

Norwegian Centre for Violence and Traumatic Stress Studies

A Week to Count 2012

Ministry of Justice and Public Security

(webpage) <http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/jd.html?id=463>

Violence Survey 2012

Per Hellevik and Ole Kristian Hjemdal

Norwegian Center for Violence and Traumatic Stress Studies (NKVTS).

The Norwegian Center for Violence and Traumatic Stress Studies (NKVTS) is a company of Unirand corp. which is owned by the University of Oslo. NKVTS is made up of the former Psychosocial Center for Refugees, National Center for Victim Studies and Information on Violence, National Resource Center for Sexually Abused Children and parts of the Office for Disaster Psychiatry.

The goals of the center are:

To develop, sustain and disseminate expertise and knowledge that can help in:

- Reducing health-related and social consequences that can follow from exposure to violence and traumatic stress.
- Preventing violence and traumatic stress.

The center's endeavors are research and development, teaching, guidance and counselling.

The center was founded by the following: Ministry of Children, Equality and Social Inclusion, Ministry of Health and Care Services, Ministry of Justice and Public Services, Ministry of Defense and the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs.

ISBN 978-82-8122-062-1 (pdf)

Foreword

In the government's plan of action against violence in intimate relationships of 2012 cited from proposition nr. 5: As a part of exposing violence in intimate relationships and bringing the issue into light, there was to be completed a new "week to count" in 2012 using the surveys in 2003, 2005 and 2008 as a template.

In the same way previous surveys had been commissioned, the Norwegian Center for Violence and Traumatic Stress Studies corp. was asked to carry out the survey.

The survey was done in week 38, from the 17th to the 24th of September, 2012. The survey was this time web-based, where participants logged into an electronic registration form. For this the Norwegian Social Science Data Service's «NSD Websurvey» solution was utilized, and NSD also helped in setting up and carrying out the survey.

Researcher Per Hellevik at NKVTS had the main responsibility for the practical execution of the survey, for the analysis of data and reporting of the results, while the Head of Section for Violence and Trauma for Adults, Ole Kristian Hjemdal, has been the project leader for this survey as he had been for previous surveys.

1 Introduction

1.1 Design and practical execution

Collaborators

In “A week to count- 2012” the data was collected online, for the first time. NKVTS, in collaboration with the Norwegian Social Science Data Service (NSD), developed an online version of the questionnaire that was used in 2008. By using the same questionnaire/survey that was utilized in 2008, we were able to compare data from this year’s survey with those of 2008. This was done with some caution because the data collection in 2008 was done through paper questionnaires and not through an online questionnaire. The questionnaire used in 2008 was based on questionnaires from surveys done in 2003 and 2005. NSD’s Websurvey is a tool for collecting data over the internet. This service enables scientists to create self-defined questionnaires with several different variables and data, which then can be answered by participants who are provided with access to the form.

Services

For this survey we sent out invitations to the following services: all police districts of Norway, all crisis centers, all family counselling offices, all child protective services/ and case workers on duty, all Norwegian labor and welfare administration offices (NAV), all elderly protective services, service for victims of crime, all assault care units at the accident and emergency departments. Together 1153 invitations with access codes were sent. After various corrections were made for surveys sent to wrong addresses due to coordinated intra-municipal services, shared registry’s etc., a total of 972 invited services were registered. This was a large increase (of invites/ invitations) compared to previous surveys. In 2003, 274 services were invited to participate, in 2005, 315 services were invited and in 2008, 334 were invited. Due to the larger number of invitations sent out, our possibility to collect more data was enhanced, but at the same time complicated our ability to send reminders and follow up individual services.

Time of Survey

The survey took place during the calendar week 38, the 17- 24 of September. This was close to the time period for the measurements in 2008, which was the 18-26 of September. The deadline for registration of cases was 19th of October. The services had over one month to register the data in the online form. We used an extended time-limit because several services registered cases first on paper and then transferred them to the online registration form. This was especially important when there were several case workers involved in registration. It was therefore important that the services had the possibility to gather all the forms before the registration closed.

Recruitment

Based on the address information obtained from services home pages and list of addresses used in previous surveys, we sent out informative letters to all of the 972 participating services. The letter contained information regarding the background history of the survey, a summary of results from the previous survey

done in 2008, information about the present year's survey, and a copy of the registration form which was to be used. Every service was asked to confirm their participation and registered e-mail address. There was also included a tentative time table. The information letter was sent out on the 23rd of August.

Confirmation of participation

Very few of the invited services confirmed their participation in the survey. This meant that we lacked an overview of which services that wanted to participate, as well as lacking confirmation as to whether or not the e-mail addresses we had registered and planned to use were correct. We therefore chose to send access codes to all of the e-mails we had registered. This meant that several of the services who had not confirmed participation, actually did participate in the registration.

Registration

Every participating service was given an individual ID-number and access codes accompanying their individual ID-number. In order to register cases, participants had to use the access code to gain access to the online form. These access codes were sent out through the NSD, together with general information about the registration. Also, information on how to answer each question was provided in the online form.

The online-form was a direct copy of the registration form which was used in 2008. This meant that services who had participated in the previous survey had, for the most, little difficulty in filling out the form. Services who experienced problems contacted the researchers who guided them through registration.

Violence in intimate relationships was in the survey defined as "all violence in intimate relationships which include all physical (including sexual assault and rape) and mental violence and threats, from either present or former partners (including girlfriend/boyfriend) or other family members. All of the cases that fell under this definition, which were worked on during the time of the survey, were to be registered. This included all cases of that week, both the new cases and the ones that were already established.

Follow-up

During "A week to count" 2005 there was a comprehensive phoning up of the services, which increased the participation rate drastically. In 2008 we chose only to remind some of the services of the registration. In this year's survey it was not possible to telephone all the services due to the large number of services invited to participate. There was though, a comprehensive follow-up of the services associated with the registration, as several of the services had problems finding the access codes provided for them. Several of the registered email addresses were centralized mail addresses to the service/municipality. This resulted in several of the access codes being sent to the wrong person or not passed on at all.

Analysis

One of the advantages of having the survey online was that the data files were generated automatically and were sent to NKVTS as soon as the registration was finished. This saved us a lot of time and decreased the possibility that human error could affect the quality of the data. All analyses were done using the statistic program IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, version 19.

1.2 Methodical challenges

There were some challenges associated with the collection of data in “A week to count- 2012.” The challenges were for the most part associated with the drastic increase in number of services invited to participate. The invitation to participate was in most cases sent out before the case workers had received any clarification about participation from their supervisor(s). It was also difficult to reach all of the services, due to insufficient address information, both through regular mail and e-mail. Some of the information letters and e-mails were sent to centralized mailboxes (for example the municipalities’ centralized mailbox or NAV’s centralized mailbox for online inquiries) and those who received this letter were then expected to forward the letter to the appropriate service. This worked to some degree.

Furthermore there were difficulties in sending out access codes, which were to be used by the individual service in order to register cases. We experienced complications especially in the cases where we sent individual codes to a centralized mailbox. E-mails “disappeared” or were forwarded to the wrong recipient(s). Some services had to be sent access codes several times. This most likely led to some services never receiving access to the registration form.

Several services also chose not to participate. There can be several reasons for this. Some services rarely work with cases involving violence in close relationships. These services might have chosen not to participate because they regarded the survey having little relevance to their work. We were also told that services lacked time and resources.

There were also, in some cases, some challenges regarding the registration itself. In hind sight we have seen that some of the questions were constructed in a difficult manner and/or lacked supplementary information to be sufficiently comprehensible. This has led to some errors in registration (for example conflicting gender information given for the same victim of violence).

