PIECES

Data sources related to violence against children:
PIECES Policy Paper #2

Contents

Introduction

Violence against children, including physical violence, sexual violence, emotional violence, and neglect, is a violation of children's rights. Article 19 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child calls for legislative, administrative, social and educational actions to protect children from all forms of violence and abuse (UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), 1989). Article 19 implicitly assumes that the maltreatment of children is a preventable phenomenon and it is a State's responsibility to address this child phenomenon through a comprehensive approach, including implementation of data collection systems and monitoring of the phenomenon. This landmark document served as a reference for the Charter on Fundamental Rights of the EU, Article 24 on the rights of the child, which ensures visibility and respect for child rights within EU law (Charter on Fundamental Rights of the EU, 2000) and influenced the EU Agenda for the rights of the child (EU Agenda for the rights of the child, (COM/2011/0060 final)). The Committee for the Rights of the Child General comment No. 13 in 2011 recognized that measures to end child violence must be massively strengthened and expanded in order to effectively deal with the pervasive problem. The report highlights the governmental obligations to establish policies, programmes, monitoring and oversight systems required to protect the child from all forms of violence. This includes, for example 'Establishing a comprehensive and reliable national data collection system in order to ensure systematic monitoring and evaluation of systems (impact analyses), services, programmes and outcomes based on indicators aligned with universal standards, and adjusted for and guided by locally established goals and objectives at the national and sub-national government levels' (CRC General Comment No.13, 2011).

Yet, children who are exposed to violence or victims themselves still remain largely invisible and many are undetected in families in which such violence occurs (DG Justice and Consumers, 2015).

In response to the growing awareness of the harm done to children exposed to violence and full recognition of children as rights-holders, a wide range of services exist throughout Europe to provide interventions. Children and their families affected by violence use health care, child welfare, mental health, and law enforcement agencies, as well as the courts and community-based services. Each service generates its own data using different definitions and classifications within and between programs, at the local or regional level and only a small portion of data tend to be gathered at the national level. We recognize that these services reach only a small percentage of children exposed to violence. For example, in France a representative survey (Contexte de la sexualité en France) of women found that 27% of women interviewed reported being victims of sexual abuse as children, but only 2.7% of children are currently identified as being victims of sexual abuse through child protection services; the discrepancy in numbers may also be related to the difference in time frame and the fact that sexual abuse may be reported to the police directly and not to child protection services—nonetheless the difference remains (Guyavarch, 2008). This finding has been found in other reports suggesting a ten-fold difference between official data and those reported in surveys (Sethi et al., 2013).

Thus, there exists the problem of difficulty in identifying violence, especially in the family, and a lack of harmonization of data definitions and classifications between the many service providers. Furthermore, children lack the skills to communicate the trauma they are suffering and few professionals have the skills to identify child victims (Sethi et al., 2013). Also, many professionals are reticent to report a suspicion of violence towards a child due to the stigma attached for the family. Other factors impacting reporting include age, culture, religion, accessibility of health care and difficulty involved in the identification of child violence-- the continuum from 'accident' to maltreatment (MacKay and Vincenten, 2014; UNICEFa, 2014; UNICEFb, 2014).

Nonetheless, researchers rely on these data to investigate the prevalence and incidence of children exposed to violence and the impact of resilience and risk factors. This knowledge is shared with policy makers and practitioners to fund and design interventions to tackle this complex problem.

To further explore the state of current data systems, an in-depth investigation of existing data sources (national administrative databases, registries, and survey data) related to violence against children across the EU was included as part of the project 'Policy Investigation in Europe on Child Endangerment and Support (PIECES)'. PIECES is a two year initiative led and coordinated by the European Child Safety Alliance in partnership with experts in Austria, England, France, Lithuania, Romania and Spain, whose purpose is to conduct in-depth investigations of six policy areas in violence against children (VAC) in EU Member States provide a better understanding of how those policies are being implemented, monitored and evaluated with the intent of assisting in further defining good practice in the field (see Appendix 1 for a full description of the PIECES project).

This report presents a summary of findings from Policy area 2, which examined data sources related to violence against children.

Rationale and Objectives

The rationale for investigating data sources related to violence against children is simply that data drives policy (UNICEFa 2014) and epidemiological data are necessary for taking action and generating evidence (DG Justice and Consumers, 2015; Sethi et al., 2013). By this we mean that professionals working in the field, researchers studying the problem and policy makers proposing interventions to reduce the problem all require sound data upon which to base decision-making. This is especially relevant in times of economic crisis when Member States have difficult decisions to make regarding allocation of resources to public health and social welfare programs. Furthermore, increasingly policy making is taking place at the European level through the European Commission with decisions affecting all Member States. It is crucial that data are available throughout the European Union and that they are harmonized so comparisons are possible (Butchart et al., 2006; Council of Europe, 2014; Council of Europe, 2009).

The objectives of this working paper are:

- To map information in the European Union Member States plus Norway on national level data related to violence against children covering all forms of neglect, physical violence, sexual and psychological/emotional abuse, inside and outside the family, as well as on self-harm and suicide as potential outcomes of violence against children and indirectly affected due to exposure to violence in within the family

- To analyse, synthesise and provide recommendations on enhancing existing data sources, specifically the ability to measure prevalence and incidence of child maltreatment and availability and use of national level administrative data and ad hoc surveys for monitoring and prevention

Methods

Survey development

A survey was developed to capture relevant details of existing, routine, national level administrative data and ad hoc surveys for monitoring and prevention of violence against children aged 0 to 18 years. This included questions on national measures of prevalence and incidence for all forms of VAC, information on national level data registers (Mortality, Hospitalisation, Trauma, Police, Child Protection) and national level ad hoc surveys that included child maltreatment and its outcomes (see Appendix 2 for the complete survey questionnaire). The initial survey was drafted by the lead author and then reviewed by the PIECES project team and an external panel of experts from the Greece, the UK, Canada and the European chapter of the International Society for the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (ISPCAN). Following revisions, the survey questions were uploaded to a web-based survey platform in English only. The on-line survey and survey process were piloted in six countries (AT, ES, FR, LT, RO, UK-England) and adjusted prior to contacting the remaining countries.

Respondents and survey process

Purposive snowball sampling was used to develop a database of potential respondents. All 28 EU member states plus Norway were included, and due to decentralisation of responsibility for aspects of policy related to VAC in the UK, attempts were made to complete a separate survey for England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales. Contact was first made with experts identified during a previous project examining violence against children (MacKay & Vincenten, 2014) and the WHO violence and injury prevention focal points in EU member states and appropriate respondents were sought. Additional key informants were identified through PIECES project team member's professional networks and experts contacted also recommended alternate/additional respondents.

The data collection process involved identifying and contacting an expert within each country who could review the proposed list of respondents for all six policy areas including data, recommend adjustments if needed, and assist in encouraging completion of the survey by those invited to participate. Following this an email inviting participation was then sent to each potential respondent along with a letter of support from the main funder – Directorate General of Justice and Consumers – and a link and passwords to allow completion of the on-line survey. No incentive was provided to complete the questionnaire, however arrangements were also made to complete the surveys over the telephone in a few cases where there were technical or language difficulties. If the invited respondent was unable/unwilling to participate they were also asked to suggest alternate respondents. Invited respondents were contacted up to 10 times (minimum 3 contacts), prior to moving onto an alternate respondent.

Data collection for the remaining countries initially took place over a 6-month period from May to October but was extended to January 2015 in an attempt to increase the response rate. Completed surveys were converted to an Excel spread sheet and distributed to the lead author for review and analysis.

Data Analysis

Data were reviewed for completeness, tabulated and a descriptive analysis was conducted. The survey and analysis of the results were divided into two main themes: a description of national administrative data and a description of ad-hoc surveys on violence against children. The presentation of the results follows in the same manner. An SPSS database was created to produce descriptive statistics.

Results

Response

Respondents in 28 countries were contacted (Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the UK where a separate respondent was sought for England, N. Ireland, Scotland and Wales) and out of the potential 32 surveys, 19 (59%) were completed. Forty percent of the respondents worked for a non-governmental organisation, another 40% for the government, 10% for international organisations (United Nations and UNICEF) and another 10% for private organisations. For four countries more than one respondent completed part of a survey as expertise was needed from various fields (e.g., one respondent for the hospital data and another for the child protection data. The countries with more than one response were: Finland-2 responses, Germany-2 responses, Malta-2 responses and Sweden-3 responses. The responses from seven countries (Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Ireland, Lithuania, Luxembourg) were incomplete therefore it was not possible to include these countries for all of the analyses. For example the respondent for Croatia only referred to the Balkan Epidemiological Study on Child Abuse and Neglect (BECAN) study undertaken in nine Balkan countries from 2009 to 2013 that investigated the prevalence and incidence of child abuse and neglect in representative randomized samples of the general population of pupils attending three grades (the grades attended mainly by children 11, 13 and 16 year-olds)(BECAN Croatia, 2012). For the 12 remaining countries where no survey was completed, no information is included regarding the availability and quality of the data sources is in the field.

National administrative data

Table 1 on the next page provides an overview of data sources available in the 19 countries where the survey was completed. All have mortality registers (National Cause of Death Register), 14 have National Patient Registers, only six have a National Trauma Register, 11 have a National Police Register and 13 countries have indicated available National Child Protection Registers. Only three countries (Denmark, Finland, Norway) have access to the total range of data registers for VAC. Respondents from seven countries (Austria, Denmark, Finland, Norway, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden) reported having a national trauma registry with child violence data. Three respondents (Bulgaria, Greece, Ireland) stated they did not know if there were such data available in the national trauma registry. The Malta respondent stated that another source is used for the trauma registry but did not specify a name.

