



# WP4



## BECAN Project

“Balkan Epidemiological Study  
on Child Abuse and Neglect”

Grant agreement no.: 223478,  
Collaborative Project



Faculty for special education  
and rehabilitation, University of  
Belgrade

January 2013



## CASE-BASED SURVEILLANCE STUDY (CBSS): SERBIA REPORT

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



## REPORT INFORMATION

### Project

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

### Report

Deliverable number:	4.2 (+ Achievements 4.2 and 5.4)
Deliverable title:	Report on Incidence rates (on national and Balkan level) of reported CAN cases
Due date of deliverable:	38 <sup>th</sup> Month
Actual submission date:	40 <sup>th</sup> Month
Authors:	Ljiljana Stevković, Nikola Petković, Lazar Tenjović, Veronika Išpanović-Radojković,
Beneficiary:	Faculty for special education and rehabilitation, University of Belgrade, Republic of Serbia
Work Package no.:	4
Work Package title:	Case-based Surveillance
Work Package leader:	Institute of Child Health-Department of Mental Health & Social Welfare
WP Participants:	CRCA-AL, SWU-BG, UNIZG-HR, UniCIPsy-FYRoM, UBB-RO, FASPER-RS, AAHD-TR, FPN-BiH
Person-months for deliverable:	306,76 (ICH- GR: 92, CRCA-AL: 11, SWU-BG: 8, UNIZG-HR: 34,36, UniCIPsy-FYRoM: 21, UBB-RO: 44,4, FASPER-RS: 40, AAHD-TR: 15, FPN-BiH: 41)
Dissemination level:	PU
Nature:	R
Version:	Final
No of pages (+ cover):	60
Keywords:	case, child abuse neglect (CAN), surveillance, incident, forms of maltreatment, caregiver, perpetrator, family, agencies, services, archives, databases

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Child abuse and neglect is a complex health and social phenomenon caused by both individual and family factors, and social factors. Continuing process of victimization, child abuse and neglect results in immediate and long-term health and behaviour consequences (at individual level) and financial consequences and social consequences (at broader social level).

The extent of the problem is impossible to determine mainly due to the fact that the victimization of children remains hidden behind a veil of secrecy and the lack of a monitoring system. The starting point for successful prevention and suppression of victimization of children is efficient system of recording data CAN, based on information from the incident, the family, the perpetrator and the victim. Despite the efforts made in the field of better application of the general and specific protocols in practice, and application of the principles of the National Strategy for the Prevention and Protection of Children from Violence 2008-2015, Serbia still has not developed a national database on child abuse and neglect cases, and strategies for monitoring this phenomenon.

Scope of the CBSS is to identify to what extent the official, registered incidence of child abuse and neglect is in accordance with the hidden incidence in general population. The primary aim of the CBSS is to measure all forms of CAN incidence rate and to compare its results with the results of the epidemiological survey.

Collection of data was made in 14 centres for social work in municipalities as the epidemiological study. For extraction of information an Extraction form A for organizations and Extraction form B for individual cases were used. Data were collected from April till November 2012. Collected data were analyzed in December 2012.

The findings of CBSS indicate that only a small proportion of children who experienced some type of CAN comes to the attention of the Centers for social work which could provide them the needed help and support.

According to the results of the epidemiological study app. 500 in 1000 children in general population experienced multiple victimization (2-4 types of violent experience) while only app. 2 cases of CAN in 1000 children of general population were registered in Centers for social work which are the main statutory agency for child protection in Serbia.

The origins of this gap between the high incidence of CAN in general population and a low incidence of cases registered in CSW are twofold. First, there is a low sensitivity of parents to the adverse childhood experiences of their children. Data on help seeking and received services indicate that more than half of families (59.3%) did not turned for help because of violence to any child or family service. One of the reasons for such behaviour of parents is certainly their attitude towards violence against children. The fact is that many parents consider corporal punishment as legal and obligatory method of upbringing children.

Another reason of parental reluctance to turn to social services for help is their mistrust because of the low efficiency of these services. The research indicated that the inter-sectoral cooperation and the exchange of data on individual cases between social protection, health care, educational services, police and others in the child protection network is on a very low level.

Within the services which are in charge of assessment and management of CAN cases, the monitoring of CAN cases seems to be the weakest point. It seems that plenty of information is recorded, but no secondary analysis takes place. Categorization of the cases, analysis of referrals and the outcomes of the casework are missing, and without them interventions and measure remain inefficient,.

Another great challenge is that there is no central databases, and given that the institutions dealing with child abuse and neglect use different parameters for observing and recording the cases no accurate data on the real extent of violence that children suffer in Serbia, are available.

It became evident that the further development of system for prevention and protection from abuse and neglect is impossible without establishment of a unique system for registration of data on violence and monitoring the effects of implemented measures and programs.

Accordingly, the main objectives of the case-based surveillance study have been achieved. Namely, CBSS provided information on the magnitude and characteristics of CAN, stressed the shortcomings in CAN data and reporting system and therefore the necessity for the implementation of specific form for recording CAN and development of national database and monitoring system.

It is strongly recommended to implement the results and lessons learnt from the CBSS study in the development of an integrated system of registration of data on CAN (central data base), which is one of the specific objectives of the Action plan for the implementation of the National Strategy for prevention and protection of children from abuse and neglect . It is encouraging that the first steps in integrating the outputs of the CBSS (tools, methods etc) in further development of the CAN surveillance system in Serbia are already taking place.

	page(s)
<b>DOCUMENT INFORMATION</b>	i
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	ii
<b>CONTENTS</b>	iv
<b>List of Tables</b>	v
<b>CHAPTER A: INTRODUCTION &amp; BACKGROUND</b>	1
<b>A.1. The BECAN Project</b>	1
<b>A.2. CBSS in Republic of Serbia: Background, Aim and Objectives</b>	2
Specific objectives	3
<b>A.3. Current situation concerning CAN Monitoring System in Republic of Serbia</b>	4
<b>A.4. The necessity for improvement of a National CAN Monitoring System</b>	5
<b>A.5. CBSS Challenges Encountered in Republic of Serbia</b>	6
<b>CHAPTER B. METHODOLOGY</b>	8
<b>B.1. Organization of CBSS in Republic of Serbia</b>	8
<b>B1.1. Timeframe</b>	8
<b>B.1.2. Identification of Eligible Services-CBSS Data Sources</b>	9
<b>B.1.3. Preparation of the National Research instruments</b>	10
<b>B.1.4. Train the National Research Team</b>	10
<b>B.2. Process followed for Data Collection</b>	10
<b>CHAPTER C. CBSS RESULTS IN REPUBLIC OF SERBIA</b>	11
<b>C.1. Description of Participating Services &amp; their Archives-Databases</b>	11
<b>C.2. CAN incidence in Republic of Serbia</b>	19
<b>C.2.1. Children's vulnerability to CAN and to Specific Forms of Maltreatment</b>	
<b>C.2.2. Child- CAN victims' characteristics</b>	
<b>C.2.3. Characteristics of Families and Households of Maltreated Children</b>	
<b>C.2.4. Characteristics of CAN-Perpetrators</b>	
<b>C.2.5. Characteristics of Caregivers of Maltreated Children</b>	
<b>C.2.6. Agencies involved in administration of CAN cases and Services provided to children-victims and their families</b>	
<b>C.3. File completeness concerning the characteristics of the recorded CAN cases: lessons learned from the missing values</b>	45
<b>CHAPTER D. CONCLUSIONS</b>	52
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	54
<b>Literature</b>	
<b>ANNEXES</b>	
<b>ANNEX I: List of Organizations that provided data</b>	
<b>ANNEX II: Extraction Forms Part I &amp; II</b>	
<b>ANNEX III: Operations' Manual for Researchers</b>	

## LIST OF TABLES

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

## CHAPTER A: INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

### A.1. The BECAN Project

The Project “Balkan Epidemiological Study on Child Abuse and Neglect” (B.E.C.A.N.) run from September 2009 until January 2013 in 9 Balkan countries and was co-funded by the EU’s 7<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (FP7/2007-2013)<sup>1</sup> and the participating partner Organizations. The project’s coordinator was the Institute of Child Health, Department of Mental Health and Social Welfare, Centre for the Study and Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (ICH-MHSW), in Athens (Greece), while the national coordinators for each of the participating countries were the following Organizations:

- Children's Human Rights Centre of Albania (Albania)
- Department of Medical Social Sciences, South-West University "Neofit Rilski" (Bulgaria)
- Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Sarajevo (Bosnia & Herzegovina)
- Department of Social Work, Faculty of Law, University of Zagreb (Croatia)
- University Clinic of Psychiatry, University of Skopje (F.Y.R. of Macedonia)
- Social Work Department, Faculty of Sociology and Social Work, Babes-Bolyai University (Romania)
- Faculty for Special Education and Rehabilitation, University of Belgrade (Serbia)
- Association of Emergency Ambulance Physicians (Turkey)

The project’s evaluation was conducted by Istituto degli Innocenti (Italy) and the project’s external scientific supervision was undertaken by Prof. Kevin Browne, Head of the W.H.O. Collaborating Centre for Child Care and Protection (United Kingdom) and Chair of Forensic Psychology and Child Health, Institute of Work, Health & Organisations, University of Nottingham.

The BECAN project included the design and realization of an *Epidemiological field survey* and a *Case-Based Surveillance study* in 9 Balkan countries mentioned above (Albania, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, F.Y.R. of Macedonia, Greece, Romania, Serbia and Turkey).

The 9 **Epidemiological surveys** that were conducted aimed at investigating the prevalence and incidence of child abuse and neglect (CAN) in representative randomized samples of the general population of pupils attending three grades (the grades attended mainly by children 11, 13 and 16 year-olds). In addition, supplementary surveys were conducted to convenience samples of children that have dropped out of school in countries where the drop-out rates are high for producing estimates of respectful CAN indicators at national level. Data were collected by two sources, namely by matched pairs of children and their parents, by using two of the ICAST Questionnaires (the ICAST-CH and the ICAST-P) modified for the purposes of the BECAN project.

---

<sup>1</sup> Grant Agreement No: HEALTH-F2-2009-223478.



The **Case-based surveillance study** (CBSS) aimed at identifying CAN incidence rates based on already existing data extracted from the archives of agencies involved in the handling of CAN cases (such as child protection, health, judicial and police-services and NGOs) in the same geographical areas and for the same time period as the epidemiological field survey. The collected data were related to the characteristics of individual cases such as child, incident, perpetrator(s), caregiver(s), and information concerning the family. At the same time, the CBSS targeted to map the existing surveillance mechanisms, where available, and to outline the characteristics of the surveillance practices in each participating country. Moreover, comparison at national level between incidence rates of CAN as found in field survey in one hand and in case based surveillance study on the other would produce evidence based estimates of the instantiation of the “iceberg” phenomenon regarding CAN, viz. that actual rates of the phenomenon are substantially higher than the number of cases actually known or provided for by services in the participant countries.

In addition, in the context of the BECAN Project were built National Networks of agencies (governmental and non-governmental) working in the fields of child protection from the areas of welfare, health, justice, education and public order. In total, 9 National Networks were developed in the participating countries, having more than 430 agencies-members. Last but not least, a wide range of dissemination activities were conducted which included the organization of National Conferences and one International Conference, scientific papers, announcements to scientific conferences and meetings, publications in press/media, publication of Reports, etc (more information about the project’s activities can be found at the project’s website: [www.becan.eu](http://www.becan.eu)).

Finally, BECAN aimed to include all aforementioned outcomes in terms of evidence produced, experience gained and networking of resources into comprehensive consolidated reports at national and Balkan level that could facilitate evidence based social policy design and implementation for improving child protection services and overall provisos.

The current Report describes in detail the methodology and the main results of the Case-based surveillance study (CBSS) conducted in Serbia.

## **A.2. CBSS in Serbia: Background, Aim and Objectives**

BECAN Case-based surveillance study constitutes a systematic effort to collect data on child abuse and neglect, and at the same time to map the existing surveillance mechanisms. Due to that, the primary aim of the CBSS is to measure all forms of CAN incidence rate. Since the incidence rate concerns the measurement of the number of children maltreated in one year, the sample includes all recorded cases in exact 12-month period, no matter to the status of the abuse and neglect (substantiated, suspected, and unsubstantiated cases).

The second aim of the study is to compare its results with the results of the epidemiological survey. Such a comparison is expected to reveal a more realistic picture concerning the difference between reported and hidden incidence of CAN cases in school-aged children nationally in participating countries. Therefore, the results could be use in order to identify potential weaknesses of the existing surveillance mechanisms in each individual country, even for those that have already established a CAN surveillance system. At the

national level, the conclusions of the CBSS and the results of its comparison with the respective results of the epidemiological survey could be used for the development of a strategic plan in the context of the BECAN project suggesting the establishment of national permanent CAN monitoring systems in countries where no such systems exist or to improve already available systems. Furthermore, identification of the differences between the epidemiological survey and the CBSS results within each country and consequent comparison of these differences among countries could potentially indicate what works better in CAN surveillance and to assess the quality of the already existing CAN surveillance systems in terms of their usefulness, simplicity, flexibility, acceptability, sensitivity, specificity, representativeness, timeliness and resources, given that different methodologies, tools and mechanisms are currently employed for the monitoring of CAN.

Beside these two main aims, specific objectives of BECAN Case-based surveillance study are:

- To collect data on child maltreatment from a range of sources nationwide in each country about the characteristics of individual cases including case identity, and information about child victim, incident of violence and/or abuse, perpetrator(s), caregiver, family, household, previous maltreatment, agencies involved and services provided. What is more important for prevention of CAN, on the basis of this information the objective is to outline the profile of maltreated children and their families, to identify potential risk factors and characteristics of groups at risk. Also, on the basis of this information the objective is to explore the severity of child abuse and neglect in terms of duration and harm or injury caused, and to outline investigation outcomes, including substantiation rates, placement in care, use of child welfare court, and criminal prosecution.
- To collect data related to characteristics of the existing surveillance systems targeting the outline of the current situation in the participating countries concerning CAN-surveillance infrastructures and identify common patterns and differences in the methods and tools used. Towards this objective, data were collected concerning the identity of the agencies keeping CAN-related records, their legal status, the sector they belong to and their mission, their size (number of employees and the number of child abuse and neglect cases turnover), the people who make the recording and whether they have received any special training in handling CAN cases, the sources of referrals, whether routine screening is being enforced and implemented and whether these agencies collect statistic data on CAN. Furthermore, data on characteristics of the records, such as format of the record (database or archive, electronic or paper), the total time-period covered by the archive/database, use of a specific "CAN recording form", the type of cases that are included in the record and whether further documentation accompanying the record is available in the agencies, were also collected<sup>2</sup>.

A case-based surveillance study is based on the same methodology, and conducted in the same geographical area and for the same time period as the epidemiological study, in all participating countries, including Serbia.

---

<sup>2</sup> See more in *Protocol for extracting CAN information from archives/databases & Extraction forms* (2010). Available at: [www.becan.eu](http://www.becan.eu)

### **A.3. Current situation concerning CAN Monitoring System in Serbia**

In Serbia the main statutory agencies responsible for investigation and management of child abuse and neglect cases are Centres for social work (CSWs) which are public governmental institutions under the central governance and financing of the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs. Since the adoption of the new Family Law (2005), the amendments to the Criminal Law (2006) and the new Law on Social Protection (2011) referral of all CAN cases to one out of the 153 CSWs has been obligatory. Health, education and police services, as well as NGOs, are obliged to report to Centre for social work if they have any information or concern that a child has been abused or neglected or it is at risk of CAN<sup>3</sup>. Therefore, the data for the Case-based surveillance study has been collected from archives of selected centres for social work.

The procedure of reporting, registering, managing and monitoring the CAN cases is defined by the General protocol for protection of children from abuse and neglect which was adopted by the Government in 2006. The General Protocol has foreseen that all the relevant ministries should create and adopt their specific protocols regulating the intra-sectoral child protection process. In line with that, the following special protocols were adopted in different sectors: for Social care institutions (institutions for children without parental care and for children with disabilities) in 2006; for Police in 2007, amended in 2011; for Educational system, in 2007; for Health care system, in 2009 and for Judiciary, in 2009. These legally binding documents provide a framework for an integrated inter-sectoral collaboration in child protection. They define, for the first time, the steps, roles and responsibilities of all main actors in the process of child protection in the local community.

The adoption of the General Protocol was followed by training of inter-sectoral child protection teams supported by UNICEF and Save the Children. The challenge remains that this training of inter-sectoral child protection teams has only been implemented in 25 municipalities to date, or 16% of the total 153 CSWs in Serbia. According to the Action Plan for the implementation of the National Strategy (2009-2015), multidisciplinary child protection teams need to be trained and established in at least 15 new municipalities per year, which has not yet been realized. The Action Plan foresees also that in each Centre for Social Work there should be at least one case manager trained for managing high risk and complex cases of child abuse and neglect, while in Centres for Social Work with higher caseloads there should be 2 to 4 trained social workers. That is not the case in many CSW.

Collaboration between sectors remains a challenge - regulation of the exchange of data on individual cases and obligatory inter-sectoral cooperation and provision of feedback between police, social protection, health care and other stakeholders is weak. An indicator of weak inter-sectoral collaboration is that the multi-sectoral child protection teams are reasonably well functioning in only 15-20% out of 153 municipalities in Serbia.

