

CENTRE FOR  
SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

Aids and Society Research Unit

**THE AMY BIEHL HIV & AIDS PEER  
EDUCATORS PROGRAMME:  
AN IMPACT ASSESSMENT  
OF THE VALUED BENEFITS  
AND DISBENEFITS FOR THE  
PROGRAMME PARTICIPANTS**

Stephen Porter  
Kim Wale

CSSR Working Paper No. 142

December 2005

Stephen Porter is a Researcher at the AIDS and Society Research Unit within the Centre for Social Science Research at the University of Cape Town.

Kim Wale is completing a Masters degree in Sociology at the University of Cape Town.

# The Amy Biehl HIV & AIDS Peer Educators Programme: An Impact Assessment of the Valued Benefits and Disbenefits for the Programme Participants

## Abstract

*This paper is the final deliverable of an impact assessment programme commissioned by the Amy Biehl Foundation to investigate the deeper impacts, benefits and disbenefits, on the recipients of the HIV/AIDS peer educators programme. This paper posits an interesting methodology based on Sen's capability approach which sought to explore the impact of the peer education programme upon dimensions of well-being and other agency objectives. The programme was found to be having a very positive impact upon the recipients. Overall the programme was found have important unintended, but predictable outcomes upon youth's knowledge, confidence and inner voice. The suggestion in this paper is that changes in feelings of self-worth are valuable in enhancing choices and decisions made generally in the peer educators lives and especially in regards to the knowledge gained in the area of HIV/AIDS. This is a positive appraisal; it tells us that the programme empowers youths through knowledge and relationships, which in turn enhances their own feeling of self-worth<sup>1</sup>. Coaching the peer educators with reliable knowledge about HIV/AIDS is instrumentally and substantively important, enabling informed choices that can lead them to enjoy a long and healthy life.*

---

<sup>1</sup> An interesting comparison to these results can be found in Campbell and MacPhail (2002) who had very similar findings, although they used a different approach.

# Introduction

This paper is the final deliverable of an impact assessment commissioned by the Amy Biehl Foundation to investigate the deeper impacts, and benefits and disbenefits, on the recipients of their HIV & AIDS peer educators programme<sup>2</sup>.

The programme itself has undergone some recent changes in management and in future will require further sources of funding. For the foundation this paper is an aid for the future development of the programme: it aims to assist in extenuating the constructive and alleviate the unconstructive aspects of the programme. For an academic audience this paper presents an interesting methodology for accessing and reporting the multi-dimensional impacts of a development intervention.

Cognisance needs to be taken of the environment in which the peer educator's programme is functioning. HIV & AIDS is a pandemic. The Western Cape has prevalence rates of 11.6% for Women between 15-49 and 5.6% for the total population of the province (ASSA, 2005). HIV & AIDS is a disease linked to poverty and inequality (Barnett & Whiteside, 2002: 27). It is likely therefore that prevalence rates are higher in the informal settlement which the programme is operating, Nyanga in Cape Town. Nyanga has widespread conditions characteristic of poverty such as lack of sanitation, informal housing, and high unemployment. This means that the peer educator's lives are very likely to be directly touched by HIV & AIDS on a regular basis in one form or another, people they know, or are related to, are likely to be infected.

This environment sets the programme apart from other youth 'empowering' interventions such as dance lessons or after school activities. The potential of the programme is to influence understanding and behaviour towards HIV & AIDS which can prolong the life and also enhance everyday beings and doings.

In sum, the programme had and is having a very positive impact upon the recipients. The level 1 programme, the preliminary education stage, was classified as a very good programme that made solid progress in expanding valuable ends. The level 2 programme, a stage which involves work in the community, was more than very good, though it was not quite excellent as every bit of the potential was not used. This is a positive appraisal. The programme empowers youths through knowledge and relationships, which in turn enhances their own feeling of self-worth<sup>3</sup>. These are unintended effects,

---

<sup>2</sup> For a full explanation of the term 'impact assessment' as used in this document please see Roche, 1999

<sup>3</sup> An interesting comparison to these results can be found in Campbell and MacPhail (2002) who had very similar findings, although they used a different approach.

though not unpredictable. The suggestion in this paper is that changes in feelings of self-worth are valuable in enhancing choices and decisions made generally in the educators lives and especially in regards to the knowledge gained.

Coaching the peer educators with reliable knowledge about HIV & AIDS is instrumentally and substantively important, enabling informed choices that can lead them to enjoy a long and healthy life. The gains in confidence and feelings of self-worth enjoyed by the youths are, however, also substantively important, it positively shapes the way the educators are able to manage their lives today.

## Background

The HIV & AIDS peer educators programme has been functioning in Cape Town from 2004. It was originally and successfully set-up in George. The programme has three overall objectives. Firstly, it seeks to overcome difficulties in the diffusion of knowledge on HIV & AIDS. The programme coaches young adults who then, in turn, coach younger children. The programme “challenges the notion of skills and knowledge transfer as the preserve of adults or teachers; it encourages the youth to be active producers and facilitators of skills and knowledge” (Amy Biehl, 2005). Secondly, emphasis is placed on making clear that HIV & AIDS is a present threat in youth's lives, seeking to “penetrate the psyche of those who boldly contend that it will not affect them” (*ibid*). Finally, empowerment of women is sought as part of the process. Women are particularly at risk of contracting HIV & AIDS due to their biology and relative subordination in many parts of Africa, and indeed the world (Epstein, 2004: 17). The Amy Biehl programme seeks to “deal with embedded cultural stereotypes which....preserve and perpetuate unequal social order” (Amy Biehl, 2004). In essence, the HIV & AIDS peer education programme can be stated to be a development intervention that intends to impact upon the gender stereotypes and the choices young people make in their sexual behaviour.

The programme operates at two levels. Level 1 peer educators are usually in grade 11. During this year they are taught about HIV & AIDS and relevant topics such as relationships, sex and sexuality, rape and sexual abuse. The level 1's are introduced to these issues over the school year with the aim of enhancing their public speaking skills as well as developing understanding of these issues. The level 2's are usually grade 12's and facilitate sessions in lower schools as well as taking part in the group meetings organised by Amy Biehl. They also participate in other activities within the community, for example, volunteering at clinics. To become a level 2 peer educator you are required to go through the level 1 stage first.

Recently two needs have arisen that make the implementation of an impact assessment especially pertinent. First, there has been a managerial level shift, with new staff now running the programme, and second, there is a need to find new sources of funding. Both of these issues have helped shape the remit and organisation of the impact assessment.

The remit of this impact assessment was to appraise the project beyond the objectives of the programme and try to identify deeper unintended changes, valued and disvalued, that may have been brought about as a result of the intervention. In short, the assessment sought to understand the changes in the valued beings and doings felt by the programme participants and question the remit of the programme. Undertaking the assessment in these terms would aid the new staff, helping them to tailor the programme in the coming school year for the new and old groups of peer educators.

This open remit fed into the objectives of the appraisal. This assessment is aimed at aiding staff to extenuate benefits and reduce negative aspects of the programme. For potential funders, this paper demonstrates that the HIV & AIDS peer educators programme has undergone a robust appraisal process that has established that the programme has very important psycho-social impacts upon programme participants well-being beyond the knowledge gained of HIV & AIDS. Though negatives were identified, these can be mitigated as a result of this appraisal. The aim of this paper therefore is to discuss the methods employed and results gained in implementing a methodology designed to develop deeper understanding of the peer educators beyond programme objectives.

