

**TECHNICAL REPORT**

# Violence against women: an EU-wide survey

Survey methodology,  
sample and fieldwork



**FRA**

EUROPEAN UNION AGENCY FOR FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS



***Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers  
to your questions about the European Union.***

Freephone number (\*):  
00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11

(\*): Certain mobile telephone operators do not allow access to 00 800 numbers or these calls may be billed.

More information on the European Union is available on the Internet (<http://europa.eu>).

FRA – European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights  
Schwarzenbergplatz 11 – 1040 Vienna – Austria  
Tel.: +43 158030-0 – Fax: +43 158030-699  
Email: [info@fra.europa.eu](mailto:info@fra.europa.eu) – [fra.europa.eu](http://fra.europa.eu)

Cataloguing data can be found at the end of this publication.

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2014

ISBN 978-92-9239-273-4  
doi:10.2811/67959

© European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2014  
Reproduction is authorised, except for commercial purposes, provided the source is acknowledged.

# Violence against women: an EU-wide survey

Survey methodology,  
sample and fieldwork

# Country codes

Country code	Country
AT	Austria
BE	Belgium
BG	Bulgaria
CY	Cyprus
CZ	Czech Republic
DE	Germany
DK	Denmark
EE	Estonia
EL	Greece
ES	Spain
FI	Finland
FR	France
HR	Croatia
HU	Hungary
IE	Ireland
IT	Italy
LT	Lithuania
LU	Luxembourg
LV	Latvia
MT	Malta
NL	Netherlands
PL	Poland
PT	Portugal
RO	Romania
SE	Sweden
SI	Slovenia
SK	Slovakia
UK	United Kingdom



# Contents

INTRODUCTION .....	5
1 DEVELOPING THE SURVEY .....	6
1.1. Stakeholder consultations.....	6
1.2. Pretest/pilot study .....	6
1.3. Preparations for the full-scale survey .....	7
2 QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPMENT .....	8
2.1. Structure of the questionnaire .....	8
2.2. Questionnaire translation.....	9
2.3. Mode of completion.....	9
3 INTERVIEWER TRAINING .....	11
3.1. Training activities – national research managers .....	11
3.2. Training activities – interviewers .....	11
4 SAMPLING.....	12
4.1. Sampling method .....	13
4.2. Clustering.....	13
4.3. Selection of addresses.....	14
4.4. Selection of respondents .....	14
5 PILOTING .....	16
6 FIELDWORK .....	18
6.1. Fieldwork materials.....	18
6.2. Fieldwork dates .....	18
6.3. Fieldwork observation.....	18
6.3.1. Sensitivity of fieldwork.....	18
6.3.2. Fieldwork challenges.....	19
6.4. Interview duration.....	20
7 RESPONSE RATE .....	21
8 QUALITY CONTROL .....	26
8.1. Editing and data validation .....	26
9 WEIGHTING .....	28
9.1. Weighting procedure.....	28
9.2. Sensitivity analysis based on the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents .....	29
10 CONFIDENCE INTERVALS.....	32
11 MEDIA MONITORING.....	34
11.1. Search terms .....	34
11.2. Overview of the outcomes of media monitoring.....	37
11.3. Assessment of the media monitoring.....	37
REFERENCES .....	39
ANNEXES .....	40



# Introduction

This is the first European Union (EU)-wide survey to collect comparable data on women's experiences of gender-based violence in all 28 EU Member States. The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) carried out the survey in response to a request from the European Parliament<sup>1</sup> for data on violence against women, which the Council of the EU reiterated in its Conclusions on the eradication of violence against women in the EU.<sup>2</sup>

This report presents a detailed overview of the research methods used by FRA when collecting survey data on women's personal experiences of various forms of violence. FRA started to develop the survey through desk research and stakeholder consultations in 2010, followed by a pretest study in six EU Member States in 2011 to test a draft questionnaire. The full-scale survey in the EU-28 was carried out in 2012.

The survey interviewed a total of 42,000 women – 1,500 in each of the 28 EU Member States, with the exception of Luxembourg, where the sample size was 900 women.<sup>3</sup> Respondents were selected using a random probability methodology to give a representative sample of the female population aged 18–74 years in each country. All respondents were interviewed face to face by female interviewers, who received training in person to address the topics covered in the survey. The training included measures to ensure that the interviewers carried out the interviews in a sensitive and confidential manner.

FRA contracted Ipsos MORI to manage and coordinate the data collection work in the EU-28. Ipsos MORI carried out this work in partnership with the European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control, affiliated with the United Nations (HEUNI), and the United Nations Inter-regional Crime and Justice Research Institute (UNICRI), based in Helsinki and Turin, respectively. Ipsos MORI oversaw the data collection, subcontracting national research agencies in each country to carry out the interviews. UNICRI and HEUNI advised in survey design and interviewer training, as well as helping to manage country contacts.

The following chapters cover the procedures used in the development and administration of the survey. The annexes related to fieldwork materials include:

- a list of country-specific categories used in the questionnaire;
- the survey questionnaire, which was the data collection tool used by interviewers, either in computer-assisted format (in 23 EU Member States) or on paper (in five Member States);
- the contact sheet, which interviewers completed every time they contacted an address, to make sure they interviewed a randomly selected respondent and recorded the outcome of the interview correctly.

---

1 European Parliament (2009), Resolution on the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council – An area of freedom, security and justice serving the citizen – Stockholm programme, Strasbourg, P7\_TA(2009)0090, para. 29.

2 Council of the EU (2010), *Council conclusions on the eradication of violence against women in the European Union*, 3000th Employment and social policy meeting, Brussels, 8 March 2010.

3 The sample size was smaller in Luxembourg because of the relative size of the population in the country and also the small team of interviewers who were available for fieldwork.

# 1 Developing the survey

The survey development started in 2010 and included desk research on existing national and international violence against women surveys, as well as stakeholder consultations to identify the key policy needs and expectations in this area. This process also included an analysis of calls for data which had been made when EU Member States underwent a review by the Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW Committee). The overview carried out by FRA also covered the need for indicators, which the United Nations (UN Economic Commission for Europe and UN Statistical Commission) had suggested, as well as other data needs identified in, for example, resolutions by the European Parliament and the Council of Europe.

## 1.1. Stakeholder consultations

FRA set out to design the content of the survey so that it would serve the needs of policy makers at the EU and Member State levels, in response to repeated calls for an EU-wide overview of the prevalence of various forms of violence against women, as well as the nature and consequences of such violence. The first stakeholder meeting, in June 2010, convened a group of research experts, policy makers, practitioners and non-governmental organisation (NGO) representatives to discuss the key issues which the survey could address. This meeting was followed immediately by an expert meeting in which FRA discussed the practical challenges related to the survey, from questionnaire design to sampling and fieldwork methods. In November 2010, FRA organised another consultation, this time concentrating on policy makers and their data needs.

Following the early, broad-based consultations at the time when the aims of the survey were being developed, FRA continued to consult experts in collecting and analysing survey data on violence against women, at both the national and international levels. The experts met, in slightly different groupings, twice in 2011 (in January and in July) and again in January 2013. The meeting in January 2011 discussed the planned pilot/pretest study and the draft set of survey questions to be tested, whereas the meeting in July 2011 discussed the results of the pilot/pretest study with a view to developing the full-scale survey. The experts met for the final time in January 2013, to examine the preliminary results from the full-scale survey, to assist FRA in consideration of final data analysis.

Over 2010–2013, the expert meetings involved a number of leading specialists in the area of survey research and

analysis of violence against women in the EU. These included Stéphanie Condon (Institut national d'études démographiques, INED, France); Claudia Garcia-Moreno (World Health Organization); Carol Hagemann-White (University of Osnabrück, Germany); Markku Heiskanen (European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control, affiliated with the United Nations); Henriette Jansen (independent consultant); Kristiina Kangaspunta (United Nations Office for Drugs and Crime); Liz Kelly (London Metropolitan University, the United Kingdom); Agnieszka Litwinska (Eurostat); Manuela Martínez (University of Valencia, Spain); Santiago Moran Medina (Ministry of Equality, Spain); Els Mortier (European Commission, Directorate-General for Justice); Maria Giuseppina Muratore (Istat, Italy); Natalia Ollus (HEUNI); Jurgita Pečiūrienė (European Institute for Gender Equality, EIGE); Renée Römkens (Institute on Gender Equality and Women's History, the Netherlands); Monika Schröttle (University of Bielefeld, Germany); and Sylvia Walby (Lancaster University, the United Kingdom).

## 1.2. Pretest/pilot study

FRA carried out a pilot/pretest study in six EU Member States – Finland, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Poland and Spain – in 2011. This study was designed to test the draft survey questionnaire through the use of quantitative and qualitative research methodologies, which included face-to-face interviews and focus group discussions.

Following an open call for tender, HEUNI and UNICRI jointly coordinated the research, and the two organisations were also in charge of the pretest fieldwork in Finland and Italy, respectively. In other pretest countries, the work was managed by the University of Bielefeld (Germany), the Eszter Foundation (Hungary), the Feminoteka Foundation (Poland) and the University of Pompeu Fabra (Spain).

In these EU Member States, interviewers were trained to carry out cognitive interviews with randomly selected women (15 respondents in each of the six Member States) and with women who were identified by women's shelters and other victim support organisations as having been victims of violence (10 respondents in each of the six). Although this approach to the selection of interviewees was not used in the full-scale survey – which selected all respondents through random probability sampling procedures – it was important to ensure that a number of interviewees in the pretest had some experiences of violence to report, to test all parts of the draft survey questionnaire. Attention was also given to having women from different age groups





participate in the research. FRA participated in selected training sessions to assess the functioning of the training programme and to identify additional training needs for the full-scale survey. The interviewers were encouraged to give feedback on each stage of the fieldwork, from initial training sessions to the end of interviews.

The interviews were based on a draft survey questionnaire which the interviewer and the interviewee completed together, followed by a cognitive interview concerning the questions and topics that had been addressed earlier. The cognitive interviews explored different women's understanding of key concepts to be examined in the survey; they related, in particular, to experiences of physical, sexual and psychological violence in the 'domestic' sphere as well as in other locations such as the workplace, and new settings, such as internet-based social networks. After each interview, the interviewer completed a separate questionnaire to document any problems she had had when carrying out the interview. The interviews with women identified by women's shelters and other support organisations were also recorded, and the recordings were evaluated based on the behavioural coding approach. This involves researchers listening to the recorded interviews and using an agreed criteria to code instances where the interviewee had problems answering a particular item, or she asked for more information, as well as cases where the interviewer had problems in asking the question as it was written in the questionnaire.

Following the results of the pretest, FRA revised the draft survey questionnaire before it was used in the full-scale survey of the 28 EU Member States. Overall, the pretest results highlighted the importance of sufficient interviewer training for the success of the fieldwork, and the role of the NGOs as a resource for interviewees who would like to continue talking about their experiences with someone after the survey interview. The feedback from the research teams also strongly recommended the use of computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI) to assure high data quality and a 'smooth' survey experience for both the interviewer and the interviewee. However, all survey companies are not geared up for the use of CAPI in all Member States.

### 1.3. Preparations for the full-scale survey

Based on the results of the pretest study and inputs received through the expert consultations, FRA launched an open call for tender to select the contractor for the full-scale survey covering the 28 EU Member States.<sup>4</sup> Many of the key parameters of the survey were already fixed by FRA in the technical specifications of the call for tender. For example, it specified that the survey would be done using face-to-face interviews by only female interviewers. All interviewers working on the project were required to attend a two-day training programme to ensure that they were acquainted with the topic of the research and with good practices for carrying out a survey on a sensitive subject.

<sup>4</sup> At the time of the survey fieldwork in 2012, Croatia was not yet an EU Member State. However, as Croatia joined the EU in July 2013, in the interests of brevity this report refers to information pertaining to '28 EU Member States' instead of '27 EU Member States and Croatia'.

## 2 Questionnaire development

The violence against women survey questionnaire was developed by FRA. When finalising the questionnaire, FRA took into account the comments and suggestions stemming from the pretest study, meetings with stakeholders and survey experts, and inputs from the fieldwork agencies. Over the course of the questionnaire design and development, FRA also referred to a number of previous national surveys on violence against women, from both EU Member States as well as non-EU countries such as Australia, Canada and the United States. Particular consideration was given to surveys which had sought to measure the prevalence and nature of violence across countries, such as the International Violence Against Women Survey<sup>5</sup> (IVAWS) and the WHO Multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence.<sup>6</sup>

### 2.1. Structure of the questionnaire

The final questionnaire consists of 12 sections, as illustrated in Table 2.1. The full survey questionnaire is included in this report as Annex 2. In some cases, the titles of the questionnaire sections in Annex 2 differ from what is indicated in Table 2.1 as the topic of the corresponding section. Drafting the questionnaire, it was important to avoid terms such as 'rape', 'violence' or 'stalking', because different women might have different preconceived ideas on the types of violence usually associated with these terms, and the types of perpetrators involved. Following the example of numerous national surveys on violence against women, the FRA survey also asked about women's experiences of violence by describing various acts of violence in as concrete terms as possible. Therefore, the survey asked women whether or not they had experienced any of these acts, instead of asking if they had generally experienced 'violence' or 'rape', because the latter approach would have made results less comparable between respondents and Member States.

As a result, for example, whereas Table 2.1 indicates that section H of the survey questionnaire addressed women's experiences of stalking, in the questionnaire in Annex 2 this section is titled 'Repeated incidents'. While during the face-to-face interviews only the interviewer could see the questionnaire, it nevertheless used terms such as 'Repeated incident' to discourage the interviewer from resorting to other terms (such as

'stalking', 'violence' or 'rape') when introducing the sections and interacting with the respondent.

Table 2.1: Structure of the questionnaire

Section of the questionnaire	Topics covered
A	Introduction
B	Health, feelings of safety, knowledge about available services
C	Sexual harassment
D	Experience of violence by non-partners
E	Experience of violence by the current partner
F	Background questions concerning the current partner
G	Experience of violence by previous partners
H	Stalking
I	Experience of violence in childhood
J	Socio-demographic questions concerning the respondent
K	Concluding questions
L	Self-completion questionnaire

Source: FRA, *Violence against women: an EU-wide survey, 2012*

Sections A to K of the questionnaire were administered by the interviewer. In some cases, showcards were used to assist women in remembering the available answer categories, especially when the questions involved many answer categories and respondents could choose multiple categories, based on their experiences. After the face-to-face interview (Sections A-K), interviewers gave respondents a short self-completion questionnaire (Section L). The aim of the self-completion questionnaire was to offer women another way of disclosing their experiences of violence, in a more anonymous way than the face-to-face interview. Respondents were asked to complete the short paper questionnaire on their own, without the assistance of the interviewer, and to seal it in an envelope which would not be opened by the interviewer and which was delivered separately to the central research team. The additional experiences of violence – that is experiences which were indicated on the self-completion questionnaire but not during the face-to-face interview – have been examined in the main results report.<sup>7</sup> They add only a little to the prevalence rates of various types of violence.

<sup>5</sup> Johnson et al. (2008).

<sup>6</sup> Garcia-Moreno et al. (2005).

<sup>7</sup> FRA (2014), *Violence against women: an EU-wide survey. Main results*, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union, available at: <http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2014/vaw-survey-main-results>.

## 2.2. Questionnaire translation

An English-language master questionnaire was finalised and approved before being translated into other languages of the 28 EU Member States (Table 2.2). To ensure that questions and results were comparable, national adaptations to the questions were kept to a minimum. In a small number of questions, the answer categories were adapted to each country to make it easier for the respondents to answer. This involved, for example, the education categories and income categories. In such cases, the national categories, which are listed for each country in Annex 3, were later coded back to common categories for EU-level comparisons.

Table 2.2: Questionnaire languages used in each country

Country	Languages
AT	German
BE	French, Flemish
BG	Bulgarian
CY	Greek
CZ	Czech
DE	German
DK	Danish
EE	Estonian, Russian
EL	Greek
ES	Castilian, Catalan
FI	Finnish
FR	French
HR	Croatian
HU	Hungarian
IE	English
IT	Italian
LT	Lithuanian
LU	Luxembourgish, German, French
LV	Latvian, Russian
MT	Maltese, English
NL	Dutch
PL	Polish
PT	Portuguese
RO	Romanian
SE	Swedish
SI	Slovenian
SK	Slovakian
UK	English

Source: FRA, *Violence against women: an EU-wide survey, 2012*

The same translation process was applied for each of the languages listed in Table 2.2. This process was designed to ensure that the translated questions would closely follow the meaning of the original questions, which had been formulated in English. Therefore, a number of control measures were applied and the translation process progressed as follows:

1. When the questionnaire and showcards were almost finalised, they were sent to the national research agencies for translation.
2. The questionnaire was translated by a qualified and experienced expert from each national research agency into the relevant languages.
3. The questionnaire was also translated separately by linguists in the Ipsos MORI central translation team into each language.
4. The two translations (one produced by the national research agency and one by the Ipsos MORI translation team) were merged and researchers in each country received feedback based on this process. The national research agencies made all the necessary adjustments to the final questionnaire. The master questionnaire was also revised based on the feedback from the translation process, and the additional changes were communicated to the national research agencies so that they could amend the translations accordingly.
5. The revised translated questionnaires were proof-read by the Ipsos MORI translation team.
6. Based on the results of the pilot interviews, further small changes were made to the master questionnaire and the translations.
7. The national research agencies sent the final translated questionnaires and showcards to Ipsos MORI, and the Ipsos MORI Translation Team rechecked and validated the translated national versions.
8. The FRA provided final comments to the translations before the translations were finalised by Ipsos MORI and sent to the national research agencies.

## 2.3. Mode of completion

The survey was carried out using face-to-face interviews, which took place either in the respondent's home or in another place of her choosing. Questionnaires were administered using either computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI) or pen and paper interviewing (PAPI) (Table 2.3).

Table 2.3: Survey administration method, by EU Member State

EU Member State	Survey administration method
AT	CAPI
BE	CAPI
BG	PAPI
CY	PAPI
CZ	CAPI
DE	CAPI
DK	CAPI
EE	PAPI
EL	CAPI
ES	CAPI
FI	CAPI
FR	CAPI
HR	CAPI
HU	CAPI
IE	CAPI
IT	CAPI
LT	PAPI
LU	CAPI
LV	PAPI
MT	CAPI
NL	CAPI
PL	CAPI
PT	CAPI
RO	CAPI
SE	CAPI
SI	CAPI
SK	CAPI
UK	CAPI

Source: FRA, *Violence against women: an EU-wide survey, 2012*

While the questionnaire was being translated and checked, the countries using the CAPI data collection tool worked to code the questionnaire for the CAPI software. Based on the experiences from the pretest study, CAPI emerged as the preferred method for data collection. Because a number of questions in the final questionnaire are relevant to only some of the respondents, complex routing instructions are needed to ensure that respondents hear only the questions which are relevant to them. Once the relevant routing patterns are programmed, the CAPI software takes care of the routings and the interviewer can concentrate on the respondent. The survey used CAPI in 23 EU Member States. Research teams in five Member States did not have the necessary technical capacity, so in these Member States the interviews were carried out using paper questionnaires. In these countries, interviewers received two days of additional training in the correct application of the interviewer instructions on the paper questionnaire. The interviewer training programme is described in the next chapter.

Once the questionnaire translations had been approved, the final changes were made to the CAPI program code, which was then thoroughly tested by the research teams in each EU Member State. To test the CAPI questionnaire, the national research teams checked that the question wording and the routing were correct.



## 3 Interviewer training

The requirements for interviewers on this project were different from most surveys a research company might carry out. All interviewers selected to work had to be female and have a minimum of three months' experience of random probability survey work. This was particularly important for agencies using the random route methodology for sampling the respondents, as the interviewer's experience and ability to follow the precise instructions have a direct impact on the quality of the sample. The national research managers introduced the project to a group of experienced female interviewers in each EU Member State. The interviewers could decline to work on the project if they were not comfortable with the topic. The central coordination team trained first the national research managers, who went on to train the interviewers in each country. It is worth pointing out here that some other surveys that have included questions on violence against women – such as national crime surveys – have not always used female-only interviewers.

### 3.1. Training activities – national research managers

Each country manager was required to attend a two-day 'train-the-trainers' briefing in Berlin in February 2012 to ensure that they were well informed and able to train their agency field force. Country managers were trained in two sessions: the first on 13–14 February 2012 and the second on 15–16 February 2012. FRA attended both sessions to observe the training, to answer questions and to identify any additional training needs.

