



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

ECE/CES/GE.30/2006/6
8 September 2006

ENGLISH ONLY

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE
CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN STATISTICIANS

STATISTICAL COMMISSION

Group of Experts on Gender Statistics

Fourth session
Geneva, 11-13 September 2006
Item 3 of the provisional agenda

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Analysis of national surveys carried out by the countries of the conference of european statisticians to measure violence against women*

Submitted by UNECE Task Force on Measurement of Violence Against Women

Composition of the Task Force on Violence
Against Women:

Dragana Djokovic Papic – Republic of
Serbia
George Kavelashvili - Georgia
Henrica Alexandrina F.M, Jansen - WHO
Holly Johnson – Canada
Linda Laura Sabbadini – Italy
Maria Giuseppina Muratore– Italy
Riet Groenen – UNFPA
Sami Nevala - HEUNI
Victoria Velkoff – USA
Vladimir Magnaradze – Georgia
UNECE Secretariat

* This paper has been prepared at the invitation of the secretariat.

Table of content	
Executive Summary.....	5
Introduction.....	7
1. Institutional Framework.....	9
2. Methodology.....	11
2.1. Reference Population.....	11
2.2. Sample.....	12
2.3. Mode of data collection.....	13
2.4. Reference period.....	14
2.5. Telescoping effect.....	16
2.6. Quality control.....	18
2.7. Interviewer training.....	19
2.8. Non-Responses.....	20
2.9. Survey average length.....	22
2.10. Major methodological challenges met during the design of the survey.....	23
3. Content.....	24
3.1. Indicators produced.....	24
4. Data Dissemination.....	30
5. Concluding remarks.....	31
ANNEX A.....	33
ANNEX B.....	35
ANNEX C.....	49
ANNEX D.....	51
ANNEX E.....	61

Executive Summary

This report presents a comparative analysis of 25 national surveys carried out to measure violence against women (VAW) by 17 countries, which are participating in the Conference of European Statisticians. Fifteen of these surveys were entirely dedicated to VAW, while ten focused on broader subjects (such as victimization, health) and included a module on VAW.

The objectives of the analysis were: i) to take stock of the work undertaken by countries in defining and implementing survey methodology to measure VAW; and ii) to understand the differences and commonalities between methodologies used in the region and identify areas appropriate for standard recommendations on definitions and methodology, which could help study VAW on a broader scale.

The analysis revealed that much progress has been made. Many national statistical offices and other government institutions have started to engage in the production of statistics based on VAW surveys or VAW modules included in other surveys. However, surveys to measure VAW are still carried out as an *ad hoc* activity.

Although methodologies differ greatly between the surveys and modules addressing VAW, common features can be found. These include:

- the use of highly detailed questions about violent acts, behaviours and/or attitudes, instead of general definitions of violence, which could lead to subjective interpretations
- the selection of physical and sexual violence as the minimum set of dimensions to investigate
- in dedicated surveys, the exploration of a broader range of facets, including psychological abuse, stalking, and economic violence (modules focused only on physical and sexual violence)
- the use of “lifetime” and “one year before the survey” as the most common reference periods

These similarities illustrate that a multi-stage process of standardization of methodologies is timely. Common features could constitute the basis for a standard minimum module, to be implemented in the countries of the region under the framework of official statistics.

Indicators on prevalence were produced by almost all surveys, while incidence indicators were produced by 60 per cent of the surveys. Dedicated VAW surveys were more likely to include indicators of both prevalence and incidence. The vast majority of surveys also produced indicators on severity of violent acts, while less than half measured attitudes towards violence.

Almost all surveys and modules on VAW included questions on perpetrators. Among the different categories of perpetrators included in the questionnaires, partners, ex-partners, friends and strangers were the most common, but few surveys explicitly mentioned other family members.

Dedicated VAW surveys were more likely to use “lifetime” as reference period, but in most cases they also inquired about recent events (mostly one year reference period). VAW modules included in victimization surveys focused more on recent reference periods (in most cases one year, but also three or five years).

The majority of surveys relied on cross-sectional samples, mostly stratified by geographical area. Households were usually the basic sampling unit, with one person per household being selected in the majority of cases. Sample size depended highly on the means and resources of the institution conducting the survey and it determines the level of details for which reliable estimates can be calculated. In the 25 surveys considered, the size of the sample ranged between around 500 households in Moldova, and 60,000 households in Italy.

In most cases, interviews were carried out by telephone or face-to-face. The majority of countries paid great attention to training and monitoring of interviewers.

In almost every survey, measures were taken to check and improve the quality of data gathered. There is some evidence that tools such as: advance letters, follow-ups, call backs and the use of proxy, reduced non-responses. The type of institution that carried out the survey also affected the response rate and the sample sizes.

Introduction

The Beijing Platform for Action, adopted at the Fourth World Conference on Women in 1995, categorizes Violence Against Women (VAW) as an obstacle to the achievement of the objectives of equality, development and peace. It underlines that violence against women violates and impairs, or nullifies the enjoyment by women of their human rights and fundamental freedoms.

The Platform for Action provided an important impetus for data collection and research on VAW. Specifically, it called attention to the lack of data on VAW and exhorted governments to build national statistical capacity to collect such data, disseminate findings, and to encourage research into the causes and consequences of different forms of VAW.

In the decade following the Beijing Conference, enormous progress has been made in documenting the extent and nature of VAW. While a great deal has been accomplished already, there are still challenges and gaps in developing knowledge on this issue in all parts of the world, due in part to the lack of standardized methods and questionnaires for data collection.

The most common forms of data collection on the subject are population-based surveys and service-based data. Population-based surveys that query women about their experiences as victims of violence, are considered as the most reliable method for collecting information on the extent of violence perpetrated against women in a general population. They reflect actual occurrences of victimization rather than what is reported to officials.

Under the Conference of European Statisticians¹, an UNECE Task Force on Violence against Women was established with the following main objectives:

- To exchange and promote methods for specialized VAW surveys
- To promote training for National Statistical Offices (NSOs) and users in the field of VAW
- To define common concepts, develop a core set of indicators and identify a minimum set of questions for a short-module that can be incorporated into on-going surveys
- To create guidelines for collecting data on VAW in the domain of official statistics.

As a part of the work of the Task Force (TF) on Violence Against Women, UNECE contacted Member States, as well as relevant experts, and asked them to provide details on VAW surveys that have been conducted in their respective countries. Questionnaires were sent to 20 countries and three research centres, and reply was received from most of them (see Table 1. in the Appendix)², including the DHS (Demographic and Health surveys) and the EUICS (European Crime and Safety Surveys) survey that are used in a number of UNECE countries.

¹ The Conference of European Statisticians (CES) is the body formed by Heads of National Statistical Offices of the 56 countries of the UN Economic Commission for Europe (all countries of North America and Europe, including CIS countries and Israel). The following countries are also regularly participating in CES activities: Japan, South Korea, Australia, New Zealand, Mexico and Brazil.

² Reply to the questionnaire was not received, or not received in time for: Ireland, Lithuania, New Zealand and RHS (Reproductive Health Survey).

The 17 reporting countries have conducted altogether 23 surveys that included questions on violence against women. In total, by adding the DHS and EUICS waves that included questions on VAW, 25 different surveys were considered in this analysis. The majority of these questionnaires (15 out of 25) were used for doing specialized surveys, and 10 were used in surveys on different subjects with a module on violence against women.

The surveys listed here represent an important contribution to VAW surveys and research. However, this endeavour should be seen as part of the overall survey research on violence against women in these countries, while other such surveys typically concentrate on particular geographical areas or specific groups of potential victims (e.g. immigrants, ethnic minorities, disabled, sexual minorities).

The Questionnaire sent to the countries was divided into two main parts:

Part 1. Questionnaire on victimization surveys including questions on:

- Type, periodicity, and main objectives of the survey. Institution responsible, frequency as well as reference population.
- Interview mode, use of interviewers, sampling techniques and sample size.
- Telescoping, non-response, and methodological challenges.
- Dissemination of the data.

Part 2. Questionnaire on gender-based violence including questions on :

- Perpetrators, types of violence: physical, sexual, psychological, economical and stalking, as well as some supplementary questions to the first part.

In 2005-2006, UNECE built an inventory on VAW surveys on the basis of the above questionnaires, including both specialized/dedicated surveys, and surveys on other subjects ("multi-purpose surveys" for instance), which comprised a module or subset of questions on VAW. The main objective of VAW surveys could be different. In some cases all kinds of violence against women were explored, in other cases only violence perpetrated by men - both at home and outside the home - was considered and, finally, other instances only covered domestic violence. A list of the countries that replied to the information requested, the names of the surveys conducted, as well as the type of the survey and sample size, is available in Annex A. The surveys are presented in three categories: dedicated, independent violence against women surveys; general victimisation surveys with modules or questions on violence against women, and other surveys with modules or questions on violence against women.

The result of these analyses provides an overview of how countries in the recent past collected data on violence against women through surveys, and constitutes the basis for recommendations on how to enhance methods for the assessment of the phenomenon, especially through improved and more systematic data gathering.

1. Institutional Framework

National Statistical Offices in the UNECE region have played a strong role in developing survey methodology to measure violence against women and gender-biased violence. Research-based institutions have also contributed in the region to carry out national surveys on VAW and to give an impetus to the need of developing methodology for population-based data collection activities.

The involvement of the national statistical office (NSO) or another government institution, which is part of a national statistical system, can be seen as an indication of a political will to measure the magnitude and the different forms of VAW in a country. The involvement of the national statistical system in measuring VAW has a strong link with the acceptance of a country to put VAW in its national agenda. This may not apply to research-led institutions, which can carry out national survey of a very good quality, but may not be backed by an institutional and political commitment of the country to provide official statistics on VAW.

The information collected in the UNECE Inventory shows that there is a wide range of national surveys on VAW. The majority of these surveys (52%) were carried out by NSO or other government institutions, but research-focused institutions represent also a large share (44%). It can be noticed that while general victimisation surveys have become standard practice in many countries, and often they are carried out on a regular basis by either National Statistical Offices, or specialized criminological centres (Table 1.1), violence against women surveys are carried out by a larger group of organisations, in some cases in cooperation with each other.

Table 1.1. Institution mainly responsible for VAW Survey/Module

Type of Survey/Module	Type of Institution					Total Surveys
	National Statistical Office	Ministry	Research Institute	University	Missing	
Violence against women survey	4	2	4	5	-	15
Victimisation survey with module on VAW	4	2	2	-	-	8
Other surveys (Multipurpose survey with the inclusion of a module on victimisation; DHS)	1	-	-	-	1	2
Total/ Percentage	9 (36%)	4 (16%)	6 (24%)	5 (20%)	1 (4%)	25 (100%)

VAW can be measured in population surveys through a specialized or dedicated survey that focuses only on the topic of VAW or through an ad-hoc VAW module included in surveys that have a broader scope such as victimization surveys or health surveys. The majority (60%) of the reported studies are dedicated violence against women surveys while in 32% of the studies VAW was measured using a module included in general victimisation surveys and in 8% of the studies using a module on multipurpose or health surveys (Table 1.i in Annex B). It is likely that many of the countries reporting on the use of dedicated violence against women surveys have also conducted general victimisation surveys with some questions on violence against women.

Therefore there may be more surveys with information (modules or questions) on violence against women than what is reported here.

For most of the surveys (80%) the main objective was to measure victimisation (Table 1.ii in Annex B) and other crime-related issues such as fear of crime and insecurity (60%) and unreported crimes (68%). Whereas this may be evident in case of dedicated violence against women surveys and victimisation surveys, it would also be possible that a module on violence against women were inserted in a survey with different emphasis. In the current review there are only two examples of this: the Australian General Social Survey and the Demographic and Health Surveys, which both included a violence against women module. The main objective of three specialized violence against women surveys was related to couple-life patterns or women's health rather than to victimisation.

Efforts were made to collect information on the implementation of the main internationally supported programmes on victimization surveys and VAW surveys, namely the International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS)³, the International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS)⁴, and the WHO-Multi-country study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence⁵. Most of the reported surveys that focus only on VAW are not directly based on the ICVS model (Table 1.iii in Annex B). Questions that can be comparable with the ICVS model can be found in seven surveys or ad hoc modules included in the inventory. Indeed the ICVS was carried out in all of the countries included in the inventory, however none of the parties contacted reported the ICVS as a source for VAW statistics. This may be due to the small sample used in the national ICVS which does not provide reliable estimates of specific victimizations such as those related to VAW or to the fact that the ICVS was carried out by institutions (mainly research institutions) which were not known by the respondents. The IVAWS was carried out in Australia by the Australian Institute of Criminology (sample size of 6.677 individuals) and in Poland by the Warsaw University (sample size of 2.009 individuals). The WHO-Multi-country study was carried out in Serbia by the Autonomous Women's Center (AWC), Tirsova (Belgrade) but covered only a representative sample in one urban and rural area.

National-level surveys on violence against women, especially those conducted by national statistical institutes, have started to be fielded in countries of the UNECE region (see Tables 1.iv and 1.v in Annex B) only since the mid-90s. It can be argued that survey research on violence against women has been carried out as long as general victimisation surveys have existed, but the inadequacies of these surveys in addressing violence against women lead to the development of specialised violence against women surveys, which started for the first time in the mid-70s in the United States.

Table 1.iv in Annex B shows that before 1996 pioneering works were undertaken and after that, the first wave of national-level violence against women surveys (20%) took place between 1996 and 2000. 60% of the reported surveys were carried out within the past five years.

Overall, producing official statistics based on VAW surveys still represents a rare event in the large majority of UNECE countries. According to available information, only 17 countries conducted a national-based survey to collect information on violence against women in the

³ For further information please visit: http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/eucpn/states_crime.html

⁴ For further information on the IVAWS please visit: <http://www.heuni.fi/12859.htm>

⁵ More information is available at: <http://www.who.int/gender/violence/multicountry/en/>

period between 2001 and 2005 (either being a dedicated survey or a module on VAW included in other surveys). For 12 countries the survey was a one-time effort (see Table 1.v in Annex B) and many of the surveys carried out in the period 2001–2005 were conducted for the first time. Very few of the 25 reported surveys are conducted on a regular basis. Only the British Crime Survey and the US National Crime Victimization Survey are carried out continuously and three surveys⁶ are conducted every two to four years. Most of the countries that conducted surveys to collect information on VAW did so as an *ad-hoc* activity. There are no plans to conduct future data collection activities on VAW for 68% of the reported surveys, which suggests a lack of long-term commitment in this field. The involvement of national statistical offices and other government institutions has an impact on the sustainability of collecting data on VAW. As it is shown in Table 1.2, among the eight surveys planned before 2009, six will be carried out by NSO or government ministries.

Table 1.2. Next planned round of survey by type of Institution

Year of the planned next survey/module	National Statistical Office		Ministry		Research Institute or University		Total Survey/Module	
	N		N		N		N	%
2005	1		1		1		3	12.0
2006	1						1	4.0
2007	1						1	4.0
2008	1						1	4.0
2009	1				1		2	8.0
Missing/Not Known	4		1		9		17	68.0
Total	9	36%	2	8%	11	44%	25	100

2. Methodology

The analysis on the 25 surveys considered in this study focuses on the following methodological aspects: reference population, survey design, sampling, mode of data collection, interviewers' training and quality control.

2.1. Reference Population

There is not a common criterion for the determination of the reference population. 52% of the reported surveys do not define an upper limit for the age of the interviewees, whereas an upper limit is identified in 44% of the cases. Reasons for using an upper age limit may include concerns over the ability and willingness of older respondents to answer the survey, their ability to recall old events, difficulties in sampling older age groups⁷. Only three of the 25 surveys include respondents from both private household and institutions. (Table 2.i and Table 2.ii in Annex B).

