered themselves “ex-smokers”, one participant was an “ex-social smoker”, and one participant was a “social smoker”.

The peer educators had several different personal views on smoking. More than half of the peer educators were self-described “anti-smokers” who articulated some strong beliefs about smoking ranging from statements about the logic of choosing to smoke, to disliking the smell and taste of smoke. As peer educator 6 described:

I think its kind of dumb to be honest ... Especially with university people where we’re all greatly educated and like my generation has been beaten over the head with the whole anti-smoking campaigns.

Peer educator 5 described his/her personal opinion on smoking and how he/she cannot stand the smell of cigarette smoke:

after seeing people that are close to me smoking and the effects that it has, I tried it myself, its just such a bad habit, very dirty feeling in the mouth, unclean mouth and smelly fingers.

Peer educator 6’s personal viewpoints on smoking did not affect how he/she acts towards smokers. As he/she stated, “I’m more of a live and let live kind of [person] I
wouldn't go around yelling at smokers or anything like that." Peer educator 3 had a problem with smokers and described how previously his/her personal approach to helping others quit was not in conjunction with LTPB practices:

I was always against smoking, most of my friends, if I see them having a pack I normally take it from them and just crumple it so they can't smoke it. It's not make them stop but make them realize I am against it. Which now I know is not the exact best way to approach youth cause they are just going to take another one and smoke that one.

The other half of the peer educators thought that smoking was a personal choice and that there is a fine line where you should not push your personal beliefs on another person. Peer educator 4 related his/her personal experiences with people he/she knows who smoke to the objectives of the LTPB program. He/she stated:

I'm not anti-smoking, I have a lot of friends who smoke so obviously I always give them my piece of advice, 'do you know what this is doing to you?' But I am not uncomfortable around smokers and I'm not going to harass them about what they do.

Peer educators commented on their beliefs about why post-secondary students smoke. Peer educators attributed students' smoking behaviours to the stress, freedom, and social situations associated with university life. Several peer educators described the stress that students encounter in university to be one of the causes for smoking behaviours including "new stress that comes with exams, and just being on their own" (Peer educator 5). Similarly, peer educator 10 described the stress of university life as being the biggest contributor to high levels of students' smoking rates:

we consume a lot of coffee, don't get a lot of sleep, have a lot of stress ... it is just associated with so many different things with university living that it just seems to work I mean its not disrupting our schedule, its actually in fact helping us relax through our schedule.
Peer educator 4 and peer educator 5 believed that the freedom that university living provided increased smoking opportunities for students. As peer educator 4 described:

*a lot of students when they first come to university they are just starting to get out on their own and they are starting to go out to bars maybe more ... and they see other people doing it and they don’t want to be left out ya know, they want to be part of the group so they will smoke.*

Other peer educators felt university life provided several social situations which were conducive to smoking. Peer educator 6 believed that the act of drinking alcohol encouraged smoking due to impaired judgement:

*people drink, judgement is less than sound ... I think it would have to do a lot with drinking, and a lot to do with social situations but also I think that maybe a lot of people think that once in a while isn’t going to be that bad.*

**Peer Educators’ Understanding of the Stages of Change**

LTPB peer educators were taught the stages of change theory during training. The stages of change helped peer educators to identify students’ location within the smoking cessation continuum. Peer educators described how they modified their peer education technique or approach depending on students’ position in the stages of change.

Peer educator 3 discussed how he/she began assessing students’ readiness to quit smoking: “*the way I try to sense out where they are is by asking them questions and you know, how much do you smoke, when did you start smoking, does your family smoke, do your grandparents smoke.*” Furthermore, peer educator 3 described how he/she changed his/her peer education approach based on his/her assessment of students’ stage of change: “*I try to see people’s stage they are in, where they are to see whether or not they are interested, if they are not interested I would just say okay thanks,*
bye, I definitely don’t pressure them.” Peer educator 1 agreed that if a student is not willing to change then their peer education techniques should be modified accordingly. Peer educator 1 described: “we will get the people who are like “so I smoke?” and then we go through our Stages of Change, we let them do their thing but give them something to think about.” Moreover, peer educator 1 believed helping students make their own decisions about their own smoking through shared power was important. As peer educator 1 stated: “we are starting to get people aware of what they are doing and then let them decide.”

Peer educator 5 understood how some students were not ready to quit and therefore he/she did not pressure them with peer education concerning tobacco control unless they were ready for change. As peer educator 5 described: “sometimes they’re not thinking about quitting, they’re not at that stage so the information they don’t need it, they don’t want it, its not where their at now and they don’t want any information.” While other students were ready to begin changing their smoking behaviours, they were “receptive of it and they want to take it [peer educators’ help].”

Booth displays and walk abouts were used as different message mediums depending on what type of effect the peer educators would liked to have had on the students. Peer educator 1 believed it was the students who were contemplating quitting smoking who approach booth displays:

we then have to leave it to the students to come to us and not a lot of students are willing to come to us as much, so we find, or I find specifically in this campus, a lot of the students who do approach us are the ones who are contemplating it.
Peer educator 5 associates smoker’s lack of readiness to quit smoking with smokers’ reaction to walk abouts. Peer educator 5 described his/her experience with performing walk abouts:

its just sometimes they’re not thinking about quitting, they’re not at that stage so the information they don’t need it, they don’t want it, its not where they’re at now and they don’t want any information, they’re not mean … They take the information politely … while other students are receptive of it and they want to take it.

What Peer Education Means to Peer Educators

In the first interview, peer educators were asked what peer education means to them. All of the peer educators had the same collective idea that peer education consists of disseminating information while remaining on the same level as their peers. The peer educators described qualities of successful peer educators, their own qualities that make them successful, and some personal improvements they could make to their peer educating. The peer educators discussed four main attributes that a successful peer educator should possess, including being understanding, approachable and a good listener, knowledgeable, and outgoing and engaging.

Understanding. Peer educators discussed the importance of understanding their target audience. An excellent example of understanding the target audience was peer educator 2’s “boyfriend analogy” he/she used when talking to students about smoking cessation. He/she described the analogy he/she used while conversing one-on-one with a female student:

Quitting smoking is like breaking up with your boyfriend and you have to just put it in a box and put it away and you have to just completely separate yourself from it and its so hard, and the cravings you get afterwards are like the cravings you get, you want to call him, or you want to just stop by. You want to make sure there is not another girl there and there are so many
things that are totally comparable to ending a relationship and its like drunk
dials, like when you are drinking you want to smoke ... You know you take
the time, you sit down, you find something good that works like my boyfriend
analogy and some people it just hits them.

During training, peer educators were taught an exercise that helped to put them in
the same mind frame as smokers. The exercise asked peer educators to think about
something they do everyday that would be hard to live without. For peer educator 9
he/she thought it would be difficult to give up coffee. He/she explained how he/she
related his/her coffee drinking to students’ smoking thereby understanding the difficulty
in quitting smoking:

I am addicted to coffee which I mean isn’t as bad [as smoking] but its still it
is a drug, caffeine is a drug and I mean I know how I would feel trying to
give up coffee and if someone tried to make me give up coffee or told me that
I had to, I know its bad for me but I probably couldn’t cause I like having a
coffee in the morning it calms me down and relaxes me for the day.

Peer educators discussed understanding the addiction component of smoking cigarettes.

Peer educator 9 described this understanding and how it affects the way he/she
communicated with students:

I understand why students are so hard pressed to quit, so I think my
understanding of smokers is that I need to be understanding of them and
what they are trying to go through or I’m never going to be able to
communicate effectively with them.

Peer educator 3 believed being too pushy and telling students to quit smoking was
sometimes counterproductive as students would disconnect from the peer educators.

He/she explained his/her understanding of students who smoke:

you first have to realize that if its at a university level, it’s a student’s
choice whether they quit smoking, whether they cut back or whether
they continue, you know we are not their parents to tell them stop
smoking ... As a peer educator, just supply them with information,
if they show that they are not interested, don’t push, just tell them
you know we are here next week ... Because that can actually do more harm than good at times.

Peer educator 10 lent a sympathetic ear to understanding students’ needs in helping them to quit or reduce their smoking. Peer educators must demonstrate an understanding of how difficult it is to quit smoking in order to be helpful to students. As peer educator 10 described:

_I think it just comes more natural to me to sympathize with them and be like ‘listen I know how hard it is ... you’ll start to eventually have those urges’ ... I would just let them know its more psychological, you already associate it with so many things that you do in your day to day life, the only way to get around it is by facing it day to day._

*Approachable and good listener.* Many peer educators believed being approachable also indicates showing respect. As peer educator 9 described: “show people respect when I am talking to them and so if I respect them, they will respect me”.

Peer educator 1 thought peer education is successful due to the comfort level students gain from talking to another student their age:

_a lot of students don’t feel comfortable speaking to other people, like much older people, and much younger people because they may not feel like they can relate. I find it is just a lot easier for a lot of students, and the comfort, the comfortableness of it I think is probably the reason why it works so well._

Being approachable also includes “being easy to talk to” and not being “overbearing”.

As peer educator 3 described:

_Well I don’t attack people with information, I try sense out where they are standing first with respect to helping them quit smoking ... I try to be very kind of relaxed, kind of in a way stepping back and just kind of very calm._

Many of the peer educators explained that an indicator of understanding and being approachable is being a good listener to the students. Peer educator 1 believed he/she is successful because he/she understood the importance of listening:
A lot of people like to tell their own stories and I think a key characteristic of a peer educator should be listening skills, understanding where they are coming from, why they were doing whatever and basically taking in what they are saying rather than just shooting out your own stuff, you should do this, try that, blah blah blah. Making sure that it fits that specific person so I think that's it.

Similarly, peer educator 5 described how listening caused students to feel more comfortable when talking to him/her:

I think listening to others is a really big point when you are doing peer education, I found especially last year a lot of students just really want to talk about their experiences, and they would go on about, oh this happened to me, and just listening to them I think made them more comfortable and more at ease.

Peer educator 6 agreed with the rest of the peer educators that it is easier to talk about certain topics with someone who is close to your own age, but he/she also mentioned negative issues that can arise when other peer education type groups that he/she had encountered seemed to gain power from their educational position:

The only kind of problem I see with peer education, not that it's a terrible problem, but it might come off a little preachy ... not with anything around here but some things in Toronto, there has been a couple times where people have approached me who were peer educator type people and it seemed like just because they had that kind of a title they derived some sort of power from it.

Knowledgeable. Several peer educators believed peer education was about not pressuring students to quit but providing them with knowledge about smoking cessation without lecturing. The peer educators described:

just getting to know the students and finding out their feelings and their information about what they know and then maybe correcting that information, what they think is wrong or updating it, giving information out and just educating them on something new. (Peer educator 5)

Well we don't ever say 'oh put that cigarette out' ... we just kind of say 'hey
you’re smoking, that’s okay, but do you know exactly what it is and ask them about their habits ... So we don’t ever pressure them to quit smoking ... so its totally up to them ... they know about us after that, so its their choice. (Peer educator 4)

Peer educator 2 described how his/her knowledge about LTPB helped him/her find common ground with students:

I know enough about it that someone can come into my office and I can talk to them for half an hour about their smoking habits and it doesn’t faze me at all to do that ... I find it easy to find common ground with people.

Peer educator 3 believed his/her knowledge helped to gain the confidence of the students that he/she is a credible source of information. As peer educator 3 described:

I was posterizing somewhere around the school and a student just decided to start reading the entire poster and then I just engaged in a conversation with him about like mild cigarettes and he was light cigarette smoker. So then we started talking about that and we ended up talking in a conversation which took us about half an hour.

Furthermore, peer educator 3 described using his/her knowledge about smoking to shock students about the dangers and the effects that smoking has on the body:

a lot of people who we talk to actually get shocked about the many different chemicals that are in cigarettes and the many different dangers ... we have this bottle of tar that we have, if you smoke 2 cigarettes per day for one year we have an actual bottle with the amount of tar that you actually into your system. And it more or less comes to 2 full shot glasses, which is kind of disgusting, cause that’s what you got into your system.

Peer educator 4 would have liked to improve on his/her smoking cessation knowledge because there were some rare circumstances in which a student asked him/her questions for which he/she did not have answers. Peer educator 4 explained:

I think I would like to learn more not LTPB itself but some of the information that we give out ... they were asking me ‘well is there anything else I can do, sometimes I have cravings’... Off the top of my head I was like I have never been asked this question, I don’t know how to respond really.
Outgoing and engaging. Peer educator 4 thought a positive characteristic that he/she held was that he/she was relatively outgoing and had a good rapport with the students and was able to draw people in. Peer educator 2 described him/herself as being successful at peer educating because he/she was outgoing and not afraid to draw attention to him/herself. As he/she described:

I think the fact that I am completely outgoing, I am going to rave about myself for a little bit, I am dynamic, I am charismatic I am not afraid to speak my mind I am not afraid to stand at the booths and shout at people to get their attention, I don’t find that embarrassing ... I can speak easily in front of people.

Peer educator 9 described a fine line between being outgoing and being obnoxious,

“There is a point of being too outgoing though so I mean I think its being outgoing but also having that level of tact.”

Being outgoing helped raise awareness of LTPB and engage in peer education.

However, peer educator 2 described the challenges that sometimes arose:

if I see a couple of girls sitting and having a smoke and talking I am more likely to go up to them then to the guy who is dressed like a thug sitting against the wall like with his arms locked in, a scowl on his face, I’m like ‘gee who am I going to? The friendly girls or the angry guy? I don’t think he wants to hear what I have to say, I am going to go with the laughing girls’ cause I mean even if they say no, they will probably do it nicely, he might tell me to “F” off! And I think that’s normal, I don’t think anything that’s distinct to me but I think that’s something that personally I can work on, because if I want to be the epitome of outgoing I won’t care if I get told to “F” off!

When making hiring decisions around peer educators, both of the Campus Program Coordinator’s described that there were sometimes differing ideas about relative importance of personality (being outgoing) and work experience. One Campus Program Coordinator stated:
I looked at the experience and it wasn’t necessarily work experience, I enjoy a lot of people who have volunteer experience, people who have social skills, being in the program that we are basically marketing out towards the students … I specifically looked for personality, how they talked to people, how they dealt with the questions, if they were comfortable with the interview process and again its just because of the fact that if they can deal with an interview, a 1:1 interview or 1:4 interview they should be able to deal with people at a display.

**Peer Educators Define Their Role**

When describing their role, peer educators believed their role was to be leaders, helpers, and educators among the student body. The relationship of peer education to leadership emerged as a theme for discussion during the first focus group. There were differing views on whether the peer educators thought of themselves to be leaders to the rest of the students on their university campus. Several peer educators thought of themselves as leaders in some way and related this to their status and knowledge as peer educators. Others were indecisive or did not think they were directly leading anyone to quit smoking. Peer educator 4 viewed him/herself as a leader and related this to an issue of status or importance. As he/she stated:

*Yes in a way I guess ... Cause I do feel like people, I feel pretty important when I am standing at the display booth and people come up to me and ask me questions about smoking or anything else in regards to that so yeah I do consider myself to be a leader.*

Peer educator 2 thought he/she was 100% a leader to the rest of the students on campus because he/she also stayed in his/her LTPB role as a peer educator even when he/she was not working. He/she described:

*Definitely, I would say I definitely am ... when I realize that people are smoking right in doorways every once in a while I am like ‘can you see the sign?’ like when I am not working or anything.*
Peer educator 10 felt that the team as a whole provided leadership but he/she did not make a personal connection with being a leader to the students. He/she thought he/she would feel more like a leader once their annual contest began. He/she described, “I don’t feel like I am leading anybody to quit … like come the contest … at that point I could see myself being a leader.”

Many peer educators found it difficult to define their role as they may have been defining being an educator when they thought they were defining being a leader. For example, peer educator 9 understood his/her leadership role in connection to educating, which creates a responsibility to inform others about what he/she knows so that students can make informed decisions about their smoking behaviours. He/she explains:

I think for sure, yeah as a peer educator you do need to be a leader because the fact that we are educated in educating peers, the fact that we have that extra knowledge, I think more of like a responsibility to teach other people about it, I think that makes us a leader.

In addition, peer educator 3 described his/her role as an educator rather than as a leader. As he/she stated:

not a leader in my view … but yes in the sense that if you do want the help you could look up to me for that help for those who want the help. I would consider myself a leader but for those who don’t necessarily want to change or aren’t interested I am just an educator to them.

Peer educator 6 was hesitant at first to divulge if he/she thought he/she was a leader or not, but enjoys the self-satisfaction he/she derived from helping others. He/she related his/her peer educator position to being a helper:

Yeah that was definitely a big thing for me at first, but I like the idea that I am kind of helping people, I don’t think I am changing the world or anything but still if you help one person it kind of makes you happy.
Peer educator 1 also believed his/her role was to act as a helper for students in the smoking cessation process, while remaining on the same level. As he/she stated: “Peer education to me, to me its basically students helping students at a level at which we can understand the same things.”

*Peer Educators’ Understanding of the Modes of Message Delivery*

The modes of message delivery were the different ways the peer educators convey information and resources to students so that LTPB achieves its objectives. Here the peer educators described their understanding of the messages they were sending to students on campus and experiences performing booths displays, walk abouts, the annual “Let’s Make a Deal!” contest, and Smoke Free Day.

Each LTPB team was required to run a communication campaign on their campus which began in September and ended in April of the academic year. Booth displays and walk abouts allowed the LTPB peer educators to interact with students, distribute resources, engage in carbon monoxide testing, to learn more about students’ views of smoking on campus, and to aid students in changing their smoking behaviours. These examples of modes of message delivery respond to the first research question – How is peer education understood and implemented? (See grey shaded box in Figure 7).

