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Cognitive behavioral violence prevention (CB-VP) parenting groups are commonly used for the primary and secondary prevention of violence. These groups use persuasive messages that target violence-related attitudes and cognitions, with the expectation that this will result in behavior change. Despite their frequent use as family violence prevention strategies, little is known about the actual messages being exchanged in CB-VP groups and how participants perceive and recall these messages. This study analyzes messages aimed at changing behaviors as recalled by Hispanic participants in federally funded *Fatherhood* groups in Miami, Florida. Applying concepts from violence prevention, behavior change messages were classified by topic, type of behavior targeted, compliance gaining strategies (Marwell & Schmitt, 1967), and sources of influence (Wheeless, Baraclough & Stewart, 1983). The most common topics reported by participants included parenting role, discipline, communication content and spending time with children. Over a third of the appeals targeted behaviors that were not observable actions, but rather cognitive acts such as thinking, reflecting, and paying attention. Reward and punishment were the most frequently used compliance gaining strategies, followed by moral and expertise strategies. Most appeals were based on the expected outcomes of the proposed behaviors as the main source of influence. The results of this study provide a greater understanding of the motivations used to support behavior change messages in violence prevention parenting groups.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Family violence is endemic in the United States, accounting for a third of all violence reported to the police in the year 2000 (Durose et al., 2005). Family violence includes the different forms of abuse that occur in the home, including child abuse, intimate partner violence, elder abuse, and child sexual assault (Chalk & King, 1998; Finkelhor, Ormrod, Turner, & Hamby, 2005). Children are affected at alarmingly high rates, with approximately one in seven children suffering physical or emotional maltreatment by their parents or caregivers (Finkelhor et al., 2005). Despite the prevalence of the problem, there is still no unified theory of causation for family violence and no unequivocal approach to prevent it.

Although the various types of family violence are different, their causes and effects are intertwined, sharing common risk factors and negative outcomes for the people involved (McKay, 1994; Barnett, Miller-Perrin & Perrin, 1997; Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 2006; Tolan, Gorman-Smith, & Henry, 2006). Social policies – including legal, mental health, law enforcement and child protection - have responded to the problem of family violence in a variety of ways. Typical interventions to treat and prevent family violence consist of some combination of crisis response including temporary shelter for victims, incarceration of the offender, family therapy, the use of support groups and cognitive-behavioral interventions (Saunders & Azar, 1989; Schechter & Edleson, 1999).

Although there is some evidence of biological determinants of violence (Burgess & Draper, 1989; Rose, 2000; Pedersen, 2004), it is generally understood that
the behaviors associated with family violence are learned (Mihalic & Elliot, 1997; Gelles, 1999; Foshee, Bauman, & Linder, 1999) and then reinforced by the lack of information available on how to have healthy, nonviolent family relationships. All forms of family violence share common attitudinal factors, including misguided beliefs about control and authority, expectations about familial roles, and lack of access by both victims and perpetrators to alternative behaviors (Johnson, 1996). Given these shared risk factors, a key strategy to treat perpetrators and prevent family violence is to change the attitudes and behaviors associated with it (Dibble & Strauss, 1980; Carter & Schecter, 1997; Babcock, Green & Robie, 2004).

The U.S. government has adopted the cognitive-behavioral approach and has funded a series of programs to prevent family violence by strengthening family relationships and parenting skills. Specifically, the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 provides yearly funding of $150 million to the U.S. Agency for Children and Families (ACF) to establish the Healthy Marriage Initiative and the Fatherhood Initiative. Along with providing services to assist victims stay safe and meet their basic needs, these programs use cognitive-behavioral violence prevention (CB-VP) groups to modify behaviors associated with violence, and to promote behaviors associated with healthy parenting.

Promoting healthy behaviors is the first step in a public health approach that emphasizes prevention. The public health approach can be applied to any health issue at the community level. It is based on identifying risk factors and developing interventions to reduce or mitigate these risk factors. Specifically, the public health model or approach consists of four steps: (1) Defining the problem through
systematic data collection, (2) identifying risk and protective factors through research and data analysis, (3) designing, implementing and evaluating prevention strategies, and finally (4) promoting widespread adoption of the most promising prevention strategies while continuing to monitor their impact and cost-effectiveness (WHO, nd).

CB-VP parenting programs are precisely this kind of intervention, responding to risk factors – in this case specific behaviors - associated with family violence. From a communication perspective, the goal of these interventions is to gain compliance with desired behaviors related to reducing and preventing violence. Despite their clear intent to modify behavior through communication, CB-VP groups have never been analyzed for their compliance inducing content.

This study analyzed accounts of *Fatherhood* group participants about the messages exchanged in the groups aimed at changing parenting behaviors. The *Fatherhood* groups are federally funded prevention interventions that aim to reduce family violence and increase involvement of fathers in children’s lives. Participants in this study attended *Fatherhood* groups in Miami, Florida during 2007. These groups are primary prevention interventions, intended for parents who may be at risk, but who have not been charged with any acts of family violence or child neglect. Group members participate voluntarily either by self-referral, or at the suggestion of their child’ school, their faith community, or other community organizations. All study participants were Spanish speakers of Hispanic ethnicity. This is an understudied group has been traditionally excluded from family violence intervention research.
The messages exchanged in these groups, as recalled by participants, were classified according to the behaviors they targeted and the reasons given for the suggested change. The analysis focused on the appeal topic, the type of behavior targeted, the type of compliance gaining strategies used which were based on Marwell & Schmitt (1967), and the sources of influence which were based on Wheeless, Barraclough, & Stewart’s (1983) three domains of compliance gaining influence. Because compliance gaining messages give reasons to comply with a suggested behavior, using this approach provides a useful framework to study the reasoning behind behavior change messages in violence prevention parenting groups.

Chapter 2 begins with a brief history of social responses to family violence in the United States and the resulting reliance on CB-VP groups as a primary modality of intervention as well as a review of research on the cognitions associated with family violence and the use of CB-VP groups to prevent family violence. Following that, literature on attitude and behavior change is reviewed with particular emphasis on compliance gaining and sources of influence. Chapter 3 details the research methods used and the specific questions posed in relation to CB-VP; Chapter 4 presents the research findings by each focus area; and Chapter 5 discusses the implications of the findings for the application of a compliance gaining approach to the design of family violence prevention programs.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents a review of relevant literature that contextualizes the present study in terms of both family violence prevention practice and communication research, and justifies the research questions asked. The first section presents the evolution of response policies towards family violence in the United States. This history helps explain why cognitive behavioral violence prevention (CB-VP) interventions such as parenting groups - the focus of this study - have become the treatment of choice for primary and secondary family violence prevention. It also discusses the controversies and limitations of CB-VP groups as a useful intervention in cases of family violence. The second section focuses on the attitudes associated with family violence, since this is the basis for a cognitive behavioral approach to violence prevention. The third section addresses the logic behind CB-VP groups, which are based on social cognitive theory. The fourth section discusses compliance gaining and the use of communication to change behaviors, with particular attention to compliance gaining messages. Finally, the fifth section examines the sources of influence and the motivations behind behavior change messages.

History of the Response to Family Violence in the United States

This study analyzes messages recalled by participants in Fatherhood parenting program whose goal it is to prevent family violence. Fatherhood groups are part of the larger movement to address violence through behavior change interventions. This cognitive behavioral approach is the result of a much larger history of policies and practices that have been grappling with the problem of family
violence and how to effectively prevent it. Public response to family violence reveals how social norms have slowly changed regarding the right of the state and other institutions to intervene within the intimacy of familial relationships, and how to achieve behavior change within complex family dynamics.

Until the late 1800s, under English common law, children in the United States were considered the property of their fathers, and disciplining of children was considered a private matter. Although the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children was established in 1875, it wasn’t until 1974 that the United States Congress enacted the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA), which provided federal funds dedicated to prevent child abuse (Dracker, 1996). While some extreme cases of child abuse had been prosecuted, the issue was not seriously addressed on a national level until 1962, when Dr. Henry C. Kempe described the *Battered Child Syndrome* and urged physicians to report suspected child abuse cases to the authorities (Kempe, Silverman, Steele, Droegemuller & Silver, 1962). By the late 1960s most states had made child abuse a criminal act (Schechter, 1982), and an extensive effort developed across the country to educate parents on what constitutes child abuse and how they may be held accountable (Straus & Gelles, 1986). However, violence against wives was still regarded as appropriate on certain occasions (Martin, 1976) and an article in the Archives of General Psychiatry suggested that the victim of spousal violence was responsible for the violence and therefore the one who needed treatment, not the perpetrator (Snell, Rosenwald, & Robey, 1964). On the criminal justice side, assault against a spouse or other family member could be prosecuted in most states in the 1960s, but this was rare. Arrest was
considered inappropriate for solving the complex social and psychological problems involved in family conflicts (Martin, 1976) and family violence was still considered a private matter.

During the 1970s and 1980s battered women’s shelters emerged as the primary institutional response to family violence. By 1989 over 1,200 shelters were in operation nationwide housing over 300,000 battered women and children per year (Dobash & Dobash, 1992). The landmark book by Lenore Walker, *The Battered Women's Syndrome*, published in 1984 brought the plight of abused women to the public’s attention. A decade later, the passing of the Violence Against Women Act in 1994 followed by the arrest (and subsequent acquittal) of O.J. Simpson in the murder of his wife, as well as the temporary removal of his children, also helped raise public awareness of family violence in the United States (Maxwell, Huxford, Borum, & Hornik, 2000), and its devastating effects on families and children of all social classes.

While public awareness increased significantly, there was not any consensus on the treatment of the problem of family violence. In the 1980s, law enforcement started to change its stance on domestic violence and moved from considering it a private matter to treating it as criminal assault (Sherman & Berk, 1984; Straus & Gelles, 1986). Meanwhile, the battered women’s movement advocated for policies to hold perpetrators accountable for their actions through law enforcement and incarceration (Shepard & Pence, 1999). On the treatment side, professionals in the mental health field began adopting a family systems theory approach, working with families to address their dysfunctions within their community settings, a shift from
the family separation approach of the shelter movement (Bowen & Gilchrist, 2004). Clearly, the criminal justice, social service and mental health disciplines had different approaches to addressing family violence. The debate between these camps continues to this day, particularly with respect to who is responsible for stopping the violence (Saunders & Azar, 1989).

With increasing arrests for family violence, it became impractical to incarcerate all offenders. Mixed societal attitudes about the appropriate response prompted the development of different modalities of treatment as alternatives to incarceration (Straus & Gelles, 1986). Demand for family-oriented and community based prevention programs grew, particularly in minority communities where the existing menu of service options focused on family separation were not culturally accepted (Villar, Aaron, Lorenzo, & Concha, 2004). Also, family violence started to garner attention as a public health problem that required a multi-level preventive focus (Rosenberg & Fenley, 1991), rather than a simply curative or reactive approach.

The current standard of practice to prevent and treat family violence is a coordinated community response (CCR) that includes support services for victims, mechanisms of accountability for perpetrators enforced through the courts, and the virtually universal use of cognitive behavioral group interventions aimed at changing attitudes and behaviors linked to domestic violence and/or child abuse (Carter & Schecter, 1997; Shepard & Pence, 1999; Shepard, Falk & Elliott, 2002).

The latter form of intervention - the cognitive behavioral violence prevention (CB-VP) group – usually takes place in community settings such as governmental agencies, faith-based organizations, community organizations, and schools.
Cognitive behavioral interventions are based on the premise that changing the way people think will lead to changes in behavior. Thus, the goal of the Fatherhood CB-VP groups is to modify behavior by providing information and addressing the attitudes and beliefs that are associated with family violence. There are many variations of this approach, but most interventions share some basic characteristics. Groups are typically held once a week for 1.5 to 2 hours. They are led by one or two trained facilitators and may last between 8 weeks to 36 weeks. There is usually a curriculum or set of topics or objectives that must be covered, but the style of implementation will vary by program and facilitator, and is greatly influenced by the groups’ members. Participants are encouraged to share their experiences and provide some level of social support to each other.

There are advantages and disadvantages to CB-VP groups as a primary intervention for family violence. An important advantage is that group interventions are relatively inexpensive compared to individual treatment (Taylor & Biglan, 1998). Furthermore, groups appear to be more culturally acceptable than individual clinic-based services among immigrant families, families using English as a second language, and parents of children with severe behavior problems (Cunningham, Bremner, & Boyle, 1995). On the other hand, group programs face challenges such as lack of participation and retention, especially with troubled families who need services the most (Spoth & Redmond, 1995). Another problem is the difficulty in replicating standard programs with different groups of people in different settings (Gondolf, 1996; McCollum, Yates, Laumann, & Hsieh, 2007).
Despite these challenges, there is still great hope in these interventions to modify individual behaviors to prevent family violence at the community level. The main goal of these groups is to alter beliefs and attitudes toward violence and personal responsibility, and to teach alternative behaviors (Edleson & Tolman, 1992). The interventions also challenge participants to question their beliefs about family relationships, parenting, and the value of children. Furthermore, CB-VP groups are seen as a way to monitor families that are at risk for violence, and serve as a means to identify cases of violence that require more intensive intervention (Williams-Burgess, Vines, and Ditulio, 1995).

The main activity in CB-VP groups is communication through lectures, guided discussion and open conversation. Thus, their main instruments for behavior change are messages that target violence-related attitudes and cognitions, with the expectation that this will result in behavior change. In order to change behaviors, the content of these groups must include messages that target specific attitudes linked to family violence. It is important to understand what attitudes people have and what motivates them to keep or change these cognitions. The following section reviews research on attitudes associated with family violence.

**Attitudes Associated with Family Violence**

Most of the attitudes that are linked with family violence involve misguided beliefs about roles, goals and authority (Cahn, 1996). For instance, parents who abuse their children tend to have little or no knowledge of child development and have unrealistic expectations for child behavior at different developmental stages leading to high levels of frustration (Johnson, 1996).
Other attitudes that are related to violence are those related to gender roles and definitions of violence. Piispa (2004) found that attitudes towards violence and variations in the meaning of violence were predictive of Finnish women’s likelihood to report partner violence. Younger women, influenced by changing social norms, had a lower threshold of tolerance for violence, and were more likely to have negative attitudes towards violence in relationships than were older women. Older women who experienced the same behavior had attitudes and beliefs that did not lead them to conclude that they were victims of violence. Differences in attitudes towards gender roles and violence were more predictive of the likelihood to report violence than the more traditional risk factors such as having children, cohabitating and low educational status and financial dependency.

Wood (2001) found that women who were in violent relationships tended to have traditional gender attitudes. These traditional attitudes were characterized by males’ dominant role and women’s submissive role, such as the male having the last word in an argument, and men having the right to tell women what to do. These attitudes helped explain why women stayed in violent relationships. Similarly, studies have found that men who batter their intimate partners also hold these traditional gender roles. Besides having traditional attitudes about gender roles, men in violent relationships also tend to have tolerant attitudes toward violence (Feder & Dugan, 2002; Cranwell, Kolodinsky, Carsten, Schimdt, Larson & MacLachlan, 2007). Participants in CB-VP groups, including the groups in this study, discuss traditional gender roles and how such roles may lead to violence and aggression.
Another area addressed in CB-VP groups is individual and societal understandings of what constitutes violence. For example, the point when verbal aggression becomes violence is a difficult distinction. But research demonstrates that chronic exposure to verbal aggression has detrimental effects. Communication researchers have looked at the impact of aggressive communication in families and its effect on promoting violence. Verbal aggressiveness is one of the most prevalent forms of family violence (Cahn 1996). Verbal aggression in families is associated with spousal abuse and child abuse (Infante, Chandler, & Rudd, 1989; Infante, Sabourin, Rudd, & Shannon, 1990, Sabourin, 1996, Wilson, 1999). Children who grow up in verbally abusive households tend to be more verbally aggressive and have trouble forming their own satisfactory relationships later in life (Infante, 1987; Beatty & Dobos, 1992; Beatty, Zelley, Dobos, & Rudd, 1994; Beatty, Burant, Dobos, & Rudd, 1996). CB-VP groups address these concerns by helping participants understand the negative effects of abusive language and behavior and help participants reach their own conclusions about definitions of violence.

In addition to beliefs about gender roles and definitions of violence, CB-VP groups target cognitions about accountability. People in situations of family violence often alter their beliefs to justify or excuse abusive behavior from loved ones. Cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957) provides an explanation for why people stay in violent relationships. Family violence creates a great deal of cognitive dissonance when people are forced to reconcile abusive behavior coming from a person they love. In order to minimize the dissonance created by family violence, victims tend to focus on their partner’s positive aspects, such as affectionate and
caring behavior (Marshall, Weston, & Honeycutt, 2000). Victims find alternative ways to interpret the violence they are experiencing in order to reduce dissonance. A study with abused women found that forgiveness and willingness to let go of the anger towards their partner was a way of coping with the distress of violence in the family (Gordon, Burton & Porter, 2004). Perpetrators also frequently take on dissonance reducing cognitions by dismissing, excusing or justifying violence against their loved ones, instead of taking responsibility for their behavior (Stamp & Sabourin, 1995; Wood, 2004). Being accountable for one’s violent behavior is often related to developing empathy for the people that are harmed.

