Indicators on Violence against Children:

Guidelines for Field Testing

UNICEF Child Protection Section, Programme Division, New York
I. Field Test Purpose

The field test of the Indicators should be conducted between July and October 2006 in at least one (1) country in each of the seven (7) UNICEF regions to ensure that the indicators are measurable in different cultural backgrounds while providing the same quality level of information.

The indicators and methods outlined in this manual remain a work in progress. Field testing is necessary:

- to evaluate their usefulness - are they able to provide valid and relevant data for UNICEF country offices in the field test countries for advocacy purposes, knowledge of the extent of the problem, and intervention development (or - refinement);
- to determine whether the information is relevant across cultures and measurable in all UNICEF regions;
- to identify optimal methods of data collection; and,
- to specify the resources required for implementation.

After the field tests are completed, the indicators and the manual will be revised to incorporate the lessons learned in the actual research field. Please carefully read through the attached Manual for the Measurement of Indicators of Violence against Children. These field test guidelines do not provide general information on the measurement of the indicators since such information can be found in the accompanying manual. All comments and suggestions for improving these documents are welcome.

II. Field Test Process

The first step will be to carefully read through the Manual for the Measurement of Indicators of Violence against Children. It is critical to start thinking about research ethics and the availability of resources from the outset of planning the field test process. After considering these issues, the researchers should choose which indicators they will field test. Whenever possible, the complete set of twelve indicators should be field tested together.

In general, the research process for field testing the indicators can be divided into six distinct steps.

1. Selection of partners

The main research process should be carried out by a partner with extensive experience in the field of quantitative research methodology and statistical analysis. Since the field test involves the collection of the actual data as well as the provision of feedback on the research process with regard to the appropriateness of the methodology and the possible refinement of the indicators, a partner with extensive knowledge of the MICS or the management of other related household surveys that are conducted by UNICEF would be ideal. In addition to this technical background, the partner should also provide an experienced staff of interviewers to carry out the actual surveys and offer training and assistance for all staff throughout the research process.

However, it will be possible to collect much of the information necessary for the indicators using methods other than household surveys. Desk reviews of official records will suffice for several of the proposed indicators.

please direct questions and comments to: sschuhmacher@unicef.org
2. Adaptation of research instruments

As mentioned above, multiple methods may be used to collect the data needed for the indicators. We have simply provided a few examples of methods that might be used to collect this information. Ultimately, the methods selected will depend on the appropriateness for different settings in accordance with local and/or national circumstances, priorities, and resources.

Draft modules for several of the indicators were developed by UNICEF PD/CPS in New York. The modules can be found in Appendix B of the indicator manual. These draft instruments should be used as a basis for the research. It is encouraged to add responses or rephrase questions to these modules if this is needed according to the cultural background, as long as the main target of the question remains the same. However, it is not encouraged to develop new questions with a significantly different focus and stimulus. One aim of the field tests is to be able to provide working instruments for the indicators. Therefore, a whole new development of these modules in each field test country would hinder this purpose and endanger the indicator project as a whole, as data from different countries would not be comparable. Whenever possible, we encourage that these modules be incorporated into surveys planned for the near future to reduce survey costs in terms of the burden of data collection and sampling effort.

As outlined in the indicator manual, the following methodologies are proposed for the measurement of indicators (the ID’s of the relevant indicators can be found in the parentheses):

- **Surveys of Individuals** (Indicators 1, 2, 3, 11)
  If possible, data for these Indicators can be gathered via pre-existing household or classroom surveys of individuals that seek representative data for the population. A prime example of this is the Multi-Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS\(^1\)) that ensures a sound methodological setup and uniformity of the research process (e.g. selection of the target child within a household) over time as well as the gathering of all relevant socio-economical data (age, sex, household income, etc.) within its framework. Classroom surveys can be used as an alternative to household surveys to collect data from children and teachers, as long as the methodology used results in data that is representative and comparable to findings from household surveys. These surveys may take the form of paper-and-pencil questionnaires or interviews.

- **Surveys of Institutions** (Indicators 12)
  Data for this indicator can best be gathered by using a survey of schools in the target country. In comparison to individual surveys, the target population is not “children, who currently go to school,” but “schools in the target country.” Therefore, the target audience for this survey is the dean or administrative personnel of the school. However, the selection of target schools has to be representative. That is, the schools selected should represent the overall composition of the country. If the sample exclusively consists of schools in urban areas, then the information collected will not be representative of schools in rural areas.

- **Desk Review** (Indicators 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10)
  It is proposed to gather the data for the rest of the indicators via desk reviews that rely on the collection and analysis of official data sources. The definitions for the inclusion of cases can be found in the profiles of the respective indicators.

---

\(^1\) A rich source of information on the MICS background and methodology (including a comprehensive research manual) can be found at www.childinfo.org.
3. Sampling

At this stage, the goal is simply to field test the manual in multiple countries and languages. Data from these field tests will not be generalizable so it may not be necessary at this stage to define a probability based sample. The sample size should be determined so that the data set allows for desegregation at least for children’s age and sex, and, if possible, for the regional level as well. As for all field test steps, the sample size should be discussed with the specialized partner in great detail.

