

**An innovative approach to
changing social attitudes around
family violence in New Zealand:**
Key ideas, insights and lessons learnt
The Campaign for Action on Family Violence

Prepared by
Point Research Ltd.

Prepared for
Centre for Social Research and Evaluation
Te Pokapū Rangahau Arotake Hapori

March 2010

ISBN 978-0-478-32387-0 (Online)

Table of contents

Executive summary	3
Introduction	5
Research approach	7
Method	7
The Campaign	8
Background	8
Process	9
Approach	10
Structure	11
Impact	16
Findings	16
Lessons and insights	20
Mass media	20
The brand	22
Media training	24
Relationships	24
Community development	26
Monitoring and evaluation (action and reflection)	28
Future steps	29
Conclusion	32
References	34
Appendix 1: Discussion guide	38
Appendix 2: Documentation	41

Executive summary

In 2005, amid growing concerns about the level of family violence in New Zealand, the Government established the Taskforce for Action on Violence within Families. The Campaign for Action on Family Violence, the “It’s not OK” Campaign, is an initiative of that taskforce.

This aim of this research is to:

- articulate the key ideas, messages and approach of the “It’s not OK” Campaign (the Campaign)
- review the evidence to better understand how well the Campaign is working
- focus on lessons and insights that can be used to inform the future development of the Campaign and enhance future government-led initiatives.

Data sources include 29 key informant interviews as well as documents and information pertaining to the Campaign.

Overall, the report shows that the Campaign has impacted in the following ways.

- The Campaign is highly visible. Recall of Campaign messages is high across all groups, particularly Māori and Pacific peoples.
- The understanding of the behaviours that constitute family violence appears to be increasing.
- The Campaign has had an impact on people’s motivation to act.
- The Campaign has given strength to local initiatives, including giving them the confidence to use a wide range of social marketing strategies.
- The Campaign is contributing towards increased reporting of family violence and more people are seeking help from agencies.
- Family violence is being reported in the media with greater accuracy and is more likely to be portrayed as a serious social problem.

The report finds that the impact of the Campaign is likely due to the following factors.

- The Campaign utilises a complex, layered, integrated approach. Mass media are used to market the Campaign messages to the public.
- The Campaign is positive. It aims to create social change by inspiring opportunities and possibilities for change.
- Social marketing strategies that are particularly effective include the tagline “It’s not OK”, which is simple and clear, and positive, universally appealing stories that are designed to challenge social norms.
- The Campaign has provided an umbrella under which government, community organisations and media can all work.
- A number of cross-sector partnerships underpin the Campaign, including contractual relationships with four key collaborative partners from the family violence sector.

- Service providers and family violence networks have used the “It’s not OK” branding to support their own local activities that link them to the national Campaign.
- Aspects of the Campaign take a community development approach. It has tapped into and supported the work already being undertaken in the community.
- Community-based organisations are funded to undertake innovative initiatives and in doing so the gap that exists between community needs and government policy is narrowed.
- A community-based approach has enabled a wide range of initiatives to emerge, some of which appear to have been highly successful in working in family violence prevention.
- The media have been strategically and respectfully engaged. Media advocacy and media training have been used to great effect both by the Campaign team and family violence networks.
- Ongoing research, monitoring and evaluation have enabled the Campaign to be responsive and adapt when and where necessary.

Ways forward for the Campaign could include:

- a holistic approach for Māori whānau, where Māori whānau (kuia, koroua, pākēkē, rangatahi and tamariki) are supported to achieve wellbeing
- more diverse voices (for example, women and children)
- talk about help giving and receiving behaviour
- increasing future Campaign leverage and sustainability by continuing to build a social movement through community partnerships, mass media messaging and social networking.

Introduction

Family violence is a significant social issue in New Zealand. It is estimated that one-in-three women has been the victim of domestic violence (Fanslow & Robinson, 2004). Between 2000 and 2004, 56 women, 26 men and 39 children under the age of 17 were murdered by a family member (New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse, 2007). In 2005, New Zealand Police recorded more than 60,000 offences and non-offence incidents involving family violence, at which over 62,000 children and young people under the age of 17 were present or involved in some capacity (Standards New Zealand, 2006). Despite this, many thousands of cases go unreported; Police estimate they see only 18 per cent of all violence within homes (New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse, 2007). The economic cost is estimated at between \$1.2 and \$5.8 billion each year (Snively, 1995).

Domestic violence affects all segments of the population and all ethnicities in New Zealand; however, the prevalence rates within Māori communities are even higher than the rates for the general population (New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse, 2007).

International law requires New Zealand to act with due diligence to prevent, investigate and punish acts of domestic violence. It also provides for effective remedies to the victims of domestic violence.¹

In 2005, amid growing concerns about the level of family violence in New Zealand, the Government established a multi-agency taskforce, the Taskforce for Action on Violence within Families, to advise on how to address the issue. As part of its plan of action, the Taskforce is supporting a campaign to reduce society's tolerance of violence and change people's damaging behaviour within families.

The Campaign for Action on Family Violence, the "It's not OK" Campaign, a social marketing action programme designed to change how New Zealanders think and act about family violence, is an initiative of that taskforce.

The four-year national campaign was launched on 4 September 2007. The Campaign is part of a community-wide movement led by individuals and organisations throughout New Zealand that are working together to help prevent family violence. It provides information, resources and support to create a society that says family violence is never okay. It is designed to reduce society's tolerance of violence and change attitudes and behaviours towards family violence.

The message at the heart of the Campaign is simple: family violence is not okay. It is not okay at any level, from verbal and emotional abuse to violent assault.

¹ See Fenrich & Contesse (2009) for a full exposition of the laws.

We all have a responsibility to speak out against it. We must make it clear that it is not okay to hit your spouse or partner; it's not okay to verbally or physically abuse your children or an older family member; and it's not okay to take the life of anyone, let alone someone you are meant to care for. (Rt Hon Helen Clark²)

The Campaign vision is “all families and whānau have healthy, respectful, stable relationships, free from violence”. The Te Rito³ principles underpin that vision. These are that:

- all people have a fundamental right to be safe and to live free from violence
- the unique customary and contemporary structures and practices of whānau, hapū and iwi must be recognised, provided for and fully engaged
- historical attitudes and stereotypes influence women's lack of power in relationships
- family violence prevention is to be viewed and approached in a broad and holistic manner
- perpetrators of violence in families and whānau must be held accountable for their violent behaviour
- there must be a strong emphasis on prevention and early intervention, with a specific focus on the needs of children and young people
- approaches to family violence prevention must be integrated, co-ordinated and collaborative
- the community has a right and responsibility to be involved in preventing violence in families and whānau
- the diverse needs of specific populations must be recognised and provided for when developing and implementing family violence prevention initiatives
- family violence prevention initiatives should be continually enhanced as information and better ways of working are identified.

The key objectives of the Campaign are to increase awareness of family violence so that it becomes visible and talked about throughout New Zealand; to increase understanding of family violence and its many impacts; to increase the personal relevance of family violence so New Zealanders acknowledge that it involves all of us, and that we can all help do something about it; to promote a greater propensity to act on family violence for victims, perpetrators, families and influencers; and to create a social climate that supports behavioural change.

The purpose of this review is to understand and articulate the approach of the Campaign and determine how well the Campaign is working.

In particular, it will articulate the key ideas, messages and approach of the Campaign; review the evidence to better understand how well the Campaign is working, and focus on lessons and insights that can be used to inform the future development of the Campaign and enhance future government-led initiatives.

² Speech at launch of the Campaign for Action on Family Violence, 4 September 2007.

³ Te Rito: New Zealand Family Violence Prevention Strategy (2002). Ministry of Social Development. Wellington, New Zealand.

Research approach

Method

Document Review

This project has been informed by a critical analysis of relevant literature relating to family violence, social change and social movements, as well as a number of policy documents and other information pertaining to the Campaign, including research and evaluation reports prepared by the Centre for Social Research and Evaluation (CSRE) at the Ministry of Social Development (MSD), Community Action Fund (CAF) documentation, general documents including monthly Campaign monitoring reports, Many Voices documentation and mass media and advocacy documentation.⁴

Interviews

Interviews were undertaken with a total of 29 key informants: eight members of the Campaign team, seven local service and network representatives, three Many Voices representatives, eight representatives from partner agencies and three Campaign consultants. Interviews were conducted in person or by phone, and used a semi-structured interview guide.⁵ Interviewees were asked to consider and reflect on a range of key areas such as:

- the activities of the Campaign
- the approach of the Campaign
- which aspects of the Campaign are working well
- the ways in which the Campaign is making a difference
- which aspects have not worked well and what has been learnt along the way
- whether the Campaign has had any other influence
- the next steps and future directions of the Campaign.

Interviewees were also asked to reflect on evidence, examples and stories that could be used to highlight and illustrate their points.

Data Analysis

The data analysis process was an iterative one, whereby themes and patterns were not predefined, but were progressively arrived at by repeating rounds of analysis on qualitative data obtained during in-depth interviews and through the document review. Analysis was guided by the objectives of the review and the key questions in the discussion guide.

