Manual for the Measurement of Indicators of Violence against Children

Please note: The indicators and methods described in this manual are still in a developmental stage. All comments and suggestions for improving this document are welcome. After the field tests are completed, the indicators and the manual will be revised and expanded upon to incorporate the lessons learned in the actual research field. Please review the field test guidelines associated with this manual as there are special considerations relevant to field testing that need to be addressed.

Table of Contents

I. Background

1. Introduction

The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that 40 million children below the age of 15 suffer from abuse and neglect, and require health and social care. Violence against children is a global problem. Children experience violence in schools, in institutions, on the streets, in the workplace, in prisons, as well as in their own homes. Violence can affect children's physical and mental health, impair their ability to learn and socialize, and undermine their development as functional adults and good parents later in life. In the most severe cases, violence against children leads to death.

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 (1989) calls for legislative, administrative, social and educational actions to protect children from all forms of violence and abuse.

The UN Study on Violence against Children has raised awareness of the importance and need for core indicators on this sensitive issue. Since violence against children is often hidden and shrouded in secrecy, data collection is weak or non-existent in many countries. Better data on the extent and consequences of violence against children will enable the development of appropriate responses at the local and the national level. In addition, cross-cultural comparisons are needed to allow for the investigation into regional variations in children's experiences of violence.

2. Process Summary

UNICEF engaged in a consultative process in 2004-2005 to develop a list of global indicators[1] on violence against children for use by the UN, partner organizations and researchers worldwide.

To share the same definition as the UN Study, the indicators project uses the WHO definition of **violence** as:

> …the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation (World Report on Violence and Health, 2002).

A comprehensive desk research was conducted, which included a wide range of research activities covering social, medical, and psychological literature on violence. The literature review led to the creation of a preliminary list of potential indicators. The indicators in this list were drawn from existing data collection methods and surveys in the field. Additional indicators were added in cases in which – according to the scientific mainstream or Child Rights Agencies –data gaps exist or further information is needed.

These indicators were refined by experts in the course of several consultations in 2004 through 2006. Using the feedback from the Regional Consultations of the UN Study on Violence against

---

[1] The term "indicator" is used in this project to refer to quantitative data that is able to provide us, via a single numeral, a rough understanding of the prevailing circumstances in a given country. More information on Human Rights based Indicators can be found in Rajeev Malhotra and Nicolas Fasel: „Quantitative Human Rights Indicators - A survey of major initiatives": http://www.abo.fi/instut/imr/research/seminars/indicators/Background.doc

Children and internal consultations, a shortened list of 'core' indicators was assembled that was deemed to be able to meet both UNICEF's programmatic measurement and evaluation needs as well as the experts' data needs. These core indicators were discussed and verified during internal and external meetings with experts in the area (i.e. at ISPCAN conferences in Berlin and Singapore) from August to December 2005.

The violence indicators will be field-tested and verified during 2006 to ensure their quality and practicality.

> More detailed information on the background of the indicator project, a report on the processes of the project, and presentations of the project are available on the UNICEF intranet under "Other Information and Reports: Indicators for Violence against Children at home and at school."

3. Ethics

As with all research involving children, ethical and safety issues are paramount. The information collection process must be carried out to the highest ethical standards in order to protect and respect the rights of children. No data should be collected or stored that would in any way jeopardize a child's safety. In particular, direct interview methods with children should only be used if the required information is not otherwise available by any other means. The management team must also ensure that a policy to preserve confidentiality is in place to control disclosure of personal and identifying information when data is passed to other individuals for collation and indicator calculation. A unique identifier or case ID will need to be created to allow for linkage of data within and across information sources (i.e. police records and hospital records). The principle of confidentiality should be subject to the need to act to provide immediate protection to a child where necessary.

Approval from a committee on human subjects' protection (an ethics committee or institutional review board) may be required in some countries in order to conduct a community survey. If such approval is required, it should be planned for in the beginning stages of the information collection process. Even in settings where such approval is not required, it is essential that researchers adopt and maintain a code of ethics. All members of the research team should be prepared to address ethical issues.

In some countries and regions mandatory reporting laws exist which require certain kinds of professionals to report suspicions of child abuse to authorities or social services agencies. The ethical conduct of research requires respect for participant's confidentiality, respect for autonomy, and protection for vulnerable populations. Mandatory reporting laws could interfere with efforts to protect the confidentiality of research participants. Furthermore, mandatory reporting could put a child's safety at risk in settings where effective support services are unavailable, or in settings where an official report could lead to the child's removal from home and placement in an institution. Hence, direct interview methods are not recommended under such circumstances for ethical and safety reasons.

The methodology section of this manual addresses ethical issues involved with interviewing children; however, this brief manual does not attempt to cover the weighty topic of the ethical conduct of research on violence against children in depth. For more thorough guidance, one should refer to the following resources:

- Save the Children's (2004) publication, *So you want to involve children in research? A toolkit supporting children's meaningful and ethical participation in research relating to violence against children*, can be found at: http://www.savethechildren.net/alliance/resources/So_you_want_to_research_apr2004.pdf.

- The Population Council's publication, *Ethical Approaches to Gathering Information from Children and Adolescents in International Settings: Guidelines and Resources*, by Katie Schenk and Jan Williamson (2005), can be found at: http://www.popcouncil.org/pdfs/horizons/childrenethics.pdf.

4. Organization of this Manual

UNICEF's *Manual for the Measurement of the Juvenile Justice Indicators* provided the structure and framework for this draft of the Manual for the Measurement of Indicators of Violence against Children.

This manual is organized in six parts. Part I has provided background information on the indicators of violence against children. Part II provides a menu of the indicators on violence against children, including a one-page profile for each of the proposed indicators. Part III highlights important definitions related to the indicators to promote consistency of measurement. Part IV describes how to create a system map that will provide a platform from which to use of the indicators on violence against children. Part V addresses methods for measuring the indicators. Part VI provides a few brief notes on the interpretation of the indicators. Appendix A defines key terms related to the indicators. Appendix B contains tools that can be utilized to collect information for some of the indicators. Appendix C lists supplemental indicators on violence against children that have yet to be field tested.

II. The Indicators

The indicators are intended to promote and improve the consistency of violence against children monitoring efforts. Although desirable, it may or may not be possible to collect information for each of the proposed indicators. As a result, it is not expected that a country will collect information on each and every one of the indicators. Instead, the list of indicators is intended to function as a menu from which countries may pick and choose the most appropriate indicators for measurement based on the existence of relevant information systems, the feasibility of information collection methods, the availability of resources, and the cultural context in the country.

This manual describes a general methodology that can be used to collect information on the indicators. The indicators will need to be measured in different ways, depending on the source of the information. Ultimately, the methods selected will depend on the appropriateness for different settings in accordance with local and/or national circumstances. Whenever information for the indicators is taken from information systems that exist in relevant institutions (i.e. records from police or hospitals), it is important to remember that the validity of the indicators will depend on the accuracy and completeness of the relevant institutions' information systems.

1. Indicator Framework

The indicators are designed to tap more than just the incidence and prevalence of violence against children. While such indicators are useful to measure the final outcome of violence against children, they do not provide relevant information on the processes used to address issues of violence. Thus, the scope of the violence indicators project encompasses both an outcome and advocacy oriented perspective (How many children are victimized?) and a programmatic perspective that is intended to identify clear breaches in the **Protective Environment** and to formulate effective interventions.

A Protective Environment functions as a safety net for children by preventing and responding to violence, abuse and exploitation. The indicators should provide information on the strengths and weaknesses of the following components of the Protective Environment: strengthening government commitment and capacity to fulfil children's right to protection; addressing harmful attitudes, customs and practices; developing children's life skills, knowledge and participation; building capacity of families and communities; providing essential services for prevention, recovery and reintegration, including basic health, education and protection; and establishing and implementing ongoing and effective monitoring, reporting and oversight.

The majority of the indicators in the field of "Violence against Children" attempt to quantify the levels of child rights violations by measuring the incidence or prevalence of violence against children. The set of proposed indicators, however, includes both indicators that assess the situation of children, as well as indicators that show the level of functioning of the protective environment – the existence of the elements of the protective environment framework and gaps. The violence indicators aim to measure both the extent to which child rights violations occur (at home, at school, etc...) and the extent to which legal, policy and social structures exist in order to protect children from victimization (by household member, peers, teachers and other school staff, etc…).

Table 1 below presents these two types of indicators, **Violation indicators** and **Protective Environment indicators**. The protective environment indicators can be considered as *intermediate outcome indicators* in that they measure behaviours and practices that will affect the desired long-term outcomes, reductions in levels of violence against children. The violation indicators measure the *long-term outcomes*, the extent to which violations occur. Each of the twelve proposed indicators has been designated as either a violation indicator or a protective environment indicator.

Table 1

Violation Indicators	Protective Environment Indicators
Quantify the levels of child rights violations or violations of international standards for violence against children in different environments.	Reveal the structures in place and possible gaps in the protective environment for children.
Environment-specific • **Self-reported violence against children (1)** *Morbidity and Mortality* • **Child homicide rate (4)** • **ER visit rate due to assaults in children (5)** • **Hospital discharge rate due to assaults in children (6)** *School* • **Children who skipped school due to violence (11)**	*Environment-specific* • **Children's life skills (2)** • **Adults' attitudes towards violence against children (3)** *Child Protection System* • **Official reports of violence against children (7)** • **Substantiated cases of violence against children (8)** • **Child victims referred to services (9)** • **Use of services by child victims (10)** *School* • **School violence policy (12)**

Within the two broad types of indicators on violence against children, those indicators that focus on violations and those indicators that focus on the protective environment, sub-categories of indicators exist. Tables 2-5 present the indicators in their respective sub-categories. The indicators on violence against children that share measurement techniques and interpretation have been grouped together in this manual. The proposed indicators are split into the following four sub-categories: environment-specific indicators, morbidity and mortality indicators, child protection system indicators, and school indicators.

2. Environment-specific indicators

The true level and nature of violence against children in a country may be most accurately measured by asking children and families directly about their experiences. Furthermore, in settings where vital statistics and hospital-based data are non-existent or unreliable, community surveys may be the only source of information on violence against children.