Empathy and morality are important factors in dealing with conflict and preventing violence (Poole, 2004). Two notable characteristics of domestic batterers is the desire for dominance over the people around them and deficient moral reasoning (Lipsey, Chapman & Landenberger, 2001). A study by Buttell (1999) found that domestic batterers used a level of moral reasoning that was significantly below that of a control group from the general population. When presented with a moral dilemma and then asked to evaluate the best course of action in a situation, batterers were found to respond more similarly to institutionalized juvenile delinquents than to other non-abusive adults. The importance of the moral dimension in family violence prevention is supported by recent interviews with facilitators of batterer intervention programs who were asked to list the main attitudes they target in their groups. Lack of empathy and accountability was reported to be a key target area for attitude change by the interview participants (Villar, Orrego & Farr, 2008). CB-
VP group facilitators try to strengthen moral reasoning and empathy among participants as one of the mechanisms to promote behavior change.

As this review has shown, family violence is associated with some very specific attitudes and cognitions. Some of these associated attitudes include traditional gender roles, lack of clarity over what constitutes violence, lack of empathy, and cognitive mechanisms to justify violent behavior. Research informs prevention practitioners about the cognitions that facilitate and perpetuate violence in families. CB-VP groups are designed to confront these attitudes and counter them with alternative attitudes and suggested behaviors. By understanding these cognitions violence prevention programs can target their messages more specifically. Parenting curricula target these attitudes - including gender roles, accountability, moral values, and definitions of violence - to promote behavior change. The following section reviews research on CB-VP groups and their effect on parenting attitudes and behaviors.

**Attitude and Behavior Change through CB-VP Parenting Groups**

In addition to modifying attitudes and beliefs associated with family violence, a key strategy to prevent child abuse is to improve parenting practices and family functioning (Brunk, Henggeler, & Whelan, 1987). CB-VP parenting groups use communication strategies to modify perceptions about parenting, and promote healthy, non-violent family interactions. They help people manage their expectations about relationship roles and routines, and how to resolve conflict (Huston, McHale, & Crouter, 1986; Halford, 2004), which is important in preventing family violence. Parenting groups are used in a variety of settings, and mostly focus on giving parents
the skills they need to handle children that pose specific challenges, such as children with social and behavioral problems, children with chronic illnesses and children who have experienced violence in the home (Fadden, 1998; Taylor & Biglan, 1998).

Parenting group interventions, including the *Fatherhood* groups described in this study, are often multidimensional, and address a wide variety of issues beyond violence prevention, including the role of individual characteristics and cultural factors that affect parenting practices. Stressors related to poverty, immigration status, and social isolation are also associated with family violence (Negroni-Rodriguez, 2003; Frias & Angel, 2005; Zayas, 2005). Some parenting interventions include components that focus on non-parenting issues, such as finances and marital discord (Taylor & Biglan, 1998). By enhancing parents' ability to cope with other stresses in their lives, they are able to increase their effectiveness as parents (Wells, Griest, & Forehand, 1980; Griest et al., 1982). This is why parenting group curricula go beyond topics directly related to violence and include issues that are indirectly related, such as handling stress, strengthening marital relationships, and parents’ role in the children’s education, among others.

Despite the relative ubiquity of parenting classes and groups as a violence prevention strategy, their ability to bring about behavior change is unclear. A recent systematic review of literature on the use of parenting programs for child abusive parents found that there was insufficient evidence to claim a direct effect on reducing violence (Barlow, Johnston, Kendrick, Polnay, & Stewart-Brown, 2006). However, the review concluded that that group parenting programs are effective in improving
outcomes associated with physical abuse, such as discipline practices, child abuse potential, and behavioral adjustment (Kellerman et al, 1998; Barlow et al., 2006).

Most research on parenting interventions to prevent child abuse is based on individual home visits. Results generally provide support for cognitive behavioral strategies. In a study that compared a standard intervention with one that included a cognitive retraining component found that the prevalence of physical abuse was significantly lower in the cognitive retraining group than the control groups (Bugental, Ellerson, Lin, Rainey, Kokotovic, & O'Hara, 2002). Another individual intervention, the PCIT (parent child interaction therapy), which focuses on cognitive and behavioral change, resulted in significantly fewer repeated reports of physical abuse compared to control groups (Chaffin et al., 2004). Although these studies do not necessarily support the use of groups as the best method to prevent child abuse, they do support the use of cognitive approaches to reduce violent parenting practices (MacMillan, MacMillan, Offord, Griffith, & MacMillan, 1994).

Although the evidence to support parenting groups as a violence prevention strategy is equivocal, there is plenty of evidence indicating their beneficial effects to families. Cognitive behavioral parenting groups were found to be effective in reducing child conduct problems, antisocial behaviors, and negative parent-child interactions (Taylor, Schmidt, Pepler & Hodgins 1998; Taylor & Biglan, 2004) as well as improvements in parenting interactions (Scott, Spender, Doolan, Jacobs & Aspland, 2001; Hartman, Stage, Webster-Stratton, 2003). Furthermore, a study that compared community based parenting groups to individual clinic-based parent
training found that groups were more effective in improving behavior in the home and maintaining those changes over time (Cunningham, Bremmer & Boyle, 1995).

Thus, there is enough evidence to support the use of parenting groups as a family strengthening intervention, but before claims can be made about their effect on behavior change, it is important to understand what happens in the groups. If the ultimate goal of CB-VP groups is to change behavior, researchers must identify links between cognitions associated with violence, messages used to modify these cognitions, and messages motivate behavior changes. The following section explores the link between cognitions, behaviors and motivation to change.

**Social Cognitive Theory: from Cognition to Behavior**

Parenting behaviors are based on individual observation, experience, and the personal process of trial and error (Kellerman et al., 1998). CB-VP groups try to correct dysfunctional patterns of thinking that lead to violence, such as responding to anger and taking responsibility for one’s actions instead of blaming others (Lipsey, Chapman & Landenberger, 2001). The theoretical link between learned patterns of thinking and behavior is operationalized in social-cognitive theory (Bandura, 1973; 1986). It assumes that people take on behaviors through observational learning. According to SCT, people learn how to act from watching the actions of others and observing the deterrents or reinforcements for the behavior (Bandura, 1997). Through social learning, people form attitudes about which behaviors are appropriate for certain situations, which behaviors are likely to be rewarded, and which are likely to be punished. Attitudes may be formed passively, through social learning and
observation, but changing an attitude or belief once it is developed, usually requires the use of persuasive strategies (Rokeach, 1967).

Based on SCT, cognitive behavioral interventions take the approach that changing how people think about themselves and their environment will impact their attitudes toward a specific behavior, which will in turn result in a change in behavior. Attitudes towards a behavior serve as mediators between environmental stimuli and behavioral responses (Slater, 1999). This can be illustrated with an example of a conflict situation in a family. A parent who is frustrated with his child’s misbehavior must decide how to act. The parent may have cognitions about the negative effects of violence, and these cognitions result in a negative attitude towards corporal punishment. This attitude should lead the parent to opt for a non-violent method of discipline such as withdrawal of privileges instead of a spanking. Another parent, the other hand, may perceive violence as a tool for dominance, and if the person perceives dominance over her child as desirable, this attitude may lead to a violent response given the same stimulus (child’s misbehavior). Under this framework, changing attitudes about a behavior will change the motivation to engage in the behavior.

However, it is clear that attitudes do not always translate into consistent behaviors, particularly in situations of family violence. It has been found that even parents who hold negative attitudes towards violence sometimes resort to verbal aggressiveness and corporal punishment (Dibble & Straus, 1980). This suggests that it is not sufficient to change attitudes, but that CB-VP groups must also engage in compliance gaining messaging to motivate behavior change regardless of the
underlying attitudes. In order to achieve this, facilitators must provide good reasons to supersede social learning and promote an advocated behavior change (Wilson & Morgan, 2003). What is a ‘good’ reason will depend on the target of the message. Reasons are selected based on their likelihood to influence the message receiver. The reasons for why people should alter their beliefs or behaviors may include “appeals to core values, linkages with important groups, or explanations of tangible consequences to be gained if targets do what the source advocates” (Wilson & Morgan, 2003, p. 447). This requires strategic compliance gaining message production that targets specific behaviors with specific arguments for change.

When discussing behavior change, there must first be a clear understanding of what constitutes a behavior. Different disciplines apply slightly different definitions to what constitutes a behavior. In science, animal behaviors may be conscious or unconscious, overt or covert, purposive or purposeless. For purposes of this study, however, behaviors are defined as conscious observable and non-observable actions performed by an agent with a particular purpose, cause or function. The inclusion of purely cognitive non-observable behaviors in this definition was derived from several explanations found in the literature about what constitutes behavior. For example, while it is widely agreed that people are aware of their mental actions, and Peacocke (2006) argues that this is also true of mental actions. He states that the only difference between mental action and bodily action is that one is done with the mind, and the other with the body, but they both serve a function for the person doing them (Peacocke, 2006, 2008). Mele (1997) further distinguishes actions between overt actions that essentially involve movement of the body, and non-observable cognitive
actions, such as solving a problem in one’s head, or deliberating before making a decision. Taylor (1963) also supported this view of action, indicating that an act does not necessarily require bodily movement. What it does require, according to Taylor, is for the person engaging in the act to be conscious of it, and to be the author, initiator or originator of the act. The concept of non-observable cognitive behaviors is also supported by educational theory. Specifically, Bloom’s (1984) taxonomy of cognitive domains includes six levels of intellectual behaviors: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. While educators must find ways to demonstrate changes in cognition through observable actions, it is assumed that mental or cognitive behaviors must take place before changes in observable actions can occur.

Social learning theory is based on a model of behavior change that assumes cognitive changes precede behavior changes. Thus, it is important to understand if these are physical actions that can be observed by others, or mental actions that take place in the mind and cannot be observed. Compliance gaining research focuses on observable actions, but in the context of a behavior change process, not all changes may be visible to observers. For this purpose, appeals in this study were coded by behavior type, referring to whether the behaviors constitute observable actions or cognitive behaviors. Given the diverse goals of CB-VP groups, this study also set out to find out whether the type of behavior targeted varied depending on the topic of the appeal.

The first set of research questions are concerned with the specific behaviors being targeted by the Fatherhood groups. While the group content is largely
 atheoretical, it is based on what attitudes and behaviors are known to be associated with family violence discussed above. To describe the behaviors targeted by compliance gaining messages, the first three research questions consider the topic of compliance gaining appeals and the type of behavior addressed. Type of behavior refers to whether the elicited behavior is an observable action, or a ‘mental’ cognitive behavior. Therefore the following research questions are posed focusing on specific behaviors targeted by *Fatherhood* groups.

**RQ1a:** What parenting and violence prevention topics are addressed by CG gaining appeals?

**RQ1b** What types of behaviors (cognitive behaviors vs. observable actions) are targeted by CG appeals?

**RQ1c** Does type of behavior targeted vary by the topic of the compliance gaining appeal?

**Compliance Gaining: Communication for Behavior Change**

Compliance gaining is a persuasive process, which is specifically concerned with behavior change (Fitch, 1994; Wheeless, Barraclough, & Stewart, 1983). In contrast to other kinds of persuasion aimed only at influencing beliefs and attitudes, compliance gaining appeals are messages that target specific changes in behavior that may or may not be accompanied by changes in attitude. Like all persuasive messages, they are based on the use of arguments to support the recommended change in behavior. These are typically arguments about the merits of the behavior or the likely outcome of the behavior. They tend to focus either on logic, such as
emphasizing the expected effects of the behavior, or on emotion, such as the target’s desires, moral beliefs or sense of duty.

Compliance gaining messages are selected by the persuader based on assumptions of what makes the target or persuadee comply with a request or recommendation for action. People have different reasons to comply (Checkel, 2001). One possibility is rational choice, based on cost/benefit calculations. In other words, people will comply if they perceive the benefit of complying to be worth the effort. Another reason to comply is based on socialization, and each person’s perceptions of the right thing to do, based on social learning, socialization, and social norms (Checkel, 2001).

Compliance gaining research has largely relied on pre-determined categories of strategies and tactics used to obtain compliance from a target. There are numerous taxonomies used to classify compliance gaining strategies and tactics. Perhaps the best known taxonomy was established by Marwell & Schmitt (1967), and has since been repeatedly elaborated, expanded, condensed and critiqued (Seibold, Cantrill & Meyers, 1985; Wheeless, Barraclough & Stewart, 1983). The Marwell & Schmitt (1967) taxonomy was selected to classify the appeals in this study because it is based on the concept of power in social influence, which is the underlying rationale for this study. While French and Raven’s (1959) conception of power considered only the power of the speaker over the target, Marwell and Schmitt extended that concept to broader sources of influence, that are not necessarily between the speaker and the target. Marwell and Schmitt (1967) developed a framework that, though imperfect, may be applied to virtually any compliance gaining situation regardless of the
relationship between the speaker and the compliance gaining target. Because the strategies are based on French and Raven’s (1959) work, each strategy type is conceptually related to a source of power or influence that motivates people to comply with a suggested behavior. The source of influence or power is of particular interest in behaviors linked to violence. Violence prevention practitioners use a wide variety of arguments to discourage aggressive and controlling behavior, based on assumption about their audiences’ values, goals and motivations. Applying the Marwell & Schmitt framework to analyze violence prevention messages will identify the source of power motivating behavior change, whether the goal is to promote protective strategies or reduce risk-inducing behaviors.

Marwell and Schmitt’s (1967) list of 16 compliance gaining techniques has been widely used by communication researchers to understand the compliance gaining process (e.g., Burgoon, Pfau, Parrott, Birk, Coker & Burgoon, 1987; Jackson & Backus, 1982; Lustig & King, 1980; Miller, Boster, Roloff & Seibold, 1977, 1987; Sillars, 1980). Marwell & Schmitt’s techniques include: reward, punishment, positive expertise, negative expertise, liking, gifting/pre-giving, debt, aversive stimulation, moral appeal, positive self-feeling, negative self-feeling, positive altercasting, negative altercasting, altruism, positive esteem of others, and negative esteem of others. All of these strategies appeal to certain aspects of human nature that are expected to motivate people to act on someone’s request or recommendation.

What motivates people to change takes on special dimension in a parenting context. Conceptions of what is beneficial to the self are likely to be interrelated with what is beneficial for the family unit or for individual family members. Similarly,
appeals that target people’s need to fulfill other’s expectations have to balance the expectations of society in general with the expectations of their family members. Therefore, Marwell & Schmitt’s (1967) taxonomy may be somewhat limited in its applicability to messages aimed at parenting behavior change. Anticipating this shortcoming, appeals were also coded for a third-party referent, such as children or spouse, if applicable.

The second set of research questions focus on the compliance gaining strategies used to influence the targeted behaviors. Analyzing the compliance gaining strategies found in behavior change messages in the Fatherhood groups will reveal the motivating power behind the messages. In other words, the choice of compliance gaining appeal implicitly or explicitly integrates the facilitators’ expectations about what will make participants change their behavior. This is useful in violence prevention to understand the assumed motivations for behavior change. Therefore the following research questions are raised to examine the use of compliance gaining strategies:
**RQ2a:** What kinds of compliance gaining strategies are used to motivate behavior change in Fatherhood groups?

**RQ2b:** Do appeal strategies differ for different topic areas?

**RQ2c:** Do appeal strategies differ when the compliance gaining target is a cognitive behavior rather than an action?

**RQ2d:** Do appeal strategies refer to third persons (family members) to gain compliance?

**Sources of Influence: Motivations behind Compliance Gaining Appeals**

Some of Marwell & Schmitt’s (1967) 16 strategies are interrelated. Several compliance gaining researchers have grouped them into larger dimensions, based on their style or approach, such as aggressive or nonaggressive (Roloff & Barnicott, 1978; Burgoon, Dillard & Doran, 1984; Burgoon, Parrott, Burgoon, Coker, Pfau & Birk; 1990) or positive, negative or neutral (Helme & Harrington, 2004; Cropley, 2004). Another way to group Marwell & Schmitt’s strategies is based on method used to obtain compliance. Wiseman & Schenck-Hamlin (1981) proposed four types of appeals: those based on sanctions or threats, altruism or good will, explanations or logical reasoning, and deceit. Marwell & Schmitt (1967a) themselves identified five factors in compliance gaining based on what motivates or persuades a person to act. They determined that people respond to rewarding activity, punishing activity, use of expertise, activation of impersonal commitments (such as moral values and beliefs), and activation of personal commitments (based on relationships with others). These larger dimensions of compliance gaining focus on the sources of influence that
motivate people to take a particular action or adopt a new behavior. Specifically, reward and punishment compliance gaining messages will appeal to people’s desire to obtain positive outcome or prevent a negative one. Moral and expertise appeals depend on people’s desire to be right and to be righteous. Appeals based on personal and impersonal commitments count on people’s concern over their image, both their self image and the image that others have of them.