## **Objectives**

The original methodology developed by Alkire (2002), on which this impact assessment is based, sought to comprehend the perceptions of the valued and disvalued impacts of programmes upon the participants. Because of the very close match between the original and current assessments remit the objectives are taken straight from the original methodology. The objectives of the assessment are:

“ [1] to access and report the multidimensional impacts of the activity to the funding institution such that these impacts were comparable across activities, and so could be factored into ongoing funding decisions by the donor and feed into ‘best practices’

[and 2] to assess impacts in such a way that the concerned community could (and did) reflect critically on *the relative value or desirability of different* impacts and formulate ongoing objectives (and on the basis of these select monitoring indicators)” (Alkire, 2002: 225).

## Scope

Assessment had to be completed over a period of 8 weeks spending approximately 24 hours in the field. The chief beneficiaries of the programme, the level 1 and 2 peer educators, were the participants of the focus group discussions. The methodology, a tried and tested approach to impact assessment developed for Oxfam by a researcher from Oxford University, has been adapted to fit the circumstances. The approach focuses on the valued/disvalued, intended/unintended experience of the programme in the eyes of the participants.

Three conditions of the focus group discussion were introduced in this specific circumstance to enhance the validity of the information gleaned. First, peer educators had the choice of answering questions in their first language Xhosa or in English, a native Xhosa speaker therefore acted as facilitator. Second, due to the limited timeframe, revisits were not possible to the field, we therefore had to do our best with what was available, if not enough or too many children were present - in the given context it was not possible to turn children away or seek them - we continued with the assessment. Third, the programme co-ordinators from the Amy Biehl foundation were not present during the proceedings, this initially gave the peer educators some misgivings, but it was felt that the absence of co-ordinators was necessary so that disbenefits could be explored as fully as possible.

## Methodology

The methodology is based on the work of Alkire (2002) who sought to place Sen's capability approach into operation (for example see Sen, 1992, 1999). The capability approach centralises the attainment of human freedom as the end space in which the achievement of development ought to be evaluated. Sen, the originator of the capabilities approach, states “development can be seen...as a process of expanding the real freedom that people enjoy” (Sen, 1999:3); freedom is both the “*primary end* and...the *principal means* of development” (Sen, 1999: 36). Therefore development is perceived as the removal of unfreedom, such as poverty, and the enhancement of valued ‘doings and beings’, such as, literacy, and political participation (Sen, 1999: 10, 32).

The approach Alkire has developed aims to understand whether freedoms that people value have been enhanced by a specific intervention, put another way, it sought to understand how the programme participants have been able to flourish. Public reasoning is central in this approach; participants are given the space to recognise, define, and choose examples or instances of benefits or disbenefits themselves. This focus is entirely appropriate given the assessments remit to concentrate upon the intended and unintended impacts of the project.

Participation is at the core of this approach, people are centralised in this methodology and are understood to be able to engage in public reasoning and comprehend what the valued and undesired changes were in their life. The methodology utilises dimensions of impact, these are sometimes termed ‘middle level indicators’.

As Alkire states:

“[i]n simple terms, this account addresses the problem of over specification by proposing generic dimensions, rather than needs or virtues or capabilities, that represent the *most basic* reasons for action which are incommensurable in kind” (2002: 76)

This helps to overcome the disadvantages of purely open-ended questions - the likelihood of positive answers which ignore areas of valuable and disvalued change - and of a questionnaire approach - the closing off of the option of public reasoning. Alkire asserts the dimensions are:

“like the ‘primary colours’ of values. An infinite range of shades can be made from our three primary colours, and not every painting (or life or community or income generation project) uses all or even most shades, but if, for example, all red hues were entirely missing, then my understanding of colour would be consistently skewed” (2002: 52).

In this approach, if one dimension was not felt to be of importance, it is not considered an issue, the assessment is interested in the most valued and disvalued aspects of the programme from the participant's point of view. The dimensions of impact are contained in Table 1, Appendix 1.

Weighting of impacts in this methodology is achieved through a process of reflection and discussion by participants. To achieve weightings, the participants discussed the main areas of change, and then were asked to inter-rank impacts within the dimensions, finally they intra-rank the dimensions as a whole giving a mark out of ten to the three most important impacts. Consensus was sought, but if this did not emerge, the tensions are noted.

This methodological approach has several advantages over alternative evaluation/assessment approaches. Some evaluation approaches favour assessment by pre-selected ‘objectives’ and often quantifiable indicators. This approach, however, shrouds unintended impacts through overspecification and can ‘force’ participants down a line of reasoning that highlights areas of change not important for them. This has been termed the ‘indicator dilemma’; “[t]his dilemma...notes that indicators which are used to verify impact can, by definition, only capture expected change and will only reflect those areas of change that can be made explicit” (Roche, 1999: 43). So in terms of the peer educator programme, one objective is to “deal with embedded cultural stereotypes which...preserve and perpetuate unequal social order” (Amy Biehl, 2004). In defining an indicator for assessment of gender stereotypes, for example, it would be possible to draw on literature on subordination and domination of women and produce indicators and ‘results’ based on the answers. However, our defined notion of subordination may have little do to with the lives of the participants. By having the spotlight on gender issues, we may well close off other lines of discussion relating to the family or indeed their own self-confidence, that may be perceived as more valuable by the participants. The downstream effect is that deeper questioning of programme objectives is unable to take place; actual impacts are ignored in favour of intended, but possibly limited objectives. This means that a programme could be judged a failure, for example by not preventing unprotected sex, though it could be satisfying broader needs.

When you lose your keys, you do not only look where the light is best. In the same way, when conducting assessment we ought not concentrate on only those things that we seek to measure; areas outside of the ‘spotlight’ can be more important to participants than areas within the narrow beam. During the assessment and this paper, the programme objectives are placed to one side and the valued changes to participants are emphasised.

Turning to the implementation of the methodology, the dimensions in Table 1, Appendix 1, were explored during two sessions, each lasting for two hours; first with the level 1 and then with level 2 peer educators. The intention was to follow a systematic step by step process which sought to “identify *all* valued benefits/disbenefits, by engaging with the chains of practical reasoning that they already use” (Alkire, 2002: 226). Practicalities in the field meant that it was not possible to adhere to a strict process. Further, due to limitations in the experience of the researchers, time, and training of the facilitator, relatively open questions were asked directly related to the dimensions of impact. Preferably dimensions should have emerged through discussion. To enable this, the researchers would have been experienced in participatory facilitation and a full days training given to the chief facilitator - this however was not possible.

At a high level, the impact assessment proceeded as follows: at the start of the assessment, the purpose of the session, and the meaning of impact were explained, discussion was then initiated. Discussion took place in each dimension of impact and questions were asked in a preset order as in Table 2 Appendix 1. The facilitator then encouraged further discussion. Disbenefits were explored separately. The session concluded with a period of reflection where participants inter and intra-ranked – as described above - the most important impacts and highlighted areas of change. Table 2 Appendix 1 contains details of questions and alternative words used to elicit further discussion from participants, while Table 3 Appendix 1 contains the specific details of the steps taken by the facilitator. Programme co-ordinators were involved in the subsequent analysis of results to see what further light they could shine on issues.