Table 1 – National data sources on violence against children

Countries	Mortality Register	Hospitalisation discharge registry	National trauma registry	National police register	Child protection register
Austria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Belgium	Yes	No	No	No	No
Bulgaria	Yes	Yes	Unknown	Yes	Yes
Croatia	Yes	No response	No response	No response	No response
Denmark	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
England	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No*
Finland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
France	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Other – not national
Germany	Yes	Yes regional only	Yes regional only	Yes	Yes
Greece	Yes	Yes	Unknown	Yes	Yes
Ireland	Yes	Yes	Unknown	Yes	Yes
Lithuania	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Luxembourg	Yes	Yes	Yes regional only	Yes regional only	Yes regional only
Malta	Yes	Yes	Other	Yes	Yes
Norway	Yes	Yes	Yes	No response	No response
Romania	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Slovakia	Yes	No response	Yes	No response	Yes
Spain	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sweden	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-

* Since 2008 data in England is documented on children with child protection plans and children in need and there is no longer a child protection register

Repeat victimization, data sharing and data linking of administrative data sources on child violence in the EU

As children who are victims of violence typically access a number of different services, data are often spread out in numerous databases so questions related to identifying repeat victims and data sharing and linkage were explored. Table 2 shows that six (England, Malta, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden) out of 14 respondents reported having routine identification of repeat victimisation of children for certain administrative data sources and five (Denmark, Finland, Romania, Slovakia, Sweden) out of 15 respondents have national data sharing agreements to assist organisations in sharing child violence data. In addition, in Denmark, England, Finland, Romania, Slovakia and Sweden, it is possible to link administrative data sources together to have a comprehensive picture of the child as a victim. In the Nordic countries, comprehensive administrative data are routinely registered. In Finland, Denmark and Sweden, national legislation exists concerning merging of different data sources, for example Criminal statistics, National Patient registers and other registers in the national statistics. The Criminal Statistics in these countries include both data about alleged perpetrators and victims, and data are registered by the individual civil number (CPR). It is thus possible to analyse correlations between police reported cases concerning individual victims (and offenders) and the same individuals' contacts to hospitals or primary health care, their ethnic origin, the family's socio-economic status - and many other relevant data that are available in the national statistics and which illuminate risk factors for violence and other abuse against children.

Ad-hoc surveys

After providing information on availability and data sources of prevalence and incidence data related to child violence, respondents were asked to provide information about national level ad hoc surveys since 2008 that include/have included child maltreatment and its outcomes, regardless of whether the survey samples were representative of the population. Table 3a on pages 11-13 shows answers from the 13 respondents who completed this section of the survey, of which 11 reported on one or more ad-hoc survey including VAC since 2008. Of the countries that reported national level adhoc surveys, all surveys were representative of the national population except for France's survey and the majority were implemented one-time only and covered multiple types of child violence.

Table 3b on pages 14-15 shows additional information about the ad-hoc surveys implemented. In only six countries were children included as respondents, and only in the Nordic countries was it possible to use a unique identifier to link survey data with other databases. Only five countries (Denmark, Finland, Greece, Romania, UK covering England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland) collect information on ethnicity and only in Greece are data regarding exposure to violence as witness and outcome of the maltreatment included in the survey. The time frame from data collection to results being made available ranged from 5 months to 36 months and the majority of survey results were available through a report. The most recent year survey data are available varied less, with all respondents reporting 2013 or 2014 except for Romania (2012).

Table 2. Repeat victimization, data sharing and data linking of existing data sources on child violence in the EU

Countries	Routine identification of repeated victimisation (e.g. flagging)	National data sharing agreements	Possibility to search and link data on one child victim from multiple data sources	One source of data can be electronically accessed by another agency to assist a victim
Austria	No	Yes	No	Yes
Belgium	No	No	No – confidentiality laws prohibit such sharing	No
Denmark	No	Yes	Yes by unique personal identification number	Yes
England	Yes for hospital discharge database and child protection registery	No	Yes	Yes
Finland	No	Yes	Yes	Unknown
France	No	No	No	No response
Germany	No	No	No	No response
Greece	No response	No	No – confidentiality laws prohibit such sharing	No
Luxembourg	No	No	No	No
Malta	Child protection registry only	No	No	No
Norway	No	No	No	No response
Romania	Yes for police database and child protection registry	Yes	Yes	Yes
Slovakia	Child protection registry only	Yes	Yes	Yes
Spain	Yes for hospital discharge database, child protection registry, police database	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Sweden	Yes for hospital discharge database	Yes	Yes by personal identify number	Yes

Table 3a. Overview of ad-hoc surveys related to child violence in the EU

Countries	# surveys since 2008	Child maltreatment themes covered	Authority responsible for most recent survey design	Authority financed the most recent survey	Survey sample representative at national level	Frequency of most recent survey
Croatia	More than two	• Child solicitation/ grooming • Violence in schools, peer-to-peer violence, cyber/online bullying	Ministry responsible for Social Services/ Child Protection	Ministry responsible for Social Services/ Child Protection	Yes	One-time
Denmark	More than two	• Physical, emotional, sexual abuse, neglect • Child prostitution, pornography • Violence at schools, peer-to-peer violence, online/cyber bullying • Exposure to domestic violence, dating violence, female genital mutilation • Self-harm, suicide	National research institute at University of Copenhagen and Southern Danish university	Ministry of Children, Social Affairs and Integration	Yes	Periodically repeated
Finland	More than two	• Child abuse, sexual abuse, peer violence, internet-related, witness	Police College of Finland	Police College of Finland	Yes	One-time
France	More than two	• Physical violence, exposure to domestic violence • Violence in schools, female genital mutilation	Ministry responsible for social services/ child protection	Ministry responsible for social services/ child protection	No	No response

PIECES

Countries	# surveys since 2008	Child maltreatment themes covered	Authority responsible for most recent survey design	Authority financed the most recent survey	Survey sample representative at national level	Frequency of most recent survey
Germany	More than two	• Physical, sexual, emotional violence, exposure to domestic violence • Violence in schools, dating violence	Ministry responsible for social services/ child protection	Ministry responsible for social services/ child protection	Yes	One-time
Greece	Two	• Physical, emotional, sexual abuse and exploitation, neglect, corporal punishment, in home and school • Child prostitution	Institute of Child Health	Ministry responsible for social services/ child protection	Yes	One-time
Luxembourg	None					
Malta	More than 2	• Physical, sexual, emotional abuse and neglect • Bullying, cyber bullying • Violence in care settings • Self-harm and suicide	Ministry for Social Services/ Child Protection	Ministry for Social Services/ Child Protection	No response	One-time
Norway	Unknown exact number, 3 last ones cited	• Sexual abuse • Teenage intimate relationships • Bullying, cyber bullying	University of Bergen	Ministry of Public Health	Yes	One-time

Countries	# surveys since 2008	Child maltreatment themes covered	Authority responsible for most recent survey design	Authority financed the most recent survey	Survey sample representative at national level	Frequency of most recent survey
Romania	One	• Physical, emotional, sexual abuse, neglect and abandonment, exposure to domestic violence • Child prostitution, pornography • School violence, online/cyber bullying • Suicide	EU project BECAN	Ministry for Social Services/ Child Protection	Yes	One-time
Slovakia	More than two	• Physical, sexual, emotional abuse, neglect, corporal punishment, exposure to domestic violence • Peer to peer/ school violence, online/cyber bullying • Suicide	Ministry for Social Services/ Child Protection	Ministry for Social Services/ Child Protection	Yes	One-time
Spain	None					
Sweden	More than two	• Physical, emotional, sexual abuse, neglect, corporal punishment • Violence in schools, bullying	Ministry for Social Services/ Child Protection	Ministry for Social Services/ Child Protection	Unknown	One-time
UK	One	• Physical, sexual, emotional abuse, neglect, corporal punishment, witnessing violence • Violence by adult and peer perpetrators in home, schools and community	National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (NSPCC)	NSPCC & various corporate and private donors	Yes	One-time

Table 3b. Additional details on ad-hoc surveys related to child violence in the EU

Countries	Children included as respondents	Variables collected	Unique identifier for record linkage	Time frame from data collection to results available	Survey results available	Gaps/limitation in the survey data reported
Croatia	Yes	Age, gender, geographical location, type of maltreatment, relationship victim/perpetrator, outcome of maltreatment	No response	5 months	Report online	No
Denmark	Yes	Age, gender, nationality, ethnicity, geographical location, type of maltreatment, relationship victim/perpetrator, outcome of maltreatment	Yes	6 months	Online survey reports	Yes – published review
Finland	Yes	Age, gender, nationality, ethnicity, geographical location, type of maltreatment	Yes	6 months	Online survey report	Yes – published article
Germany	No	Age, gender, nationality, type of maltreatment	No	No response	Report	No response
Greece	Yes	Age, gender, nationality, ethnicity, geographical location, type of maltreatment, relationship victim/perpetrator, exposure to violence as witness, outcome of maltreatment	Unknown	12 months	Report	Yes
Norway	Yes	Age, gender, family income level, geographic location, type of maltreatment, relationship victim/ perpetrator	Unknown	Unknown	Scientific report	Low response rate to survey (48%)
Romania	Yes	Age, gender, nationality, ethnicity, geographic location, type of maltreatment, relationship between victim/perpetrator	Unknown	36 months	Online survey report	Yes – training of researchers

Countries	Children included as respondents	Variables collected	Unique identifier for record linkage	Time frame from data collection to results available	Survey results available	Gaps/limitation in the survey data reported
Slovakia	Yes	Age, gender, nationality, family income level, geographic location, type of maltreatment, relationship victim/perpetrator	Unknown	Approximately 5 months	Online report	Unknown
Sweden	No	Age, gender, nationality, geographic location, type of maltreatment, relationship victim/perpetrator	Yes – personal identifier	36 months	Scientific articles summary report	Yes
UK	Yes	Age, gender, ethnicity, violence experienced over lifetime and past year, type of violence, exposure to violence, location of violence, frequency, relationship victim/perpetrator, long standing illness & disability, family income, family circumstances, outcome of maltreatment	No	24 months	Online survey report Scientific articles	No

PIECES

Existence and data sources of types of child violence in the EU

Tables 4a-4d show the existence and data sources used for documenting prevalence and incidence rates of violence against children for 24 types of violence (including self-harm, attempted suicide and suicide as an outcome of violence). It must be noted that because of great differences in national legislation, public opinions, accessible counselling and definitions of adverse childhood experiences in the EU Member States it is not possible to make cross-country comparisons on VAC.