Table 2 groups together the three Environment-specific indicators. The environment-specific indicators are based on community surveys that obtain information on violence from children and

adults. Each of these indicators can be modified to cover a specific environment where violence against children occurs (home, school, workplace, prisons, etc…). In addition to describing the magnitude of the problem, the environment-specific indicators can assist in setting priorities for action and can guide the design of appropriate interventions.

Table 2

Environment-specific indicators	
1. **Self-reported violence against children**	Proportion of children who have indicated via self-reports that they have been victims of violence in the last 12 months
2. **Children's life skills**	Proportion of children who know what to do/who to turn to in case of victimization. (or who accept Violence against Children as means of education)
3. **Adults' attitudes towards violence against children**	Proportion of adults who accept violence against children as a means of education

The information required for the three environment-specific indicators will necessarily come from surveys using sampling techniques. Thus, the methodology for collecting information on the environment-specific indicators will be the most resource intensive out of the entire list of violence indicators. In addition to requiring similar methods of information collection, these three indicators share a common feature in that each can be modified to collect information on violence against children in different environments: at home, at school, in institutions, in the workplace, and in prisons. Although the environment-specific indicators may be more costly to implement compared to indicators that can be gathered from information systems (i.e. medical, criminal justice, or child welfare information systems), their ability to adapt to measure violence across multiple environments enhances their utility.

Rather than provide a comprehensive assessment of violence in a country, these indicators should be used as a starting point to monitor child rights abuses in specific environments and to evaluate the progress of collaborative efforts including local organizations and government counterparts.

3. Morbidity and Mortality indicators

The most basic indicators that every country should be able to provide information on relevant to violence against children are the three morbidity and mortality indicators found in Table 3 below. The WHO recommends these indicators as part of the upcoming framework for child maltreatment prevention that is due for publication in September 2006. These three indicators are also included in the Inter-American Coalition for the Prevention of Violence's list of recommended population-level indicators for monitoring violence against children of all ages in the Latin American region.

Table 3

Morbidity and Mortality indicators	
4. Child homicide rate	Homicide rate in children during a 12 month period per 100,000 population
5. ER visit rate due to assaults in children	Emergency room visits due to assaults in children during a 12 month period per 100,000 population
6. Hospital discharge rate due to assaults in children	Hospital discharges due to assaults in children during a 12 month period per 100,000 population

The information required for the three morbidity and mortality indicators will come from medical records and police records. No single institution is likely to collect all of the information recommended. As a consequence, it is likely that information from a number of sources (police records *and* medical records) will need to be combined in order to calculate the indicators. Medical records should provide mortality and morbidity data for children. Police records should provide supplementary information on violent crimes against children. Mortality data will reflect the most serious incidents of violence against children, whereas morbidity data will reflect the magnitude of the problem and resource utilization.

It is important to note that each of the three morbidity and mortality indicators will be prone to underreporting in many countries. For example, in settings where children's births have not been registered, it is highly unlikely that their deaths or injuries will be registered. In many other settings, child deaths caused by violence may be inappropriately classified as accidental deaths. Similarly, children's hospital visits for injuries due to assaults may be misattributed as injuries due to accidents by parents or attending health professionals. In remote rural areas, children will be less likely to visit a hospital even if they have been seriously injured due to an assault.

Underreporting is a serious problem because it masks the true extent of the situation of violence against children, leading to an overly positive picture of the situation. One could easily misinterpret the indicators and come to the false conclusion that violence against children is not a problem. Therefore, caution should be used when interpreting and presenting this information. Any suspicion of underreporting should be acknowledged in the discussion of the indicators.

Furthermore, it would be insufficient to try to monitor and report on children's experiences of violence solely via the morbidity and mortality indicators. Indeed, this is not recommended. The indicators that depend on official data on violence (Indicators 4-8) should always be interpreted together with information based on self-reports of violence, such as Indicator 1, to account for underreporting.

4. Child protection system indicators

The four Child protection system indicators are grouped together in Table 4. Each indicator measures a different aspect of the child protection system in a country; does the system identify and report, investigate, refer and treat children affected by violence? Together, these indicators show how well the child protection system in a country is functioning overall.

Table 4

Child protection system indicators	
7. Official reports of violence against children	Number of children officially reported as victims of violence to authorities during a 12 month period per 100,000 children
8. Substantiated cases of violence against children	Number of substantiated cases of violence against children during a 12 month period per 100,000 children
9. Child victims referred to services	Percentage of child victims referred to Recovery, Reintegration, or Psychological Support Services during a 12 month period
10. Use of services by child victims	Percentage of child victims who used Recovery, Reintegration, or Psychological Support Services during a 12 month period

The information required for the four child protection system indicators will come from child protection information systems in countries where cases of violence against children are reported to relevant authorities (a child welfare system or a criminal justice system). Violence against children is not reportable in some countries and even in countries where violence is reportable, information systems may not exist or may not be adequate to provide enough information for the child protection system indicators.

The interpretation of the child protection system indicators can be complex. For example, the number of official reports of violence against children could increase over time, not because violence against children is increasing, but rather because detection efforts have increased and awareness of the problem has increased. In fact, an increase in reports should reflect favourably upon the child welfare system during the beginning phases of monitoring efforts. The importance of interpreting the violence indicators, especially the child protection system indicators, within the context of a specific country cannot be overemphasized. As stated above, an increase in one of the system indicators will be interpreted in a positive light in most countries. However, in countries with established and well-functioning child protection systems, an increase in one of the system indicators may actually reflect an increase in the prevalence of violence against children. Overall, the child protection system indicators should not be used to measure children's experiences of violence, but instead, as a measure of the capacity and functioning of the child protection system.

5. School indicators

Table 5 below highlights two supplemental indicators for violence against children that occurs in the school environment. Unlike the morbidity and mortality, child protection system, and environment specific indicators, these indicators only collect information on violence in one environment: the school environment.

Table 5

School indicators	
11. Children who skipped school due to violence	Proportion of children, who skipped school because they were afraid / felt unsafe to go to school due to violence in the last 12 months
12. School violence policy	Percentage of schools with protective school policies in place

The information for the School indicators will come from surveys of children (Indicator 11) and schools (Indicator 12). Additional information relevant to violence against children in the school environment comes from the Environment-specific indicators once they have been disaggregated for place of victimization, as follows: the proportion of children who have indicated via self-reports that they have been victims of violence *at school* during the last 12 months (Indicator 1), the proportion of children who know what to do/who to turn to in case of victimization *at school* (Indicator 2), and the proportion of adults (parents and teachers) who accept violence against children as a means of education *at school* (Indicator 3). Thus, a more complete picture of the situation of violence against children in schools will emerge when one considers Indicators 1, 2, 3, 11 and 12 together versus looking only at one or two of the school-related indicators individually.

6. Supplemental indicators

The environment-specific, morbidity and mortality, child protection system, and school indicators outlined above provide a starting place from which to assess violence against children. For obvious reasons, Tables 1-4 do not provide an exhaustive list of all possible indicators for violence against children.

Appendix C contains supplementary tables of indicators on violence against children which may provide useful supporting information. At this time, the measurement of the twelve proposed environment-specific, morbidity and mortality, child protection system, and school indicators should be prioritized over the measurement of the supplemental indicators.

7. Information about the indicators

The indicator profiles on pages 14-25 set out basic information about each indicator. They outline what the indicator measures, why it is a useful measurement to make, and how to measure it.

Each indicator profile is set out in the format below.

Indicator # : name of indicator
Definition of indicator

Purpose:
This section describes why it is helpful to measure the indicator.

Category:
Violation or *Protective Environment* /

Environment-specific or *Morbidity and Mortality* or *Child protection* s*ystem* or *School*

There are three environment-specific indicators, three morbidity and mortality indicators, four child protection system indicators, and two school indicators.

Level:
National, Regional, Local

Numerator:
This section provides information needed to calculate the indicator.

Denominator:
This section provides information needed to calculate the indicator.

Target population:
This section details which children or adults must be counted in order to measure a particular indicator. Sometimes, it may not be possible to count a whole relevant child or adult population. When this is the case, it may be possible to take a *sample* from the relevant child or adult population.

Disaggregation:
The indicators are most able to provide assistance to country officials where information is available in a disaggregated form. This box provides suggested categories of disaggregation.

Information Source(s):
This section suggests possible data sources.

Origin:
This section provides information on the origin of the indicator.

Notes on Methodology:
This section provides additional information and helpful hints on measuring the indicator.

Tools:
This section will detail the tools needed to collect information for some of the indicators. These tools may be particularly helpful where no existing information is available, requiring information for the indicators to be collected by the use of sampling, or where existing information is required to be further organized before collection.

The tools used to collect information from existing information systems will likely vary depending on the country context.

8. Disaggregation

Where appropriate, the indicators should be disaggregated by regions or subgroups rather than reported for the population as a whole. Disaggregation is extremely important for the purposes of maximising the usefulness of the violence indicators. This is due to the fact that disaggregation both reveals patterns that are not apparent from looking at the complete group as a whole, and allows the situation of particularly vulnerable sub-groups of children to be examined.

The suggested categories of disaggregation are listed in Table 6 below. The categories will vary slightly, depending upon which indicator is being measured.

Table 6 – The Disaggregation Categories

Disaggregation Category:	Recommended for Indicators
Age (under 5, 5-9, 10-14, 15-17) and gender of child	1, 2, 4-11
Ethnic group/language group of child	1-12
Educational level of child	1, 2, 4-11
Family size / position of child in family (oldest/youngest child)	1, 2, 4-11
District/Region	1-12
Income level of family	1-11
Education of caregivers	1-11
Type of violence: physical, sexual, emotional, neglect	1, 2, 4-11
Age & gender of perpetrator	1, 4-11
Identity of perpetrator: parent/care taker, sibling, teacher, peer	1, 2, 4-11
Place of victimization: home, neighbourhood, school, workplace, institution, other	1-11
Authority violence reported to: criminal justice system, child welfare system	7-10
Reporter of violence: health facility, educational facility, private service provider, public service provider, social work centre, police station, relative, self	7-10

9. Indicator profiles

Indicator 1: Self-reported violence against children
Proportion of children, who have indicated via self-reports that they have been victims of violence at home/school in the last 12 months

Purpose:
This indicator reflects the prevalence of different types of violence at home/school. Compared to indicators that rely on official reports, this indicator can be considered more accurate with regard to the 'real' extent of abuse experiences of children. Depending on the type of abuse and the cultural background, only a small proportion of abuse experiences are reported to the authorities. By asking children themselves about their experiences in a confidential atmosphere, it is possible to estimate the prevalence of abuse that does not leave visible marks or require immediate medical treatment.