Wheeless, Barraclough & Stewart (1983) also developed larger categories of influence related to compliance gaining. They reviewed several studies on power, influence and compliance gaining, and determined that all compliance gaining messages appeal to one of three sources of influence, which are congruent with current thinking in social influence theory regarding the motivations to change attitudes or behaviors (Wood, 2000). These sources of influence or motivations relate to the expected consequences of an action, the target’s relationships with other people, and the target’s moral values.

In the Wheeless et al. (1983) framework, appeals based on expectancies and consequences assume that people will act rationally to maximize the likelihood of obtaining their desired outcome. To appeal to this source of influence, compliance gaining messages would use logical cause-effect arguments. Appeals based on relationships and identifications, are similar to Marwell &Schmitt’s (1967a) personal commitments. This assumes that people are social beings and care about how others perceive them and how they perceive themselves with respect to others. Messages appealing to this source of influence would refer to social roles, reputation, and other people’s esteem and expectations of the compliance gaining target. Finally, appeals
based on values and obligations assume that people have an inner set of rules by which they guide their actions and decisions. These rules may be culturally learned, imposed by society or inspired by spirituality or religion. Appeals that evoke this source of influence will use arguments that appeal to an individuals’ moral code by arguing for what is righteous, correct, virtuous, or important. What qualifies as such will vary from individual to individual and effective compliance gaining messages are crafted based on the target’s belief and value system.

Understanding the sources of influence invoked in Fatherhood group messages will help describe the mechanisms of change that facilitators are expecting to activate through their compliance gaining messages. In other words, it will help explain why facilitators expect that particular messages will be effective to result in behavior change, and what motivations people have to comply with a particular behavior change request. This is important for violence prevention practice to be able to craft effective behavior change messages that respond to the target audience’s goals and motivations.

The third set of research questions goes beyond specific appeal strategies and looks at the sources of influence used in the behavior change appeals, based on Wheeless et al.’ (1983) three domains of influence domains. This will reveal the sources of influence used in compliance gaining appeals across different parenting and violence prevention topics and types of targeted behaviors. This will provide insight on the different strategies used to modify behaviors related to family violence. Therefore the following research questions are presented:

RQ3a Which source of influence is most frequently used in CG gaining appeals?
RQ3b  Do sources of influence differ for different topic areas?

RQ3c  Do sources of influence differ when the CG gaining target is a cognitive behavior rather than an action?

Summary

The literature review presented in this chapter demonstrates the importance of CB-VP groups as a tool in family violence prevention in today’s social context. It is the responsibility of scholars in this area to analyze and critique these interventions, in order to better understand the mechanisms involved in changing attitude and behaviors related to family violence.

Research on cognitive behavioral violence prevention (CB-VP) groups suggests that these interventions have a positive effect on parental discipline methods (including use of nonviolent approaches), level of familial conflict, and management of stress affecting the family (Kellerman et al, 1998) but the mechanisms of change are not clear (Biglan et al, 1997, Taylor & Biglan, 1998; Gondolf, 1999; Bowen & Gilchrist, 2004). There is a gap between what is known regarding the attitudes and behaviors that support violence in families, and how best to modify them. Little is known about how violence prevention messages are used in CB-VP groups to effect parenting behavior change. Studies have not focused on how group facilitators target messages to change these attitudes and beliefs, nor on how group participants recall and process these messages. This is an underdeveloped area of research that holds promise for communication scholars interested in behavior change and future violence prevention strategies. Before any change in parenting behavior can be attributed to the messages exchanged in CB-VP groups, there must be a greater
understanding what messages are being sent, and how these messages are recalled and interpreted by group participants. The present study builds on existing research on attitude and behavior change and will apply that knowledge to analyze the compliance gaining messages used to change attitudes and behaviors in the Fatherhood parenting groups.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Participants

Study Sample

Participants were adult males and who participated in the federally funded Fatherhood groups in Miami-Dade County, coordinated through local community based organization EnFamilia, Inc. EnFamilia, located in Homestead, FL is a non-profit, multi-faceted family education center whose mission is to build healthy family relationships, examine and preserve cultural values and enrich the quality of life through education and the arts. EnFamilia received funding from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families in 2006 to administer a program aiming to improve the relationships between the fathers and their children. The program is called Promoting Responsible Fatherhood, and the groups are referred to as Fatherhood groups. The letter of agreement from EnFamilia to collaborate on this study is located in Appendix A.

Fatherhood group participants are parents who may be at risk for family violence due to social and familial distress, but who have not been charged with any acts of violence or neglect, and are not involved with the court system for domestic violence or child abuse. In other words, this is a primary prevention intervention, not intended for known perpetrators of violence. Participants are referred from faith based organizations, schools, and community-based organizations such as day care centers, after school programs and community counseling centers. The program consists of 12 hours of program content (8 sessions of 1.5 hours). EnFamilia
determines that a participant has successfully completed the program if they attend at least six of the eight program sessions, or 9 out of 12 hours. Program content is based on the 24/7 Dad curriculum, distributed by the National Fatherhood Initiative, Inc, a national non-profit, organization that aims to improve the well-being of children by increasing the proportion of children with involved, responsible, and committed fathers. The sessions focus on the following content themes: family of origin, masculinity, self-awareness, expressing emotion, physical and mental health, fathering and family roles, discipline, children’s development, balancing work and family, and getting involved with their children.

Although the *Fatherhood* program curriculum was initially designed for men, women began to express interest in attending the groups. Since it is a federally funded service program, it would have been illegal to discriminate based on gender, and the community based organizations that were implementing the program had to include mothers in the *Fatherhood* program. Given this policy, approximately 20% of the participants in the *Fatherhood* program are now female.

Although twenty-five participants were interviewed, only 24 were included in the analysis. One interview was excluded because it was used for coder training purposes. Excluding the practice case, nineteen (19) men and 5 women were interviewed for this study, from July to October 2007. Fifty percent (n=12; 8 men and 4 women) were from the Homestead/ Florida City area groups; 37.5% (n=9; 8 men and 1 woman) came from the Hialeah/Hialeah Gardens group, and another 12.5 percent (n=3) were from the Kendall/Cutler Ridge area. All participants were of Hispanic ethnicity and all interviews were conducted in Spanish. Countries of origin
reported by participants included Colombia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua and Puerto Rico. Participants ranged in age from 21 to 64 years, with a mean age of 41.6. They reported having between one and five children, with a mean number of children of 2.5 (m=2.52; sd =1.47). Two participants were expectant fathers and did not yet have any children at the time of the interview. Participants’ children ranged from less than one year to 29 years of age. Several participants did not share a residence with their children because they were separated from their child’s mother. To be as unobtrusive as possible, and at EnFamilia’s request, no data on education, income or legal status was collected as part of these interviews. EnFamilia later provided de-identified demographic information for the 23 of the 25 participants interviewed for this study. Only one participant was born in the United States, the rest were foreign born. Over eighty percent (n=19; 82.6%) had lived in the United States for longer than 5 years; one (4.3%) had lived in the U.S. between three and five years, and the rest (13.0%) did not respond to this question. All interviews were conducted in Spanish, indicating that all participants were fluent in Spanish. However, only three (13.0%) participants reported to speak no English at all. Three participants (13%) reported they spoke English well or perfectly; three (13%) spoke enough to communicate; nine (39.1%) reported speaking only “a little bit” of English. One participant (4.3%) spoke English at home; six (26.1%) reported speaking both English and Spanish, and the rest (n=15; 65.2%) spoke only Spanish at home. One person (4.3%) did not respond to this question.
With respect to years of education, participants reported having between zero and 17 years of education. The mean number of years in school was 8.3 (std dev=5.6). Twenty of the 23 interviewees (86.9%) for whom there was demographic data available, reported that they were working at the time they started the groups. Over half of the participants reported working in jobs related to agriculture and construction. Table 1 presents the breakdown of reported occupations. Also, a fourth of the participants reported earning less than $25,000 per year, and another fourth reported making between $10,001 and $20,000 per year. Table 2 presents participants’ annual income.

**Table 1: Participant Occupations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Frequency (% of employed participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>7 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Employed</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/Business</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/Office assistant</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (mechanic)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Participant Annual Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Income</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $3,000</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,001 - $5,000</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,001 - $10,000</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,001 - $15,000</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,001 - $20,000</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $20,000</td>
<td>6 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recruitment

Participants were recruited by the interviewers at their group meetings with the permission of the group facilitator. Eligible participants must have participated in at least eight hours of the program. This minimum number of hours was selected to ensure that participants had enough exposure to program content to be able to adequately respond to the interview questions. Facilitators informed group participants about the study and allowed the interviewers to introduce themselves to the group. At that time, arrangements were made to conduct face to face interviews. Most interviews were conducted during or immediately following the group meeting. Written informed consent was obtained individually from each participant prior to the interviews, and a copy of the informed consent was provided to participants with the investigators’ contact information. Only the interviewer and the participant were present during the consent procedure, and participants were given the opportunity to decline participation. The recruitment, consent procedure and data collection methods were approved by the University of Miami IRB. Since only interested participants went through the informed consent procedure, there was a 100% rate of consent and participation. No information was collected on Fatherhood group participants who did not wish to be interviewed. All participants received $20.00 in cash at the end of the interview. The study protocol, informed consent form and recruitment materials were approved by the University of Miami Institutional Review Board. Copies of the approved Informed Consent Form and recruitment flier are included in Appendix B.
Sampling

Participants were recruited to represent the geographic distribution of the EnFamilia Fatherhood groups. At the time of data collection, Fatherhood groups met in six sites across three areas of Miami-Dade County: Homestead (3 sites), Hialeah (2 sites) and Kendall (1 site). In its first year, the program, which was intended to serve 250 clients, actually served 218 Hispanic parents in the three areas combined. Interviewees were recruited to proportionally represent the three areas. A target number of participants was set for each of the three sites (12 from Homestead, 7 from Hialeah, and 6 from Kendall), and potential interviewees were recruited until the target number was reached. Participants were recruited as a non-probability purposive sample based on their willingness to participate, their fulfillment of the inclusion criteria, and distribution among the three geographic areas targeted by the program. A non-purposive sample is justified given the relative homogeneity of the group. The recruitment procedure resulted in a group of study participants that adequately represented the age and gender distribution of the Fatherhood group participants. The only stratification considered in recruitment was based on geographic location. Eligibility criteria included being at least 18 years of age, having at least eight hours of participation in the program, and completing the informed consent procedure.

A sample size of 24 represents 11% of the program participants. This sample size is also congruent with similar published studies that include content analysis of social interaction transcripts (Parrott, Burgoon, & Ross, 1992; Parrott, 1994; Eckstein, 2004; Pratt, Norris, van de Hoef, & Arnold, 2004).
Data Collection

Interviews

The data analyzed in this study consisted of interview transcripts. The interview questions were designed to elicit responses that would allow the investigator to address the research questions. An open ended interview method of data collection was selected because this method has been effectively used in communication research to describe and analyze the causes and effects of family violence (Rudd, Dobos, Vogl-Bauer & Beatty, 1997; Wood, 2001; Eckstein, 2004). Some have proposed that the interview itself serves as a way for the interviewee to reflect in new ways about the issue under study (Stamp & Sabourin, 1995; Montalbano-Phelps, 2003). The flexible nature of the in-depth interview allowed for the emergence of new topics and appeals that could have been overlooked using pre-determined categories in a multiple choice survey format.

The Fatherhood groups focus on a variety of issues that encompass family violence prevention and positive parenting. Group participants were asked to recall the messages they heard in the group and the attitudes or behaviors they were encouraged to adopt. Participants were asked to recount messages they heard in the Fatherhood group, based on probing questions such as: “What did the facilitator say in the group?” “Why did they say you should do that?” “What else was said about that?” “Can you think of anything else that was said in the group?” Interviewers continued probing until participants could no longer produce any new messages or topics discussed in the groups. Interviews were guided by an interview schedule. A copy of the interview schedule is attached in Appendix C.
Interviews were conducted as open-ended conversations by three trained interviewers. Sixty percent of the interviews were conducted by the principal investigator. Two additional interviewers were trained to allow for interviews to take place at the same date and location of the regularly scheduled groups without asking parents to wait a long time to be interviewed. The additional interviewers were trained by the principal investigator and either observed an interview prior to doing one on their own, or conducted a mock interview as part of their training. One of the interviewers was a Hispanic woman who works with community agencies and has years of experience working with parents from the target population. The other was a Hispanic male who is experienced researcher and has also worked with the target population for over 10 years. Interviewers were selected for their ability to speak Spanish, familiarity with the target population, and their experience conducting interviews, assessments and/or intake procedures with families from this demographic. The principal investigator reviewed the transcripts of the secondary interviewers to ensure that they followed the interview schedule.

Data Processing and Analysis

Transcription

Interviews were tape-recorded with participants’ consent. An audiotape of each interview was forwarded to a research assistant who transcribed the interviews. Each interview was then transcribed to allow for line-by-line analysis and to ensure fidelity of quotes. Interviews ranged in length from 11 minutes to 68 minutes, with an average length of 24.5 minutes.
Units of Analysis

Content analysis data has two levels of unitization: sampling unit, and unit of analysis (Krippendorf, 1980; Neuendorf, 2002). The sampling units are the participants, which are independent of each other. The units of analysis are the compliance gaining messages reported by participants during their responses to the interview questions. These are not independent because multiple units came from the same study participant.

For purposes of this study, a compliance gaining appeal was defined as a message that was exchanged during the Fatherhood group sessions as recounted by the interviewee, that had the purpose of influencing a particular behavior (Burgoon, Parrott, Burgoon, Birk, Pfau, Coker, 1990; Fitch, 1994; Parrot, Burgoon and Ross, 1992; Kellerman & Shea, 1996).

Interview questions prompted participants for examples of specific compliance gaining messages. To be considered a separate unit of analysis, a full compliance gaining message had to include a recommended behavior or action and a reason to support the behavior. If a single proposed behavior was accompanied by more than one reason, these were divided into separate units of analysis (e.g. “never hit a child because it traumatizes them and you can get in trouble with the law”). Similarly, if more than one behavior was justified by a single reason, they were considered multiple units of analysis. For example, if a participant recalled the following appeal: “set a good example and treat them with respect so you can feel proud of yourself,” two units of analysis were extracted. The first would be an appeal for the behavior to set a good example for the reason that you will feel proud of
yourself. The second would be an appeal to treat them with respect for the same reason. In cases where two reasons or two behaviors were cited in the same sentence but these reasons or behaviors were virtually identical, they were considered a single unit, as in the following example: “to sit with your family at the table, to eat with them” or “because it is important, it is good”). In these instances sitting with the family at the table and eating with them constitute the same activity. Likewise using the word good is just an emphasis of the word important and would be considered an elaboration on the same theme thereby constituting one unit of analysis. The individual appeals or units of analysis were used to establish both frequency and type of appeal. This method of coding the interview data is based on similar studies that coded transcripts of social interaction by Parrot, Burgoon and Ross (1992), Letendre & Davis, 2004, Heleme & Harrington, (2004), Drummond (2005), and Sabourin (2007). It is particularly useful in this instance because it allows for coding of open ended interview transcripts converting narrated accounts into quantitative data units.

**Case Identification**

The number of compliance gaining appeals reported by participants ranged from 4 to 26, with an average of 10.12 appeals reported per participant. A total of 253 compliance gaining messages were extracted from the 25 interviews used in the analysis. The ten compliance gaining appeals taken from the first interview were used to train the second coder and was excluded from analysis.

Two coders read through all the transcripts and independently identified compliance gaining messages. After the initial reading there were minor discrepancies as to what constituted a full compliance gaining message given the
criteria established in the codebook. After coding units separately, the first coder identified 260 individual units, while the second coder identified 249. This resulted in a 95.7% agreement between coders on unitizing, and Guetzkow U was 0.02 (Guetzkow, 1950). U is the difference between coders as a percentage sum of the number of units obtained by each coder. It is calculated as $U = \frac{(O_1-O_2)}{(O_1+O_2)}$, where $O_1$ represents the number of units obtained by the first coder, and $O_2$ is the total obtained by the second coder. The closer Guetzkow's U is to zero, the higher the agreement between coders. Values < 0.10 are conventionally regarded as acceptable (Lambert, 1995).

The final sample of 253 appeals was derived after discussion between the coders. One of the conceptual challenges encountered was that a substantial portion of the recommended behaviors (34%) were not actions, but rather cognitive behaviors, such as “paying more attention to ….” or “taking into account…” There was some discussion about whether these constituted behaviors or attitudes. The principal investigator decided to include all of the appeals and code for observable action or non-observable cognitive behavior as the target of the appeal. In other words, the action of changing an attitude would be considered a behavioral target for a compliance gaining message. This change in the definition of a compliance gaining appeal is supported by the literature cited in Chapter 2. The modified definition was reflected in the codebook.

