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Introduction

One of the key recommendations of the World Report on Violence against Children addresses the need to change societal norms regarding violence against children. Paulo Sérgio Pinheiro, an independent expert for the United Nations secretary-general’s study on violence against children, recommended promoting non-violent values and awareness-raising: “I recommend that States and civil society should strive to transform attitudes that condone or normalize violence against children, including stereotypical gender roles and discrimination, acceptance of corporal punishment, and other harmful traditional practices. States should ensure that children’s rights are disseminated and understood, including by children. Public information campaigns should be used to sensitize the public about the harmful effects that violence has on children. States should encourage the media to promote non-violent values and implement guidelines to ensure full respect for the rights of the child in all media coverage.”

The United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child General Comment No. 13 (2011) also speaks about educational measures that “should address attitudes, traditions, customs and behavioural practices which condone and promote violence against children. They should encourage open discussion about violence, including the engagement of media and civil society. They should support children’s life skills, knowledge and participation and enhance the capacities of caregivers and professionals in contact with children. They can be initiated and implemented by both State and civil society actors under the responsibility of the State”.

The Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe’s Recommendation CM/Rec (2009)10 calls on each member state to develop an integrated national strategy for the protection of children from violence that has as its main objective “the qualitative change in the perception of children and childhood, and of violence against children”. Further they suggest that “this objective can only be achieved when all segments of society have become sufficiently aware of the rights of the child and of the harmful impact of violence on children; when organisational cultures and practices have been strengthened in this regard, and bridges built across professions to afford more and better protection to children; when mindsets have been transformed, including through the means of information and communication technologies; when the underlying economic and social conditions associated with violence have been addressed – in other words it is only possible when a genuine culture of respect for the rights of the child has permeated the fabric of society”. The recommendation calls for the promotion of “a clear and unequivocal intolerance of all forms of violence against children, however mild, throughout society. Public attitudes rooted in social and cultural norms and traditions which accept, condone or support violence, including stereotypical gender roles, racial or ethnic discrimination, acceptance of corporal punishment and other harmful traditional practices should be publicly condemned and eliminated. The harmful effects that all forms of violence have on children should be made widely known”.

While a recent report by MacKay and Vincenten found that the majority of member states that participated in the study have undertaken awareness raising activities in the past five years, particularly in the area of child maltreatment, many reported campaigns of limited scope and others indicated there had been no such campaigns.

To further explore awareness raising activities addressing violence against children across the EU, an in-depth investigation 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).
Rational and Objectives

Public awareness activities are an important part of violence prevention because societal norms and cultural attitudes are risk and protective factors for the development of various forms of violence, including violence against children. The widely quoted ‘Ecological model’ (Figure 1) has been promoted by major human rights organisations such as the World Health Organisation (WHO) to explain the causes and contributing factors for violence. This model proposes that violence and poor outcomes for children are best understood as resulting from a complex interaction between risks and protective factors at the four levels of the individual child, the family/relationships, the community and the broader society. The fourth – societal level – looks at the broad societal factors that help create a climate in which violence is encouraged or inhibited. These factors among others include various social and cultural norms that give priority to parental rights over child welfare, those that regard suicide as a matter of individual choice instead of a preventable act of violence, those that entrench male dominance over women and children etc.

