



WP4

BECAN Project

**“Balkan Epidemiological Study
on Child Abuse and Neglect”**

Grant agreement no.: 223478,

Collaborative Project

Social Work Department,
Faculty of Sociology and Social
Work, Babes-Bolyai University
January 2013



CASE-BASED SURVEILLANCE STUDY (CBSS): ROMANIAN REPORT

In the context of Achievement 4.2: “Incidence rates of reported and/or detected CAN cases, types of CAN and socio-demographic characteristics of families, in 9 Balkan countries” & Achievement 5.4: “Ten Reports of the researches results (9 National and 1 Balkan)” for the preparation of Deliverable 4.2: “Report on Incidence rates (on national and Balkan level) of reported CAN cases”

REPORT INFORMATION

Project

Project acronym:	BECAN
Project full title:	Balkan Epidemiological Study on Child Abuse and Neglect
Grant agreement no.:	223478
Funding scheme:	Collaborative Project
Project start date:	1-10-2009
Project duration:	40 months
Call topic:	Promoting healthy behaviour in children and adolescents, Implementation of research into healthcare practice, Trends of population health [HEALTH-2007-3.3-1, 3.1-1, 3.2-7]
Project web-site:	www.becan.eu

Report

Deliverable number:	4.2 (+ Achievements 4.2 and 5.4)
Deliverable title:	Report on Incidence rates (on national and Balkan level) of reported CAN cases
Due date of deliverable:	38 th Month
Actual submission date:	40 th Month
Authors:	[Gabriella Tonk, Julia Szigeti, Imola Antal, Maria Roth]
Beneficiary:	[Babes-Bolyai University, Romania]
Work Package no.:	4
Work Package title:	Case-based Surveillance
Work Package leader:	Institute of Child Health-Department of Mental Health & Social Welfare
WP Participants:	CRCA-AL, SWU-BG, UNIZG-HR, UniCIPsy-FYRoM, UBB-RO, FASPER-RS, AAHD-TR, FPN-BiE
Person-months deliverable:	for 306,76 (ICH- GR: 92, CRCA-AL: 11, SWU-BG: 8, UNIZG-HR: 34,36, UniCIPsy-FYRoM: 21, UBB-RO: 44,4, FASPER-RS: 40, AAHD-TR: 15, FPN-BiE: 41)
Dissemination level:	PU
Nature:	R
Version:	Final
No of pages (+ cover):	60
Keywords:	case, child abuse neglect (CAN), surveillance, incident, forms of maltreatment, caregiver, perpetrator, family, agencies, services, archives, databases

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Child abuse and neglect (CAN) constitutes a complex public health problem caused by numerous factors related to individual, family and community characteristics.^{i,ii} Although it has wider recognition in the northern hemisphere and in high-income countries, CAN occurs in every country across all social, cultural, religious and ethnic population-groups, resulting in immediate and long-term social, health and financial consequences.^{iii,iv}

Despite the importance of the problem, accurate estimates of its extent and characteristics in the general population are difficult to achieve mainly due to two reasons: a. the silence that surrounds maltreatment cases because of shame, social stigma and the consequent criminal liability leading to CAN underreporting and b. the lack of coordinated national CAN monitoring efforts that leads the majority of the world countries to have no valid and reliable data on its magnitude.^v

The Romanian national database which relies on the Quarterly monitoring report submitted by the county level general directorates for social assistance and child protection to the Ministry of Labor, Family and Social Protection is *not case-centered*, but it is the only one which has specific information about child abuse and neglect in Romania. The institutional and legal framework constitutes an important starting point for developing a national case-based surveillance system.

The actual database is missing important variables recommended by relevant studies in order to get a clearer image of the phenomenon of child abuse and neglect. Information is missing regarding the socio-economical status of the child victim (we have so far only sex, age and type of residence) and of the perpetrator. Nevertheless, we have more information on actions taken (decision of separation of the child of the family) and type of services provided. We don't have any information about services provided to other family members. But, due to the fact that the database is not case-centered, we can not know, what is the percentage of children have benefited from and what kind of services, if there is a correspondence between type of abuse and services provided etc. In one word, no analysis is possible, beyond the rough numbers of registered cases, which also does not reveal trends or evolutions and efficiency of the system, only the development of reporting capacity of institutions.

Scope of the CBSS

BECAN CBSS constitutes a systematic effort to a) collect CAN data from already existing archives and databases of the Romanian general directorates for social assistance and child protection which are the specialized units on county level responsible for child protection and promotion of children's rights and b) to map the existing surveillance mechanisms in Romania.

The primary aim of the CBSS is to measure all forms of CAN incidence rate, namely the number of children maltreated in a single year, including substantiated, suspected, and unsubstantiated cases based on already existing CAN surveillance practices for a specific time period.

The second aim of the study is to compare its results with the results of the epidemiological survey;

Method of data collection & analysis

The original national sample was compound of general directorates for social assistance and child protection from 16 counties and 1 sector of Bucharest. These institution were the only type which entered in the study, because according to law, all professionals and institutions has the duty to report abuse cases to these institutions (established in every county of Romania and every sector of Bucharest).

An estimation of number of abuse and neglect cases was made based on the official statistics of the first semester of 2010. Based on this data 4 counties were eliminated from the sample because there were very few files registered in the first semester of 2010 in comparison with the other counties (less then 20 cases).

One institution refused collaboration in terms of the methodology (namely to provide access for field researchers to files), although request was sent by the Ministry of Labor, Family and Social Protection which is a national partner of the project. Instead they offered to fill in the Information Extraction Form and send to the University, but we've got only two files from that county.

A total number of 288 files were included in the research, of those children who have born in 1995, 1993 and 2000, reported to be victims of abuse and neglect. Substantiated, unsubstantiated and cases under investigation were taken in consideration. The analysis of the national database has been made through document analysis.

Key findings

There is an evidence that efforts are made by the child protection departments to improve the condition of the child victim and her/his family, but there is no information regarding the adequacy, outcome and efficiency of this endeavor.

Regarding data presented above concerning characteristics of abuse, indicates that files are missing important information in a great extent. Although it is a well known fact that decision concerning the removal of child from family home is influenced by personal believes, it is inconsistent and prone to error (Fitch, D. 2006), assessment instruments which enable professionals to make better decisions are still missing in Romania.

The shortage of information concerning problems (behavioral, educational, substance abuse) that children exposed to violence are usually facing indicates an inadequacy between assessed needs and treatment plan which is developed for a child

Need assessment deriving from analysis of the present state of the CAN in the country based on discrepancies identified between epidemiological survey & case-based surveillance study suggests the improvement of the existing CAN Monitoring System at national aiming at follow up on the rates and characteristics of CAN and creation of a basis for assessment of the effectiveness and efficiency of any present or future CAN-related intervention and policy.

Recommendations

- Creating a common understanding of CAN among different sectors by developing common/compatible definitions and reporting mechanisms
- Improving the national CAN monitoring system to capture the trends and evolution of the phenomenon and of the response of the child protection system to CAN cases

improving secondary legislation by reviewing existing standards and methodologies and developing a toolkit for child protection specialists nationally applicable

CONTENTS

DOCUMENT INFORMATION

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CONTENTS

List of Tables

CHAPTER A: INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

A.1. The BECAN Project

A.2. CBSS in Romania: Background, Aim and Objectives

A.3. Current situation concerning CAN Monitoring System in Romania

A.4. The necessity for improvement of a National CAN Monitoring System

CHAPTER B. METHODOLOGY

B.1. Organization of CBSS in Romania

B1.1. Timeframe

B.1.2. Identification of Eligible Services-CBSS Data Sources

B.1.3. Preparation of the Romanian Research instruments

B.1.4. Train the Romanian Research Team

B.2. Process followed for Data Collection

CHAPTER C. CBSS RESULTS IN ROMANIA

C.1. Description of Participating Services & their Archives-Databases

C.2. CAN incidence in Romania

C.2.1. Children's vulnerability to CAN and to Specific Forms of Maltreatment

C.2.2. Child- CAN victims' characteristics

C.2.3. Characteristics of Families and Households of Maltreated Children

C.2.4. Characteristics of CAN-Perpetrators

C.2.5. Characteristics of Caregivers of Maltreated Children

C.2.6. Agencies involved in administration of CAN cases and Services provided to children-victims and their families

C.3. File completeness concerning the characteristics of the recorded CAN cases: lessons learned from the

missing values

CHAPTER D. CONCLUSIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS

Literature

ANNEXES

ANNEX I: List of Organizations that provided data

ANNEX II: Extraction Forms Part I & II

ANNEX III: Operations' Manual for Researchers

LIST OF TABLES

- Table C.1.1** Organizations/Services that participated in CBSS by providing access to their archives/databases by geographical area
- Table C.1.2** Profile of the Organizations/Services that provided data for the CBSS
- Table C.1.3** Main characteristics of Archives/Databases from which the data were derived
- Table C.2.1** Child maltreatment incidence per form of CAN, age, gender and geographical area
- Table C.2.2** Status of CAN's substantiation for children 11, 13 & 16 years old, per form of maltreatment and geographical area (for the year 2010)
- Table C.2.1.1** Single versus Multiple Forms of abuse per age, gender and geographical area
- Table C.2.1.2** Physical abuse: Specific types of physical abuse, injuries sustained and severity of injuries per gender and age (for the year 2010)
- Table C.2.1.3** Sexual abuse: Specific types of sexual abuse per gender and age (for the year 2010)
- Table C.2.1.4** Psychological abuse: Specific types of psychological abuse per gender, age and geographical area (for the year 2010)
- Table C.2.1.5** Neglect: Specific types of neglect per age, gender and geographical area (for the year 2010)
- Table C.2.1.6** Single and Multiple forms of abuse per gender, age and geographical area (for the year 2010)
- Table C.2.2.1** Child-CAN victims' characteristics per age and gender
- Table C.2.2.2** Child-physical abuse victims' characteristics
- Table C.2.2.3** Child-sexual abuse victims' characteristics
- Table C.2.2.4** Child-CAN psychological abuse victims' characteristics
- Table C.2.2.5** Child-neglect victims' characteristics
- Table C.2.3** Children-victims' Family and Household characteristics per form of maltreatment
- Table C.2.4** Perpetrators and Caregivers
- Table C.2.5.1** Perpetrators' characteristics per form of maltreatment
- Table C.2.5.2** Caregivers who are also Perpetrators' characteristics per form of maltreatment
- Table C.2.5.3** Caregivers' characteristics per form of maltreatment
- Table C.2.6.1** Agencies involved in CAN cases' administration per form of maltreatment
- Table C.2.6.2** Referrals made to services and services provided to children-victims and their families per form of maltreatment
- Table C.3** Availability of information concerning the characteristics of the recorded CAN cases

CHAPTER A: INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

A.2. CBSS in Romania: Background, Aim and Objectives

BECAN CBSS constitutes a systematic effort to a) collect CAN data from already existing archives and databases of the Romanian general directorates for social assistance and child protection which are the specialized units on county level responsible for child protection and promotion of children's rights and b) to map the existing surveillance mechanisms in Romania.

The primary aim of the CBSS is to measure all forms of CAN incidence rate, namely the number of children maltreated in a single year, including substantiated, suspected, and unsubstantiated cases based on already existing CAN surveillance practices for a specific time period.

The second aim of the study is to compare its results with the results of the epidemiological survey; in this manner the opportunity will be provided to test whether the non-systematic recording of CAN cases (reported/detected) in some of the participating countries and the more systematic surveillance in some others sufficiently depict the CAN incidence rates. Such a comparison is expected to reveal a more realistic picture concerning the difference between reported and hidden incidence of CAN cases in school-aged children nationally in the nine Balkan countries. Therefore, the results can be used as a "needs assessment" indicator in order to identify potential weaknesses of the existing surveillance mechanisms in each individual country, even for those that have already established a CAN surveillance system. The conclusions of the CBSS and the results of its comparison with the respective results of the epidemiological survey could be used for the development of a strategic plan in the context of the BECAN project suggesting the establishment of national permanent CAN monitoring systems in countries where no such systems exist or to improve already available systems. Furthermore, these data would operate as a starting point to enable the analysis of fundamental questions about the causes of variation between and within these countries, cultures and ethnic groups. Moreover, identification of the differences between the epidemiological survey and the CBSS results within each country and consequent comparison of these differences among countries could potentially indicate what works better in CAN surveillance and to assess the quality of the already existing CAN surveillance systems in terms of their usefulness, simplicity, flexibility, acceptability, sensitivity, specificity, representativeness, timeliness and resources, given that different methodologies, tools and mechanisms are currently employed for the monitoring of CAN.

Specific objectives of BECAN CBSS are:

- To identify CAN incidence rates, namely to quantify the size of the problem based on already existing data in the same geographical areas and for the same time period the epidemiological survey will be conducted in nine Balkan countries.
- To collect data on child maltreatment from a range of sources nationwide in each country about the characteristics of individual cases including case identity, child-, incident-, perpetrator(s)-, caregiver-, family-, household, previous maltreatment-, agencies involved- and services provided-related information (see also "indicators to be explored"). On the basis of this information the objective is to

outline the profile of maltreated children and their families, to identify potential risk factors and characteristics of groups at risk, to explore the severity of CAN in terms of duration and harm/injury and to outline investigation outcomes, including substantiation rates, placement in care, use of child welfare court, and criminal prosecution.

- To collect data related to characteristics of the existing surveillance systems targeting the outline of the current situation in the participating countries concerning CAN-surveillance infrastructures and identify common patterns and differences in the methods and tools used. Towards this objective, data are going to be collected concerning the identity of the agencies keeping CAN-related records, their legal status, the sector they belong to and their mission, their size (number of employees and the number of CAN cases turnover), the people who make the recording and whether they have received any special training in handling CAN cases, the sources of referrals, whether routine screening is being enforced and implemented and whether these agencies collect statistic data on CAN. Furthermore, data will be collected on characteristics of the records, namely the format of the record (database or archive, electronic or paper), the total time-period covered by the archive/database, whether a specific "CAN recording form" is used, the type of cases that are included in the record and whether further documentation accompanying the record is available in the agencies.

Indicators

The following are specific indicators suggested to be explored targeting:

- to measure the extent of CAN (total incidence and incidence per form of CAN and status of substantiation)
- to outline risks for CAN related to child, family and household, characteristics of perpetrator exposure to abuse
- to map the characteristics of existing archives/databases and agencies collecting CAN data or recording CAN cases

A.3. Current situation concerning CAN Monitoring System in Romania

Data system at the central level

Law number 272/2004 regarding the protection and promoting of the children rights is the one that stipulates the organization, functioning and responsibilities of the institutions specialized in the domain of the child protection both at the local and central level.

Until not very long ago, the institution responsible at the central level, specialized in this field was The National Authority for the Protection of the Family and Children Rights (ANPDC). The role of the institution was to create the legal background, coordinate and control the activity of protection and promotion of children's rights at a national level, as well as to monitor the way the children rights are respected. In this sense the ANPDC was responsible with the elaboration of the legislative projects,

methodologies, work guides for the service suppliers belonging to the domain. ANPDC also elaborated the national strategies and action plans, initiated programs through which it has financed the implementation of these strategies.

In the same time it has centralized information regarding the Child Protection system and the respect of Children's Rights on monthly, respectively yearly basis.

The Emergency Ordinance no. 68 from 30 June 2010 regulates the dissolution of the ANPDC and its reorganization within the Ministry of Education, Health and Family and Social Protection as a specialized organization.

Romania has a national statistics system regarding the respect for Children's Rights, including the right to protection since 2007.

Amongst collecting information from the central institutions that are connected to the child protection as the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Administration and Internal Affairs, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of External Affairs, Ministry of Health (see the third and fourth periodical report of Romania for the Children's Rights Committee), monitoring the respect of children's rights is realized through a specific mechanism of data collection.

The instrument used in the monitoring is the monthly monitoring sheet which has its actual form since 2007. The systematic registration of the information at the national level started in 2004.

From 2007 until now, there hasn't been an evaluation of the monitoring system and of the data that has been collected.

The monthly monitoring sheet is build upon the ONU Convention of Children's Rights that has the following chapters (see Appendix 1)

1. General implementing measures – contains data regarding the human resource engaged at the level of the local authorities with attributions regarding the child protection
2. Civil rights and freedoms- contains data regarding the child's birth and child's abandonment.
3. The family environment and alternative care – contains data about the children whose parents are working abroad, day care services, the residential type of services, data regarding the children that are separated beneficiary of special protection, data of abuse and neglect, homeless children.
4. Health and wellbeing - contains data about disabled children and children with HIV/AIDS, children that are exposed to risk situations (the type of situations that might lead to the separation of the child from its parents).

