



Department of Sociology



On-Line Papers – Copyright

This online paper may be cited or briefly quoted in line with the usual academic conventions. You may also download them for your own personal use. This paper must not be published elsewhere (e.g. to mailing lists, bulletin boards etc.) without the author's explicit permission.

Please note that if you copy this paper you must:

- include this copyright note
- not use the paper for commercial purposes or gain in any way
- you should observe the conventions of academic citation in a version of the following form:

Sylvia Walby, 'Developing Indicators on Violence Against Women', published by the Department of Sociology, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YL, UK at <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fss/sociology/papers/walby-Indicatorsgenderbasedviolence.pdf>

Publication Details

This web page was last revised on 1st February 2007.

Developing Indicators on Violence Against Women

Sylvia Walby

Professor Sylvia Walby

Department of Sociology

Lancaster University

Lancaster LA1 4YD, UK

S.Walby@lancaster.ac.uk



DEVELOPING INDICATORS ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

INTRODUCTION

This paper is a contribution to the development of indicators of violence against women. It provides an overview of the current discussion concerning the purpose, role and development of indicators on violence against women. It summarises the relevant literature, providing an overview of current and proposed indicators, their advantages and disadvantages, and their relationship with data. It concludes with recommendations as to the role of indicators and possible processes for their development.

THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF INDICATORS

Why indicators?

Indicators summarise complex data into a form that is meaningful for policy makers. They constitute a key link between an evidence base and policy making. There have been many policy innovations to reduce and eliminate violence against women; much political good-will; and much rhetoric. In order to decide whether initiatives are having a positive impact it is necessary to know whether the situation is deteriorating or improving. There are many forms and types of knowledge about the nature of violence against women and the policies to stop this. Often these data are too complicated to support the decision-making of policy makers without the input of considerable time and expertise. The purpose of indicators is that they provide a simple summary of a complex picture, abstracting and presenting in a clear manner the most important features needed to support decision-making (Berger-Schmitt and Jankowitsch 1999; Luxembourg Presidency 2005; UN Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean 2004; Statistics Canada 2002; Walby 2005a).

The UN General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to conduct an in-depth study on all forms of violence against women, including a statistical overview (UN 2003). In order to achieve this, it is necessary to consider the development of indicators that effectively summarise the complex data. The collection of statistics on violence against women is part of the process of developing institutional mechanisms for the advancement of women, agreed by governments in the 1995 UN Platform for Action (UN 1995). The development of indicators on violence against women has been recommended by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR 2003). Further, indicators are needed in order to make links with related policy agendas, such as the Millennium Development Goals.

Indicators have been used to good effect in several policy domains. For example, the indicators used in the Millennium Development Goals have helped to provide a clear focus for policy action, helping to build a clear sense of direction within a specific time-frame, facilitating the involvement of numerous diverse policy actors. A further example is that of the Structural Indicators used by the European Union which are used to define common targets, to be achieved by diverse policy instruments.

What criteria?

Several criteria for the selection of the indicators have been developed (Berger-Schmitt and Jankowitsch 1999; UN Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean 2004; Statistics Canada 2002). In general, indicators should:

- Summarise complex data.
- Be unambiguous and easy to interpret.



- Enable an assessment as to whether an improvement or deterioration has occurred.
- Be meaningful and relevant to policy makers, service providers and the wider informed public.
- Be capable of being supported by reliable and robust quantitative data.
- Be available at regular intervals and be comparable between countries and population groups.
- Be neither so many as to confuse, nor so few as to mislead.

Disadvantages of indicators?

The main potential disadvantage of indicators is if they are inappropriate and thus misleading. This can happen if the process of simplification and abstraction is poorly done. It can also happen if the data to support the indicators is inaccurate and/or insufficient.