Figure 1. Ecological model for understanding violence

One of the key mechanisms used to change societal and cultural norms is social marketing. Andreasen defines social marketing as “the application of proven concepts and techniques drawn from the commercial sector to promote changes in diverse socially important behaviors such as drug use, smoking, sexual behavior”. Social marketing campaigns can use a range of strategies to raise awareness, educate the public and promote change. A report on a mass media based campaign identified five potential message strategies for mass media prevention campaigns: messages about criminal sanctions, promoting community intervention, mobilising social disapproval, drawing attention to the consequences, and informing the public that help is available. Evans explains that social marketing uses three theory based approaches - behavioural, persuasion focused, and those based on exposure - to target changes in health risk behaviour. Social cognitive theory, developed by A.Bandura, is based on response consequences, observational learning, and behavioural modelling. Persuasion theory indicates that people must engage in message “elaboration” for long-term persuasion to occur. Exposure theorists study how the intensity of and length of exposure to a message affects behaviour. Media-based social marketing campaigns could have potential to contribute to the prevention of child maltreatment. A media-based social marketing campaign could contribute to the prevention of child maltreatment by raising public awareness of the issue and educating and fostering pro-social behaviours within families.
The 2013 European Report on preventing child maltreatment describes media-based public awareness programmes as universal violence prevention programmes that aim to disseminate messages among the general population using channels such as television, radio, printed materials and the Internet. The report suggests that awareness programmes can be used for a variety of purposes, including raising awareness of child abuse, promoting positive parenting practices, changing social norms regarding the acceptance of abusive behaviour and encouraging the reporting of maltreatment. According to the authors of the report, few studies have examined the effectiveness of mass media programmes in reducing child maltreatment, and findings from studies have been mixed. The report provides evidence that public awareness campaigns can be effective in educating the public about the existence of child maltreatment and its effects on victims.

The objectives of this investigation were:

- To collect information about awareness raising campaigns addressing violence against children from experts in EU Member States
- To analyse and synthesise received responses, identify gaps and good practices and provide recommendations for further action on awareness raising
Methods

Survey development

The process of questionnaire development included several stages, beginning with the drafting of an initial questionnaire to cover various aspects about campaigns relating to any form of violence against children. The World report on violence and health defines child abuse or maltreatment as “all forms of physical and/or emotional ill-treatment, sexual abuse, neglect or negligent treatment or commercial or other exploitation, resulting in actual or potential harm to the child’s health, survival, development or dignity in the context of a relationship of responsibility, trust or power.”

An initial question asked about the focus of all campaigns in the last five years, and then subsequent questions asked about the three most recent campaigns including the purpose of the campaign, the target audience, the type of organization leading the campaign, partnership, funding, communication channels and means used in the campaign, if the campaign involved celebrities, professional athletes or other personalities, if the campaign was formally evaluated and whether the reach of the campaign had been estimated.

In the next phase the project team reviewed the draft and agreement was reached on the content, phrasing, and definitions. Special attention was devoted to eliminating duplication of issues by the members of the research consortium, while still covering the highest possible range of related aspects. The internal review process was followed by an external panel of either independent or public body experts in the area of violence against children from countries including Greece, the UK, and Canada, as well as from the European charter 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 (Austria, France, Lithuania, Romania, Spain and 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 (total n=32). Contact was first made with experts identified during a previous project examining violence against children (MacKay & Vincenten, 2014) and the WHO violence & injury prevention focal points in EU member states (MS) and appropriate respondents were sought. Additional 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 who could review the proposed list of respondents for all six policy areas including awareness raising activities, recommend alternate respondents 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 web 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. No ethics review was sought as no confidential information was gathered other than respondent identity and they were assured this would be kept confidential.
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 spreadsheet and distributed to the lead author for review and analysis.

Analysis
Data were reviewed for completeness, tabulated and a descriptive analysis was conducted.

Results

Survey response
The response rate to the survey was 53%, with responses provided by 17 out of the 32 countries (counting Scotland, Northern Ireland, England and Wales separately). Two of the countries (Finland and Slovakia) did not complete the questionnaire and are excluded from the analysis and Bulgaria provided a description of two campaigns which were used to complete the survey but provided limited information. Thus the results presented here represent information from only 15 countries (47%): Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Greece, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, the Netherlands and England (UK). Among the 15 countries, three (20%) were members of a government department, one (7%) was an academic/senior practitioner and 11 (73%) were working in violence prevention or child protection focused NGOs.

Campaigns in the last five years
To assess the breadth of campaigns in the last five years, respondents were asked if there had been one or more national campaign designed to raise awareness of any of 27 possible options related to violence against children. None of the respondents indicated there had been a campaign in the past five years for seven of the topics: gang violence, violence in the workplace, violence in care (e.g., foster care, care home), violence in detention or in the justice system, use of force or restraint in secure accommodation, self harm and suicidal behaviour.