*Messages of LTPB Program Awareness and Tobacco Awareness*

In the first interview, the peer educators were asked “what messages is your LTPB team trying to send to the students on campus?” The peer educators had many of the same answers. Peer educators felt it was their role as a peer educator to send two main messages concerning: LTPB program awareness and tobacco awareness.
Figure 7. Peer educators' understanding of the modes of message delivery and its relationship to understanding the peer educator.

Several peer educators described the importance of increasing student awareness of LTPB's name and the supports they provide. Peer educator 6 provided an example of LTPB program awareness by saying: "Mostly that we exist ... saying that we are here ... telling people what we do, just trying to get our name out there and have people know about us." Peer educator 1 thought program awareness was the key message they were trying to send to students on campus. He/she stated:

we are here to help them and help students specifically with if they are looking to quit, if they are looking for resources, looking to help someone, we can provide the resources, people to contact, clinical staff, help.
Peer educator 1 believed that as a team they wanted to provide program awareness but at the same time they wanted to stress tobacco awareness:

we are not here to judge, we feel that they are at the age where they can decide to make their own decisions, they are young adults and as a result of that whatever they do it is basically their choice.

Similarly, peer educator 5 explained that the message they were trying to send was tobacco awareness; specifically the contents of cigarettes and what they could do to harm the body. As peer educator 5 described:

The effects of smoking. We educate about tobacco awareness and we are there for what they need if they want information on something we can offer it to them, we just want to let them know what cigarettes are made of and what its all about.

Peer educator 2 agreed his/her role was to emphasize to students that LTPB is a tobacco awareness program and differentiates this from messages about anti-smoking. He/she stated: “we get horribly offended when we get called the anti-smoking group in the newspaper, we always make sure that there is a correction printed.”

Peer Educators’ Understanding of Booth Displays and Walk Abouts

Booth displays and walk abouts were the two peer education type modes which were most commonly used to disseminate the LTPB messages (see Table 11). Throughout this study, at each campus, it was evident that each peer educator had a different opinion on whether booth displays or walk abouts were more effective in disseminating their tobacco control messages. Peer educators discussed walk abouts and booth displays in four ways: recognition and acceptance, quantity and reach, effect, and approach. Table 11 presents the descriptions peer educators provided at the focus groups.
Table 11. Comparison of booth displays and walk about.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition and acceptance</th>
<th>Booth Displays</th>
<th>Walk About</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People who know who we are seek us out (Peer educator 6)</td>
<td>Chalking (using chalk to promote program or the 9 meter rule around building entrances) gets our name out there and creates general interest (Peer educator 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred people to our table, that means people know who we are (Peer educator 9)</td>
<td>More general for getting our name out (Peer educator 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better acceptance (Peer educator 10)</td>
<td>Less positive, not negative but less interested (Peer educator 11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in the program (Peer educator 5)</td>
<td>More personal (Peer educator 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can actually give help for their specific suggestions (Peer educator 4)</td>
<td>More laid back, people are more inclined to talk to you, people are easier to talk to (Peer educator 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light/mild displays, gives people the information they may not know (Peer educator 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity and reach</th>
<th>Booth Displays</th>
<th>Walk About</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantity of people (Peer educator 3)</td>
<td>Quality of talking to people, hit less people but get more out of it (Peer educator 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad range of people (Peer educator 10)</td>
<td>Walk about you can miss somebody (Peer educator 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Booth Displays</th>
<th>Walk About</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willing to change, “fence sitters”, want to quit (Peer educator 7)</td>
<td>More effective to reach people (Unknown)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective for getting name out there cause you can reach more people especially more people who wouldn’t normally come to the booth (Peer educator 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Booth Displays</th>
<th>Walk About</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They approach you and you get more positive feedback on those people (Peer educator 8)</td>
<td>Soliciting, infringing (Peer educator 10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At booth displays they (students) choose you (Peer educator 5)</td>
<td>Target smokers (Peer educator 12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of the students who do approach us are the ones who are contemplating it (Peer educator 1)</td>
<td>Intrusive (Unknown)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You are guessing who you think will be interested (Peer educator 8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ignore us (Peer educator 7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Several peer educators discussed both walkabouts and booth displays as important to gaining recognition and acceptance of LTPB among students on campus.

Peer educator 9 described one experience he/she had during a walkabout:

I had this really in-depth conversation with one of the smokers about what we do, what the government laws are at the moment and even though he didn't want to quit in the end, at least he thought that LTPB was a positive force and he appreciated what we were doing and realized from a person who used to think we were anti-smoking Nazis and actually thought that we were a good group of people.

As indicated in this quote, gaining acceptance was related to the ability of peer educators to dispel myths about LTPB being an anti-smoking organization. Sometimes this was to no avail:

you get the people who scoff at you and are just like ‘stupid, anti-smokers’ and then you just explain to them who we actually are and their like ‘alright, but, enough is enough, I smoke, get over it’. (Peer educator 2)

Several peer educators discussed booth displays as a better mode of message delivery for gaining recognition and acceptance from the students on campus compared to walkabouts due to approach. Peer educators felt more accepted from the students because at booth displays it was the students who were approaching them for information, education or assistance in smoking cessation. Peer educators also discussed walkabouts and booth displays in terms of the quantity of students they reach on campus. Many peer educators believed booth displays were more effective in reaching large quantities of students. In comparison, as described in Table 11, walkabouts created interactions with smaller groups of selected students but included a deeper level of engagement. Regarding the effect of LTPB peer education, many peer educators believed walkabouts were the best method in achieving quality interactions with the students. Peer
Peer educator 5 thought by performing walk abouts peer educators could have an effect on students’ smoking behaviours. Peer educator 5 thought walk abouts were: “more personal, looking for people who might benefit from the information.”

Booth displays and walk abouts were used as different message mediums depending on what type of effect the peer educators would like to have on the students. Peer educator 1 believed it was the students who were contemplating quitting smoking who approach booth displays:

we then have to leave it to the students to come to us and not a lot of students are willing to come to us as much, so we find, or I find specifically in this campus, a lot of the students who do approach us are the ones who are contemplating it.

Peer educator 5 associates smoker’s lack of readiness to quit smoking with smokers’ reaction to walk abouts. Peer educator 5 described his/her experience with performing walk abouts:

its just sometimes they’re not thinking about quitting, they’re not at that stage so the information they don’t need it, they don’t want it, its not where they’re at now and they don’t want any information, they’re not mean ... They take the information politely ...while other students are receptive of it and they want to take it.

As indicated in Table 11, booth displays were approached by students who choose to approach; with walk abouts to a certain extent peer educators were choosing who to approach. There were different understandings among peer educators about the approach taken during walk abouts and how that was perceived by students on campus. Peer educator 10 believed students see walk abouts as soliciting while booth displays allow students to approach them:

when you talk to people at walk abouts and my experience with it, wearing that shirt and having a bunch of information is almost like you are soliciting
going up to them and you are infringing on them ... whereas if its at a display they are voluntarily coming to you for information, I feel you get a better ratio of acceptance at booth displays compared to walk abouts.

In comparison, peer educator 1 described walk abouts as more laid back and less infringing than booth displays:

Walk abouts people are more inclined and much more easier to talk to compared to display booths ... I find with us we make it more personal, we don’t attack people.

Despite some members disagreeing with each other on which method was more effective, peer educator 1 saw both methods as being effective because of the variability in preference among peer educators: "it’s a good thing that we have that diversity that some of us would like to do walk abouts, others like to do booths.” This describes that the processes which underlie peer education include walk abouts and booth displays as peer educators perceive both methods to be effective for message dissemination.

Team Dynamics and Processes

This theme described dynamics and processes in the team which demonstrated the underlying processes of peer education. As shown in the grey box in Figure 8 this theme includes commitment, involvement, leadership, decision-making around tasks and scheduling, communication and team culture of friendship. This theme responds to the second research question – What processes underlie the peer education teams?

Commitment to and Involvement with the Team

Commitment and involvement on the peer education teams helped the teams to achieve their goals around peer education. The commitment level of one peer educator affected the motivation of others as well as impacted the level of trust and friendship on the team. During focus groups, peer education teams brainstormed definitions for
commitment and involvement. The way the teams defined these terms provided key insight into the functioning of the peer education teams. Being respectful, responsible and reliable were the most cited definitions of commitment from the peer educators. Peer educator 6 believed being committed to the team meant showing respect for fellow teammates. He/she stated: “Show respect for fellow team mates, showing up on time, showing up for booth displays.” Peer educator 7 related commitment to being responsible and reliable. He/she stated: “Commitment usually means helping others, you commit to helping someone else, be there stick to with it.”

Other peer educators discussed commitment in terms of staying focused. To peer educator 3, commitment meant, “Staying both focused and driving towards that goal.” Peer educator 7 related commitment to concentrating on tasks even when it may have
been difficult to accomplish those tasks. He/she stated that to him/her, commitment meant sticking it out, "through thick and thin."

Peer educators also defined and discussed commitment in terms of accomplishing tasks and demonstrating going above and beyond the call of duty. Peer educator 9 believed for the most part his/her team was highly committed because they demonstrated going above and beyond their job description. He/she elaborates:

>a lot of people on the team really enjoy what we are doing and you can tell and they are willing to take that extra step. Maybe they are not even getting paid for those extra hours but they are willing to take that extra step to get stuff done, to make the board look extra good or get that extra registrant.

Peer educators generally defined commitment as a thought and involvement as an action. Peer educator 6 summarized the definitions:

>one is more of a thought and one is more of an action, commitment to me is being emotionally committed to the team, like I believe I am a part of the team, involvement I think is more my actions, I am involved in spreading the word.

Peer educator 9 provided an example of volunteers to show the difference between commitment and involvement. He/she described: "you can be involved in something and not committed, for example, some of our volunteers that are doing it to look good on their resume, they are involved but they are not necessarily committed to what we are doing."

During the second and third individual interviews, the participants discussed the commitment levels of their team and if they had changed along the course of the school year. Many peer educators described specific times throughout the academic year (midterms, final exams) as corresponding to lower levels of commitment and involvement. Other peer educators thought commitment and involvement levels
improved as the academic year advanced due to increased pride in their LTPB position and because as friendships progressed they did not want to let their teammates down.

Peer educator 10 believed team commitment levels on the Ryerson team increased over the course of the year, mainly because they recognized they had a problem with commitment and collectively made an active decision to come together and be committed for the sake of their contest.

Both teams struggled with commitment issues with one member of the team. The peer educators discussed how low commitment of one peer educator could produce negative outcomes for two groups. Low commitment can have a negative effect on the rest of the team; and have an effect on the target audience they serve.

The lack of commitment and involvement of one peer educator could produce negative effects on the rest of the team in terms of bringing down team morale, decreasing trust and friendship, and creating added stress. Peer educator 7 thought the low commitment level of one peer educator could have a negative impact on the entire team, “Bogs down the whole team, for example, if someone is not pulling their weight the whole team has to suffer.” Peer educator 9 and peer educator 10 realized how the low commitment by some peer educators could have had a negative impact on the morale and motivation of the team. Peer educator 10 described: “if you’re supposed to be involved in a display and you are not there, your involvement hurts the other person cause the slack needs to be picked by someone else.” The rest of the team no longer wanted to work with the one problem peer educator because the team could no longer trust that he/she would show up to booth displays, meetings, and team events.
Peer educator 9 believed that the lack of commitment had an impact on the problem peer educator’s friendship with the rest of the team. He/she explained:

its not for the lack of us trying, its just he/she will come to do his/her hours and leave and so you don’t feel as, its not that we haven’t tried to make him/her feel more connected, and inviting her out with us and come in for lunch ... he/she doesn’t really talk to anyone he/she just uses the computer and leaves.

Peer educator 2 explained the added stress the problem peer educator causes resulting in a lack of trust from the other teammates:

[the team has] to pick up the slack and it’s a huge downer to get paired up with [the problem staffer] at this point cause he/she is not dependable and for all they know, they are going to get stuck doing it themselves which isn’t fair ... I know no one wants to work with him/her even at booths cause a lot of times he/she will show up late to a booth or won’t show up or if he/she is supposed to be relieving someone and they have a class he/she will show up 10 minutes late and she will be just like ‘oh sorry I was in the library!’ ... definitely there is starting to be stress surrounding him/her.

Peer educator 2 also believed that commitment of peer educators was imperative to ensuring that their message was disseminated to the students on campus. He/she stated:

Just as simple as showing up, if it was a free for all and come if you feel like it situation, we wouldn’t have booths most of the time. We wouldn’t get anything created or it might take one person hours and it just leads to a lot of equal parts in the team and it makes us get our message out a lot more effectively and lets people know who we are because we have this commitment to each other and the team we are a more effective organization.

Team Cohesion

Team cohesion was an important underlying process of peer education. Peer educators described cohesion as being important to their team because cohesion helped to motivate each other, build off each other’s ideas, get along with one another, act as a support system, increase commitment levels of peer educators, and work effectively. The
commitment issues of one peer educator on each team did affect team cohesion but only between the problem peer educator and the rest of the team.

Peer educator 4 related spending a lot of time together as a team to getting along with one another. He/she stated: "we all have a chance to have our say and to contribute to the group and we meet more than once a week so we spend a lot of time together talking about different issues so definitely we get along." Even within the first couple of months peer educator 2 saw his/her team was beginning to work well as a group. He/she stated: "I am definitely starting to see growth as a team which is amazing to see and there is a lot of excitement when I talk about things that we want to do this year as a team." Peer educator 2 believed the different personalities of peer educators meshed well together and the team became a cohesive unit. He/she stated: "I think I have definitely had positive experiences this year in terms of watching them kind of start to develop as a team." Peer educator 1 related the different personalities of each peer educator to positive assets in terms of team dynamics. He/she described:

great ideas come out of them, we have one member who is amazing at doing research, he’ll find an idea, we’ll take off with that, as a group we can feed off of that and do something great. Each person on our team gives something else ... which I think is great.

Leadership within the team

Peer educators evaluated their Campus Program Coordinator’s and Team Leader’s leadership style and performance and provided definitions of leadership. Peer educators discussed leadership in terms of: organization and management, equality and non-hierarchal, knowledgeable, dedication and commitment, trustworthy, and encouragement and motivation.
Several peer educators believed leadership was important for organization and management to provide direction, motivate the team, and provide feedback to the rest of the team. Peer educator 10 discussed that leadership was important to the team because without it there would be no organization: “goals wouldn’t be reached, everybody does their own thing, on their own time, on their own beliefs.” Peer educator 1 believed leadership, “allows for feedback, making sure you are on the right track, the right direction.” Peer educator 4 believed leadership was important to help motivate and encourage the rest of the team: “congratulate a job well done and encourage us to continue with what we are doing.” One of the Campus Program Coordinator’s commented on the Team Leader’s leadership abilities and how they worked together in the two leadership positions. The two leaders differed in terms of their leadership styles, however this worked to their advantage when managing the team. He/she described:

[The team leader] has done awesome, I find his/her leadership abilities, they compliment mine and I say that cause I know what I expect and I know what I need to help make things work, especially with this team, he/she is not the type of leader where he/she is completely out there and is pushing full force, that would be my kind of role, I think he/she is more the organized one, I guess the best way to put it is if we played good cop, bad cop, I would be the bad cop and he/she would be the good cop.

Peer educator 6 and peer educator 9 described leadership in terms being non-hierarchical. Peer educator 6 and peer educator 9 believed not deriving power, or having a sense of entitlement or authority makes their Campus Program Coordinator a good leader. Furthermore, the aspect of effective delegation was seen by peer educator 9 as an important characteristic of a good leader:

He/she is a step above us but at the same time he/she’s completely on the same level so he/she never makes it feel like ‘I am better than all of you and I am in charge so you must listen to me’ its more just delegation like ‘okay so
you need to get this done this week, this, this, and this.’

Peer educator 2 also discussed the importance of having the Team Leader position. He/she thought the Team Leader helped bridge the gap between leader and followers. The Team Leader emphasized equality within her team, “brings the team really close together because there is not that separation so much between the boss and the group and it really provides a really nice med way into the rest of the group.”

Having high commitment to and involvement in the team was also another quality cited by peer educators as demonstrating good leadership. Several peer educators described the importance of the Campus Program Coordinator being involved in the team’s events and activities:

he/she makes it a point of you know, if we are having a team building time for a banner, booth or poster he/she will be there and he/she will be doing it as well to be a part of the team, I think that’s really key as a leader to not only above but a part of. (Peer educator 4)

He/she works well over the amount of hours that she gets paid for and I think that’s something that in order for an operation like this to run smoothly especially with the amount of special event type things that we do, it’s a necessity. (Peer educator 6)

However, the Campus Program Coordinators described the challenges that came with being too involved or overly committed. As one Campus Program Coordinator stated: “I know its myself so I guess one of the difficulties I have is just kind of dealing with the fact that not everyone is going to be like, ‘Yeah, LTPB! as I am’.” The other Campus Program Coordinator described how he/she had to change his/her leadership style because he/she was over committing him/herself to the LTPB program:

I was advised by Head Office actually to take a huge step back and like let our Team Leader, get thrown into the situation, he/she was definitely overwhelmed, and once I kind of realized that, that wasn’t the way to do it, I
kind of knew that from the beginning but I kept getting advised to leave him/her alone, I took it upon myself to help him/her out and I started doing things where I probably shouldn’t have but...as a result of that I think it has actually helped the team so I think even though it was a challenge for me we definitely accomplished it.