5. Spare time and cultural activities - contains data regarding playgrounds

6. Special protection measures – data regarding children that have committed a criminal offence but cannot yet be trialed; children that are Romanian citizens on the area of different foreign states who have been identified as victims of exploitation and trafficking, repatriated children, repatriated unaccompanied children and children that are accompanied by their families, intern trafficking – notification at DGASPC for intern child trafficking.

The data collection regarding abuse, neglect and child exploitation refer to children who come into contact with the child protection service, that need protection because they are at risk of being or have already been abused/neglected and whose parents do not have the capacity of offering them protection and the proper care as well as the ones that benefit from prevention measurements regarding family separation. The variables used for the collection of data regarding CAN are the following:

- The source of the notification (the child, the professionals, any individual, self denunciation) and the ways of notification (child support line, phone call to the usual telephone number of the organization)
- The children that have stayed with their families that benefit from child support
- Total number of children for which the DGASPC manager decide in favor of emergency foster care (and PIP services)
- The number of children for which the legal authority decided upon emergency foster care, using the presidential order while DGASPC is offering PIP services.
- The number of cases for which a criminal prosecution has been started
- The number of cases still in progress
- The number of closed cases
- The area where the abuse has taken place (family, AMP, Residential Services, Educational Units, the names of other units must be specified, other locations – have to be named)
- The distribution according to sex
- The distribution on age groups
- The services the child benefits from
 - Rehabilitation services (psychological counseling, psychotherapy, other types of therapy)
 - Medical services (other than rehabilitation services)
 - Educational services (school reintegration, guidance and preparation for a certain profession)
 - Juridical counseling / assistance

All these variables are divided in different types of abuse (physical abuse, emotional abuse, sexual abuse, neglect, exploitation through work, sexual exploitation, exploitation in the direction of committing delinquent acts.)The sheet also contains information regarding homeless children.

But because this is not a child centered system and also because the information related to the socio-demographical data is missing, the data regarding the abuse incident and the aggressor (see criteria ChildOnEurope), the data base does not offer too much information on abuse as a phenomenon in Romania or over the evolution of the protection system (G. Tonk., J. Adorjani, E. Laszlo J., 2012).

Another monitoring instrument, besides the Monitor Sheet is a Child Monitoring and Tracking Information System (CMTIS), a data base centered on the child benefiting from the special protection measures, but it does not contain specific information on abuse and neglect.

CMTIS has been built in 2006 within the frames of the partnership with the USA government, with the purpose of monitoring the evolution and the reform of the child protection system from Romania. It has three sections: children, staff and finance. The children section has the purpose of monitoring the evolution of the children who benefit from special protection measures (separated from their families). The data records allows the evolution of each case specifically, the changes regarding the child's foster care , the period of the protection measures, finalization of the intervention.

CMTIS contains all the details to identify the children that benefit from these sorts of services.

The data base has been set using special procedures within each DGASPC department in the country, the entrance is done by password and it can be accessed only by professionals. The passwords are asked from the ANPDC by the DGASPC managers, the ones responsible for the correct handling of the data base.

The professionals from within the DGASPC are responsible for supplying CMTIS with new data, on basis of the files of the children that benefit from these services. There is no unitary procedure regarding the way the form is filled in (the department responsible for filling in the date base, the people responsible, special security measures), these are established at county level. The way the data base is used is in agreement with the legislation in the field of protection of the information with a personal characteristic.

The percentage of the filling of the data base is approximately 80-90%.

The legislative frame of the data collection at local level

The attributions regarding the child protection at the local level are fulfilled by the organizations of social assistance and child protection at county level (DGASPC), these being the specialized

institutions that function under the authority of the county councils and have a juridical personality. DGASPC is the institution which has the role of implementing the politics and strategies regarding social care and child, family, elderly people and the disabled people protection.

The DGASPC have under their authority the residential institutions that protect the children that have been separated from their families. They also have responsibilities concerning the child that has been neglected, abused, exploited and the children who need special protection (have been separated from their families). These responsibilities are supplementing the responsibilities of the local councils in larger and smaller towns. From this reason, the collaboration between these institutions is essential. Law number 272/2004 stipulates the necessity of the existence of the Public and Social Assistance Services (SPAS) that are under the authority of the local councils; at the level of smaller towns there have to be at least 3 people with social assistance attributions.

The role of SPAS is to monitor and ensure that the children rights are respected, that families are informed regarding the children rights and parental obligations, the children rights as well as to identify and evaluate cases where children are at risk at being separated from their families, as well as offering support services for their families.

The necessity of reporting and penalties when the obligations are not respected

Law number 272/2004 stipulates the obligation of the professionals, which by the nature of their job encounter such cases, to notify if abuse on a child can be suspected. The guideline for the implementation of the Law no. 272/2004 regarding the protection and the promoting of children rights¹ gives details and examples the professional categories to which the law refers to: social workers working in the maternities, pediatrics sections, SPAS representatives, medical staff that monitors pregnant women, teachers, maternal assistance, the staff from the residential institutions for the child's protection, police workers, DGASPC representatives and private authorized institutions (ONG'S) . There are no clear sanctions regarding the lack of notification. The phenomena of abuse/neglect of the child are a multidimensional one involves the cooperation of several institutions and the law recognizes this aspect.

The identification of the institution responsible at the local, county and national level.

Law 272/2004 as well as secondary legislation designates the institutional professional responsible and stipulates the development of an institutional infrastructure, of the procedures and internal mechanism that would allow the correct and valid registration of the cases of abuse.

¹ The manual for implementing Law no. 272/2004 regarding the protection and promoting of children rights, UNICEF Romania and ANPDC, Ed. Vanemonde, 2006

Art. 91(2) stipulates the establishment of the specialized departments of "The Child Help Line" (CHP) a telephone number known to public which will record notifications of the cases of abuse.

Article no. 177/2003 about the approval of Obligatory Minimal Standards for the child's phone, the obligatory minimal standards regarding the Counseling Centers for the abused, neglected, or exploited child as well as the obligatory minimum standards regarding the center of communitarian resources to prevent abuse, neglect and exploitation stipulates the making at the level of every DGASPC of a emergency intervention department altogether with the Child Help Line and a mobile team. This service must operate 24/7 with a short, free of charge phone number.

According to the information provided by ANPDC in 2008 only a few General Services for Child Protection (almost 10 out of 47) have a department to meet the standards. 38 General Services have set up a help-line, 28 have 24/7 support, 35 implemented the short phone number (983), in 24 cases the call is charged, 19 operate in a standard location and 18 have specialized staff.

The duty of the service is to evaluate immediate risks of the child involved and to intervene in case of emergency.

The standards stipulates that the counselors within Child Helpline department use evaluation instruments to estimate the immediate needs of the caller, the risk and the importance of the situation. The same standards stipulate a compulsory reporting sheet and the initial evaluation performed by the specialist taking over the case. The law 272/2004 refers to the duties of the public service of social work, of general directorate of social work and child protection regarding initial assessment. These duties involve among others to identify risk situations, evaluation, reporting the case, providing services and monitoring cases of abuse and neglect. Article 34(1) stipulates: "The public social work service will take all necessary measures for early detection of risk situations that may cause separation of the child from his

In this respect an important responsibility of PSSW (Public Service of Social Work) is the identification of cases of abuse and neglect and the risk situations that might appear. If there is any concern that a child's life and safety is endangered within the family PSSW representatives have the right to pay the child a visit and to assess how he is been taken care of. If the social worker considers "that the physical, mental, spiritual, moral or social development of the child is endangered" is bound to notify the General Direction of Public Services , "in order to take measures prescribed by law".

Regarding the mandatory reporting of suspected abuse by professionals working directly with a child, the law states that they must notify the SPAS or DGASPC in the jurisdiction the case has been identified. Meanwhile, according to art. 92 DGASPC is required: "a) verify and settle all

complaints on cases of abuse and neglect, including those coming from foster parents; b) to provide services stipulated in art. 107 specialized for the needs of children victims of abuse or neglect and their families.

Article 92 stipulates that all notifications must be verified by DGASPC.

Since most of the cases come to the attention of social services and of DGASPC, in this case the law is inconclusive because both SPAS and DGASPC have the responsibility to verify the notification. We must also mention that when measures to be taken in this phase are concerned the law does not differentiate between different levels of severity of abuse.

Because in this case, Law 272/2004 does not have implementing rules to clarify this, in the absence of sufficiently detailed collaboration protocols, if the notification is made both at SPAS and DGASPC, there may be overlaps in the tasks and steps taken by these institutions at local and county level.

If the initial assessment shows that child's life is endangered, or even after the intervention of the social services the situation does not improve, SPAS must notify DGASPC to implement a protection measure.

In this case, art no.92 from law 272/2004 as well as art 2 from HG 1.434/2004 must be applied. In this respect, DGASPC makes the initial assessment again in order to recommend special protection measures. Standard case management requires that "SPAS and the villages' city halls as well as DGASPC from the administrative sectors in Bucharest should elaborate procedure for identification, recording, initial assessment, taking over and distribution of cases as well as for designating a representative so that the initial assessment to be made within the period prescribed by current SMO for emergency situations."

From the dates concerning the notification procedure and registration CAN cases show that the abuse cases recorded like these are those notified as abuse cases.

This is probably the causewhy, in the statistics concerning the reason for entering the special protection system the rate of entering it because of abuse and neglect is extremely low, that is 21,6%, compared to "poverty" that represents the reason in 44.27 % of the cases. However there are doubts (that are also confirmed by one of the subjects of our interview) that, not all cases benefit from a (fair) evaluation of the experiences/history and of the risk of abuse. The cases that are registered as "social cases" can in fact cover abuse and neglect.

The fact that not all the cases that come into contact with the social services are evaluated regarding abuse and neglect is also connected to the working instrument within SPAS.

Through Appendix A the methodology recommends to the professionals an instrument of work for the initial evaluation that is in fact a model of social investigation and offers explanations and guides the filling in of the sheet. In this respect, the Methodology stipulates: "... the evaluation has to comprise the following key elements:

- a) If the basic needs of the child are being satisfied. For example: nutrition, home, health, education, care, emotional development, social abilities, safety and security etc.
- b) If the specific needs of a child are being met. For example the ones due to a temporary or permanent disability, chronic disease, family trauma etc.
- c) The ability and potential of the parents of taking care of their child and satisfy its needs;
- d) If the child is in a risk situation – especially if the child is being abused physically, sexually, emotionally or is being neglected
- e) If there are supportive networks within the extended family, community etc.

The evaluation has to cover all the aspects of the child's life: social, psychological, medical, educational, juridical".

Nevertheless, Appendix A does not offer too many references for the evaluation of the key elements mentioned above, especially regarding the existence of a presupposed abuse, of the risk level. Among the few explanatory identification data as the socio-demographical and socio-economical information regarding the family, the model comprises special sections for information regarding the child's education, living conditions and medical needs. Information regarding abuse/ neglect can come out in the narrative description regarding : "relevant family history" , " the description of the child's/family problem", "the presentation of the situation/events", "the identification of the needs", but the sheet does not include filter questions.

There is also no special section the references regarding the evaluation of the parental abilities. There are however sections that offer information regarding family climate and social resources (connections with the community). This information is of course important in order to identify resources but is far from being sufficient for a complete and valid evaluation, that has to serve the purpose of establishing if the quality of the child's care meets the "sufficient care" criteria (L. Waterhouse, J. Carnie, 1992) and to identify the situation of abuse and evaluate if the child is in a real danger. Going further, this social investigation is meant to represent a recommendation with regard to keeping the child in the family or separating it from it.

A.4. The necessity for improvement of the National CAN Monitoring System

The analysis of the present situation regarding the legislative and institutional frame of the monitoring system concerning cases of abuse and neglect shows us existing conditions of the system as well as the needs for developing it.

The big discrepancy between the identified CAN cases, that show up in the national statistics and the prevailing of abuse and neglect, also pointed out in the BECAN research, clearly underline the necessity of improving the system of detection of CAN cases in close connection to the necessity of developing procedures of registration and evaluation of cases of abuse and neglect, documentation of the intervention that has taken place and has thoroughly followed a well established and clear procedure that ensures monitoring and evaluation of the results of the intervention.

Table no. 1. The strengths and the weaknesses of the Romanian system of collecting and monitoring the dates concerning CAN

The objectives helped by the data base	Romanian central data system	
	Strong points	Weak points
Monitoring the phenomenon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the existence of legislative regulations and the institutional infrastructure for monitoring - by monitoring we understand monitoring the recording and reporting available data in the counties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the variables included in the monitoring instrument are not the most relevant for capturing some tendencies regarding the phenomenon of abuse
Collecting information in order to evaluate interventions and policies		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the variables included in the monitoring instrument are not the most relevant for capturing the tendencies in the development of the protection system - unreliability in confirming the reported dates at the county level
Managerial and planning control regarding the staff, instruments and financing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the existence of CMTIS as IT support represents an opportunity for the future 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - not filling in the fields <i>staff</i> and <i>finances</i> makes the managerial control and planning the budget difficult

Table no.2. The strong and the weak points of the Romanian system of collecting and monitoring data about CAN – Characteristics of the system

Characteristics of collecting and monitoring data	Strong points	Weak points
Definitions and clear procedures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - proper framing of abuse and neglect in law 272/2004 - the existence of guidelines for filling in the monitoring sheet -the existence of some general procedures on identifying, evaluating and recording the abuse, according to the secondary legislation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lack of legislative tool to correlate the severity of abuse (significant harm) and the security of the child (likelihood of abuse) to the measures to be taken by specialists , what evaluating and recording suspicions of abuse mean
Locating the central, regional and local responsible institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - law 272/2004 designates the institutions responsible for identification, record and treatment of abuse cases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ambiguity on the legislative level regarding SPAS position in evaluating, recording and reporting abuse cases
Clear methodologies for specialists on the local level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proper legal framing (order no. and order no. Case standard management) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lack of synchronization in secondary legislation
Set of descriptive variables about situation, measurements and background	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - at the central level detailed data regarding the measurements taken in case of abuse are recorded 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - periodical monitoring sheet does not include relevant demographic information about the abuse incident - lack of information about the aggressor
Involvement of specialists in the process of data analyses and of analyzing the results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - specialists from the counties are involved in developing monitoring tools and in the testing process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - specialists from the counties are not involved in data analyses and analyzing the results
Collecting data and regular reporting in order to familiarize the specialists to consider their work in terms of reported data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The reporting is done on regular, periodical basis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - self evaluation and self monitoring are not compulsory - constant feedback regarding the dates and the development of dates at the county level is not required

Table no.2. The strong and the weak points of the Romanian system of collecting and monitoring data about CAN – Resource availability

Resource availability	Strong points	Weak points
Protocols to coordinate different data generating sectors	- a protocol with the Ministry of Internal Affairs is being elaborated	- there aren't any protocols between different sectors concerning data integration and collection mainly because of the differences between the various definitions of abuse
Standard forms for reporting and recording	- there are two recording instruments in Order no. and Order no. where other relevant questions for reporting cases of abuse and initial evaluation can be added - existence of some resources in the country (Neamt county, for example)	- lack of national standard consistent working tools to facilitate screening and assessing cases of abuse
Guidebooks and implementing definitions and methodologies	- in 50% of the counties there is a guidebook/manual to describe the mechanism and the procedure of recording the cases	- at the national level there aren't any consistent guidebooks in implementing definitions and methodologies
User friendly data base and storing soft	- all counties have computerized data base, and 27 th counties have CAN computerized database	- the data base for the monitoring and specialized department are not integrated except the case of one county (Bihor)
Training to promote the implementation of the system and its usage	- there were training sessions for monitoring department staff all over the country when introducing the monitoring periodical sheet	- there was not a continuous instructional improvement to take into consideration staff turnover
Mandatory reporting and penalties in case of infringement	- law 272/2002 stipulates the mandatory reporting for specialized staff	- there are not legal measures/penalties in case of non-reporting
Financial resources for updating and development of the system	- monitoring services are financed from the state budget both on central and county level	- there aren't any other special funds for consistent developing, evaluating and updating the monitoring system

CHAPTER B. METHODOLOGY

B.1. Organization of CBSS in Romania

In Romania the BECAN CBSS has the following steps:

1. Identification of data sources
2. Sampling
3. Management of data collection
 - a. Training
 - b. Tools
 - c. Data collection
 - d. Coding, entering data
 - e. Verifying data base
 - f. Statistical analysis
4. Elaboration of National Research Report

B1.1. Timeframe

1. Identification of data sources: **April- October 2010**
2. Sampling: **October-December 2010**
3. Management of data collection
 - a. Training: **October 2010 –January 2011**
 - b. Tools: **October 2010 –January 2011**
 - c. Data collection: **February - May 2011**
 - d. Coding, entering data: **May-June 2011**
 - e. Verifying data base: **July-November 2011**
 - f. Statistical analysis: **November 2011 – January 2012**
4. Elaboration of National Research Report: **October – December 2012.**

B.1.2. Identification of Eligible Services-CBSS Data Sources

For the needs of BECAN CBSS, the program Consortium agreed to adopt the conceptual definition of child maltreatment and its forms (namely, physical-, sexual-, psychological-abuse and neglect), agreed by the Romanian team also.

