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Abstract

It is increasingly argued that the effectiveness of health promotion interventions should be measured to inform policy and practice. The randomized controlled trial (RCT) continues to be regarded as the ‘gold standard’ of health services research but health promotion practitioners have raised concerns about the RCT’s appropriateness for evaluating their work. A preferred model is currently the pragmatic trial, measuring effectiveness under ‘routine’ conditions, incorporating a process evaluation to examine context, implementation and receipt. This model was chosen by A Stop Smoking in Schools Trial (ASSIST) to evaluate an intervention in which influential Year 8 students (12–13 years old) were trained to encourage non-smoking behaviour through informal conversations with their peers. Outcome data show that the intervention was effective in reducing smoking levels in intervention schools compared with control schools. In this paper we describe the extensive process evaluation embedded within the trial and, rather than focusing on resultant data, we consider the potential for such detailed examination of process to affect the intervention’s delivery, receipt and outcome evaluation. We describe how some acknowledged challenges were addressed within ASSIST, which have relevance for future similar trials: Hawthorne effects, overlapping roles within the team and distinguishing between the intervention and its evaluation.

Introduction

It is increasingly accepted that evidence of effectiveness is required to inform health promotion practice and assist policy makers in decisions concerning resource allocation [1, 2], but there is less agreement about which methods to employ in developing the evidence base. In health services research, the randomized controlled trial (RCT) is widely regarded as the ‘gold standard’ for evaluating interventions. However, concerns have been raised about the appropriateness of RCTs for evaluating health promotion programmes. These include difficulties in meeting the strict requirements of an RCT, the perceived preoccupation with measuring outcomes rather than the process and the implications for health promotion practice [3–9]. While the ‘model’ RCT requires that a standardized intervention, with statistically measurable outcomes, be implemented uniformly with a specific target audience, these conditions are unlikely to be met in complex health promotion programmes where social and environmental factors vary considerably. Even if strict standardization could be achieved for a trial, producing evidence of efficacy under ‘ideal’ conditions is not sufficient to generalize conclusions to the ‘real world’ in which health...
promotion activities are ultimately required to be effective.

The constraints imposed by trial designs make it almost impossible to use the flexible and participatory approaches considered fundamental to good practice by many health promotion specialists [4, 6, 7, 10]. It has been argued that specific research standards should be developed for health promotion rather than being adapted from other disciplines [5, 11]. However, others have looked for ways in which the RCT could be adapted to achieve a better ‘fit’ with complex interventions. Recommendations have included gathering contextual and process data; employing a mixture of qualitative and quantitative research methods; using multiple research methods, investigators and data sources and undertaking translational and participatory research involving ‘coalitions’ which include practitioners, clients and the wider community [1, 4, 9–14]. Methods have been proposed to blend ‘evidence-based’ interventions with theory-based and experience-based knowledge [11, 15, 16], while others argue that the solution is to ‘allow the form to be adapted while standardising the process and function’ [17].

While the debate about appropriate methods to evaluate health promotion interventions goes on, the RCT continues to be widely heralded as the gold standard. In recent years a preferred model has been that of the pragmatic trial, which aims to measure the effectiveness of an intervention in routine practice [18, 19]. Pragmatic trials can adopt a ‘black box’ approach [20], allowing the intervention to take its course and relying on quantitative research methods to measure outcomes. However, the importance of collecting process data to avoid Type III errors (evaluating an intervention that was inadequately implemented) was identified some time ago [21, 22]. It is now widely accepted that outcome data should be illuminated by an integral process evaluation providing information about how an intervention was implemented and received, what its strengths and weaknesses were and what activities occurred under what conditions [23–26] (Table I). This was the model used for A Stop Smoking in Schools Trial (ASSIST).

