Peers helping peers: Development and evaluation of a peer support worker training series
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Abstract

Background
Peer support workers (PSWs) are essential to the substance use treatment and recovery system, though they often lack access to professional development that accounts for the personal recovery experiences PSWs utilize in their work.

Methods
This study is an evaluation of a series of five training modules for PSWs designed in collaboration with PSW consultants. Evaluation consisted of pre-/post-test knowledge questions and qualitative feedback from individuals who completed all five modules.

Results
Knowledge scores increased for all five modules. Qualitative feedback was largely positive, with participants suggesting that integrating PSWs into the module development team made the finished product more relevant to PSWs.

Conclusions
Findings affirmed the importance of providing trainings designed by and for PSWs working with people with substance use disorders and suggested that PSW confidence can be improved through targeted trainings. This training development model demonstrates promise for future substance use training programs for PSWs.
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Introduction

Peer support workers (PSWs), individuals in recovery who help others through shared lived experience and mutual respect, have become essential to substance use disorder (SUD) treatment and recovery organizations. PSWs help reduce substance use (Tracy et al., 2012) and re-hospitalization rates (Sledge et al., 2011); increase treatment retention and satisfaction (Tracy et al., 2011); improve relationships with providers (Wright-Berryman et al., 2011); and increase housing stability and social support access (Boisvert et al., 2008). The expansion of PSW services in recent decades has exposed difficulties faced by PSWs in the workplace, including a lack of role clarity, low pay, and few opportunities for career growth (Almeida et al., 2020; Gagne et al., 2018; Lapidos et al., 2018; Mancini, 2018). This lack of role clarity can lead to a scope of work that does not match up with the skills and experiences that make PSWs effective (Adams et al., 2023; Scannell, 2021), which can reduce PSWs’ sense of personal accomplishment and increasing emotional exhaustion (Weikel & Fisher, 2022). Low sense of accomplishment and high emotional exhaustion are two key indicators of burnout on Maslach’s Burnout Inventory (MBI; Maslach et al., 2018; Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Scanlan et al., 2020).

Because burnout is correlated with turnover (Gharakhani et al., 2019; Marques et al., 2023), not addressing sources of PSW burnout, such as the need for additional training, could be leading experienced PSWs to leave the field. When PSWs leave their jobs, they tend to move on to another field entirely (Weikel & Fisher, 2022), leaving clients without the benefit of their expertise.

PSW training and training need

Many PSWs complete training to obtain certification, such as the Certified Peer Specialist (CPS) credential. Even with the certification, many PSWs feel unprepared for the
reality of PSW work (Rebeiro Gruhl et al., 2016) and would like more training options that align with their role (Almeida et al., 2020; Cronise et al., 2016). This has been found to be true in Missouri, where PSWs must pass an exam after completing a one-week training (Missouri Department of Mental Health, n.d.) covering such topics as models of recovery, methods of engagement, and ethics to become certified. In recent statewide recovery housing evaluations funded by the State Opioid Response (SOR) grant, PSWs, who often work as house managers, indicated a need to supplement their CPS training and lived experience with more job-specific training (Stringfellow et al., 2019; Wood et al., 2021). For instance, PSWs cited a lack of knowledge about Medication for Addiction Treatment (MAT) and a need to know how to discuss it with those they serve, particularly for those whose recovery path did not include MAT (Wood et al., 2021).

Because of the impact of chaotic drug use on their academic preparation and previous work experience (Robertson et al., 2021), PSWs may struggle to navigate the professional expectations of the behavioral healthcare systems in which they are employed, where much of their experience is as clients (Mancini, 2018). Within the field of peer support work, there are few formal mentors, without whom PSWs may struggle to overcome barriers to their career growth (Almeida et al., 2020; Gagne et al., 2018; Mancini, 2018). For PSWs, entering a complex field with little experience, brief training, and limited mentorship can contribute to low self-efficacy, decreased job satisfaction, and frequent turnover (Almeida et al., 2020; Gagne et al., 2018). While many PSW employers do provide some training for PSWs, they are often designed for other professionals (such as counselors) and do not consider the strategies and dynamics that make PSWs effective (Vélez-Grau et al., 2019). PSWs need access to high quality training
opportunities designed for the PSW role to gain knowledge, skills, and strategies to help them
navigate their workplaces and succeed in their work.