For *selection of potential organizations* to be recruited as data sources the eligibility criteria was to be a general directorate for social assistance and child protection (GDSACP), reasoned by the structure of the Romanian child protection system (see above) and the specific role of the GDSACP

Next, informational material along with an invitation was sent to all eligible agencies (47 GDSACP) in order to inform them about the BECAN CBSS and to invite them to participate by providing information regarding their databases/archives. This process was made via a questionnaire entitled “Form Summarizing the Characteristics of existing CAN-related database / archive” developed for this specific reason.

To achieve compliance of agencies for participation in BECAN CBSS, a Partnership agreement was signed between Babes-Bolyai University and the National Authority for Protection of Family and Child’s Rights, thus the National Authority get informed about CBSS aims, namely to develop a *ready-to-use toolkit for extracting CAN information from existing archives/databases* and to develop and formulate a major argument for establishing permanent CAN Monitoring Systems at both national and Balkan levels. Principle agreement on efforts to improve the existing CAN Monitoring System is also included.

For creating a national sample originally those general directorates for social assistance and child protection were taken into consideration which were selected for the BECAN epidemiological study as well (see Table 1.). These institutions were the only type which entered in the study, because according to law, all professionals and institutions have the duty to report abuse cases to these institutions (established in every county of Romania and every sector of Bucharest).

An estimation of number of abuse and neglect cases was made based on the official statistics of the first semester of 2010. Based on this data 5 counties were eliminated from the sample because there were very few files registered in the first semester of 2010 in comparison with the other counties (less than 20 cases). One county was added to the remained 12 counties (Dolj), thus the total number of counties is 13.

One institution refused collaboration in terms of the methodology (namely to provide access for field researchers to files), although request was sent by the Ministry of Labor, Family and Social Protection which is a national partner of the project. Instead they offered to fill in the Information

Extraction Form and send to the University, but only two files were sent, which were also included in the data base.

National sample

According to the national data base on CAN, the total number of registered CAN cases in 2009 was 11686. 5377 cases were registered in the first trimester of 2010, out of which 2449 were cases of children between 10 and 17 years old. So approximately 1200 cases were registered in one year, for the ages of 11, 13 and 16, in the whole county. Due to the high number of reported cases, a national sample was intended to be developed. However, the number of files found on the field was much lower and no sampling was needed.

Table nr. 1. Number of estimated and found files

COUNTIES	TOTAL ESTIMATED FILES	TOAL FILES FOUND	Rate of found/ estimated files
Bacau	41	24	58,54
Iasi	131	34	25,95
Vaslui	104	35	33,65
Constanta	134	10	7,46
Galati	76	6	7,89
Prahova	224	62	27,68
Timis	106	39	36,79
Cluj	20	17	85,00
Satu Mare	74	22	29,73
Brasov	28	16	57,14
Bucureşti	5	3	60,00
Gorj	61	18	29,51
Dolj		2	
Total	1004	288	28,49

A total number of 288 files were included in the research, of those children who have born in 1995, 1993 and 2000, reported to be victims of abuse and neglect. Substantiated, unsubstantiated and cases under investigation were taken in consideration.

Some possible explanations of the great discrepancy between estimated (reported) and found files:

- In some counties the files of children are kept in the office they are benefiting service from and the register of the abuse service is not complete
- In some of the counties following a report no investigations and no monitoring were realized if the specialists were able to have a short discussion with the parents in which they promised that they will not abuse or neglect their child any more. In these cases files are compound only of one paper of report, with very few or no information about the child, not including the age either. These “files” were not taken in consideration.

B.1.3. Preparation of the Romanian Research instruments

The data collection tools and operational booklet were developed by the international team, coordinated by the Institute of Child Health Department of Mental Health and Social Welfare (Athens).

The Romanian team adopted the common toolkit which was translated into Romanian without any changes.

The toolkit is composed by: CBSS Protocol, CBSS Operation Booklet, CBSS: Extraction Form Part A (Agencies), Extraction Form Part B (Files). After translation the research team tested the instruments and made the needed adaptation.

B.1.4. Train the Romanian Research Team

Train the Trainers seminar

The Train the Trainers seminar took place on 11-12 October 2010 in Cluj-Napoca, Romania. The training was conducted by the Institute of Child Health Department of Mental Health and Social Welfare (Athens), 34 trainees from the partners from the nine Balkan countries participated.

During the 1st day of the training, the WP4-Toolkit was introduced (theoretical background & methodological issues) on the basis of presentations which –apart from the Research Protocol for the CBSS and the Operations’ Booklet- also included information on how to organize the train-the-researchers’ seminars and the necessary material (all material used during the train the trainers seminar are available in the BECAN Managerial Forum). Furthermore, both extraction forms (for agencies and for CAN cases) were discussed in detail through a process of reviewing each individual variable.

Training the researchers

Trained partners ("trainers") in their turn organized and conducted in their countries two-day seminars for training the researchers' groups *before* starting the implementation of the extraction of information on reported/detected cases of CAN.

The aim of these seminars was to train the national research group in order to adequately and uniformly extract and code data. For the needs of these seminars, it was decided to develop a short instructional booklet including operational definitions of the main terms of the CBSS protocol, a detailed description of its content and instructions of how-to-use the protocol in regards to the extraction, recording and coding of the data.

The training for WP4 took place during the same seminar organized for the training of the epidemiological study, the field researchers' team involved in WP3 and WP4 was the same. The third day was dedicated to the WP4 training, on 12th November.

The topics were as follows:

- Presentation of the BECAN CBSS study
- Presentation of the variables for Form 1 – Agencies
- Exercise: mock interviews in pairs
- Presentations of the variables for Form 2 – Case-Files
- Exercise: mock extraction using a case-study
- Discussions
- Organisational issues: Forming the pairs and the four research groups.

The tools used during the training were: CBSS Operations Booklet, extraction forms (Part I, II), Protocol, case-description, one copy of a case-file for each participant.

After the training seminar the researchers had the duty to extract data from the file they received, using the extraction form. One more meeting was organized for discussing the home-works, on the 24th and on the 25th November. After the second meeting the field researchers have received one more case file sent by email, for extracting data for second home-work.

During the training four groups were formed, each of them coordinated by a field coordinator.

After the field research was scheduled, a third meeting took place for each research team, before the first field work, when we discussed results of the data extraction based on the last case file. Each meeting took approx. 2 hours, followed by an individual meeting with the field coordinator in order to make the instructions regarding sampling and organizing the field research.

The majority of trainees are social workers, enrolled in for Master's degree in Social Work.

B.2. Process followed for Data Collection

Fieldwork was conducted in the second semester of school, year 2011, from February to May 2011. The research team included four field coordinators, each having 4 or 5 subordinate field operators (a total of 17 field operators) and together have to cover four counties. The exact period to conduct research for each team coordinator was established with its operators. The order for going to each county was established by each team, depending on the program members, but all teams went for 3-5 days in each county to conduct the research, then turned back to Cluj for returning the completed questionnaires. For each county were contacted at first the Social Assistance and Child Protection directors from the sample (phone or email). In the first phase we applied Extraction Form Part A (Agencies), with the General Director (amounting to a total of 13 questionnaires) and after, the files were analyzed using Extraction Form Part B (CAN Cases). As mentioned previously, 288 cases of abuse cases were selected. Regarding selecting files only criteria to take into account was the child's age.

Field operators worked in teams of two operators. At the end of each day of field work we had team meetings, the coordinator of field operators field discussed the events of that day, than questionnaires were checked and also offered supervision and support. Also, coordinators could contact the project manager throughout the movements necessary to obtain clarifications and supervision.

Questionnaires were introduced by a field operator based on data prepared by the Institute of Child Health Department of Mental Health and Social Welfare. After data entry was performed, they were verified by WP4 coordinator and a statistician.

Data analysis was carried out by the coordinator of WP4 and will develop the national research report.

CHAPTER C. CBSS RESULTS IN ROMANIA

The analysis of the results made with the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20.

C.1. Description of Participating Services & their Archives-Databases

Following the process described in part B.1.2 and given the situation (adapted per country), a total of xxx organizations/child services were identified in the xxxx (geographical areas that were the same as WP3). From these organizations/services xxx (number) fulfilled the eligibility criteria set for the needs of the CBSS in (country). [If there is any sampling procedure for the organizations please, describe it here]. Out of the xxx (number) of the eligible organizations that were invited to participate in the CBSS, xxx (number) provided access to their archives. In Table C.1.1 the identified, eligible [selected by sampling], and finally participating organizations/services-data sources for the CBSS are presented below.

CHAPTER C. CBSS RESULTS IN ROMANIA

The analysis of the results made with the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20.

C.1. Description of Participating Services & their Archives-Databases

Following the process described in part B.1.2 and given the existing child protection system in Romania, a total of 16 specialized county level child protection agencies from the 5 geographical areas (that were the same as WP3) were contacted to provide data. From these organizations/services 13 fulfilled the eligibility criteria set for the needs of the CBSS in Romania, namely that have reported more than 10 registered CAN cases for 2010 to the National Authority for Protection of Family and Child's Rights. Out of the 13 of the eligible organizations that were invited to participate in the CBSS, 12 provided direct access to their archives and one sent the extraction forms filled by own staff, evoking confidentiality of cases. In Table C.1.1 the identified, eligible and selected by sampling, and finally participating organizations/services-data sources for the CBSS are presented below.

Table C.1.1. Organizations/Services that participated in CBSS by providing access to their archives/databases by geographical area

		Total		Area A		Area B		Area C		Area D		Area E	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Total identified Agencies		47	100	16	34	7	14,8	14	29,7	8	17	2	4,2
Agencies invited to provide data		16	34	5	31,2	1	14,2	5	35,7	4	50	1	50
Eligible		13	100	4	25	1	14,2	3	21,4	4	50	1	50
Non eligible		3	23	1	6,25	0		2	14,2	0		0	
Eligible agencies		13	100										
[Selected by sampling]		13	100	4	25	1	14,2	3	21,4	4	50	1	50
Provided data		13	100	4	25	1	14,2	3	21,4	4	50	1	50
Non eligible agencies		3				0		2	14,2				
<i>Reason n: Less than 10 cases for 2010</i>		3	23	1	25	0		2	14,2	0		0	

Table C.1.3. Main characteristics of Archives/Databases from which the data were derived

	Total	Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D	Area E
	f	f	f	f	f	f
Total CSW (or Agencies)						
Trained staff for recording cases						
<i>No</i>	1	0	1	0	0	0
<i>Yes</i>	10	3	0	3	3	1
<i>Yes, but not formal</i>	2	1	1	0	0	0
Specialties of staff who record CAN						
<i>Social Workers</i>	13	4	1	3	3	1
<i>Education-related professional</i>	1	0	0	1	0	0
<i>Judicial officer</i>	1	1	0	0	0	0
Type of archive						
<i>Paper archive</i>	13	4	1	3	4	1
<i>Electronic archive</i>	4	2	0	0	1	1
<i>Database</i>	11	3	1	3	3	1
Existence of recording form						
<i>No</i>	1	0	0	0	1	0
<i>Yes</i>	12	4	1	2	3	1
Type of cases recorded in the files						
<i>Reported CAN cases</i>	6	3	0	0	2	1
<i>Detected CAN cases</i>	6	3	0	0	2	1
<i>Mixed file (including non-CAN cases)</i>	11	3	1	3	3	1
Availability of text description						
<i>No</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Yes</i>	13	4	1	3	4	1
Availability of further documentation						
<i>No</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Yes</i>	13	4	1	3	4	1

C.2. CAN incidence in Romania

Table C.2.1. Child maltreatment incidence per form of CAN, age, gender and geographical area

	General population for selected areas*	CAN Cases identified*				All forms of CAN	Incidence /1000 children					
		Physical Abuse	Sexual Abuse	Psychological Abuse	Neglect		Physical Abuse	Sexual Abuse	Psychological Abuse	Neglect	All forms of CAN	
Area A												
Male	109869	13	8	11	16	38	0,12	0,07	0,10	0,15	0,35	
11	36332	8	3	9	6	18	0,22	0,08	0,25	0,17	0,50	
13	37067	1	4	1	6	12	0,03	0,11	0,03	0,16	0,32	
16	36470	4	1	1	4	8	0,11	0,03	0,03	0,11	0,22	
Female	112083	14	27	6	18	56	0,12	0,24	0,05	0,16	0,50	
11	37064	2	6	0	11	19	0,05	0,16	0,00	0,30	0,51	
13	37812	6	10	3	5	21	0,16	0,26	0,08	0,13	0,56	
16	37207	6	11	3	2	16	0,16	0,30	0,08	0,05	0,43	
Overall	221952	27	35	17	34	94	0,12	0,16	0,08	0,15	0,42	
11	73396	10	9	9	17	37	0,14	0,12	0,12	0,23	0,50	
13	74879	7	14	4	11	33	0,09	0,19	0,05	0,15	0,44	
16	73677	10	12	4	6	24	0,14	0,16	0,05	0,08	0,33	
Area B												
Male	26169	1	0	0	2	3	0,04	0,00	0,00	0,08	0,11	
11	8962	1	0	0	1	1	0,11	0,00	0,00	0,11	0,11	
13	8624	0	0	0	0	1	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,12	
16	8583	0	0	0	1	1	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,12	0,12	
Female	26697	0	0	0	0	0	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	
11	9142	0	0	0	0	0	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	
13	8798	0	0	0	0	0	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	
16	8757	0	0	0	0	0	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	
Overall	52866	1	0	0	2	3	0,02	0,00	0,00	0,04	0,06	
11	18104	1	0	0	1	1	0,06	0,00	0,00	0,06	0,06	
13	17422	0	0	0	0	1	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,06	
16	17340	0	0	0	1	1	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,06	0,06	
Area C												
Male	108185	7	1	12	34	47	0,06	0,01	0,11	0,31	0,43	
11	35199	0	0	5	7	12	0,00	0,00	0,14	0,20	0,34	
13	36062	4	1	5	15	20	0,11	0,03	0,14	0,42	0,55	
16	36924	3	0	2	12	15	0,08	0,00	0,05	0,32	0,41	
Female	110368	8	7	8	22	34	0,07	0,06	0,07	0,20	0,31	
11	35909	2	2	1	2	5	0,06	0,06	0,03	0,06	0,14	
13	36789	2	1	2	9	12	0,05	0,03	0,05	0,24	0,33	
16	37670	4	4	5	11	17	0,11	0,11	0,13	0,29	0,45	
Overall	218553	15	8	20	56	81	0,07	0,04	0,09	0,26	0,37	
11	71108	2	2	6	9	17	0,03	0,03	0,08	0,13	0,24	
13	72851	6	2	7	24	32	0,08	0,03	0,10	0,33	0,44	
16	74594	7	4	7	23	32	0,09	0,05	0,09	0,31	0,43	
Area D												
Male	91482	14	3	9	35	48	0,15	0,03	0,10	0,38	0,52	

11		30465	4	0	3	19	21		0,13	0,00	0,10	0,62	0,69
13		30677	8	2	4	12	19		0,26	0,07	0,13	0,39	0,62
16		30340	2	1	2	4	8		0,07	0,03	0,07	0,13	0,26
	Female	93329	21	16	14	24	51		0,23	0,17	0,15	0,26	0,55
11		31080	15	1	9	10	20		0,48	0,03	0,29	0,32	0,64
13		31296	2	5	2	7	11		0,06	0,16	0,06	0,22	0,35
16		30953	4	10	3	7	20		0,13	0,32	0,10	0,23	0,65
	Overall	184811	35	19	23	59	99		0,19	0,10	0,12	0,32	0,54
11		61545	19	1	12	29	41		0,31	0,02	0,19	0,47	0,67
13		61973	10	7	6	19	30		0,16	0,11	0,10	0,31	0,48
16		20000	6	11	5	11	28		0,30	0,55	0,25	0,55	1,40
	Area E Male	14988	2	0	0	6	7		0,13	0,00	0,00	0,40	0,47
11		5132	1	0	0	3	3		0,19	0,00	0,00	0,58	0,58
13		5037	0	0	0	2	2		0,00	0,00	0,00	0,40	0,40
16		4819	1	0	0	1	2		0,21	0,00	0,00	0,21	0,42
	Female	15291	1	0	0	3	3		0,07	0,00	0,00	0,20	0,20
11		5236	0	0	0	0	0		0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
13		5138	1	0	0	1	1		0,19	0,00	0,00	0,19	0,19
16		4917	0	0	0	2	2		0,00	0,00	0,00	0,41	0,41
	Overall	30279	3	0	0	9	10		0,10	0,00	0,00	0,30	0,33
11		10368	1	0	0	3	3		0,10	0,00	0,00	0,29	0,29
13		10175	1	0	0	3	3		0,10	0,00	0,00	0,29	0,29
16		9736	1	0	0	3	4		0,10	0,00	0,00	0,31	0,41
	Total Male	350693	37	12	32	93	143		0,11	0,03	0,09	0,27	0,41
11		116090	14	3	17	36	55		0,12	0,03	0,15	0,31	0,47
13		117467	13	7	10	35	54		0,11	0,06	0,09	0,30	0,46
16		117136	10	2	5	22	34		0,09	0,02	0,04	0,19	0,29
	Female	357768	44	50	28	67	144		0,12	0,14	0,08	0,19	0,40
11		118431	19	9	10	23	44		0,16	0,08	0,08	0,19	0,37
13		119833	11	16	7	22	45		0,09	0,13	0,06	0,18	0,38
16		119504	14	25	11	22	55		0,12	0,21	0,09	0,18	0,46
	Overall	708461	81	62	60	160	287		0,11	0,09	0,08	0,23	0,41
11		234521	33	12	27	59	99		0,14	0,05	0,12	0,25	0,42
13		237300	24	23	17	57	99		0,10	0,10	0,07	0,24	0,42
16		236640	24	27	16	44	89		0,10	0,11	0,07	0,19	0,38