---

<sup>3</sup> See more in Ispanovic-Radojkovic, V. (2010) Current situation concerning child abuse and neglect in Serbia. Belgrade: Faculty for special education and rehabilitation. Available at: [www.becan.eu](http://www.becan.eu)

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

The findings of a recent UNICEF study<sup>4</sup> indicate that while there is a comprehensive legislative basis for protection of children from abuse and neglect in Serbia, there is a lack of standardized implementation among service providers in identification, reporting and recording of CAN cases. The monitoring system seems to be the weakest point. It seems that plenty of information is recorded, but no secondary analysis takes place. There are no central databases, and given that the institutions dealing with child abuse and neglect use different parameters for observing and recording the cases (UNICEF Serbia and SBS, 2009:45), the recorded information are difficult to compare<sup>5</sup>. Therefore accurate data on the real extent of violence that children suffer in Serbia is difficult to give. Categorization of the cases, analysis of referrals and the outcomes of the casework are missing, and without them interventions and measures may be missing their goal and targets.

Since 2009, the CSWs in Serbia have been using a common CAN record form but it is mainly a descriptive one and there is still no database on CAN cases in CSWs. The CSWs report annually to the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs on the number and type of CAN cases, and the services provided. Some data on the relationship between the perpetrator and the child victim could be found in these reports also but there are no specific data on the child victim or the perpetrator, which would enable the creation of victim and perpetrator profiles and identification of potential risks for violent victimization of children, which could serve as a base for planning of preventive activities<sup>6</sup>.

Recently some significant efforts have been made in improving the CAN monitoring system. In accordance with the guidelines of the CRC related to the reporting of CAN cases a revised form for reporting CAN cases in the CSW has been adopted<sup>7</sup>. The application of this revised format of reporting is still in its early stage and therefore it is difficult to evaluate its impact.

The Ministry of Labour and Social Policy seems to be developing new software to track social assistance and services, which will hopefully change the situation. However, the exchange of information and data between the systems is not regulated.

The Ministry of Health has established a working group for the implementation of Special protocol for health system. One of the specific aims of the working group is to create a special written form for recording each case of abuse and/or neglect within the health care system.

---

<sup>4</sup> UNICEF (2012): Thematic Study: Serbia. *How to improve responsiveness of service providers in identifying, reporting and referring cases of violence against children.*

<sup>5</sup> UNICEF Serbia i Republički zavod za statistiku (2009) *Indikatori u maloletničkom pravosuđu: Analiza dostupnosti statističkih i drugih podataka u oblasti maloletničkog pravosuđa.*

<sup>6</sup> Stevkovic, Lj. (2012) Mesto žrtve u evidencijama nasilja nad decom. *Temida*. Vol. 15, br. 3, str. 77-98

<sup>7</sup> Stevkovic, Lj. (2012) Mesto žrtve u evidencijama nasilja nad decom. *Temida*. Vol. 15, br. 3, str. 77-98

It is encouraging that one of the main objectives of the *National Strategy for the Prevention and Protection of Children from Violence 2008-2015* is the improvement of the system of reporting abuse, neglect and exploitation of children and of the system for collecting and analyzing data.

Soon after the adoption of the Strategy, in order to regulate more precisely the application of its provisions in practice, the Government of the Republic of Serbia adopted in 2010 an *Action plan for the implementation of the National Strategy for the Prevention and Protection of Children from Violence 2010-2012* (the Action Plan). One of the specific aims of the Action Plan (specific objective 2.6) is the improvement of the system for data collection and reporting of abuse, neglect and exploitation of children. In regard to this specific objective the activities, indicators of achievement and facilitators of specific procedures of relevant ministries and other stakeholders in the system of child protection are specified<sup>8</sup>. It is especially encouraging that the support of research on the causes, consequences, prevention and protection of children from all forms of violence is emphasized as one of the objectives of the Action Plan.

It is expected that the lessons learnt from the CBSS will inform the process of establishing a more efficient national CAN monitoring system. The first steps towards that direction are already in progress.

#### **A.5. CBSS Challenges Encountered in Serbia**

As already mentioned the CSW are the main statutory agencies to which all concerns on CAN have to be reported and therefore it was decided that the study will be conducted in the CSWs providing services to vulnerable children and families in the same geographical area in which the epidemiological study was planned.

The first step in preparing the CBSS was to obtain a permission from the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy to conduct the research in the Centres for Social Work. A meeting was scheduled with the Ministry and detailed information on the BECAN study and specifically on the CBSS has been presented followed by written information. The Ministry welcomed the research and gave the permission as the aims and objectives of the study were in line with actual efforts of the Ministry to improve the responsiveness of service providers in identifying, reporting and referring cases of violence against children.

It was originally planned that 72 out of 153 CSW in Serbia will participate in the Case-based surveillance study as they were providing services to vulnerable children and families in the same geographical area in which the epidemiological study was taking place.

The field research was scheduled to take place from April to July 2011 but it had to be postponed due to financial constraints. Namely, in April 2011, at the end of the interim reporting period the funds of the 1<sup>st</sup> payment by EC were already used. As the waiting time for the 2<sup>nd</sup> payment was longer than planned, it was decided that FASPER will cover the costs of the field research of WP3 (epidemiological study) which was already in progress and that the CBSS will be postponed until the 2<sup>nd</sup> payment arrive. It happened in

---

<sup>8</sup> Vlada Republike Srbije (2010) *Akcioni plan za primenu Nacionalne strategije za prevenciju i zaštitu dece od nasilja 2010-2012*.

December 2011 and we informed the Ministry and the CSW that we intended to start the CBSS in January 2012. The Ministry requested that we postpone the beginning of the study for a few months because a re-organization of the internal administrative procedure and an introduction of a new software was already taking place in the CSWs and there was also another study which was in progress in some of the CSW. Thus, the start of the CBSS field research had to be postponed until April 2012.

In the meantime we encountered another problem. The cost of WP3 field research turned out to be higher than originally planned due to increase in the price of travel, accommodation and other field expenses of the epidemiological study (WP3) and the funds remained for CBSS (WP4) turned out to be much lower than needed.

In the situation of time and money constraint a decision was made to revise the sampling procedure of the CSW but taking care to maintain the statistical validity of the sample. The method selection of final sample is described in the next chapter.

Due to reduced sample and the financial constraint the number of researchers had to be reduced also and 2 researchers were conducting the field research in 14 CSW.

### B.1. Organization of CBSS in Serbia

In accordance with pre-defined and accepted methodological framework of CBSS implementation of the study is preceded by preparation, which included a series of activities necessary for the successful implementation of the study. Namely, first the project coordinator together with representatives of partner countries set out the criteria for the definition and classification of CAN cases and types of information and indicators to be searched and collected. Then the consortium set up the criteria for the selection of agencies/organizations that will be included in the study on the basis of each partner country provide a list of organizations that meet the established criteria. In Serbia, as noted above CSWs are the institutions in charge of investigating cases of child abuse and neglect and therefore were selected for the Case-based surveillance study.

The CBSS study in Serbia was organized through the following steps:

1. Creation of a National CAN network:
  - a. Identification of eligible Organizations to join the National CAN network
  - b. Obtaining an agreement/ memorandum with the eligible Organizations
  - c. Setting up a Forum of CAN network at the BECAN site
  - d. Maintaining the exchange of information through the Forum
2. Obtaining permission for the CBSS from the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy
3. Ensuring the cooperation with the CSWs
  - a. Informing the directors of the CSWs on CBSS at a meeting
  - b. Obtaining the data on registered CAN cases in the CSW
4. Selecting the eligible CSWs for the preliminary sample
5. Training of trainers
6. Translation of CBSS protocol and CBSS operation booklet to Serbian language
7. Training of field researchers for CBSS
8. Printing the CBSS questionnaires
9. Selecting the final sample
10. Conducting the research in the CSW
11. Entering and analyzing the data
12. Drafting the CBSS report

The details of these steps are described in the following chapters.

#### B1.1. Timeframe

The first activities to prepare the CBSS started immediately with the beginning of the BECAN project. In the period from October 2009 to March 31<sup>st</sup> 2010 identification of the eligible Organizations to join the National CAN network was completed. After that an invitation for joining the national BECAN network was sent to the identified Organizations. Up to now Serbia has developed a National CAN network with the following membership structure: 153 Centres for Social Work, 7 health care institutions, 4 educational institutions and

13 NGOs. In this first phase, the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs was contacted, and approval for the implementation of the case-based surveillance study was obtained.

From April, 1<sup>st</sup> 2010 to September, 30<sup>th</sup> 2010, the CSWs that met the criteria for inclusion in the Case-Based Surveillance Study were identified. Also, during this time period CBSS protocol and CBSS operation booklet have been translated.

From October 1<sup>st</sup> 2010 to March 31<sup>st</sup> 2011, the following activities were carried out:

- Two-day train the trainers workshop in Cluj, Romania, which was attended by researchers from Serbia (October 2010)
- Translation of the Extraction form A (for organizations) and Extraction form B (for cases) (November-December 2010)
- Meeting with the directors of the CSWs who were selected for the CBSS in order to inform them about the BECAN project and CBSS (January 2011)
- Two-day train the trainees workshop (February 2011)

The CBSS was scheduled to start in April 2011 but due to financial constraints it was delayed until April 2012. Data collection was carried out from April to November 2012, while data entry and analysis were completed in December 2012.

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

As the CSW is the main statutory agency for child protection and all other sectors (health, education, police, NGOs) are due to report and refer the CAN concerns to the CSW, it was decided that the CBSS will be conducted in the CSWs.

As described above first a permission to conduct the research in the CSWs was obtained by the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy.

In January 2011 the directors of 72 CSW were invited to a meeting organized jointly by the BECAN research team and the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy. The main goal of the meeting was to obtain cooperation with the directors and provide smooth unfolding of the research activities within the CBSS. The directors were informed about the BECAN project, the aims and objectives of the CBSS and preparatory activities which were planned for the following period (providing information about the number of cases in the CSWs included in the study, training of field researchers and the organization of the CBSS study.). The directors proved to be very cooperative and accepted willingly to participate. They provided the information that in 72 CSW there were 810 children aged 10 to 16 who were registered because of CAN concern in the period from 01.02.2010 to 18.02.2011, that is, in the period when the epidemiological study was taking place. Due to the method of registering and filing the cases they could not provide the exact number of children aged 11, 13 and 16 and that had to be done later on by the researchers.

Due to financial and time constraints which are described in the chapter above the CBSS study had to be postponed until April 2012 and the sample had to be reduced.



The following method was used in selecting the sample which will be reduced in number but still representative of the whole country.

### ***B.1.3. Preparation of the National Research instruments***

Soon after the Coordinator and partner countries achieved an agreement about the data that will be collected and the instruments, the CBSS protocol and CBSS operation booklet were translated to Serbian language without any modification.

### ***B.1.4. Train the National Research Team***

Training of the field researchers for CBSS was organized as two-day seminar and held on February 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup>, 2011 in hotel "Park", Belgrade, Serbia. It was designed to cover all required topics. The trainers were Ljiljana Stevković and Jasmina Ivanović who attended the train-the-trainers workshop and also Prof. Veronika Išpanović as the national scientific coordinator. The training was organized in accordance with the recommendation of the Consortium. There were 13 trainees, all experts in the field of social work and protection of children and they have all successfully finished the training for the CBSS. As for their specialties, 3 trainees were social workers, 8 psychologists, 1 teacher and 1 lawyer. Preparation and organization of the training passed without any difficulties.

### ***B.2. Process followed for Data Collection***

The sampling procedure has been described above in details.

The collection of data in 14 CSWs which entered the sample took place from April to November 2012. The directors of each of the 14 CSWs were informed about the start of the study by e-mail and telephone and a date for conducting the research in their centre was agreed. The researchers went to the Centre on the scheduled day and examined all the files of the CAN cases of children aged 10 to 16 with the assistance of one staff member appointed by the director of the Centre. Only the files of children aged 11, 13 and 16 years who were registered in the period from February 1, 2010 to February 28, 2011 were retained for further examination. The researcher read the file herself/himself and asked the staff member for clarification, if needed. That staff member also provided the needed information on the organization of the Centre.

The data coding and analyzing were done strictly according to the methodology of the original project proposal which was agreed by all partner countries.

## CHAPTER C. CBSS RESULTS IN SERBIA

The analysis of the results made with the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 19.

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

Following the process described in part B.1.2 and given the situation in Serbia, a total of 16 organizations/child services were identified in 4 geographical areas that were the same as in WP3. From these organizations/services all 16 fulfilled the eligibility criteria set for the needs of the CBSS in Serbia. But, as already explained, due to financial and time constraint and the fact that some of the identified Centres for social work did not have registered CAN cases in the requested period (2010), the number of centres in the final sample was 14. Out of 14 eligible organizations that were invited to participate in the CBSS, 14 provided access to their archives. In Table C.1.1 the identified, eligible and finally participating organizations/services-data sources for the CBSS are presented below.

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

	Total		Belgrade		Vojvodina		W/SW Srb.		E/SE Srb.	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
<b>Total Agencies identified</b>	16	100	4	100	4	100	4	100	4	100
<b>Agencies invited to provide data</b>	16	100	4	100	4	100	4	100	4	100
Eligible	14	87.5	3	75	4	100	3	75	4	100
Non eligible	2	12.5	1	25	0	0	1	25	0	0
<b>Eligible agencies</b>	14	100	3	100	4	100	3	100	4	100
(Selected by sampling)	14	100	3	100	4	100	3	100	4	100
Provided data	14	100	3	100	4	100	3	100	4	100
<b>Non eligible agencies</b>	2	100	1	100	0	0	1	100	0	0
Reason a. e.g. Accepted the invitation but had no CAN cases during 2010	2	100	1	100	0	0	1	100	0	0

. The sampling of organizations participating in the study has identified the same number of organizations (4 each) in every region within the geographical area covered by the BECAN project (Belgrade, Vojvodina, West - South West Serbia and East - South East Serbia). Also, after additional analysis, for aforementioned reasons, one organization from Belgrade and one from the region of West – South West Serbia were excluded from the sample. Consequently, the final sample included 4 organizations from Vojvodina and from East – South East Serbia, and 3 organizations from Belgrade and from West – South West Serbia.

Table C.1.2. Profile of the Organizations/Services that provided data for the CBSS

	Total		Belgrade		Vojvodina		W/SW Serbia		E/SE Serbia	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
<b>Total CSW Sector</b>	14	100	3	100	4	100	3	100	4	100
<i>Health Sector</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Social Welfare</i>	14	100	3	100	4	100	3	100	4	100
<i>Judicial Sector</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Public Order/Police</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Education</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Mission</b>										
<i>Primary Prevention</i>	14	100	3	100	4	100	3	100	4	100
<i>Secondary Prevention/Support</i>	14	100	3	100	4	100	3	100	4	100
<i>Tertiary Prevention/Treatment</i>	14	100	3	100	4	100	3	100	4	100
<i>Legal Support</i>	14	100	3	100	4	100	3	100	4	100
<b>Geographic area</b>										
<i>Urban</i>	14	100	3	100	4	100	3	100	4	100
<i>Suburban</i>	14	100	3	100	4	100	3	100	4	100
<i>Rural</i>	11	78.5	0	0	4	100	3	100	4	100
<b>Routine Screening Policy</b>										
<i>No</i>	14	100	3	100	4	100	3	100	4	100
<i>Yes</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Special CAN-training for personnel</b>										
<i>No</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Yes, but not formal</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Yes</i>	14	100	3	100	4	100	3	100	4	100
<b>Availability of CAN data</b>										
<i>No</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Yes</i>	14	100	3	100	4	100	3	100	4	100

Table C.1.2 presents the profile of organizations included in the study. As already mentioned in the report, the case-based surveillance study in Serbia was realized in the centres for social work, which, by the field of activity, belong to the sector of social welfare. All centres included in the sample are involved in activities at all levels of prevention (primary, secondary and tertiary), as well as legal aid provided to beneficiaries. As far as the geographical area of operation of all centres is concerned, all 14 centres cover urban and suburban areas, while 11 centres included in the sample also cover the rural area. Results have shown that despite the fact that each of the centres in the sample had developed specialized training on CAD problems for its staff and an available archive on CAD, the practice of screening for child abuse and neglect has not been developed yet.

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

	Total		Belgrade		Vojvodina		W/SW Serbia		E/SE Serbia	
	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
<b>Total CSW</b>	14	100	3	100	4	100	3	100	4	100
<b>Trained staff for recording cases</b>										
No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yes	14	100	3	100	4	100	3	100	4	100
Yes, but not formal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Specialties of staff who record CAN</b>										
Social Workers	14	100	3	100	4	100	3	100	4	100
Health Professionals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mental Health Professionals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Education-related professional	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Police officer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Judicial officer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Type of archive</b>										
Paper archive	14	100	3	100	4	100	3	100	4	100
Electronic archive	11	78.5	3	100	3	75	2	66.6	3	75
Database	4	28.5	3	100	1	25	0	0	0	0
<b>Existence of recording form</b>										
No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yes	14	100	3	100	4	100	3	100	4	100
<b>Type of cases recorded in the files</b>										
Reported CAN cases	14	100	3	100	4	100	3	100	4	100
Detected CAN cases	14	100	3	100	4	100	3	100	4	100
Mixed file (including non-CAN cases)	14	100	3	100	4	100	3	100	4	100
<b>Availability of text description</b>										
No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yes	14	100	3	100	4	100	3	100	4	100
<b>Availability of further documentation</b>										
No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yes	14	100	3	100	4	100	3	100	4	100

In terms of characteristics of the archives and/or databases of the centres for social work from which data were collected for the purposes of this study, results have shown a partially satisfactory situation. Namely, in all 14 centres for social work in the sample, there are staff members trained for recording CAN cases, and all of them are social workers. When we look at the type of archives maintained by centres for social work, the results of the study indicate that all centres have paper archives. Electronic archives are maintained by 11, and databases by 3 centres for social work. Results by regions show that electronic archives

are maintained by 3 SCWs in Belgrade, 3 in Vojvodina and 3 in East – South East Serbia, and 2 CSWs in West – South West Serbia. All 3 CSWs in Belgrade and one CSW in Vojvodina keep databases.

