

Supporting Paper 2  
5 October 2007

ENGLISH ONLY

**UNITED NATIONS STATISTICAL COMMISSION  
and ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE**

**UNITED NATIONS DIVISION FOR THE  
ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN**

**CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN STATISTICIANS**

**UNITED NATIONS STATISTICS DIVISION**

**Expert Group Meeting on indicators to measure violence against women**

(Geneva 8-10 October 2007)

Co-organized by UNDAW, UNECE and UNSD

in collaboration with ECA/ECLAC/ESCAP/ESCWA

**INDICATORS, CRIME AND VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN**

**Supporting Paper**

Submitted by UNODC\*

**INTRODUCTION**

A large amount of literature already exists on the measurement of violence against women through the use of specialised surveys that seek information from women concerning their experience of violence. Such surveys recognise the fact that violence against women has underlying social and cultural complexities and that many women subject to violence are in hard-to-reach populations such as educational or custodial institutions, armed conflict settings or traditional communities. Obtaining accurate reporting of experience of violence from such groups in a survey interview situation can be an extremely sensitive task. Such groups are even less likely to report victimisation to State authorities.

Nonetheless, at the same time, all forms of violence against women are (or should) be a crime in a national law and this should not be forgotten in the process of measuring violence against women and in indicator development. Indeed, the criminal justice response to violence against women is arguably an important aspect of any violence against women indicator set. This paper sets out issues associated with indicator development, with a focus on the links between violence against women and methodologies employed in the measurement of crime statistics and trends. It advocates strengthening the links between any indicator set for violence against women and the developing work in crime trend assessment and monitoring.

**VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND CONVENTIONAL CRIME INDICATORS**

For the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), the need for better data and improved national data collection capacity is paramount.<sup>1</sup> The existence of indicators can play a key part in this process. While the term itself frequently has different meanings within different contexts, at its core, an indicator simply provides a common way of measuring and presenting information. The recent work of

---

\* Prepared by Steven Malby and Anna Alvazzi del Frate.

<sup>1</sup> Commission on Narcotic Drugs and Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, "Strategy for the period 2008-2011 for the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime", UN Doc. E/CN.7/2007/14–E/CN.15/2007/5.

UNODC has focussed on the identification of core indicators for conventional crime and the development of indicators for complex crime, including transnational organized crime, corruption and trafficking in persons.<sup>2</sup> Such an endeavour requires the development of appropriate definitions for data collection purposes and the selection of the most important facets of each crime. As at the date of writing, the Policy and Analysis Research Branch of UNODC is in the process of devising such indicators.

The development of indicators for violence against women represents a closely related but distinct challenge to that of crime indicators.

In the case of conventional crime indicators, the population of interest (whether incidents, perpetrators, or victims) is self-defined in the sense that the act is called a crime in law. This law is usually domestic and includes actions such as homicide, assault, rape, robbery, theft, automobile theft, burglary, fraud, bribery and drug-related crimes. The challenge at the international level is to identify actions that are commonly criminalised and to collect data on the number of incidents, usually together with the number of perpetrators, over a certain time period from administrative statistics.<sup>3</sup> The periodic United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and Operations of Criminal Justice Systems (CTS) administered by UNODC is based on this approach.<sup>4</sup> Indicators that could be generated from the CTS derive from the number of police recorded crimes during one year and could include, for example, the yearly number of reported rapes per 100,000 population.

Data on the number of acts and on the number of victims can also be collected through the use of victim surveys, such as surveys based on the International Crime Victim Survey (ICVS). Information from crime victim surveys can include both the proportion of persons who have suffered a crime in a defined period (the prevalence) and the number of criminal acts experienced by victims during that same period (the incidence). Crime victim surveys may include questions both on acts that are criminal in domestic law and on acts that are not.