## **Caveats**

Although the above process was intended to be followed in both sessions, some caveats were apparent, and indeed unavoidable given the on-the-ground situation:

- Participant numbers in the two groups was not a consistent. In the level 1 group, there were around 14 participants (around 50% of the total level 1 educators); this number was too large. In the second group, we only had 3 participants (representing 25% of the total level 2 educators); this number was too small. It is difficult to say what the exact effect of this was. On the one hand, a large group may have discouraged some people from speaking, some participants did remain quiet. For the level 2's, a smaller group meant that certain opinions of the quieter participants could be more fully explored. A further encouraging sign was that all participants in the level 2 discussion mentioned very similar changes. However, caution must be added, it could be speculated that those present were those most keen on the programme, although it would be fair to point out that the session did take place on the last day before study leave and some of the level 2's were working on an assignment. It is emphasised here that future exercises should involve a broader constituency of educators to ensure that the sample is more representative.

Yet, even given selection bias, - i.e. the keener participants being the ones likely to attend and take part in discussion - the views of these participants, it is argued here, do reveal benefits and disbenefits of the project at hand. Taking account of these views and feeding them back into on-going project formulation and monitoring means that some of the most valued benefits can

be extenuated and some disbenefits can be reduced. More information may have been 'discovered' given a larger number of participants, but there are only so many changes that a maturing project can factor in. Therefore the assessment undertaken and the results uncovered provide a valid basis for ongoing project formulation within the on-ground limitations for change and provide a valid basis for on-going monitoring which can include a larger number of participants. In sum, the assessment has helped formulate questions about the programmes set-up and objectives rather than providing a 'road map' for change.

Due to differing levels of participation, practical constraints were also apparent. The low level of participation in the level 2 group meant that impacts raised were not written on the board as a reference point. The consequence of this was that in the level 2's session, the weighting and inter-ranking within the dimensions was not undertaken. The group discussion (see steps 2,3,5,6 table 2 Appendix 1) had taken longer and the same points had been raised in a variety of ways. Without the valued dimensions on the board, inter-ranking could not be easily accomplished. The participants also appeared fatigued at this point. However, the interconnections between various dimensions were healthily discussed during the earlier stages of the interview and with a small group consensus and tensions on these issues could be identified. Importantly the intra-ranking between dimensions was undertaken. To that extent it is asserted that adaptation of the methodology and lower participation did not seriously compromise the results in terms of gaining valuable knowledge and areas of change on a project level.

A session which was designed to reflect upon results - debriefing for facilitators - took place on the following day for the level 1's, for the level 2's it took place immediately afterwards. This does not have appeared to have adversely affected the quality of debrief.

## **Results**

The aim of the following section is to present and analyse the results that arose from the focus group discussions. Firstly, the results from the Level 1 and 2 peer educators will be presented in tabulated form, this table does not elaborate about the results, but rather presents a rough overview of the findings. Second, these results will be analysed and discussed in greater detail. Third, the limitations and successes of the methodology will be reflected upon. Finally, an overall conclusion will be given.

The tables below, represents a summary of the level 1 and 2 focus groups. Each table is divided into a dimension section, a valued benefit section and an example/elaboration section. During the focus group, discussion would be initiated for each dimension. The aim of this discussion was to reach a form of consensus among the peer educators as to which benefits were generally most valued. The benefits in the table represent the peer educators most commonly agreed on valued benefits. Weightings attributed to the top three impacts are contained under the dimension column. For the level 1's, the valued benefits are presented in inter-ranked order. For each valued benefit, either a quote or elaboration is given to illustrate the meaning of the valued benefit. A discussion of the significance of the highest ranked valued benefits follows in the discussion section.

## Overview of Results from Focus Group with Level 1 Peer Educators

### *Valued Benefits Identified by Level 1 Peer Educators*

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Valued Benefit</i>	<i>Example/Elaboration</i>
Life-Health-Security Ranked 3 <sup>rd</sup> Mark 7/10	Knowing your HIV status.	"HIV is an affecting disease, you must know your status"
	Knowing the consequences of sex.	"Use of condoms"
	Knowing the consequences of alcohol and drug abuse.	"Drugs and alcohol are not good because you will end-up being and alcoholic and you can be addicted"
Knowledge Ranked 1 <sup>st</sup> Mark 10/10	Knowing that confidentiality is essential when discussing HIV & AIDS.	The level 1s learnt that confidentiality when talking about HIV is extremely important. However, they felt that this dimension needs to be improved on i.e. there is not enough confidentiality within the group.
	Knowing how to protect yourself from contracting HIV.	"We know we have to use a condom when we are sexually active"
	Knowing how to help people who are HIV positive.	"We know how you can council another person"
	Knowing about STIs.	The level 1s demonstrated knowledge about many different types of sexually transmitted infections.
Work and Play	Passing on information they have learnt to their friends.	"you can give a friend advice of using a condom"
	Being careful not to engage in risky behaviour at parties.	"If you are at a party you mustn't put yourself at risk" E.g. Be careful not to get too drunk at a party.

	Improved schoolwork about HIV & AIDS and teenage pregnancy.	“When we are given work at school about teenage pregnancy or AIDS we know that we give a lot of work and we do our work well because we have a lot of experience”
Relationships	Valuing trust in relationships	The level 1s learnt that it is important to have trust in your relationships.
	Talking about sex with peers and partner.	“You can share your information with your partner and friends”
	Teaching their parents to be open to discussion on HIV & AIDS	Their parents used to switch the television off when there is a programme about AIDS, so now they told their parents to please watch the programme as it is important.
Inner Voice	Gaining confidence in themselves and in their ability to say no.	The level 1s described their feelings of confidence on two levels. In their hearts they said they felt happy and confident. In their heads they are confident to say no sex without a condom.
	Feeling free because of the knowledge they have gained.	The Level 1 educators feel free because of the knowledge that they have gained from the programme. Knowledge that has empowered them.
	Feeling happy because of the knowledge they have gained.	“We feel happy because at first we didn’t know anything about HIV, pregnancy, drug and alcohol abuse”
Empowerment Ranked 2 <sup>nd</sup> Mark 8/10	Being empowered to say no to sex without a condom.	“I can take the decision to say no, no, no!” The grade 11 said that before they would not think of saying no to sex, but now they can make the decision to say no.
	Believing in themselves.	“It influenced me very good because if I want to be a lawyer no-one can tell me what to do about my life”
	Being empowered to make their own decisions.	“I can take the decision even if my mom is against the boy. It’s my body.”
Beauty-Culture	Realising that AIDS is not an abodaki (“black”) disease, it kills all races.	“it influenced that HIV was for black people only, but no it’s for all people who are living in a free world”
	Awareness about the dangers of HIV infection while undertaking circumcision practices.	Level 1 males reflected that when they are circumcised in the bush, they still only use one instrument and don’t sterilise it. They felt that they should be using different instruments and sterilising them.
	Awareness about beliefs that circulate about HIV.	They said that some Amaxhwele (traditional healers) say that if you sleep with a virgin you won’t get HIV. They believe that these traditional healers are wrong.

Religion	Change in their beliefs and attitudes about HIV & AIDS	The Grade 11 peer educators expressed a change in their attitudes towards HIV. “We do not isolate ourselves from infected people. There is no need to insult people, because they are human beings like us”
	Change in the church’s beliefs and attitudes about HIV & AIDS	The church is also changing its beliefs about HIV. Before the church believed that “the person infected has done an evil thing. They say she/he must not mix with the other youth because she/he will influence them”. However, the church is learning that people with AIDS are the same as anybody else.