TYPES OF INDICATORS

Introduction

This section introduces the main types of indicators in general, prior to the detailing of specific proposals for indicators on violence against women by existing governmental and non-governmental bodies. There are two major kinds of indicators:

- Outcomes
- Policy actions

Indicators of outcomes are the more usual type of indicators (e.g. Millennium Development Goals). The concern is to measure the extent of the phenomenon of interest, how it changes over time and compares between countries or social groups.

Indicators of policy actions have also been proposed. These are more common in policy domains where quantitative measures of the extent of the phenomenon of interest are under-developed, unreliable or non-existent.

Indicators of types of outcome

Indicators of outcome in relation to violence against women may focus on one of:

- Prevalence
- Number of incidents per population unit
- Severity and impact

Prevalence is the proportion of a specific population (e.g. all women, women aged 16-59; ever married women) that suffered violence in a specific time period (e.g. ever, since 16, the last year). The number of incidents per population unit is different from prevalence in that it takes into account that there may be multiple incidents against a person. Severity and impact may be measured in a number of ways, including frequency, level of injury, and generation of fear.

A proxy measure of outcome is when the phenomenon measured is different from the one of interest, but which is expected to co-vary with this.



Indicators of Policy Actions

A wide variety of policy activities to reduce and eliminate violence against women may be measured, including the actions taken by the criminal justice and civil justice systems, the health system, and the provision of refuges and other forms of sanctuary.

PROPOSED INDICATORS BY SOURCE

Proposals for indicators of violence against women have been developed by a number of governmental and non-governmental bodies. In addition, surveys of violence against women often include 'headline' figures when reports are published, which have some similarities with indicators. The report focuses on indicators produced by the following: European Union; European Women's Lobby; Statistics Canada; the US Centers for Disease Control and National Center for Injury Prevention and Control; UK government; UN Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean; United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees; and the UNDAW Expert Group on good practices.

European Union

The Council of the European Union agreed in 1998 to develop a set of indicators and benchmarks in order to monitor the implementation of the 1995 UN Beijing Platform for Action, including violence against women. Since then several EU Presidencies (Spanish, Danish, Irish, Greek, Dutch), in association with the Commission, Council and a High Level Group on gender mainstreaming, have made progress on the development of indicators on violence against women (Presidencia de la Unión Europea 2002; European Union 2004).

Three indicators on domestic violence were adopted in 2002:

- the number of female victims;
- types of victim support;
- measures to end violence.

There are proposals for three indicators on sexual harassment in the workplace:

- The percentage of employees who report incidents of sexual harassment.
- The percentage of private and public enterprises that have a policy on sexual harassment.
- The percentage of private and public enterprises that have procedures for sanctions for perpetrators of sexual harassment.

While some ad hoc data on violence against women has been collected at the national level by surveys, there is no regularly collected data at EU-level to support any of these six indicators.

European Women's Lobby

The European Women's Lobby (EWL) produced a 'Proposal for a policy framework and indicators in the areas of legislation, justice, service provision, training of professionals, civil society, data collection and prevention' as part of its strategy 'towards a common European framework to measure progress on violence against women.' The indicators concern policy development, rather than outcomes, and are qualitative rather than quantitative. Eleven policy domains and associated indicators are identified (see below), within each of which several sub-indicators (not listed here).



1. Policy: National Action Plan on violence against women.
2. Budgets: Budget allocated to violence against women, as a percentage of Gross Domestic Product.
3. Legislative framework: Legislation.
4. Remedies for redress: Complaints lodged to the police.
5. Criminal and civil justice system: classification of actors of violence that are recognised as a crime; criminal justice; outcomes of the Criminal Justice System; Civil Justice; Outcomes of Civil Justice; High Court; Duration of the justice system; Victim protection (during the course of justice).
6. Training of Professionals: Professional categories in the following areas: law enforcement officers; police personnel; justice personnel; health workers; (other) statutory bodies such as social workers, interpreters.
7. Service provision: Shelters/refuges; Other service provision.
8. Women's Diversity: Migrant women; women asylum seekers; women in institutions, including in care, elderly women in homes, prisoners, mental hospitals; women victims of trafficking for the purpose of sexual exploitation; trafficking in women for the purpose of marriages, domestic slavery.
9. Civil Society – Women's Non Governmental Organisations: state support to NGOs; Practices within NGOs.
10. Data collection: Statistics; Research.
11. Prevention: Raising public awareness; Education Programmes.

