

1 **Lesson Learnt from Peer Volunteers in a Peer-Led Pain Management**
2 **Program among Nursing Home Residents**

3
4 Mimi Mun Yee TSE¹

5 mimi.tse@polyu.edu.hk

6

7 Shamay Sheung Mei NG²

8 shamay.ng@polyu.edu.hk

9

10 Xue BAI³

11 xue.bai@polyu.edu.hk

12

13 Paul Hong LEE¹

14 paul.h.lee@polyu.edu.hk

15

16 Raymond LO⁴

17 losk@ha.org.hk

18

19 Daphne Cheung¹

20 daphne.cheung@polyu.edu.hk

21

22 Kin Cheung¹

23 kin.cheung@polyu.edu.hk

24

25 Suey Shuk Yu YEUNG⁵

26 s.y.yeung@vu.nl

27

28 ¹School of Nursing, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong SAR

29 ²Department of Rehabilitation Sciences, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong
30 SAR

31 ³Department of Applied Social Sciences, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong
32 SAR

33 ⁴Department of Geriatrics and Palliative Medicine, Shatin Hospital, Hospital Authority, Hong
34 Kong SAR

35 ⁵Department of Human Movement Sciences, Vrije Universteit Amsterdam, the Netherlands

36 **Corresponding author:** Dr. Mimi Mun Yee TSE, FG 425, School of Nursing, The Hong
37 Kong Polytechnic University, Hung Hom, Hong Kong SAR, email: mimi.tse@polyu.edu.hk,
38 phone: +852 2766 6541

39 Abstract

40 **Background:** Chronic pain is common among older adults and is associated with adverse
41 physical and psychological outcomes. Given the expected burden and limited healthcare
42 resources, an innovative and cost-effective method to manage chronic pain should be
43 developed. Peer volunteers (PVs) have been used as an affordable alternative to professional
44 services to help patients manage their chronic conditions including pain with success and
45 acceptance. The aim of this paper is to explore the experiences and perceptions of PVs in a
46 peer-led pain management program among nursing home residents.

47 **Methods:** This longitudinal study formed part of a wider research study, a clustered
48 randomised controlled trial, which investigates the effectiveness of a 12-week peer-led pain
49 management program (PAP) in relieving chronic pain and enhancing pain self-efficacy
50 among nursing home residents. Quantitative data were collected from questionnaires
51 (demographics, pain situation and pain knowledge) for all PVs. Qualitative data (PVs'
52 experiences in leading the PAP, their perceived benefits, limitations and barriers encountered,
53 its usefulness to the participants and recommendations for improving the PAP) were collected
54 from focus group for a selected sample at baseline (before attending the training) and at week
55 12 (upon completion of the PAP). Data were analysed using the Statistical Package for Social
56 Sciences and NVivo 8.

57 **Results:** A total of 46 PVs were recruited (34 female, 74%), with mean \pm SD age of 61.0 \pm 5.1
58 years. Thirty-one PVs reported to have chronic pain. Before the training, self-rated pain
59 knowledge was 39.1 \pm 20.4 (maximum 100 points). When actual pain knowledge was
60 assessed, a mean pain knowledge score of 86.1 \pm 10.6 points was found. There was a
61 significant difference between the self-rated pain knowledge and the pain knowledge score
62 ($p < 0.001$). PVs reported to have improvement in their knowledge and skills. No PVs reported

63 negative comments regarding their role in the PAP, although experienced barriers such as
64 communication, space and privacy were reported.

65 **Conclusions:** This study provides further evidence that peer-led pain management program is
66 feasible. Barriers identified may benefit the design and planning of future PAP.

67 **Trial registration:** ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT03823495), 30 January 2019. (Retrospectively
68 registered).