When it comes to violence against women, the object is to measure a phenomenon that is not “self-defined” in the sense of a criminal act, but rather consists of a range of actions that may cause harm or suffering to women. Whilst a significant proportion of such actions are likely to be caught by laws on homicide, assault, sexual assault and rape, it is difficult to be confident that all violent actions<sup>5</sup> will constitute crimes under the national law of any given country. As set out in the *In-depth study of the Secretary General on all forms of violence against women*, forms of gender-based violence include sexual harassment, trafficking in women, and marital rape.<sup>6</sup> Such actions are not criminal offences in a number of countries and hence remain undetected in administrative crime statistics. In addition, other forms of violence may be perpetrated or condoned by the State, as in the case of forced sterilisation or violence perpetrated by police officers or prison guards. As a result, neither administrative crime statistics nor general crime victim surveys are easily able to capture the entire range of violence against women.

---

<sup>2</sup> Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, “World crime trends and responses: integration and coordination of efforts by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and by Member States in the field of crime prevention and criminal justice”, UN Doc. E/CN.15/2007/2, 22 January 2007, p. 4.

<sup>3</sup> A number of notable exceptions exist, such as trafficking in persons, where the crime is well defined at the international level (by the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children in the case of trafficking in persons) but may not necessarily be criminalized in the same manner, or at all, in national law.

<sup>4</sup> See [http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/crime\\_survey\\_tenth.html](http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/crime_survey_tenth.html)

<sup>5</sup> See for example General Assembly Resolution 48/104: “Violence against women means any act of gender-based violence that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual or psychological harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or in private life.”

<sup>6</sup> United Nations General Assembly. “In-depth study on all forms of violence against women, Report of the Secretary General”, UN Doc. A/61/122/Add.1, 6 July 2006.

Moreover, whereas crime indicators in general are concerned mainly with the numbers of crimes committed, indicators for violence against women have been called upon to meet wider demands, in line with the fact that violence against women is a human rights violation in and of itself.<sup>7</sup> Proposals for violence against women indicators include, for example, identification of risk factors associated with violence against women, services for victims, and measurement of public attitudes and perceptions concerning violence.<sup>8</sup>

The most widespread way of collecting such information to date has been through the use of specialised surveys and modules to general surveys that seek information from women concerning their experience of violence. Such surveys, including the *WHO Multi-country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence against Women*<sup>9</sup> and the *International Violence against Women Study*<sup>10</sup> have generated a wealth of information, much of which is suitable for inclusion in a set of indicators for violence against women. However, administrative crime statistics and general victim surveys also have much to contribute to an indicator set.

Insofar as specialised violence surveys focus on violence experienced by the respondent, they do not capture homicide as a form of violence against women. Whilst this data may be found in the police recorded crime statistics of some countries, the gender of homicide victims is frequently not available. One alternative possible source of such data is public health statistics. The WHO causes of death database, for example, contains data on death by homicide and purposely inflicted injury disaggregated by gender.<sup>11</sup> Administrative statistics may also be used to provide relevant information about the system *response* to crime. Thus, whilst such comparisons must be made with caution, it is, in principle, possible to compare the number of recorded crimes (rape, for example) with the number of persons suspected, prosecuted and convicted for that crime; a comparison often known as the "attrition rate".

In conjunction with administrative statistics, general victim surveys may be useful for providing estimates of the "dark figure" of crime. Comparison of information from victim surveys for a crime such as rape with police recorded figures indicates the extent to which victims are prepared to report the incident to the police. Reasons for non-reporting are complex, and may range from fear of the police, to fear of the perpetrator, to cultural restraints. An understanding of reporting is crucial, however, to the training of police in this area. Victims will not report violence to the police where there is a risk that they may suffer secondary victimisation. Police officers should be sensitive to the trauma experienced by victims and able to deal professionally and carefully with women who have been subject to acts of violence. UNODC is currently developing a *Handbook for effective Police Responses towards Violence against Women* as a resource for training police officers in this respect. The Handbook will be piloted in the Southern Africa region and in Vietnam, including in police training academies.

The nature of the criminal justice system response to violence against women is an important aspect of the phenomenon and the way in which society deals with it. Both crime victim surveys and the periodic CTS are able to provide significant information both about the phenomenon and the response. One important challenge in respect of indicators for violence against women is to *choose indicators that relate well to the developing work in crime trend assessment and monitoring and reflect the criminal justice system response*.

