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(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this research was to determine the status of peer education programs in state-supported institutions in Virginia. The result of this research was to provide base-line data relative to peer education programs in colleges in Virginia. Survey research methodology, specifically interview by telephone, was used to determine the following: (a) the number of peer education programs available, (b) the types of peer education programs currently being implemented, (c) selection process of peer educators, (d) evaluation techniques of peer education programs, (e) the number of students providing peer education instruction, (f) the number of students receiving peer education instruction, (g) the funding sources for peer education programs, (h) the academic and administrative units involved in peer education programs, (i) types of compensation given to peer education instructors, and (j) the training protocol for the peer education instructors including how peer educators are trained in terms of length and content. Data were presented by size and type of institution.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Peer education programs in higher education are currently popular and receive positive evaluations from students and administrators alike. Peer education programs normally focus on promoting and teaching prevention and intervention techniques involving such social issues as violence and substance abuse. Peer education also provides coping mechanisms for these issues. Academic subjects are another realm in which peer education is utilized. Offices of student affairs often use peer educators to facilitate orientation sessions, assist as academic advisors, and serve as residence advisors.

Colleges and universities use different terms for defining peer education. Tutoring, mentoring, and peer education encompass many meanings; however, the most basic definition is "students teaching students."

Presently, peer education programs in higher education concentrate on topics such as self-esteem, academics, social problems, and health problems. These programs are typically found in a counseling center, student center, or division of student affairs. The programs usually include a peer education supervisor, a training program, and an evaluation component. Some programs, however, give compensation or academic credit to student instructors.

Underlying peer education is the spirit of volunteerism. Students who choose to participate as peer educators usually are so concerned with various issues of interest that they dedicate their time to inform others of these issues of concern. Student peer educators are more widely accepted by students as experts in certain social issues. Peers are usually more accepted, are available to ask for advice, and are more credible than are
"non-college" adults. Peer education programs in higher education encourage personal growth and development among students who participate.

The purpose of this research was to compile a profile of peer education programs at public institutions of higher education in Virginia. The remainder of this research identifies discuss similarities and differences in peer education programs in state-supported colleges and universities in Virginia.

History

Although the literature indicates that there are many peer education programs among colleges and universities throughout the country, not many peer education programs, as we now know them, were in existence before 1970 (Drew, 1990). This section will highlight and explain the evolution of peer education.

Tutoring is a highly personalized method of teaching in which instruction occurs either in a one-to-one setting or in small groups. The method can be traced to the ancient Greeks. The Socratic method, questioning students individually or in small groups, directs student learning and can be viewed as a precursor to the type of individual and small group tutoring that is now taken for granted at so many institutions of higher education. Tutoring serves as both a supplement and support for students experiencing difficulty with their studies. For the Greeks, tutoring served as their primary method of instruction. In England, at Oxford University, the tutorial, a weekly private meeting between a student and teacher, has served as an important and primary component of a student's education for many years (Zaritsky, 1989).

In the 1950s and 1960s in Britain, the collaborative learning movement was developed by secondary teachers and medical educators. In the 1970s, collaborative learning made its way across the Atlantic. It encompassed familiar terms of peer tutoring, peer evaluation, classroom group work, peer assistance, learning, and teaching.
This concept of using fellow students to instruct, collaborate, assist, and inquire together was not new. The ancient Greeks had used student leaders as student teachers. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, American educators used peer teachers and assistants in one-room schools in rural parts of the United States.

Today, the use of peer teaching-learning contributes significantly to an increase in learning and presents a positive, supportive classroom atmosphere. Students’ work improved when help was given by peers, and peers, in turn, learned from the students they helped and from the act of helping. Collaborative learning brings new power to peer influence and challenges the traditional format of education. It has been recognized that social integration by way of peer support is directly related to persistence in a college. Support groups or "subcultures" promote bonding with the institution (Drew, 1990).

When and where the first college peer educators emerged is not identifiable in the literature, but one of the earliest recorded instances of a peer education effort was at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, where student health aides were organized in response to a 1957 Asian flu epidemic. In another instance, in the 1960s at a small midwestern college, a spontaneous student initiative attempted to warn fellow undergraduates about the dangers of marijuana, LSD, and other drugs that were being contaminated with dangerous substances. But such peer health education efforts were not welcomed nor sanctioned by college health authorities.

In rural New England, a small group of college students began their own campus sexual education program in 1971. At that time, abortion counseling and abortion were illegal, no contraceptives were available on campus, and the nearest Planned Parenthood clinic was 40 miles away. Students traveled to Washington, D.C., to educate themselves about reproductive health and returned to train other students to help them. They began by holding peer education sessions about contraceptives, distributing a Canadian birth
control handbook, and helping women on campus raise money and find resources for safe abortions. Their goal was to educate their peers so that unintended pregnancies were less likely to occur (Sloane & Zimmer, 1993).

**Peer Education Today**

Students in higher education rely on their peers as the most important source of information. They often learn about taking risks in areas such as sexuality or alcohol use from uninformed peers, other unreliable sources, or personal experimentation. Peers serve as counselors, teachers, role models, and enablers for each other, regardless of their ability. Empowering peers to help each other in informed, health-enhancing ways increases the likelihood that students will use health care resources appropriately (Sloane & Zimmer, 1993).

The peer recipients are not the only ones who profit from the peer education experience. Those who serve as peer instructors experience cognitive benefits as well. The opportunity to access other students’ perspectives and to learn from other students rather than a non-peer instructor may be especially important for promoting the cognitive development of beginning college students. Effective learning strategies acquired from peers during in-class activities tend to positively transfer to students’ out-of-class study strategies. Thus, cooperative learning procedures could serve to increase the effectiveness of the peer teaching learning process, both inside and outside the classroom. The opportunity to work regularly in small groups promotes social involvement, integration, and bonding among students. These social-networking processes are strongly associated with higher rates of student retention. College students report that they are more satisfied with courses that allow them to engage in group discussion (Cooper, 1990).
On college campuses, peer education instruction may take many forms, including resident assistant and peer academic advisement programs. The types of instruction may include didactic lecturing to large groups, interactive facilitation of small discussion groups, and interventions with individuals and couples. In addition, the operational description of "peer" varies with the demographic profile of each campus or student group. Critics of peer education question the volume or quality of training peer educators receive in preparation for entering the field. Clearly, the length of training should correlate with the activities in which peer educators will be engaged. The greater the complexity of the skills one wants peer educators to practice, the more extensive the training should be (Gould & Lomax, 1993).

Peer education is a highly cost-effective support strategy. Peer education programs are prevalent because paraprofessional-staffed programs are less expensive to operate than professional-staffed programs, and use of paraprofessionals enables professionals' time to be used to provide services more in line with their educational background and expertise.

Peer education on college and university campuses has grown from self-educated students responding to campus health issues to state-of-the-art health education and motivational models designed to empower students to help each other promote positive health beliefs and behaviors. Future peer education possibilities will involve many facets of college life created by people who care and believe that prevention is the essential component for empowering future leaders on both a personal and professional level (Sloane & Zimmer, 1993).

The future of peer education is likely to include growth in diverse campus populations and to do a better job of integrating related education issues. Peer education must demonstrate that it can provide positive behavior changes among students who
abuse drugs, alcohol and sexual behavior. To accomplish this goal, peers must have the support of their institutions of higher education and of foundation and federal agencies. This is a powerful legacy that will distinguish higher education as a pioneering contributor to the future physical and mental awareness of our nation (Sloane & Zimmer, 1993).

Planning and Evaluation

Keeling and Engstrom (1993) determined that there are basic, important, and difficult characteristics to design an enhanced peer education program. Planning must dictate what activities and programs constitute the highest and best use of peer educators. Some of these characteristics are: the evaluator must exhibit the ability to sense, monitor, and react to change; the program must be frequently and carefully evaluated in the context of an ongoing appraisal of campus needs in education and promotion; the ability to match the talents, skills, and preparation of peer educators to the most appropriate tasks, activities, and programs; the peer education supervisor must recruit people with specific talents that match the program's needs; the peer education supervisor must recruit students who are broadly representative of the diversity of students on campus; the programs must be highly targeted, carefully designed, and frequently evaluated; the training activities must be carefully monitored and should be specifically tailored to the needs of each group of trainees; awareness of and responsiveness to the diversity of learning styles among students and their focus on visual learning; commitment to inclusive programming must be addressed, and the programs must be flexible and focus on effective marketing. If peer education programs are to be kept fresh, vibrant, relevant, and connected, it is critically important that the results and context are looked at carefully and often. These characteristics and their follow-through are essential for peer education programs to be successful.
In 1983, Winston and Ender surveyed a stratified random sample of divisions of student affairs to determine the extent of use of paraprofessionals, who were defined as undergraduate students who were selected and trained to offer services or programs to their peers. Seventy percent of the 118 schools they examined indicated they used paraprofessionals. There is little information, however, on systematic research evaluating the effectiveness of the services provided or the appropriateness of various peer counselor training programs. Unless administrators demand that evaluation be part of a peer education program, it appears that such evaluations will not increase because those who are responsible for the programs often do not have the skills to evaluate properly and outside evaluators are costly. At minimum, evaluation techniques should focus on program objectives and should include evaluations of the training, content, trainers, peer educators, their presentations, and the students' responses to the programs. Existing literature gives little indication of how successful peer education programs have been in encouraging positive behavioral change in students. Until these programs can provide evidence on their effectiveness, questions about their impact on the health choices students make will continue (Fennell, 1993).

The influence of peer relationships is especially important when students are away from their families and experiencing significant life transitions. Much has been written regarding peer education throughout colleges and universities in the United States; however, very little literature has been written regarding peer education in Virginia's colleges and universities. Since the literature suggests that peer education programs in higher education have meaningful implications, it is beneficial to student affairs practitioners to know the full spectrum of the various programs available to more accurately portray types of programs. It is also advantageous to learn the extent of
involvement of these programs. How many students are served? Is training provided? Are students compensated? Are programs routinely evaluated? These are only a few of the questions that the Virginia survey will attempt to answer.

**Research Question**

To what extent are peer education programs implemented in state-supported colleges and universities in Virginia and what are the characteristics of their programs, such as the selection process, compensation, and training and evaluation techniques?

**Limitations of Research**

For purposes of this research, only state-supported institutions in Virginia were surveyed.

**Significance of Research**

This research is important for publicly-supported colleges in Virginia, student affairs practitioners, faculty, administrators, and college students. The uncertainty is that no one knows the extent of peer education programs in publicly-supported colleges and universities in Virginia. The survey will determine the extent to which peer education programs are available throughout Virginia's colleges and universities. After peer education programming characteristics are recognized and comprehensible, colleges throughout Virginia could learn from one another about the positive aspects of providing peer education programs.