Category:
Violation / Environment-specific

Level:
National, Regional, Local

Numerator:
Number of children who report being victims of violence in the last 12 months

Denominator:
Total number of children in the sample

Target population:
The numerator population is all children in the sample who report being victims of violence in the last 12 months. The denominator population is the total number of children in the sample.

Sampling will need to be used for this indicator.

Disaggregation:
Age/gender/ethnic or language group of child
District/region
Type of violence
Identity of perpetrator
Place of victimization

Information Source(s):
Information from this indicator must be collected through research methods using representative samples of children.

Note: it may be desirable to collect this information retrospectively from young adults (18-24) or from parents rather than directly from children –see methodology.

Origin:
National Child Abuse & Neglect Data System 2003

Notes on Methodology:
A child is considered a victim if he/she responds positively to any of the questions regarding victimization experiences, regardless of frequency of the event. Every victim is only counted once, regardless of the number of victimization experiences.

The following criteria should be met:
- Respondents' safety and confidentiality is of the utmost importance.
- Respondents should be asked about easily identifiable acts of violence (such as "slapping", "Kicking", etc.) to ensure cross-cultural comparability (recommended instrument modified CTS PC).
- If one decides, for ethical reasons, to ask *young adults* (18-24) instead of children (see ISPCAN retrospective questionnaire), it is important to note that the 12-month timeframe will be lost.
- Alternatively, some data on this issue can be gathered by asking *parents* about "forms of education and punishment" that have been practiced on the target child during the last 12 months (see MICS optional module on child discipline or ISPCAN parent questionnaire).

Tools:
1. Household surveys (*young adults or parents*)
   a. ISPCAN's pilot retrospective, or parent questionnaires
   b. MICS optional module on child discipline

2. Classroom surveys (*children*)
   a. ISPCAN's pilot children's questionnaire

Indicator 2: Children's life skills
Proportion of Children who possess life skills- who know what to do in case of victimization at home/school

Purpose:
This indicator shows the proportion of children who are aware of their rights and have the life skills and ability to recognize and act upon any victimization experience. A low ratio indicates that children are mostly dependent on other people to identify and report children's victimization. This indicator is also useful as a proxy for the general level of children's awareness of their rights.

Category:
Protective Environment / Environment-specific

Level:
National, Regional, Local

Numerator:
Number of children who possess life skills

Denominator:
Total number of children in the sample

Target population:
The numerator population is the number of children in the sample who possess life skills. The denominator population is the total number of children in the sample.

Sampling will need to be used for this indicator.

Disaggregation:
Age/gender/ethnic or language group of child
District/region
Type of violence
Identity of perpetrator
Place of victimization

Information Source(s):
Information from this indicator must be collected through research methods using representative samples of children.

Origin:
UNICEF PD CPS and Education Section recommendation

Notes on Methodology:
Children are considered to possess life skills, if they :

- are able to identify signs of violence (critical thinking) AND
- feel able to resist violence from perpetrators (personal skills) AND
- know or feel comfortable contacting someone in case of violence (dimension communication) AND
- can act on violence (action)

Tools:
Household surveys (*children*) or
Classroom surveys (*children*)
   Information collection tool 4 contains modules that could be added to a survey to collect this information.

Indicator 3: Adults' attitudes towards violence against children
Proportion of adults who accept Violence against Children as means of education at home/school

Purpose:
This indicator shows the overall attitude toward violence in the lives of children that is held by their parents. One can expect that the more widespread the acceptance of corporal punishment is in a population, the lower the threshold for the use of violence will be within that population.

Category:
Protective Environment / Environment-specific

Level:
National, Regional, Local

Numerator:
All adults in sample who have a positive attitude towards corporal punishment against children

Denominator:
Total number of adults in the sample

Target population:

The numerator population is the number of adults in the sample who endorse corporal punishment. The denominator population is the total number of adults in the sample.

Sampling will need to be used for this indicator.

Disaggregation:
Age/gender/ethnic or language group of adult
District/region
Place of victimization

Information Source(s):
Information from this indicator must be collected through research methods using representative samples of adults.

Origin:
Child Trends 2002. Charting Parenthood: A Statistical Portrait of Fathers and Mothers in America, Washington D.C. (only for Parents)

MICS optional modules on child discipline and domestic violence used as model tools on attitudes towards violence

Notes on Methodology:
One adult with at least one positive attitude towards corporal punishment against children counts as one case, regardless of how many positive attitudes this adult communicated.

Tools:
Household surveys (*adults*) or
School surveys (*teachers*)
> ***Information collection tool 5*** contains modules that could be added to a survey to collect this information.

Indicator 4: Child Homicide Rate
Homicide rate in children during a 12 month period per 100,000 population

Purpose:
This indicator measures the extent of the most severe form of violence against children, those acts of violence that result in the death of a child, in the target population. As homicide can be considered a relatively highly reported crime, rates can also be used as a proxy indicator for the overall rate of violence in the environment.

Category:
Violation / Morbidity and Mortality

Level:
National

Numerator:
the number of homicides in children by age group during a 12 month period * 100,000 population of children

Denominator:
the number of children by age group in the population

Target population:
The numerator population is all children in the country who were reported as victims of homicide within the 12 month period. Where it is not easy to collect information about the whole numerator population, the number of reported victims from a representative sample of regions can be used to estimate the total value.

Disaggregation:
Age/gender/ethnic or language group of child
District/region
Type of violence
Identity of perpetrator
Place of victimization

Information Source(s):
Child deaths due to homicide may be recorded in vital registration systems (medical records/death certificates). Information on child deaths from police and criminal justice system records could supplement this information. Information sources should be identified within each of these authorities.

Origin:
WHO child maltreatment prevention indicators
Inter-American Coalition for the Prevention of Violence

Notes on Methodology:

- 0-4 age group selected as sub-population most susceptible to child abuse
- Homicide rate includes deaths due to neglect and abandonment
- Validity relies on competence of medical personnel trained to identify violent children's deaths. Many deaths might not be discovered due to low capacity or no existence of post-mortem investigation.

Tools:
This indicator is based on data that comes from information systems. *Information collection tool 1* can be used to organize and collect relevant information from existing information systems.

Indicator 5: ER visit rate due to assaults in children
Emergency room visits due to assaults in children during a 12 month period per 100,000 population

Purpose:
This indicator measures the extent of less severe forms of violence against children, those acts of violence that do not result in the death of a child but that do require outpatient medical care in the form of a visit to the emergency room, in the target population.

Category:
Violation / Morbidity and Mortality

Level:
National

Numerator:
The number of ER visits due to assault in children by age group during a 12 month period * 100,000 population of children

Denominator:
The number of children by age group in the population

Target population:
The numerator population is all children in the country who visited an ER due to assault within the 12 month period. Where it is not easy to collect information about the whole numerator population, the number of children who visited an ER from a representative sample of regions can be used to estimate the total value.

Disaggregation:
Age/gender/ethnic or language group of child
District/region
Type of violence
Identity of perpetrator
Place of victimization

Information Source(s):
Data from vital registration systems (hospital records)

Origin:
WHO child maltreatment prevention indicators
Inter-American Coalition for the Prevention of Violence

Notes on Methodology:

- 0-4 age group selected as sub-population most susceptible to child abuse
- Indicator should attempt to collect information on physical and sexual assaults, as well as injury due to neglect.
- Validity relies on competence of medical personnel trained to identify violent injuries in children.

Tools:
This indicator is based on data that comes from information systems. ***Information collection tool 2*** can be used to organize and collect relevant information from existing information systems.

Indicator 6: Hospital discharge rate due to assaults in children
Hospital discharge rate due to assaults in children during a 12 month period per 100,000 population

Purpose:
This indicator measures the extent of more severe forms of violence against children, those acts of violence that do not result in the death of a child but that do require inpatient medical care in the form of admission to a hospital, in the target population.

Category:
Violation / Morbidity and Mortality

Origin:
WHO child maltreatment prevention indicators
Inter-American Coalition for the Prevention of Violence

Level:
National

Numerator:
The number of hospital discharges due to assault in children by age group during a 12 month period * 100,000 population of children

Denominator:
The number of children by age group in the population

Target population:
The numerator population is all children in the country who were discharged from a hospital due to assault within the 12 month period. Where it is not easy to collect information about the whole numerator population, the number of discharged children from a representative sample of regions can be used to estimate the total value.

Disaggregation:
Age/gender/ethnic or language group of child
District/region
Type of violence
Identity of perpetrator
Place of victimization

Information Source(s):
Data from vital registration systems (hospital records)

Notes on Methodology:
- 0-4 age group selected as sub-population most susceptible to child abuse
- Note that countries and institutions with more advanced health care services will likely have lower hospitalisation rates. As a result, Indicator 6 must be interpreted in light of this.
- Less useful for making cross-country comparisons vs. Indicator 5 since hospital discharge rates often depend on the quality of services available; countries and institutions with more advanced health care services will likely have lower hospitalisation rates.
- Indicator should attempt to collect information on physical and sexual assaults, as well as injury due to neglect.

Tools:
This indicator is based on data that comes from information systems. ***Information collection tool 2*** can be used to organize and collect relevant information from existing information systems.

Indicator 7: Official reports of violence against children
Number of children officially reported as victims of violence to authorities during a 12 month period per 100,000 children

Purpose:
This indicator measures the level of functioning of the child protection system. A well functioning child protection system should *identify, report*, investigate, refer and treat cases of violence. Extremely low levels of official reporting by different service providers may indicate a weak child protection system rather than a low prevalence of violence.

Category:
Protective Environment /
Child protection system

Level:
National, Regional, Local

Numerator:
Number of children officially reported as victims of violence during a 12 month period * 100,000 population of children

Denominator:
Population of children

Target population:
The numerator population is all children in the country who were reported as victims of violence within the 12 month period. Where it is not easy to collect information about the whole numerator population, the number of reported victims from a representative sample of regions can be used to estimate the total value.