### *Disbenefits Identified by Level 1 Peer Educators*

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Valued Disbenefit</i>	<i>Description</i>
Life-Health Security	There is not always food provided at group meetings	The level 1s say that they are at the meetings for a very long time and they get very hungry. There is supposed to be food every week, but this is not always the case.
Relationships	Lack of respect understanding and acceptance between level 1 peer educators	The level 1s felt that there was a lack of understanding, respect and acceptance within the group. They said that sometimes the group ignores or makes fun of people’s problems. They felt that respect was not equally shared among the group members, and that they don’t take each other seriously.
Work and Play	Lack of punctuality and attendance of group members	The grade 11 felt that sometimes group members were late or absent from the group. They expressed a desire for greater attendance and punctuality of group members.

### *Increasing Valued Benefits: Level 1 Peer Educator Suggestions*

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Suggestion</i>	<i>Description</i>
Life-Health Security	Food at every meeting	They would like to have food at every meeting. If there is food provided at every meeting they will not feel hungry.
Relationships	For interns to stay longer	They would like interns to stay for longer, they were doing creative writing with Morgan then she had to leave.
Work and Play	More fun activities	The level 1s feel that the group is always very serious. They would like to have some fun with the group to lighten the seriousness.
	Leadership skills workshop	The level 1s say that they would really enjoy a leadership skills workshop

## Results From Level Two Peer Educator Focus Group

### *Valued Benefits Identified By Level Two Peer Educators*

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Valued Benefit</i>	<i>Example/Elaboration</i>
Life-Health-Security	Knowing how to protect yourself from contracting HIV.	“You get told what to do when someone is bleeding and all that sort of stuff to protect yourself against HIV.”
	Knowing how to help people infected with HIV.	“You know what to eat and what medicine to go for when you have HIV”
	Experiencing a positive change in your life.	“We've learned a lot and it's really changed our life getting to be responsible and being privileged to teach others in our community, church and everywhere”
Knowledge Ranked 3 <sup>rd</sup> Mark 8/10	Having the space to explore and question relationships and sex.	“There are times when you talk about relationships and boyfriends and having sex. I never got a chance to talk about those things with my mother. There was a time when I didn't know, did you have to have sex with your boyfriend in order to get him”
	Learning about HIV and accept the disease.	“My sister was HIV positive and she died and my heart did not accept it. Becoming a peer educator I found it easier to accept it and deal with it in so many ways”
	Learning to rely on people.	“I really learnt a lot at my last camp, it was really touching and comforting, I really learnt to rely on people” “Everyone has problems all you have to do is talk about it”
Work and Play	Gaining knowledge and communication skills.	“Sometimes I get asked by a student about HIV and it's a skill to be able to say I know this and I know this, I know what is HIV and all the things you have to be if you are HIV positive”
	Gaining problem-solving skills.	“We are also told how to solve problems and we apply that throughout our lives”
	Having responsible fun.	“We went on camp and had fun and really enjoyed ourselves. You don't always have to be serious, you know. We are teenagers, we can go out and have fun and be responsible”

Relationships Ranked 2 <sup>nd</sup> Mark 9/10	Sharing problems.	“When you have problems you can come to the group and talk about it, even if its problems with your mother, then the others will tell you if you were wrong or right and all that stuff”
	Creating a more open relationship with our parents.	“I told my mother I had a boyfriend, I wanted to give her that knowledge, so it happened when I'd joined Amy Biehl. And like she heard we were talking about condoms, sex and she saw my papers from Amy Biehl, and she asked what it was about and I told her”
	Getting more respect and trust from our parents.	“Knowing we are part of Amy Biehl gives our parents power to believe in us, that we know something”
	Applying the knowledge we learn to our relationships with our boyfriend/girlfriend.	One of the Grade 12 respondents broke up with her old boyfriend because he wouldn't use a condom. When she got a new boyfriend she brought him along to Amy Biehl, so they could both be informed about HIV. “I took my boyfriend to see what we are doing at Amy Biehl and we apply that knowledge”
Inner Voice Ranked 1 <sup>st</sup> Mark 9/10 there was a tension in discussion between 8/10 and 10/10	Gaining confidence.	“I'm also a shy person, but when we go to the clinics/schools we have no time to be shy, all we have time for is to stand up in front of about 30 people and tell them what we have to say”
	Feeling proud about being a peer educator.	“I'm a peer educator, I've got a name and people know I'm not just a student, I'm someone you can come and ask if you have a problem”
	Having a sense of identity.	“I feel like the real Nomapho [her name] now”
Empowerment	Making our own decisions.	“We are taught to look at the advantages and consequences of the decisions we make” “There's nothing wrong with making a bad decision, because you can learn from it and you won't make the same bad decision again”
	Having the opportunity to teach.	“We've been given the knowledge and the privilege to teach others about HIV”
	Having the opportunity to find jobs.	“There's an opportunity to find jobs if we want to teach about HIV and AIDS” “There's this thing in Stellenbosch, if you want to go on as a peer educator you can join them and all you have to do is pay the registration fee”

Beauty-Culture	Hope.	“For me, it has taught me to have hope. I hope that one day they will find a cure for HIV”
Religion	Change in beliefs about HIV.	“I used to think HIV was this big thing and you should stay away from people with HIV... When I wasn’t in the programme I had a lot of myths about HIV and I believed them, but now I’ve turned them into knowledge”
	Change in the church’s beliefs about HIV.	“The church did not used to accept HIV, but now they do”

### *Disbenefits Identified By Level 2 Peer Educators*

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Valued Disbenefit</i>	<i>Example/Elaboration</i>
Relationships	The level 2s have formed meaningful relationships with each other. They fear that when the programme ends, these relationships will end too.	“We are not going to see each other again”
	The educators expressed sadness about the fact that the people who come from Amy Biehl leave them and are replaced by new people. They grow to love the people from Amy Biehl involved in the HIV programme and then they leave. They then have to get used to new people only to have them leave.	“It takes time to forget about someone, we were getting used to Nomi and then she left and some of us were crying. Then Adrienne came and we fell in love with her again and she left. And now we’ve got Mandisa and we don’t know, maybe she will go too”
Work and Play	Amy Biehl will often arrive late for Peer educator meetings.	Amy Biehl will often arrive late. This means that the peer educators have to wait around for Amy Biehl to arrive. Because they start late, they end late, impacting upon other necessary work and play activities that need to take place. “If they say three o’ clock, they come at twenty to four. Then it can go till five, and coming back at five o’ clock I still have to cook and eat and do my homework, I’ve got everything to do”
Empowerment	When the programme ends, they no longer have the opportunity to be a peer educator.	The level 2s worry that when the programme ends they will no longer have the choice to be a peer educator.

## *Increasing Valued Benefits: Level 2 Suggestions*

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Suggestion</i>	<i>Elaboration/Example</i>
Work and Play	Amy Biehl co-ordinators arrive on time.	If the meetings start on time, they will end on time. If the programme ends on time then peer educators have more time to engage in there work and play activities outside of Amy Biehl
Empowerment	The continued involvement of peer educators with Amy Biehl after they have finished school.	The peer educators would like the choice/opportunity to continue to be involved with Amy Biehl after school has ended. “We are now in grade 12, I wish that maybe next year we can still be involved in the programme even if we are not at school”

## **Discussion**

### **Valued Benefits**

The exercise of ranking the dimensions allowed us to identify which benefits of the programme were the most valuable to the peer educators. All of the level 1 peer educators agreed that knowledge, empowerment and life-health security are the top three most valued dimensions, although there was prolonged discussion around intra-ranking knowledge and empowerment. Within the dimension of knowledge the most significant valued benefits identified were: learning to be confidential when discussing HIV, knowing how to protect oneself from contracting HIV, knowing how to help others with HIV and knowing about STIs. Within the dimension of empowerment the most significant valued benefits identified were: being able to say no to sex, believing in themselves and being able to make their own decisions. Within the dimension of life-health security the most significant valued benefits identified were: knowing your HIV status and knowing the consequences of sex and the risks of alcohol and drug abuse.