In summary, various peer education programs throughout institutions in the Commonwealth of Virginia will be described and investigated in detail to reveal similarities and differences among the ways peer education programs are implemented and maintained. These data will give student affairs practitioners a better idea of how a normative peer education program should be implemented and maintained.
CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

Introduction

Over the past two decades, psychological and educational research has established that students can have a significant influence upon one another's intellectual and social development. Some research has suggested that certain educational material may be more readily grasped through peer interchange than through traditional adult-student instruction. This may come as a surprise to adults accustomed to thinking of peer influence as, at best, a distraction from learning and, at worst, an inducement to antisocial attitudes and activity.

Cognitive-development psychologists look to peer interaction as a means of providing students with uniquely constructive feedback. For a number of reasons, a student's peers often act as a particularly compelling source of cognitive dissonance. First, students of similar age speak to one another on a level that can easily be understood. Second, they speak to one another without hedging words. Third, they take the feedback of another student seriously and are strongly motivated to reconcile contradictions between themselves and other students. Fourth, informational communications between students often are less emotionally threatening than corrective advice from an adult. A peer encounter can reveal to its participants strategies that are specifically appropriate for solving cognitive tasks. Peers approach one another as equals and work out concepts through the cogeneration and consensual validation of intellectual strategies (Damon, 1984).

Bloom's Taxonomy (1993) uses three areas of therapy: observation, interaction, and talk for healthy tutor training. Six major classes are constructed from these three areas to reveal their essential properties as well as the interrelationships among them.
The first area is observation therapy which allows for developing knowledge to treat academic, social, psychological, and physical issues that may interfere with the learning process. The second area is interaction therapy which allows tutors to role play and use the knowledge of the observation techniques. Role playing emphasizes remembering and applying the generalizations and principles developed during observation treatment. Role-playing also allows tutors to experience the collaborative process and try out new techniques. Talk therapy focuses on the tutors' needs, allows for elements of time, synthesis and evaluation by combining and recombining knowledge, comprehension, application, and analysis. The goal of talk therapy is to strip away preconceived ideas while building up a new authority (Rubenstein, 1993).

The results of a survey (Zaritsky, 1989) which were mailed out to institutions of higher education throughout New York State indicate that peer tutoring, perhaps because of the individualized instruction it can provide at relatively low cost, is almost universally available as a service to students. Fifty-six (95%) of the institutions surveyed reported that they have at least one peer tutoring program, and only three (5%) reported they did not widely use peer tutoring as a support system. Institutions supported anywhere from one to fourteen tutoring programs. Most reported a combination of funding sources including: the college, grant funding, and federal/state funds for EOP and other "special" category students. Forty (80%) reported that peer tutoring was available at all three levels: remedial/developmental courses, entry level courses, and advanced courses. The survey results revealed, overwhelmingly, that institutions recognize that it is necessary to pay their peer tutors. Fifty-four institutions (96%) indicated that they provide their peer tutors with training (Zaritsky, 1989).
Benefits of Peer Education Programs

The many benefits of peer tutoring to the professor, the peer educator, and the peer student assure its continued value in the collegiate setting. Males benefit more overall from acting as peer educators. This pattern of more positive male attainments carries over into other age groups and into non-academic perceptions such as a more positive self-concept with better class participation. In successful peer education programs, individual needs must be met, prejudice toward minorities must be overcome, cooperation must overcome competition, and creativity must be adapted in response to set curricula. If a student wishes to make progress, lessons can be arranged daily in the subjects studied, even if the student has to hire a peer for additional assistance. Motivational factors are inseparably linked to the perception of learning gains by the peer educator and peer student. The increased self-confidence of the learner should be viewed as a most desirable outcome of peer education (Wagner, 1989).

Those who benefit most from peer education programs are the peer educators themselves. Many peer educators have said that information gained through training has had a significant positive impact on their own personal health behaviors. The training provided to peer educators is intensive, expensive, and interpersonal. Peer education programs provide a positive situation for all involved—the student body, the professional health educators, and the peer educators themselves. Institutions benefit from peer education programs in that "difficult" topics, such as human sexuality, alcohol and drug use, and date rape, are addressed by individuals who are highly accessible to their audiences and have credibility (Gould & Lomax, 1993).

Another beneficial aspect of peer education is role modeling related to perceived attitudes integrated with skills in decision making, problem solving, and communication. The basis of the peer education approach is that both trainers and the trainees benefit
from the experience. The underlying goal of peer education initiatives must be to help reduce students' risk behaviors as a means of decreasing preventable death and disability (Sloane & Zimmer 1993).

Research suggests that peer education is beneficial in many ways for both the peer educator and the student receiving instruction. The next two sections will focus on programming available at the university level. There are a multitude of university programs in existence, ranging in scope from student peers helping older returning college students feel more comfortable at school to health-related programs where date rape, HIV, alcohol and drug abuse prevention and intervention programs are prevalent throughout college and universities. Most of the programs provide some type of training, limited and extensive, to the peer education tutor. Some programs compensate their peer education tutors, some give college credit, and all programs reported significantly rewarding results.

Selected University Peer Education Programs

The Peer Advising Program at Iowa State University selects its peer advisors from a pool of upper-class students (Cyclone Aides) who are trained to work during summer orientation with new freshmen. When selecting peer advisors, an effort is made to maintain a broad representation of majors, interests, backgrounds, and living conditions. Peer advisors who have participated in the intensive training program serve as Cyclone Aides during summer orientation. The training, provided by the Office of Student Life, is designed to include information about campus life. Participants spend approximately 100 hours in the program. Throughout the year, peer advisors meet weekly for in-service training, which includes reviewing information on university rules, regulations, and procedures; services available to students; and career planning resources.
During the first year of the program, peer advisors were given one academic credit for their services. In the first year, the strategy was to establish a peer advising office in the Open Option Advising Center (a center for advising students without majors) of the College of Sciences and Humanities and have the peer advisors available in the office during periods of peak student traffic in the Center. To increase the visibility of the peer advising service, a pamphlet was produced outlining the program; advertisements were placed in the student newspaper; and contacts were established with residence halls, the Greek system, and departmental clubs. Peer advising can have a significant positive impact on the grade point averages of students in academic difficulty. Results indicated that peer advisors can increase retention and improve the academic progress of high-risk students. Further, the use of peer advisors is an effective and economical way to assist freshmen in their adjustment to the university environment (Davis & Ballard, 1985).

Between 1972 and 1982, the Student Counseling Center (SCC) at Illinois State University employed a large contingent of student paraprofessionals, called resource students (RSs). These paraprofessionals worked in two roles: a general peer-helping role and a specific program delivery role. In the general role, RSs provided peer counseling, information dissemination, referral, and assessment in both residence hall and off-campus environments. All RSs attended an intensive one-week paid training session in the fall, with training time divided between general peer counseling skills and specific program role responsibilities (Presser, 1984).

Black Freshman Network (BFN) is the minority retention program at Georgia State University which is a predominately white, non-residential, state-supported institution. The BFN is a multifaceted outreach/retention program. Its goals are to help Black freshmen: (a) make the emotional transition to college; (b) understand
requirements, rules and regulations; (c) make the social transition to college life; (d) make the intellectual transition to college; (e) set academic career and personal goals; and (f) seek appropriate academic advising. The peer advisors are responsible for facilitating quarterly support group meetings with their advisees, conducting telephone information sharing, and attending quarterly staff meetings called by the director. Peer advisors for the BFN are undergraduate and graduate students ranging in age from 19 to 29, married and single, black as well as white. Selection is based upon academic standing and experience in working with people, preferably in a helping capacity such as tutoring or serving as a "Big Sister" or "Big Brother." Enthusiasm about the purpose of the program and flexibility of both personal and academic schedules are other important variables. Experience has shown that mainstream student leaders are not necessarily the most suitable peer advisors. Although these students are dedicated and enthusiastic, they are often "over-extended," busy with responsibilities such as full-time jobs, heavy academic course loads, or leadership roles in other campus organizations. Peer advisors take the initiative in promoting and providing services for the students. It should be noted that the peer advisors do not provide personal counseling nor do they advise students on what courses to take. Peer advisors provide their fellow students with insight and information based on current experience, and they improve the relationship between student and institution. Often the contact made by the peer advisor simply communicates to the new student that someone is available, if needed. An evaluation of the program is conducted using interviews and responses. The survey revealed that all freshmen responded "yes" when asked if they thought the program was needed, and the majority (68%) felt that the program projected a positive image (Lewis, 1986).

Tutor training at the University of California at Berkeley Student Learning Center is an intensive process that has important elements of mentoring as well as training.
Students wishing to become tutors must be third-year students with at least a B average in the subject. Participation in the Student Learning Center support services has consistently been responsible for increased levels of classroom achievement (Robert & Thompson, 1994).

The University of Memphis Center for Student Development, Warmline, is a peer counseling program that provides information and support for older-than-average, returning, first-time University of Memphis students. Warmline peer counselors contact returning students by telephone. Peer counselors are University of Memphis students, often from the graduate counseling program, who commit to Warmline for at least one semester and attend all training sessions (Chickering, 1987).

A study conducted at Michigan State University was designed to determine what sources undergraduate students use to fulfill mentoring needs. Results indicated that students primarily rely on individuals categorized as education-related and friends for their mentoring needs. Five career functions were identified of a mentor: sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging assignments. Four psychological functions of mentoring were also identified: role modeling, confirmation, counseling, and friendship. Mentoring during college can enhance the quality of faculty-student interactions and impact a student’s successful transition to a career (Awbrey, 1993).

The Students Serving Students Program at Youngstown State University was initially designed to meet the needs of a large commuter population. The program is staffed by 20 upper-class students who contact all first-year and transfer students prior to the opening day of classes. Staff serve as peer resources throughout the students' first year of enrollment. Students Serving Students is having a positive impact not only on retention, but also on the quality of students' lives. Student Assistants are expected to
become familiar with the numerous services, activities, programs, and organizations available at YSU. Any on or off-campus employment other than the Student Assistantship is prohibited. Student Assistantships receive a stipend (Bleidt, 1991).

In an effort to curb high first-year attrition rates and to motivate students from a state of passive learning to one of active participation, Bergen Community College implemented a program of peer teaching-learning and group inquiry strategies in a pre-clinical dental hygiene course. Peer involvement diminished competitiveness, fostered professional partnerships, reduced anxiety, increased motivation, and facilitated active involvement in the learning process (Drew, 1990).

The Academic Skill Center at Black Hills State University provides a peer assistance program comprising both individual tutoring in classes offered in each academic division and credit classes in study skills. Peer tutors are upper division students who have earned good grades and can implement appropriate interpersonal skills. Each class is instructed by a team of two students. Peer tutors are upper division students (juniors and seniors) who have earned good grades, and who are able to implement appropriate interpersonal skills. New tutors are given training dates which will occur as soon as they return the next semester. The training is conducted by the director and returning tutors (Anderson, 1989).