⁶ The Citizen's Safety Survey in Italy, the Violence Against Women Macro-Survey in Spain and the Multinational European Crime and Safety Survey

⁷ If the sample is limited to private residences, with the exclusion of hospitals and other institutions elderly person can be easily underreported because they may live in homes or other institutions.

In most cases the surveys are limited to adult respondents; one of the most important considerations in collecting data on VAW is that participating in the survey should not have an ill effect to the respondent, and in any case, not expose her to the risk of further victimisation. For this reason the topic of the survey is usually revealed only to the respondent, even in situations when more persons must be screened before the respondent is identified. In case of under aged respondents this might not be possible for legal or research-ethical grounds, and therefore the surveys often limit their focus to adult population.

For the majority of the surveys the reference population included only women. However, 36% of surveys interviewed also men with the objective of collecting information on their experience as victims of violence. In all these cases, the same questionnaire was used to interview women and men. Most of these surveys are not dedicated to VAW only, but they have a more general focus on victimization. Only the dedicated VAW survey carried out in the USA included also men in the reference population. A full list of the surveys that included men in their sample is available in Table 2.iv in Annex B.

2.2. Sample

Sample design

The majority of surveys (18 out of 25) in this inventory are cross-sectional, collecting data from a sample of households or individuals in one point of time. Three surveys are panel surveys: longitudinal surveys using a standardized questionnaire, involving interviewing of a representative panel of households or individuals at specified intervals (e.g. annual), which are useful for monitoring trends over time. Two surveys used mixed methods and one survey used an "other" design (Table 2.v in Annex B).

Sampling techniques

The preferred sampling strategy used was multi-stage sampling with stratification: 16 out of 25 surveys. The remaining surveys used a simple probability sample (4 out of 25). For five surveys this information was missing or "other" was reported. All surveys with a multi-stage sample identified one or more types of stratification. All of the 16 stratified samples were stratified by geographical area, while half of these (eight) were also stratified by degree of urbanization. Five surveys were stratified by age, six by sex, and only one by marital status (Table 2.vi in Annex B).

Where households were the basic sampling unit, most surveys selected only one person in the household for the interview (12 out of 15 surveys). In two surveys all persons of a certain age in the selected household were interviewed and one survey used "another" method. Nine surveys directly selected individuals, without selecting first a household (see Table 2.1).

When more than one person was interviewed in one household, it is not clear if they were all asked the same questions on violence. If they were, this could have posed a serious risk to the respondents. If the focus of a survey on domestic violence becomes known to other members of the household, a perpetrator may find out about the topic of the interview. For women experiencing violence, the mere act of participating in a survey, may provoke further violence, or place the respondent or the interviewer at risk.

Table 2.1. Selection methods

	Number	Percentage
Household		
All persons of the household of a certain age	2	13%
Only 1 person	12	80%
Other	1	7%
Total	15	60%
Individual	9	36%
Missing	1	4%
Total	25	100%

Sample size

Sample sizes varied enormously, depending on the survey: from around 500 households in the Social Survey on Domestic Violence Against Woman conducted in the Republic of Moldova to 60.000 households in the Italian Citizens' Safety Survey. For samples based on individuals the size ranges instead from 333 individuals in Moldova to 75.000 for the National Crime Victimization Survey conducted in the United States. (See Table 2.viia and Table 2.viib in Annex B).

Nine surveys in five countries (Australia, Italy, Mexico, UK and USA) had a sample size of more than 10.000 households and ten surveys in nine countries (Australia, Canada, Finland, Germany, Italy, Spain, Sweden, UK and USA) had a sample of over 10.000 individuals⁸.

2.3. Mode of data collection

Surveys can be carried out face-to-face, by telephone, or they can be self-administered. The most common ways of administering the questionnaires in the surveys considered in this analysis were by face-to-face interviews (11 surveys), and telephone interviews (CATI or Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing; 12 surveys), regardless of type of survey (victimization survey, violence against women survey or multi-purpose survey). Interviewers have therefore had a crucial role in collecting data (see Table 2.2).

Among the 11 face-to-face interviews, eight were conducted at home using a paper questionnaire and two with an electronic questionnaire (CAPI or Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing). In one case, the face-to-face interview was carried out in a place different from home ("WHO Multi-country study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence" conducted in Serbia and Montenegro). Among the self-administered survey various methods were used: postal questionnaires (four surveys), CASI -Computer Assisted Self-Interviewing- (two surveys), and one survey used an "other" method. No country reported having used Internet surveys, a special type of self-administered interviews.

⁸ Evidently, several of the large surveys where households were selected before individuals are mentioned twice

Table 2.2. Methodologies to administer questionnaire by type of survey

	Type of survey			Total for all surveys	
	Violence against women survey	Victimisation survey with a module on VAW	Other surveys (Multipurpose survey with the inclusion of a module on victimisation; DHS)	N	%
Face to face interviews at the respondent's home using paper questionnaire	5	2	1	8	32%
Face to face interviews at the respondent's home using electronic questionnaire – CAPI	-	1	1	2	8%
Face to face interviews elsewhere (please specify):	1	-	-	1	4%
Self-administered questionnaires (CASI)	1	1	-	2	8%
Self-administered questionnaires (Postal questionnaire)	3	1	-	4	16%
Self-administered questionnaires	1	-	-	1	4%
Telephone interviews (CATI)	8	4	-	12	48%
Internet survey	-	-	-	0	0%
Combinations or other modes	-	1	-	1	4%

2.4. Reference period

Addressing problems related to reference period and telescoping effect⁹ is less relevant for surveys on VAW than it is for victimization surveys. In victimization surveys the focus is on obtaining current reliable estimates of victimization rates, while the most critical issues in measuring VAW relate to the definition of violence, the identification of violence typologies, the disclosure by victims, the recognition of groups at risk, information on perpetrators of violence and the different patterns of violence in its several forms.

For these reasons, “lifetime” and “one year” are the most commonly used reference periods to study VAW. The “one year” or “12 month before interview” period was used by 84% of surveys. “Lifetime” or “since the age of 16” (in some cases 18 and 15) was used in 68% of surveys¹⁰. In particular, surveys inspired by the IVAWS used “since the age of sixteen” as reference period both for physical and sexual violence, and had only two questions to collect data for incidences happened before the 16th birthday, one for physical and one for sexual violence. The use of other time references such as “five years”, “three years before the interview” and “last 6 months” is residual.

⁹ Telescoping effect is one aspect of respondent failure to correctly remember information about events they have experienced. Telescoping is a temporal memory failure: placing an event in a point in time when it did not actually occur.

¹⁰ About 24% of these surveys put the lower-bound to 16 years of age

It is important to notice that when the reference period is “one year”, many surveys referred to the calendar year as a fixed reference period. However, some surveys implemented a sort of “moving” reference period, considering the first month of the last 12 months period before the interview as the reference period to report violent events. In the American NCVS, which is an on-going panel surveys, the reference period is the previous interview, which occurs every 6 months¹¹.

Dedicated VAW more frequently applied “lifetime” as reference period (87%), followed by “one year”(80.0%). “Five years” or “three years” were used only in 20.0% of the cases. On the contrary, modules on VAW were more likely to use “one year” (70.0%) than “lifetime” (40.0%). “Three years” and “five years” were also used more often (20.0%). This because most of the VAW modules were included in victimization surveys, where the focus is on yearly estimates of victimization rates and more importance is given to shorter reference periods.

Table 2.3. Type of reference period used by survey’s type

Reference period	Violence against women survey		Victimisation survey with module on VAW		Other surveys (Multipurpose survey with the inclusion of a module on victimisation; DHS)		Total number of surveys by type of reference period	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
One year/previous 12 months	12	80.0	7	70.0	2	100.0	21	84.0
Five/three years	3	20.0	2	20.0	0	0.0	5	20.0
Lifetime -or > 16/18years	13	87.0	4	40.0	0	0.0	17	68.0
Total number for type of survey	15	100.0	8	100.0	2	100.0	25	100.0

In many cases, more than one reference period was used for the same episode of violence. Only 48% of the analyzed surveys collected data for only one time reference (mainly lifetime or one year). 28% of the surveys asked questions related to both “lifetime” and “previous one year”, while 16% of the surveys considered three reference periods: “life time”, “five year” and “one year before the interview”. Combining different time references is one of the strategies normally used to reduce the telescoping effect, even if, in surveys on VAW, this strategy is mainly used to give different estimates for different reference periods.

Some surveys (seven) used different reference periods for different episodes of violence. Violence occurred during childhood is the form of violence for which different reference periods were most commonly used. Sometimes information related to physical/sexual abuse by parent,

¹¹ This technique is called “bounding”. Using this technique the information collected from each interview is compared to information collected during previous interviews to ensure that the earlier reported victimizations are not double counted. See “Telescoping effects and survey non-response in the National Crime Victimization Survey, Michael R. Rand, paper presented at the ECE-UNODC Meeting on Crime Statistics, Vienna 25-27 January 2006 (<http://www.unece.org/stats/documents/2006.01.crime.htm>).

sexual abuse by non-parent, and any other abuse was collected in reference to the period before the 15th or 16th year of age¹². Other examples of different reference periods considered for different types of violence are in the survey on VAW conducted in France: “lifetime” was used for sexual violence while “from the 18th birthday” was used for physical violence. In Canada instead, the GHS employed the five-year period for spousal violence and stalking.

In the modules included in victimization surveys, whose common reference period is one year, sexual crimes are sometimes collected using “lifetime” as reference period.

2.5. Telescoping effect

According to collected information, telescoping effect¹³ does not seem to be an important issue. Answers provided to a direct question on measures taken to reduce it show that 52% of surveys did not specifically address this issue and 44% did not take any measure (for 8% of the surveys no information was provided). However, a deeper look at the methodology used in the analyzed surveys reveals that some strategies were indeed used to reduce the telescoping effect. For example shorter reference periods were considered, in general from “lifetime” to “1 year” (5 cases). Although these were not reported as measures to address the telescoping effect.

Based on the methodology used in the analyzed surveys, it emerges that a good approach is to adopt a combination of strategies. Indeed, among the surveys that adopted any measure, 50% did adopt more than one. Different measures to reduce the telescoping effect include¹⁴:

- Validate the reporting date in a different section of the questionnaire
- Use of funnelling questions
- Reduce the reference period
- Improvement of interviewers training
- Assistance to place the event in the lifetime calendar (for example looking for reference to seasons or special events in life)

The majority of the surveys that reported the use of special measures to reduce the telescoping effect collected extra information on the event (five surveys). Others reduced the reference period (three surveys) and made use of funnel questions (four surveys respectively). Only the American NCVS used panel data for this purpose. For six surveys other methods were reported. These reflected the importance of interviewers training and the use of life events calendar.

¹² Questions asked about childhood were not very detailed if compared to those related to the period after the age of sixteen. Usually there were about six or seven questions screening physical violence in adulthood, and only one addressing childhood. Some countries asked only sexual abuses before the 16th year of age.

¹³ See footnote 7 for the definition of telescoping effect

¹⁴ An example of this is available in the Italian experience to reducing telescoping effect for many crimes except sexual assault. See “*Addressing telescoping and non-response - analysis from the victimization surveys inventory*”, Joint meeting UNECE –UNODC on Crime Statistics, Vienna 25-27 January 2006 (<http://www.unece.org/stats/documents/2006.01.crime.htm>).

Table 2.4. Special measures taken to reduce the telescoping effect

	N	% on surveys (25)	% on measures' respondents (11)
Reporting of the event date	5	20.0	42.0
Use of funnel questions	4	16.0	33.0
Reducing of the reference period	3	12.0	25.0
Use of panel data	1	4.0	8.0
Other	6	24.0	50.0
No specific measures were taken	11	44.0	
Missing	2	8.0	
No specific measures were taken + missing	13	52.0	

What follows is a description of special measures adopted by the surveys to address the telescoping effect:

a) *Reporting the event date*

Of the five surveys that adopted the event date strategy (some of them used it to check and to make data imputation *a posteriori*), two are specialized VAW surveys and three are surveys that included modules on VAW. Beside, while four of them considered the year, or twelve month, as reference period, one made use of the “six months before the interview” time reference.

b) *Use of Funnel questions*

Only four surveys used funnel questions to address telescoping effect. Two are dedicated VAW surveys and two included a module in a victimization survey. The most used reference period is the combination of “one year” and “lifetime”. Italy’s module survey used “1 year”, “3 years” and “lifetime” jointly, while EUICS used only one year.

c) *Shortening the reference period*

Only specialized VAW surveys declared to reduce the reference period as a strategy to cope with the telescoping effect. All of them used “1 year” and “lifetime” as reference period. They are the Violence against women Surveys of: Poland, Switzerland and USA.

d) *The use of panel data*

Only the USA NCVS used this strategy. This survey is a panel survey, where the reference period is “sixth months before the interview”, or “since the previous interview” (the interview are carried out every six months). People in the sample are re-interviewed for seven times in three years and the data stemming from the first interview are used only to check subsequent interviews.

e) Other strategies

Other strategies consist in: anchoring the recall period to some specific period, improving the interviewers training, using calendar events when asking about the date (they might also suggest to remember the season, the dresses they were wearing or things happened in interviewees' life, i.e. dear dates, as anniversaries and birthdays.)

Out of the six surveys that reported these strategies, two are dedicated VAW surveys and four are modules.

In three surveys the reference period is both "one year" and "lifetime", while in two cases they are combined with other reference periods. Two surveys employed "5 years" as reference period (jointly with the others) and one used six months.

f) No measures taken and missing values

Most of the surveys that declared not to use measures to reduce the telescoping effect are VAW specialized surveys and only two are surveys that included a VAW module. This suggests that the main focus of VAW specialized surveys is to measure the broad size of prevalence of violence among women, and not yearly or six-monthly estimates of crime incidence.

The surveys for which no information was reported on the telescoping effect are the Canadian VAW survey and the DHS.

2.6. Quality control

Most surveys reported to have monitored data quality and the performance of interviewers. In addition, most surveys adopted measures to ensure confidentiality and safety. Failure to adhere to these measures can in fact compromise the quality of the data, and also put participants at risk of physical or emotional harm. For surveys on violence against women it is more important than for surveys on less sensitive topics to monitor indicators on the quality of the interviews. In particular, it is essential to timely identify those interviewers who consistently find significantly more or less disclosure of violence than average, or who have a different response rate than the average interviewer. Such a difference may be caused by the interviewer not having the right characteristics and/or training for this type of survey. The World Health Organization has developed safety and ethical guidelines for conducting research on domestic violence¹⁵ and set standards for research on this and other sensitive topics. These guidelines primarily address issues such as guaranteeing the privacy and confidentiality of the interview, specialized selection and training in gender issues and violence for interviewers, providing a minimal level of information and/or referral for respondents in situations of risk, and providing emotional as well as technical support for field staff.

Out of the 25 analyzed surveys, 17 reported the use of performance indicators to monitor the survey operations during or after the fieldwork, five did not monitor the survey work and three reported that this was not applicable to the survey (Table 2.viii in Annex B).

¹⁵ WHO *Putting Women First: Ethical and Safety Guidelines for Research on Violence against Women*, Geneva: WHO, 2001. WHI/FCH/GWH/01.1 (Also available in Spanish and French)

Specialized surveys on violence against women more often developed special tools to check interviewers behaviour and performance. In general, the instruments used to monitor the quality vary from survey to survey and differ on the basis of: mode of data collection, monitoring phase (which can be at: the beginning of the work, the intermediate phase, the end of the work), and approach: qualitative or quantitative. Moreover, the performance can be measured directly (when evaluating the interviewers) or indirectly (when evaluating their work). Among the most used tools, there are: supervision and checking response rates. Supervision includes monitoring interviews and interviewers- either through a random sample or in their entirety- with a special supervision questionnaire. Through this questionnaire respondents are asked to report the behaviour of the interviewer and her/his ability to handle specific situations. In CATI this may translate into a sub-sample of interviews being overheard by the supervisor. An ample description of qualitative and quantitative tools that can be used in the different phases of the survey process is provided in Annex C.