The level 2 peer educators demonstrated a bit of tension in identifying the top three valued benefits. There was some disagreement about which was most important dimension. One of the peer educators felt it was knowledge, the other one felt it was inner voice and the other felt it was relationships. However there was a consensus that these three were the top three valued benefits. Within relationships the most significant valued benefits identified were: sharing problems with the group, openness and trust in relationship with parents; and applying knowledge to relationship with partner. Within inner voice the most significant valued benefits identified were: confidence, pride and a sense of identity. Within knowledge the most significant valued benefits identified were:

questioning sex and relationships, learning about HIV, learning to rely on people.

The ranking exercise is useful, it must be recognised though that the valued benefits in one dimension, are connected to and influence the valued benefits in the other dimensions; as one participant emphasised, “but our relationships improved because of the knowledge applied to it”. The freedom to engage in open and trusting relationships influences the freedom to feel confidence and pride in oneself, which in turn influences relationships.

These findings demonstrate that, in general, the most valued dimensions for the level 1s and 2s are knowledge, relationships, empowerment, inner-voice and life-health-security. The broader aim of the programme to educate the peer educators with knowledge about HIV & AIDS is attained, but acts as a vehicle through which other dimensions are enhanced. These could be said to be unintended, but predictable outcomes. The educators are learning about HIV & AIDS in ways that enhance their relationships, feelings of worth, decision-making capacity and health, in turn this impacts on the application of knowledge. This represents a very useful and beneficial feature of the HIV & AIDS programme and should be extenuated.

## **Disbenefits and Peer Educator Suggestions**

In this section we aim to discuss the disbenefits of the programme. The disbenefits refer to the areas where the impact on their life has some detrimental effect. These areas represent potential for the valued benefits of the programme to be further enhanced by cutting out or reducing these detrimental effects.

In general, the level 1s identified disbenefits in the life-health-security, relationship and work/play dimensions. The most important disbenefit, which was heatedly discussed, was in the relationship dimension. Many of the level 1s identified lack of respect in group relations as a disbenefit. This is a disbenefit because not trusting other members inhibits the formation of meaningful relationships between peer educators. It is suspected by the co-ordinators that this is a result of having a larger overall group size than the level 2s and leads to the creation of factions and cliques. In the life-health security dimension, most of the level 1s agreed that not getting food regularly is a disbenefit. This is because they get hungry during meetings. Feelings of hunger impinge on the ability to concentrate, this further results in disbenefits in the knowledge dimension. In terms of the work/play dimension there was a general consensus that lack of attendance and punctuality of group members is a disbenefit. If group members are arriving late and missing group meetings it impinges on the work done within the group as a whole.

In general, the level 2's identified disbenefits in the relationship, work/play and empowerment dimension. In terms of the relationship dimension, all three level 2s identified the coming and going of people involved as a disbenefit because it is upsetting and disruptive continually having to get used to new people. Another disbenefit identified by most of the level 2s in the relationship dimension was the ending of the peer educators close contact and group relationships when the programme ended. In terms of work/play, all three peer educators identified lateness of Amy Biehl as a disbenefit. This is a disbenefit because late meetings encroach on the time needed to fulfil and complete other commitments and activities in the work/play dimension such as homework, cooking and eating. In terms of the empowerment dimension, for all three level 2s, the ending of the programme is identified as a disbenefit because they lose the opportunity of being a peer educator.

## **Scope for improvement**

*Level 1 Peer Educators:* There is significant scope for improvement in enhancing the relationship between the peer educators. Although the level 2s are in a different stage of the programme and hence development to level 1s, it might be useful to see if anything was done differently for the level 2s that might have influenced the quality of relationships. It might be useful to introduce exercises and discussions specifically aimed at enhancing intra-group relations. The group members suggested more fun activities. Fun activities might be used with a dual focus, to lighten the seriousness of the group and create a space for them to form meaningful relationships.

*Level 2 Peer Educators:* The level 2s are at the stage where their peer education programme is coming to a close and they are expressing uncertainty about the future and sadness that the group is ending. The results indicate that for the level 2s, the programme is not just about learning about HIV & AIDS. It has become a therapeutic space, a support structure, a sense of pride, and identity. The level 2s have been so influenced by the programme that it has become an extremely valuable part of their lives, this is very positive, but at the same time problematic. For this programme to suddenly end could actually have negative effects, because many of the valued benefits would end with it. Therefore there is a need to address this disbenefit. Firstly, it would be useful to introduce closure sessions where group members can reflect on the programme, how it has affected them and how it can continue to benefit them in the future. Secondly, possibilities for using their knowledge in the future could be discussed.

*The Amy Biehl Organisation:* Areas for improvement within the organisation, the 'business processes' related to the programme, also became evident during the assessment. The level 1s identified the lack of food at meetings as a valued disbenefit that impacts on their life-health-security dimension because they feel hungry. This disbenefit also impacts on the knowledge dimension because it is difficult to concentrate if you are hungry.

The level 2s identified lateness as a disbenefit of the Amy Biehl Foundation. Amy Biehl co-ordinators are often late for peer educator meetings. The level 2s gain many valued benefits from the programme. However, due to lateness on the part of Amy Biehl, the programme encroaches on many of their other activities that need to get done such as homework and housework. If Amy Biehl could ensure that they were at meetings on time, it would allow the level 2s to gain their valued benefits from the programme, without impacting them negatively in other areas of their life. Therefore this would enhance the overall valued benefits of the programme.

These organisational disbenefits relate to the Amy Biehl 'business processes'. It has become apparent that the HIV & AIDS programme is going to be expanded next year. It is important that throughout the planning of the new Amy Biehl programme, goals are balanced against capacity. If the foundation sets goals that are beyond its capacity, it is likely to experience similar organisational disbenefits, for example being late for the programme. It could be possible to employ old level 2 peer educators in the new expanded programme.

The second organisational disbenefit identified by the level 2s was the coming and going of people involved in the programme. The people from Amy Biehl who get involved in the HIV & AIDS programme have a significant effect on the lives of the peer educators. It takes a while for everyone to get used to each other and learn people's names. When everyone is used to each other, very strong bonds form and the facilitators have a huge positive influence in the lives of the educators. In the two years that the peer educator programme has been running, the level two educators have had three different facilitators. Sadness and confusion was expressed about the abrupt departure of their first facilitator. They still did not know why she left. The role of co-ordinator was then taken over by an intern who left after six months. Now they have Mandisa and they are concerned that she will also leave them. As part of this it should be recognised that the satisfaction or happiness of the co-ordinator impacts upon the programme due to the high degree of interaction required.

There is a responsibility that comes with having influence in someone's life. It is unfair to create that influence and then leave. It is hugely important that the influence of the people involved is constant and people do not just come and

then suddenly leave. If the same co-ordinator could remain with the same group of peer educators from the beginning to the end, this would enhance the programme.