---

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 17.

<sup>8</sup> S. Walby, "Developing Indicators on Violence against Women", Department of Sociology at Lancaster University.

<sup>9</sup> World Health Organization, "*WHO Multi-country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence against Women*", 2005.

<sup>10</sup> H. Johnson, N. Ollus, S. Nevala, "Violence against women, an international perspective", Springer, 2007.

<sup>11</sup> See <http://www.who.int/whosis/database/mort/table1.cfm>

The remainder of this paper examines the issues associated with indicator development for violence against women. It does so, in particular, with respect to the experience of the United Nations CTS and crime victim surveys.

## ISSUES FOR INDICATOR DEVELOPMENT

As discussed above, the complex nature of the phenomenon of violence against women carries with it a number of significant challenges for indicator development that are over and above those encountered with crime indicators in general.

These challenges, both conceptual and methodological in nature, have been well documented in the literature. Key issues include:<sup>12</sup>

1. What basic elements should be measured; (i) whether outcomes for women themselves, (ii) societal attitudes and perceptions, (iii) policy responses or (iv) State justice and welfare system responses;
2. In respect of outcomes for women; (i) whether measurement should focus on prevalence (the proportion of women who have experienced violence) or incidence (the number of acts of violence experienced during a specific period), (ii) the range of actions that should be included as violence, (iii) how severity and impact should be measured, (iv) the time period to which data should relate and (v) which sub-populations should be reported, such as stratification by age, marital status or geographic location;
3. In respect of perpetrators of violence, how such persons should be defined; and
4. What elements of responses to violence should be included: (i) degree of criminalisation of violent acts; (ii) victim police reporting and secondary victimisation, (ii) availability or usage of victim support (service-based data), (iii) policy or practice relating to prevention of violence.

### Qualitative measurements

The elements listed at point one above include both *quantitative* and *qualitative* factors. There is precedent at the international level for the inclusion of both such factors within an indicator set. In particular, the 15 UNODC/UNICEF juvenile justice indicators are suitable for use as a model for the development of indicators for violence against women. As with violence against women, the juvenile justice indicators deal with a particularly vulnerable group of persons and are concerned both with the causes of crime and the system response to it.<sup>13</sup>

The 15 UNODC/UNICEF juvenile justice indicators are made up of 11 quantitative indicators (such as the number of children arrested during a 12 month period per 100,000 child population) and four qualitative, or policy, indicators (such as the existence of a specialised juvenile justice system). Measurement of the policy indicators is achieved by policy analysis tools which, through standardised questions that must be answered “yes” or “no”, assign a quantitative measure to an otherwise qualitative factor. In principle there is no reason why a set of indicators for violence against women could not also include qualitative factors, provided that some standardised measure were to be developed to assess the factor in as uniform manner as possible across countries.

A number of such tools already exist in the form of questionnaires that explore attitudes towards gender roles. Section six of the questionnaire used by the WHO Multi-country Study on Women’s Health and

---

<sup>12</sup> S. Walby, “Developing Indicators on Violence against Women”, Department of Sociology at Lancaster University.

<sup>13</sup> See UNODC/UNICEF “Manual for the Measurement of Juvenile Justice Indicators”, United Nations publication No. E.07.V.7.

Domestic Violence against Women, for instance, contained eight questions, including “*if a man mistreats his wife, others outside of the family should intervene* – (agree), (disagree), (don’t know)”. The challenge for an indicator, related for example to attitudes about violence, is to identify a common set of questions and to develop a form of scoring system for calculation of the indicator, based on responses to the set of questions. The final “score” (which constitutes the indicator value) then represents (in this example) whether the country or local environment is generally permissive or restrictive with respect to violence against women.

The juvenile justice qualitative indicators use a scoring system of “Level 1, 2, 3 or 4”, based on whether 0 to 25 percent, 25 to 50 percent, 50 to 75 percent, or 75 to 100 percent of the relevant policy tool questions were answered in the affirmative.<sup>14</sup> A similar mechanism could also be used for qualitative factors chosen for inclusion in a set of indicators for violence against women. Qualitative indicators for violence against women could be used to represent elements such as the environment within which violence occurs and the State’s response to violence.