Statistics Canada

Statistics Canada (2002) recommends indicators for six themes:

- Severity and prevalence of violence against women
- Impact of violence against women
- Risk factors associated with violence against women
- Institutional and community-based resources
- Victims' use of services
- Public attitudes and perceptions

The report provides a wide range of detailed data under each heading, drawn from two large scale national surveys. The focus is on the question of whether or not there has been a reduction in the violence.

The prevalence figure is based on any experience of physical or sexual violence since the age of 16. Much of the data is focused on spousal violence, defined broadly so as to include both marital and common-law unions. The measures of severity include a modified Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS). There is also data on prevalence in the last year. There is a separate section on homicide, using data from sources other than surveys. The impact measures include self-reported levels of psychological impact and fear, physical injury, whether injuries were medically treated, whether there was time off work, and also the economic cost of the violence. The report identifies gaps in data supporting the indicators.

US Centers for Disease Control, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control

Saltzman et al (2002) provide a uniform definition of intimate partner violence in order to promote consistency in the use of terminology and data collection, in a report sponsored by the US Centers for Disease Control, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, and based on extensive consultation, primarily within the US.

The report is concerned with that sub-set of violence against women that is intimate partner violence (IPV), not the full range of violence against women. Each of the terms is carefully and fully defined. The recommendation is to collect data on:



- the number of people affected by IPV,
- the characteristics of such people,
- the number and type of IPV episodes,
- the associated injuries,
- other consequences.

UK government

The UK government (2004) intends to have a set of performance indicators against which to measure the medium and long-term success of its domestic violence strategy. In some instances the indicator could be supported by already existing data; in others the data would need to be collected; hence there is not as yet a published account of the full list of indicators supported by data. The proposed indicators are below together with an account of whether there is published data to support them:

- Homicides as a result of domestic violence (data available annually from published *Criminal Statistics*);
- Headline prevalence of domestic violence (as measured by the British Crime Survey (BCS) Inter-Personal Violence module) (a recent addition to the annual crime survey, the findings of which are usually published);
- Numbers of (a) young people and (b) all people who think that violence is acceptable in some circumstances (data will become available annually from the recent addition to the BCS);
- Percentage of domestic violence incidents with a power of arrest where an arrest was made related to incident and, of this, the percentage of partner-on-partner violence (within the Policing Performance Assessment Framework) (data currently collected annually by the police).
- A new indicator covering rates of attrition in domestic violence (no data on this yet published);
- The number of civil orders made (data published annually by the Department of Constitutional Affairs);
- A new Best Value Performance Indicator designed to assess the overall effectiveness of local authority services to domestic violence victims (the new indicator has yet to be applied to all local authorities);
- An indicator relating to victim satisfaction with the support they have received from key agencies (no data on this yet published).

UN Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean

The UN Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean produced a report on the reasons why it is important to measure violence against women, containing a review of existing practices in Latin America together with recommendations (Alm eras, Bravo, Milosavjevic, Monta o and Rico 2004). The report draws on a number of national surveys of violence against women, which have been carried out in Latin America and the Caribbean. These use a variety of definitions. It presents proposals for indicators for future data collection, rather than providing indicators for which the relevant data already exists.

They focus on one sub-set of violence against women, that of intimate partner violence. They propose five indicators capturing various dimensions of incidence: the rate of violence; the rate of physical violence; the rate of psychological violence; the rate of sexual violence; the rate of unreported violence. They recommend disaggregating these measures of incidence by selected characteristics, including: geographical area; poverty status of households; age of women; activity status; pregnancy status; racial and ethnic group; and relationship with aggressor.