Disaggregation:
Age/gender/ethnic or language group of child
District/region
Type of violence
Identity of perpetrator
Place of victimization
Authority violence reported to
Reporter of violence

Information Source(s):
Violence could be reported to the criminal justice system or the child welfare system.

Information sources should be identified within each of these authorities. These may be at the local level, the district or regional level, or at central level, depending upon availability of sufficiently disaggregated information at higher levels in usable form.

Origin:
CEE/CIS Child Protection

National Child Abuse and Neglect Data Systems (2002)

Notes on Methodology:
Desk review/data collection of official data on reported acts of violence (one case = one reported act, regardless of victim or perpetrator). This indicator neither measures the severity nor the occurrence of the allegations.

Not all countries will have reporting systems that will allow for the provision of this data in the depth needed.

Officially reported numbers depend upon implementation of processes and capacity. Increase/decrease cannot not always be interpreted correctly. However, indicator provides good base for computing underreporting.

As this indicator does not make statements about the substance of reported allegations, it serves as a measurement for the general level of awareness of the subject of violence against children and the willingness to report in the country.

Tools:
This indicator is based on data that comes from information systems. ***Information collection tool 3*** can be used to organize and collect relevant information from existing information systems.

Indicator 8: Substantiated cases of violence against children
Number of substantiated cases of violence against children during a 12 month period per 100,000 children

Purpose:
This indicator measures the level of functioning of the child protection system. A well functioning child protection system would identify, report, *investigate*, refer and treat cases of violence. Extremely low levels of substantiated cases may be due to a lack of investigation by authorities and may indicate a weak child protection system rather than a low prevalence of violence. This indicator is a *subset* of Indicator 7.

Category:
Protective Environment /
Child protection system

Level:
National, Regional, Local

Numerator:
Number of reported cases that were substantiated during a 12 month period * 100,000 population of children

Denominator:
Population of children

Target population:

The numerator population is all children in the country who were reported as victims of violence within the 12 month period whose cases were substantiated by the authorities.

Where it is not easy to collect information about the whole numerator population, the number of reported victims from a representative sample of regions can be used to estimate the total value.

Disaggregation:
Age/gender/ethnic or language group of child
District/region
Type of violence
Identity of perpetrator
Place of victimization
Authority violence reported to
Reporter of violence

Information Source(s):
Violence could be reported to the criminal justice system or the child welfare system. Information sources should be identified at different levels within each of these authorities.

Origin:
National Child Abuse and Neglect Data Systems (2002)
UNICEF PD CPS recommendation

Notes on Methodology:
Desk review/data collection of official data on reported acts of violence (one case = one reported and substantiated act, regardless of victim or perpetrator).

Not all countries will have reporting systems that will allow for the provision of this data in the depth needed.

Tools:
This indicator is based on data that comes from information systems. ***Information collection tool 3*** can be used to organize and collect relevant information from existing information systems.

Indicator 9: Child victims referred to services
Percentage of child victims referred to Recovery, Reintegration, or Psychological Support Services during a 12 month period

Purpose:
This indicator measures the level of functioning of the child protection system. A well functioning child protection system would identify, report, investigate, *refer* and treat cases of violence. An extremely low level of referrals indicates a weak child protection system rather than a low prevalence of violence.

Category:
Protective Environment /
Child protection system

Level:
National, Regional, Local

Numerator:
Number of child victims referred to Recovery, Reintegration, or Psychological Support Services during a 12 month period * 100

Denominator:
Number of substantiated cases of violence against children during a 12 month period **(from Indicator 8)**

Target population:

The numerator population is all children in the country who were reported as victims of violence who were referred to Recovery, Reintegration, or Psychological Support Services within the 12 month period. Where it is not easy to collect information about the whole numerator population, the number of reported victims from a representative sample of regions can be used to estimate the total value.

Disaggregation:
Age/gender/ethnic or language group of child
District/region
Type of violence
Identity of perpetrator
Place of victimization
Authority violence reported to
Reporter of violence

Information Source(s):
Violence could be reported to the criminal justice system or the child welfare system. Information sources should be identified at different levels within each of these authorities.

Origin:
CEE/CIS Child Protection
UNICEF PD CPS recommendation

Notes on Methodology:
Desk review/data collection of all reported cases that were referred to Recovery, Reintegration, or Psychological Support Services.

Not all countries will have reporting systems that will allow for the provision of this data in the depth needed.

The preferred child population for the denominator is the subset of *substantiated* cases. However, depending on the availability of data, the denominator child population may be the number of *reported* cases of violence against children **(from Indicator 7)** instead of the number of substantiated cases of violence against children **(from Indicator 8).**

Tools:
This indicator is based on data that comes from information systems. ***Information collection tool 3*** can be used to organize and collect relevant information from existing information systems.

Indicator 10: Use of services by child victims
Percentage of child victims who used Recovery, Reintegration, or Psychological Support Services during a 12 month period

Purpose:
This indicator measures the level of functioning of the child protection system. A well functioning child protection system would identify, report, investigate, refer and *treat* cases of violence. An extremely low level of service utilization indicates a weak child protection system rather than a low prevalence of violence.

Category:
Protective Environment/Child protection system

Origin:
UNICEF PD CPS recommendation

Level:
National, Regional, Local

Numerator:
Number of child victims who used Recovery, Reintegration, or Psychological Support Services during a 12 month period * 100

Denominator:
Number of substantiated cases of violence against children during a 12 month period **(from Indicator 8)**

Target population:
The numerator population is all children in the country who were reported as victims of violence who used Recovery, Reintegration, or Psychological Support Services within the 12 month period. Where it is not easy to collect information about the whole numerator population, the number of reported victims from a representative sample of regions can be used to estimate the total value.

Disaggregation:
Age/gender/ethnic or language group of child
District/region
Type of violence
Identity of perpetrator
Place of victimization
Authority violence reported to
Reporter of violence

Information Source(s):
Information will need to be collected *both* from authorities in the criminal justice or child welfare system **and** from the service providers. A list of children reported as victims during the 12 month period should then be cross-checked against the children who received services during that same period.

Notes on Methodology:
Desk review/data collection of all reported cases that used Recovery, Reintegration, or Psychological Support Services.

Not all countries will have reporting systems that will allow for the provision of this data in the depth needed.

The preferred child population for the denominator is the subset of *substantiated* cases. However, depending on the availability of data, the denominator child population may be the number of *reported* cases of violence against children **(from Indicator 7)** instead of the number of substantiated cases of violence against children **(from Indicator 8).**

Tools:
This indicator is based on data that comes from information systems. ***Information collection tool 3*** can be used to organize and collect relevant information from existing information systems.

Indicator 11: Children who skipped school due to violence
Proportion of children, who skipped school because they were afraid / felt unsafe to go to school due to violence in the last 12 months

Purpose:
Skipping School can be considered as a 'hard' consequence towards an anticipated unsafe environment at or on the way to school. The social costs of skipping school in itself can be considered high (dependent on the anticipated penalty if discovered) so in this case, the anticipated risk of victimization is greater than the cost of skipping. It may also be 'the last resort' for children themselves to escape anticipated threats (further actions, such as moving away, school transfer, etc. involve the whole household). Besides serving as an indicator for the severity of the anticipated threats, it may also serve as an indicator of educational/developmental consequences due to violence.

Category:
Violation / School

Level:
National, Regional, Local

Numerator:
All children in the sample who did not go to school at least once in the past 12 months because they felt it would be unsafe at school or on their way to or from school.

Denominator:
Number of children that go to school or should go to school (according to legislation) in the sample.

Target population:

The numerator population is the number of children in the sample who have skipped school due to violence in the past 12 months. The denominator population is the total number of children in the sample.

Sampling will need to be used for this indicator.

Disaggregation:
Age/gender/ethnic or language group of adult
District/region
Type of violence
Identity of perpetrator
Place of victimization
Type of school (elementary, secondary, public, private, etc.)

Information Source(s):

Information from this indicator must be collected through research methods using representative samples.

Origin:
UNICEF PD CPS and Education Section recommendation

National Youth Risk Behavior Survey 2003

Notes on Methodology:
A child is considered a to be a school skipper if he/she has at least once skipped school in the last 12 months because of fear of violence, regardless of frequency of the event. Every victim is only counted once, regardless of the number of events.

Tools:
Information collection tool 6 is a module that could be added to a survey to collect this information.

Indicator 12: School violence policy
Percentage of schools with protective school policies in place

Purpose:
This indicator shows the overall commitment of the school administrations to protect children. A school with such a policy can be considered aware of protective issues and willing to follow up on violations. The indicator is a Policy Indicator but may also be measured in a quantitative form using the calculation below.

Category:
Protective Environment / School

Level:
National, Regional, Local

Numerator:
Number of schools that have a protective policy in place *100

Denominator:
Total number of schools (private and public) in sample

Target population:
The numerator population is all schools in the country that have protective school policies in place. The denominator population is all schools in the country.
Sampling from a representative group of schools can be used to estimate the overall proportion of schools that have protective policies in place.

Disaggregation:
District/region
Type of school (elementary, secondary, public, private, etc.)
Enrollment size of school

Information Source(s):
Information for this indicator may be gathered from country legislation, governmental ministries such as ministries of education, and existing literature and reports at the central level, together with information sources at the local level such as local schools.

Origin:
UNICEF PD CPS recommendation

Notes on Methodology:
A school should be considered protective, if it has a protective policy in place that promotes a healthy, safe and protective environment (including children's emotional, psychological and physical well-being), e.g. An anti-corporal punishment policy, a teachers code of conduct which prohibits the use of violence, etc.

This indicator will not need to be measured in quantitative form in countries with national-level school policies.

Indicator does not give information about the efficiency of activity.

Tools:
Information collection tool 7 may be used in sampling or for the organisation of existing information.

III. Consistency of Measurement

To enable comparisons across countries, regions, and globally, the information collection process for the violence indicators must share a consistent approach to definitions and measurement. In this section, definitions of common terms are provided for guidance in measuring the indicators in a consistent manner.

The majority of the violence indicators require the collection of information on individual **children**. For the purposes of the indicators, children are defined according to the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) as all individuals below the age of 18. Contact with parents, social inquiry reports, and medical examinations may be necessary to determine the age of young persons in countries where a lack of birth registration makes the identification of young persons who are actually under the age of 18 years extremely difficult.