The great majority of the analyzed surveys reported different kinds of tools to check the interviewers' work (only six did not provide an answer on this)¹⁶. See Table 2.ix in Annex B.

No difference according to survey type emerges: dedicated VAW surveys adopted several control strategies just as well as module surveys. Instead, differences can be observed when looking at the institution carrying out the survey. Government-related institutions, Statistical offices and Ministries are more likely to adopt control measures than research centres or universities. This is true also for some of the international survey programmes such as the IVAWS and DHS. Exceptions are: the Swiss IVAWS- in which some standards of control are used- as well as the WHO's Multi-country study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence, carried out by Serbia and Montenegro. In other cases, as in the Australian and Polish IVAWS, the use of monitoring tools is declared but the type of tools is not specified.

Monitoring interviewers' performance helps improve the quality of surveys, especially if a combination of many strategies is used, before and during the collection phase. However, also many other elements affect the quality of a survey -such as: training and interviewers' innate skills, survey mode, legitimacy of institution carrying out the survey, citizens' willingness to cooperate- and these differ from country to country. Thus, it is not easy to measure and quantify with precision the extent of the impact of interviewing monitoring on the quality of the results.

2.7. Interviewer training

There is evidence that interviewers' characteristics and training contribute to data quality, easier disclosure of respondents' experience of violence, improved confidentiality of the information and safety of the respondent. The ECE inventory does provide information on the duration of the interviewers' training, but the latter does not seem to be significantly correlated with non-response rates nor with the type of survey, both in the case of a module and of a dedicated survey. Besides, there is a wide field that could be documented further, as sex and other characteristics of the interviewers, which are critical aspects in surveys. Experience with interviews on violence against women has shown that, despite the sensitivity of the topic, it is

¹⁶ Four surveys were self-administered and the monitoring of the interviews is not applicable to them.

possible for interviewers to collect reliable and valid information on violence against women, provided they are sensitive to the issue and have received appropriate training¹⁷

The inventory provides valuable information on the type of professional expertise that was provided to the training of interviewers. The professional category that was most often involved in the training of interviewers was statisticians (10 of the 25 analyzed surveys). Psychologists and sociologists were also widely involved (nine and eight surveys). "Others" categories were part of the training (eight surveys), while very few surveys involved medical doctors and/or people from community services. More than half of the surveys (14) employed more than one of the professional categories listed above. Involvement of these professional categories indicates that attention was given to sensitizing the interviewers on the topic of the survey¹⁸. (Table 2.5).

Table 2.5. Professional expertise used in carrying out the training of the interviewers

	Questionnaire	
	N	Percentage
Statistician	10	40%
Psychologist	9	36%
Sociologist	8	32%
Medical doctor	1	4%
Community Service	2	8%
Other	8	32%
N/A	3	12%
More than one category	14	56%

Ensuring confidentiality and safety are essential for data quality and conducting surveys in an ethical way. Out of the 25 surveys 21 reported that they had measures in place to ensure confidentiality and 17 (about two thirds of all surveys) that they had measures to ensure safety. Two surveys reported that they did not have any arrangements for confidentiality and safety (Table 2.x in Annex B).

2.8. Non-Responses

Out of the 25 analyzed surveys, 16 reported on non-response rate (64%) of individuals, and almost half of them (43.7%) stated to have a non-response rate lower than 10%. As far as *households* non-response rate is concerned, data were available for fourteen surveys (56%) but only six of them (35.7%) showed a non-response rate lower than 10%. Non-response rates, both for individuals and households, were over 50% only in very few surveys (two over 16 for individuals, one over 14 for households).

¹⁷Jansen, H.A.F.M., C. Watts, M. Ellsberg, L. Heise, C. Garcia-Moreno. Interviewer Training in the WHO Multi-Country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence. *Violence Against Women*, Vol 10 No 7, 831-849, July 2004

¹⁸ For three surveys no answer was provided on this. This may suggest that no specific training was given, possibly because the self-administered postal questionnaire was used.

Refusals were the main determinant of non-response in the analyzed surveys, while other components¹⁹ had a lower impact.

Issues that affect refusals include: wording, length of the interview, sensitive nature of the survey topic, survey method, level of people trust due to political and security issues in the country, as well as time availability of the respondents.

In order to understand what affects non-responses and refusals, some factors were analyzed: type of institution carrying out the survey, advance letter sent to the interviewees, use of call-backs (or repeated visits in case the interview was face-to-face) at different times of the day and different days of the week, follow-up work, proxy interviews. The categories of institutions considered were: national statistical office, ministry, research institute and university. The advance letter consisted of an introductory letter presenting the content and purpose of the survey, while the follow up work aimed to gather information from incomplete questionnaires and could have been made by telephone and/or through personal visit and mail (in one case, the purpose of the follow up concerned the cleaning of data on stalking). The surveys with the lowest non-response rates appeared to be the ones that made use of: advance letters, call-backs, follow-ups, and proxies. The type of institution that carried out the survey also affected the response rate in some of the surveys. In fact, lower non-response rates are usually found for those surveys that were conducted by national statistical offices (NSO). This finding may be due to interviewees' higher trust in a well-known institution and to NSOs' reputation. See Tables 2.xi-2.xiv in Annex B.

Other elements were considered as tools to reduce non-responses in the analyzed surveys: advance letter with token incentive, a toll free number, interviewer training and interviewer monitoring, supervision of non-responses and field work, senior interviewers (whose experience played a role in trying to reduce refusals). However, the number of surveys that declared to make use of these tools is too small to understand their impact on the response rate.

Another issue related to non-responses concerns the collection of information on non-respondents. It is important to collect information on the non-respondents since their experience of VAW can be different from that of the respondents -and thus cause bias on estimates. However, only in eight surveys basic information was collected on non-respondents²⁰ (see Table 2.xv in Annex B).

The respondent substitution is a procedure used only in 36% of surveys (see Table 2.xi in Annex B). In one survey the substitution was implemented only when respondents refused to collaborate, while in the remaining eight cases it was used when respondents refused or could not be contacted

A deep analysis of non-responses by the type of survey and tools used to improve response rates is presented in Annex D.

¹⁹ Non-contacts, change of address, empty houses, women not meeting with their phone appointments, interrupted interviews

²⁰ Although, sometimes, some information -such as territorial variables- is collected in other surveys, and even if this was not reported into the ECE inventory, it could be very useful in the construction of weighting procedures.

2.9. Survey average length

The range of interviews average length is very wide: it varies from a minimum of 1 minute to a maximum of 1,5 hours. Survey length depends on many factors, but first of all on the number of individuals interviewed in a household and on the number of questions included in the questionnaire. The impact of these different factors is not easy to determine, also because in typical violence survey the length differs according to the violence episodes experienced²¹. It can be assumed that VAW modules included in other surveys are less completed and with less questions of dedicated surveys on VAW.

Table 2.6. Average time to complete survey

Class average time to complete survey	N	% on surveys (25)	% on measures' respondents (19)
<=15	2	8.0	11.0
16-30	8	32.0	42.0
31-45	5	20.0	26.0
>=46	4	16.0	21.0
missing	6	24.0	
Total	25	100.0	100.0

As it can be seen in Table 2.6, the most frequent class of average time is 16-30 minutes, followed by 31-45 minutes and by more than 46 minutes. Only the 8% of surveys lasted less than 16 minutes. In 24% of the surveys, the average length is not indicated.

Except for the shortest surveys (less than 15 minutes), which were all VAW modules included in broader-scope surveys, the type of survey (dedicated or other surveys) does not seem to have an impact on the duration. In fact, if the second class of average length, (16-30) minutes, is typical of dedicated VAW surveys (five surveys out of eight, 62.5%), when the length of the interview increases, the presence of module surveys decreases, but they do not disappear completely. 80% of surveys lasting 30-45 minutes are dedicated VAW surveys (four out of five), one is a victimisation survey with a VAW module (Canada General Social Survey on Victimization). Surveys lasting more than 45 minutes are dedicated surveys in 50% of cases, for the other 50% are modules included in other surveys.

In general, an important issue affecting the length of the survey is the technique used to collect the data. However, the analysis of the ECE inventory reveals somehow surprising results. The administration of the questionnaire should last more in face to face interviews and self-administered questionnaires, while it should be faster in telephone interviews, because it could make the respondent tired or bored, with negative consequences on the quality of data. However, the shortest surveys (less than 16 minutes) were both face-to-face interviews and postal questionnaires, none used CATI. Although it has to be considered that often the VAW modules

²¹ It should be noted that some interviews can be very long: for example, a woman who was victim of violence and who establishes a trustful relationship with the interviewer can speak extensively about her experience, although this is not what happens in the majority of the cases.

were face-to-face and took less time. Most of the CATI surveys lasted 16-30 minutes, but a not irrelevant number lasted more than 30 minutes. See Table 2.xvii in Annex B.

There are very few cases that consider other survey methods or their combinations. Self-administered questionnaires took longer. Usually combining different strategies took much time, with the exception of one survey that employed a mixed mode involving CATI interviews and lasted 16-30 minutes.

2.10. Major methodological challenges met during the design of the survey

When asked to point out the main difficulties met during the design of the survey (some solved, some not), 40% did not indicate any difficulty, while the other 60% - 15 surveys, mostly dedicated VAW surveys – mentioned more than one problem and offered a very complex panorama that varies from content to methodological problems, from dissemination to sample reliability.

As shown by Table 2.xviii in Annex B, many of the reported challenges focused on:

- questionnaire construction (24,4%)
- definition, design and size of sample (19,5%)
- respecting interviewees' sensitivity (19,5%)
- specificity of the topic (12,2%)
- non-responses (9,8%)
- methodology and dissemination (7,3%).

Regarding the questionnaire construction, much attention was given to: the measures that could be used to deal with a very sensitive topic, how to ask questions about violence, how to help women remember episodes of domestic violence, how to deal with the issue without prejudices and in such a way that questions are accepted. Especially France and Sweden underlined these aspects.

The problems related to sample strategy involve different aspects. Attention was drawn to the possibility to reach small and sparse populations, migrants, and people who are not easy to interview. The problem is that many of these sub-populations, usually not well represented in the statistics, are often more at risk of experiencing violence and abuse. The other important issue, linked to telephonic methods, is the coverage. There is an increasing trend in the spread and use of mobile phones and at the same time a decrease in the landline possession. Most of the samples only cover landlines. These coverage problems were underlined by Australia and Italy. Other problems were related to the quality and the size of the standard errors, which are generally very high for rare events, such as violence.

Regarding the establishment of a relationship with interviewees, attention was drawn to preserving the privacy and safety of respondents and interviewers (Australia - Personal Safety Survey, Germany, WHO-study in Serbia and Montenegro). This is an important ethical issue: to speak with women when they are alone or in a safe situation and to ensure their privacy. Another aspect highlighted was the importance of organising interviewers' trainings that give special attention to being sensitive to the interviewees as well as having skilful interviewers who are able to create an atmosphere of trust.

About the topic specificity the following problems were underlined: difficulties in defining violence as well as the risk to underestimate the phenomenon due to disclosure problems and sensitivity of the issue. The definition and inclusion of violent events in the questionnaire and/or disclosure problems were addressed particularly by Finland, France and Italy.

Non-response, refusals and non-sampling error is another important topic that was highlighted as one of the hardest problems by the Australian-IVAWS and Finland.

About dissemination, the main issues were related to the presentation of the results, in particular the presentation to media (as stated by Australia, France) and the construction of meaningful indicators.

3.Content

3.1. Indicators produced

With the exception of countries participating in two internationally comparative surveys²², the surveys included in the ECE inventory were developed by each country independently and consequently contained different questions and approaches to measuring violence. 84% of all surveys provided estimates of the prevalence of violence among women in the population (which represents the proportion of women affected by at least one type of violence). Six-in-ten surveys provided estimates of the incidence of violence (which counts the number of incidents per population). Indicators of the severity of violent acts were provided by 76%, and 44% measure attitudes towards violence among the women responding. Over half provided other types of indicators, such as: reporting to the police, women's perception of the effects of violence (feelings of guilt, depression, difficulties with studies and at work, fear, poor self esteem, tiredness and listlessness, and so on), costs of violence and many other.

The availability of these various indicators varies according to whether the questionnaire was part of a victimization survey or was a dedicated violence against women survey. Dedicated surveys were more likely to include indicators of prevalence and incidence, questions about respondents' attitudes towards violence and other indicators. There were two other types of surveys included in the ECE inventory, both of which included indicators of prevalence and incidence and severity of assaults. One contained questions designed to measure attitudes toward violence and one contained other indicators. See Table 3.1.

²² International Violence Against Women Survey and the WHO Multi-country Survey on Women's Health and Domestic Violence Against Women)

Table 3.1. Indicators produced according to type of survey or module

Type of survey/module	Prevalence of violence		Incidence of violence		Severity of violence		Attitudes towards violence		Other		Total surveys N
	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	
Violence against women survey	13	87	9	60	11	73	8	53	12	87	15
Victimization survey	6	75	4	50	6	75	2	25	3	38	8
Other surveys (Multipurpose survey with the inclusion of a module on victimisation; DHS)	2	100	2	100	2	100	1	50	1	50	2
Total	21	84	15	60	19	76	11	44	16	64	25

Perpetrators

As shown in Table 3.i in Annex B, surveys vary in their focus on types of perpetrators. While it might be expected that all surveys or modules on violence against women would include violence by intimate partners, 92% indicated they could identify husbands or partners from among the perpetrators. 84% were able to identify ex-husbands and ex-partners. Smaller proportions were able to identify sons and daughters, fathers or fathers-in-law, mothers or mothers-in-law, and siblings or brothers/sisters-in-law. Perpetrators other than family, such as friends, neighbours, acquaintances and strangers were included in over three-quarters of the survey questionnaires.

The types of perpetrators identified on these surveys also varied according to whether the questionnaire was a dedicated survey on violence against women or a module contained on a victimization survey (Table 3.2.). All modules contained on victimization surveys specified violence perpetrated by husbands or partners and this was true for all but one dedicated survey. Dedicated surveys were more likely than modules in victimization surveys to identify sons and daughters, mothers and siblings but less likely to identify other family members. Questionnaires that formed modules on victimization surveys were more likely to include questions identifying friends, neighbours, acquaintances and strangers.

Table 3.2. Types of perpetrators by type of survey

	Type of survey					
	Victimization survey		Violence against women survey		Other surveys (Multipurpose survey with the inclusion of a module on victimization; DHS)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Husband/partner	8	100	14	93	1	50
Sons/daughters fathered by husband/partner	4	50	9	60	1	50
Own sons/daughters fathered by non-current husband/partner	3	38	9	60	1	50
Sons/daughters of current husband/partner (not one's own)	3	38	9	60	1	50
Father or my husband/partner's father	6	78	10	67	1	50
Mother my husband/partner's mother	4	50	9	60	1	50
Brothers/Sisters or brothers/sisters in law	4	50	9	60	1	50

Other family members	7	88	9	60	1	50
Ex-husband or ex-partner	8	100	12	80	1	50
Friends	8	100	12	80	1	50
Neighbour	6	100	12	80	1	50
Acquaintances at work or school	8	100	12	80	1	50
Stranger	8	100	12	80	1	50
Other	8	100	7	47	1	50
Total surveys	8	100	15	100	2	100

Almost all of the 25 surveys or modules that provided the required information used detailed questions to measure physical violence. These included questions about being: pushed, thrown objects, slapped, kicked, bitten, hit, beaten up, choked, and having a weapon used against. Twenty-four surveys out of 25 used at least one of those detailed definitions, thus there is evidence for a widespread acknowledgement of the limits of employing general questions about physical assaults. With respect to the reference period (when the violence occurred), the majority of dedicated surveys used “lifetime”, often jointly either with “one year” or with both “one year” and “five years”. For the surveys that only had a module on VAW, the most common time reference was instead “one-year”.