*Collective Vision of the Team*

Examples of communication within the team, weekly team meetings and brainstorming processes reveal an understanding of the collective vision of the team. Communication within the team was one area in which the two teams differed. For McMaster, communication was a major strength within their team where they had little problems throughout the year. For Ryerson, communication between peer educators was a challenge at the beginning of the year. Here communication will be discussed in terms of how communication happens, what communication results in, and challenges to communication.

Weekly team meetings generally operated the same for both McMaster and Ryerson. Both teams had one set weekly team meeting that occurred on the same day and time each week. The team meetings were run either by the Campus Program Coordinator or Team Leader. At times the meetings were formal with agendas. At other times the meetings were informal and were used as brainstorming and creative sessions. The Health Educators were usually informed of the team meetings and occasionally the Health Educators attended the more important and formal meetings. McMaster held weekly team meetings as well as weekly creative sessions where peer educators spent time in their LTPB office working together to prepare to implement activities. For example, during creative sessions peer educators developed a new booth display board and created new fun games for students to play while at booth displays.
Effective communication resulted in the team working well together, providing a comfort for peer educators to work together, and efficiently running and maintaining the team’s LTPB website. Communication within the team allowed the team to work together when certain situations arose. As peer educator 4 described:

there has been times where someone hasn’t been able to make it for their shift so we are close, I pretty much talk to those guys every single day even when I am not working so if I can’t make it to a shift, I can call them, I can somehow get a hold of them easily.

Peer educator 10 related the weekly team meetings to increased communication within his/her team. Peer educator 6 believed communication within his/her team was fairly high. Peer educator 6 described how his/her team stayed in contact with each other and how this helped his/her team run effectively. This quote seems to transcend communication and speaks to the team’s ability of sharing a joint team vision:

we are all on MSN so anything in conflicts in scheduling or anything go away pretty quickly. Anything to do with soliciting for instance or anything work related is usually fairly well thought out too, if [the Campus Program Coordinator] asked someone to do something there’s never any confusion or anything like that.

Peer educator 1 wanted peer educators to feel more comfortable with one another so that they could brainstorm ideas and relay messages more efficiently. He/she stated: “they are comfortable but not to the point where they could just shoot out an email and say ‘hey this is an idea, what’s going on, what do you guys think about it’.” Whether meetings were formal or informal in style proved to be important to the development of message exchange and increased trust between peer educators. Peer educator 9 attributed the informal creative sessions to increased trust and communication within the team.

He/she described:
people show up and they come with ideas and we all work on it together, and I think that has been really effective because its giving them extra time to work together ... and when people are being creative together I find because its more laid back, its not very structured ... it builds a lot of trust and a good atmosphere for the group

Peer educator 10 felt that his/her team had reached a comfort level where they could openly share ideas. He/she described his/her team’s brainstorming process:

the open and honesty of information sharing at our meetings. We are able to come up and suggest something and when something is brought forward like an idea usually without us even saying it, it usually goes around and we get everybody’s opinion on it and if it seems to be a really good idea then we usually try to incorporate it.

There were also some challenges with communication for the Ryerson team at the beginning of the school year. Ryerson had some slight problems with communication between peer educators at the beginning of the year. Peer educator 10 thought having two leaders on a team sometimes created communication problems when assigning the team tasks. He/she described the occasional confusion in communication:

it all seems like our Team Coordinator [Campus Program Coordinator] and our Team Leader need more sort of communication so it gets down to our peer educators because ... once you go through too many people, it gets too long and nothing gets done.

Peer educator 3 agreed that communication was an issue at the beginning of the year. He/she explained: “Communication was one of them, between one another at the beginning of the year ... also getting back to myself and Peer educator 1 what people will be on displays, just kind of getting organized.” Peer educator 10 thought communication would help the team be more organized in assigning tasks: “emails, one might be sent one day ... a whole bunch of ideas going out but you don’t know who is following through with those ideas. So it would be a lot easier if it was specified
who is doing what so you don’t end up doing the same job.” At Ryerson, communication improved throughout the year as peer educators got to know each other better, and there was an improved organization in assigning the team tasks.

*Decision Making Around Tasks and Scheduling*

Assigning tasks and scheduling was challenging as different peer educators have different strengths, class schedules, participation in jobs and other activities. The Campus Program Coordinators on each team found that giving peer educators the freedom to choose their own tasks proved to be very effective. Peer educator 6 believed that the choice helped peer educators to be more committed, excited, and involved in tasks.

He/she stated:

> [The Campus Program Coordinator] kind of gave us a choice of what areas we wanted to work on specifically and I think that really helped people commit to it, helped people get excited about putting more effort into it, if you get to choose what area you are working on you are happy with it.

For Smoke Free Day the McMaster team decided to delegate themselves their own tasks by organizing themselves into smaller committees. Peer educator 2 explained how the team organized themselves to ensure efficiency on the big day:

> the team is really excited about it they have decided they kind of want to break up into committees and each head up a section in Smoke Free Day so someone wants to be in charge of promotions and someone wants to be in charge of media.

Similarly, peer educator 3 discussed distributing tasks among one another based on their own strengths - which worked well for the team. This delegation system provided peer educators with a sense of autonomy: “it gives them the freedom to make their own decisions and it kind of also gives them the feeling of my opinion is worth something, as opposed to I have to ask for permission to change something type of mentality.”
The Ryerson team finally came up with a schedule that worked for everyone on the team by forcing everyone to get together and stay at a meeting until they had a schedule that worked. The McMaster team developed two schedules. Each week collectively they would decide if they would operate on their Wednesday and Friday schedule or their Tuesday and Thursday schedule. The hours on both schedules were set hours each week that never changed. The Team Leader of the McMaster team explained:

they knew pretty much they would be working those hours Tuesday/Thursday every week or Wednesday/Friday so they had those blocked into their schedule. So if they don’t show up for booths its harshly looked at ‘cause it’s not like it’s changing every week. For the past month and half it has been Wednesday/Friday every week so if you don’t show up its kind of like lack of responsibility, it should be in your agenda this is when I work.

It took a while for the Ryerson team to figure out an efficient system to distribute the tasks to the members of the team. At first the Campus Program Coordinator was emailing the team every Sunday a list of tasks they had to complete. This is another example of the team working together towards a shared vision. The Team Leader of Ryerson explained the distribution of tasks:

Sunday night they receive an email pointing out exactly going, you know number #1 and they know who they are, these are your responsibilities for this week, due Friday at 3pm ... they know exactly what they are responsible to do and they are able to get everything done.

Subsequently, the Ryerson team realized that some members would rather perform the same type tasks based on skills, preference and personality. Therefore the same peer educators worked on the same types of tasks throughout the year. For example, one peer educator dealt with all media issues throughout the course of the year, another peer educator dealt with the ‘theme of the month’ each month, and another peer educator specialized in all creativity aspects for the LTPB activities. Peer educator 1 believed this
method of assigning the team tasks was simple yet effective. He/she stated: "it just keeps it simpler and I find they know what to expect, they know what to do instead of having to change it over, it makes it easier definitely."

**Team Culture of Friendship**

The dynamics of the McMaster and Ryerson teams were different. The dynamics of the teams included a representation of the culture of the two teams in terms of friendship. Peer educators discussed their team’s culture as joking or humorous, relaxed, and comfortable.

During several observations, the researcher noticed the McMaster team encouraging each other while the Ryerson team was observed as being restless, stressed and at times disrespectful towards the researcher but respectful and courteous towards each other. At the McMaster focus group the researcher noticed how peer educators were encouraging of each other by stating “good answer” or “good one” after someone had provided an answer to one of the researcher’s questions.

At the first Ryerson focus group, the team started to get restless because the focus group format may have seemed redundant as the team was asked to define several terms. The focus group also began at 6pm and lasted until 8pm, which made it a long day for peer educators who had been at school all day. While the researcher was writing down in point form the team’s answers on the flipchart, the researcher told the team "I feel like a teacher, that everyone is horsing around behind my back!" and the team began to laugh. The researcher felt a little bit disrespected that the team was not taking the focus group as serious as she wanted them to. They were not paying attention at times, making jokes, laughing, and were having several side conversations.
When peer educators individually discussed the culture of their team, several peer educators described humour as a key aspect of their team. As peer educator 5 described:

We are more laid back, we also like jokes and having fun ... like when we are coming up for ideas for posters and we came up with an absurd idea or something really funny we say it anyways just to show [the Campus Program Coordinator] and make him/her laugh, that's a pretty big part of our team, its humour.

Peer educator 9 believed that because they were such a small group, they became close friends joking around with one another. As he/she described:

I would say we have our own inside jokes ... you are working with the same people every week so you get to know the way that they work and it really helps out, so its kind of fun, but I don't think its ever to the point where if anyone comes to the booth they feel its uncomfortable as in this is a little clique and I am not involved, I think its more of a helpful thing.

Peer educator 10 thought the culture of his/her team was very relaxed but also needed structure at times. He/she stated: “I mean our culture was very relaxed but at times needs some sort of structure, its good that [the Campus Program Coordinator] comes with a ‘To-Do List’ or an agenda.”

Peer educator 2 found solace coming to work and being a member of his/her LTPB team. He/she explained the comfortableness of being a LTPB employee helped him/her to forget personal issues. He/she felt relaxed being a member of the LTPB team. As peer educator 2 described:

‘I had a huge fight with my boyfriend last night’ or whatever and then its like we get into the hallway and we are like ‘ahhh’ you know, you put that t-shirt on (LTPB t-shirt) and all of a sudden we are like ‘okay!’ you know?

Friendships within peer educators played an integral role into the overall dynamics of the team. Peer educators discussed what their friendships entailed in and outside of work, and how friendship impacted their team. Peer educators also discussed leadership
in relation to friendship. Peer educator 6 described one of their work outings which turned into a social event:

we did a fundraiser at Quarters [campus bar] we sold candy for like a buck or less ... we only really sold from about 10:30 pm to 12:30 am, we all kind of packed it all up, had fun, a few drinks, dancing.

Peer educator 3 discussed the type of outings where he/she and some members of his/her team got together: “We are very social amongst one another, we do go out on other times than LTPB ... we will meet up you know just go out, see the Blue Man’s Group or just something, non-LTPB related.” Peer educator 4 also discussed that he/she was friends with his/her team mates and they got together for social events outside of work: “once in a while we go out to dinners ... we did Secret Santa together so that was more like a family friend thing ... I played water polo with [two members of the team] so that was fun, it was like aside from work.” Peer educator 1 stated that his/her most rewarding experience over the past year was getting to know and eventually becoming friends with members of his/her team. He/she described how he/she didn’t expect to become such great friends with his/her team mates:

getting to know the peer educators cause they are great people, I didn’t expect myself to get to the point where I wanted to be really good friends with them afterwards but I think I am at that point where I think it would be really cool.

Several peer educators also believed there were smaller groups of friends within the team. Peer educator 4 explained:

I feel like there is groups within the team cause some people have known each other from last year whereas I am new to the team so I am kind of just starting to get to know people and I do feel closer to some people than others just based on I guess more related in age or their program.

Peer educator 6 discussed smaller friendships on the team as being somewhat alienating
because of the inside jokes they had with each other and the rest of the team would not know what they were talking about. Conversely, peer educator 2 believed that smaller friendships within the team helped to increase the enjoyable time peer educators had while at work.

The Campus Program Coordinator of Ryerson wanted to really encourage friendships being built on the team because he/she believed that friendships foster increased responsibility to the team. The Campus Program Coordinator explained how he/she may have pushed friendships a little too much:

I think I pushed it too far, I wanted them to feel comfortable with one another to I guess you could say build a little minor community within LTPB, I find that when you make friendships and you deal with people, it makes you want to do better sometimes and it makes you feel more responsible in doing work and that was my whole objective of it but I think that it went a little too far and now they are a little too comfortable with each other.

One of the Campus Program Coordinator’s thought the Team Leader sometimes did not know where to draw the line between being a leader and being a friend. He/she stated:

the Team Leader, I think it’s a great thing that he/she is having that flexibility and that comfort with them but it may also be a problem because they are friends with the other people, like ‘can you push this deadline just a little bit more just so that we can get this thing done now I have school?’

The same Campus Program Coordinator commented on his/her own strategy to stay friends with the team while also remaining respected as a leader. This involved keeping a “bit of a distance” or a “good space” between him/herself and other members of the team. One of the Team Leaders discussed how he/she managed being a friend and a leader to their ‘problem peer educator’:

everyone is already told in the beginning that you work for LTPB so that’s
where we have to get the work done even though we are still friends ... at LTPB I dealt with him/her, I was his/her manager, quote unquote and he/she was the employee, but the moment we leave that aspect and we are in the classroom we are classroom buddies.

In terms of friendship and leadership peer educator 9 believed that his/her Campus Program Coordinator would rather be respected by his/her team mates as their leader. Peer educator 9 commented on his/her Campus Program Coordinator’s approach to leadership, “He/she doesn’t really care if you like him/her, he/she more cares if you respect him/her, its not I want to be your bestest friend, its do you respect me enough to know what I am talking about and that what I am telling you to do.” This quote provided important insight into successful leadership. Peer educator 9 believed successful leadership was about obtaining respect not acquiring more friends.

*Macro Influence on Peer Education*

Peer educators were influenced by factors outside the team including campus characteristics, campus culture, tobacco policies at each university and support from the various university administrations on campus. Within each theme there are examples which hinder or enhance the peer education process. Supports from the university included financial support, administrative support, school showing support for LTPB activities and school newspaper support. These different types of support from the macro environment affected the peer education teams in terms of their successes and challenges. The relationship with the campus clinic and the influence of Head Office will also be discussed in terms of how it affected the workings of the peer education teams. This theme responds to the third research question - What influences in the macro environment affect the functioning of the peer education teams? The themes are depicted
in Figure 9 (see grey shaded box) and the relationship of these macro influences on team dynamics and processes and the modes of message delivery are also shown (see arrows on Figure 9).

**Figure 9.** The macro influences on peer education teams and the peer educators.

**Campus Characteristics and Culture**

The McMaster and Ryerson campuses created different environments for the LTPB teams to work. Many peer educators described several characteristics of their campus as either enhancing or hindering their success as a LTPB team, including:

- laid back and open mindedness of students;
- health conscious campus;
• small size and location of university;

• having a Student Centre/central meeting place and the layout of their campus;

• having a diversity of students on campus; and

• open, closed or commuter type campus.

Several peer educators related the laid back and accepting nature of students on their campuses to the success of their team. Peer educator 5 related students on Ryerson’s campus to being open minded of receiving resources which acts as a benefit to his/her team: “People are used to people giving them stuff, information, they are more tolerant of getting resources, getting handouts.”

Several members of the McMaster team commented on the emphasis of healthy living on their campus in both the academic programs offered and the proportion of non-smokers on campus. Peer educator 8 believed the emphasis on healthy living correlated with his/her team’s objectives and promoted the agenda of LTPB. He/she stated:

there is this drive towards more health promotion, fitness, exercise and now smoking, so I think that has triggered more emphasis towards our group and our program, there is more out there saying smoking is bad for you.

Peer educator 9 attributed the McMaster campus being located in Hamilton to having a low smoking population. Peer educator 9 discussed the high pollution in Hamilton in relation to health conscious students on campus. He/she stated:

... a lot of people know that Hamilton it’s a dirty place to begin with and that the air isn’t that great and a lot of people know about the health hazards when they move here ... its an industrial city ... I think people know that ... so there are like ‘I really don’t want to pollute my lungs anymore than they already have to be’.

A low smoking population on campus also was perceived as making it difficult for the team to educate many students about tobacco awareness. Peer educator 9 added:
"Schools with less non-smokers may have more success with rates and sheer numbers.” Peer educator 2 explained the challenge of recruiting 100 peer educators for the contest due to McMaster’s low smoking rate:

the goal was always to get 100, and for Mac that’s a good number, we tend to have a smaller smoker base than some schools, like the typical university base is supposedly 25% smokers but really its not the case here and even that was kind of an obstacle that we faced with study recruitment cause a lot of the times we would go back to people this time of the year and they would be like ‘you got me in the fall’ so maybe its just the same people that smoke on campus.

Campus characteristics such as having a small sized university and the location were mentioned by the peer educators as influencing the work that they do. Peer educator 4 believed McMaster’s small campus facilitated their team in disseminating their LTPB messages to students. He/she stated: “it’s a small campus so we can, its easier to reach the students because they are all kind of in a smaller area.”

On of the main differences between the campuses was the presence or absence of a Student Centre. McMaster had a Student Centre where large amounts of students can eat, meet, and socialize. Peer educator 6 related the Student Centre to their success at reaching students. He/she stated: “I think the fact that the Student Centre is a very central building ... the Student Centre is great place for booths, makes our job a bit easier, there is less response in department buildings.” Ryerson did not have a Student Centre. Peer educator 10 from Ryerson commented on the students of different faculties segregating themselves. The researcher believed this could have been due to Ryerson not having a central meeting place for the entire university population. Peer educator 10 explained:
when you talk about Ryerson university its hard to speak cause your going to hear a different view from everybody in different disciplines, if you are in Nursing, or Engineering, or Business, Nursing people are only in one area and Business people are only in one area, same with the Engineers.