## C.2. CAN incidence in Serbia

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

		General population for selected areas*	CAN Cases identified*					Incidence /1000 children				
			Physical Abuse	Sexual Abuse	Psychological Abuse	Neglect	All forms of CAN	Physical Abuse	Sexual Abuse	Psychological Abuse	Neglect	All forms of CAN
<b>Belgrade</b>	<b>Male</b>	11549	13	0	18	2	21	1.13	0.00	1.56	0.17	1.82
	10	2037	0	0	3	0	3	0.00	0.00	1.47	0.00	1.47
	11	1786	5	0	4	1	6	2.80	0.00	2.24	0.56	3.36
	12	1808	1	0	1	1	2	0.55	0.00	0.55	0.55	1.11
	13	1861	3	0	4	0	4	1.61	0.00	2.15	0.00	2.15
	14	1955	1	0	2	0	2	0.51	0.00	1.02	0.00	1.02
	15	2102	3	0	4	0	4	1.43	0.00	1.90	0.00	1.90
	<b>Female</b>	11027	7	3	8	2	12	0.63	0.27	0.73	0.18	1.09
	10	1961	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	11	1740	2	2	2	0	3	1.15	1.15	1.15	0.00	1.72
	12	1737	1	1	1	0	2	0.58	0.58	0.58	0.00	1.15
	13	1839	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	14	1867	3	0	4	2	6	1.61	0.00	2.14	1.07	3.21
	15	1883	1	0	1	0	1	0.53	0.00	0.53	0.00	0.53
	<b>Overall</b>	22576	20	3	26	4	33	0.89	0.13	1.15	0.18	1.46
	10	3998	0	0	3	0	3	0.00	0.00	0.75	0.00	0.75
	11	3526	6	2	6	1	9	1.70	0.57	1.70	0.28	2.55
	12	3545	1	1	2	1	4	0.28	0.28	0.56	0.28	1.13
	13	3700	3	0	4	0	4	0.81	0.00	1.08	0.00	1.08
	14	3822	4	0	6	2	8	1.05	0.00	1.57	0.52	2.09
	15	3985	4	0	5	0	5	1.00	0.00	1.25	0.00	1.25
<b>Vojvodina</b>	<b>Male</b>	17017	15	11	16	12	38	0.88	0.65	0.94	0.71	2.23
	10	2904	2	0	2	2	4	0.69	0.00	0.69	0.69	1.38
	11	2625	3	1	4	2	6	1.14	0.38	1.52	0.76	2.29
	12	2740	4	7	2	1	11	1.46	2.55	0.73	0.36	4.01

	13		2759	3	0	4	3	7	1.09	0.00	1.45	1.09	2.54
	14		2873	2	2	2	2	6	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.70	2.09
	15		3116	1	1	2	2	4	0.32	0.32	0.64	0.64	1.28
	<b>Female</b>		15933	14	18	14	11	38	0.88	1.13	0.88	0.69	2.38
	10		2741	2	1	1	0	4	0.73	0.36	0.36	0.00	1.46
	11		2489	4	1	4	1	5	1.61	0.40	1.61	0.40	2.01
	12		2520	3	3	4	4	8	1.19	1.19	1.59	1.59	3.17
	13		2611	3	6	3	3	12	1.15	2.30	1.15	1.15	4.60
	14		2667	2	7	2	3	9	0.75	2.62	0.75	1.12	3.37
	15		2905	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	<b>Overall</b>		32950	29	29	30	23	76	0.88	0.88	0.91	0.70	2.31
	10		5645	4	1	3	2	8	0.71	0.18	0.53	0.35	1.42
	11		5114	7	2	8	3	11	1.37	0.39	1.56	0.59	2.15
	12		5260	7	10	6	5	19	1.33	1.90	1.14	0.95	3.61
	13		5370	6	6	7	6	19	1.12	1.12	1.30	1.12	3.54
	14		5540	4	9	4	5	15	0.72	1.62	0.72	0.90	2.71
	15		6021	1	1	2	2	4	0.17	0.17	0.33	0.33	0.66
<b>W/SW Serbia</b>	<b>Male</b>		9986	11	0	13	19	27	1.10	0.00	1.30	1.90	2.70
	10		1680	3	0	3	3	5	1.79	0.00	1.79	1.79	2.98
	11		1563	3	0	3	4	6	1.92	0.00	1.92	2.56	3.84
	12		1600	3	0	4	6	7	1.88	0.00	2.50	3.75	4.38
	13		1612	0	0	0	3	3	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.86	1.86
	14		1688	2	0	2	2	4	1.18	0.00	1.18	1.18	2.37
	15		1843	0	0	1	1	2	0.00	0.00	0.54	0.54	1.09
	<b>Female</b>		9263	11	5	18	15	27	1.19	0.54	1.94	1.62	2.91
	10		1623	0	1	1	4	5	0.00	0.62	0.62	2.46	3.08
	11		1412	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	12		1462	5	3	4	3	8	3.42	2.05	2.74	2.05	5.47
	13		1534	1	0	5	4	5	0.65	0.00	3.26	2.61	3.26
	14		1557	5	1	7	2	7	3.21	0.64	4.50	1.28	4.50
	15		1675	0	0	1	2	2	0.00	0.00	0.60	1.19	1.19
	<b>Overall</b>		19249	22	5	31	34	54	1.14	0.26	1.61	1.77	2.81
	10		3303	3	1	4	7	10	0.91	0.30	1.21	2.12	3.03
	11		2975	3	0	3	4	6	1.01	0.00	1.01	1.34	2.02
	12		3062	8	3	8	9	15	2.61	0.98	2.61	2.94	4.90
	13		3146	1	0	5	7	8	0.32	0.00	1.59	2.23	2.54
	14		3245	7	1	9	4	11	2.16	0.31	2.77	1.23	3.39
	15		3518	0	0	2	3	4	0.00	0.00	0.57	0.85	1.14
<b>E/SE Serbia</b>	<b>Male</b>		14111	7	2	11	7	17	0.50	0.14	0.78	0.50	1.20
	10		2328	2	0	1	2	3	0.86	0.00	0.43	0.86	1.29
	11		2141	2	1	4	0	5	0.93	0.47	1.87	0.00	2.34
	12		2261	0	0	2	1	2	0.00	0.00	0.88	0.44	0.88

13		<b>2378</b>	2	1	2	2	4	0.84	0.42	0.84	0.84	1.68
14		<b>2376</b>	0	0	1	2	2	0.00	0.00	0.42	0.84	0.84
15		<b>2627</b>	1	0	1	0	1	0.38	0.00	0.38	0.00	0.38
<b>Female</b>		<b>13533</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>0.81</b>	<b>0.74</b>	<b>1.40</b>
10		<b>2288</b>	1	0	1	1	2	0.44	0.00	0.44	0.44	0.87
11		<b>2060</b>	0	0	3	3	3	0.00	0.00	1.46	1.46	1.46
12		<b>2164</b>	0	1	1	1	3	0.00	0.46	0.46	0.46	1.39
13		<b>2169</b>	2	2	4	4	7	0.92	0.92	1.84	1.84	3.23
14		<b>2358</b>	0	1	1	1	3	0.00	0.42	0.42	0.42	1.27
15		<b>2494</b>	1	0	1	0	1	0.40	0.00	0.40	0.00	0.40
<b>Overall</b>		<b>27644</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>0.22</b>	<b>0.80</b>	<b>0.61</b>	<b>1.30</b>
10		4616	3	0	2	3	5	0.65	0.00	0.43	0.65	1.08
11		4201	2	1	7	3	8	0.48	0.24	1.67	0.71	1.90
12		4425	0	1	3	2	5	0.00	0.23	0.68	0.45	1.13
13		4547	4	3	6	6	11	0.88	0.66	1.32	1.32	2.42
14		4734	0	1	2	3	5	0.00	0.21	0.42	0.63	1.06
15		5121	2	0	2	0	2	0.39	0.00	0.39	0.00	0.39
<b>Total Male</b>		<b>52663</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>1.10</b>	<b>0.76</b>	<b>1.96</b>
10		8949	7	0	9	7	15	0.78	0.00	1.01	0.78	1.68
11		8115	13	2	15	7	23	1.60	0.25	1.85	0.86	2.83
12		8409	8	7	9	9	22	0.95	0.83	1.07	1.07	2.62
13		8610	8	1	10	8	18	0.93	0.12	1.16	0.93	2.09
14		8892	5	2	7	6	14	0.56	0.22	0.79	0.67	1.57
15		9688	5	1	8	3	11	0.52	0.10	0.83	0.31	1.14
<b>Female</b>		<b>49756</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>0.72</b>	<b>0.60</b>	<b>1.03</b>	<b>0.76</b>	<b>1.93</b>
10		8613	3	2	3	5	11	0.35	0.23	0.35	0.58	1.28
11		7701	6	3	9	4	11	0.78	0.39	1.17	0.52	1.43
12		7883	9	8	10	8	21	1.14	1.01	1.27	1.01	2.66
13		8153	6	8	12	11	24	0.74	0.98	1.47	1.35	2.94
14		8449	10	9	14	8	25	1.18	1.07	1.66	0.95	2.96
15		8957	2	0	3	2	4	0.22	0.00	0.33	0.22	0.45
<b>Overall</b>		<b>102419</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>0.80</b>	<b>0.42</b>	<b>1.06</b>	<b>0.76</b>	<b>1.94</b>
10		17562	10	2	12	12	26	0.57	0.11	0.68	0.68	1.48
11		15816	19	5	24	11	34	1.20	0.32	1.52	0.70	2.15
12		16292	17	15	19	17	43	1.04	0.92	1.17	1.04	2.64
13		16763	14	9	22	19	42	0.84	0.54	1.31	1.13	2.51
14		17341	15	11	21	14	39	0.87	0.63	1.21	0.81	2.25
15		18645	7	1	11	5	15	0.38	0.05	0.59	0.27	0.80

\* Source: National Statistics Authority

\* Source: 14 Agencies corresponding to 9,8% of the available agencies )

Table C.2.1 presents the incidence of CAN in registered cases, by forms of abuse, age and gender of the child, and geographical area. On the whole, based on officially registered cases, it can be concluded that, on average, two out of 1,000 children are victims of some form of abuse or neglect. The most prevalent is the psychological abuse, while sexual abuse is the least prevalent. When interpreting the data on sexual abuse, we should certainly keep in mind that the already low readiness in both children and families to report CAN is even lower for this type of abuse. In addition to this, an almost equal incidence of physical abuse and neglect of children has been recorded. Looking by age, children at the age of 12 are the most exposed to a form of abuse or neglect, while children at the age of 15 are the least exposed. More specifically, physical and psychological abuse is the most prevalent in children at the age of 11, while most cases of sexual abuse were recorded in children aged 12, and neglect in thirteen-year-olds. Certain gender-related differences are also noted. Namely, the results have shown that boys at the age of 11 are the most exposed to some form of CAN, whereas for girls the age limit rises. Namely, the highest CAN incidence in girls has been recorded at the age of 14. The distribution of different forms of CAN is comparatively the same in boys and girls, with sexual abuse being somewhat more prevalent in girls, which was expected and in accordance with the results of numerous studies, and the thesis on gender dimension of CAN. Looking by regions, the highest registered incidence of CAN in the course of 2010 was reported in the region of West – South West Serbia, as well as in Vojvodina. The lowest CAN incidence was registered in East – South East Serbia, followed by Belgrade.

Table C.2.2 presents the status of cases of abuse and neglect (with regard to substantiation of suspected abuse) of children aged 11, 13 and 16, by form of abuse and geographical area. Results indicate that the highest percentage refers to substantiated cases of physical, psychological and sexual abuse and neglect. Unsubstantiated cases of a suspected form of CAN are significantly less present. In that sense, most cases falling into this category of “indicated” cases are related to sexual abuse of children (9.3%). In addition to this, 5.1% of neglect cases have the status of unsubstantiated CAN, while in the period of data collection, one case of child sexual abuse was still in the assessment phase (ongoing). Unsubstantiated cases of neglect were recorded in the data of CSWs in West – South West Serbia, while the ongoing case of child sexual abuse was recorded in the data of a Vojvodina CSW. Looking by the type of CAN and by regions, results indicate that Belgrade and Vojvodina have the highest number of substantiated cases of psychological abuse and neglect, the region of West – South West Serbia reported the highest number of substantiated cases of physical and psychological abuse, while all CAN cases reported and also substantiated in the observed period in the region of East – South East Serbia were the cases of violent victimization of children. With regard to suspected abuse, such cases were reported in three out of four regions. In Belgrade and the region of West – South West Serbia suspected sexual abuse was the most prevalent in reported cases, while in Vojvodina it was suspected physical abuse.



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

	Status of Substantiation										
	No of Cases**	Substantiated		Indicated		Unsubstantiated		Ongoing		Unspecified	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
<b>Belgrade-Total</b>	<b>33</b>										
Physical abuse	20	19	95.0	1	5.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Sexual abuse	3	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Psychological Abuse	26	26	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Neglect	4	4	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<b>Vojvodina-Total</b>	<b>76</b>										
Physical abuse	29	27	93.1	2	6.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Sexual abuse	29	27	93.1	1	3.4	0	0.0	1	3.4	0	0.0
Psychological Abuse	30	29	96.7	1	3.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Neglect	23	22	95.7	1	3.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<b>W/SW Serbia-Total</b>	<b>54</b>										
Physical abuse	22	22	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Sexual abuse	5	3	60.0	2	40.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Psychological Abuse	31	31	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Neglect	34	30	88.2	0	0.0	4	11.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
<b>E/SE Serbia-Total</b>	<b>36</b>										
Physical abuse	11	11	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Sexual abuse	6	6	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Psychological Abuse	22	22	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Neglect	17	17	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<b>Overall-Total</b>	<b>199</b>										
Physical abuse	82	79	96.3	3	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Sexual abuse	43	38	88.4	4	9.3	0	0.0	1	2.3	0	0.0
Psychological Abuse	109	108	99.1	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Neglect	78	73	93.6	1	1.3	4	5.1	0	0.0	0	0.0

\*According to the Agencies that provided information for maltreatment

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

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

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

		Total CAN cases		Single vs. Multiple CAN				Individual forms of CAN							
				Single form		Multiple forms		Physical Abuse		Sexual abuse		Psychological abuse		Neglect	
<b>Belgrade-Total</b>		<b>33</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100</b>
	<i>male</i>														
	10	3	9.1	3	21.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	11.5	0	0.0
	11	6	18.2	2	14.3	4	21.1	5	25.0	0	0.0	4	15.4	1	25.0
	12	2	6.1	1	7.1	1	5.3	1	5.0	0	0.0	1	3.8	1	25.0
	13	4	12.1	1	7.1	3	15.8	3	15.0	0	0.0	4	15.4	0	0.0
	14	2	6.1	1	7.1	1	5.3	1	5.0	0	0.0	2	7.7	0	0.0
	15	4	12.1	1	7.1	3	15.8	3	15.0	0	0.0	4	15.4	0	0.0
	<b>subtotal</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>63.6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>64.3</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>63.2</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>65.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>69.2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>50.0</b>
	<i>female</i>														
	10	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	11	3	9.1	1	7.1	2	10.5	2	10.0	2	66.7	2	7.7	0	0.0
	12	2	6.1	1	7.1	1	5.3	1	5.0	1	33.3	1	3.8	0	0.0
	13	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	14	6	18.2	3	21.4	3	15.8	3	15.0	0	0.0	4	15.4	2	50.0
	15	1	3.0	0	0.0	1	5.3	1	5.0	0	0.0	1	3.8	0	0.0
	<b>subtotal</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>36.4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>35.7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>36.8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>35.0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>30.8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>50.0</b>
<b>Vojvodina-Total</b>		<b>76</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100</b>
	<i>male</i>														
	10	4	5.3	2	4.4	2	6.5	2	6.9	0	0.0	2	6.7	2	8.7
	11	6	7.9	2	4.4	4	12.9	3	10.3	1	3.4	4	13.3	2	8.7
	12	11	14.5	8	17.8	3	9.7	4	13.8	7	24.1	2	6.7	1	4.3
	13	7	9.2	4	8.9	3	9.7	3	10.3	0	0.0	4	13.3	3	13.0
	14	6	7.9	4	8.9	2	6.5	2	6.9	2	6.9	2	6.7	2	8.7
	15	4	5.3	2	4.4	2	6.5	1	3.4	1	3.4	2	6.7	2	8.7
	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>48.9</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>51.6</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>51.7</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>37.9</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>53.3</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>52.2</b>
	<i>female</i>														
	10	4	5.3	4	8.9	0	0.0	2	6.9	1	3.4	1	3.3	0	0.0
	11	5	6.6	1	2.2	4	12.9	4	13.8	1	3.4	4	13.3	1	4.3
	12	8	10.5	4	8.9	4	12.9	3	10.3	3	10.3	4	13.3	4	17.4
	13	12	15.8	9	20.0	3	9.7	3	10.3	6	20.7	3	10.0	3	13.0
	14	9	11.8	5	11.1	4	12.9	2	6.9	7	24.1	2	6.7	3	13.0
	15	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	<b>subtotal</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>51.1</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>48.4</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>48.3</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>62.1</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>46.7</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>47.8</b>
<b>W/SW Serbia -Total</b>		<b>54</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>
	<i>male</i>														
	10	5	9.3	2	8.7	3	9.7	3	13.6	0	0.0	3	9.7	3	8.8
	11	6	11.1	3	13.0	3	9.7	3	13.6	0	0.0	3	9.7	4	11.8
	12	7	13.0	3	13.0	4	12.9	3	13.6	0	0.0	4	12.9	6	17.6
	13	3	5.6	3	13.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	8.8
	14	4	7.4	2	8.7	2	6.5	2	9.1	0	0.0	2	5.6	2	5.9