Table 4a on pages 17-21 starts with the responses from the 19 respondents on types of violence that are most commonly included as part of VAC, namely physical and sexual abuse, neglect, abandonment, sexual exploitation and corporal punishment. The data sources for all types of violence varied both within and between countries depending on the type within a country and between countries. For example administrative data sources were used for some types of violence and population representative surveys for others. This is problematic as there is a known gap between self reported prevalence and officially recorded cases, thus it is not possible to compare these data. Only three of the 19 respondents (Ireland, Malta, Spain) stated they had data on child abandonment. In addition, data definitions vary between countries (for sexual abuse some countries included child pornography, other countries counted contact and non contact abuse so surveys are not comparing the same measures), sources vary (administrative and survey data), age groups vary (under 11 years, 0 -18 years, 15-16 years, etc.), and target groups vary (all children, only specific school classes).

Table 4b on pages 22-25 provides data on additional types of child violence: emotional abuse, exposure to domestic violence, dating violence, child prostitution, child pornography, child solicitation. Information regarding emotional abuse - defined by WHO as isolated incidents, as well as a pattern of failure over time on the part of a parent or caregiver to provide a developmentally appropriate and supportive environment (WHO 2006) - was obtained for 11 out of the 19 countries. The majority of country respondents stated data were not available or did not know about data concerning child prostitution, child pornography or child solicitation. In England and Malta child prostitution is included in the classification of child sexual abuse, therefore these data are not available separately.

Table 4c on pages 26-29 covers other types of violence, namely peer-to-peer, school, gang, workplace, care settings and in detention or justice system. For these types of violence no respondent stated that all of these data existed and the majority of respondents stated data were available on only half of these types of violence. The respondent in Croatia responded that none of these data were available at the national level. Only respondents from Bulgaria and Romania reported having data on violence in care settings and no respondent was able to confirm data on violence against children in the workplace or in the justice system. Only England reported having data on gang violence and the Bulgarian respondent stated there were data for this type of violence, but the classification was 'violence on the street' so their data may also include non-gang violence.

Table 4d on pages 30-33 shows the existence and data sources for online/cyber bullying, female genital mutilation, other cultural/traditional practices and suicide/self-harm. Respondents in seven countries (Croatia, Denmark, Finland, Malta, Norway, Romania, Sweden and the UK) report having data on online/cyber bullying, either incidence or prevalence data. Only Denmark reported the availability of data on female genital mutilation, forced marriages or harmful traditional practices, although in England female genital mutilation is recorded as violence against women regardless of the victim's age. Only the respondents from Greece and Luxembourg stated it was not possible to obtain national data on suicides, while all other respondents (except for Croatia where there was no response) stated this was possible based on vital/cause of death statistics.

Table 4a. Existence and data sources on prevalence and incidence of violence against children in the EU at national level

Countries	Prevalence/incidence of physical abuse	Prevalence/ incidence of child neglect	Prevalence/ incidence of child abandonment	Prevalence/ incidence sexual abuse	Prevalence/ incidence sexual exploitation	Prevalence/ incidence corporal punishment
Austria	Yes - prevalence Source: ad-hoc retrospective survey Gewaltprävalenz-Studie Österreich 2011 Yes - incidence Source: Police data, # of cases of child abuse	Yes - prevalence Source: ad-hoc retrospective survey Gewaltprävalenz-Studie Österreich 2011 Yes - incidence Source: Police data, # of cases of child abuse	No	Yes - prevalence Source: ad-hoc retrospective survey Gewaltprävalenz-Studie Österreich 2011 Yes - incidence Source: Police data, # of cases of child abuse	No prevalence Yes - incidence Source: Police data, # of cases of child abuse	No prevalence Yes - incidence Source: Police data, # of cases of child abuse
Belgium	No	No	No	No	No	No
Bulgaria	Yes - prevalence and incidence combined Source: State Agency for Child Protection records	Yes - prevalence and incidence combined Source: State Agency for Child Protection records	No	Yes - prevalence and incidence combined Source: State Agency for Child Protection records	No response	No response
Croatia	Yes - prevalence Source: research study as part of Balkan Epidemiological Study on Child Abuse and Neglect (BECAN) Project 2012 No response incidence	Yes - prevalence Source: research study as part of Balkan Epidemiological Study on Child Abuse and Neglect (BECAN) Project 2012 No response incidence	No response	Yes - prevalence Source: research study as part of Balkan Epidemiological Study on Child Abuse and Neglect (BECAN) Project 2012 No response incidence	No response	Yes - prevalence Source: research study as part of Balkan Epidemiological Study on Child Abuse and Neglect (BECAN) Project 2012 No response incidence

Countries	Prevalence/incidence of physical abuse	Prevalence/ incidence of child neglect	Prevalence/ incidence of child abandonment	Prevalence/ incidence sexual abuse	Prevalence/ incidence sexual exploitation	Prevalence/ incidence corporal punishment
Denmark	Yes both Source: National Youth Survey 2008, physical violence by parents in last 12 months	Yes both Source: National statistics on out-of-home placements for children due to neglect	No response	Yes - prevalence Source: National Youth Survey 2008, % 15-16 years reporting non-consent sexual experience before age of 15 Yes - incidence Source: Police data	Unknown	Yes - prevalence Source: National Youth Survey 2008 No response incidence
Finland	Yes - prevalence Source: Child Victim Survey, 12 and 15 year olds, latest data 2013 Yes - incidence Source: police data, violent crimes against minors (under 18)	No	No	Yes - prevalence Source: Child Victim Survey, 12 and 15 year olds, latest data 2013 Yes - incidence Source: police data, sexual abuse and violent crimes against minors (under 18)	Yes - prevalence Source: Child Victim Survey, 12 and 15 year olds, latest data 2013 Yes - incidence Source: police data, violent crimes against minors (under 18)	Yes - prevalence Source: Child Victim Survey, 12 and 15 year olds, latest data 2013 and ad-hoc survey by National Police College 2012 Yes - incidence Source: police data, violent crimes against minors but not classified as corporal punishment
France	No	No	No	No	No	No
Germany	Yes - prevalence Source: 2014 study, % report experiencing violence Yes - incidence Source: Police data, # of cases of child abuse	Yes Source: 2011 study, % reporting experiencing neglect	No	Yes - prevalence Source: 2014 study, % reporting experiencing sexual abuse Yes - incidence Source: Police data, # cases of child sexual abuse	No	No
Greece	No	No	No	No	No	No

Countries	Prevalence/incidence of physical abuse	Prevalence/ incidence of child neglect	Prevalence/ incidence of child abandonment	Prevalence/ incidence sexual abuse	Prevalence/ incidence sexual exploitation	Prevalence/ incidence corporal punishment
Ireland	Yes - prevalence Source: not provided No response incidence	Yes - prevalence Source: not provided No response incidence	Yes - prevalence Source: not provided No response incidence	Yes - prevalence Source: not provided No response incidence	Yes - prevalence Source: not provided No response incidence	No
Lithuania	No prevalence Yes - incidence Source: Ministry of the Interior, child protection units	No	No	No prevalence Yes - incidence Source: Ministry of the Interior, child protection units	No prevalence Yes - incidence Source: Ministry of the Interior, child protection units	No
Luxembourg	No	No	No	No	No	No
Malta	Yes both Source: Foundation for Social Welfare Services Database, number of cases and National Statistics Office Malta	Yes both Source: Foundation for Social Welfare Services Database, number of cases and National Statistics Office Malta	Yes both Source: Foundation for Social Welfare Services Database, number of cases and National Statistics Office Malta	Yes both Source: Foundation for Social Welfare Services Database, number of cases and National Statistics Office Malta	No	No
Norway	Yes Source: ad-hoc survey 2013, % of 0-18 years Yes - incidence Source: Child Welfare Authority, # receiving home or out-of-home placement in 2013	Unknown prevalence Yes - incidence Source: Child Welfare Authority, # of 0-18 years receiving home or out-of-home placement in 2013	Unknown	Yes Source: ad-hoc survey 2013, % 0-18 years Yes - incidence Source: Child Welfare Authority, # receiving home or out-of-home placement in 2013	Unknown	No

Countries	Prevalence/incidence of physical abuse	Prevalence/ incidence of child neglect	Prevalence/ incidence of child abandonment	Prevalence/ incidence sexual abuse	Prevalence/ incidence sexual exploitation	Prevalence/ incidence corporal punishment
Romania	No prevalence Yes - incidence Source: statistics from Ministry of Labour, Family, Social protection, # cases	No prevalence Yes - incidence Source: statistics from Ministry of Labour, Family, Social protection, # cases	No	No prevalence Yes - incidence Source: statistics from Ministry of Labour, Family, Social protection, # cases	No prevalence Yes - incidence Source: statistics from Ministry of Labour, Family, Social protection, # cases	No prevalence Yes - incidence Source: statistics from Ministry of Labour, Family, Social protection, # cases
Slovakia	Yes both Source: ad-hoc survey 2013 % of 14-16 years of which 41% were with disabilities	Yes both Source: ad-hoc survey 2013 % of 14-16 years of which 41% were with disabilities	Unknown	Yes both Source: ad-hoc survey 2013 % of 14-16 years of which 41% were with disabilities	Yes Source: ad-hoc survey 2013, included in definition of sexual abuse	Yes Source: ad-hoc survey 2013, included in definition of physical abuse
Spain	Yes - prevalence Source: 2013 study Unknown incidence	Yes - prevalence Source: 2013 study Unknown incidence	Yes - prevalence Source: 2013 study Unknown incidence	Yes - prevalence Source: 2013 study Yes - incidence Source: Health Ministry	Unknown	Unknown
Sweden	Yes - prevalence Source: research study (latest 2011) every five years Yes - incidence Source: Hospital discharge register, % child discharges and/or specialised open care for physical assault (ICD-10 code YES85-Y09)	Yes - prevalence Source: research study (latest 2011) every five years No incidence	No	Yes - prevalence Source: research study by Prof. Svedin 1990-2013 Unknown incidence	No	Yes - prevalence Source: research study by Prof. Svedin 1990-2013 No incidence

