

BECAN Epidemiological Survey on Child Abuse and Neglect (CAN) in Turkey

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

The BECAN project included the design and realization of an **Epidemiological field survey** and a **Case-Based Surveillance study** in 9 Balkan

¹ Grant Agreement No: HEALTH-F2-2009-223478.

countries (Albania, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, F.Y.R. of Macedonia, Greece, Romania, Serbia and Turkey).

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

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

The Timeline of the National Survey

In our national survey, data collection process took place between February – May 2012. Data was collected in different timelines per geographical area. The timelines per each geographical area are listed below:

- Izmir : 15.02.2012 – 23.03.2012
- Zonguldak : 26.03.2012 – 30.03.2012
- Denizli: 15.05.2012 – 30.05.2012

There was no delay in data collection process for each geographical area. It was significant to conduct survey as quickly as possible due to ethical reasons. Therefore, the study was initially conducted in Izmir. The research team immediately moved to other geographical area, Zonguldak. Finally, organization of the third area –Denizli- was planned and the research team conducted the survey.

The Research Team

The research team of Association of Emergency Ambulance Physicians in BECAN Project is listed below:

- Zeynep Sofuoglu, MD, PhD – Scientific Coordinator, Organization of the Survey
- Turhan Sofuoglu, MD – National Coordinator, Organization of the Survey
- Ismail Umit Bal, MD – Field Coordinator, Organization of the Survey
- Fulya Aydin, MA - Clinical Psychologist,
- Sinem Cankardes, MA – Clinical Health Psychologist,
- Birsu Kandemirci, BA – Psychologist

The research team also consisted of:

- 3 medical doctors
- 3 social service workers
- 2 nurses
- 1 sociologist
- 1 media relations worker
- 1 child development specialist
- 3 psychologist

Total of 20 researchers have worked in data collection process.

B. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Permissions to Access the Schools

In order to have the access to the schools, applications were made to three provinces' Directorate of National Education. Application document included a petition, brief information about the importance of the study and the ICAST questionnaires for children and parents. Dates of applications and approvals are given in the figure below:

Figure 1. Dates of Applications and Approvals

	Application date	Approval date
Izmir	31.10.11	20.12.11
Zonguldak	21.02.12	28.02.12
Denizli	09.04.12	24.04.12

After the approval, Directorate of National Education sent a briefing to all the schools inside these provinces.

Schools that were chosen randomly were called one by one in order to make an appointment. After that, researchers went to these schools at scheduled times. They told about the aims of the study and how the process would be. When the school directory gave the permission for the study, a day was arranged for the research.

Ethical Clearance of the Research

For the ethical approval of the research, application was made to Tepecik Training and Research Hospital's Ethical Committee. Application document included the importance of research, the procedure of research and the questionnaires for children and parents. The document was sent to Ethical Committee in 24.11.2011 and after their evaluation; the research had been approved in 29.11.2011.

2. Field Researchers' Training

In WP3 Field Researchers' Training, initially the Researcher's Guidelines were developed. The Researcher's Guidelines and Training Manual were translated into Turkish. The organizational information required for training is prepared from this manual by using PowerPoint slights. In the process of finding field researchers, ads were put on newspapers and the websites that especially psychologists, counselors have mostly visited were used. The people who have interested in the study have sent their CV to coordinators of the study. After the irrelevant and inappropriate CV's were eliminated, the remaining people were called for a meeting in the association. After a short interview, the people who were really interested in studying child abuse and who were emotionally inclined to work in CAN field research were invited to training. After the groups were formed, trainings were conducted in the meeting room of Association of Emergency Ambulance Physicians.

In this study, three WP3 Field Researchers' Training has been conducted. The timeline of the first group training was 26-27th April 2011. The second group training took place in 16-17th May 2011. Finally, the third group training has been conducted in 15-16th December 2011. The numbers of participants in the trainings were 9, 6 and 15, respectively.

The number and characteristics of the participants in three training are listed in the figure below:

Figure 2. Number and Characteristics of Participants

Training Group	A/A	Sex (M=male, F=female)	Researcher's Specialty/Education Credentials
First Group Training	1.	F	Psychology Department 4 th year student
	2.	M	Psychology Department 4 th year student
	3.	F	Psychologist, BA
	4.	F	Psychology Department 4 th year student
	5.	M	Sociology Department 2 nd year student
	6.	F	Social Sciences Teacher, MA
	7.	M	Sociologist, BA
	8.	F	Clinical Psychologist, MA
	9.	M	Psychologist, Human Resources, MA
Second Group Training	10.	F	Psychology Department 4 th year student
	11.	M	Sociology Department, 2 nd year student
	12.	F	Sociologist, BA
	13.	F	Sociology Department, 4 th year student
	14.	F	Sociologist, BA
	15.	F	Sociologist, BA
Third Group Training	16.	F	Clinical Health Psychologist, MA
	17.	F	Psychologist, BA
	18.	F	Psychologist, BA
	19.	F	Media Relations Worker, BA
	20.	F	Medical Doctor, MD
	21.	F	Medical Doctor, MD
	22.	F	Medical Doctor, MD
	23.	M	Social Service Worker
	24.	F	Social Service Worker
	25.	F	Child Development Specialist
	26.	M	Social Service Worker
	27.	F	Nurse
	28.	F	Nurse
	29.	F	Sociologist, BA
30.	M	Psychologist, BA	

All the trainings were conducted in two days, in total of 16 hours. The duration of training was 8 hours in each day. The program of the training is placed below.

***BECAN: Field Researchers Training
İzmir, 2011
Training Program***

1st DAY

- 09:00 – 09:30 – Introduction, Discussing expectations about training**
09:30 – 10:00 – The concept of child abuse and neglect-1
10:00 – 11:15 – The concept of child abuse and neglect-2
11:15 – 12: 15 – National Legislation on CAN
12:15 – 13:00 – Lunch break
**13:00 – 14:00 – Presentation of Association of Emergency
Ambulance Physicians**
14:00 – 14:30 – Presentation of BECAN
14:30 – 14:45 – Coffee break
14:45 – 16:30 – Introduction of ICAST- CH and ICAST-P Questionnaires
16:30 – 18:00 – Discussion and Evaluation

2nd DAY

- 09:00 – 12:15 – Organization and Coordination of Research**
- **Students and their parents in the school setting**
- **Drop-outs and their parents**
12:15 – 13:00 – Lunch Break
13:00- 15:00 - Ethical and Safety Issues
✓ ***Reacting on CAN cases***
✓ ***Crisis intervention and supervision of researchers***
✓ ***Participants' safety and other ethical issues***
✓ ***Researchers' safety***
✓ ***Safety of Data: Storage and access***
15:00 – 15:15 Coffee Break
15:15 – 16:30 Revision of “Guidelines for Researchers”
✓ ***Explanation of post-training obligations***
16:30 – 18:00 – Discussion and Evaluation

In all trainings, initially the trainers introduced themselves to participants. Then, participants introduced themselves to each other. Expectations of each participant for the training were discussed. The most significant part of the first day training was introduction of concepts of child abuse and neglect. A long time was given to make participants' minds clear about the definitions of CAN. It was understood that even long-years experienced specialists were unclear about some culture-specific CAN concepts like incest in Turkey. After the concepts were clarified, legal regulations of CAN in Turkey were presented.

Then, presentation of the Association of Emergency Ambulance Physicians was made. This was followed by the presentation of BECAN Project that the aim and

structure of project were given in detail. Finally, the ICAST tools, ICAST-C and ICAST-P were presented in detail. Every participant was given two types of questionnaires. The structure of the questions and answers were introduced. The questions were presented according to abuse types that helped the participants to learn more about abusive behaviors by examples. The first day of the trainings were finished with discussions and evaluations.

In the second day of the trainings, morning sessions were dedicated to introducing organization and coordination of the field research for both school setting and drop-outs. Structure of the study, obligations of the supervisors, obligations of the field researchers, required materials for the study were clarified in detail. Another significant issue of the training was to inform participants for ethical issues. Reacting on CAN cases, crisis intervention and supervision of researchers, participants' safety, researchers' safety and storage of data were clearly explained. These parts of the training were very comforting for the field researchers, since it helped them to consider how ethical issues were significant in this study. Finally, at the end of second day training, the researchers were given their post-training workshop obligations. They were given "Researcher's Training Manual" and ICAST-C and ICAST-P questionnaires, interview cards. They were expected to apply these questionnaires to the people they know as a parent- child pair. The aim of this obligation was to support the issues they learned in the training and to evaluate them about how comfortable and disciplined they were when working on CAN issues.

After the training, field researchers performed their post- training obligations accordingly. Two weeks later, participants came to the meeting room at a scheduled time. They delivered the questionnaires that they applied and shared their positive and negative experiences with each other and with their supervisors. In accordance with these experiences, sharing was done about the solution of these difficulties.