More than half of surveys and modules contained detailed questions about sexual violence. Of the 25 questionnaires, 23 addressed forced sexual intercourse (rape) while fewer included questions about other types of sexual violence, such as submitting to sexual intercourse because of intimidation, or being forced to do engage in degrading sexual acts. “One-year” jointly with “lifetime” rates of sexual violence were the most common in dedicated surveys, followed by “one-year”, “lifetime” and “five years” jointly. In victimisation surveys with a module on VAW the most used time reference was “one year”, just as for physical violence. Few of these surveys used the three- or five-year reference period to estimate the prevalence of sexual violence.

Psychological abuse has been found to be an important correlate of physical and sexual violence in intimate relationships, as well as being a form of abuse in its own right. However, not all surveys and modules included in the ECE inventory contained questions about psychological abuse by intimate partners.

Information included in the ECE inventory distinguished between:

- psychological violence in terms of “*control*” - which indicates all kinds of acts and attitudes meant to limit women’s freedom (just as: emotional blackmail, deciding what she can do, and so forth)- and
- psychological violence in terms of *berating*- i.e., verbal abuse, humiliation, etc.

Among the 25 analyzed surveys, 20 included questions to measure psychological abuse and the number of questions included to measure this type of abuse ranged from 2 to 14. The most commonly used items for assessing psychological abuse were isolation tactics such as hindering the woman from keeping in touch with family or friends (for “control”), and humiliation, verbal abuse, and threatening to hurt others (for “berating”). Once more, dedicated surveys showed the same pattern for the time references: “lifetime” and “one year” jointly with “lifetime” are still the most used reference periods. Instead, only five out of ten modules asked questions about psychological violence. Of the three modules for which these data is available two used

“lifetime” and “one year” jointly, while one used “five years” (Canada-General Social Survey on Victimization).

Stalking is an important predictor of serious partner violence and homicide and it was included in the 80% of dedicated surveys while only in the 40% of modules. In most countries where legislation criminalising stalking exists, the law stipulates that the behaviour must be persistent and repetitive. Surveys that included questions on stalking did so in a way that captures the many possible facets of the behaviour and considered following or spying on the victim, leaving unwanted letters or phone calls or other communication, keeping watch over her home or place of work, or making threats to harm her, her children or others. In dedicated surveys, the most used definition for stalking was “vandalized her property or destroyed something she loved”, while “one year and lifetime” were the most common reference periods. All the modules including stalking referred to “followed or spied her”, “sent unsolicited letters” “made unsolicited phone calls” and stood outside her home/school/workplace”, while fewer modules encompassed other forms of stalking.

Financial or economic abuse can leave women isolated and is considered as an abuse of power in intimate relationships. However, few surveys or modules included questions to address the prevalence of economic abuse.

Eighty percent of all surveys included indicators of physical injury and a majority of these also include questions related to use of medical services as a consequence of the violence. More than four-in-ten asked victims whether they needed to take time off from paid or unpaid work because of the impact of the violence, and half enquired whether victims feared serious bodily harm or death as a result of the violence. These indicators provide additional important information about the severity of violence and can help countries to assess the need for health and social services for victims of violence.

Dedicated surveys on violence against women were more likely than modules contained on victimization surveys to include detailed behaviourally-specific questions regarding physical violence, psychological abuse, economic abuse and stalking. However, with respect to sexual violence, modules on victimization surveys were more likely to include various measures of this type of violence. They were also more likely than dedicated surveys to include some indicators of stalking. Both of the ‘other’ types of surveys measured physical violence comprehensively, but measured other types of violence and abuse less consistently, and neither measured stalking at all.

Table 3.3. Type of violence by type of survey

Type of violence	Type of Survey		Victimisation Surveys (8)		Other (DHS and Australian General Social Survey) (2)	
	Violence Against Women Surveys (15)		N	%	N	%
Physical Violence	N	%	N	%	N	%
Pushed, grabbed, shoved	13	87%	6	75%	2	100%
Threatened to hit	10	67%	4	50%	2	
Threw something	12	80%	5	62%	2	
Slapped	12	80%	7	87%	2	
Kicked, bit or hit	14	93%	6	75%	2	
Hit with something	14	93%	5	62%	2	
Beat up	11	73%	5	62%	2	

Choked	13	87%	5	62%	2	
Used or threatened with a gun or knife	13	87%	6	75%	2	
Other	9	60%	5	62%	2	
At least one indicator of physical violence	15	100%	7	87%	2	100%
Sexual violence						
Physically forced to have sexual intercourse when she did not want to	14	93%	8	100%	1	50%
Had sexual intercourse when she did want to but she was afraid of what partner might do	4	27%	5	62%	0	
Was forced to do something sexual that she found degrading or humiliating	10	67%	2	25%	1	
Other (of which, attempted rape)	9 (4)	60% (44%)	7 (1)	87% (14%)	0	
Included at least one indicator of sexual violence	14	93%	8	100%	1	(DHS) 50%
Psychological abuse: control						
- including psychological harassment	4	27%	3	37%	0	
Isolates her	11	73%	2	25%	0	
Torments her constantly	3	20%	1	12%	0	
Hinders her from visiting her family or to keep in touch with friends and neighbors	14	93%	3	37%	1	
Ignores her or treated her indifferently	8	53%	1	12%	0	
Gets angry when she spoke with another man	11	73%	1	12%	1	(DHS)
Expects her to ask permission before seeking health care for herself	1	7%	0		0	
Decides what she can do or not do	4	27%	0		0	
Emotional blackmail	4	27%	1	12%	0	
Other	5	33%	3	37%	1	(DHS)
Included at least one indicator of controlling behaviour	15	100%	4	50%	1	(DHS) 50%
Psychological abuse: berating						
Verbal abuse	9	60%	2	25%	1	
Humiliates her	10	67%	2	25%	1	
Says that what she does is always wrong	4	27%	0		0	
Doesn't care about her needs (you have the worst place at home, the worst of the meals, etc.).	1	7%	1	12%	0	
Blames her in front of her children	3	20%	0		0	
Perpetrator has done things to scare or intimidate her on purpose	6	40%	1	12%	0	
Perpetrator has threatened to hurt someone she cared about	12	80%	2	25%	1	(DHS)
Other	4	27%	1	12%	0	
Included at least one indicator of berating	14	93%	4	50%	1	(DHS) 50%
Stalking						
Followed or spied on her	9	60%	4	50%	0	
Sent her unsolicited letters /written correspondence	4	27%	4	50%	0	
Made unsolicited phone calls to her	6	40%	4	50%	0	
Stood outside her home, school, or workplace	5	33%	4	50%	0	
Left unwanted items for her to find	1	7%	2	25%	0	
Tried to communicate in other ways against her will	4	27%	3	37%	0	
Vandalized her property or destroyed something she loved	7	47%	3	37%	0	
Made direct or indirect threats to harm her, her children, relatives, friends or pets	7	47%	2	25%	0	
Other	2	13%	4	50%	0	
Included at least one indicator of stalking	12	80%	4	50%	0	0%
Economic abuse						
Doesn't value her work	1	7%	0		0	
Refuses to let her go out to work	6	40%	0		0	
Takes the money she earn	7	47%	1	12%	0	
Does not pay his fair share of the household expenses	3	20%	0		0	
Other	6	40%	1	12%	1	(DHS)
Included at least one indicator of economic abuse	10	67%	2	25%	1	(DHS) 50%

Dedicated surveys on violence against women tended to contain a wider range of reference periods and therefore were able to estimate prevalence rates in a variety of ways. Looking at physical violence, for example, two dedicated surveys were able to provide one-year estimates of the prevalence of physical violence and three measured physical violence over the lifetime. However, ten provided estimates for more than one time period. A similar pattern is shown for sexual violence, whereby 11 out of 14 dedicated surveys provided prevalence rates for more than one time period compared with four out of eight VAW modules. Psychological abuse, economic abuse and stalking were measured on fewer survey modules as compared with dedicated surveys. (Table 3.3 and Table 3.4)

Table 3.4. Type of violence and reference period by type of survey

Type of Survey	Violence Against Women Surveys (15)	Victimisation Surveys (8)	Other (DHS and Australian General Social Survey) (2)
Physical Violence (at least one question)	15	7	2
One year	2	2	1
One year, Lifetime	5	1	1
One year, Five years, Lifetime	5	1 (only 5 years)	0
Lifetime	3	0	0
Not available	0	3	0
Sexual Violence (at least one question)	14	8	1
One year	1	2	0
One year, Lifetime	6	1	1
One year, Five years, Lifetime	5	2 (1: only 5 years; 1: 1,3,Lifetime)	0
Lifetime	1	0	0
Not available	1	3	0
Psychological Violence control (at least one question)	15	4	1
One year	2	0	0
One year, Lifetime	4	1	0
One year, Five years, Lifetime	1	1 (only 5 year)	0
Lifetime	5	0	1
Not available	3	2	0
Psychological Violence berating (at least one question)	14	4	1
One year	3	0	0
One year, Lifetime	3	1	1
One year, Five years, Lifetime	1	1 (only 5 year)	0
Lifetime	3	0	0
Not available	4	2	0
Stalking (at least one question)	12	4	0
One year	2	0	0
One year, Lifetime	4	0	0
One year, Five years, Lifetime	0	1 (only 5 year)	0
Lifetime	2	0	0
Not available	4	3	0
Economic Violence (at least one question)	10	2	1
One year	2	0	0
One year, Lifetime	2	1	0
One year, Five years, Lifetime	0	1 (only 5 year)	0
Lifetime	2	0	1
Not available	4	0	0

About three-quarters of all questionnaires in the inventory enquired about use of medical, social or other government services, or seeking support from friends or family. (Table 3.ii and Table

3.iii in Annex B). Questions about victims' use of health or social services, or relying on friend and family for emotional support are important indicators of the steps victims take to get help. Combined with data about the severity of the violence, information about victims' use of services can help identify the proportion of women who do not obtain help despite suffering serious injury or fearing their lives were in danger.

A relatively high percentage of all surveys and modules –84% -asked victims about their search for help from the police, while just over half of the surveys enquired about the charges brought by the police against the offender. Inclusion of these types of questions can help to further understand the situations that are not brought to the attention of the police, despite the act of violence could have resulted in serious consequences for the victims. They can also contribute to a greater understanding of the police response when charges are played brought against perpetrators of violence. (See Table 3.iv in Annex B)

4. Data Dissemination

Widespread dissemination of the results of surveys is critical so that the results can be used effectively by:

1. community groups in their efforts to raise public awareness of the nature and extent of violence against women and to lobby governments for funding and policy change
2. medical and social service agencies for the design of services for victims and offenders
3. judicial authorities for raising awareness among police, lawyers and judges and improving the criminal justice response to violence
4. educators for the training of service providers and others whose work brings them into contact with victims and offenders
5. governments for the purposes of forming legislation and policies that respond to violence against women

Population surveys on violence against women consistently indicate that a small minority of women report these crimes to the police. It is therefore important that survey results are presented in comparison with police-recorded crime to reinforce that the level of violence recorded by police does not fully represent the level of violence in society, and that to use police statistics solely as the basis for policy development may result in harmful policies. However, comparison of survey results with police statistics was done by only 36% of the analyzed surveys (Table 4.i in Annex B). These relatively low percentages may be due to the absence of consistently recorded police data in some countries.

The accuracy with which surveys are undertaken and the precision of the estimates are critical for the credibility of surveys on violence against women. Surveys that are seen to lack precision will not have the same credibility as those that are methodologically sound and presented in a way that specifies confidence intervals and other statistical indicators of margin of error. Information about precision of survey estimates is available in the ECE inventory for 15 of the 25 surveys. All but two surveys, presented results which specified confidence intervals and, for one survey, the type of margin of error varied according to the group or level of data presented (Table 4.ii in Annex B)

The method of disseminating survey results is also important. Widespread dissemination through published reports, data files and the internet helps ensure that the results will reach a wide audience and will be broadly used. Release of micro-data files makes the data available in its original form to researchers (usually with some suppressions to protect confidentiality of respondents) who can explore the data for details not published in reports, which often are no more than summaries or highlights. This helps expand on the knowledge that is generated by these surveys. More than half of the surveys included in the inventory made micro-data files available for public use. (Table 4.iii in Annex B)

Internet is rapidly becoming the major vehicle through which researchers, community groups and decision-makers access knowledge and research results. Making survey results available on the internet therefore has the potential to reach a much broader audience than limiting dissemination to printed reports. More than two-thirds of all surveys made survey results available on the internet. (Table 4.iv in Annex B)

5. Concluding remarks

A complex phenomenon with consequences and causes that involve many aspects of society, violence against women displays different specificities across countries. These need to be taken into consideration when setting out to conduct a survey on this subject. However, some common standards should be introduced in order to make data from different surveys comparable.

Although population surveys are widely considered as the most reliable method for collecting information on VAW²³, countries still carry out VAW surveys on *ad hoc* basis. In the last ten years, much progress has been made and many national statistical offices and other government institutions have engaged in the production of statistics based on VAW surveys, or other surveys including VAW modules. However, many countries still measure VAW only through police or court records. Importantly, among the countries of the Conference of European Statisticians, only 17 reported the availability of one or more national surveys used to measure VAW. Statisticians and users of statistics need to be made increasingly aware about the importance of developing proper statistical tools to measure VAW under the framework of official statistics. Countries also need to be assisted in their efforts to design and implement population-based surveys, with the objective of improving national information on VAW.

The evidence gathered by this report sheds light on the different approaches and methodologies used in this field. It shows that much work needs to be done in order to introduce harmonization. However, many surveys display common features such as: avoidance of general definitions of violence and use of highly detailed and behaviour-specific questions, inclusion of physical and sexual violence as a minimum set, and use of “lifetime” and “one year before the survey” as reference period. These similarities could form the basis for a multi-stage process of methodology standardization. They could constitute the foundation for a common minimum

²³ See report of the Expert Group Meeting on VAW held in April 2005 in Geneva, organized by the UN Division on the Advancement of Women in collaboration with UNECE and WHO (<http://www.unece.org/stats/documents/ece/ces/ge.30/2006/5.e.pdf>).

module, to be implemented in the different countries of the region under the framework of official statistics. Although further standardization might be a long-term objective, this analysis represents a concrete beginning. Other processes active in the region could be encouraged to join efforts in the same direction.

Given the diversity of objectives and national contexts, it is difficult to draw general conclusions or recommendations on the best methodologies to measure VAW. Although dedicated VAW surveys can study this area in broader and deeper terms, some modules - especially those included in large victimization surveys - can provide valuable information. The latter have the advantage of being carried out on a regular basis, as is the case in Canada, UK, and USA. This analysis does not provide clear evidence whether the mode of data collection affects the quality of the data: there is no clear relation between the various modes (face-to-face interviews, telephone interviews or self-administrated questionnaire) and non-responses/refusals²⁴. There is some evidence that tools, such as advance letters, follow-ups, call-backs and the use of proxy, do actually improve the quality of the results. The type of institution responsible for the survey also affects the response rate and the sample sizes. Government institutions and particularly national statistical offices have regular data collection activities, and this may increase their ability to reach people and mobilize the needed resources for bigger samples. These institutions can also assure better regularity in fielding surveys to measure VAW.