Countries	Prevalence/incidence of physical abuse	Prevalence/ incidence of child neglect	Prevalence/ incidence of child abandonment	Prevalence/ incidence sexual abuse	Prevalence/ incidence sexual exploitation	Prevalence/ incidence corporal punishment
England	Yes - prevalence Source: National Survey of Child Safety and Victimisation 2009 Incidence yes Source: Department of Education, number of child protection plans	Yes - prevalence Source: National Survey of Child Safety and Victimisation 2009 Incidence yes Source: Department of Education, number of child protection plans	No	Yes - prevalence Source: National Survey of Child Safety and Victimisation 2009 Incidence yes Source: Department of Education, number of child protection plans	No	Yes - prevalence Source: National Survey of Child Safety and Victimisation 2009

PIECES

Table 4b. Existence and data sources on prevalence and incidence of violence against children in the EU at national level

Countries	Prevalence/incidence of emotional abuse	Prevalence/ incidence of child exposure to domestic violence	Prevalence/ incidence of dating or intimate partner violence	Prevalence/ incidence of child prostitution	Prevalence/ incidence of child pornography	Prevalence/ incidence of child solicitation
Austria	Yes - prevalence Source: ad-hoc retrospective survey Gewaltprävalenz-Studie Österreich 2011, as psychological Yes - incidence Source: Police data, # of cases of child abuse	Yes - prevalence Source: ad-hoc retrospective survey Gewaltprävalenz-Studie Österreich 2011 Yes - incidence Source: Police data, # of cases of child abuse	Yes - prevalence Source: ad-hoc retrospective survey Gewaltprävalenz-Studie Österreich 2011 Yes - incidence Source: Police data, # of cases of rape or physical abuse	No - prevalence Yes - incidence Source: Police data, # of cases of sexual abuse of minor	No - prevalence Yes - incidence Source: Police data, # of cases of sexual abuse of minor	No - prevalence Yes - incidence Source: Police data, # of cases of sexual abuse of minor
Belgium	No	No	No	No	No	No
Bulgaria	Yes Source: State Agency for Child Protection records, classified as psychological violence	Yes Source: State Agency for Child Protection records, classified as family violence	No response	No response	No response	No response
Croatia	Yes - prevalence Source: research study as part of Balkan Epidemiological Study on Child Abuse and Neglect (BECAN) Project 2012 No response incidence	Yes - prevalence Source: research study as part of Balkan Epidemiological Study on Child Abuse and Neglect (BECAN) Project 2012 No response incidence	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

Countries	Prevalence/incidence of emotional abuse	Prevalence/ incidence of child exposure to domestic violence	Prevalence/ incidence of dating or intimate partner violence	Prevalence/ incidence of child prostitution	Prevalence/ incidence of child pornography	Prevalence/ incidence of child solicitation
Denmark	Yes - prevalence Source: National Youth Survey, % reporting verbal assault from parents No incidence	Yes - prevalence Source: National Youth Survey, % reporting physical assault from parents No incidence	Yes - prevalence Source: National Dating Survey % of children 1-24 years exposed to violence from present or former dating partner No response incidence	Yes - prevalence Source: National Youth Survey, % reporting economic favour for sexual experience with adult Unknown incidence	Yes - prevalence Source: Police data in collaboration with surveillance of the Internet with Save the Children Denmark No response incidence	No
England	Yes - prevalence Source: National Survey of Child Safety and Victimisation 2009 Incidence yes Source: Department of Education, number of child protection plans	Yes - prevalence Source: National Survey of Child Safety and Victimisation 2009	Yes - prevalence Source: National Survey of Child Safety and Victimisation 2009	No - prevalence Yes - incidence Source: Police data	No - prevalence Yes - incidence Source: Police data	Yes - prevalence for online solicitation only Source: National Survey of Child Safety and Victimisation 2009 Yes - incidence Source: Police data
Finland	Yes - prevalence Source: Child Victim Survey, 12 and 15 year olds, latest data 2013 No response incidence	Yes - prevalence Source: Child Victim Survey, 12 and 15 year olds, latest data 2013 No response incidence	Yes - prevalence Source: Child Victim Survey, 12 and 15 year olds, latest data 2013 No response incidence	Yes - prevalence Source: Child Victim Survey, 12 and 15 year olds, latest data 2013	Unknown prevalence Yes - incidence Source: police data, sexual abuse against minors	Unknown prevalence Yes - incidence Source: police data, grooming
France	No	No	No	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Germany	No	No	No	No	No	No
Greece	No	No	No	No	No	No

Countries	Prevalence/incidence of emotional abuse	Prevalence/ incidence of child exposure to domestic violence	Prevalence/ incidence of dating or intimate partner violence	Prevalence/ incidence of child prostitution	Prevalence/ incidence of child pornography	Prevalence/ incidence of child solicitation
Ireland	Yes - prevalence Source: not provided No response incidence	Yes - prevalence Source: not provided No response incidence	No	No	No	No
Lithuania	No	No	No	No	No	No
Luxembourg	No	No	No	No	No	No
Malta	Yes both Source: Foundation for Social Welfare Services Database, number of cases	No	No	No - prevalence Yes - incidence Source: police data	No - prevalence Yes - incidence Source: police and justice data as sexual abuse	No
Norway	Yes - prevalence Source: ad-hoc survey 2013, 5 under 18 years Yes - incidence Source: Child Welfare Authority, children 0-18 years receiving home, out-of-home placements	Yes - prevalence Source: ad-hoc survey 2013, 5 under 18 years Yes - incidence Source: Child Welfare Authority, children 0-18 years receiving home, out-of-home placements	No - prevalence Unknown incidence	No - prevalence Unknown incidence	No - prevalence Unknown incidence	Unknown
Romania	No - prevalence Yes - incidence Source: statistics from Ministry of Labour, Family, Social protection, # cases	No	No	No	No - prevalence Yes - incidence Source: statistics from Ministry of Labour, Family, Social protection, # cases, part of sexual abuse	No
Slovakia	Yes both Source: ad-hoc survey 2013 % of 14-16 years of which 41% were with disabilities	Yes both Source: ad-hoc survey 2013, included in physical abuse	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

Countries	Prevalence/incidence of emotional abuse	Prevalence/ incidence of child exposure to domestic violence	Prevalence/ incidence of dating or intimate partner violence	Prevalence/ incidence of child prostitution	Prevalence/ incidence of child pornography	Prevalence/ incidence of child solicitation
Spain	Unknown	Yes - prevalence Source: research study Unknown incidence	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Sweden	Yes - prevalence Source: research study every five years (latest 2011) No incidence	Yes - prevalence Source: research study every five years (latest 2011) No incidence	Yes - prevalence Source: research study every five years (latest 2011) No incidence	No	No	No

PIECES

Table 4c. Existence and data sources on prevalence and incidence of violence against children in the EU at national level

Countries	Prevalence/incidence of peer to peer violence	Prevalence/ incidence of gang violence	Prevalence/ incidence violence in schools	Prevalence/ incidence workplace violence minors	Prevalence/ incidence of violence in care settings (foster care, nurseries, etc.)	Prevalence/ incidence of violence in detention or the justice system
Austria	Yes prevalence Source: ad-hoc retrospective survey Gewaltprävalenz-Studie Österreich 2011, as psychological Yes incidence Source: Police data, # of cases of child abuse	No	Yes prevalence Source: ad-hoc retrospective survey Gewaltprävalenz-Studie Österreich 2011, as psychological Yes incidence Source: Police data, # of cases of child abuse	No	No	No
Belgium	No	No	No	No	No	No
Bulgaria	No	Yes both combined Source: State Agency for Child Protection records reported as occurring on the street	Yes both combined Source: State Agency for Child Protection records reported as occurring in school	No response	Yes both combined Source: Child Protection Services reported as occurring in special institutions, foster care	No response
Croatia	Yes prevalence Source: research study 2013 (no further information provided) No response incidence	No response	Yes prevalence Source: research study 2013 (no further information provided) No response incidence	No response	No response	No response

Countries	Prevalence/incidence of peer to peer violence	Prevalence/ incidence of gang violence	Prevalence/ incidence violence in schools	Prevalence/ incidence workplace violence minors	Prevalence/ incidence of violence in care settings (foster care, nurseries, etc.)	Prevalence/ incidence of violence in detention or the justice system
Denmark	Yes prevalence Source: National Youth Survey 2008, % reporting ever been assaulted by peers Incidence yes Source: National Youth Survey % assaulted past year by peers	No	Yes prevalence Source: National Youth Survey, % of physical assaults took place at or near school and WHO HSBC survey 2010,% victims of bullying No response incidence	Yes prevalence Source: Research study of reported violence by employers Unknown incidence	Yes prevalence Source: national criminal statistics No response incidence	Yes both Source: media and youth surveys, cases of violence against detainees (criminal responsibility at age 16 in Denmark)
England	Yes prevalence Source: National Survey of Child Safety and Victimisation 2009	Yes prevalence Source: National Survey of Child Safety and Victimisation 2009	Yes prevalence Source: National Survey of Child Safety and Victimisation 2009	No	No	No prevalence Yes incidence Source: Youth Justice Board
Finland	Yes prevalence Source: Child Victim Survey, 12 and 15 year olds, latest data 2013 No response incidence	Unknown prevalence Yes incidence Source: police data	Yes prevalence Source: Child Victim Survey, 12 and 15 year olds, latest data 2013 No response incidence	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
France	No	Unknown	No	Unknown	No	Unknown
Germany	No	No	No	No	No	No