They propose four additional indicators based on administrative records for estimating the incidence of demand being met by care services: rate of demand for care; rate of demand for care in relation to physical violence; rate of demand for care in relation to sexual violence;



rate of demand for care in relation to psychological violence. Each of these is calculated as the number of women who received relevant services as proportion of the population.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (2003) reported on guidelines for prevention and response to sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) against refugees, returnees and internally displaced persons. Within the guidelines was a strong requirement for effective documentation of the extent and nature of such abuse. The document presents a clear set of definitions of different forms of SGBV, including sexual violence, physical violence, emotional and psychological violence, harmful traditional practices, and socio-economic violence, together with a set of reporting tools. A key indicator is that of the 'sexual and gender-based report rate' which is based on the number of incidents of SGBV in a population during a designated time period (month, year etc), expressed as a number of incidents per 10,000 persons during that time period.

UNDAW Expert Group on Good Practices

The UNDAW (2005b) Expert Group on 'Good practices in combating and eliminating violence against women' noted that 'the need for agreed indicators is pressing'. They recommend several types of indicators of good practices including:

Legal framework:

- Whether the legal framework reaches minimum standards with respect to gender equality and violence against women, including whether customary laws conflict, or in harmony, with the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.
- Number of officially recorded cases and the proportion prosecuted and convicted.
- Number of perpetrators completing re-education programmes and the number of these re-offending
- Number of asylum applications granted and refused on grounds of gender-related persecution
- Number of trafficked women identified, proportion repatriated and proportion given permission to remain in the country of destination.

Services

- Number of NGOs working in the field and their funding
- Number of shelter places per 100,000 population
- Extent of provision of services, including sexual assault centres, advocacy projects
- Number of cases dealt with by services
- Training of staff: extent to which it takes place.

Prevention

- Prevention projects
- The size and proportion of relevant budgets allocated to prevention.

Women's Experiences of Provision

- Women's sense of safety and satisfaction with services
- Whether length of time from onset of abuse to seeking help is falling
- Increase in activity and services and in their effectiveness

Proxy Indicator (Ellsberg)

There is a proposal for a proxy indicator of violence against women: attitudes towards violence against women (Ellsberg 2005). The potential advantage of this indicator is that it might be easier to collect survey evidence of attitudes towards violence against women than collecting data on its occurrence. The disadvantage is that the relationship between attitudes and practice is not definite and might be expected to vary over time and between countries (UN 2005).



Survey Statistics

There are many national surveys that report a range of statistics on violence against women. On publication, some of these surveys highlight a limited number of statistics. Although these 'survey highlights' are not called indicators, nonetheless they are intended to be indicative or representative in some way of the more complex and detailed data available from the survey. Of the many surveys, just three examples are reported here.

The main summary statistic used in the Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) (in Cambodia, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Haiti, India, Nicaragua, Peru and Zambia) is that of the prevalence of domestic violence from spouses and partners among ever married women aged 15-49, ever (Kishor and Johnson 2004). Data is also presented on such violence in the last year; and on sexual violence from a spouse. The severity of the violence is measured in several ways including: a modified version of the Conflict Tactics Scale; the number of incidents in the last 12 months; and the seriousness of injuries. They also report on help seeking and the use of services.

The World Health Organization (WHO) multi-country (Bangladesh, Brazil, Japan, Namibia, Peru, Samoa, Tanzania, Thailand) study on women's health and domestic violence is intending to report on the life-time and last year prevalence and frequency of violence against women aged 15-19 from intimate partners and others (Garcia-Moreno et al 2003).