At Ryerson, many peer educators discussed how their peer education team became lost in the lack of a central meeting place and other people or organizations competed for students’ attention. Peer educator 1 related the fast pace of Toronto to the difficulty in gaining the attention of students while performing walk abouts. Being in the downtown core of Toronto, Ryerson students were used to being handed information on the streets and on campus. Some Ryerson peer educators considered this a contributor to their success while others considered it a challenge to their success. Peer educator 3 believed Ryerson students mimicked the qualities of the metropolitan city and therefore had no time to engage in a conversation with a peer educator. Peer educator 1 believed that being located in Toronto where students see flashy advertisements everyday also made their job more difficult to stand out. Peer educator 1 explained:

*We definitely have to be a lot different than a lot of other things out there because I guess the whole media aspect of it, students here see more than enough advertisements, it’s a blur so we have to step up and be different, so it makes it that much harder than everybody else.*

Several peer educators discussed how having a diverse campus acted as a contributor to their team’s success. Peer educator 1 believed Ryerson’s campus diversity allowed his/her team to also be diverse. Peer educator 1 explained: “*Because its so diverse it allows our team to be diverse and allows us to have more perspectives I guess you could say that we can include.*” Peer educator 1 and peer educator 10 believe the diversity of Ryerson’s campus acted as a facilitator to his/her team’s success. Peer
Peer educator 1 thought the diversity helped to keep his/her team energized as well as generated creative ideas for message dissemination. As he/she described:

I think the fact that our campus is so diverse, our team is able to pick out the diversity and that because we are also in Toronto it makes things a lot more interesting and keeps our team definitely energized and definitely willing to find other methods of getting the word across because we are again in downtown Toronto being this is somewhat of a media campaign you know we are not always looking to take the same approach as everybody else is.

For peer educator 10, he/she believed that because his/her campus was so diverse, it contributed to students being open minded about listening to what he/she and his/her team had to say about tobacco awareness.

An open or closed style campus was discussed by the peer educators as having an effect on the work that they do. Peer educator 1 believed Ryerson’s open style and commuter type campus acted as a barrier to his/her team being successful because students did not stay on campus long enough to participate in social events. He/she explained:

if we do have an event its hard to get students to come to our event cause especially if its after hours because again a lot of students do commute so that’s always a huge aspect.

Peer educator 10 commented on Ryerson being a commuter school and how it affected students’ independence. He/she stated: “Everybody goes at their own pace, everybody seems very independent, its very much a commuter school, everybody commutes in does their work and leaves.” Peer educator 10’s quote indicates the hindrance to their LTPB team’s success because students did not stay around and socialize on campus due to their eagerness to return home. Peer educator 10 also believed that since many students commuted to school, they did not spend a lot of time on campus outside of the classroom.
Peer educator 10 believed since students did not remain on campus for long periods, this had an effect on the students remembering their peer educational messages. Peer educator 6 believed McMaster, like Ryerson was also a commuter school. Being a commuter school acted as a barrier to the work of the peer education team because students were not on campus to receive the education from the peer education team. Peer educator 6 stated: “a lot of people are not around on weekends or out of high traffic times.”

Campus Tobacco Policies

The tobacco policies in place during the time of study at McMaster and Ryerson was no smoking indoors and no smoking within nine meters (McMaster) or twenty feet (Ryerson) of a building entrance. Several peer educators discussed the prohibition of selling cigarettes and sponsoring cigarettes companies on campus, the lack of students who abide by the policies, the lack of enforcement of tobacco policies on campus and the impact tobacco policies had on the peer education teams. Peer educators from both universities discussed the same frustrations and challenges with tobacco policies on their campuses.

At McMaster, policies ban the selling of cigarettes and sponsoring cigarette companies. Ryerson did not own any convenience stores on campus but Ryerson did prohibit the sponsoring of tobacco companies. Peer educator 9 stated: “No selling of cigarettes on campus, its policy.” As well, peer educator 2 added: “there is no tobacco sponsorship allowed.”

Several peer educators described McMaster’s tobacco policies as a hindrance to their success. Peer educator 2 believed: “some people obey the nine meter rule but those are the ones who are against a smoke free campus because they are already
abiding by the nine meter rule.” Several peer educators discussed the reason students did not abide by the policies on campus was because they were simply unaware the policies were in effect. Even if students were aware of policies on campus, locations of the ‘butt-stops’ were within nine meters of a door. Peer educator 9 explained how this causes confusion for smokers: “since the ‘butt-out or butt-stop’ little things aren’t nine meters from the door, it makes no sense … even if they [students] are informed it’s confusing.”

Many of the peer educators discussed the lack of enforcement of tobacco policies on campus. The lack of enforcement was directly related to who currently was or should have been responsible for enforcing the policies. Several peer educators discussed Campus Security’s reluctance of being responsible for enforcing tobacco policies on campus. Peer educator 1 believed it was the duty of the university’s faculty and staff to monitor and enforce the tobacco policies on campus. Just as McMaster’s Campus Security did not want to enforce policies, peer educator 1 believed Ryerson’s faculty and staff did not want to do it either because they were not pressured to do the enforcement. Peer educator 10 believed the lack of enforcement discredited the work of their LTPB team. He/she described:

no one really abides by the rules of smoking 20 feet away from the doors but since its not enforced it obviously hurts us because … we would be like ‘look you are not allowed to smoke here’ and they would be like ‘yeah well no one is stopping me’ so it sort of just totally discredits you and that’s the one thing that the school is not doing.

About half of peer educators thought more strict policies would contribute to their success, while the other half thought more strict policies would actually hinder their success. Peer educator 6 sees the issue as debateable either way. He/she believed their
LTPB team could help the smokers who would be thinking about quitting because of the strict policies. But peer educator 6 also believed there could be some negative backlash from the smokers who would think the LTPB organization was the force behind making the policies more strict. Peer educator 9 believed smokers would associate more strict policies with LTPB, such as ticketing smokers and therefore create negative repercussions for their team. He/she explained:

if tomorrow security started patrolling and fining people they would be like ‘is it your fault that security has started patrolling? Did you put them up to this? Are you the ones who are making them do this?’ and then we will lose that respect from smokers.

Several peer educators commented on students not abiding by the tobacco policies on campus. Peer educator 6 believed that the location of McMaster’s Student Centre and the way the building was constructed acted as a hindrance to the nine-meter policy. Peer educator 6 explained:

the nine meters from the door policies, staff and students barely ever think about it, especially with the Students Centre, just the way it is constructed is kind of against that, with the way that things overhang to keep the snow out and stuff so to be nine meters away from the door you would be out in like the cold in the middle of the courtyard.

Conversely, peer educator 10 believed more strict tobacco policies on campus would help credit the work of their team. Peer educator 10 explained, “It would definitely be more helpful because then at least we could show that things are being done and that it is an issue that is being addressed.”

How the University Supports Peer Education Teams

University campuses support or lack of support for their LTPB team had a direct impact on work of the teams. Analysis of the data suggests that campuses can be
supportive to the teams administratively, including support from the Health Educators and through each school showing support for LTPB activities. The support from the campus newspapers, and the campus clinic were also important factors to the teams being successful.

**Relationship with administration on campus.** Peer educators discussed their relationship with administration on campus as having an effect on the work that they do. Administration was discussed by the peer educators in four types of ways: financial support from administrations on campus, challenges with administration reserving space for LTPB activities, lack of administration affiliating themselves with LTPB, and the process of administration approving media-related resources.

Both McMaster and Ryerson LTPB teams received financial support from several different organizations and groups on campus. Ryerson University itself contributed an overall of $1000 each year for the contest winners in each of the four categories. Both teams also had peer educators who were involved in the Ontario Work-Study Program (OWSP). This was another aspect in which the universities supported the LTPB teams financially. The OWSP assists students who demonstrate financial need to meet exceptional costs, often unexpected, and not recognized under OSAP (Ryerson University, 2005). Work Study is a component of OSAP. Work Study is funded by the Ministry of Training Colleges and Universities as well as each University. The three peer educators involved in the OWSP were paid the equivalent to what LTPB would pay them.

Administration presented both teams with challenges when they were trying to reserve space on campus for their booth displays and other LTPB events. The
administration at both universities were not supportive in showing affiliation between the university and LTPB. However, both teams had some positive experiences dealing with administration. Overall, both teams were content with their university’s administrative support that provided them with sufficient LTPB office space on campus. The McMaster and Ryerson teams had challenges with reservation procedures, or lack there of, to book space within their campus to hold booth displays and other events. Ryerson did not have any procedures to follow in order to book displays with the administration at their school, it was on a “first come, first serve basis”. Peer educator 3 described his/her frustrations with finding a good location on campus to hold their booth displays and competing with off campus organizations such as MasterCard and Vector Marketing. Similarly, peer educator 6 described his/her frustrations with booking displays where student-run groups, such as LTPB did not have any priority over non-student run groups who were selling clothing or accessories. He/she explained:

bookings for tables ... its kind of weird that there’s not some sort of precedence for us ... like we have to line up in the same line as like the guy who sells bracelets or whatever, like its not worthy of being in the marketplace.

The policy on booking booth displays at McMaster changed several times throughout the academic year, which caused some confusion for the LTPB team. This caused frustration when reserving events and booth displays on campus. Peer educator 3 wanted less bureaucracy around campus, especially in residences. Peer educator 3 thought less bureaucracy would mean more effectiveness in obtaining access to residences to promote LTPB activities.
There were several instances where administrations did not publicly affiliate themselves with the LTPB team on campus. This was discouraging for many of the peer educators because a lack of affiliation to them meant a lack of support. Several peer educators from both teams wished that their LTPB campus website could be accessed through their university’s website. Many peer educators felt alienated as a student-run organization because there was no link from their school’s website to their LTPB website. Peer educator 3 believed that Ryerson’s Student Union was not supportive of their LTPB team because LTPB was technically not a Student Union group. He/she explained the frustrations with not being affiliated as a Ryerson group:

our Ryerson Student Union is not very supportive of it, they have an entire board with little flyers we can’t even put our flyers there just because it is strictly for Student Union groups and we are technically with Brock University so we are not with them, so we are not allowed to have our, even though we work on campus, so from them we don’t get a lot of support.

Peer educator 10 believed Ryerson University could support his/her team better if they helped to promote LTPB through a visible booth on campus and through their website. He/she explained:

if there was a designated booth in like one of the main lobby’s or on a corner of the street or something where students would walk by everyday, that would be huge for Ryerson as a whole. Anything along those lines of having a central location or even a central theme that Ryerson could even promote would be better, put it on their website, put it on a specific place on their website, have a special link to Ryerson university website.

Teams also need approval from administration to put up posters around campus. Peer educator 1 enjoyed the efficiency of obtaining approval and working with Student Services for posters. Conversely, peer educator 3 wished administration would have approved some of their racy posters to put up around campus because these types of
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Posters would have attracted more attention to their LTPB program. Peer educator 1

found administration challenging to the team in terms of getting anything LTPB related
approved. He/she stated: “there is a lot of red tape with administrative stuff, to get
things started, to get things going, to get things approved, that’s always a
challenge.”

Support from campus Health Educators. In terms of administration, overall both
teams had positive experiences with their campus Health Educators. Ryerson had a
Director of Health Promotions and a Health Promotions Nurse that assisted their LTPB
team while McMaster usually dealt with just one Health Educator. Health Educators were
essentially the supervisors of the LTPB teams. They supervised but were not involved
with all the miniscule day-to-day activities. The Campus Program Coordinators were to
inform the Health Educators in advance of any major changes to the team including
management, programming, or operational protocols. Peer educators discussed the Health
Educators as helping their team:

• with administration – printing letters, envelopes, linking with campus health, linking
  with other resources on campus;
• creatively – providing practical ideas and experience;
• by providing guidance and leadership – answering health questions, support to the
  team.
• in writing proposals and budgeting for campus events.

Two peer educators from Ryerson were grateful for the hands on approach of the
Health Promotions Nurse, however at times they felt her over-involvement created more
work for their team. As they explain:
I found at points she almost made extra work for us to do because the year before we had the freedom to do whatever, this year we had more obligations to her, because she was here this year and she did it different than our other Health Nurse. (Peer educator 1)

She is too involved ... If we were a part of Ryerson then I would understand cause we are actually under her wing, whereas we are actually under Brock’s so things like having to report to her with all the weekly reports ... we should actually do for Brock and Brock asks me of that. That’s a little bit too much at times on our belief, but it’s her style of keeping on track and knowing exactly what we are doing. I don’t know if it’s her way of trying to control us exactly. (Peer educator 3)

_School showing support for LTPB activities._ Sometimes organizations or groups of people could not support the two teams financially or administratively, but there were other ways in which the teams felt they were supported by the faculties and administrations on their campus such as:

- emotional and verbal support – letters received in response to Smoke Free Day;
- helping to promote awareness of their team – professors who distributed resources and made referrals, being invited to residence training, bookstore distributed LTPB bookmarks;
- symbolic support – faculties and administrations wearing pins and hanging posters; and
- resource supports – donated space from campus pubs.

Support from campus newspapers. Both LTPB teams used their school newspapers for positive promotion of LTPB and their activities through advertisements and articles. The experience working with campus newspapers was very different for each team. The Ryerson team had a positive experience while the McMaster team’s newspaper’s lack of support had a direct impact on the team’s emotional state and overall effectiveness.
The LTPB team of McMaster started off on a positive note with their newspapers. Peer educator 2 described the supportive relationship they had with the Silhouette at the beginning of the year:

one of the editors came and actually approached me to make an interview with me during Welcome Week cause she wanted to interview me to see who we were, what we were about, and like we got mentioned in the paper the very first week of school just like, ‘this place is here if you want like this is what they are there for so’.

Peer educator 2 noted how the Silhouette seemed extremely interested in their upcoming contest and Smoke Free Day. This was a welcomed support since last year the McMaster team had some problems with a certain individual writing negative opinion pieces about them. This year it happened again. The McMaster team described the “Scary Smoking Guy” who wrote anti-LTPB articles flooded with opinions rather than factual information about smoking. In addition to being antagonistic towards peer educators in face-to-face interactions, the antagonistic student had wrote an article titled “Butt out and mind your own.” which was written in the January 19, 2006 edition of the Silhouette. The first line of his article stated, “Am I the only one who’s had enough of these “smoke-free week” girls?” The article had quite an impact on the team and brought down team morale. Peer educator 4 explained his/her feelings towards the antagonistic student and the negative publicity this provided for LTPB:

I know peer educator 2 was really upset, mostly because it was just such bad publicity, cause a lot of people read the paper ... people do a lot of times listen to what they read, especially because there was nothing else to contradict that, what we are and what we actually do so people who don’t know were getting this impression of all wrong information so I guess we were kind of upset about that.
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Peer educator 4 wrote a rebuttal article printed in the Silhouette on February 2, 2006 titled, “Butt out of smoke out”. In the article peer educator 4 stated:

“As one of those “smoke-free girls”, I felt it was necessary to write a response to the appalling accusations made by [student’s name] as well as to clear up the many misunderstandings resulting from a lack of adequate research conducted by the author.”

However, peer educator 2 explained the negative impact the article could have had on their upcoming Smoke Free Day:

I am in the middle of getting support from McMaster Student’s Union [MSU] for Smoke Free Day and its just the worst possible time to put out his article cause now MSU is concerned about negative responses we might get for Smoke Free Day and they are considering not funding us.

Unfortunately the McMaster Students Union Affairs Fund that her team applied for was not accepted and subsequently they did not receive funding for their Smoke Free Day due to the negative press they received.

Ryerson had a much more positive experience with their school newspapers, “The Ryersonian” and the “EyeOpener”. For the Ryerson team, peer educator 10 was mainly in charge of media. Peer educator 10 thought it was surprisingly easy to get support this year from the newspaper. In previous years they had some issues. He/she explained, “non-acceptance last year ... I didn’t really have any problem, I was expecting a lot more politics behind it but really there was nothing really.” Peer educator 10 discussed his/her experience with the newspaper: “when I went to them just last week on my own to talk to them they were receptive, they were like ‘yeah sure we’ll do it’.”

Relationship with campus clinic. McMaster had a full campus health clinic open to students on campus. Ryerson had no medical health clinic at all on campus. LTPB
teams whose campus was equipped with student health clinics were responsible for keeping the clinics stocked with LTPB resources (posters, Quit kits, nicotine replacement therapies, notepads, and business cards). LTPB teams were encouraged to have a reciprocal relationship with campus clinics. LTPB teams would refer students to the campus clinic to receive professional medical help in quitting smoking while campus clinics would refer patients who smoke to LTPB to receive peer education and support. Peer educator 2 believed his/her team had a good working relationship with the clinic because the clinic advertised their services as a reputable student health service. Peer educator 2 believed their campus clinic was supportive of their work. He/she explained: "Clinic is really supportive of us they hand out our packages, business cards, pamphlets, bookmarks ... clinic recognizes us as a reputable student service."

Peer educator 6 described the positive working relationship between his/her team and the clinic on campus:

we are actually very close with the health clinic ... we haven’t had a lot of referrals this year back and forth but if they have anyone who smokes who has a health concern they send them to [the Campus Program Coordinator] and I think I have only done one or two referrals but anyone who comes to us and they say they have tried quitting and even tried the gum or the patch and its not working they can get Zyban if they just talk to a doctor.

*LTPB Head Office.* Head Office played a major supervisory role to all LTPB teams. The teams received programming instructions and had bi-weekly conference calls with Research Coordinators from Head Office. Each week teams were to send in weekly quotas to Head Office including quotas of: the number of interactions, study recruitment numbers and the amount of resources distributed. Head Office controlled the major decisions concerning programming and management at each campus. Head Office had an
effect on the peer education teams in terms of: technical aspects, communication, design of resources, and demands on the teams.