As discussed in the previous section, university programs mentioned entail various types of peer education programs. Most involve peer education in an academic environment. The peer health education university programs are discussed in the following section. These programs include health or social concerns of the college population. Programming for issues such as date rape, HIV prevention, and drug and alcohol abuse are a few of the topics addressed.
University Peer Health Education Programs

Since 1970, peer education has evolved and expanded to address comprehensive programs in health promotion and risk reduction. In anticipation of continued interest in and practice of peer education, it is relevant to focus on peer education, both as a means of supporting college health's inquiry into what is effective peer education and of opposing professionals' wholehearted acceptance of peer education as a panacea without comprehending all of the implications for program coordination (Gould & Lomax, 1993).

During the fall of 1987, Arizona State University received a grant to demonstrate the feasibility and effectiveness of using student professionals to teach assertive and decision-making skills to their peers. These skills were taught as an early intervention strategy to address the dynamics of peer pressure in drug use among high-risk college age youth. The student paraprofessionals named their 90-minute early intervention program "Party Education 101" to encourage participation. Evaluations indicated the program was well received. The paraprofessional recruitment process began with an advertisement campaign which included posting of job notices at the Student Employment Office. A 40-hour training session was required (Brigman & Austin, 1989).

The University of North Carolina at Wilmington (UNCW) established ALTERNATIVES!, a comprehensive University program that provides substance abuse education prevention services for all members of the University community. ALTERNATIVES! is administered by the Division of Student Affairs and is funded by student health fees and a grant awarded by the U.S. Department of Education's Fund for the improvement of Post Secondary Education (FIPSE). Peer educators provide substance abuse education and prevention services. Peer educator responsibilities include staffing a resource center, providing educational programming, serving as role models for students, and supporting students who ask for assistance. There are ten requirements for
becoming a peer educator: successful academic performance in relevant classwork; compatible career goals; optimistic outlook; interpersonal warmth; leadership ability; minimum grade point average of 2.5, tolerance of divergent values, high energy level; interest in the program; and, problem solving skills (Student Services, 1988).

The health advocate program of Olin Health Center at Michigan State University employs health advocates who serve as the peer branch of the university's health education/public health service. Since initiation of the program in January 1986, more than 125 students have participated in training and service for which they receive academic credit. They enroll in a two-credit training course that meets three hours per week for one term during the academic year. The 30-hour training includes both general and specific components with approximately 20 hours of activities designed to enhance general health promotion knowledge and an additional 10 hours of skill building directly related to team participation and service responsibilities (Allen, 1993).

Peer education programs dealing with sexual assault are important for starting dialogue and improving students' awareness. If a peer education effort is to be effective, the college or university must have written policies condemning sexual assault, investigative and reporting procedures, and comprehensive sexual education and information programs. One method of educating about rape on campus is through peer education. The following is a brief list of services, policies, and programs that should be implemented in addition to a peer education program: (a) a campus sexual assault task force, (b) a written policy condemning sexual assault, (c) investigative and reporting procedures, (d) comprehensive services for survivors, (e) security, (f) policies encouraging low-risk use of alcohol, and (g) comprehensive sexuality education and information. Experience at Brown University revealed the need to provide peer educators with opportunities during initial training for open and honest dialogue on the
politics of campus rape, facing issues of power and dominance, women's dress as a factor in rape, and the distinction between victim and survivor. These discussions can be strained and frustrating, but they are necessary steps in resolving conflict among peer educators and helping them provide a consistent message (Simon, 1993).

Sexual assault, including both date rape and gang rape, is of concern for college students today. The University of Maine is addressing this serious national problem through a peer education program that enlists athletes as role models for appropriate social and sexual behavior, as well as physical strength, agility, and stamina. Because the risk of rape is four times higher for women aged 16 to 24 than for any other age group, the college years are the period of the greatest risk for rape for traditional college-age women. Athletes are recruited during the year through the human sexuality class, coaches, and recommendations from current members of the program. As members of the program, athletes attend biweekly training meetings. Each meeting has three components: business, educational, and practice sessions. The program attempts to dispel myths about gender expectations that are believed to contribute to rape, particularly myths about what constitutes normal male behavior. Athletes for Sexual Responsibility offers student-athletes a unique opportunity for community service, allowing them to be positive role models for other athletes as well as for other students (Caron, 1993).

An institution-wide effort to discourage abuse and illegal use of alcohol and other drugs was the goal of the health promotion program at Purdue University when it received a grant from FIPSE in 1989. The Purdue University Alcohol Education Innovation Award--Student Competition, as it was called--emphasized peer health education, and alternative activities were designed and delivered by students to reach as many people on campus as possible with an alternative activity. Peer influence has long
been recognized as an important force for changing values, beliefs, and behaviors of adolescents and young adults, and these interpersonal approaches have often been exceedingly influential in shaping individual behavior. Similarity in age, interests, and life experiences among peers often increases the persuasiveness of the message (Morritz, Seehafer, Maatz-Majestic, 1993).

Training leaders in a men's residence hall focused on communication and life skills in an effective way to stimulate peer discussions on HIV prevention and risk reduction and appears to have positive influences on behavioral change or intention. The program at the University of Wisconsin-Madison was extremely cost-effective and generated more than 350 conversations in a single residence hall in one month. A larger, more refined program over a longer period of time produced sustained prevention benefits and changes in the peer norms that so strongly influence behavior. Main objectives were to develop a practical, brief training curriculum for men in the residence halls that would generate a large number of peer-to-peer conversations on HIV prevention and demonstrate that the expected number of opinion-leader-initiated conversations about risk reduction in the residence hall actually occurred during the intervention month. On the assumption that low self-esteem seriously inhibits an individual's ability to maintain risk-reducing behavior changes, the peer educators also learn about the complexities of behavior change (Grossberg, Tillotson, Roberts, Roach, Brault, 1993).

At Florida Atlantic University, a classroom-based program was developed to train peer educators to enter regularly scheduled classrooms (with faculty permission) to make presentations on the causes, prevention, and treatment of HIV (Richie & Getty, 1994).

In 1970, the University of Massachusetts, Amherst pioneered a program using student peer educators in the fields of alcohol and other drug use and sexuality. Peer
educators had an impact on the campus through their creative and innovative health-promotion interventions. Restructuring at the university collapsed three individual, topic-based peer education programs into one integrated two-semester course in response to critical personnel problems and economic realities. The university staff has trained more than 1,300 peer educators who guided more than 3,500 peer education outreach projects that reached approximately 43,250 participants. The Health Aid Program evolved into the one-semester Peer Health Promotion Program (1980s), which was opened to all undergraduate students, who were trained in stress management, cancer prevention, safety, and fitness. Peer educators focus primarily on designing and conducting health promotion activities that influence students to reduce behavioral risk, promote positive health behaviors, and reduce barriers to maintaining health. They are highly valued as change agents on the campus because they effectively convey information and communicate with their peers in ways that the professional staff cannot. In preparing peer education programming on the campus, the university employs three different models: training through academic coursework, community development/volunteer educators, and paid peer educators. About 90% of the current peer educators are trained in academic courses. The restructured training combines individual peer sexuality education, peer alcohol and drug education, and peer health promotion into a single two-semester class, Peer Health Education I and Peer Health Education II. The third training model, the healthy reach program, includes paid employment. It provides health education for families and international students, and recruits, trains, and employs students who are members of those constituencies as healthy reach workers. These peer educators also attend regular meetings aimed at continuing education, skill building, and logistical
trouble-shooting. This program helps recruit, train, and retain students who need the motivation of income because of financial or family obligations (Edelstein & Gonyer, 1993).

As seen in the literature review, an equal amount of peer education programming is involved in both academics and health or social concerns. There are various prerequisites for becoming a peer educator and training is varied and compensation is mixed. There are also many benefits of using peer education to educate students on various academic and social issues.
CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

Purpose of Research

The purpose of this research was to determine the status of peer education programs in state-supported institutions in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Procedures

A literature review was conducted to determine the general nature of various types of peer education programs available in the United States. Nineteen colleges were selected based upon peer education programs in place, and they offered peer education programs ranging from academic programs to social programs. These colleges and the attributional characteristics of their peer education programs are displayed in Appendix B. Based on these colleges' typical attributes such as programs available, student requirements, training, and whether or not peer instructors are compensated monetarily or by credit, it was determined that these peer education programs could be used as a guide to determine the status of peer education programs in Virginia.

An initial plan to send a written survey to peer education supervisors was abandoned in favor of a telephone survey. It was determined that a telephone survey method would be most appropriate to best serve the purpose of this research for two reasons. First, it would be more cost-efficient, and secondly, more control would be utilized as misunderstandings of questions could be explained. Borg and Gall (1989) found that reduced cost is probably the greatest advantage of the telephone method. Another advantage they cited was that interviewers can work from a central location, monitor interviews, and quality control is much easier. The questions asked were general questions which evolved from the types and characteristics of programs from the nineteen institutions identified in the literature.
A step-by-step procedure for the telephone survey method was implemented as follows:

1. All two-year and four-year state-supported colleges and universities in Virginia were identified using the 1995 Higher Education Directory.

2. Phone calls were placed to the Office of Student Affairs at each institution. The person who answered the phone was asked to provide the name of the contact person for their peer education program(s).

3. After it was known who all contact persons were at each institution, calls were placed to the contact persons.

4. After initial introductions, the contact person was informed of the research with regard to compiling a descriptive profile of peer education programs in Virginia.

5. The contact person was asked 11 questions (Appendix A) regarding the availability of peer/tutoring education programs available at their institution. If another program was offered and another person was the supervisor of that program, the contact person gave the name of that contact person and that person was contacted as well.

6. Using the worksheet developed (Appendix A), answers to questions were recorded. If a question was misunderstood, it was explained in more detail.

7. After responses were recorded, they were transferred to a new worksheet to expand hurriedly written notes during interviews.

8. The final data analysis displays five tables of information regarding the 45 institutions surveyed. The five tables represent small two-year colleges (2,000 or less student enrollment), large two-year colleges (2,000 or more student enrollment), small four-year colleges (10,000 or less student enrollment), large four-year colleges (10,000 or more student enrollment), and a summary of responses from all colleges surveyed.
Instrumentation

The worksheet was developed for recording the following: (a) the number of peer education programs available, (b) the types of peer education programs currently being implemented, (c) evaluation techniques of peer educators and peer education programs, (d) the funding sources for the peer education programs, (e) the academic and administrative units involved in the peer education programs, and (f) the training protocol for the peer education programs including how peer educators are screened and trained in terms of length and content. See Appendix A for a copy of the worksheet used for data collection.

Permission

The Institutional Review Board approved this research (see Appendix C).
CHAPTER FOUR

Findings

Data Collection

A total of 45 two-year and four-year public colleges and universities in Virginia were surveyed by telephone. Of the 45 colleges contacted, three did not have peer or tutor education programs available and one college had a program in transition. Thus, the data analysis was based upon programs found at 41 colleges.