**Attitudes and perceptions of violence.** An indicator on “*attitudes and perceptions of violence*” would be useful both for interpretation of “outcomes” indicators, and – if measured periodically – for monitoring the impact of awareness raising or preventative programmes. As discussed above, specialised questionnaires already exist in this respect. As a result, indicator development would require only consensus on a common set of relevant questions and the possible assignment of a scoring system.

**Preventative measures.** A qualitative indicator on “*preventative measures*”, including the criminalisation of forms of violence, would be useful both to the international community and to States in identifying areas for intervention. As noted, not all forms of violence against women are criminalised in all countries and the range of policy and practice for the prevention of gender-based violence may also vary between countries. In the same way as for the juvenile justice indicators, information on whether violence-prevention good practice or standards and norms are enshrined in law or policy *and* implement in practice, could be extracted from questionnaires and standardised tools. A scoring system can again be used to present the results. From the criminal justice system point of view, such an indicator could aid interpretation of victim police reporting rates and levels of police recorded crime itself.

### Quantitative measurements

In addition to these two possible qualitative measurements, any indicator set for violence against women must contain quantitative measures. As set out at point two in the list above, in respect of outcomes for women, there are a number of possible approaches to capturing the extent of violence against women, including through the concepts of prevalence and incidence. These are discussed below.

**The nature of violence.** An important starting point for the quantitative measure of violence is to define the nature of violence experienced. As noted above, violence against women can take many forms and include a wide range of severity. An indicator based simply on the proportion of women who have experienced any form of violence in the past 12 months (for example), provides little information on the true nature of the problem within a particular country. Both the CTS and standard CVS questionnaire

---

<sup>14</sup> For instance, in respect of juvenile justice Indicator 15 “*Existence of a national plan for the prevention of child involvement in crime*”, 24 questions from a dedicated policy-analysis tool are used to assess whether a prevention plan exists and whether it is in conformity with international norms and standards. The responses to these questions are used to assign Level 1, 2, 3 or 4 to the indicator. The levels correspond to: Level 1; “*No plan for the prevention of conflict with the law amongst children exists in law or policy*”, Level 2; “*Plan exists but is only weakly protected by law or policy*”, Level 3; “*Plan exists and is moderately protected by law or policy*”, and Level 4; “*Plan exists and is extremely well protected by law or policy*”. It has been recognised that this system requires amendment such that Level 1 (“*No plan*”) is only assigned where zero questions are answered in the affirmative.

contain classifications of different forms of violence. The tenth CTS, for instance, defines assault as “*physical attack against the body of another person, including battery but excluding indecent assault*”.<sup>15</sup> Respondents are asked to indicate whether data on police recorded assault includes “*slapping and/or punching*” and also to provide separate figures, along with a definition, of aggravated/major assault (as distinguished from simple assault) where such a separate crime exists in national law. The CTS also requests data on police recorded rape (defined as “*sexual intercourse without valid consent*”) and human trafficking (defined as per the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime).<sup>16</sup>

The tenth CTS also introduces, for the first time, an annex requesting further details on police recorded homicide. This includes the request for information disaggregated by homicide related to “*intimate/proximity*”, “*family*” and “*sex*”. With the possible exception of rape, the CTS is unable, however, to provide direct information on the extent of violence against women. This is because it does not request information disaggregated by the sex of the victim.<sup>17</sup> Nonetheless, an understanding of the definitions of violence used by the CTS is highly relevant to the development of indicators for violence against women. The use of definitions consistent with those of the CTS would allow greater comparability with existing international crime data. As in the CTS, physical assault, for example, should be clearly distinguished from indecent/sexual assault in any indicator set. The definition of physical assault should also be clear as to those actions, such as slapping, that are included.