* Source: National Statistics Authority

* Source: xxx Agencies corresponding to xxx% of the available agencies (if any sampling was made for agencies/data sources, the respective calculations should be done here)

Table C.2.2. Status of CAN's substantiation* for children 11, 13 & 16 years old, per form of maltreatment and geographical area (for the year 2010)

	No of		Substantiated		Indicated		Unsubstantiated		Ongoing		Unspecified/other	
	Cases	f	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Area 1-Total	109											
Physical abuse	27	20	74,1	3	11,1	2	7,4	1	3,7	1	3,7	
Sexual abuse	31	23	74,2	2	6,5	2	6,5	4	12,9	0	0,0	
Psycholog. Abuse	17	13	76,5	2	11,8	1	5,9	1	5,9	0	0,0	
Neglect	34	28	82,4	1	2,9	1	2,9	1	2,9	3	8,8	
Area 2-Total	3											
Physical abuse	1	1	100,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	
Sexual abuse	0	0										
Psycholog. Abuse	0	0										
Neglect	2	2	100,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	
Area 3-Total	109											
Physical abuse	15	13	86,7	2	13,3	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	
Sexual abuse	8	3	37,5	2	25,0	1	12,5	2	25,0	0	0,0	
Psycholog. Abuse	20	8	40,0	8	40,0	1	5,0	0	0,0	2	10,0	
Neglect	56	45	80,4	10	17,9	1	1,8	0	0,0	2	3,6	
Area 4-Total	135											
Physical abuse	34	18	52,9	10	29,4	6	17,6	0	0,0	0	0,0	
Sexual abuse	19	13	68,4	4	21,1	2	10,5	0	0,0	0	0,0	
Psycholog. Abuse	22	13	59,1	8	36,4	1	4,5	0	0,0	0	0,0	
Neglect	60	51	85,0	5	8,3	4	6,7	0	0,0	0	0,0	
Area 5-Total	12											
Physical abuse	3	3	100,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	
Sexual abuse	0	0										
Psycholog. Abuse	0	0										
Neglect	9	9	100,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	
Overall-Total	368											
Physical abuse	80	55	68,8	15	18,8	8	10,0	1	1,3	1	1,3	
Sexual abuse	58	39	67,2	8	13,8	5	8,6	6	10,3	0	0,0	
Psycholog. Abuse	59	34	57,6	18	30,5	3	5,1	1	1,7	2	3,4	
Neglect	161	135	83,9	16	9,9	6	3,7	1	0,6	5	3,1	

*According to the Agencies that provided information for maltreatment

** In many cases multiple forms of CAN were identified; therefore, sum of CAN's forms is higher than the number of cases

C.2.1. Children's vulnerability to CAN and to Specific Forms of Maltreatment

Table C.2.1.1 Single versus Multiple Forms of abuse per age, gender and geographical area

	Total CAN Cases		Single vs. Multiple forms of CAN				Individual forms of CAN							
	f	%	Single form		Multiple forms		Physical abuse		Sexual abuse		Psychological abuse		Neglect	
			f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Area A-Total	94	100.0	77	100.0	17	100.0	27	100.0	35	100.0	17	100.0	34	100.0
<i>male</i>														
11	18	19.1	11	14.3	7	41.2	8	29.6	3	8.6	9	52.9	6	17.6
13	12	12.8	12	15.6	0	0.0	1	3.7	4	11.4	1	5.9	6	17.6
16	8	8.5	6	7.8	2	11.8	4	14.8	1	2.9	1	5.9	4	11.8
subtotal	38	40.4	29	37.7	9	52.9	13	48.1	8	22.9	11	64.7	16	47.1
<i>female</i>														
11	19	20.2	19	24.7	0	0.0	2	7.4	6	17.1	0	0.0	11	32.4
13	21	22.3	18	23.4	3	17.6	6	22.2	10	28.6	3	17.6	5	14.7
16	16	17.0	11	14.3	5	29.4	6	22.2	11	31.4	3	17.6	2	5.9
subtotal	56	59.6	48	62.3	8	47.1	14	51.9	27	77.1	6	35.3	18	52.9
Area B-Total	3	100.0	3	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0
<i>male</i>														
11	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0
13	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
16	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0
subtotal	3	100.0	3	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0
<i>female</i>														
11	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
13	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
16	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
subtotal	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Area C-Total	80	100.0	64	100.0	16	100.0	15	100.0	8	100.0	20	100.0	56	100.0
<i>male</i>														
11	12	15.0	12	18.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	25.0	7	12.5
13	20	25.0	16	25.0	4	25.0	4	26.7	1	12.5	5	25.0	15	26.8
16	15	18.8	13	20.3	2	12.5	3	20.0	0	0.0	2	10.0	12	21.4
subtotal	47	58.8	41	64.1	6	37.5	7	46.7	1	12.5	12	60.0	34	60.7
<i>female</i>														
11	5	6.3	4	6.3	1	6.3	2	13.3	2	25.0	1	5.0	2	3.6
13	12	15.0	10	15.6	2	12.5	2	13.3	1	12.5	2	10.0	9	16.1
16	16	20.0	9	14.1	7	43.8	4	26.7	4	50.0	5	25.0	11	19.6
subtotal	33	41.3	23	35.9	10	62.5	8	53.3	7	87.5	8	40.0	22	39.3
Area D-Total	99	100.0	73	100.0	26	100.0	35	100.0	19	100.0	23	100.0	59	100.0
<i>male</i>														
11	21	21.2	16	21.9	5	19.2	4	11.4	0	0.0	3	13.0	19	32.2
13	19	19.2	14	19.2	5	19.2	8	22.9	2	10.5	4	17.4	12	20.3

16	8	8.1	7	9.6	1	3.8	2	5.7	1	5.3	2	8.7	4	6.8
subtotal	48	48.5	37	50.7	1	42.3	14	40.0	3	15.8	9	39.1	35	59.3
<i>female 11</i>	20	20.2	11	15.1	9	34.6	15	42.9	1	5.3	9	39.1	10	16.9
13	11	11.1	7	9.6	4	15.4	2	5.7	5	26.3	2	8.7	7	11.9
16	20	20.2	18	24.7	2	7.7	4	11.4	10	52.6	3	13.0	7	11.9
subtotal	51	51.5	36	49.3	1	57.7	21	60.0	16	84.2	14	60.9	24	40.7
Area E-Total	11	100.0	8	100.0	2	100.0	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	100.0
<i>male 11</i>	3	27.3	2	25.0	1	50.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	33.3
13	2	18.2	2	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	22.2
16	2	18.2	2	25.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	11.1
subtotal	7	63.6	6	75.0	1	50.0	2	66.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	66.7
<i>female 11</i>	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
13	1	9.1	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	11.1
16	3	27.3	3	37.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	22.2
subtotal	4	36.4	2	25.0	1	50.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	33.3
All areas-Total	287	100.0	225	100.0	6	100.0	81	100.0	62	100.0	60	100.0	160	100.0
<i>male 11</i>	55	19.2	42	18.7	1	21.3	13	16.0	3	4.8	17	28.3	36	22.5
13	54	18.8	45	20.0	9	14.8	14	17.3	7	11.3	10	16.7	35	21.9
16	34	11.8	29	12.9	5	8.2	10	12.3	2	3.2	5	8.3	22	13.8
subtotal	143	49.8	116	51.6	2	44.3	37	45.7	12	19.4	32	53.3	93	58.1
<i>female 11</i>	44	15.3	34	15.1	1	16.4	19	23.5	9	14.5	10	16.7	23	14.4
13	45	15.7	35	15.6	1	16.4	11	13.6	16	25.8	7	11.7	22	13.8
16	55	19.2	41	18.2	1	23.0	14	17.3	25	40.3	11	18.3	22	13.8
Subtotal	144	50.2	109	48.4	3	55.7	44	54.3	50	80.6	28	46.7	67	41.9

Table C.2.1.2 Physical abuse (n=81): Specific types of physical abuse, injuries sustained and severity of injuries per gender and age (for the year 2010)

	Male				Female				Total			
	11	13	16	All	11	13	16	All	11	13	16	All
Total CAN cases	55	54	34	143	44	45	55	144	99	99	89	287
No Physical abuse cases identified	14	13	10	37	19	11	14	44	33	24	24	81
Type of physical ab-Unspecified	21,43	7,69	30,0	18,9	42,1	18,1	57,1	40,9	33,3	12,5	45,8	30,8
Type of physical abuse-Specified	64,29	92,31	70,0	75,6	57,89	81,8	35,71	56,82	60,61	87,50	50,00	65,43
Spanking	0,00	7,69	0,00	2,70	15,79	0,00	0,00	6,82	9,09	4,17	0,00	4,94
Slapping/Beating	50,00	38,46	60,00	48,65	26,32	54,55	7,14	27,27	36,36	45,83	29,17	37,04
"Beat-up"	0,00	38,46	40,00	24,32	15,79	18,18	0,00	11,36	9,09	29,17	16,67	17,28
Pushing/Kicking/Throwing	0,00	30,77	20,00	16,22	10,53	27,27	14,29	15,91	6,06	29,17	16,67	16,05
Hitting with an object	7,14	23,08	40,00	21,62	21,05	18,18	14,29	18,18	15,15	20,83	25,00	19,75
Grabbing/Shaking	14,29	15,38	10,00	13,51	10,53	0,00	0,00	4,55	12,12	8,33	4,17	8,64
Hitting on head	21,43	30,77	20,00	24,32	10,53	9,09	7,14	9,09	15,15	20,83	12,50	16,05
Hair pulling	21,43	15,38	0,00	13,51	5,26	9,09	0,00	4,55	12,12	12,50	0,00	8,64
Twisting ears	21,43	7,69	0,00	10,81	5,26	0,00	0,00	2,27	12,12	4,17	0,00	6,17
Locking up	14,29	7,69	0,00	8,11	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	6,06	4,17	0,00	3,70
Pinching	7,14	0,00	0,00	2,70	5,26	0,00	0,00	2,27	6,06	0,00	0,00	2,47
Threatening with a knife or gun	7,14	0,00	0,00	2,70	0,00	9,09	0,00	2,27	3,03	4,17	0,00	2,47
Tying up or tying to something	0,00	7,69	0,00	2,70	0,00	9,09	0,00	2,27	0,00	8,33	0,00	2,47
Stabbing/Shooting	0,00	0,00	10,00	2,70	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	4,17	1,23
Forcing Spicy Foods	7,14	0,00	0,00	2,70	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	3,03	0,00	0,00	1,23
Severity of Injury-Unspecified	7,14	46,15	20,00	24,32	57,89	36,36	64,29	54,55	36,36	41,67	45,83	40,74
Severity of Injury-Specified	64,29	53,85	70,00	62,16	31,58	63,64	35,71	40,91	45,45	58,33	50,00	50,62
No Injury	0,00	0,00	10,00	2,70	10,53	0,00	0,00	4,55	6,06	0,00	4,17	3,70
Minor	14,29	15,38	20,00	16,22	5,26	27,27	21,43	15,91	9,09	20,83	20,83	16,05
Moderate	14,29	23,08	30,00	21,62	26,32	27,27	7,14	20,45	21,21	25,00	16,67	20,99
Severe	0,00	0,00	20,00	5,41	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	8,33	2,47
Life threatening	7,14	7,69	0,00	5,41	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	3,03	4,17	0,00	2,47
Nature of Injury-Unspecified	30,00	53,85	12,50	44,44	60,00	40,00	71,43	61,90	58,06	50,00	52,17	53,85
Nature of Injury-Specified	70,00	46,15	87,50	55,56	40,00	60,00	28,57	38,10	41,94	50,00	47,83	46,15
Bruise	42,86	30,77	50,00	40,54	21,05	27,27	21,43	22,73	30,30	29,17	33,33	30,86
Cute/Bite/Open wound	0,00	7,69	30,00	10,81	5,26	18,18	0,00	6,82	3,03	12,50	12,50	8,64
Burn	7,14	0,00	0,00	2,70	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	3,03	0,00	0,00	1,23
Fracture	0,00	0,00	10,00	2,70	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	4,17	1,23
Organs system injury	7,14	7,69	0,00	5,41	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	3,03	4,17	0,00	2,47

Table C.2.1.3 Sexual abuse (n=62): Specific types of sexual abuse per gender and age (for the year 2010)

	Male				Female				Total			
	11	13	16	All	11	13	16	All	11	13	16	All
Tolta CAN cases identified (287)	55	54	34	143	44	45	55	144	99	99	89	287
Total Sexual abuse cases identified (62)	3	7	2	12	9	16	25	50	12	23	27	62
Type of Sexual abuse-Unspecified	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	6,3	4,0	4,0	0,0	4,3	3,7	3,2
Type of Sexual abuse-Specified	100,0	85,7	100,0	91,7	0,0	93,8	88,0	74,0	25,0	91,3	88,9	77,4
Completed sexual activity	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	44,4	75,0	56,0	60,0	33,3	52,2	51,9	48,4
Attempted sexual activity	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	11,1	12,5	16,0	14,0	8,3	8,7	14,8	11,3
Touching/fondling genitals	0,0	14,3	0,0	8,3	33,3	6,3	4,0	10,0	25,0	8,7	3,7	9,7
Adult exposing genitals to child	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	22,2	0,0	8,0	8,0	16,7	0,0	7,4	6,5
Sexual exploitation	33,3	71,4	0,0	50,0	22,2	6,3	12,0	12,0	25,0	26,1	11,1	19,4
Sexual harassment	0,0	0,0	50,0	8,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	3,7	1,6
Voyeurism	33,3	0,0	0,0	8,3	0,0	0,0	8,0	4,0	8,3	0,0	7,4	4,8

Table C.2.1.4 Psychological abuse (n=60): Specific types of psychological abuse per gender, age and geographical area (for the year 2010)

	Male				Female				Total			
	11	13	16	All	11	13	16	All	11	13	16	All
Total CAN cases identified (287)	55	54	34	143	44	45	55	144	99	99	89	287
Total Psychol. abuse cases identified (60)	17	10	5	19	10	7	11	28	27	17	16	60
Type of Psychol. abuse-Unspecified	11,8	0,0	0,0	10,5	10,0	14,3	9,1	10,7	11,1	5,9	6,3	8,3
Type of Psychol. abuse-Specified	82,4	100,0	100,0	100	90,0	85,7	90,9	89,3	85,2	94,1	93,8	90,0
Rejection through verbal abuse	23,5	30,0	80,0	57,9	30,0	14,3	27,3	25,0	25,9	23,5	43,8	30,0
Isolation	5,9	10,0	20,0	15,8	0,0	14,3	9,1	7,1	3,7	11,8	12,5	8,3
Ignorance	17,6	10,0	40,0	31,6	0,0	0,0	27,3	10,7	11,1	5,9	31,3	15,0
Exploitation	0,0	20,0	20,0	15,8	50,0	14,3	0,0	21,4	18,5	17,6	6,3	15,0
Terrorization	41,2	40,0	60,0	73,7	0,0	28,6	18,2	14,3	25,9	35,3	31,3	30,0
Witnessing family violence	64,7	70,0	60,0	100	50,0	71,4	45,5	53,6	59,3	70,6	50,0	60,0

Table C.2.1.5 Neglect (n=160): Specific types of neglect per age, gender and geographical area (for the year 2010)