Comparisons were made of all two-year and four-year institutions to determine the nature of their peer and tutor education programs. The data included various types of programs, departmental units responsible for the program, funding, number of students providing peer education instruction per semester, selection process, types of compensation, the number of students receiving peer education instruction, the teaching method, the dominant structure of the teaching (one-on-one, group, or combination instruction), whether the program was an extension of a course, the nature of training provided, and evaluation techniques used.

Results are displayed according to size and nature of the institutions: (a) small two-year colleges, (b) large two-year colleges, (c) small four-year colleges, (d) large four-year colleges, and (e) questions asked and a summary of responses.

Data from the research are displayed by college and by major category of information and are shown in five tables. If a college offered more than one program, the programs were numbered. The first category lists in alphabetical order the college or university and the address. The second category lists the scope of the peer education program(s), the departmental unit under which is responsible for the program, and the funding source. The third category lists the number of students providing instruction per semester, the selection process, and whether or not the students are compensated. The
fourth category lists the number of students receiving instruction per semester, the

teaching method (by lab, subject, or department), and the dominant teaching structure

(one-on-one, group, or combination). The fifth category lists whether or not the program

is an extension of a course and type of training provided. The sixth category examines

whether or not the program is evaluated and if it is evaluated by semester or annually.

Table 1 shows data of small two-year colleges. Table 2 depicts results of large
two-year colleges. Table 3 examines small four-year colleges. Table 4 displays large
four-year colleges. Table 5 summarizes questions asked and responses of all colleges.

Small Two-Year Colleges

Fifteen small (< 2,000 students) two-year colleges had peer tutoring, tutoring

services, and trio programs available. All programs were academically oriented and most

offered only one peer education program. These programs were grant funded. An

average of 15 students taught peer education each semester. Students in the program

were faculty referred. An average of 298 students received peer education instruction per

semester. The primary teaching method was by subject. No peer education program was

an extension of a course. Most colleges provided monetary compensation for their peer

instructors. The dominant structure of student participation was one-on-one for most

colleges. Most colleges provided moderate training in peer education at the beginning of
each semester. The majority of programs were evaluated by students using a survey at
the end of each semester.

Large Two-Year Colleges

Fourteen large (> 2,000 students) two-year colleges had peer tutoring programs

available. All programs were academically oriented and most offered two peer education

programs. These programs were state funded. An average of 17 students taught peer

education each semester. Students in the program were faculty referred. An average of
Table 1

Peer Education Programs in Small Two-Year Colleges (Enrollment < 2,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/University Address</th>
<th>Peer Education Program/ Departmental Unit/Funding</th>
<th>Number of students providing instruction per semester/Selection Compensation</th>
<th>Number of students receiving instruction per semester/Teaching method/Dominant structure</th>
<th>Is program an extension of a course? Type of training provided?</th>
<th>Is program evaluated? When? How?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue Ridge Community College/Weyers Cave, VA 24486</td>
<td>NO PROGRAMS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danby Lancaster Community College/ P. O. Box 1000, Clifton Forge, VA 24422</td>
<td>Achievement Center - developmental classes in reading and English/Student Support Services/grant</td>
<td>20/faculty referred/$5.00 hr. and up</td>
<td>250+/subject-group tutoring first, then individual/group</td>
<td>no/pre-semester training consisting of a day and a half then weekly and biweekly after semester begins</td>
<td>Tutors evaluate tutees and faculty evaluate tutors and program each semester as part of survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danville Community College, 1008 E. Main St., Danville, VA 24541</td>
<td>Peer Tutoring-helping student to succeed/learning Resources Center (Library)/state</td>
<td>8-10/student fills out application to teach and professor must approve, must have C or better in subject area, faculty referral/$4.25 hr.</td>
<td>175-200/department/one-on-one</td>
<td>no/handbook and old tutor teaches new tutor</td>
<td>sends stats to Dean of Students and evaluation form to tutees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Shore Community College, 29300 Lankford Hwy., Melfa, VA 23410</td>
<td>Tutoring Services Network-developmental math and English/Student Services/state</td>
<td>7-8/volunteer by proficiency level/work-study wages</td>
<td>15-20/subject/one-on-one</td>
<td>no/no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University Address</td>
<td>Peer Education Program/ Departmental Unit/Funding</td>
<td>Number of students providing instruction per semester/Selection Compensation</td>
<td>Number of students receiving instruction per semester/Teaching method/Dominant structure</td>
<td>Is program an extension of a course? Type of training provided?</td>
<td>Is program evaluated? When? How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanna Community College, P.O. Box 339, Locust Grove, VA 22508</td>
<td>PASS Center (Peer Asst. Student Support Center): remedial or additional assistance to achieve a higher grade (Tutoring)/Department of Information Services (Library)/grant</td>
<td>10/self-initiated, faculty referral, must have a 3.0 overall and a 3.5 in subject teaching/$5.50/hr.</td>
<td>110/center divided into cubicles/combinations</td>
<td>no/hire trainer, view videotapes for 8 hours</td>
<td>survey and discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Fairfax Community College, P.O. Box 47, Middletown, VA 22645</td>
<td>1. Tutoring Program- assistance in academic subjects/Student Services/state; 2. Project Wipp (Wellness involves promotion and prevention)- develop research or thesis project on alcohol and drug abuse prevention or peer leadership and present to classrooms/Student Services/grant</td>
<td>1. 40/volunteer-$4.50/hr. 2. 7/faculty appointed/3 credits and class paid for</td>
<td>1. 100-150/subject/one-on-one 2. 500+independent study/groups</td>
<td>1. no/hours of video 2. yes/attend day long seminar</td>
<td>1. discussion 2. evaluation by grade earned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Empire Community College, P.O. Drawer 700, Big Stone Gap, VA 24219</td>
<td>1. Student Support Gain Program-trio program (low income, first generation, student w/disabilities)/Student Services/grant; 2. Peer Leaders-alcohol and drug awareness prevention and education/Students Services/grant</td>
<td>1. 20-25, recruit, must be referred by 2 faculty, minimum QCA of 2.0, prefer over 3.0/$4.25/hr.; 2. 10, nominated by faculty/$50 per month</td>
<td>1. 90/subject and lab/combinations 2. 225/programs into community/combinations</td>
<td>1. no/training handbook and initial training meeting and monthly meetings, videotapes 2. no/OCTA and family systems, outside speakers in community</td>
<td>1. mid-semester discussion and end of year survey 2. evaluation after each session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University Address</td>
<td>Peer Education Program/Departmental Unit/Funding</td>
<td>Number of students providing instruction per semester/Selection/Compensation</td>
<td>Number of students receiving instruction per semester/Teaching method/Dominant structure</td>
<td>Is program an extension of a course? Type of training provided?</td>
<td>Is program evaluated? When? How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Henry Community College, P. O. Box 5311, Martinsville, VA 24112</td>
<td>1. Peer Tutor Program-(tri)- all subjects-academic study skills/Student Support Services/grant and state; 2. Peer Mentor Program- returning student paired w/new student/Student Support Services/grant</td>
<td>1. 20, faculty referred, B or better in subject tutoring/$4.65+; 2. 12, GPA and volunteer/$10 per hr.</td>
<td>1. 750-800/LRC Room/one-on-one 2. 15/anywhere on campus/one-on-one</td>
<td>1. no/30 hour initial training and meetings throughout year Certification after training and pay raise 2. no/summer - 3 days offered (6 hrs per day)</td>
<td>1. survey annually 2. evaluation form sent out to mentors and mentees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul D. Camp Community College, 271 Kenyon, Franklin, VA 23851</td>
<td>trio program/Student Support Services/grant</td>
<td>10-15/faculty referred and A or B in subject, $5.29 hr.</td>
<td>100/anywhere on campus/one-on-one</td>
<td>no/tutor handbook and 1-2 hr. workshop each semester</td>
<td>everybody evaluates each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rappahannock Community College, Warsaw, VA and Glenns, VA</td>
<td>NO PROGRAMS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Bland College, 11301 Johnson Road, Petersburg, VA 23805</td>
<td>1. Math Lab-peer tutoring developmental math/Division of Science and Quantitative Methods/state; 2. Computer Lab-computer improvement/Academic Computing/state</td>
<td>1. 5, faculty referred, $4.25/hr.; 2. 6-7, faculty referred or volunteer, $4.25/hr.</td>
<td>1. 150/lab/one-on-one 2. 2000/lab/one-on-one</td>
<td>1. no/no 2. Computer Science 202/some at beginning</td>
<td>1. no 2. no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside Virginia Community College (Christiana), 109 Campus Dr., Alberta, VA 23821</td>
<td>trio program/Student Support Services/grant</td>
<td>5, faculty referred, $4.25 hr.</td>
<td>30/subject/one-on-one</td>
<td>no/no</td>
<td>questionnaire sent to tutees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Education Program/Departmental Unit/Funding</td>