The standard CVS questionnaire refers only to the use of force for identification of assault, but does classify sexual crimes as rape, attempted rape, indecent sexual assault, and offensive behaviour. When classifying the type of violence event, it is important for a set of indicators to distinguish between the *nature* of the action itself, and the *impact* or effect on the victim. This paper returns to the issue of impact or effect below. With respect to the action however, review of the CTS, CVS and existing specialised surveys on violence against women suggests that appropriate top-level categories may be:

- homicide;
- rape;
- major assault;
- assault;
- sexual assault;
- harassment;
- female genital mutilation/cutting; and
- trafficking in persons.

Where further detail is required, these categories may also have sub-categories, such as honour killings as a percentage of homicides. However, for the purposes of global indicators, these eight categories could represent a compromise between detail and ease of measurement and presentation.

**Prevalence and incidence.** Once the nature of violence has been defined, it is important that a set of indicators for violence against women are able to represent the extent to which such acts occur. Two possible measures exist: the proportion of women who have experienced one or more acts of violence

---

<sup>15</sup> Questionnaire for the Tenth United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and Operations of Criminal Justice Systems, covering the period 2005 – 2006. Available at [http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/crime\\_survey\\_tenth.html](http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/crime_survey_tenth.html).

<sup>16</sup> United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants of Land, Sea, and Air, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (General Assembly resolution 55/25, annexes I-III).

<sup>17</sup> The definition of rape used by the CTS does not exclude male victims. In practice, however, the vast majority of police reported rape is constituted by female victims.

during a defined timeframe (prevalence) and the number of acts of violence experienced during the timeframe (incidence). Commentators note that the use of a prevalence-based measurement has the disadvantage of under representing the repetition and frequency of violent events, particularly in the context of domestic violence, and that the counting of the number of incidents, rather than the prevalence rate, is the more usual approach in crime statistics.<sup>18</sup>

Whilst it is true that, in general, reported crime rates tend to be incidence based (in the sense that crimes such as burglary, robbery or theft are usually reported and counted as individual events), the point does not hold so clearly with respect to domestic violence. Women who are repeat victims of domestic violence do not commonly report each event suffered to the police but – where they report at all – often do so once a certain threshold of tolerance of violence has been reached following a particular act, or as a result of some other external intervention. A history of violent events is thus reported to the police as the latest act. Where evidence cannot clearly be produced of historic events, it is unlikely that these are recorded as separate incidents by the police. To some extent, the tenth CTS questionnaire also aims to solve the difficulty by asking whether multiple offences are counted in police recorded crime “*as one offence*” or “*as two or more offences*”.<sup>19</sup> As such, the use of prevalence would not necessarily be incompatible with recorded crime statistics, at least with respect to domestic violence.

Nonetheless, a measure of the repeated nature of violent acts remains important. Whilst the use of incidence itself carries with it the danger of inaccurate recall in victim surveys, an important sub-indicator to a prevalence based measure could still be whether the victim was subject to the violent act “*once*” or “*more than once by the same perpetrator*” during the timeframe of measurement. Common periods used in violence against women surveys are life-time, last year and five years. Life-time prevalence surveys suffer significant problems in terms of respondent recall and are unsuitable for accurately measuring changes in the level of violence against women against time over a short to medium period. For the purposes of global indicators on violence against women, a one-year timeframe is probably most appropriate. Measurement of the proportion of women experiencing at least one violent event in the past year also allows direct comparability with recorded crime statistics, being most usually presented on a yearly basis.

**The perpetrator.** The identity of the perpetrator is key to describing the pattern of violence against women within a particular country. The standard CVS questionnaire makes use of the questions:

- Did you know the offender(s) by name or by sight at the time of the offence?
- Were any of them your spouse, ex-spouse, partner, ex-partner, boyfriend, ex-boyfriend, a relative or a close friend, or was it someone you work with?

For the purposes of the global indicators on violence against women, it may be sufficient to use the categories of “*current intimate partner*”, “*previous intimate partner*”, “*relative*”, “*otherwise known to the victim*”, and “*stranger*”.

**Police reporting.** Any set of violence against women indicators should include a quantitative indicator on the proportion of victims reporting the most recent act of violence experienced to the police. A basic measure of reporting is crucial to understanding the “dark figure” of particular forms of violence against women – the difference between police recorded rape, for example, and the level actually experienced. The standard CVS questionnaire includes the questions:

- Did you or anyone else report the incident to the police?