The themes and patterns were isolated by examining, coding and comparing the interview and document data.

⁴ For an expanded list of documentation, please see Appendix II.

⁵ See Appendix I for the interview guide.

The Campaign

Background

Much work has been done over the past 30 years to address family violence in New Zealand. Legislation, regulation and family violence intervention initiatives directed at individuals or families and whānau have all sought, in some way, to reduce the incidence of family violence. In addition, there have been a number of public information and advertising campaigns (both within New Zealand and internationally) that have been aimed at reducing family violence.

However, research commissioned in 2005 by the Families Commission found public information and advertising campaigns have tended to be short duration, low-intensity programmes, lack audience insight and research, lack ongoing funding and lack ongoing evaluation to inform the campaign's effectiveness, which has resulted in limited long-term success (Fanslow, 2005). The research suggested that achieving a society where family violence is unacceptable would only occur once the dominant New Zealand societal narrative, which minimised, justified and normalised all but extreme violence, was addressed. Moreover, the research proposed that, to be effective, a campaign against family violence would need to clarify from the outset what it is trying to achieve, set minimum standards for victim safety and offender accountability, and send a strong message that family violence is not tolerated (ibid).

In 2005, the Taskforce for Action on Violence within Families (the Taskforce) was established. Its brief was "to advise the Family Violence Ministerial Team on how to make improvements to the way family violence is addressed, and how to eliminate family violence in New Zealand" (MSD, 2008). The Taskforce consisted of government and non-government agencies, independent Crown entities and the judiciary, and signalled a significant commitment by all involved to work together and provide leadership to end family violence and promote stable, healthy families.

The Campaign for Action on Family Violence, the "It's not OK" Campaign, is an initiative of the Taskforce. It is led by MSD and the Families Commission in association with communities and other government agencies, such as the Accident Compensation Corporation, Ministry of Health and New Zealand Police. Strategic advice on how the Campaign can impact on Māori and Pacific peoples in New Zealand is provided to the Campaign, via the Taskforce, by a Māori Reference Group and Pacific Advisory Group.

The areas of family and whānau violence that the Campaign was designed to target were taken from the Te Rito Family Violence Prevention Strategy (2002), which defined family violence as:

"[a] broad range of controlling behaviours, commonly of a physical, sexual and/or psychological nature and which typically involve fear, intimidation and emotional deprivation. It occurs within a variety of close interpersonal relationships, such as between partners, parents and children, siblings, and in other relationships where significant

others are not part of the physical household but are part of the family and/or are fulfilling the function of family”.

By using this definition, the following target areas were chosen:

- child abuse/neglect (abuse/neglect of children by an adult)
- spouse/partner abuse/intimate partner violence (violence by adult partners)
- elder abuse/neglect (abuse/neglect of older people aged approximately 65 years and over, by a person with whom they have a relationship of trust)
- parental abuse (violence perpetrated by a young person against their parent)
- sibling abuse (violence among siblings).

Process

Considerable preparation was undertaken prior to the launch of the Campaign.

The process was designed to make the most of the Campaign resources by creating an impact at a societal, organisational, community and family level that, it was envisaged, would eventually lead to social change.

Consultation

In the early stages of planning, the Campaign engaged the collective skills of four key stakeholders: the National Collective of Independent Women’s Refuges, Relationship Services, the National Network of Stopping Violence Services and Jigsaw Family Services (hereafter ‘National Partners’). Work with these stakeholders, along with the Māori Reference Group and Pacific Advisory Group, ensured that the Campaign had the benefit of the experience of four of the key groups and many of the key people involved in family violence interventions in New Zealand.

The groups were chosen because each had a wide national reach, each was recognised as having specific expert knowledge in relation to the impacts and implications of family violence for women, men, couples and children, and each had demonstrated a commitment to working with government, with each other and other community partners at a national level to address family violence, including a strong commitment to the Te Rito strategy.

Prior to the launch, the government Campaign team together with the national and collaborative partners (hereafter the ‘Campaign team’) had a number of issues to work through.⁶ The Campaign team approached the Campaign with a solid set of underlying principles, chiefly that it would be based on reciprocity and responsiveness, community driven and relationship based. To build and strengthen the relationships behind the Campaign, engagement with communities and partnerships with non-governmental organisations (NGOs) were considered key. To this end, there was an extensive process of consultation, feedback, and more consultation. This consultation, and the relationships that were derived from it, continue to underpin the Campaign.

⁶ Note the distinction between the ‘government Campaign team’, which comprises members of MSD and the Families Commission, and the ‘Campaign team’, which comprises the government Campaign team, along with partner agencies and organisations.

Research

In the early stages of the Campaign planning, formative research was commissioned to better understand family violence. Prior to the research being undertaken, it was thought that the Campaign might start by addressing male violence towards intimate partners. This research (including interviews and focus groups with perpetrators and the general public), however, found that there was a lack of understanding of the nature and scope of family violence. It also suggested that it would be counterproductive to single out target groups because this could 'ghettoise' the issue and enable groups that weren't targeted to disassociate themselves from the Campaign messages (Gravitas Research and Strategy Limited, 2006a; New Zealand Families Commission, 2007).

In view of the results, the Campaign team considered that challenging social beliefs around family violence would be an important factor in family violence prevention (Caton, 2001). The Campaign was designed to reframe family violence as a serious social issue, build a shared understanding of what constitutes family violence, and promote a belief that it is possible to do something about it.

Media Training

One of the lead strategies for the Campaign was media training, both for people who were used as sources of information on family violence, and for the media themselves.

Training was undertaken prior to the Campaign launch to prepare the media. Journalists and journalism students were given training on reporting family violence accurately and in a way that dispels myths. Community spokespeople were trained in how to engage confidently with reporters and get important family violence messages into local media. A network of media spokespeople was formed around the country that reporters could go to for family violence stories.

Approach

Family violence interventions tend to be directed at families and communities and rarely venture into the wider, societal environment (Fanslow, 2005).

The Campaign team decided early on in the Campaign that dealing with family violence as a singular issue, with a singular response, would not be effective as it would not take into account or focus on the complexity of factors that have contributed to the problem (Torjman, 2003).

The Campaign team used a social marketing approach based on a mass media campaign and community action. The research suggested that social marketing could change attitudes and behaviour in relation to family violence (Davies et al, 2003; Gadomski et al, 2001; Wray, 2006), and that media campaigns had been shown to be effective in increasing awareness, affecting attitudes and empowering people to act against issues of family violence (Colmar Brunton, 1997). There was also compelling evidence to suggest that, to achieve effective long-term change, media campaigns needed to be supported by layers of activities and interventions, and use consistent messages that were communicated through multiple sources (Davis et al, 2003).

The Campaign utilises a complex, layered, integrated approach based on the principles of community development. This framework, including mass media, is designed to provide the basis for an audience-driven approach to behavioural change and create an environment that supports desired behaviour rather than just targeting individuals.

The first phase of the Campaign 'set the context' by defining family violence. It was designed to change social norms by drawing a clear line in the sand that violent behaviour towards others was not okay, and gave a strong message that perpetrators could ask for help to change. The basis for this approach was that violence and abuse exists in secrecy; that perpetrators have been allowed to exist in an environment that is implicitly (or sometimes explicitly) supportive of violence; and that there needed to be agreement about the types of behaviour that constituted family violence.

The second phase of the Campaign was aimed at addressing intimate partner violence. The aim was to get perpetrators of violence to 'self-identify' by focusing on the damage that their behaviour caused, rather than the behaviour itself. At the core of this phase was the idea that it is possible for perpetrators to change their behaviour if they are motivated enough, and if they can be persuaded that change is in their best interests.

Structure

The Campaign comprises five strands:

- mass media communications
- media advocacy
- a Community Action Fund (CAF) designed to support community initiatives that raise awareness of family violence and support social change in both geographic and identity communities
- partnerships with community, sports, business and government organisations
- research and evaluation.

In addition to the five strands, the Campaign is supported by resources, including a toll-free information line that connects callers to local services (where appropriate), a Campaign website (www.areyouok.org.nz), an e-newsletter and a number of free print resources.

Figure 1 illustrates how the resources and five strands work together to spread Campaign messages and leverage opportunity. Each of the five strands is described in greater detail below.

Figure 1: “It’s not OK” Campaign structure



Mass Media

To date, two sets of television advertisements have been developed. The first set featured local celebrities and ordinary New Zealanders, men and women, voicing short messages about what’s not okay. These included: “It’s not OK to teach your kids that violence is the way to get what you want”, “It’s not OK to blame the drink”, “It’s not OK to punch a hole in the wall to show your wife who’s boss”. The “It’s not OK” advertisements concluded with a positive message, “Family Violence – It’s not OK ... but it is OK to ask for help”.