<td>College/University Address</td>
<td>Number of students providing some learning instruction &amp; Selec. Compens</td>
<td>Number of hours of instruction per semester/Teaching method/Dominant structure</td>
<td>Is program an extension of a course?</td>
<td>Is program a training product?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Instruction &amp; Selection Compens</td>
<td>Instruction &amp; Selection Compens</td>
<td>Instruction &amp; Selection Compens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside Virginia Community College</td>
<td>Newport News, VA 23601</td>
<td>50-50 classroom/combination</td>
<td>12 faculty referred, $425 hr.</td>
<td>12 faculty referred, $425 hr.</td>
<td>12 faculty referred, $425 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Virginia Community College</td>
<td>Richlands, VA 24641</td>
<td>300, lab/one-on-one</td>
<td>50, faculty referred, $425 hr.</td>
<td>50, faculty referred, $425 hr.</td>
<td>50, faculty referred, $425 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Nelson Community College</td>
<td>Hampton, VA 23660</td>
<td>200, subject/one-on-one</td>
<td>200, subject/one-on-one</td>
<td>200, subject/one-on-one</td>
<td>200, subject/one-on-one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University Address</td>
<td>Peer Education Program/ Departmental Unit/Funding</td>
<td>Number of students providing instruction per semester/Selection Compensation</td>
<td>Number of students receiving instruction per semester/Teaching method/Dominant structure</td>
<td>Is program an extension of a course? Type of training provided?</td>
<td>Is program evaluated? When? How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Virginia Community College/506 Wards Rd., Lynchburg, VA 24502</td>
<td>CVCC Tutorial Program-Meet needs of at-risk students in math, English, accounting, biology and chemistry/Student Services/state</td>
<td>12/faculty appointed/ $9.00 and up</td>
<td>100+/lab/one-on-one</td>
<td>no/B or better average, if student has a degree, nothing else is required</td>
<td>End of semester, Dean and Division Chairs take part in discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Newport University/50 Shoe Lane, Newport News, VA 23606</td>
<td>1. Writing Ctr.-help increase writing skill/English/state 2. Math Ctr.-help increase math skills/mathematics/state</td>
<td>1. 3-4/$4.25 hr. 2. 3-4/$4.25 hr.</td>
<td>1. 200/lab/one-on-one 2. same</td>
<td>1. no 2. no</td>
<td>1. no 2. no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College (Downtown Campus), 700 E. Jackson Street, Richmond, VA 23285-5622</td>
<td>1. Student Special Services-developmental math, reading, writing/Student Services, grant and state 2. Tutorials-college level writing and math, history and psychology/Student Services, grant and state</td>
<td>1. 13-20, faculty referred, $5.50-$12.00/hr. 2. 13-20, faculty referred, $5.50-$12.00/hr.</td>
<td>1. 300+/subject/one-on-one 2. 300+/lab/one-on-one</td>
<td>1. no, expertise in subject 2. no, expertise in subject</td>
<td>1. 2 counselors evaluate at end of semester/discussion 2. 2 counselors evaluate at end of semester/discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College (Parham Rd.), P. O. Box 85622, Richmond, VA 23285-5622</td>
<td>Placement, Testing and Tutorial Services-extra assist. in academic subjects/Student Services/state</td>
<td>40/faculty referral and volunteer/yes-$5.10 hr.</td>
<td>250/tutorial centers/one-on-one</td>
<td>no, once per semester workshop is held on Sat. morning</td>
<td>discussion and survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University/Address</td>
<td>Peer Education Program/Departmental Unit/Funding</td>
<td>Number of students providing instruction per semester/Selection Compensation</td>
<td>Number of students receiving instruction per semester/Teaching method/Dominant structure</td>
<td>Is program an extension of a course? Type of training provided?</td>
<td>Is program evaluated? When? How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New River Community College, P. O. Box 1127, Dublin, VA 24084</td>
<td>1. Tutoring Services-academic subjects, handicapped and academically gifted/Arts &amp; Sciences/joint, 2. Student Support Services into program/Student Services/grant</td>
<td>1. 25-30, volunteer, 2. 5, faculty referred, high QCA/4.30 hr, if a tutor has a degree $5.00 hr.</td>
<td>1. 175/lab and subject/one-on-one 2. 100/subject/one-on-one</td>
<td>1. no/seminar at beginning of semester, 2. training on how to work with a disabled population</td>
<td>1. questionnaire 2. tutors evaluate using written survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Virginia Community College (Alexandria), 3001 North Beauregard Street, Alexandria, VA 22311</td>
<td>1. Tutorial Services-academic and peer support/ Counseling/ state 2. Mentoring Program in progress</td>
<td>25, faculty referred, 3.0 or better, senior citizens with degree, volunteer, $3.50/hr.</td>
<td>1400+/lab combination</td>
<td>no/training packet</td>
<td>two-way survey each semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Virginia Community College (Arlington), 8333 Little River Turnpike, Arlington, VA 22203</td>
<td>1. Tutoring Center-supplemental academic assistance/Learning Resource Center/state 2. Writing Center-English students writing across the curriculum/Learning Resource Center/state</td>
<td>1. 15, faculty referred, A or B average, $5.50/hr. 2. 15, faculty referred, A or B average/no</td>
<td>1. 2000/lab/combination 2. 3000/lab/one-on-one</td>
<td>1. no/3-4 hours on methods of tutoring, and management techniques, speakers, 2. no/self-training</td>
<td>1. no 2. survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Virginia Community College (Loudoun), 1000 Harry Floodbyrd Hwy., Sterling, VA 20164</td>
<td>1. Writing Center-develop writing skills/Student Support Services/state 2. Tutorial Services-all subjects except writing/Student Support Services/state</td>
<td>1. 15, selected by Writing Honors Program, $5.50 hr. 2. 25, volunteer, A or B in class, $5.50 hr.</td>
<td>1. 25/lab/one-on-one 2. 40/anywhere on campus/combination</td>
<td>1. no/Honors Classes 2. no/A or B in class tutoring</td>
<td>1. survey 2. end of year survey to tutors and tutees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University Address</td>
<td>Peer Education Program/Departmental Unit/Funding</td>
<td>Number of students providing instruction per semester/Selection Compensation</td>
<td>Number of students receiving instruction per semester/Teaching method/Dominant structure</td>
<td>Is program an extension of a course? Type of training provided?</td>
<td>Is program evaluated? When? How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Virginia Community College (Manassas), 6901 Sudley Rd., Manassas, VA 22110</td>
<td>1. Tutorial Service-academic courses: math, accounting and chemistry, Counseling Office/state; 2. Writing Center-improve English and content, reading and writing, study skills/Learning Resource Center (Library)/state</td>
<td>1. 15-20, faculty referred, $5.50/hr. 2. 10, faculty referred, $5.50/hr.</td>
<td>1. N/A/anywhere on campus/one-on-one 2. 600/center/one-on-one</td>
<td>1. no/no 2. no/1 credit course: Tutor Training</td>
<td>1. grades at end of semester 2. survey, semester and annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Virginia Community College (Woodbridge), 15800 Neabsco Mill Rd., Woodbridge, VA 22191</td>
<td>1. Tutorial Program-retention tools for most subjects/Student Development/state; 2. Tutor Lab-English and Math/Student Development/state</td>
<td>1. 15-25/faculty referred, high QCA, $5.50/hr. 2. 6, faculty referred, high QCA, $5.50/hr.</td>
<td>1. 250/anywhere on campus/one-on-one 2. 30/English and Math Lab/one-on-one</td>
<td>1. no/tutor training session, tapes 2. no/3-4 hours, tapes</td>
<td>1. discussion 2. formal evaluation, questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont Virginia Community College, Charlottesville, VA 22901-8714</td>
<td>NO PROGRAMS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidewater Community College (Portsmouth), 7000 College Dr., Portsmouth, VA 23703</td>
<td>Peer Tutoring Program-academics, all subjects/Learning Resources/state</td>
<td>12-17, faculty referred and A-B average, $5-$7 per hour</td>
<td>200-500/ subject/combination</td>
<td>no/handbook, videos, and meet throughout semester</td>
<td>tutees evaluate or call and discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidewater Community College (Va. Beach), 1700 College Crescent, Va. Beach, VA 23456</td>
<td>Tutor Study Skills Lab-all subjects and academics/Student Services/state</td>
<td>27, faculty referred, $5.00-$6.80 per hour</td>
<td>2000/lab/combination</td>
<td>no/tutor manual and tutor training tapes</td>
<td>mid-term evaluation for teacher for student tutor evaluation and at end of semester tutees evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University Address</td>
<td>Peer Education Program/Departmental Unit/Funding</td>
<td>Number of students providing instruction per semester/Selection Compensation</td>
<td>Number of students receiving instruction per semester/Teaching method/Dominant structure</td>
<td>Is program an extension of a course? Type of training provided?</td>
<td>Is program evaluated? When? How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidewater Community College, 1428 Cedar Rd., Chesapeake, VA 23320</td>
<td>Tutoring Program-academics-only math/Student Development/state</td>
<td>1, faculty referral, $6.40 per hr.</td>
<td>less than 5/ subject/one-on-one</td>
<td>no/no</td>
<td>discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Western Community College, P. O. Box 14045, Roanoke, VA 24038</td>
<td>rio program/Student Affairs/grant</td>
<td>20, self and faculty referral and advertisement, $4.25 hr.</td>
<td>250/subject/one-on-one</td>
<td>no/video and handbook</td>
<td>tutors verbally evaluate and survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
576 students received peer education per semester. The primary teaching method was by lab. No peer education program was an extension of a course. Most colleges provided monetary compensation for their peer instructors. The dominant structure of student participation was one-on-one for most colleges. Most colleges provided moderate training in peer education at the beginning of each semester. The majority of programs were evaluated by students through discussion at the end of each semester.