The third area for review is that of interns. Working for Amy Biehl for three months is a valuable experience for the interns from developed countries. They don't have to stay for too long and they get to experience poverty and aspects of development in Africa. While there is potential for interns to increase the valued benefits of programmes, the emphasis needs to be on how the interns can help Amy Biehl rather than how Amy Biehl can help the interns. Each time an intern gets involved, the participants have to go through the process of building trust, learning names and forging relationships all over again. This is a process that takes time and energy. Then just as the interns begin to affect the lives of the people involved, they leave. There is huge instability and confusion that can result from these comings and goings of interns. However, there is also huge potential that comes from including interns. The level 1's said that they really enjoyed the creative writing course that one intern gave them. The course was relevant and useful for the level 1's. Even though she stayed for 6 months, they suggested that they would have liked her to stay longer.

The disbenefit of instability caused by interns can be reduced if interns come for a longer period of time, possibly a full year and have a structured withdrawal process. Awareness needs to be given to the fact that the HIV & AIDS programme works at a deeper emotional level than others in the foundation. Seeking behavioural change in a delicate area such as HIV & AIDS requires participants to open up, this means that the comings and goings have the potential to be very disruptive as well as valuable. Ensuring that interns engage in relevant and useful activities with the educators can enhance the valued benefits to the peer educators. For example, level 1 peer educators suggested that they would like a leadership course. If an intern could do a course of this nature with the level 1's it would be relevant and useful to them. By increasing the length of time spent by an intern and ensuring that they bring something relevant to the programme, the internships could be more geared towards the needs of the participants.

## **Aggregating Impacts**

Aggregating impacts represents a subjective attempt to rate how well the programme enhanced values. The programme is rated in terms of what is possible given the circumstances and capacity. Although quite subjective, the purpose served by the rating is to allow quick comparison, to make explicit feelings about programme performance, to raise questions rather than giving

answers. A higher rating indicates something different about a programme, a feeling that something more was achieved and to be learnt, not that one programme failed. The criteria for ranking are derived from Alkire (2002: 229). See Box 1, Appendix 1.

Using these criteria for ranking the HIV & AIDS peer learning programme we have subjectively ranked the level 1s at 3 and the level 2s at 3 ½. Our findings indicate that the level 1 peer educator's programme is a good programme that has made solid progress in expanding valued benefits. The peer learners identified many valued benefits across all the dimensions. However, in terms of the relationship dimension there is great potential to enhance the relationships between level 1 peer educators that have not been used. In order to move to a 4 rank, it is necessary to use the potential of enhancing relationships between the level 1 peer educators.

The level 2 peer educators were ranked a 3 ½. Our findings indicate that the level two peer learning programme is a very good programme. The programme has made solid progress in all dimensions. A significant difference between the level 1s and level 2s is that the level 2s forged very meaningful, respectful and therapeutic relationships with each other. However, this programme cannot be ranked excellent, because not all potential is used. More thought needs to be given to programme 'roll-off'. The sadness that the level 2's felt when facilitators come and go represents an area, which could be improved on. Therefore the level 2s programme is not quite excellent, but it is very good.

The difference between the level 1 and level 2 peer educators is due to the difference in valued benefits within relationships. Where the level 2s had managed to forge meaningful and respectful relationships with each other, this was identified as lacking in the level 1s. However, these different ratings are not comparable as the two programmes are in different stages of the process. The difference in relationships for the two programmes could be because the level 2s have been engaged in the process for longer than the level 1s.

## **Reflection upon methodology**

Reflection upon the methodology is necessary to establish the areas where the methodology did well and where difficulties arose. This will aid future monitoring and assessment. The limitations outlined by Alkire (2002: 231) were considered as part of the management of this project and were attempted to be mitigated.

## Limitations and mitigations

- *The methodology needs to be complemented by other tools.* Although time constrained, we spent extra time with the programme co-ordinators, Bennie and Mandisa, in order to understand why some of the disbenefits may have been raised. This contributed to a more in-depth understanding of the past and the future of the programme.
- *Duration and magnitude of changes not understood through process.* To some extent contrast of the level 1s to level 2s does enable speculation on the duration and magnitude of the changes. For example, we know that participants in both programmes value the increased confidence and in some ways have changed their behaviour as a result of the programme. Ongoing monitoring would enhance this hypothesis.
- *The assessment represents a snapshot.* Again contrast between level 1s and 2s enables limited knowledge on the changes the programme brings about on a broader level, however, ongoing monitoring, on a yearly basis could further reinforce, or indeed dispel certain findings.
- *Attribution of impact may not be very robust.* For this we rely upon programme participants and the value of reasoned discussion. In this circumstance no other intervention took place directly in participants lives which could have reinforced such a wide range valued doings and beings. Attributing impacts to the programme therefore appears laudable.
- *Only programme participants were included.* This is a tricky area. In future participants of the broader constituency with whom the level 2s work should also be included in appraisal to explore the impact of peer educators on their doings and beings. It could require further development of the methodology to include sampling of a control group, i.e. a group which had not undergone the peer educator's programme of a similar age. It is suggested here that caution be exercised in attempting to do this as it could be a very difficult procedure without much gain. The focus of the peer education programme is on peer educators
- *Long term and short term impacts.* Again although comparison is possible between level 1s and 2s it would be better to track the progress of both groups independently. Monitoring could help this continuous learning process.
- *Skill of facilitator.* Given the time and budget constraints facilitation proved effective in terms of the results gleaned. However in future it would

preferable to have a facilitator trained professionally to enable a more robust process.

- *Important interconnections between dimensions could be missed.* There is a danger that results get placed into ‘silos’ of different dimensions. It is important to explore interconnections of results. In this view in future it may be preferable to not mention the dimensions to participants, or only do this later in the process so that interconnections can be more fully analysed.

## **Successes**

- The methodology did turn up interesting areas of impact outside of the programme objectives.
- Though conducted in a limited fashion in an ambitious timeframe at the ground level the project was completed on time with interesting results. The methodology in some ways enabled this. The relative simplicity with the onus of reporting and analysis upon participants mean that results could be confidently presented.
- The impact assessment did achieve its objectives. The multidimensional impacts were accessed and consequently relevant suggestions, based on further discussion, have been raised to improve the programme in accordance with the values of the programme participants.

## **Conclusion**

This evaluation has represented an attempt to assess the valued benefits and disbenefits of the HIV & AIDS peer education programme undertaking a methodology adapted from Sen's capability approach. Our findings indicate that the programme enhances the valued benefit of knowledge while also enhancing benefits in a range of valued dimensions. On consensus, the level 1s identified knowledge, empowerment and life-health security as the top three dimensions in which valued benefits were enhanced. On consensus, the level 2s identified relationships, inner-voice and knowledge as the top three dimensions in which valued benefits were gained, although there was some tension on which was the most important dimension.

Therefore the programme is not only acting to teach the peer educators about HIV & AIDS but also to enhance their relationships, feelings of self-worth, decision-making capability and health. The importance of the programme on the psycho-social well-being of programme participants is beyond just the

knowledge gained of HIV & AIDS. The educators are learning about HIV & AIDS in ways that enhance their relationships, feelings of worth, decision-making capacity and health; *these should be recognised and improved upon*. In the view of this paper, it is not fair to judge the programme on behavioural change alone, that the programme has enabled participants to make informed choices and decisions should itself be seen as a success.