For some services, receiving only one access code caused difficulties. This meant that only one person could register cases at a given time. Several of the services solved this by assigning the responsibility of registering data to one person, but this didn’t always work satisfactorily. Also some of the participants found it difficult to fill in an online form. In future surveys a larger degree of attention to “user-friendliness” as well as taking into consideration varying degrees of computer skill(s), has to be made.

2 Selection and sources of error.

2.1 Response rate

In “A week to count-2012” we sent out invitations to a total of 972 services, more than triple the number of services compared to the survey of 2008. A total of 275 services participated in the registration, which yielded a response rate of 28.3 %. Especially NAV (Norwegian labor and welfare administration office) and child protective services failed to participate in the survey. These services were especially difficult getting in contact with, due to the large number of them using centralized municipal mailboxes or NAV’s centralized postal system. We suspect that a large number of the invitations sent to child care services and NAV-offices were never received by the correct service/person.

As we had seen during the 2008 survey, there were several services that did not reply to whether or not they would participate. This made it difficult to clarify whether or not the lack of registration meant that services had not had any cases involving violence in intimate relationships, or if they did not participate in the survey at all. No reply was registered as a “non-participant.”

Table 2.1 Services handling cases of violence in intimate relationships during the survey week.

	Number	Percentage
Yes	227	23.4
No	48	4.9
No reply	697	71.7
Total	972	100

The table shows how many services that registered whether or not they had cases involving violence in intimate relationships during the survey week, and how many services that did not reply. Some services chose to deliver the registered form on paper or by e-mail. In these cases, we registered the data manually, here at NKVTS. There is a considerably lower response rate this year than that of 2008, where 69% of the contacted services replied. There was though, an increase of services who participated, 275 this year compared to 230 in 2008. The reason for the lower response rate, yet an increased number of participants is that in previous years we included only child protective services and social services in four municipalities in each county, while this year we included all of the municipalities. As is shown in the table below, the response rate for the Child Protective Services and especially NAVoffices was low, which draws the response rate as a whole down.

Table 2.2 Survey's response rate per county

Invited services		Replied	No reply	Proportion of participation
	Number	Number	Number	Percentage
Police Districts	27	24	3	88.9
Crisis Centers	48	37	11	77.1
Family Counseling Offices	58	43	15	74.1
Child Protective Services /on duty case workers	361	124	237	34.3
Norwegian Labor and Welfare Administration (NAV)	430	28	402	6.5
Elderly Protective Services	2	2	0	100
Services for Victims of Crime	14	8	6	57.1
Assault Care Units at Accident and Emergency	31	9	22	29.0
Other	1	0	1	0
Total	972	275	697	28.3

Compared to 2008 the response rate for all the different services, apart from elderly protective services and the police districts, were lower in this year's survey. There are most likely a number of reasons for this. One of the reasons may be that in 2008, several services that had initially not registered cases still replied, which increased the response rate. The survey being online might also have had an impact. We don't believe that the low response rate can be interpreted as a decrease in awareness of violence in intimate relationships now, compared to 2008. Also the response rate from the crisis centers has decreased from 92% in 2008 to 77 % this year. We don't believe that the crisis centers are any less aware of these problems now, than they have been in previous years.

Table 2.3 Response rate per County.

County		Replied	No reply	Proportion participating
	Number	Number	Number	Percentage
Østfold	47	15	32	31.9
Akershus	62	31	31	50.0
Oslo	22	15	7	68.2
Hedmark	51	16	65	31.4
Oppland	54	13	41	24.1
Buskerud	55	25	30	45.5
Vestfold	37	10	27	27.0
Telemark	42	14	28	33.3
Aust-Agder	30	4	26	13.3
Vest-Agder	31	11	20	35.5
Rogaland	66	17	49	25.8
Hordaland	75	17	58	22.7
Sogn and Fjordane	50	13	37	26.0
Møre and Romsdal	74	19	55	25.7
Sør-Trøndelag	41	7	34	17.1
Nord-Trøndelag	42	8	34	19.0
Nordland	89	18	71	20.2
Troms	55	14	41	25.5
Finnmark	49	8	41	16.3
Total	972	275	697	28.3

If we look at the response rate and compare it to each individual county, we see that it was the services in the Oslo and Akershus area that to the greatest extent participated in the survey. At the same time the response rate has a tendency to drop in concordance with the geographical distance from Oslo/Akershus.

Several of the participating services are stationed in the Oslo/Akershus area, which affects the geographic distribution of the response rate. In some of the smaller counties only the NAV offices and/or child protective services were able to participate.

In future surveys, we recommend that encouragement to participate comes from higher administration before invitations are sent out. In this year's survey the Police accomplished this. In each police district, specific responsibility for reporting was given to family and violence coordinators, and was for the most part a success. Similar efforts should be made in the next survey at NAV, assault care centers and the different child protective services.

3 Registered cases

Despite the small proportion of participating services, we registered more data in this year's survey than we had ever done before. During the survey week there were 2128 registered cases involving violence in intimate relationships, compared to 1357 in 2008. The data provided us with an adequate foundation for analysis of both the condition of participating services and for comparisons with previous surveys.

3.1 Cases and type of service

Table 3.1 Proportion of registered cases distributed amongst type of service.

	Number of services	Number of cases	Percentage of cases
Police Districts	24	398	18.7
Crisis Centers	37	658	30.9
Family Counseling Offices	43	292	13.7
Child Protective Services/ on duty case worker	124	679	31.9
Norwegian Labor and Welfare Administration NAV-Offices	28	33	1.6
Elderly Protective Services.	2	19	0.9
Services for Victims of Crime	8	23	1.1
Assault Care Units at A&E	9	26	1.2
Total	275	2128	100

The table shows the distribution of cases amongst participating services. In total, 275 services reported back to us during the survey week, but 48 of them informed us that they had not had any cases involving violence in intimate relationships during the survey week. Thereby, 227 of the participating services registered a total of 2128 cases.

Compared to the survey of 2008 the relative proportion of the registered cases per type of service has somewhat changed; crisis centers registered 38% of the cases in 2008, family counseling offices registered 26%, and child protective services registered 12%. The increase of registered cases from child protective services is probably attributed to the increased number of these services participating in this year's survey.

Crisis centers and child protective services registered the most cases, representing respectively 30.9% and 31.9 % of the data collected. Though the crisis centers and child protective services registered almost the same number of cases, it is important to note, that the number of service offices within/belonging to the two individual services are quite different. 124 Child Protective Services registered a total of 679 cases compared to 37 Crisis Centers registering 658 cases.

Table 3.2 Average number of cases per type of service.

	Number
Police Districts	16.5
Crisis Centers	17.7
Family Counseling Offices	6.7
Child Protective Offices/ on duty case workers	5.4
NAV-offices	1.1
Elderly Protective Services	9.5
Services for Victims of Crime	2.8
Assault Care Units at A& E	2.8
Total	7.74

The average number of cases per service has increased for all types of services compared to the survey in 2008. Overall, the average number of cases has increased from 5.90 in 2008 to 7.74 in 2012, an increase of 31%. The largest increase is seen in the police districts, where the average number of cases has risen from 9.5 in 2008 to 16.6 in 2012. The crisis centers have also shown a pronounced increase in number of cases, from 11.0 in 2008 to 17.7 in 2012. Similarly, in child protective services we see an increase in average number of cases from 3.6 in 2008 to 5.4 in this year's survey.

The services with the lowest number of cases throughout the survey week are services for victims of crime (Norwegian abbreviation RKK), assault care units and NAV-offices. The number of cases from the RKK has shown a slight increase (from 2.4 to 2.9) since the last survey. Assault care centers have risen from 1.8 to 2.9. The NAV-offices have registered on average 1.2 cases this year, an increase from 0.3 cases in 2008. The low number of registered cases from the NAV-offices can be an indication as to why so few of them chose to participate. A small number of cases involving violence in intimate relationships may have led some of the offices to view the survey as of little relevance to their work. Some of the NAV-offices that informed us that they didn't wish to participate explained that they viewed the survey as having little applicability to their type of work.