	Male				Female				Total			
	11	13	16	All	11	13	16	All	11	13	16	All
Total CAN cases identified (287)	55	54	34	143	44	45	55	144	99	99	89	287
Total Neglect cases identified (160)	36	35	22	93	23	22	22	67	59	57	44	160
Type of Neglect-Unspecified	19.4	8.6	18.2	15.1	8.7	4.5	9.1	7.5	15.3	7.0	13.6	11.9
Type of Neglect-Specified	80.6	85.7	86.4	83.9	95.7	90.9	90.9	92.5	86.4	87.7	88.6	87.5
Physical neglect	69.4	65.7	59.1	65.6	82.6	63.6	50.0	65.7	74.6	64.9	54.5	65.6
Medical neglect	25.0	25.7	13.6	22.6	39.1	18.2	27.3	28.4	30.5	22.8	20.5	25.0
Educational neglect	44.4	48.6	54.5	48.4	60.9	45.5	45.5	50.7	50.8	47.4	50.0	49.4
Economic exploitation	8.3	5.7	9.1	7.5	8.7	4.5	9.1	7.5	8.5	5.3	9.1	7.5
Failure to protect from physical harm	8.3	5.7	0.0	5.4	4.3	4.5	0.0	3.0	6.8	5.3	0.0	4.4
Failure to protect from sexual abuse	2.8	0.0	0.0	1.1	4.3	4.5	13.6	7.5	3.4	1.8	6.8	3.8
Failure to provide treatment for mental problems	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	4.5	3.0	1.7	0.0	2.3	1.3
Permitting maladaptive/criminal behaviour	13.9	20.0	27.3	19.4	4.3	13.6	9.1	9.0	10.2	17.5	18.2	15.0
Abandonment/Refusal of custody	19.4	17.1	18.2	18.3	17.4	27.3	9.1	17.9	18.6	21.1	13.6	18.1

Table C.2.1.6 Single and Multiple forms of abuse (n=xxx) per gender, age and geographical area (for 2010)

	Male				Female				Total			
	11	13	16	All	11	13	16	All	11	13	16	All
Cases	55	54	16	143	44	45	55	144	99	99	89	287
Single CAN form	76,4	83,3	85,3	81,1	77,3	77,8	72,7	75,7	76,8	80,8	77,5	78,4
Physical abuse	7,3	13,0	20,6	12,6	20,5	11,1	5,5	11,8	13,1	12,1	11,2	12,2
Sexual abuse	3,6	13,0	5,9	7,7	20,5	26,7	36,4	28,5	11,1	19,2	24,7	18,1
Psychological abuse	12,7	3,7	5,9	7,7	2,3	4,4	7,3	4,9	8,1	4,0	6,7	6,3
Neglect	52,7	53,7	52,9	53,1	34,1	35,6	23,6	30,6	44,4	45,5	34,8	41,8
Multiple CAN forms	23,6	16,7	14,7	18,9	22,7	22,2	25,5	23,6	23,2	19,2	21,3	21,3
Physical & Sexual	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,2	5,5	2,8	0,0	1,0	3,4	1,4
Physical & Psychological	9,1	5,6	2,9	6,3	4,5	4,4	1,8	3,5	7,1	5,1	2,2	4,9
Physical & Neglect	7,3	1,9	5,9	4,9	0,0	4,4	5,5	3,5	4,0	3,0	5,6	4,2
Sexual & Psychological	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,2	0,0	0,7	0,0	1,0	0,0	0,3
Sexual & Neglect	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,2	1,8	1,4	0,0	1,0	1,1	0,7
Psychological & Neglect	7,3	3,7	5,9	5,6	0,0	4,4	3,6	2,8	4,0	4,0	4,5	4,2
Physical, Sexual & Psych.	1,8	0,0	0,0	0,7	0,0	0,0	1,8	0,7	1,0	0,0	1,1	0,7
Physical, Sexual & Neglect	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,2	0,0	0,7	0,0	1,0	0,0	0,3
Physical, Psych. & Neglect	0,0	5,6	0,0	2,1	15,9	0,0	5,5	6,9	7,1	3,0	3,4	4,5

C.2.2. Child-CAN victim characteristics

Table C.2.2.1 Child-CAN victims' characteristics per age and gender

	All forms of Maltreatment (n=240)											
	male				Female				Total			
	11	13	16	All	11	13	16	All	11	13	16	All
Total number of children-victims (287)	55	54	34	143	44	45	55	144	99	99	89	287
Educational status												
Unspecified	9,1	0,0	23,5	9,1	15,9	6,7	20,0	14,6	12,1	3,0	21,3	11,8
Not attending school at all	7,3	11,1	8,8	9,1	6,8	2,2	5,5	4,9	7,1	7,1	6,7	7,0
Dropped out	1,8	11,1	14,7	8,4	4,5	11,1	10,9	9,0	3,0	11,1	12,4	8,7
Attends school	80,0	61,1	52,9	66,4	72,7	80,0	63,6	71,5	76,8	69,7	59,6	69,0
Work status												
Unspecified	69,1	55,6	52,9	60,1	61,4	71,1	56,4	62,5	65,7	62,6	55,1	61,3
Not working	29,1	42,6	41,2	37,1	38,6	28,9	41,8	36,8	33,3	36,4	41,6	36,9
Working domestic/ unpaid	1,8	1,9	5,9	2,8	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,0	1,0	2,2	1,4
Working salaried work	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,8	0,7	0,0	0,0	1,1	0,3
Education-related problems												
Unspecified	45,5	59,3	47,1	51,0	50,0	46,7	54,5	50,7	47,5	53,5	51,7	50,9
None	20,0	20,4	26,5	21,7	22,7	31,1	23,6	25,7	21,2	25,3	24,7	23,7
Learning disability	20,0	7,4	8,8	12,6	4,5	15,6	5,5	8,3	13,1	11,1	6,7	10,5
Specialized education class	1,8	3,7	0,0	2,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,0	2,0	0,0	1,0
Irregular school attendance	2,4	1,7	2,1	6,3	2,8	1,0	3,1	7,0	5,2	2,8	5,2	13,2
Behaviour-related problems												
Unspecified	34,5	38,9	26,5	34,3	50,0	26,7	29,1	34,7	41,4	33,3	28,1	34,5
None	29,1	25,9	20,6	25,9	18,2	31,1	14,5	20,8	24,2	28,3	16,9	23,3
Problems in school	14,5	7,4	14,7	11,9	6,8	2,2	18,2	9,7	11,1	5,1	16,9	10,8
Problems in home	9,1	5,6	11,8	8,4	9,1	20,0	18,2	16,0	9,1	12,1	15,7	12,2
Violent behaviour	7,3	7,4	20,6	10,5	0,0	8,9	3,6	4,2	4,0	8,1	10,1	7,3
Bullying	5,5	1,9	11,8	5,6	0,0	4,4	1,8	2,1	3,0	3,0	5,6	3,8
Self-harming behaviour	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	10,9	4,2	0,0	0,0	6,7	2,1
Running away	16,4	13,0	26,5	17,5	15,9	22,2	30,9	23,6	16,2	17,2	29,2	20,6
Negative peer involvement	1,8	1,9	32,4	9,1	0,0	15,6	16,4	11,1	1,0	8,1	22,5	10,1
Inappropriate sexual behaviour	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	11,1	7,3	6,3	0,0	5,1	4,5	3,1
Criminal involvement	7,3	16,7	14,7	12,6	4,5	6,7	3,6	4,9	6,1	12,1	7,9	8,7
Substance abuse problems												
Unspecified	63,6	64,8	61,8	63,6	61,4	64,4	52,7	59,0	62,6	64,6	56,2	61,3
None	29,1	31,5	29,4	30,1	31,8	28,9	34,5	31,9	30,3	30,3	32,6	31,0
Drug abuse	0,0	0,0	2,9	0,7	0,0	0,0	1,8	0,7	0,0	0,0	2,2	0,7

Alcohol abuse	3,6	0,0	2,9	2,1	0,0	0,0	1,8	0,7	2,0	0,0	2,2	1,4
Diagnosed Disabilities												
Unspecified	32,7	27,8	35,3	31,5	25,0	31,1	27,3	27,8	29,3	29,3	30,3	29,6
None	43,6	59,3	47,1	50,3	56,8	57,8	45,5	52,8	49,5	58,6	46,1	51,6
Physical handicap	5,5	9,3	5,9	7,0	4,5	6,7	9,1	6,9	5,1	8,1	7,9	7,0
Visual-hear-speechimpairment	5,5	0,0	2,9	2,8	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	3,0	0,0	1,1	1,4
Impaired cognitive functioning	5,5	3,7	5,9	4,9	9,1	2,2	9,1	6,9	7,1	3,0	7,9	5,9
Psychiatric disorder	14,5	1,9	0,0	6,3	2,3	4,4	3,6	3,5	9,1	3,0	2,2	4,9

Table C.2.2.2 Child-physical abuse victims' characteristics

All forms of Maltreatment (n=240)												
	male				Female				Total			
	11	13	16	All	11	13	16	All	11	13	16	All
Total number of children-victims (81)	14	13	10	37	19	11	14	44	33	24	24	81
Educational status												
Unspecified	21,4	0,0	10,0	10,8	15,8	9,1	7,1	11,4	18,2	4,2	8,3	11,1
Not attending school at all	0,0	7,7	10,0	5,4	0,0	0,0	7,1	2,3	0,0	4,2	8,3	3,7
Dropped out	7,1	7,7	10,0	8,1	0,0	9,1	7,1	4,5	3,0	8,3	8,3	6,2
Attends school	78,6	92,3	70,0	81,1	84,2	81,8	50,0	72,7	81,8	87,5	58,3	76,5
Work status												
Unspecified	71,4	76,9	100,0	81,1	52,6	90,9	71,4	68,2	60,6	83,3	83,3	74,1
Not working	42,9	38,5	50,0	43,2	26,3	36,4	28,6	29,5	33,3	37,5	37,5	35,8
Working domestic/ unpaid	0,0	0,0	10,0	2,7	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	4,2	1,2
Working salaried work	0,0	7,7	10,0	5,4	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	4,2	4,2	2,5
Education-related problems												
Unspecified	42,9	38,5	10,0	32,4	52,6	36,4	78,6	56,8	48,5	37,5	50,0	45,7
None	35,7	46,2	70,0	48,6	21,1	36,4	0,0	18,2	27,3	41,7	29,2	32,1
Learning disability	7,1	7,7	0,0	5,4	10,5	9,1	0,0	6,8	9,1	8,3	0,0	6,2
Specialized education class	7,1	0,0	10,0	5,4	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	3,0	0,0	4,2	2,5
Irregular school attendance	2,0	2,0	2,0	6,1	4,1	4,1	6,1	14,3	6,1	6,1	8,2	20,4
Behaviour-related problems												
Unspecified	35,7	46,2	20,0	35,1	36,8	36,4	35,7	36,4	36,4	41,7	29,2	35,8
None	28,6	30,8	40,0	32,4	15,8	27,3	0,0	13,6	21,2	29,2	16,7	22,2
Problems in school	7,1	7,7	20,0	10,8	5,3	0,0	14,3	6,8	6,1	4,2	16,7	8,6
Problems in home	14,3	0,0	20,0	10,8	15,8	27,3	14,3	18,2	15,2	12,5	16,7	14,8
Violent behaviour	7,1	15,4	10,0	10,8	0,0	18,2	14,3	9,1	3,0	16,7	12,5	9,9
Bullying	21,4	7,7	10,0	13,5	0,0	9,1	0,0	2,3	9,1	8,3	4,2	7,4
Self-harming behaviour	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	21,4	6,8	0,0	0,0	12,5	3,7

Running away	0,0	15,4	10,0	8,1	31,6	27,3	50,0	36,4	18,2	20,8	33,3	23,5
Negative peer involvement	0,0	0,0	20,0	5,4	0,0	18,2	14,3	9,1	0,0	8,3	16,7	7,4
Inappropriate sexual behaviour	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	7,1	2,3	0,0	0,0	4,2	1,2
Criminal involvement	0,0	15,4	10,0	8,1	5,3	0,0	0,0	2,3	3,0	8,3	4,2	4,9
Substance abuse problems												
Unspecified	64,3	61,5	40,0	56,8	57,9	54,5	64,3	59,1	60,6	58,3	54,2	58,0
None	28,6	38,5	40,0	35,1	36,8	27,3	7,1	25,0	33,3	33,3	20,8	29,6
Drug abuse	0,0	0,0	10,0	2,7	0,0	0,0	7,1	2,3	0,0	0,0	8,3	2,5
Alcohol abuse	0,0	0,0	10,0	2,7	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	4,2	1,2
Diagnosed Disabilities												
Unspecified	21,4	7,7	10,0	13,5	10,5	36,4	28,6	22,7	15,2	20,8	20,8	18,5
None	42,9	92,3	70,0	67,6	68,4	54,5	28,6	52,3	57,6	75,0	45,8	59,3
Physical handicap	0,0	7,7	10,0	5,4	5,3	9,1	21,4	11,4	3,0	8,3	16,7	8,6
Visual-hear-speechimpairment	28,6	0,0	10,0	13,5	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	12,1	0,0	4,2	6,2
Impaired cognitive functioning	0,0	0,0	10,0	2,7	10,5	0,0	14,3	9,1	6,1	0,0	12,5	6,2
Psychiatric disorder	21,4	7,7	0,0	10,8	5,3	0,0	7,1	4,5	12,1	4,2	4,2	7,4

Table C.2.2.3 Child-sexual abuse victims' characteristics

	All forms of Maltreatment (n=288)											
	male				Female				Total			
	11	13	16	All	11	13	16	All	11	13	16	All
Total number of children-victims (62)	3	7	2	12	9	16	25	50	12	23	27	62
Educational status												
Unspecified	0,0	14,3	0,0	8,3	22,2	0,0	20,0	14,0	16,7	4,3	18,5	12,9
Not attending school at all	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	6,3	0,0	2,0	0,0	4,3	0,0	1,6
Dropped out	0,0	0,0	50,0	8,3	11,1	12,5	4,0	8,0	8,3	8,7	7,4	8,1
Attends school	100,0	85,7	50,0	83,3	66,7	81,3	76,0	76,0	75,0	82,6	74,1	77,4
Work status												
Unspecified	33,3	14,3	100,0	33,3	33,3	62,5	48,0	50,0	33,3	47,8	51,9	46,8
Not working	66,7	85,7	0,0	66,7	66,7	37,5	52,0	50,0	66,7	52,2	48,1	53,2
Working domestic/ unpaid	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Working salaried work	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Education-related problems												
Unspecified	33,3	57,1	50,0	50,0	44,4	31,3	36,0	36,0	41,7	39,1	37,0	38,7
None	33,3	14,3	0,0	16,7	33,3	50,0	40,0	42,0	33,3	39,1	37,0	37,1
Learning disability	0,0	14,3	0,0	8,3	0,0	12,5	12,0	10,0	0,0	13,0	11,1	9,7
Specialized education class	33,3	0,0	0,0	8,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	8,3	0,0	0,0	1,6
Irregular school attendance	0,0	2,0	2,0	4,1	4,1	2,0	6,1	12,2	4,1	4,1	8,2	16,3

Behaviour-related problems												
Unspecified	66,7	57,1	50,0	58,3	44,4	31,3	44,0	40,0	50,0	39,1	44,4	43,5
None	33,3	28,6	0,0	25,0	44,4	31,3	20,0	28,0	41,7	30,4	18,5	27,4
Problems in school	0,0	14,3	0,0	8,3	0,0	6,3	12,0	8,0	0,0	8,7	11,1	8,1
Problems in home	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	12,5	12,0	10,0	0,0	8,7	11,1	8,1
Violent behaviour	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	4,0	2,0	0,0	0,0	3,7	1,6
Bullying	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	6,3	0,0	2,0	0,0	4,3	0,0	1,6
Self-harming behaviour	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	4,0	2,0	0,0	0,0	3,7	1,6
Running away	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	11,1	18,8	16,0	16,0	8,3	13,0	14,8	12,9
Negative peer involvement	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	12,5	16,0	12,0	0,0	8,7	14,8	9,7
Inappropriate sexual behaviour	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	25,0	8,0	12,0	0,0	17,4	7,4	9,7
Criminal involvement	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	4,0	2,0	0,0	0,0	3,7	1,6
Substance abuse problems												
Unspecified	66,7	71,4	50,0	66,7	44,4	68,8	44,0	52,0	50,0	69,6	44,4	54,8
None	33,3	28,6	0,0	25,0	55,6	25,0	44,0	40,0	50,0	26,1	40,7	37,1
Drug abuse	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	4,0	2,0	0,0	0,0	3,7	1,6
Alcohol abuse	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Diagnosed Disabilities												
Unspecified	33,3	42,9	0,0	33,3	44,4	25,0	20,0	26,0	41,7	30,4	18,5	27,4
None	33,3	28,6	50,0	33,3	55,6	62,5	48,0	54,0	50,0	52,2	48,1	50,0
Physical handicap	0,0	28,6	0,0	16,7	0,0	6,3	4,0	4,0	0,0	13,0	3,7	6,5
Visual-hear-speechimpairment	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Impaired cognitive functioning	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	6,3	16,0	10,0	0,0	4,3	14,8	8,1
Psychiatric disorder	33,3	0,0	0,0	8,3	0,0	6,3	4,0	4,0	8,3	4,3	3,7	4,8