During coding, the criteria of what constitutes a full compliance gaining appeal were modified slightly. As described above, in the initial definition a complete appeal included a single proposed behavior and a single reason endorsing it.
However, there were some cases in which the respondent recalled a message that was clearly intended to influence a behavior, but the interviewer was unable to elicit a reason for the proposed behavior, either because they could not remember or because they changed or strayed in responding to the probing question. The principal investigator decided to include these cases as units of analysis, because they clearly described a desired behavior change, and would help respond to RQ1. There are 12 such appeals, accounting for 4.9% of the database, that are coded for the variables that relate to the proposed behavior, and the reason was coded as “not stated.”

Variable Coding

Systematic coding of the compliance gaining appeals was done using a coding sheet developed for this project. Each appeal included in the database was given a unique identification number. Then each appeal was coded for the following variables: (a) behavior type (b) primary and secondary topic (c) compliance gaining strategy; (d) compliance gaining influence domain, and if applicable (e) referent. These variables are defined below. Operational definitions of each coding category are included in the codebook located in Appendix D.

The first set of variables refers to observable actions versus cognitive behaviors targeted by the appeal referred to as behavior type. The topic variable describes what general area of violence prevention or positive parenting the appeal relates to. Topics included:

- Paternal and male roles
- Disciplinary strategies
- Showing affection
- Spending time with family
- Communication styles and quantity
- Corporal punishment
Dealing with conflict
Handling stress and anger
Issues related to work, school, and finances
Familial and cultural background

These topics were identified in preliminary interviews with group facilitators as the goals that they intended to communicate on the groups. The principal investigator intentionally made the list exhaustive to allow for detailed description of the appeals reported by participants. Two of the pre-established topics –conflict with children and other stress - were not coded as topics for any of the cases, and another three topics emerged in the course of reading the transcripts. The three additional topics were housework, education/schoolwork, and self-awareness. Each appeal was coded for one primary topic and a secondary topic if applicable. The individual topics are defined in the codebook located in Appendix D.

The second set of research questions identified the reasons given in the appeal to support the recommended action or cognition. Compliance gaining strategy codes are taken directly from Marwell & Schmidt’s (1967) taxonomy of compliance gaining strategies. These include:

- Reward
- Punishment
- Positive expertise
- Negative expertise
- Liking
- Ingratiation
- Gifting
- Pre-giving
- Debt
- Aversive stimulation
- Moral appeal
- Positive self-feeling
- Negative self-feeling
- Positive altercasting
- Negative altercasting
- Altruism
- Positive esteem of others
- Negative esteem of others.

Source of influence domain categories were taken from Wheeless et al.’s (1983) three influence domains:
• Expectancies/consequences
• Relationship/identification
• Values/obligations.

Finally, the referent variable was coded for appeals that employed reward or punishment strategies, or strategies referring to the esteem of others. This variable helped describe the appeals, as they indicated if the effect of a behavior on others is part of the message.

**Intercoder Reliability and Data Analysis**

A code sheet was developed for systematic coding of the study variables. The code sheet used to code each appeal is attached in Appendix E. A code book with instructions, definitions, and coding categories was developed to train the secondary coder and ensure intercoder reliability. The primary and secondary coders used the first interview to practice. This interview contained 10 appeals. They discussed the ten appeals from the first interview while referring to the code book to ensure they both understood coding criteria. Minor changes were made to the codebook at this point. Because the two coders coded these cases jointly before the final definitions were established for each variable code, the interview used to practice was excluded from the study. Once the coding criteria were fully agreed upon, both coders went on to code 10% of the sample. The 10% sample was a systematic random sample selected by generating a random number using the Microsoft Excel RANDOM function, and then selecting every tenth case after that number for a total of 25 appeals.

Thanks in part to the extensive training and discussion with the second coder prior to coding, inter-coder reliability was substantial or high for all of the variables.
except secondary topic (see Table 3 below). The secondary coder generally did not
code for secondary topic, while the primary coder did in 40% of the cases. Thus,
secondary topic is excluded from the intercoder reliability analysis.

Folger, Hewes & Poole (1984) consider Cohen’s kappa as the preferred
measure for reliability in content analysis because it corrects for chance, and is
commonly used in research that involves the coding of behavior (Bakeman, 2000).
To assess intercoder reliability between the first and second coder, percent agreement
and Cohen’s Kappa were calculated. The average intercoder reliability for all
variables was 0.861. Table 3 presents the intercoder agreement and measures of
intercoder reliability for each individual variable coded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>% Agreement</th>
<th>Cohen's Kappa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direction of appeal</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior type</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>0.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic primary</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>0.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of influence</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>0.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG Strategy type</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>0.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>0.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>90.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.861</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the high level of intercoder reliability, the primary coder proceeded to
code the entire sample of 243 appeals extracted from 24 interviews.

The statistics used to respond to the research questions are primarily
descriptive. All quantitative data collected are categorical. The codes for each case
were entered into an SPSS database to calculate frequencies and cross-tabulations.
Chi square analysis was used to compare the distribution of specific strategies and
influence domains across different types of targeted behaviors and topics.
Limitations

Two tapes had significant audio problems, and had prolonged spaces of unintelligible audio, accounting for approximately 15% of these two interviews. The research assistant transcribed as much as possible and indicated *unintelligible audio* in the corresponding parts of the transcripts. Despite these technical difficulties, the coders were able to extract compliance gaining messages from all of the transcripts.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter presents the analysis of the compliance gaining messages reported by Fatherhood group participants in the course of the in-depth interviews. The findings are presented by research question.

Specific Behavior Targeted by Fatherhood Groups

The first set of research questions refer to topics of the appeals and the types of behaviors targeted in the Fatherhood groups. The first research question (RQ1a) provides a general description of the types of parenting topics addressed in the Fatherhood groups. Most of the topics expected to be covered were reported by the participants, with the exception of conflict with children and other stress. However, the participants recalled certain topics much more frequently than others. The most frequently reported topics were parental role, discipline, communication, spending time with children, relationships with spouse, corporal punishment, and self-awareness – each of which accounted for over 5% of the responses. RQ1b addressed the proportion of compliance gaining messages that targeted observable behaviors as opposed to non-observable cognitive behaviors. It is interesting to note that almost forty percent (38.3%) of the appeals were aimed at changing a cognitive or mental action. RQ1c compared the proportion of action and cognition appeals across the different topics and found there was a statistically significant difference. This difference is explained by four topic categories. While most topics addressed primarily observable actions, the topics of ‘paternal role’, ‘stress and anger management’, ‘family history’, and ‘self-awareness’ were more likely to call for
changes in a cognitive behavior. In other words, appeals related to these topics were more likely to encourage participants to think about these topics, rather than urge them to take a particular action. Each research question is now discussed in detail.

**RQ1a: What parenting and violence prevention topics are addressed by CG gaining appeals?**

By far the most frequently reported topic was paternal role, which refers to appeals that have to do with the roles and responsibilities of fathers. The next most frequently cited topics for compliance gaining messages were discipline strategies and communication quality. Communication content refers to appeals for behaviors relating to the frequency and amount of communication, the range of topics discussed, and the intimacy of communication. The fourth most frequently cited topic was the importance of spending time with children. The fifth most common topic was communication style. Communication style refers to the delivery of messages, such as the tone and volume of communication, particularly regarding screaming or yelling as styles of communication. Table 4 details the frequencies for the primary and secondary topics, and provides examples of appeals addressing each topic.

**Table 4: Compliance Gaining Appeal Topics: Examples and Frequencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic category</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Topic 1</th>
<th>Topic 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Paternal role  | “Don’t behave (with your children) like a judge who is always ready to punish them”  
“Be a friend to your children”  
“Understand that the father is the one who teaches, who guides” | 54 (22.2%) | 8 (3.3%) |
| Discipline strategies | “In a moment of punishment, tell them “you are not going to play your PlayStation for a week””  
“Don’t only punish them, but let them understand why”  
“Have a clear mentality of what we want to discipline” | 26 (10.7%) | 5 (2.1%) |
Table 4 cont’d: Compliance Gaining Appeal Topics: Examples and Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic category</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Topic 1 Freq (%)</th>
<th>Topic 2 Freq (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication quality (i.e. content)</td>
<td>“Tell them (the kids) the problems that are happening in the family”</td>
<td>26 (10.7%)</td>
<td>15 (2.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Recover a sense of humor”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time with children</td>
<td>“Dedicate more time to my child than my job”</td>
<td>21 (8.6%)</td>
<td>6 (2.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Give time to your children, play with them, be active”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with spouse</td>
<td>“Don’t focus on your wife’s mistakes all the time”</td>
<td>16 (6.6%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Treat my wife better because she is not a slave”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication style (i.e. how it’s said)</td>
<td>“Don’t scream at the kids”</td>
<td>16 (6.6%)</td>
<td>9 (3.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“When they do something that is not good, don’t react aggressively, but talk instead”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical violence/corporal punishment</td>
<td>“Don’t use violence to control your children”</td>
<td>15 (6.2%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Not hitting our children (because) there are better ways to correct them”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self awareness</td>
<td>“Realize that you make mistakes”</td>
<td>15 (6.2%)</td>
<td>13 (1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Recognize if you have vices and take responsibility for what you are doing”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing affection</td>
<td>“Hug my wife and my children”</td>
<td>11 (4.5%)</td>
<td>3 (1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Tell them ‘I love you’”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress / anger management</td>
<td>“Know how to manage your stress so that you can listen to your children”</td>
<td>8 (3.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RQ1b: What types of behaviors (cognitive behaviors vs. actions) are targeted by CG appeals?

Almost two thirds of the appeals (61.7%) targeted a change in an action or an observable behavior such as listening or helping. This is in line with the compliance gaining focus on behavior. However, over one third (38.3%) of the appeals reported targeted an action that was not observable, but rather a mental or cognitive act, such as understanding or thinking differently about something. Table 5 presents examples of each type of behavior as well as the frequency within the sample.

Table 5: Type of behavior targeted by compliance gaining appeals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Targeted behavior</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Action                    | “Listen to the children”  
“Helping the wife with housework”  
“Not hitting the children”  
“Never tell a child he is not good for anything” | 150 (61.7%) |
| Cognitive Behavior        | “Reject what you consider bad about your own upbringing”  
“Try to understand your children”.  
“Be less machista; open your eyes and don’t be so closed minded thinking that all the time the man has to be ‘the man of the house’” | 93 (38.3%) |

TOTAL 243 (100.0%)

The finding that almost 40% of the behavior change messages recalled by Fatherhood participants addressed a cognitive behavior is important. As discussed earlier, CB-VP groups attempt to change behaviors by changing cognitions and encouraging the adoption of new behaviors. This is normally done by presenting specific facts, ideas, and perspectives that support the desired behavior. However, these findings show that a relatively large proportion of the behavior change appeals...
were not promoting a specific action, but encouraging participants to think and reflect about parenting and violence.

In order to gain a deeper understanding of the types of compliance gaining messages recalled by participants, the next research question (RQ1c) tested for differences in proportions between appeals targeting actions and cognitive behaviors across different topics. Knowing which topics lend themselves to action appeals and which lend themselves to appeals calling for mental acts will help researchers understand the mechanisms of behaviors change for different type of parenting behaviors goals. It will also help facilitators create messages that are more targeted and specific to family violence prevention.

**RQ1c: Do the type of behaviors targeted vary by topic?**

To respond to this question, the types of behaviors targeted were cross-tabulated with the topic of the appeals. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 6. The most noteworthy findings of the cross tabulation of topic and behavior type is that four topics account for the appeals targeting cognitive behaviors rather than actions. These are appeals relating to the topics of paternal role, stress/anger management, family history, and self-awareness. For all other topics action goals account for 3 to 4 times the number of appeals that target cognitive goals. Self-awareness by definition entails a cognitive process of self analysis. Managing stress and anger also requires mental action through conscious self-control. Appeals relating to ‘paternal role’ targeted both actions and cognitive behaviors, but included cognitive behaviors in a much larger proportion that any other category except self-awareness and anger that only targeted cognitive behaviors. The difference in the
The distribution of action and cognitive behavior appeals across Fatherhood topics was statistically significant (p<0.0001).

**Table 6: Cross-tabulation of Topics and Type of Targeted Behavior**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fatherhood Group Topics</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Cognitive Behavior</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paternal role</td>
<td>20 (37%)</td>
<td>34 (63%)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>21 (818%)</td>
<td>5 (19%)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication style</td>
<td>11 (69%)</td>
<td>5 (31%)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication content</td>
<td>22 (85%)</td>
<td>4 (15%)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical violence/corporal punishment</td>
<td>12 (80%)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending time with children</td>
<td>21 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship w/spouse</td>
<td>12 (75%)</td>
<td>4 (25%)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress &amp; anger management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show affection</td>
<td>11 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family History</td>
<td>2 (29%)</td>
<td>5 (71%)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict with Spouse</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male role</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Schoolwork</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self awareness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housework</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8 (57%)</td>
<td>6 (43%)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>150 (68%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>93 (38.%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>243</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages do not total 100% because of rounding; Pearson Chi-Square=94.66, df=16, p<0.0001

The first set of research questions (RQ1a-RQ1c) have described the type of issues and topics addressed in fatherhood groups and the types of behaviors that compliance gaining messages try to elicit. They help explain the ‘what’ in parenting behavior change. The second set of research question helps explain the ‘how’ of behavior change through the analysis of the compliance gaining strategies used in behavior change appeals.

**Compliance Gaining Strategies and Targeted Behavior**

The compliance gaining messages selected by facilitators incorporate expected motivations for behavior change. As discussed earlier in this paper,
compliance gaining messages propose a specific action or behavior, and provide an argument for why it should be undertaken. Comparing how the compliance gaining strategies selected by facilitators vary by topic and type of behavior also helps understand the intended mechanisms of behavior change through compliance gaining appeals. The Marwell & Schmitt (1967) taxonomy of compliance gaining strategies to classify the appeals provides a framework for this analysis, based on the reason or argument provided by the facilitator to encourage adoption of the suggested behavior. RQ2a looked at the type and frequency of compliance gaining strategies used in the behavior change appeals recalled by Fatherhood group participants. RQ2b tested for differences in the distribution of compliance gaining strategies across different parenting topics. Knowing which compliance gaining strategies are more likely to be used in certain topic areas reveals the facilitators expected mechanisms of behavior change through compliance gaining messages. It is important to describe how behavior change messages are used within the groups. RQ2c considered whether certain strategies are more likely to be used to elicit observable actions rather than cognitive behaviors. As above, understanding how compliance gaining strategies are used to target specific types of behaviors reveals facilitators assumptions about participants cognitive mechanisms of behavior change. Finally RQ2d looked at whether third persons were included as part of the compliance gaining appeals. The results are presented below by individual research question.

**RQ2a: What kinds of compliance gaining strategies are used to motivate behavior change in Fatherhood groups?**
Using the Marwell & Schmitt (1967) taxonomy as the framework for classifying compliance gaining messages, the behavior change appeals recalled by participants were coded according to the compliance gaining strategy used. Three of Marwell & Schmitt’s strategy types were not found in any appeals: liking, ingratiation and pre-giving. This is reasonable given the context of a parenting intervention. Liking, ingratiation and pre-giving all have to with the direct relationship between the speaker and the target. *Fatherhood* group content is aimed at changing behavior, not toward the persuader, but toward third persons that are not part of the compliance gaining message exchange. Table 7 presents the frequency of all appeal strategies reported by participants.

The most frequently cited compliance gaining strategy was a reward strategy, accounting for 32.5% of all the appeals, followed by punishment strategies with 16.1% of the appeals recalled by participants using this strategy. These top two strategies were based on the consequences of an action, which indicates that participants tended to recall messages that had to with the positive or negative effects of their actions as parents.
Table 7: Compliance Gaining Strategies: Examples and Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CG strategy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>“Learn how to raise you kids so you can correct them better within the system”</td>
<td>79 (32.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>“Punish children …but not physically punishing them because physical punishment leaves a scar in the soul”</td>
<td>39 (16.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive expertise</td>
<td>“Talk also about all the work that the woman has to do because … women have more to do than men”</td>
<td>29 (11.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Try to understand what's going on … every person is different and we don’t all think alike”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral appeal</td>
<td>“Express love in physical ways because physical contact is super important”</td>
<td>26 (10.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Don’t focus only on giving your children material things because it's better to focus on a good education”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative expertise</td>
<td>“Don’t hit your children … in this country it is considered bad and it's prohibited”</td>
<td>22 (9.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive altercasting</td>
<td>“Give children an education because it's a father's role”</td>
<td>15 (6.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive esteem of others</td>
<td>“Try that the time spent with children is time that generates gratitude so that when we have transcended this earth, our children will say ‘My dad … had his negative things like all human beings, but the important thing is that the positive prevails.’ So that children can have a nice memory of their father.”</td>
<td>7 (2.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aversive stimulation</td>
<td>“Have communication with your children…there are so many TVs and so-called communication mediums that the family is out of touch.”</td>
<td>6 (2.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative esteem of others</td>
<td>“Not to be a repressive father because … the child will fear the father.”</td>
<td>4 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive self feeling</td>
<td>“Teach them and educate them…so we will feel a great success when they grow up.”</td>
<td>2 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative altercasting</td>
<td>“Be loving with your children, some fathers only instill fear when they should instill love”</td>
<td>2 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt</td>
<td>Learn from the mistakes of my parents…they did their job, now it's my turn</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 (4.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>243 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After reward and punishment, the next three most frequently used appeal strategies were positive expertise (11.9%) moral appeal (10.7%) and negative expertise (9.1%). These three strategies depend on the target having certain beliefs about the world, and being likely to make decisions based on those beliefs. They are
based on the assumption that people want to ‘do the right thing’. What is the right thing can be determined by an internal value system, as in the case of moral appeals, or by other people’s expertise. Moral appeals are based on the target’s values, or notions of right and wrong. This refers to any appeals that are based primarily on the argument that something is good, bad, right, wrong, important, better (than something else) or worse (than something else). Positive and negative expertise strategies are based on ‘the nature of reality’ or the participants’ beliefs about the world, that support the suggested action.