69

70 **Keywords:** volunteer, peer groups, pain management, nursing homes

71 **Background**

72 Chronic pain is common among older adults, with a prevalence of more than 50% among
73 community-dwelling older adults [1] and 80% among nursing home residents [2]. This may
74 be underreported as some older adults incorrectly believe that pain is a normal process of
75 ageing [3]. The consequences of chronic pain include impaired activities of daily living,
76 mobility, depression and anxiety and an increased burden on healthcare cost [2, 4]. With the
77 populations continue to age, it is expected that the prevalent rates for chronic pain increase.
78 Given the expected burden and limited healthcare resources, an innovative and cost-effective
79 method to manage chronic pain should be developed.

80 Peer volunteers (PVs) have been used as an affordable alternative to professional
81 services to help patients manage their chronic conditions including pain with success and
82 acceptance [5-8]. Indeed, the success of peer-led program depends upon the feasibility of the
83 PVs' role [9]. Studies examining peer support showed that PVs found their roles as satisfying
84 as they gained valuable new skills [10, 11]. Therefore, it is important to understand why PVs
85 volunteer, their expectations and experiences in a peer-led program. To the best our
86 knowledge, no previous studies have examined PVs' experiences of volunteering in a peer-
87 led pain management program among nursing home populations.

88 The aim of this paper is to fill the research gap by exploring the experiences and
89 perceptions of PVs in a peer-led pain management program among nursing home residents. It
90 formed part of a wider research study, a clustered randomised controlled trial, which
91 investigates the effectiveness of a peer-led pain management program in relieving chronic
92 pain and enhancing pain self-efficacy among nursing home residents.

93 **Methods**

94 *Study design & Samples*

95 This study used a longitudinal design to examine quantitative and qualitative data provided
96 by PVs who delivered a 12-week pain management program (PAP) to nursing home residents
97 living in Hong Kong. Data were collected from questionnaires for all PVs and from focus
98 group for a purposeful sample at baseline (before attending the training) and at week 12
99 (upon completion of the PAP).

100

101 *Recruitment and training of peer volunteers*

102 PVs were recruited from the Institute of Active Aging (IAA) hosted by the Faculty of Health
103 and Social Sciences of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University. They were mostly retired,
104 highly educated and willing to volunteer to contribute to the community. Criteria for being
105 PVs: (i) aged 55 years or older; (ii) scored >6 in the Abbreviated Mental Test to designate
106 their mental/cognitive capacity as older PVs; (iii) able to attend training workshops and
107 biweekly meetings with the research team for case reviews, discussions, and to reinforce
108 strategies on pain management education; (iv) passed an exit test, including a knowledge test
109 on pain management, demonstrating various non-pharmacological practices, and using the
110 teaching manual. The principal investigator (MMYY) and one of the co-investigator were the
111 assessors and supplementary classes were given to those PVs who did not pass the exit test;
112 and (v) willing to lead the PAP in a nursing home. Fifty-eight individuals expressed interest
113 in the study: 46 PVs attended the training and completed the self-administered questionnaire,
114 29 of them completed the training workshops.

115 PVs attended four training workshops over two weeks, and each workshop lasted for
116 2 hours. Topics for the training workshops: (i) discuss what a peer is; (ii) communication
117 skills; (iii) client safety and confidentiality; (iv) managing crises and emergencies; (v)

118 motivational strategies to enhance the compliance of the clients; (vi) demonstrations on the
119 use of the teaching manual (i.e. “I can do it”) and various non-pharmacological practices.
120 Training was conducted in small groups with the use of the following teaching methods:
121 dialectic lecturing (group), small group discussion, case sharing, demonstration and return-
122 demonstration (individual) on non-pharmacological pain management. The instructional
123 model was group-based but the research team was also available for individual consultations.
124 Return-demonstration was designed as individualized coaching to ensure skill mastery.

125

126 *Data collection*

127 *Demographic information*

128 Questionnaire was completed by PVs to obtain their demographic information including sex,
129 age, marital status, educational level, occupation, medical history and voluntary experience.

130

131 *Pain situation*

132 PVs were asked if they have any chronic pain and pain intensity in the previous 24 hours was
133 assessed using the Chinese version of the Brief Pain Inventory [12]. PVs were asked to rate
134 the pain on a scale of 0 (no pain) to 10 (worst pain).