This analysis did not explicitly address the measurement of violence against men. More than one third of the analysed surveys included men in their reference population, and most of them were victimization surveys with a module on VAW. However, no information was collected on what questions were addressed to men and the comparability of the results against the data collected for women.

There are methodological challenges which countries still face when designing surveys to measure VAW. The majority of countries reported the following:

- ◆ questionnaire design
- ◆ sample size and design
- ◆ sensitivity of the topic and how to address it with the respondent

Research to address these topics has been undertaken over the last 20 years. However, more needs to be done to involve official statisticians, and to initiate a discussion on how to best implement VAW surveys under the framework of official statistics.

²⁴ Similar results were achieved in a review of about 80 victimization surveys carried out in the UNECE region presented at a joint UNECE-UNODC Meeting on crime statistics in January 2006. At that meeting it was concluded that cultural factors and the organization of regular data collection present in the countries highly determine the efficiency and quality of the way a survey is implemented (See the report of the meeting at: <http://www.unece.org/stats/documents/2006.01.crime.htm>).

ANNEX A

List and Basic Characteristics of responding Surveys

	Country	Name of Survey	Part on VAW	Institution	Year	Sample Size	
						H	P
1	Australia	1) International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS) – Australian component 2) General Social Survey 3) Crime and Safety Survey 4) Personal Safety Survey	1) Survey 2) Module 3) Module 4) Module	1) Australian Institute of Criminology 2) Australian Bureau of Statistics 3) Australian Bureau of Statistics 4) Australian Bureau of Statistics	1) Dec.2002 to June 2003 2) 2002 3) Apr 2005 4) 2005, August – November enumeration Survey is still in the field	1) 17.247 2) 17.000 3) 27.100 4)-	1) 6.677 2) - 3) 54.400 4) -
2	Canada	1) Violence Against Women Survey 2) General Social Survey on Victimization	1) Survey 2) Module	1) Statistics Canada 2) Statistics Canada	1) Feb-May 1993 2) Jan- Dec 2004	1)- 2)-	1) 12.300 2) 23.766
3	Denmark	Violence against women survey (IVAWS)	Survey	Ministry of Justice	Oct-Nov 2003	-	3.552
4	Finland	Faith, hope, battering	Survey	Ministry of Justice	Autumn 1997	-	7.100
5	France	National French survey on violence against women	Survey	Institut de démographie de l'Université Paris 1, France	May - July 2000	6.970	6.970
6	Germany	Health, Well-Being and Personal Safety of Women in Germany: A representative study of women in Germany.	Survey	University of Bielefeld	Jan-Nov 2003	-	10.126
7	Italy	1) Women Safety Survey 2) Citizen's safety survey	1) Survey 2) Module	1) ISTAT 2) ISTAT	1) missing 2) March-Sept 2002	1)25.000 2)60.000	1)25.000 2) 60.000
8	Mexico	National Survey on the Dynamics of Relationships within Households	Survey	INEGI	Oct –Nov 2003	45.995	-
9	Norway	The hidden violence?	Module	Norwegian Centre for Violence- and Traumatic Stress Studies	Feb-June 2003	-	8.000
10	Poland	International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS)	Survey	Warsaw University	May 2004	-	2.009
11	Republic of Moldova	Sociological survey "Domestic violence against women "	Survey	NBS	Dec 2000	519	333

12	Serbia and Montenegro	"WHOM multi-country study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence"	Survey	Autonomous Women's Center (AWC), Tirsova 5a 11000, Belgrade, Serbia	March-June 2003	2.769	1.456
13	Spain	Violence Against Women Macro-Survey	Survey	Instituto de la Mujer	July 1999-2002	-	20.552
14	Sweden	Captured Queen. Men's violence against women in "equal" Sweden – a prevalence study	Survey	Feminist Studies in Social Sciences, Uppsala University	Oct 1999-Jan 2000	-	10.000
15	Switzerland	Violence against women (IVAWS)	Survey	University of Lausanne	Apr 2003	1.975	-
16	UK	British Crime Survey	Module	Home Office England & Wales	The survey is continuous	51.000	51.000
17	USA	1) Full report of the Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women 2) National Crime Victimization Survey	1) Survey 2) Module (special questions)	1) Center for Policy Research 2) Bureau of Justice Statistics	1) Nov 1995-May 1996 2) on-going	1)16.000 2)42.000	1)16.000 2)75.000
18	DHS	Demographic and health survey	Module	-	-	-	-
19	EUIC (15 countries: Sweden, Finland, Denmark, UK, Ireland, Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, France, Germany, Austria, Portugal, Spain, Italy, Greece)	European Crime and Safety Survey (ICVS)	Module (special questions)	Gallup Europe, UNICRI, Max Planck Institute, CEPS/INSTEAD - GeoX	Feb- July 2005	2.000	2.000
<i>Total Countries</i> ²⁵ 17 <i>Total Questionnaires</i> ²⁶ 25							

²⁵ Excluding DHS and EUIC, because they include more than one country.

²⁶ Some countries have more than one survey.

ANNEX B

Table 1.i. Type of Survey/Module

Type of Survey/Module	Survey/Module	
	N	Percentage
Violence against women survey	15	60.0
Victimisation survey with a module on VAW	8	32.0
Other surveys (Multipurpose survey with the inclusion of a module on victimisation; DHS)	2	8.0
Total	25	100.0

Table 1.ii. Main objectives of Survey/Module

Main objectives of the Survey/Module	Survey/Module	
	N	Percentage
To measure dark figure/unreported crimes	17	68.0
To measure victimization	20	80.0
To measure fear of crime and insecurity	15	60.0
To measure crime prevention measures, security systems and/or strategies	9	36.0
To measure uncivil behaviours and social decay	4	16.0
To measure attitude towards the police and the criminal justice system	9	36.0
Other	12	48.0

Table 1.iii. Was the International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS) standardised form used in the Survey/Module?

Was the International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS) standardised form used in the Survey/Module?	Survey/Module	
	N	Percentage
Yes, full original form was used	1	4.0
Yes, part of the original form was used	1	4.0
Yes, adapted form was used	1	4.0
No, but there are comparable questions	7	28.0
No, the ICVS form was not used	13	52.0
Other	4	16.0

Table 1.iv. Period in which survey/module was last conducted

Last Sweep of survey/module	Survey/Module	
	N	Percentage
< 1995	1	4.0
1996 – 2000	5	20.0
2001-2005	15	60.0
On-going	2	8.0
Missing	2	8.0
Total	25	100

Table 1.v. Frequency of Survey/Module

Frequency	Survey/Module	
	N	Percentage
One-time	12	48.0
Every (number of years)	3	12.0
Irregular	5	20.0
Yearly (since ...)	0	0.0
Continuous	2	8.0
Other	3	12.0
Total	25	100

Table 2.i. Reference population: Age

Information collect on person of:	Questionnaire	
	Number	Percentage
...all ages	1	4.0
...aged X years and over	13	52.0
...aged between X and Y years	11	44.0
Missing	0	0.0
Total	25	100

Minimum age 12 years old

Maximum age none

Table 2.ii. Persons living in household and institutions

Information collected on:	Questionnaire	
	Number	Percentage
...persons living in private HH only	22	88.0
...BOTH persons living in private HH and persons living in institutions (like home for elderly or hospitals)	3	12.0
Missing	-	
Total	25	100

Table 2.iii. Recorded information on gender-based violence for men

	Questionnaire	
	N	Percentage
With the same questionnaires as for women	9	36.0
With another questionnaire	0	0.0
information was not recorded for men	16	64.0
total	25	100.0

Table 2.iv. List of Surveys interviewing men

	Country	Survey	Part related to VAW
1	Australia	General Social Survey (Multipurpose survey with the inclusion of a module on victimization)	Module
2	Australia	Crime and Safety Survey	Module
3	Australia	Personal Safety Survey	Module
4	Canada	General Social Survey on Victimization	Module
5	Norway	The hidden violence?	Module
6	UK	British Crime Survey	Module
7	USA	National Crime Victimization Survey	Module (special questions)
8	USA	Full report of the Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women	Survey
9	EUICS	European Crime and Safety Survey (ICVS)	Module (special questions)

Table 2.v. Survey design

	Number	Percentage
Cross-sectional	18	72%
Panel	3	12%
Mixed	1	4%
Other	2	8%
Missing	1	4%
Total	25	100%

Table 2.vi. Sampling techniques used

Method	Number	Percentage
Multi-stage sampling with stratification	16	64%
Simple probability sample	4	16%
Other/Missing	5	20%
Total	25	100%
Types of stratification		
Geographical area	16	64%
Degree of urbanization	8	32%
Age/Sex	5/6	20%/24%
Marital status	1	4%

Table 2.vii a. Sample Size

	Households (out of a total of 14)	Individuals (out of a total of 20)	Total
Less than 1.000	1	1	2
1.000 < n <= 10.000	4	9	13
10.000 < n <= 20.000	3	3	6
20.000 < n <= 50.000	5	3	8
Over 50.000	1	4	5
Total	14	20	

Table 2.vii b. Sample size

	Minimum	Maximum
Households	519	60.000
Individuals	333	75.000

Table 2.viii. Surveys that calculated quality performance indicators during and after the field work

	Questionnaire	
	Number	Percentage
Yes	17	68%
No	5	20%
Not applicable/not available	3	12%
Total	25	100%

Table 2.ix. Use of specific tools to check the interviewers behaviour and performance

	Questionnaire	
	Number	Percentage
Yes	19	76%
No	2	8%
Not applicable/not available	4	16%
Total	25	100%

Table 2.x. Surveys/questionnaires for which special arrangements were made

Special Arrangements	Questionnaire	
	Number	Percentage
To ensure confidentiality	21	84%
To ensure safety	17	68%
None of them	2	8%

Table 2.xi. Individuals Response Rate and Survey Characteristics

Individual non-response rate <= 10 %								
Country	Questionnaire name (in English)	Questionnaire method	Institution	Pre-approach letter	Call-backs or repeated visits	Follow up	Proxies	
Australia	General Social Survey (module on VAW)	Face to face interviews at the respondent's home using electronic questionnaire - CATI	NSO	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Canada	Violence Against Women Survey (survey on VAW)	Telephone interviews (CATI)	Ministry	N/A	N/A	No	No	No
Canada	General Social Survey on Victimization (module on VAW)	CATI	NSO	Yes	N/A	No	No	No
Mexico	National Survey on the Dynamics of Relationships within Households (survey on VAW)	Face to face interviews at the respondent's home using paper questionnaire	NSO	No	No	No	No	No
Sweden	Captured Queen. Men's violence against women in "equal" Sweden – a prevalence study (survey on VAW)	Self-administered questionnaires (Postal questionnaire)	University	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
USA	Full report of the Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women (Survey on VAW)	CATI	Research Centre	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
USA	National Crime Victimization Survey (Module -special questions)	CATI+ Face to face interviews at the respondent's home using paper questionnaire	Ministry	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Individual non-response rate between 10 % < rate <= 20 %								
France	National French survey on violence against women (survey on VAW)	CATI	University	Yes	N/A	No	No	No
Serbia and Montenegro	"WHO Multi-country study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence (survey on VAW)	Face to face interviews at the respondent's home and elsewhere using paper questionnaire	Research Centre	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Individual non-response rate between 20 % < rate <= 30 %								
Finland	Faith, hope, battering (survey on VAW)	Self-administered questionnaires (Postal questionnaire)	Ministry	Yes	N/A	No	No	No
Australia	Crime and Safety Survey (module on VAW)	Self-administered questionnaires (Postal questionnaire)	NSO	Yes	N/A	Yes	No	No
Individual non-response rate between 30 % < rate <=50 %								
Germany	Health, Well-Being and Personal Safety of Women in Germany: A representative study of women in Germany (survey on VAW)	Face to face interviews at the respondent's home using paper questionnaire+ CASI	University	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A
Norway	The hidden violence? (module on VAW)	Self-administered questionnaires (Postal questionnaire)	Research Centre	No	N/A	No	No	No
EUICS	European Crime and Safety Survey (ICVS) (Module-special questions)	CATI	Research Centre	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes

Individual non-response rate >=50 %							
Spain	Violence Against Women Macro-Survey (survey on VAW)	Face to face interviews at the respondent's home using paper questionnaire+ CATI	Research Centre	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Australia	International Violence Against Women (survey on VAW)	CATI	Research Centre	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Individual non-response rate not available							
		Primarily face to face interviews at the respondent's home using an electronic questionnaire, with an option of a telephone interview or interview at another dwelling preferable to the respondent					
Australia	Personal Safety Survey (Module on VAW)		NSO	No	N/A	No	No
Denmark	Violence against women survey – IVAWS (survey on VAW)	CATI	Ministry	No	N/A	No	No
Italy	Women Safety Survey (survey on VAW)	CATI	NSO	Yes	N/A	No	Yes
Italy	Citizen's safety survey (module on VAW)	CATI	NSO	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Poland		Face to face interviews at the respondent's home using paper questionnaire					
	International Violence Against Women Survey –IVAWS (survey on VAW)		University	N/A	N/A	No	No
Republic of Moldova		Face to face interviews at the respondent's home using paper questionnaire					
	Sociological survey "Domestic violence against women "(survey on VAW)		NSO	N/A	N/A	Yes	No
Switzerland	Violence against women –IVAWS (survey on VAW)	CATI	University	N/A	Yes	No	Yes
UK	British Crime Survey (module on VAW)	Face to face interviews at the respondent's home using electronic questionnaire (CAPI)+ CASI	Ministry	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
DHS	Demographic Health Surveys (module on VAW)	Face to face interviews at the respondent's home using paper questionnaire		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 2.xii. Households Response Rate and Survey Characteristics

Households non-response rate <= 10 %							
Country	Questionnaire name (in English)	Questionnaire method	Institution	Pre-approach letter	Call-backs or repeated visits	Follow up	Proxies
Australia	General Social Survey (module on VAW)	Face to face interviews at the respondent's home using electronic questionnaire - CAPI	NSO	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Canada	General Social Survey on Victimization (module on VAW)	CATI	NSO	Yes	N/A	No	No
Italy	Citizen's safety survey (module on VAW)	CATI	NSO	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
UK	British Crime Survey (module on VAW)	Face to face interviews at the respondent's home using electronic questionnaire (CAPI)+ CASI	Ministry	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
USA	National Crime Victimization Survey (Module -special questions)	CATI+ Face to face interviews at the respondent's home using paper questionnaire	Ministry	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Households non-response rate between 10 % < rate <= 20 %							
Mexico	National Survey on the Dynamics of Relationships within Households (survey on VAW)	Face to face interviews at the respondent's home using paper questionnaire	NSO	No	No	No	No
Households non-response rate between 20 % < rate <= 30 %							
Australia	Crime and Safety Survey (module on VAW)	Self-administered questionnaires (Postal questionnaire)	NSO	Yes	N/A	Yes	No
Canada	Violence Against Women Survey (survey on VAW)	Telephone interviews (CATI)	Ministry	N/A	N/A	No	No
France	National French survey on violence against women (survey on VAW)	CATI	University	Yes	N/A	No	No
USA	Full report of the Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women (Survey on VAW)	CATI	Research Centre	N/A	Yes	Yes	No
Households non-response rate between 30 % < rate <=50 %							
Denmark	Violence against women survey – IVAWS (survey on VAW)	CATI	Ministry	No	N/A	No	No
Serbia and Montenegro	"WHO Multi-country study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence (survey on VAW)	Face to face interviews at the respondent's home and elsewhere using paper questionnaire	Research Centre	N/A	Yes	Yes	No
EUICS	European Crime and Safety Survey (ICVS) (Module-special questions)	CATI	Research Centre	No	Yes	No	Yes
Households non-response rate > =50 %							
Australia	International Violence Against Women (survey on VAW)	CATI	Research Centre	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Households non-response rate not available							
Australia	Personal Safety Survey (Module on VAW)	Primarily face to face interviews at the respondent's home using an electronic questionnaire, with an option of a telephone interview or interview at another dwelling preferable to the	NSO	No	N/A	No	No

		respondent					
Finland	Faith, hope, battering (survey on VAW)	Self-administered questionnaires (Postal questionnaire)	Ministry	Yes	N/A	No	No
Germany	Health, Well-Being and Personal Safety of Women in Germany: A representative study of women in Germany (survey on VAW)	Face to face interviews at the respondent's home using paper questionnaire+ CASI	University	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A
Italy	Women Safety Survey (survey on VAW)	CATI	NSO	Yes	N/A	No	Yes
Norway	The hidden violence? (module on VAW)	Self-administered questionnaires (Postal questionnaire)	Research Centre	No	N/A	No	No
Poland	International Violence Against Women Survey –IVAWS (survey on VAW)	Face to face interviews at the respondent's home using paper questionnaire	University	N/A	N/A	No	No
Republic of Moldova	Sociological survey “Domestic violence against women “(survey on VAW)	Face to face interviews at the respondent's home using paper questionnaire	NSO	N/A	N/A	Yes	No
Spain	Violence Against Women Macro-Survey (survey on VAW)	Face to face interviews at the respondent's home using paper questionnaire+ CATI	Research Centre	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sweden	Captured Queen. Men’s violence against women in “equal” Sweden – a prevalence study (survey on VAW)	Self-administered questionnaires (Postal questionnaire)	University	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
Switzerland	Violence against women –IVAWS (survey on VAW)	CATI	University	N/A	Yes	No	Yes
DHS	Demographic Health Surveys (module on VAW)	Face to face interviews at the respondent's home using paper questionnaire	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 2.xiii. Households and Individuals Response Rate by Various Variables