Each training session lasted two full days, and was delivered by staff from Ipsos MORI and HEUNI. The training content was divided between the two days.

#### Day 1

- an introduction to the survey
- violence against women as a phenomenon
- facts about violence
- interviewer training and selection
- sampling and fieldwork
- a practice interview

#### Day 2

- discussion about the practice interviews
- additional training and role play exercises
- further information and training on sampling and fieldwork
- a thorough introduction to the questionnaire and individual questions
- a question and answer session

Additional training was given at the end of Day 2 to the country managers from the five EU Member States where PAPI questionnaires were used. The trainers from Ipsos MORI and HEUNI, with the five country managers, examined the routing instructions included in the paper questionnaire.

### 3.2. Training activities – interviewers

HEUNI and Ipsos MORI produced the materials for the interviewer training sessions, and the same training materials were used in all EU Member States. Each country held at least two training sessions in different parts of the country to ensure that all interviewers were adequately trained. FRA staff observed training sessions in Austria, Bulgaria, Finland, Germany, Italy, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, Spain and the United Kingdom.

In line with the training of the national research managers, the interviewer training was two days in length. Training for interviewers covered the same topics as the training for country managers, although more focus was placed on the realities of fieldwork, including a detailed discussion on how to deal with distressed respondents and a thorough training session on the random route methodology (in countries where it was used). Interviewers were also encouraged to be open about how they felt about carrying out the interviews, and to report to their area manager if they felt too emotionally drained to continue. Indeed, throughout the training, emphasis was placed on ensuring the well-being of both the respondents and the interviewers, and interviewers were assured that they could stop interviewing at any stage of the fieldwork. Non-governmental organisations concerned with violence against women were invited to take part, at the beginning of training sessions, to provide some background information about the issue and inform interviewers about the services they could refer respondents to.

## 4 Sampling

To meet the key requirements of collecting good-quality, reliable and comparable data, the survey used probability sampling methods to identify respondents in each EU Member State. The sampling guidance issued for this survey and followed by all national research agencies participating in the project is based on the following principles.

1. All residents (units of the sampling universe) had a chance of being included in the sample. In a multi-stage sampling design, the selections at each stage were completed using a random method.
2. The selection probability of each sampling unit was known.
3. No substitutions were allowed. The key requirement for the random approach was that the interview be carried out with the person randomly selected in the household. Only one person was interviewed per household.
4. Repeat visits were conducted. If an interviewer did not manage to conduct an interview at the first visit

(either because nobody answered the front door or because the randomly selected respondent was not at home), she then made additional visits (she was obliged to try at least three times including the first attempt) to increase the likelihood of the selected respondent taking part in the survey. Visits had to be tried on different days and at different times of the day, with a minimum of 10 days between the first and last visit.

The survey in each EU Member State covered all women aged 18 to 74 years who were living in the Member State in question, and who spoke at least one of the official languages of the country. In total, less than 1 % of people contacted were unable to take part because they did not speak one of the official languages. Sampling frames (Table 4.1) were thus selected to ensure that every eligible female resident of the Member State had a reasonable chance of being included in the sample. As with most other household surveys, certain populations, such as persons living in institutions (those in nursing homes, prisons, army barracks, student hostels and others) and homeless people, were excluded.

Table 4.1: Sampling frames used, by EU Member State

EU Member State	Sampling frame	Pre-selected or random walk	Units of selection
AT	Statistics Austria census	Random Walk	Area
BE	Communes	Random Walk	Area
BG	Central Election Commission of Bulgaria	Random Walk	Area
CY	Population Census by the Statistical Service	Random Walk	Area
CZ	Regional technical units (database by Czech Statistical Bureau)	Random Walk	Area
DE	Sample selected by the company ADM	Random Walk	Area
DK	Post codes/communes	Preselected	Individuals
EE	Census enumeration areas	Random Walk	Area
EL	Census enumeration areas	Random Walk	Area
ES	Electoral districts	Random Walk	Area
FI	Population register	Preselected	Individuals
FR	Statistics of the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (INSEE)	Random Walk	Area
HR	List of all polling stations	Random Walk	Area
HU	Territories of the polling stations	Preselected	Addresses
IE	Census 2006 Population by Area Volume 1	Random Walk	Area
IT	Census enumeration areas	Random Walk	Area
LT	Electoral districts	Random Walk	Area
LU	Communes	Preselected	Addresses
LV	Geoadministrative area sample frame	Random Walk	Area
MT	Electoral register	Preselected	Individuals
NL	Four-digit post codes	Preselected	Addresses
PL	Geoadministrative area sample frame	Random Walk	Area

EU Member State	Sampling frame	Pre-selected or random walk	Units of selection
PT	Census 2001	Random Walk	Area
RO	Electoral districts	Random Walk	Area
SE	SCB (Statistics Sweden)	Preselected	Individuals
SI	Population register	Preselected	Individuals
SK	Regional technical units	Random Walk	Area
UK	Small user postcode address file	Preselected	Addresses

Source: FRA, *Violence against women: an EU-wide survey, 2012*

The type of sampling frame and the information available on the sampled addresses and individuals in each EU Member State influenced the choice of method that could be used for contacting the respondents (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2: Method used for contacting the sampled addresses and individuals for the first time, by EU Member State

EU Member State	Method of first contact
AT	Visit
BE	Visit
BG	Visit
CY	Visit
CZ	Visit
DE	Visit
DK	Telephone
EE	Visit
EL	Visit
ES	Visit
FI	Telephone
FR	Visit
HR	Visit
HU	Visit
IE	Visit
IT	Visit
LT	Visit
LU	Visit
LV	Visit
MT	Letter
NL	Visit
PL	Visit
PT	Visit
RO	Visit
SE	Telephone
SI	Letter
SK	Visit
UK	Letter

Source: FRA, *Violence against women: an EU-wide survey, 2012*

## 4.1. Sampling method

The sampling was based on a two-stage clustered stratified design with equal probability of selection for households within clusters. As the first stage, primary sampling units (PSUs) were selected for this survey with probability proportional to size (PPS). Wherever possible, local electoral territorial units were used as PSUs, as they have the benefit of having limited and well-defined geographic boundaries and there is usually up-to-date information available concerning the people living there. Census enumeration districts or local authorities were used as PSUs where local electoral territorial units were not available. In each PSU, a set number of addresses was selected with a view to conducting a maximum of 30 interviews within the PSU.

To ensure maximum representativeness of the selected PSUs, the samples were implicitly stratified by geographical region and by urban/rural character. All PSUs available in each country were compiled in one list, representing the total population of the country. They were then listed within each region by level of urban-ness, and then in alphabetical order. The PSUs were then selected with probability proportional to size. PSU size was measured by the number of households or, if that information was not available, by the number of residents 18 years old and older, the number of citizens 18 years old or older, or the total population size within the PSU.

Typically, 50 PSUs and 50 reserve PSUs were selected in each country, with the aim of conducting 30 interviews in each PSU. In most countries, the reserve PSUs were used only after the addresses in the main PSUs had been exhausted.

## 4.2. Clustering

The survey used a clustered sample design. Clustering is a process by which the survey population is broken down into smaller geographical areas (clusters), and a limited number of clusters are selected for inclusion in the survey. This process reduces the statistical efficiency of samples (i.e. it leads to wider confidence

intervals), but this effect is limited and clustering is often necessary because without it collecting data through face-to-face interviews would be logistically difficult and much more expensive. If clustering were not employed, interviewers would have to travel long distances between addresses, making it very time- and cost-inefficient to complete fieldwork and without a significant gain in sample reliability.

### 4.3. Selection of addresses

Preselected samples increase the accountability of interviewers and ensure that the probability of selecting a respondent is always known and can be measured. A preselected sampling frame is one which has all sampling units (based on addresses or individuals) in one list. For example, in the United Kingdom, the Small User Postcode Address File (PAF), developed and updated by the Royal Mail, lists all addresses in the country which receive fewer than 25 pieces of correspondence each day, which effectively excludes businesses and lists predominantly private residences.

In countries where preselected sampling frames do not exist, the random route technique of selecting addresses was used. This did not change other aspects of sampling design. For example, the same procedure for selecting PSUs was followed in all countries, irrespective of whether sampling used preselected or random route techniques.

In those countries where pre-selected sampling frames were used, the addresses to be visited were selected by simple random '1-in-*n*' selection of households or individuals from the list within each PSU.

In countries where random route fieldwork procedure was used, the fieldwork coordinator selected the first address to be visited by the interviewer. Wherever possible, the geographic central point of the PSU was selected, at a roughly equal distance from all borders of the PSU. All other addresses to be visited were selected by the interviewers themselves, following strict instructions issued by the central research team. The number of addresses to be visited was fixed by the country project manager based on an estimated response rate. The exception to this was Latvia, where a separate field force of enumerators selected addresses before the fieldwork started.

### 4.4. Selection of respondents

The central research team developed a contact sheet to document the respondent selection process and to assist interviewers in determining whom to interview in households with more than one eligible respondent.

This contact sheet, which is included in Annex 3, had the following sections:

- A. Information about the address
- B. Dwelling unit selection
- C. Respondent selection
- D-I. Final outcomes
- J. Refusals

The contact sheet was used to ensure that the household and individual were randomly selected. Contact sheets were completed for all visited addresses.

If more than one household was found at an address, interviewers were instructed to list all households on the contact sheet and randomly select one household, following the same instructions as for the selection of an individual in the household. This applied mainly to the preselected sample frames where the list of addresses in a minority of cases (for example, in the United Kingdom, 1%–2% in the Postcode Address File) contained more than one household. This selection was rarely applied in countries where random route was used, as usually the number of dwelling units is already self-evident before the interviewer contacts the household.

At the door, interviewers asked to speak to a woman in the household. They explained why they were visiting the household and the objective of the research, following standard procedures. The survey was introduced as a survey about women's well-being and safety; more details on the content of the survey were given only once the respondent had been selected. This was done to protect the respondent's safety in case she lived with someone who would not want her to take part in a survey on violence against women, including potential perpetrators of violence.

After establishing contact with a woman in the household, interviewers completed the respondent selection grid on the contact sheet. All women aged 18 to 74 years living under the same roof in this household and who could speak one of the official languages of the country were included. Household members who were away from the household for a period of three months or longer were excluded from the selection.

Each contact sheet included a selection grid (Figure 4.1) to select randomly one of the eligible women in the household as a respondent. Interviewers first listed the eligible women who were living in the household. After completing the list, the interviewer searched the selection grid for a column indicating the total number of





eligible respondents in the household, and underneath this she could find a random number, which identified which of the women, based on their position on the list, was to be interviewed. The numbers indicated on the second row in Figure 4.1 were randomly generated independently for each selection grid. In the example in Figure 4.1, if the list of eligible women in the household contained three names, according to this selection grid the second woman on the list would be selected.

Figure 4.1: Selection grid

No. of dwelling units/ persons	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Random number indicating the dwelling unit/household member to be selected	1	2	3	4	5	6	8	7	9

Source: FRA, *Violence against women: an EU-wide survey, 2012*

## 5 Piloting

Before the full survey, pilot interviews were carried out in all 28 EU Member States. Local interviewers conducted pilot interviews and provided feedback to their country managers. Table 5.1 shows the timing of the pilot interviews, distribution of the interviews by respondent's age, type of area where they live and education, as well as the number of interviewers

used for piloting the survey. The pilot interviews took place before the local interviewer training sessions. Therefore, national research managers trained a small number of interviewers separately before the pilot interviews, and feedback from these interviewers could be taken into account when finalising the training programme.

Table 5.1: Details of the pilot interviews, by EU Member State

EU Member State	Fieldwork dates		Number of interviews									No. of interviewers
			Total	Age			Urbanity		Education			
	Start	Finish		18-34	35-54	55-74	Urban	Rural	University	Secondary	Incomplete secondary	
AT	25/02	28/02	20	7	7	6	10	10	6	7	7	5
BE	26/02	28/02	20	6	7	7	12	8	3	11	6	5
BG	25/02	28/02	20	7	6	7	12	8	10	8	2	5
CY	23/02	28/02	20	7	9	4	15	5	8	8	4	4
CZ	24/02	27/02	20	9	6	5	15	5	5	10	5	4
DE	24/02	28/02	20	7	6	7	12	8	5	10	5	5
DK	22/02	28/02	20	5	7	8	10	10	9	10	1	4
EE	23/02	27/02	20	6	6	7	10	10	8	9	3	7
EL	24/02	28/02	25	4	12	9	25	0	6	16	3	5
ES	26/02	28/02	20	7	6	7	12	8	8	11	1	5
FI	28/02	05/03	20	8	3	9	12	8	6	11	3	6
FR	29/02	01/03	25	8	6	10	12	12	7	11	6	8
HR	26/02	28/02	20	8	6	6	10	10	8	7	5	9
HU	28/02	01/03	20	4	9	7	15	5	4	6	10	10
IE <sup>a</sup>	25/02	28/02	20	3	7	5	7	8	3	4	8	3
IT	25/02	28/02	20	6	7	6	10	10	6	6	7	4
LT	26/02	28/02	20	7	7	6	16	4	9	9	2	8
LU	27/02	29/02	20	6	8	6	10	10	5	11	5	4
LV	26/02	28/02	20	6	8	6	15	5	8	7	5	4
MT	25/02	28/02	20	9	3	8	13	7	6	7	7	4
NL	25/02	28/02	20	7	7	6	10	10	8	8	4	5
PL	24/02	27/02	20	8	8	4	12	8	8	8	4	4
PT	25/02	28/02	20	5	7	8	15	5	8	7	5	3
RO	25/02	28/02	20	6	6	8	12	8	5	8	7	4
SE	25/02	27/02	20	6	8	6	8	12	8	7	5	4
SI	24/02	28/02	20	7	8	5	15	5	6	9	5	4
SK	24/02	27/02	20	6	8	6	11	9	7	6	7	5
UK <sup>b</sup>	24/02	28/02	20									3

Notes: <sup>a</sup> Because of a programming error in the CAPI (computer-assisted personal interviewing) software in Ireland, the demographic details were recorded for only 15 of the 20 interviews.

<sup>b</sup> Because of a programming error in the CAPI software in the United Kingdom, the demographic details of the interviews were not recorded. However, a range of respondents was interviewed in line with the quotas.

Source: FRA, Violence against women: an EU-wide survey, 2012

The pilot interviews were the first time that interviewers in all 28 EU Member States approached randomly selected women, asking them to participate in the survey. The feedback from the pilot interviewers was used in the training sessions which were organised later for all interviewers, in order to help them to contact the

respondents and introduce the survey in a way that encourages women to take part. Many respondents during the pilot were already interested to know where and how the results of the survey would be reported, and information on this was added to the interviewer instructions in the full-scale survey.

## 6 Fieldwork

### 6.1. Fieldwork materials

In addition to the interviewer training materials, the central research team prepared the following materials for use in all EU Member States:

- information letter about the survey;
- interviewer instructions and questionnaire instructions;
- contact sheets;
- paper copy of the questionnaire or CAPI script (to be installed on interviewers' laptops);
- Showcards;
- list of services and NGOs that could be offered to the respondents after the interview.

Additionally, in countries where random route sampling was used, interviewers received maps on which they could indicate their route. In those countries where it was possible to establish first contact with the respondent by telephone, a separate telephone screener questionnaire was used.

To counter any bias arising from the order of answers in some of the showcards, 50 % of interviews were conducted with a 'reversed' set, where the list of answer categories was the opposite way around. However, not all showcards were reversed because in some cases it was more important to keep the order of items unchanged; for example, when there was a list of violent incidents which progressed from less to more severe.

The list of services and NGOs was included in the fieldwork pack so that interviewers could offer this information at the end of the interview, and the respondents could either accept it or say that they did not need it. The list provided details of at least three organisations working to protect and advise women victims of violence. In countries where a national domestic violence hotline (or equivalent) existed, this was included on the list, in addition to more specific and regional hotlines (of particular importance in countries with more than one official or widely spoken language). The lists were designed to be small and discreet, avoiding references to domestic violence or women's experiences of violence.

### 6.2. Fieldwork dates

In most countries, fieldwork started in late March or early April 2012. In a small number of countries, delays in translating and finalising the fieldwork materials affected the start date of the interviews.

Most countries finished fieldwork by 22 July 2012, which had been set as the fieldwork deadline. It was important that countries finished by this date to avoid any bias in the sample caused by people going on summer holidays. However, in Sweden, Ireland and the United Kingdom, fieldwork was not finished by 22 July so in these three countries interviews were put on hold and interviewing resumed after the summer break on 27 August. In Sweden, where the main holiday period starts earlier, the interviews that were carried out from the last week of June until mid-July were based on appointments which had been made earlier, but new contact attempts were not made, and new contacts were made only from 27 August onwards. Table 6.1 presents the fieldwork start and end dates, along with the number of interviewers who worked on the survey in each EU Member State.

### 6.3. Fieldwork observation

#### 6.3.1. Sensitivity of fieldwork

Because the survey was highly sensitive, all national research agencies put in place procedures to support interviewers as well as respondents. During in-country interviewer training, services and NGOs working with victims of violence against women were invited to give presentations to help prepare interviewers for what they might encounter. Additionally, interviewers were encouraged to consider both respondents' safety and their own safety and well-being, and think about when it might be appropriate to suspend or discontinue an interview.

Each national research agency was instructed to provide a named fieldwork coordinator for all interviewers, with whom interviewers could have regular contact on how the survey was progressing. Interviewers were encouraged to give detailed feedback on how they felt the interviews were going, and any issues they had encountered in door-to-door visits.



Table 6.1: Timing of the interviews and the number of interviews, by EU Member State

EU Member State	Start date	End date	No. of interviewers	Summer break
AT	22/03/12	15/07/12	23	n/a
BE	07/05/12	23/07/12	101	n/a
BG	30/03/12	25/06/12	60	n/a
CY	29/03/12	10/07/12	48	n/a
CZ	30/03/12	05/07/12	46	n/a
DE	27/03/12	05/06/12	50	n/a
DK	21/03/12	03/07/12	79	n/a
EE	26/03/12	19/06/12	64	n/a
EL	23/04/12	30/06/12	45	n/a
ES	10/05/12	11/07/12	40	n/a
FI	10/04/12	01/07/12	59	n/a
FR	27/04/12	20/07/12	80	n/a
HR	23/03/12	10/06/12	54	n/a
HU	02/05/12	21/06/12	50	n/a
IE	16/04/12	13/09/12	44	23/07/12–27/08/12
IT	26/03/12	30/06/12	62	n/a
LT	28/03/12	15/07/12	80	n/a
LU	02/04/12	12/07/12	28	n/a
LV	27/03/12	02/07/12	65	n/a
MT	22/03/12	13/07/12	26	n/a
NL	02/04/12	07/07/12	59	n/a
PL	17/04/12	18/06/12	103	n/a
PT	04/04/12	02/04/12	32	n/a
RO	17/04/12	23/07/12	33	n/a
SE	04/05/12	05/09/12	37	23/07/12–27/08/12
SI	10/04/12	18/07/12	33	n/a
SK	01/04/12	23/07/12	46	n/a
UK	23/03/12	17/09/12	60	23/07/12–27/08/12

Source: FRA, *Violence against women: an EU-wide survey, 2012*

### 6.3.2. Fieldwork challenges

Throughout fieldwork, Ipsos MORI received a weekly fieldwork update from each Member State. This provided details of the latest fieldwork outcome figures and provided space for qualitative comments on other factors affecting fieldwork. Ipsos MORI also reported to FRA on a weekly basis on the progress made.

The most common problem that interviewers reported during fieldwork was related to the emotional burden that they felt when conducting interviews with women who had had traumatic experiences. In several countries, some interviewers decided to work on the survey only for a part of the full duration of the

fieldwork, and others took breaks of between one and three days between interviewing days. These breaks had not been accounted for when planning the duration of the fieldwork, so the interviews took longer to complete than expected. National fieldwork managers took a number of actions to address the burden on the interviewers, including additional training sessions to train more interviewers, to ensure that interviewers who worked on the project could take the time they needed, and that the work could be shared to avoid burdening individual interviewers too much. Work was also reallocated so that interviewers who were trained to work on the FRA survey could spend more of their time working on it and still have time to take breaks between interviews.