15	2	3.7	2	8.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.2	1	2.9
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>65.2</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>38.7</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>41.9</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>55.9</b>
<i>female 10</i>	5	9.3	4	17.4	1	3.2	0	0.0	1	20.0	1	3.2	4	11.8
11	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
12	8	14.8	3	13.0	5	16.1	5	22.7	3	60.0	4	12.9	3	8.8
13	5	9.3	0	0.0	5	16.1	1	4.5	0	0.0	5	16.1	4	11.8
14	7	13.0	0	0.0	7	22.6	5	22.7	1	20.0	7	22.6	2	5.9
15	2	3.7	1	4.3	1	3.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.2	2	5.9
<b>subtotal</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>34.8</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>61.3</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>58.1</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>44.1</b>
<b>E/SE Serbia-Total</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100</b>
<i>male 10</i>	3	8.3	1	5.6	2	11.1	2	18.2	0	0.0	1	4.5	2	11.8
11	5	13.9	3	16.7	2	11.1	2	18.2	1	16.7	4	18.2	0	0.0
12	2	5.6	1	5.6	1	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	9.1	1	5.9
13	4	11.1	2	11.1	2	11.1	2	18.2	1	16.7	2	9.1	2	11.8
14	2	5.6	1	5.6	1	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.5	2	11.8
15	1	2.8	0	0.0	1	5.6	1	9.1	0	0.0	1	4.5	0	0.0
<b>subtotal</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>47.2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>44.4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>63.6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>33.3</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>41.2</b>
<i>female 10</i>	2	5.6	1	5.6	1	5.6	1	9.1	0	0.0	1	4.5	1	5.9
11	3	8.3	0	0.0	3	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	13.6	3	17.6
12	3	8.3	3	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	16.7	1	4.5	1	5.9
13	7	19.4	3	16.7	4	22.2	2	18.2	2	33.3	4	18.2	4	23.5
14	3	8.3	3	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	16.7	1	4.5	1	5.9
15	1	2.8	0	0.0	1	5.6	1	9.1	0	0.0	1	4.5	0	0.0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>52.8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>55.6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>36.4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>66.7</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>58.8</b>
<b>All areas-Total</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>100</b>
<i>male 10</i>	15	7.5	8	8.0	7	7.1	7	8.5	0	0.0	9	8.3	7	9.0
11	23	11.6	11	11.0	13	13.1	13	15.9	2	4.7	15	13.8	7	9.0
12	22	11.0	14	14.0	9	9.1	8	9.8	7	16.3	9	8.3	9	11.5
13	18	9.0	11	11.0	8	8.1	8	9.8	1	2.3	10	9.2	8	10.3
14	14	7.0	9	9.0	6	6.1	5	6.1	2	4.7	7	6.4	6	7.7
15	11	5.5	6	6.0	6	6.1	5	6.1	1	2.3	8	7.3	3	3.8
<b>subtotal</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>51.8</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>54.0</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>49.5</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>56.1</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>30.2</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>53.2</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>51.3</b>
<i>female 10</i>	11	5.5	9	9.0	2	2.0	3	3.7	2	4.7	3	2.8	5	6.4
11	11	5.5	2	2.0	9	9.1	6	7.3	3	7.0	9	8.3	4	5.1
12	21	10.6	11	11.0	10	10.1	9	11.0	8	18.6	10	9.2	8	10.3
13	24	12.1	12	12.0	12	12.1	6	7.3	8	18.6	12	11.0	11	14.1
14	25	12.6	11	11.0	14	14.1	10	12.2	9	20.9	14	12.8	8	10.3
15	4	2.0	1	1.0	3	3.0	2	2.4	0	0.0	3	2.8	2	2.6
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>48.2</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>46.0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50.5</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>43.9</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>66.7</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>48.7</b>

Table C.2.1.1 presents the structure of cases of single and multiple CAN, by gender and age of children and by geographical area. Overall results show that of recorded cases in all four regions, the cases of single form (100) and of multiple form of CAN (99) are nearly equally present. Looking by gender, single form of CAN is somewhat more present in boys, while multiple forms of abuse and neglect are more present in girls than a single form of violent victimization.

Multiple forms of CAN in boys are also more present in boys at a younger age (11-year-olds), whereas in girls, in accordance with the aforementioned results related to incidence and gender, they are more present at an older age (14 years of age). The single form of CAN in both boys and girls is present at a nearly same age (12 and 13 years of age, respectively). Looking by regions, in Belgrade and in the region of West – South West Serbia, in cases of CAN recorded in the course of 2010, multiple abuse and neglect is more present compared to single forms. In the remaining two regions, single forms of CAN are more present compared to multiple CAN. Looking by gender and region, both boys and girls in Belgrade are more exposed to multiple CAN, while in the region of West – South West Serbia multiple violent victimization is more present compared to single form of CAN only in girls.

Table C.2.1.2 Physical abuse (n=82): Specific types of physical abuse, injuries sustained and severity of injuries per gender and age (for the year 2010)

	Male							Female							Total						
	10	11	12	13	14	15	All	10	11	12	13	14	15	All	10	11	12	13	14	15	All
Total CAN cases identified	15	23	22	18	14	11	103	11	11	21	24	25	4	96	26	34	43	42	39	15	199
Total Physic. Ab. cases ident.	7	13	8	8	5	5	46	3	6	9	6	10	2	36	10	19	17	14	15	7	82
Type of physical abuse-Uns.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Type of physical abuse-Spec.	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Spanking	42.9	61.5	37.5	50.0	40.0	20.0	45.7	100.0	16.7	33.3	50.0	10.0	50.0	33.3	60.0	47.4	35.3	50.0	20.0	28.6	40.2
Slapping/Beating	85.7	92.3	75.0	87.5	80.0	80.0	84.8	66.7	83.3	100.0	83.3	80.0	0.0	80.6	80.0	89.5	88.2	85.7	80.0	57.1	82.9
"Beat-up"	0.0	7.7	37.5	62.5	20.0	40.0	26.1	33.3	0.0	11.1	0.0	10.0	0.0	8.3	10.0	5.3	23.5	35.7	13.3	28.6	18.3
Pushing/Kicking/Throwing	14.3	23.1	50.0	37.5	80.0	80.0	41.3	0.0	0.0	11.1	50.0	30.0	0.0	19.4	10.0	15.8	29.4	42.9	46.7	57.1	31.7
Hitting with an object	14.3	15.4	12.5	25.0	20.0	40.0	19.6	0.0	33.3	22.2	0.0	0.0	50.0	13.9	10.0	21.1	17.6	14.3	6.7	42.9	17.1
Grabbing/Shaking	14.3	15.4	37.5	50.0	60.0	80.0	37.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	30.0	0.0	16.7	10.0	10.5	35.3	28.6	40.0	57.1	28.0
Hitting on head	57.1	76.9	50.0	100.0	40.0	80.0	69.6	33.3	66.7	55.6	66.7	50.0	50.0	55.6	50.0	73.7	52.9	85.7	46.7	71.4	63.4
Hair pulling	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	20.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	6.7	0.0	3.7
Twisting ears	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2
Locking up	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	20.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	13.3	0.0	3.7
Forcing to hold painful position	14.3	0.0	12.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	6.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	5.9	7.1	0.0	0.0	3.7
Pinching	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Threatening with a knife or gun	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	20.0	20.0	6.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	6.7	14.3	3.7
Burning/Scalding	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	20.0	20.0	8.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9	7.1	6.7	14.3	4.9
Tying up or tying to something	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	5.9	7.1	0.0	0.0	2.4
Choking/Smothering/Squeezing	0.0	7.7	0.0	12.5	20.0	20.0	8.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	5.3	0.0	14.3	6.7	14.3	6.1
Stabbing/Shooting	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Biting	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Forcing Spicy Foods	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	20.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	6.7	0.0	2.4
Severity of Injury- Unspec.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2
Severity of Injury- Specified	14.3	38.5	75.0	62.5	60.0	60.0	50.0	33.3	50.0	55.6	33.3	30.0	50.0	41.7	20.0	42.1	64.7	50.0	40.0	57.1	46.3
No Injury	85.7	61.5	25.0	37.5	40.0	40.0	50.0	66.7	50.0	33.3	66.7	70.0	50.0	55.6	80.0	57.9	29.4	50.0	60.0	42.9	52.4
Minor	14.3	38.5	50.0	62.5	60.0	60.0	45.7	33.3	50.0	44.4	33.3	30.0	50.0	38.9	20.0	42.1	47.1	50.0	40.0	57.1	42.7
Moderate	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	17.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7
Severe	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2
Life threatening	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Nature of Injury- Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6
Nature of Injury- Specified	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	83.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	93.8	100.0	100.0	91.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	97.4
Bruise	14.3	38.5	75.0	62.5	60.0	60.0	50.0	33.3	50.0	55.6	33.3	30.0	50.0	41.7	20.0	42.1	64.7	50.0	40.0	57.1	46.3
Cute/Bite/Open wound	0.0	15.4	12.5	25.0	20.0	0.0	13.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	30.0	0.0	13.9	0.0	10.5	17.6	14.3	26.7	0.0	13.4
Burn	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2
Fracture	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2
Organs system injury	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Concussion	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sprain/Strain	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	17.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7

Table C.2.1.2 presents forms of physical abuse, types and severity of sustained injuries by gender and age of children (in the observed period, in cases reported in the course of 2010). Looking by gender, 46 cases were identified where boys were the victims of physical violence, and 36 cases with girls as victims of the same form of abuse and neglect. Looking by the forms of physical abuse and gender, both boys and girls in the sample were more exposed to less severe forms. Namely, both in boys (84.8%) and in girls (80.6%) the most prevalent form of physical abuse was slapping or beating (by hand), followed by hitting on the head with knuckles or the back of the hand (boys 69.4%, girls 55.6%). Spanking (with the hand) (45.7%) and a more severe type of physical abuse in the form of pushing, kicking or throwing (41.3%) are present in boys in a comparatively equal percentage. In girls, spanking is somewhat more prevalent (33.3%) compared to the said more severe form of physical abuse (19.4%). A little more than one-third of boys were the victims of forceful grabbing by the clothes or a body part and shaking, while a little over a quarter of boys were victims of beating up. As opposed to boys, the incidence of forceful grabbing/shaking (16.7%) and hitting with an object (13.9%) is comparatively the same in girls. Other forms of physical abuse are less present in both boys and girls. Other forms of physical abuse, of which most fall into the category of severe violence, are present in children of both genders in a much lower percentage.

In half of the cases, physical violence was such that it did not lead to injuries in victims, either boys or girls. In situations where injuries did occur, they were minor injuries in children of both genders. Looking by the gender, a little over one-third of boys aged 11 and nearly two-thirds of boys aged 13 have sustained minor injuries as a consequence of physical abuse. In girls, such injuries are slightly more prevalent in eleven-year-olds (50.0%) than in thirteen-year-olds (33.3%). With regard to the specific type of injury, bruises and injuries in the form of cuts, bites or open wounds were mostly identified in children of both genders. In this case too, the same distribution of injuries per age of boys and girls is noted, so these injuries are more present in boys aged 13, and in girls aged 11. In addition to this, one-quarter of boys aged 12 and 11.1% of girls of the same age sustained injuries to the bone and joint system in the form of sprains and strains, as a result of physical abuse. Injuries of moderate severity were present in 12.5% of boys (burns) and 11.1% of girls (fractures) at the age of 12.

Table C.2.1.3 Sexual abuse (n=43): Specific types of sexual abuse per gender and age (for the year 2010)

	Male							Female							Total						
	10	11	12	13	14	15	All	10	11	12	13	14	15	All	10	11	12	13	14	15	All
<b>Total CAN cases identified</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>199</b>
Total Sexual abuse cases identif.	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>43</b>
Type of Sexual abuse- Unspec	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>
Type of Sexual abuse-Specified	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	<b>100.0</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	<b>100.0</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	<b>100.0</b>
Completed sexual activity	0.0	0.0	57.1	0.0	50.0	100.0	<b>46.2</b>	0.0	33.3	37.5	37.5	66.7	0.0	<b>43.3</b>	0.0	20.0	46.7	33.3	63.6	100.0	<b>44.2</b>
Attempted sexual activity	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>7.7</b>	50.0	33.3	25.0	25.0	22.2	0.0	<b>26.7</b>	50.0	40.0	13.3	22.2	18.2	0.0	<b>20.9</b>
Touching/fondling genitals	0.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	<b>84.6</b>	50.0	66.7	87.5	50.0	55.6	0.0	<b>63.3</b>	50.0	80.0	93.3	44.4	63.6	0.0	<b>69.8</b>
Adult exposing genitals to child	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	<b>92.3</b>	50.0	33.3	37.5	37.5	55.6	0.0	<b>43.3</b>	50.0	60.0	66.7	44.4	63.6	0.0	<b>58.1</b>
Sexual exploitation	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>	50.0	0.0	12.5	37.5	33.3	0.0	<b>26.7</b>	50.0	0.0	6.7	33.3	27.3	0.0	<b>18.6</b>
Sexual harassment	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	<b>6.7</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	0.0	<b>4.7</b>
Voyeurism	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>

A total of 43 cases of child sexual abuse were identified in the observed period, and this form of abuse was, as expected, more present in girls than in boys. We certainly must not neglect the fact that boys were the victims of sexual abuse in 13 cases, most of them at the age of 12. The most prevalent in boys was the non-contact sexual abuse, in the form of adult exposing genitals to child, followed by touching and fondling of child's genitals as a form of contact sexual abuse. Nearly a half of the boys were victims of sexual abuse in the form of completed sexual activity (boys at the age of 12 and 14). The most prevalent in girls were the forms of contact sexual abuse such as touching and fondling of genitals, and completed sexual activity, as well as adult exposing genitals to child, as a form of non-contact sexual abuse. A little over one-quarter of girls in the sample were the victims of attempted sexual activity and sexual exploitation, whether in the form of prostitution or for pornographic purposes. Looking by the gender categories, results indicate that nearly all forms of sexual abuse are more prevalent in older than in younger girls. This result, of course, must be taken with reservation, having in mind that girls at an older age are more capable of recognizing sexual abuse and more ready to report it.

Table C.2.1.4 Psychological abuse (n=109): Specific types of psychological abuse per gender and age (for the year 2010)

	Male							Female							Total						
	10	11	12	13	14	15	All	10	11	12	13	14	15	All	10	11	12	13	14	15	All
Total CAN cases identified	15	23	22	18	14	11	103	11	11	21	24	25	4	96	26	34	43	42	39	15	199
Total Psychol. abuse cases identi	9	15	9	10	7	8	58	3	9	10	12	14	3	51	12	24	19	22	21	11	109
Type of Psychol. abuse- Unspec	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Type of Psychol. abuse-Specified	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Rejection through verbal abuse	22.2	33.3	44.4	20.0	42.9	37.5	32.8	33.3	11.1	50.0	41.7	50.0	0.0	37.3	25.0	25.0	47.4	31.8	47.6	27.3	34.9
Isolation	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	14.3	0.0	5.2	33.3	0.0	10.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	5.9	8.3	0.0	5.3	9.1	9.5	0.0	5.5
Ignorance	0.0	6.7	11.1	10.0	0.0	0.0	5.2	33.3	0.0	0.0	8.3	14.3	0.0	7.8	8.3	4.2	5.3	9.1	9.5	0.0	6.4
Corruption	11.1	6.7	0.0	20.0	28.6	0.0	10.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	8.3	7.1	0.0	9.8	8.3	16.7	0.0	13.6	14.3	0.0	10.1
Exploitation	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	14.3	0.0	3.4	33.3	22.2	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	7.8	8.3	8.3	0.0	9.1	4.8	0.0	5.5
Terrorization	66.7	73.3	66.7	90.0	28.6	87.5	70.7	66.7	66.7	80.0	58.3	57.1	100.0	66.7	66.7	70.8	73.7	72.7	47.6	90.9	68.8
Witnessing family violence	88.9	73.3	55.6	60.0	57.1	75.0	69.0	66.7	77.8	50.0	75.0	50.0	66.7	62.7	83.3	75.0	52.6	68.2	52.4	72.7	66.1

As mentioned earlier in the report, in cases recorded in the course of 2010, the majority of boys and girls in our sample were the victims of psychological abuse. The most prevalent in children of both genders were terrorization (70.7% of boys and 66.7% of girls) and witnessing family violence, as a form of indirect violent victimization (69.0% of boys and 62.7% of girls). In boys, as well as in girls aged 11 and 13, terrorization and witnessing family violence were the most prevalent. In addition to this, in one-third of boys and a little more than one-third of girls, we identified rejection through verbal abuse by adult in charge of taking care of the child. Other forms of psychological abuse (isolation, ignoring, corruption and exploitation) were present in lower percentages.