Both teams had communication troubles from Head Office to their Team Leader. There was a Listserv where Head Office emailed information such as tasks to be completed and updates to the Team Leaders of every LTPB team who then passed on the information to their web specialists. The web specialist from McMaster explained their communication difficulties: “At the beginning of the year we had a little trouble with the web administration just communicating between campuses and messages were getting lost.” Peer educator 1 agreed that they were having a communication problem with Head Office by saying, “we were having problems with our Head Office not sending in certain stuff and keeping people out of the loop even though they should be in the loop … I thought it wasn’t great.” Similarly, the Team Leader of Ryerson described his/her frustrations with Head Office and the miscommunication ultimately causing him/her to not be on the ListServ for the entire year.

Many of the peer educators spoke about their frustrations with Head Office controlling decisions about their design of LTPB resources. Peer educators enjoyed the freedom to tailor the LTPB program to their campus. This included making decisions surrounding: posters, themes, displays and the website. Peer educator 3 and peer educator 6 shared their distaste for the new website layout because it hindered information sharing. Peer educator 10 enjoyed that LTPB was student orientated and believed that LTPB was an organization that really understood their target audience. Peer educator 9 discussed how focus groups were conducted on some of the LTPB resources. Several Campus Program Coordinators provided constructive comments on some of the resources but felt
their criticisms were not taken into account by Head Office. Peer educator 9 explained, “the things that they discussed at that critiquing and the comments that they put in weren’t taken into consideration and weren’t changed.”

Many peer educators commented on Head Office being demanding of the team. Peer educator 1 became a little stressed out when Head Office put pressure on his/her team. However, peer educator 1 believed the pressure from Head Office had a positive effect on the team:

*when I get pressure from Head Office to do certain things I then put pressure upon the team … it does put them at like okay now we have got to be a little bit better make sure things run a little bit more on task.*

Peer educator 1 also commented on Head Office asking LTPB teams to perform research on the LTPB program during exams. Peer educator 1 explained his/her frustrations with Head Office’s demands:

*there is an issue that I have recently started to deal with, Brock wants us to do research on our first week of exams, getting students to sign up for research, I think its ridiculous for our peer educators especially because of the fact that they are here for school, we are not here to do this stuff, I mean we should be but at the same time school is our number one priority.*

The Ryerson team believed they had been successful this year at contest recruitment as well. Peer educator 3 believed his/her team would have probably been able to recruit more contest participants if it was not for the Brock research study. Head Office’s demands of recruiting for their research study impeded on the team’s ability to reach their quotas for their regular work, such as contest recruitment. Peer educator 5 believed that weekly quotas were important to Head Office and this pressure caused the team stress. He/she stated:

*I think the numbers are important to Brock and that’s why they’re trying to*
push with everything ... they want us to get rid of our information and put up all the posters and things like that, so sometimes that stress comes down on the team.

Outcomes of the Peer Education Process

Themes around the peer educator’s understanding of LTPB and smoking, the individual as peer educator, team structures and dynamics and the macro influence on peer education combined to have an effect on the outcomes of the peer education process. Outcomes of the peer education process include the receptivity from students, building relationships, teamwork, and observable successes. Figure 5 is presented again as Figure 10 and shows each of the previously discussed sections and their impact on the outcomes of the peer education process (grey shaded box on Figure 10).

Receptivity from Students

The peer educators discussed receptivity from students in one of three ways: how they were received, how they were received in direct connection to their approach, and how receptivity affected the functioning of the team. Generally peer educators on both teams discussed their LTPB messages being well received by the students on campus. If not positive, students were unresponsive.

Peer educators believed their LTPB message was well received by students because they were eagerly asking for information about smoking cessation, attending events and signing up for the contest. Peer educator 4 explained:

you would think that most people would like their smoking because they want to smoke and they are happy with it but its actually not true cause a lot of people are smoking but they want to quit, they just can’t. So I think that when they see us out there, if they have never heard of us they are really interested so I have had a lot of people come up to me and just be like ‘do you guys have anymore information, like what can I do?’ So I think its well received.
Figure 10. The outcomes of the peer education process.
Peer educator 4 related students’ enthusiasm as an indicator of the team’s success. He/she described:

I felt successful when they got excited and they are like ‘oh my gosh, yeah you can help me!’ or “there is a contest I can win stuff for quitting, I want to quit anyways” so just I felt I accomplished something and I felt successful because I felt I taught them something, I helped them learn something new about what they can do to stop smoking.

Peer educators were not always positively received by the students on campus. Peer educator 6 felt the most difficult situations he/she had dealt with were the students who were smokers and very proud of being smokers and were not receptive to the LTPB program. He/she described:

the most difficult situation I have been in are the people who are very proud of the fact that they smoke ... its still not the easiest situation to deal with when there is a couple of people that hang out at the booth or at least passing by and making sort of remarks about their own opinions.

In addition to the previously discussed incident involving the campus newspaper, the only other incident of a lack of receptivity with students on campus involved a male student and the CO tester at a booth display. The CO tester was having technical difficulties and some students were blowing extremely high readings. Peer educator 2 described how the students were making a mockery out of the CO tester: “this couple came and they did a CO test and one of them blew a 102 and he got excited about it, he was like ‘oh my god, that’s awesome’.” The one male student who blew a reading of 102 then went and got six of his smoking friends to try to see who could blow the highest CO reading.

Peer educator 9 thought their team may have been receiving so much positive support because of their approach. They did not pressure students to quit smoking. Peer
educator 9 stated: "I think we are generally well received 'cause students aren’t being intimidated, they are not being pressured." Peer educator 1 also believed the LTPB message was well received on campus because they did not pressure students to quit and they treated students as adults who could make their own decisions. Peer educator 1 explained how their approach was directly related to the receptivity shown by students:

The students that we have spoken to who understand our message and our points of view definitely feel that it is a good thing, they enjoy the fact that they are not being pressured and its not like what a lot of high schools used to do, scare tactics, we are not pressuring people into stopping ... We are giving information out and letting them make the informed decisions themselves.

Peer educator 9 believed students’ receptivity to their LTPB team had an impact on how the team functioned. Peer educator 9 thought the students’ receptiveness of their team helped to increase their team’s motivation. He/she explained: "I think because the students are being so responsive its really keeping everyone’s spirits high right now, no one has been like, “we really don’t care". Similarly, peer educator 9 also related students who were unresponsive to bringing down their team morale. He/she explained: "I mean you can get students who are just like that “I don’t care what you do” and if you get enough of those in a day its enough to take someone down and be like, “why am I doing this?” Peer educator 9 described a specific case with one individual who did not understand LTPB’s peer education efforts. Peer educator 9 described how this made him/her frustrated and brought down his/her morale:

there is one of my peers ... he constantly comes up to the booth and he is just like ‘I don’t understand why you do this cause all my roommates smoke and I don’t care, I don’t care if they’re around me, I don’t care’ and I am like ‘but they are hurting you too’ and he’s ‘nope I just don’t care’ ... it makes the rest of your day be like ‘oh I don’t want to be at booth, no one wants to talk to me.’
Building Relationships

Building relationships between peer educators and students was an important goal of the peer education teams. Peer educators wanted to be supportive to students who wanted to quit smoking, educate students about living smoke-free and become more approachable. Earlier reported in understanding, peer educator 2’s boyfriend analogy was his/her biggest success with educating students on campus. Peer educator 2 discussed the female student who he/she had a conversation about quitting smoking and related it to breaking up with a boyfriend. Furthermore, peer educator 2 described his/her lasting impact on the female student: “she will come in a couple of times [to their LTPB office] and since and be like “still not smoking!” and I am like “awww!” I can’t even remember her name but it just made me feel so good.” Peer educator 3 and peer educator 10 also built personal relationships with students. Peer educator 10 described his/her experience with helping a student to quit smoking:

this gentlemen has approached me ... I have seen him around the school every so often, I mean he does currently smoke but he showed a lot of emphasis on wanting to quit or at least cut back a lot and I guess I was just there at the right time so I gave him all the information and it felt sort of empowering for me because, this is my chance to pass on what I know and my experiences to hopefully help this person, so in that aspect I felt like I was actually taking part of the role of peer educator.

Teamwork

Several peer educators discussed working together as a team as being a sign of their team being successful. Peer educator 10 related the team working together as an indicator of success. He/she explained how the team demonstrated teamwork setting up
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for the contest party: “We had a lot of help setting up the place too, it took four hours, a lot of us came out early to help organize, help set up, take down. There wasn’t just one or two people trying to set up the whole thing.” Reflecting over the past academic year, peer educator 10 also related his/her team’s success to the determination of peer educators:

I think we have done a lot more than even last year, some of them last year I don’t they got the message out nearly as much as what we have. I think it has a lot to do with everybody on the team is more determined to perform their office hours, to go out and displays and actually be actively involved in telling everyone to come out, [the Campus Program Coordinator] has done a lot on his/her own personal time to make sure that the message gets across.

Peer educator 9 noted increased confidence in the team as a success indicator.

Peer educator 1 explained how the team had been working well together due to increased organization and understanding:

the team working together to get everything organized ... we now understand where we are all coming from so I think that is a huge step in the right direction for the team and now we know who we are and what to do, what we need to get done and if one person isn’t able to, maybe they can speak to another person to get help, so I think that’s a huge accomplishment.

Peer educator 3 discussed how finally finding a schedule that worked for the whole team enabled the team to ultimately work together. Peer educator 3 explained: “Learning to set up our scheduling so that we can actually work together which was a big issue at first.”

Peer Educators’ Perceptions of Successes

Peer educators’ perceptions of successes described by peer educators include:

Smoke Free Day, quantitative indicators, directly impacting students’ smoking behaviours, sharing positive stories with each other and inspiring students to become
involved in tobacco initiatives. Overall, program awareness and reach was the most cited goal by the peer educators. Peer educators wanted to try and reach as many students as possible, have successful communication campaigns, and spread the word of LTPB in a positive way. Peer educator 6 described the importance of Smoke Free Day for LTPB to become more known among students:

we are trying to be more effective ... hand out more materials, be more active, have a presence on campus, like when we did Smoke Free Day last year up until then nobody really knew on campus, who we were so since then a lot of people do now. I know its kind of spreading and I think we are trying keep going a lot, just become a little more known.

Peer educators also discussed reaching large quantities of students on campus and correlated quantity with team success. For example, peer educator 9 personally validates team success with quantitative indicators. He/she explained:

I think the signs of success for us is if people access our website because obviously they read our resource and they saw our website and saw where they have logged on. If we give away those small books, Smoke/Quit books those are more obviously more indicative then if we give away a sticker or a pamphlet or something.

The team knew they had been successful because they ultimately had a direct impact on several Ryerson students quitting and reducing smoking as well as staying smoke free.

Peer educator 3 explained the outcomes of the contest:

Quit for Good we had one person who completed it successfully, so he got the $500, gift basket and a hug [joking]. We had one person who won the Party Without the Pack, well we had three people, one person who got the main prize which was $200 and a gift basket and we had one person who won the Keep the Count.

Peer educator 1 related students’ actual quitting smoking to being successful as a peer educator. He/she stated: “we find that to be a success indicator and then they come
back and they remember our names and they say ‘hey how’s it going!’ They keep us updated upon whether or not they are still smoking or not.”

Smoke Free Day also had an impact on students’ smoking behaviours. Peer educator 2 noticed the number of students who were listening to their keynote speaker, Shaine Peters. Peer educator 2 believed Smoke Free Day was a success at getting tobacco-related messages across to the students on campus. Peer educator 4 believed Smoke Free Day could have also helped students to quit smoking because they also distributed Nicorette (nicotine replacement therapy). As well, one of the volunteers noticed that there were not as many students outside smoking on campus on Smoke Free Day. Peer educator 9 stated: “Sam [volunteer] said he thought it seemed that there were less people smoking outside.”

Inspiring students to become involved in tobacco initiatives was another instance where peer educators knew they were being successful. Peer educator 9 also described how Smoke Free Day inspired a student on campus to try to start her own petition to encourage the enforcement of the nine-meter policy. Peer educator 9 explained:

one girl came up and asked me about the nine meter rule and was very intense about it and like ‘do people know about this nine meter rule?’ ... and she was just like ‘what can I do about it or what can you do’ ... ‘well I am thinking about it, can I start a petition?’ and I am like ‘100% you can start your own petition, give us an email and we will help you with that.

Peer educator 9 related LTPB’S direct impact on students quitting smoking with his/her team being successful. He/she described:

so we are always on campus, people can find us and this guy was like ‘I quit two weeks ago’ and we’re like ‘that’s amazing’, he’s like ‘Yep, I just, ya know used one of your little books and it worked! And I would really like to get my sister to quit so do you guys have another book that I can give her?’ ... It only happens like once a week if you’re lucky but at least ya know your
helping people.

Summary of Chapter Four

Chapter Four presented a description of the themes that arose in discussions with peer educators. Five themes were discussed, understanding the peer educator, peer educators understanding of the modes of message delivery, team dynamics and processes, the macro influence on peer education and the outcomes of the peer education process. A model of the processed of peer education highlighting the five themes was presented and the interrelationships between the five themes was discussed. In Chapter Five these themes are discussed further in relation to the literature.
Chapter Five: Discussion and Conclusions

The purpose of this instrumental case study was to examine the processes of peer education through the exploration of peer education teams within the LTPB organization. The aim of this research was to answer the following research questions:

I. **What processes underlie the peer education teams?**

II. **How do peer educators understand and implement peer education?**

III. **What influences in the macro environment affect the functioning of the peer education teams?**

IV. **How do processes of peer education relate to processes of empowerment?**

Findings from this study show the complexities of the processes of peer education through the discussion of the following themes from Chapter Four: *understanding the peer educator; peer educator’s understanding of the modes of message delivery; team dynamics and processes; macro influences on peer education; and outcomes of the peer education process*. Bringing together the concepts from Chapter Two and the themes explored in Chapter Four, this chapter presents a model of the processes of peer education framed in ecological theory (Figure 11). Shown in Figure 11 are the concepts from the literature (in Upper and Lower Case) and several important themes described in Chapter Four (in italics and underlined). Each of the different layers in Figure 11 represents the different levels of the ecological environment which alone, or together, effect the process of peer education. Building from these findings, this chapter will expand on three main ideas. First, the individual empowerment process that occurs between the peer educators and young adult students resulting from the interaction
between peer educators and Students. In Figure 11, the triple line is used to represent the process of individual empowerment occurring between the students and the peer educators (inner two rings). From the literature we know young adults experience several contributors or barriers to quit attempts, including attachment and resilience. From social learning theory we understand that young adults need a place to demonstrate behaviour.
Peer educators act as role models to the students on campus by providing a trusting relationship. This helps to increase students’ school and peer attachment. Peer educators can also augment resiliency and protective factors by providing support and teaching social skills such as resisting peer pressure. Findings from this study describe qualities of the peer educators (understanding, outgoing and engaging, approachable and listening, and knowledgeable), which help peer educators to take on different roles when performing peer education techniques.

Second, social cohesion within the peer education team has an impact on peer education processes. Team cohesion is affected by qualities such as commitment among peer education peer educators and the presence of transformational leadership (see Figure 11). The findings show that overall both teams demonstrated high team cohesion which had an effect upon the group empowerment process. This in turn had an effect on the work of individual peer educators.

Third, the campus environment had an impact on the peer education process. As displayed in the outer layer of the ecological model (see Figure 11), this includes aspects such as tobacco policies and campus culture. A reciprocal relationship between the campus environment and the work of peer education teams and individual peer educators was suggested. Each of these main findings are discussed further in the sections that follow.

The focus of this study was to arrive at a new model which defined the processes of peer education. In this chapter, findings from this study will be used to address Shiner’s (1999) concern that “although issues related to implementation are considered in the peer education literature they are rarely placed within any conceptual framework and,
as a consequence, have not become a core part of the way that we define peer education” (p. 559). This study also responds to Milburn’s (1995) suggested link between empowerment and peer education when he asked, “peer education aims to tap into what is known about existing social processes and to harness this power, but to whose ends? How does this approach relate to other ideas current in health promotion about empowerment?” (p. 408). The findings of this study place peer education in an ecological and empowerment framework thus adding to the definitive literature on peer education. Here the process of peer education is defined as: peer educators adopting different roles to facilitate the process of empowerment through knowledge exchange.

At the conclusion of this chapter the findings are discussed in terms of its contribution to the literature on peer education and health promotion and its application to LTPB. The strengths and limitations of this study are considered as well as recommendations for future research and final conclusions.

*Understanding the Individual Empowerment Process Through Peer Education*

The findings from this study help to address the need for further understanding of the relationship between peer education and empowerment raised by Milburn (1995). Peer education is defined as “peers offering credible and reliable information about sensitive life issues and the opportunity to discuss this in an informal peer group setting” (Topping & Ehly, 1998, p. 6). Empowerment is “a process or a framework that describes the changes that occur as an individual, group, or community mobilizes themselves toward increased citizen power” (Arai, 1996, p. 28). Peer educators in this study described the different ways they interacted with the students they encountered. They described how they modified their approach and the content of their message depending
on their assessment of where the students were in relation to the stages of change.

Building from Figure 11, additional details about the interaction between the peer educators and the young adult students are provided in Figure 12. The bottom half of the diagram represents the young adult students with whom the peer educators interact. These young adult students are engaged in a range of smoking behaviours and are at different stages of readiness for change. In the theme, *peer educators' understanding of the stages of change* (described in Chapter Four) peer educators indicated that they modified their interactions according to their assessment of the students' location in the stages of change. This is consistent with the literature on empowering approaches (Lord, 1991; Arai, 1996). Peer educators have the potential to facilitate change through an empowerment process.