No documentary method was used to evaluate the training. Field researchers were willing to participate in the research and were so disciplined about administering questionnaires. However, there were delays in getting study permissions in Turkey. After two trainings were applied in April and May, no research could be conducted due to permission delays. In this period, most of the researchers found other jobs and they were unable to participate in the study that begun in Izmir, in January 2012. To overcome this problem, a third training was conducted in the middle of December that was a close date to the beginning of WP3 Epidemiological Study in Turkey.

C. METHODOLOGY

1. Sampling Method – Sample

- In case that you were not able to include **Urbanicity** (urban/rural) in your sampling process, please describe the stratification of your sample on the basis of your data (as resulting from item 4.1 of the ICAST-CH) (N and %)

The Target Population of Students

The target population of this study consists of students of three provinces (Izmir, Zonguldak and Denizli). In each province, the intention was to reach the 3% of primary and high school student population.

The total number of the theoretical sample for these three provinces was 9102. For 5th grade students, the target population was 2913 for three provinces. For 7th grade, this number was 3162 and for 10th grade students, the target population was 3027. This information was taken from the National Education Statistics Formal Education 2010-2011. This book is prepared by the Ministry of National Education with the contributions of Turkish Statistical Institute within the framework of Official Statistics Program.

On the basis of the numbers that was obtained from the booklet, the schools had been chosen by means of a computer program called “Random Number Generator”. This program was helpful to reach the target populations, because it calculated the numbers and chose the most appropriate schools.

In Izmir, the target population consists of 5724 students. In order to reach this number, the research was conducted in 29 schools (18 primary schools and 11 high schools) in 17 different districts. At the end, the resulting sample was 4818.

In Zonguldak, the target population was 1534. The questionnaire was conducted in 11 schools (7 primary schools and 4 high schools) in 3 different districts. The resulting sample for Zonguldak was 1403.

In Denizli, the target population was 1844. The research was conducted in 14 schools (10 primary schools and 4 high schools) in 5 different districts. After all, the resulting sample was 1305.

- The stratification of the students' sex in your sample (N and %).

In three cities, there were a total number of 54 schools that had been the participator of this study. When the age and gender distribution analyzed, it can be obtained that the participators of this study were approximately equal in terms of gender (49,2% for girls and 50,8% for boys). The total numbers and percentages for each grade are given below:

Table 1. The stratification of the students' sex in three cities

Gender	Grade								Total	
	5 th		7 th		10 th general		10 th vocational		N	%
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
girl	1257	50,3	1213	47,3	561	59,6	672	44,2	3703	49,2
boy	1243	49,7	1351	52,7	381	40,4	848	55,8	3823	50,8
Total	2500		2564		942		1520		7526	

In Izmir, there were 4818 participants in total 51,3% of whom were girls. This number was 1600 for 5th grade students (780 girls and 820 boys). The percentage of boys for 5th grade participants was 51,2%. There were 1744 7th grade students who participated in the study (820 girls and 934 boys) and 53,25% of them were boys. There were 1477 students from 10th grade (873 girls and 604 boys) and 59,11% of them were girls. Details can be observed from the table below:

Table 2. The stratification of the students' sex in Izmir

Gender	Grade								Total	
	5 th		7 th		10 th general		10 th vocational		N	%
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
girl	780	48,8	818	46,9	421	60,2	451	58,2	2470	51,3
boy	820	51,2	926	53,1	278	39,8	324	41,8	2348	48,7
Total	1600		1744		699		775		4818	

In Zonguldak, there were a total number of 1403 students participating in the study 60,1% of whom were boys. There were 458 students from 5th grade (240 girls and 218 boys), 435 students from 7th grade (200 girls and 235 boys), 105 students

from 10th grade general schools (70 girls and 35 boys) and 405 students from 10th grade vocational schools (50 girls and 355 boys). The percentages of boys were 47,6%, 54%, 33,3% and 87,7% for 5th, 7th, 10th general school and 10th vocational school grades respectively. Details are given in the table below:

Table 3. The stratification of the students' sex in Zonguldak

Gender	Grade								Total	
	5th		7th		10th general		10th vocational		N	%
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
girl	240	52,4	200	46	70	66,7	50	12,3	560	39,9
boy	218	47,6	235	54	35	33,3	355	87,7	843	60,1
Total	458		435		105		405		1403	

In Denizli, 1305 students participated in the study 51,6% of whom were girls. For 5th grade students, the total number was 442 (237 girls and 205 boys) and 53,6% of the participants were girls. For 7th grade students, the total number was 385 (195 girls and 190 boys) and 50,6% of them were girls. For 10th grade general school students, the number of participants were 138 (70 girls and 68 boys) and 50,7% of them were girls. For 10th grade vocational school students, the number of participants were 340 (171 girls and 169 boys) and 50,3% of them were girls. The table is given below:

Table 4. The stratification of the students' sex in Denizli

Gender	Grade								Total	
	5 th		7 th		10 th general		10 th vocational		N	%
	N	%	N	%	N	%				
girl	237	53,6	195	50,6	70	50,7	171	50,3	673	51,6
boy	205	46,4	190	49,4	68	49,3	169	49,7	632	48,4
Total	442		385		138		340		1305	

2. Response rates

The study was conducted in three different provinces; Izmir, Zonguldak and Denizli. In Zonguldak and Denizli, there was no school director that refused to participate in the research. But in Izmir, although the plan was to reach 30 schools, one school director did not want the students to participate in the study. It was an elementary school located in Konak, and the aim was to conduct the survey with 5th and 7th grade students. Director of the school insisted on seeing the questionnaire before giving the permission. After he and the counselor of school investigated the questionnaire, they decided not to give permission. Their explanation was that, they thought that some of the questions were containing violence and the students might be affected.

Comments about Response Rates

In this study, response rates are high. When it considered that participation depends on voluntariness and participants answered the questions sincerely, it can be said that students were collaborationist about the research. Another reason for the high response rates might be the fact that no informed consent was sent to the families. It was observed in the pilot testing that, sending informed consent to the families caused a reduction in the response rates, because families considered that the questionnaire was related with the school and they did not want to have trouble with school directory. That is the reason they did not want to participate in the study. Another reason is that, omitting the parental consent might provide the students' participation whose families are abusive.

Table 5. Participant's Response Rates in Izmir

Children	Age			Total
	11	13	16	
Children present in the classroom on the day that the questionnaires were distributed.	1658	1788	1581	5027
Negative consent forms received from parents for their children's participation in the research.	0	0	0	0
Children who refused (themselves) to participate in the research.	26	21	97	144
Collected ICAST-CH (completed)	1624	1774	1498	4896
Questionnaires that you excluded from the dataset (completed but invalid)	0	2	5	14

Number of children that discontinued the completion (withdraw)	1	6	0	7
Parents	Child's Age			Total
	11	13	16	
Distributed ICAST-P (number of children that took an ICAST-P questionnaire at home)	356	354	1263	1973
Returned (completed and not blank) ICAST-P questionnaires	352	352	690	1394
Questionnaires that you excluded from the dataset (completed but invalid)	3	2	10	15
Valid Pairs (Child - Parent)	Child's Age			Total
	11	13	16	
Validly completed ICAST-CH (by a child) and ICAST-P (by her/his caregiver)	341	345	671	1357

Table 6. Participant's Response Rates in Zonguldak

Children	Age			Total
	11	13	16	
Children present in the classroom on the day that the questionnaires were distributed.	462	443	513	1418
Negative consent forms received from parents for their children's participation in the research.	0	0	0	0
Children who refused (themselves) to participate in the research.	0	3	0	3
Collected ICAST-CH (completed)	462	440	513	1415
Questionnaires that you excluded from the dataset (completed but invalid)	0	2	1	3
Number of children that discontinued the completion (withdraw)	0	0	0	0
Parents	Child's Age			Total
	11	13	16	
Distributed ICAST-P (number of children that took an ICAST-P questionnaire at home)	462	440	513	1415
Returned (completed and not blank) ICAST-P questionnaires	290	243	210	743
Questionnaires that you excluded from the dataset (completed but invalid)	3	3	2	8
Valid Pairs (Child - Parent)	Child's Age			Total
	11	13	16	
Validly completed ICAST-CH (by a child) and ICAST-P (by her/his caregiver)	283	237	207	727

Table 7. Participant's Response Rates in Denizli

Children	Age			Total
	11	13	16	
Children present in the classroom on the day that the questionnaires were distributed.	444	392	484	1320
Negative consent forms received from parents for their children's participation in the research.	0	0	0	0
Children who refused (themselves) to participate in the research.	1	0	0	1
Collected ICAST-CH (completed)	443	392	484	1319
Questionnaires that you excluded from the dataset (completed but invalid)	1	0	0	1
Number of children that discontinued the completion (withdraw)	0	0	0	0
Parents	Child's Age			Total
	11	13	16	
Distributed ICAST-P (number of children that took an ICAST-P questionnaire at home)	443	392	484	1319
Returned (completed and not blank) ICAST-P questionnaires	188	118	242	548
Questionnaires that you excluded from the dataset (completed but invalid)	3	4	14	21
Valied Pairs (Child - Parent)	Child's Age			Total
	11	13	16	
Validly completed ICAST-CH (by a child) and ICAST-P (by her/his caregiver)	184	114	226	524

3. Research Tools

The Questions That Were Added to ICAST

There were no questions that were added to ICAST-P and ICAST-CH.