Table C.2.1.5 Neglect (n=78): Specific types of neglect per age and gender (for the year 2010)

	Male							Female							Total						
	10	11	12	13	14	15	All	10	11	12	13	14	15	All	10	11	12	13	14	15	All
Total CAN cases identified	15	23	22	18	14	11	103	11	11	21	24	25	4	96	26	34	43	42	39	15	199
Total Neglect cases identified	7	7	9	8	6	3	40	5	4	8	11	8	2	38	12	11	17	19	14	5	78
Type of Neglect-Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Type of Neglect-Specified	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Physical neglect	100.0	85.7	44.4	87.5	50.0	100.0	75.0	100.0	100.0	87.5	72.7	100.0	50.0	86.8	100.0	90.9	64.7	78.9	78.6	80.0	80.8
Medical neglect	57.1	42.9	11.1	37.5	50.0	100.0	42.5	60.0	50.0	62.5	36.4	62.5	0.0	50.0	58.3	45.5	35.3	36.8	57.1	60.0	46.2
Educational neglect	100.0	71.4	88.9	75.0	83.3	100.0	85.0	80.0	75.0	50.0	81.8	75.0	100.0	73.7	91.7	72.7	70.6	78.9	78.6	100.0	79.5
Economic exploitation	28.6	28.6	22.2	25.0	16.7	0.0	22.5	20.0	0.0	37.5	18.2	37.5	0.0	23.7	25.0	18.2	29.4	21.1	28.6	0.0	23.1
Failure to protect from physicl harm	0.0	0.0	22.2	12.5	16.7	0.0	10.0	0.0	25.0	12.5	18.2	12.5	0.0	13.2	0.0	9.1	17.6	15.8	14.3	0.0	11.5
Failure to protect from sexu abuse	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.5	7.1	0.0	3.8
Fail to provide trea for menl probl.	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	33.3	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	5.9	5.3	0.0	20.0	3.8
Permitting maladaptive/crim beh	0.0	0.0	33.3	12.5	16.7	33.3	15.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	12.5	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	17.6	10.5	14.3	20.0	10.3
Abandonment/Refusal of custody	0.0	0.0	11.1	25.0	0.0	66.7	12.5	0.0	0.0	25.0	27.3	12.5	0.0	15.8	0.0	0.0	17.6	26.3	7.1	40.0	14.1

Table C.2.1.5 presents specific forms of neglect by gender and age of children. Results indicate that boys were most frequently victims of educational neglect (85.9%), physical neglect (75.0%) and medical neglect (42.5%), while around one-fifth of boys were exposed to economic exploitation as a form of



neglect. Other forms of neglect (permitting maladaptive/criminal behaviour – 15.0%; abandonment/refusal of custody – 12.5%; failure to protect from physical harm – 10.0% failure to provide treatment for mental disorder, illness – 5.0%; failure to protect from sexual abuse – 2.5%) are less prevalent in boys. A similar distribution of different forms of neglect is also present in girls, who were most frequently victims of physical neglect (86.8%), followed by educational neglect (73.7%). Also, in comparison with boys, girls were more frequently victims of the adult caregiver’s failure to protect them from sexual abuse. Looking by age groups, in eleven-year-olds the highest prevalence of physical neglect is noted (90.9%), followed by educational neglect in a slightly lower percentage (72.7%), while in thirteen-year-olds the prevalence of these two forms of neglect is more or less the same (78.6%). Other forms of neglect are less prevalent in these two age categories (in the range of 5.9% to 21.1%).

Table C.2.1.6 Single and Multiple forms of abuse (n=199) per gender and age (for the year 2010)

	Male						Female						Total								
	10	11	12	13	14	15	All	10	11	12	13	14	15	All	10	11	12	13	14	15	All
Total cases	15	23	22	18	14	11	103	11	11	21	24	25	4	96	26	34	43	42	39	41	199
Single CAN form	53.3	43.5	59.1	55.6	57.1	45.5	52.4	81.8	18.2	52.4	50.0	44.0	25.0	47.9	65.4	35.3	55.8	52.4	48.7	40.0	50.3
Physical abuse	6.7	8.7	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	27.3	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	4.2	15.4	5.9	2.3	2.4	0.0	0.0	4.0
Sexual abuse	0.0	8.7	27.3	0.0	14.3	0.0	9.7	18.2	0.0	23.8	25.0	20.0	0.0	18.8	7.7	5.9	25.6	14.3	17.9	0.0	14.1
Psychological abuse	26.7	13.0	4.5	16.7	7.1	18.2	13.6	9.1	9.1	9.5	4.2	8.0	0.0	7.3	19.2	11.8	7.0	9.5	7.7	13.3	10.6
Neglect	20.0	13.0	22.7	38.9	35.7	27.3	25.2	27.3	9.1	19.0	16.7	16.0	25.0	17.7	23.1	11.8	20.9	26.2	23.1	26.7	21.6
Multiple CAN forms	46.7	56.5	40.9	44.4	42.9	54.5	47.6	18.2	81.8	47.6	50.0	56.0	75.0	52.1	34.6	64.7	44.2	47.6	51.3	60.0	49.7
Physical & Sexual	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	9.1	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	2.9	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
Physical & Psychological	20.0	39.1	18.2	33.3	35.7	45.5	31.1	0.0	27.3	14.3	16.7	28.0	50.0	19.8	11.5	35.3	16.3	23.8	30.8	46.7	25.6
Physical & Neglect	13.3	4.3	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	4.8	4.2	0.0	0.0	2.1	7.7	2.9	2.3	4.8	0.0	0.0	3.0
Sexual & Psychological	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	9.1	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	2.4	0.0	6.7	1.5
Sexual & Neglect	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	1.5
Psychological & Neglect	6.7	8.7	9.1	0.0	7.1	0.0	5.8	18.2	27.3	4.8	20.8	8.0	25.0	14.6	11.5	14.7	7.0	11.9	7.7	6.7	10.1
Physical, Sexual & Psych.	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	18.2	9.5	0.0	8.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	5.9	4.7	2.4	5.1	0.0	3.5
Physical, Sexual & Neglect	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Physical, Psych. & Neglect	6.7	4.3	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	9.5	0.0	4.0	0.0	3.1	3.8	2.9	9.3	0.0	2.6	0.0	3.5
Sexual, Psych. & Neglect	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.5
Physical, Sexual, Psych & Neglect	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

With regard to multiple forms of child abuse, results indicate that girls, compared to boys, are more exposed to a combination of various forms of abuse at the same time. In cases of multiple abuse, both in boys and in girls, a combination of two forms of abuse is the most prevalent, primarily psychological abuse combined with physical abuse or neglect (the same ratio in terms of prevalence in percentages is present in the observed age categories of 11 and 13 year-olds). In situations when three forms of maltreatment are combined, boys are more exposed to physical abuse combined with psychological abuse and neglect, while girls are more exposed to physical and sexual abuse combined with psychological abuse.

## C.2.2. Child-CAN victim characteristics

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

	All forms of Maltreatment (n=199)																				
	male							Female							Total						
	10	11	12	13	14	15	All	10	11	12	13	14	15	All	10	11	12	13	14	15	All
Total CAN cases	15	23	22	18	14	11	103	11	11	21	24	25	4	96	26	34	43	42	39	15	199
<b>Educational status</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Not attending school at all	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	8.3	8.0	0.0	5.2	0.0	2.9	2.3	4.8	5.1	0.0	3.0
Dropped out	20.0	0.0	4.5	5.6	7.1	18.2	7.8	18.2	0.0	9.5	12.5	16.0	0.0	11.5	19.2	0.0	7.0	9.5	12.8	13.3	9.5
Attends school	80.0	95.7	95.5	94.4	92.9	81.8	91.3	81.8	100.0	85.7	79.2	76.0	100.0	83.3	80.8	97.1	90.7	85.7	82.1	86.7	87.4
<b>Work status</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
Not working	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	90.9	95.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	97.9	100.0	97.1	97.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.0
Working domestic/ unpaid	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
Working salaried work	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Education-related problems</b>																					
Unspecified	20.0	4.3	4.5	5.6	0.0	0.0	5.8	9.1	0.0	14.3	12.5	16.0	0.0	11.5	15.4	2.9	9.3	9.5	10.3	0.0	8.5
None	73.3	78.3	77.3	66.7	85.7	27.3	70.9	54.5	45.5	71.4	79.2	56.0	50.0	63.5	65.4	67.6	74.4	73.8	66.7	33.3	67.3
Learning disability	6.7	13.0	4.5	22.2	7.1	36.4	13.6	18.2	36.4	9.5	4.2	16.0	25.0	14.6	11.5	20.6	7.0	11.9	12.8	33.3	14.1
Specialized education class	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	9.1	1.9	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	2.1	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.1	6.7	2.0
Irregular school attendance	2.0	4.1	8.2	6.1	2.0	14.3	36.7	6.1	6.1	2.0	4.1	10.2	4.1	32.7	8.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	12.2	18.4	69.4
<b>Behaviour-related problems</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
None	93.3	78.3	81.8	72.2	78.6	36.4	75.7	81.8	54.5	76.2	66.7	64.0	75.0	68.8	88.5	70.6	79.1	69.0	69.2	46.7	72.4
Problems in school	6.7	8.7	18.2	27.8	21.4	18.2	16.5	0.0	45.5	0.0	16.7	20.0	25.0	15.6	3.8	20.6	9.3	21.4	20.5	20.0	16.1
Problems in home	0.0	4.3	4.5	5.6	0.0	27.3	5.8	9.1	9.1	19.0	8.3	4.0	25.0	10.4	3.8	5.9	11.6	7.1	2.6	26.7	8.0
Violent behaviour	0.0	4.3	9.1	0.0	0.0	27.3	5.8	0.0	0.0	4.8	4.2	4.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	2.9	7.0	2.4	2.6	20.0	4.5
Bullying	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	1.9	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.9	2.3	0.0	0.0	6.7	1.5
Self-harming behaviour	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	5.9	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	1.5
Running away	0.0	4.3	0.0	5.6	7.1	9.1	3.9	0.0	0.0	19.0	12.5	4.0	25.0	9.4	0.0	2.9	9.3	9.5	5.1	13.3	6.5
Negative peer involvement	6.7	4.3	4.5	5.6	14.3	36.4	9.7	9.1	9.1	4.8	4.2	0.0	0.0	4.2	7.7	5.9	4.7	4.8	5.1	26.7	7.0
Inappropriate sexual behaviour	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	12.5	4.0	0.0	5.2	0.0	0.0	4.7	7.1	2.6	0.0	3.0
Criminal involvement	0.0	0.0	9.1	5.6	7.1	27.3	6.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	8.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	4.7	4.8	7.7	20.0	5.0
<b>Substance abuse problems</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
None	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	90.9	99.0	100.0	100.0	95.2	100.0	96.0	100.0	97.9	100.0	100.0	97.7	100.0	97.4	93.3	98.5
Drug abuse	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	1.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	4.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	2.6	6.7	1.5
Alcohol abuse	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	1.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	4.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	2.6	6.7	1.5
<b>Diagnosed Disabilities</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
None	100.0	91.3	90.9	100.0	78.6	81.8	91.3	90.9	81.8	85.7	91.7	96.0	100.0	90.6	96.2	88.2	88.4	95.2	89.7	86.7	91.0
Physical handicap	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	7.1	0.0	1.9	9.1	9.1	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	3.1	3.8	2.9	2.3	2.4	2.6	0.0	2.5
Visual-hear-speech impairment	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	1.9	0.0	9.1	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	5.9	0.0	2.4	2.6	0.0	2.0
Impaired cognitive functioning	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	7.1	9.1	2.9	0.0	0.0	9.5	0.0	4.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	2.9	4.7	0.0	5.1	6.7	3.0
Psychiatric disorder	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	9.1	1.9	0.0	0.0	4.8	4.2	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	4.7	2.4	0.0	6.7	2.0

This section presents the results related to characteristics of child victims of abuse and neglect.

Table C.2.2.1 presents the characteristics of child victims by gender and age. As we can see, most children who were identified by CSWs as CAN victims in the course of 2010 attend school regularly, do not work, have no behaviour-related problems, no problems in school, no alcohol/drug abuse problems, or a diagnosed health condition. Looking by the age groups and the type of potential problem, the most frequently reported problem in children at the age of 15 is irregular school attendance, which is the least prevalent in ten-year-olds. Behaviour-related problems, which can be mild or severe, such as involvement in criminal activities, are the most frequent in children in the oldest age category (15 years of age) and the least frequent in the youngest children in the sample. In eleven-year-olds, compared to children in other age categories, self-harming behaviour is the most prevalent, while in children at the age of 13 the most frequently reported problem is age-inappropriate sexual behaviour. Involvement in criminal activities is not present in children at the age of 10 and 11, and it is present in a smaller percentage in other age categories, with the exception of fifteen-year-olds where, as was already mentioned, all behaviour-related problems are the most prevalent. In addition to this, alcohol and drug abuse problems have been recorded in children at the age of 12, 14 and 15. With regard to the children's health condition, health problems were identified, in a smaller percentage, in nearly all age categories, such as physical handicap, visual/hearing/speech impairment, impaired cognitive functioning or a diagnosed psychiatric disorder.

Looking by the gender, no differences were noted between boys and girls, CAN victims, in terms of their educational status, work status and problems in school. However, behaviour-related problems at home are more prevalent in girls, and consequently, running away from home, while boys display negative peer involvement (e.g. vandalism, substance abuse). With regard to substance abuse and health condition, no differences have been noted between boys and girls.

Table C.2.2.2 Child-physical abuse victims' characteristics

	Physical Abuse (n=82)																				
	male							Female							Total						
	10	11	12	13	14	15	All	10	11	12	13	14	15	All	10	11	12	13	14	15	All
Total Physical abuse cases	7	13	8	8	5	5	46	3	6	9	6	10	2	36	10	19	17	14	15	7	82
<b>Educational status</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Not attending school at all	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	2.4
Dropped out	28.6	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	20.0	8.7	0.0	0.0	22.2	16.7	10.0	0.0	11.1	20.0	0.0	11.8	14.3	6.7	14.3	9.8
Attends school	71.4	92.3	100.0	87.5	100.0	80.0	89.1	100.0	100.0	55.6	83.3	80.0	100.0	80.6	80.0	94.7	76.5	85.7	86.7	85.7	85.4
<b>Work status</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Not working	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	83.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	97.2	100.0	94.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	98.8
Working domestic/ unpaid	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2
Working salaried work	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Education-related problems</b>																					
Unspecified	28.6	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	6.5	0.0	0.0	22.2	16.7	20.0	0.0	13.9	20.0	0.0	11.8	14.3	13.3	0.0	9.8
None	71.4	76.9	87.5	62.5	80.0	40.0	71.7	100.0	50.0	44.4	83.3	60.0	100.0	63.9	80.0	68.4	64.7	71.4	66.7	57.1	68.3
Learning disability	0.0	15.4	0.0	25.0	20.0	60.0	17.4	0.0	50.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	26.3	5.9	14.3	6.7	42.9	14.6
Specialized education class	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	1.2
Irregular school attendance	0.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	4.1	8.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	4.1	10.2
<b>Behaviour-related problems</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
None	100.0	76.9	87.5	62.5	80.0	60.0	78.3	66.7	66.7	66.7	66.7	50.0	50.0	61.1	90.0	73.7	76.5	64.3	60.0	57.1	70.7
Problems in school	0.0	7.7	12.5	37.5	20.0	20.0	15.2	0.0	33.3	0.0	16.7	30.0	50.0	19.4	0.0	15.8	5.9	28.6	26.7	28.6	17.1
Problems in home	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	20.0	4.3	33.3	0.0	22.2	16.7	0.0	50.0	13.9	10.0	0.0	11.8	14.3	0.0	28.6	8.5
Violent behaviour	0.0	7.7	12.5	0.0	20.0	0.0	6.5	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	10.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	5.3	11.8	0.0	13.3	0.0	6.1
Bullying	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Self-harming behaviour	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	10.5	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	3.7
Running away	0.0	7.7	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	16.7	0.0	50.0	13.9	0.0	5.3	17.6	14.3	0.0	14.3	8.5
Negative peer involvement	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	2.2	0.0	16.7	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	5.3	5.9	0.0	0.0	14.3	3.7
Inappropriate sexual behaviour	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	1.2
Criminal involvement	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	40.0	6.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	6.7	28.6	4.9
<b>Substance abuse problems</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
None	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	90.0	100.0	97.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	93.3	100.0	98.8
Drug abuse	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	1.2
Alcohol abuse	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Diagnosed Disabilities</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
None	100.0	92.3	87.5	100.0	80.0	100.0	93.5	100.0	83.3	88.9	83.3	100.0	100.0	91.7	100.0	89.5	88.2	92.9	93.3	100.0	92.7
Physical handicap	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Visual-hear-speech impairment	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	10.5	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	3.7
Impaired cognitive functioning	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2
Psychiatric disorder	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	11.1	16.7	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	11.8	7.1	0.0	0.0	3.7

The majority of child victims of physical violence, just as the total sample of CAN victims, attend school regularly, do not work, have no problems in school or behaviour-related problems, no substance abuse problems and no diagnosed disorders. Among child victims of physical violence who do not belong to this category, there are 9.8% of children who have dropped out of school, 14.6% of children with learning disabilities, and 6.2% of children who do not attend school regularly. The behaviour-related problems they generally manifest include problems in school, such as isolation and truancy. The same percentage of children manifests behaviour-related problems at home and has run away from home at least once. Drug abuse was registered in only 1.2% of children, while sensory and psychiatric disabilities were prevalent the most (and in the same percentage) of all health conditions.