From the findings of this study, the top half of Figure 12 identifies the qualities and roles of the peer educators, and the modes of message delivery for the process of individual empowerment to occur. As shown in Figure 12, central to the individual empowerment process is the credibility of peer educators. This is generally supported in the literature as being fundamental to peer educators (Lindsey, 1997; Orme & Starkey, 1998; Shiner & Newburn, 1996; Turner & Shepherd, 1999). The experience of the peer educators in this study supports this conceptualization. As discussed in Chapter Two, Shiner and Newburn (1996) argued that peer education is most likely to be effective if the peer educators' possess person-based, experience-based and message-based credibility. Person-based credibility is related to age but also sex and ethnic origin (Shiner & Newburn, 1996). All of the peer educators involved in this study possessed
Figure 12. A model of the empowerment process within peer education.
person-based credibility in terms of age, sex, and ethnic origin (since both teams’ overall diversity reflects the diversity of their campus). According to Orme and Starkey (1998), young people perceive peer education to be an effective approach to drug education because peer educators: relate more to other young people who talked the same language, understood the way young people think, did not lecture or “talk down” to them, they were easier to talk to, and young people listen more to other young people. Peer educators in this study also described peer education as a successful method of disseminating tobacco awareness describing the same criteria as Orme and Starkey (1998). In this study person-based credibility was described in terms of the peer educators being understanding, approachable and listening (see Figure 12). Peer educator 9 described peer education as a form of education where there is a lack of authority figures and lack of intimidation resulting in a mutual understanding. Peer educator 9 described peer education as:

being there and being that voice for peers to come up to you and talk to you without being overwhelmed or intimidated. It’s almost a form of education where there isn’t an authority figure, you don’t feel like your being told what to do.

Similarly, peer educator 6 believed that peer education is successful because students find it easier to relate to other students who are approximately the same age. Peer educator 6 described his/her personal feelings relating to other students: “I think there’s a certain level of comfort … I find it a lot easier to relate to someone closer to my age.” The development of a mutual understanding and shared power in discussion and decision making is consistent with the distribution of power central to empowerment. Person-based credibility appears to be essential to the shift in power required for individual empowerment to occur.
Message-based credibility refers to the appropriateness of the message for the people concerned (Shiner & Newburn, 1996). In this study peer educators discussed being knowledgeable as a key quality possessed by peer educators. From the training they received, peer educators believed they were able to assess which stage of change students “were at”. Peer educators could then engage students in an appropriate peer education message based on their stage of change. Peer educators described changing their message and the information they distributed based on their assessment. For example, when the peer educators encountered students who were in the precontemplation stage with no plans to quit smoking they tailored their smoking cessation messages to focus on LTPB program awareness while distributing the SMOKE booklets.

In addition to message-based credibility, six of the twelve peer educators also possessed experience-based credibility. Four peer educators were ex-smokers, one was an ex-social smoker, and one was a social smoker. Furthermore, one of the peer educators was the Let’s Make a Deal! Contest winner from the previous year. The contest winner explained how he/she was seen as a credible role model to the students on campus by describing his/her experiences with quitting smoking: “I tell them yeah I used to smoke, I usually start out like that and then I get acceptance sort of in a way and then carry on with that conversation.” This peer educator perceived that experience with smoking cessation allowed for him/her to gain initial acceptance and achieve credibility within the target audience.

Credibility of the peer educators was important in the development of a relationship with students, and provided the basis for the empowerment process. Throughout this study the peer educators’ descriptions of the peer education process
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indicated a strong connection between the stages of change and the individual empowerment process. Although peer educators rarely used the word empowerment in their descriptions, through their interviews and focus group session, the peer educators were essentially describing the relationships and processes which are consistent with the literature on the empowerment process. As noted in Chapter Two, one cannot empower another individual, nor can individuals achieve empowerment on their own (Arai, 1996). Peer educators cannot simply give empowerment to students on campus nor can students on campus achieve empowerment alone. Throughout this process both the students and the peer educators incorporate knowledge and engage in a process of change.

The individual empowerment process includes five interrelated stages: experiencing powerlessness, awareness, connecting and learning, mobilization/action, and contribution (Arai, 1996; 1997). Peer educator 3 tried to guess what stage of change each student was in before tailoring his/her smoking cessation message. Peer educator 3 showed how he/she respected students’ readiness to change when he/she stated, “I try to guess the stage they are in, to see whether or not they are interested, if they are not interested ... I definitely don’t pressure them.” As the peer educators described their role as a leader, educator and helper they connected their approach to the different types of interactions with students and the different modes of message delivery that they could use at different times. This connection between peer education, the stages of change and the stages in the empowerment process are elaborated on in Table 12. As described in each row of Table 12, the role of the person providing support in the empowerment process changes across stages as do the modes of message delivery that peer educators
Table 12. Peer education as a process of empowerment and knowledge for change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YOUNG ADULT /TARGET OF INTERVENTION</th>
<th>PROCESS OF PEER EDUCATION</th>
<th>PEER EDUCATOR</th>
<th>Modes of Message Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stages of Change Theory</td>
<td>Stages of Empowerment</td>
<td>Role of Peer Educator</td>
<td>(Themes from Chapter Four)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precontemplation</td>
<td>No change/Powerlessness</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>• Distribute SMOKE booklets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No intention of quitting smoking within the foreseeable future</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Status &amp; importance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge</td>
<td>• Booth displays (LTPB awareness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Viewed by target audience as leader and is approached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintains role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemplation</td>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>• Distribute SMOKE/QUIT booklets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not yet ready to change but may be seeking information to help make that decision</td>
<td>• Respond to a catalyst such as new information</td>
<td>• Status &amp; importance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Thinking about quitting within next six months</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge</td>
<td>• Booth displays &amp; Walk Abouts (LTPB &amp; Tobacco Awareness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Viewed by target audience as leader and is approached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintains role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>Connecting &amp; Learning</td>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>• Peer one-on-one-support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Benefits outweigh costs</td>
<td>• Supportive relationship and knowledge exchange through connecting with others</td>
<td>• Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May be ready for change</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Providing knowledge so students can make informed decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possibly seek extra help &amp; support</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Shared power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Take action within the next month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• At least one unsuccessful quit attempt in past year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>• Contest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Making the change</td>
<td>• Organize skills, knowledge &amp; resources to act on expanded choices &amp; opportunities offered to them</td>
<td>• Encouragement &amp; moral support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clear goal, realistic plan, support &amp; rewards</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilitate understanding on the same level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Successfully quit for one day to six months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>• End of contest social or party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New behaviour sustained for at least six months</td>
<td>• Integrate knowledge &amp; skills into personal reality &amp; structure of everyday life</td>
<td>• Encouragement &amp; moral support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The smoker self identifies as being an ex-smoker.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilitate understanding on the same level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Smoke Free Day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
utilize at each stage. The relationship between peer educators and young adults changes as the young adult smokers progress through each of the stages. Since empowerment cannot be given to another person, empowerment becomes a process of knowledge exchange and dialogue as peer educators utilize modes of message delivery to facilitate change based on the students’ stage of change in the smoking cessation process.

For some students the process of peer education begins in the stage of precontemplation (see third row of Table 12). In the precontemplation stage of change, student smokers experience no change, or powerlessness, in changing their smoking behaviours although they may be exposed to information and knowledge in relation to smoking cessation. At the individual level, powerlessness can be seen as the expectation of the person that his or her own actions will be ineffective in influencing the outcome of life events (Kieffer, 1984). Building from Arai (1997) the role of the peer educator is to be a leader to students to promote the LTPB program. Peer educators discussed that their role here was to provide awareness so that students would know how to access LTPB and their services should they want to quit smoking in the future. At this stage, peer educators believed distributing SMOKE booklets and performing booth displays to promote LTPB program awareness were the most appropriate messages they should be sending.

In the contemplation stage of change (see row four in Table 12), student smokers are beginning to think they will try to quit smoking within the next six months. Although the student smoker is aware of the benefits of change, they are not yet ready and may be seeking information or help to make that decision (Naidoo & Wills, 2000). In the corresponding empowerment stage of awareness, individuals respond to a catalyst such as new information or they are acting out on anger (Arai, 1996; Lord, 1991). Here the peer
educator continues the role of a leader. As student smokers seek out knowledge or respond to new knowledge, the credibility of the peer educator as a knowledgeable and credible source of information is important. Many modes of message delivery can be utilized to target students who are in this stage of the smoking cessation process including, walk abouts and booth displays promoting tobacco awareness as well as LTPB program awareness. Peer educator 9 believed promoting tobacco awareness was imperative for the students who were contemplating quitting smoking. Peer educator 9 demonstrated his/her peer education approach for a student in the contemplation stage:

I think its not quit please, its more like tobacco awareness, if you wanna smoke, great can you at least know what this is doing to you, we just want everyone to be informed about the choices they are making.

This quote demonstrates the role of a leader – to share knowledge with the students so that they may make informed decisions concerning their smoking behaviours.

In the preparation stage of change student smokers are about to take action in the smoking cessation process (Naidoo & Wills, 2000) (see row 5 on Table 12). When the perceived benefits seem to outweigh the costs and when the change seems possible as well as worthwhile, the student smoker may be ready to change, perhaps seeking some extra support (Naidoo & Wills, 2000). In this stage of empowerment, connecting and learning offers student smokers supportive relationships and knowledge exchange through connecting with others (Arai, 1996). Here, peer educators described building personal connections with students and engaging in knowledge transfer to support the decision-making process as the students weigh the costs and benefits. The role of the peer educator is to act as an educator and provide knowledge transfer, but most importantly, to share power. Peer educator 10 believed he/she could tailor his/her advice to a certain
student in the preparation stage by talking and listening to their situation. For peer educator 10, listening to each student's experience about smoking allowed him/her to customize his/her advice and educational information to each student. As he/she explained:

I would much rather talk to the person and see how they sort of act, think, feel, and then therefore present what I think in a way that they will actually listen and obtain the information, that way I think is much more effective.

In another example of the empowerment process in the preparation stage, peer educator 5 described the use of the CO tester in his/her role as an educator. The results of the CO tester, along with education from peer educator 5 assisted a student to realize how much smoking had affected her body and to make a conscious decision to try to quit smoking. Peer educator 5 described how this motivated the student to recruit other student smokers to perform the CO test:

I told her about the contest and other ways to stay smoke free and I encouraged her to keep at the smokeless living and she was still in shock that it was pretty high and she came back with a friend afterwards. So we saw her come back. She was like okay she wants to try it too. She started bringing people over.

This above quote by peer educator 5 also describes how he/she helped a student in the preparation phase move into the action stage of change. In the action stage of change the peer educator's role as helper facilitates students to make informed decisions and take action to change smoking behaviours.

In the action stage of change, individuals have successfully quit smoking for a period of one day to six months (see row 6 on Table 12). In this stage, the early days of change require positive decisions by the student smoker to do things differently, such as altering regular patterns of behaviour throughout the day (eating a piece of fruit instead of
going for a cigarette break in between classes). A clear goal, a realistic plan, support and rewards are features of this stage (Naidoo & Wills, 2000). In the corresponding mobilization stage of empowerment, an individual is able to organize skills, knowledge and resources and able to act on the expanded choices and opportunities presented to them (Arai, 1996). In this study, the peer educators provided encouragement (emails and friendly phone calls) and moral support (mid-contest social gatherings) and continued in the role of helper to facilitate students’ understanding of the challenges associated with quit attempts. Peer educator 9 described how he/she encouraged students to continue to stay smoke free during a mid-contest social. Peer educator 9 demonstrated his/her role as a helper for students who are in this action stage of change: “we held a social for all the people who were in the smoking categories, to come in before reading week to talk about their habits and techniques for not smoking.” A peer education technique used in this stage of empowerment is the contest which provides a platform for students who were trying to quit, reduce or never begin smoking for a period of six weeks.

In the maintenance stage of change, the new behaviour (smoke free living) is sustained and the student moves into a healthier lifestyle (Naidoo & Wills, 2000) (see row 7 in Figure 12). In the corresponding empowerment stage of contribution, an individual is able to integrate knowledge and skills into their personal reality and structure of their everyday lives (Arai, 1996). As the knowledge becomes integrated, the smoker begins to identify as an ex-smoker. Peer educator 8 described two students who participated in the contest and successfully quit smoking. The students were actively committed to stay smoke free and participated in Smoke Free Day. As peer educator 8 described:
there were two girls that attended our contest social and they were out yesterday and it was funny cause they wore the buttons on their shirts, they were all into the whole Smoke Free Day and it was just nice to see that they were so dedicated and committed to not smoking anymore.

Another example of this stage is last year’s Let’s Make a Deal contest winner who became a peer educator for the 2005-2006 school year. This winner is living smoke free and fulfilling a contribution by helping others along the smoking cessation continuum.

In this last stage, peer educators continue to provide peer education in the role of a helper to encourage and provide moral support in order for students to continue to stay smoke free and avoid relapses.

**Group Empowerment Effects on Peer Education**

Transformational leadership and team cohesion within the peer education teams were found to have an effect upon the collective effort of the team and group empowerment. As indicated in Figure 12, the functioning of the teams had a powerful impact on the peer educators and their ability to facilitate the individual empowerment process. For example, there were many instances where peer educators shared success stories with the rest of their team. This demonstrates how the social power of the team is used to support the individual peer educator’s ability to function. Empowerment at the group level involves the development of group power through their shared experience, analysis, and the influence of groups on their own efforts (Presby, Wandersman, Florin, Rich & Chavis, 1990). Examples from the findings will demonstrate the group empowerment process and the effect of group empowerment on individual empowerment.
The awareness phase at the group level is connected to the peer education team’s development and communication of a collective vision, or knowledge of the common goals. Here there is a strong relationship to the presence of transformational leadership. Bass (1985) asserted that transformational leadership would result in followers performing beyond expected levels of performance as a consequence of the leader’s influence. Rouche, Baker and Rose (1989) defined transformational leadership as the ability of a leader to influence the values, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviours of others by working with and through them to accomplish the organization’s mission and purpose. The findings suggest that both Campus Program Coordinators of McMaster and Ryerson are considered transformational leaders. Bass (1985) asserted that the leader acts as a model for subordinates; behaves in ways that motivate and inspire followers by providing meaning and challenge; and communicates a vision. An example of transformational leadership was shown when peer educator 4 discussed how his/her Campus Program Coordinator highly motivated the team during contest recruitment. He/she described:

it started out kind of slow, the first day, we didn’t get as many people as we wanted cause I think a few of us it was our first time so we weren’t really sure what to do and how to approach people and that, but then our Campus Program Coordinator really motivated us, he/she really said that we really have to make these goals, this and that and so we just all got into it and we had some incentives.

Transformational leadership is also important at the connecting and learning phase of the group empowerment process. Markulis, Sashittal and Jassawalla (2006) state that leadership affects team performance and that there is a link between leadership and team dynamics. For example, in terms of team dynamics, team leaders are known to help ensure peer educator involvement and commitment, hold members accountable for
Peer education completing tasks, use rewards to motivate members, differentiate between destructive management and constructive conflict, and increase team cohesiveness and cooperation (Markulis, Sashittal & Jassawalla, 2006). Both Campus Program Coordinators at each campus demonstrated being successful on each of these aspects. During the connecting and learning phase of the group empowerment process, the peer education teams connected their shared experiences through leadership and cohesion in order to successfully take action as peer educators. Peer educators discussed how sharing positive peer education stories with the team helped foster group empowerment. Peer educator 9 described how sharing positive stories with the team helps to boost team morale:

we try to share stories about what we have encountered each week and I think that really builds up team spirit and faith in what we are doing because personally you may not have had a specific experience that stands out in your mind, obviously someone else has and even if there is one of those per week, you’re doing something.

In terms of differentiating between destructive management and constructive conflict peer educator 6 provided an example of his/her Campus Program Coordinator being non-hierarchal:

He/she is very calm, again with the people recently who kind of have been sketching out on things he/she has also been very level headed about it, he/she hasn’t taken his/her authority to be like ‘you know what you missed this and now you get this crappy job for the next two weeks’.

As indicated in this quote from peer educator 6, his/her Campus Program Coordinator could have used destructive management by punishing peer educators who have not been committed to the team.

Cohesion was also found to have an effect on group empowerment. Cohesion is defined as “a dynamic process which is reflected in the tendency for a group to stick
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together and remain united in the pursuit of its goals and objectives” (Carron, 1982, p. 124). Cohesion has also been identified as a prerequisite for team effectiveness (Hackman & Morris, 1975; Lott & Lott, 1961; Miesing & Preble, 1985; Summers, Coffelt & Horton, 1988). Leaders can also affect team performance when dealing with conflict situations. The relationship between team cohesion and group empowerment is best described in the example of the two problem peer educators. These two problem peer educators had the potential to hinder team effectiveness. As discussed in the findings, each team had one peer educator who was not as committed and involved as the rest of the peer educators. At McMaster the problem peer educator’s lack of commitment and involvement had an effect on cohesion and friendships within the team. However, this one problem peer educator did not disrupt cohesion and friendships of the entire team, rather the interactions between the problem peer educator and the other members of the team. The other team members showed a lack in trust and did not wish to work with the problem peer educator. For example, peer educators disliked being scheduled to work with the problem peer educator at booth displays because they could not trust that the individual would show up for his/her shift. This would create a problem since a booth display requires the teamwork of two peer educators to function well. This shows how the lack of commitment and involvement of one peer educator can disrupt team cohesion, and hinder group empowerment.