The UK British Crime Survey special module on domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking reported both prevalence rate (with the emphasis on last year, though experience since 16 is also reported), and the number of incidents (Walby and Allen 2004). The prevalence rate is expressed as a proportion of the population aged 16-59, disaggregated by gender. There were several measures of severity, including a modified version of the Conflict Tactics Scale; frequency; and the seriousness of injuries. They also report on help seeking and the use of services. A shorter version of this special module on domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking is now running as a component of the British Crime Survey on an annual basis.

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF VARIOUS INDICATORS IN THE LIGHT OF DATA REQUIREMENTS AND CONSTRAINTS

Indicators of the extent of violence against women

There are several areas where the definition of indicators (and summary statistics) concerning the amount of violence against women diverges between proposals, and where a consensus needs to be established in order to achieve consistency. The following discussion is intended primarily to map the terrain of the debate on indicators of the extent of violence against women so that it may be more effectively focused. In addition some tentative conclusions are drawn. The main areas under technical discussion are as follows:

- the range of types of violence;
- the range of types of perpetrator, especially in relation to domestic violence;
- prevalence and/or incidents;
- the measurement of severity;
- time period: life-time or last year.
- Population sub-set: age and marital status

Range of forms of violence: There is an issue as to the breadth of range of forms of violence that can be effectively included in just a few indicators. The definition used by the UN in the 1993 Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women was: 'Any act of gender-



based violence that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual or mental harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or private life' (United Nations 1993). It is important to have a policy statement that is inclusive of many different forms of violence against women, including domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sexual harassment in the workplace, female genital mutilation, dowry deaths and so-called honour crimes. However, operationalising this range of forms of violence within a limited number of indicators is very challenging. Many indicators have focused on the more common forms of violence, such as domestic violence, in order to have sufficient cases each year to enable the development of a robust and comparable 'rate'. The greater the number of indicators, the wider the range of forms that can be included, however, the development of indicators for types of violence that are less common has the disadvantage that they might not be reliable, because of the small numbers that would be reported to a survey. The detailing of the specificity of the cultural form that violence might take has both the advantage of being close to the experiences of the women affected as well as the disadvantage of potentially being used to stigmatise more marginal communities.

Range of perpetrators: There is a choice between a narrow or wide range of perpetrators: first, a specific focus on intimate partner (including former partners) violence; second, the inclusion of all family and household members, thereby including violence between generations; third, any perpetrator; fourth, to confine the analysis to that against women, or to include children and men as potential victims. Violence from intimate partners is a sub-set of the full range of gender-based violence. A focus on intimate partners provides a clear and specific focus, but if the full range of sexual violence and so-called honour crimes are to be included, then the restriction to intimate partners is too narrow. However, if all types of perpetrators and victims/survivors are included then there is a danger of losing the gender-based focus.

Prevalence and incidents: The measurement of the extent of violence against women is sometimes focused on prevalence, that is, the proportion of the population that has experienced violence in a given period, usually either (adult) life-time or the previous year. This figure, which ranges from around one quarter to one half of women in their life-time, has been important in the establishment of the scale of the problem (Krug et al 2002) and in raising consciousness about the issue (Garcia-Moreno et al 2003). The concept of prevalence needs to be distinguished from that of incidence (Hélie, Clément and Larrivée 2003). The notion of prevalence captures the particular and specialised nature of domestic violence as a coercive course of conduct, a series of related occurrences, rather than a one-off event. However, prevalence is not a concept widely used in the related domain of criminal justice. The counting of the number of incidents, rather than the prevalence rate, is the more usual approach in crime statistics. If domestic violence enters crime statistics as a 'course of conduct', then it counts as just one crime incident, even though there are usually several events. In this way, the repetition and frequency of the attacks disappears from view thereby leading to underestimates of the extent of violent crime and domestic violent crime in particular. It is important to include as indicators the number of incidents as well as the prevalence rate, not just one or the other, if the extent of violence against women is to be adequately represented in mainline criminal statistics.