Table C.2.2.3 Child-sexual abuse victims' characteristics

	Sexual Abuse (n=43)																				
	male							Female							Total						
	10	11	12	13	14	15	All	10	11	12	13	14	15	All	10	11	12	13	14	15	All
Total Sexual abuse cases	0	2	7	1	2	1	13	2	3	8	8	9	0	30	2	5	15	9	11	1	43
<b>Educational status</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Not attending school at all	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	11.1	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	9.1	0.0	4.7
Dropped out	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	33.3	0.0	20.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	27.3	0.0	14.0
Attends school	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	50.0	100.0	87.5	75.0	55.6	0.0	73.3	50.0	100.0	93.3	77.8	63.6	100.0	81.4
<b>Work status</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Not working	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	66.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	96.7	100.0	80.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	97.7
Working domestic/ unpaid	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3
Working salaried work	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Education-related problems</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	44.4	0.0	23.3	50.0	0.0	6.7	11.1	36.4	0.0	16.3
None	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	92.3	0.0	66.7	87.5	75.0	22.2	0.0	56.7	0.0	80.0	93.3	77.8	36.4	0.0	67.4
Learning disability	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	44.4	0.0	20.0	50.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	36.4	0.0	14.0
Specialized education class	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	7.7	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	4.7
Irregular school attendance	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	6.1	0.0	8.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	6.1	2.0	10.2
<b>Behaviour-related problems</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
None	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	92.3	100.0	66.7	75.0	75.0	44.4	0.0	66.7	100.0	80.0	86.7	77.8	54.5	0.0	74.4
Problems in school	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	12.5	22.2	0.0	13.3	0.0	20.0	0.0	11.1	18.2	0.0	9.3
Problems in home	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3
Violent behaviour	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bullying	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Self-harming behaviour	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3
Running away	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	12.5	11.1	0.0	13.3	0.0	0.0	13.3	11.1	9.1	0.0	9.3
Negative peer involvement	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	6.7	11.1	0.0	0.0	4.7
Inappropriate sexual behaviour	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	25.0	11.1	0.0	13.3	0.0	0.0	6.7	22.2	9.1	0.0	9.3
Criminal involvement	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	2.3
<b>Substance abuse problems</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
None	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	87.5	100.0	88.9	0.0	93.3	100.0	100.0	93.3	100.0	90.9	100.0	95.3
Drug abuse	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	11.1	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	9.1	0.0	4.7
Alcohol abuse	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Diagnosed Disabilities</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
None	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	92.3	100.0	66.7	87.5	87.5	88.9	0.0	86.7	100.0	80.0	93.3	88.9	90.9	0.0	88.4
Physical handicap	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	2.3
Visual-hear-speech impairment	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	20.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	4.7
Impaired cognitive functioning	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	11.1	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	9.1	0.0	4.7
Psychiatric disorder	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	2.3

As presented above, related to children victims of physical violence, children who were victims of sexual abuse also attend school regularly, do not manifest behaviour problems or problems in school, have no substance abuse problems, or a diagnosed physical, sensory or mental disorder. Among child victims of sexual abuse who deviate from this profile and do not belong to this category, 14.0% have dropped out of school, while 4.7% never attended school at all. The problems in school that they generally manifest are learning difficulties and irregular school attendance (truancy). When it comes to behaviour problems, children who have survived sexual abuse manifest problems in school and consequently run away from school. In addition to this, they manifest age-inappropriate sexual behaviour. This is also one of the indicators of sexual violent victimization of children. 4.7% of these children have drug abuse problems, which can also indicate, as in children who are victims of other forms of CAN, an attempt to cope with a traumatic experience. Also, in a smaller percentage of these children, visual, hearing and speech impairments were diagnosed, as well as impaired cognitive functioning.

Table C.2.2.4 Child-CAN psychological abuse victims' characteristics

	Psychological Abuse (n=109)																				
	male							Female							Total						
	10	11	12	13	14	15	All	10	11	12	13	14	15	All	10	11	12	13	14	15	All
Total Psychological abuse cases	9	15	9	10	7	8	58	3	9	10	12	14	3	51	12	24	19	22	21	11	109
<b>Educational status</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Not attending school at all	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	7.1	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	4.8	0.0	1.8
Dropped out	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	25.0	5.2	33.3	0.0	10.0	8.3	14.3	0.0	9.8	8.3	0.0	10.5	4.5	9.5	18.2	7.3
Attends school	100.0	100.0	88.9	100.0	100.0	75.0	94.8	66.7	100.0	90.0	83.3	78.6	0.0	86.3	91.7	100.0	89.5	90.9	85.7	81.8	90.8
<b>Work status</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Not working	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Working domestic/ unpaid	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Working salaried work	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Education-related problems</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	10.0	16.7	14.3	0.0	9.8	0.0	0.0	10.5	9.1	9.5	0.0	5.5
None	100.0	80.0	77.8	80.0	71.4	37.5	75.9	66.7	44.4	70.0	75.0	57.1	0.0	62.7	91.7	66.7	73.7	77.3	61.9	45.5	69.7
Learning disability	0.0	13.3	0.0	20.0	14.3	50.0	15.5	33.3	33.3	20.0	8.3	14.3	0.0	19.6	8.3	20.8	10.5	13.6	14.3	45.5	17.4
Specialized education class	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	12.5	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.5	9.1	2.8
Irregular school attendance	0.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	8.2	14.3	2.0	6.1	0.0	2.0	4.1	2.0	16.3	2.0	8.2	2.0	2.0	6.1	10.2	30.6
<b>Behaviour-related probl</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
None	100.0	86.7	88.9	80.0	71.4	50.0	81.0	100.0	55.6	90.0	58.3	64.3	0.0	68.6	100.0	75.0	89.5	68.2	66.7	54.5	75.2
Problems in school	0.0	6.7	11.1	20.0	28.6	12.5	12.1	0.0	44.4	0.0	16.7	21.4	0.0	19.6	0.0	20.8	5.3	18.2	23.8	18.2	15.6
Problems in home	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	25.0	5.2	0.0	11.1	10.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	9.8	0.0	4.2	10.5	9.1	0.0	27.3	7.3
Violent behaviour	0.0	6.7	11.1	20.0	28.6	12.5	12.1	0.0	44.4	0.0	16.7	21.4	0.0	19.6	0.0	20.8	5.3	18.2	23.8	18.2	15.6
Bullying	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Self-harming behaviour	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
Running away	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	12.5	3.4	0.0	0.0	10.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	9.8	0.0	0.0	5.3	18.2	0.0	18.2	6.4
Negative peer involvement	0.0	6.7	11.1	0.0	14.3	25.0	8.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	4.2	5.3	4.5	4.8	18.2	5.5

Inappropriate sexual behaviour	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	7.1	0.0	<b>5.9</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	4.8	0.0	<b>2.8</b>
Criminal involvement	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	14.3	25.0	<b>6.9</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	7.1	0.0	<b>3.9</b>	0.0	0.0	5.3	4.5	9.5	18.2	<b>5.5</b>
<b>Substance abuse problems</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>
None	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	<b>100.0</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	92.9	0.0	<b>98.0</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	95.2	100.0	<b>99.1</b>
Drug abuse	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	<b>2.0</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	<b>0.9</b>
Alcohol abuse	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Diagnosed Disabilities</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>
None	100.0	86.7	77.8	100.0	71.4	87.5	<b>87.9</b>	66.7	100.0	90.0	91.7	100.0	0.0	<b>94.1</b>	91.7	91.7	84.2	95.5	90.5	90.9	<b>90.8</b>
Physical handicap	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>1.7</b>	33.3	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	<b>3.9</b>	8.3	0.0	5.3	4.5	0.0	0.0	<b>2.8</b>
Visual-hear-speech impairment	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	<b>3.4</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	<b>2.0</b>	0.0	4.2	0.0	4.5	4.8	0.0	<b>2.8</b>
Impaired cognitive functioning	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	<b>3.4</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	<b>1.8</b>
Psychiatric disorder	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	12.5	<b>3.4</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>0.0</b>	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	9.1	<b>1.8</b>

Child victims of psychological abuse who do not belong to the category of those who do not manifest any problems and go to school regularly, in a smaller percentage compared to child victims of sexual abuse, have dropped out of school and nearly one-third of them attend school irregularly. The same percentage of children (15.6%) manifests behaviour problems in school, in the form of violent behaviour directed towards other children, objects, or in interpersonal relationships. 5.5% of these children are involved in certain criminal activities, which can be brought in connection with the fact that the same percentage has manifested an aspect of negative peer involvement.



Table C.2.2.5 Child-neglect victims' characteristics

	Neglect (n=78)																				
	Male							Female							Total						
	10	11	12	13	14	15	All	10	11	12	13	14	15	All	10	11	12	13	14	15	All
Total Neglect cases	7	7	9	8	6	3	40	5	4	8	11	8	2	38	12	11	17	19	14	5	78
<b>Educational status</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Not attending school at all	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	12.5	0.0	7.9	0.0	9.1	0.0	10.5	7.1	0.0	5.1
Dropped out	42.9	0.0	11.1	12.5	16.7	0.0	15.0	20.0	0.0	25.0	18.2	25.0	0.0	18.4	33.3	0.0	17.6	15.8	21.4	0.0	16.7
Attends school	57.1	85.7	88.9	87.5	83.3	100.0	82.5	80.0	100.0	75.0	63.6	62.5	0.0	73.7	66.7	90.9	82.4	73.7	71.4	100.0	78.2
<b>Work status</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Not working	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Working domestic/ unpaid	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Working salaried work	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Education-related problems</b>																					
Unspecified	42.9	14.3	11.1	12.5	0.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	27.3	12.5	0.0	15.8	25.0	9.1	17.6	21.1	7.1	0.0	15.4
None	42.9	57.1	44.4	50.0	83.3	0.0	50.0	40.0	25.0	50.0	63.6	50.0	0.0	47.4	41.7	45.5	47.1	57.9	64.3	0.0	48.7
Learning disability	14.3	28.6	11.1	25.0	0.0	0.0	15.0	20.0	25.0	12.5	9.1	12.5	0.0	15.8	16.7	27.3	11.8	15.8	7.1	20.0	15.4
Specialized education class	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	1.3
Irregular school attendance	2.0	0.0	8.2	6.1	2.0	6.1	24.5	6.1	6.1	2.0	2.0	6.1	4.1	26.5	8.2	6.1	10.2	8.2	8.2	10.2	51.0
<b>Behaviour-related problems</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
None	85.7	42.9	66.7	62.5	66.7	0.0	60.0	80.0	25.0	62.5	45.5	62.5	0.0	57.9	83.3	36.4	64.7	52.6	64.3	40.0	59.0
Problems in school	14.3	14.3	33.3	37.5	33.3	33.3	27.5	0.0	75.0	0.0	36.4	12.5	0.0	21.1	8.3	36.4	17.6	36.8	21.4	20.0	24.4
Problems in home	0.0	14.3	11.1	12.5	0.0	33.3	10.0	0.0	25.0	37.5	9.1	12.5	0.0	15.8	0.0	18.2	23.5	10.5	7.1	20.0	12.8
Violent behaviour	0.0	14.3	11.1	0.0	0.0	66.7	10.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	9.1	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	9.1	11.8	5.3	0.0	40.0	7.7
Bullying	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	2.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	40.0	3.8
Self-harming behaviour	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	1.3
Running away	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	18.2	12.5	0.0	13.2	0.0	9.1	11.8	10.5	14.3	0.0	9.0
Negative peer involvement	14.3	14.3	11.1	12.5	33.3	66.7	20.0	20.0	0.0	12.5	9.1	0.0	0.0	7.9	16.7	9.1	11.8	10.5	14.3	40.0	14.1
Inappropriate sexual behaviour	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	5.9	10.5	0.0	0.0	3.8
Criminal involvement	0.0	0.0	22.2	12.5	16.7	33.3	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	12.5	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	11.8	10.5	14.3	20.0	9.0
<b>Substance abuse problems</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
None	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	66.7	97.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	80.0	98.7
Drug abuse	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	1.3
Alcohol abuse	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Diagnosed Disabilities</b>																					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
None	100.0	85.7	88.9	100.0	66.7	66.7	87.5	80.0	75.0	75.0	81.8	87.5	0.0	81.6	91.7	81.8	82.4	89.5	78.6	80.0	84.6
Physical handicap	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	2.5	20.0	25.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	7.9	8.3	9.1	0.0	5.3	7.1	0.0	5.1
Visual-hear-speech impairment	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	1.3
Impaired cognitive functioning	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	16.7	33.3	7.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	12.5	0.0	5.3	0.0	9.1	5.9	0.0	14.3	20.0	6.4
Psychiatric disorder	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	9.1	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	11.8	5.3	0.0	0.0	3.8

The children who were victims of neglect, in comparison with other child victims, have the highest percentage of school dropouts (16.7%). In connection with this, a half of those who have not dropped out attend school irregularly. Behaviour problems that they manifest the most are problems in school, problems at home, as well as various aspects of negative involvement with peers. In terms of health problems, physical handicaps and cognitive impairments are present the most compared to all other children victims of abuse and neglect.

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

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

	Form of Maltreatment				
	Physical abuse (n=82)	Sexual Abuse (n=43)	Psychological abuse (n=109)	Neglect (n=78)	All forms of maltreatment (n=199)
<b>Family Status</b>					
Unspecified	0.0	2.3	0.0	1.3	1.0
Married parents	63.4	76.7	68.8	48.7	62.3
Divorced parents	23.2	4.7	18.3	21.8	19.6
Single parent family	4.9	7.0	5.5	15.4	8.5
Step family	7.3	9.3	4.6	9.0	6.5
Foster family	1.2	2.3	2.8	3.8	2.0
Adoption family	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Number of co-habitants</b>					
Unspecified	0.0	2.3	0.0	1.3	1.0
1	9.8	9.3	8.3	12.8	9.5
2	22.0	37.2	18.3	23.1	25.1
3	47.6	32.6	50.5	32.1	40.2
4	11.0	7.0	14.7	10.3	11.6
>5	4.9	4.7	2.8	6.4	4.5
<b>Co-habitants identity</b>					
Unspecified	0.0	2.3	0.0	1.3	1.0
Mother	89.0	95.3	90.8	69.2	82.4
Father	64.6	67.4	66.1	48.7	60.8
Siblings	74.4	55.8	78.0	69.2	68.8
Grandparent(s)	13.4	2.3	9.2	19.2	14.1
Other blood/in-laws relative(s)	4.9	2.3	1.8	10.3	5.0
Parent's partner	8.5	16.3	5.5	6.4	7.5
<b>Other CAN victims</b>					
Unspecified	1.2	2.3	0.0	1.3	1.5
None	42.7	72.1	34.9	44.9	46.2
Siblings	56.1	25.6	65.1	53.8	52.3
<b>Other types of abuse</b>					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
None	41.5	79.1	31.2	75.6	59.3
Intimate partner violence	53.7	18.6	65.1	21.8	37.7
Elderly abuse	3.7	0.0	2.8	1.3	1.5
Sibling abuse	1.2	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.5
<b>Housing adequacy</b>					
Unspecified	2.4	9.3	11.9	17.9	11.6
No	81.7	65.1	67.9	46.2	64.8
Yes	15.9	25.6	20.2	35.9	23.6
<b>Household income</b>					
Unspecified	1.2	9.3	4.6	9.0	7.5
Very low	22.0	39.5	24.8	46.2	29.6
Low	35.4	27.9	33.0	23.1	29.6
Moderate	36.6	20.9	33.9	15.4	30.2
High	4.9	2.3	3.7	0.0	3.0
Very high	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Source of income</b>					
Unspecified	0.0	9.3	4.6	11.5	8.0
No source of income	7.3	25.6	9.2	32.1	19.6
Full time employment	63.4	37.2	60.6	33.3	51.8
Part time/Seasonal employment	17.1	14.0	12.8	15.4	12.6
Social assistance	3.7	4.7	5.5	6.4	4.0
No reliable source	8.5	0.0	7.3	1.3	4.0
<b>Financial problems</b>					
Unspecified	0.0	9.3	4.6	9.0	7.0
No	39.0	16.3	33.0	15.4	29.6
Yes	61.0	62.8	62.4	69.2	63.3

In most of the recorded cases of CAN, a child-victim of any form of maltreatment comes from a complete family in which parents are married. In case of physical and psychological abuse, about 50% of families are three-member families, whereas in case of sexual abuse and neglect about one-third of families consist of two or three members. When it comes to the relationship of co-habitants with child-victim, parents of the child, siblings, grandparents and other blood/in-laws relatives mainly live in the same household. New partner of a parent lives in the same household with 16.3% of the children-victims of sexual abuse. Apart from child-victim, the abuse of their siblings is also present in more than a half of the cases, as well as partner abuse in the family of a third of children-victims of any form of CAN.

Furthermore, they are usually families with inadequate housing conditions. As for the amount of income, there are huge differences according to the type of abuse. Namely, the families from which children-victims of sexual abuse and neglect come from, are mainly families with significantly low income, whereas in cases of physical and psychological abuse families usually have middle-range income. The link between exceptionally low income and neglect may indicate that neglect is rather a product of inability of a parent to meet all needs of a child than it is their conscious and willing failure. In this respect, regardless of the type of abuse, most families have financial difficulties in spite of the fact that a full-time employment is their major source of income. A third of the families characterised with neglect of a child are the families without any reliable source of income.

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

Table C.2.4 Perpetrators and Caregivers

	Perpetrators and Caregivers			
	Perpetrators only	Perpetrators & Caregivers	Caregivers only	Total
Frequency	<b>70</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>419</b>
%	16.7	37.7	45.6	100.0

When it comes to the perpetrator – caregiver relation, as demonstrated in the Table above, in a third of the cases the perpetrator is a person who is at the same time the child's caregiver, i.e. their legal guardian. In almost half of the cases, the person is only a caregiver, whereas in 16.7% of cases they are only perpetrators.