Cultural Validation of ICAST

ICAST questionnaires were culturally valid for our country in general. However, it was experienced in the pilot testing that, students had some difficulties in understanding some of the words. After the pilot testing, field researchers had a meeting and shared their experiences about the implementation and frequently asked questions. In our country, “scalded” and “curse” were the most common words that children asked for the meaning. After detecting that, explanation for these words were added in brackets.

4. Data Collection & Fieldwork process

The Steps Before the Data Collection

The first step was arranging the schools depending on districts and the target numbers for each province. After preparing the school lists, it was time to get in contact with these schools. Each school was called by telephone and told about the project. After giving detailed information about the process, they were kindly requested for their permission to conduct the research in their school. When the school accepted the request, a soft copy of the permission from Directorate of National Education was sent to them in case they did not receive it from Directorate of National Education. After calling every school and getting permissions, each school was recalled to make an appointment about the exact date and time. What's more, the information about the number of students in each class was taken.

One day before the appointment date, the questionnaires were prepared according to the class sizes. When the appointment day arrived, an adequate number of researchers went to the schools. It was important to reach the schools 10-20 minutes before the appointment, so researchers had enough time to meet the director of school or someone in charge.

Process of Data Collection

When the researchers got into classroom, first they introduced themselves to the students and told about the research. The questionnaires that were enumerated and paired with the parent questionnaires were distributed to the students by the researchers (Parent questionnaires were in a closed envelope with the consent forms). After distribution, the researchers explained how to fill the questionnaire. They emphasized that students did not need to write their names or any other information about their identity apart from their age and gender. Also, students were informed that, there is no correct or wrong answer in this questionnaire, the only thing they should do was to choose the most appropriate answer. Students were told not to look at each other's questionnaire during the application. In case there were students who were not able to conduct the survey because of physical or mental disabilities, researchers helped them if required. On such an occasion, a researcher sat nearby the student and read the questions in a low voice and marked his/her answers on the questionnaire.

When students completed the questionnaires, researchers collected them. When the application completely finished, researchers gave information about the closed envelopes, what was inside them and what were they requested to do. They explained that, students should bring the parent questionnaires back in the following three days. The questionnaires collected three days later by the researchers.

The Process Followed After Data Collection

While conducting the survey in a class, researchers paid attention to maintain the process at least twosome. One of the researchers recorded the real size of the class, number of students that were present at the time of application and other information to the reporting form while the other one observed the students and helped them out about the questions. The researchers paid attention to fill the reporting form correctly. After each day, researchers came together in the meeting room of Association of Emergency Ambulance Physicians and made assessment of the general situation. The problems encountered teachers who did not behave collaboratively, students who drew attention with their emotional reactions or mental problems were discussed. Afterwards, the information about students was recorded.

- Other Related Aspects

In each class, researchers made a standard explanation at the end of the application. They told about the parent questionnaires and wanted students to bring the closed envelopes back three days after the current day. The researchers reminded students of their parents' freedom about the participation. However, even if their parents did not fill it, students were responsible to bring the empty questionnaire in the closed envelope.

At the end of three days given for a school, researchers connected with the school about the questionnaires and asked if they were collected. When the school directory said that the questionnaires were ready to be taken, the researchers went to the school to collect them. However, in some cases, school directors said that they needed some more days to completely collect the questionnaires. In such circumstances, researchers went to the school at stated time and brought the questionnaires from the school.

5. Ethical considerations related to the fieldwork process

Privacy, Anonymity and Confidentiality

While answering the questions, students sometimes felt uncomfortable since some of the questions were too private to answer. In order to ensure students about privacy, anonymity and confidentiality, an explanation was made to them before applying the questionnaire. The researchers who were in charge of helping students in the classes were trained about this issue comprehensively. In the explanation, the students were told that they don't have to write their names or any information about their identity apart from their age and gender. It was explained that, the important information for this research is not their personal features, but the results in total. No one, like their parents, teachers or friends would learn anything about their answers without their allowance. This explanation helped them to be more open and sincere while answering the questions. In addition, the researchers cared about the students' position in the class in order to prohibit them seeing each other's answers.

Limits of Confidentiality

In the training of researchers, there were a lot of important points to be mentioned. One of them was the limitations about confidentiality that they might encounter while conducting the survey. Since the questionnaire was including some private questions about participators' immediate vicinity, the researchers were told to relieve them about the confidentiality. But in some cases, this confidentiality needed to be ignored. To exemplify, the researchers told students that, they could feel comfortable to talk to them about their private issues if they wish. Researchers sometimes explained that students might have an interview with the counseling service of the school.

On the other hand, students may want to withdraw or even refuse to participate. Researchers were informed about students' rights to quit the research without any explanation. However, it was important for researchers to kindly ask the reason for withdrawing. In such cases, refusal may give some hints about the adverse childhood experiences or create useful information about the usage of the questionnaire.

Contact with the Pupils or Parents

The first aim of the researchers was not to hurt or harm participants. For this reason, they paid attention not to leave any written material with the children. During the application, researchers helped the students who wanted to share their feelings, but they tried not to give unrealistic hopes. In case families want to get in contact with the researchers, they could find the address and telephone information from the school directory. Likewise, researchers took the information of counselors and the school directory.

Safe Storage of Collected Data

While and after the application, no one was allowed to see the filled questionnaires apart from researchers. The questionnaires were put in a closed file and were brought to the Association of Emergency Ambulance Physicians. In order to protect files, they were put in private boxes and stored.

Informed Consent procedures

In Turkey, the Ministry of National Education (MioNE) uses a “Guide for research, support for research permissions and implementations in schools and institutions”. In this guide there is an article for consent forms: “If the people in the sample that were identified for the research tools of the medical research are adults, these people are asked for their written consent to participate. If the people of the sample are not adults, then they are asked for their parent’s consent form by being informed about the possible harms of the research.” In this study, this procedure was followed in pilot study. The informed consent forms were distributed to children in the classroom to give their parents. However, this process was not followed for the main epidemiological study, since the school directories were not disposed to deliver parents informed consent forms. Additionally, children in the pilot study had a tendency to fill these forms on their own without giving them to their parents. On the other hand the article in the research guide of MioNE was related to “medical research”. There would be no medical application like blood injection in this research and therefore the content of the informed consent form was not related to this study. For these reasons, the informed consent form procedure was not applied in the main epidemiological study.

The Process Designed and Followed in Case of a CAN Case's Disclosure

During the applications, there were a few students who announced a CAN case. When there was such a disclosure, researchers asked the students' permission to share this information with the counselors. The researchers were taught that, if the students do not give this permission, they should not share this information with the counselor unless in the case that the life of a person is in danger. However, such a circumstance did not happen and all these students gave the permission. When the researchers told the counselors about these students, all the counselors from different schools told that they were aware of the situation and were following these students and having meetings with their families. As a consequence, the researchers do not design a process about following the cases.

D. RESULTS

1. Data analysis and Presentation of results

Demographic Results

In Turkey, a total number of 7526 students participated in the study and 50,8% of them were boys.

Table 8. Students' gender

Q. 1	Gender
Girl	3703
Boy	3823
Total	7526
<i>Missing</i>	0

The ages of participants ranged between 10 and 18.

Table 9. Students' ages (Completed years)

	%
	Age
10	1,82
11	25,92
12	7,33
13	27,46
14	4,44
15	2,33
16	23,19
17	6,83
18	0,68
Total	100,00
<i>Missing</i>	0,00

The study was arranged to be conducted with 11, 13 and 16 year-old students. In Turkey, these ages referred to 5th, 7th and 10th grades of the public schools. Tenth grade students were divided into groups: general school students and vocational school students. In Table 10. the percentages of students within each grade are shown:

Table 10. Grade groups

	Grade Group
11 years old	33,22
13 years old	34,07
16 years old (General school)	12,52
16 years old (Vocational school)	20,20
Total	100,00

Most of the students (93,2%) claimed that they never flunked a year in school. Among the ones who flunked, 94,89% of them lost only one year (Table 11.).

Table 11. Flunked years

Q. 4	%
NO	93,20
YES	6,80
Total	100,00
Missing	0,52
(If yes) Flunked years	
1	94,89
2	4,52
3	0,59
4	0,00
5	0,00
6	0,00
7	0,00
8	0,00
Total	100,00
Missing	0,00

Among 7526 students from three different provinces, 89,98% of them had married parents. It can be observed from the Table 12. that, most of the parents live together.