Severity and impact: There are several ways in which the severity of violence against women may be represented in indicators. In relation to domestic violence, the most frequently used scaling is that of the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS), used in US surveys in 1975 and 1985 (Gelles and Straus 1990) and included as an element, albeit in modified forms, in many later surveys (Johnson 1996; Kishor and Johnson 2004; Walby and Myhill 2001). The CTS consists of a list of items (slightly varied in different versions) of which the latter are regarded as violence. The violent items are: L pushed, grabbed, or shoved him/her/you; M slapped him/her/you; N Kicked, bit, or hit him/her/you with a fist; O Hit or tried to hit him/her/you with something; P Beat him/her/you up; Q Choked him/her/you; R Threatened him/her/you with a knife or gun; S Used a knife or fired a gun. However, several problems have been identified



with this scale. Its use may produce spurious gender symmetry. It may not fully take meaning and context into account; the impact of the act may vary; women are much more likely to be frightened and stay frightened than men; the same act is associated with different amounts of injury when men or women are the perpetrators. The scale omits some forms of domestic violence, such as sexual assault and stalking. Finally, since the scale is unique to domestic violence, it makes comparisons with other forms of violence difficult. One key alternative measure of severity is that of the level of physical (and mental) injuries caused by the violent assaults. The use of injury as an impact measure has two advantages in particular: it avoids the problem of the differential gender impact of the same act; and it enables easier linkage to mainstream crime concepts, since the scaling of violent crimes usually includes the level of injury as a key element. A further important measure of impact is that of the frequency of the attack.

Time-period: There is a choice as to whether the focus is on experience over a life-time or last year. The life-time measures are important in establishing the scale of the problem and raising its priority (Garcia-Moreno et al 2003). By contrast, evaluation of innovative policies requires regular measurements of the amount of violence against women over time, for which the 'last year' rates are more appropriate. However, reliable data over the shorter time period requires a much larger sample size, because of the lower proportion experiencing violence last year as compared with over a life-time, and thus entails a more expensive survey. This issue highlights the practical resource issues in the development of the methods by which data on violence against women is collected. While many countries have now conducted one-off surveys of the life-time prevalence of violence against women (Garcia-Moreno et al 2003; Krug et al 2002; Presidencia de la Unión Europa 2002a, 2002), the collection of adequate data on an annual basis is extremely rare, with annually collected data being almost entirely confined to methods, such as generic crime surveys, which are known to underestimate the levels of violence against women (Walby and Myhill 2001). It was striking that national country reports from Europe to Beijing+10 repeatedly emphasised the extent of policy innovation in relation to violence against women, but provided *little if any evidence* as to their effectiveness (Luxembourg Presidency 2005). The challenge is to develop methods to generate adequate annual data, ideally internationally comparable, using a realistically available amount of resource.

Population sub-groups e.g. age and marital status. There are practical issues in survey methodology, which have resulted in the surveyed population being restricted in some ways. In particular, some have only collected data from women in a specific age range, omitting older women, while others have been confined to married women, when the focus has been domestic violence. While ideally there would be no age limitation, the practicalities of surveys mean that this is likely to remain a common practice. The restriction to ever-married women is overly restrictive if the focus is a wider range of violence against women.

Data to support indicators of the extent of violence against women

There are now many nationally representative sample surveys of violence against women. The methodology has reached a high level of sophistication (UN 2005a), though there remain a series of methodological dilemmas and challenges (Garcia-Moreno et al 2003; Johnson 1996; Straus and Gelles 1990; Walby 2005b; Walby and Myhill 2001). In the development of survey methodology the priorities are the use of a comprehensive sampling frame and the use of modes of enquiry that generate a high response rate, so as to include the more marginal groups of women who are most likely to have been at risk. In the delivery of the questionnaire, the methodological priority is to prioritise confidentiality in order to facilitate disclosure; this is confidentiality not only from other household members, but also from the interviewer. The need for annual surveys in order to generate data about experiences last year, not only across the life-time, brings a sharp focus to the issue of cost and the advantages of mainstreaming. Hybrid surveys, in which special modules are attached to mainline surveys, enable annual collection of data, while maintaining specialist framing and modes of questioning, especially that of self-completion.