---

<sup>18</sup> S. Walby, “Developing Indicators on Violence against Women”, Department of Sociology at Lancaster University, p. 9.

<sup>19</sup> Questionnaire for the Tenth United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and Operations of Criminal Justice Systems, covering the period 2005 – 2006, Table 4, answer 4b.4.

- On the whole, were you satisfied with the way that the police dealt with the matter?
- For what reason were you dissatisfied? [Police didn't do enough, were not interested, didn't find or apprehend the offender, didn't keep me properly informed, didn't treat me correctly/were impolite, slow to arrive, other reasons]

While satisfaction with the police response to reporting is important, ease of measurement and presentation may require that the reporting indicator be limited only to the fact of reporting or not. That said, two exceptions might be considered as sub-indicators.

Firstly, a sub-indicator on secondary victimisation by State authorities following reporting could be included. This would be expressed as the proportion of women who, having reported an act of violence to any State authority (police, health or social welfare systems) experienced further violence (by type) at the hands of State authorities. Such events may occur for example, where victims are further abused by a police officer or other service provider. Such victimisation is likely to exacerbate existing psychological distress and delay recovery from the initial trauma. Secondary victimisation by service providers is a major preventable form of harm to the victim and its elimination should be a priority for all professionals working with victims of gender-based violence.

Secondly, by way of measurement of the criminal justice response to reported acts of violence against women, a sub-indicator on the proportion of reported acts leading to resolution might also be considered. The tenth CTS, for example, while it does not collect information on the gender of homicide victims, includes a new homicide annex that requests information on the "*percentage of cases solved*".<sup>20</sup> Although few States may be able to provide this information in practice, the question nonetheless increases international focus on the effectiveness of the criminal justice system. In the same way, an indicator on percentage of reported cases of violence against women resolved may assist in building momentum for technical assistance to States in the development of relevant criminal justice information systems.

**Impact of violence.** As noted above, any set of indicators should make a distinction between the nature of the event and the particular impact upon a victim. Whilst this paper includes this element within the quantitative indicators section, the impact upon a victim remains a particularly subjective issue. Nonetheless, specialised surveys on violence against women have attempted to probe this area through structured questions. The questionnaire used by the International Violence against Women Survey, for instance, included the questions:

- Did you feel that your life was in danger (during this incident?)
- Were you physically injured?
- What were your injuries? [bruises, cuts/scratches/burns, fractures, head or brain injury, broken bones, broken nose, internal injuries, miscarriage, genital injury, other]
- Were you injured so badly that you needed medical care?
- Have you ever used alcohol or medication to help you cope with this experience?
- Did you contact a specialised agency in relation to this incident? [shelter or transition home, crisis centre/crisis line, counsellor, women's centre, community/family centre, other]
- Taking everything into account, how serious was this incident for you at the time? [very serious, somewhat serious, not very serious, don't know]

A set of indicators on violence against women might choose to use any of these impact measures. The most consistent and easy to measure is likely to be a classification scale based on injury. Further approaches based on the economic cost of violence may also be considered.

---

<sup>20</sup> Questionnaire for the Tenth United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and Operations of Criminal Justice Systems, covering the period 2005 – 2006, Table 20.



## METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES AND A POSSIBLE INDICATOR SET

As discussed in this paper, a set of indicators for violence against women should, in addition to capturing the nature and extent of the phenomenon as accurately and clearly as possible, aim to relate well to the developing work in crime trend assessment and monitoring. As a result, the indicators chosen and the definitions employed should aim, so far as possible, to make use of all currently available information, including that collected by the United Nations CTS, by the use of the standard CVS questionnaire, and through specialised violence against women surveys and modules.