In this project, a broader focus on **violence against children** was selected over a narrower focus on **child abuse** to share the same base and to contribute to the UN Study on Violence against Children. While the indicators are intended to measure violence against children, they could also be considered as indicators for child abuse. The perpetrator-victim relationship in cases of child abuse is adult-child, whereas the perpetrator-victim relationship in cases of violence against children could be either adult-child or child-child. The indicators for violence against children measure instances of child abuse as well as instances of peer violence.

As mentioned in the Process Summary in section 1.2 of this manual, the indicators project uses the following WHO definition of **violence**:

> …the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation (World Report on Violence and Health, 2002).

The way that violence is defined in each country system is likely to differ significantly from the WHO definition. In many settings, threats or acts that result in psychological harm but not physical harm, may not be considered as instances of violence. For this reason, it is essential that the nature of violence measured by the indicators is explicitly identified wherever possible.

For instance, Indicator 7 measures the number of children officially reported as victims of violence to authorities in the last 12 months per 100,000 children.

Indicator 7 -number of reported victims in the 12-month period per 100,000 child pop.	
Country A	700
Country B	500

In Country A, 700 children were officially reported as victims of violence to authorities during a 12 month period per 100,000 children. In Country B, 500 children were officially reported as victims of violence to authorities during a 12 month period per 100,000 children. A comparison of the two countries based on this rough indicator would lead one to believe that levels of reporting are higher in Country A than in Country B.

However, such rough indicators do not enable an understanding of the differences in reporting between the two countries. A fuller picture emerges only when the nature of violence reported in each country is accounted for.

The indicator project breaks violence down into the following **four categories of violence**, as outlined by the WHO:

Physical violence	Those acts of commission by a perpetrator that cause actual physical harm or have the potential for harm
Sexual violence	Those acts where a perpetrator uses a child for sexual gratification
Emotional violence	The failure of a caregiver to provide an appropriate and supportive environment; such acts include restricting a child's movement, denigration, ridicule, threats and intimidation, discrimination, rejection and other non-physical forms of hostile treatment
Neglect	The failure of a caregiver to provide for the development of the child- where the caregiver is in a position to do so- in one of more of the following areas: health, education, emotional development, nutrition, shelter and safe living conditions

Now, let's return to the example above and look at Indicator 7 disaggregating for the four different types of violence.

Indicator 7 -number of reported victims in the 12-month period per 100,000 child pop.					
	Physical violence	**Sexual violence**	**Emotional violence**	**Neglect**	**Total**
Country A	500	150	0	50	700
Country B	500	0	0	0	500

The law in Country A defines reportable acts of violence against children as acts of physical violence, sexual violence, emotional violence, or neglect. The disaggregated information shows that 500 children per 100,000 children were officially reported as victims of physical violence, 150 children per 100,000 children were officially reported as victims of sexual violence, 0 children were officially reported as victims of emotional violence, and 50 children per 100,000 children were officially reported as victims of neglect in Country A. The law in Country B defines reportable acts of violence against children only in terms of physical violence so all of the 500 children per 100,000 children were officially reported as victims of physical violence. A comparison of the two countries based on the indicator once it has been disaggregated by nature of violence would lead one to conclude that while levels of reporting of physical violence and emotional violence are roughly the same in Countries A and B, the two countries differ when it comes to levels of reporting on sexual violence and neglect.

It is extremely important to note that **low levels of reported violence in a country <u>can not</u> be interpreted to mean that the prevalence of violence against children is low**. Indicator 7 does not provide information on the extent of violence in a country since most acts of violence against children are never reported. Instead, Indicator 7 tells us the level of functioning of the child protection system in the country when it comes to identifying and reporting different types of violence against children.

Likewise, Indicators 4, 5 and 6 do not accurately reflect the prevalence of violence against children in a country. Even where extensive police and medical records exist, these records will only cover the most severe instances of violence against children. When it comes to estimating the actual prevalence of violence against children, Indicator 1 is recommended to be used, as it not only captures the more severe instances of violence, but also instances of violence that do not leave any marks.

IV. Mapping the System

Laws and policies defining violence against children, procedures for reporting violence against children, and services available for victims and families affected by violence will differ in each country system. Therefore, the **first step** in collecting information on the violence indicators is for the country to generate a map of the system.

The purpose of the map is to guide and inform the information collection process. The system map will enable (A) the identification of relevant information sources; and (B) the identification of relevant target populations.

Information sources may be located within the criminal justice system, the child welfare system, recovery, reintegration, or psychological support services providers, schools, and hospitals. Information sources may also be classified according to whether they are found at the local, district, regional or central level. Identifying individuals that can act as information sources within a relevant body or institution can be particularly valuable for ensuring consistency and quality of information.

Target populations are the particular groups of children or adults that must be counted in order to measure a particular indicator. These could be for instance: 'all children officially reported as victims of violence during a 12 month period.' For other indicators, in particular for the Environment-specific indicators, it will be necessary to take a *sample* from the child population.

A comprehensive system map of information sources and child populations will likely highlight (i) Laws, (ii) Systems, and (iii) the Connections between these.

- The system map will describe relevant laws for child victims of violence including criminal laws child protection or welfare laws and relevant government policies.

- The system map will describe the systems used for dealing with child victims of violence including which bodies or institutions are responsible for the five areas of:
  A.   Detection and Reporting (to criminal justice system or child welfare system)
  B.   Investigation
  C.   Decision on cases
  D.   Child welfare/ services

- The system map will describe the connections between these systems, such as how child victims of violence move from one system to the other.

Laws

A country's legal framework should provide information on: who is a child under national law, whether laws exist that prohibit violence against children in various settings (home, school, foster care, institutions), including physical violence, sexual violence, emotional violence, and/or neglect, the possibility of mandatory reporting and for whom it applies, who is responsible for investigating reported cases of violence against children (criminal justice system vs. child welfare system), the competent authorities responsible for making a decision on cases of reported victimization, and the role of social or child welfare services.

Systems

A useful approach to identifying and categorising systems that deal with children who are victims of violence is to look for bodies and institutions that play a role in each of the four categories of: (A) detection and reporting, (B) investigation, (C) decision on cases, and (D) child welfare / services. Possible bodies and institutions include: criminal justice systems, child welfare systems, hospitals, schools, private service providers, public service providers, doctors, social workers, and police officers. Each body or institution can then be split up into local, district, regional and national levels to facilitate identification of information sources at the appropriate level.

Connections

In order to map the connections between the various aspects of the systems, it is helpful to consider which body or institution a child victim of violence might come into contact with first and then move forwards and outwards to identify how, and via which route, the child may come into contact with other relevant systems.

The end result will be a system map that charts the possible routes a child may take through a particular country system. The map can then be used to easily identify key information sources and to mark those child populations that will be used for measuring the indicators.

V. Methodology

This section aims to provide more detailed information on methods that may be used to collect information on the violence indicators. The two methods for collecting this information are the use of information systems and sampling. To determine the most appropriate method for information collection, one must consider: 1) the extent to which existing information sources systematically record accurate information, 2) whether the development of new information systems is possible within a reasonable timeframe, and 3) the feasibility of sampling from existing information sources.

1. Information systems

The mapping exercise will allow researchers to identify possible information sources (schools, hospitals, etc…) that might maintain information systems relevant to the indicators. However, not all information sources will systematically record information on violence against children. Furthermore, whenever information for the indicators is taken from information systems that exist in relevant institutions (i.e. records from police or hospitals), it is important to remember that the validity of the indicators will depend on the accuracy and completeness of the relevant institutions' information systems.

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 information systems into accordance and document all decisions in this step, or b) state that this information system 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.

Once accurate and complete information systems have been identified, it is important to plan an efficient method for extracting the information needed to calculate the indicators. This information must be in a form that allows for the levels of disaggregation outlined in the indicator profiles.

Thus, sufficient information on individual children collected at the local level should be passed on up to the regional or central level for collation and the calculation of the indicators.

2. Sampling

Sampling is the collection of information from a part of the whole target population. The information about that one part is then used to make inferences about the population as a whole. Sampling may be used to collect information for the indicators on violence against children when the required information does not exist in information systems or when the information in information systems is incomplete.

For more detailed information on sampling and household survey methodology, please refer to the following UNICEF resource:

- The Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) is a household survey programme developed by UNICEF to assist countries in filling data gaps for monitoring the situation of children and women. The *MICS3 Manual* (2005), which provides relevant information on sampling, data collection and analysis, can be found at: http://www.childinfo.org/mics/mics3/manual.php.

For more detailed information on sampling techniques and research methodologies that pertain specifically to the measurement of violence, kindly refer to the following WHO resource:

- The WHO's *Guidelines for Conducting Community Surveys on Injuries and Violence* (2004) provides extensive information on the topic of sampling in addition to providing step-by-step instructions on how to conduct a community-based survey on violence. This resource can be found at: http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2004/9241546484.pdf.

Sample design

Survey methodologies will be required to gather data for some of the indicators, so an important step in the field testing process is the sample design. In order to obtain representative data from a survey of individuals, a **random** sample of households has to be selected[2]. Usually, to ease the coordination of interviewers during the survey and to limit travel costs, the sample should be selected in two steps: first by choosing via random selection the primary sampling units (PSU) that usually consist of cities and villages (or regions) that represent the overall composition of the country. If the sample mainly consists of cities, while the majority of the inhabitants live in rural areas (or vice versa), the data coming from this sample design cannot be considered representative. After choosing these PSUs, the households[3,4] to be surveyed within the PSUs have to be randomly selected as well.

Sample size

The sample size should be determined so that the data set allows for disaggregation at least for children's age and sex, and, if possible, for the regional level as well. The sampling size should be large enough to be able to provide representative data about the smallest possible group of children (e.g. girls between the ages of 8-10 living in households in rural areas) within a 95% confidence interval. As for all research steps, the sample size should be discussed with the specialized partner in great detail.

---

[2] Usually a rough number of households in a given country is easy to obtain, while the number of households with children is much harder to obtain. Therefore, it should be aimed to identify a household first and then "screen" during the survey process to determine whether children live in the household.

[3] A *household* is defined in the Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey as a group of persons who live and eat together.

[4] This applies to schools for indicator 13.