Type of Institution	Level of non-response rate for households							Level of non-response rate for individuals							Total of surveys
	< =10 %	10 % <= 20 %	20% < rate <= 30%	30 % < rate <= 50 %	> 50 %	N/A	Total	< = 10 %	10 % < rate <= 20 %	20% < rate <= 30%	30 % < rate <= 50 %	> 50 % rate	N/A	Total	
National Statistical Office	3	1	1			3	8	3		1			4	8	9
Ministry Research Centre or Institute	2		1	1	1	1	5	2		1		2	1	5	4
University			1			4	5	1	1		1	1	2	6	5
Missing-N/A						1	1						1	1	1
Total	5	1	4	3	1	11	25	7	2	2	3	2	9	25	
Pre-approach letter	5	-	2	-	1	8	-	3	1	2	1	1	3	-	11
Call-backs/Repeated visits	4	-	1	2	1	8	-	3	1	-	1	1	3	-	9
Follow-up work conducted	1	-	2	1	1	5	-	2	1	1	1	1	1	-	7
Proxies allowed	4	-	-	1	-	5	-	2	-	-	1	-	4	-	7

Table 2.xiv. Refusal Rate by Various Variables

Type of Institution	Refusal Rate by Various Variables					
	< =10 %	10 % <= 20 %	20% < rate <= 30%	30 % < rate <= 50 %	> 50 %	Total
National Statistical Office	1	1	1			3
Ministry Research Centre or Institute	2			1		3
University				1		1
Missing-N/A						
Total	3	1	1	2		7
Pre-approach letter	1	1		1		3
Call-backs/Repeated visits	2	1		1		4
Follow-up work conducted	2			1		3
Proxies allowed	1	1				2

Table 2.xv. Collection of basic information on non-respondents

Yes, basic information on the non-respondents collected by a short questionnaire		
<i>Country</i>	<i>Questionnaire name (English)</i>	<i>Follow-up Questionnaire type</i>
Australia	Crime and Safety Survey	two mail follow-ups and partial telephone follow-up conducted
France	National French survey on violence against women	None
Germany	Health, Well-Being and Personal Safety of Women in Germany: A representative study of women in Germany.	additional dates to complete interviews in the case of interruption
Italy	Women Safety Survey	None
Italy	Citizen's safety survey	None
Serbia and Montenegro	"WHO Multi-country study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence"	Follow-up visits if possible
Spain	Violence Against Women Macro-Survey	Unknown
USA	National Crime Victimization Survey	None
<i>Total</i>		8

Table 2.xvi. Questionnaires that select new respondent if a respondent refused and/or could not be contacted

Select new respondent if respondent refuses		
<i>Country</i>	<i>Questionnaire name (English)</i>	<i>Percentage of Total</i>
Australia	International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS) – Australian component	
<i>SubTotal</i>	1	4.2
Select new respondent if respondent cannot be contacted		
<i>Country</i>	<i>Questionnaire name (English)</i>	<i>Percentage of Total</i>
None		
<i>SubTotal</i>	0	0.0
Select new respondent in both cases: if respondent refuses or cannot be contacted		
<i>Country</i>	<i>Questionnaire name (English)</i>	<i>Percentage of Total</i>
Denmark	Violence against women survey	
France	National French survey on violence against women	
Italy	Women Safety Survey	
Italy	Citizen's safety survey	
Poland	International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS)	
Spain	Violence Against Women Macro-Survey	
Switzerland	Violence against women	
EUICS	European Crime and Safety Survey	
<i>SubTotal</i>	8	32.0
<i>Total</i>	9	36.0

Table 2.xvii. Classes of average time to complete the survey, by survey method

Questionnaire method	<=15	16-30	31-45	>=46	Total
CATI		5	3		8
Face to face	1	2	1	1	5
Postal questionnaire	1		1		2
Face to Face + CATI		1		1	2
Face to face+ Self-administered questionnaires				2	2
<i>Total</i>	2	8	5	4	19

Table 2.xviii. Methodological challenges met during the design of the survey

Major methodological challenges met during the design of the survey	N	%
Regarding questionnaire construction		
construction of the questionnaire to be accepted by most women (progressive path from the easier facts to be said to the most intimate ones)	2	
wording of violence in a not suggestive way...	1	
To add questions on fear of crime	1	
combining sexual assault questions with the main survey form	1	
To add the male component of the survey	1	
To uncover cases of sexual violence and of physical/sexual violence by partners	2	
Length	1	
Total	10	24,4
regarding sample		
high standard error	2	
coverage especially for telephone technique	2	
migrants, dispersed, small population, homeless or living in group facilities or institutions	2	
representative	2	
Total	8	19,5
regarding the topic specificity		
Sensitivity	1	
definition of violent events	3	
Underestimation, disclosure	1	
Total	5	12,2
regarding the dissemination		
presentation of results (in precise terms preventing from false interpretation), media	2	
construction of global indicators with a clear meaning	1	
Total	3	7,3
regarding interviewees		
Sensitivity component in training	1	
skilful interviewers	1	
maintaining privacy	2	
ethical and safety issues: maintaining safety of respondents and interviewers	3	
interviewers - interviewees' relationship	1	
total	8	19,5
regarding the technique and the methodology		
change in methodology to reduce cost	1	
experiment in CATI	1	
To manage a complex data set	1	
Total	3	7,3
regarding non response		
high percentage of refuse	3	
non sample error	1	
Total	4	9,8
Total responses	41	

Table 3.i. Types of perpetrators identified in the questionnaire

	Questionnaire	
	Number	Percentage
Husband/partner	23	92
Ex-husband or ex-partner	21	84
Friends	21	84
Acquaintances at work or school	21	84
Stranger	21	84
Neighbour	19	76
Other family members	17	68
Father or my husband/partner's father	16	64
Other	16	64
Brothers/Sisters or brothers/sisters in law	14	56
Mother my husband/partner's mother	14	56
Sons/daughters fathered by husband/partner	14	56
Own sons/daughters fathered by non-current husband/partner	13	52
Sons/Daughters of current husband/partner (not one's own)	13	52

Table 3.ii. Severity and impacts of violence

	Questionnaire	
	Number	Percentage
Injuries	20	80
Victims use of medical service	18	72
Victims need to take time off from daily activities	11	44
Fear of bodily harm or death	13	52

Table 3.iii. Use of health and social services, informal supports

	Questionnaire	
	Number	Percentage
Victims use of medical service	18	72
Victims use of social, government services	19	76
Victims reporting to friends, family	19	76

Table 3.iv. Reporting to police and the criminal justice response

	Questionnaire	
	Number	Percentage
Victims reporting to the police	21	84
Charges brought against the offender	14	56

Table 4.i. Survey results were compared to data on crimes reported to police

	Questionnaire	
	Number	Percentage
Yes	9	36
No	12	48
No answer	4	16
Total	25	100

Table 4.ii. Types of margin of error

	Questionnaire	
	Number	Percentage
95% confidence interval	3	12
Other CIs (0.03, 0.15, 0.1-0.2, 0.035)	9	36
Different according to data (group, territory, level, etc)	1	4
Not enough specified (published w SE, etc)	2	8
Unreliable data	0	0

Table 4.iii. Availability of public use micro-data files

	Questionnaire	
	Number	Percentage
Yes	14	56
No	10	40
No answer	1	4
Total	25	100

Table 4.iv. Availability of survey results on the Internet

	Questionnaire	
	Number	Percentage
Yes	17	68
No	5	20
No answer	3	12
Total	25	100

ANNEX C

Qualitative and Quantitative Tools to Improve Interviewers' Performance

Qualitative tools:

- ✓ Pre-interviewing phase
 1. simulations of real interviews before contacting a woman;
 2. supervision during their first interviews;
- ✓ Interviewing phase
 3. on-going supervision by one supervisor (for instance every four interviewers);
 4. listening to a few interviews (almost every day);
 5. listening devices during interviews;
 6. frequent and on a regular basis debriefings sessions and counselling options;
 7. feedbacks provided by other interviewers;
 8. discussion about progress and issues arisen;
 9. number of contact made by survey managers to solve any issues and provide support where necessary;
 10. use of monitoring measures for non-response and disclosure of violence;
- ✓ Post interviewing and interviewing phase
 11. calls made to the interviewees to check the interviews.

Quantitative tools concerning the planning and implementation of performance indicators:

- ✓ Interviewing phase
 1. indicators calculated on households contacted
 - number and rate of completed interviews;
 - interruption rate;
 - refusal rate;
 - non response rate;
 - rate of households not in target;
 2. indicators calculated on attempts of call:
 - rate of calls that have as outcome a non-response
 - rate of appointments
 - outcomes of the calls made by interviewers;
 3. average length of interview;
 4. analysis of questionnaire paths;
 5. violence rates;
 6. quality section to be fulfilled by interviewers at the end of the questionnaire on interview and interviewee (difficulties met, woman availability and sincerity);
 7. control charts;
- ✓ Post interviewing
 - analysis of data cleaning at the time of data entry by interviewers.

ANNEX D

Non-responses and refusals: a deeper analysis

We re-calculated the non-response rates, when possible, on the basis of the further required information summarised in the following table:

A	B	C	D	E	F
Number of complete interviews	Number of interrupted interviews	Refusals	Households contacted but without an interview	Households not reached	Total number of households included in the sample

The recalculated non-response rate is given by the ratio $C / (A + B + C)$, that represent actually a refusal rate. Non-responses usually include refusals, ineligible and non contacts. The last two categories are mainly determined by the interview techniques (face to face, phone, postal) and related sampling directory used to draw statistical units²⁷. Refusals are also mainly related to: sensitivity of the subject, interviewers' training, previous experience and skills, specific strategies used to reduce refusals as proxies and/or substitutions of the selected person, reputation and acceptance of the institution in charge of the survey and type of participation (if mandatory or voluntary and eventually with some sort of incentives). Thus, from now on what we will call "non-response rate" is actually the refusal rate, which will be analysed in relation to the above-mentioned possible causes.

The calculation was possible for the following surveys:

AUSTRALIA	General Social Survey
AUSTRALIA	Personal Safety Survey
DENMARK	Violence against women survey
FINLAND	Faith, hope, battering
FRANCE	National French survey on violence against women
ITALY	Citizen's safety survey
MEXICO	National Survey on the Dynamics of Relationships within Households.
POLAND	International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS)
SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO	"WHO Multi-country study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence"
SPAIN	Violence Against Women Macro-Survey
USA	Full report of the Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women
USA	National Crime Victimization Survey

but for Denmark, Finland, Mexico, Poland and the USA National Crime Victimization Survey the detailed data for interrupted interviews (B) was not available, so it was not considered in the corresponding denominators.

²⁷ Directories can be not updated about household address changes (could be not contact), or about business offices that took over where there were previous household dwelling place (ineligible unit), etc. Also not contact depends on a list sample design or RDD sample design.

For the following surveys the details specified above were not available, so different strategy were considered:

AUSTRALIA	International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS) – Australian component
AUSTRALIA	Crime and Safety Survey
CANADA	Violence Against Women Survey
CANADA	General Social Survey on Victimization
GERMANY	Health, Well-Being and Personal Safety of Women in Germany: A representative study of women in Germany.
NORWAY	The hidden violence?
SWEDEN	Captured Queen. Men's violence against women in "equal" Sweden – a prevalence study
SWITZERLAND	Violence against women
UK	British Crime Survey

For both Canadian surveys, the sum of the provided household and individual non-response rates were considered. For the Australian IVAWS, Germany, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland the provided individual non-response rate was considered, while for UK and Crime and Safety Australian survey the complement to 100 of the percentage of completed interviews among the total number of households included in the sample was calculated (rate for individuals in the case of Australia).

No data to calculate non-response rates were available for

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA	Sociological survey "Domestic violence against women "
ITALY	Women Safety Survey
EUICS	European Crime and Safety Survey

as the Italian survey is still on field, while the Republic of Moldova survey did not provide information about non-responses and EUICS surveys provided a non-response rate of 50% indicating 2000 completed interviews and 2000 households/individuals as the size of sample last time the survey was carried out.

Finally the following rates were considered:

AUSTRALIA	International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS) – Australian component	58.1%*
AUSTRALIA	General Social Survey	1.78%*
AUSTRALIA	Crime and Safety Survey	20.81%
AUSTRALIA	Personal Safety Survey	20.41%*
CANADA	Violence Against Women Survey	36.00%
CANADA	General Social Survey on Victimization	12,60%
DENMARK	Violence against women survey	19.73%*
FINLAND	Faith, hope, battering	1.31%*
FRANCE	National French survey on violence against women	45.46%*
GERMANY	Health, Well-Being and Personal Safety of Women in Germany: A representative study of women in Germany.	48.00%
ITALY	Citizen's safety survey	17.10%*
MEXICO	National Survey on the Dynamics of Relationships within Households.	2.86%*

POLAND	International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS)	22.20%*
NORWAY	The hidden violence?	44.00%
SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO	"WHO Multi-country study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence"	6.30%*
SPAIN	Violence Against Women Macro-Survey	4.58%*
SWEDEN	Captured Queen. Men´s violence against women in “equal” Sweden – a prevalence study	30.00%
SWITZERLAND	Violence against women	28.10%
UK	British Crime Survey	49.61%
USA	Full report of the Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women	42.55%*
USA	National Crime Victimization Survey	7.75%*

Rate with (*) refer to refusal rate

The refusal rate varies from 1,8% to 58,1% and the non-response rate, due to both refusals and other causes of non-answer, are very different. Anyway, in the 66,7% of surveys it is less than 30%.

Table 1 Non response rate

	N	%
less or equal 10%	6	28,6
10% < rate <= 20%	3	14,3
20% < rate <= 30%	5	23,8
30% < rate <= 50%	6	28,6
> 50% rate	1	4,8
Total	21	100,0

Analysis of non response rates

All the information on non-responses so far discussed, will be considered and analysed in the following paragraph, in which the different profile of each survey is taken into account along with the level of non-response rate in the survey.