3.2 Cases and geography

Table 3.3 Number of inquiries distributed amongst health region and county and population base.

<i>Counties</i>	<i>(N=2128)</i>	<i>Percentage of cases</i>	<i>Percentage of population</i>	<i>Difference cases/ population base</i>
Finnmark	50	2.3	1.5	+0.8
Nordland	83	3.9	4.8	-0.9
Troms	89	4.2	3.2	+1.0
<i>The Northern Norway Health Region</i>	222	10.4	9.5	+0.9
Møre and Romsdal	140	6.6	5.1	+1.5
Nord-Trøndelag	74	3.5	2.7	+0.8
Sør-Trøndelag	73	3.4	6.0	-2.6
<i>The Central Norway Health Region</i>	287	13.5	13.8	-0.3
Aust-Agder	49	2.3	2.2	+0.1
Buskerud	160	7.5	5.3	+2.2
Telemark	36	1.7	3.4	-1.7
Vest-Agder	173	8.1	3.5	+4.6
Vestfold	107	5.0	4.7	+0.3
<i>The Southern Norway Health Region</i>	525	24.6	19.1	+5.5
Hordaland	150	7.0	9.8	-2.8
Rogaland	165	7.8	8.9	-1.1
Sogn and Fjordane	22	1.0	2.2	-1.2
<i>The Western Norway Health Region</i>	337	15.8	20.9	-5.1
Akershus	192	9.0	11.2	-2.2
Hedmark	87	4.1	3.9	+0.2
Oppland	47	2.2	3.8	-1.6
Oslo	287	13.5	12.3	+1.2
Østfold	144	6.8	5.6	+1.2
<i>The Eastern Norway Health Region</i>	757	35.6	3.8	-1.2
<i>Total</i>	2128	100	100	0

In the table above there are two of the health regions that stand out. The Southern Health Region shows the largest number of cases of violence compared to its demographic profile, whilst the Western Regional Health Authority has the lowest number of cases. This same tendency was seen in the previous survey. In the Southern Regional Health Authority, Vest-Agder clearly shows the highest number of cases of violence. This was also seen in 2005, 2008 and now in 2012.

Similar to the last survey, Rogaland and Hordaland's results contribute to lowering the results as a whole. Additionally, Sogn and Fjordane have gone from raising the results as a whole in 2008, to now lowering the results even more still. Nevertheless, this time the distribution of cases correspond more with the demographic profile then they did in the survey of 2008.

The proportional distribution of cases by region and county, to a large degree parallel the proportion of violent crimes reported to the police in the same geographical areas.

Table 3.4 Proportion per county of cases being worked on compared to the proportion of cases of filed police reports of violent crime

County	Proportion of cases	Proportion of police reported violent crimes	Deviation
Sogn and Fjordane	1.0	1.3	-0.3
Telemark	1.7	4.1	-2.4
Oppland	2.2	2.7	-0.5
Finnmark	2.3	2.7	-0.4
Aust-Agder	2.3	2.5	-0.3
Sør-Trøndelag	3.4	5.2	-1.8
Nord-Trøndelag	3.5	2.5	1
Nordland	3.9	5.4	-1.5
Hedmark	4.1	3.2	0.9
Troms	4.2	3.9	0.3
Vestfold	5.0	5.5	-0.5
Møre and Romsdal	6.6	3.8	2.8
Østfold	6.8	5.4	1.4
Hordaland	7.0	9.2	-2.2
Buskerud	7.5	5.1	2.4
Rogaland	7.8	8.6	-0.8
Vest-Agder	8.1	4.1	4
Akershus	9.0	9.1	-0.1
Oslo	13.5	15.6	-2.1

The largest deviations were found in Vest Agder, who reported 8.1 % of the cases, but account for only 4.1% of officially filed police reports; in Møre and Romsdal they reported 6.6 % of the cases but account for 3.8% of the filed police reports; and in Buskerud they reported 7.5% cases but only 5.1 % of the filed police reports. On the other hand, Oslo had 15.6 % of filed police rapports, yet had only 13.5 % of the cases in this survey, and Hordaland had 9.2 % of filed police rapports but only 7% of the registered cases.

4 Contact with assistance services

How clients initiated and established contact with the different services is a central component of «A week to count». This information provides important indications as to how accessible services are for their clients, how active the services are in exposing violence, and to what degree they are used by other services.

4.1 Who established contact?

Table 4.1 Who established contact?

	Number	Percentage
The victim contacted us	711	33.9
We contacted the victim	61	2.9
Another service contacted us	875	41.7
Perpetrator (s) contacted us	83	4.0
Others contacted us	367	17.5
Total	2097	100

Similar to the survey of 2008, a large amount of cases are initiated by the clients themselves by contacting assistance services. The proportion of cases where victims establish contact was 55 % in 2008, while in this year's survey it was approximately 34%. In other words there has been a 20% drop in cases initiated by the victim themselves in contacting assistance service. Most of this must be attributed to the strong rise in number of referred cases (from other services). In 2008 the percentage of cases referred from other services was 23%, while in this year's survey it was over 41%.

As we have also seen in previous surveys, there are still only a small number of cases where a service contacts the victims themselves. This was seen in only 3 % of the registered cases. Nevertheless, there has been an increase from 2008, where this only happened in 1% of the cases. Concurrently, we have seen a decrease in cases where the perpetrator contacts the assistance service. In 2008 happened in 6% of the cases, while this year it was seen in about 4% of the cases.

Table 4.2 Who established contact- type of service.

Service	Victim		We contacted		Other service		Perpetrator		Other	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Police Districts	190	48.5	27	6.9	103	26.3	7	1.8	65	16.6
Crisis Centers	244	37.8	11	1.7	287	44.4	5	0.8	99	15.3
Family Counseling Offices	148	51.4	1	0.3	49	17.0	56	19.4	34	11.8
Child Protective Services/on duty caseworker	75	11.2	21	3.1	411	61.2	12	1.8	153	22.8
Norwegian Labor and Welfare Administration (NAV-Offices)	13	40.6	1	3.1	11	34.4	3	9.4	4	12.5
Elderly Protective Services	10	55.6	-	-	2	11.1	-	-	6	33.3
Services for Victims of Crime	17	73.9	-	-	4	17.4	-	-	2	8.7
Assault Care Units at A& E	14	53.8	-	-	8	30.8	-	-	4	15.4

In the majority of the services, a large number of cases are initiated by the victims contacting the services themselves. An exception to this is seen at the child protective services, where this happens in only 11.2% of their cases. This is only natural in that children, to a very little degree, are able to contact assistance services themselves without the help of a grown up. Child protective services acquire most cases through referrals from other services. Additionally, in almost one out of every four cases at the child protective services, “other(s)” initiates the contact. “Other(s)” is for the most part reports from parents, schools/nursery schools, community health centers or doctors/hospitals.

Crisis centers also receive a large proportion of their cases through referrals from other services. Crisis centers often manage cases where there is a pressing need for the victim to escape the perpetrator. As we will see later, crisis centers refer many of their own cases to other services.

The police are the service that most often they initiate contact with the victims. This is primarily attributed to the nature of police work; being out and about in the community and therefore in contact with those exposed to violence. The police therefore, to a larger degree than other assistance services, are able to start cases based on direct contact with the victims.

Family counseling offices are the services that have the most contact initiated by the perpetrator themselves. These are low- threshold treatment services, which offer couples counseling, counseling in parental cooperation, and couples mediation during separation and severance of the relationship. This may result in family counseling offices having more contact with both the perpetrator and the victim compared to other services.