3. Interviewing children

The majority of the violence indicators (Indicators 4-10, and 12) rely on data from information systems and, thus, interviews with children are not necessary to collect this information. Adults (parents, teachers, etc…), not children, will need to be interviewed to collect information on adult attitudes towards violence against children for Indicator 3.

However, a child's rights perspective supports methods of research that collect information on children's experiences from their own perspective. Two of the indicators (Indicators 2 & 11) require information that can only be collected by surveys or interviews conducted directly with children; these indicators relate to children's life skills and children's past experiences with skipping school due to feeling unsafe.

While it would be ideal to collect information on unofficial reports (self-reports) of violence (Indicator 1) from children themselves, ethical and safety considerations may prevent researchers from conducting interviews directly with children on this sensitive topic. Since ISPCAN's children questionnaire collects information on violence directly from children themselves (via the group administration of paper-and-pencil surveys), it is critical that researchers take extra precautions to protect children's safety when using this instrument. ISPCAN's children's questionnaire manual provides guidelines on the ethical use of the instrument. Researchers should not use direct interview methods if they determine that such methods could put child participants at risk of harm.

It may be easier and safer to collect information for Indicator 1 from young adults (18-24) by asking for their retrospective self-reports of violence (please refer to ISPCAN's retrospective questionnaire and manual). The use of retrospective reports by young adults may be particularly useful for collecting information on childhood violence in countries that have mandatory reporting laws on violence against children. Unlike children's self-reports or parental reports of violence, retrospective reports of violence from young adults will not lead to breaches in confidentiality in countries with mandatory reporting laws. Alternatively, some information on this issue can be gathered by asking parents about their children's experiences of violence or by asking parents about "forms of education and punishment" that have been practiced on the target child during the last 12 months (please refer to ISPCAN's parent questionnaire and manual and the MICS's optional module on child discipline).

Informed consent

It is not ethical to include children in research without their informed consent. Whenever interviewing children, it is important to be aware of the power imbalance between children and adults. An interview should never be imposed upon a child without his/her full consent. The interviewer should explain the purpose of the research to the child so that the child knows what he/she will be asked about and how. In addition to obtaining the informed consent of each individual child, it may be necessary to seek the permission of the child's parent or guardian. The interviewer has to make clear that the child can not only choose to abort the interview at any time, but that he/she can also refuse to answer questions that he/she is not comfortable with, without suffering any consequences. If applicable, children should be informed that the researchers may be required to break confidentiality if a child discloses that he/she is in immediate danger.

Confidentiality

The participants should be informed that the information will be gathered and analyzed anonymously, so that it will not be possible to identify any individual child during or after the interview. While contact protocols should be used to monitor the research field, the datasets should be kept and managed at different places at all times. The data should be kept in a safe place so that people outside of the research team do not have access to the information.

The research team must prepare for the possibility that children being abused may come forward during the study and ask researchers for help. The balance between protecting children's welfare and protecting children's autonomy and confidentiality is delicate. In certain situations, it may be necessary for researchers to breach confidentiality to act to provide immediate protection to a child. Children in need of such assistance should be referred to appropriate psychological support services. A research protocol should be developed at the outset to prevent researchers from taking individual or impulsive actions to help children. Instead, the protocol should instruct researchers to ask children who disclose abuse what actions they would like to be taken and to discuss available options with these children. The research protocol should include the creation and distribution of a list of community resources for children in need of assistance.

Training and preparation

A person who has extensive knowledge in child development should be consulted when preparing and conducting interviews with children, especially when the interviews include sensitive questions such as those about victimization experiences. It should be taken into account that boys and girls who are abused on a regular basis may not necessarily fall into the same age-developmental stage (in terms of psychological maturity) as other children, making the choice of interviewing approach much more complex.

Researchers often differ in their interpersonal styles, and some researchers are undoubtedly more gifted at interacting with children than others. However, appropriate techniques for interviewing children can be developed via training. The most effective training methods usually combine elements of role play and continued practice under supervision.

Since the aim of the indicator project is to find out about violence against children and the status of the Protective Environment, building a good rapport is essential to get to know more about children's living situations and their thoughts and perceptions about them. Some children, especially those who are accustomed to violence or who fear retaliation by the perpetrator, may tend to cope with the interviewers by concealing or distorting information. When boys or girls have been experiencing violence from a very young age or in a very repressive environment, the unkind treatment they have endured may have deeply affected their behavior and they may have learned to make themselves as unobtrusive and inconspicuous as possible.

One should be aware that an unknown woman or man who comes to ask questions might initially be viewed as a significant threat. Moreover, boys or girls interviewed in or near places of victimization can hardly be expected to respond in a trusting or relaxed manner. Therefore, it is not recommended that children be interviewed about violence in the school environment while they are at school. For the same reason, it is not recommended that children be interviewed about violence in the home environment while they are at home. Children should always be sought out of sight of any (possible) perpetrators. Whatever method is used for household surveys, all interviews should only be conducted with the respondent present, not with other members of the family in the room. If adults do not allow their children to be interviewed alone, the interview with the children should be cancelled.

4. Data Analysis

Data analysis is the process whereby the information collected for the indicators is collated at the central level and then used to calculate the indicators. 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…). The WHO's *Guidelines for Conducting Community Surveys on Injuries and Violence* (2004) should be referenced for detailed information on appropriate techniques for

assuring data quality and performing data analysis. Additional information on data processing and analysis can be found in UNICEF's *MICS3 Manual* (2005).

The data analysis for the indicators takes the form of simple descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages, and rates. Many of the indicators on violence against children utilize the calculation of rates since rates facilitate comparisons across groups and over time. Most rates will use population data as their base.

Victimization rate =   Number of victims
                           ---------------------------------- x 100,000 child population
                           Total population of children

At this point, it should be determined whether the information provided by the indicators serves the purposes outlined in the indicator profiles under "Purpose" and if not, the reasons and possible explanations for this.

VI. Interpretations

The indicators on violence against children can be used at the local institutional level, the national governmental level and the international level. The indicators should be used to monitor child rights abuses and to evaluate the progress of collaborative efforts including local organizations and government counterparts.

When interpreting the indicators, it is extremely important to remember that their usefulness is strongly linked to a particular country context. For more detailed information, please refer to the cautionary notes on interpreting the Morbidity and Mortality and Child protection system indicators in Section II of this Manual. The results obtained for the violence indicators are subject to misuse if evaluators do not interpret them in a country-specific context. Cross-country comparisons may be useful for some indicators, but for most, comparisons over time within a country or within a region will be more meaningful.

Appendix A

Definitions	
Child	Any individual below the age of 18 years old.
Violence	The intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation.[5]
At home	If a child is victimized while under the (legal) supervision of a parent (/ caretaker), the victimization is considered "at home," irrespective of the identity of the perpetrator.
At school	If a child is victimized while under the (legal) supervision of a teacher or other school personnel, during school related activities, or on the way to and from school, the victimization is considered "at school", irrespective of the identity of the perpetrator.
Physical violence	Those acts of commission by a perpetrator that cause actual physical harm or have the potential for harm.[5]
Sexual violence	Those acts where a perpetrator uses a child for sexual gratification.[5]
Emotional violence	The failure of a caregiver to provide an appropriate and supportive environment; such acts include restricting a child's movement, denigration, ridicule, threats and intimidation, discrimination, rejection and other non-physical forms of hostile treatment.[5]
Neglect	The failure of a caregiver to provide for the development of the child- where the caregiver is in a position to do so- in one of more of the following areas: health, education, emotional development, nutrition, shelter and safe living conditions.[5]
Perpetrator	Any person who inflicts violence or abuse or causes violence or abuse to be inflicted on a child.[6]
Ethnicity	A set of characteristics- cultural, social, religious and linguistic – that form a distinctive identity shared by a community of people.[7]
Official report	A case of violence against a child that is reported to and recorded by the criminal justice system or the child welfare system.
Self-report	A case of violence against a child that is reported by the child himself or herself in an unofficial survey (or via a proxy-report from a parent or caregiver, or via a retrospective report from a young adult).

---

[5] Krug EG et al., eds. *World report on violence and health*. Geneva. World Health Organization, 2002.

[6] Saltzman et al. *Intimate partner violence surveillance: Uniform definitions and recommended data elements*. Atlanta: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. Centers for Disease Control, 1999.

[7] Moccia et al., eds. *The State of the World's Children 2006: Excluded and Invisible*. New York: The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), 2005.

Life Skills	Cognitive abilities to take action and generate change acquired through learning or developed through experience.[8]
Recovery, Reintegration, or Psychological Support Services	Therapeutic services for child victims of violence, such as: therapeutic day care, individual therapy, group therapy, family therapy, temporary foster care, hospitalization, etc…
Information Systems	Internal methods or structures that enable bodies or institutions that deal with child victims of violence to systematically record, update and retain information about those children (i.e. police records, hospital records).
Information source	Information sources are single institutions or individuals supply information for measurement of the indicators on violence against children.
Sampling	Sampling is the collection of information from part of the whole population. Information about that part is used to make inferences about the whole population.

---

[8] UNICEF PD Basic Education and Gender Equality intranet website definition

Appendix B

This appendix contains seven Information Collection Tools that can be used to collect information for the indicators on violence against children.

- Tool 1 collects information for Indicator 4.

- Tool 2 collects information for Indicators 5 & 6.

- Tool 3 collects information for Indicators 7 – 10.

- Tool 4 collects information for Indicator 2.

- Tool 5 collects information for Indicator 3.

- Tool 6 collects information for Indicator 11.

- Tool 7 collects information for Indicator 12.

Information collection tools 1-3 are tools designed to collect data from information systems. These 3 tools facilitate the collection of information for the **Morbidity and Mortality** and **Child protection system** indicators, indicators 4-10.