In addition to the elements described above, a set of indicators for violence against women should take account of the differing experience of women by age and geographical location within a country. Where data is derived from crime victim surveys or specialised violence against women surveys, samples should ideally be stratified by age group. Sampling may also be stratified by urban/rural or clustered in geographic locations within a country. In addition, in order to capture less visible groups of women who may be subject to higher levels of violence than captured by a household survey (women in refugee camps for example), sampling should, where possible, also be carried out in these locations. Such locations should be treated as a separate strata from the household survey for the purposes of calculation of the mean overall level of violence (by type of event) and the assignment of confidence intervals.

A particularly vulnerable group often overlooked is women in the criminal justice system, particularly those detained in pre-sentence detention. Such women may be subject to particularly high degrees of violence from prison guards, other prisoners, or police officers. A UNODC study of female prisoners and their social reintegration in Afghanistan found that 14 percent of female prisoners interviewed volunteered information that they had been beaten by the police and/or investigator after their arrest. Others also alleged sexual abuse during transfer to detention.<sup>21</sup> While detection of such violence may prove extremely difficult through survey methodology, it is important that, where possible, violence against women indicators include information collected from such groups.

Where police recorded crime data is available, the rate of victim reporting to police from crime victim surveys can be used to provide an estimate for the true rate, or to cross-check results from specialised violence surveys themselves. In addition, reliable demographic data is important when deriving information from household surveys. Particularly where information about violence is presented “per 100,000 women”, it is crucial that the population figure used in the calculation is accurate. Where data is disaggregated by age or geographic location, the challenge becomes even greater.

With the points discussed in this paper in mind, a possible set of five indicators for violence against women are suggested below. These include two qualitative indicators; “*attitudes and perceptions of violence*” and “*preventative measures*” and two quantitative indicators; “*number of women per 100,000 women experiencing at least one event of [eight categories of violence] during the last year*”, and “*number of women per 100,000 experiencing at least one violent event perpetrated by [five categories of perpetrator] during the last year*”. The set of indicators is not intended to be definitive but rather represents an attempt at presenting a workable set of values that can be measured using a concrete methodology in light of existing work on specialised violence against women surveys and the field of criminal justice information and crime trends monitoring.

---

<sup>21</sup> United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, “*Afghanistan. Female prisoners and their social integration*”, New York, 2007.

UNODC proposed violence against women indicators

	Definition of Indicator	Methodology
<b>Qualitative Indicators</b>		
Indicator 1	<b>Attitudes and Perceptions of Violence</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Specialised household violence survey employing standardised questions.</li> <li>▪ Assignment of score representing a scale of permissive to restrictive environment for violence against women.</li> </ul>
Indicator 2	<b>Preventative Measures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expert assessment of criminalisation of acts of violence against women and other preventative State programmes using a checklist employing standardised questions.</li> <li>▪ Assignment of score representing a scale of permissive to restrictive environment for violence against women.</li> </ul>
<b>Quantitative Indicators</b>		
Indicator 3	<p><b>Number of women per 100,000 women experiencing at least one event during the last year of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Homicide (subset: honour killings)</li> <li>▪ rape</li> <li>▪ major assault</li> <li>▪ assault</li> <li>▪ sexual assault</li> <li>▪ harassment</li> <li>▪ female genital mutilation/cutting</li> <li>▪ trafficking in persons</li> </ul> <p><b>Disaggregation by:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Whether event occurred once or more than once during the last year</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Whether reported event to the police</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Sub-indicator: Percentage of reported cases resolved</b></li> <li>○ <b>Sub-indicator: Percentage of women who experienced secondary victimisation</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Use of recorded crime data for homicide where available and public health or WHO data on death by violence.</li> <li>▪ Estimate of other events based on crime victim surveys and specialised violence surveys. Triangulation using police reporting rates and crime data where available.</li> <li>▪ Disaggregation data collected by crime victim surveys and specialised violence surveys.</li> </ul>
Indicator 4	<p><b>Number of women per 100,000 women experiencing at least one violent event during the last year perpetrated by:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ current intimate partner</li> <li>▪ past intimate partner</li> <li>▪ relative</li> <li>▪ otherwise known person</li> <li>▪ stranger</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Use of crime victim surveys and specialised violence surveys.</li> </ul>

\*\*\*\*\*