## C.2.5. Characteristics of Perpetrators and Caregivers

Table C.2.5.1 Perpetrators' characteristics per form of maltreatment

	Form of Maltreatment				
	Physical abuse (n=82)	Sexual abuse (n=43)	Psychological abuse (n=109)	Neglect (n=78)	All forms of maltreatment (n=199)
<b>Number of Perpetrators</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>70</b>
Unspecified	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
1	83.3	85.7	70.4	78.9	82.9
2	16.7	10.7	29.6	21.1	17.1
3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4 or more	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Status of allegation</b>					
Unspecified	0.0	3.6	0.0	5.3	4.3
Perpetrator	100.0	92.9	96.3	84.2	91.4
Alleged Perpetrator	0.0	3.6	3.7	10.5	4.3
<b>Gender</b>					
Unspecified	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	2.9
Male	83.3	96.4	77.8	52.6	77.1
Female	16.7	0.0	22.2	47.4	20.0
<b>Age group</b>					
>18	37.5	46.4	22.2	5.3	30.0
19-24	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	1.4
25-34	8.3	10.7	7.4	0.0	5.7
35-44	12.5	0.0	0.0	15.8	8.6
45-54	20.8	0.0	37.0	57.9	21.4
55-64	16.7	7.1	22.2	15.8	14.3
>65	0.0	32.1	0.0	0.0	12.9
<b>Educational Level</b>	4.2	0.0	11.1	5.3	5.7
Unspecified					
Has not attended school	25.0	42.9	14.8	15.8	27.1
Elementary school	4.2	10.7	7.4	0.0	5.7
Middle School	16.7	3.6	3.7	15.8	11.4
High School	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	38.6
Technical School	41.7	14.3	66.7	68.4	0.0
University	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Post-graduate studies	12.5	32.1	7.4	0.0	17.1
<b>Employment status</b>					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Employed	16.7	35.7	3.7	0.0	15.7
Unemployed	41.7	42.9	40.7	63.2	50.0
Retired	29.2	25.0	37.0	31.6	25.7
<b>Marital Status</b>					
Unspecified	12.5	0.0	18.5	5.3	8.6
Single	16.7	50.0	7.4	0.0	21.4
Married	8.3	17.9	11.1	5.3	11.4
Living together	16.7	3.6	7.4	0.0	7.1
Separated	20.8	3.6	11.1	26.3	12.9
Divorced	0.0	0.0	14.8	21.1	5.7
Widow/er	29.2	28.6	33.3	26.3	30.0

(Table C.2.5.1 cont.)

	Form of Maltreatment				
	Physical abuse (n=82)	Sexual abuse (n=43)	Psychological abuse (n=109)	Neglect (n=78)	All forms of maltreatment (n=199)
<b>Relation to child</b>					
Unspecified	0.0	10.7	0.0	0.0	18.6
Mother	4.2	0.0	7.4	42.1	12.9
Father	37.5	3.6	44.4	52.6	28.6
Step-mother	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4
Step-father	8.3	0.0	3.7	0.0	2.9
Full sibling	8.3	0.0	7.4	0.0	2.9
Partial/half sibling	4.2	3.6	3.7	0.0	4.3
Step-sibling	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Grandparent	12.5	0.0	18.5	5.3	8.6
Other blood relative	4.2	0.0	3.7	0.0	1.4
In-laws	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	2.9
Foster Parent	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Caregiver in institution	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Health care provider	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Parent's partner	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Date	8.3	7.1	7.4	0.0	2.9
Roommate	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Work-relation	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Neighbour	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	5.7
Friend	0.0	10.7	0.0	0.0	4.3
Official /legal authority	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Stranger	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4
School Teacher	4.2	32.1	3.7	0.0	14.3
Teacher/Coach (outside school)	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	1.4
Family friend	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>History of substance abuse</b>					
Unspecified	20.8	42.9	3.7	0.0	22.9
None	45.8	21.4	51.9	73.7	47.1
Drug abuse	8.3	3.6	7.4	0.0	2.9
Alcohol abuse	33.3	35.7	44.4	26.3	30.0
<b>Physical-Mental Disabilities</b>					
Unspecified	25.0	67.9	7.4	0.0	32.9
None	66.7	32.1	85.2	84.2	60.0
Physical handicap	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Psychiatric Disorder	8.3	0.0	0.0	5.3	4.3
Impaired cognitive functioning	0.0	0.0	7.4	10.5	2.9
<b>History of victimization</b>					
Unspecified	25.0	67.9	7.4	0.0	32.9
None	75.0	28.6	88.9	100.0	65.7
Yes	0.0	3.6	3.7	0.0	1.4
<b>Previous similar allegations</b>					
Unspecified	25.0	39.3	7.4	0.0	21.4
None	16.7	57.1	74.1	94.7	70.0
Yes	58.3	3.6	18.5	5.3	8.6

In all forms of maltreatment, there were one or two perpetrators. In case of physical abuse, all perpetrators have the status of a confirmed perpetrator; in case of sexual and psychological abuse about 3% of perpetrators have the status of alleged perpetrator, whereas in case of neglect 10.5% of them have the status

of alleged perpetrator. Males are usually the perpetrators in all forms of CAN, except neglect where there is almost the same percentage of male and female perpetrators. They are usually middle-aged persons with secondary school educational level. Unlike other forms, in case of sexual abuse a third of the perpetrators have post-graduate educational level. In accordance with the findings on the financial status of a family, a half of the perpetrators are unemployed, which is more noticeable in case of neglect. Nearly a third of the perpetrators are pensioners, in respect of all forms of maltreatment. In addition, about a third of the perpetrators are widows/widowers, then persons without partners (21.4%), separated (12.9%) or partners living together (7.1%). The smallest number of perpetrators is divorced.

As for the relationship of the perpetrator with the child, the father is most frequently the one who is violent towards the child in all forms of abuse, except sexual, where a teacher is the perpetrator in a third of the cases. In cases of sexual abuse, apart from the teacher, the perpetrator may be a neighbour, friend as well as an emotional partner of the child-victim. A child-victim's partner can be the perpetrator of both physical and psychological abuse. There are fewer mothers perpetrators than fathers, except in case of neglect. Grandparents abuse children mostly psychologically and physically. A third of the perpetrators in all forms of CAN are alcoholics, which is in line with most studies on factors of family violence, both in partner relations and in relations towards children. In most cases, the perpetrator does not have victimization history and no allegations have been made against them, except those who physically abused a child.

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

	Form of Maltreatment				
	Physical abuse (n=82)	Sexual abuse (n=43)	Psychological abuse (n=109)	Neglect (n=78)	All forms of maltreatment (n=199)
<b>No of Caregivers/Perpetrators</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>158</b>
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1	73.9	77.8	81.1	49.4	69.0
2	26.1	22.2	20.0	40.7	31.0
3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4 or more	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Status of allegation</b>					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Perpetrator	92.8	88.9	95.8	93.8	93.0
Alleged Perpetrator	7.2	11.1	4.2	6.2	5.7
<b>Gender</b>					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Male	72.5	77.8	75.8	55.6	67.7
Female	27.5	22.2	24.2	44.4	31.0
<b>Age group</b>					
>18	4.3	5.6	4.2	4.9	1.9
19-24	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25-34	0.0	5.6	0.0	3.7	1.9
35-44	13.0	5.6	9.5	16.0	11.4
45-54	55.1	44.4	61.1	54.3	55.1
55-64	26.1	38.9	17.9	16.0	20.3
>65	1.4	0.0	6.3	4.9	5.1
<b>Educational Level</b>					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Has not attended school	2.9	5.6	1.1	3.7	3.8
Elementary school	14.5	27.8	14.7	37.0	24.1
Middle School	18.8	27.8	18.9	21.0	20.3
High School	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	43.0
Technical School	52.2	27.8	52.6	34.6	0.0
University	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Post-graduate studies	10.1	11.1	11.6	2.5	7.6
<b>Employment status</b>	1.4	0.0	1.1	1.2	1.3
Unspecified					
Employed	2.9	5.6	1.1	2.5	3.2
Unemployed	53.6	33.3	55.8	30.9	46.2
Retired	42.0	61.1	41.1	66.7	49.4
<b>Marital Status</b>	1.4	0.0	2.1	0.0	1.3
Unspecified					
Single	1.4	0.0	1.1	2.5	2.5
Married	2.9	5.6	3.2	11.1	6.3
Living together	69.6	50.0	70.5	53.1	60.1
Separated	7.2	27.8	4.2	4.9	6.3
Divorced	2.9	0.0	3.2	2.5	2.5
Widow/er	13.0	5.6	14.7	8.6	12.0



(Table C.2.5.2 cont.)

	Form of Maltreatment				
	Physical abuse (n=82)	Sexual abuse (n=43)	Psychological abuse (n=109)	Neglect (n=78)	All forms of maltreatment (n=199)
<b>Relation to child</b>					
Unspecified	2.9	11.1	1.1	4.9	2.5
Mother	21.7	22.2	23.2	44.4	30.4
Father	72.5	44.4	71.6	48.1	60.8
Step-mother	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Step-father	1.4	22.2	3.2	1.2	3.2
Full sibling	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Partial/half sibling	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Step-sibling	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Grandparent	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other blood relative	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.6
In-laws	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Foster Parent	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Caregiver in institution	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Health care provider	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Parent's partner	1.4	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.6
Date	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Roommate	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Work-relation	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Neighbour	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Friend	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Official /legal authority	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Stranger	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
School Teacher	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Teacher/Coach (outside school)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Family friend	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>History of substance abuse</b>					
Unspecified	1.4	0.0	3.2	3.7	3.8
None	58.0	55.6	57.9	61.7	61.4
Drug abuse	2.9	16.7	3.2	3.7	4.4
Alcohol abuse	37.7	33.3	35.8	28.4	30.4
<b>Physical-Mental Disabilities</b>					
Unspecified	2.9	0.0	2.1	2.5	1.9
None	88.4	72.2	84.2	80.2	83.5
Physical handicap	1.4	0.0	4.2	3.7	2.5
Psychiatric Disorder	7.2	22.2	10.5	11.1	9.5
Impaired cognitive functioning	0.0	5.6	2.1	6.2	3.2
<b>History of victimization</b>					
Unspecified	4.3	11.1	2.1	4.9	5.7
None	85.5	83.3	91.6	92.6	89.9
Yes	10.1	5.6	6.3	2.5	4.4
<b>Previous similar allegations</b>					
Unspecified	2.9	5.6	1.1	2.5	3.2
None	84.1	88.9	87.4	85.2	85.4
Yes	13.0	5.6	11.6	12.3	11.4

When it comes to caregivers who are at the same time child abusers, the situation is a bit different. In all forms of maltreatment, the perpetrator is usually one person with the status of confirmed perpetrator. When the perpetrator is also a caregiver, middle-aged males (45-54 years old) having technical school degree are prevailing. Unemployed caregiver-perpetrator is prevailing in cases of physical and psychological abuse, whereas in cases of sexual abuse and neglect, pensioners prevail. Unlike those who are perpetrators “alone”, persons who are both caregivers and perpetrators usually co-habit and they are child’s blood relatives (father, mother). In case of sexual abuse, apart from a father, a mother and a step father may also be perpetrators. Approximately a third of caregivers-perpetrators are alcohol abusers, most of them do not have a history of victimization or allegations made for similar offences.

Table C.2.5.3 Caregivers' characteristics per form of maltreatment

	Form of Maltreatment				
	Physical abuse (n=82)	Sexual abuse (n=43)	Psychological abuse (n=109)	Neglect (n=78)	All forms of maltreatment (n=199)
<b>Number of Caregivers</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>191</b>
Unspecified					5.2
1					77.0
2					17.8
3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4 or more	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Gender</b>					
Unspecified	6.1	7.7	7.5	7.5	6.1
Male	17.1	33.8	13.1	27.5	26.1
Female	76.8	58.5	79.4	65.0	73.3
<b>Age group</b>					
Unspecified	11.0	10.8	11.2	22.5	10.5
>18	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
19-24	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	1.0
25-34	14.6	7.7	15.9	7.5	11.0
35-44	54.9	63.1	51.4	25.0	51.8
45-54	13.4	15.4	18.7	22.5	16.8
55-64	1.2	3.1	0.9	5.0	2.6
>65	4.9	0.0	3.7	12.5	4.7
<b>Relation to child</b>					
Unspecified	6.1	7.7	7.5	10.0	6.8
Mother	69.5	60.0	72.0	27.5	59.7
Father	14.6	29.2	11.2	7.5	17.8
Step mother	1.2	0.0	0.9	2.5	0.5
Step father	0.0	1.5	0.0	2.5	1.0
Grandmother	7.3	1.5	4.7	22.5	7.3
Grandfather	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.5	1.6
Sibling	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.5
Step sibling	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.5
Other blood relative	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	1.0
In laws relative	0.0	0.0	0.9	2.5	0.5
Foster mother	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.5
Foster father	1.2	0.0	2.8	7.5	1.6
Caregiver in institution	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Parent's partner	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Type of Guardianship</b>					
Unspecified	7.3	9.2	7.5	7.5	6.8
Parent	80.5	87.7	82.2	35.0	76.4
Legal guardian	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
Step parent	1.2	1.5	0.9	5.0	1.6
Foster parent	2.4	0.0	3.7	10.0	3.1
Caretaker	7.3	1.5	5.6	42.5	11.5

(Table C.2.5.3 cont.)

	Form of Maltreatment				
	Physical abuse (n=82)	Sexual abuse (n=43)	Psychological abuse (n=109)	Neglect (n=78)	All forms of maltreatment (n=199)
<b>Educational Level</b>					
Unspecified	12.2	7.7	14.0	42.5	15.7
Has not attended school	8.5	23.1	9.3	5.0	11.5
Elementary school	18.3	21.5	19.6	10.0	17.8
Middle School	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
High School	45.1	43.1	48.6	37.5	46.1
Technical School	1.2	0.0	0.9	2.5	0.5
University	14.6	4.6	7.5	2.5	7.9
Post-graduate studies	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Employment status</b>					
Unspecified	11.0	9.2	8.4	42.5	9.4
Employed	39.0	47.7	38.3	30.0	42.4
Unemployed	45.1	38.5	49.5	27.5	39.3
Retired	4.9	3.1	3.7	0.0	8.9
<b>Marital Status</b>					
Unspecified	9.8	7.7	7.5	7.5	7.9
Single	4.9	3.1	3.7	10.0	5.2
Married	54.9	76.9	60.7	52.5	62.3
Living together	6.1	6.2	4.7	2.5	5.2
Separated	3.7	1.5	3.7	0.0	2.1
Divorced	14.6	3.1	15.0	12.5	11.5
Widow/er	6.1	1.5	3.7	15.0	5.8
<b>History of substance abuse</b>					
Unspecified	7.3	9.2	7.5	10.0	7.3
None	91.5	86.2	91.6	90.0	91.1
Drug abuse	1.2	3.1	0.9	0.0	1.0
Alcohol abuse	1.2	3.1	0.9	0.0	1.0
<b>Physical-Mental Disabilities</b>					
Unspecified	6.1	7.7	7.5	7.5	6.3
None	91.5	81.5	86.0	85.0	86.9
Physical handicap	0.0	1.5	2.8	5.0	2.1
Psychiatric Disorder	2.4	3.1	2.8	0.0	2.6
Impaired cognitive functioning	0.0	7.7	0.9	2.5	3.1
<b>History of victimization</b>					
Unspecified	9.8	7.7	8.4	10.0	8.4
None	81.7	89.2	82.2	82.5	85.9
Yes	8.5	3.1	9.3	7.5	5.8
<b>History of CAN allegations</b>					
Unspecified	6.1	7.7	7.5	7.5	6.3
None	92.7	90.8	90.7	90.0	92.7
Yes	1.2	1.5	1.9	2.5	1.0

When it comes to caregivers who are not perpetrators, we can have different image about gender structure and relationship with a child. Namely, women, i.e. mothers are dominant caregivers in case of all forms of maltreatment. As for neglect, apart from mothers, the caregivers can be a grandmother, grandfather, other blood relative and foster parent. As for the type of guardianship, parents of child-victim act as caregivers in most cases. In respect of educational level and employment status, they are mainly persons with secondary school degree who are employed. In case of sexual abuse, about a fifth of the caregivers have not acquired any degree, or they only have primary educational level. Unlike perpetrators, caregiver are usually married, do

not have any mental or physical disabilities/disorders, are not drug or alcohol abusers and do not have a history of victimization or previous allegations in terms of CAN.

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

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

	Form of Maltreatment				
	Physical abuse (n=82)	Sexual abuse (n=43)	Psychological abuse (n=109)	Neglect (n=78)	All forms of maltreatment (n=199)
<b>Case assessment of allegation</b>					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.5
Medical /Health services	20.7	51.2	14.7	11.5	20.6
Mental Health services	2.4	4.7	1.8	5.1	3.0
Education services	8.5	2.3	11.0	21.8	11.1
Social services	89.0	97.7	92.7	96.2	93.5
Police services	57.3	83.7	49.5	26.9	48.7
Legal/Judicial services	13.4	51.2	14.7	14.1	21.1
<b>Maltreatment confirmation</b>					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.5
Medical /Health services	18.3	51.2	11.9	10.3	19.6
Mental Health services	2.4	4.7	1.8	6.4	3.5
Education services	6.1	0.0	3.7	14.1	7.0
Social services	98.8	95.3	100.0	97.4	98.0
Police services	50.0	81.4	45.0	21.8	43.2
Legal/Judicial services	14.6	44.2	18.3	17.9	22.1
<b>Legal Action Taken</b>					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.5
None legal action taken	3.7	2.3	5.5	11.5	7.0
Social service/police -NO court involvement	63.4	16.3	61.5	52.6	52.8
Emergency protection procedures implemented	15.9	18.6	18.3	37.2	21.1
Judicial action to protect victim by court order(s)	4.9	2.3	5.5	6.4	4.5
Judicial action to remove parent(s) rights	7.3	16.3	9.2	21.8	12.6
Police/Judicial action to prosecute abuser	24.4	79.1	17.4	6.4	25.6
<b>Care plan for child</b>					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Child remains in family with no intervention	31.7	30.2	33.0	21.8	31.7
Child remains in family with planned intervention	52.4	51.2	48.6	42.3	46.2
Child removed from family (parents co-operation)	14.6	7.0	13.8	21.8	14.6
Child removed from family home by court order	1.2	11.6	4.6	14.1	7.5
<b>Out of home placement</b>					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
No out of home placement	79.3	76.7	77.1	61.5	74.4
Children's Home Institution-NO individual carer	2.4	11.6	1.8	10.3	6.5
Mother/child shelter	6.1	2.3	6.4	1.3	3.5
Kinship Care with relatives/extended family	3.7	0.0	4.6	6.4	5.0
Foster Care with volunteer/paid carers	4.9	0.0	7.3	19.2	8.5
Adoption with parents agreement or court order	0.0	2.3	0.0	1.3	0.5
Abuser leaves the family home	3.7	2.3	2.8	0.0	1.5

Table C.2.6.1 presents the data related to services included in assessment and confirmation of allegation, as well as about measures taken with a view to protecting a child. CSW has mainly carried out the assessment and confirmation of allegations in terms of all forms of CAN. Apart from the CWS, health services, police and judicial services were also involved, whereby all said services were most engaged in assessment and confirmation of suspected sexual abuse of a child. When it comes to type of legal action taken in case of suspicion and confirmation of abuse, CSW has, within its jurisdiction, undertaken all measures in social protection domain with no court involvement in respect of all forms of maltreatment except sexual abuse. The procedure of emergency child protection has been applied in about 20% of cases in terms of all forms of CAN, except neglect where it has been applied in more than one third of cases. Judicial action to remove parent(s) right has been mainly taken in case of sexual abuse and neglect, whereas police and judicial action to prosecute abuser has been usually taken in case of sexual abuse.