Codes for use with tools 1-3:

For use with Tools 1-3							
Column E		Column F		Column H		Column I	
Ethnic Group		Type of violence		Identity of Perpetrator		Place of Victimization	
1	To be defined	1	Physical violence	1	Parent / care taker	1	Home
2	To be defined	2	Sexual violence	2	Sibling	2	Community/Street
3	To be defined	3	Emotional Violence	3	Teacher	3	School
4	To be defined	4	Neglect	4	Peer	4	Workplace
5	To be defined			5	Employer	5	Institution
6	To be defined			6	Other Relative	6	Prison
7	To be defined			7	Gang	7	Other
				8	Other adult	8	Not known
				9	Not known		

For use with Tools 3					
Column J		Column K		Column N	
Authority violence reported to		Reporter of violence		Type of Service Referred to	
1	Child welfare system	1	Public health facility	1	Individual therapy
2	Criminal justice system	2	Private health facility	2	Group therapy
3	Other	3	Educational facility	3	Family therapy
		4	Social Work Centre	4	Therapeutic day care
		5	Police Station	5	Temporary foster care
		6	Family / relative	6	Hospitalization
		7	Self (child)	7	Other
		8	Other		
		9	Unknown		

Information Collection Tool 1 – this tool organizes and collects information from vital registration systems for *Indicator 4-* Homicide rate in children during the 12 month period

Information Source Name:	
Address and Contact Details:	

PERIOD: [*dd/mm/yy*] – [*dd/mm/yy*]

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Child reference	Gender	Date of Birth	Age at time of death	Ethnic Group	Type of Violence	Date of death	Identity of Perpetrator	Place of Victimization
ID #	M / F	[*dd/mm/yy*]	Years	?– ?	1 – 4	[*dd/mm/yy*]	1-9	1-8
TOTAL NUMBER OF CHILD VICTIMS OF HOMICIDE:								

Information Collection Tool 2 – this tool organizes and collects information from hospitals for *Indicator 5*: Emergency room visits due to assaults in children during the 12 month period and *Indicator 6*: Hospital discharges due to assaults in children during the 12 month period

Information Source Name:	
Address and Contact Details:	

PERIOD: [*dd/mm/yy*] – [*dd/mm/yy*]

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Child reference	Gender	Date of Birth	Age at time of ER visit	Ethnic Group	Type of Violence	Date of ER visit	Identity of Perpetrator	Place of Victimization
ID #	M / F	[*dd/mm/yy*]	Years	?– ?	1 – 4	[*dd/mm/yy*]	1-9	1-8

J	K	L
Inpatient Stay	Age at time of discharge	Date of discharge
Yes / No	Years	[*dd/mm/yy*]

TOTAL NUMBER OF CHILD ER VISITS:
TOTAL NUMBER OF CHILD HOSPITAL DISCHARGES:

Information Collection Tool 3 – this tool organizes and collects information from relevant authorities (the child welfare system or the criminal justice system) for *Indicator 7*: Number of children officially reported as victims during the 12 month period, *Indicator 8*: Number of substantiated cases during the 12 month period, *Indicator 9*: Percentage of child victims referred to services during the 12 month period, *Indicator 10*: Percentage of child victims who used services during the 12 month period

Information Source Name:	
Address and Contact Details:	
Type of Authority:	

PERIOD: [*dd/mm/yy*] – [*dd/mm/yy*]

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Child reference	Gender	Date of Birth	Age at time of report	Ethnic Group	Type of Violence	Date of report	Identity of Perpetrator	Place of Victimization
ID #	M / F	[*dd/mm/yy*]	Years	?– ?	1 – 4	[*dd/mm/yy*]	1-9	1-8

J	K	L	M	N	O	P
Authority violence reported to	Reporter of violence	Date Investigation Completed	Report Substantiated	Type of Service Referred to	Date of Referral	Services used
1-3	1-9	[*dd/mm/yy*]	Yes / No	1-7	[*dd/mm/yy*]	Yes / No / Not known

TOTAL NUMBER OF CHILDREN OFFICIALLY REPORTED AS VICTIMS:
TOTAL NUMBER OF SUBSTANTIATED CASES:
TOTAL NUMBER OF CHILDREN REFERRED:
TOTAL NUMBER OF CHILDREN WHO USED SERVICES:

Information Collection Tool 4 – this tool collects information for *Indicator 2*:
Children's life skills

The UNICEF PD Education section together with the Child Protection section developed draft modules to collect information on children's life skills as they relate to violence against children.

Two draft modules were developed for **life skills**: Example Module A and Example Module B.

- Example Module A only collects information on the **actions** a child would recommend to a friend who was a victim of violence.

- Example Module B is designed to collect information on a child's **critical thinking, personal values, and communication** as they relate to hypothetical violence, in addition to collecting information on the **actions** a child would recommend to a friend who was a victim of violence.

Example Module B attempts to capture multiple realms of children's life skills whereas Example Module A only captures information on one realm of children's life skills.

Field testers have a **choice** as to whether they wish to field test one or both of the example modules to collect information for Indicator 2. Feedback on the field test process should specify which example module(s) were selected to collect this information. Feedback will be used to further refine the tool.

Example Module A (shorter version; source UNICEF PD Education Section)

CHILDREN'S LIFE SKILLS	
1 Imagine that you have a close friend whose **parent*** often calls your friend stupid, or calls him or her names, or screams violently at him or her. What would you recommend your friend to do?	(a) I would recommend:
	(b) there is nothing that can be done, because:
2 Imagine now that your friend is often beaten very much by his or her **parent*** over very small matters. What would you recommend your friend to do then?	(a) I would recommend:
	(b) there is nothing that can be done, because:
3 Imagine now that your friend's **parent *** shows him/her sexual things or makes your friend do sexual things that he/she does not want to do. What would you recommend your friend to do then?	(a) I would recommend:
	(b) there is nothing that can be done, because:
4. Imagine now that your friend's **parent*** does not provide enough for your friend to eat and/or drink, even though there is enough for everyone. What would you recommend your friend to do then?	(a) I would recommend:
	(b) there is nothing that can be done, because:

NOTE: in each question **parent** can be replaced by a different potential perpetrator: *teacher*, *classmate(s)*, *employer*, *peer(s)*, etc…, depending on the environment of interest: *home*, *school*, *workplace*, etc…

NOTE: to allow for disaggregation, each question taps a different type of violence: Question 1 - emotional violence, Question 2 - physical violence, Question 3 - sexual violence, and Question 4 – neglect

Suggested Codes for Life Skills Questions
b. There is nothing that can be done **(b) = 0 this represents an absence of life skills in specific area**
a. children's open ended answers **(a) = 1 this represents possession of life skills in specific area**

If desired, children's open-ended answers for choice (a) can be coded into the following 3 categories of life skills taken from The Participatory Assessment Tool (this step is not necessary in order to calculate Indicator 10):

1. Avoidance	avoid conflict- avoid situations or talk of topics that might upset the perpetrator self restraint- keep quiet and not say anything to further aggravate the situation placate the perpetrator- apologize at the moment to avoid further trouble
2. Escape	escape- hide or lock yourself up in a room so they cannot hurt you run away- move out of the house or take to the street to escape the situation
3. Act	self-defense- defend yourself by hitting back or shouting back seek help from close friends/relatives- talk to someone about the problem/ ask for help seek protection- call the police for help or another organization that helps children take offensive action- become verbally or physically violent or frighten the perpetrator

Example Module B (longer version; source UNICEF PD Education Section)

CHILDREN'S LIFE SKILLS-SCHOOL

1 Which of these situations do you think should be avoided at school (select as many as you want):
Could maybe be presented in a table: Strongly agree to Strongly disagree

(a) children hurting others

(b) teachers hurting others

(c) children speaking in a sexual way or doing sexual things to other children

(d) teachers speaking in a sexual way to children

(e) children threatening others

(f) teachers threatening children

*(Relates to **critical thinking** as concerns perpetrator and category of violence: the more replies identified, the more positive the reply)*

2 If any of these situations happened to me, I would (select one):

(a) do nothing, because:

(b) avoid the situations or places where it could happen.

(c) try to solve the situation by:

*(Relates to **personal values**: reply a would be considered as negative, both replies b and c would be considered as positive)*

3 If any of these situations happened to me or another child, I would seek help from:
(a) friends
(b) a teacher
(c) a parent
(d) another adult
(e) I wouldn't seek help from anyone.

*(Relates to **communication**, and who a child would turn to)*

4 Imagine that a close friend of yours :

(a) has trouble with other children at school, because they threaten or hurt him or her on a regular basis.
() I would recommend:
() there is nothing that can be done, because:

(b) is treated very unfairly by a certain teacher: for example, a teacher calls your friend stupid all the time or calls him or her names.
() I would recommend:
() there is nothing that can be done, because:

(c) gets hit by a teacher very often.
() I would recommend:
() there is nothing that can be done, because:

(d) is addressed by a teacher in a sexual way.
() I would recommend:
() there is nothing that can be done, because:

*(Relates to what **action**)*

Information Collection Tool 5 – this tool collects information for *Indicator 3*: Adults' attitudes towards violence against children

The UNICEF PD Child Protection section developed draft modules to collect information on adults' attitudes as they relate to violence against children.

Two draft modules were developed for **adults' attitudes**: Example Module A and Example Module B.

- Example Module A was drafted based on a measure of adult attitudes on corporal punishment from Child Trends 2002. Charting Parenthood: A Statistical Portrait of Fathers and Mothers in America, Washington D.C. (only for Parents).

- Example Module B was drafted based on a measure of adult attitudes on domestic violence from the MICS3 optional module on domestic violence.

Field testers have a **choice** as to whether they wish to field test one or both of the example modules to collect information for Indicator 3. Feedback on the field test process should specify which example module(s) were selected to collect this information. Feedback will be used to further refine the tool.

Example Module A (source UNICEF PD Child Protection Section)

	ATTITUDES TOWARD CORPORAL PUNISHMENT– HOME					

1. Below you'll find a list of statements. Please tell us for each statement, if you agree with the statement or not. Please use the scale from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree' to select the choice that best matches your opinion.

		strongly agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
a	Most children these days do not respect their parents.					
b	Most disciplinary problems with children can be solved by talking to them.					
c	Corporal punishment, if administered correctly, has positive effects on the rearing of the child.					
d	Sometimes it is necessary to discipline a child by using corporal punishment.					
e	It is more important for a caretaker to be feared than to be loved.					
f	I want my child to succeed in later life, even if I have to hurt him or her sometimes.					

	ATTITUDES TOWARD CORPORAL PUNISHMENT– SCHOOL					

2. Below you'll find a list of statements. Please tell us for each statement, if you agree with the statement or not. Please use the scale from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree' to select the choice that best matches your opinion.

		strongly agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
a	Some teachers I know are afraid of their students.					
b	Most children these days do not respect their teachers.					
c	Most disciplinary problems with children can be solved by talking to them.					
d	Corporal punishment, if administered correctly, has positive effects on the rearing of the child.					
e	Sometimes it is necessary to discipline a child by using corporal punishment.					
f	It is more important for a teacher to be feared than to be loved.					
g	The children's parents support me wherever they can.					