Table 12 . Marital status of parents

Q. 5.1	Your parents are:
married	89,98
divorced/separated	5,78
never married	0,35
one parent is not living anymore	1,82
both parents are not living anymore	0,43
Don't want to answer	1,50
Don't know	0,13
Total	100,00
<i>Missing</i>	0,61

Educational levels of parents were obtained from the questionnaire. Results showed that primary school graduation was most common for both mothers and fathers. Secondly, high school graduation was also at high levels. Table 13 shows the distribution for each grade:

Table 13. Educational levels of parents

Q. 5.2	%	
	Mother	Father
Hasn't gone to school	5,86	1,36
Some grades of Primary school	6,45	4,53
Primary school	41,52	30,53
Middle school	15,44	20,02
High School / Lyceum	19,37	23,66
Vocational / Technical school	0,29	0,93
University	6,57	11,27
Post graduate studies (Masters, Doctorate)	0,85	1,34
Don't know	3,63	6,33
Total	100	100
<i>Missing</i>	0,71	3,25

Students were asked who they were living with. Results showed that, most of the students were living with their mothers (94,01%) and fathers (90,08). Nearly half of them were living with their brothers (49,59%) and sisters (45,51%). The table below presents the home situations in a detailed way:

Table 14 . The people that child is living together at home

Q. 5.6	%			
	YES	NO	Total	Missing
father	90,08	9,92	100,00	0,45
mother	94,01	5,99	100,00	0,45
stepfather (mother's spouse)	0,88	99,12	100,00	0,45
stepmother (father's spouse)	0,88	99,12	100,00	0,45
foster father	0,09	99,91	100,00	0,45
foster mother	0,09	99,91	100,00	0,45
mother's partner	0,52	99,48	100,00	0,45
father's partner	0,48	99,52	100,00	0,45
grandfather	5,59	94,41	100,00	0,45
grandmother	10,74	89,26	100,00	0,45
male sibling(s) (at least 1 brother)	49,59	50,41	100,00	0,60
female sibling(s) (at least 1 sister)	45,51	54,49	100,00	0,50
other relatives	4,23	95,77	100,00	0,68
<i>AUNT</i>	44,94			
<i>UNCLE</i>	51,58			
<i>COUSIN</i>	18,99			
<i>AUNT IN LAW</i>	14,24			
<i>NEPHEW / NIECE</i>	4,11			
<i>BROTHER IN LAW</i>	2,53			
<i>GRANDUNCLE</i>	0,95			
<i>STEP SIBLING</i>	0,95			
<i>GRAND COUSIN</i>	0,32			
<i>GRAND GRANDMOTHER</i>	0,32			
other non-relatives	0,94	99,06	100,00	0,58
<i>CHILD'S FRIEND</i>	21,43			
<i>NEIGHBOURS</i>	17,14			
<i>LIVES IN THE ORPHANAGE</i>	4,29			
<i>STAYS IN A DORMITORY</i>	2,86			
<i>NURSE</i>	2,86			
<i>FATHER'S FRIEND</i>	2,86			
<i>FAMILY FRIEND</i>	1,43			

Prevalence and Incidence of Each Question in Subscales

The questions were analysed one by one for each sub scale, in order to see the most common answers. Results for psychological abuse scale showed that “Insulted you by calling you dumb, lazy or other names like that? (37,13%)”, “Compared you to other children in a way that you felt humiliated? (34,71%)” and “Refused to speak to you (ignored you)? (32,80%)” were the most common statements that children reported to experience.

Table 15 . Most Common Statements for Psychological Abuse

%	Never	Yes (either in the past year or before)							Don't want to answer	Total	Missing	Prevalence	Incidence
		Before the last 12 months	1-2 times (once or twice a year)	3-5 times (several times a year)	6-12 times (monthly or bimonthly)	13-50 times (several times a month)	> 50 times (once a week or more often)	Missing					
Shouted, yelled, or screamed at you	67,55	3,43	8,12	4,61	2,10	3,28	3,56	4,35	2,99	100,00	0,82	29,46	21,68
Insulted you by calling you dumb, lazy or other names like that?	58,36	4,28	9,70	5,80	2,94	4,65	6,80	2,97	4,50	100,00	0,56	37,13	29,89
Cursed you?	72,08	2,91	6,44	3,10	1,65	2,56	3,30	3,02	4,94	100,00	0,97	22,98	17,05
Refused to speak to you (ignored you)?	64,21	3,49	9,12	5,65	3,19	4,13	4,13	3,09	2,99	100,00	0,94	32,80	26,22
Blamed you for his/her bad mood?	67,38	3,49	9,29	4,80	2,69	3,77	2,81	2,13	3,65	100,00	0,82	28,97	23,35
Read your diary, your SMS or e-mail	70,99	2,85	6,70	3,83	2,36	3,45	4,57	2,92	2,32	100,00	1,10	26,68	20,92
Went through your bag, drawers, pocket	75,13	2,22	6,03	3,24	1,95	2,85	4,18	2,13	2,27	100,00	0,61	22,59	18,25
Compared you to other children in a way that you felt humiliated?	61,58	4,05	9,77	6,27	3,25	4,36	5,09	1,94	3,71	100,00	0,54	34,71	28,72
Ashamed or embarrassed you intentionally?	75,20	3,04	6,44	3,21	1,72	2,43	2,41	2,27	3,28	100,00	0,62	21,53	16,22
Said that they wished you were dead?	78,56	1,45	4,75	2,92	1,31	2,02	3,45	2,40	3,14	100,00	0,90	18,30	14,45
Threatened to leave you or abandon you?	87,69	1,11	2,59	1,14	0,62	0,93	0,99	2,45	2,48	100,00	0,89	9,83	6,26
Threatened to kick you out of house?	92,07	0,12	1,21	0,70	0,52	0,60	0,59	2,45	1,74	100,00	0,86	6,19	3,62
Locked you out of the home?	92,48	0,68	1,64	0,71	0,32	0,37	0,31	2,02	1,47	100,00	0,58	6,05	3,35
Threatened to invoke ghosts or evil spirits?	87,60	5,18	1,60	0,66	0,50	0,38	1,04	1,60	1,44	100,00	0,52	10,96	4,18
Threatened to hurt or kill you?	93,25	0,43	0,98	0,53	0,37	0,28	0,61	1,90	1,64	100,00	0,52	5,10	2,78
Did not get enough to eat (went hungry)?	93,43	0,00	1,26	0,71	0,28	0,55	0,75	0,80	2,22	100,00	0,72	4,35	3,55
Have to wear clothes that were dirty or old?	95,28	0,35	0,61	0,37	0,17	0,25	0,36	0,86	1,74	100,00	0,80	2,98	1,77
Locked you up in a small place or in a room?	91,54	2,03	1,62	0,41	0,25	0,27	0,43	1,87	1,57	100,00	0,73	6,89	2,98
Threatened you with a knife or a gun?	95,00	0,31	0,82	0,39	0,16	0,09	0,32	1,87	1,03	100,00	0,78	3,96	1,78

Results indicated that, the most common physical abusive behaviours that children were exposed to were ear twisting (35,13%), slapping (28,57%) and pinching (26,04%).

Table 16 . Most Common Statements for Physical Abuse

%	Never	Yes (either in the past year or before)							Don't want to answer	Total	Missing	Prevalence	Incidence
		Before the last 12 months	1-2 times (once or twice a	3-5 times (several times a	6-12 times (monthly or bimonthly)	13-50 times (several times a	> 50 times (once a week or	Missing					
Pushed or kicked you?	82,27	2,34	3,98	2,05	1,12	1,49	2,13	2,24	2,38	100,00	0,76	15,34	10,76
Grabbed you by your clothes	85,72	1,88	3,20	1,51	0,87	1,10	1,22	2,25	2,24	100,00	0,88	12,04	7,91
Slapped you?	68,17	6,81	9,85	3,55	1,72	2,32	2,09	2,23	3,26	100,00	0,94	28,57	19,53
Hit you on head with knuckle	74,16	2,96	6,87	3,52	1,90	2,51	2,93	2,08	3,06	100,00	0,85	22,78	17,74
Spanked you on the bottom	90,34	0,95	1,62	0,62	0,25	0,52	0,80	2,14	2,75	100,00	0,84	6,91	3,82
Hit you on the buttocks with	88,78	1,89	2,34	1,06	0,47	0,58	0,86	1,83	2,21	100,00	0,64	9,01	5,30
Hit you elsewhere (not buttocks)	90,29	1,26	1,67	0,86	0,39	0,47	0,79	1,86	2,41	100,00	0,74	7,30	4,18
Hit you over and over again	87,65	1,27	2,52	1,30	0,62	0,82	1,15	2,09	2,59	100,00	0,82	9,77	6,40
Choked you or smothered you	93,74	0,58	0,62	0,31	0,16	0,33	0,43	2,23	1,59	100,00	0,87	4,66	1,85
Intentionally burned or scalded	94,86	0,62	0,45	0,13	0,09	0,16	0,25	1,99	1,44	100,00	0,82	3,71	1,09
Put chilli pepper, hot pepper,	88,48	4,37	2,20	0,65	0,18	0,26	0,67	1,44	1,74	100,00	0,69	9,78	3,96
Tied you up or tied you to something	95,48	0,60	0,29	0,16	0,12	0,11	0,31	1,87	1,06	100,00	0,80	3,45	0,98
Roughly twisted your ear?	62,37	8,94	13,07	4,21	2,06	2,67	2,21	1,97	2,49	100,00	0,88	35,13	24,22
Pulled your hair?	74,59	4,34	7,05	3,49	1,92	2,16	2,63	2,01	1,81	100,00	0,89	23,60	17,24
Pinched you roughly?	72,35	4,39	7,78	3,95	2,45	2,36	3,16	1,94	1,61	100,00	0,81	26,04	19,71
Forced you to hold a position	92,69	0,42	1,11	0,59	0,40	0,38	0,71	2,00	1,71	100,00	0,81	5,60	3,19

Among the feeling of neglect questions, “Felt that you were not important?” was the most frequent answer with 31,10 percentage.