The second phase of the Campaign six months later, which focused on perpetrators’ stories, took a more gendered approach to family violence.⁷ The advertisements featured four men, not actors, telling their personal stories. Three talked about how they stopped being violent after many years of abusing partners and families. The fourth talked about how he influenced a friend to ‘man up’ and stop being abusive to his partner.

⁷ This is in line with research that demonstrates that men are the main perpetrators of intimate partner abuse. Although there are a number of research reports that argue that women’s violence towards men is equivalent to men’s violence towards women, there is evidence that these findings are misrepresented and can in fact undermine policies designed to prevent and reduce male partner violence against women. See Giles (2005) for a discussion.

In order to convince perpetrators (and those around them) that change was possible, the initial media activity focused on perpetrators who recognised that their violence was counterproductive and identified its negative impacts, who wanted and were open to taking action to change, and who may not know where or how to seek help, or were unwilling to seek help for fear of being judged or stigmatised.

Media training and Advocacy

The Campaign provides media training, including ongoing workshops, with journalists and journalism schools on family violence, and media training for spokespeople from key organisations. A set of guidelines for journalists has been developed.

There are 176 people on the list of media training community spokespeople and most are regularly engaged in media activity with their local news outlets. A smaller group appear in national media frequently, mainly those in the main centres.

Community Action Fund (CAF)

In contrast to previous government-led 'top down' family violence public education campaigns, there was early recognition from the Campaign team that the Campaign must "live within communities". This is primarily achieved through the CAF and Many Voices strands.

The purpose of the CAF is to build and support community ownership and commitment to the prevention of family violence; support local change; encourage community organisations to work collaboratively to prevent family violence; and to ensure the objectives and messages of the national Campaign are echoed, made relevant and acted on in local communities. It prioritises initiatives that are collaborative, innovative and designed to effect change. It does not provide funding for helping services.

The CAF enables communities to take Campaign messages into everyday places, such as supermarkets, sports clubs, schools, cafés, and to showcase the messages on buses, billboards and so on. It ensures that greater community leverage for Campaign messages is achieved through collaboration between local networks and service agencies by encouraging them to share resources and combine prevention activities. CAF funding enables media training for community organisation spokespeople, ensuring that national messages are reinforced constantly in local and regional media.

Ongoing and regular communication from CAF project leaders and activities is used to feed back into the national Campaign. CAF activity is not confined to short-term projects. Initiatives are encouraged to implement projects that have sustainable elements, such as creating organisational violence-free policies or planning 'spin off' unfunded activity from CAF-funded projects.

To date, there have been four rounds of the CAF. A total of 147 community grants have been made, distributing \$3.2 million to community organisations around the country. The types of activities include community events designed to raise awareness around family violence, local media campaigns using Campaign messages tailored for a specific community, school and workplace projects, community forums and hui,

awareness-raising activities with specific groups (eg, men, Māori, Pacific peoples) and developing community mentors.⁸

Many Voices

Many Voices is centred on the development of relationships and partnerships between businesses, sports teams, local councils and the like that are designed to expand the influence of the Campaign.

Many Voices opportunities are assessed against the audience reach, sustainability, the ability to involve others (based on community linkages), fit with existing Campaign activities and potential leverage, innovation, the cost to the Campaign, the credibility of the individuals involved and their ability to 'get stuff done'. Partners include:

- local authorities that promote the Campaign at a local level
- Taiohi Morehu, Upper Hutt youth leaders who have engaged their community in preventing family violence through performing arts
- sports organisations that have used logos on uniforms, courtside messages, community and school visits
- businesses, workplaces and organisations, such as Rotary International
- New Zealand Police, with the Campaign team providing media training for police family violence co-ordinators
- kapa haka teams, with 12 of the 14 winning regional teams wearing supporting messages at Te Matatini 2009⁹
- Super Māori Fullas who are sharing their kaupapa of the importance of supporting whānau and living violence-free lives, and encouraging others to do the same.

Ongoing Research and Evaluation

One of the fundamental strands of the Campaign is ongoing research and evaluation. A number of evaluative documents have been prepared by both internal (CSRE) and external researchers to assist in different ways in determining how much the Campaign has contributed to changing community awareness around family violence. In addition, formative research is used to inform the Campaign strategy.

Campaign monitoring and evaluation activities include the following.

Community study (mass media, community action and NGO projects)

The community study examined the impact of the Campaign in four communities in New Zealand – Christchurch, Porirua, Te Tairāwhiti (Gisborne) and Waitakere. A key goal of the research was to look for stories of significant change in each of the communities.

⁸ See http://www.areyouok.org.nz/community_action_fund.php for a full list of CAF projects.

⁹ Te Matatini is a national kapa haka, or Māori, cultural performing arts festival.

Reach and retention survey (mass media)

The tracking surveys measured the reach and retention of the television advertisements that are part of the mass media component of the Campaign. Three surveys were completed, in December 2007, April 2008 and September 2008.

CAF evaluation

A report on a formative process and early outcomes evaluation of the CAF was commissioned in 2008. The data has not yet been publicly released, although the findings have informed this review.

Media Audit

A media audit was commissioned by the MSD Family and Community Services (FACS) Campaign team to measure changes in the way family violence has been reported by the news media since the media advocacy project began in 2006. This improvement is measured by the number of stories, size and placement, headline size and content.

Resources

The five strands are supported by a number of freely available resources. Resources are used for two purposes, first to publicise the Campaign and heighten awareness of the Campaign messages (eg, tangible resources such as t-shirts) and to add depth to the Campaign messages (eg, publications and research).

The resources are available for free from the website (www.areyouok.org.nz). Moreover, organisations are free to produce their own resources using the Campaign logo and/or messages.

A number of publications have been developed to support the Campaign. These are also free and can be downloaded or ordered from the website. A Community Action Toolkit, which includes information about how to get involved in action at a local level to counter family violence, can also be downloaded.

The resources include:

- a free information phone line that provides information and advice and connects callers to services in their own areas, where appropriate
- a Campaign website, which provides information and advice (www.areyouok.org.nz)
- Campaign material, including booklets, posters and flyers
- media information, including a media manual and guidelines for reporters
- community action material
- family violence research.

Impact

Ongoing research and evaluation has been used extensively throughout the Campaign to assess the Campaign's impact and effectiveness.

The research and evaluation documents used to inform this section of the report include:¹⁰

- Attitude Survey Report (CSRE, December 2009)
- community study (CSRE, May 2009)
- reach and retention surveys 1–3 (CSRE, ongoing)
- CAF Early Outcomes Evaluation (Pam Oliver & Associates, 2008)
- Ministerial Report on Campaign Effectiveness (April 2009)
- Report on Business Engagement and Action (Unravel Research, June 2009)
- data tracking: calls to 0800 number, distribution of resources and website usage.

Findings

Awareness

The findings from these documents suggest, first, that the Campaign is highly visible. The September 2008 reach and retention survey found that 95 per cent of respondents can recall at least one of the television advertisements. Further, the attitudes survey showed that unprompted recall of a family violence campaign was 85 per cent, with 38 per cent of respondents specifically mentioning the "It's not OK" Campaign.

Although Campaign recall is high across all groups, the Campaign appears to be particularly effective in reaching Māori and Pacific peoples. The highest recall of the Campaign was by Māori females (99 per cent) and Māori males (98 per cent).¹¹

Community events around family violence also have a high recall and are seen to be very positive for the communities.

The Campaign is normalising discussion about family violence. The third reach and retention survey (September 2008) shows that two-thirds (68 per cent) of people who saw the advertisements had discussed them with someone.

Almost two-thirds of those who had seen the advertisements said they had thought more about family violence, and felt the advertisements helped them to understand more about intolerable behaviours.

¹⁰ In addition to these documents, Police and service providers were interviewed and asked whether there have been changes in service provision contacts, and reporting and recording data, and whether the Campaign had contributed to these changes.

¹¹ Note that Māori and Pacific peoples are considered 'harder to reach' in media campaigns than other groups. Recall by Pacific peoples, although lower than Māori, was still high (89% male and 90% female).

Once their awareness of behaviours that constituted family violence was heightened, respondents in the concept testing reported that the advertisements highlighted their understanding of the scale and significance of family violence.

The reach and retention survey also showed that the television advertisements helped respondents to understand that they should not tolerate violence within families (68 per cent), that a life without violence is possible (88 per cent), and that it is possible to influence someone to change their violent behaviour (57 per cent).

Personal impact

More than one-third of respondents (37 per cent) from the reach and retention survey believed that the television advertisements had personal relevance to their lives, and had impacted on them in some way.

For many respondents in the attitude survey, the television advertisements had reinforced positive attitudes or changed negative attitudes towards family violence. More than one-third (37 per cent) reported being impacted by what they had seen or heard, and a further 23 per cent reported that the Campaign reinforced what they already believed.

The Campaign reach and retention survey (September 2008) shows the Campaign is motivating people towards change, with almost nine out of 10 people saying the advertisements made them feel that change is possible (with the strongest impact being on Māori men and women and Pacific women), one-in-five saying they had taken action as a result of the Campaign, and nearly six out of 10 people believing they could influence someone else's behaviour.