*A Missouri’s PSW-focused training program*

Based on targeted interviews and focus groups with PSWs and those working in recovery
housing settings (Stringfellow et al., 2019; Wood et al., 2021), Missouri’s SOR grant staff
developed a series of supplemental trainings to address the reported gaps in PSW continuing
education options. Following a widely-circulated survey requesting input from PSWs, the team
selected five module topics: 1) Professional expectations, ethics, and boundaries for the Certified
Peer Specialist (CPS) role; 2) How to identify and address stress, compassion fatigue, grief, and
secondary trauma; 3) How to talk about Medication for Addiction Treatment (MAT); 4) How to
work with peers with co-occurring mental illness and substance use disorders; and 5) How to
assess and refer individuals experiencing suicidality, domestic violence, and sex trafficking. An
online format was also selected based on preferences expressed in the survey. Between January
and April of 2021, the team collaborated with six PSW consultants to develop and deliver online
module content. Module videos consisted of consultant-narrated presentations (e.g., summarizing
existing research, in-depth discussions of the module topics, and explanations of tools available
to PSWs) and video role-plays (acted out by consultants and a team member as practical
demonstrations of the content and available tools).

The team and consultants used principles of adult learning theory (Collins, 2004; Howell
& Buck, 2012; Knowles, 1978; Roumell, 2019) to design training modules with potential
learners’ life demands in mind. To best engage PSWs, the PSW consultants were the “actors”
featured in each module, ensuring the viewers saw the presenters to be competent and the content
to be relevant (Howell & Buck, 2012). Real-life examples from the consultants’ work and
roleplays depicting common workplace encounters helped build connections between practical applications of content (Collins, 2004) and learners’ existing knowledge and experience (Roumell, 2019). The training also incorporated best practices for online learning, which included using an approachable tone and limiting the amount of information participants see at one time (Mayer, 2019). The team contracted with a health communication firm that specializes in health literate material to turn the module content into polished, professional videos that are accessible to a range of health literacy levels.

This paper outlines the results from the mixed methods evaluation of these training modules, which focused on two questions: 1) How much did participants’ knowledge of each topic increase after watching the modules? and 2) Among the training participants, how applicable to their jobs did they find each module?

**Materials and Methods**

**Procedure**

Following IRB approval, recruitment of PSWs to complete the online modules occurred through a four-pronged approach: 1) periodic submission of the project flyer to statewide substance-use-focused mailing lists; 2) periodic posting on social media; 3) housing the flyer on the STR/SOR website; and 4) informal word-of-mouth advertising by the PSW consultants and project partners. Participants could visit the registration website via URL or QR code. After registration, participants received links to the modules via email.

Each module contained a pre-test, video, supplementary materials (e.g., Missouri Credentialing Board’s Peer Code of Ethics), and post-test. Participants needed a score of 70% or higher on the post-test to pass each module. If they failed to reach a score of 70% or higher three times on a single module, participants had to re-take the module. Upon successful completion of
the module, participants were emailed a certificate of completion that was valid toward recertification credentials for CPS in Missouri. The modules were available for free. Individuals who completed all five modules were contacted three months after completing their final module to participate in follow-up qualitative feedback interviews.

*Pre- and post-tests assessing changes in knowledge*

Each module included a pre- and post-test consisting of 5-9 multiple choice knowledge questions (e.g., “True or False: methadone, buprenorphine, and naltrexone all work the same way in the body”). Participants were allowed to complete the post-test multiple times, but only the first attempt was used in analysis to avoid repeated test effects.

*Qualitative feedback from participants*

Of the 96 total participants, the 27 who completed all 5 modules were contacted for follow-up interviews. Interviews were conducted between March and June 2022 with the six individuals who agreed to participate. Four of the participants were men, five were White, one of whom identified as Latino, and one was Black. All six identified as being in recovery, and five were CPS.