4.2 How contact was established?

Table 4.3 Distribution of the different types of contact. (24- hour client, day client and participant of group counseling, apply only to crisis centers)

Type of contact	Number	Percentage
In person	577	27.3
Telephone	943	44.6
Mail/e-mail	244	11.6
Text message	7	0.3
House call/ Emergency response	96	4.5
24-hour client	(104)	(4.9)
Day client	(36)	(1.7)
Participant of group counseling	(1)	(0)
Other	104	4.9
Total	2112	100

The most common method used in establishing contact was the telephone. Compared to the survey of 2008, we have seen some changes in regards to how contact was first initiated. In the last survey we saw that contact was established in person (physically visiting the service) in 39% of the cases, and by telephone in 37% of the cases. This year, in about 27% of the cases, the client came in person and 44% used the telephone. This increase in telephone use has to be seen in association with the increased number of referred cases from other services. These referrals are primarily done through the telephone and by mail/e-mail.

Still, in over one quarter of the cases contact is made in person. In the majority of these cases, the victims themselves show up at the service. Meeting up in person is also employed by services when referring cases to other services.

Table 4.4 Who established contact- type of contact.

	Victim	We contacted	Another service	Perpetrator	Other(s) contacted us
	%	%	%	%	%
In person	41.2	14.8	17.8	26.5	25.6
Telephone	48.0	32.8	40.6	65.1	45.0
Mail/e-mail	1.5	4.9	21.6	2.4	10.6
Text message	0.1	1.6	-	4.8	0.3
House call/ Emergency response	2.0	19.7	5.8	1.2	4.9
24-hour client	(1.7)	(11.5)	(7.0)	-	(4.8)
Day client	(3.4)	(3.3)	(0.8)	-	(0.8)
Participant of group counseling	-	-	(0.1)	-	-
Other	2.1	11.5	6.3	-	7.4
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Victims use the telephone or come in person in 90% of the cases where they initiate contact. When contacting the victim, services use the phone in close to 33% of cases, but they also make house calls and often come in person.

In close to two-thirds of cases where another service initiates contact, it is done through the telephone or via mail/e-mail. It is important to note that in 18 % of the cases initiated by another service, meeting up in person is the used form of contact.

In 65% of the cases where it is the perpetrator that initiate contact, they use the telephone. Further, we observe that perpetrators show up in person at services in 27 % of the cases they initiate. Perpetrators are also the group that uses text messaging (SMS) the most.

In 2008, text messaging was first included as a method of contact in the survey. Similarly to this year's survey text messaging was a rarely used form of contact.

Table 4.5 Type of contact for different services.

	In person	Telephone	Mail/ e-mail	Text messages	House call/ emergency call	24-hour client	Day client	Group counseling	Other
Police District	33.8 %	39.0 %	10.6 %	0.8 %	7.3 %	0.5 %	0.3 %	-	7.6 %
Crisis Centers	23.9 %	50.4 %	1.4 %	-	0.8 %	15.5 %	5.3 %	-	2.7 %
Family Counseling Offices	30.9 %	59.7 %	7.3 %	-	-	-	-	-	2.1 %
Child Protective Services/ on duty caseworker	23.2 %	36.0 %	25.1 %	0.6 %	8.9 %	-	-	0.1 %	6.0 %
Norwegian Labor and Welfare Admin. NAV-offices	37.5 %	34.4 %	3.1 %	-	3.1 %	-	-	-	21.9 %
Elderly Protective Services	16.7 %	72.2 %	-	-	5.6 %	-	-	-	5.6 %
Services for Victims of Crime	21.7 %	73.9 %	4.3 %	-	-	-	-	-	-
Assault Care Center at A & E	80.8 %	7.7 %	3.8 %	-	-	-	-	-	7.7 %
Proportion of total	27.3 %	44.6 %	11.6 %	0.3 %	4.5 %	4.9 %	1.7 %	0.1 %	4.9 %

The type of work the different services do, affect the ways in which contact is made with their clients. For example, the majority of cases established at assault care units are done in person. This is to be expected in that victims of sexual assault often require acute treatment. Elderly protective services have a high percentage of telephone contact. The elderly might find meeting up in person, or using modern forms of contact like e-mail or text messaging difficult.

4.3 Previous contact?

During registration of cases for the survey, one had to check off for whether or not the client had been in contact with the service before the survey week, or if they were new clients. Violence in intimate relationships is defined as violence amongst people who interact regularly. This entails that cases might progress over time and that violence perpetuates, leading to services being involved in the same case on numerous occasions.

Table 4.6 Type of service and previous contact.

	Already a registered client	New client	N
Police District	50.8 %	49.2 %	384
Crisis Center	78.9 %	21.1 %	644
Family Counseling Office	67.7 %	32.3 %	285
Child Protective Service/ on duty caseworker	60.9 %	39.1 %	663
NAV-office	77.4 %	22.6 %	31
Elderly Protective Service	44.4 %	55.6 %	18
Services for Victims of Crime	59.1 %	40.9 %	22
Assault Care Center at A & E	24.0 %	76.0 %	25
Proportion of total	65.2 %	34.8 %	2072

Crisis centers, family counseling offices, NAV-offices and child protective services have a high percentage of cases involving clients who have already been in contact with them once or several times before. On the other hand assault care units have a large number of new clients.

Compared to the survey of 2008 there is an increase of cases involving formerly registered clients, where contact has already been established. The increased number of referred cases amongst services might be the cause of some of this rise. This is illustrated in the table below.

Table 4.7 Registered or new client. Who established contact?

	Victim		We contacted		Other service		Perpetrator		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Registered client	438	32.6	35	2.6	589	43.9	53	3.9	228	17.0
New client	259	35.9	25	3.5	272	37.7	29	4.0	136	18.9

In close to 44% of cases involving clients already registered at one service, contact was initiated by another service. Also, in cases involving new clients, in over 37% of the cases, another service is responsible for establishing contact. In 2008 this was respectively 21% and 27%. It appears that cooperation and communication amongst services has increased.

There are only a few cases where services contacted the client (both new and registered) themselves. This is self-explanatory in that cases involving new clients, services will not have information as to whether or not victims need help before contact is first established. In cases where the client is already registered, a low percentage of contact by the services can indicate inadequacy in follow-up of the client.

Table 4.8 Victims gender and previous contact.

	Male (N=516)	Female (N=1549)	Total (N=2071)
Registered client	64.0 %	65.8 %	1350
New client	36.0 %	34.2 %	721

There does not seem to be any difference concerning gender distribution between already registered and new clients. In 2008 there was a larger difference in gender distribution. When the victim was a man, he was already a registered client in 45% of the cases, and a new client in 40% of the cases. In cases where the victim was a woman, she was already a registered client in 57% of the cases, and a new client in 33% of the cases. Still, it is difficult to compare this year's results with those of 2008, in that we lack information as to whether or not 15% of the men and 10% of the women were registered or new clients.

Table 4.9 Type of violence and previous contact.

	Physical violence	Sexual violence/ Rape	Psychological violence	Threatening behavior	Financial abuse/ Property damage	Other
Registered client	65.1 %	69.4 %	72.8 %	71.9 %	73.8 %	67.9 %
New client	34.9 %	30.6 %	27.2 %	28.1 %	26.2 %	32.1 %
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

There are some differences in distribution regarding type of violence and whether or not the client is new or registered. Amongst cases involving physical and sexual violence/rape the proportion of new clients is close to 9% greater than that seen in new cases involving psychological violence, threatening behavior, financial abuse and property damage and other types of violence.

These results are again difficult to compare to those of 2008, since we then had insufficient data as to whether or not the client was registered or new. Nonetheless, there seems to be a decrease of cases of new clients exposed to psychological violence and threatening behavior, and an increase of new clients' subjected to sexual violence/rape in this year's survey.

4.4 Previous contact during the survey week?

All services registered whether or not contact with the client had taken place before the survey week, and if contact had been made several times during the actual survey week. These numbers show how many cases were worked on several times during the survey week.