Similarly, the community study found that the Campaign is contributing to people asking for support for family violence issues, and wanting to address problems earlier.

Evidence of Community Change

The community study showed that the Campaign has given strength to local initiatives, including giving them the confidence to use a wide range of social marketing strategies. Service providers and community organisations report increased morale and a better understanding of their work. Providers report that the Campaign gives their own local efforts "a boost" by giving momentum to local activities, and Police, health and social agencies say family violence issues are easier to broach with clients.

The community study also showed that the Campaign has supported communities to work differently. Collaboration and partnerships between local government, communities, providers and businesses have increased, and more community leaders and 'celebrities' want to champion the issue and be involved. The Campaign has also supported community groups to provide services and resources specific to their own communities' needs.

In addition, the funded projects report a range of positive community impacts, including increased attention to family violence and greater community awareness of family violence issues. They also report increased involvement by a greater diversity of local

organisations in family violence prevention and changes in family violence reporting attitudes and behaviour, resulting in earlier intervention.

Contacting Services

The community study suggests that the Campaign is contributing towards increased reporting of family violence and more people are seeking help from agencies. Service providers attribute an increase in approaches to their services for help to the television advertising, supported by community-level activity.

The volume of calls to the 0800 family violence information line (0800 456 450) is heavily influenced by mass media activity, with the number of calls generally doubling during periods when the television advertisements are showing.

Averaged over the lifetime of the Campaign, the information line has received approximately 350 calls a month, with the highest number of calls in the month of June 2008 (645). Around four out of every 10 callers are male.

People have responded really strongly, and men much more strongly than I would have predicted. (National Partner Representative)

In October 2008, Police attributed the 29 per cent increase in family violence reporting to an increased awareness of family violence, for which the Campaign is partly responsible.¹²

It's driving work for us. (Family violence) is now what we call volume crime – like burglaries. It's about nearly a third of all calls to service. (Police)

An increase in Police recording has also been partly credited to the Campaign.

... we'd often turn up and not document it properly. (Now) we're able to say it's not actually a trespass job, it's a family violence job we've got here. (Police)

The National Collective of Independent Women's Refuges reports that more women are seeking help after experiencing violence for many years, and more women are seeking help earlier. One local network reported that they are now working with more than double the number of women they are funded for.

We're funded for 115 women a week and we work with 300. We don't close off at anything. More advertising means more people coming through, but how can you say no to people who need help? We aren't doing ourselves a favour, but that's not the issue. We can't let it stop us from doing things. (NGO Representative)

¹² New Zealand Police National Crime Statistics release October 2008.

It's always good when someone is trying to help to change the issue. We have never been busier... (National Partner Representative)

Men, in particular, are seeking help for their use of violence. As well as using services, they are using the 0800 information line and other helplines, the Campaign website, and engaging with national and local Campaign champions.

Media Reporting

A media audit commissioned by the FACS Campaign team to measure change in the way family violence is reported by the news media since 2006 showed that family violence is being reported with greater accuracy and is more likely to be portrayed as a serious social problem.

The audit found that, by 2008, news stories were more likely to contain a message about family violence (90 per cent), less likely to contain a myth (20 per cent) more likely to be on the front page or lead a broadcast bulletin (8.8 per cent) and more likely to contain a call to action (25 per cent). Further, reporters were more likely to name family violence and use language that described and condemned violence in the home.

Awards

The Campaign's success has also been recognised elsewhere; in 2009, the Campaign won a prestigious Gold Quill award for excellence in communication.¹³

¹³ The Gold Quill award is a global communication award. In 2009, the International Association of Business Communicators (IABC) received nearly 1,000 entries from 26 countries. Of these, 122 were selected to receive awards – 41 Awards of Excellence and 81 Awards of Merit. The Campaign was singled out for a special feature in IABC's Communication World Magazine. See <http://www.iabcwellington.co.nz/2009/04/20/nz-public-sector-wins-big-in-global-communication-awards/> (downloaded 3 September 2009).

Lessons and insights

There are a number of lessons and insights that can be used to better understand the Campaign and how well it is working.

The Campaign is premised on the understanding that family violence is a complex area that requires complex solutions. To this end, mass media communications, media advocacy, cross-sector partnerships and community-based funding are designed to address different levels of complexity. Ongoing research, monitoring and evaluation are used to inform this campaign.

The Campaign's impact is likely a result of this approach, which has utilised the strategies identified in the research that support social change, and directly addressed the shortcomings identified in previous public information and advertising campaigns (see Fanslow, 2005).

Mass media

Positive Approach

The Campaign takes a positive approach by aiming to inspire change. The approach of the Campaign was a departure from many other New Zealand social marketing campaigns, in that it did not use 'shock' tactics to blame, shame and demonise people to deliver the message, but instead chose a gentler approach.

The Campaign team believed that television advertisements depicting extreme family violence would allow people to distance themselves from the issue: "that's about other people". It was believed violent behaviour would be better addressed by exposing the personal and family costs, and the possibility and benefits of changing it (FCB & Senate RFP Response, 2007, unpublished).

Some interviewees said at first they had difficulty accepting that such a 'gentle' approach could be used with an issue like family violence. They felt the Campaign would be 'weak' and that it wouldn't change attitudes or behaviour.

(When I first saw the Campaign) I thought "that is so not going to work". But of course I didn't have the heart to say anything ... But actually it just grew on people everywhere. It's bloody clever. (Many Voices Representative)

All who had expressed reticence about the value of the approach admitted that they were surprised at the impact of the Campaign in terms of reach and retention, changing attitudes and driving people to seek help from service providers. They felt that the Campaign approach had, in fact, been vindicated.

The Use of Stories

The formative research had indicated that the dominant societal narrative or social norm prior to the Campaign was one in which all but extreme violence was minimised, justified and normalised. The Campaign stories were designed to counter this view.

Stories that challenge the dominant or accepted ways of looking at the world are known as ‘antenarratives’ (Baskin, 2008). The antenarratives used in the Campaign promote the possibility of social change *because* they are authentic and believable.

The stories are real; the use of actors (as in other social marketing campaigns) merely promotes an ‘illusion’ of change. Indeed, social marketing advertisements that have appeared to portray ‘real’ stories from real people, but in fact have used actors, have generated considerable public hostility,¹⁴ and in some cases formal complaints to the Advertising Standards Authority.¹⁵ It appears that people feel deceived, let down and robbed of hope when the ‘reality’ on offer is actually an illusion or ‘act’.

The Campaign team understood that to shift social norms and change attitudes and behaviour, the audience needed to see people who have changed. That they have changed makes their stories convincing and offers an achievable vision.

Vic Tamati is just raw and he’s honest and he’s real. He connects with people. And he doesn’t sugarcoat. He says “I did this. And I’m taking responsibility for it”. People really responded to that because they can relate. (Campaign Representative)

Connecting with the target Group (Everyone)

It is generally accepted in marketing practice that targeting ‘everyone’ is a great way to include ‘no one’ and alienate ‘most’ (Kotler, 2008). In attempting to change social norms by changing the views of the general public (ie, rather than targeting priority groups or ‘segments’ in phase one), the Campaign ran directly contrary to usual social marketing practice.

Despite this, the Campaign has had high reach and retention amongst *all* population groups, as demonstrated in the previous section.

The high percentage of people who can recall the Campaign may be attributed to the use and selection of stories in the advertisements. These stories were designed to appeal to a wide range of people, rather than a target group.

The complex mix of people, situations and circumstances covered in the stories reflects the complex nature of family violence. For example, the stories spoke to perpetrators by

¹⁴ Like some reality with your TV?, Hazel Phillips, National Business Review, Monday 4 August 2008.

¹⁵ See for example the complaint to the Advertising Standards Authority for the Land Transport New Zealand and Accident Compensation Corporation advertisement that features a woman who appears to have suffered a brain injury but is, in fact, an actor. The complainant saw the advertisement as misleading and not socially responsible. It is noted that the complaint was rejected. See Complaint 08/367 203.152.114.11/decisions/08/08367.doc (downloaded 15 August 2009).

showing them the negative effects of their behaviour and introducing them to the positive effects of change; they spoke to victims by helping them understand that violence against them was unacceptable, and to feel supported to seek help; and they spoke to influencers by exposing the secrecy and silence that surrounds family violence.

In this respect, the stories (particularly those in phase one) were universal; they appealed to 'everyone' and were deliberately designed to alienate 'no one'.

The perpetrators' stories in phase two of the Campaign, which focused on the damage caused by violence, rather than the behaviour itself, were clear, simple, moving and also appeared to connect with people.

It is noted that there was considerable debate about whether the advertisements should focus on perpetrators.

The Campaign team believed that targeting perpetrators was most likely to have an immediate impact on actual behaviour and incidences of family violence (FCB & Senate RFP Response, 2007, unpublished). Some interviewees were concerned that the perpetrators would receive too much attention and become campaign 'heroes'; however, most now consider the focus on perpetrators to have been a strength of the Campaign as they believe it has encouraged perpetrators to recognise the harm caused by their behaviour.