### Table I. Adapting the RCT to evaluate health promotion interventions: characteristics of trials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of trial</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanatory trial</td>
<td>(i) Standardized intervention implemented in ideal research conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Measuring outcomes (efficacy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Quantitative research methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic trial</td>
<td>(i) Standardized intervention implemented in routine conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Measuring outcomes (effectiveness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Quantitative research methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic trial with process evaluation</td>
<td>(i) Standardized intervention implemented in routine conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Measuring outcomes (effectiveness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Examining process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) Quantitative and qualitative research methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from the ASSIST process evaluation provide valuable insight, for example, into the views and activities of participants [27]. However, the purpose of this paper is not to present analysis of the resultant data but to consider some of the methodological difficulties inherent in implementing process evaluation within an RCT and give practical examples of how these were managed within ASSIST. Others have discussed problems of implementing process evaluation within a school-based RCT in relation to data collection activities, response rates, communication and organizational pressures [28]. Some of the ways in which these issues were addressed within ASSIST have been discussed in previous papers concerning the implementation of the intervention [29] and the study design [30]. In this paper we are concerned with some of the tensions inherent in attempting to meet the differing requirements of the intervention and the outcome and process evaluations: the potential for increased Hawthorne effects, overlapping roles within the team and the importance of distinguishing between the intervention and its evaluation.
Methods

A Stop Smoking in Schools Trial (ASSIST)

Smoking among young people continues to concern health practitioners, politicians and policy makers. Given the opportunity for access to the majority of young people over prolonged periods, it is perhaps not surprising that school-based health promotion programmes have been heralded as a way forward. But, despite the factors favouring this approach, the acknowledged lack of sufficiently evaluated studies, particularly in the United Kingdom, has called into question the effectiveness of school-based programmes [31–33]. Peer education has enjoyed considerable popularity as a health promotion approach with young people but, again, there is mixed evidence about its effectiveness [24, 34–36].

In ASSIST, peer education was combined with diffusion of innovation theory [37, 38]. A team of health promotion specialists and researchers developed a school-based, peer-led intervention in which Year 8 students, identified as influential by their peers, were trained to act as ‘peer supporters’ whose role was to discourage smoking through informal conversations with other students in their year. A promising feasibility study [39] led to the funding of a full-scale trial involving 10 730 students at baseline in 59 schools in south-east Wales and the west of England, the majority of which were co-educational, state-funded comprehensive schools. Thirty schools were randomly assigned to receive the intervention and the remaining 29 constituted the control group. Key elements of the trial design are outlined in Table II and the full design is described in detail elsewhere [30].

Smoking behaviour questionnaires and saliva samples were collected at baseline from all Year 8 students in the 59 trial schools. Students were also asked to complete a peer nomination questionnaire to identify other Year 8 students whom they respected, looked up to and regarded as good leaders. In intervention schools, the 17.5% most nominated students were asked to attend a recruitment meeting at which they were invited to undertake training to become peer supporters. This ensured a desired 15% of the year group undertaking the role after attrition [40]. Nominated students who agreed to train as peer supporters, and had parental consent to participate in the intervention, were taken out of school for a two-day training event run by health promotion trainers. The training aimed to give the students the information, skills and confidence to intervene in informal situations and encourage other Year 8 students not to smoke.

During the following 10 weeks, while the peer supporters undertook their role and recorded their experiences in a diary, the health promotion trainers conducted four school-based follow-up visits to support and encourage the peer supporters in their role. A detailed description of the intervention has been published elsewhere [29]. After 10 weeks the intervention ended, the diaries were collected and the peer supporters were presented with certificates and gift vouchers to acknowledge their efforts. The trial continued, however, and outcome data were collected through smoking behaviour questionnaires and saliva samples immediately post-intervention, and when the students were in Years 9 and 10. Results from the trial are promising. Data from the smoking behaviour questionnaires indicate that the risk of students who were occasional or experimental smokers at baseline going on to report weekly smoking at 1-year follow-up was 18.3% lower in intervention schools. This promising result was supported by analysis of salivary cotinine [27].

The process evaluation

The purpose of the process evaluation was to examine the context, implementation and receipt of the intervention by providing ‘snapshots’ at different points throughout the study, as well as providing ongoing monitoring over time.

Development

Piloting of ASSIST was conducted in three schools geographically removed from the final trial location. At this stage the design and content of the
process evaluation were developed and agreed. A sub-group of the research team took primary responsibility for the process evaluation but all members of the team, which included statisticians, social scientists and health promotion specialists, were encouraged to comment before the process evaluation was finalized. Similarly, process data from the pilot study were used to refine aspects of the intervention and the outcome evaluation. These refinements were discussed at meetings of the multidisciplinary team.