Table 4.10 Contact with the services earlier during the survey week.

	Total	Percentage
No	1581	76.8 %
Yes, once	236	10.8 %
Yes, twice	60	2.8 %
Yes, three or more times	182	8.4 %
Total	2059	100

The majority of cases are worked on, once, during the survey week. This does not necessarily mean that these cases are completed and closed, but that they do not require more work during that week. Nevertheless, in over 23% of the cases, clients have been in contact with services once or more during the survey week. In over 8% of the cases clients have been in contact with services three or more times during the week. This indicates that several of the registered cases require comprehensive and immediate work by the assistance services.

Similar to the survey of 2008, cases which were already registered before the survey week are also the cases that are worked on the most. Table 4.11 shows how many cases that have been worked on up to several times during the survey week, distributed between registered and new clients. Amongst previously registered clients, over 30% of the cases were worked on up to several times during the survey week. For new clients 7% of their cases were worked on several times.

Table 4.11 Contact previously with the service during the survey week- registered or new client.

	Registered client		New client	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
No	904	68.5 %	665	92.6 %
Yes, once	195	14.8 %	37	5.2 %
Yes, twice	50	3.8 %	9	1.3 %
Yes, three or more times	171	13.0 %	7	1.0 %
Total	1320	100	718	100

Cases involving violence in intimate relationships are often comprehensive and complicated. We have seen that services to a larger degree involve other services in the management of these cases. Violence in intimate relationships often occurs over long periods of time. This implies that cases become more comprehensive and labor-intensive as time passes and additional services are involved. It is important to put an end to violence as early as possible. This is especially important for the victim(s), but will also decrease work-load and make available resources and work-capacity of the services, resources and work-capacity that can be used in other cases.

Table 4.12 Percentage of cases where the victim has been in contact with one or more other service(s).

The client also had contact with	Number	Percentage
Police	987	46.4
Social Services	407	19.1
Medical Services	679	31.9
Child Protective Services	996	46.8
Family Protective Services	386	18.1
Crisis Centers	508	23.9
Mental Health Services	320	15.0
Services for Victims of Crime	43	2.0
Schools/Nursery Schools	668	31.4
Elderly Protective Services	35	1.6
Home Care Services/ Home Healthcare Nurse	38	1.8
Other	365	17.2

Clients are first and foremost in contact with the police and child protective services in addition to the service in which their case was first registered. Medical services, schools and nursery schools are also often involved in previously registered cases. These figures illustrate that cases of violence in intimate relationships are comprehensive, and involve many different areas of the assistance service. It also might indicate widespread cooperation amongst different assistance services.

Table 4.13 Average number of contact with other services in each case for the different services.

	Average	Number
Police District	1.6	384
Crisis Centers	2.9	659
Family Counseling Offices	2.6	292
Child Protection Services/ on duty caseworkers	2.6	726
Norwegian Labor and Welfare Admin. (NAV-offices)	2.0	47
Elderly Protection Services	2.7	19
Services for Victims of Crime	3.4	23
Assault Care Unit at A & E	1.1	29
Total	2.6	2128

This table gives us an indication as to how many other services have been involved in one particular case, according to the type of service that first registered the case. Cases registered by the Police and Assault Care Units have the lowest number of cases where other services have been involved. Cases registered by the Crisis Centers and Services for Victims of Crime have the highest number where other services have been involved.

5 The registered cases

In addition to information about the different services and different aspects of the cases, we have also registered a great deal of information about the victim/perpetrator. This provides us with interesting data regarding gender, age and marital status of those involved in the different cases. Additionally, the different aspects of the violence itself, for example type of violence, how often and where it occurred have been registered.

5.1 Information about the victim

Table 5.1 Victim- gender and age.

	Male		Female		Gender not given		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
0-6 years	137	6.5 %	188	8.9 %	2	0.1 %	327	15.4 %
7-14 years	216	10.2 %	224	10.6 %	1	0.0 %	441	20.8 %
15-17 years	58	2.7 %	82	3.9 %	-	-	140	6.6 %
18-25 years	27	1.3 %	226	10.7 %	-	-	253	11.9 %
26-39 years	31	1.5 %	519	24.5 %	-	-	550	26.0 %
40-59 years	37	1.7 %	269	12.7 %	1	0.0 %	307	14.5 %
60-79 years	13	0.6 %	33	1.6 %	-	-	46	2.2 %
Over 80 years	3	0.1 %	12	0.6 %	-	-	15	0.7 %
Not known/not given	7	0.3 %	28	1.3 %	4	0.2 %	39	1.8 %
Total	529	25.0 %	1581	74.6 %	8	0.4 %	2118	100 %

The figures from this year's survey show that in approximately 75% of the registered cases, the victim is a woman. The numbers also show that there has been a rise in number of male victims since 2008. In the last survey 16.5 % of the victims, were male. This year it has increased to 25%. This is primarily a result of more boys, age 14 years or younger, are registered as victims in this year's survey. Inclusion of more child protection services in this year's survey, could explain this increase. We are not able however; to conclude from these figures that violence against children has increased.

It is still important to note how many cases actually do involve children. More than 42% of all of the victims are 17 years old or younger. Violence against children and youth is a large social problem. Research shows that being exposed to violence at a young age increases the likelihood of also being exposed to violence as an adult (Hjemdal, Sogn, & Schau, 2012).

Table 5.2 Types of violence and victim's gender.

	Male (N=529)	Female (N=1587)	Gender not given (N=9)
Physical violence	75.0 %	70.0 %	0.1 %
Sexual violence/ Rape	8.1 %	19.0 %	0.0 %
Psychological violence	57.8 %	65.4 %	0.0 %
Threatening behavior	44.8 %	49.0 %	0.0 %
Financial abuse/ Property damage	8.8 %	16.1 %	0.0 %
Other	7.7 %	6.3 %	0.0 %

The percentage is over 100% due to the registration of several different types of violence per case.

Physical abuse was the most common form of violence registered. Physical violence was experienced in three quarters of cases where the victim was a man or a boy, and in 70% of cases where the victim was a woman or a girl. In addition to physical violence the most common type of violence registered was psychological violence and threatening behavior. Sexual violence and financial violence/property damage was seen more often when the victim was a women/girl, than when the victim was a man or a boy. The distribution of different forms of violence in relation to gender corresponds well with results from previous prevalence studies of violence in the general population (Haaland, Clausen, & Schei, 2005; Pape & Stefansen, 2004) .

Table 5.3Victim's gender and type of service.

	Male (N=529)	Female (N=1587)	Not given (N=9)
Police district	24.6 %	75.4 %	0.0 %
Crisis Centers	16.7 %	83.1 %	0.2 %
Family Counseling Office	15.5 %	84.5 %	0.3 %
Child Protection Services/ on duty caseworkers	36.6 %	62.5 %	0.9 %
Norwegian Labor and Admin. (NAV-offices)	34.4 %	62.5 %	3.1 %
Elderly Protective Services	36.8 %	63.2 %	0.0 %
Services for Victims of Crime	13.0 %	87.0 %	0.0 %
Assault Care Units at A & E	26.9 %	73.1 %	0.0 %
Total Distribution	24.9 %	74.7 %	0.4 %

The majority of victims are female. This is the case (to a varying degree) in all of the services, though discrepancies have been seen from survey to survey. In 2003 and 2005 the distribution of men and women using services for victims of crime was about equal. In 2008 this distribution had changed to 23 % men and 74% women. In this year's survey only 13% of the clients of services for victims of crime were male. In 2008 the gender distribution at the assault care units was 49% male and 49% female. In this year's survey 27% of clients were male. In this year's survey there were only a small number of cases registered by services for victims of crime and assault care units. This small number may be the cause behind the observed changes in gender-distribution and is probably not representative for the actual gender distribution of these services as a whole, but more likely a result of coincidence during the sampling process.