Table 1 provides an overview of topics reported for remaining 20 topics for the 14 countries responding. The most common campaign topics indicated were those addressing sexual abuse (11), bullying or cyberbullying (10) and physical violence in the family (8), online abuse (8), exposure of child to domestic violence (7) and child sexual exploitation (7).

The number of topics covered by country ranged from 2 to 12 (mean average 6). The countries reporting the greatest number of topics covered were Cyprus and Greece followed by Lithuania, Poland and Portugal.
Table 1. Overview of forms of violence addressed by awareness raising campaigns in the past 5 years (n=14*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of violence</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>CY</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>LT</th>
<th>LV</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical violence in the family</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child neglect</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child abandonment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child sexual abuse</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child sexual exploitation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal punishment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional abuse of children</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure of child to domestic violence</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating or intimate partner violence in young people’s relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child prostitution</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child pornography</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child solicitation/grooming</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying and/or cyberbullying</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer to peer violence</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence in schools</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence in communities/neighbourhoods/public places</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online abuse</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female genital mutilation/cutting</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced marriage</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmful traditional practices</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total topics per country</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* data unavailable for Bulgaria; UK refers to England only
Details of most recent campaigns

The remaining analysis is based on further detail provided by respondents on up to three of the most recent awareness raising campaigns. Several examples of the campaigns are provided in Appendix 2 to provide an idea of recent campaigns.

Ten respondents described three campaigns, two respondents described two campaigns and three respondents described one campaign. The titles and focus of the 37 campaigns upon which details were reported are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Title* and focus of selected awareness raising campaigns (up to three per country)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Campaign #1</th>
<th>Campaign #2</th>
<th>Campaign #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Weisse Feder (White Feather Campaign) <a href="http://www.schulpyschologie.at/gewaltauflaen/">http://www.schulpyschologie.at/gewaltauflaen/</a></td>
<td>Together for fairness and against violence to children and youth</td>
<td>Kampagne „misses-mister-miss handelt“ (Campaign on Abuse by Happy Kids) <a href="http://www.happykids.at/">http://www.happykids.at/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>ONE in FIVE Campaign</td>
<td>Sexual violence against children</td>
<td>Justice for all girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Child sexual exploitation</td>
<td>Child prostitution</td>
<td>Problem je manji kad se podijeli (A problem seems smaller when is shared)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Svaki propušten poziv je propuštena prilika (Every missed call is a missed opportunity)</td>
<td>Childline support for children</td>
<td>I roditeljima je potrebna podrška (Parents need support too)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>ONE in FIVE campaign</td>
<td>Child sexual abuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Titles and focus are provided as an example of recent campaigns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Campaign #1</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Campaign #2</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Campaign #3</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>Words hurt for a lifetime</td>
<td>Child emotional abuse (in the family)</td>
<td>You never know, who is on the other side</td>
<td>Abuse online, safety online</td>
<td>Protect me - I am small</td>
<td>Abuse against babies/very small children, prevention of shaken baby syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>Traditions that should not be passed on</td>
<td>Corporal punishment of children</td>
<td>Words hurt for a lifetime</td>
<td>Emotional abuse of children</td>
<td>Bad touch</td>
<td>Child sexual abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Een Veilig Thuis. Daar maak je je toch sterk voor?</td>
<td>Child abuse</td>
<td>Geweld in huiselijke kring</td>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>Signalere kun je leren</td>
<td>Child abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Stop Cyberbullying</td>
<td>Against online bullying</td>
<td>Every move online leaves a trace</td>
<td>Grooming</td>
<td>Bad tradition</td>
<td>Against corporal punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Cut the violence</td>
<td>Bullying, dating violence, sexual violence, domestic violence against children</td>
<td>Your safety is not a game. Stay connected</td>
<td>Street safety and violence against children and young people in the street/public places</td>
<td>Dislike homophobic bullying</td>
<td>Bullying/cyberbullying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Campaign for combating and preventing family violence</td>
<td>Family violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK***</td>
<td>This is abuse</td>
<td>Violence in young people's intimate relationships</td>
<td>Full Stop</td>
<td>Child maltreatment - neglect, social, physical and emotional abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* note that in many cases the title has been translated to English; links to related websites are listed if provided

** limited information available

*** UK refers to England only
When the type of lead agency for these campaigns was examined, 76% were led by NGOs, 19% by governmental agencies and 5% by hospitals (Figure 2).