135

136 *Pain knowledge*

137 Self-rated pain knowledge was reported by the PVs before the training and at week 12, upon
138 completion of the nursing home work, in a 100-point Likert scale with higher point indicating
139 higher self-rated pain knowledge. Actual pain knowledge was assessed by completing a pain
140 knowledge questionnaire before the training and at week 12. It consists of 14 items about
141 common myths on pain management methods (Appendix 1). One point was given for each
142 correct answer. Higher point (maximum 100 points) indicates higher pain knowledge.

143 *Qualitative data*

144 Around 15% of PVs were invited for focus group interview conducted by the research
145 assistant. Field notes were taken during the focus group and were included in the analysis.
146 The interview included open-ended questions in areas related to PVs' experiences in leading
147 the PAP, their perceived benefits, limitations and barriers encountered, its usefulness to the
148 participants and recommendations for improving the PAP.

149

150 *Data analysis*

151 Data were analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Quantitative
152 data was summarized using means (standard deviations) for continuous variables and
153 proportions (n) for categorical variables. Paired sample t tests was used to assess the
154 difference in self-rated pain knowledge and pain knowledge score (two-tailed $p < 0.05$). For
155 the qualitative part of the study, 9 PVs provided qualitative data on their experience in
156 leading the PAP, perceived benefits and barriers encountered and suggestions on how to
157 improve the program. Written logs were examined. The transcribed data from focus groups
158 with PVs were analysed using NVivo 8.

159

160 *Ethical considerations*

161 Ethical approval was obtained from the Human Subjects Ethics Sub-committee of Hong
162 Kong Polytechnic University (approval ID: HSEARS20171218005) and all participants gave
163 their written informed consent prior to data collection.

164 **Results**

165 *Characteristic of peer volunteers*

166 Table 1 shows the characteristics of the PVs. A total of 46 PVs were recruited (34 female,
167 74%), with mean±SD age of 61.0±5.1 years. Majority of them are married, with a university
168 degree and had a technical job. Almost all PVs had previous voluntary experience. Most of
169 the PVs were invited by others to volunteer. Twelve PVs have chronic diseases with
170 hypertension as the most common one.

171

172 *Pain*

173 Thirty-one PVs reported to have chronic pain, with a mean±SD pain score of 2.4±2.0 out of
174 10. Before the training, self-rated pain knowledge was 39.1±20.4. When actual pain
175 knowledge was assessed, a mean pain knowledge score of 86.1±10.6 points was found.
176 Questions that were incorrectly answered by most of the PVs include “Pain is unavoidable
177 and need to be tolerated in elderly”, “Visual stimulation does not have any effect in relieving
178 pain” and “Oral analgesic should be taken according to the severity of the chronic pain”.
179 There was a significant difference between the self-rated pain knowledge and the pain
180 knowledge score ($p<0.001$).

181

182 *Qualitative data*

183 The PAP helped PVs to increase their knowledge and skills about pain management methods.
184 PVs described their experience in leading the PAP as “meaningful” (“I was appreciated by
185 nursing home residents”, “Nursing home residents were touched and said they never expect
186 us to be so nice to them”).

187 Perceived benefits reported by the PVs included helping themselves (“My pain is
188 gone after volunteer in the program”, “I feel happy by helping others”), helping others (“I can

189 see that the participants are happier and feel less lonely”, “this program effectively relieve
190 pain of the participants”) and boosting their sense of self-worth (“My family and friends
191 recognized my achievement and were proud of me to be a volunteer”, “I am satisfied to give
192 something back to the society and provide support to the participants”).

193 When discussing the barriers encountered in leading the PAP, PVs reported that some
194 nursing home residents had hearing impairment that it was challenging to communicate with
195 them effectively. Some nursing home residents were too frail and required more assistance in
196 completing the activities in each session. PVs also reported that “the space in the nursing
197 home is limited” and “protecting privacy of each nursing home residents is difficult”.