**Small Four-Year Colleges**

Six small (<10,000 students) four-year colleges had peer tutoring, wellness, and peer advising programs available. Academic and social programs were available and most offered two peer education programs. These programs were state funded. An average of 22 students taught peer education per semester. Students usually volunteered their services. An average of 273 students received peer education instruction per semester. The primary teaching method occurred in residence halls. Only one peer education program was an extension of a course. Most colleges provided compensation for their peer instructors. The dominant structure of student participation was one-on-one for most colleges. Most colleges provided extensive training in peer education at the beginning of each semester, and training was on-going. The majority of programs were evaluated by students using a survey at the end of each semester.

**Large Four-Year Colleges**

Six large (>10,000 students) four-year colleges had peer tutoring, peer mentoring, and career programs available. Academic and social programs were available and most offered three or more peer education programs. These programs were state funded. An average of 39 students taught peer education per semester. Students usually volunteered their services. An average of 494 students received peer education instruction each semester. The primary teaching method was taught by subject. Only one peer education
Table 3

Peer Education Programs in Small Four-Year Colleges (Enrollment < 10,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/University Address</th>
<th>Peer Education Program/ Departmental Unit/Funding</th>
<th>Number of students providing instruction per semester/ Selection/Compensation</th>
<th>Number of students receiving instruction per semester/ Teaching method/Dominant structure</th>
<th>Is program an extension of a course? Type of training provided?</th>
<th>Is program evaluated? When? How?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Washington College, 1301 College Avenue, Fredericksburg, VA 22401</td>
<td>Wellness Program-6 groups of peer education: Alcohol (Natural Highs), Human Relations (Diversity), CPR&amp;First Aid, Eating Disorders, Sexual Assault, Res. Halls and Community Groups/Resident Life/state</td>
<td>75, volunteer</td>
<td>500/residence halls/combination</td>
<td>no/administrators, Red Cross, Crisis Center</td>
<td>survey annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk State University, 2401 Corpse Avenue, Norfolk, VA 23504</td>
<td>1. Tutorial Program-academic subjects (sciences, math and English)/Student Support Services/grant, 2. Trio Program-vets who want to start or re-start college program or GED/Upward Bound/grant 3. Student Development Center-academics, career resource library, personal development/Counseling Center/state; 4. Upward Bound-academic enrichment for high school students who want to go to college/Student Affairs/grant</td>
<td>1. 30, student and faculty referred, $5.00; 2. 11-15, 3.0 QCA, junior or senior, $5.50/hr.; 3. 22-25, volunteer and Honor Society, no; 4. 7, volunteer, $5.50/hr.</td>
<td>1. 400, tutorial center, one-on-one 2. 80-120, classroom, combination 3. 200+, lab center, one-on-one 4. 60, subject, combination</td>
<td>1. no, minimum training of 3 hours before semester and ongoing; 2. no, orientation and tutor handbook; 3. no, Junior or above; 4. no, combination all day training and follow up weekly</td>
<td>1. tutors and tutees evaluate by survey and discussion each semester; 2. survey each semester; 3. end of year discussion; 4. discussion and survey each month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radford University, Box 6930, Radford, VA 24142</td>
<td>Peer Advising Program-academics and personal counseling/Student Affairs/grant</td>
<td>9, advertise, $4.25 hr.</td>
<td>60-70/subject/one-on-one</td>
<td>no/handbook, videos, speakers, 20 hours summer and 15-20 hours fall</td>
<td>discussion and survey for tutees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University Address</td>
<td>Peer Education Program/ Departmental Unit/Funding</td>
<td>Number of students providing instruction per semester/ Selection/ Compensation</td>
<td>Number of students receiving instruction per semester/ Teaching method/Dominant structure</td>
<td>Is program an extension of a course? Type of training provided?</td>
<td>Is program evaluated? When? How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Military Institute, 400 Lejeune Hall, Lexington, VA 24450</td>
<td>Peer Tutoring-academics-high risk courses (math, chemistry, physics, statics, foreign language)/Student Affairs/state</td>
<td>12, self and faculty referral, $4.25 hr.</td>
<td>175/classroom/one-on-one</td>
<td>no/1 hr. at beginning of semester and 3 sessions throughout semester or monthly</td>
<td>tutors and tutees are surveyed yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia State University, P. O. Box 9003, Petersburg, VA 23806</td>
<td>trio program/Student Support Services/grant</td>
<td>9, by department, $4.25 + hr.</td>
<td>150 max/department/small group</td>
<td>no/3 hours initial and throughout semester as needed</td>
<td>students survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of William and Mary, 240 Blow Hall, Williamsburg, VA 23187</td>
<td>1. Peer Helpers-support to student community on normal adult developmental issues/Counseling Center/state 2. Peer Educators-sexuality, nutrition, wellness, fitness /Student Health/state</td>
<td>1. 30, volunteer, 4 credits 2. 8-10, volunteer, no</td>
<td>1. 30-60/residence halls/one-on-one, 2. 750-1000/residence halls/combination</td>
<td>1. yes/1st semester-3 cr. training, 2nd semester-ppticum; 2. no/Baccus in Denver- training packet, workbook and videos/40-45 hours/students get certification in peer education</td>
<td>1. seminar -based on course grade 2. survey and discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University Address</td>
<td>Peer Education Program/ Departmental Unit/Funding</td>
<td>Number of students providing instruction per semester/ Selection/ Compensation</td>
<td>Number of students receiving instruction per semester/ Teaching method/Dominant structure</td>
<td>Is program an extension of a course? Type of training provided?</td>
<td>Is program evaluated? When? How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason University, M.S. 2A2 4400 University Dr., Fairfax, VA 22030</td>
<td>1. Tutor Referral Service-lists of students available in academic areas/Counseling and Student Development/state; 2. Campus Networks Program—substance abuse, sexual abuse and stress mgmt./Health Education/state; 3. RAs—Residence Life no longer available/Housing/state; 4. New Student Center—Teaching assistance to University 100 course (Orientation)/Student Services/state; 5. Minority Student Services—summer program (recruitment and retention)/grant; 6. African-American Program-buddy program/state</td>
<td>1. 50-75/advertise, good grades, referral/yes 2. 25/faculty referred/no 3. N/A 4. 30 sections of 20 students per section/faculty referred/yes-$1000 at fall orientation 5. N/A/yes 6. self-referral/yes</td>
<td>1. 300/subject/one-on-one 2. 25/group/combination 3. N/A/group/group 4. 600/academic course group 5. 30/ N/A/combination 6. 268-75 per buddy</td>
<td>1. no/minimal amount-self-instruction 2. no/extensive-National Certified Peer Ed. Program/3 days 3. no/extensive 4. yes/New Student Center Uni. 100/ extensive 5. N/A/extensive 6. no/extensive</td>
<td>All programs are evaluated by Director of departmental unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University Address</td>
<td>Peer Education Program/Departmental Unit/Funding</td>
<td>Number of students providing instruction per semester/Selection/Compensation</td>
<td>Number of students receiving instruction per semester/Teaching method/Dominant structure</td>
<td>Is program an extension of a course? Type of training provided?</td>
<td>Is program evaluated? When? How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison University, Counseling and Student Development Center, Harrisonburg, VA 22807</td>
<td>1. Career Peers—programs for (greeks, res. life)/Career Services/state; 2. Lead Center-Leadership/Student Activites/state; 3. Peer Educators—stress, nutrition, women’s health, sexual assault/Health Center/state; 4. Peer Mentors—support system for first year and transfer students for social, cultural and academic support/Center for Off-Campus Living/state</td>
<td>1. 10/volunteer/no 2. 20/volunteer/no 3. 20/volunteer/yes (credit) 4. 8/ad in paper and interview/no</td>
<td>1. 896/library, res. halls/combination 2. 600/experiential combination 3. 500/classroom, res. halls, info tables, fairs combination 4. 90/group combination</td>
<td>No to all, joint training, including 15 hours of classroom instruction, meet weekly for 3 hours, have speakers, go to retreats</td>
<td>1. by semester and formal end of year 2. discussion and survey 3. survey semester and annually 4. survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Dominion University, 122 Academic Skills Center, Norfolk, VA 23529</td>
<td>1. Big Brother/Big Sister—social and academic, upper class student matched with lower class student/Student Affairs/state; 2. trio program/Student Services/grant</td>
<td>1. no numbers, 60% freshmen and 40% upper class/no 2. 15-16 per year/faculty referred/graduate assistantships</td>
<td>1. 100/must have two contacts per semester/combination 2. 75/subject/one-on-one</td>
<td>1. no/upper-class beginning of semester (2 sessions) for 1 hr. 2. no/16 hour training</td>
<td>1. survey to freshmen 2. questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia, Center for Substance Abuse, Charlottesville, VA 23209</td>
<td>SAMS Program (Student Athlete or Student Assistant Mentor)—educate students about substance abuse and alcoholism involved in prevention and responsible usage/grant</td>
<td>200, elected by groups, volunteer</td>
<td>total athletes and greeks 3000+/SAM teach their own group/groups</td>
<td>no/2 two-day sessions of three hours and training throughout year</td>
<td>survey given to athlete mentors and for discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University, P. O. Box 842500, Richmond, VA 23284</td>
<td>University Tutorial Program—all subjects for freshmen and sophomores only, marginal students/Office of Academic Support/state</td>
<td>40, advertise, use honors students/500 and higher</td>
<td>300+/subject/combination</td>
<td>no/2-3 hours at beginning of semester</td>
<td>tutes and tutors survey and by grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University Address</td>
<td>Peer Education Program/Departmental Unit/Funding</td>
<td>Number of students providing instruction per semester/Selection/Compensation</td>
<td>Number of students receiving instruction per semester/Teaching method/Dominant structure</td>
<td>Is program an extension of a course? Type of training provided?</td>
<td>Is program evaluated? When? How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA 24061</td>
<td>1. Tutoring Program in Athletic Advising-support service for athletes/Provost/state; 2. Counseling Services and Greek time, stress and risk management/state; 3. Student Health Services-teach students about health related issues/state; 4. MAPS Program (multicultural awareness-program series) Dean of Students-facilitate information sessions on racism and sexism/state; 5. Peer Assistance Program (Career Services) help students gain career related experience, human experience and advising students/state</td>
<td>1. 70-100, must have 2.8 to 3.0 GPA/ $5.00 hr. undergraduate and $7.50 grad student; 2. 10 greens, volunteer and recruit, no; 3. 12 volunteer, no; 4. 12 volunteer, no; 5. 12, volunteer, no</td>
<td>1. 300-350/ subject/one-on-one; 2. 200+/ classroom/group; 3. 75/4/NA/ group; 4. 500/NA/ combination; 5. 500/NA/small group</td>
<td>1. no/3 hrs. at beginning of semester; 2. no/assist w/planning and meet every other week; 3. 30 hours before fall semester; 4. no/2 full days and ongoing; 5. no/12.25 hours per semester and ongoing</td>
<td>1. tutees and tutors evaluate each other through a survey information form; 2. by grade; 3. after 30 hours of training, peer educators given a test; 4. discussion; 5. discussion and written</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
program was an extension of a course. Most colleges did not provide compensation for their peer instructors. The dominant structure of student participation was combination (one-on-one and group) for most colleges. Most colleges provided extensive training in peer education at the beginning of each semester, and training was on-going. The majority of programs were evaluated by students using a survey at the end of each semester.

**Similarities and Differences Among Institutions**

Whereas two-year colleges only offered academic programs and usually offered only one peer education program, four-year colleges offered a variety of academic and social peer education programs and typically offered two or more programs. Peer education programs at two-year colleges usually fell under the departmental unit of student support services; however, peer education programs at four-year colleges fell under various departmental units. Some of these were students affairs, counseling, and health. Small two-year colleges utilized grant funding, and large two-year and all four-year institutions relied more on state funding. Two-year colleges relied on faculty referral for their peer education student instructors and four-year colleges relied more on students to volunteer their services. Peer education instruction reached out to more students in the larger institutions. The large two-year and four-year colleges almost doubled the number of students receiving instruction from small two-year and four-year colleges. The teaching methods were different for all colleges. Only two programs stemmed from a course out of dozens of peer education programs offered at all colleges. Almost all colleges compensated monetarily their peer education instructors with the exception of large four-year institutions and they relied on student volunteers. Most colleges used one-on-one instruction as the dominate structure, with the exception of large four-year institutions, and they used group and combination instruction. Two-year
### Table 5