4. Data Collection

Generally, the data quality of all indicators relies on representative data. For this reason, the main question to be considered before the start of data collection on indicators 4-10, which rely mainly on official sources, is the reliability of the available official data. If data is deemed not to be reliable (e.g. by comparing other data sources with the official data), mechanisms must be developed to: a) bring these sources into accordance and document all decisions in this step, or b) state that this indicator cannot deliver reliable data under the available conditions. In cases where the recorded information does not cover all children in the target population, sampling should be used to estimate the value for the whole population.

5. Data Analysis

After the completion of data collection, the data for all indicators should be analyzed according to the set formulas (“nominator,” “denominator,” and “target population”) and at the levels and disaggregation outlined in the indicator profiles and checked for data quality (is the data gathered in accordance to other data sources, etc…).

At this point, it should also be determined if the data from the indicators serves the purpose outlined in the indicator profiles under “rationale” and if not, the reasons and possible explanations for this. The three main questions to ask when evaluating each indicator are:

1) can this indicator be used for advocacy purposes?
2) does this indicator uncover the true extent of the problem? and,
3) can this indicator be used to develop and refine interventions?

III. Communication with HQ and Documentation

Throughout the entire field test process, there should be close communication with regard to all of the important steps, procedures, and decisions. The purpose of the ongoing communication is to document all problems and issues that arise related to the indicators and to allow for the development of “lessons learned” for their further refinement.

In addition, the field test countries are asked to provide the following information by 31 October, 2006:

1. the completed feedback form;
2. the findings (data on each indicator) in tables, disaggregated according to the indicator sheets; and,
3. overall conclusions in the form of a short summary (1 page).
IV. Contact persons at HQ

The following persons can be contacted at HQ regarding the field test process:

Mr. Gopalan Balagopal (Senior Adviser Child Protection Section), gbalagopal@unicef.org,

Ms. Stella Schuhmacher (Child Protection Section), sschuhmacher@unicef.org,

V. Feedback Form

This form is designed to elicit feedback on the Indicators of Violence against Children and the Manual for the Measurement of Indicators of Violence against Children. Your suggestions will be used to revise and update this tool.

Please return the completed form to Stella Schuhmacher at sschuhmacher@unicef.org by 31 October, 2006.

Thank you in advance for your valuable feedback.

With warm regards,

UNICEF Child Protection Section
**INDICATOR FEEDBACK FORM**

1. Your name:  

2. Country in which you are working:  

3. Please circle the number(s) of the indicators that were field tested in your country:  

```markdown  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12  
```

Kindly complete both sections A and B of the feedback form. Thank you!

---

**A. Please provide your overall feedback on the indicators and the manual.**

4. Do you find the manual for the measurement of the indicators:  
   a) relevant [ ] Yes [ ] No  
   b) useful [ ] Yes [ ] No  
   c) practical [ ] Yes [ ] No  
   d) Please explain providing specific reasons (use as much space as you need):  

---

5. What are the strengths of the indicators and/or the manual (use as much space as you need)?
6. What are the weaknesses of the indicators and/or the manual (use as much space as you need)?

7. Is an important indicator on violence against children missing that you believe should be included (use as much space as you need)? Would any of the Supplemental Indicators be more useful than the 12 proposed indicators? Kindly consider the tables of Supplemental Indicators located in Appendix C of the Manual and refer to these indicators by their numbers in your comments.

8. Is there any topic not included in the manual that you believe should be there (use as much space as you need)?

9. What are some of the obstacles you faced in using the indicators and/or the manual (use as much space as you need)?

10. What additional resources may be required to support training and/or the use of the indicators and/or manual (use as much space as you need)?

11. Do you have any other suggestions regarding content, layout, language or any other adaptation that would make the manual more useful, practical and/or user-friendly (use as much space as you need)?
B. For each individual indicator that was field tested, please provide the following feedback (copy and paste the blank table as many times as needed).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Number:</th>
<th>Indicator Name:</th>
<th>Please attach your findings (data for this indicator) in tables, disaggregated according to the indicator profile.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Did you find this indicator to be:

a) **relevant** – (does it uncover the extent of the problem?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( ) YES</td>
<td>[ ] YES</td>
<td>[ ] NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) **useful** – (can it be used for advocacy purposes?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( ) YES</td>
<td>[ ] YES</td>
<td>[ ] NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) **practical** – (can it be used to develop and refine interventions?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( ) YES</td>
<td>[ ] YES</td>
<td>[ ] NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Please explain your answers for a-c above by providing specific reasons and lessons learned from field testing regarding the usefulness of the indicator (use as much space as you need):

---

e) Please explain the research methodology and processes that were used to collect and analyze the information for this indicator (use as much space as you need):

---

f) Please explain any lessons learned regarding the research methodology. Be sure to provide relevant feedback on any information collection tools that were used for this indicator (use as much space as you need).

---

g) Please provide us with concrete suggestions for the refinement of this indicator (use as much space as you need).