Twenty-minute interviews were conducted between three and six months after participants completed the final module, through January 2022. Two team members conducted semi-structured interviews about participants’ general reactions to the modules, practicality of the content, changes in practice since completing the modules, responses to PSW participation in the creation of modules, and topics for future trainings (e.g., “How helpful was it to see real-life scenarios that could be experienced on the job role-played in skits by the peers?” and “Since taking the training modules, have there been instances where you have had to apply what you
learned into a real-life scenario?”). Interview participants were compensated with $25 digital gift cards to either Walmart or Target.

**Participants**

Participants (defined as anyone who completed at least one module; \( N=96 \)) were primarily White (88%; \( n=84 \)), women (71%; \( n=68 \)), and between the ages of 26 and 45 (61%; \( n=59 \)). Most participants worked in Missouri (91%; \( n=87 \)), identified as people in recovery from substance use (90%; \( n=87 \)), and were CPS (87%; \( n=83 \)). See Table 1.
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**Data analysis**

**Pre- and post-tests assessing changes in knowledge**

Wilcoxon signed-rank tests were used to compare total pre- and post-test scores (sum of the number of correct responses). A power calculation was conducted with an alpha level of .05 and a power of .80, which suggested a minimum sample size of 33 was needed to find an average difference as small as 0.3.

**Qualitative feedback from participants**

Data were analyzed using Braun and Clarke’s (2006) thematic analysis techniques. After the first interview was conducted, four team members developed codes. The team planned to approach the transcript with provisional codes based on the interview questions but found that an inductive process using open coding better captured participants’ responses. The remaining interviews were independently coded by two team members using Atlas.TI 8 (Version 8.4.26.0). Codes were revised and added as needed through discussion and agreement by both coders. After all interviews were coded, the full team reconciled differences between the two coders and
finalized the coded documents. The team arranged codes into thematic groups, summarized each theme, and selected representative quotations.

Results

Pre- & post-tests

Knowledge scores improved from pre-test to post-test in each of the five modules:

Professionalism \[ Z = -3.4; p < .001; r = -.4 \], Grief and Compassion Fatigue \[ Z = -3.4; p < .001; r = -.4 \], MAT \[ Z = -4.6; p < .001; r = -.6 \], Co-Occurring Disorders \[ Z = -3.0; p < .01; r = -.4 \], and Assessing for Suicidality, Domestic Violence, and Sex Trafficking \[ Z = -3.4; p < .001; r = -.5 \].

See Table 2 for complete results.

[Table 2]

Qualitative feedback from participants

Qualitative feedback interviews were conducted with people who completed each of the five modules (n=6). Three themes were identified during analysis of these interviews: knowledge, PSW integration, and PSW learning needs.

Knowledge

Participants indicated that the modules built upon their existing knowledge and experience to deepen their understanding of the topics. One participant stated, “I knew a lot of it just because it’s what I do every day, but hearing someone else's perspective always gives you insight that you may not necessarily have had before. It just broadens your knowledge.” Another shared that reviewing material he had learned in the past “reminded me of the things that I had gotten lax on.” One participant described how they had been able to apply material from the modules in their job: “I deal with [suicide ideation] frequently in my role now, so being able to ask the direct questions makes a difference,” while another participant felt better prepared for
their work: “[The modules] gave me more insight and perspective to be able to do my job better and be better for the clients and the peers that I work with.” One participant described how new knowledge gained through the modules had normalized their experiences:

I learned about things that I was experiencing that I didn't realize I was experiencing, as it pertained to the grief one especially. A client passed away a little bit before I did these trainings, and I was just, like, blown away by what I wasn't paying attention to in my own thoughts and feelings…I’m like, okay, well, if other people are putting that out there, that it affected them, like, I’m not alone.

**Peer integration**

Participants reacted positively to the integration of PSWs into the development team and their visible presence as training presenters. They stated that PSWs' unique experiences and perspectives make their input essential to any trainings designed for PSWs: “Who can give better insight than those who have actually experienced what they're trained to support the client with, in reference to recovery efforts, strategies, coping skills, and so forth?” They also discussed ways PSWs’ input made these modules particularly relevant to them and their work: “The peer experience just looks different than the clinical side of things. It makes it more relatable for me because I don't have a degree. I get very lost in clinical trainings.”