It is also noted that a critical distinction was made in the advertisements between stigmatising perpetrators, and stigmatising violent behaviour. This is consistent with the approach of not 'demonising' perpetrators of violence. The male perpetrators were characterised as men with unacceptable behaviour, rather than unacceptable men.

Most of the interviewees, particularly those from an advertising background, attribute at least part of the high reach and retention of the mass media advertisements to the 'cut through' of the advertisements.¹⁶ They identified the story-telling nature of the advertisements as a strong point of difference amongst the advertising 'clutter'.

The brand

Those interviewed believe that the Campaign provided an umbrella under which government, community organisations and media could all work. The Campaign also provided all those involved with a common language around family violence.

I think it's contributed to the collaboration and cooperation. It hasn't got rid of those fundamental differences but we're talking the same language when we're talking about violence, we have greater understanding. (National Partner Representative)

Unlike most brands, the "It's not OK" messages and artwork are freely available and used extensively by a range of groups and organisations, funded and unfunded.

¹⁶ The cut through of an advertisement is its ability to stand out amongst the clutter of competing advertisements.

Most interviewees believe that the Campaign has achieved extraordinary leverage off the Campaign branding, and were able to give numerous examples in support of this view.

Service providers and community groups use the “It’s not OK” branding to support their own local activities and link them to the national Campaign. For example, Waitakere City in Auckland ran a “Family Violence – It’s Not OK in Waitakere” series of billboards, the Hamilton Abuse Intervention project ran bus advertising and the National Collective of Independent Women’s Refuges’ printed and handed out 7,500 fans with their logo on one side and the Campaign logo on the other at the Parachute music festival, as well as arranging for 14 groups, including the supreme winners from the Te Matatini kapa haka festival to wear the Campaign logo on their t-shirts.

You don’t have to come and ask permission and we try to make it available to you, to communities, and that’s been quite refreshing.
(Campaign Team)

There is also an acknowledgement that ‘one size will not fit all’ and the messages are able to be adapted to make them more relevant. The National Collective of Independent Women’s Refuges, for example, together with MSD, collaborated on a message, “Tiakina to whānau – keeping our whānau safe” for the Te Matatini festival.

Sharing the use of logos is seen by those from community and partner organisations as demonstrating a true partnership philosophy.

The Tagline

The intention behind the tagline “It’s not OK – but it is OK to ask for help” was to give the general public a voice that was neither accusatory nor judgemental. It is a conversation starter, a statement of intent, and a call to action. Its strength lies in the fact that it crosses complex boundaries; at a community level it is a values-based statement about what behaviour will, and will no longer, be accepted, and at an individual level it is an affirmation of rights.

“It’s not OK”, and “It’s OK to ask for help” are designed to encourage open debate at all levels of society (FCB & Senate RFP Response, 2007, unpublished).

(It’s) the sort of voice that you could use in a pub. You could start a conversation around “are you OK?” rather than “are you bashing your wife?” (Campaign Consultant)

Many of those interviewed attributed the success of the tagline, “It’s not OK”, to the way it echoes the Kiwi vernacular. The message is used in everyday conversation and is reinforced by everyday situations.

This is all of us, this is our NZ and the genius is that you can use “It’s not OK” for a (minor) situation right through to someone in a gang situation. (National Partner Representative)

Media training

Media training is a significant component of the communications strand of the Campaign. The consideration given to the role of the media and, in particular, the preparation undertaken prior to the Campaign has been identified by interviewees working in communications as both highly effective and 'groundbreaking'.

The media is a lens through which the public views family violence, and reporters can influence the way people think and act. Although media can function as a positive force in family violence prevention, it can also be counterproductive.

By strategically using media, free media coverage can be obtained and unhelpful representations contradicted (Andreasen, 1995; Donovan & Vlasis, 2005; Krug et al, 2002; Martin et al, 2007; Wray, 2006).

The media audits show that media advocacy and media training have been used to great effect, both by the Campaign team, and family violence networks. In addition to the increase in media coverage, and an increase in the accuracy of media reporting on family violence, there is now a network of media advocates trained to comment on family violence issues, write press releases and respond confidently when approached by reporters. They are able to, and do, provide local stories and offer local perspectives, further increasing the coverage of family violence in the media.

Relationships

The Campaign team, whilst tasked with leading the project, recognised that they would be more effective in harnessing the contributions of other sectors. Cross-sector learning and cross-pollination across the government departments and NGOs involved in the Campaign has been identified by interviewees as one of the Campaign's greatest strengths.

The engagement of various groups in the planning and implementation process acknowledges that social change is difficult for any one agency or organisation to successfully undertake. A collective process is recognised as important in shaping and envisioning large-scale change, and understanding the complexity of issues such as family violence (Rothman, 2001; Netting et al, 2007).

I know that one person can't do this. It's a collaborative effort. It's like a recipe. You can make a recipe, but if you leave out one thing it's not going to be the same. (Campaign Representative)

Relationships and trust between the Campaign partners, however, took time to build, and required ongoing fostering and attention.

We couldn't walk into the room with stakeholders and flick a switch and have a relationship – it would take time to earn it. We were going to have to do things ... it was very adaptive. (Campaign Representative)

At the outset, some partner agencies and NGOs were wary of government moving into the family violence space. Many had seen other government family violence interventions come and go, had struggled for years for funding and recognition, and some believed the new Campaign would stretch their existing resources and funding to breaking point. Others were cynical about the depth and length of the Government's commitment and were loathe to give some of 'their space' to people, who to them, did not appear to have a great depth of understanding of family violence.

When people who are not family violence practitioners move in there are issues – (for example) they use different terms, they don't use the same language and they have different ideas. (NGO Representative)

Most interviewees acknowledged, however, that the people involved in the Government Campaign team had considerable media and social marketing expertise, along with experience in working in partnership with organisations, and supporting community development. In this way, the Campaign was able to draw on the experience of NGOs and partner agencies in the areas of frontline and service provision, and on their deep understanding of their communities; and government expertise in the areas of prevention, social marketing and social transformation.

The Campaign team was aware that it would need to create a 'new space', rather than direct its efforts into a space already successfully occupied by the family violence sector. A social marketing campaign, with a focus on education and prevention, was the space in which the Campaign team felt that it could use its experience to add value. Some interviewees from partner and community organisations felt it took them time to see that it was, in fact, a new space.

Although we (the family violence sector) had extensive experience in service provision, prevention and social marketing was a newer area for us. It took us a while to understand that this was a new space and that our expertise was in the secondary and tertiary sectors. It took us a while to recognise that government could add something here. (NGO Representative)

Ultimately, working together enabled the Government Campaign team, partner organisations and NGOs the opportunity to stand back and examine what they knew about family violence, and understand that there was still something that could be learned from each other.

... basically we (the sector) haven't stopped to think if (our usual) approach is going to stimulate the changes in behaviour that we want ... (NGO Representative)

We probably all thought we were experts in this area – but actually none of us were – we all brought expertise to it – and we were able to work from there. (NGO Representative)

The primary benefit of this collaborative way of working is that it gives both government agencies and stakeholders, that may see problems differently, the opportunity to explore differences and search for solutions that might not otherwise have been found (Gray, 1989). Within complex systems, these relationships and connections are seen as crucial to innovation and creating social change (Westley et al, 2006: Gladwell 2000).

Most of the interviewees acknowledged that working collaboratively was not always easy. It was felt that the leadership of the Campaign, in particular, the ability to manage competing views, hold the project lightly, listen, and act responsively while adhering to the goals of the Campaign, allowed those working together on the Campaign to navigate through some major differences and disagreements.

There were, however, practical issues that at times threatened the stability of the collaborative relationships.

Once the Campaign was under way, additional funding took some time to ‘catch up’ with the business generated by the Campaign. Earlier Campaign reports have found some service providers were concerned that the Campaign had increased the demand for services in a way that had not been anticipated and for which they were not prepared or resourced. They felt a campaign that encouraged people to take action and seek help was somewhat weakened if the help people needed was not available and readily accessible. The cost of services came as a surprise to some people who were motivated to seek help.

We’ve had a double-whammy of the success of the Campaign and the economic crisis. So there are not the dollars around and more people coming through the programmes and it puts a huge strain on community organisations. (National Partner Representative)

Relationships have also been established with key people wishing to be involved in the Campaign. Some of these, such as mayors, are leaders in their communities, others are local ‘champions’ who have the commitment, enthusiasm, expertise and local knowledge to champion the cause.

Community development

The community development approach appears to have worked well for both the Campaign team, and the CAF-funded community groups.

It was clear from the outset that the Campaign would need to take an innovative approach to community initiatives if it were to achieve social change.