![Figure 2. The type of organization leading the campaign (n=37)](image)

The most common target audiences for the campaigns were the general public (71%), staff of educational institutions (49%), parents/caregivers (49%) and children (40%) (Figure 3). A specific question asking whether the issues of child poverty or child social and health inequalities were considered during campaign development and/or implementation were poorly answered. Only one (3%) indicated that the issues had been considered, although a number of respondents indicated they did not know. The example given was conducting discussion groups conducted in schools from impoverished urban areas so that children and young people with risk factors for victimization and social vulnerabilities were included.

![Figure 3. Target audience(s)* of the campaign (n=37)](image)
Figure 4 provides a breakdown of the reported purposes of the 37 campaigns. The most common purposes reported were to raise awareness about the problem (84%), give a message to the general public that violence is unacceptable (59%), advertise sources of help (49%), encourage victims to seek help (43%), challenge widely held unhelpful beliefs (41%) and help professionals or parents respond to the issue (41%).

Figure 4. The purpose(s)* of the campaign (n=37)

Figure 5 provides a breakdown of funding sources for the campaigns. The most frequently mentioned funder was government (35%), followed by private/corporate funding (22%) and charity/foundation (22%).

Figure 5. Funding sources* for the campaign (n=37)
Only one campaign (3%) was funded fully from donations from individuals. Among the 41% who indicated ‘other’ sources of funding the majority were EU programmes (which could also be considered government), although the Council of Europe and self-funding were also mentioned. Pro bono work by an advertisement agency was mentioned in the descriptions of 29% of campaigns and voluntary work in 9%.

The most commonly reported channels of communication used during the 35 campaigns providing information were social ads on TV (66%), followed by posters (49%) and websites (43%) (Figure 6). Other forms of communication reported included production of an educational booklet, TV programme or series, radio ad, social networking tools and other - application for mobile phones (GR), magnet for the refrigerator (LT), guidelines for schools (PL), e-learning for schools (NL). Nine (26%) of the campaigns reported involving celebrities, who varied from composers (CY), singers (CY, LT), actors (CY, LT, PT), journalists (CY), models, TV celebrities (AT, LT) and sportsmen (AT).

![Figure 6. Communication channels* used in campaign (n=35)](image)

Only 10 (31%) of the 32 campaigns where information regarding child participation was available, indicated children had been involved in the design, delivery or evaluation of the campaign. However an equal number did not know whether or not children had actively participated. However, when the details of child participation were examined, most were not what would be considered good examples of child participation. For example they were involved during the design phase as actors or models in still photography and video shoots. Even when their involvement was described as participatipation in the creation of a PSA announcement it is not clear that included their input to messages, etc. Children were involved in the delivery of campaigns in a few cases, participating in peer-to-peer training sessions and other activities targeting bullying implemented within their schools where they were the target audience of the activities. Similarly, they were involved in assessing the campaign impact as recipients of campaign activities.
The survey also included a question about the reach of the campaign, however data on reach were provided for only seven of the campaigns and measures of reach varied. The campaign “Words hurt for a lifetime” in Lithuania was reported as being known to 42% of the country population and the same campaign delivered in Latvia was estimated to have reached 38% of the inhabitants of Latvia. The campaign “Cut the violence” from Portugal was reported to have received 140,000 online views. Another Portuguese campaign, “Your safety is not a game. Stay connected”, received around 20,000 online views of the campaign online and 60,000 copies of campaign material were distributed to schools. The Lithuanian campaign “Protect me - I am small” reported that 53% of the population noticed the campaign (39% of population was acknowledged with the campaign material; 14% more knew about the campaign, but were not acknowledged with the material) and 30% of the population in Latvia were aware of the “Bad touch” campaign.