Two researchers were allocated to work part-time on the process evaluation, constituting one whole-time equivalent. Because of the size of the trial, limited time and resources, and the desire to collect process data from key participants in all intervention schools at each stage of the intervention, it was agreed that the health promotion trainers would have a significant role in providing and collecting process data. The trainers were asked to administer short, self-complete questionnaires to peer supporters and teachers throughout the recruitment, training and support of the students involved. The trainers were also asked to complete similar questionnaires about their own experiences. This allowed the two researchers who were primarily responsible for implementing the process evaluation to undertake more detailed study in eight trial schools (see below). A training session was organized before the main trial started at which the content of the process evaluation and the role of the trainers in collecting and providing routine process data were discussed and agreed.

Data collection

The feasibility study [39] and pilot phase were important formative stages in the development of the ASSIST intervention, during which pertinent process data were collected and analysed. However, for the purpose of evaluating the ASSIST intervention as it was implemented during the trial, it was agreed that the health promotion trainers would have a significant role in providing and collecting process data. The trainers were asked to administer short, self-complete questionnaires to peer supporters and teachers throughout the recruitment, training and support of the students involved. The trainers were also asked to complete similar questionnaires about their own experiences. This allowed the two researchers who were primarily responsible for implementing the process evaluation to undertake more detailed study in eight trial schools (see below). A training session was organized before the main trial started at which the content of the process evaluation and the role of the trainers in collecting and providing routine process data were discussed and agreed.

Data collection

The feasibility study [39] and pilot phase were important formative stages in the development of the ASSIST intervention, during which pertinent process data were collected and analysed. However, for the purpose of evaluating the ASSIST intervention as it was implemented during the trial, a training event for the team of health promotion trainers was regarded as the beginning of the intervention. Process data were collected systematically from ‘training the trainers’ until the end of the trial (Table III).

The process evaluation adopted a broad scope of enquiry but particularly focused on the intervention’s context, implementation and receipt. Contextual information was gathered from all schools during the outcome data collection sweeps through questionnaires asking teaching staff and Year 8 students about their understanding of, and attitudes
towards, school smoking policies and practices. Relevant school staff and health promotion agencies were asked to provide information about current and planned anti-smoking initiatives. Data were collected to examine variations in the level of staff interest and commitment to the intervention as well as how schools responded to the recruitment, training and support of peer supporters. An important area of enquiry concerned the experiences of the students involved, including their reaction to the nomination process and the experience of being selected, or not selected, to train as a peer supporter. For those who were selected, the process evaluation explored their perceptions of the training and support given, and how they undertook their peer supporter role. Other questions related to the consistency and intensity of the intervention. Were there variations in the way the intervention was delivered in practice? If so, why did these variations occur and what impact might they have had on its effectiveness?

The main sources, methods and stages of process data collection are shown in Table IV. A detailed record of the process evaluation design and rationale, including illustrations of all data collection methods used, has been compiled [41].

In all intervention schools relevant school staff, peer supporters and health promotion trainers completed short questionnaires about the recruitment, training and follow-up sessions. To gain more detailed understanding, ‘in-depth’ process evaluation was conducted in four intervention schools, matched with four control schools. These were all state schools purposively selected on the basis of deprivation levels, size and geographical location (see Table II for stratification criteria).

Designated contact staff at the four in-depth control schools were interviewed about the conduct