Table 17 . Most Common Statements for Feeling of Neglect

%	Never	Yes (either in the past year or before)							Don't want to answer	Total	Missing	Prevalence	Incidence
		Before the last 12 months	1-2 times (once or twice a	3-5 times (several times a year)	6-12 times (monthly or bimonthly)	13-50 times (several times a	> 50 times (once a week or	Missing					
You did not feel cared for?	67,56	3,68	9,69	5,40	2,62	3,33	3,81	0,80	3,10	100,00	0,68	29,34	24,86
Felt that you were not important?	65,81	2,83	9,75	6,48	2,54	3,64	5,09	0,76	3,09	100,00	0,62	31,10	27,50
Felt that there was never any love in the house?	70,06	2,69	8,12	5,50	2,33	2,93	4,37	0,71	3,30	100,00	0,62	26,63	23,24

Questions about positive or non-violent parenting were responded positively. Children tended to declare their parents’ positive behaviours. “Explained you why something you did was wrong?” (80,56%), “Gave you an award for behaving well?” (79,57%) and “Told you to start or stop doing something (e.g. start doing your homework or stop watching TV)?” (63,88%) were the most common questions that were declared by children.

Table 18 . Most Common Statements for Positive and Non-Violent Parenting

%	Never	Yes (either in the past year or before)							Don't want to answer	Total	Missing	Prevalence	Incidence
		Before the last 12 months	1-2 times (once or twice a	3-5 times (several times a year)	6-12 times (monthly or bimonthly)	13-50 times (several times a	> 50 times (once a week or	Missing					
Told you to start or stop doing something?	33,25	2,39	7,85	7,33	6,69	11,32	26,22	2,09	2,87	100,00	0,90	63,88	59,41
Explained you why something you did was wrong?	15,41	2,62	11,10	11,46	8,66	14,54	28,70	3,48	4,02	100,00	1,21	80,56	74,46
Gave you an award for behaving well?	17,41	5,05	15,28	16,27	9,87	15,48	14,86	2,77	3,03	100,00	0,76	79,57	71,75
Gave you something else to do?	57,27	2,45	6,29	6,31	4,97	7,42	8,20	2,45	4,65	100,00	0,78	38,08	33,19
Took away your pocket money?	81,60	1,34	4,04	2,47	1,26	1,77	1,90	2,98	2,65	100,00	0,64	15,75	11,43
Forbade you something that you wanted to do?	59,11	3,03	13,10	6,85	3,52	4,89	4,63	2,81	2,07	100,00	1,02	38,82	32,98
Forbade you to go out?	69,60	2,80	8,97	4,87	2,45	3,53	3,38	2,68	1,72	100,00	0,92	28,68	23,20

The table below shows the maximum number of experiences children can mention within each scale. It can be observed in the table that, children declared to be exposed to one or multiple psychological abusive behaviours more than physical abusive behaviours or neglect. On the other side, a great amount of children mentioned that their parents/caregivers used one more than one positive discipline ways. For each category, there were very small amount of children who did not report any of the experiences.

Table 19. Maximum number of experiences children can mention within each scale

Type of experience - %		Missing	Total	NA: all items are "I don't want to answer"	NA: some items are "never" & some "I don't want to answer"	Number of different behaviors (items) experienced																			Total No of children who report at least one experience	Total no of children who report either none or at least one experience	
						0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18			19
Psychological abus	Prevalence	0,01	100,00	0,00	3,59	25,83	14,79	11,56	9,67	7,32	6,13	5,45	4,01	2,95	2,03	1,49	1,08	0,81	0,56	0,72	0,84	0,31	0,49	0,20	0,17	70,58	96,41
	Incidence	0,02	100,00	0,00		25,75	18,76	13,81	11,51	8,46	6,18	4,57	3,38	2,22	1,48	1,25	0,78	0,47	0,40	0,30	0,30	0,13	0,13	0,13	100,00		
Physical abuse (16)	Prevalence	0,23	100,00	0,27	3,45	37,90	15,94	11,75	8,23	6,09	4,25	3,34	2,16	1,66	1,16	0,81	0,53	0,45	0,23	0,12	1,03	0,64			58,38	96,28	
	Incidence	0,49	100,00	0,00		32,93	21,16	13,88	10,18	6,42	4,63	3,58	2,11	1,56	1,07	0,81	0,55	0,26	0,26	0,35	0,26				100,00		
Neglect (3 items)	Prevalence	0,41	100,00	1,31	2,47	53,61	14,42	12,13	16,06																42,62	96,22	
	Incidence	1,09	100,00	0,00		35,36	28,39	36,25																	100,00		
Positive Discipline (Prevalence	0,11	100,00	0,13	1,69	4,27	11,25	22,94	20,86	17,62	12,25	5,27	3,71												93,91	98,18	
	Incidence	0,12	100,00	0,00		15,67	27,19	22,91	17,84	9,76	4,54	2,08													100,00		

Table 20. focuses on the prevalence and incidence values for each maltreatment form. Students declared to suffer from psychological violence with a high percentage. At the same time, they claimed that, their parents/caregivers were using positive and non-violent parenting strategies frequently.

Table 20. Prevalence and Incidence for Maltreatment Forms

%	Maltreatment Form (Scale)			
	Psychological violence (19 items)	Physical violence (16 items)	Feeling of Neglect (3 items)	Positive & non violent parenting (7 items)
Prevalence	70,58	58,38	42,62	93,91
Incidence	62,82	46,06	37,55	90,74
D.W.A.	0,00	0,27	1,31	0,13
D.W.A. + Never	3,59	3,45	2,47	1,69
Never	25,83	37,90	53,61	4,27
Total	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
Missing	0,01	0,23	0,41	0,11
95% CI for PREVALENCE	69,55	57,27	41,50	93,37
	71,61	59,50	43,73	94,45
95% CI for INCIDENCE	61,73	44,94	36,45	90,09
	63,91	47,19	38,64	91,40

Results About The Effects of Gender on CAN

The role of gender in experiencing maltreatment forms are presented in the table below. Gender effect found to be insignificant for psychological maltreatment. Boys reported to experience more physical maltreatment than girls. For neglect and positive parenting, girls reported more experience than boys.

Table 21. Prevalence-Incidence (per Gender)

GENDER	%	Maltreatment Form (Scale)			
		Psychological violence (19 items)	Physical violence (16 items)	Feeling of Neglect (3 items)	Positive & non violent parenting (7 items)
GIRLS	Prevalence	70,89	56,12	48,12	94,65
	Incidence	63,06	43,61	43,09	91,73
	D.W.A.	0,00	0,14	0,84	0,08
	D.W.A. + Never	3,08	3,05	2,00	1,46
	Never	26,03	40,69	49,04	3,81
	Total	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
	Missing	0,00	0,05	0,11	0,08
	95% CI for PREVALENCE	69,43	54,52	46,51	93,92
		72,35	57,72	49,73	95,37
	95% CI for INCIDENCE	61,50	42,01	41,50	90,84
64,61		45,21	44,69	92,62	
BOYS	Prevalence	70,28	60,58	37,25	93,19
	Incidence	62,59	48,45	32,14	89,79
	D.W.A.	0,00	0,39	1,77	0,18
	D.W.A. + Never	4,08	3,83	2,92	1,91
	Never	25,64	35,19	58,06	4,71
	Total	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
	Missing	0,03	0,39	0,71	0,13
	95% CI for PREVALENCE	68,83	59,03	35,71	92,39
		71,73	62,14	38,79	93,99
	95% CI for INCIDENCE	61,05	46,86	30,65	88,82
64,12		50,04	33,62	90,75	

Chi square values for each maltreatment form are given below. The highlighted values show the significant effect of gender on types of maltreatment. Gender effect is not significant for being exposed to psychological maltreatment.

Table 22. Chi Square Distribution for Gender

	Item	Psychological violence	Physical violence	Feeling of Neglect	& non violent physical
Prevalence	Pearson Chi square	0,015	21,184	79,716	3,96
	Significance (p-value)	0,902	.000	.000	.047
Incidence	Pearson Chi square	0,167	18,468	95,714	6,369
	Significance (p-value)	0,683	.000	.000	0,012

The prevalence and incidence of per question classified according to gender. Both girls and boys tended to report high percentages of at least one experience of psychological abuse and positive discipline.