More extensive information on evaluation, including the evaluations reports, was only provided for two campaigns, one from the Netherlands and the other from Lithuania. The lack of evaluation is concerning as it means investment of resources without an assessment of their impact - whether positive or negative.
Discussion

The results of the survey need to be considered in light of several limitations. First is the low response rate, which means that despite repeated attempts the results only represent campaigns from less than half of EU member states. Second while we received a description of various campaigns from the respondents, the questionnaire only asked for the details of up to three campaigns from the past five years. Thus it is important to note that the responses may not cover all awareness-raising campaigns in the responding countries during the time period in question. It is also worth noting that while the survey aimed to elicit information on campaigns implemented at the national level, we noted that a number of the national campaigns reported reflected national implementation of international campaigns such as Free Our Voices (http://www.freeourvoices.org), One in Five (http://www.coe.int/t/dg3/children/1in5/default_en.asp), #ENDviolence against children (http://www.unicef.org/endviolence/).

According to the WHO Ecological model of violence certain societal attitudes towards violence could be a risk factor and might create a climate where violent behaviour is accepted. However it is accepted that changing societal attitudes is a long and difficult task. The survey results indicate that many interesting campaigns have been implemented in the countries participating, but in the majority cases no information on whether the campaigns resulted in a change at the societal level was provided. One campaign with more information on evaluation, Soul City used media to promote messages for change in healthy relationships and healthy behaviour and while no results were available, they have posted their methodology to measure audience impact on the campaign website.16

As awareness-raising campaigns attempt to provide some information or convey a certain message, it is important to use methods measuring the impact of such campaigns on the society to ensure the objectives are being met. Therefore evaluation of campaigns is important as it helps to understand whether a campaign has met its goals – reached the target audience and had the intended impact (e.g., changing attitudes). Pre- and post-campaign comparison surveys or other methods could be used for the evaluation purposes. Evaluation evidence also is important to ensure that unintended negative impacts have not occurred and there have actually been positive gains.17 The little information received from the respondents on the evaluation could mean that no evaluation of impact has been done or it could be that the respondents were not aware about the evaluation. For example, although the information on evaluation of the UK the Home Office campaign “This is Abuse” was not provided in the questionnaire, we were able to find an evaluation report on the internet.18 This makes it difficult to assess based on the results of this survey how big of an issue failure to measure impact of campaigns is.

A challenge is that campaigns measure individual attitudes assuming that attitudes necessarily predict behaviour. Evidence on behaviour change in terms of the prevalence of violence is slim. Also campaigns assume that shared social norms about violence influence whether or not violence happens but few measure the social norms – shared beliefs, what the population think others expect them to do and whether they conform.

Another issue that did not appear to be addressed very well in the campaigns described is child participation. Child participation is one of the core principles of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), which asserts that children and young people have the right to freely express their views and that there is an obligation to listen to children’s views and to facilitate their participation in all matters affecting them within the family, schools, local communities, public services, institutions, government policy, and judicial procedures.19,20 In this sense it recognizes the potential of children to share their perspectives and to participate as actors of change. As such it behoves those developing awareness campaigns, and particularly campaigns directly targeting children, to involve children in campaign development and implementation. Further that involvement should not be token, but should involve real opportunities for children to give their input into messages, communication channels, etc.
Related to this is the fact that the development of material for campaigns is resource intensive and expensive, therefore in-kind contributions from advertising agencies and media support can be very important to the success of a campaign, and this type of arrangement was certainly prevalent in the campaigns described by respondents. Given the sensitivity of the topic, it is important that experts in the prevention of violence against children work closely with the businesses developing the campaigns as the communication channels, look, key messages and related materials are developed and the campaign is implemented. Further where possible it is always advisable to focus test campaign materials with the target audiences prior to finalising them.

**Conclusions and recommendations**

Despite the lower than anticipated response rate, the information provided by experts in the participating countries indicates that awareness-raising activities are underway. What is less clear from the information provided is whether the campaigns are achieving their purpose.

Given our findings, we make recommendations in four areas:

**Evaluation**

A systematic and rigorous evaluation of a campaign is important in order to not only assess for positive impacts, but also to see if there were any negative effects. Evaluation methods exist and resources should be made available from the outset of planning to ensure this important step is built in to all campaigns.