It may seem self-evident to point out that an intervention which encourages youths to be active role models and teaches public speaking would have important impact upon confidence and feelings of self-worth. The suggestion here though is that the dimensions of impact, being interconnected, may produce a ‘virtuous cycle’ of change. A more confident individual is more likely to reflect upon choices and decisions made, and if mistakes were made – we are all only human – they try not to make them again in the future. The importance of the focus of the programme upon HIV & AIDS is that the confidence to make decisions coupled with the knowledge appears to enhance behaviour that can enable people to escape premature mortality related to HIV & AIDS and help others.

There is also scope for improvement within the programme. This can be achieved through cutting out unhelpful aspects which were felt. The valued benefits of the programme could be greatly enhanced in the following ways:

- Creating a ‘team’ of the peer educators
- Incorporating fun activities geared towards enhancing relationships into the Level 1 programme.
- Supplying food at every peer education meeting.
- Ensuring that the co-ordinators arrive on time.
- Allowing for closure and reflection at the end of the peer educator process
- Considering future possibilities for level 2’s who are finishing school.
- Ensuring that the consistency of co-ordinators
- Ensuring that interns stay for a long enough period of time and engage in activities that are relevant and useful to the peer educators.

Aggregating subjectively the valued benefits and disbenefits into a rating of the programme, we rated the level 1s ‘3’ and the level 2s ‘3 ½’. The level 1 programme was enhanced valued benefits in many dimensions; however valued benefits and disbenefits occur in the relationship dimensions. The level 2 programme enhances valued benefits in many dimensions, however it was not quite excellent as all potential was not utilised.

On the whole we found that both programmes are making meaningful changes in the peer educators lives by enhancing valued doings and beings which in turn

enhance their freedoms. There is scope for improvement in both programmes, which could further enhance valued benefits and freedoms.

# Appendix 1

This appendix contains the training materials and processes used in the field. It is an accurate reflection of the information used in preparation for the impact assessment.

## Training with facilitator

- Discussion of concepts and phrases and their meaning in Xhosa
- Going through methodology step by step
- Going through meaning of concepts
- Work through issues
- Essential attitudes to participatory exercise (drawn from Alkire, 2002: 225):
  - Wear simple clothing
  - Local language
  - Adapted methodology flexibly to the situation
  - Respected traditional and religious customs
  - Organised meetings at convenient times
  - Attitude of informal learning and openness
  - Encourage quieter to speak more and louder to speak less
  - Informal chat at start and at end

## Role of the Facilitator

- Facilitators should “bring up dimensions that have not ‘risen to the eye’ to provoke discussions on valued ends” (Alkire, 2002: 224). The “objective of enabling others to reflect on valued capabilities would be foiled if the facilitator asks (or seemed to ask) a closed ended question about impacts on a fixed category of values” (Alkire, 2002: 224).
- Discussion in chains of practical reasoning is required therefore facilitators should clearly communicate on the meaning of ‘impact’ and its relation to the changes the programmes caused to their valued beings and doings. To do this we will use the definitions in Table 1 these are broad and vague as well as using alternate words and phrases.
- In this instance due to constraints on time and in order to mitigate risks we are to use the open ended questions contained in Table 2 (Table 3 contains further details of the steps discussed with the facilitator), following the step by step process. The facilitator also needs to try and act as arbitrator to bring out important experiences, curtailing discussion where only absolutely necessary.

- The facilitator in this assessment will ask questions in English and then explained the concepts in Xhosa. It was necessary to approach the issue of the questions in this manner as in discussion with the facilitator she felt it would be too hard to translate the concepts into Xhosa, and given that the children were to a large extent bi-lingual phrasing the questions first in English would enable the children to understand what was being asked before the discussion was broadened in Xhosa.

*Table 1: Dimensions of impact*

<i>Dimension of Impact:</i>	<i>Description:</i>
1. Life-Health-security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes related to physical survival</li> </ul>
2. Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical, practical, about others, about themselves</li> </ul>
3. Excellence in work and play	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on skills used at work, and at home during relaxation</li> </ul>
4. Relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within community, family, with outsiders, within groups</li> <li>• Between men and women</li> </ul>
5. Inner voice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At peace with themselves, with their conscience, sense of harmony</li> </ul>
6. Empowerment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability to make meaningful choices and decisions and to influence others</li> </ul>
7. Beauty/environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on environment, sense of harmony with nature: has intervention created or destroyed things of beauty culture</li> </ul>
8. Religion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on deeper values, sources of meaning</li> </ul>

*Source: Alkire, 2002: 267-271; Roche, 1999: 47.*

*Table 2: Description of open ended questions*

<i>Step</i>	<i>Description</i>
Step 1	<p><i>Introduction:</i> The general intent of the exercise is to think about the full range of impacts of an activity, good, bad, anticipated and unanticipated). ‘Impacts’ relate the peer educators experience and their reasons for doing things. These are things that may have changed as a result of the programme, but may not have been intended by the programme. The dimensions were written on a blackboard and then reviewed as follows.</p>
Step 2	<p><i>Start of discussion:</i> The discussion opened straight into the questions:</p> <p><i>Dimension of Impact:</i>      <i>Questions used to initiate discussion. Firing words and statements used ad hoc in discussion:</i></p> <p>1. Life-Health-security      Questions: Has the programme influenced the way you take care of yourself? Has the programme influenced the way you approach your health? Has the programme influenced the way you protect yourself against harm?</p> <p>Alternate words: Life-Health-security, existence – physical condition - safety measures, protection</p> <p>2. Knowledge      Questions: Have you learnt anything from this programme? Has it been useful? Has this changed anything?</p> <p>Alternate words: Knowledge, information, understanding</p> <p>3. Excellence in work and play      Questions: Has the programme influenced your schoolwork? Has the programme influenced you when you have fun?</p> <p>Alternate phrase: Excellence in work and play, merit in occupations and having fun, brilliance in labour and fooling around, excellence in schoolwork and amusing yourself, doing well in your work and messing around</p> <p>4. Relationships      Questions: Has the programme influenced your relationships with others?</p> <p>Alternate phrase: Relationships, especially gender relations, affairs, particularly relations with the other sex, relationships, especially between you and other males and females</p> <p>5. Inner voice      Questions: Has the programme influenced how you feel about your self? Has the programme influenced your general sense of well-being?</p>

	<p>6. Empowerment</p> <p>Alternate words: Inner voice, internal influence, private ideas, personal voice, inner feeling, feeling internally within yourself</p> <p>Questions: Has the programme influenced the way you make decisions? Has the programme influenced the choices/opportunities you have?</p> <p>7. Beauty/environment</p> <p>Alternate words: Empowerment, making choices, influencing others, getting what you want</p> <p>Question: Has the programme influenced the way you feel about the world out there?</p> <p>8. Religion</p> <p>Alternate words: Beauty / environment, prettiness / surroundings, splendour / atmosphere, attractiveness / setting</p> <p>Question: Has the programme influenced your beliefs?</p> <p>Alternate Words: Religion, faith, belief, religious conviction</p>
Step 3	<p><i>Focus on negative impacts:</i> Prompting on negative impacts. Stress given that changes may not have occurred in a dimension</p>
Step 4	<p><i>Break:</i> 5 min break taken</p>
Step 5	<p><i>Trivial impacts separated from the central ones</i> (participation encouraged by all members) The facilitator helped talk around a consensus. If no consensus was reached, impacts were not discarded.</p>
Step 6	<p><i>Ranking Exercise:</i> Attempt to try and rank the top three-four impacts in each dimension of impact. Then intra-rank each of the dimension against the other giving a mark out of ten</p>
Step 7	<p><i>Explicit scrutiny:</i> past, present and future. This is a general discussion. Negative impact explored with questions such as: “How do these negative impacts come about?” “How can we prevent them?” “Were the positive changes from the programme worth the effort?” “Was the mix of important dimensions acceptable?” “Do you want to make changes to programme future”</p>
Step 8	<p><i>Close</i> Thanks to all participants and informal chat</p>

Source: Drawn in part from Alkire, 2002: 228-231.