Table C.2.2.4 Child - psychological abuse victims' characteristics

All forms of Maltreatment (n=287)												
	male				Female				Total			
	11	13	16	All	11	13	16	All	11	13	16	All
Total number of children-victims (60)	17	10	5	32	10	7	11	28	27	17	16	60
Educational status												
Unspecified	0,0	10,0	0,0	3,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	5,9	0,0	1,7
Not attending school at all	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	18,2	7,1	0,0	0,0	12,5	3,3
Dropped out	0,0	0,0	20,0	3,1	0,0	0,0	9,1	3,6	0,0	0,0	12,5	3,3
Attends school	100,0	90,0	80,0	93,8	100,0	100,0	72,7	89,3	100,0	94,1	75,0	91,7
Work status												
Unspecified	76,5	60,0	240,0	96,9	90,0	157,1	63,6	96,4	81,5	0,0	118,8	96,7

Not working	23,5	40,0	80,0	37,5	10,0	28,6	36,4	25,0	18,5	35,3	50,0	31,7
Working domestic/ unpaid	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Working salaried work	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Education-related problems												
Unspecified	70,6	80,0	20,0	65,6	50,0	42,9	63,6	53,6	63,0	64,7	50,0	60,0
None	23,5	30,0	40,0	28,1	20,0	42,9	9,1	21,4	22,2	35,3	18,8	25,0
Learning disability	23,5	10,0	20,0	18,8	10,0	14,3	0,0	7,1	18,5	11,8	6,3	13,3
Specialized education class	5,9	0,0	0,0	3,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	3,7	0,0	0,0	1,7
Irregular school attendance	6,1	2,0	2,0	10,2	4,1	0,0	6,1	10,2	10,2	2,0	8,2	20,4
Behaviour-related problems												
Unspecified	41,2	30,0	0,0	31,3	40,0	42,9	27,3	35,7	40,7	35,3	18,8	33,3
None	35,3	50,0	60,0	43,8	10,0	57,1	18,2	25,0	25,9	52,9	31,3	35,0
Problems in school	17,6	0,0	0,0	9,4	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	11,1	0,0	0,0	5,0
Problems in home	5,9	10,0	0,0	6,3	20,0	0,0	9,1	10,7	11,1	5,9	6,3	8,3
Violent behaviour	0,0	10,0	20,0	6,3	0,0	0,0	9,1	3,6	0,0	5,9	12,5	5,0
Bullying	11,8	0,0	20,0	9,4	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	7,4	0,0	6,3	5,0
Self-harming behaviour	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	27,3	10,7	0,0	0,0	18,8	5,0
Running away	0,0	20,0	40,0	12,5	50,0	0,0	45,5	35,7	18,5	11,8	43,8	23,3
Negative peer involvement	0,0	10,0	20,0	6,3	0,0	0,0	9,1	3,6	0,0	5,9	12,5	5,0
Inappropriate sexual behaviour	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Criminal involvement	0,0	0,0	20,0	3,1	10,0	0,0	0,0	3,6	3,7	0,0	6,3	3,3
Substance abuse problems												
Unspecified	82,4	70,0	40,0	71,9	70,0	57,1	54,5	60,7	77,8	64,7	50,0	66,7
None	11,8	30,0	40,0	21,9	30,0	28,6	18,2	25,0	18,5	29,4	25,0	23,3
Drug abuse	0,0	0,0	20,0	3,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	6,3	1,7
Alcohol abuse	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	9,1	3,6	0,0	0,0	6,3	1,7
Diagnosed Disabilities												
Unspecified	23,5	10,0	0,0	15,6	0,0	28,6	18,2	14,3	14,8	17,6	12,5	15,0
None	47,1	90,0	100,0	68,8	70,0	57,1	45,5	57,1	55,6	76,5	62,5	63,3
Physical handicap	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	20,0	14,3	18,2	17,9	7,4	5,9	12,5	8,3
Visual-hear-speech impairment	11,8	0,0	0,0	6,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	7,4	0,0	0,0	3,3
Impaired cognitive functioning	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	10,0	0,0	18,2	10,7	3,7	0,0	12,5	5,0
Psychiatric disorder	23,5	0,0	0,0	12,5	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	14,8	0,0	0,0	6,7

Table C.2.2.5 Child-neglect victims' characteristics

	All forms of Maltreatment (n=240)											
	male				Female				Total			
	11	13	16	All	11	13	16	All	11	13	16	All
Total number of children-victims	36	35	22	93	23	22	22	67	59	57	44	160
Educational status												
Unspecified	16,7	22,9	36,4	23,7	8,7	0,0	13,6	7,5	13,6	14,0	25,0	16,9
Not attending school at all	11,1	14,3	9,1	11,8	4,3	18,2	13,6	11,9	8,5	15,8	11,4	11,9
Dropped out	2,8	14,3	13,6	9,7	13,0	13,6	13,6	13,4	6,8	14,0	13,6	11,3
Attends school	69,4	48,6	40,9	54,8	73,9	68,2	59,1	67,2	71,2	56,1	50,0	60,0
Work status												
Unspecified	77,8	65,7	59,1	68,8	65,2	86,4	63,6	71,6	72,9	73,7	61,4	70,0
Not working	19,4	31,4	31,8	26,9	34,8	13,6	36,4	28,4	25,4	24,6	34,1	27,5
Working domestic/ unpaid	2,8	2,9	9,1	4,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,7	1,8	4,5	2,5
Working salaried work	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	4,5	1,5	0,0	0,0	2,3	0,6
Education-related problems												
Unspecified	50,0	65,7	63,6	59,1	52,2	54,5	63,6	56,7	50,8	61,4	63,6	58,1
None	8,3	11,4	9,1	9,7	21,7	18,2	13,6	17,9	13,6	14,0	11,4	13,1
Learning disability	25,0	5,7	13,6	15,1	4,3	22,7	0,0	9,0	16,9	12,3	6,8	12,5
Specialized education class	0,0	5,7	0,0	2,2	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	3,5	0,0	1,3
Irregular school attendance	12,2	8,2	6,1	26,5	10,2	2,0	10,2	22,4	22,4	10,2	16,3	49,0
Behaviour-related problems												
Unspecified	36,1	37,1	31,8	35,5	47,8	22,7	9,1	26,9	40,7	31,6	20,5	31,9
None	16,7	20,0	13,6	17,2	8,7	27,3	4,5	13,4	13,6	22,8	9,1	15,6
Problems in school	19,4	5,7	13,6	12,9	8,7	0,0	27,3	11,9	15,3	3,5	20,5	12,5
Problems in home	11,1	8,6	9,1	9,7	17,4	22,7	36,4	25,4	13,6	14,0	22,7	16,3
Violent behaviour	11,1	5,7	22,7	11,8	0,0	13,6	4,5	6,0	6,8	8,8	13,6	9,4
Bullying	0,0	0,0	9,1	2,2	0,0	0,0	4,5	1,5	0,0	0,0	6,8	1,9
Self-harming behaviour	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	18,2	6,0	0,0	0,0	9,1	2,5
Running away	25,0	17,1	31,8	23,7	21,7	22,7	45,5	29,9	23,7	19,3	38,6	26,3
Negative peer involvement	2,8	2,9	36,4	10,8	0,0	18,2	22,7	13,4	1,7	8,8	29,5	11,9
Inappropriate sexual behaviour	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	9,1	9,1	6,0	0,0	3,5	4,5	2,5
Criminal involvement	11,1	22,9	13,6	16,1	8,7	13,6	4,5	9,0	10,2	19,3	9,1	13,1
Substance abuse problems												
Unspecified	63,9	71,4	72,7	68,8	65,2	72,7	59,1	65,7	64,4	71,9	65,9	67,5
None	27,8	25,7	27,3	26,9	26,1	27,3	27,3	26,9	27,1	26,3	27,3	26,9
Drug abuse	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Alcohol abuse	5,6	0,0	0,0	2,2	0,0	0,0	4,5	1,5	3,4	0,0	2,3	1,9
Diagnosed Disabilities												
Unspecified	38,9	34,3	54,5	40,9	21,7	31,8	31,8	28,4	32,2	33,3	43,2	35,6
None	41,7	54,3	31,8	44,1	52,2	54,5	45,5	50,7	45,8	54,4	38,6	46,9
Physical handicap	8,3	5,7	4,5	6,5	4,3	4,5	18,2	9,0	6,8	5,3	11,4	7,5
Visual-hear-speechimpairment	2,8	0,0	0,0	1,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,7	0,0	0,0	0,6
Impaired cognitive functioning	8,3	5,7	4,5	6,5	17,4	4,5	4,5	9,0	11,9	5,3	4,5	7,5
Psychiatric disorder	8,3	0,0	0,0	3,2	4,3	9,1	0,0	4,5	6,8	3,5	0,0	3,8

C.2.3. Characteristics of Families and Households of Maltreated Children

Table C.2.3 Children-victims' Family and Household characteristics per form of maltreatment

	Form of Maltreatment				
	Physical abuse (n=100)	Sexual abuse (n=100)	Psychological abuse (n=100)	Neglect (n=100)	All forms of maltreatment (n=300)
	81	62	60	161	287
Family Status					
Unspecified	4,9	6,5	18,3	0,6	8,7
Married parents	42,0	54,8	41,7	18,6	36,2
Divorced parents	19,8	25,8	8,3	5,6	18,1
Single parent family	14,8	19,4	16,7	6,8	17,8
Step family	2,5	3,2	1,7	1,2	2,4
Foster family	14,8	19,4	15,0	3,7	13,6
Number of co-habitants					
Unspecified	4,9	21,0	3,3	8,7	10,1
1	11,1	4,8	13,3	6,2	8,7
2	14,8	24,2	18,3	19,3	18,1
3	18,5	21,0	18,3	17,4	19,5
4	13,6	4,8	5,0	14,3	11,8
>5	37,0	22,6	41,7	31,1	30,0
Co-habitants identity					
Unspecified	4,9	21,0	3,3	6,8	9,1
Mother	63,0	64,5	66,7	59,0	63,8
Father	65,4	48,4	66,7	53,4	55,7
Siblings	72,8	54,8	66,7	69,6	65,9
Grandparent(s)	11,1	8,1	18,3	16,8	18,1
Other blood/in-laws relative(s)	9,9	8,1	23,3	8,7	7,3
Parent's partner	11,1	14,5	3,3	9,3	10,1
Other CAN victims					
Unspecified	24,7	43,5	26,7	31,7	33,1
None	25,9	41,9	13,3	12,4	23,3
Siblings	48,1	12,9	56,7	49,7	40,1
Other types of abuse					
Unspecified	38,3	56,5	41,7	18,6	53,0
None	21,0	37,1	11,7	56,5	24,0
Intimate partner violence	33,3	6,5	43,3	12,4	15,0
Elderly abuse	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Sibling abuse	7,4	1,6	3,3	9,3	6,6
Housing adequacy					
Unspecified	11,1	29,0	11,7	16,8	18,1
No	30,9	21,0	45,0	36,0	30,0
Yes	54,3	45,2	41,7	36,6	44,9
Household income					

Unspecified	61,7	71,0	61,7	70,8	69,7
Very low	11,1	11,3	18,3	19,3	14,3
Low	16,0	4,8	8,3	6,8	8,4
Moderate	9,9	12,9	10,0	2,5	7,0
High	1,2	0,0	1,7	0,6	0,7
Very high	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Source of income					
Unspecified	11,1	32,3	10,0	24,2	23,0
No source of income	1,2	1,6	0,0	3,1	2,1
Full time employment	32,1	27,4	23,3	13,0	22,3
Part time/Seasonal employment	4,9	4,8	8,3	4,3	4,9
Social assistance	37,0	24,2	35,0	38,5	32,1
No reliable source	7,4	3,2	18,3	7,5	8,0
Financial problems					
Unspecified	40,7	38,7	36,7	46,6	42,5
No	13,6	22,6	20,0	5,0	13,6
Yes	44,4	33,9	43,3	43,5	40,1

C.2.4. CAN-Perpetrators & Caregivers of maltreated children

Table C.2.4 Perpetrators and Caregivers

Perpetrators and Caregivers			
Perpetrators only	Perpetrators & Caregivers	Caregivers only	Total
93	246	114	453
20,53	54,30	25,17	100

C.2.5. Characteristics of Perpetrators and Caregivers

Table C.2.5.1 Perpetrators' characteristics per form of maltreatment

	Form of Maltreatment				
	Physical abuse	Sexual	Psychological abuse	Neglect	All forms of maltreatment (n=)
Number of cases	81	62	60	160	363
Number of perpetrators involved					
Unspecified	0,0	4,8	0,0	3,1	2,2
1	82,7	75,8	78,3	63,1	72,2
2	16,0	9,7	20,0	31,3	22,3
3	1,2	3,2	1,7	1,3	1,7
4 or more	0,0	4,8	0,0	0,0	0,8
Status of allegation	24	47	12	31	93
Unspecified	4,17	6,38	8,33	3,23	5,38
Perpetrator	62,50	68,09	66,67	70,97	69,89
Alleged Perpetrator	33,33	17,02	25,00	25,81	20,43
Gender					
Unspecified	0,00	4,26	0,00	0,00	2,15
Male	75,00	87,23	66,67	41,94	73,12
Female	25,00	4,26	33,33	58,06	24,73
Age group	24	47	12	31	93
>18	8,33	10,64	0,00	0,00	7,53
19-24	16,67	17,02	0,00	0,00	10,75
25-34	8,33	10,64	25,00	12,90	10,75
35-44	12,50	4,26	16,67	19,35	11,83
45-54	0,00	0,00	8,33	0,00	3,23
55-64	0,00	2,13	0,00	3,23	0,00
>65	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
Educational Level	24	47	12	31	93
Unspecified	62,50	80,85	41,67	70,97	72,04
Has not attended school	8,33	0,00	8,33	0,00	2,15
Elementary school	0,00	2,13	0,00	0,00	1,08
Middle School	8,33	6,38	8,33	6,45	6,45
High School	12,50	2,13	16,67	6,45	6,45
Technical School	4,17	0,00	16,67	0,00	2,15
University	0,00	2,13	0,00	0,00	1,08
Post-graduate studies	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
Employment status	24	47	12	31	93
Unspecified	58,33	70,21	33,33	67,74	65,59
Employed	16,67	14,89	25,00	12,90	16,13
Unemployed	20,83	4,26	25,00	6,45	7,53
Retired	0,00	2,13	16,67	9,68	4,30
Marital Status	24	47	12	31	93
Unspecified	29,17	63,83	33,33	41,94	49,46
Single	4,17	17,02	0,00	0,00	8,60
Married	20,83	4,26	25,00	12,90	11,83
Living together	25,00	6,38	16,67	29,03	16,13
Separated	8,33	0,00	16,67	6,45	4,30
Divorced	4,17	0,00	16,67	3,23	2,15
Widow/er	4,17	2,13	8,33	6,45	4,30

	Form of Maltreatment				
	Physical abuse	Sexual	Psychological abuse	Neglect	All forms of maltreatment (n=)
Relation to child	24	47	12	31	93
Unspecified	0,00	10,64	0,00	0,00	5,38
Mother	12,50	0,00	25,00	48,39	17,20
Father	29,17	4,26	58,33	32,26	21,51
Step-mother	0,00	0,00	0,00	3,23	1,08
Step-father	0,00	2,13	0,00	0,00	2,15
Full sibling	4,17	4,26	0,00	0,00	3,23
Grandparent	4,17	2,13	8,33	3,23	2,15
Other blood relative	12,50	10,64	8,33	6,45	0,00
Health care provider	0,00	2,13	0,00	0,00	1,08
Parent's partner	12,50	6,38	0,00	32,26	6,45
Date	8,33	6,38	0,00	0,00	3,23
Neighbour	8,33	17,02	0,00	0,00	9,68
Friend	8,33	8,51	0,00	0,00	6,45
Stranger	0,00	6,38	0,00	0,00	3,23
Teacher/Coach (outside school)	0,00	10,64	0,00	0,00	5,38
Family friend	0,00	2,13	0,00	0,00	1,08
History of substance abuse					
Unspecified	54,17	76,60	58,33	80,65	73,12
None	8,33	8,51	0,00	0,00	6,45
Drug abuse	4,17	0,00	0,00	0,00	1,08
Alcohol abuse	33,33	8,51	41,67	19,35	17,20
Physical-Mental Disabilities					
Unspecified	75,00	78,72	75,00	77,42	76,34
None	16,67	10,64	0,00	0,00	8,60
Physical handicap	0,00	2,13	0,00	0,00	1,08
Psychiatric Disorder	4,17	0,00	25,00	3,23	3,23
Impaired cognitive functioning	0,00	2,13	0,00	0,00	1,08
History of victimization					
Unspecified	91,67	85,11	100,00	83,87	86,02
None	4,17	0,00	0,00	0,00	1,08
Yes	0,00	6,38	0,00	3,23	4,30
Previous similar allegations					
Unspecified	54,17	76,60	50,00	64,52	68,82
None	8,33	12,77	0,00	0,00	7,53
Yes	33,33	4,26	50,00	22,58	16,13