---

Table III. ASSIST process evaluation: key stages and issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome data collection</th>
<th>Stage of intervention</th>
<th>Key process information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>Training the trainers</td>
<td>(i) General arrangements at each stage (venue, timing, staff ratios, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline data collection</td>
<td>Peer nomination</td>
<td>(ii) Whether stated aims and objectives were met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Year 8):</td>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Variations in content and style of delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) smoking behaviour questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) Interactions between participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) saliva sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>(v) Response of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer supporter recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>(vi) Issues/concerns raised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer supporter training</td>
<td></td>
<td>(vii) Extent to which peer supporters were carrying out their role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four follow-up sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td>(viii) Understanding of and attitudes towards school smoking policies and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of certificates/vouchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-intervention data collection</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(i) Extent to which peer supporters carried out their roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Year 8):</td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Understanding of and opinions about the intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) smoking behaviour questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Perceived impact of the intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) saliva sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-year follow-up (Year 9):</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(i) Peer supporters’ longer term views of the intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) smoking behaviour questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Understanding of and attitudes towards school smoking policies and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) saliva sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year follow-up (Year 10)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Understanding of and attitudes towards school smoking policies and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) smoking behaviour questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) saliva sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the trial in school, the perceived effect of data collection on students and staff and the value of peer-led health promotion. Considerably more data were collected in the four in-depth intervention schools. Individual interviews were conducted with key school staff at baseline and post-intervention,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Data collection tool</th>
<th>Stage of the trial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Year 8 students in all intervention and control schools</td>
<td>Self-complete smoking behaviour questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer supporters in all intervention schools</td>
<td>Self-complete questionnaires</td>
<td>1st PS follow-up session ($n=759$) 4th PS follow-up sessions ($n=733$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer supporters in four intervention schools selected for in-depth study</td>
<td>33 semistructured interviews, 10 focus groups</td>
<td>Post-intervention ($n=106$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% random sample of non-peer supporters in four intervention schools selected for in-depth study who indicated they had conversations about smoking with peer supporters</td>
<td>Semistructured interviews</td>
<td>Post-intervention ($n=32$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School staff</td>
<td>Teachers supervising data collection in all intervention and control schools</td>
<td>Self-complete ‘smoking policy’ questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising teachers in intervention schools</td>
<td>Self-complete questionnaires</td>
<td>PS recruitment ($n=27$) PS training ($n=31$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact teachers/key staff in four intervention schools selected for in-depth process evaluation</td>
<td>Semistructured interviews</td>
<td>Baseline ($n=8$) Post-intervention ($n=10$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact teachers in four control schools selected for in-depth process evaluation</td>
<td>Semistructured interviews, self-complete questionnaire</td>
<td>Baseline ($n=9$) Post-intervention ($n=5$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSIST team</td>
<td>Health promotion trainers at all intervention schools</td>
<td>Self-complete questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health promotion trainers</td>
<td>Semistructured interviews</td>
<td>Post-intervention ($n=11$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers in four intervention schools selected for in-depth process evaluation</td>
<td>Observation pro forma</td>
<td>Training the trainers ($n=2$) PS recruitment ($n=3$) PS training ($n=6$) 1st PS follow-up session ($n=4$) 2nd PS follow-up session ($n=3$) 3rd PS follow-up session ($n=3$) 4th PS follow-up session ($n=3$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PS, peer supporter.
and non-participant observations of the recruitment, training and support of peer supporters were undertaken. It was not possible to observe the peer supporters ‘at work’ since they had been asked to have informal conversations with their friends in everyday situations. Instead, data concerning their activities were collected immediately post-intervention through interviews and focus groups with peer supporters, and interviews with a 25% random sample of Year 8 students who reported having conversations with peer supporters in their smoking behaviour questionnaires. In addition, interviews with the health promotion trainers covered each stage of the intervention across all schools.

**Analysis**

The development of a clear analysis plan was a key element of the process evaluation design. A data analysis group was formed, consisting of team members with a range of qualitative and quantitative research skills, to develop the plan, and manage and analyse the multiple data sources. Results are not presented here but will form the basis of other papers. In this paper we go on to consider strategies employed to overcome some of the challenges of implementing the process evaluation within the trial.

**Challenges and solutions**

Despite arguments in favour of embedding process evaluation within RCTs, it is acknowledged that there are challenges involved. Here we consider three issues relevant to ASSIST that are likely to be of relevance to other health promotion interventions: Hawthorne effects, overlapping roles and distinguishing between the intervention and its evaluation.

**Hawthorne effects**

The Hawthorne effect refers to the potential impact of the research process on outcomes when subjects respond to special attention from researchers [42–44]. Two examples are discussed here, one relating to the peer supporters and the other concerning the health promotion trainers.

Qualitative data concerning the response of peer supporters to their involvement in the intervention were sought through observations, interviews and focus groups. This had the potential to heighten awareness among the peer supporters of the important part they were playing in the research, and consequently to influence their commitment and performance as peer supporters. Focusing the in-depth process evaluation in four of the 30 intervention schools helped to limit this effect across the whole trial. As an additional safeguard, interviews and focus groups, during which young people were asked to consider their experiences in detail, were undertaken when the intervention had finished. This was when memories were fresh enough for the young people to reflect upon each stage, but after they had carried out their peer supporter role.