**PSW learning needs**

Participants appreciated that the modules had been designed to meet their learning needs. One participant indicated that the length of the modules was convenient to their schedule: “I didn't feel like it was rushed through, and I was never sitting there going, ‘I can't wait to get through this.’ I feel it was a pretty good length.” “My schedule gets pretty full, so it gives me an opportunity to do it at my pace and fit it in where I can,” said another. Although most
participants stated that they liked the online format, five participants indicated a desire to return to in-person learning. One stated, “I really do like instructor-led training better because it sticks with me better,” and another said he misses the “comradery” that can form during in-person training. Participants also indicated these PSW-led trainings held their attention better than the more clinical trainings they’ve been provided in the past: “The clinical trainings get very wordy. It gets very terminology [sic] and wordy, and I lose interest.”

**Discussion**

Trainings designed for and by PSWs which focus on information and skills specific to the peer role can help PSWs feel better prepared to do their jobs effectively. Pre-post comparisons show the training modules helped participants improve their knowledge about each of the five training topics (professional expectations; compassion fatigue and grief; MAT; co-occurring mental illness and SUD; and suicidality, domestic violence, and sex trafficking). Qualitative feedback revealed that even participants with existing understanding of module content learned new information, were refreshed on information they had forgotten, and perceived the modules to be a worthwhile time investment. Participants expressed appreciation for the ability to work on the trainings at their own pace, the inclusion of PSWs in the development and presentation of the modules, and the length of each module. This feedback suggests that strategically incorporating adult learners’ needs when developing online training modules facilitates learning transfer (Collins, 2004; Roumell, 2019), which increases the participants’ confidence in their ability to do their jobs well. These findings support the centering of the needs of the target audience in training development.

**Limitations and future research**
Some limitations to this study should be noted. First, the sample of participants lacked racial, gender, and geographical diversity. Given that the sample was largely White, women, and Missouri-based, these findings may not be generalizable across different demographic groups and geographical regions. Second, the sample of individuals who completed all five modules ($n=27$) was much smaller than the total unduplicated sample of people who completed any one of the modules ($n=96$). Since only individuals who completed all five modules were eligible for the follow-up qualitative feedback interviews, there was a relatively small pool of participants. Though this allowed the team to ask participants about all the modules, those who did not complete all modules could have valuable information, such as why they did not pursue them. The qualitative feedback participants were also predominantly White, so participants of other races may have had distinct experiences not represented here.

Future research should continue to examine how best to integrate members of target populations into the development of trainings and programs. There is a need to identify more strategic approaches to meeting the needs of PSWs and other paraprofessionals as their roles continue to expand in the social service and behavioral health fields. Additionally, research regarding practical application of skills from training modules designed for PSWs is necessary to understand learning transfer when utilizing this approach to training development, as well as the impact on PSW burnout and turnover. Finally, research focused on experiences from more racial, gender, and geographically diverse PSWs is necessary to help identify unique needs of these populations.

**Conclusion**

The available training in the mental health professions has historically not been designed for PSWs. This project sought to evaluate a “by peers, for peers” supplemental training series
intended to fill some knowledge gaps that PSWs have following certification. Qualitative feedback showed that investing in peer-specific training can help increase PSWs’ feelings of competence in supporting clients and emphasized that connecting new information to existing knowledge, integrating PSWs into content development and presentation, and centering the learning needs of PSWs were helpful to participants. Despite limited opportunities for career advancement (Gagne et al., 2018; Lapidos et al., 2018), PSWs’ engagement in a field in which their expertise has become essential may be enhanced through targeted supplemental trainings.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Listed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Not to Answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhere Else</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Recovery from Substance Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certified Peer Specialist (CPS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module topic</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Pre-test M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grief and Compassion Fatigue</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication for Addiction Treatment (MAT)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Occurring Disorders</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing for Suicidality, Domestic Violence, and Sex Trafficking</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .01; **p ≤ .001