The lack of robust data to support the proposed indicators in most countries at the current time constitutes a serious problem for the project of the development of an indicator. If there is no data, then there is no indicator. The consequences of poor data for indicators of outcomes are much worse than for poor data for indicators of policy actions. If there is poor data on the amount of violence against women, which is much more likely to involve the under-counting rather than the over-counting of the amount of violence against women, then the indicators would be unreliable and misleading, perhaps producing falsely-based complacency. Indeed there are fears that there might be a perverse incentive for official surveys to undercount the amount of violence against women, in order for a country to look good in the eyes of the international community, with detrimental consequences for the development of effective policy. For this reason, some have argued for indicators for policy only.

One response to this issue is to suggest that the development of the indicator will help to drive forward the improvement of the process of data collection. Indeed if there were a UN indicator, then national statistical offices might be more likely to put in the resources and to develop the capacity needed to conduct effective surveys of the amount and nature of violence against women.

Data to support policy indicators

The sources of data for indicators of policy actions are diverse. Some of this information could derive from administrative sources, based on routine record keeping by state and non-governmental bodies running services. This might include the criminal justice system, civil legal system, health system, providers of refuge and support. However, currently, this data is rarely routinely collected in a way that allows for the identification of the use of services by women who have suffered violence. There would be a need to develop substantial capacity in this area in order to obtain the data needed to support the indicators of policy actions. However, they do not face the problem of perverse incentives as in the case of the indicators on the extent of violence against women.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The development of indicators and methods of collecting quantitative data on violence against women is central to both robust evaluation of policy developments and to the development of explanations. There is an extensive debate on this issue (UN 2005a, 2005b). In conclusion, this paper makes a series of recommendations.

Indicators of the violence against women need:

- to measure its extent, both the prevalence rate and the number of incidents per population unit;
- to measure severity, by including both injury levels (physical and sexual) and frequency;
- to distinguish between acts carried out by intimate partners (including former partners), from other family or household members, and by other people;
- to encompass events over the last year, as well as the life-time.

The reliability of these indicators depends upon the data collected to support them. This requires the development of high quality surveys, which use sophisticated methods, to agreed international standards, and which are carried out regularly, perhaps annually.

Indicators of policy actions need to include:



- services to shelter and support victims e.g. the number of shelter places per 100,000 population; provision of advocacy services.
- the actions of the criminal justice system, civil legal system and health systems e.g. whether the legal system reaches CEDAW standards in relation to gender based violence; the attrition rate of cases in the legal system; training of staff.
- the budgetary allocations to support services.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alm3ras, Diane, Rosa Bravo, Vivian Milosavljevic, Sonia Monta1o and Maria Nieves Rico (2004) *Violence Against Women in Couples: Latin America and the Caribbean. A Proposal for Measuring its Incidence and Trends*. *Mujer y desarrollo* 40. (Santiago, Chile: UN Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean).

Berger-Schmitt, R. and Jankowitsch, B. (1999) *Systems of Social Indicators and Social Reporting: The State of the Art*. EUReporting Working Paper No.1. Mannheim: Centre for Survey Research and Methodology.

European Union (2004) *Council Resolution on the review of the implementation by the Member States and the EU institutions of the Beijing Platform for Action*. 1502/04. SOC 558. JAI 497. Brussels.

European Women's Lobby (EWL) (2003) *Proposal for a Policy Framework and Indicators in the Areas of Budgets, Legislation, Justice, Service Provision, Training of Professionals, Civil Society, Data Collection and Prevention*. (Brussels: European Women's Lobby).