<u>Suggested Codes for Module A</u>
The respondent is coded as **1 = positive attitude toward corporal punishment**, if :
Question 1 – home
-respondent ticks *strongly agree* or *somewhat agree* for <u>at least one</u> out of c,d,e,f
OR if respondent ticks *strongly disagree* for b

Question 2 – school
-respondent ticks *strongly agree* or *somewhat agree* for <u>at least one </u>out of d,e,f
OR if respondent ticks *strongly disagree* for c

All others questions and options coded as **0 = no positive attitude toward corporal punishment**

please direct questions and comments to: sschuhmacher@unicef.org   45

Example Module B (source UNICEF PD Child Protection Section / modeled after MICS optional module on domestic violence)

ADULT ATTITUDES TOWARD CORPORAL PUNISHMENT – HOME

1. All adults use certain ways to teach children the right behavior or to address a behavior problem. In your opinion, is a parent justified in hitting or beating a child in the following situations:

	YES	NO	Don't Know
a) If the child leaves the house without telling the parent?	1	2	8
b) If the child is in danger of harming him or herself?	1	2	8
c) If the child is disobedient toward an elder?	1	2	8
d) If the child argues with a sibling?	1	2	8
e) If the child fights with another child in the neighborhood?	1	2	8
f) If the child steals something?	1	2	8
g) If the child does poorly in school?	1	2	8
h) If the child refuses to do chores?	1	2	8

ADULT ATTITUDES TOWARD CORPORAL PUNISHMENT – SCHOOL

2. All adults use certain ways to teach children the right behavior or to address a behavior problem. In your opinion, is a teacher justified in hitting or beating a student in the following situations:

	YES	NO	Don't Know
a) If the child leaves the class without asking the teacher?	1	2	8
b) If the child is late for class?	1	2	8
c) If the child is disobedient toward a teacher?	1	2	8
d) If the child fights with another student?	1	2	8
e) If the child falls asleep in class?	1	2	8
f) If the child steals something?	1	2	8
g) If the child performs poorly on a test?	1	2	8
h) If the child refuses to do homework?	1	2	8

Suggested Codes for Module B
The respondent is coded as **1 = positive attitude toward corporal punishment**, if :
Questions 1 – home: the respondent circles 1 (YES) for at least one out of a-h
Question 2 – school: the respondent circles 1 (YES) for at least one out of a-h

The respondent is coded as **0 = no positive attitude toward corporal punishment**, if:
Question 1 – home: the respondent circles 2 (NO) for all of a-h
Question 2 – school: the respondent circles 2 (NO) for all of a-h

Information Collection Tool 6 – this tool collects information for *Indicator 11*:
Children who skipped school due to violence

Example Module (source UNICEF PD Child Protection Section / based on National Youth Risk Behavior Survey (2003))

SKIPPING SCHOOL	
1 During the last 12 months, did you ever **not go to school** because you felt you would be **unsafe** at school or on your way to or from school?	( ) YES, I skipped school because I felt unsafe during the last 12 months. **-> continue to question 2** ( ) NO, I never skipped school because I felt unsafe during the last 12 months. **-> please exit this module**
2 Can you estimate how many days did you not go to school **because you felt you would be unsafe** at school or on your way to or from school during the last 12 months?	I skipped school in the last 12 months on _____ days because I felt unsafe.
3 What was **the main reason that you were afraid** to go to school? (please mark only the most important reason)	I was afraid because: ( ) Children threaten or hit me on my way to or from school ( ) Adults threaten or hit me on my way to or from school ( ) There are gangs on my way to school ( ) Other students at school regularly make fun of me ( ) Other students at school regularly threaten me ( ) I was afraid that a student at school would hit me ( ) A teacher at school calls me names, stupid or lazy ( ) A teacher at school threatens me ( ) I was afraid that a teacher at school would hit me ( ) There are gangs in school or near the school ( ) other students at school make sexual comments about me ( ) other students at school try to make me do sexual things ( ) a teacher at school makes sexual comments about me ( ) a teacher at school tries to make me do sexual things ( ) other: _____

NOTE: Question 1 allows for child to be counted as a case for the numerator of the indicator, Question 2 provides additional information on the frequency/severity of the problem (*not necessary to calculate Indicator 12*), and Question 3 allows for disaggregation of the information by perpetrator, place of victimization, and type of violence.

Information Collection Tool 7 – this tool collects information for *Indicator 12*:
School violence policy

Example Module (source UNICEF PD Child Protection Section)

School Policy	
1. Does the school policy allow school employees (teachers or non-teachers) to use corporal punishment on students to manage student misbehavior?	() yes () no
*Please **attach** a copy of the written school record, administrative record, internal policy document, or teacher's code of conduct that states the school's policy on the use of corporal punishment.*	
2. Does the school have an official reporting mechanism in place in the school to allow children to report violence?	() yes () no
*Please **attach** a copy of the written school record, administrative record, or internal policy document that verifies the existence of any official reporting procedures.*	

Suggested Codes for School Policy
Answers to both questions 1 and 2 must be YES for a school to count as having a protective school policy in place.

Appendix C

This appendix contains Supplemental Indicators on violence against children.

Supplemental Child protection system indicators			
#	Indicator	Comments	Data Sources
13	Proportion of medical/official/police personnel who are trained in identifying violence against children	Does not provide information about effectiveness of training, but supplements morbidity and mortality indicators.	Survey of target personnel
14	Number of active social workers per 100,000 population	Broad indicator.	Official data
15	(Existence) & Caseload of a confidential helpline or counseling center for victims	Provides information on children's utilization of services, but not quality of service	Information systems: CPS agencies / Surveys of service providers
16	Time between reported act of violence and successful follow-up	Difficult to define "successful" follow up	Official data
17	Enforcement of laws against all kinds of violence against children (at home, at school, etc…)	Challenging to measure.	Official data?
18	Proportion of officially reported repeatedly abused children of all reported child victims	Challenging to measure	Official data?
19	Average sentences of perpetrators in cases of violence against children (at home, at school, etc…)	The degree and severity of abuse would need to be classified in great detail, otherwise the data would not be comparable or meaningful. In addition, sentences might not always be in terms of 'years/months in prison.'	Court review
20	Existence of recovery, reintegration, and psychological support services for victims.	Background information. Does not provide information on utilization or quality of services.	Official data.

Supplemental violation indicators			
#	Indicator	Comments	Data Sources
21	Proportion of child homicides per total number of homicides during the last 12 months	Provides additional information.	Official data
22	Percentage of caregivers who experienced violence as a child	Does not reflect actual situation of children	Survey of caregivers
23	Proportion of re-notifications on the same perpetrator	Challenging to measure and prevalence expected to be low	Court records

Supplemental policy indicators			
#	Indicator	Comments	Data Sources
24	Existence of laws against all kinds of violence against children (at home, at school, etc…)	Provides background information that is easy to collect by UNICEF CO's.	Legislative review
25	Existence of (follow up) mechanisms after official report on violence against children	Provides background information that is easy to collect by UNICEF CO's.	Legislative review
26	Existence of routine data collection on violence against children (at home, at school, etc…)	Does not provide information about effectiveness or efficiency of monitoring.	Legislative review
27	Existence of routine post-mortem investigation to determine the cause of a child's death	Provides information on monitoring.	Legislative review
28	Ratification status of international agreements CRC / ICCPR / Regional agreements	Provides background information that is easy to collect by UNICEF CO's.	Legislative review
29	Status of implementation of ratified international agreements CRC / ICCPR / Regional agreements into the legal framework	Provides background information that is easy to collect by UNICEF CO's.	Legislative review
30	Existence of reporting mechanisms for violence against children (at home, at school, etc…)	Provides background information that is easy to collect by UNICEF CO's.	Legislative review
31	Existence of a national committee on violence against children, CRC enforcement	Does not provide information about impact of committee	Official data
32	Existence of standard procedures to deal with reported perpetrators	Does not provide information on effectiveness of procedures	Legislative review

Supplemental Environment-specific indicators

#	Indicator	Comments	Data Sources
33	Proportion of children who do not accept corporal punishment as a means of education (at home, at school, etc…)	Provides information on children's attitudes and awareness of rights-related to life skills	Survey of children
34	Differences in adults' (parents, teachers,) attitudes towards corporal punishment for girls/boys (gender differences)	Not of primary interest.	Survey of adults
35	Differences in adults' (parents, teachers,) attitudes towards corporal punishment for members of other ethnic groups (ethnic differences)	Not of primary interest.	Survey of adults

Supplemental school indicators

#	Indicator	Comments	Data Sources
36	Number of anti-violence campaigns in schools during the last 12 months	Does not provide information about the quality or impact of campaigns. Need a definition for a campaign.	Information systems: school records / Surveys of schools
37	Proportion of teachers with non-violence (classroom management) training	Does not provide information about effectiveness of training. Trained teachers may still use violence.	Survey of teachers
38	Proportion of schools with supervision in non-classroom settings (schoolyard, lunch, recreation areas, etc.) in effect	Does not provide information about effectiveness of supervision	Survey of schools
39	Existence of effective procedure / school policy for intervention in violence against children	Existence of such a policy does not equal enforcement	Survey of schools
40	Requirement for teachers to participate in non-violence (classroom management) training during their education.	Does not provide information on quality of training or actual behavior of teachers.	Teachers' education curriculum review
41	Existence of laws/legal gaps that excuse corporal punishment at school	Provides additional information on policy	Legislative review

Supplemental open discussion indicators			
#	Indicator	Comments	Data Sources
42	Number of published or 'aired' articles/books/radio/TV media reports related to violence against children (at home, at school, etc…) during the last 12 months	Does not provide information about the quality or impact of media reports.	Media review
43	Number of public campaigns on violence against children (at home, at school, etc…) during the last 12 months	Does not provide information about the quality or impact of campaigns. Need a definition for a campaign.	Media review
44	Number of public statements of senior government officials condemning violence against children (at home, at school, etc…) during the last 12 months	Does not provide information about the quality or impact of such statements.	Media review