Table 23. Prevalence and Incidence (per Gender-number of items)

Type of experience -	GENDER		Missing	Total	NA: all items are "I don't want to answer"	NA: some items are "never" & some "I don't want to"	Number of different behaviors (items) experienced																			Total No of children who report at least one experience	Total No of children who report either none or at least one experience	
							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18			19
Psychological abuse	GIRLS	Prevalence	0,00	100,00	0,00	3,08	26,03	14,96	12,04	9,40	6,29	6,43	5,64	4,24	3,21	2,13	1,57	1,32	0,78	0,54	0,73	0,86	0,19	0,38	0,14	0,03	70,89	96,92
		Incidence	0,00	100,00	0,00		25,82	18,63	13,32	10,79	8,65	6,60	4,80	3,85	2,36	1,46	1,24	0,81	0,39	0,43	0,43	0,17	0,13	0,09	0,04	100,00		
	BOYS	Prevalence	0,03	100,00	0,00	4,08	25,64	14,63	11,09	9,94	8,32	5,83	5,26	3,79	2,69	1,94	1,41	0,84	0,84	0,58	0,71	0,81	0,42	0,60	0,26	0,31	70,28	95,92
		Incidence	0,04	100,00	0,00		25,67	18,90	14,30	12,21	8,28	5,77	4,35	2,93	2,09	1,51	1,25	0,75	0,54	0,38	0,17	0,42	0,13	0,17	0,21	100,00		
Physical abuse (16)	GIRLS	Prevalence	0,05	100,00	0,14	3,05	40,69	15,89	11,46	7,59	5,84	3,86	3,08	2,11	1,70	1,54	0,70	0,41	0,49	0,27	0,08	0,73	0,38		56,12	96,81		
		Incidence	0,12	100,00	0,00		32,59	21,93	14,44	9,79	6,07	4,15	3,53	2,35	1,92	1,12	0,87	0,50	0,31	0,06	0,25	0,12			100,00			
	BOYS	Prevalence	0,39	100,00	0,39	3,83	35,19	15,99	12,03	8,85	6,33	4,62	3,60	2,21	1,63	0,79	0,92	0,66	0,42	0,18	0,16	1,31	0,89		60,58	95,77		
		Incidence	0,81	100,00	0,00		33,22	20,49	13,39	10,51	6,72	5,04	3,63	1,90	1,25	1,03	0,76	0,60	0,22	0,43	0,43	0,38			100,00			
Neglect (3 items)	GIRLS	Prevalence	0,11	100,00	0,84	2,00	49,04	14,25	12,98	20,90																48,12	97,16	
		Incidence	0,25	100,00	0,00		30,43	27,16	42,41																		100,00	
	BOYS	Prevalence	0,71	100,00	1,77	2,92	58,06	14,59	11,30	11,35																	37,25	95,31
		Incidence	2,17	100,00	0,00		41,80	30,00	28,20																		100,00	
Positive Discipline (16)	GIRLS	Prevalence	0,08	100,00	0,08	1,46	3,81	11,54	24,08	21,65	16,97	11,70	5,03	3,68													94,65	98,46
		Incidence	0,09	100,00	0,00		16,26	27,93	23,66	16,29	9,43	4,12	2,30														100,00	
	BOYS	Prevalence	0,13	100,00	0,18	1,91	4,71	10,97	21,84	20,09	18,26	12,78	5,50	3,75													93,19	97,90
		Incidence	0,15	100,00	0,00		15,08	26,46	22,17	19,37	10,09	4,96	1,87														100,00	

Results about the Effects of Grade Group on CAN

Maltreatment forms were examined through grade groups. For each grade group, the prevalence and incidence rates of psychological violence and positive parenting were higher. General school students (16 years old) reported high rates for each maltreatment forms. However, incidence percentage of physical violence was higher for 13-year-old children.

Table 24. Prevalence-Incidence (per Grade Group)

%		Maltreatment Form (Scale)			
GRADE GROUP		Psychological violence (19)	Physical violence (16)	Feeling of Neglect (3)	Positive & non violent
11 years old	Prevalence	56,70	48,76	27,57	91,68
	Incidence	48,94	42,26	24,72	87,76
	D.W.A.	0,00	0,28	0,88	0,16
	.W.A. + Never	4,88	3,69	2,49	2,76
	Never	38,42	47,27	69,05	5,40
	Total	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
	Missing	0,04	0,24	0,48	0,04
	95% CI for PREVALENC	54,76 58,65	46,80 50,72	25,82 29,33	90,59 92,76
	95% CI for INCIDENCE	46,98 50,90	40,32 44,20	23,02 26,41	86,47 89,04
	13 years old	Prevalence	69,73	58,43	40,44
Incidence		62,05	47,87	36,13	90,51
D.W.A.		0,00	0,27	1,53	0,12
.W.A. + Never		3,67	3,83	2,86	1,45
Never		26,60	37,47	55,17	4,84
Total		100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
Missing		0,00	0,27	0,47	0,16
95% CI for PREVALENC		67,96 71,51	56,52 60,34	38,53 42,34	92,65 94,54
95% CI for INCIDENCE		60,17 63,93	45,93 49,80	34,26 37,99	89,37 91,64
16 years old (general)		Prevalence	86,41	68,76	61,00
	Incidence	78,03	45,70	53,45	94,90
	D.W.A.	0,00	0,53	1,17	0,21
	.W.A. + Never	1,80	3,19	1,59	0,74
	Never	11,78	27,52	36,24	2,34
	Total	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
	Missing	0,00	0,11	0,11	0,11
	95% CI for PREVALENC	84,22 88,60	65,80 71,72	57,88 64,12	95,57 97,85
	95% CI for INCIDENCE	75,38 80,67	42,51 48,88	50,27 56,64	93,49 96,30
	15 years old (vocational)	Prevalence	85,00	67,70	59,58
Incidence		77,50	49,51	51,12	93,48
D.W.A.		0,00	0,07	1,72	0,07
.W.A. + Never		2,43	2,57	2,31	0,92
Never		12,57	29,66	36,39	2,64
Total		100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
Missing		0,00	0,20	0,39	0,13
95% CI for PREVALENC		83,20 86,80	65,35 70,05	57,11 62,05	95,44 97,32
95% CI for INCIDENCE		75,40 79,60	46,99 52,02	48,60 53,64	92,24 94,72

Table 25. Chi Square Distribution for Grade Group

	Item	Psychological violence	Physical violence	Feeling of Neglect	Positive & non violent parenting
Prevalence	Pearson Chi square	4,74	1,908	5,582	29,749
	Significance (p-value)	.000	.000	.000	.000
Incidence	Pearson Chi square	4,396	23,352	3,963	49,591
	Significance (p-value)	.000	.000	.000	.000

Results about the Effects of Geographical Area on CAN

Geographical area was another main variable that affected the CAN degrees. For all three geographical areas, the percentages of psychological violence and positive parenting were high. In Denizli, all forms of maltreatment rates were higher than other two geographical areas.

Table 26. Prevalence-Incidence for Geographical Area

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA	%	Maltreatment Form (Scale)			
		Psychological violence (19)	Physical violence (16)	Feeling of Neglect (3)	Positive & non violent
İZMİR	Prevalence	70,29	58,52	41,40	93,29
	Incidence	62,36	46,20	36,58	90,02
	D.W.A.	0,00	0,37	1,56	0,19
	.W.A. + Never	3,94	3,75	2,52	1,83
	Never	25,76	37,36	54,52	4,70
	Total	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
	Missing	0,02	0,27	0,48	0,12
	95% CI for PREVALENC	69,00 71,58	57,13 59,92	40,00 42,79	92,58 93,99
	95% CI for INCIDENCE	60,99 63,73	44,79 47,61	35,22 37,94	89,18 90,87
	ZONGULDAK	Prevalence	66,57	53,92	38,38
Incidence		58,23	42,44	33,52	90,58
D.W.A.		0,00	0,07	0,79	0,00
.W.A. + Never		3,42	3,21	2,72	1,78
Never		30,01	42,80	58,11	4,56
Total		100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
Missing		0,00	0,07	0,29	0,07
95% CI for PREVALENC		64,10 69,04	51,31 56,53	35,84 40,93	92,38 94,93
95% CI for INCIDENCE		55,65 60,81	39,85 45,03	31,05 36,00	89,06 92,11
DENİZLİ		Prevalence	75,94	62,67	51,65
	Incidence	69,43	49,46	45,43	93,56
	D.W.A.	0,00	0,08	0,92	0,08
	.W.A. + Never	2,45	2,61	2,00	1,07
	Never	21,61	34,64	45,43	2,38
	Total	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
	Missing	0,00	0,23	0,31	0,08
	95% CI for PREVALENC	73,62 78,26	60,05 65,30	48,94 54,37	95,47 97,47
	95% CI for INCIDENCE	66,93 71,92	46,75 52,18	42,72 48,13	92,23 94,89

Table 27. Chi Square Distribution for Geographical Area

	Item	Psychological violence	Physical violence	Feeling of Neglect	Positive & non violent parenting
Prevalence	Pearson Chi square	26,615	21,398	54,211	14,243
	Significance (p-value)	.000	.000	.000	.001
Incidence	Pearson Chi square	37,43	13,497	45,919	11,575
	Significance (p-value)	.000	.001	.000	.003

Results about the Effects of Urbanicity on CAN

The effects of urbanicity are shown in the table below. It can be inferred that, students who live in the urban areas reported more experience in all maltreatment forms.