Countries	Prevalence/incidence of peer to peer violence	Prevalence/ incidence of gang violence	Prevalence/ incidence violence in schools	Prevalence/ incidence workplace violence minors	Prevalence/ incidence of violence in care settings (foster care, nurseries, etc.)	Prevalence/ incidence of violence in detention or the justice system
Greece	No	No	Yes prevalence Source: online study by Ministry of Education, % primary students victims of bullying No incidence	No	No	No
Ireland	No	No	No response	No	No response	No response
Lithuania	No	No	No	No	No prevalence Yes incidence Source: Ministry of the Interior, child protection	No
Luxembourg	No	No	No	No	No	No
Malta	Yes both Source: Foundation for Social Welfare Services Database, number of cases	No	Unknown	No	No	Unknown
Norway	Yes prevalence Source: ad-hoc survey 2007, % of 18-19 years Unknown incidence	No prevalence Unknown incidence	Yes prevalence Source: ad-hoc survey 2012, % of 9-19 years Unknown incidence	No prevalence Unknown incidence	No prevalence Unknown incidence	Unknown

Countries	Prevalence/incidence of peer to peer violence	Prevalence/ incidence of gang violence	Prevalence/ incidence violence in schools	Prevalence/ incidence workplace violence minors	Prevalence/ incidence of violence in care settings (foster care, nurseries, etc.)	Prevalence/ incidence of violence in detention or the justice system
Romania	Yes prevalence Source: research study (no further info provided) Yes incidence Source: statistics Ministry of Education	No	Yes prevalence Source: research study (no further info provided) Yes incidence Source: statistics Ministry of Education	No	No prevalence Yes incidence Source: statistics from Ministry of Labour, Family, Social protection, # cases, part of sexual abuse	No prevalence Yes incidence Source: Ministry of Internal Affairs
Slovakia	No	No	No	No	No	No
Spain	Yes prevalence Source: research study Yes incidence Source: Estudio Cisneros, %	Unknown	Yes prevalence Source: research study Yes incidence Source: Estudio Cisneros, %	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Sweden	Yes prevalence Source: research study 2011 No incidence	No	No	No	No	No

PIECES

Table 4d. Existence and data sources on prevalence and incidence of violence against children in the EU at national level

Countries	Prevalence/incidence of online/cyber abuse, cyber-bullying	Prevalence/ incidence of female genital mutilation/ cutting	Prevalence/ incidence of forced marriages	Prevalence/ incidence of harmful traditional practices	Prevalence/incidence of self-harm/ suicide
Austria	No	No	No	No	Yes incidence self-harm Source: Hospital Discharge Register Yes suicide Source: Cause of death statistics
Belgium	No	Yes prevalence Source: not specified No response incidence	No	No	Yes Source: Mortality Register # suicides per year
Croatia	Yes prevalence Source: research study 2013 (no further information provided) No response incidence	No response	No response	No response	No response
Denmark	Yes Source: research study, % of 15-16 years report sexual harassment by Internet, % non-consent sexual experience	Yes prevalence Source: national criminal statistics as criminalised	Marriage under 18 not permitted based on Special regulations concerning possible honour-related forced marriages	Yes both Source: social authorities or police	Yes both self-harm Source: Youth Survey 2008, % ages 15-16 years attempt suicide ever / report suicidal attempts, self-harm in last week Yes suicide Source: National Cause of Death statistics

Countries	Prevalence/incidence of online/ cyber abuse, cyber-bullying	Prevalence/ incidence of female genital mutilation/ cutting	Prevalence/ incidence of forced marriages	Prevalence/ incidence of harmful traditional practices	Prevalence/incidence of self-harm/ suicide
Finland	Yes prevalence Source: Child Victim Survey, 12 and 15 year olds, latest data 2013 Yes incidence Source: police data	No prevalence Yes incidence Source: police data	No	Unknown	Yes self-harm Source: Hospital Discharge Register 2010-2012 Yes suicide Source: Mortality Register, Statistics Finland
France	No	Unknown	Unknown	No	Unknown self-harm Yes suicide Source: annual vital statistics
Germany	No	No	No	No	Yes Source: Mortality Register, annual number
Greece	No	No	No	No	No
Lithuania	No	No	No	No	Yes Source: Statistics department
Luxembourg	No prevalence Yes incidence Source: not specified	No	No	No	No
Malta	Yes both Source: Foundation for Social Welfare Services Database, number of cases	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Yes self-harm prevalence Source: ad-hoc survey Yes suicide Source: Mortality Register

PIECES

Countries	Prevalence/incidence of online/ cyber abuse, cyber-bullying	Prevalence/ incidence of female genital mutilation/ cutting	Prevalence/ incidence of forced marriages	Prevalence/ incidence of harmful traditional practices	Prevalence/incidence of self-harm/ suicide
Norway	Yes prevalence Source: ad-hoc survey 2012 study, 9-19 years, % from classmates/other students/ teachers No incidence	No	No	No	Yes self-harm Source: 2003 survey of 15-16 years Yes suicide Source: Mortality Register, Statistics Norway
Romania	Yes prevalence Source: EU Kids Online research study No incidence	No prevalence Unknown incidence	No	No	No self-harm prevalence Yes suicide Source: research study (no further info provided)
Slovakia	No	No	No	No	Yes self-harm incidence Source: statistical evaluation conducted by the National Health Information Centre, 0 to 19 Yes suicide Source: statistical evaluation conducted by the National Health Information Centre, 0 to 19
Spain	Unknown prevalence Yes incidence Source: Guardia Civil	No	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

Countries	Prevalence/incidence of online/ cyber abuse, cyber-bullying	Prevalence/ incidence of female genital mutilation/ cutting	Prevalence/ incidence of forced marriages	Prevalence/ incidence of harmful traditional practices	Prevalence/incidence of self-harm/ suicide
Sweden	Yes prevalence Source: research study every five years (latest 2011) No incidence	No	No	No	Yes prevalence self-harm Source: research study 1995 – 2007 Yes incidence self-harm Source: Hospital discharge and specialised open care register for self-harm (YES60-YES84) 2013 Yes suicide Source: Mortality Register, annually
UK	Yes Source: National Survey of Child Safety and Victimisation 2009	Yes	No	No	No self-harm Yes suicide Source: Cause of Death Statistics and Child Death Review Board

Discussion

A large number of Member States have national action plans to combat various forms of violence against children, and data collection is part of these action plans. Yet the results of this survey show that comprehensive data collection on VAC was only available in the Nordic countries, Denmark in particular. Furthermore, the data are highly fragmented at the national level, as three to five different registers contain different data related to child violence and the administrative data sources on child violence reported upon by the national respondents from the 20 EU countries was highly uneven. Another challenge is lack of data linkage and data sharing as the majority of responding countries reported it is not possible for data from one to be accessed by another agency and over half of the countries survey respondents reported that no data sharing agreements exist. Thus, key information remains unknown to stakeholders, practitioners and researchers assisting in the prevention of child violence.

This echoes the data results provided by the respondents are similar to findings in the 'European Report on the Prevention of Child Maltreatment' (Sethi et al., 2013) and to responses from the TACTICS project of the European Child Safety Alliance which assessed the ability of MS to provide incidence data on child intentional injuries (MacKay and Vincenten, 2014). Data concerning child victims of violence in the EU Member States are spread out between numerous databases and multiple reports and are therefore not utilised as a whole but only in parts (MacKay and Vincenten, 2014). This lack of a comprehensive data picture hinders research work as well as policy makers who only glimpse a piece of the data picture.

We also found that few countries measure progress towards eliminating violence against children using repeated surveys to estimate the magnitude and nature of non-fatal violence in the home and elsewhere. The countries that did perform surveys collected different measures and they were not systematically found throughout the surveys. Table 5 is a suggested breakdown of data variables on VAC adapted from the UNICEF Manual for the Measurement of Indicators of Violence against Children that all Member States could agree to follow in order to harmonise key indicators throughout the EU.

Table. 5 Potential breakdown of data variables on violence against children

Disaggregation Category	EU Status
Age of child	Available
Gender of child	Available
Ethnicity	Not collected to date by all Member States
Educational level of child	Not collected to date by all Member States
Education of caregivers	Not collected to date by all Member States
Income level of family	Not collected to date by all Member States
Geographical location of incident (address)	Make available in statistical yearbooks as currently only available in police records
Type of violence: physical, sexual, emotional, neglect, etc.	Available for some but not all types of violence
External cause of death (firearm, strangulation, etc.)	Available but need to reduce the high % of undetermined/misclassification through institutionalization of Child Death Review Boards

Disaggregation Category	EU Status
Manner of death (e.g., homicide, suicide)	Available but need to reduce the high % of undetermined/misclassification through institutionalization of Child Death Review Boards
Age & gender of perpetrator	Make available in statistical yearbooks as currently only available in police records or criminal justice system records
Victim-perpetrator relationship: parent/care taker, sibling, teacher, peer, employer, other relative, gang, other adult, Unknown	Make available in statistical yearbooks as currently only available in separate administrative databases
Place of victimization: home, neighborhood, school, workplace, institution, other	Make available in statistical yearbooks as currently only available in child welfare or police records
Authority violence reported to: criminal justice system, child welfare system, other	Make available in statistical yearbooks as currently only available in child protection or police records
Type of service child referred to: individual therapy, group therapy, family therapy, therapeutic day care, temporary foster care, hospitalization, other	Make available in statistical yearbooks as currently only available in child welfare records
Reporter of violence: health or educational facility, private service provider, public service provider, social work centre, police station, relative, self	Make available in statistical yearbooks as currently only available in police or child protection records

Adapted from the UNICEF Manual for the Measurement of Indicators of Violence against Children 2006, available online: http://www.unicef.org/violencestudy/pdf/Manual%20Indicators%20UNICEF.pdf

Limitations

There are several limitations to be noted when considering the results of this survey. Firstly, the working paper would profit from a higher response rate than the present, about or less than 60% and more complete information on behalf of respondents from different Member States. Thus the findings may not have relevance to all EU member states. Secondly, the data information is based on self-reporting from one to two respondents per country, so there will inevitably be subjective interpretations and partial knowledge about available data given it is in most countries highly fragmented between many institutions. Had the project budget and timeline allowed, ideally it would have been good to have one or more key respondents for each data source in each country (e.g., one from police services, one from child protection services, one from the hospital services, and so forth).