As we have seen in previous surveys, this year's survey also registered a high number of violence in intimate relationships at crisis centers. Here gender distribution has changed; in 2008 the victim was male in only 5% of cases, in this year's survey this number has tripled to nearly 17%. In 2010 the municipalities were obligated by law to offer help to both men and women at their crisis centers. This has led to more men making use of and seeking help at crisis centers. In the rapport «Reporting from Crisis Center Services 2011» conducted by Sentio Research Group Norway (2011), they showed a clear increase of male clients. The same tendency was also seen in our findings in this year's survey.

Table 5.4 Type of violence and age.

	0-6 years	7-14 years	15-17 years	18-25 years	26-29 years	40-59 years	60-79 years	Over 80 years	Age not given
Physical violence	72.1 %	78.4 %	70.7 %	68.7 %	70.5 %	67.7 %	65.2 %	46.6 %	56.4 %
Sexual violence/Rape	15.2 %	10.2 %	17.1 %	22.9 %	18.8 %	17.2 %	13.0 %	0.0 %	15.3 %
Psychological violence	55.9 %	55.1 %	57.1 %	63.6 %	72.2 %	68.7 %	73.9 %	86.6 %	61.5 %
Threatening behavior	38.2 %	45.8 %	42.8 %	52.9 %	54.8 %	47.8 %	47.8 %	60.0 %	41.0 %
Financial violence/ Property damage	8.2 %	6.8 %	5.7 %	14.6 %	19.7 %	22.8 %	30.4 %	33.3 %	10.2 %
Other	6.1 %	4.0 %	8.5 %	9.4 %	6.5 %	7.1 %	4.3 %	6.6 %	17.9 %

Compared to the survey of 2008 there has been an overall increase in most types of violence. Still this varies to some degree depending on the age-group. Physical violence has increased in all age groups; sexual violence has increased in all age groups except for those between 60-97 years where it has decreased by 4%; psychological violence has increased in all age groups except for the youngest where it has decreased by 1%; threatening behavior has increased in all age groups except among the youngest where it has decreased by 19%; financial violence/ property damage has decreased amongst those from 7-29 years old and the eldest, in the remaining groups it has increased; and other violence has increased for all age groups except amongst the eldest where it has decreased by over 10%.

5.2 Where and when did the violence occur

Table 5.5 Cases of domestic violence.

	Male		Female		Gender not given		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
0-6 years	119	86.9 %	172	91.5 %	2	0.7	293	89.6 %
7-14 years	197	91.2 %	199	88.8 %	-	-	396	89.8 %
15-17 years	53	91.4 %	72	87.8 %	-	-	125	89.3 %
18-25 years	23	85.2 %	190	89.2 %	-	-	213	84.2 %
26-39 years	30	96.8 %	451	86.9 %	-	-	481	87.5 %
40-59 years	31	83.8 %	254	94.4 %	-	-	285	92.8 %
60-79 years	11	84.6 %	29	87.9 %	-	-	40	87.0 %
Over 80 years	3	100 %	10	83.3 %	-	-	13	86.7 %
Not given	4	57.1 %	23	82.1 %	-	-	27	69.2 %
Total	471	86.3 %	1400	88.0 %	2	0.7 %	1873	86.2 %

The majority of registered cases in this year's survey concerns domestic violence. In over 86% of cases, violence takes place in the home. In 2008 this proportion was 80% and in 2004 it was 86%. The prevalence of cases of domestic violence has in other words been consistently high throughout the last surveys. During the former survey, a larger proportion of female victims than male victims were violated in the home, while in this year's study nearly the same proportion of men and women victims were exposed to domestic violence.

Table 5.6 Other arenas for violence. Distributed by gender.

	Male (N=529)	Female (N=1587)
Other private residence	8.9 %	10.6 %
In public	5.7 %	10.8 %
Institution	1.5 %	1.4 %
Workplace/School etc.	1.7 %	2.5 %
Food and Beverage Services areas/ Hotels etc.	0.8 %	2.1 %
Other places	3.8 %	6.7 %
Threats by telephone/letters/e- mails/text messages	6.0 %	13.8 %
Not given	3.6 %	3.7 %

This table shows the percentage of cases of violence experienced outside the home for each gender. The numbers of these cases are small compared to the number of cases involving domestic violence. We see a bigger difference in gender-distribution in cases involving violence outside the home. Compared to the survey of 2008 there is a lower incidence of cases involving violence outside the home.

Table 5.7 The last time the violence/threat occurred.

	Number	Percentage
Less than one week ago	495	23.3
Less than one month ago	547	25.8
Less than one year ago	670	31.6
Less than five years ago	194	9.1
More than five years ago	-	-
During childhood	67	3.2
Not given	148	7.0
Total	2128	100

From this table we can see, to what degree, registered cases involve ongoing violence or if the violence has taken place earlier. In nearly 50% of cases, violence has occurred during the last month, while in over 80% of the cases, violence has occurred during the last year. Compared to 2008, there are more cases involving violence that have occurred a month or more ago. In the 2008 survey, in a total of 41% of the cases, violence had taken place during the past week.

The question answered in connection with registration was “When did the violence/threat last occur?” This showed that in over 12 % of all cases assistance services work with, violence has occurred at least one year ago. This illustrates that cases of violence in intimate relationships are complicated and call for extensive follow-up work over long periods of time.

5.3 The Perpetrator

Table 5.8 Gender of perpetrator. *The total percentage is higher than 100 due to the possibility of more than one perpetrator per case.*

	Percentage
Unknown	1.2 %
Male	85.9 %
Female	19.2 %

Several studies have shown that when asking the question whether or not people have committed specific acts of violence in intimate relationships (behavioral questions), the distribution of gender amongst those who confirm they have done so are practically equal (Haaland et al., 2005; Pape & Stefansen, 2004; Straus, 1999). Still we see a larger proportion of male perpetrators than female amongst the registered cases amongst the different services. This unequal distribution was also seen in the previous survey. In 2008 the perpetrator was female in 12% of the cases.

In this year's survey the percentage of women who commit acts of violence has increased to over 19%. This has to be seen in concordance with the increased number of registered cases from the child protection services in this year's survey. Women more often commit acts of violence towards their children, than they do towards other people. An increase of registered cases from child protection services therefore results in an increase in number of female perpetrators.

Table 5.9 Gender and age of perpetrator(s).

	Male		Female		Gender not given	
	N	Percentage	N	Percentage	N	Percentage
under 15 years	22	1.0 %	7	0.3 %	-	-
15-17 years	47	2.2 %	10	0.5 %	1	0.0 %
18-25 years	129	7.5 %	28	1.3 %	-	-
26-39 years	684	32.1 %	209	9.8 %	2	0.1 %
40-59 years	722	33.9 %	151	7.1 %	1	0.0 %
60-79 years	64	3.0 %	15	0.7 %	2	0.1 %
over 80 years	2	0.1 %	-	-	-	-
Age unknown	170	8.0 %	31	1.5 %	10	0.5 %

The total percentage is higher than 100 due to the possibility of more than one perpetrator per case.

Table 5.9 illustrates the gender-distribution amongst perpetrators according to their age. As we mentioned earlier, there is a higher percentage of female perpetrators in this year's survey compared to the survey of 2008. In both genders the majority of perpetrators are between 26 and 59 years old.

Table 5.10 The victims relationship to the perpetrator, in different age groups. The victim is female.