Garcia-Moreno, Claudia, Charlotte Watts, Henriette Jansen, Mary Ellsberg and Lori Heise (2003) 'Responding to violence against women: WHO's multicountry study on women's health and domestic violence', *Health and Human Rights*, 6, 2, 113-127.

H3lie, Sonia, Marie-Eve Cl3ment, and Marie-Claude Larriv3e (2003) 'Epidemiological considerations in the conceptualization and utilization of "prevalence" and "incidence rate" in family violence research: A reply to Brownridge and Halli (1999)', *Journal of Family Violence*, 18, 4, 219-225.

Johnson, H. (1996) *Dangerous Domains - Violence Against Women in Canada*. (Canada: Nelson Canada).

Kishor, Sunita and Kiersten Johnson (2004) *Profiling Domestic Violence: A Multi-Country Study*. (Calverton US: Measure DHS+, ORC Macro).

Krug, Etienne G., Linda L. Dahlberg, James A. Mercy, Anthony B. Zwi and Rafael Lozano (eds) (2002) *World Report on Violence and Health*. (World Health Organization: Geneva, WHO).

Luxembourg Presidency (2005) *Report of the Luxembourg Presidency on the Progress made by the Enlarged EU following the Beijing Platform for Action (Beijing +10)*. Prepared by: Anne Marie Theisen, Nadine Spoden, Mieke Verloo and Sylvia Walby. Luxembourg: Luxembourg Presidency.

Millennium Development Goals (2005) *Millennium Development Goals*. Accessed at: www.developmentgoals.org

Presidencia de la Uni3n Europea (EU Presidency) (2002) *Good Practice Guide to Mitigate the Effects of and Eradicate Violence Against Women*. Paper prepared by the Institute of Women, Spanish Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs and by Mar3a Diaz Aguado and Rosario Mart3nez Arias of the Universidad Complutense de Madrid. Accessed at <http://www.mtas.es/mujer/guiain.pdf>

Saltzman, Linda E., Fanslow, Janet L., McMahon, Pamela M., and Shelley, Gene A. (1999) *Intimate Partner Violence Surveillance Uniform Definitions and Recommended Data Elements, Version 1.0*. (2nd printing with revisions 2002). (National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: Atlanta, USA).

Statistics Canada (2002) *Assessing Violence Against Women: A Statistical Profile*. Federal Provincial Territorial Ministers Responsible for the Status of Women and Statistics Canada. (Ottawa: Statistics Canada).

Straus, M.A. and Gelles, R.J. (eds) (1990) *Physical Violence In American Families*. (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers).

UK (2004) Answer to a Parliamentary Question: accessed at <http://www.crimereduction.gov.uk/dv12e.htm>

United Nations General Assembly (1993) *Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women*. UN General Assembly 20 Dec 1993. UN Doc. A/RES/48/104. (New York: UN).



United Nations Division for the Advancement of Women (2005a) Report of Expert Group on 'Violence against women: a statistical overview, challenges and gaps in data collection and methodology and approaches for overcoming them'. 11-14 April 2005, Geneva Switzerland.

United Nations Division for the Advancement of Women (2005b) Report of Expert Group on 'Good practices in combating and eliminating violence against women'. 17-20 May 2005, Vienna Austria.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (2003) *Sexual and Gender-Based Violence against Refugees, Returnees and Internally Displaced Persons*. (Geneva: UNHCR).

Walby, Sylvia (2005a) 'Measuring women's progress in a global era', *International Social Science Journal*, June, 184, 371-387.

Walby, Sylvia (2005b) 'Improving the statistics on violence against women', *Statistical Journal of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe*, 23, 3-4.

Walby, Sylvia and Jonathan Allen (2004) *Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault and Stalking: Findings from the British Crime Survey*. Home Office Research Study 276. (London: Home Office).

<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs04/hors276.pdf>

Walby, Sylvia and A. Myhill (2001) 'Comparing the methodology of the new national surveys of violence against women', *British Journal of Criminology*, 41, 3, 502-22.