**Table 3: Step by Step Methodology in full**

<i>Step</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>'Spiel'</i>	<i>Logistics</i>	<i>Timing</i>
Step 1	<p><i>Introduction:</i></p> <p>Explain the general intent of the exercise – To think about the full range of impacts of an activity, good bad, anticipated and unanticipated</p>	<p>There should be a quick informal how are you/introduction.</p> <p>“Good afternoon, my name is Mrs M we have asked you all to be part of an exercise to help understand the peer learning programme from your point of view. The things that have changed your life in a good way and the things that have affected you in a bad way. In essence the ways your life may have changed as a result of the peer review group”</p> <p>“I will be facilitating and am completely separate from the Peer group programme, so please feel free to say whatever you like about the changes in your life. We are interested in the impacts on your life of the programme. ‘Impacts’ relate to the your own experience and your own reasons for doing things. These are things that may have changed as a result of the programme, but may not have been intended by the programme”</p> <p>“We will be looking at changes around the following dimensions (refer them to paper on walls with titles on them). These are just a guide and you should not be led into just one area by them. Broadly, <i>Life-Health-security</i>, refers to...see Table 1” (this is done to ensure that the participants are kept in the loop. Treating them like adults and not just lab mice!!)</p>	<p>We are looking to conduct an interview with 10-12 participants. The selection will be random, although an effort will be made to have a representative selection of boys as well girls.</p>	<p>A total of 2 hours is available for this exercise, however a working assumption of 1:45 is made because of possible delays. Although time keeping will have to be maintained by Stephen and Kim (It is imperative that we are there a little early, will discuss with Amy Biehl foundation)</p> <p>5 mins</p>
Step 2	<p><i>Start of discussion:</i></p> <p>Going straight into the</p>	<p>“What valuable and negative impacts/changes have you noticed”</p>	<p>At this stage we will need 5 pieces of paper up on the wall, each divided into 2. This will represent</p>	<p>45 mins max</p>

	questions:	“How as the programme influenced your life”	<p>the 8 dimensions of well-being and a separate piece of paper if other valued ends come up that are not related dimensions immediately.</p> <p>The facilitators role here is to direct and manage the discussion. Direct: participants need to be discussing impacts upon their life and movement should attempted to be made to different areas, although not directly using the terminology. Some people may have to be directed to talk less some more. If some yes or no answers come up the facilitator needs to push these answers further, e.g. how, what, why</p> <p>One of the participants could be used to write things up on the board, i.e. be told when to write things up. This can be rotated during the session.</p>	
Step 3	<i>Focus on negative impacts</i>	<p>Ask specific promoting questions refer to table 3.</p> <p><i>Also prompt on negative impacts as these can be underreported</i></p> <p><i>Stress needs to be given that changes may not have occurred in a dimension</i></p>	As above	10 mins min depending on above.
Step 4	<i>Break:</i>	“Okay we are going to take a quick break, we will start again in 5mins	Facilitator and Stephen and Kim will have to have a quick check through the lists.	5 mins break Only try to use 1 hour for this first set of exercises including the break. If you are ahead of time press on!
Step 5	<i>Trivial impacts separated from the central ones.</i>	“As you can see we have separated out the impacts into 8 categories. What we would life to do is try and find out	Trivial are marked to be removed	10 mins max

	(participation required by all members)	<p>which of these is most important to you. First we would like to separate the important from the trivial. It is very important that you all participate”</p> <p>Facilitator needs to help talk around a consensus. If no consensus is reached we keep them in.</p>		
Step 6	<p><i>Ranking Exercise:</i></p> <p>Then try and rank the top three-four impacts in each category of impact.</p>	<p>“Now we would like you all to try and rank the top three or four in each dimension.</p> <p>Now lets try and define the most important 3 or 4 overall dimension on a scale of 1-5, 5 being the most important.</p>	Dots or stars can be used to signify the relative significance of each.	20 mins
Step 7	<p><i>Explicit scrutiny:</i></p> <p>Past, present and future. This is a general discussion. This is important</p>	<p>Review meaning of the values</p> <p>Negative impact explored. “How do these negative impacts come about”</p> <p>“How can we prevent them”</p> <p>“Were the positive changes from the programme worth the effort”</p> <p>“Was the mix of important dimensions acceptable”</p> <p>“Do you want to make changes to programme future”</p>	Brief notes should be taken by facilitator on piece of paper. Tape recordings will be returned to later.	15 mins
Step 8	Close	<p>“Thank you very much for taking part. Please let the Bennie or Madisa know if you had any problems with this exercise”</p> <p>Informal discussion with participants if time allows</p>	Food should be laid on as often happens during the peer educators session	2 mins

## Analysis and debrief

The day following or immediately after the focus groups, a short debrief will be required to talk about how things worked and how it could be made better. During this debrief the facilitator, and assessors briefly translate and review the impacts and what was said. From here Kim and I will make an initial subjective judgement about the programme using the scoring systems below. The following method was utilised by Alkire and is building upon a work by the World Bank PPA (Alkire, 2002: 228) and is used to judge the impact against the programmes potential:

### *Box 1: Scoring system*

5. Incredible. Used all of the potential and created more. Did a truly amazing job given the circumstances.
  4. Excellent. Used every bit of potential that was offered.
  3. Good. Made solid progress in expanding valuable ends.
  2. Fair. Made certain progress but left quite a few possibilities unused
  1. Weak. Simply did not make adequate progress given the situation and it potential
- Null. No Evident Change
- Negative. Things were made worse

*Source: Alkire (2002: 228).*

## References

Actuarial Society of South Africa (ASSA) (2005) *Actuarial Projection of the Epidemic: Summary Statistics*, electronic, [www.assa.org.za](http://www.assa.org.za), accessed, 10/11/2005

Alkire, S. (2002), *Valuing Freedoms: Sen's Capability Approach and Poverty Reduction*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Amy Biehl (2005) *Amy Biehl Peer Educators Programme Proposal*, unpublished internal resource

Barnett, T and Whiteside, A (2002) *AIDS in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Disease and Globalisation* (New York: Macmillan)

Campbell, C. and MacPhail, C. (2002) 'Peer education, gender and the development of critical consciousness: participatory HIV prevention by South African youth' *Social Science & Medicine* (55) pp.331-345

Epstein, B. (2004) 'The Demographic Impact of HIV & AIDS' in Haacker, M. (ed) *The Macroeconomics of AIDS*, (Washington: IMF), pp.1-40

Roche, C (1999), *Impact Assessment for Development Agencies: Learning to Value Change* (Oxford: Oxfam Publications)

Sen, A, (1992). *Inequality reexamined*. New York: Sage

Sen, A. (1999), *Development as Freedom*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press)