Victims age	The victim is female (N=1581)								
	Partner (spouse, domestic partner, boy/girlfriend)	Previous partner (spouse, domestic partner, boy/girlfriend)	Mother	Father	Son	Daughter	Other Family Member	Other	Not known/ Not given
0-6 years	-	-	-	-	-	168	1	8	20
7-14 years	-	-	-	-	-	170	4	22	40
15-17 years	5	2	-	-	-	52	3	10	21
18-25 years	97	48	5	-	-	52	8	32	39
26-39 years	322	173	11	-	-	25	6	26	28
40-59 years	166	69	31	-	-	8	2	15	10
60-79 years	21	4	5	-	-	0	1	5	2
over 80 years	2	-	5	-	-	0	0	5	0
Not given	17	8	1	-	-	2	4	0	1
Total	630	304	58	-	-	477	29	123	161

Tables 5.10 and 5.11 show the relationship the victims have to their perpetrators. In table 5.10 we focused on cases where the victim was a girl/woman. The table shows the actual number of perpetrators in the survey. The majority of perpetrators were either a partner or a former partner (spouse, domestic partner, or boy/girlfriend). Close to 60% of the female victims were subjected to violence by her partner or former partner, while in over 30% of the cases it was the parents who subjected their daughter to violence.

Compared to the survey of 2008, there is a slight decrease in cases of violence committed by a partner or a former partner. The cases where the perpetrator is a parent has doubled since the last survey, probably as a result of the increased number of child protection services participating. Cases where the perpetrator was registered as “other,” the perpetrator was often a stepparent or the mother’s new boyfriend. In addition some of the violence was committed by other siblings. As we have witnessed in earlier surveys the largest majority of perpetrators were between the ages of 18 to 59 years old.

Table 5.11 The victims relationship to the perpetrator, in different age groups. The victim is male.

Victims age	The victim is male (N=529)								
	Partner (spouse, domestic partner, boy/girlfriend)	Previous partner (spouse, domestic partner, boy/girlfriend)	Mother	Father	Son	Daughter	Other Family Member	Other	Not known/ Not given
0-6 years	0	0	-	0	125	-	2	4	11
7-14 years	0	0	-	0	189	-	3	9	28
15-17 years	1	0	-	0	50	-	0	9	6
18-25 years	3	1	-	0	16	-	1	6	1
26-39 years	22	1	-	2	5	-	0	6	4
40-59 years	19	8	-	7	5	-	0	2	3
60-79 years	4	1	-	4	0	-	0	3	1
Over 80 years	1	0	-	1	0	-	0	1	-
Not given	5	1	-	1	0	-	1	1	2
Total	55	12	-	15	390	-	7	41	56

In table 5.11 we focused on cases where the victim was man/boy. It is interesting to compare the results from this table to those of the previous table (where the victim was a woman/girl). While the majority of women were exposed to violence from a partner/ previous partner, the parents were responsible for most of the violence experienced by men/boys. In a total of 73% of cases involving a male victim, the parents were responsible for this violence. In close to 60% of these types of cases, the victim is 14 years old or younger.

If we compare this table to the survey from 2008, we see a decline in number of cases where the man is subjected to violence from his partner, from around 16% to about 10%. At the same time, the number of boys under the age of 14 exposed to violence by their parents has increased from 35% to 60%. This is also a result of the increased number of cases received from child protective services.

Table 5.12 Cases involving repeated violence from the same perpetrator earlier.

	Number	Percentage
Never	125	5.9
Yes, once	67	3.2
Yes, twice	104	49.1
Yes, for several years	552	26.1
Not known/ Not given	333	15.7
Total	2117	100

In less than 6 % of the cases the victim had not been subjected to violence earlier from that specific perpetrator, and in close to 80% of cases, victims had been exposed to violence from the same perpetrator more than twice. Compared to the survey in 2005 and 2008, cases involving a “new” perpetrator have sunk by almost 4%, while the numbers of cases involving the same perpetrator have increased by nearly 7%. This may be linked to the increased number of cases from Child Protection Services, where it is often the parents/stepparents who are responsible for the violence.

6 Children's contact with assistance services.

6.1 Number of cases

In 908 of the 2179 cases in total, children under the age of 18 were involved. This accounts for 43% of all the registered cases.

The 908 cases included both cases where the child was directly subjected to violence and cases where the child witnessed violence someone else was subjected to.

Table 6.1 Has the child witnessed the violence or have they been directly subjected to violence? Actual numbers and percentage of all cases (in parenthesis).

	Not a witness	Witness
Not exposed		253 (27.9 %)
Exposed	350 (38.5 %)	304 (33.5 %)

In 253 of the cases, the child was a witness to, but not directly subjected to the violence, while in the rest of the cases the children had themselves been directly subjected to violence. A series of studies in recent years have shown that witnessing violence in the family in itself can cause as much harm and psychological trauma to the child as if they were directly subjected to the violence themselves (Pinheiro & United Nations., 2006). We will therefore not distinguish between those children who only have witnessed violence and those who have been directly subjected, but refer to all of them as victims.

Table 6.2 Children's own cases and type of service where case is registered.

	Number	Percentage
Child Protective Services/on duty caseworker	521	57.4
Crisis Centers	179	19.7
Police District	129	14.2
Family Counseling Offices	64	7.0
NAV-offices	10	1.1
Assault Care Units at A & E.	4	.4
Services for Victims of Crime	1	.1
Total	908	100

In over half of the cases where the victim was a child (under the age of 18) the case was registered by services within the child protection sector. Due to the larger number of child protective services included in this year's survey, compared to previous surveys, it is difficult to compare this year's results with those of previous years. If we look at crisis centers, police districts and family counseling offices where the number of invited services has not changed compared to previous surveys, we found that in all of these services

there has been a marked increase of child victims. Compared to the survey of 2008, the number of these cases has tripled in crisis centers, from 64 in 2008 to 179 this year, and has close to quadrupled in police districts, from 34 cases in 2008 to 129 cases this year while family counseling offices show a slight increase from 55 cases in 2008 to 64 cases this year. For the other services involved, no noteworthy changes were observed.

The increase in number of cases involving child victims shows a continuing trend observed in previous surveys, where the number has increased between each survey. There is little reason to believe that this increase mirrors a corresponding increase in the number of children subjected to abuse and violence in Norway. This rise must first and foremost be credited to a continually growing awareness to these types of cases amongst the various services.

6.2 Victim and Perpetrator

Table 6.3 The child victim, age and gender.

	Girl		Boy		Total	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Age group						
0 - 6 years	188	38,1	137	33,3	327	36,0
7 - 14 years	224	45,3	216	52,6	441	48,6
15 - 17 years	82	16,6	58	14,1	140	15,4
Total	494	100	411	100	908	100

A little over half of the boys and a little under half of the girls were in the age group of 7-14 years old, while one-third of both boy and girl victims were within the youngest age group (0-6 years old).

The services were requested to report which type of abuse the child had been subjected to or witnessed. Since so many children were subjected to or witnessed more than one type of violence (over 60% had been subjected to at least two different types of abuse), the number of acts of violence/abuse surpasses the total number of abused children.

Table 6.4 Types of violence children were subjected to.

	Number	Percentage
Physical violence	681	75,0
Sexual violence/rape	119	13,1
Psychological violence	506	55,7
Threatening behavior	387	42,6
Financial violence/property damage	65	7,2
Other	50	5,5

Physical violence is the most common form of violence, followed by psychological violence and threats. If we observe the girls and boys separately, we find that a larger proportion of boys than girls have been subjected to physical violence, psychological violence and threats, while twice as many girls than boys have been subjected to sexual abuse.

Table 6.5 Percentage of girls and boys subjected to specific types of violence.

	Girls	Boys
Physical violence	72,5 %	78,3 %
Sexual violence/ Rape	16,6 %	8,8 %
Psychological violence	53,6 %	58,4 %
Threatening behavior	40,9 %	45,0 %
Financial violence/ property damage	7,5 %	6,8 %
Other	4,7 %	6,6 %

In 149 of the 908 cases registered there were more than one offender, most often two, but in one case there had been a total of six different perpetrators. In the majority of cases the perpetrator was male, either one or several men. In a little over one-fourth of the cases, however, the offender was a female, either one or several women, or both women and men.