**Summary of Most Common Responses To Questions About Peer Education Programs By All Colleges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions Asked of Each Respondent</th>
<th>Small 2-Year Colleges</th>
<th>Large 2-Year Colleges</th>
<th>Small 4-Year Colleges</th>
<th>Large 4-Year Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. a) What are the names of your peer education programs? b) Which departmental unit do they fall under?</td>
<td>a) Peer Tutoring, Tutoring Services, and Trio Programs; b) Student Support Services</td>
<td>a) Tutoring Services; b) Student Support Services</td>
<td>a) Wellness, Tutorial, Peer Tutoring, and Peer Advising Programs; b) Student Affairs</td>
<td>a) Peer Educator, Peer Mentor, Career, and Tutorial Programs; b) Health and Counseling Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. a) What purpose does your peer education program serve? b) What is the average number of peer education programs offered?</td>
<td>a) Academic programs; b) 1</td>
<td>a) Academic programs; b) 2</td>
<td>a) Academic and social peer education programs; b) 2</td>
<td>a) Academic and social peer education programs; b) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How is it funded?</td>
<td>grant</td>
<td>state</td>
<td>state</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions Asked of Each Respondent</td>
<td>Small 2-Year Colleges</td>
<td>Large 2-Year Colleges</td>
<td>Small 4-Year Colleges</td>
<td>Large 4-Year Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How many peer educators (students providing instruction) are involved each semester in each program and how are they identified?</td>
<td>15/faculty referred</td>
<td>17/faculty referred</td>
<td>22/students volunteer their services</td>
<td>39/students volunteer their services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How many students participate in the peer education program each semester?</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What is the primary teaching method used by each peer education program?</td>
<td>subject</td>
<td>labs</td>
<td>residence halls</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Are any of your peer education programs an extension of some course?</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no to most/yes to 1</td>
<td>no to most/yes to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions Asked of Each Respondent</td>
<td>Small 2-Year Colleges</td>
<td>Large 2-Year Colleges</td>
<td>Small 4-Year Colleges</td>
<td>Large 4-Year Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Are peer educators compensated for their services?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What is the dominant structure of student participation?</td>
<td>one-on-one instruction</td>
<td>one-on-one instruction</td>
<td>one-on-one instruction</td>
<td>combination (one-on-one and group instruction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. What is the training method or preparation for peer educators?</td>
<td>moderate training at beginning of semester</td>
<td>moderate training at beginning of semester</td>
<td>extensive training, at beginning of semester and ongoing</td>
<td>extensive training, at beginning of semester and ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Is the program evaluated? How is it evaluated and how often?</td>
<td>survey/at end of semester</td>
<td>survey/at end of semester</td>
<td>survey/at end of semester</td>
<td>survey/at end of semester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
colleges offered moderate one-time training to their peer educators and four-year colleges offered extensive on-going training to their peer educators. The majority of all colleges evaluated their programs by survey and at the end of each semester.

**Normative Peer Education Programs**

A normative peer education program is a program which could be labeled as “typical.” For example, two-year colleges address needs of commuter students and provide peer education programs which identify areas of need for students. In response to need, all two-year colleges in Virginia provide academic peer education programs. Four-year colleges address concerns of students’ living arrangements which, in turn, branch into social-related problems and recognize the need for providing peer education programs.

There are typical characteristics of peer education programs which are notable among two-year and four-year colleges. One main characteristic is that all two-year colleges offer programs which are academically oriented. Another characteristic is that two-year colleges monetarily compensate their peer education instructors. Also, two-year colleges’ student peer educators are referred by faculty; whereas, four-year colleges’ student peer educators volunteer their services.

In a hypothetical two-year college, academic peer education programs are offered and student support services provide most programs. Two-year colleges typically offer one or two programs and most of these programs in small two-year colleges are grant funded; the larger two-year colleges are state funded. Larger two-year colleges rely on labs as a place to instruct students. Peer education training is moderate two-year colleges.

In a hypothetical four-year college, academic and social peer education programs are offered and student affairs and health and counseling services provide most programs.
Four-year colleges usually offer two or more programs and the majority of programs are state funded. Students are taught in residence halls and by subject area. Four-year colleges provide extensive training for their peer education instructors.

In summary, a normative model peer education program would incorporate both academic and social programs for the benefit of students. Students would be enticed to become a peer educator by receiving credit and the credit would ideally stem from the extension of a course. Students would also be compensated monetarily for their services. Peer educators would have access to use classrooms, conference rooms, or other locations available on campus to teach other students. Students could be taught either in a one-on-one, group, or combination setting, depending on academic or social interests. Students would be fully trained by a staff member in the department who would provide on-going training for the overall peer education experience. A thorough evaluation of the program and peer educator would be completed each semester using both discussion and a more formal written evaluation. Topics evaluated would be based on objectives, outcomes, selection, and training components.

Discussion of Findings

The findings were somewhat as expected. There were peer education programs in place in all but three colleges surveyed. The questions asked in the telephone survey were answered satisfactorily by all contact persons at each college. There were obvious differences in peer education programs in two-year and four-year colleges. For example, two-year colleges offered programs based on need (academics), and four-year colleges offered programs based both on need and interest.

The findings indicated that 90% of two-year and four-year institutions offered one or two peer education programs. The remaining 10% offered two or more programs. Eighty-five percent of all colleges surveyed focused primarily on academic topics rather
than on social issues. More four-year institutions may want to compensate their peer education instructors monetarily if they hope to provide more of an incentive to students to provide instruction.

As Fennell (1993) suggested, for maximum effectiveness, an evaluation process should be incorporated into peer education programs. Although most peer education programs surveyed did involve a formal evaluation, the evaluation was based on the end result of the peer education program. Baseline program objectives, content, and training of peer education programs needed more attention. Therefore, peer education programs were not evaluated as completely as they could have been.

The findings indicate most colleges (56%) offer only one peer education program, and of these (85%) offer only academic programs. At all two-year institutions, more emphasis is placed on academic peer education programs than on social peer education programs. For many older college students who may opt to attend a two-year institution, they may not be receiving the attention they need from administrators or fellow students to feel accepted by their younger cohorts. Sloane and Zimmer (1993) found that various types of peer education programs, not only academic programs, could help older students feel more at ease about the college experience. Older returning students often have a harder time fitting in with their younger cohorts and this can, in turn, lead to a stressful collegiate experience for them. Socially-oriented peer education programs could provide them with an outlet to voice concerns about issues that interest them.

With all of the extra-curricular activities and time students devote to studies, students need more of an incentive to participate in peer education programs. Moreover, student peer educators should ideally receive course credit as well as monetary compensation for their services.
Although there are various peer education and tutor education programs available in Virginia, not much concern is placed on training peer education instructors. From the results of the survey, most training takes place in a handbook or video, and in some cases, possessing a degree qualifies a peer educator to teach other peers. A more thought-out evaluation process should include program objectives, training, and desired outcomes. Training needs to be presented more than once per semester and needs to be ongoing.

Evaluation techniques need to be more intensive and incorporate all aspects of the peer education program. Initial phases of planning, selection, training, and implementing peer education programs must be considered in the evaluation process. Evaluations should take place at the end of the semester as well as annually to optimally evaluate a program.

To summarize the data, the survey has established a profile of peer education programs in place in Virginia colleges. The knowledge from the findings will allow student affairs practitioners, college administrators, and program coordinators to fully understand the extent and nature of peer education programs in Virginia. The results obtained from this research could be used to prepare peer education programs at various universities. The knowledge acquired from this research will allow individuals to perceive similarities and differences in peer education programs by both type and size of institution. The survey results will help student affairs practitioners, college administrators, and college program coordinators better serve the needs of implementing and maintaining peer education programs.

The telephone survey conducted in Virginia of peer education programs was similar to the literature review of samples of 19 peer education programs available at institutions throughout the United States. However, all of the 19 institution’s peer education programs consisted of socially-oriented programs. The mix of academic and
social programs was absent. These programs were fully-structured peer education programs. There were no tutors or labs in the language of the literature review. This fact indicates that there are not as many “peer education” programs in Virginia as thought. In Virginia, tutors and labs are indicative of two-year colleges, and there are various academic and social programs available at four-year colleges.
CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Conclusions, and Implications

Summary of Research

Qualitative research methodology was conducted to discover the nature of peer education programs in 29 two-year and 12 four-year public institutions in Virginia.

The literature review revealed descriptions of 19 institutions throughout the United States which included various types of peer education programs available (see Appendix B).

Using the 1995 Higher Education Directory, it was established that there were 45 publicly-supported institutions of higher education in Virginia. The Office of Student Affairs from each institution was contacted, and they provided the name of the peer education supervisor for their institution.

The telephone survey interview method was conducted of all two-year and four-year public institutions in Virginia. A five to ten minute telephone interview was then conducted using the worksheet developed for a complete data collection (see Appendix A).

The 41 institutions surveyed, which had peer education programs, identified various components of their programs including: (a) the number of peer education programs available, (b) the types of peer education programs currently being implemented, (c) the evaluation techniques of peer educators and peer education programs, (d) the funding sources for the peer education programs, (e) the academic and administrative units involved in the peer education programs, and (f) the training protocol for the peer education programs, including how peer educators are screened and the actual training in terms of length and content. The purpose of this effort was to establish a profile of peer education programs in public institutions in Virginia.
Conclusions

There were equal numbers of two-year and four-year public institutions in Virginia. Most colleges offered various types of peer education programs; however, there are some differences in ways programs are maintained. For example, two-year colleges offered only academic programs to their students, while, four-year colleges offered both academic and social programs. As the institution size increased, the number of recipients of peer education instruction also increased. Two items of interest are (a) only small two-year colleges relied on grant-funding for their programming, and (b) the majority of four-year colleges relied more on student volunteers. In contrast, two-year colleges relied on faculty referral for students to become peer educators.

Although the research and telephone survey method used the term “students teaching students” as a guide when asking questions pertaining to each college’s “peer education program,” it was determined that most two-year and some of four-year colleges had tutoring programs rather than peer education programs. This fact suggests that peer education programs are not nearly as widespread as the need suggests. Need for socially-related peer education programs is strong, but actual practice in Virginia emphasized academic support, especially in two-year colleges. The difference in terminology suggested that although both terms “tutor” and “peer education” have the same simple definition “students teaching students,” the implementation, maintenance, and outcome of programming techniques were somewhat different.

Two-year colleges had labs available to students who needed special or individualized instruction in certain academic subjects. The students seeking additional instruction from these labs simply needed extra help with a mathematical problem or a research paper. This extra attention may occur on a one-time only basis. This type of tutor assistance does not fit the overall definition of peer education programming.
Peer education programs are programs which are implemented, maintained, and evaluated on a consistent basis. There are many criteria to consider when supervising a peer education program such as source of funding, need, selection, training, compensation, and evaluation techniques. Tutor labs are different in nature than peer education programs because tutor labs are an integral on-going part of two-year colleges’ focus on learning. Since two-year colleges focus their students’ needs (tutoring) in academics rather than social-related issues, they really do not have “peer education programs” in existence based on the broad overall definition of peer education.

Implications

From the data analysis summary and conclusion of this research, it is likely that there needs to be more emphasis placed on “peer education” programs within public-institutions in Virginia. As seen in Chapter 2, there are many benefits of peer education programs. Some of the main benefits to students involved in peer education were enhanced role modeling, decision making, problem solving, and communication skills. These benefits are two-way in that the peer education instructor and peer education recipient learn from one another. Benefits attained from involvement in peer education programs enable students to acquire leadership and empathy skills.

Most two-year colleges have tutor labs in place; however, they have limited if any socially-related peer education programs available. If a potential need of a social issue were to arise, various components of peer education programming need to be addressed. These components would consist of: topic of social issue, purpose of program, person responsible for overseeing program, departmental unit responsible, source of funding, how peer education instructors would be selected, where peer education instruction would occur, compensation of peer education instructors, structure of peer education instruction (one-on-one, group, or combination), training methods, and evaluation.
techniques. These are the many factors that must be considered upon implementation of a new peer education program.