Table 28. Prevalence-Incidence for Urbanicity

%		Maltreatment Form (Scale)			
URBANICITY		Psychological violence (19)	Physical violence (16)	Feeling of Neglect (3)	Positive & non violent
Urban	Prevalence	71,04	58,65	42,96	94,11
	Incidence	63,40	46,27	37,89	90,99
	D.W.A.	0,00	0,29	1,41	0,15
	.W.A. + Never	3,55	3,42	2,43	1,70
	Never	25,41	37,64	53,20	4,04
	Total	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
	Missing	0,02	0,26	0,44	0,11
	95% CI for PREVALENC	69,95	57,46	41,76	93,54
	95% CI for INCIDENCE	72,14	59,85	44,16	94,68
	95% CI for INCIDENCE	62,23	45,06	36,72	90,29
Rural	Prevalence	67,55	56,66	40,37	92,57
	Incidence	59,00	44,76	35,27	89,21
	D.W.A.	0,00	0,10	0,61	0,00
	.W.A. + Never	3,87	3,66	2,75	1,63
	Never	28,59	39,57	56,27	5,80
	Total	100,00	100,00	100,00	100,00
	Missing	0,00	0,00	0,20	0,10
	95% CI for PREVALENC	64,62	53,57	37,30	90,93
	95% CI for PREVALENC	70,48	59,76	43,44	94,21
	95% CI for INCIDENCE	55,93	41,65	32,28	87,26
95% CI for INCIDENCE	62,08	47,87	38,26	91,15	

Table 29. Chi Square Distribution for Urbanicity

	Item	Psychological violence	Physical violence	Feeling of Neglect	Positive & non violent parenting
Prevalence	Pearson Chi square	4,822	1,421	2,812	6,427
	Significance (p-value)	.28	.233	.094	.011
Incidence	Pearson Chi square	7,106	0,679	2,535	2,326
	Significance (p-value)	.008	.410	.111	.127

Results about the Effects of Gender x Grade Group on CAN

- Psychological Violence

The joint effects of gender and grade group on psychological abuse are observed in the table. Among the girls, 16-year-old vocational school students declared to be exposed to psychological abuse more than other grade groups. For the boys, the greatest percentages were recorded for 16-year-old general school students.

Table 30. Prevalence-Incidance for Gender x Grade group (Psychological Violence)

Psychological Violence - %		Measure								
GENDER	GRADE GROUP	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+ Never	Never	Missing		95% CI for	95% CI for
GIRLS	11 - years old	53,94	45,74	0,00	4,85	41,21	0,00	33,95	8 -	59 - 48,5
	13 - years old	71,39	64,14	0,00	3,13	25,47	0,00	32,76	5 -	74 - 66,84
	years old (gen	87,52	78,79	0,00	0,89	11,59	0,00	15,15	9 -	91 - 82,17
	years old (vocat	87,80	80,36	0,00	1,49	10,71	0,00	18,15	2 -	95 - 83,36
	Total	70,89	63,06	0,00	3,08	26,03	0,00	100,00	3 -	75 - 64,61
BOYS	11 - years old	59,50	52,17	0,00	4,91	35,59	0,08	32,50	7 -	61 - 54,95
	13 - years old	68,25	60,18	0,00	4,15	27,61	0,00	35,35	6 -	77 - 62,79
	years old (gen	84,78	76,90	0,00	3,15	12,07	0,00	9,97	7 -	87 - 81,13
	years old (vocat	82,78	75,24	0,00	3,18	14,03	0,00	22,19	4 -	83 - 78,14
	Total	70,28	62,59	0,00	4,08	25,64	0,03	100,00	3 -	75 - 64,12

- Physical Violence

The joint effects of gender and grade groups on the physical violence are shown in the table below. For girls, 16-year-old general school students declared high percentages of physical violence more than the other grade groups. Among the boys, again 16-year-old general school students reported to experience physical violence more than the others.

Table 31. Prevalence-Incidence for Gender x Grade group (Physical Violence)

Physical Violence - %		Measure									
GENDER	GRADE GROUP	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+ Never	Never	Missing		95% CI for	95% CI for	
GIRLS	11 - years old	44,35	37,66	0,24	3,82	51,59	0,08	33,94	5	48 - 40,34	
	13 - years old	55,73	45,09	0,08	3,05	41,14	0,00	32,77	3	59 - 47,89	
	years old (gen	66,25	43,93	0,18	2,68	30,89	0,18	15,13	3	72 - 48,04	
	years old (vocat	70,39	51,79	0,00	1,93	27,68	0,00	18,16	4	71 - 55,56	
	Total	56,12	43,61	0,14	3,05	40,69	0,05	100,00	2	51 - 45,21	
BOYS	11 - years old	53,23	46,93	0,32	3,55	42,89	0,40	32,51	5	55 - 49,71	
	13 - years old	60,86	50,37	0,45	4,54	34,15	0,52	35,29	5	67 - 53,05	
	years old (gen	72,44	48,29	1,05	3,94	22,57	0,00	10,01	5	78 - 53,31	
	years old (vocat	65,56	47,69	0,12	3,08	31,24	0,35	22,19	6	62 - 51,06	
	Total	60,58	48,45	0,39	3,83	35,19	0,39	100,00	3	66 - 50,04	

- Feeling of Neglect

The joint effects of gender and grade groups on the feeling of neglect are shown in the table below. It can be observed for the girls that, 16-year-old vocational school students felt neglected more than the other grade groups. Among the boys, 16-year-old general school students declared feeling of neglect more than the others.

Table 32. Prevalence-Incidence for Gender x Grade group (Feeling of Neglect)

Feeling of Neglect - %		Measure									
GENDER	GRADE GROUP	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+ Never	Never	Missing		95% CI for	95% CI for	
GIRLS	11 - years old	27,99	25,04	0,72	2,47	68,82	0,24	33,90	1	34 - 27,44	
	13 - years old	48,06	42,79	0,49	2,06	49,38	0,00	32,79	5	5 - 45,57	
	years old (gen	66,96	60,71	0,89	1,25	30,89	0,18	15,14	7	77 - 64,76	
	years old (vocat	70,09	62,65	1,64	1,64	26,64	0,00	18,17	3	79 - 66,31	
	Total	48,12	43,09	0,84	2,00	49,04	0,11	100,00	1	45 - 44,69	
BOYS	11 - years old	27,15	24,39	1,05	2,51	69,29	0,72	32,51	7	2 - 26,79	
	13 - years old	33,53	30,10	2,46	3,58	60,42	0,89	35,27	-	364 - 32,55	
	years old (gen	52,23	42,78	1,57	2,10	44,09	0,00	10,04	2	51 - 47,75	
	years old (vocat	51,19	41,92	1,78	2,85	44,18	0,71	22,18	1	59 - 45,26	
	Total	37,25	32,14	1,77	2,92	58,06	0,71	100,00	1	35 - 33,62	

- Positive & Non-Violent Parenting

The joint effects of gender and grade groups on positive parenting are shown in the table below. For girls, 16-year-old vocational children reported non-violent parenting experiences more than other grade groups. Among the boys, 16-year-old students from general schools declared non-violent parenting experiences more than the others.

Table 33. Prevalence-Incidence for Gender x Grade group (Positive & Non-Violent Parenting)

Positive & Non Violent Parenting		Measure																		
GENDER	GRADE GROUP	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+ Never	Never	Missing							95%	95%					
														CI for	CI for					
GIRLS	11 - years old	91,40	87,26	0,16	2,95	5,49	0,08							5	- 92	- 89,11				
	13 - years old	94,97	92,57	0,00	1,07	3,96	0,08							74	- 91	- 94,05				
	years old (gen	97,50	95,71	0,18	0,36	1,96	0,18							1	- 94	- 97,39				
	years old (vocat	97,77	95,24	0,00	0,30	1,93	0,00							5	- 93	- 96,85				
	Total	94,65	91,73	0,08	1,46	3,81	0,08							2	- 94	- 92,62				
BOYS	11 - years old	91,95	88,25	0,16	2,57	5,31	0,00							4	- 96	- 90,04				
	13 - years old	92,36	88,65	0,22	1,78	5,64	0,22							4	- 96	- 90,34				
	years old (gen	95,54	93,70	0,26	1,31	2,89	0,00							6	- 96	- 96,14				
	years old (vocat	95,27	92,08	0,12	1,42	3,19	0,24							84	- 96	- 93,9				
	Total	93,19	89,79	0,18	1,91	4,71	0,13							9	- 92	- 90,75				

Results about the Effects of Gender x Geographical Area on CAN

- Psychological Violence

The joint effects of gender and geographical area on psychological violence are shown in the table below. It can be observed that, both girls and boys living in Denizli reported higher rates of psychological violence. Girls tended to report more experience of psychological violence than boys except the ones live in Zonguldak. In Zonguldak, boys seem to experience more psychological violence.