While we don’t know precisely what works to stop it, we know that what society is doing at the moment isn’t working particularly well as a preventative tool ... We keep looping back to the same literature, and coming up with the same

tentative conclusions. So if we want to advance the field at this point we may just have to take our best informed guesses, try them and see. (Fanslow, 2005:7)

CAF-funded organisations have been encouraged to try new things, to do things differently, to monitor and improve activities and “keep innovating” until they get it right. This approach has enabled a wide range of initiatives to emerge, some of which appear to have been highly successful in family violence prevention.

Many Voices, too, allows the Campaign team to respond to opportunities and approaches that emerge over and above the contracted partnerships of the CAF. This increases their ability to respond flexibly to community requests for funding outside CAF rounds, and to engage a wider range of Campaign partners.

The approach to innovation is guided by a clear purpose and underpinned by accountability. The CAF-contracted partnerships are required to be with community-based collaborations to reach defined audiences, with robust messaging exposure, and show how they are making a difference and working towards community change.

Community organisations see the approach as narrowing the gap that exists between community needs and government policy.

Further, many of the interviewees believe that funding community initiatives through the CAF fund is government recognition of the community’s contribution to social change. This commitment to community development and capacity building is seen as differentiating the Campaign from other government initiatives.

The role of communities in contributing to social change is supported by research that shows that social networks and neighbourhoods might actually be protective factors in family violence. Research also suggests that for individuals in need, they more often turn to someone they know than to a formal service (Gadomski et al, 2001; Mancini et al, 2006), as we are more easily influenced by people close to us than by professional helpers (Flora et al, 1989).

Moreover, for many of those interviewed, the approach acknowledges that communication is much more than the use of media such as television advertisements. Working with community-based organisations and family violence networks is seen as having ‘fast tracked’ progress as they are able to extend the reach of the messages far beyond mass media audiences, and in a way that is meaningful to their communities.

People, especially at the political and grass roots levels, communicate persuasively when they are committed, honest and equipped with good information. People become aware of an issue through communications, but their awareness is much greater if they become engaged in the process. (Campaign Team)

Many of the CAF projects are self-sustaining and undertake activities without further funding.

The interviewees felt that collaboration and networking between CAF projects and others working in the family violence space appear to be strengthening the prevention focus and community engagement in those areas.

Monitoring and evaluation (action and reflection)

Measuring the effectiveness of programmes or initiatives that seek transformative social change is difficult and poses a number of complex evaluation challenges in terms of implementation and achievement. Particularly difficult is translating the cause-oriented language of social change into goals, objectives and activities that have measurable outcomes (Netting et al, 2007).

The evaluation team has reacted to the complexity of family violence and social change by widely scoping the evaluation and monitoring activities and recognising that these activities are themselves iterative and emerging. Monitoring is central to the process of measurement; the formative data produced from the monitoring activities provide the basis for the Campaign's continued innovation.

Within the Campaign, thinking and working evaluatively constantly challenges those involved to strive to be more effective, and to be responsive and adapt when and where necessary. Ongoing monitoring, evaluations and research are used to create an action–reflection cycle, which is critical for projects that are interested in deep and sustainable social change and are committed to significantly increasing the impact of their activities, continuous progress and rapid responses to complex situations (Patton, 2006).

The wide scope and extent of internal and commissioned research has enabled the examination of both national and community-specific impacts and, more importantly, has allowed insight into the social context of family violence and how effective behavioural change is facilitated in specific communities. This knowledge is then used to target specific aspects of the Campaign based on the needs of different communities.

The ongoing nature of the monitoring and evaluation gives the Campaign capacity to experience change whilst still maintaining the integrity of the original objectives (Westley et al, 2005). This ability to simultaneously change and remain the same is also known as 'resilience'; it is one of the key properties of healthy systems and may indeed be one of the most important facets of the Campaign.

Future steps

The interviewees had a wide range of suggestions for future steps for the Campaign. These will need to be evaluated against the overall Campaign strategy, but they are areas for consideration by the Campaign team.

A holistic approach for Māori Whānau

Some have suggested that the next steps of the Campaign take a more holistic approach to Māori whānau, where Māori whānau (kuia, koroua, pākēkē, rangatahi and tamariki) are supported to achieve wellbeing. This would involve moving away from a victim and perpetrator perspective, reconnecting family to their whānau networks and marae, focusing on the shared role of whānau in protecting women and children, and working with men on understanding whānau and family relationships.

We say male by birth, man by choice. (NGO Representative)

What I'm seeing is that most government-assisted anti-violence initiatives focus solely on the victim and perpetrator, and whilst that's understandable, little attention is given to their whānau despite the violence, in most cases, being intergenerational. (NGO Representative)

At the core of this holistic approach is the reframing of attitudes and behaviours to focus on the whole whānau. It empowers and gives skills to families with which to recognise violence. Whānau find solutions to whānau violence within their own tribal traditions and experience, and work collectively on transforming their whānau.

Many service providers, particularly those that provide services to Māori, are already working within this framework. However, given the high family violence prevalence rates among Māori, and our increased understanding as to how families and communities can aid and support behavioural change, regardless of ethnicity, this holistic approach could arguably apply to all family violence interventions.

More diverse Voices

Some interviewees felt that they would like to see more diversity in the Campaign. It was felt that the women's and children's voices, in particular, needed to be made more visible in future iterations of the Campaign.

I think I would make sure that women's and kid's stories were much more there. But when you look at the poster material and the ads you can't see them. (National Partner Representative)

One of the things that I think the Campaign has possibly missed – or I haven't seen any evidence of it being focussed on – is the kids. And I think there are opportunities there around kids, to help children's understanding of what's acceptable and what's not. What

abuse looks like, and what the consequences of them being exposed to it may be. (National Partner Representative)

Others felt that the Campaign needed to address family violence in migrant communities. Fenrich and Contesse (2009) noted that migrant women often come from cultures where there is no reporting and no law on domestic violence, where violence is “part of life for the woman”.¹⁷ They continued that “Generally, migrant women tend to report domestic violence less than Māori and Pākehā women”. As a consequence, they felt that the “Government’s notable public Campaign efforts should be especially sensitive to migrant women”.

Lack of multi-lingual information is a problem ... I think some of these ads, if they were spoken in Korean and Hindi – imagine someone sitting there and hearing their own language on television saying “it’s not OK to make your wife feel useless.” It would make such an impact because you don’t often hear that. So there’s room possibly to better communicate with those ethnic communities. It’s hard to address, I know, and expensive. But necessary. (Many Voices Representative)

Giving and Receiving Help

Many of the interviewees felt that the next step in the Campaign was to talk about help giving and receiving behaviour. This was seen as a ‘natural progression’.

We have said that the behaviour is not okay. We have said that it is okay to ask for help. Now we need to show how to give and receive help. (Campaign Representative)

We are picking up things in an attitude survey – people will say “I don’t know what to do.” Some don’t and depending on the situation but intervening is incredibly awkward and embarrassing and you’re putting relationships at risk and we live within family dynamics.(Campaign Representative)

Fostering the conditions of a social movement

There is some evidence that a community-wide movement may be beginning to emerge, led by individuals and organisations throughout New Zealand that are working together to help prevent family violence.

For most interviewees, one of the biggest questions was “what happens when the Campaign is no longer funded?”. National Partner agencies, many of which have seen other family violence campaigns come and go, were pessimistic about the Campaign’s future, should funding be lost. They believe enough capacity has not yet been built to entrench the Campaign within communities.

¹⁷ Interview with Shila Nair, National Co-ordinator, Shakti Asian Women’s Centre, Auckland (16 May 2008) cited in Fenrich and Contesse (2009).

By fostering the conditions of a social movement, the Campaign leverage could further increase. It would also make the Campaign more sustainable.

Rather than us pulling the train we need to be sitting behind it and pushing it so it has its own momentum. (National Partner Representative)

Although it is difficult to “create a social movement” there are a number of ways that conditions for a social movement can be fostered. Some of these are already under way, others require further support.

Ganz (2009) describes social movements as requiring:

- purposive action
- distributive leadership that brings people together around shared values, to form relational commitments to each other
- a sense of injustice but a requirement for hope.

The research suggests that decentralised social movements with minimum division of labour are more successful than social movements with centralised decision-making structures (Jenkins 1983; Ganz 2009). Furthermore, events are extremely useful tools for social movements, especially when they have a strong emotional impact, as emotional responses are needed to implement agency (della Porta & Diani, 2006). For collective behaviours to spread, the structure of a social network is important. Some scholars argue that spatial networks are more effective for participation. For example, McAdams, 1988 (cited in Centola & Macy, 2007) found that participation spreads most effectively in populations that are spatially clustered, such as amongst neighbourhoods and ethnic groups.

Social networking internet sites, in particular, offer new potential in connecting groups and building social movements.

Factors that can inhibit social movements can include aspects that revere charismatic leadership, one person or group taking credit for the success of the Campaign (success needs to be distributive too) and media coverage that makes superstars of leaders. These can aggravate internal rivalries (della Porta & Diani, 2006).

Businesses, sports organisations and large-scale employers are now contacting the Campaign team to ask how they can be part of the Campaign. This will take the Campaign messages to an even wider audience, as these groups have not been actively involved in family violence prevention.