As regards the care plan for child, the data demonstrate that in about a half of the cases a child has remained in family with planned intervention. The action regarding child removal from family by court order has been taken mainly in case of sexual abuse and neglect. Removal of a child from a family and home has been rarely applied in the cases monitored, that being placement to Children’s Home institution with no individual carer (sexual abuse and neglect), mother and child shelter (physical and psychological abuse) and foster care (neglect).

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

	Form of Maltreatment				
	Physical abuse (n=82)	Sexual abuse (n=43)	Psychological abuse (n=109)	Neglect (n=43)	All forms of maltreatment (n=199)
<b>Referrals made to services</b>					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.5
None	59.8	51.2	55.0	62.8	59.3
Parent support program	3.7	4.7	7.3	9.0	5.5
Drug or alcohol counselling	2.4	0.0	2.8	3.8	1.5
Other family counselling	0.0	0.0	1.8	1.3	1.0
Social welfare assistance	9.8	14.0	11.0	20.5	12.6
Food Bank	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	1.0
Shelter services	4.9	4.7	7.3	3.8	5.0
Domestic violence counselling	18.3	11.6	22.0	3.8	13.6
Psychiatric services	3.7	14.0	5.5	5.1	5.0
Psychological services	8.5	25.6	12.8	9.0	13.1
Special education referral	0.0	2.3	0.9	1.3	1.0
Recreational program	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Victim support program	0.0	2.3	0.9	0.0	1.0
Medical/dental services	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other child counselling	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Services received</b>					
Unspecified	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.5
None	56.1	51.2	55.0	62.8	59.3
Parent support program	3.7	4.7	7.3	9.0	5.5
Drug or alcohol counselling	2.4	0.0	2.8	3.8	1.5
Other family counselling	0.0	0.0	1.8	1.3	1.0
Social welfare assistance	9.8	11.6	11.0	20.5	12.1
Food Bank	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	1.0
Shelter services	4.9	4.7	5.5	2.6	4.0
Domestic violence counselling	18.3	11.6	22.9	5.1	14.1
Psychiatric services	3.7	11.6	4.6	3.8	4.0

Psychological services	11.0	27.9	13.8	9.0	14.6
Special education referral	0.0	2.3	2.8	3.8	2.0
Recreational program	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Victim support program	0.0	2.3	1.8	0.0	1.5
Medical/dental services	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.5
Other child counselling	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Data on referrals made to services and services provided demonstrate that, generally speaking, (all forms of CAN) more than a half of families (59.3%) have not referred to any of the services dealing with children and families. When it comes to concrete services families referred to and services required, domestic violence counselling (13.6%), psychological counselling services (13.1%) and social welfare assistance (12.6%) have been the most prevalent. Nearly the same percentage of families referred to shelter for violence victims (5%), parent support program (5.5%) and psychiatric services (5%). Social protection services (social welfare) were mainly referred to by the families characterised with neglect and sexual abuse of a child. Furthermore, families with sexual abuse of a child referred to the relevant medical service in psychological and psychiatric domain. The families with physical and psychological child abuse mainly referred to domestic violence counselling service, which may imply that in these families partner violence is present, too. The families least referred to victim support program, Food Bank, special education program and drug or alcohol counselling services. In line with the services families referred to for assistance and support is the type of services provided on that occasion, whereby nearly 60% of the families from which a child-victim of abuse and neglect comes from, have not been provided with any service regarding assistance or support.

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

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

	Availability of information (n=758)			
	Available information		Non-available information (missing/unspecified)	
	f	%	f	%
Report date (exact date of intake)	199	100	0	0
<b>Child-related information</b>				
Age	199	100	0	0
Date of birth	199	100	0	0
Gender	199	100	0	0
Nationality	199	100	0	0
Educational Status	199	100	0	0
Work Status	199	100	0	0
Education-related problems	199	100	0	0
Behaviour related problems	199	100	0	0
Substance-abuse problems	199	100	0	0
Diagnosed Disabilities	199	100	0	0
<b>Contact details</b>				
Telephone number	190	95.5	9	4.5
Address	199	100	0	0
<b>Incident related information</b>				
Duration of maltreatment	199	100	0	0
Source of referral	199	100	0	0
Scene of incident	199	100	0	0
Form of maltreatment	199	100	0	0
<b>Physical abuse (n=247)</b>				
Status of substantiation	82	100	0	0
Specific Forms	82	100	0	0
Injury due to physical abuse	82	100	0	0
Nature of injury(-ies)	82	100	0	0
<b>Sexual abuse (n=99)</b>				
Status of substantiation	43	100	0	0
Specific Forms	43	100	0	0
<b>Psychological abuse (n=709)</b>				
Status of substantiation	109	100	0	0
Specific Forms	109	100	0	0
<b>Neglect (n=625)</b>				
Status of substantiation	78	100	0	0
Specific Forms	78	100	0	0
<b>Case assessment of allegation</b>	198	99.5	1	0.5
<b>Maltreatment confirmation</b>	198	99.5	1	0.5
Legal action taken	198	99.5	1	0.5
Care plan for child	199	100	0	0
Out of Home placement	199	100	0	0



(Table C.3. cont.)

	Availability of information (n=758)			
	Available information		Non-available information (missing/unspecified)	
	f	%	f	%
<b>Perpetrator(s)' related information</b>				
Number of perpetrators	228	100	0	0
Status of allegation	223	97.8	5	2.2
Gender	224	98.2	4	1.8
Age	197	86.40	31	13.60
Nationality	211	92.54	17	7.46
Educational level	203	89.0	25	11.0
Employment status	212	93.0	16	7.0
Marital status	209	91.7	19	8.3
Relationship to child	221	96.9	7	3.1
History of substance abuse	208	91.2	20	8.8
Physical-Mental Disabilities	200	87.7	28	12.3
History of victimization/abuse	196	86.0	32	14.0
Previous similar allegations	208	91.2	20	8.8
<b>Contact details</b>				
Telephone number	190	83.3	38	16.7
Address	222	97.4	6	2.6
<b>Caregiver(s) related information</b>				
Relation to Perpetrators				
Number of caregivers	191	100.0	0	0.0
Relationship to Child	178	93.2	13	6.8
Type of Guardianship	178	93.2	13	6.8
Gender	180	94.2	11	5.8
Age	171	89.5	20	10.5
Nationality	107	56.0	84	44.0
Educational level	161	84.3	30	15.7
Employment status	173	90.6	18	9.4
Marital status	176	92.1	15	7.9
History of substance abuse	177	92.7	14	7.3
Physical-Mental Disabilities	179	93.7	12	6.3
History of victimization/abuse	175	91.6	16	8.4
History of CAN allegations	179	93.7	12	6.3
<b>Contact details</b>				
Telephone number	182	95.3	9	4.7
Address	199	100.0	0	0.0
<b>Family-related information</b>				
Family status	197	99.0	2	1.0
Number of co-habitants	197	99.0	2	1.0
Co-habitants' identity	197	99.0	2	1.0
Other CAN victims	196	98.5	3	1.5
Other types of abuse	199	100.0	0	0.0
Referrals made to services	198	99.5	1	0.5
Services received	198	99.5	1	0.5
<b>Household-related information</b>				
Housing adequacy	176	88.4	23	11.6
Household income	184	92.5	15	7.5
Source of income	183	92.0	16	8.0
Financial problems	199	100.0	0	0.0
<b>Previous maltreatment</b>				
Type of most severe maltreatment	199	100.0	0	0.0
Perpetrator(s)	197	99.0	2	1.0
Investigating agencies	199	100.0	0	0.0
<b>Follow-up information</b>				
	197	99.0	2	1.0

The primary aim of the CBSS was to measure all forms of CAN incidence rate and to compare its results with the results of the epidemiological survey in order to identify to what extent the official, registered incidence of child abuse and neglect is in accordance with the hidden incidence in general population.

The other aims were to learn more on children's vulnerability to CAN and to specific forms of maltreatment, on the characteristics of the child- victim of CAN, characteristics of families and households of maltreated children, of CAN perpetrators, of caregivers of maltreated children and also on agencies involved in administration of CAN cases and services provided to children victims and their families.

The methodology and the instruments agreed on the level of the Consortium were respected in the study. For extraction of information an Extraction form A for organizations and Extraction form B for individual cases were used.

The CBSS Serbia was realized in the centres for social work, which, by the field of activity, belong to the sector of social welfare and are the main statutory agency responsible for child protection.

Collection of data was made in 14 centres for social work in same municipalities in which the epidemiological study took place. These 14 CSW are 9,8% of the total of 153 CSW in the country but the way of sampling was such that the sample is representative. There is the same number of organizations in every geographical region covered by the BECAN project (Belgrade, Vojvodina, West-South West Serbia and East-South-East Serbia). All 14 centres cover urban and suburban areas, while 11 centres included in the sample also cover the rural area.

The characteristic of the CSW in the sample are the following: All centres included in the sample are involved in activities at all levels of prevention (primary, secondary and tertiary), as well as legal aid provided to beneficiaries. Beside the paper archives which are kept by all CSW, electronic archives are maintained by 11, and databases by 3 centres for social work. Results by regions show that electronic archives are maintained by 3 SCWs in Belgrade, 3 in Vojvodina and 3 in East – South East Serbia, and 2 CSWs in West – South West Serbia. All 3 CSWs in Belgrade and one CSW in Vojvodina keep databases. The staff members of the CSW are trained for recording CAN cases, and all of them are social workers.

The main results are those concerning the incidence of CAN. On the whole, based on officially registered cases, it can be concluded that, on average, two out of 1,000 children are victims of some form of abuse or neglect. The most prevalent is the psychological abuse, while sexual abuse is the least prevalent. When interpreting the data on sexual abuse, we should certainly keep in mind that the already low readiness in both children and families to report CAN is even lower for this type of abuse. In addition to this, an almost equal incidence of physical abuse and neglect of children has been recorded. Looking by age, children at the age of 12 are the most exposed to a form of abuse or neglect, while children at the age of 15 are the least exposed. More specifically, physical and psychological abuse is the most prevalent in children at the age of 11, while most cases of sexual abuse were recorded in children aged 12, and neglect in thirteen-year-olds.

Certain gender-related differences are also noted. Namely, the results have shown that boys at the age of 11 are the most exposed to some form of CAN, whereas for girls the age limit rises. Namely, the highest CAN incidence in girls has been recorded at the age of 14. The distribution of different forms of CAN is comparatively the same in boys and girls, with sexual abuse being somewhat more prevalent in girls, which was expected and in accordance with the results of numerous studies, and the thesis on gender dimension of CAN. Looking by regions, the highest registered incidence of CAN in the course of 2010 was reported in the region of West – South West Serbia, as well as in Vojvodina. The lowest CAN incidence was registered in East – South East Serbia, followed by Belgrade. The case of single and multiple form of CAN n are equally present in the recorded cases. Looking by gender and region, both boys and girls in Belgrade are more exposed to multiple CAN, while in the region of West-South West Serbia multiple violent victimization is more present compared to single form of CAN only in girls.

Regarding the status of registered cases of abuse and neglect (substantiated of suspected abuse) the results indicate that the highest percentage refers to substantiated cases of physical, psychological and sexual abuse and neglect. Unsubstantiated cases of a suspected form of CAN are significantly less present. In that sense, most cases falling into this category of “indicated” cases are related to sexual abuse of children (9.3%). In addition to this, 5.1% of neglect cases have the status of unsubstantiated CAN.. Looking by the type of CAN and by regions, results indicate that Belgrade and Vojvodina have the highest number of substantiated cases of psychological abuse and neglect, the region of West – South West Serbia reported the highest number of substantiated cases of physical and psychological abuse, while all CAN cases reported and also substantiated in the observed period in the region of East – South East Serbia were the cases of violent victimization of children. In Belgrade and the region of West – South West Serbia suspected sexual abuse was the most prevalent in reported cases, while in Vojvodina it was suspected physical abuse.

The characteristic of the perpetrators were the following. Mostly males were the perpetrators of all types of CAN except the in neglect where the males and females are equally present as perpetrators. The perpetrators are mostly middle aged persons, with middle level of education, except in case of sexual abuse where 1/3 of perpetrators have a postgraduate university education. One half of perpetrators are unemployed and in beglect cases it is even more frequent.

As to the relation between the child and the perpetrator, it is the father who was the perpetrator in most cases except in cases of sexual violence where the teachers were the perpetrators in 1/3 of cases. The mothers as perpetrators are less present then the fathers except in cases of neglect. One third of perpetrators of all types of CAN are abusing alcohol

In most of registered cases the child-victim is leaving in complete family, with both parents but the financial situation and the lodging of most of families is rather poor. This is particularly the situation in families where the child neglect is the main type of CAN

Our research findings indicate that only a small proportion of children who experienced some type of CAN comes to the attention of the Centers for social work which could provide them the needed help and support. In the CSW app. 2 cases of CAN are registered in 1000 children of general population (incidence rate per 1000 children in 1 year= 1.9), and some of these children experienced multiple victimization.

On the other hand, according to the results of the epidemiological study 45,5% of children, that is somewhat less than 500 in 1000 children, reported on experience of 2-3 types of violence, and 2,9% of children, that is app. 30 in 1000 children experienced all 4 types of violence (physical, psychological, sexual and neglect) in the year that preceded the investigation, In other words, only each 15<sup>th</sup> child who experienced all 4 types of violence reached the CSW.

The origins of this gap between the high incidence of CAN in general population and a low incidence of cases registered in CSW: are twofold

First, there is a low sensitivity of parents to the adverse childhood experiences of their children. Data on help seeking and received services indicate that more than half of families (59.3%) did not turn for help because of violence to any child or family service. One of the reasons for such behaviour of parents is certainly their attitude towards violence against children. The fact is that many parents consider corporal punishment as legal and obligatory method of upbringing children.

Another reason of parental reluctance to turn to social services for help is their mistrust because of the low efficiency of these services. The research indicated that the inter-sectoral cooperation and the exchange of data on individual cases between social protection, health care, educational services, police and others in the child protection network is on a very low level.

Within the services which are in charge of assessment and management of CAN cases, the monitoring of CAN cases seems to be the weakest point. It seems that plenty of information is recorded, but no secondary analysis takes place. Categorization of the cases, analysis of referrals and the outcomes of the casework are missing, and without them interventions and measures remain inefficient.

Another great challenge is that there is no central databases, and given that the institutions dealing with child abuse and neglect use different parameters for observing and recording the cases no accurate data on the real extent of violence that children suffer in Serbia, are available.

It became evident that the further development of system for prevention and protection from abuse and neglect is impossible without establishment of a unique system for registration of data on violence and monitoring the effects of implemented measures and programs.

The Action plan for the implementation of the National Strategy for prevention and protection of children from abuse and neglect has as one of the specific objectives (2.6) “Improvement of the system for collecting and analyzing data and reporting on CAN and exploitation”. The following activities for reaching this objective are recommended::

- Development of new or improvement of existing procedures and tools for registration and follow up of trends in the field of protection of children from violence across all sectors: health, education, social protection, police and judiciary.
- Development of an integrated system of registration of data in CAN (central data base)
- Training of the staff in all sectors for the application of central data base
- Conducting inter-sectoral research on violence against children
- Use of international standardized questionnaires for surveillance of violence against children

The results and experience gained by the implementation of the BECAN study as well as the developed and modified instruments are a great asset in reaching the above specific objective. It is encouraging that the first steps in integrating the outputs of the BECAN study in further development of the CAN surveillance system in Serbia are already in progress.

ANNEX I: List of Agencies

<b>Region</b>	<b>Municipality</b>
Beograd	Center for Social Work Novi Beograd
Beograd	Center for Social Work Cukarica
Beograd	Center for Social Work Stari Grad
Vojvodina	Center for Social Work Ruma
Vojvodina	Center for Social Work Pancevo
Vojvodina	Center for Social Work Novi Sad
Vojvodina	Center for Social Work Kikinda
West/SW Serbia	Center for Social Work Prijepolje
West/SW Serbia	Center for Social Work Kragujevac
West/SW Serbia	Center for Social Work Cacak
East/SE Serbia	Center for Social Work Aleksinac
East/SE Serbia	Center for Social Work Cuprija
East/SE Serbia	Center for Social Work Niš
East/SE Serbia	Center for Social Work Kruševac