## 6.4. Interview duration

The interview length (Table 6.2) was recorded from the start of section A of the questionnaire (introduction) to the end of section K (concluding questions). It did not include time taken to introduce the survey and select the respondent before the interview could start, or for completing the self-completion questionnaire or the interviewer feedback questions after the interview. The interview length could be affected by a number of factors, such as the prevalence of victimisation and the time a respondent needed to answer questions. For example, women without a current or a previous partner did not need to complete these sections of the questionnaire, and women who had not experienced a particular type of violence (such as physical and/or sexual violence by the current partner, previous partner or another person,

sexual harassment or stalking) did not need to answer many of the follow-up questions, which were relevant only to those women who had experiences of violence to talk about. In addition, the method of administering the survey could affect the interview length, as interviewers working with paper questionnaires needed more time to navigate through the questionnaire to make sure that the routings were correctly followed, whereas interviewers working with CAPI did not need to do this, as the CAPI software helped them move automatically to the next applicable question.

It was normal practice in most countries to record the interview length. However, this variable was not included in the questionnaire and so a few countries recorded only the start time and not the end time of the interview.

Table 6.2: Average length of the interview and method of survey administration, by EU Member State

EU Member State	Average interview length (minutes)	Survey administration method
AT	64	CAPI
BE	43	CAPI
BG	38	PAPI
CY	Interview length not recorded	PAPI
CZ	48	CAPI
DE	57	CAPI
DK	57	CAPI
EE	47	PAPI
EL	43	CAPI
ES	Interview length not recorded	CAPI
FI	41	CAPI
FR	43	CAPI
HR	35	CAPI
HU	33	CAPI
IE	25	CAPI
IT	Interview length not recorded	CAPI
LT	46	PAPI
LU	Interview length not recorded	CAPI
LV	Interview length not recorded	PAPI
MT	33	CAPI
NL	51	CAPI
PL	35	CAPI
PT	41	CAPI
RO	30	CAPI
SE	45	CAPI
SI	25	CAPI
SK	43	CAPI
UK	31	CAPI

Source: FRA, *Violence against women: an EU-wide survey, 2012*



## 7 Response rate

The response rates have been calculated using the 'response rate 3' (RR3) definition of response rates by the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR).<sup>8</sup> The response rates are calculated as a ratio of completed interviews out of the total number of respondents who were eligible to take part in the survey. The survey population was defined as women aged 18 to 74, resident in the country where the interview took place, who speak at least one official language of that country. Households without any eligible respondents are not included in the response rate calculations.

However, in a number of situations it is not possible to determine directly if any eligible persons live in the sampled address. The most common reason is non-contact after the minimum number of visits/calls, but it also includes situations where information about the household was refused by the first contact or where the interviewer was not able to locate the issued address, among others. This presents a known challenge to calculating the response rate. Table 7.1 shows the method used for estimating the number of eligible addresses based on the information collected

Table 7.1: Estimation of eligibility among addresses/individuals with unknown eligibility, by EU Member State

EU Member State	Total number of addresses/individuals issued			Eligible as a percentage of addresses/individuals known to be eligible/ineligible	Estimated number of eligible among unknown eligibility
	Eligible	Ineligible	Unknown eligibility		
	n	n	n	%	n
AT	2,044	548	996	78.9	769
BE	3,721	808	1,017	82.2	836
BG	2,044	789	732	72.1	529
CY	1,506	128	615	92.2	567
CZ	2,852	605	723	82.5	597
DE	2,279	540	740	80.8	598
DK	2,833	3,138	3,584	47.4	1,701
EE	1,696	1,431	1,169	54.2	634
EL	1,621	332	613	83.0	509
ES	3,243	2,334	2,816	58.1	1,638
FI	3,946	2	0	99.9	0
FR	4,674	1,288	1,239	78.4	971
HR	2,491	596	812	80.7	655
HU	1,552	287	294	84.4	248
IE	3,790	862	623	81.5	476
IT	1,676	437	1,190	79.3	944
LT	2,052	774	1,590	72.6	1,155
LU	4,017	2,408	1,417	62.5	886
LV	1,828	587	415	75.7	314
MT	2,471	469	691	84.0	581
NL	3,222	2,439	4,339	56.9	1,470
PL	2,272	523	1,831	81.3	1,483
PT	1,794	602	666	74.9	499
RO	2,103	648	1,001	76.4	766
SE	6,143	349	1,588	94.6	1,503
SI	3,329	388	123	89.6	110
SK	2,807	647	841	81.3	684
UK	3,405	1,729	1,029	66.3	683
<b>TOTAL unweighted</b>	<b>78,995</b>	<b>25,420</b>	<b>33,401</b>	<b>77.3</b>	<b>22,321</b>

Source: FRA, *Violence against women: an EU-wide survey, 2012*

<sup>8</sup> American Association for Public Opinion Research (2011), p. 46.

from visited households and the number of addresses with unknown eligibility. The method assumes that the proportion of eligible addresses out of all households with unknown eligibility is the same as the proportion of eligible addresses out of those households which interviewers were able to contact and whose eligibility could be determined.

The number of **eligible** addresses is based on addresses that were given a final outcome code of:

- successful interview;
- refusal by contacting the field office;
- no contact with selected person after three visits/calls;
- refusal by selected person before interview;
- proxy refusal by someone else at the address;
- broken appointment – no recontact;
- at home but ill during the survey period;
- away or in hospital during the survey period;
- physically or mentally unable to participate;
- unable to conduct the interview as selected person speaks an official language not spoken by the interviewer (in such a case, the field office was contacted to assign another interviewer to follow up);
- other unproductive results; or
- partial interview.

The number of **ineligible** addresses is based on addresses that were given a final outcome code of:

- not yet built/under construction;
- demolished/derelict;
- vacant/empty housing unit;
- non-residential address (business);
- communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings);

- occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home);
- preselected person deceased at the time of contact;
- preselected person unknown at the address (mistake in the records);
- preselected person abroad for longer than three months;
- preselected person had moved out of the address;
- other ineligible address;
- no eligible respondents at address; or
- unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages of the Member State.

The number of addresses with **unknown** eligibility is based on addresses that were given a final outcome code of:

- issued, not attempted;
- inaccessible;
- unable to locate address;
- no contact made at address after three visits/calls;
- all information about address/dwelling unit refused;<sup>9</sup>
- unable to establish eligibility for physical/mental reasons;
- unable to confirm eligibility as the contact does not speak any of the official languages;
- unable to conduct interview as selected person speaks an official language not spoken by the interviewer (in such a case, the field office was contacted to assign another interviewer to follow up);
- further information refused by contact; or
- other reason for not selecting a person.


Figure 7.1 presents an overview of the main outcomes in household and respondent selection.

<sup>9</sup> This code covers those situations where contact was established but the interviewer was not able to record whether any eligible respondents live at this address or not.





Figure 7.1: Fieldwork outcomes



Source: FRA, *Violence against women: an EU-wide survey, 2012*

Table 7.2 presents the overall achieved response rates in each country. The response rates are based on the method described in Table 7.1: a ratio of completed interviews and eligible addresses (addresses where interviewers were able to confirm the eligibility, and addresses with estimated eligibility, as described earlier in this chapter).

Table 7.2 presents separately countries where respondents were selected using a random-route approach, and countries where the first contact was by telephone. Respondents were contacted by telephone in some of the countries where it was possible to draw a sample of respondents directly from the population register. In most countries, respondents were selected using

a random-route approach in a representative sample of areas in these countries. Telephone recruitment of randomly selected respondents was used in countries where a sufficiently inclusive frame of telephone numbers for individuals was available: Denmark, Finland and Sweden. Telephone prerecruitment for face-to-face surveys can be expected to have lowered the overall

response rate, as it is easier for respondents to decline to participate on the telephone than if the interviewer visits in person. However, it is difficult to state this conclusively, given that face-to-face surveys with face-to-face recruitment are very rarely done in these countries for various reasons, for example the long distances between addresses and low population density.

Table 7.2: Number of issued addresses, completed interviews, eligibility of addresses and response rate, by EU Member State

EU Member State	Total issued	Complete interviews	Known eligibility	Estimated eligibility	Response rate
	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i> <sup>a</sup>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	(%)
<b>1. Countries where the first contact with respondents was made in person</b>					
AT	3,400	1,505	1,856	769	57.3
BE	5,546	1,537	3,721	836	33.7
BG	3,562	1,507	2,044	529	58.6
CY	2,249	1,505	1,506	567	72.6
CZ	4,180	1,620	2,852	597	47.0
DE	3,559	1,534	2,279	598	53.3
EE	6,358	1,500	1,696	634	64.4
EL	2,566	1,500	1,621	509	70.4
ES	8,393	1,520	3,243	1,638	31.1
FR	7,206	1,528	4,674	971	27.1
HR	3,899	1,505	2,491	655	47.8
HU	2,133	1,512	1,552	248	84.0
IE	4,275	1,567	2,790	476	48.0
IT	3,303	1,531	1,676	949	58.4
LT	4,426	1,552	2,052	1,155	48.4
LU	7,842	908	4,903	886	18.5
LV	2,830	1,513	1,828	314	70.6
MT	3,631	1,501	2,471	581	49.2
NL	10,000	1,510	3,222	2,467	26.5
PL	4,831	1,513	2,272	1,483	40.3
PT	3,062	1,515	1,794	499	66.1
RO	3,752	1,579	2,103	765	55.1
SI	3,840	1,501	3,329	110	43.6
SK	4,295	1,512	2,807	684	43.3
UK	6,163	1,510	3,405	683	36.9
<b>2. Countries where the first contact with respondents was made over the telephone</b>					
DK	9,555	1,514	2,833	1,701	33.4
FI	3,948	1,520	3,946	0	38.5
SE	8,080	1,504	6,143	1,503	19.7
<b>TOTAL unweighted</b>	<b>136,884</b>	<b>42,023</b>	<b>77,109</b>	<b>23,807</b>	<b>42.1</b>

Notes: <sup>a</sup> The FRA survey results are based on 42,002 responses. While in total 42,023 interviews were completed, 21 interviews were removed from the data set at the data cleaning stage, and excluded from analysis.

Source: FRA, Violence against women: an EU-wide survey, 2012



The overall response rate across the EU-28 (42.1 %) is similar to the response rates achieved in, for example, the European Quality of Life Survey (response rate: 41.3 %), which was carried out by the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound, an EU agency) in September 2011 to February 2012 in 27 EU Member States,<sup>10</sup> or the European Working Conditions Survey (response rate: 44.2%), which Eurofound carried out in 2010 in 27 EU Member States and seven non-EU countries.<sup>11</sup>

It is difficult to compare the response rates across countries, because the cultural settings, general acceptability

of unsolicited approaches, saturation with other survey research activities and other country-specific factors have a dominant effect on the resulting response rates. Within countries, various aspects of the survey are likely to have an impact on the response rates, among them the general level of interest in the topic, the survey's perceived relevance to respondents, the experience of the interviewers and fieldwork coordinators, the number of attempts at contacting, whether or not approaches are reissued after soft refusals<sup>12</sup> and the method of establishing the first contact. The subject of the FRA survey on violence against women could have served to increase refusals to take part in the survey.

---

<sup>10</sup> Eurofound (2012).

<sup>11</sup> Eurofound (2010).

---

<sup>12</sup> Reissuing is when an address is reallocated to another interviewer to visit to try to complete an interview. A soft refusal is when a selected respondent or someone else in the household has refused to take part at a particular time, but has not said they will not take part at all.

## 8 Quality control

As a minimum, a random 10 % of all interviews were back-checked by fieldwork managers and in most countries 5 % of refusals were also back-checked. In addition, in countries using the random route method, a selection of interviews were back-checked to ensure the random route methodology had been followed correctly, both by using maps in the office and by checking in the field.

Interviews to be checked were selected randomly and the respondents were contacted by telephone, face to face or by post. If the respondent was contacted by post, the letter was sent to the named respondent, and the letter did not give details about the content of the survey in case someone else opened the letter, for example a partner. The back-checks took place throughout the fieldwork period, to reduce the risk of systematic problems recurring over a long period of time. If interviewers were found not to be conducting the interviews appropriately, they were removed and additional interviewers were trained to replace them. From one to three interviewers were removed from the project during the fieldwork in Belgium, Bulgaria, Germany, Poland and Romania.

Each fieldwork agency checked slightly different questions during the back-checks; however, almost all countries checked some or all of the following:

- address
- respondent selection (Kish grid)
- age of respondent
- recall of showcards being used
- recall of self-completion questionnaire and envelope being given
- self-completion questionnaire returned
- estimated duration of the interview

In addition to verification checks, a number of other quality checks were carried out.

- all contact sheets with a final 'non-contact' outcome were checked to ensure that a minimum of three visits had been recorded
- interviewers were monitored to check that their interviews were not consistently shorter than expected

- response rates were monitored at an interviewer level and interviewers with a low response rate were selected for verification
- the sample profile was checked
- the percentage of refusals was checked to make sure it was not too high

### 8.1. Editing and data validation

The CAPI program contained range, logic and consistency checks. That is, it monitored interviewers' entries to make sure that the entered values were valid (based on the response options listed in the questionnaire), followed the routings of the questionnaire and did not contradict the answers given to earlier questions. In countries where paper questionnaires were used, all questionnaires were checked for completeness, accuracy and logic immediately after they had been returned by interviewers. In case of inconsistencies, respondents were contacted to complete the missing information. In a small number of cases, complete questionnaires were discarded because of the amount of missing information or severe inconsistencies.

A single template, a datamap, was created by Ipsos MORI for entering the data from both questionnaires and contact sheets. The datamap was used by national research agencies to create a data entry template using their own software. Data from paper questionnaires were entered and data from CAPI interviews were directly transferred to the template.

The numerical data were then converted into ASCII (American Standard Code for Information Interchange) format and uploaded to a central location. A specialist software package, WebADC (Web-based ASCII Data Check), was used for managing the upload. Every country was issued a unique link that gave it access only to upload its data, but not to see the other countries' uploads. The data were then checked for consistency by the central research team.

Any personal details were removed before the data were uploaded to a central location. A unique identification number was added to the data to identify each respondent. The data transfer and storage processes complied with Ipsos MORI's standards for information security set by its accreditation for quality, ISO 9001:2008, market research process quality standard, ISO 20252:2006, and information security, ISO 27001:2005.



Three data files were uploaded and checked. The first one was uploaded after 10 % of interviews had been completed, the second one after 50 % of interviews had been completed and the final one after fieldwork was completed. Therefore, the data checks were performed at an early stage of data collection to address any possible problems in good time.

## 9 Weighting

As is normal with surveys, the sample may over- or under-represent certain groups of respondents compared with the total population, and such differences are often addressed through weighting. The published results of the FRA survey on gender-based violence against women have been weighted to take into account women's age and the area where they live (urban or rural). This section describes how the weights have been calculated, as well as analysing in more detail the effect of other variables which have not been included in the weighting procedure, such as education or employment status.

### 9.1. Weighting procedure

The weights for the dataset were calculated in three stages: (A) sampling design weights, (B) demographic profile weights and (C) country population weights (the last only for the results for EU-28).

Design weights were calculated to compensate for the uneven probability of selection of respondents. Primary sampling units (PSUs) were selected with probability proportional to size, so by definition they had an unequal chance of selection (A1). This may also occur on other occasions, for example if the selected PSU has too few addresses overall and there is a need to visit fewer addresses than were planned, thus decreasing the likelihood of each address to be selected, or if there are two eligible respondents in a household, which decreases the chance of each eligible potential respondent to take part in the survey, as only one per household will be selected and interviewed (A3). The following probabilities of each stage of selection were calculated.

- Probability of selecting the PSU (A1): ratio of the PSU size to the population size (in the same units which were used for the initial sampling).
- Probability of selecting an address (A2): the ratio of the number of issued addresses to the total number of addresses in PSU. This stage is optional only for those countries which did not have individual-based frames.
- Selection of a woman inside the household (A3): 1 divided by the number of eligible women inside the household.

Design weights were calculated as the inverted product of the three probabilities described above.

$$Wt_{design} = \frac{1}{A1 \times A2 \times A3}$$

- Capping (A4): the weights were calibrated to the average of 1 within each country and the design weights were calibrated to allow the maximum value of 4. This was done to avoid the distorting effect of a small number of very high weights on the effective sample size, and the unreasonably large effect which responses with very high weights could have on individual results.

Following the first stage and using the dataset weighted by design weights, the demographic profile (non-response) weights were calculated by rim weighting.

- Age (B1): weighting by the age bands used in the questionnaire (18-24, 25-34, 35-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60-69, 70-74).
- Rural/urban (B2): weighting by the location of the interview. The data on this were linked to the PSU and provided by the national research agencies. The urban/rural scales used differed depending on the country.

The resulting in-country weights were calibrated to the average of 1 within each country dataset.

- Country (C): weight to compensate for the variation in the size of the target population in different countries. The ratio of the number of women aged 18 to 74 in each country to the EU-28 total, multiplied by the ratio of the number of interviews conducted in the country to the number of interviews conducted in total.

$$Wt_{overall} = Wt_{in-country} \times \frac{n_{country}}{n_{overall}} \times \frac{N_{country}}{N_{overall}}$$

The procedure above describes all the possible stages of weighting involved. There is a certain variation between how weights were calculated for each country, and some weighting stages have not been applied in some countries, because of differences in the availability of sampling frames, sampling methods and availability of background demographic information.

To examine the effect of weighting on the age distribution of the respondents, Table 9.1 presents respondents' age before and after weighting. The unweighted data show that the original sampling was slightly skewed towards the oldest age group, with fewer respondents in the two youngest age groups. Particularly high shares of the oldest age group were found in Bulgaria, Estonia, Finland, Portugal and Sweden. The sample in Cyprus, on the other hand, was skewed towards the youngest age group. The weighting adjusts the age distribution to correspond with the population distribution.



Table 9.1: Age of respondents, by EU Member State (unweighted %, weighted %, unweighted n)

EU Member State	18-29			30-39			40-49			50-59			60+			No answer		
	u %	w %	n	u %	w %	n	u %	w %	n	u %	w %	n	u %	w %	n	u %	w %	n
AT	23	19	344	20	20	302	19	22	293	14	18	212	24	21	354	0	0	0
BE	20	21	309	16	19	248	22	21	333	21	19	318	21	21	329	0	0	0
BG	12	20	181	16	20	238	15	18	227	20	19	306	37	24	554	0	0	1
CY	38	29	565	20	18	303	18	19	264	16	16	237	8	17	126	1	1	10
CZ	17	20	274	21	22	346	19	17	307	17	18	280	25	22	403	1	1	10
DE	12	18	187	17	17	254	24	22	373	21	19	327	26	24	393	0	0	0
DK	25	23	380	14	15	206	19	20	293	19	18	289	23	23	343	0	0	3
EE	15	24	232	15	17	227	15	18	224	20	19	303	34	23	512	0	0	2
EL	18	20	266	18	19	265	22	20	333	17	18	262	25	23	372	0	0	2
ES	14	21	212	19	22	288	22	21	341	19	17	282	26	19	397	0	0	0
FI	14	19	207	15	18	235	17	19	253	20	20	303	34	24	519	0	0	3
FR	13	20	198	18	20	278	23	20	339	21	19	312	24	21	366	1	1	12
HR	15	20	221	17	19	259	18	19	266	23	20	351	27	23	408	0	0	0
HU	15	20	220	20	21	299	16	17	237	20	20	304	30	23	452	0	0	0
IE	16	22	244	23	27	362	19	19	295	18	16	278	25	16	390	0	0	0
IT	11	18	174	18	20	279	27	22	418	23	18	349	20	23	310	0	0	1
LT	16	23	247	14	18	224	19	20	301	21	18	329	28	21	439	1	1	12
LU	12	20	108	20	22	182	28	22	257	20	18	186	19	18	175	0	0	0
LV	18	23	278	16	18	244	17	18	261	19	18	288	29	23	441	0	0	1
MT	12	21	176	16	20	242	18	17	269	22	19	336	32	22	477	0	0	1
NL	10	19	153	17	19	250	24	22	367	24	19	364	25	21	376	0	0	0
PL	22	23	332	24	20	368	14	16	219	18	20	279	19	19	292	2	1	23
PT	11	20	164	15	20	233	17	20	263	20	18	299	37	22	555	0	0	1
RO	19	23	301	20	20	319	19	18	302	17	19	275	24	20	382	0	0	0
SE	8	20	115	14	20	204	22	19	331	24	18	354	33	23	500	0	0	0
SI	18	21	271	14	18	213	20	20	294	20	20	303	28	21	414	0	0	6
SK	16	24	246	22	21	335	21	18	312	19	19	289	21	18	313	1	1	17
UK	15	22	222	19	19	280	20	21	297	19	17	284	28	21	425	0	0	2
EU-28	16	20	6827	18	19	7483	20	20	8269	20	18	8299	26	22	11017	0	0	107

Notes: u % = unweighted percentage; w % = weighted percentage; n = unweighted number of respondents.