Table 6.6 Perpatrators gender.

	Number	Percentage
Not given	24	2,6
Only male	631	69,5
Only female	135	14,9
Both female and male	118	13

The majority of offenders were in the age group of 26-59 years; over four-fifths of perpetrators were in this age-group.

Table 6.7 Number of perpetrators in the different age-groups.

Age	Number	Percentage
Under 15 years	16	1,54
15 - 18 years	29	2,79
19 - 25 years	40	3,85
26 - 39 years	461	44,41
40 - 59 years	403	38,82
60 - 79 years	24	2,31
Over 80 years	-	-
Not known/not given	65	6,26
Total	1038	100

In the survey we asked about the victim's relationship to the perpetrator, and not the perpetrator's relationship to the victim. We therefore cannot, with absolute certainty, determine how much abuse against children is committed by the father or the mother. If we look at the cases where the child's relationship to the perpetrator is either a son or a daughter, that is where the parents are committing the violence, we found that this is the case in 771 (85%) of the 908 cases. If we also look at the gender of the perpetrator we find that it is the fathers that are responsible for most of the violence against their children. In over four-fifths (82%) of cases where the parents are responsible for the violence, the father is one of the perpetrators, either alone or with others, and in a little over one-fourth (28%) of the cases the mother is amongst the

perpetrators, acting alone or together with others. In the majority of cases where the perpetrator is not a parent, the perpetrator is either not given, or it is someone outside the family who is responsible for the abuse.

Table 6.8 Exposed to similar violence earlier by the same perpetrator.

	Number	Percentage
No	43	4,7
Yes, once	13	1,4
Yes, several times	480	52,9
Yes, for several years	196	21,6
Do not know/not given	172	18,9
Not answered	4	,4
Total	908	100

In three-quarters of the cases the child had been subjected to similar violence previously from the same perpetrator, and in one-fifth of the cases the victimization had perpetuated for several years. As we also know that the majority of children had being subjected to more than one type of violence; we must describe these children as heavily burdened, and in great danger of developing subsequent psychological damage.

Tabel 6.9 Where did the violence take place?

	Women/girl		Man/boy		Total
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number
Private residence	443	74,3	369	75,8	816
Another private residence	44	7,4	35	7,2	79
In public (street, road, public transport)	34	5,7	22	4,5	56
Institution	6	1,0	3	0,6	9
Workplace/School etc.	7	1,2	7	1,4	15
Food and Beverage Service Area, Hotel, Boarding House	2	0,3	2	0,4	4
Other place	21	3,5	15	3,1	36
Threats by telephone/letter/e-mail/text messages	20	3,4	18	3,7	38
Not known/Not given	19	3,2	16	3,3	35
Total	596	100	487	100	1088¹

Most violence took place in the child's own home or in someone else's private residence and the distribution amongst the different arenas are about the same for both sexes. This of course does not imply that children are not exposed to violence or abuse in public areas or schools, but that those responsible for this type of abuse are for the most part other than those who are not in an intimate relationship with the child, and therefore not included in our study.

¹ The total numbers of units (arena for the violence and specific type of violence) in this table are larger than the total number of children due to the individual child can be exposed to violence in several different places.

6.3 Contact with the Assistance Services

In a little over 30% of the cases the victimized child had not been in contact with the service previously, but was a new client. In one-fourth of the cases the child had been in contact with the service several times during the survey week.

Table 6.10 Who established contact?

Who established contact?	Number	Percentage
The victim contacted us	80	8,8
We contacted the victim	27	3,0
Another service contacted us	523	57,6
The Perpetrator(s) contacted us	28	3,1
Others contacted us	240	26,4
Not answered	10	1,1
Total	908	100

In most cases involving child victims, the cases are reported to the service through another service. It was very rare for a service itself to initiate contact. This includes the police. Still, it is more common for police to initiate contact (7% of the cases) or the child contacting the service themselves (16% of the cases), compared to the other services.

If we look at which other services the victim has been in contact with, we get the following picture.

Table 6.11 The victims contact with other services.

	Is also registered with	Is referred to us from	Is referred from us to	Has contacted them self	Total
Child Protection Services	494	99	68	17	678
School/ Nursery School	338	58	10	35	441
Police	238	75	87	33	433
Medical Services	215	27	52	30	324
Crisis Centers	147	10	5	8	170
Mental Healthcare Services	101	10	39	9	159
Family Counseling offices	88	6	12	11	117
Social Services	83	0	13	11	107
Elderly Protection Services	9	6	0	3	18
Home Healthcare Services	7	2	3	0	12
Services for Victims of Crime	6	0	0	4	10
Other services	109	14	29	19	171

Child protective services are the services most child victims are in contact with, followed by schools/nursery schools and the police. Child Protective Services are also the services that referred the most cases to other services, while the police was the service that received the most referred cases from other services.

6.4 Victim's children and siblings

In addition to the questions regarding the main target of the violence, it was also asked whether or not the victim had children or siblings under the age of 18. This was the incidence in close to two-thirds of the cases.

Table 6.12 Has the victim children/siblings under the age of 18?

	Number	Percentage
Yes	1375	63,1
No	516	23,7
Not known/ not given	213	9,8
Total	2104	96,5
Not answered	75	3,5
Total	2179	100

Previous studies on violence in intimate relationships have shown that children of families where violence takes place often are witnesses to the violence, or are also themselves subjected to the violence (Haaland, Clausen, & Schei, 2005). To get an idea as to how many children are involved, we asked the services how many children or siblings the victim had and how old their children and siblings were. A total of 2607 children were affected in the 1375 cases where the victim had children or siblings under the age of 18.

Table 6.13 Number of children in the different age-groups which witnessed or were subjected to violence distributed amongst type of service.

Type of service	Total number of cases	0-6 years	7-14 years	15 – 18 years	Not known	Total Number of children	Number of children per case
Police District	383	151	161	55	16	383	1,00
Crisis Center	659	375	329	116	13	833	1,26
Family Counseling Office	291	171	132	40	3	346	1,19
Child Protective Services/ on duty caseworker	694	365	450	128	41	984	1,42
NAV-office	33	18	8	0	2	28	0,85
Elderly Protective Services	19	0	0	0	0	0	0,00
Services for Victims of Crime	23	0	3	2	1	6	0,26
Assault Care Units at A & E.	26	12	10	2	3	27	1,04
Total	2128	1092	1093	343	79	2607	1,23

If we look at the number of cases each service worked with during the survey week, child protective services worked with the most children per case, on average 1.42 children per case.

References

- Haaland, T., Clausen, S.-E., & Schei, B. (Eds.). (2005). *Vold i parforhold - ulike perspektiver : resultater fra den første landsdekkende undersøkelsen i Norge*. Oslo: Norsk institutt for by- og regionforskning.
- Hjemdal, Ole Kristian, Sogn, Hanne, & Schau, Line. (2012). Vold, negative livshendelser og helse. En gjennomgang av data fra to regionale helseundersøkelser. (Vol. Rapport 1/2012). Oslo: NKVTS.
- Nersund, Ranita & Govasmark, Hege. (2011). *Rapportering fra krisesentertilbud 2011*. Sentio Research Norge. Hentet 16.11.12, fra http://www.krisesenter.com/statistikk/PDFdocs/rapportering_krisesentrene2011.pdf.
- Pape, H., & Stefansen, K. (Eds.). (2004). *Den skjulte volden?: En undersøkelse av Oslobefolkningens utsatthet for trusler, vold og seksuelle overgrep*. Oslo: Nasjonalt kunnskapssenter om vold og traumatisk stress.
- Pinheiro, P. S., & United Nations. (2006). *World report on violence against children*. Geneva: United Nations Secretary-General's Study on Violence against Children.