Based on data gathered from the telephone survey, the four main components lacking in peer education programs were technique of student selection, compensation, types of training, and evaluation techniques. Two-year colleges relied on faculty referral for student selection, and four-year colleges relied more on students volunteering their services for becoming a peer educator. If four-year colleges wanted to increase their numbers of student peer educators, they might offer course credit as an incentive for becoming a peer educator. If students were given an option of monetary compensation or academic credit for becoming a peer education instructor, these incentives should peak student interest. Two-year colleges offered limited to moderate training to their peer education instructors. This could be due to the fact that tutor labs did not require an in-depth training component as a "peer education" program would. Therefore, a peer education program would need extensive and on-going training techniques to fully develop empathy skills of peer education instructors. Evaluation techniques would need to be used consistently after each semester and each year and should consist of discussion and a formal written evaluation.

Private colleges as well as colleges and universities outside of the state of Virginia could also benefit from the findings of this research. If peer or tutor education programs at private colleges and other out-of-state colleges are similar to the programs found in Virginia, then these colleges could use data acquired from this survey to enable them to compare, and, possibly to enhance their own peer education programs.
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Appendix A

WORKSHEET ON PEER EDUCATION/TUTORING/MENTORING
PROGRAMS IN PUBLICLY-SUPPORTED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
IN VIRGINIA

Name of Institution ________________________________

Name of person responding __________________________

1. What are the names of your peer education programs at your institution and which
departmental unit do they fall under?

2. What purpose does your peer education program serve?

3. How is it funded?

4. How many peer educators (students providing instruction) are involved each
semester in each program and how are they identified?

5. How many students participate in the peer education program each semester in
each program?

6. What is the primary teaching method used by each peer education program
(example: labs, department, subject)?

7. Are any of your peer education programs an extension of some course?

8. Are peer educators compensated for their services (ex: paid, academic credit, or
rewarded another way)?

9. What is the dominant structure of student participation (ex: one-on-one, small
group or a combination)?

10. What is the training method or preparation for peer educators (ex: number of
hours)?

11. Is the program evaluated? How is it evaluated and how often?
### Appendix B

**SAMPLES OF 19 PEER EDUCATION PROGRAMS AVAILABLE AT INSTITUTIONS THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Institution</th>
<th>Programs Available</th>
<th>Student Requirements and Training</th>
<th>Credit or Paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>Assertive and decision-making skills/Party Education 101</td>
<td>2.5 GPA, full time student, age 18-24, resident hall living experience/40 hours</td>
<td>Paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergen Community College</td>
<td>Peer/Teaching Learning</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Hills State University</td>
<td>Peer Assistance Program</td>
<td>Upper division students, good grades/Training by directors and returning tutors</td>
<td>Paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University</td>
<td>Sexual Assault Peer Education (SAPE)</td>
<td>Male and female students/Meetings</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Atlantic University</td>
<td>AIDS Peer Education Program (AEP)</td>
<td>Male and female students/Meetings</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td>Black Freshman Network</td>
<td>Based upon academic standing/Meetings</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Institution</td>
<td>Programs Available</td>
<td>Student Requirements and Training</td>
<td>Credit or Paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois State University</td>
<td>General peer-helping role and specific program delivery role</td>
<td>Written application, two letters of recommendation, and a 1/2 hour interview with two current RSs (resource students) (peer educators) /Intensive one-week paid training session in the fall</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>Peer Advising Program</td>
<td>Communication skills, experience working with people, scholarship, extracurricular activities, acceptance of varied lifestyles/Training provided by Office of Student Life, provides information about campus life-all-day workshop in September-weekly meetings</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaGuardia Community College</td>
<td>Peer Tutoring Program</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis State University</td>
<td>Warmline-Peer Counseling Program/Provides information and support to older than average returning or first time MSU students</td>
<td>MSU students from the graduate counseling program/Weekly sessions</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Institution</td>
<td>Programs Available</td>
<td>Student Requirements and Training</td>
<td>Credit or Paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>Health Advocate Program</td>
<td>Students interested in promoting health education/public service/2-credit training course that meets 3 hours per week for 1 term during the academic year</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdue University</td>
<td>The Purdue University Alcohol Education Innovation Award: Student Competition-emphasizes peer health education</td>
<td>N/A/ Formal training</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Berkeley</td>
<td>Summer Bridge Program-Successful minority retention</td>
<td>Third-year students with at least a B average/Training-N/A</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maine</td>
<td>Athletes for Sexual Responsibility-Date Rape</td>
<td>Athletes-application and interview with director/Biweekly training meetings</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts</td>
<td>Health Aid Program/Peer Health Promotion Program</td>
<td>Selected students/3 training models: academic coursework, community development/volunteer educators and employed peer educators</td>
<td>2 - 6 credits per academic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Institution</td>
<td>Programs Available</td>
<td>Student Requirements and Training</td>
<td>Credit or Paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Massachusetts-Amherst</td>
<td>Peer Alcohol and Drug Education Program</td>
<td>Students who have knowledge, experience and demonstrated abilities/Training over 2-3 semesters</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of N. Carolina-Wilmington</td>
<td>ALTERNATIVES!- Substance abuse education and prevention services</td>
<td>Students must have successful academic performance, compatible career goals, optimistic outlook, interpersonal warmth, leadership ability, 2.5 GPA, tolerance of divergent values, high energy level, interest in program, problem solving skills/Systematic Communication Skills Model/Retreat and eight 2-hour sessions</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
<td>HIV Peer Education</td>
<td>Students are selected/Three 2-hour training sessions</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown State University</td>
<td>Students Serving Students Program/Commuter University</td>
<td>Students must have 2.5 GPA, be full time/Attendance at regular staff meetings</td>
<td>Paid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C
MEMORANDUM

TO: Lynn Young
Health and Physical Education

FROM: Ernest R. Stout
Associate Provost for Research

DATE: February 27, 1995

SUBJECT: IRB EXPEDITED APPROVAL/"Peer Education Programs Throughout State Supported Institutions"
Ref. 95-062

I have reviewed your request to the IRB for the above referenced project. I concur that the experiments are of minimal risk to the human subjects who will participate and that appropriate safeguards have been taken.

This approval is valid for 12 months. If the involvement with human subjects is not complete within 12 months or there is a significant change in the protocol of the project, the project may be resubmitted for extension or approval.

On behalf of the Institutional Review Board for Research Involving Human Subjects, I have given your request expedited approval.

Best wishes.

ERS/php
CERTIFICATION OF EXEMPTION OF PROJECTS
INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

Principal Investigator(s): Lynn Young

Department: Health and Physical Education

Project Title: Peer Education Programs Throughout State Supported Institutions

Source of Support: Departmental Research X, Sponsored Research _, Proposal No._

The criteria for "exemption" from review by the IRB for a project involving the use of human subjects and with no risk to the subject is listed below. Please initial all applicable conditions and provide the substantiating statement of protocol.

a. The research will be conducted in established or commonly established educational settings, involving normal education practices. For example:
   1) Research on regular and special education instructional strategies;
   2) Research on effectiveness of instructional techniques, curricula or classroom management techniques.

b. The research involves use of education tests (__, cognitive, __, diagnostic, __, aptitude, __, achievement), and the subject cannot be identified directly or through identifiers with the information.

X c. The research involves survey or interview procedures, in which:

   1) Subjects cannot be identified directly or through identifiers with the information;
   2) Subject's responses, if known, will not place the subject at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subject's financial standing or employability;
   3) The research does not pertain to sensitive aspects of subject's own behavior (illegal conduct, drug use, sexual behavior, or alcohol use);
   4) The research involves survey or interview procedures, with elected or appointed public officials, or candidates for public office.

d. The research involves the observation of public behavior, in which:

   1) The subjects cannot be identified directly or through identifiers;
   2) The observations recorded about an individual could not put the subject at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subject's financial standing or employability;
   3) The research does not pertain to sensitive aspects of the subject's behavior (illegal conduct, drug use, sexual behavior or use of alcohol).

c. The research involves collection or study of existing data, documents, recording pathological specimens or diagnostic specimens, of which:

   1) The sources are publicly available; or
   2) The information is recorded such that the subject cannot be identified directly or indirectly through identifiers.

2. I further certify that the project will not be changed to increase the risk or exceed exempt condition(s) without filing an additional certification or application for use by the Human Subjects Review Board.

Note: If children are in any way at risk while this project is underway, the chairman of the IRB should be notified immediately in order to take corrective action.

Lynn Young, 2/20/95
Principal Investigator(s) Date

Principal Investigator(s) Date

Departmental Reviewer Date

Chair, Institutional Review Board Date
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ANNE LYNN YOUNG
600 S. Franklin Street
Christiansburg, Virginia 24073
Home: 382-0150    Office: 231-4009

EDUCATION

M.A. Student Personnel, Virginia Polytechnic Institute & SU, December 1995
B.S. Business Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute & SU, May 1989

EXPERIENCE

Administrative Assistant, Alumni Association, 7/95 - present

- Assist Director in expanding communications network, program evaluations and preparation of correspondence and reports
- Schedule Alumni Board Activities
- Assist with Committee Responsibilities
- Coordinate alumni award applications and selections
- Assist with chapter and reunion programs
- Serve as liaison with Personnel Services
- Coordinate departmental budget activities

Executive Secretary, College of Education, Academic Dean’s Office, 8/94-7/95

- Assist College of Education students with various changes in their schedules, majors, transcripts, etc.
- Provide support for Director of Tomorrow’s Teachers Program
- Assist the Division of HPE faculty with any needs or concerns regarding students or classes
- Assist the Division Director of Curriculum and Instruction with personnel and related matters
- Direct the workload of workstudy students
- Utilize Microsoft Word, WordPerfect, Quattro Pro, and Apple Macintosh software

Executive Secretary, College of Education, Health and Physical Education, 9/89-8/94

Administrative Assistant/Office Manager for the Division serving in the capacity of accountant, facilities management, student records, staff supervisor, scheduling, purchasing agent and grants management.
Adult Vocational Educational Teacher - YMCA Open University, 1989-93

Office Services Specialist, Mathematics, 1985-1989

Student Teacher, Christiansburg Middle School, March through May 1988

Clerk-Typist C, University Development, 1984-85

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

April 1995 - Attended the training workshop OCTA (On Campus Talking About Alcohol) which highlighted various components of substance abuse among students.

March 1995 - Attended the SAMS (Student Assistant/Athlete Mentor) Dissemination Project at the University of Virginia which was a two-day training session for peer education supervisors.

ACTIVITIES

Parliamentarian, College of Education Classified Staff Association, 1993-94.
President, College of Education Classified Staff Association, 1992-93.
Parent’s Board (TAPS) at Tiny Tots Day Care Center, 1990-91.
Member of Big Brothers/Big Sisters of the New River Valley, 1987-91.