A more complex example of the Hawthorne effect concerns the impact of the research on the health promotion trainers’ behaviour. Process evaluation can have a formative purpose in providing feedback as an intervention progresses so that changes can be made to improve implementation [45]. This approach is favoured by health promotion trainers who welcome the opportunity to adapt their practice in the light of experience. But process evaluation can also exert a ‘quality control’ effect [46] where, for example, researchers overtly monitor whether an intervention is being implemented according to specific instructions. This approach may be preferred by researchers within an RCT where standardization of delivery is required to link a specific intervention with a measurable effect.

The research priority for standardization was discussed at team meetings throughout the design and piloting phases of ASSIST. When the main trial started, the health promotion trainers were asked to complete short questionnaires in every school at each stage of the intervention, reflecting on whether predetermined aims and objectives had been achieved. In addition, observations of the recruitment, training and follow-up visits were conducted in those schools selected for in-depth process evaluation. These activities inevitably reminded the trainers of the importance of consistency in an RCT (Box 1).
However, the process evaluation also provided opportunities, through the routine questionnaires and during post-intervention interviews, for the health promotion trainers to comment on aspects of the standardized training programme that could be improved. For example, there was some agreement among the training team that the school-based follow-up sessions for peer supporters could be improved (Box 2). Thus, although the need for standardization prevailed, the process evaluation also provided a means by which the complexities of implementation were acknowledged and professional judgement could be expressed.

### Overlapping roles

Although ASSIST was relatively well funded, the size and complexity of the trial required team members to adopt a variety of roles and the health promotion trainers undertook a significant role in providing and collecting process data. Problems can arise from overlapping roles in this way, including the potential for reporting bias and a tendency towards positive appraisal. A systematic review of different study designs of peer-delivered health promotion for young people found that, while evidence from outcome studies was equivocal as to the effectiveness of the peer approach, the process evaluations overwhelmingly reported highly positive appraisals by young people [24]. This tendency may be compounded where health promotion trainers are asked, as was the case with ASSIST, to report on how well they had implemented an intervention that they were instrumental in designing.

This issue was confronted within ASSIST through dialogue about the central aims of the research and the best ways in which these could be achieved. During team discussions it was emphasized that the performance of individual trainers was not being assessed but that data were being sought about the complex issue of how the intervention might operate in the ‘real world’. Preliminary analysis of the post-intervention interviews has revealed willingness among the health promotion trainers, including those who were instrumental in designing the intervention, to discuss shortcomings and suggest improvements, for example, in relation to the original ‘training the trainers’ event and the school-based follow-up visits (Box 2).

At the same time, through team discussions and data collection activities in school, the researchers grew to appreciate some of the practical problems of delivering health promotion interventions in school settings, the difficulties inherent in requiring trainers to deliver a standardized programme in line with the requirements of an RCT and the implications for wider implementation should outcome data suggest that the intervention was successful.

### Distinguishing between intervention and evaluation

Just as difficulties may arise through overlapping roles within the team, problems can occur in...
maintaining a distinction between activities that are part of the intervention and those that are part of the process evaluation. Two examples are given here.

At the first and fourth follow-up visits, all peer supporters completed process evaluation questionnaires asking them to reflect on their feelings about being selected for training, their conversations with other students and whether the training and support had adequately prepared them for their role. It is possible that completing these questionnaires encouraged peer supporters to be more reflective, and consequently more committed, throughout the 10-week intervention than if they had only filled in evaluation forms at the end of the training event as is common practice in health promotion interventions. Since all peer supporters in all intervention schools were asked to complete these questionnaires, it can be argued that they should be regarded as an integral part of the intervention. We are now, in fact, unable to evaluate how effective the intervention would have been without the process of completing these questionnaires. However, it was felt that the information was potentially valuable and similar questionnaires could be easily incorporated into the intervention if it proved successful and was implemented on a wider basis.