Team cohesion is also demonstrated through an individual’s leadership style and ability to maintain friendships with members of the team. Goffman (1959) explains that: when members of a team have different formal statuses and range in a social establishment, then we can see that the mutual dependence created by
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membership in the team is likely to cut across structural or social cleavages in the establishment and thus provide a source of cohesion for the establishment (p. 82).

Goffman’s (1959) quote can be applied to the discussion of leaders and their friendships with the rest of the team from Chapter Four. On both teams, the leaders were also friends with the other peer educators which according to Goffman increases cohesion. One of the Campus Program Coordinators commented on his/her strategy to stay friends with the team while also remaining respected as a leader. He/she explains:

I’ll still try to make an effort to go out with them and everything but I will definitely leave a good space, like I won’t be as cool, crazy as I normally would be with other friends ... I will still let them know, you know things are still good, things we are going to be great but once this year is done then basically things will go back into full swing but I think keeping a bit of a distance doesn’t hurt, at least from my perspective right now.

This quote shows how maintaining friendships with members of the team allowed the leader to be non-authoritative and non-hierarchal. This increased team cohesion and lead to greater team effectiveness.

Leadership is the sum of individual characteristics and team dynamics. Strong relationships promote the leader’s ability to increase the team’s effectiveness. Conversely, weak leadership can decrease the team’s effectiveness. In this study, the Campus Program Coordinators and Team Leaders on each team were observed showing excellent leadership abilities. In addition, peer educators commented on the exceptional leadership abilities of their Campus Program Coordinator and Team Leader on both teams.

Transformational leadership can also be connected with the mobilization phase in the group empowerment process. In the mobilization phase, transformational leadership allows for greater organization of skills, knowledge and resources to act on expanded
choices and opportunities. Transformational leadership was shown in this study when both Campus Program Coordinators delegated tasks to their peer educators based on each peer educator’s particular skills. In doing so, peer educators enjoyed their tasks and overall team effectiveness was increased.

At the group level, empowerment was also shown during the contribution phase. In the contribution phase within the group empowerment process, the group integrates knowledge and skills into the team’s reality and structure of everyday life (Arai, 1996). There were several examples from the findings where the peer educators themselves may not have felt they were successful in aiding any student to quit smoking. However, the teams shared success stories among team members which helped peer educators feel more successful because they identified themselves as a function of their group and the team’s overall effectiveness.

The Relationship between the Macro Environment and the Peer Education Team

Framing the study in ecological theory led to an understanding that the macro environment might impact the peer education teams. This was captured in the research question, “what influences in the macro environment affect the functioning of the peer education”? From the findings, the researcher discovered that the peer education teams also had an effect on the macro environment. As depicted in Figure 11, campus support (finance, administration), tobacco policies, campus culture and the sales of tobacco on campus had an effect on the ability of the peer education teams to function on campus. For example, the peer education teams perceived a lack of enforcement concerning tobacco policies and interpreted this as a challenge. This challenge affected the functioning of the team as it decreased morale as the team perceived a lack of support for
their efforts. However, peer education teams also affected factors in the macroenvironment. For example, peer educators felt responsible for enforcing tobacco policies on campus. Post-secondary students have widely endorsed more stringent campus tobacco control policies, including comprehensive smoking restrictions and decreasing tobacco marketing on campus (Hammond, Tremblay, Chaiton, Lessard & Callard, 2005). Yet, despite this support it appears as though university and college administrators continue to underestimate the importance of and support for tobacco control policies on campus (Hammond, et al., 2005). This was particularly true for the McMaster team.

Ramsay and Hoffmann (2004) noted that peers and “college life” were central to a former smoker’s ability to stay smoke free. Participants of Ramsay and Hoffmann’s (2004) pilot project also reported the pressure of university life including exams, papers, and juggling several jobs as inescapable challenges to remaining smoke free. In this study, peer educators described how the campus culture both supported and acted against the smoking cessation and prevention activities of the peer education teams. Campuses may also act to encourage tobacco prevention and cessation activities through: financial and administrative support of peer education teams, assisting a Smoke-free campus or restricting smoking areas on campus, and enforcing tobacco policies on campus. Conversely, peer education teams also affect campus culture by acting as role models to the students and promoting the denormalization of smoking among young adults on campus. Peer education teams advocated to have space and visibility on campus to support their ability to interact with student on campus. However, at times, the lack of administrative support from each university made the work of the peer education teams more difficult.
Implications and Application of Understanding Peer Education as a Process of Empowerment and Knowledge for Change

The research process itself had an impact on the peer education teams involved in this study. In speaking with peer educators after the first focus group had finished, the researcher experienced an unanticipated and overwhelming positive response from the peer educators. The peer educators expressed their gratitude for being involved in the focus group. They saw it as an educational experience where they learned about their role as a peer educator as well as their role within the team. Furthermore, after the first focus group had concluded, the Campus Program Coordinator from the Ryerson team asked for the researcher’s flip chart paper so that the team could use the concepts discussed for leadership purposes.

The findings from this study may also be used in the training of peer education teams in three main ways. First, in training peer educators can be taught to use specific peer educational approaches that fit with student smoker’s stage of change. Table 13 displays the stages of change with guiding examples of roles peer educators can apply for student smokers within each phase. Discussed in the findings section, peer educators define qualities of peer educators, peer educators listed four characteristics peer educators need to have in order to be successful: understanding, approachable and listening, knowledgeable, and outgoing and engaging. Being aware of these qualities and their importance in peer education may help peer educators to understand their role and feel more effective. Having a brainstorming session or role playing during training could help prospective peer educators to better understand their changing role as educators, helpers and leaders before beginning peer education practices with students.
Second, discussing important team characteristics (team goals, commitment, involvement and leadership) can help peer educators to better understand their position as a peer educator on the LTPB team. This could add to the peer educators supporting and understanding each other within the context of the team. Defining commitment, involvement and leadership would be useful for training purposes because peer educators would gain an understanding of what will be expected of them. Furthermore, peer educators will learn how their own lack of commitment and involvement can have a negative effect on the team. The leaders of each team can also be trained upon transformational leadership and the importance of communicating goals and a team vision. Leaders can also support their peer education teams through storytelling of successful techniques (e.g., the boyfriend analogy) and discussing case studies of how to deal with problematic students and situations (e.g., the antagonistic student writing newspaper articles).

Third, many of the peer educators were unaware of the interrelationship between the campus and their team. During training, peer educators could learn how the macro environment can affect the work of their team or how their team may influence the macro environment. This research suggests the importance of having increased awareness of campus smoking policies and the ways the lack of policies or their enforcement might disempower teams and individual peer educators. This research also highlights the need to develop ways for teams to respond to campus policies in keeping with their role as peer educators. This may include advocacy work and mobilizing students on campus for policy change. The peer educators discussed students not knowing about tobacco policies and the problems with implementation of some of the policies. Previously discussed the
response for Smoke Free Day at the McMaster campus was extremely positive, highlighting the fact that many students on campus are in favour of a smoke free campus. Peer educators could continue their work with tobacco policy compliance and awareness. Peer educators could work with campus groups to plan for practical solutions for creating designated smoking areas or even a smoke-free campus.

In a more general sense, the findings presented here may also be applied to health promotion programs utilizing peer education as an approach. This research highlights how important the team is to individual peer educators. For example, many of the peer educators in this study at times felt they were not leading anyone to quit smoking and this decreased their morale. However, many times their team members discussed successful peer education stories during meetings and informal conversations with each other. Being part of a team helped peer educators to feel as though they were being successful at helping students to quit and therefore increased their morale and motivation to engage in their roles as peer educators. Thus, health promotion programs should stress the importance of teams and the effect it can have on individual peer education performance. Team cohesion and friendships could also be encouraged.

Peer education approaches understood within an ecological framework (see Figure 11) help to understand factors within the micro, meso and macro systems of the environmental context which effect peer educators and teams. This could be helpful for developing new programs using peer education approaches. In this study, the researcher hypothesizes that the theory generated here could also be transferable to other peer education led health promotion programs. However, it should be noted that while well-documented knowledge might be generalized to similar populations, the qualitative
researcher cannot specify the external validity of an inquiry (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Thus the researcher cannot know the specific sites to which transferability might be used for application in the future, but applicants can. Patton (2002) notes that process evaluations are particularly useful for dissemination and replication of model interventions where a program has served as a demonstration project or is considered to be a model worthy of replication by other sites. Furthermore, by describing and understanding the details and dynamics of program processes it is possible to isolate critical elements contributing to program successes and failures (Patton, 2002).

**Strengths and Limitations of the Study**

A main strength of this qualitative study is that it adds to the conceptual literature on peer education. This research also addresses the gap in the literature concerning social and cultural factors associated with peer education identified by Milburn (1995). This research first identified smoking as a social issue in that the broader ecological environment has an impact on individual smoking behaviour (Figure 1). Perhaps the most important understanding arising from this study is the understanding of the processes of peer education in relation to empowerment within an ecological framework. Several researchers of peer education have noted the lack of a clear definition of peer education (Orme & Starkey, 1999; Turner & Shepherd, 1999; Shiner, 1999). Topping and Ehly (1998) define peer education as “peers offering credible and reliable information about sensitive life issues and the opportunity to discuss this in an informal peer group setting” (p. 6). Where this definition focuses on the “what” of peer education, this study led to a definition for the processes of peer education; that is, the “how” of peer education. Here the process of peer education is seen as a fluid process of knowledge
Peer education exchange in which peer educators adopt different styles of facilitation as people move through stages of empowerment and change.

A further strength of this study is the methodology. This study utilized three qualitative methods (interviews, focus groups and observations) to research the processes of peer education. This is also known as methods triangulation. Triangulation strengthens a study by combining methods (Patton, 2002). Studies that use only one method are more vulnerable to errors linked to that particular method (e.g. loaded interview questions) than studies which use multiple methods of data to provide cross-data validity checks (Patton, 2002). The findings from each of the methods of data collection helped to verify the findings from the other types of methods and shed light on different aspects of peer education. For example, the researcher observed the McMaster team performing contest recruitment. The researcher noticed peer educators at the booth display immersed in reading a newspaper article. Before the researcher left the campus the researcher inquired as to what the peer educators were reading. The peer educators were reading the opinion article written by the antagonistic student. After gaining a first hand knowledge about the antagonistic student, the researcher was able to ask the team in depth during individual interviews about the impact of the article upon their team. Probing for more insight into the peer education process contributed to a deeper level of understanding of peer education.

Another strength of this study is the trustworthiness of the research. All of the qualitative techniques identified by Lincoln and Guba (1985) were utilized in this study to ensure trustworthiness of the data. Table 13 shows each of the trustworthiness techniques outlined by Lincoln and Guba (1985). For a more in depth discussion of each
of the techniques used in this study, see the section on *trustworthiness of qualitative research* in Chapter Three of this document.

A limitation of the study was not interviewing all peer educators from each team. Both of the “problem peer educators” were not interviewed. If all 12 peer educators had been interviewed, the perspective of the “problem peer educators” could have helped to better understand reasons for their lack of commitment to the team. However, it is important to note that the researcher had no way of knowing at the beginning of data collection that the two “problem peer educators” were not chosen for individual interviews. It should be noted that although there were two “problem peer educators” this does not mean that they were not good peer educators. They may not have been the most committed team members but that does not imply that they were not effective as individual peer educators.

Table 13. Techniques for establishing trustworthiness used in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Area</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Technique used in this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>1. Activities in the field that increase the probability of high credibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Prolonged engagement</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Persistent observation</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Triangulation (sources, methods, and investigators)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Peer debriefing</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Negative case analysis</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Referential adequacy</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Member checks</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferability</td>
<td>6. Thick description</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>7.a) Dependability audit, including audit trail</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmability</td>
<td>7.b) Confirmability audit, including audit trail</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Hunter, 2005; Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 328.
A further limitation was not interviewing other persons affiliated with the peer education teams including the students on campus, the Health Educators, and members of the LTPB Head Office. The findings in this study are the peer educators’ perceptions of how they were received by the students, and about their relationship with Health Educators and Head Office. It would have strengthened this study to obtain insight from others about their relationships with peer educators.

Another limitation was not observing peer educators while they were performing walkabouts. This could have provided insight into how receptive the students were when the peer educators were approaching the students, and about the nature of the knowledge exchanged and interaction that occurs.

Recommendations for Future Research

Four main recommendations arise from this study as directions for future research. First, qualitative methods should continue to be employed when investigating peer education programs as well as health promotion programs. An in-depth account from the people who play pivotal roles in implementing health promotion programs through interviews, observations and focus groups is key to understanding these strategies. The same methodologies utilized in this study could be used to examine other health promotion programs.

Second, future studies should research peer education and empowerment processes in the context of different health issues such as drug prevention and HIV/AIDS prevention interventions. It would be valuable to observe the processes of peer education of other health issues to see if the processes of peer education are consistent across different health issues. Furthermore, the topic of study here was the processes of peer
Peer education teams. The findings indicated that two types of empowerment processes occurred. It would be beneficial to research the perceptions of the other party involved, the target audience. Researching the young adult students on campus and their experiences with the peer educators would provide a fuller understanding of the empowerment process.

Third, it is recommended that outcome studies be performed upon peer education. This would connect the evaluation of the processes of peer education with the evaluation of outcomes as a result of peer education. An outcome study would be able to assess the effectiveness of the empowerment process at the group and individual level. This was beyond the scope of this study but would strengthen understanding of the effectiveness of peer education processes.

Fourth, in future studies it would be appropriate to use the methods from this study to explore another peer education led team that was not a tobacco control initiative. For example, a peer education team that addresses sex education. This would enable further examination of the processes of peer education to deepen our understanding of this approach to health promotion, as well as to explore whether there are differences in the approach to peer education based on the health issue being addressed.

Conclusions

The findings of this study can be applied to both theory and practice. In the theoretical sense this study provided further understanding of the processes of peer education through an ecological and empowerment framework. This study also contributes a new definition of the processes of peer education: peer education is a fluid
process of knowledge exchange in which peer educators adopt different styles of facilitation as people move through stages of empowerment and change.

The ecological model (Figure 11) emphasizes the importance of systems at all three levels (micro, meso and macro) upon peer education led health interventions. This model also highlights how the individual empowerment process occurs between the peer educators and their target audience. Furthermore, findings suggest a group empowerment process was also occurring as a result of transformational leadership, cohesion, commitment and involvement to the team. Findings of this study show the complexities of the processes of peer education including a connection between the stages of change and the changing role of the peer educator across stages of the empowerment process.

In the practical sense this study suggests peer educators can be further trained to: use specific peer educational approaches that fit with student smoker’s stage of change; better understand their position as a peer educator on the LTPB team; understand the reciprocal relationship between the macro environment and the peer education teams. The findings may also be applied to health promotion programs utilizing peer education as an approach. This research highlights the effects of team and group empowerment on individual peer educators. Furthermore, the ecological framework could be applied to other health promotion programs utilizing peer education approaches to understand the micro, meso and macro systems inherent in the peer education team’s environment. Finally, qualitative approaches should continue researching peer education in other health promotion contexts. As researched here, the processes of the peer education is imperative to our understanding of this approach for tobacco control and beyond.
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Appendix B: Consent Form

Informed Consent Form - Participant

Title of Study: A Qualitative Case Study of the Processes of Peer Education in a Young Adult Smoking Cessation and Prevention Program, Leave the Pack Behind

Principal Researcher: Tiffany Gartner, Master of Arts Student, Department of Community Health Sciences
Faculty Advisor: Dr. Susan Arai, Department of Community Health Sciences

Interviewer: Tiffany Gartner

Name of Participant: (please print) ____________________________________________________________

• I have been given and have read the Letter of Introduction provided to me by the Principal Investigator conducting the research.

• I understand that the purpose of this investigation is to examine the processes of peer education through the exploration of two teams within the Leave the Pack Behind organization.

• I understand that my participation in this study may include three interviews that will last for approximately one hour each, if I am randomly chosen to do so.

• I understand that my participation in this study will involve a) participation in focus groups that will last for approximately two hours each; and b) observations of booth displays and of a Leave the Pack Behind team meeting.

• I understand that my participation in the study will bring only minimal risks or harms as stated in the Letter of introduction, and these risks (e.g., in focus groups my anonymity cannot be guaranteed) have been explained to me. I understand that my responses will remain confidential and my true identity will not be revealed by Tiffany Gartner, and Dr. Arai (Faculty Advisor).

• I understand that participation in this study is voluntary and that I may withdraw from the study at any time and for any reason without penalty.

• I understand that if I choose to withdraw from the study my employment with Leave the Pack Behind will not be affected.

• I understand that I may ask questions of the researchers at any point during the research process.

• I understand that there is no obligation for me to answer any questions I they feel are invasive, offensive or inappropriate.

• I understand that there will be no payment for my participation.

• I understand that the interviews and focus group that I participate in will be audio taped to ensure accuracy and will be destroyed upon completion of the study.

• I understand that my interview data is not anonymous (since my identity is known by Tiffany and Dr. Arai). I understand that all personal information will be kept strictly confidential and that all information will be coded so that my name will not be associated with specific responses.

• I understand that confidentiality will be maintained.

• I understand that only Tiffany and Dr. Arai (faculty advisor) will have access to the audio tapes and original observation data, and that information will be labeled with code names to ensure that peer educators cannot be identified. All original audio tapes and information containing my true identity will be stored in a locked cabinet in the Dr Arai’s office. The notebook in which observations will be recorded will be kept in the possession of the researcher at all times. Upon completion of the study all audio tapes, original observation notes, and the master list linking the participant with their code name will be destroyed.
I understand that the results of this study will be distributed in academic journal articles and conference presentations and a summary of the results will be made available to peer educators in the study.