PIECES

Conclusions and recommendations

National research agendas on violence against children in all settings have been identified as best practice in order to build knowledge, improve programme development and measure progress. These agendas require reliable and valid data. Thus, the adoption of a national research agenda represents the most appropriate way of promoting an integrated and systematic approach to data collection, analysis, dissemination and research (4). Guidelines for data collection have been developed at the global level through the United Nations Model Strategies and Practical Measures on the Elimination of Violence against Children in 2014, and it is important for EU guidelines to harmonise with these in order to be able to compare data internationally. EU Member States have a duty to improve data collection and information systems regarding child violence in order to identify vulnerable subgroups, inform policy and programming at all levels, and track progress towards the goal of preventing violence against children.

Recommendations

Specific recommendations stemming from these results are in line with the 'Coordination and cooperation in integrated child protection systems Reflection paper' (DG Justice and Consumers, 2015) and international recommendations such as Violence against Children Surveys (VACS), the United Nations Model Strategies and Practical Measures on the Elimination of Violence against Children in the Field of Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, Istanbul Convention, National Action to Address Child Intentional Injury - 2014: Europe Summary and the UNICEF Child Protection Monitoring and Evaluation Reference Group (CP MERGE) Technical Working Group on Data Collection on Violence against Children Indicator Framework (Appendix 3-7):

- Comprehensive, objective, disaggregated and comparable VAC data from each Member State should be centrally available, accessible and up to date

- Indicators and statistical systems for monitoring and evaluation should be established as part of a national coordinating framework that is effectively regulated and independently monitored and accountable, ensuring accessible, quality data related to violence against children

- Children should be consulted and participate in the development and execution of surveys that measure outcomes for children, and include children's own assessment of interventions

References

Balkan Epidemiological Survey on Child Abuse and Neglect (BECAN) in Croatia. Athens, 2012.

Butchart et al. Preventing child maltreatment: a guide to taking action and generating evidence / World Health Organization and International Society for Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect. Geneva, World Health Organisation, 2006.

Charter on Fundamental Rights of the EU, Article 24, (2000/C 364/01).

Child Right Convention (CRC) General Comment No.13, 42 (v), page 15. 2011.

Council of Europe. Council of Europe Policy guidelines on integrated national strategies for the protection of children from violence. Recommendation CM/Rec(2009)10.

Council of Europe. Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence (Istanbul Convention). 2014. Available online at http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/standardsetting/convention-violence/default_en.asp

Directorate General Justice and Consumers. Coordination and cooperation in integrated child protection systems. Reflection paper. DG Justice and Consumers, Belgium, 2015.

EU Agenda for the rights of the child, (COM/2011/0060 final).

Guyavarch E. Observation National de l'Enfance en Danger (ONED). Une estimation du chiffre noir de l'enfance en danger par le biais des enquetes de victimation. 2008.

MacKay M and Vincenten J. National Action to Address Child Intentional Injury - 2014: Europe Summary. Birmingham: European Child Safety Alliance, 2014.

Sethi et al. European Report on Preventing Child Maltreatment. WHO, Copenhagen, 2013.

UNICEFa. Child Protection Monitoring and Evaluation Reference Group, Measuring Violence against Children: Inventory and assessment of quantitative studies. Division of Data, Research and Policy, UNICEF, New York, 2014.

UNICEFb. Hidden in Plain Sight: A statistical analysis of violence against children. Division of Data, Research and Policy, UNICEF, New York, 2014.

UNICEF. Child Protection Monitoring and Evaluation Reference Group (CP-MERG). Ethical principles, dilemmas and risks in collecting data on violence against children: A review of available literature, Statistics and Monitoring Section. Division of Policy and Strategy, UNICEF, New York, 2012.

UNICEF. Manual for the Measurement of Indicators of Child Violence. 2005. http://www.unicef.org/violencestudy/pdf/Manual%20Indicators%20UNICEF.pdf

United Nations. United Nations Model Strategies and Practical Measures on the Elimination of Violence against Children in the Field of Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice. Draft Resolution. United Nations, New York, 2014.

PIECES

Acknowledgements

Appendix 1 – PIECES project description

PIECES – Policy Investigation in Europe on Child Endangerment and Support was a two year initiative led and coordinated by the European Child Safety Alliance (ECSA) in partnership with experts in Austria, England, France, Lithuania, Romania and Spain. The aim of the project was to conduct in-depth investigations of select policy issues in violence against children in the EU28 plus Norway, in order to provide a better understanding of how those policies are being implemented, monitored and evaluated. The intent was that the knowledge gained will assist in further defining good practice in the field of children and violence.

The target audience for the results are national and European governments and agencies who assess, set policy and invest in the prevention of violence against and by children as well as researchers in the field of child maltreatment, with the aim of ultimately preventing violence against all children in the EU with a focus on the most vulnerable children.

The project consisted of four steps:

- Development of a key informant list of those knowledgeable on the adoption, implementation and monitoring of policies to address violence against children in the EU28 plus Norway in order to ensure collection of valid detailed data on existing policies.

- Selection of 6 policies areas for more detailed study with the input of key informants to ensure those selected would have the most benefit to the field in Europe.

- Development and implementation of online surveys addressing the six policy areas selected to capture issues such as scope, target audiences, roles and responsibilities, infrastructure, barriers and enabling factors related to adoption, implementation and monitoring of policies including the level at which these activities/factors occur (national, regional, municipal, community, etc.).

- Analysis, synthesis and expert consultation on survey results and the identification of gaps, recommendations for good practice and issues to be considered when transferring polices to other Member States and priorities for further research.

Policy Areas explored

The six policy areas selected were:

1. **Content analysis of existing national strategies addressing violence against children**
    This investigation involved an in-depth look at existing national plans/strategies addressing violence against children to assess what was and was not covered. The investigation used a children's rights framework to explore the content of national strategies on VAC (covering key areas of provisions for primary prevention, protection, bringing justice, overcoming harm and child participation) and their implementation (the legal framework, system response, resources, capacity, coordination, cross sector working responsibilities). Informants were asked about the specific content of national strategies covering child maltreatment, violence against children in schools and communities, preventing child suicide.

2. **Data sources on violence against children**
    This investigation involved an in-depth exploration of existing routinely collected administrative data and periodic surveys in the area of violence against children, including suicide as a potential outcome of abuse.

3. **Reporting and follow-up of violence against children**

This investigation explored in-depth the reporting mechanisms for violence against children and the processes for following-up reported cases.

4. **Evidence-based violence against children prevention efforts related to building resilience in children and positive parenting**

This investigation involved an in-depth exploration of national home visitation programmes (both population-based and targeted programmes) and family support programmes (parenting programmes, etc.).

5. **National Child Death Review Committees to inform policy and practice related to violence against children**

This investigation involved an in-depth look at national multi-disciplinary child death review committees to identify current practices and the benefits of these reviews for improving policy and practice for preventing and responding to violence against children.

6. **National awareness activities on violence against children**

This investigation involved an in-depth look at national awareness raising activities related to violence against children.

Each of the six policy areas explored also looked at whether children were consulted on policy/programme development and implementation (child participation) and whether the issue of child poverty/inequalities was considered during policy/programme development, implementation or monitoring (child inequalities).

A summary report regarding the programme, working papers for the other individual policy areas and case studies of good examples of practice are available online at www.childsafetyeurope.org/PIECES.

Appendix 2 – Paper version of survey questionnaire

PIECES: Policy investigation in Europe on Child Endangerment & Support

In depth investigations policy area #2: Data sources related to violence against children.

PIECES partner taking the lead: Marc Nectoux, Psytel (FR).

This survey aims to map information on national level data related to violence against children covering all forms of neglect, physical violence, sexual and psychological abuse, as well as on self-harm and suicide as potential outcomes of violence against children in the European Union Member States. The purpose of the survey is to identify knowledge about good practices that can be shared between countries in Europe to support future planning and implementation. The survey has questions about the ability to measure prevalence and incidence of child maltreatment and availability and use of national level administrative data and ad hoc surveys for monitoring and prevention.

As an expert working in this field, we ask that you please answer as many questions as possible and where relevant please provide hyperlinks (e.g. to data reports or online data)

Name of respondent: (fill in the blank)

Organisation: (fill in the blank)

Position in organisation: (Fill in the blank)

Address: (fill in the blank)

City: (fill in the blank)

Country: (fill in the blank)

Telephone: (fill in the blank)

E-mail address: (fill in the blank)

I. Measures of prevalence and incidence of violence against children

Does your country have <u>national estimates</u> of the incidence and prevalence of the following for children (for the purposes of this survey we define children as under 18 years of age)?

- By incidence we mean the number (or rate) of new cases in a given time period (e.g., number of new cases of child maltreatment per 100,000 children under 18 years reported to child protection services in a given year).