**Communication channels**

The majority of campaigns used traditional channels of communication (e.g., TV ads and programmes). The expanded use of social media and Internet is recommended to increase the audience reach. The adoption of social media is increasingly necessary to reach out to groups who are abandoning traditional broadcast technologies (e.g., Radio, television). However, it is also important to ensure that communication channels selected are appropriate to the target audience and do not inadvertently decrease access to information (e.g., some high risk groups may not use social media).

**Child participation**

Specific efforts should be made to actively engage child participation in ways that protect their rights during the development and implementation of awareness campaigns addressing violence against children. Particularly when children are a target audience for campaign messages and activities opportunities for input or feedback should be created.

**Exchange of good practice**

Given the resources required to develop awareness campaigns, it may be that the adaptation of well-designed social marketing campaigns that have been evaluated and found to be effective (i.e., evaluated and shown to have increased awareness, changed attitudes, etc.) from one country to another may provide a means of reducing costs. The EU and international organisations could play an important role in facilitating the exchange of information necessary to achieve this.
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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:

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.).
4. 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 – Examples of campaigns

Campaign “Cut the violence”, Portugal

TV ad: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b8vXfb80gF4
Radio ad: https://soundcloud.com/apav_pt/spot-corta-com-a-violencia
Various material: http://www.apavparajovens.pt/pt/go/corta-com-a-violencia
Special website: http://www.apavparajovens.pt/en

E-ABC (European anti-bullying campaign), Greece

Special website: http://www.e-abc.eu/
TV ad: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZMXJfVPYoy0&list=PL%201TbKE72X8N-JxyquGHsIB8FrJ_aJLg
This is abuse, UK

Special website [http://thisisabuse.direct.gov.uk/](http://thisisabuse.direct.gov.uk/)
Appendix 3 – Paper version of survey questionnaire

PIECES: Policy investigation in Europe on Child Endangerment & Support

In depth investigations - policy area #6: National awareness raising activities related to violence against children.

This survey aims to collect information on national campaigns designed to raise awareness and inform the public about various forms of children abuse and neglect in European Union Member States. The purpose of the survey is to identify knowledge about good practice that can be shared with policy makers across Europe to support future planning and implementation. The survey has questions about the types of abuse covered by national campaigns, the target audiences, who implemented and funded the campaigns, the campaign tools developed and whether campaigns were evaluated.

As an expert in this field in your country who has agreed to take part, we ask that you please answer as many questions as possible and provide requested links for further information where available.

Name of respondent: (Fill in the blank)

Specialty: (Fill in the blank)

Organization: (Fill in the blank)

Position in the organization: (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)

1. In the past 5 years has there been a national campaign designed to raise awareness of any of the following
   (Tick all that apply)
   - Physical violence in the family
   - 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
   - Bullying and/or cyberbullying
   - Peer to peer violence
   - Gang violence
   - Violence in schools
   - Violence in workplaces (where minors are working)
 Violence in communities/neighbourhoods/public places
 Violence in ‘care’ (e.g., foster care, nurseries, care homes, etc.)
 Violence in detention or in the justice system (e.g., by the police, in young offender accommodation, etc.)
 Use of force or restraint in secure accommodation
 Online abuse
 Female genital mutilation/cutting
 Forced marriage
 Harmful traditional practices
 Self harm
 Suicidal behaviour

The following questions are asked about the three most recent campaigns relating to any of the issues mentioned above. If there were fewer than three national campaigns in the last five years please provide information on what has been undertaken.

2. What was the title and focus of the three most recent campaigns?
   Campaign #1   Name: ___________________________ Focus:
   Campaign #2   Name: ___________________________ Focus:
   Campaign #3   Name: ___________________________ Focus:

Questions 3-18 will repeat for each campaign listed in #2 above.