Compliance gaining messages were coded as using expertise appeals when their main argument was a statement about how the world works. In expertise appeals, facilitators stated a condition of the world that, if true, would lead people to undertake the suggested behavior. For example, an appeal saying “help out around the house because women also have a lot of work to do” proposes an action – help out around the house – and provides a statement about the nature of reality as its supporting argument – women have a lot of work too. While there are various implicit arguments in that statement including the desire to be fair and the desire to be respectful, the actual argument used was that women are also busy. This statement about the way the world works is supposed to get the participant to understand why they need to change their behavior. In this example, the link to family violence prevention lies in beliefs about gender roles. The reasoning behind this appeal is to provide an alternate view – more feminist and less traditional – of women’s lives. This challenge to traditional beliefs about gender roles is intended to motivate the proposed behavior change, in this case, to help out around the house.
The next two most common appeals were positive altercasting (6.2%) and positive esteem of others (2.9%). These appeals are related in that they both refer to social norms and pressure to meet others’ expectations. Appeals that use positive altercasting are messages based on the human desire to act like other good people. Unlike moral appeals that refer to internal values systems, altercasting appeals refers to external values systems such as social norms or peer pressure. Altercasting appeals point out what ‘good’ or ‘bad’ people tend to do, with the expectation that the persuadee will want to do what ‘good’ people do and avoid what ‘bad’ people do. Messages appealing to the positive esteem of others rely on people’s desire to be evaluated positively by others. These are messages that use the prospect of third parties being pleased or displeased with the actions of the target. These types of appeals take on a more complex dimension in the context of parenting behavior and family violence prevention, since the third parties are typically the participant’s family members.

The next question explores the variation of compliance gaining strategies across different parenting and violence prevention behaviors.

**RQ2b: Do compliance gaining strategies differ for different topic areas?**

This question was answered by cross tabulating compliance gaining strategies with the topics of the appeals. Tables 8a and 8b present the results of the cross tabulation. These were divided into two tables to facilitate reading. It is important to note that this includes only the primary topic. Some compliance gaining strategies were used with additional topics, but are not reported here because they were coded
as secondary topics. Table 8c presents the cross tabulation of the topics and strategies that accounted for at least 5% of the total sample.

Reward strategies were most frequently used across all topics, with the exception of physical violence/corporal punishment, where there were no appeals using a reward strategy, as well as conflict with spouse, stress/anger management, showing affection, family history and relationship with spouse ($\chi^2 =307.7; p<0.001$). For the topics of ‘physical violence/corporal punishment’, ‘conflict with spouse’ and ‘stress/anger management’, the punishment strategy was the most prevalent with accounting for 40 - 50%. In other words the most frequently recalled argument regarding these topics was that failure to act as recommended was likely to result in an undesirable outcome.

Appeals that were related to the topics of ‘family history’ were most likely to use moral appeals than any other type. In other words, when recalling appeals related to that topic, the messages tended to focus on what was the right thing to do. Appeals regarding the topics of ‘showing affection’ and ‘relationship with spouse’ were distributed across a variety of compliance gaining strategies, with no one strategy emerging as the primary one. Strategies for these two topics included reward, punishment, positive expertise, negative expertise, morality, positive self feeling, positive altercasting, and negative esteem of others.
Table 8a: Cross-tabulation of Compliance Gaining Strategies by Topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CG strategy</th>
<th>Parental role</th>
<th>Male role</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Communication style</th>
<th>Communication content</th>
<th>Physical violence/ corporal punishment</th>
<th>Conflict with spouse</th>
<th>Stress &amp; anger management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>20 (37.0%)</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>8 (30.8%)</td>
<td>6 (31.3%)</td>
<td>14 (32.9%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2 (33.3%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>7 (13.0%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3 (11.5%)</td>
<td>2 (12.5%)</td>
<td>4 (15.4%)</td>
<td>8 (40.0%)</td>
<td>3 (50.0%)</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive expertise</td>
<td>6 (11.1%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3 (11.5%)</td>
<td>1 (6.3%)</td>
<td>2 (7.7%)</td>
<td>3 (20.0%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative expertise</td>
<td>8 (11.1%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6 (11.5%)</td>
<td>2 (12.5%)</td>
<td>1 (3.9%)</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aversive stimulation</td>
<td>2 (3.7%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 (3.9%)</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral appeal</td>
<td>3 (5.8%)</td>
<td>5 (19.2%)</td>
<td>2 (12.5%)</td>
<td>2 (3.9%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 (10.7%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive self feeling</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive alienation</td>
<td>7 (13.0%)</td>
<td>1 (3.8%)</td>
<td>1 (6.3%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative alienation</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive esteem of others</td>
<td>3 (6.6%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3 (11.5%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative esteem of others</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3 (11.5%)</td>
<td>3 (18.8%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8b: Cross-tabulation of Compliance Gaining Strategies by Topic (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CG strategy</th>
<th>Work issues</th>
<th>Shown affection</th>
<th>Time w/ children</th>
<th>Family History</th>
<th>Relationship w/ spouse</th>
<th>Education &amp; schoolwork</th>
<th>Housework</th>
<th>Self-awareness</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>2 (100.0%)</td>
<td>2 (18.2%)</td>
<td>8 (38.1%)</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
<td>1 (18.8%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 (33.3%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 (35.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (19.1%)</td>
<td>2 (12.5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
<td>1 (7.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive expertise</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (9.1%)</td>
<td>4 (25.0%)</td>
<td>1 (6.0%)</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
<td>5 (35.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative expertise</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (4.8%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aversive stimulation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral appeal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (18.2%)</td>
<td>3 (143%)</td>
<td>3 (42.8%)</td>
<td>4 (25.0%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
<td>1 (7.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive self feeling</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (9.1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (6.0%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive aftercasting</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (9.1%)</td>
<td>2 (28.6%)</td>
<td>1 (6.3%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative aftercasting</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (6.0%)</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive esteem of others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (4.8%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative esteem of others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (9.1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (6.3%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
<td>1 (7.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages do not total 100% because of rounding. Pearson chi-square=307.7; p<0.001.

Although chi-square analysis of this table (divided in two for presentation purposes) showed a statistically significant difference in proportions of strategies used across parenting topics, further analysis was conducted to verify the results.

Chi-square analysis is concerned with proportions, not frequencies. Thus, the validity of chi-square analysis is limited in tables that are very large or have a high number of
blank cells. A smaller table was used to streamline the test to assess whether compliance gaining strategies varied by topic. The smaller table included only the topics and compliance gaining strategies that accounted for at least 5% of the total sample. Table 8c presents these results.

**Table 8c**: Cross tabulation of Top 6 Compliance Gaining Strategies by Top 8 Topics (frequency, % within topic category)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 6 strategies</th>
<th>Paternal role</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Communication style</th>
<th>Communication content</th>
<th>Physical violence/corporal punishment</th>
<th>Spending time with children</th>
<th>Relationship w/spouse</th>
<th>Self awareness</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>20 (41%)</td>
<td>8 (35%)</td>
<td>5 (39%)</td>
<td>14 (64%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (44%)</td>
<td>3 (21%)</td>
<td>5 (42%)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>2 (15%)</td>
<td>4 (18%)</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
<td>4 (22%)</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive expertise</td>
<td>6 (12%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (11%)</td>
<td>4 (29%)</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative expertise</td>
<td>6 (12%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (17%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral appeal</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
<td>2 (15%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (17%)</td>
<td>4 (29%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive altercasting</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>0 (7%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages do not total 100% because of rounding; Pearson Chi-Square=47.93, p=0.071

Chi-square analysis with the reduced table does not support the findings of the larger table. It can be concluded that the statistical significance found with the larger table is due to error resulting from the large amount of cells that are empty or have a frequency below he expected number. Despite the lack of statistical significance, the reduced table also shows that reward strategies are the most likely appeal for all the leading topics except relationship with spouse and physical violence. Physical violence is more likely to use punishment strategies while ‘relationship with spouse’ had moral appeals and positive expertise as the most frequently used strategies.

Among the top strategies and topics, moral appeals were used in 21.7% of the appeals relating to discipline and positive expertise appeals accounted for 25% of appeals.
related to corporal punishment. Despite the difference in statistical significance between the large and reduced tables, the descriptive findings are the same. Reward appeals predominate for most of the topics with some notable exceptions, already discussed above.

**RQ2c: Do compliance gaining strategies differ when the targeted behavior is a cognitive act rather than an action?**

This research question considers whether certain strategies are more likely to be used to elicit observable behaviors rather than cognitive non-observable behaviors. As above, understanding how compliance gaining strategies are used to target specific types of behaviors reveals facilitators assumptions about participants cognitive mechanisms of behavior change.

Among all compliance gaining strategies, appeals that targeted adopting an action were about twice as prevalent as appeals targeting a cognitive change. The only strategies that were more likely to address cognitive behaviors than actions were positive altercasting and positive esteem of others, but there was no statistically significant difference in the distribution of appeal strategies across appeal goals. Thus, it suggests that strategy types should be targeted by topic, but not by whether the behavior targeted is an observable action or a cognitive act. Table 9 presents the cross tabulation of compliance gaining strategies and the type of behavior targeted.
Table 9: Cross-tabulation of Compliance Gaining Strategies by Type of Behavior Targeted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CG Strategy</th>
<th>Behavior Type</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Cognitive Behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>49 (62.0%)</td>
<td>30 (38.0%)</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>29 (74.4%)</td>
<td>10 (25.6%)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive expertise</td>
<td>17 (58.6%)</td>
<td>12 (41.4%)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative expertise</td>
<td>11 (50.0%)</td>
<td>11 (50.0%)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt</td>
<td>1 (100.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aversive stimulation</td>
<td>3 (50.0%)</td>
<td>3 (50.0%)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral appeal</td>
<td>15 (57.7%)</td>
<td>11 (42.3%)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive self feeling</td>
<td>2 (100.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive altercasting</td>
<td>6 (40.0%)</td>
<td>9 (60.0%)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative altercasting</td>
<td>1 (50.0%)</td>
<td>1 (50.0%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive esteem of others</td>
<td>3 (42.9%)</td>
<td>4 (57.1%)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative esteem of others</td>
<td>3 (75.0%)</td>
<td>1 (25.0%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None given</td>
<td>10 (91.1%)</td>
<td>1 (9.1%)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>150 (61.7%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>93 (30.3%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>243</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages do not equal 10 because of rounding. Pearson chi-square = 14.85; df=12; p=0.249 (NS)

**RQ2d: Do appeal strategies refer to third persons to gain compliance?**

This research question refers to third persons included in the behavior change appeals. This variable was coded to further describe the appeal strategies that included references to other family members, which may play a role in compliance messages given the interrelationships between the interests and goals of family members.

For those appeals that used punishment or reward strategies, an additional variable was coded to identify whose punishment or reward was stated or implied the appeal. This concept becomes particularly relevant in the context of a family violence intervention. As discussed earlier, the behaviors being promoted with compliance gaining messages pertain to the participant’s relationships with their children and spouses. When the appeal refers to the positive or negative esteem of
others, it is important to understand who those important others included in the compliance messages are. Similarly, when appeals talk about rewards and punishments, it is important to understand to what extent messages refer to personal rewards and punishments for the participants or if they include rewards and punishments for the participants’ loved ones. An example of the self as the referent for reward and punishment appeals is “help children be more organized to feel proud of your children”. An example of the target’s children as the referent would be “give them a good example (say 'good morning’, greet people) to give them good manners.”

Table 10 presents the breakdown of the different referents for all compliance gaining appeals using reward and punishment strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>Self (Frequency, % within CG Strategy)</th>
<th>Children (Frequency, % within CG Strategy)</th>
<th>Both self &amp; child(ren) (Frequency, % within CG Strategy)</th>
<th>Entire family (Frequency, % within CG Strategy)</th>
<th>Spouse (Frequency, % within CG Strategy)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>16 (20.3%)</td>
<td>38 (48.1%)</td>
<td>18 (22.8%)</td>
<td>6 (7.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>9 (23.1%)</td>
<td>22 (56.4%)</td>
<td>5 (12.8%)</td>
<td>3 (7.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>25 (21.2%)</td>
<td>60 (50.8%)</td>
<td>23 (19.5%)</td>
<td>9 (7.6%)</td>
<td>1 (0.8%)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages do not equal 10 because of rounding. Pearson chi-square= 2.27; df=4;p=0.685 (NS)

For all referents, reward strategies were approximately twice as likely as punishment strategies, except for the referent that included both self and children, where rewards were over three times more likely than punishment strategies. Children were the most frequent referents of reward and punishment appeals, accounting for 48.1% (n=38) of all reward appeal strategies and 56.4% (n=22) of all punishment strategies. The next most frequently cited referent was the self with
20.3% (n=16) of all reward strategies and 23.1% (n=9) of the punishment strategies. There was no statistically significant difference in the types of referents included in reward and punishment strategies. It is reasonable that children would be the most likely referents for both punishments and rewards in a program to change parenting behavior.

Referents were also coded for appeal strategies that evoked the positive or negative esteem of others. These are strategies that use a person’s desire to be liked by others. This analysis reveals facilitator assumptions about whose opinions participants are concerned with. Esteem strategies were used in only 11 appeals, or approximately 5% of all appeals reported. Not surprisingly, over 90% of these referred to the positive or negative esteem of their children. Table 11 presents the cross tabulation of referents for the 11 cases that used a positive or negative esteem appeals.

**Table 11: Cross-tabulation of referents by Positive and Negative Esteem Strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referent Esteem of others</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Spouse</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive esteem</td>
<td>7 (100.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative esteem</td>
<td>3 (75.0%)</td>
<td>1 (25.0%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10 (90.9%)</td>
<td>1 (9.1%)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages do not equal 10 because of rounding. Pearson chi-square = 1.925; df=1; p=0.165 (NS)

Examples of esteem appeals with referents of children include “Know how to apologize, know how to say ‘hey look, I made a mistake’ because you will win the admiration of your daughters” (positive esteem) and “Don’t make promises you are not going to keep so they don’t think you are lying to them” (negative esteem). There was no statistically significant difference in the distribution of references used
for positive and negative esteem appeals. In terms of frequency, all positive esteem appeals referred to the esteem of the target’s children. In other words, the appeals supported the proposed action or cognitive behavior to provoke positive feelings of the participants’ children toward them. Of the four negative esteem appeals, 3 justified the proposed behavior as a way to avoid negative esteem of the participants’ children, and one was aimed at preventing the negative esteem of the participants’ wife. This trend suggests that facilitators assume parents are concerned with the esteem of their children more than with that of any other third party, when it comes to parenting behaviors. However, further research is needed to confirm this.

Sources of Influence Underlying Compliance Gaining Strategies

Analysis of compliance gaining strategies provides a description of the behavior change messages used in Fatherhood groups. However, as discussed earlier, the different compliance gaining strategies are interrelated to the extent that they appeal to a smaller number of motivations for change. In order to look at these motivations for change, the next set of research questions considers the sources of influence that underlie the different compliance gaining strategies. The third set of research questions was concerned with classifying the appeals under Wheeless et al.’s (1983) three general domains of influence. These domains are conceptually related to Marwell & Schmitt’s (1967) compliance gaining strategies in that they are concerned with the motivation, or reason given for undertaking a behavior. While Marwell & Schmitt focus on specific message strategies, Wheeless et al. (1983) focus on what aspect of human nature is expected to elicit compliance. Understanding how sources of influence relate to parenting topics and behaviors types will provide a deeper
understanding of how compliance gaining messages are expected to work to change parenting behavior.