Table C.2.5.2 Caregivers who are also Perpetrators' characteristics per form of maltreatment

	Form of Maltreatment				
	Physical abuse	Sexual	Psychological abuse	Neglect	All forms of maltreatment (n=)
No of Caregivers/Perpetrators	72,00	19,00	62,00	172,00	246,00
Status of allegation					
Unspecified	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,58	0,41
Perpetrator	83,33	84,21	85,48	84,88	84,55
Alleged Perpetrator	16,67	15,79	14,52	13,37	14,23
Gender					
Unspecified	0,00	0,00	1,61	0,00	0,41
Male	61,11	84,21	66,13	65,83	52,85
Female	38,89	15,79	32,26	75,00	46,75
Age group					
>18	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
19-24	2,78	0,00	3,23	1,16	0,81
25-34	13,89	15,79	3,23	11,63	11,38
35-44	29,17	21,05	32,26	29,65	28,46
45-54	23,61	26,32	19,35	15,12	17,48
55-64	6,94	0,00	3,23	1,74	3,25
>65	0,00	5,26	0,00	0,00	0,41
Educational Level					
Unspecified	44,44	42,11	27,42	48,26	45,93
Has not attended school	2,78	5,26	1,61	3,49	3,66
Elementary school	2,78	5,26	6,45	1,16	3,66
Middle School	6,94	10,53	1,61	13,95	10,98
High School	12,50	21,05	19,35	11,63	13,41
Technical School	8,33	5,26	9,68	2,33	7,72
University	4,17	0,00	3,23	0,00	2,03
Post-graduate studies	0,00	0,00	1,61	0,00	0,00
Employment status					
Unspecified	19,44	31,58	11,29	26,16	23,58
Employed	22,22	15,79	24,19	14,53	19,92
Unemployed	22,22	26,32	19,35	33,72	28,05
Retired	5,56	10,53	4,84	0,58	2,85
Marital Status					
Unspecified	6,94	10,53	1,61	8,72	8,54
Single	5,56	15,79	0,00	9,88	7,32
Married	48,61	52,63	61,29	37,79	43,90
Living together	22,22	15,79	17,74	19,77	18,29
Separated	1,39	0,00	3,23	7,56	5,28
Divorced	12,50	0,00	8,06	9,88	10,16
Widow/er	2,78	5,26	8,06	4,65	5,28

(Table C.2.5.1 cont.)

	Form of Maltreatment				
	Physical abuse	Sexual	Psychological abuse	Neglect	All forms of maltreatment (n=)
Relation to child	72,00	19,00	62,00	172,00	246,00
Unspecified	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,58	0,41
Mother	31,94	15,79	30,65	50,58	53,66
Father	52,78	63,16	59,68	40,70	45,93
Step-mother	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
Step-father	0,00	5,26	1,61	0,58	0,81
Full sibling	1,39	0,00	1,61	0,58	0,41
Grandparent	1,39	0,00	1,61	0,58	0,81
Other blood relative	4,17	5,26	0,00	0,58	1,63
In-laws	1,39	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,41
Parent's partner	4,17	5,26	16,13	2,91	6,10
History of substance abuse					
Unspecified	31,94	42,11	32,26	49,42	46,75
None	15,28	15,79	8,06	11,63	14,23
Drug abuse	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,58	0,41
Alcohol abuse	48,61	42,11	59,68	36,05	36,18
Physical-Mental Disabilities					
Unspecified	48,61	42,11	45,16	50,00	50,41
None	27,78	47,37	25,81	23,84	28,05
Physical handicap	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,58	0,41
Psychiatric Disorder	6,94	0,00	3,23	4,65	4,47
Impaired cognitive functioning	1,39	0,00	0,00	1,74	1,63
History of victimization					
Unspecified	63,89	84,21	59,68	68,60	70,33
None	11,11	0,00	8,06	6,98	9,35
Yes	6,94	0,00	3,23	4,65	4,47
Previous similar allegations					
Unspecified	40,28	52,63	45,16	50,58	51,63
None	20,83	26,32	19,35	13,37	16,67
Yes	18,06	5,26	4,84	15,12	14,23

Table C.2.5.3 Caregivers' characteristics per form of maltreatment

	Form of Maltreatment				
	Physical abuse	Sexual	Psychological abuse	Neglect	All forms of maltreatment (n=)
Number of Caregivers	37	51	21	37	114
Unspecified	2,7	3,9	0,0	13,5	7,0
1	24,3	37,3	142,9	216,2	119,3
2	64,9	68,6	109,5	159,5	103,5
3	8,1	0,0	4,8	2,7	0,9
4 or more	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Gender					
Unspecified	2,7	2,0	0,0	8,1	4,4
Male	29,7	27,5	14,3	45,9	30,7
Female	64,9	70,6	85,7	48,6	64,9
Age group					
>18	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
19-24	0,0	2,0	0,0	0,0	0,9
25-34	16,2	19,6	19,0	8,1	14,9
35-44	37,8	25,5	38,1	24,3	32,5
45-54	8,1	19,6	0,0	2,7	12,3
55-64	0,0	2,0	4,8	8,1	3,5
>65	0,0	2,0	0,0	5,4	2,6
Relation to child					
Unspecified	0,0	2,0	4,8	2,7	1,8
Mother	56,8	60,8	66,7	13,5	49,1
Father	24,3	17,6	4,8	27,0	23,7
Step mother	0,0	2,0	0,0	0,0	0,9
Step father	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,7	1,8
Grandmother	5,4	5,9	14,3	24,3	10,5
Grandfather	0,0	2,0	0,0	0,0	0,9
Sibling	0,0	2,0	0,0	0,0	0,9
Other blood relative	5,4	2,0	9,5	162,2	7,0
Caregiver in institution	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,7	1,8
Parent's partner	5,4	3,9	0,0	2,7	1,8
Type of Guardianship					
Unspecified	5,4	3,9	4,8	8,1	5,3
Parent	81,1	78,4	71,4	40,5	71,1
Legal guardian	0,0	2,0	0,0	5,4	2,6
Step parent	0,0	2,0	0,0	2,7	1,8
Foster parent	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,7	0,0
Caretaker	10,8	11,8	23,8	43,2	19,3

(Table C.2.5.3 cont.)

	Form of Maltreatment				
	Physical abuse	Sexual	Psychological abuse (n=)	Neglect	All forms of maltreatment (n=)
Educational Level					
Unspecified	54,1	52,9	57,1	83,8	59,6
Has not attended school	0,0	3,9	0,0	0,0	1,8
Elementary school	2,7	5,9	0,0	2,7	4,4
Middle School	5,4	3,9	9,5	8,1	6,1
High School	29,7	11,8	28,6	2,7	14,9
Technical School	0,0	17,6	0,0	5,4	9,6
University	5,4	2,0	4,8	0,0	3,5
Post-graduate studies	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Employment status					
Unspecified	27,0	39,2	14,3	35,1	33,3
Employed	29,7	27,5	23,8	13,5	27,2
Unemployed	2,7	3,9	9,5	2,7	4,4
Retired	0,0	3,9	0,0	16,2	7,0
Marital Status					
Unspecified	13,5	11,8	19,0	27,0	17,5
Single	8,1	0,0	14,3	13,5	4,4
Married	45,9	58,8	33,3	32,4	50,0
Living together	18,9	21,6	19,0	24,3	20,2
Separated	0,0	5,9	0,0	0,0	2,6
Divorced	5,4	0,0	4,8	0,0	2,6
Widow/er	0,0	0,0	0,0	5,4	1,8
History of substance abuse					
Unspecified	54,1	60,8	52,4	67,6	62,3
None	18,9	27,5	23,8	10,8	23,7
Drug abuse	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Alcohol abuse	21,6	9,8	19,0	21,6	14,0
Physical-Mental Disabilities					
Unspecified	54,1	54,9	61,9	73,0	60,5
None	16,2	33,3	4,8	18,9	25,4
Physical handicap	8,1	7,8	9,5	0,0	4,4
Psychiatric Disorder	13,5	0,0	19,0	8,1	7,9
Impaired cognitive functioning	2,7	2,0	0,0	0,0	1,8
History of victimization					
Unspecified	75,7	76,5	71,4	86,5	79,8
None	8,1	21,6	4,8	10,8	15,8
Yes	10,8	0,0	19,0	0,0	4,4
History of CAN allegations					
Unspecified	48,6	51,0	52,4	45,9	54,4
None	18,9	35,3	14,3	16,2	28,1
Yes	18,9	2,0	23,8	13,5	8,8

C.2.6. Agencies involved in administration of CAN cases and Services provided to children-victims and their families

Table C.2.6.1 Agencies involved in CAN cases' administration per form of maltreatment

	Form of Maltreatment				
	Physical abuse	Sexual	Psychological abuse	Neglect	All forms of maltreatment
	81	62	60	161	287
Case assessment of allegation					
Unspecified	0,00	0,00	0,00	1,24	0,70
Medical /Health services	30,86	37,10	13,33	7,45	19,16
Mental Health services	0,00	3,23	0,00	0,00	0,70
Education services	9,88	3,23	6,67	7,45	6,97
Social services	97,53	83,87	95,00	93,79	93,03
Police services	44,44	67,74	25,00	22,36	36,59
Legal/Judicial services	11,11	19,35	5,00	6,21	10,80
Maltreatment confirmation					
Unspecified	6,17	8,06	5,00	7,45	6,97
Medical /Health services	32,10	33,87	13,33	7,45	18,82
Mental Health services	0,00	1,61	0,00	1,86	1,39
Education services	8,64	0,00	3,33	3,11	3,83
Social services	92,59	56,45	93,33	88,82	83,62
Police services	27,16	41,94	13,33	9,94	21,25
Legal/Judicial services	11,11	9,68	11,67	8,70	10,10
Legal Action Taken					
Unspecified	9,88	12,90	6,67	5,59	7,67
None legal action taken	27,16	12,90	18,33	25,47	25,78
Social service/police -NO court involvement	17,28	30,65	26,67	21,12	22,30
Emergency protection procedures implemented	29,63	20,97	33,33	38,51	31,01
Judicial action to protect victim by court order(s)	3,70	1,61	3,33	6,21	4,18
Judicial action to remove parent(s) rights	4,94	0,00	5,00	2,48	1,39
Police/Judicial action to prosecute abuser	12,35	29,03	10,00	3,11	10,45
Care plan for child					
Unspecified	8,64	17,74	20,00	15,53	16,03
Child remains in family with no intervention	19,75	11,29	16,67	9,94	12,54
Child remains in family with planned intervention	29,63	46,77	33,33	27,95	34,15
Child removed from family (parents co-operation)	11,11	14,52	3,33	16,15	12,54
Child removed from family home by court order	23,46	8,06	23,33	22,36	18,82
Out of home placement					
Unspecified	7,41	14,52	6,67	11,18	10,80
No out of home placement	50,62	58,06	50,00	36,02	47,39
Children's Home Institution-NO individual carer	19,75	17,74	13,33	19,88	17,77
Mother/child shelter	2,47	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,70
Kinship Care with relatives/extended family	6,17	8,06	10,00	8,70	7,32
Foster Care with volunteer/paid carers	4,94	0,00	8,33	8,07	5,57
Adoption with parents agreement or court order	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
Abuser leaves the family home	1,23	0,00	3,33	0,62	1,05

Table C.2.6.2 Referrals made to services and services provided to children-victims and their families per form of maltreatment

	Physical abuse	Sexual	Psychologic al abuse	Neglect	All forms of maltreatment
	81	62	60	161	287
Referrals made to services					
Unspecified	27,16	25,81	25,00	32,92	30,66
None	0,00	1,61	3,33	1,86	2,09
Parent support program	13,58	9,68	13,33	11,80	13,24
Drug or alcohol counselling	2,47	1,61	1,67	1,24	1,39
Other family counselling	24,69	22,58	31,67	18,01	20,21
Social welfare assistance	6,17	20,97	1,67	11,80	12,54
Food Bank	1,23	1,61	0,00	5,59	3,48
Shelter services	6,17	3,23	5,00	7,45	5,92
Domestic violence counselling	14,81	3,23	11,67	3,11	5,92
Psychiatric services	38,27	43,55	40,00	29,81	35,54
Psychological services	8,64	8,06	10,00	3,73	5,57
Special education referral	1,23	3,23	0,00	5,59	3,83
Recreational program	3,70	1,61	3,33	4,97	3,83
Victim support program	7,41	9,68	8,33	5,59	6,62
Medical/dental services	14,81	12,90	11,67	9,32	10,80
Other child counselling	6,17	16,13	10,00	13,04	12,89
Services received					
Unspecified	8,64	9,68	5,00	22,36	16,38
None	4,94	4,84	6,67	1,86	3,48
Parent support program	19,75	12,90	15,00	11,18	13,94
Drug or alcohol counselling	4,94	1,61	3,33	2,48	2,09
Other family counselling	23,46	19,35	25,00	14,29	18,12
Social welfare assistance	6,17	19,35	3,33	10,56	11,15
Food Bank	2,47	1,61	0,00	4,35	3,14
Shelter services	4,94	4,84	3,33	9,94	7,32
Domestic violence counselling	14,81	4,84	11,67	2,48	5,92
Psychiatric services	40,74	40,32	40,00	29,19	35,89
Psychological services	11,11	9,68	10,00	5,59	6,62
Special education referral	1,23	3,23	0,00	6,21	4,18
Recreational program	6,17	3,23	5,00	4,97	4,53
Victim support program	8,64	11,29	8,33	4,97	6,97
Medical/dental services	14,81	14,52	15,00	13,04	12,89
Other child counselling	11,11	22,58	15,00	14,91	16,38

C.3. File completeness concerning the characteristics of the recorded CAN cases: lessons learned from the missing values

Table C.3 Availability of information concerning the characteristics of the recorded CAN cases

	Availability of information (n=xxx)			
	Available information		Non-available information (missing/unspecified)	
	f	%	f	%
Report date (exact date of intake) (n=xxx)	280	97,22	8	2,78
Child-related information (n=288)				
Age	288	100,00	0	0,00
Date of birth	288	100,00	0	0,00
Gender	287	99,65	1	0,35
Nationality	162	56,25	126	43,75
Educational Status	244	84,72	44	15,28
Work Status	115	39,93	173	60,07
Education-related problems	156	54,17	132	45,83
Behaviour related problems	185	64,24	103	35,76
Substance-abuse problems	100	34,72	188	65,28
Diagnosed Disabilities	200	69,44	88	30,56
Contact details (n=xxx)				
Telephone number	11	3,82	277	96,18
Address	267	92,71	21	7,29
Incident related information (n=288)				
Duration of maltreatment	155	53,82	133	46,18
Source of referral	288	100,00	0	0,00
Scene of incident	249	86,46	39	13,54
Form of maltreatment	287	99,65	1	0,35
Physical abuse (n=81)				
Status of substantiation	79	27,43	209	72,57
Specific Forms	53	18,40	235	81,60
Injury due to physical abuse	44	15,28	244	84,72
Nature of injury(-ies)	36	12,50	252	87,50
Sexual abuse (n=62)				
Status of substantiation	58	20,14	230	79,86
Specific Forms	56	19,44	232	80,56
Psychological abuse (n=60)				
Status of substantiation	56	19,44	232	80,56
Specific Forms	54	18,75	234	81,25
Neglect (n=161)				
Status of substantiation	158	54,86	130	45,14
Specific Forms	141	48,96	147	51,04
Case assessment of allegation (n=xxx)	286	99,31	2	0,69
Maltreatment confirmation (n=xxx)	268	93,06	20	6,94
Legal action taken	257	89,24	31	10,76
Care plan for child	227	78,82	61	21,18
Out of Home placement	238	82,64	50	17,36
Perpetrator(s)' related information (n=339)				

Number of perpetrators	252	87,5	36	12,5
Status of allegation	342	97,99	7	2,01
Gender	345	98,57	5	1,43
Age	200	57,47	148	42,53
Nationality	166	46,63	190	53,37
Educational level	116	33,05	235	66,95
Employment status	212	60,74	137	39,26
Marital status	268	76,79	81	23,21
Relationship to child	331	91,69	30	8,31
History of substance abuse	150	41,55	211	58,45
Physical-Mental Disabilities	98	28,08	251	71,92
History of victimization/abuse	39	11,11	312	88,89
Previous similar allegations	98	28,16	250	71,84
Contact details (n=339)				
Telephone number	88	25,00	264	75
Address	282	78,33	78	21,67
Caregiver(s) related information (n=114)				
Relation to Perpetrators	345	94,01	22	5,99
Number of caregivers	255	88,85	32	11,15
Relationship to Child	112	98,25	2	1,75
Type of Guardianship	108	94,74	6	5,26
Gender	109	95,61	5	4,39
Age	75	65,79	39	34,21
Educational level	45	39,47	69	60,53
Employment status	76	66,67	38	33,33
Marital status	94	82,46	20	17,54
History of substance abuse	43	37,72	71	62,28
Physical-Mental Disabilities	45	39,47	69	60,53
History of victimization/abuse	24	21,05	90	78,95
History of CAN allegations	56	49,12	58	50,88
Contact details (n=114)				
Telephone number	55	48,25	59	51,75
Address	105	92,11	9	7,89
Family-related information (n=288)				
Family status	263	91,32	25	8,68
Number of co-habitants	259	89,93	29	10,07
Co-habitants' identity	262	90,97	26	9,03
Other CAN victims	259	89,93	29	10,07
Other types of abuse	136	47,22	152	52,78
Referrals made to services	200	69,44	88	30,56
Services received	241	83,68	47	16,32
Household-related information (n=288),				
Housing adequacy	236	81,94	52	18,06
Household income	120	41,67	168	58,33
Source of income	222	77,08	66	22,92
Financial problems	166	57,64	122	42,36
Previous maltreatment (n=288)				
Type of most severe maltreatment	58	74,36	20	25,64
Perpetrator(s)	58	77,33	17	22,67
Investigating agencies	63	67,74	30	32,26
Follow-up information (n=288)	5	1,74	283	98,26

CHAPTER D. CONCLUSIONS

CAN Incidence

Considering the incidence rate, the results show that the incidence of CAN in general is very similar between the different age groups (ages of 11, 13 and 16) and between genders (see Table C.2.1.). The incidence of different forms of CAN however is showing differences when it comes to comparison between girls and boys. The incidence of sexual abuse is twice higher in case of girls than in case of boys, the incidence of neglect is higher with one third in case of boys than in case of girls.