Source: FRA gender-based violence against women survey dataset, 2012

## 9.2. Sensitivity analysis based on the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents

FRA has examined the composition of the sample to see if the respondents' core socio-demographic characteristics correspond to the population at large, based on the socio-demographic data published by Eurostat. As described in the previous section, the FRA survey

data have been weighted to adjust for respondents' age and type of area where they live (urban/rural). Other respondent characteristics which could be interesting to consider include variables such as education, citizenship, employment and household size. However, in the absence of such additional information in the sampling frames used, these variables have not been used when weighting the results. At the same time, it is possible to compare the sample characteristics in the FRA survey with those obtained in other EU-wide surveys, such as the European Survey on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC), which is coordinated by Eurostat.

Sensitivity analysis examines whether or not changes in the data, such as small differences between the socio-demographic composition of the sample and the total population, can have an effect on the survey results. Taking socio-demographic data from EU-SILC as a benchmark, a number of core survey estimates were recalculated with several provisional weights which adjusted (in addition to age and type of area) for education (International Standard Classification of Education, ISCED, in three categories), employment (employed/not employed), household size (single/not single) and citizenship (citizen/non-citizen). Because data from EU-SILC are available only for women aged 18 to 64 years (the range in the FRA survey was 18 to 74 years), the sensitivity analysis is based on data from 18- to 64-year-old respondents also from the FRA survey. A separate adjustment weight was calculated for each of the control variables (education, employment, household size and citizenship) to reproduce the weighted distribution of the external data source within each country.

Table 9.2 shows the reweighted results when data on women's education are taken into account, as an example.<sup>13</sup> On average, accounting for education results in a difference of 0.5 % or less in the overall prevalence rate of physical and sexual violence by a partner, violence in childhood (before the age of 15) and stalking in the 28 EU Member States. The prevalence of sexual harassment is 1 % higher if adjusted for education. Considering the level of accuracy of the estimates, none of these differences are significant, and they have no or very little impact on the ranking of the countries. Also for the other variables (employment, household size and citizenship), no significant differences were observed. Data used for the sensitivity analysis are not fully comparable with data from the FRA survey, given differences in definitions used to collect the socio-demographic characteristics – therefore they were not included in the weights used for the analysis.

---

13 Eurostat online database [http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/statistics/search\\_database](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/statistics/search_database), table *Distribution of population aged 18 and over by education level and age group* (source: SILC) (data code ilc\_lvps04).





Table 9.2: Comparison of results using standard FRA survey weights and weights which additionally adjust for education, women aged 18–64 years, by EU Member State (%)

EU Member State	Physical and/or sexual violence by a partner since the age of 15		Stalking since the age of 15		Sexual harassment since the age of 15 (based on a full set of 11 items)		Physical and/or sexual violence before the age of 15	
	Using standard weights	Using weights adjusted for education	Using standard weights	Using weights adjusted for education	Using standard weights	Using weights adjusted for education	Using standard weights	Using weights adjusted for education
AT	12.3	12.3	14.5	14.4	35.7	36.0	26.6	27.3
BE	23.7	23.0	25.1	26.0	63.9	67.6	26.5	30.5
BG	23.6	23.3	10.4	10.6	26.6	27.1	29.5	28.7
CY	13.1	13.1	12.2	12.4	38.7	38.4	12.6	13.0
CZ	21.0	20.3	9.1	8.7	52.0	52.1	31.5	31.0
DE	22.3	21.7	24.3	24.8	61.1	63.5	40.1	40.8
DK	32.3	33.6	24.7	24.0	82.1	78.6	42.3	43.2
EE	20.7	19.8	14.5	14.5	56.5	58.8	48.6	50.8
EL	18.8	18.5	13.8	14.3	46.0	45.1	23.1	23.0
ES	12.4	12.1	11.6	12.1	53.1	53.9	29.0	29.8
FI	29.9	28.8	25.6	24.4	72.9	73.0	51.8	52.6
FR	25.7	25.7	29.5	29.9	77.8	79.5	45.2	45.5
HR	12.9	12.5	13.3	13.1	44.1	44.0	30.1	29.3
HU	22.3	22.0	12.2	11.9	45.5	45.2	23.6	23.4
IE	14.1	14.2	12.8	12.6	49.3	51.8	24.8	24.9
IT	17.0	15.5	17.5	16.6	53.3	54.3	29.1	29.2
LT	21.5	21.8	8.2	7.8	37.4	37.4	17.9	17.6
LU	23.2	23.5	31.3	31.1	68.7	68.0	43.2	43.4
LV	30.8	30.5	14.7	14.9	50.6	50.7	34.1	33.6
MT	14.7	13.5	27.4	26.4	53.2	41.6	22.4	20.9
NL	24.8	25.3	26.3	26.2	73.8	72.7	30.2	30.2
PL	12.3	12.1	9.6	9.8	33.3	33.4	16.9	16.7
PT	17.8	17.4	10.0	10.3	34.8	35.5	25.3	24.4
RO	22.2	20.7	8.4	8.7	34.2	36.5	23.4	23.5
SE	27.9	30.9	33.6	34.4	82.2	81.8	39.1	40.0
SI	12.3	11.8	14.2	15.5	46.7	50.4	12.4	13.1
SK	21.7	21.2	15.8	16.0	51.2	51.3	35.1	34.9
UK	29.6	28.7	19.7	19.6	70.0	71.1	35.2	35.8
EU-28	21.1	20.6	18.8	18.9	57.2	58.3	32.5	32.9

Note: The prevalence results in this table may differ from the results presented elsewhere in this report. To use data from EU-SILC to assess the effect of education for the weighting of the results, the analysis had to be limited to data from respondents who are 18 to 64 years of age, whereas elsewhere in this report the results have been calculated based on all FRA survey respondents, who were 18 to 74 years of age.

Source: FRA gender-based violence against women survey dataset, 2012

## 10 Confidence intervals

The FRA survey is based on a random probability sample of about 1,500 women per country. This allows us to develop estimates which are representative for all women aged 18 to 74, both at the EU level and in each EU Member State. Survey estimates are never exact, as they contain some degree of error, which can be assessed based on the sampling parameters. Confidence intervals present a range within which there is a given probability that the true value lies. In this case, the 95 % probability level has been selected, meaning that 95% of all possible random samples would produce an estimate within that range. Therefore, it can be assumed that there is a 95 % probability that the true value of an indicator can be found between the lower and upper bounds of the confidence interval.

The results show, for example, that 21.6 % of women throughout the EU have experienced physical and/or sexual violence by a partner since the age of 15. When sampling design is taken into account, the confidence intervals indicate that the precision range of this estimate is from 20.4 % to 22.8 %. Because the degree of accuracy of a survey estimate depends on, for example, the sample size, for individual countries a somewhat lower degree of precision can be achieved. In Austria, for instance, the survey estimate for the prevalence of physical and/or sexual violence by a partner since the age of 15 is 12.7 %, within a range of 9.8 % to 15.7 % (at 95 % confidence level). Further details on the confidence intervals for selected survey indicators are in Table 10.1.



Table 10.1: Confidence intervals for selected survey results, by EU Member State

EU Member State	Physical and/or sexual violence by a partner since the age of 15			Stalking since the age of 15			Sexual harassment since the age of 15 (based on a full set of 11 items)			Physical and/or sexual violence before the age of 15		
	Survey Estimate (%)	95% Confidence interval		Survey Estimate (%)	95% Confidence interval		Survey Estimate (%)	95% Confidence interval		Survey Estimate (%)	95% Confidence interval	
		lower	upper		lower	upper		lower	upper		lower	upper
AT	12.7	9.8	15.7	14.9	10.0	19.7	34.7	27.2	42.1	29.6	23.7	35.6
BE	23.7	19.5	27.9	24.0	20.5	27.5	60.4	55.4	65.4	25.1	21.2	29.1
BG	23.4	17.2	29.6	9.8	6.0	13.7	24.2	17.3	31.1	28.8	21.7	36.0
CY	14.5	11.6	17.4	11.5	9.4	13.5	35.6	31.5	39.8	12.4	9.9	14.9
CZ	20.6	16.5	24.7	8.7	5.6	11.7	51.1	43.9	58.4	31.9	25.5	38.4
DE	22.2	18.5	25.8	23.5	18.5	28.6	60.0	52.6	67.4	41.6	36.3	46.9
DK	32.4	29.2	35.6	24.0	21.1	26.9	80.2	77.3	83.0	42.4	39.8	45.1
EE	20.2	17.4	22.9	13.0	10.7	15.2	52.7	47.8	57.5	47.8	42.8	52.8
EL	19.1	15.7	22.5	12.4	8.2	16.5	42.9	35.4	50.3	23.4	18.4	28.5
ES	12.7	10.4	15.0	11.4	8.6	14.3	49.7	44.2	55.3	28.1	23.4	32.7
FI	30.0	26.8	33.1	24.5	21.1	27.9	70.7	67.2	74.2	51.4	47.4	55.4
FR	26.3	23.9	28.8	28.6	25.9	31.2	74.9	72.4	77.5	44.3	41.0	47.6
HR	13.0	10.1	15.8	12.9	9.4	16.3	41.4	35.1	47.8	29.5	21.9	37.1
HU	21.2	17.6	24.9	11.6	8.8	14.3	42.4	35.0	49.8	23.7	18.2	29.3
IE	14.9	12.2	17.6	12.5	9.9	15.0	47.5	41.4	53.7	25.6	21.1	30.0
IT	18.5	13.0	24.1	18.3	11.9	24.6	51.5	44.1	58.9	30.7	23.0	38.3
LT	23.9	19.5	28.4	7.9	5.5	10.3	35.1	27.7	42.5	17.7	12.6	22.7
LU	22.3	19.3	25.4	30.2	26.3	34.2	67.0	62.9	71.1	42.6	38.3	46.8
LV	31.9	26.3	37.5	13.5	10.1	17.0	47.4	41.3	53.6	32.7	25.9	39.6
MT	14.5	11.3	17.7	26.2	22.2	30.2	49.6	43.9	55.4	21.3	17.3	25.3
NL	25.2	22.0	28.3	26.0	22.2	29.8	72.8	69.4	76.1	30.2	27.4	33.0
PL	13.2	10.7	15.8	8.8	6.4	11.2	32.0	27.2	36.7	16.6	13.8	19.5
PT	19.2	15.9	22.4	9.4	6.2	12.6	32.5	25.9	39.1	25.3	18.9	31.8
RO	23.5	19.6	27.5	7.9	4.7	11.1	31.5	26.1	37.0	23.2	17.2	29.1
SE	28.3	24.3	32.3	32.5	27.7	37.3	81.3	75.5	87.1	40.7	36.2	45.2
SI	13.3	11.2	15.4	13.7	11.4	16.0	44.1	40.4	47.7	12.5	10.5	14.5
SK	23.3	18.0	28.6	15.6	10.7	20.5	49.4	40.3	58.5	34.3	27.4	41.2
UK	29.3	24.7	33.8	19.0	15.9	22.2	68.3	64.6	72.0	36.3	31.9	40.7
EU-28	21.6	20.4	22.8	18.6	17.2	19.9	55.5	53.7	57.4	33.4	31.8	35.1

Source: FRA gender-based violence against women survey dataset, 2012

# 11 Media monitoring

In each of the 28 EU Member States, national research agencies conducted media monitoring throughout the fieldwork period, starting two weeks before the beginning of the interviews and continuing until the end of the survey interviews. National research agencies identified news articles regarding violence against women that were reported in the mainstream media. The rationale was to identify any media events which could have had an impact on the way women approached the survey and talked about their experiences. The media monitoring would make it possible to see if an increase in reported cases of violence coincided with a period of high coverage on this issue in the media.

Four or five print and online media sources were selected from each country before the fieldwork (with the exception of Luxembourg, which has fewer independent mainstream news sources owing to its size, and four print media sources only were included in the monitoring). The full list of media sources covered in each EU Member State is available in Table 11.1. The media monitoring did not cover television or radio, as this would have significantly increased the costs. At the same time, a major news event which first emerges on television or radio is likely to be also addressed in print and online media, so it would have been detected by the media monitoring activities.

The national research agencies produced weekly reports which were collected by the international coordination team. A country-by-country report on the media monitoring activities was submitted to FRA fortnightly.

## 11.1. Search terms

Before the start of the media monitoring, FRA and the survey contractors established a list of search terms which could be used to identify relevant articles. The search terms are necessarily quite broad and designed to give an overview of the type of news articles that should be recorded:

- violence/attack/assault/abuse against women
- rape/attempted rape
- physical violence
- harassment/sexual harassment
- murder/attempted murder
- personal safety

- child abuse/grooming
- helpline/women's shelter/victim support
- domestic violence
- sexual violence
- psychological violence
- stalking
- robbery
- kidnapping
- protection/restraining order
- victim of violence

These search terms cover each of the subject areas in the survey. Before media monitoring was rolled out in all 28 EU Member States, a pilot exercise took place in the United Kingdom. The piloting suggested that the results obtained using the list of search terms included all relevant stories as well as some less relevant ones. National research agencies were advised to focus on stories that received national coverage rather than to report on every single story, since news articles receiving national coverage were more likely to have the potential to affect the survey results on a large scale. Very short news articles, most of which simply acknowledged an incident in a few lines, were therefore excluded.



Table 11.1: Media monitoring sources, by type of media and EU Member State

EU Member State	Type of media								
AT	Online	http://oesterreich.orf.at/	www.krone.at	www.oez4.at	www.news.at	www.diepresse.com			
	Print	Kronen Zeitung	Österreich	Kurier	Der Standard				
BE	Online	www.rtlinfo.be (FR)	www.rtf.be (FR)	www.vtm.be (VL)	www.vrt.be (VL)				
	Print	Le Soir	Le Libre Belgique	Het Laatste Nieuws	De Standaard				
BG	Online	www.btv.bg	www.svejo.net	www.dariknews.bg	www.novini.bg	www.dnevnik.bg			
	Print	Τηλεραφ	Стандард	Труд	Трета вълна				
CY	Online	www.offsite.com.cy	www.ikypros.com	www.cytoday.eu	www.typos.com.cy	www.onlycy.com			
	Print	Φιλελεύθερος	Χαρρυγή	Η Σημερινή	Πολίτης				
CZ	Online	www.idnes.cz	www.novinky.cz	www.aktualne.cz	www.zena-in.cz	www.ceskenoviny.cz			
	Print	Blesk	Rytmus Zivota	Reflex	Blesk Pro Zeny				
DE	Online	www.zeit.de	www.spiegel.de	www.focus.de	www.welt.de	www.tagesschau.de			
	Print	Bild/Bild am Sonntag	Stern	Süddeutsche Zeitung	Frankfurter Allegemeine Zeitung				
DK	Online	www.eb.dk	www.information.dk	www.tvz.dk	www.avisen.dk	www.dr.dk			
	Print	Jyllandsposten	Berlingske	Politiken	B.T.				
EE	Online	www.delfi.ee	www.postimees.ee	www.err.ee	www.naistemaailm.ee	http://rus.delfi.ee			
	Print	Postimees	Õhtuleht	Eesti Ekspress	Eesti Päevaleht				
EL	Online	www.in.gr	www.jungle.gr	www.newsit.gr	www.newsbeast.gr	www.news247.gr			
	Print	ΤΟ ΒΗΜΑ	Η Καθημερινή	Πρώτο Θέμα	Το Έθνος				
ES	Online	www.rtve.es	www.elconfidencial.com	www.lavanguardia.com	www.zominutos.es	www.abc.es			
	Print	El País	El Mundo	El Público	El Razón				
FI	Online	www.yle.fi	www.mtv3.fi	www.iltasanomat.fi	www.ts.fi	www.hbl.fi			
	Print	Helsingin Sanomat	Ilta-lehti	Aamulehti	Kaleva				
FR	Online	www.france24.fr	www.mediapart.fr	www.huffingtonpost.fr	http://ici.tf1.fr/	www.rue89.com			
	Print	Le Figaro	Libération	Le Monde	Le Parisien/Aujourd'hui En France				
HR	Online	www.index.hr	www.tportal.hr	www.dnevnik.hr	www.net.hr	www.monitor.hr			
	Print	24 Sata	Jutarnji List	Večernji list	Slobodna Dalmacija				
HU	Online	www.origo.hu	www.index.hu	www.hvg.hu	www.hir24.hu	www.blikk.hu			
	Print	Magyar Nemzet	Népszabadság	Magyar Hírlap	Népszava				
IE	Online	www.irishtimes.com	www.rte.ie	www.eircom.net	www.thejournal.ie	www.breakingnews.ie			
	Print	Irish Independent	Irish Daily Star	Sunday Independent	Sunday World				

EU Member State	Type of media	Media Name	Website
IT	Online	La Stampa	Il Messaggero
	Print	La Repubblica	Corriere Della Sera
LT	Online	www.delfi.lt	www.lrytas.lt
	Print	Lietuvos Rytas	Respublika
LU	Online		
	Print	d'Wort	L'essentiel
LV	Online	www.delfi.lv	www.apollo.lv
	Print	Diena Daily	NRA Daily
MT	Online	www.di-ve.com	www.maltamedia.com
	Print	The Times of Malta	Il Nazzjon/ Il Mument
NL	Online	www.nos.nl	www.nieuws.nl
	Print	De Telegraaf	Algemeen Dagblad
PL	Online	www.onet.pl	www.gazeta.pl
	Print	Gazeta Wyborcza	Rzeczpospolita
PT	Online	www.diariodigital.sapo.pt	www.sapo.pt
	Print	Correio de Manha	Jornal de Notícias
RO	Online	www.ziare.com	www.agerpres.ro/media
	Print	Romania Libera	Adevarul
SE	Online	www.sydsvenskan.se	www.gp.se
	Print	Dagens Nyheter	Svenska Dagbladet
SI	Online	www.24ur.com	www.siol.net
	Print	Slovenske Novice	Delo
SK	Online	www.sme.sk	www.pravda.sk
	Print	Novy Cas	Plus Jeden Den
UK	Online	www.bbc.co.uk	www.telegraph.co.uk
	Print	The Guardian	The Sun
	Online	Yahoo	Virgilio
	Print	Panorama	L'Espresso
	Online	www.balsas.lt	www.alfa.lt
	Print	Lietuvos Zinios	Vakaros Zinios
	Online		
	Print	Tageblatt	Le Quotidien
	Online	www.tvnet.lv	http://rus.tvnet.lv/
	Print	Latvijas Avize daily	Vesti Segodinya
	Online	www.maltastar.com	www.maltarightnow.com
	Print	L-Orrizont/ It-Torca	Malta Today/Ilum
	Online	www.nieuws.nl	www.depers.nl
	Print	De Volkskrant	NRC Handelsblad
	Online	www.wp.pl	www.interia.pl
	Print	Dziennik Gazeta Prawna	Fakt
	Online	www.iol.pt	www.clix.pt
	Print	Expresso	Visao
	Online	www.mediafax.ro	www.realitatea.net
	Print	Evenimentul Zilei	Jurnalul National
	Online	www.8sidor.se	http://svt.se/2.105671/nyheter
	Print	Aftonbladet	Expressen
	Online	www.sta.si	www.rtvsllo.si
	Print	Dnevnik	Vecer
	Online	www.topky.sk	www.aktuality.sk
	Print	Plus 7 Dni	Zivot
	Online	www.news.uk.msn.com	http://uk.reuters.com/news/uk
	Print	Daily Mail	The Times

Source: FRA, Violence against women: an EU-wide survey, 2012

## 11.2. Overview of the outcomes of media monitoring

Different national research agencies used differing methods to conduct the media monitoring. Some subcontracted the work to specialised press-cutting agencies, whereas others used their in-house staff and resources to search the agreed media sources for articles which included one or more of the key terms.

Media monitoring started two weeks before the beginning of the interviews, and it continued until all the interviews were completed. By the end of the regular fieldwork period on 22 July 2012, the 28 national research agencies had identified and submitted 6,458 news articles concerned with violence against women and children. The number of articles submitted by each country in a given fortnightly period ranged from zero to 120, with an overall fortnightly average of 26 articles per country. The national research agencies which did not finish all interviews by 22 July 2012 (Ireland, Sweden and the United Kingdom) were instructed to cease interviews for the summer period, and complete them from 27 August 2012 onwards. At this time, research agencies in these three EU Member States also resumed the media monitoring activities, and collected more articles until all interviews had been completed.