**RQ3a: What source of influence is most frequently used in compliance gaining appeals to change Fatherhood group participants’ behaviors?**

The overwhelming majority of the appeals recalled by participants (61.7%; n=150) used a logical cause-effect approach, basing their reasons on the consequences or expected outcomes of adopting the proposed behavior or attitude. The next most frequently cited source of influence was relationship/identification (17.3%; n=42). This group includes the appeals that invoked a person’s perceptions of their roles and responsibilities given their self-identification and their relationship to others. Another 11.5% (n=5) were appeals that invoked a person’s values or sense of duty as the main reason to adopt the proposed behavior. Approximately 10% of the sample could not be coded for this variable, either because none of the three influence domains applied, or because no reason was given to support the advocated behavior change. Table 12 presents the frequencies of each influence domain used in the compliance gaining appeals reported in the interview.
Table 12: Sources of Influence: Examples and Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence Domain</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectancies / consequences</td>
<td>“Be persistent with what you learn in the group, even if they criticize you, so that your wife will ‘get into shape’ and understand what you are learning”</td>
<td>150 (61.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Don’t scream at your children because screaming provokes more aggression“</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Don’t hit your children because they will not learn by hitting them”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Spend time with your children because you can’t turn back time and if you don’t realize it, they could already be in with a bad group of friends.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships / Identification</td>
<td>“Men should help their wives, … that doesn’t make us any less men.”</td>
<td>42 (17.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Treat children with love and affection, because … we live for them.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Don’t give her money every time she asks for it…we have to help our children lean to walk in this life.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values / Obligations</td>
<td>“Pay attention to your kids and spend time with them because work isn’t everything” (reflects a value system)</td>
<td>28 (11.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“You can’t correct and punish children the way you (the parent) think is pertinent … In the country we live now unfortunately the laws are too strict and they don’t let parents correct their kids because they call it abuse” (reflects an obligation to obey laws)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 (4.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR- no reason given</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 (4.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RQ3b: Do sources of influence vary across different Fatherhood topics?

This research question tests whether the sources of influence vary across the different parenting topics covered in the Fatherhood groups. This is important to understand how compliance gaining messages are expected to work for different topics.

The influence domains were cross tabulated with topics reported above, to determine whether some topics lend themselves more to certain kinds of influence domains than others. Sources of influence refer to power or motivation that is evoked to persuade
the target to adopt an action or cognitive behavior. Table 13 presents the results of the cross tabulation.

**Table 13: Cross-tabulation of Sources of Influence and Topics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Influence</th>
<th>Expectancies / Consequences</th>
<th>Values / Obligations</th>
<th>Relationships / Identification</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paternal role</td>
<td>37 (68.5%)</td>
<td>3 (5.5%)</td>
<td>13 (24.1%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male role</td>
<td>1 (50.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline strategies</td>
<td>13 (50.0%)</td>
<td>4 (15.4%)</td>
<td>4 (15.4%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication style</td>
<td>9 (56.3%)</td>
<td>3 (18.8%)</td>
<td>1 (6.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication content</td>
<td>24 (92.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (3.8%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical violence / corporal punishment</td>
<td>9 (60.0%)</td>
<td>4 (26.7%)</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict with spouse</td>
<td>5 (83.3%)</td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress &amp; anger management</td>
<td>6 (75.0%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work issues</td>
<td>2 (100.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing affection</td>
<td>4 (36.4%)</td>
<td>2 (2.18%)</td>
<td>2 (18.2%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending time with children</td>
<td>12 (57.1%)</td>
<td>1 (4.8%)</td>
<td>6 (28.6%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family history</td>
<td>3 (42.9%)</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
<td>2 (28.6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with spouse</td>
<td>5 (31.3%)</td>
<td>3 (18.8%)</td>
<td>7 (43.8%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; schoolwork</td>
<td>1 (50.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housework</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self awareness</td>
<td>11 (73.3%)</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8 (57.1%)</td>
<td>2 (14.3%)</td>
<td>2 (14.3%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>150 (61.7%)</td>
<td>28 (11.5%)</td>
<td>42 (17.3%)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>243 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages do not equal 10 because of rounding; Pearson Chi-square= 93.252; df=64; p=0.010
Expectancies and consequences were the predominant argument in appeals relating to all topics except relationship with spouse. For all the remaining topic categories, actions and cognitive behaviors are to be adopted because they are effective in bringing about a desired outcome or avoiding an undesirable one. Not surprisingly, among the most common topics, the relationship/identification influence domain was highly represented in appeals relating to paternal role, family history, spending time with children and relationship with spouse. This is reasonable since all three topics relate to the roles and expectations of being a parent and spouse.

The domain of values/obligations was most represented in the area of physical violence/corporal punishment, accounting for 26.6% within that topic category. It is interesting to note that physical punishment is discouraged not only because of its undesirable effects, but also because of moral values or societal obligations (such as the obligation to follow US laws).

**RQ3c: Do sources of influence vary when the CG gaining target is a cognitive behavior rather than an action?**

This final research question looks at whether the sources of influence are different for appeals aimed at actions and those aimed at cognitive behaviors. This question was included to determine whether there are different sources of influence at work in messages targeting different types of behaviors.

There was no statistically significant difference in the distributions of behavior type across different sources of influence. However, it is noteworthy that the influence domain of Relationship/Identification was almost equally distributed between action and cognitive behavior appeals. This influence domain is highly
represented in appeals that aim to change cognitive behaviors. This is reasonable because, as seen in some of the examples cited above, many of the appeals that fall in the cognitive behavior category call on the target to consider their relationship with others and to think about the kind of parent and spouse they want to be. Table 14 shows the distribution of influence domains across appeals targeting actions and appeals targeting cognitive behaviors.

**Table 14: Cross-tabulation of Sources of Influence and Type of Behavior Targeted**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence domain</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Cognitive Behavior</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectancies/consequences</td>
<td>93 (62.0%)</td>
<td>57 (38.0%)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values/obligations</td>
<td>18 (64.3%)</td>
<td>10 (35.7%)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship/identification</td>
<td>22 (52.4%)</td>
<td>20 (47.6%)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7 (58.3%)</td>
<td>5 (41.7%)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR- no reason given</td>
<td>10 (90.9%)</td>
<td>1 (9.1%)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>150 (61.7%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>93 (38.3%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>243</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages do not equal 10 because of rounding. Pearson Chi-square= 5.659; df= 4; p=0.226 (NS)

The next chapter will discuss the results presented in this chapter in light of the previous research and the larger context of family violence prevention.
Chapter 5

DISCUSSION

This study analyzed the compliance gaining appeals recalled by participants of the *Fatherhood* violence prevention parenting group. Applying compliance gaining concepts is a new approach to studying violence prevention. Focusing on the messages exchanged between facilitators and participants to motivate behavior change provides a deeper understanding of the motivations behind behavior change in CB-VP groups. This study departs from prior research on family violence by focusing on the specific messages used to achieve the changes targeted by the interventions. While prior research focused mainly on the attitudes associated with risk for family violence and intervention modalities to address the problematic attitudes and behaviors (Cahn, 1996; Piispa, 2004; Wood, 2001; Marshall, Weston & Honeycutt, 2000), this study looked at individual messages as recalled by participants. This is in line with other recent compliance gaining approaches to compliance gaining in health and educational settings (Burgoon, Pfau, Parrott, Birk, Coker & Burgoon, 1987; Jackson & Backus, 1982; Lustig & King, 1980; Miller, Boster, Roloff & Seibold, 1977, 1987; Sillars, 1980). While it would also be important to analyze actual compliance gaining messages with those recalled by the participants, it can also be argued that recalled messages better reflect how the compliance gaining messages were interpreted by the targets, and how they are likely to play a role in behavior change.
Discussion of Study Findings

Primary Topics not Focused on Violence

The first two research questions (RQ1a, RQ1b) tried to describe the kinds of behaviors targeted in Fatherhood groups by classifying compliance gaining appeals by topic. In a violence prevention parenting intervention, it would have been reasonable to expect that corporal punishment would be a frequent topic. However, it only accounted for 5.9% (n=15) of all the appeals.

The topic of communication style was more frequently cited (7.5%; n=19) than corporal punishment (5.9%; n=15). Appeals related to the topic of communication style referred to yelling, insulting and other aggressive communication. Among the messages that focused on communication style, 31.3% targeted a cognitive rather than physical behavior. Furthermore, 25% applied punishment or negative expertise strategies to elicit behavior change. Through these messages, participants were encouraged to think about aggressive communication as having a negative effect on children, and being ineffective to achieve desired results. By encouraging people through compliance gaining messages to address the underlying beliefs that lead to aggression, physical punishment and abusive yelling become secondary targets of the appeal, while the primary target is changing how they view these actions, and the expected results of these actions.

A qualitative reading of the compliance gaining messages in the Fatherhood groups suggest that the messages made people look at corporal punishment as a symptom of deeper problems, such as lack of anger control and stress management, rather than a primary problem in itself. This was implied in messages under several
different topics with statements about how to avoid “harming children” and “doing what our parents did to us”.

_Cognitive Behaviors as Compliance Gaining Goals_

Perhaps the most surprising finding in this study is that over 38% of the targeted behaviors were cognitive behaviors \((RQ1b)\). These include messages targeting cognitive behaviors urged participants to think, reconsider, reflect, remember, imagine, understand, or undertake other mental actions, rather than observable physical actions. This does not mean that facilitators were telling people how to think or introducing specific new beliefs. Facilitators were telling people what to think about, by suggesting that it was important to reflect on their beliefs about certain topics. This type of behavior is not typically what is considered the target of a compliance gaining appeal, which is mainly thought of as a way to get somebody else to _do_ something – or take an action. This raises the question of what is an action or behavior. As discussed in the literature review, behavior in this context – the reader will find a range of definitions in different disciplines – refers to the conscious and purposeful decision of engaging in a physical or mental act. Thus, for purposes of this study, the act of intentionally and purposefully thinking about, reflecting on, remembering and paying attention to something, constitutes a behavior.

Over a third of the messages exchanged in the _Fatherhood_ groups targeted the mental acts of thinking, reflecting and reconsidering current beliefs through compliance gaining appeals. Most contemporary theories of human behavior assume that humans are rational actors, and that they will engage in practical reasoning to
deliberate about their options and choose a course of action that is most likely to benefit them (Schick, 1991). Some of these include neoclassical economic theories (Vriend, 1996), decision theory (Clemen, 1996) and game theory (Luce & Raiffa, 1989), as well as widely used health behavior theories such as the Health Belief model (Becker, 1974), the transtheoretical model, based on stages of change (Prochaska & Velicer, 1997), and the Theory of Reasoned Action/Theory of Planned Behavior or TRA/TPB (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Ajzen, 1991). In neoclassical economic theory, humans are expected to act rationally so as to maximize their income or their utility; in game/decision theory humans will act to optimize their expected outcome faced with uncertainty and a set of given circumstances. In the health belief model, people will weigh the risks and benefits of an action in order to decide whether they will perform a behavior. The transtheoretical model assumes that people must transition from a state of pre-contemplation to a state of contemplation about a suggested behavior change before any actual change in behavior takes place. In TRA/TPB humans consider what they expect from the behavior and their assessment of the likelihood and severity of all possible outcomes, and then make the decisions that benefits them most.

The idea of humans as rational actors that weigh the possible outcomes of an action with the probability of those outcomes coming about has not been explicitly incorporated into compliance gaining research. However, based on the results of this study, it can be argued that in order to change behaviors based on deep rooted beliefs, it is first necessary to gain compliance for the act of thinking about one’s beliefs. This feature of human nature illustrates the overlap between using communication to
change attitudes and beliefs, and using compliance gaining messages to change behaviors. This approach considers an additional step in the traditional order of effects, which postulates that messages influence attitudes, which in turn influence behaviors. In this view, the behavior of thinking about the likely consequences of an act precedes any changes in beliefs or behaviors. Thus, reflecting on one’s belief about a behavior is an important precursor to behavior change. Based on this analysis, the Fatherhood groups provided participants with arguments – through compliance gaining appeals - to encourage them to think about the implications of their behavior as the first step in changing their behavior.

This is insightful to help develop message strategies for family violence prevention. In other words, getting people to align their goals, expectations and actions requires that they devote time to thinking about these. Thus, an important behavior for which CB-VP groups seek compliance for is the act of reflecting on these goals. This is the underlying logic behind most behavior change interventions based on contemporary theories such as the Health Belief Model, TRA/TPB and the transtheoretical model (formerly known as stages-of-change). These results bridge the understanding of compliance gaining as a mechanism to elicit behavior change, with other theories that incorporate practical reasoning into the process. The implication for violence prevention is that messaging cannot only focus on stopping violent behaviors and encouraging desirable parenting behaviors. Rather, messages must consider that behavior change is a multi-step process and compliance gaining strategies can be used to promote changes in attitudes and beliefs along the way. In
other words, compliance gaining strategies can be used to develop messaging within
violence prevention programs based on other theories of health behavior change.

*Deep-rooted beliefs about family roles*

The most common topic of the recalled appeals was the role of the father in
the family, or paternal role. RQ1c showed that 63% of the appeals related to the topic
of the parental role, were aimed at cognitive behaviors. These appeals did not focus
on the importance of the father, since in general participants already recognized they
had an important role to play as a parent. However, the messages they heard in the
groups made them think differently about what that role was. Emphasis changed
from being a provider and disciplinarian, to being a teacher, guide, and giver of
attention or affection. It is interesting that these topics arose out of compliance
gaining appeals in a violence prevention context. The message that participants
received was not only to do things differently, but also to think about their roles
differently, with the expectation that this would change their behavior. Again, this
relates to the order of effects in behavior change described above, where the act of
thinking or reflecting about one’s beliefs precedes any attitude or behavior change.

Thus, if the goal of the compliance gaining appeal is for people to think, the
compliance gaining strategies must provide arguments supporting the adoption of that
behavior – that is the behavior of thinking about one’s beliefs. This is an in line with
the cognitive behavioral approach to family violence prevention because it
emphasizes the idea that messages must not only focus on behaviors, but also
attitudes and beliefs about parenting roles and goals.
As with compliance gaining appeals that promote action, appeals that promote cognitive processes must use messages that motivate the target. People must be asked, through direct compliance gaining messages, to engage in the act of self reflection because it will fulfill their own motivations to maintain their self-concept, build their relationship with others, or act effectively (Cialdini & Trost, 1998).

This cognition to action step-wise process is not unique to violence prevention. The popular and effective 12-step programs for addiction recovery (VandenBos, 2007) require extensive self awareness and reflection. The first six of the twelve steps involve cognitive actions such as admit, believe, decide, and make a moral inventory (Alcoholics Anonymous, 2001). Similarly, batterer intervention programs encourage participants to reflect on gender roles, cultural perception of power, and think about the type of relationship they want (Villar & Orrego, 2008).

The findings of this study demonstrate that participants recall compliance gaining strategies that get them to think differently about family-violence issues for their own instrumental goals. As discussed earlier, violence in parenting is not generally a goal in itself, but rather a means to achieve a goal such as a child’s obedience or control of a situation. In this study, many – almost 40% – of the behavior change messages were aimed at preventing violence by reminding parents to be intentional about their parenting choices, so that their actions are conducive to their own instrumental goals. These messages promoted intentionality by encouraging reflection and internal debate. This comes back to the traditional compliance gaining function of eliciting a specific behavior. Except in this case the elicited behavior is not a parenting-related action, but the act of reflecting on their beliefs about family, parenting, and violence.
The compliance gaining messages that targeted cognitive actions did not necessarily promote the adoption of a specific belief, but the act of thinking about it.

This approach could be applied for violence prevention messaging not only in interpersonal settings, such as CB-VP groups, but also in the mass media. Violence prevention media campaigns tend to assume a moral consensus about what family violence is and the need to stop it. This study suggests that before proposing actions for people to change a problematic behavior, they must understand that it is problematic, and this understanding required thoughtful reflection. As with the behavior change theories cited above – Health Belief Model, TRA/TPB, Transtheoretical model – there must first be a process of contemplation and practical reasoning, even before attitude change can take place. This type of reflection is implicit, but not explicit in the Coaching Boys into Men campaign of the Family Violence Prevention Fund (FVPF). This campaign is aimed at adult men to serve as positive role models for boys with respect to their relationships with women. The campaign urges men to teach, be there, listen, talk, be a role model and join a group – all observable actions. However, there is no call to serious reflection and self-awareness. Again, there is assumed consensus about what constitutes healthy and non-violent relationship with women. A related FVPF campaign, Founding Fathers uses celebrity endorsements and messages such as “No More” and “Give Respect” without calling for cognitive actions to get people to understand and embrace the message before taking other action. Before requesting compliance about how to respond to a violent act, audiences should be encouraged to think about their position
on the issue. Messaging to get people to think can use the same appeals as messages to encourage people to act.

The next section focuses on RQ2a, which describes the types of compliance gaining strategies in the behavior change messages recalled by *Fatherhood* participants.

**Compliance Gaining Strategies**

The most common strategies used to elicit behavior change in the Fatherhood groups were reward and punishment strategies, followed by expertise appeals, moral appeals, and altercasting appeals (*RQ2a*). As discussed in the previous chapter, reward and punishment appeals focus on the expected outcome of the suggested behaviors, with the assumption that people will act to maximize rewards and minimize punishments. This supports the notion of parents as rational actors. In other words, facilitators use reward and punishment strategies because they expect parents to respond to these appeals.

Expertise appeals are based on beliefs about the nature of reality. The fact that facilitators used expertise appeals in 20% of the recalled messages indicates that they expect that parents want to be well informed. Expertise appeals count on people’s interest in being correct, and on the expectation that people base their actions on what they believe to be accurate and true.