- By prevalence we mean the proportion of cases in the population at a given time (e.g., point estimate of the proportion of adults that report ever having been sexually abused as children)

	Prevalence	If yes for prevalence estimate specify source of data	If yes for prevalence estimate specify measure(s) and year of data	Incidence	If yes for incidence specify incidence measure(s) and timeframe	If yes for incidence specify source of data
1. Physical abuse	Yes/No/Don't know	☐ Research study ☐ Ad hoc survey ☐ Other (please specify) _____	(fill in the blank)	Yes/No/Don't know	(fill in the blank)	(fill in the blank)
2. Child neglect	Yes/No/Don't know	☐ Research study ☐ Ad hoc survey ☐ Other (please specify) _____	(fill in the blank)	Yes/No/Don't know	(fill in the blank)	(fill in the blank)
3. Child abandonment	Yes/No/Don't know	☐ Research study ☐ Ad hoc survey ☐ Other (please specify) _____	(fill in the blank)	Yes/No/Don't know	(fill in the blank)	(fill in the blank)
4. Child sexual abuse	Yes/No/Don't know	☐ Research study ☐ Ad hoc survey ☐ Other (please specify) _____	(fill in the blank)	Yes/No/Don't know	(fill in the blank)	(fill in the blank)

	Prevalence	If yes for prevalence estimate specify source of data	If yes for prevalence estimate specify measure(s) and year of data	Incidence	If yes for incidence specify incidence measure(s) and timeframe	If yes for incidence specify source of data
5. Child sexual exploitation	Yes/No/Don't know	☐ Research study ☐ Ad hoc survey ☐ Other (please specify) _____	(fill in the blank)	Yes/No/Don't know	(fill in the blank)	(fill in the blank)
6. Corporal punishment of children	Yes/No/Don't know	☐ Research study ☐ Ad hoc survey ☐ Other (please specify) _____	(fill in the blank)	Yes/No/Don't know	(fill in the blank)	(fill in the blank)
7. Emotional abuse of children	Yes/No/Don't know	☐ Research study ☐ Ad hoc survey ☐ Other (please specify) _____	(fill in the blank)	Yes/No/Don't know	(fill in the blank)	(fill in the blank)
8. Exposure of child to domestic violence	Yes/No/Don't know	☐ Research study ☐ Ad hoc survey ☐ Other (please specify) _____	(fill in the blank)	Yes/No/Don't know	(fill in the blank)	(fill in the blank)

PIECES

	Prevalence	If yes for prevalence estimate specify source of data	If yes for prevalence estimate specify measure(s) and year of data	Incidence	If yes for incidence specify incidence measure(s) and timeframe	If yes for incidence specify source of data
9. Dating or intimate partner violence in young people's relationships	Yes/No/Don't know	☐ Research study ☐ Ad hoc survey ☐ Other (please specify) _____	(fill in the blank)	Yes/No/Don't know	(fill in the blank)	(fill in the blank)
10. Child prostitution	Yes/No/Don't know	☐ Research study ☐ Ad hoc survey ☐ Other (please specify) _____	(fill in the blank)	Yes/No/Don't know	(fill in the blank)	(fill in the blank)
11. Child pornography	Yes/No/Don't know	☐ Research study ☐ Ad hoc survey ☐ Other (please specify) _____	(fill in the blank)	Yes/No/Don't know	(fill in the blank)	(fill in the blank)
12. Child solicitation/ grooming	Yes/No/Don't know	☐ Research study ☐ Ad hoc survey ☐ Other (please specify) _____	(fill in the blank)	Yes/No/Don't know	(fill in the blank)	(fill in the blank)

	Prevalence	If yes for prevalence estimate specify source of data	If yes for prevalence estimate specify measure(s) and year of data	Incidence	If yes for incidence specify incidence measure(s) and timeframe	If yes for incidence specify source of data
13. Peer to peer violence	Yes/No/Don't know	☐ Research study ☐ Ad hoc survey ☐ Other (please specify) _____		Yes/No/Don't know	(fill in the blank)	(fill in the blank)
14. Gang violence	Yes/No/Don't know	☐ Research study ☐ Ad hoc survey ☐ Other (please specify) _____		Yes/No/Don't know	(fill in the blank)	(fill in the blank)
15. Violence in schools, including bullying	Yes/No/Don't know	☐ Research study ☐ Ad hoc survey ☐ Other (please specify) _____		Yes/No/Don't know	(fill in the blank)	(fill in the blank)
16. Violence in workplaces (where minors are working)	Yes/No/Don't know	☐ Research study ☐ Ad hoc survey ☐ Other (please specify) _____		Yes/No/Don't know	(fill in the blank)	(fill in the blank)

PIECES

	Prevalence	If yes for prevalence estimate specify source of data	If yes for prevalence estimate specify measure(s) and year of data	Incidence	If yes for incidence specify incidence measure(s) and timeframe	If yes for incidence specify source of data
17. Violence in 'care' (e.g., foster care, nurseries, care homes, etc.)	Yes/No/Don't know	☐ Research study ☐ Ad hoc survey ☐ Other (please specify) _____		Yes/No/Don't know	(fill in the blank)	(fill in the blank)
18. Violence in detention or in the justice system (e.g., by the police, in young offender accommodation, etc.)	Yes/No/Don't know	☐ Research study ☐ Ad hoc survey ☐ Other (please specify) _____		Yes/No/Don't know	(fill in the blank)	(fill in the blank)
19. Online and cyber abuse, cyberbullying	Yes/No/Don't know	☐ Research study ☐ Ad hoc survey ☐ Other (please specify) _____		Yes/No/Don't know	(fill in the blank)	(fill in the blank)
20. Female genital mutilation/cutting	Yes/No/Don't know	☐ Research study ☐ Ad hoc survey ☐ Other (please specify) _____		Yes/No/Don't know	(fill in the blank)	(fill in the blank)

	Prevalence	If yes for prevalence estimate specify source of data	If yes for prevalence estimate specify measure(s) and year of data	Incidence	If yes for incidence specify incidence measure(s) and timeframe	If yes for incidence specify source of data
21. Forced marriage	Yes/No/Don't know	☐ Research study ☐ Ad hoc survey ☐ Other (please specify) _____		Yes/No/Don't know	(fill in the blank)	(fill in the blank)
22. Harmful traditional practices	Yes/No/Don't know	☐ Research study ☐ Ad hoc survey ☐ Other (please specify) _____		Yes/No/Don't know	(fill in the blank)	(fill in the blank)
23. Self harm	Yes/No/Don't know	☐ Research study ☐ Ad hoc survey ☐ Other (please specify) _____		Yes/No/Don't know	(fill in the blank)	(fill in the blank)
24. Suicide	Yes/No/Don't know	☐ Research study ☐ Ad hoc survey ☐ Other (please specify) _____		Yes/No/Don't kno	(fill in the blank)	(fill in the blank)

PIECES

II. Routinely collected administrative data

The next questions ask about national level routinely collected sources of administrative data across several sectors (e.g., health, justice, social services) <u>in relation to child maltreatment and its outcomes</u>.

	Death/mortality registry	National hospitalisation discharge database/ registry	National Trauma registry	National police database	Child protection registry
25. Does your country have the following at the national level?	Yes/No/Other	Yes/No/Other	Yes/No/Other	Yes/No/Other	Yes/No/Other
If no for all, skip to 42					
26. What is the name of the registry/database	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)
27. Are the data representative of the national population (i.e. can valid population-based estimates be made)?	Yes/No/Don't know	Yes/No/Don't know	Yes/No/Don't know	Yes/No/Don't know	Yes/No/Don't know
28. Which authority finances the data collection?	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)
29. Which authority is responsible for data collection?	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)

	Death/mortality registry	National hospitalisation discharge database/ registry	National Trauma registry	National police database	Child protection registry
30. Which authority/ organisation is responsible for data analysis and reporting?	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)
31. What is the average length of time between recording of a case and availability of data in published form? (specify in months)	(fill in # months)	(fill in # months)	(fill in # months)	(fill in # months)	(fill in # months)
32. Which is the most recent year for which data are publicly available (i.e. data are available in report form)?	(fill in year)	(fill in year)	(fill in year)	(fill in year)	(fill in year)

PIECES

	Death/mortality registry	National hospitalisation discharge database/ registry	National Trauma registry	National police database	Child protection registry
33. Which of the following variables are collected? (Tick all that apply)	☐ Age ☐ Gender ☐ Nationality ☐ Ethnicity ☐ Family income level ☐ Geographic location (e.g., postal address, rural/ urban) ☐ Type of child maltreatment (e.g., physical abuse, sexual abuse, etc.) ☐ Relationship between the victim and (suspected) perpetrator ☐ Whether child had witnessed violence ☐ Whether child had been a victim of recurrent violence	☐ Age ☐ Gender ☐ Nationality ☐ Ethnicity ☐ Family income level ☐ Geographic location (e.g., postal address, rural/ urban) ☐ Type of child maltreatment (e.g., physical abuse, sexual abuse, etc.) ☐ Relationship between the victim and suspected offender ☐ Whether victim has witnessed violence ☐ Short-and/or long-term outcomes of violence for the child	☐ Age ☐ Gender ☐ Nationality ☐ Ethnicity ☐ Family income level ☐ Geographic location (e.g., postal address, rural/ urban) ☐ Type of child maltreatment (e.g., physical abuse, sexual abuse, etc.) ☐ Relationship between the victim and suspected offender ☐ Whether victim has witnessed violence ☐ Short-and/or long-term outcomes of violence for the child	☐ Age ☐ Gender ☐ Nationality ☐ Ethnicity ☐ Family income level ☐ Geographic location (e.g., postal address, rural/ urban) ☐ Type of child maltreatment (e.g., physical abuse, sexual abuse, etc.) ☐ Relationship between the victim and suspected offender ☐ Whether victim has witnessed violence ☐ Short-and/or long-term outcomes of violence for the child	☐ Age ☐ Gender ☐ Nationality ☐ Ethnicity ☐ Family income level ☐ Geographic location (e.g., postal address, rural/ urban) ☐ Type of child maltreatment (e.g., physical abuse, sexual abuse, etc.) ☐ Relationship between the victim and suspected offender ☐ Whether victim has witnessed violence ☐ Short-and/or long-term outcomes of violence for the child