We have a great fund of goodwill; community embedding, common language will all live beyond the Campaign. So if we stopped today, things would keep happening. But how long would they keep happening? Don't know. But I would suspect quite some time because we've established the language and we've broken through and created a level of consciousness that will never go away. (Campaign Representative)

Conclusion

The aim of this review is to articulate the key ideas, messages and approach of the Campaign; assess the evidence to better understand how well the Campaign is working; and focus on lessons and insights that can be used to inform the future development of the Campaign and enhance future government-led initiatives.

The key objectives of the Campaign are to increase awareness of family violence so that it becomes visible and talked about throughout New Zealand; to increase understanding of family violence and its many impacts; to increase the personal relevance of family violence so that New Zealanders acknowledge that it involves all of us, and that we can all help do something about it; to promote a greater propensity to act on family violence for victims, perpetrators, families and influencers, and to create a social climate that supports behavioural change.

It would appear that progress towards these objectives has been made since the Campaign's inception.

The Campaign has been highly effective in reaching the public, with 95 per cent of survey respondents able to recall at least one of the advertisements.

There is evidence that awareness of family violence has increased. Two-thirds of survey respondents who saw the television advertisements felt that they had helped them to understand that they should not tolerate violence within their families and that the advertisements had helped them to understand more about intolerable behaviour. One-in-five people aged 18–49 years said that the television advertisements had motivated them to take action.

Although it is difficult to assess the extent to which a social climate that supports behavioural change has been created, service providers report considerable increases in help-seeking behaviour, with some seeing almost double the number of clients than they did prior to the Campaign. Moreover, social service providers, family violence networks and communities affirm that the Campaign is creating a more supportive environment for community action, that family violence is more personally relevant for people, there is more support for and better understanding of efforts to stop family violence, there is increased morale in and collaboration between provider organisations, and communities are mobilising around the issue.

The research commissioned by the Families Commission (Fanslow, 2005) had found that previous family violence campaigns had been limited in their success, as they tended to be short in duration, low in intensity, lack audience insight and ongoing funding, and did not undertake ongoing evaluations to inform the Campaign.

Further, the research suggested that achieving a society where family violence is unacceptable would only occur once the dominant New Zealand narrative, which minimised, justified and normalised all but extreme violence, was addressed and that any Campaign would need to send a strong message that family violence was not tolerated.

Although there was evidence that a social marketing campaign could change attitudes and behaviour, the research also suggested that any media campaign would need to be supported by layers of activities and interventions.

The “It’s not OK” Campaign has attended to this research. It has used an integrated social marketing approach that includes the use of the mass media advertising campaign, media advocacy, relationships with partner organisations and a community development approach.

The Campaign has a strong audience focus, and ongoing research, monitoring and evaluations are used to reflect on progress and inform the Campaign. The advertisements, particularly in the first phase of the Campaign, were designed to change our view of behaviour that constituted family violence and signal that it would not be tolerated. The messages are positive and offer hope of change.

The evidence from the research, evaluation and monitoring work, along with interviews from partner organisations and community groups, suggests that the Campaign is working well and having an impact on attitudes towards family violence, and motivating behaviour change.

References

- Anderson, A. A. (2004). *Theory of Change as a tool for Strategic Planning*. New York: Roundtable on Community Change; The Aspen Institute.
- Andreasen, A. R. (1995). *Marketing Social Change*. Washington DC: Jossey-Bass.
- Baskin, K. (2005). Complexity, stories and knowing. *Emergence: Complexity and Organization*, 7 (2), 32-41.
- Caton, A. (2001). *Review of Family Violence Prevention in NZ: Report on the Outcomes of Four Community Workshops*. Wellington: Ministry of Social Policy: Unpublished.
- Centola, D., & Macy, M. (2007). Complex Contagions and the Weakness of Long Ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 113, 702–34.
- Centre for Social Research and Evaluation. (2008). *Preventing Physical and Psychological Maltreatment of Children in Families: Review of Research for Campaign for Action on Family Violence*. Wellington: Ministry of Social Development.
- Clark, H. (2007, September 3). *Campaign for Action on Family Violence*. Retrieved September 1, 2009, from Speech at Launch of the Campaign for Action on Family Violence: from <http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PA0709/S00035.htm>
- Clark, H. (2003). *Theory of Change Background Basics*. Retrieved September 26, 2009, from Theory of Change by Actknowledge: <http://www.theoryofchange.org/index.html>
- Colmar Brunton Research. (1997). *Breaking the Cycle Monitor: Quantitative Research: Final Report*. Wellington.
- Davies, E., Hammerton, H., Hassall, I., Fortune, C. A., & Moeller, I. (2003). *How can the literature inform implementation of Action Area 13 of Te Rito: Public Education and Awareness*. Wellington: Ministry of Health and Ministry of Social Development.
- DeJong, W., & Wallack, L. (1999). A Critical Perspective on the Drug Czar's Antidrug Media Campaign. *Journal of Health Communications*, 4, 155–160.
- della Porta, D., & Diani, M. (2006). *Social Movements: An Introduction* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Blackwell.
- Donovan, R. J., & Vlasis, R. (2005). *VicHealth Review of Communications Components of Social Marketing/Public Education Campaigns Focusing on Violence Against Women*. Melbourne: Victorian Health Promotion Foundation.
- Fanslow, J. (2005). *Beyond Zero Tolerance: Key Issues and Future Directions for Family Violence Work in New Zealand*. Wellington: Families Commission.
- Fanslow, J., & Robinson, E. (2004). *Violence Against Women in New Zealand: Prevalence and Health Consequences*. Retrieved September 1, 2009, from New Zealand Medical Journal, 117(1206): <http://www.nzma.org.nz/journal/117-1206/1173/>

- FCB and Senate Communications. (2007). Response to Campaign to Eliminate Violence within Families. Wellington: Ministry of Social Development: Unpublished.
- Fenrich, J., & Contesse, J. (2009). *"It's not OK": New Zealand's Efforts to Eliminate Violence Against Women*. New York: Leitner Centre for International Law and Justice.
- Flora, J. A., Maibach, E. W., & Maccoby, N. (1989). The Role of Mass Media Across Four Levels of Health Promotion Intervention. *Annual Review of Public Health, 10*, 181–201.
- Gadomski, A. M., Tripp, M., Wolff, D. A., Lewis, C., & Jenkins, P. (2001). Impact of a Rural Domestic Violence Prevention Campaign. *The Journal of Rural Health, 17* (3), 266–277.
- Ganz, M. (2009, March). *Why Stories Matter: The Art and Craft of Social Change*. Retrieved September 22, 2009, from Sojourners Magazine: <http://www.sojo.net/index.cfm?action=magazine.article&issue=soj0903&article=why-stories-matter>
- Giles, J. R., Adamson, C. E., & Curren, H. M. (2005). The Social Sanctioning of Partner Abuse: Perpetuating the Message the Partner Abuse is Unacceptable in New Zealand. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand, 26*, 97–116.
- Giles, J. (2005). 'Woman Bites Dog' – Making Sense of Media and Research Reports that Claim Women and Men are Equally Violent. Retrieved September 1, 2009, from *The New Zealand Medical Journal, 118*(1215): <http://www.nzma.org.nz/journal/abstract.php?id=1731>.
- Gladwell, M. (2000). *The Tipping Point: How Little Things Can Make a Big Difference*. Washington DC: Little Brown.
- Gracia, E. (2004). Unreported Cases of Domestic Violence Against Women: Towards an Epidemiology of Social Silence, Tolerance, and Inhibition. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 58*, 536–537.
- Gravitas Research and Strategy Limited. (2006). *Reducing Family Violence Social Marketing Campaign Formative Research*. Wellington: Unpublished Report for the Ministry of Social Development.
- Gravitas Research and Strategy Limited. (2006a). Reducing Family Violence Social Marketing Campaign Summary Presentation: Strategy Overview Three. Wellington: Ministry of Social Development: Unpublished.
- Gray, A. (2002). *Integrated Service Delivery and Regional Co-ordination: a Literature Review*. Wellington: Gray Matter Research.
- Gray, B. (1989). *Collaborating: Finding Common Ground for Multiparty Problems*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Highsmith, J. (2009). *Agile Project Management: Creating Innovative Products*. Boston: Addison-Wesley Professional.