The reporting of moral appeals and altercasting strategies demonstrates that facilitators also expect parents to be motivated by ideals of behavior. Moral appeal strategies capitalize on people’s internal value systems. According to the theory of cognitive dissonance discussed earlier in this paper (Festinger, 1959), people have a
need to be internally consistent and appealing to their values brings to light any inconsistencies between people’s actions and their values. Similarly, altercasting appeals highlight external value systems and social norms. Highlighting how people’s behaviors match up with what is considered a good or bad person is an important motivator for behavior. Compliance gaining appeals urging people to align their values, through the mental act of reflection, can generate a very strong motivation to reduce dissonance. Understanding not only the frequency of the appeal strategies, but how different strategies are used to elicit different types of parenting behaviors, helps explain the expected mechanisms of change.

The type of compliance gaining strategies used in the groups seemed to vary by topic (RQ2b), although these findings were not statistically significant (based on a reduced table that included only the top reported strategies and topics). Despite the lack of statistical significance, it there was a trend in the kinds of appeal strategies most likely used for certain topics in this sample. Appeals that had to do with communication content were more likely to be based on reward strategies than any other strategy. In other words, parents were most likely to recall messages that reminded them of the benefits of communicating with their children, spending time communicating and broadening the range of topics discussed. Compliance gaining messages related to discipline and spending time with children tended to be based on rewards or positive outcomes. Conversely, appeals relating to physical violence/corporal punishment were most likely to be based on punishment strategies. In this sample, highlighting the negative effects, or lack of desired effects of corporal punishment was a much more prevalent motivator than arguments based on morality.
Further research is needed in this area to see if this is supported with larger samples in different groups.

The appeal strategy used did not vary by the type of behavior targeted (RQ2c). All strategies were more likely to target actions than cognitive behaviors, with the exception of positive altercasting and positive esteem of others. Cognitive behaviors accounted for 60% and 57.1% of these two strategy categories, respectively. Although these deviations from the expected distribution did not result in statistical significance, it is interesting to note the possible relation between external value systems – which are reflected in both positive altercasting and positive esteem of others – and messages aimed at eliciting a mental behavior. However, there is not enough information in these results to elaborate on that point.

External value systems can refer to the interests and standards of third parties. This may include the interests and standards of experts, religious or institutional codes, or social norms such as cultural or community pressures to conform. In the context of parenting, it is important to see how the standards and interests of third parties influence compliance gaining messages. Specifically, children and spouses of participants are important third parties that are used as motivators for behavior change. The final research question pertaining to compliance gaining strategies (RQ2d) addresses how third parties are incorporated into behavior change appeals.

Referents: Blurred Distinctions between Self and Other

One of the factors that complicates discussions of family violence is that in the vast majority of cases, the parties have deep emotional ties with each other. They feel love for one another and genuinely desire the well being of the rest of the family
members. Thus, in the context of parenting, appeals that use the possibility of positive and negative outcomes are not limited to rewards and punishment to the appeal recipients, but also rewards and punishment to their children or spouses. Participants in this study cited rewards and punishments to their children twice as often as they cited reward and punishments to themselves. The outcome for the children will be perceived as a reward for the parent to the extent that the outcome fulfills the parent’s goals. This once again stresses the importance of understanding the compliance target’s motivations to select the most effective appeal.

The distinction between self and other is also present in appeals that use esteem as a motivator. Positive altercasting appeals refer to what “good” people do, assuming that people want to maintain a self-image that is consistent with certain standards. This refers to their own self-value or self-esteem. These kinds of appeals were the sixth most frequent type among the top eight strategies, accounting for 5.9% of all appeals. Appeals referring to the positive and negative esteem of others were the seventh and ninth most frequent, respectively. Participants were more likely to cite appeals referring to the esteem of their children than to anyone else.

Analysis of compliance gaining strategies in a parenting context is complicated by the intimacy shared between the parties involved, and the fact that their rewards and punishments are intertwined. This is a deviation from the traditional understandings of reward and punishment under Marwell & Schmitt (1967), which are concerned with rewards and punishments bestowed directly by the persuader to the persuadee (for example, in a sales situation a salesperson may promise the reward of a price discount in exchange for a purchase behavior).
Marwell & Schmitt do not provide a category for this type of ‘third party’ reward and punishment without. The only way to consider third parties would be to add categories or to code for a referent as was done in this study. In the case of the Fatherhood CB-VP parenting program the persuader (or facilitator) uses compliance gaining strategies to elicit behaviors towards a third party – children or spouses – which will be rewarded or punished by the behavior. This needs to be considered when crafting prevention messages related to family violence, but not from a naïve perspective based solely on altruism, but on logical reasoning based on expected rewards and punishments, and on children’s esteem of the parent.

Attitude and behavior research has identified the problematic cognitions and other risk factors associated with family violence. However, communication research is needed to translate the intended attitude and behavior changes into compliance gaining messages that will be most likely to be effective with target audiences. In this instance, research has shown how Fatherhood facilitators include references to third parties (namely participant children and spouses) in their compliance gaining messages. This detailed level of message analysis provides useful insight for violence prevention practice.

**Expected Consequences: Most Common Source of Influence**

The third set of research questions looked at larger categories of sources of influence (RQ3a-RQ3c). According to social influence research, people have three general motivations to change respond to influence appeals. These are managing the self concept, building and maintaining relationships, and acting effectively (Cialdini & Trost, 1998). These three motives correspond with the three sources of influence.
used in this study: consequences/expectancies (acting effectively), roles/relationships (with others), and values/obligations (self-concept). Understanding people’s motivations to hold attitudes about certain behaviors is important to develop messages aimed at behavior change. For example, if the goal is for parents to discipline by removing privileges rather than hitting, we must help them realize why they hold favorable attitudes towards hitting because a parent might think that corporal punishment is needed to demonstrate strictness and intolerance for bad behavior, while the image of strictness is important for their own self image as a good parent (values/obligations). If that is the case, messaging has to counter the link between corporal punishment and positive self image, and/or promote a link between removing privileges as a discipline tool and positive self image. In order to do that, they must first be encouraged to analyze why they hold those values. That is where compliance gaining plays a role in the attitude and behavior change process.

Similarly, if a parent holds a positive attitude towards a behavior (such as corporal punishment) because they believe that attitude leads to positive outcome for their children (outcomes/expectancies), then the prevention message must refute that link and argue for a link between the desired behavior (e.g. removing privileges) and positive outcomes for their children. While changing attitudes is within the scope of persuasion, it is not typically considered within the narrower concept of compliance gaining. However, the results of this study demonstrate that compliance gaining strategies are used to instigate attitude change by encouraging parents to reflect about their beliefs and attitudes that may be related to violent behavior. This supports the intentional and strategic use of compliance gaining messages in violence prevention
interventions that aim to modify violence related attitudes and beliefs. The following section discusses the sources of influence invoked in *Fatherhood* group messages, and how these sources of influence shed light on their motivations to engage in the proposed behaviors.

The third set of research questions analyzed the sources of influence found in the compliance gaining appeals reported by group participants. The most frequently cited strategies (61.7%) were not based on morality, personal responsibility, or social norms, but on whether the suggested action was going to result in a desirable outcome or would avoid an adverse outcome. One of the goals of CB-VP groups is to make participants understand that their violent behavior may result in outcomes that are contrary to their own goals. For example, respondents recalled appeals related to the negative outcomes of violent behavior, or the positive outcomes of nurturing behavior. Even messages that encouraged thinking, reflecting or paying attention, were often framed as having an instrumental goal.

Another type of logical appeal based on expected consequences had to with timing or windows of opportunity. Participants recalled messages that urged them to take action now, because later it would be too late, and they would be unable to control outcomes in their favor. Examples of this kind of appeal include: “Be affectionate with the people you love, because you don’t know if you’ll be able to do it later” and “Educate them correctly now; otherwise they will overpower you later.” These appeals imply that failure to change or adopt a behavior now (whether it was an observable behavior or a cognitive act) would have the negative impact of rendering them impotent in the future. This was a rationale cited in 9.5% of the
recalled appeals, or 15.4% of the appeals based on consequences/expectancies as the source of influence.

The influence domain based on consequences and expectancies was the predominant source for most topic categories (RQ3b). However, there were two exceptions, which resulted in statistically significant chi-square test of independent proportions. The topic of relationship with spouse was more likely (43.8%) to use arguments based on relationships and identification than any other source of influence. This suggests that appeals aimed at changing behaviors toward the spouse were based on the roles of the participant within the relationship, than on the expected outcomes of the behavior. The topic of housework, which only appeared twice as a primary topic, used appeals based on values /obligations and relationships/identification. In other words, none of the appeals cited future benefits of engaging in housework, and if they did, the participants did not recall them. There was no difference in the distribution of behavior types across influence domains (RQ3c). That is to say, the likelihood of addressing an action as opposed to cognitive behavior was the same across all sources of influence.

This level of description of the compliance gaining messages used in Fatherhood groups helps researchers and practitioners understand which appeals resonate with participants based on their recollection. From the research questions, it is possible to draw preliminary conclusions about the topics and behaviors addressed in these groups, the types of compliance gaining strategies used in general and for different topics, and the sources of influence used to motivate behavior change. The findings discussed in this chapter provide a useful description of the messages being
exchanged by facilitators and participants, but they also generate questions for future research.

Study Limitations and Challenges in Family Violence Prevention Research

One important limitation of this study is the small sample size of 24 interviews. These 24 participants were all recruited from a limited number of Fatherhood groups that were being implemented during the time of the study. Given the scope and exploratory nature of this study, the small size is justified. However, the ability to generalize to a larger population may be limited.

The purely quantitative nature of the data analysis also presents some limitations. Using a pre-determined set of categories such as the Marwell & Schmitt (1967) taxonomy of compliance gaining strategies provides a useful framework to describe compliance gaining message content. However, it also forces a choice between possibly overlapping categories. This is an inherent feature of categorical coding. Given the exploratory goals of the study, and the innovative approach to the subject matter, this methodology was justified to make preliminary links between empirical data and existing theoretical paradigms.

A final concern is related to the larger issue of family violence treatment and prevention. The theories of behavior and attitude change cited in this paper are based on the premise of practical reasoning where people act in such a way to maximize the benefit to themselves or their loved ones. However, there is a proportion – exact percentages are not known – of perpetrators of family violence that are sociopaths who are not susceptible to cognitive interventions and are most likely beyond rehabilitation. It is the responsibility of all family violence prevention practitioners
and researchers to understand that these strategies will not be effective for all perpetrators. In some cases, removal and/or incarceration is the only way to keep the family safe. While this issue is beyond the scope of the present study, it is an important factor in any discussion of family violence prevention.

**Study Contribution**

The present study contributes two important ideas to the discussion of family violence prevention through communication interventions. First, that compliance gaining appeals can target not only changes in violence-related behaviors, but also – and perhaps most importantly – encourage people to engage in thinking and reflection to increase self awareness. With so many conflicting messages about proper parenting and relationships with loved ones, many people hold beliefs and engage in behaviors that may not be aligned with their own personal goals. Convincing people that thinking about family roles, their own parenting goals and how their actions further or hinder these goals is an important step in the process. It may not enough to tell people what their roles and behaviors should be, but as the findings of this study suggest, people remember appeals encouraging them to ponder these issues.

A second important idea that arises from this study is that even in an emotion-ridden topic such as parenting, people are most receptive to messages that are likely to produce their desired outcomes or prevent undesirable ones. Appeals based on relationships, morality or obligations were not as frequently recalled as appeals that referred to the consequences of their behavior. Even in their roles as parents, participants have instrumental goals and respond to messages that are based on logical cause-effect arguments. Participants remembered appeals that told them what
positive effects would result from them engaging in that behavior. This was the case even for appeals calling for cognitive behaviors such as thinking, remembering or paying attention. Compliance gaining is about using communication appeals to get others to behave in a certain way. Family violence prevention practitioners need to be aware of people’s different motivations to change their behavior in order to select the best compliance gaining strategies.

As discussed in the justification for this study, cognitive behavioral groups are now the most commonly used intervention to change behaviors among families at risk for violence. These groups use psychoeducational presentations, group discussions and dialogue to encourage behavior change among participants. Through these communication strategies, participants receive messages intended to persuade them to adopt certain behaviors.

The messages delivered by group facilitators provide arguments or reasons for people to comply with the suggested behavior change. Compliance gaining focuses specifically on why a person should change a behavior. Compliance gaining theory proved useful to study the messages exchanged between facilitators and participants in these groups, and provided a systematic framework to identify the topics and types of appeals used in the groups. The results of this study provided useful insights into people’s motivations to change behaviors in a violence prevention cognitive behavioral parenting group.

*Implications for Future Research*

Having identified the most frequently recalled compliance gaining messages used in violence prevention *Fatherhood* groups, the next step would be to conduct
surveys to assess the satisfaction and likelihood to comply with the different types of appeals among different types of participants. This kind of research would help develop message strategies not only for CB-VP groups, but also to optimize prevention messaging in the mass media. Most media campaigns aimed at family or intimate violence prevention focus on identifying violence and what to do about it. Studies about violence prevention messages typically focus on the medium (Tucker, Barone, Stewart, Hogan, Sarnelle, & Blackwood, 1999) or on audience response to violence prevention messages (Borzekowski & Poussaint, 1999; Kellermann, Fuqua-Whitley, Rivara, & Mercy, 1998). Studying message efficacy at the interpersonal level, as in CB-VP groups, can shape the content of mass media campaigns, which is often atheoretical and focused mainly on raising awareness.

The compliance gaining appeals that were the units of analysis for this study were based on recalled accounts of group participants, not on the actual compliance gaining messages delivered by facilitators. In this case, it was not possible to compare the recalled appeals with the actual appeals communicated by the facilitator in the group. *Fatherhood* facilitators and administrators did not agree to tape recording of the sessions citing concerns that it would inhibit the group members’ participation, and negatively affect the educational process and the group dynamics. However, it would be useful to see how recalled accounts compare to actual messages delivered. Most of what is known about the content of CB-VP groups comes from the curricula on which the groups are based, or on the accounts of the facilitators. Since the purpose of this research is to ensure that these groups apply communication effectively to bring about behavior change, it would be important to compare the
intentions of the planners and facilitators with the messages taken away by the participants.

Although not the main thrust of this study, the findings add to the literature on family violence by describing the perceptions of parenting roles among parents in Hispanic communities. Cultural norms play an important role in violence prevention messages. Several of the present study’s findings raise questions for intercultural research. Definitions of violence as it relates to verbal aggressiveness and corporal punishment vary greatly by culture. In addition, intercultural research is needed to continue exploring the role of third party referents. The influence of children and family members in compliance gaining messages may be different in individualistic cultures than collectivist cultures that are more “other-oriented.” Furthermore, the finding that compliance gaining messages encouraged parents to reconsider their parenting roles requires careful consideration by both researchers and practitioners. Changing one person’s attitudes and behavior may put them at odds with their culture, family and peers. Qualitative research is needed to find optimal ways to communicate violence prevention messages in a culturally competent manner. Further cross-cultural research is needed to understand the most appropriate and effective message strategies to use in different contexts. Cognitive behavioral violence prevention interventions need to be tested and evaluated in multicultural and multiethnic groups, since most interventions have been designed by and for non-Hispanic whites.

Another area for future research on compliance gaining in family violence prevention is cultural factors that affect reactions to compliance gaining appeals. All
participants in this study were of Hispanic ethnicity and immigrated to the United States from another country. While not related to the research questions, cultural beliefs underlie the data in this study. Cultural factors linked to ethnicity, such as communicative aggression, gender roles, and beliefs about authority have been found to predict risk for family violence (Cai and Fink, 2002; Galanti, 2003; Vandello, 2003). With the proportion of ethnic minorities rising within the US population, cultural factors associated with religion, immigration issues and marginalization from mainstream society may influence the appropriateness of violence prevention messages and the sources of influence evoked in compliance gaining messages addressed to them. This is important not only for reasons of culture and language, but also because of the added pressures that come with immigration and the different levels of acculturation within the same family and how this affects attitude toward violence.

Research studies like this one that focus on the message factors in violence prevention interventions add to the ongoing worldwide discussion about family violence prevention. Both the U.S. Centers for Disease Control Prevention and the World Health Organization have highlighted the importance improving parenting skills as one of the first steps of violence prevention (see Positive Action for Parents campaign at www.cdc.gov/ncipc/dvp/pafp.htm and the recommendations from WHO World Report on Violence and Health at ww.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/). However, there is insufficient analysis on the communication processes that lead to cognitive and behavior changes related to parenting roles. This line of research is
important to complement the ongoing research on prevalence and patterns of family violence, as well as research on intervention modalities.
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*EnFamilia* Letter of Agreement
February 29, 2007

Victoria Orrego-Dunleavy, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator
University of Miami
P.O. Box 248127
Coral Gables, FL 33124-2105

Re: UM Protocol # 20053305

Dear Dr. Orrego,

We have reviewed the protocol for the research project titled: “Qualitative interviews with participants and facilitators of cognitive behavioral group interventions.” I am writing to affirm the cooperation of enFAMILIA with the University of Miami on this interview study. I understand that you will be interviewing enFAMILIA group facilitators and participants as part of this project.