National research agencies submitted reports, in a pre-designed Microsoft Excel™ format, to the research coordinators fortnightly, alongside scanned images of clippings or stable hyperlinks to articles. The Excel™ template had pre-designed fields that the agencies had to complete for each article they reported on, which included:

- the source
- the title of the article
- the author
- the date the article was published
- the date the article was accessed
- whether the article was a 'follow-up' story that had been covered in earlier weeks
- summary of the main points
- measures of importance, such as the word count, or the number of times the article had been tweeted or shared on Facebook

Table 11.2 details the number of articles produced and the number of weeks the monitoring was conducted for in each country.

Table 11.2: Number of articles related to violence against women that were recorded during the survey fieldwork, by EU Member State

EU Member State	Fieldwork duration in weeks	Total number of articles
AT	18	193
BE	14	159
BG	18	314
CY	20	53
CZ	20	165
DE	12	326
DK	16	139
EE	16	65
EL	16	411
ES	16	526
FI	16	421
FR	20	182
HR	14	192
HU	14	90
IE	19	149
IT	18	436
LT	18	175
LU	20	98
LV	16	46
MT	18	113
NL	18	264
PL	12	145
PT	18	109
RO	18	328
SE	20	489
SI	16	253
SK	20	282
UK	23	398

Source: FRA, *Violence against women: an EU-wide survey, 2012*

## 11.3. Assessment of the media monitoring

An analysis of the media content collected during the fieldwork, based on the articles collected in the 28 EU Member States, did not reveal media events which could be expected to have a significant impact on the survey results. However, as shown by the number of relevant articles listed in Table 11.2, the media reported incidents of violence against women in all Member States, and some cases received sustained attention for some part of the fieldwork period.

In some EU Member States, violence against children received attention in the media, as investigations took place concerning allegations of child abuse by Catholic church officials, child abuse in care homes for children, or possession of child pornography. In France, the fieldwork period of the FRA survey coincided with the French presidential elections. During the campaign, presidential candidates stressed the need for measures to counter sexual harassment, after the French Constitutional Court had ruled that a section of the penal code which defined sexual harassment was unconstitutional. Throughout the fieldwork period, the ongoing court case against the former managing director of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) attracted some

media attention, not only in France but also in other Member States. In Poland, the media reported on the discussions at the governmental level concerning the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence, and whether or not Poland should sign and ratify the convention. In the United Kingdom, the online platform Mumsnet carried out a survey which suggested a high prevalence of non-reporting among victims of rape. The results of the Mumsnet survey resulted in a social media campaign with the Twitter hashtag '#ididnotreport', and the Twitter campaign spread from the United Kingdom to France and Germany when interviews for the FRA survey were being carried out.





# References

American Association for Public Opinion Research (2011), *Standard definitions: Final dispositions of case codes and outcome rates for surveys*, 7<sup>th</sup> edition, AAPOR.

Eurofound (2012), *3rd European quality of life survey: Technical report*, available at: [www.eurofound.europa.eu/surveys/eqls/2011/methodology.htm](http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/surveys/eqls/2011/methodology.htm).

Eurofound (2010), *5<sup>th</sup> European Working Conditions Survey, 2010: Technical report*, available at: <http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/surveys/ewcs/2010/methodology.htm>.

Garcia-Moreno, C., Jansen, H. A. F. M., Ellsberg, M., Heise, L. and Watts, C. (2005), *WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence against women*, Geneva, World Health Organization.

Johnson, H., Ollus, N. and Nevala, S. (2008), *Violence against women: An international perspective*, New York, Springer.

# Annexes

## Annex 1: Country-specific information

This annex presents information country by country concerning a number of different issues about the survey questionnaire, sampling procedures, fieldwork outcomes and weighting.

Firstly, the survey asked for the most part the same questions in all 28 EU Member States to collect comparable data, but the answer categories for some questions – on the respondent's and her current partner's highest level of education, household income and the NGOs available – were different in each Member State. The education categories, for example, were selected so that they correspond to the various levels of the local education system, making it easier for respondents to select a category that is relevant to them. When respondents were asked about their household income, they could either indicate the relevant amount or answer using one of the categories listed in this annex. The income categories could be expressed as monthly income or annual income, as is customary in each Member State.

Secondly, the annex includes short notes on the sampling procedure used in each Member State. These notes provide more detail on the adopted sampling approach at the national level, supplementing the information provided in Chapter 4 concerning the overall sampling procedure. The fieldwork outcomes are presented for each country with a detailed breakdown according to the various outcome codes, including reasons why an interview could not be carried out at a particular address. The final set of tables presented for each country shows the data used for calculating the weights based on respondents' age and area where they live (urban or rural). Each national research agency compiled these data at the national level from various up-to-date data sources.

### Austria

#### Country-specific questions

##### **Bo6: NGOs**

Frauenhelpline (0800 222 555)

Frauenhäuser

Regionale Gewaltschutzzentren oder Interventionsstellen

##### **F09/J09: Education**

Pflichtschule ohne Abschluss (=kein Schulabschluss)

Pflichtschule (Volks-/Hauptschule) mit Abschluss

Lehre

Berufsbildende mittlere Schule (ohne Matura)

Berufsbildende oder allgemeinbildende höhere Schule (BHS/AHS) (mit Matura)

Akademien/Diplomlehrgänge (z.B. Physio-Therapeut, Krankenpfleger, etc.)

Hochschulstudium – Fachhochschule, Universität

Weiß nicht

Nicht zutreffend

Verweigert

##### **J02: Income**

Up to €1,600

€1,601–€2,300

€2,301–€3,000

Over €3,000

#### Specific sampling procedures

Census enumeration units were used as PSUs. The number of women was used as the PSU size indicator. Households were selected through random walk.



## Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	3,400
35	Total number of successful interviews	1,505
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>502</b>
1	Not yet built/under construction	9
2	Demolished/derelict	6
3	Vacant/empty housing unit	30
4	Non-residential address (business)	67
5	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	47
6	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	60
7	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	0
8	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	0
9	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	0
10	Preselected person has moved out from this address	0
11	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	8
12	No eligible respondents at address	275
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>196</b>
13	Issued, but not attempted	0
14	Inaccessible	14
15	Unable to locate address	0
16	No contact made at address after three calls	182
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>76</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	46
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	3
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	27
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>724</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	717
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	7
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>392</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	0
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	37
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	255
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	32
27	Broken appointment – no recontact	5
28	At home ill during survey period	2
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	2
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	8
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	46
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	5
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>5</b>
34	Partial interview	5

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18-24	357,444	11.48
25-34	541,693	17.40
35-39	303,457	9.75
40-49	695,742	22.35
50-59	549,665	17.66
60-69	478,983	15.38
70-74	186,339	5.99
Total	3,113,323	100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
1	Rural	9.91
2		18.42
3		31.00
4		6.22
5		7.27
6		7.17
7	Urban	20.01
Total		100.00

## Belgium

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs (French)

Ecoute violences conjugales  
Collectif contre les violences familiales et l'exclusion  
SOS Viol

#### Bo6: NGOs (Dutch)

CAW Federatie  
Vluchthuis  
Tele-Onthaal

#### F09/J09: Education (French)

1. Aucun terminé
2. Primaires
3. Secondaire inférieur professionnel ou technique
4. Secondaire inférieur général
5. Secondaire supérieur professionnel (A3)
6. Secondaire supérieur technique (A2)
7. Secondaire supérieur général
8. Septième année professionnelle ou technique de transition (donnant accès à l'enseignement supérieur) ou formation ouvrant l'accès à une profession (pas de niveau supérieur).
9. Supérieur de type court (A1)
10. Supérieur de type long
11. Universitaire
12. Doctorat ou post-doctorat



**F09/J09: Education (Dutch)**

1. Niet voltooid lager onderwijs
2. Lager onderwijs, basisschool, speciaal lager onderwijs, bijzonder lager onderwijs
3. Lager beroepsonderwijs, lagere technische school
4. Lager algemeen secundair onderwijs
5. Hoger secundair beroepsonderwijs
6. Hoger secundair technisch (A2)
7. Hoger algemeen secundair
8. Zevende jaar beroepsonderwijs (verleent toegang tot hoger onderwijs) Opleiding onder leerovereenkomst (niet hoger onderwijs met toegang tot beroep)
9. Hoger onderwijs korte type (HOKT) (A1)
10. Hoger onderwijs lange type (HOLT)
11. Universiteit
12. Doctoraal en postdoctoraal

**J02: Income**

The same income categories were used in French and Dutch language areas.

Up to €1,146

€1,146–€1,985

€1,985–€3,086

€3,086–€5,643

**Specific sampling procedures**

Communes were used as PSUs. The number of women aged 18 to 74 years was used as the PSU size indicator. Following the selection, the individual-based sampling frame was used to select women in each PSU.

**Final outcomes**

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	5,546
<b>35</b>	Total number of successful interviews	1,537
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>631</b>
<b>1</b>	Not yet built/under construction	0
<b>2</b>	Demolished/derelict	11
<b>3</b>	Vacant/empty housing unit	99
<b>4</b>	Non-residential address (business)	118
<b>5</b>	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	0
<b>6</b>	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	0
<b>7</b>	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	0
<b>8</b>	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	188
<b>9</b>	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	215
<b>10</b>	Preselected person has moved out from this address	0
<b>11</b>	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	0
<b>12</b>	No eligible respondents at address	0
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>1,017</b>
<b>13</b>	Issued, but not attempted	0
<b>14</b>	Inaccessible	0
<b>15</b>	Unable to locate address	276
<b>16</b>	No contact made at address after three calls	741
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>17</b>	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	0

Code no.	Final outcomes	
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	0
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	0
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>0</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	0
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	0
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>2,360</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	0
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	502
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	1,386
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	216
27	Broken appointment – no recontact	0
28	At home ill during survey period	67
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	0
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	12
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	177
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	0
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>1</b>
34	Partial interview	1

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18-24	460,919	11.95
25-34	693,304	17.97
35-39	369,716	9.58
40-49	795,172	20.61
50-59	729,334	18.90
60-69	563,898	14.61
70-74	246,162	6.38
Total	3,858,505	100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
1	Rural	4.93
2		7.37
3		11.80
4		15.40
5		20.80
6	Urban	39.71
Total		100.00



## Bulgaria

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs

Фондация “Асоциация Анимус”	Nationalna goreschta linia za domaschno nasilie
Фондация “Надя Център”	Nadja Centre Foundation
Регионални приюти за жени, пострадали от насилие, или центрове за спешна помощ	Zastita na zheni – regional women’s shelters or emergency centres

#### Fo9/Jo9: Education

1. Незавършено начално образование (I – IV клас) 1
2. Завършено начално образование (I – IV клас) 2
3. Прогимназиално образование (V – VIII клас) 3
4. Средно/средно-специално образование (IX – XII/XIII клас) 4
5. Завършили програми след средно образование, но не висше образование/Колеж 5
6. Специалист/Професионален бакалавър или Бакалавър 6
7. Магистър или Доктор 7

#### Jo2: Income

Up to BGN 200 (up to €100)

BGN 201–500 (€101–250)

BGN 501–1,000 (€251–500)

Over BGN 1,000 (€EUR 500)

### Specific sampling procedures

EKATTE classifier, which is a classification of administrative-territorial and territorial units, was used to list PSUs. The number of voters aged 18 years and over was used as the PSU size indicator. Random walk was used to select addresses.

### Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	3,562
<b>35</b>	Total number of successful interviews	1,507
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>786</b>
<b>1</b>	Not yet built/under construction	0
<b>2</b>	Demolished/derelict	52
<b>3</b>	Vacant/empty housing unit	149
<b>4</b>	Non-residential address (business)	0
<b>5</b>	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	6
<b>6</b>	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	73
<b>7</b>	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	0
<b>8</b>	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	6
<b>9</b>	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	2
<b>10</b>	Preselected person has moved out from this address	0
<b>11</b>	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	26
<b>12</b>	No eligible respondents at address	472
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>439</b>
<b>13</b>	Issued, but not attempted	0
<b>14</b>	Inaccessible	117
<b>15</b>	Unable to locate address	0
<b>16</b>	No contact made at address after three calls	322

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>162</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	134
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	19
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	9
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>131</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	123
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	8
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>535</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	12
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	31
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	364
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	88
27	Broken appointment – no recontact	2
28	At home ill during survey period	11
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	21
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	5
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	0
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	1
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>2</b>
34	Partial interview	2

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18–24	341,361	11.66
25–34	542,620	18.54
35–39	273,082	9.33
40–49	519,475	17.75
50–59	551,352	18.84
60–69	498,740	17.04
70–74	199,918	6.83
Total	2,926,548	100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
7–8	Rural	7.32
6		6.40
5		11.59
4		6.26
3		9.26
2		15.15
1		28.88
0	Urban	15.14
Total		100.00



## Croatia

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOS

Autonomna ženska kuća – linija za pomoć 0800 55 44

Udruga za zaštitu obitelji – Rijeka (U. Z. O. R.)

B.a.B.e (Budi aktivna, Budi emancipirana)

#### Fo9/Jo9: Education

1. Nezavršena osnovna škola

2. Osnovna škola

3. Završena srednja strukovna škola u trajanju do tri godine

4. Srednja strukovna škola u trajanje 4 godine, gimnazija

5. No code

6. Završen prvi stupanj obrazovanja na fakultetu (provostupnik) ili viša škola

7. Završen viši stupanj obrazovanja na fakultetu

#### Jo2: income

Up to HRK 3,000

HRK 3,001–5,000

HRK 5,001–8,000

More than HRK 8,000

### Specific sampling procedures

The polling stations were used as PSUs. The number of registered voters was used as the PSU size indicator. Addresses were selected by random walk. The population of smaller islands were excluded from the survey.

### Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	3,874
35	Total number of successful interviews	1,505
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>593</b>
1	Not yet built/under construction	0
2	Demolished/derelict	34
3	Vacant/empty housing unit	161
4	Non-residential address (business)	0
5	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	0
6	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	67
7	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	0
8	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	0
9	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	0
10	Preselected person has moved out from this address	0
11	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	50
12	No eligible respondents at address	281
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>163</b>
13	Issued, but not attempted	0
14	Inaccessible	7
15	Unable to locate address	0
16	No contact made at address after three calls	156

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>208</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	205
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	2
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	1
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>441</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	404
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	37
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>963</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	0
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	27
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	752
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	42
27	Broken appointment – no recontact	59
28	At home ill during survey period	0
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	2
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	7
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	3
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	71
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>1</b>
34	Partial interview	1

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18-24	190,173	11.45
25-34	305,097	18.37
35-39	145,813	8.78
40-49	315,084	18.97
50-59	326,425	19.65
60-69	253,208	15.25
70-74	125,076	7.53
Total	1,660,876	100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
9	Rural	14.49
8		11.45
7		10.03
6		9.95
5		6.23
4		6.88
3		8.45
2		7.73
1	Urban	24.79
Total		100.00

## Cyprus

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs

Σύνδεσμος για την πρόληψη και αντιμετώπιση της βίας στην οικογένεια (1440)	Sindesmos gia tin prolipsi kai antimetopisi tis vias stin ikogeneia (1440)/Association for preventing and addressing domestic violence (1440)
Γραμμή του πολίτη (1460)	Grammi tou politi (1460)/Citizen's Line (1460)
Γραμμή έκτακτης ανάγκης (199)	Grammi ektaktis anagkis (199)/Emergency Helpline (199)

#### Fo9/J09: Education

1. Δεν έχει ολοκληρώσει τη δημοτική εκπαίδευση
2. Δημοτική ή πρωτοβάθμια
3. Κατώτερη δευτεροβάθμια
4. Ανώτερη δευτεροβάθμια
5. Μεταλυκειακή, όχι τριτοβάθμια
6. Πρώτο στάδιο τριτοβάθμιας
7. Δεύτερο στάδιο τριτοβάθμιας

#### J02: Income

- Up to €500
- €501–1,000
- €1,001–2,700
- €2,701 or more

### Specific sampling procedures

Communities were used as PSUs. The number of households was used as the PSU size indicator. Smaller PSUs with too few households to obtain the target number of interviews were replaced with reserve PSUs. The population of smaller islands was excluded from the survey. The households were selected by random walk.

### Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	2,249
<b>35</b>	Total number of successful interviews	<b>1,505</b>
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>116</b>
<b>1</b>	Not yet built/under construction	32
<b>2</b>	Demolished/derelict	20
<b>3</b>	Vacant/empty housing unit	42
<b>4</b>	Non-residential address (business)	15
<b>5</b>	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	0
<b>6</b>	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	7
<b>7</b>	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	0
<b>8</b>	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	0
<b>9</b>	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	0
<b>10</b>	Preselected person has moved out from this address	0
<b>11</b>	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	0
<b>12</b>	No eligible respondents at address	0
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>13</b>	Issued, but not attempted	0

Code no.	Final outcomes	
14	Inaccessible	18
15	Unable to locate address	0
16	No contact made at address after three calls	0
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>0</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	0
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	0
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	0
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>597</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	597
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	0
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>13</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	1
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	0
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	0
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	0
27	Broken appointment – no recontact	0
28	At home ill during survey period	0
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	0
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	0
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	12
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	0
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>0</b>
34	Partial interview	0

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18-24	46,395	15.07
25-34	67,554	21.94
35-39	31,609	10.27
40-49	58,955	19.15
50-59	50,506	16.41
60-69	38,638	12.55
70-74	14,208	4.62
Total	307,865	100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
2	Rural	36.48
1	Urban	63.52
Total		100.00

## Czech Republic

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs

ROSA

proFEM o.p.s.

Magdalenium o.s.

#### Fo9/Jo9: Education

1. Bez vzdělání, neukončené základní vzdělání
2. Základní vzdělání
3. Střední bez maturitou, vyučený bez maturitou
4. Střední s maturitou, vyučený s maturitou
5. Vyšší odborné vzdělání (vyšší odborná škola)
6. Vysokoškolské – do stupně bakalář
7. Vysokoškolské – vyšší (magistr, inženýr, doktor)

#### Jo2: Income

Up to CZL 18,000

CZK 18,001–26,000

CZK 26,001–35,000

CZK 35, 0001 or more

### Specific sampling procedures

Regional technical units (UTJ) were used as PSUs. The number of flats were used as the PSU size indicator. Households were selected by random walk.

### Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	4,180
35	Total number of successful interviews	1,620
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>601</b>
1	Not yet built/under construction	0
2	Demolished/derelect	11
3	Vacant/empty housing unit	28
4	Non-residential address (business)	0
5	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	0
6	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	79
7	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	0
8	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	0
9	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	0
10	Preselected person has moved out from this address	0
11	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	44
12	No eligible respondents at address	439
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>212</b>
13	Issued, but not attempted	0
14	Inaccessible	18
15	Unable to locate address	0
16	No contact made at address after three calls	194

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>92</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	81
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	5
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	6
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>419</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	408
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	11
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>1,236</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	910
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	12
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	218
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	61
27	Broken appointment – no recontact	0
28	At home ill during survey period	8
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	11
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	9
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	4
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	3
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>0</b>
34	Partial interview	0

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18-24	467,843	11.70
25-34	816,652	20.42
35-39	410,637	10.27
40-49	675,000	16.88
50-59	741,995	18.56
60-69	674,025	16.86
70-74	212,293	5.31
Total	3,998,445	100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
1	Rural	17.34
2		19.58
3		17.92
4		21.77
5	Urban	23.39
Total		100.00

## Denmark

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs

Kvindekrisecentre  
Danner  
Offerrådgivningen

#### F09/J09: Education

1. Ikke fuldført folkeskolen/grundskolen
2. Folkeskole/grundskole
3. Gymnasial uddannelse
4. Erhvervsuddannelse
5. Kort videregående uddannelse
6. Mellemlang videregående uddannelse inkl. bachelor
7. Længere videregående uddannelse eller forskeruddannelse (Phd)

#### J02: Income

Under DKK 200,000  
DKK 200,000–399,999  
DKK 400,000–599,999  
DKK 600,000 or more

### Specific sampling procedures

Communities were used as PSUs. The islands of Bornholm, Laesoe and Anholt and some very small islands were excluded from the survey. The number of households was used as the PSU size indicator. An individual-based sampling frame was used for selecting individuals. The first contact was made over the telephone; those with non-contact were sent invitation letters to take part in the survey.

### Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	9,555
35	Total number of successful interviews	1,514
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>3,089</b>
1	Not yet built/under construction	0
2	Demolished/derelict	0
3	Vacant/empty housing unit	0
4	Non-residential address (business)	19
5	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	3
6	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	0
7	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	0
8	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	3,067
9	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	0
10	Preselected person has moved out from this address	0
11	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	0
12	No eligible respondents at address	0
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>1,541</b>
13	Issued, but not attempted	0
14	Inaccessible	15
15	Unable to locate address	0

Code no.	Final outcomes	
16	No contact made at address after three calls	1,526
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>1,597</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	1,560
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	26
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	11
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>446</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	405
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	41
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>1,368</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	4
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	2
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	828
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	222
27	Broken appointment – no recontact	150
28	At home ill during survey period	14
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	9
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	31
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	49
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	22
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	37
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>0</b>
34	Partial interview	0

### Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18-24	226,705	11.55
25-34	331,304	16.88
35-39	192,614	9.81
40-49	401,525	20.45
50-59	356,335	18.15
60-69	340,011	17.32
70-74	114,588	5.84
Total	1,963,082	100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
4	Rural	8.08
3		27.20
2		15.47
1	Urban	49.25
Total		100.00





## Estonia

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs

Ohvriabi  
Naiste varjupaigad  
Tugitefon 1492

#### F09/J09: Education

1 Alg- või lõpetamata põhiharidus  
2 Põhiharidus  
3 Kutseharidus põhihariduse baasil  
4 Kesk- või keskeriharidus  
5 Rakenduslik kõrgharidus  
6 Kõrgharidus – bakalaure  
7 Kõrgharidus – magister või doktor

#### J02: Income

Up to €400  
€401–€650  
€651–€1,000  
Over €1,000

### Specific sampling procedures

Census enumeration units were used as PSUs. A higher number of PSUs (150) were selected for this survey because the average size of PSUs is small. The number of women was used as the PSU size indicator. Households were selected by random walk.

### Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	6,358
35	Total number of successful interviews	1,500
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>1,303</b>
1	Not yet built/under construction	11
2	Demolished/derelect	11
3	Vacant/empty housing unit	181
4	Non-residential address (business)	46
5	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	16
6	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	9
7	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	0
8	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	0
9	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	0
10	Preselected person has moved out from this address	0
11	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	0
12	No eligible respondents at address	1,029
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>2,130</b>
13	Issued, but not attempted	0
14	Inaccessible	126
15	Unable to locate address	2

Code no.	Final outcomes	
16	No contact made at address after three calls	2,002
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>337</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	313
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	17
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	7
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>310</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	309
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	1
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>778</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	434
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	18
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	70
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	60
27	Broken appointment – no recontact	52
28	At home ill during survey period	62
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	66
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	11
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	2
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	3
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>0</b>
34	Partial interview	0

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18–24	70,339	13.31
25–34	96,654	18.29
35–39	46,959	8.89
40–49	94,239	17.83
50–59	98,409	18.62
60–69	80,707	15.27
70–74	41,164	7.79
Total	528,471	100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
3	Rural	48.37
2		20.36
1	Urban	31.27
Total		100.00



## Finland

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs

Ensi- ja turvakotien liitto

Naisten Linja

Raiskauskriisikeskus Tukinainen

#### F09/J09: Education

1. Ei koulutusta

2. Peruskoulu – alakoulu (luokat 1–6)

3. Peruskoulu – yläkoulu (luokat 7–10)

4. Lukio, keskiasteen ammatillinen koulutus

5. Erikoisammattitutkinnot

6. Korkea-asteen koulutus

7. Korkea-asteen jatkotutkinto

#### J02: Income

Less than €1,500

€1,501–€2,500

€2,501–€3,900

Over €3,900

### Specific sampling procedures

Municipalities were used as PSUs. The Aland Islands were excluded from the survey. The number of women aged 18 to 74 years was used as the PSU size indicator. The individuals were selected through the population register. The first contact was made over the telephone.

### Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	3,948
35	Total number of successful interviews	1,520
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>0</b>
1	Not yet built/under construction	0
2	Demolished/derelect	0
3	Vacant/empty housing unit	0
4	Non-residential address (business)	0
5	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	0
6	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	0
7	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	0
8	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	0
9	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	0
10	Preselected person has moved out from this address	0
11	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	0
12	No eligible respondents at address	0
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>0</b>
13	Issued, but not attempted	0
14	Inaccessible	0
15	Unable to locate address	0

Code no.	Final outcomes	
16	No contact made at address after three calls	0
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>0</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	0
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	0
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	0
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>0</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	0
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	0
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>2,428</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	7
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	550
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	967
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	45
27	Broken appointment – no recontact	81
28	At home ill during survey period	5
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	97
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	22
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	2
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	1
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	651
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>0</b>
34	Partial interview	0

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18-24	224,316	11.69
25-34	332,010	17.31
35-39	151,847	7.92
40-49	363,842	18.97
50-59	384,489	20.05
60-69	337,770	17.61
70-74	123,793	6.45
Total	1,918,067	100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
3	Rural	33.79
2		32.87
1	Urban	33.34
Total		100.00



## France

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs

3919 Violences Femmes Info

SOS Viols Femmes Informations du Collectif Féministe Contre de Viol

Centres d'hébergement, tels que SOS Femmes, Femmes Accueil ou la Maison des Femmes

#### F09/J09: Education

1. Pas de diplôme

2. BEPC/BEP/CAP

3. Baccalauréat

4. DEUG/BTS/DUT (Bac +2)

5. Licence/Maîtrise/Master 1

6. Grande école/Doctorat/DEA/DESS/Master 2

7. PhD

#### J02: Income

Under €1,000

From €1,000 up to €1,200

From €1,200 up to €1,400

From €1,400 up to €2,300

From €2,300 up to €3,000

From €3,000 up to €4,500

From €4,500 up to €5,400

€5,400 or more

### Specific sampling procedures

Communes were used as PSUs. The number of women was used as the PSU size indicator. The PSUs were stratified by region and urban-ness within region and selected with the preference of being within 25 km from the nearest suitable interviewer, within the nationwide network of interviewers. Households were selected by random walk.

### Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	5,802
<b>35</b>	Total number of successful interviews	1,528
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>1,261</b>
<b>1</b>	Not yet built/under construction	12
<b>2</b>	Demolished/derelict	18
<b>3</b>	Vacant/empty housing unit	53
<b>4</b>	Non-residential address (business)	28
<b>5</b>	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	13
<b>6</b>	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	70
<b>7</b>	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	7
<b>8</b>	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	1
<b>9</b>	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	17
<b>10</b>	Preselected person has moved out from this address	7
<b>11</b>	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	52
<b>12</b>	No eligible respondents at address	983
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>900</b>
<b>13</b>	Issued, but not attempted	7
<b>14</b>	Inaccessible	37

Code no.	Final outcomes	
15	Unable to locate address	16
16	No contact made at address after three calls	840
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>203</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	174
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	6
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	23
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>136</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	122
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	14
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>1,645</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	1
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	176
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	966
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	160
27	Broken appointment – no recontact	113
28	At home ill during survey period	18
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	43
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	10
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	27
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	3
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	128
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>5</b>
34	Partial interview	5
	<b>Other codes if applicable</b>	<b>124</b>

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18-24	2,831,034	12.42
25-34	4,021,885	17.65
35-39	2,269,639	9.96
40-49	4,573,884	20.07
50-59	4,368,973	19.17
60-69	3,372,118	14.79
70-74	1,355,692	5.95
Total	22,793,225	100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
Rural	Rural	24.18
Fewer than 20,000 people		16.43
Between 20,000 and 99,999 people		12.93
100,000 people and more		29.24
Paris agglomeration	Urban	17.21
Total		100.00

## Germany

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs

Frauenhäuser  
Frauenberatungsstellen  
Frauennotruf

#### F09/J09: Education

1. Keine abgeschlossene Schulausbildung
2. Hauptschule ohne Abschluss
3. Hauptschulabschluss (POS 8 Klassen)
4. Mittlere Reife, Realschulabschluss, weiterführende Schule ohne Abitur (POS 10 Klassen)
5. Abitur, Hochschulreife, ohne Studium (EOS 12 Klassen)
6. Abgeschlossenes Studium (Universität, Technische Hochschule, Polytechnikum, Fachhochschule)
7. Promotion, Habilitation

#### Jo2: Income

Under €1,500  
€1,500–€2,200  
€2,200–€3,100  
Over €3,100

### Specific sampling procedures

PSUs were selected by two stages. First, ADM, a company specialising in sample design, selected 258 communities, and then Ipsos Germany selected 50 communities out of 258 by simple random selection. Population was used as the PSU size indicator. Seed households were selected from the telephone directory; follow-up households were selected by random walk starting from the address of the seed household.

### Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	3,559
35	Total number of successful interviews	1,534
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>488</b>
1	Not yet built/under construction	0
2	Demolished/derelect	0
3	Vacant/empty housing unit	0
4	Non-residential address (business)	0
5	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	0
6	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	0
7	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	0
8	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	0
9	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	0
10	Preselected person has moved out from this address	0
11	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	0
12	No eligible respondents at address	488
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>231</b>
13	Issued, but not attempted	0
14	Inaccessible	0
15	Unable to locate address	0

Code no.	Final outcomes	
16	No contact made at address after three calls	231
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>217</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	184
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	3
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	30
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>292</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	292
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	0
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>795</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	0
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	62
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	458
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	93
27	Broken appointment – no recontact	51
28	At home ill during survey period	26
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	14
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	14
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	52
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	25
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>2</b>
34	Partial interview	2

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18-24	3,323,365	10.89
25-34	4,791,885	15.70
35-39	2,583,366	8.46
40-49	6,801,292	22.29
50-59	5,741,985	18.81
60-69	4,724,242	15.48
70-74	2,552,708	8.36
Total	30,518,843	100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
-5T	Rural	3.50
5-20T		9.50
20-50T		11.80
50-100T		10.30
100-500T		30.20
500T+	Urban	34.70
Total		100.00





## Greece

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs

Grammi Voytheas SOS 15900 (Helpline SOS 15900)

Grammi Amesis Voytheas tou ethnικού kentrou kinonikis allilegyis 197 (National Emergency Helpline of the Centre for Social Solidarity 197)

#### Fo9/Jo9: Education

1. Μερικές τάξεις δημοτικού
2. Απολυτήριο δημοτικού
3. Απολυτήριο γυμνασίου
4. Απολυτήριο γενικού ή επαγγελματικού λυκείου
5. (Μεταλυκειακά) Πτυχίο/πιστοποιητικό επαγγελματικής εκπαίδευσης, πτυχίο ανώτερης σχολής επαγγελματικής εκπαίδευσης
6. Πτυχίο ΑΕΙ/ΤΕΙ
7. Μεταπτυχιακό δίπλωμα/Διδακτορικό

#### Jo2: Income

Up to €775

€776–€1,190

€1,191–€2,500

€2,501 and above

### Specific sampling procedures

The smallest Greek islands and PSUs with a population of under 20 were excluded from the fieldwork. PSUs with a population of under 100 were listed in a separate list. Six PSUs, with a target number of 10 interviews each, were selected from the smaller PSU list to replace two larger PSUs with a target number of interviews of 30 each, in accordance with the proportion of population in each stratum of large and smaller PSUs. Accordingly, 48 larger PSUs were selected with the target number of 30 interviews. Households were selected by random walk.

### Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	2,566
<b>35</b>	Total number of successful interviews	1,500
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>306</b>
<b>1</b>	Not yet built/under construction	8
<b>2</b>	Demolished/derelict	6
<b>3</b>	Vacant/empty housing unit	57
<b>4</b>	Non-residential address (business)	22
<b>5</b>	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	2
<b>6</b>	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	36
<b>7</b>	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	0
<b>8</b>	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	0
<b>9</b>	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	0
<b>10</b>	Preselected person has moved out from this address	0
<b>11</b>	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	0
<b>12</b>	No eligible respondents at address	175
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>13</b>	Issued, but not attempted	0
<b>14</b>	Inaccessible	0
<b>15</b>	Unable to locate address	0
<b>16</b>	No contact made at address after three calls	39

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>455</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	455
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	0
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	0
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>119</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	119
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	0
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>147</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	0
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	0
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	111
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	5
27	Broken appointment - no recontact	0
28	At home ill during survey period	1
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	0
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	4
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	26
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	0
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>0</b>
34	Partial interview	0

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18-24	412,773	9.90
25-34	788,356	18.91
35-39	428,726	10.29
40-49	838,617	20.12
50-59	749,419	17.98
60-69	633,979	15.21
70-74	316,452	7.59
Total	4,168,322	100.00
Total		100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
1	Rural	9.33
2		7.93
3		6.71
4		7.73
5		5.33
6		13.30
7		8.49
8	Urban	41.18
Total		100.00

## Hungary

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs

NANE Egyesület telefonos lelkisegélyszolgálatáról

PATENT Jogvédő Egyesület telefonos jogsegélyszolgálatáról

OKIT – Országos Kríziskezelő és Információs Telefonszolgálatról

#### F09/J09: Education

1. Nem járt iskolába
2. 1–5 osztályt végzett (elemi)
3. 6–7 osztályt (elemi)
4. 8 osztálynál kevesebb
5. 8 általános (régen: 4 polgári vagy 4 gimnázium, új rendszerben: 9–10. osztály is, befejezetlen középiskola)
6. Szakmunkás-, szakiskolai bizonyítvány, vizsga, mesterlevél, segédlevél, tanonciskola
7. Szakközépiskolai érettségi (befejezetlen felsőfokú tanintézet)
8. Gimnáziumi érettségi (befejezetlen felsőfokú tanintézet)
9. Érettségihez kötött szakképzés (nem szakmunkásvizsga!), technikum, felsőfokúnak nevezett, diplomát nem adó felsőfokú képzés
10. Főiskolai diploma, felsőfokú technikum
11. Egyetemi diploma

#### J02: Income

HUF 90,000 and below

HUF 90,001–150,000

HUF 150,001–200,000

HUF 200,001 and above

### Specific sampling procedures

Electoral polling stations were used as PSUs. The number of households was used as the PSU size indicator. An address-based sampling frame was used to select households.

### Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	2,133
<b>35</b>	Total number of successful interviews	1,512
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>287</b>
<b>1</b>	Not yet built/under construction	2
<b>2</b>	Demolished/derelict	9
<b>3</b>	Vacant/empty housing unit	25
<b>4</b>	Non-residential address (business)	10
<b>5</b>	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	4
<b>6</b>	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	24
<b>7</b>	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	0
<b>8</b>	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	4
<b>9</b>	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	7
<b>10</b>	Preselected person has moved out from this address	6
<b>11</b>	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	61
<b>12</b>	No eligible respondents at address	135

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>141</b>
13	Issued, but not attempted	66
14	Inaccessible	23
15	Unable to locate address	6
16	No contact made at address after three calls	46
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>0</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	0
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	0
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	0
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>153</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	131
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	22
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>40</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	0
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	20
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	18
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	0
27	Broken appointment – no recontact	0
28	At home ill during survey period	0
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	0
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	0
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	0
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	2
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>0</b>
34	Partial interview	0

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18-24	442,144	11.42
25-34	759,403	19.62
35-39	370,696	9.58
40-49	642,627	16.60
50-59	769,575	19.88
60-69	631,134	16.31
70-74	255,159	6.59
Total	3,870,738	100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
1	Rural	37.66
2	Urban	62.34
Total		100.00

## Ireland

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs

Rape Crisis Centre  
Women's Aid  
Safe Ireland

#### F09/J09: Education

1. Not completed primary education
2. Primary school
3. Secondary school – Inter/Junior Cert or equivalent
4. Secondary school – Leaving Cert or equivalent
5. Post secondary, non-degree level
6. Degree-level or professional qualification
7. Postgraduate diploma/degree/doctorate

#### J02: Income

€21,500 or lower  
More than €21,500, up to €37,500  
More than €37,500, up to €66,500  
More than €66,500

### Specific sampling procedures

Electoral districts were used as PSUs. The number of households was used as the PSU size indicator. Several starting addresses were selected per PSU from a list of addresses. This was part of the standard fieldwork procedures of national research agency in Ireland and served to avoid additional clustering effects within the sampling point. Follow-up addresses were selected by random walk.

### Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	4,275
35	Total number of successful interviews	1,567
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>847</b>
1	Not yet built/under construction	89
2	Demolished/derelect	41
3	Vacant/empty housing unit	140
4	Non-residential address (business)	56
5	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	33
6	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	52
7	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	0
8	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	0
9	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	0
10	Preselected person has moved out from this address	0
11	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	15
12	No eligible respondents at address	421
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>453</b>
13	Issued, but not attempted	267
14	Inaccessible	7
15	Unable to locate address	6

Code no.	Final outcomes	
16	No contact made at address after three calls	173
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>105</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	53
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	6
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	46
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>65</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	49
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	16
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>1,232</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	0
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	58
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	1,005
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	42
27	Broken appointment – no recontact	61
28	At home ill during survey period	20
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	16
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	8
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	15
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	7
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>6</b>
34	Partial interview	6

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18-24	199,380	12.67
25-34	392,152	24.93
35-39	173,782	11.05
40-49	305,015	19.39
50-59	250,838	15.95
60-69	186,704	11.87
70-74	65,199	4.14
Total	1,573,070	100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
1	Rural	37.95
2	Urban	62.05
Total		100.00



## Italy

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs

Telefono Rosa

Casa delle donne

Rete Nazionale Antiviolenza e Servizio 1522

#### F09/J09: Education

1. Nessun titolo di studio

2. Elementari non completate

3. Elementari completate (fino a 10 anni)

4. Completato il primo ciclo di scuola secondaria (medie/fino a 14 anni)

5. Completato il secondo ciclo di scuola secondaria (medie superiori/fino a 16 o a 18 anni)

6. Completato il primo ciclo di corso universitario (laurea breve)

7. Completato l'università/corsi post-universitari

#### J02: Income

Up to €26,400

€26,400€–€40,200

€40,200–€59,700

Over €59,700

### Specific sampling procedures

Settlements (towns and villages) were used as PSUs. The PSUs were stratified by population density (in addition to the usual stratification by region) in absence of a suitable rurality indicator. The population size was used as the PSU size indicator.

### Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	3,303
35	Total number of successful interviews	1,531
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>437</b>
1	Not yet built/under construction	6
2	Demolished/derelict	22
3	Vacant/empty housing unit	35
4	Non-residential address (business)	58
5	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	31
6	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	12
7	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	0
8	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	0
9	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	0
10	Preselected person has moved out from this address	0
11	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	4
12	No eligible respondents at address	269
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>201</b>
13	Issued, but not attempted	4
14	Inaccessible	22
15	Unable to locate address	2
16	No contact made at address after three calls	173

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>129</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	116
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	2
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	11
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>860</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	769
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	91
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>144</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	0
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	11
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	86
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	27
27	Broken appointment – no recontact	7
28	At home ill during survey period	4
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	3
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	0
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	0
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	6
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>1</b>
34	Partial interview	1

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18–24	2,116,350	9.47
25–34	3,823,082	17.11
35–39	2,392,841	10.71
40–49	4,817,729	21.57
50–59	3,959,968	17.73
60–69	3,576,929	16.01
70–74	1,652,166	7.40
Total	22,339,065	100.00

Indicator (population per sq km)	Definition	% of total
0–250	Rural	30.72
250–500		18.50
500–1800		27.12
1800+	Urban	23.70
Total		100.00



## Latvia

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs

Resursu centrs sievietēm "Marta"

Krīzes centrs "Skalbes"

Talsu novada križu centrs

#### F09/J09: Education

1. Nepabeigta pamatskolas izglītība

2. Pamatskolas izglītība (4–9 klases)

3. Arodskolas izglītība (pēc 9. klases beigšanas)

4. Vispārējā vidējā izglītība (12 klases)

5. Vidējā speciālā izglītība (pēc 12. klases beigšanas), koledža, tehnikums

6. 3–4 studiju gadi augstākā mācību iestādē (pēc 1990. gada – bakalaura grāds)

7. Augstākā izglītība (pirms 1990. gada – pabeigta augstākā izglītība, pēc 1990. gada – pabeigta maģistrantūra), zinātniskais grāds

#### J02: Income

Up to LVL 200

LVL 201–349

LVL 350–499

LVL 500 or more

### Specific sampling procedures

Electoral districts were used as PSUs. The population size was used as the PSU size indicator. A separate field force of enumerators selected addresses before fieldwork started.

### Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	2,830
35	Total number of successful interviews	1,513
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>587</b>
1	Not yet built/under construction	1
2	Demolished/derelect	0
3	Vacant/empty housing unit	147
4	Non-residential address (business)	22
5	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	1
6	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	8
7	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	0
8	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	0
9	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	0
10	Preselected person has moved out from this address	0
11	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	0
12	No eligible respondents at address	408
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>217</b>
13	Issued, but not attempted	0
14	Inaccessible	13
15	Unable to locate address	0

Code no.	Final outcomes	
16	No contact made at address after three calls	204
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>164</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	157
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	4
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	3
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>34</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	34
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	0
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>315</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	0
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	11
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	213
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	62
27	Broken appointment – no recontact	0
28	At home ill during survey period	3
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	21
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	5
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	0
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	0
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>0</b>
34	Partial interview	0

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18-24	121,788	13.54
25-34	161,505	17.95
35-39	79,283	8.81
40-49	164,541	18.29
50-59	162,642	18.08
60-69	139,489	15.50
70-74	70,414	7.83
Total	899,662	100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
4	Rural	32.47
3		18.53
2		17.35
1	Urban	31.64
Total		100.00



## Lithuania

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs

Vilniaus Moterų Namai  
Klaipėdos Socialinės ir Psichologinės Pagalbos Centras  
Regioniniai moterų krizių ir

#### F09/J09: Education

1. Nebaigtas pradinis
2. Pradinis
3. Pagrindinis
4. Bendrasis vidurinis
5. Aukštesnis už vidurinį, spec. vidurinis, technikumus
6. Aukštesnysis
7. Aukštasis (universitetas, kolegija)

#### J02: Income

Under LTL 1,200  
LTL 1,200–1,600  
LTL 1,600–2,200  
LTL 2,200 or more

### Specific sampling procedures

Electoral districts were used as PSUs. The number of adults aged 18 and over was used as the PSU size indicator. Addresses were selected by random walk.

### Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	4,426
35	Total number of successful interviews	1,552
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>764</b>
1	Not yet built/under construction	32
2	Demolished/derelect	53
3	Vacant/empty housing unit	57
4	Non-residential address (business)	91
5	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	82
6	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	23
7	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	0
8	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	0
9	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	0
10	Pre-selected person has moved out from this address	0
11	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	19
12	No eligible respondents at address	407
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>734</b>
13	Issued, but not attempted	4
14	Inaccessible	22
15	Unable to locate address	42
16	No contact made at address after three calls	666

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>504</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	486
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	10
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	8
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>359</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	332
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	27
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>513</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	2
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	142
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	230
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	51
27	Broken appointment – no recontact	15
28	At home ill during survey period	11
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	21
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	7
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	12
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	22
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>0</b>
34	Partial interview	0

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18–24	182,579	14.00
25–34	226,311	17.36
35–39	118,598	9.10
40–49	260,984	20.02
50–59	233,460	17.90
60–69	190,187	14.59
70–74	91,798	7.04
Total	1,303,917	100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
2	Rural	58.83
1	Urban	41.17
Total		100.00

## Luxembourg

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs

Fraenhaus Lëtzebuerg

Fraentelefon 123 44

Service d'assistance aux victimes de violence domestique

#### Fo9/Jo9: Education

1. Keen Diplom
2. Primärschoul
3. 1ten Cycle am secondaire/secondaire technique
4. 2ten Cycle am secondaire/secondaire technique
5. Fachhéichschoul, Meeschterprüfung
6. Bac +1 bis +3
7. Bac +4 an méi

#### Jo2: Income

Under €1,500

From €1,501 up to €2,000

From €2,001 up to €2,500

From €2,501 up to €3,000

From €3,001 up to €3,500

From €3,501 up to €4,000

From €4,001 up to €4,500

From €4,501 up to €5,000

From €5,001 up to €6,000

From €6,001 up to €7,000

From €7,001 up to €8,000

More than €8,000

### Specific sampling procedures

Communes were used as PSUs. The number of addresses was used as the PSU size indicator. Addresses were selected by random walk.

### Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	7,842
35	Total number of successful interviews	908
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>2,408</b>
1	Not yet built/under construction	751
2	Demolished/derelict	69
3	Vacant/empty housing unit	0
4	Non-residential address (business)	300
5	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	0
6	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	0
7	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	0
8	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	0
9	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	33
10	Preselected person has moved out from this address	0
11	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	0
12	No eligible respondents at address	1,255

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>1,316</b>
13	Issued, but not attempted	0
14	Inaccessible	0
15	Unable to locate address	0
16	No contact made at address after three calls	1,316
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>0</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	0
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	0
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	0
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>101</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	101
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	0
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>3,093</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	0
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	14
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	3,079
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	0
27	Broken appointment – no recontact	0
28	At home ill during survey period	0
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	0
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	0
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	0
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	0
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>16</b>
34	Partial interview	16

### Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18–24	20,244	11.27
25–34	35,826	19.95
35–39	19,812	11.03
40–49	40,361	22.48
50–59	31,667	17.63
60–69	22,269	12.40
70–74	9,396	5.23
Total	179,575	100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
C	Rural	21.26
B		40.83
A	Urban	37.91
Total		100.00

## Malta

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs

Aġenzija Appoġġ (179 helpline nazzjonali għal-vittmi ta' vjolenza)

Djar ta' wenz wens għan-nisa bħal Dar Tereza Spinelli, Dar Qalb ta' Ġesu jew Dar Merħba Bik  
Il-Kummissjoni dwar il-Vjolenza Domestika

#### F09/J09: Education

1. Ma spiċċajt il-primarja
2. Spiċċajt il-primarja
3. Ma spiċċajt is-sekondarja
4. Spiċċajt is-sekondarja (GCEs/O Levels)
5. Post-secondary (Eż. Sixth Form Junior College, MCAST, ITS, A Levels, eċċ.)
6. First Degree (Eż. BA, BSc)
7. Postgraduate Degree (Eż. MA, MSc, MBA, PhD)

#### J02: Income

Under €10,000

€10,000–€19,999

€20,000–€35,000

Over €35,000

### Specific sampling procedures

Electoral districts were used as PSUs. The number of women aged 18 years and over was used as the PSU size indicator. The electoral register was used as the sampling frame for selecting individuals.

### Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	3,631
35	Total number of successful interviews	1,501
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>467</b>
1	Not yet built/under construction	8
2	Demolished/derelict	6
3	Vacant/empty housing unit	172
4	Non-residential address (business)	12
5	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	1
6	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	14
7	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	7
8	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	68
9	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	29
10	Preselected person has moved out from this address	133
11	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	8
12	No eligible respondents at address	9
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>659</b>
13	Issued, but not attempted	2
14	Inaccessible	14
15	Unable to locate address	137
16	No contact made at address after three calls	506

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>2</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	1
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	1
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	0
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>30</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	4
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	26
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>972</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	22
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	88
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	699
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	52
27	Broken appointment – no recontact	47
28	At home ill during survey period	23
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	19
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	7
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	2
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	13
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>0</b>
34	Partial interview	0

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18-24	19,932	13.06
25-34	29,782	19.51
35-39	13,125	8.60
40-49	26,199	17.16
50-59	29,485	19.31
60-69	25,051	16.41
70-74	9,085	5.95
Total	152,659	100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
4	Rural	19.47
3		12.01
2		16.02
1	Urban	52.50
Total		100.00



## The Netherlands

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs

Steunpunt huiselijk geweld  
Vrouwenopvang  
Hulplijn Tegen Haar Wil

#### F09/J09: Education

1. Niet voltooid lager onderwijs
2. Lager onderwijs
3. Lager beroepsonderwijs
4. Middelbaar algemeen voortgezet onderwijs
5. Kort middelbaar beroepsonderwijs
6. Middelbaar beroepsonderwijs
7. MBO-plus
8. Hoger algemeen voortgezet onderwijs
9. Voorbereidend wetenschappelijk onderwijs
10. Hoger beroepsonderwijs
11. Wetenschappelijk onderwijs
12. Postdoctorale opleiding
13. Aio/Oio of andere promotie-opleiding

#### J02: Income

Under €1,500  
€1,500–€2,500  
€2,500–€3,500  
Over €3,500

### Specific sampling procedures

Postcode address sectors were used as PSUs. The number of households was used as the PSU size indicator. Households were preselected from the address file.

### Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	10,000
<b>35</b>	Total number of successful interviews	1,510
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>2,371</b>
<b>1</b>	Not yet built/under construction	114
<b>2</b>	Demolished/derelict	0
<b>3</b>	Vacant/empty housing unit	13
<b>4</b>	Non-residential address (business)	537
<b>5</b>	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	3
<b>6</b>	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	0
<b>7</b>	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	0
<b>8</b>	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	0
<b>9</b>	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	0
<b>10</b>	Preselected person has moved out from this address	0
<b>11</b>	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	0
<b>12</b>	No eligible respondents at address	1,704
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>629</b>
<b>13</b>	Issued, but not attempted	0

Code no.	Final outcomes	
14	Inaccessible	50
15	Unable to locate address	125
16	No contact made at address after three calls	454
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>1,898</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	1,857
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	1
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	40
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>1,812</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	1,812
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	0
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>1,764</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	6
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	0
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	1,408
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	141
27	Broken appointment – no recontact	62
28	At home ill during survey period	5
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	18
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	5
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	68
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	51
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>16</b>
34	Partial interview	16

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18-24	703,440	11.83
25-34	995,188	16.74
35-39	589,543	9.92
40-49	1,279,459	21.52
50-59	1,124,849	18.92
60-69	925,994	15.58
70-74	326,684	5.49
Total	5,945,157	100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
5	Rural	9.90
4		20.38
3		18.41
2		28.51
1	Urban	22.80
Total		100.00

## Poland

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs

Ogólnopolskie Pogotowie dla Ofiar Przemocy w Rodzinie “Niebieska Linia”  
Fundacja Centrum Praw Kobiet  
Feminoteka

#### Fo9/Jo9: Education

1. Brak formalnego wykształcenia
2. Podstawowe – 6 klas
3. Gimnazjum 3 klasy lub podstawowe 8 klas
4. Ukończona szkoła zawodowa lub nieukończona szkoła średnia (bez matury)
5. Ukończona szkoła średnia (z maturą)
6. Nieukończone studia licencjackie (także nieukończona szkoła pomaturalna)
7. Ukończone studia licencjackie (także ukończona szkoła pomaturalna)
8. Nieukończone studia wyższe
9. Ukończone studia wyższe (z dyplomem)

#### Jo2: Income

Under PLN 1,500  
PLN 1,500–2,500  
PLN 2,501–3,500  
Over PLN 3,500

### Specific sampling procedures

The local geoadministrative units *gmynas* were used as PSUs. The population size was used as the PSU size indicator. Addresses were selected by random walk.

Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	4,831
<b>35</b>	Total number of successful interviews	1,513
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>446</b>
<b>1</b>	Not yet built/under construction	0
<b>2</b>	Demolished/derelict	0
<b>3</b>	Vacant/empty housing unit	0
<b>4</b>	Non-residential address (business)	72
<b>5</b>	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	0
<b>6</b>	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	98
<b>7</b>	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	0
<b>8</b>	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	0
<b>9</b>	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	0
<b>10</b>	Preselected person has moved out from this address	0
<b>11</b>	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	109
<b>12</b>	No eligible respondents at address	167
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>291</b>
<b>13</b>	Issued, but not attempted	5
<b>14</b>	Inaccessible	63

Code no.	Final outcomes	
15	Unable to locate address	9
16	No contact made at address after three calls	214
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>343</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	336
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	7
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	0
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>678</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	606
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	72
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>1,560</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	0
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	120
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	690
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	46
27	Broken appointment - no recontact	15
28	At home ill during survey period	14
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	35
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	5
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	2
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	633
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>0</b>
34	Partial interview	0

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18-24	1,979,227	13.55
25-34	3,113,775	21.32
35-39	1,305,048	8.94
40-49	2,433,439	16.66
50-59	3,016,239	20.65
60-69	1,934,580	13.25
70-74	821,223	5.62
Total	14,603,531	100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
Rural area	Rural	39.00
Area with up to 50,000 inhabitants		23.90
Area with 50,000-200,000 inhabitants		16.40
Area with over 200,000 inhabitants	Urban	20.70
Total		100.00



## Portugal

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs

Serviço de informação a vítimas de violência doméstica (800 202 148)

Associação de mulheres contra a violência (213 802 160)

Associação portuguesa de apoio à vítima (707 20 00 77)

#### F09/J09: Education

1. Não completou a instrução primária

2. Primária (4º ano/6º ano ou equivalente – 1º e 2º ciclos do ensino básico)

3. 9º Ano ou equivalente (3º ciclo do ensino básico)

4. 12º Ano ou equivalente (Secundário/cursos tecnológicos, artísticos/cursos profissionais)

5. Cursos de especialização tecnológica (Ensino Pós secundário)

6. Licenciatura (Universidade/Politécnico)

7. Mestrado/doutoramento

#### J02: Income

Up to €600

€601–€1,200

€1,201–€2,000

€2,001 and above

### Specific sampling procedures

The local geoadministrative units *freguesias* were used as PSUs. The population size was used as the PSU size indicator. Addresses were selected by random walk.

### Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	3,062
35	Total number of successful interviews	1,515
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>600</b>
1	Not yet built/under construction	10
2	Demolished/derelict	47
3	Vacant/empty housing unit	69
4	Non-residential address (business)	63
5	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	13
6	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	23
7	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	0
8	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	0
9	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	0
10	Preselected person has moved out from this address	0
11	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	3
12	No eligible respondents at address	372
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>361</b>
13	Issued, but not attempted	1
14	Inaccessible	55
15	Unable to locate address	0
16	No contact made at address after three calls	305

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>146</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	136
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	6
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	4
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>159</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	153
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	6
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>281</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	9
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	40
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	116
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	83
27	Broken appointment – no recontact	7
28	At home ill during survey period	5
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	4
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	6
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	2
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	9
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>0</b>
34	Partial interview	0

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18-24	416,392	10.44
25-34	780,699	19.57
35-39	412,435	10.34
40-49	789,821	19.80
50-59	710,090	17.80
60-69	604,196	15.14
70-74	275,817	6.91
Total	3,989,450	100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
1	Rural	16.29
2		5.61
3		20.55
4		15.47
5		20.22
6		18.77
7	Urban	3.10
Total		100.00

## Romania

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs

Casa Blu – Linie telefonica de ajutor pentru femei  
A. L. E. G. – Asociatia pentru Libertate si Egalitate de Gen  
Centrul Artemis

#### F09/J09: Education

1. Fara educatie
2. Școala primară (clasele 1-4) neterminată
3. Școala primară (clasele 1-4) încheiată
4. Gimnaziul (clasele 1-8) încheiat
5. Școală profesională, 10 clase de liceu
6. Liceu cu bacalaureat
7. Studii post-liceale
8. Studii universitare (facultate încheiată)
9. Studii post-universitare de tip master sau scoala postuniversitara
10. Studii doctorale, post-doctorale, rezidentiat

#### Jo2: Income

Up to RON 800  
RON 800–1,300  
RON 1,301–2,000  
RON 2,000

### Specific sampling procedures

Electoral districts were used as PSUs. The number of adults aged 18 years and over was used as the PSU size indicator. Addresses were selected by random walk.

### Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	3,752
35	Total number of successful interviews	1,579
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>646</b>
1	Not yet built/under construction	25
2	Demolished/derelict	40
3	Vacant/empty housing unit	118
4	Non-residential address (business)	36
5	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	9
6	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	26
7	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	0
8	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	0
9	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	0
10	Preselected person has moved out from this address	0
11	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	27
12	No eligible respondents at address	365
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>486</b>
13	Issued, but not attempted	0
14	Inaccessible	44

Code no.	Final outcomes	
15	Unable to locate address	0
16	No contact made at address after three calls	442
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>328</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	301
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	5
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	22
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>187</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	104
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	83
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>518</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	57
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	49
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	213
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	131
27	Broken appointment - no recontact	19
28	At home ill during survey period	2
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	13
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	5
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	2
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	27
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>8</b>
34	Partial interview	8

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18-24	1,113,852	13.54
25-34	1,653,995	20.10
35-39	821,235	9.98
40-49	1,456,398	17.70
50-59	1,526,720	18.56
60-69	1,108,231	13.47
70-74	547,217	6.65
Total	8,227,648	100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
1	Rural	9.70
2		13.60
3		15.90
4		18.65
5	Urban	42.15
Total		100.00



## Slovakia

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs

Aliancia žien

Fenestra

Inštitút pre výskum práce a rodiny

#### F09/J09: Education

1. Neukončené základné vzdelanie

2. Základné vzdelanie

3. Nižšie stredné vzdelanie (bez maturity)

4. Vyššie stredné vzdelanie (s maturitou)

5. Nadstavbové vzdelanie (nie vysokoškolské)

6. Bakalárske vzdelanie

7. Úplné vysokoškolské vzdelanie

#### J02: Income

Up to €600

€601–€850

€851–€1,250

Over €1,251

### Specific sampling procedures

Settlements were used as PSUs. The number of dwellings was used as the PSU size indicator. Households were selected by random walk.

### Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	4,295
35	Total number of successful interviews	1,512
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>632</b>
1	Not yet built/under construction	0
2	Demolished/derelict	28
3	Vacant/empty housing unit	56
4	Non-residential address (business)	0
5	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	0
6	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	105
7	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	0
8	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	0
9	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	0
10	Preselected person has moved out from this address	0
11	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	33
12	No eligible respondents at address	410
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>149</b>
13	Issued, but not attempted	0
14	Inaccessible	55
15	Unable to locate address	0
16	No contact made at address after three calls	94

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>64</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	52
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	6
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	6
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>628</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	621
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	7
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>1,307</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	709
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	47
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	396
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	79
27	Broken appointment – no recontact	4
28	At home ill during survey period	23
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	11
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	7
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	15
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	16
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>3</b>
34	Partial interview	3

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18-24	282,008	13.50
25-34	452,821	21.68
35-39	202,978	9.72
40-49	371,081	17.77
50-59	399,522	19.13
60-69	278,586	13.34
70-74	101,569	4.86
Total	2,088,565	100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
1	Rural	14.89
2		25.15
3		15.54
4		29.53
5	Urban	14.89
Total		100.00

## Slovenia

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs

SOS telefon – za ženske in otroke – žrtve nasilja (o8o 11 55)

Društvo za nenasilno komunikacijo

Združenje proti spolnemu zlorabljanju (o8o 288o)

#### Fo9/Jo9: Education

1. Nepopolna osnovnošolska izobrazba
2. Osnovnošolska izobrazba
3. Nižja ali srednja poklicna izobrazba
4. Srednja strokovna izobrazba
5. Srednja splošna izobrazba
6. Višja strokovna izobrazba, višješolska izobrazba
7. Visoka strokovna izobrazba
8. Visoka univerzitetna izobrazba
9. Specializacija, magisterij, doktorat

#### Jo2: Income

Up to €600

€601–€1,200

€1,201–€2,000

€2,001 or more

### Specific sampling procedures

Census enumeration areas were used as PSUs. Sampling was done by a third party holding the population register data. The number of women was used as the PSU size indicator. Individuals were selected from the population register data. Letters were used to contact the respondents.

### Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	3,840
<b>35</b>	Total number of successful interviews	1,501
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>386</b>
<b>1</b>	Not yet built/under construction	3
<b>2</b>	Demolished/derelict	27
<b>3</b>	Vacant/empty housing unit	6
<b>4</b>	Non-residential address (business)	1
<b>5</b>	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	102
<b>6</b>	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	3
<b>7</b>	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	6
<b>8</b>	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	86
<b>9</b>	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	39
<b>10</b>	Preselected person has moved out from this address	107
<b>11</b>	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	6
<b>12</b>	No eligible respondents at address	0
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>110</b>
<b>13</b>	Issued, but not attempted	0
<b>14</b>	Inaccessible	34

Code no.	Final outcomes	
15	Unable to locate address	33
16	No contact made at address after three calls	43
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>13</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	0
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	8
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	5
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>0</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	0
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	0
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>1,830</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	3
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	355
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	1,330
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	63
27	Broken appointment - no recontact	30
28	At home ill during survey period	12
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	27
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	8
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	2
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	0
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>0</b>
34	Partial interview	0

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18-24	84,557	11.12
25-34	145,708	19.15
35-39	70,876	9.32
40-49	151,826	19.96
50-59	149,078	19.60
60-69	109,867	14.44
70-74	48,812	6.42
Total	760,724	100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
Non-urban	Rural	50.15
Urban	Urban	49.85
Total		100.00

## Spain

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs (Castilian)

Teléfono 016

Asociación/Centro de Asistencia a Víctimas de Agresiones Sexuales (CAVAS)

Comisión para la investigación de malos tratos a mujeres (CIMTM)

#### Bo6: NGOs (Catalan)

Telèfon 016

Centre d'Assistència a Víctimes d'Agresions Sexuals (CAVAS)

Comissió per a la Investigació de Maltractaments contra les Dones

#### F09/J09: Education (Castilian)

1. Sin estudios/educación primaria incompleta
2. Educación primaria, enseñanza de primer grado (EGB 1ª etapa). Hasta los 12 años máximo
3. Enseñanza secundaria obligatoria/graduado escolar/ESO (hasta los 16 años)/EGB 2ª etapa (hasta los 14 años)
4. Enseñanza segundo grado (BUP, COU, Bachillerato, Formación profesional (FP1) hasta los 18 años
5. Ciclos formativos de Grado superior (FP2, Otras enseñanzas, etc.)
6. Estudios universitarios (diplomatura, licenciatura, ingenierías, etc.)
7. Otros estudios universitarios (Master, Doctorado, etc.)

#### F09/J09: Education (Catalan)

1. Sense estudis/No ha acabat l'educació primària
2. Educació primària, ensenyament de primer grau (EGB 1a etapa). Fins als 12 anys
3. Educació secundària obligatòria/graduat escolar/ESO (fins als 16 anys)/EGB 2a etapa (fins als 14 anys)
4. Educació de segon grau (BUP, COU, Batxillerat, Formació professional (FP1) fins als 18 anys
5. Cicles formatius de grau superior (FP2, altres ensenyaments, etc.)
6. Estudis universitaris (diplomatura, llicenciatura, enginyeries, etc.)
7. Altres estudis universitaris (màster, doctorat, etc.)

#### J02: Income (Castilian/Catalan)

Up to €1,100

€1,101–€1,700

€1,701–€2,500

Over €2,500

### Specific sampling procedures

Settlements were used as PSUs. The number of adults aged 18 years and over was used as the PSU size indicator. The PSUs were stratified by the size of settlement (in addition to the usual stratification by region) in absence of a suitable rurality indicator. The population size was used as the PSU size indicator.

### Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	8,393
35	Total number of successful interviews	1,520
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>2,275</b>
1	Not yet built/under construction	109
2	Demolished/derelict	99
3	Vacant/empty housing unit	523
4	Non-residential address (business)	213
5	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	67
6	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	239

Code no.	Final outcomes	
7	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	0
8	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	6
9	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	0
10	Preselected person has moved out from this address	0
11	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	113
12	No eligible respondents at address	906
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>2,021</b>
13	Issued, but not attempted	6
14	Inaccessible	70
15	Unable to locate address	0
16	No contact made at address after three calls	1,945
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>240</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	163
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	3
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	74
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>555</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	468
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	87
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>1,778</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	75
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	127
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	1,219
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	182
27	Broken appointment – no recontact	23
28	At home ill during survey period	26
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	37
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	10
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	59
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	20
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>4</b>
34	Partial interview	4

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18-24	1,736,173	10.26
25-34	3,601,905	21.28
35-39	1,912,628	11.30
40-49	3,535,300	20.88
50-59	2,850,220	16.84
60-69	2,315,001	13.67
70-74	977,935	5.78
Total	16,929,162	100.00

## Sweden

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs

Kvinnofridslinjen

Riksorganisation för kvinnojourer och tjejjourer i Sverige (ROKS)

Brottsofferjouren (BOJ)

#### F09/J09: Education

1. Har inte avslutat grundskolan
2. 9-årig grundskola
3. Yrkesutbildning direkt efter grundskolan
4. Gymnasieutbildning
5. Eftergymnasial utbildning, ej högskolenivå
6. Högskole- eller universitetsutbildning, kandidatexamen
7. Högskole- eller universitetsutbildning, magisterexamen
8. Doktorsexamen

#### J02: Income

Under SEK 20,000

SEK 20,000–34,999

SEK 35,000–49,999

SEK 50,000 or more

### Specific sampling procedures

The least dense rural settlements (less than 2 % of the total population) were excluded from the fieldwork. Forty-one settlements were selected as PSUs. Stockholm, Malmö and Gothenburg were treated as multiple PSUs, with a correspondingly higher number of addresses issued in each (five times as many in Stockholm, four times as many each in Malmö and Gothenburg). The individual-based population register was used as the sampling frame. Individuals were first contacted by telephone.

### Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	8,080
<b>35</b>	Total number of successful interviews	1,504
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>349</b>
<b>1</b>	Not yet built/under construction	0
<b>2</b>	Demolished/derelict	0
<b>3</b>	Vacant/empty housing unit	0
<b>4</b>	Non-residential address (business)	279
<b>5</b>	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	0
<b>6</b>	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	14
<b>7</b>	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	2
<b>8</b>	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	8
<b>9</b>	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	20
<b>10</b>	Preselected person has moved out from this address	18
<b>11</b>	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	0
<b>12</b>	No eligible respondents at address	8
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>1,436</b>
<b>13</b>	Issued, but not attempted	0
<b>14</b>	Inaccessible	0

Code no.	Final outcomes	
15	Unable to locate address	312
16	No contact made at address after three calls	1,124
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>152</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	0
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	14
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	138
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>0</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	0
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	0
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>4,639</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	20
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	28
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	3,859
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	48
27	Broken appointment - no recontact	0
28	At home ill during survey period	26
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	430
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	105
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	0
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	36
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	87
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>0</b>
34	Partial interview	0

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18-24	425,528	12.99
25-34	562,405	17.17
35-39	312,257	9.53
40-49	630,500	19.25
50-59	575,748	17.57
60-69	571,732	17.45
70-74	197,874	6.04
Total	3,276,044	100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
Rural	Rural	33.59
Urban		66.41
Total		100.00



## United Kingdom

### Country-specific questions

#### Bo6: NGOs

Women's Aid

Refuge

A national or regional helpline

#### F09/J09: Education

1. Not completed primary education

2. Completed primary education

3. Lower secondary education (ages 11–16 – GCSEs/O Levels, GNVQ)

4. Upper secondary education (ages 16–18. e.g. AS/A Levels, Scottish Highers, International Baccalaureate)

5. Post-secondary but not university (ages 18+, e.g. HND, NVQ Levels 4 and 5, HNC)

6. First degree (e.g. BA, BSc)

7. Postgraduate degree (e.g. MA, MSc, MBA, PGCE, PhD)

#### Jo2: Income (annual)

Under GBP 23,499

GBP 23,499–25,999

GBP 26,000–29,699

GBP 29,700 or over

### Specific sampling procedures

At the first stage of sampling, 50 census output areas (OAs) were selected with probability proportional to size. The number of postal addresses was used as the size indicator. However, the size of OAs was not deemed large enough to allow for the sensitivity of the survey topic, as there would not be a chance to use a large enough sampling interval to select the households. Therefore, a second stage was introduced: a higher-level OA called Medium Level Census Output Areas (MSOAs), which contain between three and six OAs each. Those MSOAs which contain the 50 selected OAs were selected as PSUs. At the second stage of selection, within each MSOA, three OAs were selected with PPS as secondary selection units (not necessarily including the initially selected OA). The address-based sampling frame was used to select addresses. The first contact was made by letter.

### Final outcomes

Code no.	Final outcomes	
	Total number of households contacted	6,163
<b>35</b>	Total number of successful interviews	1,510
	<b>D. Ineligible address or persons</b>	<b>1,690</b>
<b>1</b>	Not yet built/under construction	8
<b>2</b>	Demolished/derelict	10
<b>3</b>	Vacant/empty housing unit	185
<b>4</b>	Non-residential address (business)	49
<b>5</b>	Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings)	15
<b>6</b>	Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home)	41
<b>7</b>	Preselected person deceased at the time of contact	0
<b>8</b>	Preselected person unknown at this address (wrong records)	0
<b>9</b>	Preselected person abroad for longer than three months	0
<b>10</b>	Preselected person has moved out from this address	0
<b>11</b>	Other ineligible address (specify _____)	16
<b>12</b>	No eligible respondents at address	1,366
	<b>E. Contact not made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>856</b>
<b>13</b>	Issued, but not attempted	0
<b>14</b>	Inaccessible	18
<b>15</b>	Unable to locate address	22

Code no.	Final outcomes	
16	No contact made at address after three calls	816
	<b>F. Contact made, and eligibility of address unknown</b>	<b>73</b>
17	All information about address/dwelling unit refused	62
18	Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability	4
19	Unable to confirm eligibility as the <u>contact</u> does not speak any of the official languages	7
20	Unable to select a person as the <u>contact</u> speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
	<b>G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected</b>	<b>100</b>
21	Further information refused by contact	80
22	Other reason for not selecting a person (specify)	20
	<b>H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive</b>	<b>1,934</b>
23	Refusal by contacting Field office	53
24	No contact with selected person after three calls	435
25	Refusal by selected person before interview	1,010
26	Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	125
27	Broken appointment – no re-contact	145
28	At home ill during survey period	32
29	Away or in hospital all survey period	39
30	Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	12
31	Unable to conduct interview as selected person does not speak any of the official languages	39
32	Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	0
33	Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	44
	<b>I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome</b>	<b>0</b>
34	Partial interview	0

## Weighting

Age	Number of women	% of total
18-24	2,887,037	13.01
25-34	3,979,475	17.94
35-39	2,148,945	9.69
40-49	4,643,053	20.93
50-59	3,815,829	17.20
60-69	3,408,408	15.36
70-74	1,301,227	5.87
Total	22,183,974	100.00

Indicator	Definition	% of total
England and Wales		
8	Hamlet and isolated dwelling – less sparse	2.90
7	Town and fringe – less sparse	6.86
5	Urban >10k – less sparse	9.04
6	Village – less sparse	81.21
Total		100.00
Scotland		
1	Large urban area	42.90
2	Other urban area	57.10
Total		100.00
Northern Ireland	No weights on rurality applied	

## Annex 2: Questionnaire Survey on women's well-being and safety in Europe

The survey questionnaire on women's well-being and safety in Europe is available on the FRA website at: <http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2014/vaw-survey-technical-report>.

## Annex 3: Contact sheets and outcome codes

### Contact sheet

ID Number

COUNTRY

PSU

HH

### Survey on women's well-being and safety in Europe

#### A. General information

Sample point

Interviewer name or number

**A1. Address**

**A2. Address**

**A3. Address**

**A4. Town/Village**

**A5. Region**

**A6. Postcode**

#### OUTCOME

Please record all your visits. If outcome is final and no further visits will be made, write down the relevant code in the interim outcome (A7–A11), complete the Final outcome section (D-I), and complete A14 and A15.

No.	Day (1–7)	Date (1–31)	Month (1–12)	Time		Outcome Record <u>all</u> visits even if no response
				HH	MM	
1						<b>A7.</b>
2						<b>A8.</b>
3						<b>A9.</b>
4						<b>A10.</b>
5						<b>A11.</b>

Monday=1, Tuesday=2, Wednesday=3, Thursday=4, Friday=5, Saturday=6, Sunday=7



**Interim outcome codes**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. No contact  | 2. Contact made, but respondent not selected        |
| 3. Respondent selected, but no contact with respondent           | 4. Respondent selected, but interview not completed |
| 5. Appointment with the respondent made for another day and time | 6. Partial interview, to come back later            |

**Selection box**

No. of dwelling units/persons    2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10   A12. Selected DU    A13. Selected person  
Selection

**A14. Total number of visits****A15. Final outcome code**

Insert the final outcome code from sections D to I.

**B. Dwelling unit selection**

(For countries with pre-selected address frames only)

**B1. Is this address residential and occupied as a main residence?**

- |                  |   |  |
|------------------|---|--|
| Yes              | 1 | Continue to B2   |
| No               | 2 | Select one code from section D and close the interview |
| Unable to locate | 3 | Select one code from section E and close the interview |

**B2. Establish number of DUs at the issued address** (include both occupied and unoccupied DUs)  
If necessary, read: **Can I ask, is this house/building occupied as a single building or is it split into different units? Can I ask how many separate units are there?**

Enter number of DUs

**B3. Dwelling Unit summary**

- |                                       |   |  |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| 1 Dwelling unit                       | 1 | Go to section C  |
| 2 or more Dwelling Units              | 2 | Continue to B4   |
| Number of Dwelling Units not obtained | 9 | Select one code from section G and close the interview |

**B4. If 2 or more DUs: List all DUs at address in flat/room number order. If flat/room number not available, then from top to bottom of building, left to right, front to back.**

	Description of flats/rooms	Selected
1		<input type="checkbox"/>
2		<input type="checkbox"/>
3		<input type="checkbox"/>
4		<input type="checkbox"/>
5		<input type="checkbox"/>
6		<input type="checkbox"/>
7		<input type="checkbox"/>
8		<input type="checkbox"/>
9		<input type="checkbox"/>
10		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Look at the Selection Box on the front page**

1. In the number of DUs/people row, find the number of DUs
2. In the Select row, the number under the number of DUs is the code of selected DU
3. Tick the relevant 'DU code' box above

**If the address is not the same as the front page**

Change it on the front page

Record details of location on the NOTES page if there is no clear DU number

**C. Respondent selection**

**Good morning/afternoon/evening. My name is .... from...., the research company. We are conducting an important survey on behalf of the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights looking at issues that affect women and their wellbeing and safety. We will be interviewing women across Europe to better understand their opinions and experiences. The interview will take around 45 minutes to complete. The findings from the survey will be used to help shape policy to improve the lives of women.**

**We selected your household at random and would like to speak to one of the women that live here. I would like to assure you that all the information we collect will be kept in the strictest confidence and used for research purposes only. It will not be possible to identify any particular individual or address at any stage of the research/survey. Your participation in the survey is fully voluntary and you always can refuse to answer any questions. Is there anything you would like to ask?**

**Co. Could I check if this is your main residence?**

Yes, main residence

1 Continue to C1

No (second residence, holiday home, business address, other)

2 Select one code from section D and close the interview



**C1. Could I check how many women aged 18 to 74 live here?**

Enter the number of women 18-74

**Include**

People who normally live at this address, but are away for less than 3 months

People away at work for whom this is the main address

Boarders and lodgers

**Exclude**

People away for 3 months or more

People who live elsewhere due to work/study

Spouses who are separated and no longer resident

**C2. Person summary**

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| No women aged 18-74                     | 0 | Select one code from section D and close the interview      |
| 1 woman aged 18-74                      | 1 | Go to C5  |
| 2 or more women aged 18-74              | 2 | Continue to C3  |
| Number of women aged 18 not established | 9 | Select one code from Final outcomes and close the interview |

**C3. If 2 or more women aged 18-74:**

- Ask for name and age of all women living in the household.
- List in the order from oldest to youngest

	Name or initial	Age	Selected
1			<input type="checkbox"/>
2			<input type="checkbox"/>
3			<input type="checkbox"/>
4			<input type="checkbox"/>
5			<input type="checkbox"/>
6			<input type="checkbox"/>

Look at the Selection Box on the front page

1. In the number of DUs/people row, find the number of persons in this household
2. In the Select row, the number under the number of persons is the code of selected person
3. Tick the relevant 'Selected person' box above

**C4. Have you been able to select a person?**

- |     |   |  |
|-----|---|--|
| Yes | 1 | Continue to C5   |
| No  | 2 | Select one code from section G and close the interview |

**C5. Is the selected person able and willing to do the interview in [Official languages of the country]?**

- Yes 1 Continue to C6
- No 2 Select one code from section H and close the interview

**C6. Interviewer: Can you conduct the interview in that language?**

- Yes 1 Proceed to interview
- No 2 Select one code from section H and close the interview

**D – I. Final outcome codes**

This entire page is SINGLE CODE ONLY. Select only one response that fits best. Make sure to complete this section only in case if no further contact will be made to this household.

**D. Ineligible address or persons**

- Not yet built/under construction 1.
- Demolished/derelect 2.
- Vacant/empty housing unit 3.
- Non-residential address (business) 4.
- Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings) 5.
- Occupied but not main residence (e.g. holiday home) 6.
- Pre-selected person deceased at the time of contact 7.
- Pre-selected person unknown at this address (wrong records) 8.
- Pre-selected person abroad for longer than three months 9.
- Pre-selected person has moved out from this address 10.
- Other ineligible address (specify in the Notes) 11.
- No eligible respondents at address 12.

**E. contact not made, and Eligibility of address unknown**

- Issued, but not attempted 13.
- Inaccessible 14.
- Unable to locate address 15.
- No contact made at address after 3 calls 16.

**F. contact made, and Eligibility of address unknown**

- All information about address/DU refused 17. Go to section J
- Unable to establish eligibility due to physical/mental ability 18.
- Unable to confirm eligibility as the contact does not speak any of the official languages 19.
- Unable to select a person as the contact speaks one of the official languages, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers 20.





**G. Eligible address, but respondent not selected**

Further information refused by contact	21.	Go to section J
Other reason for not selecting a person (specify in the Notes)	22.	

**H. Eligible address and person selected, but unproductive**

Refusal by contacting Field office	23.	Go to section J
No contact with selected person after 3 calls	24.	
Refusal by selected person before interview	25.	Go to section J
Proxy refusal by someone else at the address	26.	Go to section J
Broken appointment – no re-contact	27.	
At home ill during survey period	28.	
Away or in hospital all survey period	29.	
Physically or mentally unstable/incompetent	30.	
Unable to conduct interview as selected person doesn't speak any of the official languages	31.	
Unable to conduct interview as <u>selected person</u> speaks an official language, but interviewer does not. Details passed on to Field office and/or available interviewers	32.	
Other unproductive results (specify in the Notes)	33.	

**I. Eligible address, eligible person and productive outcome**

Completed interview	34.
Partial interview	35.

Copy the Final outcome code into A15 on the frontpage

**J. Refusals****J. Reason for refusal – code all that apply**

Too busy at the time of contact	1.
Always too busy	2.
Interview takes too long	3.
Interview too intrusive	4.
Never does surveys	5.
Not interested in the subject matter	6.
Nothing in it for them, no motivation	7.
Survey is a waste of time	8.
Survey is a waste of money	9.
Worried about confidentiality	10.
Worried about misuse of the information	11.
Worried about safety/security	12.
Other reason (specify in NOTES)	13.

**K. Notes**



European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights

**Violence against women: an EU-wide survey  
Survey methodology, sample and fieldwork  
Technical report**

2013 — 103 p. — 21 x 29.7 cm

ISBN 978-92-9239-273-4

doi:10.2811/67959

A great deal of information on the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights is available on the Internet. It can be accessed through the FRA website at [fra.europa.eu](http://fra.europa.eu).

## **HOW TO OBTAIN EU PUBLICATIONS**

### **Free publications:**

- via EU Bookshop (<http://bookshop.europa.eu>);
- at the European Union's representations or delegations. You can obtain their contact details on the Internet (<http://ec.europa.eu>) or by sending a fax to +352 2929-42758.

### **Priced publications:**

- via EU Bookshop (<http://bookshop.europa.eu>).

### **Priced subscriptions (e.g. annual series of the *Official Journal of the European Union* and reports of cases before the Court of Justice of the European Union):**

- via one of the sales agents of the Publications Office of the European Union ([http://publications.europa.eu/others/agents/index\\_en.htm](http://publications.europa.eu/others/agents/index_en.htm)).

## HELPING TO MAKE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS A REALITY FOR EVERYONE IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

The FRA survey on violence against women is the first European Union (EU)-wide survey to collect comparable data on women's experiences of gender-based violence in all 28 EU Member States. This technical report presents a detailed overview of the research methods used by FRA when collecting survey data on women's personal experiences of various forms of violence.

---

**FRA – EUROPEAN UNION AGENCY FOR FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS**

Schwarzenbergplatz 11 – 1040 Vienna – Austria  
Tel.: +43 158030-0 – Fax: +43 158030-699  
fra.europa.eu – info@fra.europa.eu  
facebook.com/fundamentalrights  
linkedin.com/company/eu-fundamental-rights-agency  
twitter.com/EURightsAgency



Publications Office

ISBN 978-92-9239-273-4



9 789292 392734