Surveys with a global non-response rate less or equal 10%

The Australia survey is a multipurpose survey that includes a module on victimization with some questions on women victimization, while the USA survey is a continuous victimization survey (panel) with specific questions on women victimization. The Australian survey is performed by the national statistical institute and USA survey is performed by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. Finland, Mexico, Serbia and Montenegro, Spain are *ad hoc* surveys, performed mainly by national statistical institutes (Finland, Mexico and Spain), or by UN institutions (WHO for Serbia and Montenegro). Most of the above-mentioned surveys are face to face (on paper, while only the Australian one uses a CAPI technique), Spain and USA allow also CATI interviews. Finland is a postal survey. Only the survey in USA interviews all persons in the households older than 12, while the others interview only one person, either selected from the household at second stage, or directly through an individual sampling (Finland and Spain).

Australia, Mexico, Spain and USA provided estimates representative both at national and first regional level, Finland at national level only. Serbia and Montenegro estimates are representative for capital city.

Australia, Finland, Serbia and USA informed citizens in advance of the incoming interview by an advance letter. The possibility of repeated contacts was allowed by USA, Australia and Serbia and Montenegro, the last offering also this possibility at different times of the day. All the examined surveys

provide tools and information to convert refusals, but Spain, which considers only the possibility to substitute the woman who refused with another from the same location.

One of the main reasons of non-response was lack of trust due to political and security issues in the country, as in Serbia and Montenegro, or lack of time, as in Spain. The remaining surveys indicated mainly refusals and non-contacts.

USA and Australia allowed for proxies in case of severe illness or disabilities, and USA also did so in case of children under 14 years of age only when parents did not give the permission to interview them, and for persons temporarily absent for the entire enumeration period.

Serbia and Montenegro survey considers some basic information available from the household selection questionnaire (in particular age) about non-respondents. Also Spain and USA collected some basic information on non-respondents.

Table 2: Surveys with a global non-response rate less or equal 10%

AUSTRALIA	General Social Survey	<i>Cross-sec.</i>	<i>face</i>	1 ind select in h
FINLAND	Faith, hope, battering	<i>Cross-sec.</i>	<i>postal</i>	ind. sample
MEXICO	National Survey on the Dynamics of Relationships within Households	<i>Cross-sec.</i>	<i>face</i>	1 ind select in h
SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO	"WHO Multi-country study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence"	<i>Cross-sec.</i>	<i>face</i>	1 ind select in h
SPAIN	Violence Against Women Macro-Survey	<i>Cross-sec.</i>	<i>face + cati</i>	ind. sample
USA	National Crime Victimization Survey	<i>panel</i>	<i>face + cati</i>	All ind. older than 12
<i>Total of surveys</i>				6

Surveys with a global non-response rate 10% < rate <= 20%

Only the Denmark survey is a specific women victimisation survey, the two others having an included module on women victimisation (the Canadian survey is a multipurpose one, while the Italian survey is a victimization survey with a section on violence against women).

The Canadian and Italian surveys were performed by national statistical institutes, while for Denmark the Ministry of justice was responsible of the survey. All the above considered surveys are cross-sectional and CATI; in the case of Italy only one individual was interviewed, after being randomly selected among family components of age ranging between 14-59, while the other two surveys are based on a sample of individuals.

All the considered surveys provide representative estimates at national level, but also at first regional level in the case of Canada and Italy: at Census metropolitan level in Canada, and for 19 regions and 2 provinces in Italy.

Both Canada and Italy informed the citizens in advance of the incoming survey: in the case of Italy by a letter from the ISTAT President, while Canada sent a letter to refusal individuals to gain their cooperation. Many efforts in training interviewers to avoid or convert refusals were made both for the Italian and for the Canadian surveys, in the last case also by recruiting *ad hoc* senior interviewers.

One of the main reasons of refusals was the length of the surveys: Italian module on women victimization is inserted as the last section on victimization.

No proxies were allowed, with the exception of the Italian surveys which used them to obtain structural characteristics of household components in order to randomly select the individual to interview. Istat allowed the substitution firstly of the selected person and secondarily of the household in case there was no other eligible person in the family or in the case of a definitive refuse or impossibility to contact the household. Also Denmark allowed the substitution of the selected woman, both in case of refusal and of no contact. None of the considered surveys conducted follow-up works to cope with missing data from incomplete questionnaires/interviews.

Only Italy collected some basic information on non-respondents.

Table 3: Surveys with a global non-response rate 10% < rate <= 20%

CANADA	General Social Survey on Victimization	<i>Cross-sec.</i>	<i>cati</i>	ind sample
DENMARK	Violence against women survey	<i>Cross-sec.</i>	<i>cati</i>	ind sample
ITALY	Multipurpose Survey - Citizen's safety survey	<i>Cross-sec.</i>	<i>cati</i>	1 ind select in h*
<i>Total of surveys</i>	3			

*: "select in h" means household sample, specifying how many individuals were interviewed

Surveys with a global non-response rate 20% < rate <= 30%

All these surveys are surveys on violence, meaning they are specific on the topic, but the Australian ones which only have modules on women victimization, . All the surveys performed with the face to face technique are performed at the respondents home.

The two Australian surveys are performed by the national bureau of statistics, while the other surveys by Universities (Poland and Sweden), or by a research institute (Switzerland Criminology Institute). Two surveys are panel (Crime and safety Australian survey and the Switzerland one), while the others are cross-sectional.

Crime and safety survey interviewed all persons in the households, while the others only one person, randomly selected in the case of the Swiss and the Australian personal safety survey household samples. Estimates are representative at national level for all the considered surveys. Only for the more populous states in Australia the Personal Safety Survey estimates are still representative. Both the Australian surveys informed in advance respondents.

Poland underlines the effort made in training the interviewers in order to avoid and convert refusals, stressing the importance for the survey to gain women interest and cooperation. Switzerland instead, recalled households whose selected individual refused, in order to try to interview another woman in the same household.

Not contact nor language problems were the main reason indicated for non-response respectively by Poland and Sweden, while the information is missing for the other surveys.

No proxies were allowed with the exception of Switzerland for woman younger than 18. The Crime and Safety Australian survey allowed the possibilities of two mail follow-ups and partial telephone follow-up to gather missing data from incomplete questionnaires/interviews.

No survey collected information on non-respondents, with the exception of the Australian Crime and Safety survey, which collected details of non respondents from the labour force survey.

Table 4: Surveys with a global non-response rate 20% < rate <= 30%

AUSTRALIA	Crime and Safety Survey	<i>Panel</i>	<i>postal</i>	all persons in h
AUSTRALIA	Personal Safety Survey	<i>Cross-sec.</i>	<i>face+cati</i>	1 ind select in h
POLAND	International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS)	<i>Cross-sec.</i>	<i>face</i>	ind sample
SWEDEN	Captured Queen. Men's violence against women in "equal" Sweden – a prevalence study	<i>Cross-sec.</i>	<i>postal</i>	ind sample
SWITZERLAND	Violence against women	<i>Panel</i>	<i>cati</i>	1 ind select in h
<i>Total of surveys</i>	5			

Surveys with a global non-response rate 30% < rate <= 50%

The UK survey is the only multipurpose one with an included module in victimization.

The french and german surveys are performed by universities, Norway and USA surveys by Research institutes and Canada and UK surveys by governmental offices as national statistic office for Canada and the Home office for UK.

All the considered surveys are cross-sectional, three of them are performed by a CATI technique (Canada, France and USA), two by mixed face to face and self (CASI) technique (Germany and UK), and Norway by a postal questionnaire. Both the two face-to-face surveys are performed at the respondents' home.

Only one person was interviewed, with the exception of the survey in UK, which interviewed persons aged 16-24 in a selection of households. France and USA both used the birthday method to select one component in the selected household, the other surveys used individual samples.

All the estimates are representative at a national level, with the exception of the norwegian survey, which was conducted in Oslo. Canadian and UK estimates are representative at first and second regional levels too.

Only France and Germany informed people in advance. Repeated calls to obtain the contact (15 for France and 5 for USA) and the possibility to schedule the call according to respondents' preferences were allowed by France, UK and USA. Also Germany allowed the possibility of further appointments to complete the interviews, according to respondents' preferences. A specific training for interviewers was considered in UK to face non-response.

Canada and UK identify in not-contacts and refusals the main causes of non response, while France indicates the length of the interview. In Canada also language difficulties increased non-responses.

No proxies were allowed by most of the surveys, with the only exception of UK in the case of language difficulties. Follow up were considered by USA to verify information regarding stalking when a corresponding victimization period of 10 years or more was indicated by respondents.

France and Germany were the only two surveys that collected basic information on the non-respondents by a short questionnaire.

Table 5: Surveys with a global non-response rate 30% < rate <= 50%

CANADA	Violence Against Women Survey	<i>Cross-sec.</i>	<i>cati</i>	ind sample
FRANCE	National French survey on violence against women	<i>Cross-sec.</i>	<i>cati</i>	1 ind select in h
GERMANY	Health, Well-Beeing and Personal Safety of Women in Germany: A representative study of women in Germany.	<i>Cross-sec.</i>	<i>face+self</i>	ind sample
NORWAY	The hidden violence?	<i>Cross-sec.</i>	<i>postal</i>	ind sample
UK	British Crime Survey	<i>Cross-sec.</i>	<i>face+self</i>	lim.n° ind.in h
USA	Full report of the Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women	<i>Cross-sec.</i>	<i>cati</i>	1 ind select in h
Total of surveys				6

Surveys with a global non-response rate > 50%

The Australian IVAWS Survey is performed by the Australian Institute of Criminology. It is a CATI cross-sectional survey based on a household sample, interviewing only one person selected according to the nearest birthday of a female householder aged between 18 and 69. Estimates are representative at national level.

Respondents were informed in advance of the interview when a link was possible between the randomly extracted phone number and the corresponding address. The letter was addressed to 'Ms' to minimise the chance that a male household member would open the envelope.

The phone number was called up to 6 times in case of no answer and the calls were spread over different times of the day and week, to increase the probability of response. Refusal was the main reason of non-

response, and the possibility to substitute the woman in the household was allowed. No proxies nor follow ups were allowed to gather information for incomplete questionnaire, thus no information on non-respondents were collected.

Table 6: Surveys with a global not response rate > 50%

AUSTRALIA	International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS) – Australian component	<i>Cross-sec.</i>	<i>cati</i>	1 ind select in h
<i>Total of surveys</i>	<i>1</i>			

Other analyses on non-response rates

In the next tables it is possible to observe the different surveys behaviour, analysed by their refusal rate, in respect to variables regarding the level of estimates, the non-respondents and the effect of training length in reducing refusal rate.

Most of surveys that provide estimates at national and at first regional level are National Statistical Office, with the exception of USA surveys, performed by the US Department of Justice.

Table 7: Provide estimates both at national and at first regional level*:

Country	Survey name (English)
AUSTRALIA	General Social Survey
SPAIN	Violence Against Women Macro-Survey
USA	National Crime Victimization Survey
CANADA	General Social Survey on Victimization
ITALY	Citizen's safety survey
AUSTRALIA	Personal Safety Survey
CANADA	Violence Against Women Survey
UK	British Crime Survey

* transparent for non response rates $\leq 10\%$; light grey when $10\% < \text{non response rate} \leq 20\%$; grey when $20\% < \text{non response rate} \leq 30\%$; medium grey when $30\% < \text{non response rate} \leq 50\%$; very grey when non response rate $> 50\%$.

Table 8: Collecting basic information on the non respondent*:

SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO	"WHO Multi-country study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence"	<i>facepaper</i>
SPAIN	Violence Against Women Macro-Survey	<i>facepaper+cati</i>
USA	National Crime Victimization Survey	<i>facepaper+cati</i>
ITALY	Citizen's safety survey	<i>Cati</i>
AUSTRALIA	Crime and Safety Survey	<i>Postal</i>
FRANCE	National French survey on violence against women	<i>Cati</i>
GERMANY	Health, Well-Being and Personal Safety of Women in Germany: A representative study of women in Germany.	<i>facepaper+casi</i>

* transparent for non response rates $\leq 10\%$; light grey when $10\% < \text{non response rate} \leq 20\%$; grey when $20\% < \text{non response rate} \leq 30\%$; medium grey when $30\% < \text{non response rate} \leq 50\%$; very grey when non response rate $> 50\%$.

A way to deal with non-response is substituting the respondent when not all the persons of the household have to be interviewed (also in case of individual sample).

Table 9: Substituting the respondent when not all the person of the household have to be interviewed*

<i>Both for refusal than for not contact</i>	
SPAIN	Violence Against Women Macro-Survey**
DENMARK	Violence against women survey***
ITALY	Citizen's safety survey
POLAND	International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS)***
SWITZERLAND	Violence against women
FRANCE	National French survey on violence against women
<i>only for refusal</i>	
AUSTRALIA	International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS) – Australian component

* transparent for non response rates $\leq 10\%$; light grey when $10\% < \text{non response rate} \leq 20\%$; grey when $20\% < \text{non response rate} \leq 30\%$; medium grey when $30\% < \text{non response rate} \leq 50\%$; very grey when non response rate $> 50\%$.

**individual sample: a woman of the same location

***individual sample

The length of the training given to interviewers does not look significantly correlated with non-response rates nor with the type of survey, both in the case of a module in a multipurpose survey or victimization survey, and of a specific dedicated survey.

Among the countries with lower non-response rates Mexico dedicated more time to the interviewers training (5 days) and Australia the lesser (2 days).

Training period range is mostly 24 days, with the relevant exception of Canadian Violence against women survey (8 days) and Australian IVAWS and Germany survey (1 day).

Most of the training given to interviewers resulted in the drafting of manuals which are comprehensive of the background, purposes and procedures of the survey (self or with lectures), role-playing and mock interview. In the case of computer assistance in interviewing also some in-class practice on the electronic questionnaire was required.

Table 10: Length (in days or weeks) of the training given to interviewers*

AUSTRALIA	General Social Survey	2 days
MEXICO	National Survey on the Dynamics of Relationships within Households.	5 days
SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO	"WHO Multi-country study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence"	3 weeks or less
USA	National Crime Victimization Survey	4 ½ days
CANADA	General Social Survey on Victimization	2 days
ITALY	Citizen's safety survey	4 days
AUSTRALIA	Personal Safety Survey	3 days
POLAND	International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS)	3 days – 6 days

		(including pilot)
SWITZERLAND	Violence against women	2 days
CANADA	Violence Against Women Survey	8 days
FRANCE	National French survey on violence against women	3 days
GERMANY	Health, Well-Being and Personal Safety of Women in Germany: A representative study of women in Germany.	1 day
UK	British Crime Survey	4 days
USA	Full report of the Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women	2 days
AUSTRALIA	International Violence Against Women Survey (IVAWS) – Australian component	1 day

* transparent for non response rates $\leq 10\%$; light grey when $10\% < \text{non response rate} \leq 20\%$; grey when $20\% < \text{non response rate} \leq 30\%$; medium grey when $30\% < \text{non response rate} \leq 50\%$; very grey when non response rate $> 50\%$.

Conclusions on quality and non response

Looking at the data inventory, what emerges is the richness, complexity and variability of the different experiences. Yet it's not easy to evaluate quality in a multifaceted world that seems to have no common language. To address quality, it means first of all to define what quality is. Common definitions are necessary, just as much as common tools to monitor it. Different instruments can be used and can fit differently according to the context, but we have to identify a common background also in methodology, a starting point.

Analysing non-response rates was a hard experience. The difficulty was in finding a common lead, a common language and also in this case our mother tongues differ. Perhaps we need to start in defining a common vocabulary.