In a second example, the concern is whether data collected as part of the intervention should be used to inform the process evaluation. At the development stage, it was agreed that peer supporters would be asked to complete a simple diary specifying when and where they had conversations with other Year 8 students about smoking, the length of conversations and whether conversations had gone well or badly. Discussions took place within the team about whether the purpose of diary completion was to gather information for the process evaluation or, as part of the intervention, to keep the students focused on their peer supporter role and monitor their progress at follow-up sessions. It was agreed that diary completion should be considered part of the intervention and the process evaluation would not rely upon data contained within the diaries to examine peer supporters’ activities. Instead, process data would be collected using specifically designed questionnaires, in-depth interviews and focus groups. Subsequent qualitative data analysis suggests that this was appropriate. The diaries appeared to function well as a prompt for peer supporters, but cannot be relied upon to give an accurate indication of the number or quality of conversations undertaken since some peer supporters admitted during interviews and focus groups that they had made up some diary entries and forgotten to include others (27).

Conclusion

A preferred model for evaluating health promotion interventions is currently that of the pragmatic trial, measuring effectiveness under ‘routine’ conditions, incorporating a process evaluation. This was the case in the ASSIST intervention.
model chosen to evaluate the ASSIST school-based, peer-led smoking intervention. But while the advantages of embedding process evaluation within RCTs are increasingly accepted, there are challenges involved. A pragmatic trial aims to provide an unbiased estimate of an intervention’s effectiveness as it would be routinely implemented. However, conducting process evaluation involves additional research activity with the potential to influence outcomes.

In the case of ASSIST, additional interest in the activities of the peer supporters may have resulted in greater commitment to the role than would be the case if the intervention were to be implemented without such detailed attention to process. Similarly, researcher observations and the requirement to complete short questionnaires in relation to all intervention schools at each stage of the intervention are likely to have exaggerated the consistency with which the trainers implemented the intervention. Factors such as commitment and consistency are liable to influence the reach and intensity of the intervention and its potential impact on smoking levels. While it is unlikely that Hawthorne effects can be eliminated from any evaluation, awareness of their potential impacts should inform data collection and interpretation. Some practical measures may also be taken to minimize them. In ASSIST these included focusing in-depth process evaluation in a purposive sample of schools, and conducting interviews and focus groups at the end of, rather than during, the intervention.

Other difficulties may arise, and objectivity may be compromised, when team members are asked to take on multiple roles or where the boundaries between the intervention and its evaluation are not clear. These potential problems were confronted within ASSIST through encouraging a critical and reflective research environment particularly during the development and piloting phases. Clarity of research agenda and open debate within the multidisciplinary team were important in highlighting difficulties (such as the potential for reporting bias, or where data collection activities impinge upon the implementation of the intervention) and reaching an agreement about ways forward.

The process evaluation revealed tension between the research requirement for a standardized intervention (in the attempt to link cause and effect) and the health promotion requirement for flexibility when implementing complex interventions. In practice, the ASSIST process evaluation occupied a dual role: reinforcing standardization and providing a means by which the complexities of implementation were acknowledged and professional judgement could be expressed within the constraints of the trial. In this way we believe that the process evaluation went some way towards meeting the evaluation requirements of both researchers and health promotion practitioners.

Nevertheless, it should be acknowledged that if the process evaluation reduced variation during the trial, it consequently had the potential to increase the variation between the intervention as implemented within the RCT and the way it might be conducted outside of the trial context. There is an acknowledged lack of rigorously evaluated, peer-led interventions that have been shown to be effective in reducing smoking levels among adolescents. Bearing this in mind, the promising results from the ASSIST study have led to discussions about the wider implementation of the intervention in secondary schools in Wales. In acknowledging the ‘dual role’ of the process evaluation, the forthcoming ASSIST training manual will include some modifications to the intervention, particularly in relation to training the trainers and the school-based follow-up sessions, based on the recommendations of the health promotion trainers. This addresses, albeit belatedly, their desire to shape the intervention as a result of lessons learned during its implementation. At the same time, since the intervention was shown to be effective as trialled, the manual will also emphasize the importance to any subsequent trainers of implementing core features of the intervention consistently and in their entirety.

It is broadly accepted that RCTs evaluating health promotion programmes should include an examination of process as well as outcomes, and it is understandable that researchers tend to focus subsequent publications on the resultant data. However, it is also important to acknowledge the
tensions inherent in the process of implementing process evaluation within trials. Here we have outlined some issues pertinent to ASSIST which we believe have relevance for similar trials.
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