Taken into consideration that the original sample of agencies involved in the study was altered due to practical considerations, and representativeness of areas was thus biased, comparison of results by areas is not relevant.

Comparing the incidence results with the results of the epidemiological study, there is an evident gap between the prevalence of CAN identified by the BECAN epidemiological study and the number of cases reported/identified by the responsible agencies in the same region. This underlines the clear need for improvement of the identification, referral and registration system, in other words the case based surveillance system in Romania.

Availability of data in files

The case based surveillance study in Romania showed that the completeness of case files vary remarkably. In regard of data regarding the characteristics of child, the age, date of birth, gender, educational status is registered in a great extent (84-100%). However, data linked with other important characteristics which could be directly linked with the experience of abuse, such as educational and behavioral problems, their eventual involvement in child labor, substance abuse, health status is available in a much lower extent (see Table C.3.). Incidence related information (for example the timing of the incident and its duration, the specific forms of abuse, the severity of injuries due to the abuse, the nature of injury suffered by the child) are missing in a great extent as well.

The form of maltreatment was specified in a high percent of case files (excepting one file). Identification of the form of abuse is essential in the assessment process and intervention planning, but more detailed information regarding specific forms of the four maltreatment types are present in much lower percent in case files. Forms of physical abuse are specified in a relatively higher percent but in case of sexual and psychological abuse, the rate is much lower (see Table nr. C.3).

The scene of maltreatment is specified in a high percentage of cases, but the date when the maltreatment occurred and duration of the abuse is mentioned only in much fewer cases.

Concerning the problems children are facing at school and at home, at behavioral and health level, data is missing in a great extent from the examined files. Thus, in 35.1% of cases information regarding behavioral problems are not specified in files, educational problems, r are also recorded in low percentages; child's health condition is recorded in a higher percent. For the same reason, we can't draw general conclusions regarding the the potential risk factors, such as family status, number of co-habitants, family's income, source of income, adequacy of housing conditions, but these can be analyzed in the larger context of the Balkan research.

In regard of the characteristics of perpetrators and caregivers, same concerns are arising. However, results show a great overlap between the groups of perpetrators and caregivers, underpinning the fact evidenced by most of the studies that children are affected by violence most frequently in their own families.

Files are much more complete in regard of the information linked with the institutions which are involved in detection and assessment of abuse allegation, forms of the intervention and the provided services. Here we must note that these items are part of the Quarterly Monitoring Fiche as well, so this type of information is much frequently registered.

Children's vulnerability to each specific form of CAN

The proportion of children (among the recorded cases) who are victims of physical, sexual, psychological abuse and neglect (including all cases, detected and/or reported, substantiated and non-substantiated) shows some differences in the regard with the vulnerability to specific forms of abuse: while 56% of children suffered from neglect, the proportion of children who suffered from physical abuse is only 28% and in 20% of the cases children experienced sexual and psychological abuse.

Child-related risks for CAN

Due to the limited number of analyzed files we can not make conclusions in regard of the risk factors for the general population. However, the results give a more complex picture in reference of the characteristics of children who suffered from abuse and came in contact with the general directorates for social assistance and child protection.

The rate of male/female victims is almost equal (144 girls, 143 boys), the distribution by age is also balanced (99 aged 11, 99 aged 13 and 89 aged 16). There is no relevant data in regard of ethnicity/nationality, due to the implicit policy in Romania not to register ethnicity in official

documents². Information related to child labor seems to be missing from the analyzed files, only a very small number of cases are reported to have a formal or informal job (1.7%).

The forms of the different types of abuse is not very well documented, but in case of psychological abuse stands out the frequency of *witnessing family violence*. The most frequent form of neglect is *physical* and *educational*, followed by the *medical* neglect.

Due to the small number of cases no relevant conclusion can be drawn regarding the frequency of associated forms of abuse, but in the case of the analyzed population the physical and psychological abuse has been associated most frequently.

The school attendance is almost 70%, the percentage of drop out and lack of enrolment is evidently much higher than the general population (together is more than 15%), and it is interesting to note that the school attendance is decreasing with the age: from 80% at age of 11 decreases to 52% at age of 16 in case of boys, who seems to be more vulnerable to school drop out.

The proportion of CAN-victims (among the recorded cases) having reported and/or diagnosed problems related to education, behaviour, substance abuse and disabilities we can observe the high rate of *running away*, which is the most frequent at neglect cases (26%); learning disabilities and irregular school attendance, problems at home and at school is beyond 10% as well.

Family and Household-related risks for CAN

The rate of married and divorced/separated parents is approximately equal (35-35%). The number of co-habitants in a high percentage is more than 5, this could mean overcrowded households.

Other types of abuse experienced by other family members are not registered in the files unless in a small proportion (15% intimate partner violence and in 6.6% of cases other siblings are victims of violence).

In 30% of cases the housing conditions are not adequate, the income of the family is low and very low (in 25%), and in 32% of cases the source of income is the social benefit. Financial problems are recorded in 40% of the cases.

There is an overlap in more than 50% of the cases between the identity of perpetrator and of the caregiver.

In case of perpetrators who are only perpetrators, the gender rate shows a higher prevalence of men (73.1%) but in cases of perpetrators who are also caregivers, the difference is much smaller between men and women (52.8% men, 46.7% women).

² The only document which registers the ethnicity is the death certificate.

Characteristics of perpetrators and caregivers like information regarding the educational level, employment and marital status, similar allegations and history of abuse is missing in a great extent, but we must notice a relatively high percentage of alcohol abuse both in case of perpetrators and caregivers (14-36%).

Agencies involved, services provided

Data regarding source of referral (reporting) show us that the police and social services are the most active institutions involved in the detection of maltreatment cases, followed by parent/caregiver with a far lower percent. Other institutions which are usually also coming into contact with the child victim are much less active in detection and reporting the abuse (school and health personnel, community agencies). We can notice a very low involvement of other community members as well and the child victim her/himself. This indicate also the need for more child-friendly referral system.

Further research is needed to analyze the efficiency and adequacy of provided services.

It is important to remind the data published by the Ministry of Labor, Social Affairs and Family and the Prosecutor's Office regarding the number of cases of prosecution in trial phase is extremely low (1.1% of total number of child maltreatment cases).

In spite of the fact that many professionals complain about legal difficulties of implementing emergency orders, this is the most frequently used legal action what has been taken (G. Tonk, J. Adorjani, 2012).

Here is interesting to note, that the services provided for families by the local public authorities are in many cases unsatisfactory as the low capacity of service provision of local authorities is well known and recognized at official level (see National Strategy of Child Protection 2008-2013)

The forms of out of home placement were also collected. There is a large percent of children in this age category (11, 13, and 16) who are institutionalized due to maltreatment acts (43.1%).

At this age category mother shelters are not often used. Due to the fact that present legislation is not favorable to remove the perpetrator^{vi}, this intervention possibility is not implemented.

In agreement with the legal requirement of including in the file an individualized case management and treatment plan, our data show that families of abused children, and child victims themselves are referred to mental health services in proportion of 76,6%. Services recommended for children and families are: psychiatric services (55.1%), family counseling (27.8%), child counseling (25.1%), parent support program (21.4%), medical/dental services (19.8%), social welfare assistance (17.1%), shelter services (11.2%), psychological services (10.2%), victim support program (10.7%),

domestic violence counseling (9.1%), recreational program (7.0%), special education referral (6.4%), access to food bank (4.8%), drug or alcohol counseling (3.2%).

The CBSS study did not aim to collect information about the participation of children and their family members in the mentioned therapeutically or social services, the length of followed treatments and therapies, and other benefits as a result of these services.

There is an evidence that efforts are made by the child protection departments to improve the condition of the child victim and her/his family, but there is no information regarding the adequacy, outcome and efficiency of this endeavor. These issues are needed to be address in further studies.

Data published by the General Department for Child Protection from the Ministry of Labor, Family and Social Protection^{vii} highlights that in 2010 the total number of cases of abuse, neglect and exploitation reported by the General Directorates for Social Assistance and Child Protection was 11232. Out of total number of cases 16,2% has remained in the family and did not benefitted from any intervention and services. In 63% of cases children remained at home and benefitted from some kind of services and in 20,8% of cases the child was separated from family. According to the child protection departments' reports the following services have been provided for the child and family: psychological counselling (59%), psychotherapy (3,60%), other therapies (4,16%), medical services – others than rehabilitation (4,16%), educational services (3,40%), legal counseling and assistance (42,28%).

Both BECAN data and official statistics indicate that approximately two third of child victims benefit from some kind of services, most frequently psychological counselling. Psychotherapy is available in a very limited extent. The greatest discrepancy met between BECAN and official data is recorded regarding the percentage of legal counselling and medical services, especially psychiatric services. The file analysis evidence that a great number of children psychiatric services are provided.

Referral to services is evidenced in most cases. Further research is needed to analyze the efficiency and adequacy of provided services.

On the other hand, providing psychiatric services to maltreated children could be related to the persistency of the medical model applied by professionals from child protection system in the detriment of the ecological model. In the same time this could mean also a shortage of available specialized mental hygiene services, which, in some cases, are replaced by psychiatric services. In any of these situations the risk that maltreated children being labelled as “trouble children” is high and secondary trauma could occur in these cases. It is also important to note that there is a large percent of children victims of abuse, who are removed from their homes and benefits from out of home placement, get to institution without individual care.

Knowing the fact that in almost half of reported cases remain at home, and the services provided for families by the local public authorities are in many cases unsatisfactory as the low capacity of service provision of local authorities is well known and recognized at official level (see National Strategy of Child Protection 2008-2013), there is an urgent need for improvement of capacity of adequate service provision for these families also in order to prevent the reoccurrence of abuse.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In condition of absence of standard working tools used for risk assessment, needs assessment, decision making and intervention planning, case management relays on uncompleted assessment which many times shortage essential information that should validate and support intervention planning.

Institutional capacity development and clear methodological guidelines are needed in order to improve access to services and the quality of provided services. The need for adequate and available specialized services is enhance by the study.

It requires increasing access of rural children and families to social services and therapy to recover from the trauma caused by abuse, considering hiring social workers, community environmentally disadvantaged communities and for the creation of mobile intervention teams.

Legislative regulatory and procedural

Recognizing the progress made, it is recommended improving secondary legislation by reviewing existing standards and methodologies and developing a toolkit for child protection specialists nationally applicable as follows:

- Procedures for referral of cases of ill-treatment by professionals who have the obligation to report.
- Working procedures intra-and inter-agency throughout the management process in cases of children's exposure to mistreatment of any kind.
- Assess risks faced by any child for whom a referral was made, or reference, or a report of abuse, neglect, exploitation or trafficking, maltreatment.
- Coordinates the evaluation and adoption of common tools specialists, applicable national needs assessments for children and families.
- Establish a set of criteria for making decisions in the best interests of the child.
- Establish and coordinate a plan of action for how to involve community resources.
- Currently, the lack of demographic data and current monitoring system imperfections do not allow a fine analysis of data and identification of groups at increased risk of exposure to maltreatment.

Therefore we propose revision of a set of demographic indicators that serve to improve the monitoring of cases of maltreatment nationwide.

REFERENCES

National Institutes of Health (NIH) (2007). Research on Interventions for Child Abuse and Neglect (R01) Program. <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/pa-07-437.html>

Pinheiro, P. S. (2006). World Report on Violence against Children, United Nations Secretary-General's Study on Violence against Children, Geneva, 12.

Runyan, D. K., Dunne, M. P., Zolotor, A. J., Madrid, B. et al. (2009). The development of the international screening tool for child abuse—The ICAST P (Parent Version), *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 33, 826–832.

Tonk G. , Adorjáni J., László E. *Providing Services to Maltreated Children and Their Families. Some Findings of Romanian Case Based Surveillance Study / 91, Revista de Asistență Socială*, anul XI, nr. 2 / 2012 , pp. 3 - 7 www.revistadeasistentasociala.ro

Tonk G. , Adorjáni J., Analysis of the Romanian National Data System on Child Abuse and Neglect, *SOCIAL CHANGE REVIEW* Vol. 9, Issue 1, June 2011

Wolfe, D. A., Yuan, L. (2001). A conceptual and epidemiological framework for child maltreatment surveillance. Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada, Health Canada.

World Health Organization (1999). Report of the consultation on child abuse prevention, WHO, Geneva, 29-31 March 1999. Geneva: WHO.

ANNEXES

ANNEX I: List of Organizations that provided data

ANNEX II: Extraction Forms Part I & II

ANNEX III: Operations' Manual for Researchers

ANNEX I: List of Organizations that provided data

ID	Agency	Location
001	General Directorate for Social Assistance and Child Protection	Bacau
002	General Directorate for Social Assistance and Child Protection	Barso
003	General Directorate for Social Assistance and Child Protection	Cluj
004	General Directorate for Social Assistance and Child Protection	Constanta
005	General Directorate for Social Assistance and Child Protection	Dolj
006	General Directorate for Social Assistance and Child Protection	Galati
007	General Directorate for Social Assistance and Child Protection	Gorj
008	General Directorate for Social Assistance and Child Protection	Iasi
009	General Directorate for Social Assistance and Child Protection	Prahova
010	General Directorate for Social Assistance and Child Protection	Satu Mare
011	General Directorate for Social Assistance and Child Protection	Timis
012	General Directorate for Social Assistance and Child Protection	Vaslui
013	General Directorate for Social Assistance and Child Protection	Bucuresti

ⁱ World Health Organization (1999). Report of the consultation on child abuse prevention, WHO, Geneva, 29-31 March 1999. Geneva: WHO.

ⁱⁱ National Institutes of Health (NIH) (2007). Research on Interventions for Child Abuse and Neglect (R01) Program. <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/pa-07-437.html>

ⁱⁱⁱ Pinheiro, P. S. (2006). World Report on Violence against Children, United Nations Secretary-General's Study on Violence against Children, Geneva, 12.

^{iv} Runyan, D. K., Dunne, M. P., Zolotor, A. J., Madrid, B. et al. (2009). The development of the international screening tool for child abuse—The ICAST P (Parent Version), *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 33, 826–832.

^v Wolfe, D. A., Yuan, L. (2001). A conceptual and epidemiological framework for child maltreatment surveillance. Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada, Health Canada.

^{vi} Legislation is under revision and protection order is proposed to be introduced in favor of victims of violence in February 2012.

^{vii} http://www.copii.ro/alte_categorii.html