- Jenkins, J. (1983). Resource Mobilization Theory and the Study of Social Movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 9, 527–53.
- Kotler, K. (2008, September 29-30). *The Global Challenge - We are in this Together*. Retrieved September 10, 2009, from Proceedings of the World Social Marketing Conference, Brighton & Hove City, England: <http://www.tcp-events.co.uk/wsmc/downloads/keynotes/KOTLER%20PHILIP.pdf>
- Krug, E. G., Dalhberg, L. L., Mercy, J. A., Zwi, A. B., & Lozano, R. (2002). *World Report on Violence and Health*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Lievore, D., & Mayhew, P. (2007). *The Scale and Nature of Family Violence in New Zealand: A Review and Evaluation of Knowledge*. Wellington: Ministry of Social Development.
- Majumdar, D. (2006). Collaboration Among Government Agencies with Special Reference to New Zealand: A Literature Review. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, (27), 183–98.
- Mancini, J. A., Nelson, J. P., Bowen, G. L., & Martin, J. A. (2006). Preventing Intimate Partner Violence: A Community Capacity Approach. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment and Trauma*, 13 (3/4), 203–227.
- Martin, J. B., Green, L. W., & Carlson Gielen, A. (2007). Potential Lessons from Public Health and Health Promotion for the Prevention of Child Abuse. *Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community*, 34 (1/2), 205–222.
- Ministry of Social Development. (2008). *Taskforce for Action on Violence Within Families*. Retrieved September 17, 2009, from Ministry of Social Development: <http://www.msd.govt.nz/about-msd-and-our-work/work-programmes/initiatives/action-family-violence/index.html>
- Netting, F. E., O'Connor, M., & Fauri, D. P. (2007). Planning Transformative Programs. *Administration in Social Work*, 31 (4), 59–81.
- New Zealand Families Commission and Ministry of Social Development. (n.d.). Eliminating Family Violence Attitude and Behaviour Change Campaign. Wellington: Unpublished document.
- New Zealand Families Commission. (2009). *Family Violence Statistics Research Report no.4/09*. Wellington: <http://www.nzfamilies.org.nz/research/family-violence/family-violence-statistics-report>.
- New Zealand Families Commission. (2007). *Reducing Family Violence - Social Marketing Campaign Formative Research Report*. Retrieved September 22, 2009, from Are You OK?: http://www.areyouok.org.nz/files/test/research/CFAoFV_formative_research-1.pdf
- New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse. (2007). *NZFVC Fact Sheet - Family Violence Statistics*. Retrieved September 1, 2009, from New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse: www.nzfvc.org.nz/PublicationArea.aspx?area=Fact+Sheets

- Patton, M. Q. (2006). Evaluation for the way we work. *The Non-Profit Quarterly*, 13 (1), 28-33.
- Patton, M. Q. (1996). *Utilization Focused Evaluation: The New Century Text* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Phillips, H. (2008, August 4). *Like Some Reality with Your TV?* Retrieved September 15, 2009, from *National Business Review*: <http://www.nbr.co.nz/comment/hazel-phillips/like-some-reality-with-your-tv>
- Rothman, J. (2001). Approaches to Community Intervention. In J. Rothman, J. L. Erlich, & J. E. Tropman, *Strategies of Community Intervention* (pp. 27-64). Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock Publishers.
- Snively, S. (1995). *The New Zealand Economic Cost of Family Violence*, Department of Social Welfare, New Zealand.
- Standards New Zealand. (2006). *Screening, Risk Assessment and Intervention for Family Violence Including Child Abuse and Neglect. NZS 8006:2006*. Retrieved November 26, 2009, from New Zealand Police: <http://www.police.govt.nz/resources/2006/nzs-8006-2006/nzs-8006-2006.pdf>
- Taylor, M., Wilson, M., Purdue, D., & Wilde, P. (2005). *Lending a Hand: The Value of 'Light Touch' Support in Empowering Communities*. Retrieved September 1, 2009, from Joseph Rowntree Foundation: <http://www.jrf.org.uk/publications/lending-hand-value-light-touch-support-empowering-communities>
- Torjman, S. (2003). *Community Renewal*. Ontario: The Caledon Institute of Social Policy.
- Westley, F., Zimmerman, B., & Patton, M. (2007). *Getting to Maybe*. Toronto: Vintage Canada.
- Wray, R. J. (2006). Public Health Communication Theory and Strategies for Interpersonal Violence Prevention. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 13 (3/4), 41–60.

Appendix 1: Discussion guide

Point Research Introduction

We are doing research on behalf of MSD to better understand the approach of the Campaign for Action on Family Violence (the “It’s not OK” Campaign) and how well it is working.

The research aims to:

- describe the Campaign and its background
- describe how the Campaign works, ie, the activities
- look at the approach of the Campaign
- look at any points of difference with other social marketing and family violence campaigns
- better understand how well the approach is working
- look at possible future directions.

We would like to hear about your thoughts and experiences. We are particularly interested in examples and stories that you feel can illustrate the approach of the Campaign and how it works.

We are independent of MSD.

This is not a confidential interview. We want to share your experiences. What you say may be included in our report to FACS. Although you will not be named in the report you may be identifiable and your organisation will be identified. We will, however, send you a copy of any information that specifically identifies your organisation prior to presenting it to MSD to check for accuracy.

As we are interested in your open and frank comments, there will be a time at the end of the interview where you will be invited to speak confidentially if you wish. Although these comments may be included in the report, we will ensure that any identifying information is removed.

About You

We are interested in hearing about your work with the Campaign. Can you briefly describe what you do and who you work with?

[prompts: what you do, who it is for, how long have you be doing this, what do you cover?]

About the Campaign

We are interested in the how the Campaign works. Can you describe the activities of the Campaign?

- Can you give examples of those activities?
- How has the Campaign developed?

About the Approach

Please describe the Campaign to me. What would you say captures the approach of the Campaign?

- How would you describe to the approach to (a new organisation, a new colleague, a new senior executive) who did not know about the Campaign?

In what ways does the approach differ from other social marketing or family violence campaigns that you are aware of?

What is working well

We would like to know what parts of the Campaign approach are working well. In particular, we would like to know:

- What is it about the social marketing approach that you feel has worked particularly well?
- How does the Campaign fit with your understanding of social innovation? Can you give particular examples of innovation or innovative activities?
- In what ways do you think the Campaign is contributing to social change? Do you believe this type of change is possible without the leadership of government and the Campaign team?
- How do you think the Campaign is contributing to community development? Can you give any specific examples?
- Are you aware of any overseas programmes {note: other than those in the line by line doc} that adopt this type of approach?
- In your opinion, how does the Campaign measure up against similar overseas campaigns? In what ways is it better/not as good?
- Are there any other approaches that the Campaign takes that we haven't covered here?

Difference the campaign is making

We are interested in ways in which the Campaign is contributing towards or making a difference.

- How is the Campaign contributing towards change in families?
- Is the Campaign helping to change our communities? In what way? Are some communities experiencing more change than others?
- Can you think of any ways in which the Campaign is contributing towards organisational or agency change – both within your organisation and organisations or agencies you work with?

[Prompts: collaborative work, ways of working]

Is there anything else that has changed as a result of the Campaign? (It could be something new that you are doing, something you have stopped doing or something that you are now doing differently.)

- Can you give examples?

We are particularly interested in finding out what factors support or impede success and can be used to explain aspects of the Campaign that has worked.

What we have learnt along the way

We are interested in what the Campaign has taught us. Could you tell us what parts of the Campaign approach you consider do not work so well.

- In your opinion, does the Campaign work for all families?
- Does the Campaign work for all communities? Is there anything that can be done to fill in the gaps?
- Have there been any organisations that have been reluctant to take part?

What can we learn from this?

Is there anything else that needs to change?

Other influences

Can you tell us whether the Campaign has had any other influences?

[Prompts: parents, children, community, other organisations/agencies, other ways]

What makes you think this?

[Note to interviewer: Framed in reflective practice, How much is done/how well it is done/is anyone better off?]

Overall

Thinking about next steps – what would you think needs to happen next?

Do you have any suggestions that you think could make the Campaign more successful?

Any ideas for the future direction of the Campaign – where you think it could head?

Confidential Comments

This section will be treated in confidence. The comments will not be included in the report but will help us to clarify our thinking about the Campaign.

Closing

Do you have any other comments or suggestions?

THANK YOU.

Appendix 2: Documentation

- Research and Evaluation
 - Attitude Survey Report (CSRE, May 2009)
 - Community Study (CSRE May 2009)
 - Community attitudes and beliefs towards family violence (Gravitas Research and Strategy Ltd, February 2007)
 - Reducing Family Violence Social Marketing Campaign Formative Research (Gravitas, December 2006)
 - Reach and retention surveys 1–3 (CSRE, ongoing).
- CAF documentation
 - CAF stories by region
 - CAF Ministerial Report (2008)
 - CAF Early Outcomes Evaluation (Pam Oliver & Associates, 2008).
- General documents
 - Monthly campaign monitoring reports (January – December 2008)
 - CAFV line by line rationale (CSRE)
 - Campaign logic
 - Ministerial report on campaign effectiveness (April 2009)
 - Strategy creative and media brief.
- Many Voices documentation
 - Formative consultation notes (2008)
 - Strategy document
 - Report on Business Engagement and Action (June 2009)
 - Notes from the “2009 Ride Against Family Violence” (Super Māori Fullas).
- Mass media and advocacy documentation
 - Media Advocacy Report (October 2007)
 - Campaign Funding Rationale (March 2009)
 - Partner documentation
 - Te Matatini Report (2009)
 - Elder abuse messaging (2009).