Campaign No 1:

3. Who was/were the target audience(s) (i.e. specific group identified as the intended recipient of a campaign’s message)?
   (Tick all that apply)
   □ Children
   □ Parents/caregivers
   □ Staff of educational institutions (schools, kindergartens, daycares)
   □ Health care professionals
   □ General public
   □ Policy makers
   □ Special populations at risk (please specify)________________
   □ Migrants
   □ Other (please specify) __________________________

4. What was the purpose of the campaign?
   (Tick all that apply)
   □ Raise awareness about the problem
   □ Challenge widely held unhelpful beliefs
   □ Advertise sources of help
   □ Help professionals or parents respond
   □ Give a message to a general public that violence is unacceptable
   □ Encourage victims to seek help
   □ Raise funds for services working with children and violence
   □ Reach out to marginalised and vulnerable groups
   □ Other (please specify) __________________________
5. What type of organization led the campaign?
   (Tick most appropriate box)
   - Non-governmental organisation
   - Governmental Ministry/Department
   - Other publicly funded organization
   - Other (please specify) ________________

6. What is the name of the organisation that led the campaign? (Fill in blank)

7. Who were partners in the campaign? (please provide number of partners and list their names) (Fill in blank)

8. What were the funding sources for the campaign?
   (Tick all that apply)
   - Public (donations from individuals)
   - Charity/foundation
   - Government
   - Private/corporate
   - Other (please specify) ________________

9. Was there any non-financial support for the campaign (e.g. pro bono work by an advertisement agency (i.e. work done without compensation for the public good), volunteer work, contributions in-kind)
   (Yes/No/Don’t know)
   If yes...
   9a. Please specify the nature of the non-financial support
       (Tick all that apply)
       - Pro bono work by an advertisement agency
       - Volunteer work
       - Contributions in-kind
       - Other (please specify) ________________

10. Were children or young people involved in the design, delivery or evaluation of impact of the campaign?
    (Yes/No/Don’t know)
    If yes...
    10a. Please specify how children or young people were involved, at what stage(s) of the campaign they were involved and how they were involved (Fill in the blank)

11. Were the issues of child poverty or child social and health inequalities considered during campaign development and/or implementation?
    (Yes/No/Don’t know)
    If yes...
    11a. Please specify at which stage they were considered and what was done (Fill in the blank)
12. What communication channels and means were used in the campaign? (Tick all that apply and provide a link if available)
- Social ad on TV (provide link if available on the Internet)
- TV programme or series (provide link if available on the Internet)
- Posters (attach/provide link if available on the Internet)
- Radio ad (attach/provide link if available on the Internet)
- Stand-alone campaign website (attach/provide link if available on the Internet)
- Part of an existing website (provide link if available)
- Educational booklet (attach/provide link if available on the Internet)
- Online blog/ Twitter/ Facebook/social networking (please specify/provide link)
- Other material (please specify/provide link if available on the Internet)

13. Did the campaign involve celebrities, professional athletes or other personalities? (Yes/No/Don’t know)

If yes...
13a. Please describe who was involved and what role he/she played (Fill in the blank)

14. When was the campaign implemented (month/year)? (Fill in month and year implemented)

15. How long did the campaign run (number of months)? (Fill in # months)

16. Was the reach of the campaign estimated (the total number of different people or households exposed, at least once, to the campaign)? (Yes/No/Don’t know)

If yes...
16a. Please provide the estimated reach (Fill in the blank)

17. Was the campaign formally evaluated? (Yes/No/Don’t know)

If yes...
17a. Who conducted the evaluation? (Fill in the blank)
17b. What impact/outcome indicators were used and how were they measured? (Fill in the blank)
17c. Briefly describe the results of the evaluation? (Fill in the blank)
17d. Please provide a link or reference for the evaluation if available (Fill in the blank)

18. Is there any evidence that public opinion/social norms/attitudes targeted were impacted as a result of the campaign? (Yes/No/Don’t know)

If yes...
18a. Please specify what has been impacted (e.g., public opinion, social norms or attitudes) and nature of the evidence (e.g., data from public polls) (Fill in the blank)
If you indicated there are only hard copies of campaign materials or evaluation report please send by postal mail to:

PIECES project  
European Child Safety Alliance  
28 Calthorpe Road, Edgbaston  
Birmingham, England  
B15 1RP

Thank you for assisting us to better understand national level activities to raise awareness of violence against children across the European Union.
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

Co-funded by the DAPHNE Programme of the European Union