198 Regarding the content of the PAP, PVs like it in general. They also gave some
199 suggestions on how to improve the PAP. For example, PVs suggested to remove the
200 pharmacological management as part of the PAP since it is not appropriate to teach nursing
201 home residents as all the medications are kept and managed by the nursing staff. Therefore,
202 PVs focused on reminding residents to take the medications once given by the nursing staff
203 and not to store up the medication.

204 Discussion

205 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to explore the experiences and
206 perceptions of PVs in a peer-led pain management program among nursing home residents.
207 Consistent with findings from other peer-led programs [13, 14], PVs in this study reported to
208 have improvement in their knowledge and skills. However, analysis of the changes in self-
209 rated pain knowledge or actual pain knowledge score between study entry and at week 12
210 was not feasible at this stage due to the small sample size (n=5). No PVs reported negative
211 comments regarding their role in the PAP, although experienced barriers such as
212 communication, space and privacy were reported. These challenges need to be taken into
213 consideration when planning and implementing future peer-led PAP in nursing homes.

214 PVs perceived their role to boost their “sense of self-worth”, which has been regarded
215 as a powerful alleviator of stress and hopelessness [15]. A “sense of self-worth” also helps
216 people to have a more positive interpretation of their own health [16] and better cope with
217 chronic disease [17]. Future research can explore the changes in physical and psychological
218 health outcomes such as pain intensity, quality of life and happiness level among PVs who
219 lead the pain management program.

220 There are several limitations in this study. First, findings relate specifically to one
221 peer-led PAP among nursing home residents in Hong Kong, and may not be generalizable to
222 other peer-led PAP in other settings or other countries. Second, PVs may have
223 overemphasised the benefits for themselves because of the time and emotional investment in
224 the role. They may also have concerns about giving negative comments to the role. However,
225 most of them were open to report barriers experienced. Nonetheless, findings of this study are
226 useful for future work on implementation of the peer-led PAP. For example, the benefits
227 reported by the PVs can be used in PVs recruitment in future peer-led PAP.

228 **Conclusions**

229 This study provides further evidence that peer-led pain management program is feasible.
230 Perceived benefits of PVs included self-reported increase in pain management knowledge
231 and skills. No adverse event was reported, rather some barriers during the implementation of
232 the PAP in nursing home were encountered. These barriers identified may benefit the design
233 and planning of future PAP.

234 **List of abbreviations**

235 **IAA** Institute of Active Aging; **PV** peer volunteers; **PAP** Pain management program; **SPSS**

236 Statistical Package for Social Sciences

237 **Declarations**

238 *Ethical approval and consent to participate*

239 Ethical approval was obtained from the Human Subjects Ethics Sub-committee of Hong
240 Kong Polytechnic University and all participants gave their written informed consent prior to
241 data collection.

242

243 *Consent for publication*

244 Not applicable.

245

246 *Availability of data and material*

247 The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the
248 corresponding author on reasonable request.

249

250 *Competing interests*

251 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

252

253 *Funding*

254 This study was supported by the Health and Medical Research Fund (Ref. 15161051), Food
255 and Health Bureau, Hong Kong SAR Government. The funding body has no role in the
256 design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data or in writing the
257 manuscript.

258

259 *Authors' contributions*

260 MMYT is the overall principal investigator of the study, and the person who designed the
261 study, arranged and participated in meetings with the staff of the Institute of Active Ageing,

262 designed the content for training the volunteers, and participated in designing the manuscript
263 as well as revising it for important intellectual content. SSMN participated in designing the
264 study, designed the content for training the volunteers, provided advice on the exercise
265 component of the program, and revised the manuscript for important intellectual content. XB,
266 PHL and RL participated in designing the study and revised the manuscript for important
267 intellectual content. JKCL collected, analysed and interpreted the data and revised the
268 manuscript for important intellectual content. SSYY participated in designing the study and
269 drafted the manuscript. All of the authors read and approved the final manuscript.