Furthermore, to assess quality, it's not sufficient to look at the refusal rate, since quality is achieved from different points, thanks to an effort that involves several steps of data production. It's important to look at the sample size too, as well as, at the same time, to the planned territorial level estimates. In the design of a survey attention should be paid to these matters, since the data consistency can be at risk when these criteria are not present all together at the same time.

An indicator of the quality of the survey is the non-response rate. Analysing non-response rates was a hard experience. The difficulty was in finding a common lead, a common language and also in this case our mother tongues differ. Perhaps we need to start in defining a common vocabulary, to arrange common definitions and common tools to monitor it. Finally a refusal rate was re-calculated and analyzed, related to reasons of non-response, interviewers' training and previous experience and skills, specific strategies used to reduce refusals as proxies and/or substitutions of the selected person, typologies of the institutions in charge of the survey and corresponding type of participation (if mandatory or voluntary and eventually with some sort of incentives). In the 66,7% of surveys it is less than 30%. One of the non-response reason was the length of the interview. It differs accordingly to dedicated or module surveys, the first ones lasting more. Also face to face interviews are more likely to last more.

Mainly dedicated surveys answered about the main difficulties met during the design of the survey (some solved, some not). The panorama looks very complex and difficulties encompass: content, methodological problems, dissemination and sample reliability.

The main difficulties are related to the specificity and sensitivity of the issue of violence, and involve: questionnaire construction, definition of different types of violence, the interviewer-interviewee relationship, the design and size of the sample, coverage of sparse sub-populations and also non-responses, methodology and dissemination.

Major problems that still need to be solved concern again: coverage (especially for phone surveys), the technique chosen to collect data on violence, women's disclosure, data dissemination.

Quality is achieved by checking several factors, in an effort that involves several steps of data production. It is important to look at the sample size, as well as to the planned territorial level estimates. In the design of a survey attention should be paid to all the above matters, since the data consistency can be at risk when they are not all faced and/or present at the same time.

ANNEX E

UNECE questionnaire on gender-based surveys

Questionnaire

The analysis of the questionnaires collected from the countries will be made public and will help to take stock of the current practices used in countries to measure gender-based violence and to identify the steps towards a better harmonization of methods.

Country:

Contact details of respondent:

Name:

Institution:

Functional role:

Address:

Email:

Telephone:

Fax:

Please indicate below what type of household surveys have been conducted to collect data on crime in the country in the last 10 years, including nationally designed surveys, International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS) or others (please select all it applies):

- Ad hoc victimisation survey(s)
- Periodic victimisation survey(s)
- Continuous victimisation survey
- Multipurpose surveys with the inclusion of a module on victimisation
- Violence against women survey(s)
- Other (please specify):
- No data on crime have been collected in the last 10 years through household surveys

Please fill a copy of the questionnaire (pages 2 to 9) for each survey carried out or planned, unless two or more surveys have been carried out (or will be carried out) in different years but adopting the same methodology. Please also indicate the progressive form number (1, 2...)

If the survey was conducted by a different organization and the questionnaire cannot be completed, please provide the name of the institution that carried out the survey and information on a contact person if available.

Country:

Form Number:

Part 1.A – General questions on the survey:

1. Survey name

Survey name in original language:

Survey name in English:

2. Type of survey:

- Victimization survey
- Multipurpose survey with the inclusion of a module on victimisation (Where in the survey was the module on victimization located?): Violence against women survey
- Other (please specify):

3. Main objectives of the survey (please select all it applies):

- To measure dark figure/unreported crimes
- To measure victimization
- To measure fear of crime and insecurity
- To measure crime prevention measures, security systems and/or strategies
- To measure uncivil behaviours and social decay
- To measure attitude towards the police and the criminal justice system
- Other (please specify):

4. Institution mainly responsible for this survey and contact person:

Institution:

Department:

Name contact person:

E-mail:

Telephone number:

Fax:

5. Other institutions involved in this survey:

Providing funding:

Providing expertise:

Providing institutional support:

Other roles:

6. Was the International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS) standardised form used in the survey?

- Yes, full original form was used
- Yes, part of the original form was used
- Yes, adapted form was used
- No, but there are comparable questions
- No, the ICVS form was not used
- Other, please specify:

7. Period in which the survey was last conducted²⁸:

Please indicate the year(s) and month(s):

The next year/month in which the survey is expected to be carried out (if applicable):

8. Frequency of the survey:

- One-time
- Every _____ years since
- Irregular, Please indicate the years when it was carried out:
- Yearly, since
- Continuous (monthly, quarterly), since:
- Other (Please specify)

9. Reference population used for the survey:

Age:

- Information was collected on persons of all ages
- Information was collected only on persons aged between _____ and _____ (please specify)
- Information was collected on persons aged _____ years and more

Sex:

- Information was collected on both males and females
- Information was collected on females only
- Information was collected on males only

Population living in institutions:

- Information was collected on persons living in private households
- Information was collected on persons living in institutions, like homes for the elderly or hospitals (please specify which categories of institutions):

10. Did the reference population change for selected types of crime?

- Yes, Please indicate the types of crimes and the related population considered
- No

11. Number of interviewers engaged in the survey:

12. Were they in-house interviewers or was an external survey company involved?

13. Sex distribution of interviewers:

Women: _____ %

Men: _____ %

14. Language(s) in which the survey was carried out:

²⁸ Indicate time of fieldwork/interviewing. For multipurpose surveys, please report only the time when a victimization module was included (or it is planned to be included)

15. **What was the introductory statement used to introduce respondents to the survey/module (please translate into English)?**

16. **Was the survey mandatory or voluntary?**

- Mandatory
 Voluntary
 Other, please specify:

Part 1.B – Questions on survey methodology:

1. Survey design:

- Cross-sectional study
 Panel study
 Combination of a cross-sectional and panel study
 Other (please specify):

2. Mode of data collection used for the survey (select all it applies):

- Face to face interviews at the respondent's home using paper questionnaire
 Face to face interviews at the respondent's home using electronic questionnaire - CAPI
 Face to face interviews elsewhere (please specify):
 Self-administered questionnaires
 CASI
 Postal questionnaire
 Other, please specify:
 Telephone interviews (CATI)
 Internet survey
 Combinations or other modes (please specify and provide explanations if two or more modes are used):

Were respondents informed in advance (through letter, etc.) about the forthcoming interview? (yes/no):

3. In general two types of sample are possible to select households or individuals.

Which of these was used the last time the survey was carried out?

- A sample of households → go to question no. 4
 A sample of individuals → go to question no. 6
 Not applicable → go to question no. 7

4. If a household sample was drawn: which persons of the household were interviewed for the survey?

- Only one person
 A limited number of persons of the household, namely _____ persons
 All persons of the household of a certain age (please specify: _____)
 All persons of the household
 Other, please specify: _____ → go to question no. 7

5. How were individuals within households selected?

- Random
 Any responsible adult method
 Birthday method (please specify if last birthday or next birthday was used: _____)
 Other, please specify:

6. If a sample of individuals was drawn: were other persons belonging to the household interviewed as well?

- Yes, all members of the household were selected
 Yes, some members of the household were selected (please specify: _____)
 No other persons were interviewed

7. What kind of sampling procedure was applied?

- A multistage probability sample → go to question no. 8
 A simple probability sample → go to question no. 11
 Other procedure, namely: _____ → go to question no. 11

8. If a multistage probability sample was taken: which variables were used for the stratification? (tick more than one answer if necessary)

- Age
- Sex
- Marital status
- Geographic area
- Degree of urbanization
- Other, namely:

9. If a multistage probability sample was taken: was oversampling applied for certain groups of persons/areas?

- Yes, namely for:
- No

10. Was a substitution strategy applied to reach the desired sample size for certain groups of persons/areas?

- Yes, namely for:
- No

11. What size was the sample the last time the survey was carried out?

(net sample size, *exclusive of non-response*).

Number of households:

Number of persons:

12. At what territorial level the sample is representative?

- National level
- First regional level
- Second regional level
- Other please specify:

13. What reference period was used for the reporting of crimes? (tick more than one answer if necessary)

- Six months (e.g. only crimes occurred in the 6 months before the survey were to be reported)
- One year
- Three years
- Five years
- Life time
- Other:

14. Were some of the above listed reference periods used only to report selected types of crime?

- Yes, please specify:
- No

15. Special measures taken to reduce the telescoping effect

When collecting information on events occurred in the past, a typical distortion is caused by the so-called "telescoping effect", by which the respondent remembers an event as if it had occurred more recently than in fact took place. Please indicate if any of the specific measures listed below or other measures were taken to reduce the telescoping effect (please tick more than one answer if necessary):

- Reporting of the event date
- Use of funnel questions
- Reducing of the reference period
- Use of panel data
- Other, please specify:
- No specific measures were taken

16. What was the overall percentage of non-response the last time the survey was carried out?

(number of responding household or individuals / number of sampled households or individuals)

Percentage non-response: % (households)

Percentage non-response: % (individuals)

17. What was the average time taken to complete the survey? (If victimization module, please indicate the length of the module and the total length of the survey)

18. Information on non-response

Please indicate which were the main causes of non-response (based on objective indicators or subjective comments):

Please indicate if any specific measure was taken to reduce non-response:

19. In the case of non-response: was basic information on the non-respondents collected by

e.g. means of a short questionnaire?

- Yes
 No

20. One way of dealing with non-response is to select a new respondent if a respondent refuses or cannot be contacted. Was this method used the last time the survey was carried out?

- Yes, in case of refusal
 Yes, in cases where a respondent could not be contacted (for example because the respondent is not available or ill)
 Yes, in both cases
 No

21. Was any follow-up work conducted to gather missing data from incomplete questionnaires/interviews?

- Yes, please specify:
 No

22. For whom were proxy interviews used in the survey?

(tick more than one answer if necessary)

- No proxies were allowed
 All children under _____ years of age (please specify the age limit)
 Children under _____ years of age only when parents did not give the permission to interview the child
 Persons not at home at the time of the interview
 Persons not able to reply (e.g. because of illness or disabilities)
 Other categories (please specify):

23. Training of interviewers (in case of multipurpose surveys, please refer to the training on the module on victimization only):

Please indicate the length (in days or weeks) of the training given to interviewers:

Please indicate the training method(s) (ex. Lectures, manuals, videos...):

Please indicate if special psychological training and/or support was provided to interviewers to deal with "sensitive survey content" (e.g. sexual abuse, domestic violence...):

24. Were the results of the survey compared with data on crimes reported to the police?

- Yes, please provide documentation on studies that have been conducted to date
 No

25. If the ICVS was conducted in conjunction with another survey or a crime module was included in another survey, please provide comments or documentation on the comparability of the data:

26. What are the major methodological challenges met during the design of the survey?

27. Are there major problems in the design of the survey that still need to be addressed?

28. Is there a public use microdata file?

- Yes
 No

29. Are survey results available on internet?

- Yes, please provide the internet address:
 Yes, in the ICVS international database
 No

30. Were printed reports published with the results of the surveys?

- Yes, please provide title, language, date and any other reference information:
 Yes, as part of the ICVS analysis
 No

31. If the survey results have been made public, what margin of error was adopted in presenting the results?

32. Additional comments:

Part 2 - Questions on VAW

1. Was the information on gender-based violence recorded for men as well?

- Yes, Was the same questionnaire used?
- No

2. Were quality performance indicators calculated during and after the fieldwork?

- Yes, Please indicate how often these indicators were calculated?
 - every day
 - every week
 - end of survey
 - other
- No

3. Were specific tools used to check the interviewers behavior and performance?

- Yes, Please describe.
- No

4. What kind of professional expertise was used in carrying out the training of interviewers?

- Statistician
- Medical doctor
- Psychologists
- Community services
- Sociologists
- Other

5. Were special arrangements made to ensure confidentiality of respondents and safety of women?

Confidentiality:

- Yes, Please specify.
- No

Safety:

- Yes, Please specify.
- No

6. Were the following indicators produced/disseminated?

Prevalence of violence:

- Yes, Please specify.
- No

Incidence of violence:

- Yes, Please specify.
- No

Severity of violence:

- Yes, Please specify.
- No

Attitude towards violence:

- Yes, Please specify.
- No

Others:

- Yes, Please specify.
- No

Table 1. Were the following topics included in the Survey/Module?

Number of incidents	Was it included in the survey?		Definition	Comments
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
Injuries	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
Fear of bodily harm or death	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
Victims use of medical services	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
Victims use of social, government services	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
Victims reporting to anyone (friends, family)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
Victims need to take time off from daily activities	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
Victims reporting to the police	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
Charges brought against the offender	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
Attitude towards gender-based violence	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		

Table 2. What types of perpetrators were identified in the Survey/Module?

	Was it identified in the survey?		Comments
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Husband/partner	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Sons/daughters fathered by husband/partner	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Own sons/daughters fathered by non-current husband/partner	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Sons/Daughters of current husband/partner (not one's own)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Father or my husband/partner's father	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Mother my husband/partner's mother	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Brothers/sisters or brothers/sisters-in-law	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Other family members	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Ex husband or ex-partner	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Friends	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Neighbor	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Acquaintances at work or school	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Stranger	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
Other	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	

Table 3. Please provide the following information related to responses and non-responses.

	Number
Complete interviews	
Interrupted interviews	
Refusals	
Household contacted but without an interview	
Household not reached	
Total number of households included in the sample	

We are interested in the collection of data on definitions used on violence and its specific components. In the table below we present different types of violence and would like to know if each of the individual component was included in the Survey. We would appreciate if the prevalence rate over specified period of time (6-month, 1-year, 3-year, 5-year and lifetime) could also be reported.

Table 4. Definitions and prevalence of violence by recall periods: 6-month, 1-year, 3-year, 5-year and Lifetime rates.

Type of violence	Was it included in the survey?		Prevalence of women who experienced violence according to the reference period used in the survey.					Comments
			6 month	1 year	3 years	5 years	Lifetime	
Physical Violence								
Pushed, grabbed, shoved	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Threatened to hit	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Threw something	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Slapped	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Kicked, bit or hit	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Hit with something	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Beat up	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Choked	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Used or threatened with a gun or knife	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Other	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Sexual Violence								
Physically forced to have sexual intercourse when she did not want to	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Had sexual intercourse when she did want to but she was afraid of what partner might do	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Was forced to do something sexual that she found degrading or humiliating	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Other	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Psychological Violence : control	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
- including psychological harassment	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Isolates her	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Torments her constantly	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Hinders her from visiting her family or to keep in touch with friends and neighbors	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Ignores her or treated her indifferently	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Got angry when she spoke with another man	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Expected her to ask permission before seeking health care for herself	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Decides what she can do or not do	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Emotional blackmail	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Other	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Psychological Violence : berating								
Verbal abuse	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Humiliates her	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
- Says that what she does is always wrong	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						

Doesn't care about her needs (you have the worst place at home, the worst of the meals, etc.).	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Blames her in front of your children	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Perpetrator has done things to scare or intimidate her on purpose	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Perpetrator has threatened to hurt someone she cared about	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Other	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Stalking								
Followed or spied on her	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Sent her unsolicited letters or written correspondence	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Made unsolicited phone calls to her	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Stood outside her home, school, or workplace	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Left unwanted items for her to find	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Tried to communicate in other ways against her will	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Vandalized her property or destroyed something she loved	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Made direct or indirect threats to harm her, her children, relatives, friends or pets	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Other	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Economic Violence								
Doesn't value her work	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Refuses to let her go out to work	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Takes the money she earn	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Does not pay his fair share of the household expenses	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Doesn't value her work	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						
Other	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>						

Please attach the questionnaire used for the survey, the interview manual and any other material relevant for a better understanding of the methodology used (in the original language and in English if available)