	Death/mortality registry	National hospitalisation discharge database/ registry	National Trauma registry	National police database	Child protection registry
34. Is there a mechanism within the data system that routinely identifies if the victim has previously/ repeatedly been a victim of violence (e.g., flags repeat entries)?	Yes/No/Don't know	Yes/No/Don't know	Yes/No/Don't know	Yes/No/Don't know	Yes/No/Don't know
35. Is there a unique identifier (or group of variables) in the data set that would allow record linkage between different databases?	Yes/No/Don't know	Yes/No/Don't know	Yes/No/Don't know	Yes/No/Don't know	Yes/No/Don't know
35a. If yes, please specify variable(s)	(Fill in the blank)	(Fill in the blank)	(Fill in the blank)	(Fill in the blank)	(Fill in the blank)
36. In what form are the data published/ made available? (Tick all that apply)	☐ Hard copy ☐ Online statistics ☐ Other (specify) _____	☐ Hard copy ☐ Online statistics ☐ Other (specify) _____	☐ Hard copy ☐ Online statistics ☐ Other (specify) _____	☐ Hard copy ☐ Online statistics ☐ Other (specify) _____	☐ Hard copy ☐ Online statistics ☐ Other (specify) _____
37. Who can access the published data? (Tick all that apply)	☐ Researcher ☐ Administrator ☐ Public ☐ Ministry ☐ NGO ☐ Other (specify) _____	☐ Researcher ☐ Administrator ☐ Public ☐ Ministry ☐ NGO ☐ Other (specify) _____	☐ Researcher ☐ Administrator ☐ Public ☐ Ministry ☐ NGO ☐ Other (specify) _____	☐ Researcher ☐ Administrator ☐ Public ☐ Ministry ☐ NGO ☐ Other (specify) _____	☐ Researcher ☐ Administrator ☐ Public ☐ Ministry ☐ NGO ☐ Other (specify) _____

PIECES

	Death/mortality registry	National hospitalisation discharge database/registry	National Trauma registry	National police database	Child protection registry
38. Are the data used for any of the following purposes related to the prevention of child maltreatment? (Tick all that apply)	☐ Monitoring/surveillance ☐ Ensure victim/offender protection ☐ Inform/evaluate policy/programmes ☐ Planning purposes ☐ Contribute to database held at another organisation ☐ Preparation of report to the UN Committee of the rights of the child ☐ Research ☐ Other (specify): _____	☐ Monitoring/surveillance ☐ Ensure victim/offender protection ☐ Inform/evaluate policy/programmes ☐ Planning purposes ☐ Contribute to database held at another organisation ☐ Preparation of report to the UN Committee of the rights of the child ☐ Research ☐ Other (specify): _____	☐ Monitoring/surveillance ☐ Ensure victim/offender protection ☐ Inform/evaluate policy/programmes ☐ Planning purposes ☐ Contribute to database held at another organisation ☐ Preparation of report to the UN Committee of the rights of the child ☐ Research ☐ Other (specify): _____	☐ Monitoring/surveillance ☐ Ensure victim/offender protection ☐ Inform/evaluate policy/programmes ☐ Planning purposes ☐ Contribute to database held at another organisation ☐ Preparation of report to the UN Committee of the rights of the child ☐ Research ☐ Other (specify): _____	☐ Monitoring/surveillance ☐ Ensure victim/offender protection ☐ Inform/evaluate policy/programmes ☐ Planning purposes ☐ Contribute to database held at another organisation ☐ Preparation of report to the UN Committee of the rights of the child ☐ Research ☐ Other (specify): _____
39. What efforts been undertaken to improve the quality and usage of data (e.g. validity, missing data, increase timeliness of data)	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)

	Death/mortality registry	National hospitalisation discharge database/ registry	National Trauma registry	National police database	Child protection registry
40. What are the gaps in the data from a violence prevention perspective and what efforts have been made to address the gaps?	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)
41. Which organisations use the data? e.g. child protection, social services, education, health sector, law enforcement, etc	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)	(fill in blank)

PIECES

II.I Ad-hoc surveys

The next questions ask about national level ad hoc surveys that have included <u>child maltreatment and its outcomes</u>.

42. Since 2008 how many ad-hoc surveys implemented at the national level in your country included child maltreatment related topics?

❑ None (skip to #52)

❑ One

❑ Two

❑ More than two

❑ Other (please specify) _____

If one or more surveys has been implemented…

42a. Which child maltreatment related topics did the survey(s) cover? (Tick all that apply)

❑ Physical violence in the family in general

❑ Child neglect

❑ Child abandonment

❑ Child sexual abuse

❑ Child sexual exploitation

❑ Corporal punishment

❑ Emotional abuse of children

❑ Exposure of child to domestic violence

❑ Dating or intimate partner violence in young people's relationships

❑ Child prostitution

❑ Child pornography

❑ Child solicitation/grooming

❑ Peer to peer violence

❑ Violence in youth gangs

❑ Violence in schools, including bullying

❑ Violence in workplaces

❑ Violence in communities/neighbourhoods/public places

❑ Violence in 'care' (nurseries, care homes, etc.)

☐ Violence in detention or in the justice system (e.g., by the police, in young offender accommodation, etc.)

☐ Online and cyber abuse, cyberbullying

☐ Female genital mutilation/cutting

☐ Forced marriage

☐ Harmful traditional practices

☐ Self harm

☐ Suicidal behaviour

The following questions are asked about the three most recent adhoc surveys. If there were fewer than three adhoc surveys at the national level in the last five years please provide information on what has been undertaken

43. What was the title and focus of the three most recent adhoc surveys that have included child maltreatment related topics?

Adhoc survey #1   Name: _____ Child maltreatment topic(s) included: _____

Adhoc survey #2   Name:_____ Child maltreatment topic(s) included:_____

Adhoc survey #3   Name:_____ Child maltreatment topic(s) included:_____

Questions 44-57 will repeat for each campaign listed in #43 above.

Ad hoc survey #1:

44. Which authority was responsible for performing the survey (design, collection, analysis)? e.g. Ministry, Child Protection (Fill in blank)

☐ Ministry responsible for Health

☐ Ministry responsible for Social Services/Child Protection

☐ Ministry responsible for Justice

☐ NGO

☐ Private company

☐ Other (please specify) _____

45. Which authority financed the survey collection?

- ☐ Ministry responsible for Health
- ☐ Ministry responsible for Social Services/Child Protection
- ☐ Ministry responsible for Justice
- ☐ NGO
- ☐ Private company
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

46. Was the survey sample representative of the national population? (Yes/No/Don't know)

47. Was the survey a one time survey or is it periodically repeated?

- ☐ One-time
- ☐ Periodically repeated (specify period) _____
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

48. Were children (under 18 years of age) included as respondents? (Yes/No/Don't know)

49. Which of the following variables were collected? (Tick all that apply)

- ☐ Age
- ☐ Gender
- ☐ Nationality
- ☐ Ethnicity
- ☐ Family income level
- ☐ Geographic location (e.g., postal address, rural/ urban)
- ☐ Type of maltreatment
- ☐ Relationship between the victim and perpetrator
- ☐ Whether child witnessed domestic violence as a child
- ☐ Outcome of maltreatment for the child (e.g., types of injuries, hospitalisations, etc.)

50. Is there a unique identifier or other variable (e.g., postal code) in the data set that would allow record linkage between different databases at an individual or family level? (Yes/No/Don't know)

If yes…

    50a. If yes please specify variable(s) (Fill in blank)

51. What is the purpose of collecting the child maltreatment related data? (Tick all that apply)

- ☐ Monitor prevalence
- ☐ Inform/evaluate policy
- ☐ Inform/evaluation programming
- ☐ Plan capacity
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

52. How are the survey results made available? (Tick all that apply)

- ☐ Hard copy survey report _____ (reference)
- ☐ Survey report can be downloaded from the Internet _____ weblink
- ☐ Online survey results _____weblink
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

53. What was the timeframe between when survey data were collected and when survey results are made available? (Fill in # months)

54. Have any efforts been undertaken to improve surveys on violence against children with regards to validation of findings, question development, interview methods, training of interviewers or researchers) (Fill in blank)

55. Are there any reports stating what gaps/limitations may exist in the survey data and how these are being addressed? (Fill in blank)

IV. Data linkage

56. Are there any national data sharing agreements or laws in place to ensure data on violence against children are shared between various government departments and agencies for improved prevention?
(Yes/No/Don't know)
If Yes, please provide a reference or link.
If No…

56a. Has the issue of sharing data been discussed/considered?
(Yes/No/Don't know)

56b. Are there confidentiality laws prohibiting such sharing?
(Yes/No/Don't know)

57. Is it possible to search and link data on one child victim from multiple data sources (e.g. police, child welfare, child protection)?
(Yes/No/Don't know)

If yes…

57a. Which organisation(s) is/are responsible for this data linkage? (Fill in blank)

57b. What is the main purpose of this data linkage?

❑ System monitoring

❑ Case management/follow up

❑ Child death review

❑ Research

❑ Other (please specify) _____

57c. Can one source of data (e.g. police data) be electronically accessed by another agency (e.g. child welfare or child protection) when assisting a victim?
(Yes/No/Don't know)

Thank you for assisting us to map data on children and violence across the European Union.

EUROPEAN
child
SAFETY ALLIANCE

European Child Safety Alliance
RoSPA House
28 Calthorpe Road,
Edgbaston,Birmingham, B15 1RP, UK

E-mail secretariat@childsafetyeurope.org
Website www.childsafetyeurope.org
Tel +44 121 248 2000
Fax +44 121 248 2001

Generalitat de Catalunya
Agència de Salut Pública
de Catalunya

KAGes
LSF
Landesnervenklinik Sigmund Freud

Psytel Ingéniérie de l'information

RoSPA
The Royal Society for the
Prevention of Accidents

uclan
University of Central Lancashire

Vaikų linija
116 111 www.vaikulinija.lt