270

271 *Acknowledgements*

272 The authors thank all the participated nursing homes and the participants in the study.

273 **References**

- 274 1. Patel KV, Guralnik JM, Dansie EJ, Turk DC. Prevalence and impact of pain among
275 older adults in the United States: findings from the 2011 National Health and Aging
276 Trends Study. *Pain*. 2013;154(12):2649-57.
- 277 2. Abdulla A, Adams N, Bone M, Elliott AM, Gaffin J, Jones D, et al. Guidance on the
278 management of pain in older people. *Age Ageing*. 2013;42 Suppl 1:i1-57.
- 279 3. Kaye AD, Baluch A, Scott JT. Pain management in the elderly population: a review.
280 Ochsner J. 2010;10(3):179-87.
- 281 4. American Geriatrics Society Panel on Pharmacological Management of Persistent
282 Pain in Older P. Pharmacological management of persistent pain in older persons. *J*
283 *Am Geriatr Soc*. 2009;57(8):1331-46.
- 284 5. Cooper K, Kirkpatrick P, Wilcock S. The effectiveness of peer support interventions
285 for community-dwelling adults with chronic non-cancer pain: a systematic review.
286 *JB* *Database of Systematic Reviews and Implementation Reports*. 2014;12(5):319-
287 48.
- 288 6. Kawi J. Self-Management and Support in Chronic Pain Subgroups: Integrative
289 Review. *The Journal for Nurse Practitioners*. 2013;9(2):110-115.e115.
- 290 7. Foster G, Taylor SJ, Eldridge SE, Ramsay J, Griffiths CJ. Self-management education
291 programmes by lay leaders for people with chronic conditions. *Cochrane Database*
292 *Syst Rev*. 2007;(4):CD005108.
- 293 8. Tse MM, Yeung SS, Lee PH, Ng SS. Effects of a Peer-Led Pain Management
294 Program for Nursing Home Residents with Chronic Pain: A Pilot Study. *Pain Med*.
295 2016;17(9):1648-57.

- 296 9. Stevens Z, Barlow C, Iliffe S. Promoting physical activity among older people in
297 primary care using peer mentors. *Primary health care research & development*.
298 2015;16(2):201-6.
- 299 10. Greenwood N, Habibi R, Mackenzie A, Drennan V, Easton N. Peer support for carers:
300 a qualitative investigation of the experiences of carers and peer volunteers. *Am J*
301 *Alzheimers Dis Other Demen*. 2013;28(6):617-26.
- 302 11. Charlesworth G, Sinclair JB, Brooks A, Sullivan T, Ahmad S, Poland F. The impact
303 of volunteering on the volunteer: findings from a peer support programme for family
304 carers of people with dementia. *Health Soc Care Community*. 2017;25(2):548-58.
- 305 12. Wang XS, Mendoza TR, Gao SZ, Cleeland CS. The Chinese version of the Brief Pain
306 Inventory (BPI-C): its development and use in a study of cancer pain. *Pain*.
307 1996;67(2-3):407-16.
- 308 13. Arnstein P, Vidal M, Wells-Federman C, Morgan B, Caudill M. From chronic pain
309 patient to peer: benefits and risks of volunteering. *Pain Manag Nurs*. 2002;3(3):94-
310 103.
- 311 14. Pinto BM, Dunsiger S, Stein K, Kamson C. Peer mentors delivering a physical
312 activity intervention for cancer survivors: effects among mentors. *Transl Behav Med*.
313 2017;7(4):680-89.
- 314 15. Craft CA. A conceptual model of feminine hardiness. *Holist Nurs Pract*.
315 1999;13(3):25-34.
- 316 16. Stetz KM. The relationship among background characteristics, purpose in life, and
317 caregiving demands on perceived health of spouse caregivers. *Sch Inq Nurs Pract*.
318 1989;3(2):133-53.

- 319 17. Sandstrom KL. Searching for information, understanding, and self-value: the
320 utilization of peer support groups by gay men with HIV/AIDS. *Soc Work Health*
321 *Care*. 1996;23(4):51-74.