As indicated by my signature below, I acknowledge that I am participating freely and willingly and I am providing my consent.

Signature of the Participant: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

This study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance by the Brock University Research Ethics Board (File # 05-016).

If you have any questions or concerns about your participation in the study, you may contact Tiffany Gartner by e-mail at tqg0ab@brocku.ca or Dr. Susan Arai in the Department of Community Health Sciences at Brock University (905-688-5550, extension 4783; or e-mail sarai@brocku.ca). Concerns about your involvement in the study may also be directed to Research Ethics Officer of the Brock Research Ethics Board at 905-688-5550, extension 3035.

Thank you for your help! Please take one copy of this form with you for further reference.

How would you like to obtain the results of the study:

[ ] I would like to have a copy of the executive summary mailed to me.
Address______________________________
City/Province______________________________
Postal Code______________________________

[ ] I would like to have a copy of the executive summary e-mailed to me.
E-mail Address______________________________

I have fully explained the procedures of this study to the participant.

Researchers Signature: ___________________________
Date: ___________________________

If you wish to withdraw from the study, please indicate below your wishes regarding your data and further participation in this peer education study:

[ ] I wish that specific observations of me not be taken but acknowledge that Tiffany will continue to make general observations of the Leave the Pack Behind peer education team. I will allow data previously collected to be used in this study.

[ ] I wish that specific observations of me not be taken but acknowledge that Tiffany will continue to make general observations of the Leave the Pack Behind peer education team. I will not allow data previously collected to be used in this study.

Signature of the Participant: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
Appendix C: Letter of Introduction

Letter of Introduction – Peer educators of Leave the Pack Behind

August 2005

Dear _______________________

You are being invited to participate in a research study entitled, “A Qualitative Case Study of the Processes of Peer Education in a Young Adult Smoking Cessation and Prevention Program, Leave the Pack Behind”. Tiffany Gartner, a Masters student at Brock University, is conducting this study under the supervision of Dr. Susan Aral. We have been working with Kelli-an Lawrence, Principal Investigator and Co-Director of Leave the Pack Behind to develop this process evaluation of the peer education teams. We hope that you will participate! By participating in this study, you will have an opportunity to provide your feedback regarding your experience as a peer educator for Leave the Pack Behind.

The research questions that guide this study are as follows:
I. What are the processes underlying the peer education teams?
II. How are peer education and peer mentoring carried out by the peer education teams?
III. What are the influences in the ecological environment that affect the functioning of the peer education teams?
IV. What is the relationship between the process of peer education teams and the outcomes achieved?

If you decide to participate in the study, Tiffany will be conducting observations of the processes of peer education (2 sessions over 9 months). In addition, you may be randomly chosen to participate in an interview that will take about one hour of your time. All peer educators that have agreed to participate will also be involved in a focus group, or a group interview that will last approximately two hours. Specifically, in the interview you will be asked about your role as a peer educator. In the focus groups, group dynamics, such as leadership, commitment, involvement and cohesion will be areas that you as a group will be asked about. You will also be asked about any external influences to the peer education process, such as support from your university. Your input will help us to understand the peer education process.

To minimize any risks to you, every step has been taken to ensure that participation in this study will not affect your employment with Leave the Pack Behind whatsoever. Participation in this study is voluntary and you may decline answering any question(s) within the questionnaire or the interview that you find invasive, offensive or inappropriate. You may withdraw from the study at any stage in the process by informing the researcher (Tiffany).

In addition, we are taking great care to ensure that information provided by you will remain confidential. Anonymity cannot be guaranteed in this study since your identity is known by Tiffany and Dr. Aral. However, these researchers will be the only ones who know whether you participated in the study. You will be given a code name that will be used to label any data. Information linking your real identity to your code name will be kept in a locked drawer in Dr. Aral's office. Your real name will not be attached to observation notes, comments or issues raised within discussions, project reports or presentations generated from this study. While the interviews will be recorded for research purposes, all original audio tapes will be destroyed following the completion of the study.

A written summary of the findings will be made available to you by mail if you request a copy. Additional reports may appear in academic journals and conference presentations; however, the specific identity of the peer educators in the study will not be disclosed. Should you have any further questions concerning the interviews or the study in general, please feel free to contact us at Brock University:

- Tiffany Gartner by e-mail at tgo0ab@brocku.ca
- Dr. Susan Aral in the Dept. of Community Health Sciences (905-688-5550 extension 4783; by e-mail at sarai@brocku.ca.)
the Research Ethics Officer in the Office of Research Services, Brock University (905-688-5550, extension 3035).

This study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance by the Research Ethics Board at Brock University (file # 05-016) and the ethics committee at your University.

Thank you for your interest and involvement in this study.

Sincerely

__________________________________________

Tiffany Gartner
MA student, Brock University

__________________________________________

Susan Arai, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Faculty of Applied Health Sciences
**Appendix D: Interview Guides 1, 2 & 3**

**INTERVIEW GUIDE #1**

“This interview that is being performed is part of my M.A. thesis to understand the process of peer education. I am interviewing four people per campus, and I am using two university’s as part of my data collection (Ryerson & McMaster). I will be asking you questions about your roles and responsibilities within your team as well as questions that relate to how your team functions as a group. Before we begin, do you have any questions for me?”

“Please state your alias name. This interview is being performed on (date) at (time).”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANT’S ROLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The following questions will ask you about your role in the LTPB team at your university.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Can you tell me about your role on the LTPB team?  
2. What were some of the reasons that you joined the LTPB team?  
3. Can you tell me about your experiences with the LTPB team?  
   Probe: If you were to describe the team to a friend, what stands out for you?  
4. What do you enjoy about working for LTPB?  
5. What aspects do you enjoy about being on the LTPB team? What aspects do you not enjoy about your team or peer educators?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABOUT THE LTPB TEAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The following questions will ask you about characteristics of your LTPB team.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What are some things that you are striving to achieve as a team?  
   Probe: What do you think that some of the goals of your LTPB team are?  
7. What are the major strengths of your team?  
   (Give examples, only if they seem stuck – good communication, good leadership, strong commitment of peer educators, effective training, get along well as a group, diversity)  
   Probe: How would you describe the leadership style of your CPC? Your TL?  
   Probe: How is the motivation within the team? (High/Low)  
8. What are the main challenges or issues within your team?  
   (Give examples, only if they seem stuck – poor communication, poor leadership, weak commitment of peer educators, ineffective training, do not get along well as a group, not a diverse group)  
   Probe: How well do you think your team works together as a team?  
   Probe: How well do you think that your team effectively communicates with one another?  
   Probe: Do you think you have too little or too much staff on your team?  
9. How do you think your team could improve?  
10. What are your personal views about students’ smoking behaviours?
11. What messages is your LTPB team trying to send to the students on campus?

12. How well do you think that the message is being received?
   Probe: Is there anything that you would change?

13. What does peer education mean to you?

14. Can you tell me about your role as a peer educator?

15. How will you know if your team is being successful? What are the signs that you will look for? (Give examples, only if they seem stuck – many students interested in the program, handing out 100’s of pamphlets/booklets, cohesiveness of the team)

**LTPB IN THE BROADER ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT**

The following questions will ask you about specifics of your university, such as the campus culture.

16. How does the University support the work of the LTPB team?

16. b) How can the University support you better to achieve your LTPB goals? (probe – support from the university financially, by making it easy for them to perform activities on campus, administrative support, etc)

16. c) Question for CPC only – Does your University have a policy about smoking? Can you tell me a bit more about that?
   Probe: How are smoking policies received by students and staff?
   Probe: What would you change about this policy? (banning smoking in residence, designated smoking areas on campus, etc.)

17. How do students respond to LTPB activities?

18. What is it about your campus that contributes to the success of LTPB?
   Probe: What is it about the campus that challenges the success of LTPB?

19. Is there anything else about LTPB that you think I should know?

"That answers my last question. Your input is extremely important to me and I want to thank you very much for your time today. I really appreciate you taking the time to answer my questions."
Interview Guide Round #2

Thank you for meeting with me today. The majority of the questions I will be asking you about you as a peer educator on the LTPB team. I am going to ask you about some of your experiences so far with the team as well as I have some questions in the second half of the interview that have to do with your external environment, which is your university and its effects on you as a peer educator and your LTPB team.

1. Any follow up thoughts from the focus group? What do you remember from the focus group?

2. Has there been anything major happen to your team since the last time I talked to you? (team restructuring, extreme incident, etc.)

3. Can you tell me what you and your team have been working on lately?
   Probe: Are you starting to prepare for the contest?

4. Can you describe a time when you felt you were successful as a peer educator?
   Probes: What was it that made it successful? What messages were you trying to send?

5. Can you describe a time where you felt frustrated as a peer educator?
   Probes: What was it that made it frustrating? What messages were you trying to send?

6. Can you describe to me a time where you experienced any type of conflict when interacting with students on campus?
   Probes: What was it that made it a conflicting situation? What messages were you trying to send? How did it make you feel?

7. Do you as a peer educator feel as though you are a leader to the rest of the students on campus?
   Probe: Do you feel as though you have the ability to empower others to change their smoking behaviours?

8. What is it about you that makes you a successful as a peer educator?
   Probe: What personality characteristics contribute to yourself being a successful peer educator?

9. When you are interacting with the students, is there anything you would do differently than you are already doing now?
In, the previous questions we were talking about you as a peer educator. This next set of questions focuses on the LPTB team.

10. Have commitment levels within the team changed at all?
   Probe:
   What for you increases/decreases your involvement? The teams?

11. Have the levels of involvement within your team changed at all?
   Probe:
   What for you increases/decreases your involvement? The teams?

12. Is there anything that brings the team down?
   Probe:
   What causes the team stress?

13. I have noticed that your team only has one male/female on your team, does this have any effect on your team?
   How do you feel about being the only male/female on your team?
   Probes:
   Do you feel that the one male/female is just as close with the team as everyone else?
   Do you feel like you are a part of the group?

14. Sometimes groups that work together develop their own culture or ways of doing things.
   What is the culture of your team like?
   Probe:
   Does your team have inside jokes or sayings or language that you use only when you talk with LTPB peer educators?

15. Is your school newspaper supporting you at all this year?

16. How is your school supporting your team financially?
   Probes:
   Do you feel as though this financial support is sufficient?
   How could the university support you better financially?

17. How is your school supporting your team administratively?
   Probes:
   Do you feel as though this administrative support is sufficient?
   How could the university support you better administratively?

18. How does your school’s current smoking policy have an effect on the work you are trying to do?
   Probes:
   If your school had a more strict smoking policy would this be more help to you as a LTPB peer educator?
   If your school was 100% smoke free, how would this affect the work that you do as a LTPB peer educator?

Is there anything else that you would like to talk about today?
Interview Guide #3

This is the last round of interviews, and I will be asking you some new questions about the contest as well as some reflection type questions. I will also be asking you some of the same questions that I have asked you about before and that is because I am studying your process as a team, so I need to find out a bit more about how things have changed or stayed the same along the way.

The first couple of questions are reflection type questions that ask about your expectations and goals.

1. Looking back to the beginning of September, was this year what you expected it to be? Why or why not?

2. Do you think you have achieved your team goals or has your team set out what they wanted to accomplish?

3. Looking back over the past year what have been the major strengths of your team?

4. What have been the team’s challenges or issues that you had to endure this past year?

The next set of questions focus more on the present functioning of your team. Here you may see some questions that are similar to what I may have asked you about in the past.

5. How do you think your contest recruitment went?
   Probe – How many people did you get signed up?
   Probe – Any challenges with recruitment?

6. If you were to give advice to next year’s LTPB team, what advice would you give to them to ensure that they would be successful at peer educating?

7. Have commitment levels of peer educators changed since September? If so, how?
   Probe – Have commitment levels of the team overall changed since September? If so, how?

8. Have involvement levels of peer educators changed since September? If so how?
   Probe – Have involvement levels of the team overall changed since September? If so, how?

For Comm. Peer educators Only

9. How would you describe the leadership style of your TL? Your CPC?
   Probe - How would you rate the TL & CPC leadership abilities?

TL’s and CPC’s

10. Do you find it hard to be a leader and a friend at the same time to the peer educators?
For 2 peer educators of Ryerson

11. How has your new task scheduling been working out (emailing on Sundays)? Probe - Are you still using that method?
12. How has the commitment/involvement levels been of your web specialist been?

This next set of questions focus not so much on your team but more so on your university environment.

13. Can you tell me how your Health Educators/nurses help the work of your LTPB team?

For McMaster & 1 peer educator of Ryerson

14. How has your school newspaper been supporting you lately?

For CPC of McMaster

15. Did you get funding from Student Affairs Fund for Smoke Free Day?

These last questions focus more on yourself as an individual and how you think about yourself and your role on your LTPB team.

16. What has been your most rewarding experience this year?
17. What has been your least rewarding experience this year?
18. If your position on the LTPB team was a volunteer position, would you still have done your job if it was fewer hours a week?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>ID # (for researcher to fill in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that your remain anonymous in the reporting of the study, please choose an alias or another name that you would like us to use:</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many years worked for LTPB:</td>
<td>Job Title in LTPB:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year:</td>
<td>Program enrolled in:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: M or F</td>
<td>Age:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which of the following best described you:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular smoker (smoke 10 or more cigarettes per day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light smoker (smoke under 10 cigarettes per day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never smoked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-smoker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your ethnic origin?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European: please identify country of origin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian: please identify country of origin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Indian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: please identify country of origin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where do you live?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>off campus alone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>off campus with roommates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>off campus with family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>off campus with significant other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose three personal traits from the list that best describe you as a peer educator:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introvert</td>
<td>Extrovert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic</td>
<td>Calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>Shy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talkative</td>
<td>Quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>Follower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyal</td>
<td>Dependable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisive</td>
<td>Indecisive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus Group Guide #1

"Today you are involved in a focus group or a group interview. The first thing I am going to get you to do is fill out the short questionnaire. For those of you who did not participate in the interviews, I also have another brief questionnaire for you to fill out which is the same questionnaire the interview peer educators filled out when they were interviewed. So now lets go over the agenda for today."

"So let's now go around the room and state your name, your position on the LTPB team, and how many years you have worked for LTPB.

1. From your interviews, many of you described to me what peer education meant to you, but now I would like to get you as a group to describe to me qualities that you think a peer educator must have in order to be a successful peer educator?

2. From your interviews, I heard many of you explain to me your team goals, now as a group I would like to know what you think you LTPB team is trying to accomplish this year?

3. a) From your interviews, many of you mentioned the aspect of leadership, first I would like everyone to brainstorm the meaning of leadership, so what is leadership?  
b) Now I would like to know how is leadership important to your team?

4. a) In the interviews we also talked quite a bit about commitment, first I would like everyone to brainstorm the meaning of commitment, so what is commitment?  
b) Now I would like to know how important is commitment to your team?

5. a) Now let's brainstorm the meaning of the word involvement in relation to your team, so what is involvement?  
b) How important is involvement within your team?

6. In the interviews you talked about your successes so far, but that was still quite early in the school year, so now I would like to know what has been going well for your team? What are the successes that your team has accomplished since the beginning of the school year?

7. What are some challenges that your team has experienced so far since the beginning of the year?  
   Probe - Reflecting on your work together as a group so far, is there anything you would like to change or wish that you did differently?

8. a) Can you tell me a bit more about how you are received by the students at your school?  
b) In the interviews many of you talked about how LTPB is received by the students at your school, and the differences in how you are perceived when you are doing walk abouts compared to booth displays. Can you tell me a bit more about how you are received when you do walk abouts and booth displays? Including differences as well as similarities.
9. We talked about this in your interviews, but can you tell me a bit more about what it is about your campus that you think adds to the success of your team?

10. Now what do you think it is about your campus that may hinder your chances of success?

11. Your university can support the work of your LTPB team financially, administratively or by just supporting your cause. How well do you think that your university supports you?
   Probe – How does it impact your work when the university supports you?
   Probe – How can your university support you better?

12. As a wrap-up question, after all we have talked about, what do you think is the MOST important thing to your success?

13. Is there anything else you would like to talk about that we did not talk about today? Is there anything else that adds to your team success, influences your team dynamics, or is there anyone or anything else that could help you to achieve your goals?
Focus Group #2 – AGENDA

Discussion - Flipchart

1. Anything major happen to the team recently? (bad press, conflicts)
2. Was the contest successful?
3. Any challenges with the contest?
4. Was Smoke Free Day a success?
5. Any challenges with Smoke Free Day?
6. How was Smoke Free Day received by the students?

Explain Preliminary Findings:

1. Purpose & Research Questions
2. Diagram (flipchart)
3. Describe the Outcomes of Peer Education on Students as well as the Challenges & Successes of the Team
   - Ask the team if this is truthful?
4. Describe to the team Individual Processes of Peer Education
   - Ask the team if this is truthful?
5. Describe Team Processes of Peer Education
   - Ask the team if this is truthful?
6. Describe Campus Environment
   - Ask the team if this is truthful?

Explain the process of memberchecking (sheet at the back of executive summary)
Appendix G: Membercheck Letter

Is there anything that you would like to add to the membercheck session?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Is there anything that you would like deleted from the results?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Is there anything that was missed or needs further clarification?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

You may email your thoughts to Tiffany at tg00ab@brocku.ca or mail in the letter provided. Thank You!