We are pleased to collaborate with you and Maria Elena Villar on this research project (UM protocol # 20053305). It is our hope that this project will provide valuable insight into the relationship between group communication and attitude change.

We appreciate your interest and support and look forward to beginning this exciting project with you.

Sincerely,

Rocio Tafur-Salgado, MS
Co-Director

Carlos Salgado, MFA
Co-Director
APPENDIX B

Informed Consent Form and Recruitment Flier
Informed Consent
Qualitative interviews with participants and facilitators of group programs

You are being asked to participate in a research study because you are either a participant or a facilitator of a BIP (batterer intervention program) group.

**Purpose of the Study**
The purpose of the research is to get your perceptions about the goals of CB groups and the likely effect that they have on people’s attitudes and behaviors. The curriculum used for CB programs is aimed at changing attitudes that are linked to certain behaviors, and to help people engage in healthier behaviors. This study explores the question of how CB groups achieve this.

**Study Procedures**
Approximately 40 participants and 10 facilitators will be included in this study. If you agree to participate in the study, we will begin an interview based on a list of questions related to the study. The interview will last about 1-hour, and will be tape-recorded. If you agree to be interviewed, you are also agreeing to have it tape recorded. A research assistant will transcribe the interview tapes. No identifying information (such as names, the time and place of your group, etc.) will be included in the transcripts. Once the interviews have been transcribed, the tapes will be destroyed to protect your confidentiality. Then all the interview transcripts will be analyzed together. Study findings will be reported in a research paper and will be used to give feedback to program managers.

**Risks**
Some of the questions you will be asked might make you feel uncomfortable. You can choose not to answer any of these questions.

**Benefits**
There are no direct benefits to you for participating in this study. Your participation will provide input to the planners of these services and may benefit future CB participants.

**Right to withdraw**
Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. Refusal to participate will involve no penalty to you, and will not be reported to the courts, the group facilitator or supervisor. You may discontinue participation at any time without penalty to you. Even if you consent to participate, the Principal Investigator may decide that you cannot participate in the study.

**Costs**
There are no costs to you for participation in the study.

**Compensation**
If you are a group participant, you will receive $20 in cash after completion of the 1-hour interview. If you are a facilitator, you will receive a gift with a value of $5 in appreciation for your time.

**Confidentiality**
Protecting your confidentiality is very important. Your responses will not be reported to your supervisor, your group facilitator, your probation officer, or any officer of the courts. Findings will be reported in aggregate (combined) format only, as a research report. No identifying information will be linked to your interview transcript, and the audiotape of your interview will be destroyed after it is transcribed. The transcript will not include any information that could be used to link your responses to you, such as names, times, dates and locations. The informed consent form will be the only document identifying you as a study participant; these forms will be kept in a locked cabinet in the offices of the principal investigator at the University of Miami.

The investigators and their assistants will consider your records confidential to the extent permitted by law. Your records may also be reviewed for audit purposes by authorized University of Miami employees, The Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), or other agents who must follow the same rules of confidentiality.

**Study findings**
You can request a copy of the study report by contacting the principal investigators about a year after your interview.

**Important contact information**
If you have questions about the study, please contact the principal investigators. Victoria Orrego can be reached at 284-3052. Maria Elena Villar can be reached at 305-284-2139. You can also reach them by mail at P.O. Box 248127, Coral Gables, FL 33124-2105.

If you have questions about your rights as a research subject, please contact the University of Miami Human Subjects Research Office, 1500 NW 12th Avenue, Ste. 1000, Miami, FL 33136
Tel. 305-243-3195

---

**Signature**

The study has been explained to me and I agree to participate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Please print)</th>
<th>Person Obtaining Informed Consent/Witness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We want to know your opinion!!!!

We are conducting interviews with people who are participating in the groups provided by this agency.

Have you participated in at least 4 group sessions?

Would you like to share your opinions about the group process?

Your input will help researchers who are studying the effectiveness of these groups.

We want to know what you think!

We need to talk to you in person for about one hour, and will pay you $20 for your time. Interviews will be scheduled at a time and location convenient to you.

Call Maria Elena at 305-284-2139 or 305-989-2732 for more information.
APPENDIX C

Interview Schedule
Interview Schedule (2007)

Ice breakers
1. What do people talk about in the group? What are the main topics that are covered? What does the group facilitator want from you (the group participants)?
2. Can you give me an example of something that you discussed in this group? Can you think of any more examples?

If necessary prompt for:
Role of the father in the family / Role of men in society
- Discipline at different stages of child development
- Addressing conflict in the family / with children / with spouse
- Handling stress at home / at work
- Importance of nurturing behaviors / spending time with family

Note to interviewer: Prompt for at least 3 topics. If more than 5 topics are raised, ask participant to identify the five most important topics.

Messages to Change Attitudes and Behaviors
3. What does the facilitator say to get you to think about (topic discussed in group identified in Question 2)? Can you give specific examples?

Probing questions: What else was said about this? Can you think of another example?

4. Have you changed the way you think about (repeat topic being discussed) because of your participation in this group? Please give examples of what was said in the group that convinced you to change the way you think.

Probing questions: What else was said about this? Can you think of another example?
- What motivated you to change?

5. Is there anything that you do differently related to (repeat topic being discussed) because of this group? Please give examples of what was said in the group that convinced you to change the way you act.

Probing questions: What else was said about this? Can you think of another example?
- What motivated you to change?

Note to interviewer: Repeat Questions 3-5 for each topic raised in Q2.

Closing Questions
6. What do you think is the purpose of these groups? Please explain.
7. Do you think these groups work? Why or why not? What do they actually achieve? Please explain.
8. What has been the best thing about the group?
9. Is there anything about the group that you would change?
10. Is there anything you would like to add about what we’ve talked about today?
APPENDIX D

Code Book
There are three essential concepts in content analysis: Sampling Unit, Unit of Analysis and Codes.

**Sampling Unit**

In this study the sampling unit is the interviewee. There will be a total of 25 interviewees.

**Unit of Analysis**

The unit of analysis is what or who is studied. In this study we are studying compliance gaining messages exchanged in the Fatherhood groups as they are recalled by interviewees. For purposes of this study, a compliance gaining appeal was defined as a message that was exchanged during the Fatherhood group sessions, as recounted by the interviewee, that had the purpose of influencing a particular behavior.

To be considered a separate unit of analysis, a full compliance gaining message had to include a recommended behavior or action, and a reason to support the behavior. If a single proposed behavior is accompanied by more than one reason, these are divided into separate units of analysis. Similarly, if more than one behavior is justified by a single reason, these are considered multiple units of analysis.

When you identify a compliance gaining appeal, you are to underline it and number it. This will assign a unique ID number to each individual appeal. If there is a attempt to gain compliance, but there is no clear reason to justify the behavior, underline and number it also.

**Coding**

You will code directly on the coding sheet provided. After you have received the list of appeals, you will proceed to code each appeal on the coding sheet provided. Be careful to insert the correct ID numbers in the coding sheet, since this is the only way to link your codes to the correct appeal. You are to code six variables on for each appeal: (a) Direction of Appeal, (b) Behavior type, (c) Topic, (d) Source of Influence, and (e) Strategy type. In some cases where the strategy type includes a referent, a seventh variable may be coded: (f) referent (only if applicable). Each variable is defined below and followed by descriptions of each coding category.
CODES

Direction of appeal refers to whether the compliance gaining message tried to persuade the participant to adopt a behavior/attitude or avoid a behavior/attitude. The coding categories for this variable are defined in Table 1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>endorsement</td>
<td>Appeal endorses a particular attitude or behavior. It promotes the behavior; encourages subject to do or think about something in a certain way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>deterrence</td>
<td>The appeal tries to deter or prevent a particular attitude or behavior. It encourages subject NOT TO do or think about something in a certain way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Behavior type refers to whether the intent of the appeal is to change an attitude or a behavior. If it does not fit into any of the categories, it does not fit the criteria for inclusion as an appeal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Appeal Goal</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Observable action</td>
<td>When appeal is aimed at changing a behavior or action. It does not include purely mental or cognitive behaviors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cognitive behavior</td>
<td>When appeal is aimed at thought processes. It includes appeals for engaging in state of reflection or thinking process, which does not include a specific action or behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Topic refers to the global subject of the turn at talk in which the appeal is mentioned. Specifically it refers to the subject of the Fatherhood groups to which the appeal is related. This is one variable where we expect a moderate number of appeals to fall under #6 or ‘Other’ category. The first five categories were chosen because they were reported by facilitators as the key violence prevention topics discussed in the groups, but participants will surely report a broader range of topics. Make sure to write in the topic in the code sheet when you select code #6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Paternal role</td>
<td>Attitudes and behaviors having to do with the role of fathers in a family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male role</td>
<td>Attitudes and behaviors having to do with the role of men in society or an intimate relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Disciplinary strategies</td>
<td>Attitudes and behaviors having to do with how to handle children’s desirable and undesirable behavior, including incentives and punishments (not including corporal punishment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Communication style</td>
<td>Attitudes and behaviors having to do with the tone, volume and intent of communication with others. Includes references to yelling, screaming, and clarity of communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Communication content</td>
<td>Attitudes and behaviors having to do with the type and quality of communication with others. This refers to the content, and also the quantity of communication, and may include devoting time specifically for communication, asking questions, sharing personal stories, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Physical violence / corporal punishment</td>
<td>Attitudes and behaviors having to do with physical violence including hitting, punching, kicking, slapping, beating or any other kind of physically violent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
act against a child, spouse or any other person. Includes corporal punishment.

7 Conflict with spouse  Attitudes and behaviors having to do with handling conflict with the spouse of parenting partner. It includes strategies to resolve or deal with conflict.

8 Conflict with children  Attitudes and behaviors having to do with handling conflict with the participant’s children. It includes strategies to resolve or deal with conflict.

9 Conflict with others  Attitudes and behaviors having to do with handling conflict with people outside the family unit. It includes strategies to resolve or deal with conflict.

10 Stress (& anger)  Attitudes and behaviors having to do with how the participant deals with stress, and the effects of stress. Stress includes feeling pressured, tired, nervous, angry – or other related feeling. It includes strategies to relieve stress and anger.

11 Work issues  Attitudes and behaviors related to the participant’s job or professional situation, including the challenges of balancing work and family life.

12 Financial issues  Attitudes and behaviors related to finances, including how to spend money and giving money to children.

13 Other stress  Attitudes and behaviors related to other kinds of stress of stressful conditions. (PABLO-NOT USED)

14 Showing affection  Attitudes and behaviors related to showing affection to others, both verbally and non-verbally. It includes references to hugging, saying “I love you”, or sharing other positive emotions.

15 Spending time with children  Attitudes and behaviors having to do spending quality time with their children and accompanying them in their activities.

16 Cultural background  Attitudes and behaviors related to the person’s cultural background. Cues include references to home country or Hispanic culture.

17 Family Background  Attitudes and behaviors related to a person’s family background. This includes references to their own parents, family customs and how they were brought up.

18 Relationship with spouse  Attitudes and behaviors related to the participant’s positive relationship with spouse (distinct from code # 7 conflict with spouse).

19 Schoolwork & education  Attitudes and behaviors related to education, including references to the relative importance of education, beliefs about education, children’s homework, and relationship with children’s school.

20 Other  Any topic that does not fit into any of the preceding categories.

21 Housework  Attitudes and behaviors related to doing housework, helping the spouse with housework, etc. Housework includes cleaning, cooking, washing, etc.

22 Self-awareness  Attitudes and behaviors related to the participant’s self knowledge. This includes messages that promote analysis of one’s own thoughts and behaviors, reflection and self analysis.

**Influence domain** refers to the logical reasoning used to justify the requested behavior or attitude. Codes for appeal reasoning include cause-effect, righteousness, and roles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Appeal type</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Expectancies/Consequences</td>
<td>Appeals that justify an attitude or behavior because of it’s expected outcome or effect. (what works). This includes references to doing something when it is possible to do it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Values/Obligations</td>
<td>Appeals that justify a behavior because it is the right (or wrong) thing to do or because it conforms with internal or external rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Identification/Relationships</td>
<td>Appeals that justify a behavior because of people’s roles &amp; responsibilities in life, society, family, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Appeals that do not fall under any of the preceding categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>No reason given</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategy type** refers to which of Marwell & Schmidt’s (1967) compliance gaining strategy best applies to the appeal.

**Table 6: Strategy Type Categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Strategy Type</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>Offering a reward in exchange for compliance. Reward will be given to target by the speaker.</td>
<td>&quot;I'll throw in a pair of speakers if you buy it today.&quot; &quot;I'll make certain your manager knows how helpful you were.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>Threatening a punishment if there is no compliance. Reward will be given to target by the speaker.</td>
<td>&quot;If you don't buy it today, I won't be able to offer you this special incentive price again.&quot; &quot;If I can't get it at that price tomorrow, then I'll take my business elsewhere.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Positive Expertise</td>
<td>Agent speaks as an authority on the subject. Speaker refers rewards that will occur if target does X, because of the nature of reality. There is an assumption that the speaker knows this because of his/her expertise.</td>
<td>&quot;If you start working out at our gym regularly, you'll find that people are more attracted to you physically.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Negative Expertise</td>
<td>Agent speaks as an authority on the subject. Speaker refers to punishments that will occur if target does X, because of the nature of reality. There is an assumption that the speakers knows because of his/her expertise.</td>
<td>&quot;If you don't buy it today, you may never get another chance--our stock is almost sold out.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Liking, Ingratiation</td>
<td>Speaker seeks affinity with the target, getting them into a good frame of mind.</td>
<td>&quot;Gosh you look nice today. I just love that hat you're wearing! Should we order dessert before we look over the contracts?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gifting, Pre-giving</td>
<td>Giving something as a gift, before requesting compliance. The idea is that the target will feel the need to reciprocate later.</td>
<td>&quot;Here's a little something we thought you'd like. Now about those contracts . . .&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Debt</td>
<td>Calling in past favors.</td>
<td>&quot;After all I've done for you! Come on--this time it's me who needs the favor.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Aversive Stimulation</td>
<td>Continuous punishment, and the cessation of punishment is contingent on compliance.</td>
<td>&quot;I'm going to play my classical music at full volume if you insist on playing your rock music at full volume. When you turn yours down, I'll turn mine down.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Moral Appeal</td>
<td>This tactic entails finding moral common ground, and then using the moral commitments of a person to obtain compliance.</td>
<td>&quot;You believe that women should get equal pay for equal work, don't you? You don't believe that men are better than women, do you? Then you ought to sign this petition! It's the right thing to do.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Positive Self-feeling</td>
<td>You'll feel better if you X.</td>
<td>&quot;If you join our club today, you'll feel better about yourself because you'll know that you're improving every day.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Negative Self-feeling</td>
<td>You'll feel bad if you Y.</td>
<td>&quot;If you don't return it to him and apologize, you'll find it hard to live with yourself.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Positive Altercasting</td>
<td>Good people do X.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Smart people tend to sign up for the year in advance, because that's how they can get the best weekly rate.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Negative Altercasting</td>
<td>Only a bad person would do Y.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;You're not like those bad sports that whine and complain when they lose a game.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>Do-Me-A-Favor. Appeals to the generosity of the target.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I really need this photocopied right away, can you help me out?&quot; (An extremely common influence tactic and in wide use among friends and acquaintances).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Positive Esteem of Others</td>
<td>Other people will think more highly of you if you X.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;People resepect a man who drives a Mercedes.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Negative Esteem of Others</td>
<td>Other people will think worse of you if you Y.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;You don't want people thinking that you're a drug-head loser, do you?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Referent** This code was added to shed light on 4 specific strategy types that are related to others. This will be coded only for appeals coded as one of the following: 1-reward, 2-punishment, 15- positive esteem of others, or 16- negative esteem of others.

Table 7: Referent categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Punishment or reward is only for the participant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2    | Kids       | Punishment or reward is only for the participant’s children.  
|       |            | OR Participant is concerned with esteem of his/her children.               |
| 3    | Self & kids | Punishment or reward is for the participant’s children and for him/herself. 
|       |            | *Does not include appeals that refer to entire family.*                    |
| 4    | Family     | NOTE: Family here refers to the family as a whole or the concept of family in general.  
|       |            | Punishment or reward is only for the participant’s family.  
|       |            | OR Participant is concerned with esteem of his/her family.                |
| 5    | Spouse     | Punishment or reward is only for the participant’s spouse or intimate partner.  
|       |            | OR Participant is concerned with esteem of his/her spouse or intimate partner. |
| 6    | Other      |                                                                             |
APPENDIX E

Code Sheet
## CODING SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appeal #</th>
<th>direction of appeal</th>
<th>Behavior Type</th>
<th>topic primary (see code book)</th>
<th>topic secondary (see code book)</th>
<th>outcome frame</th>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>strategy type (see code book)</th>
<th>Referent</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>