Table 34. Prevalence-Incidence for Gender x Geographical Area (Psychological Violence)

Psychological Violence - %		Measure																		
GENDER	GEOGR. AREA	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+ Never	Never	Missing							95%	95%					
														CI for	CI for					
GIRLS	İzmir	71,26	63,52	0,00	3,40	25,34	0,00							7	- 72	- 65,42				
	Zonguldak	61,79	52,68	0,00	3,04	35,18	0,00							6	- 64	- 56,81				
	Denizli	77,12	69,99	0,00	1,93	20,95	0,00							4	- 82	- 73,45				
	Total	70,89	63,06	0,00	3,08	26,03	0,00							3	- 75	- 64,61				
BOYS	İzmir	69,28	61,14	0,00	4,52	26,20	0,04							1	- 77	- 63,11				
	Zonguldak	69,75	61,92	0,00	3,68	26,57	0,00							5	- 734	- 65,2				
	Denizli	74,68	68,83	0,00	3,01	22,31	0,00							9	- 72	- 72,44				
	Total	70,28	62,59	0,00	4,08	25,64	0,03							3	- 75	- 64,12				

- Physical Violence

The joint effects of gender and geographical area on physical violence are shown on the table below. In Denizli, both girls and boys reported to suffer from physical violence more than the other geographical areas. In addition, boys

reported to be exposed to physical violence more than girls in all three geographical areas.

Table 35. Prevalence-Incidence for Gender x Geographical Area (Physical Violence)

Physical Violence - %		Measure									
GENDER	GEOGR. AREA	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+		Missing		95% CI for PREVALENCE	95% CI for INCIDENCE	
					Never	Never					
GIRLS	Izmir	56,44	43,68	0,20	3,20	40,15	0,08	66,68	49 - 52	45,64	
	Zonguldak	47,32	36,79	0,00	3,04	49,64	0,00	15,13	9 - 59	40,78	
	Denizli	62,26	49,03	0,00	2,53	35,22	0,00	18,18	5 - 65	52,81	
	Total	56,12	43,61	0,14	3,05	40,69	0,05	100,00	2 - 51	45,21	
BOYS	Izmir	60,72	48,87	0,56	4,32	34,40	0,47	61,37	74 - 64	50,89	
	Zonguldak	58,31	46,20	0,12	3,33	38,24	0,12	22,11	8 - 63	49,57	
	Denizli	63,12	49,92	0,16	2,70	34,02	0,47	16,52	5 - 61	53,83	
	Total	60,58	48,45	0,39	3,83	35,19	0,39	100,00	3 - 66	50,04	

- Feeling of Neglect

Feeling of neglect is another type of maltreatment to be effected by gender and geographical area. The rates of neglect feeling seem to be higher both for girls and boys in Denizli. Girls in general, reported higher rates of neglect than boys did.

Table 36. Prevalence-Incidence for Gender x Geographical Area (Feeling of Neglect)

Feeling of Neglect - %		Measure									
GENDER	GEOGR. AREA	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+		Missing		95% CI for PREVALENCE	95% CI for INCIDENCE	
					Never	Never					
GIRLS	Izmir	47,73	42,50	0,97	1,99	49,31	0,16	66,65	76 - 45	44,45	
	Zonguldak	39,11	35,71	0,18	2,50	58,21	0,00	15,14	7 - 45	39,68	
	Denizli	56,97	51,34	1,04	1,63	40,36	0,00	18,22	4 - 66	55,11	
	Total	48,11	43,08	0,86	2,00	49,03	0,11	100,00	5 - 49	44,68	
BOYS	Izmir	34,69	30,31	2,19	3,09	60,03	0,81	61,35	6 - 35	32,18	
	Zonguldak	37,90	32,06	1,19	2,86	58,05	0,47	22,10	2 - 49	35,22	
	Denizli	45,86	39,01	0,96	2,39	50,80	0,63	16,54	6 - 42	42,83	
	Total	37,25	32,14	1,77	2,92	58,06	0,71	100,00	1 - 35	33,62	

- Positive & Non-Violent Parenting

Gender and geographical area's effects on non-violent parenting questions are shown in the table below. Both girls and boys from Denizli reported high rates of non-violent parenting. For Izmir and Denizli, girls reported higher rates than boys;

however in Zonguldak, boys reported to experience higher rates of non-violent parenting.

Table 37. Prevalence-Incidence for Gender x Geographical Area (Positive & Non-Violent Parenting)

Positive & Non Violent Parenting		Measure							95% CI for PREVALENCE	95% CI for INCIDENCE
GENDER	GEOGR. AREA	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+		Missing			
					Never	Never				
GIRLS	İzmir	94,16	91,24	0,12	1,34	4,38	0,12	66,68	4 - 93 - 92,36	
	Zonguldak	93,57	90,71	0,00	2,50	3,93	0,00	15,14	54 - 91 - 93,12	
	Denizli	97,33	94,35	0,00	1,04	1,63	0,00	18,19	1 - 93 - 96,1	
	Total	94,65	91,73	0,08	1,46	3,81	0,08	100,00	2 - 94 - 92,62	
BOYS	İzmir	92,37	88,74	0,26	2,35	5,03	0,13	61,42	9 - 96 - 90,02	
	Zonguldak	93,71	90,50	0,00	1,31	4,99	0,12	22,05	7 - 92 - 92,48	
	Denizli	95,56	92,71	0,16	1,11	3,17	0,16	16,53	6 - 98 - 94,74	
	Total	93,19	89,79	0,18	1,91	4,71	0,13	100,00	9 - 92 - 90,75	

Results about the Effects of Gender x Urbanicity on CAN

- Psychological Violence

The joint effect of gender and urbanicity on psychological violence is shown in the table below. It can be inferred from the table that, girls declared more psychological violence experience than boys. In addition, students from urban areas declared more experience than students from rural areas.

Table 38. Prevalence-Incidence for Gender x Urbanicity (Psychological Violence)

GENDER	URBANICITY	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+		Missing		95% CI for PREVALENCE	95% CI for INCIDENCE
					Never	Never				
GIRLS	URBAN	71,38	63,36	0,00	3,03	25,59	0,00	85,60	1 - 79 - 65,04	
	RURAL	68,11	61,35	0,00	3,38	28,52	0,00	14,40	5 - 72 - 65,48	
	Total	70,91	63,07	0,00	3,08	26,01	0,00	#####	4 - 72 - 64,63	
BOYS	URBAN	70,73	63,43	0,00	4,03	25,24	0,03	88,23	9 - 71 - 65,06	
	RURAL	66,89	56,22	0,00	4,44	28,67	0,00	11,77	4 - 74 - 60,81	
	Total	70,28	62,59	0,00	4,08	25,64	0,03	#####	3 - 75 - 64,12	

- Physical Violence

The table below shows the joint effect of gender and urbanicity on physical violence. Results show that, boys reported higher rates of physical

violence than girls both in urban and rural areas. In addition, students from urban areas reported to experience more physical violence than students from rural areas.

Table 39. Prevalence-Incidence for Gender x Urbanicity (Physical Violence)

Physical Violence - %		Measure									
GENDER	URBANICITY	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+		Missing		95% CI for PRE VALE NCE	95% CI for INCID ENCE	
					Never	Never					
GIRLS	URBAN	56,30	43,98	0,16	2,90	40,64	0,06	85,59	7 - 56	- 45,71	
	RURAL	55,16	41,46	0,00	3,94	40,90	0,00	14,41	4 - 58	- 45,65	
	Total	56,14	43,62	0,14	3,05	40,68	0,05	#####	4 - 52	- 45,22	
BOYS	URBAN	60,87	48,42	0,42	3,90	34,81	0,44	88,18	2 - 63	- 50,11	
	RURAL	58,44	48,67	0,22	3,33	38,00	0,00	11,82	89 - 5	- 53,28	
	Total	60,58	48,45	0,39	3,83	35,19	0,39	#####	3 - 66	- 50,04	

- Feeling of Neglect

Neglect rates were higher for girls than boys. When the urbanicity evaluated, the students from urban areas reported higher rates than students from rural areas.

Table 40. Prevalence-Incidence for Gender x Urbanicity (Feeling of Neglect)

Feeling of Neglect - %		Measure									
GENDER	URBANICITY	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+		Missing		95% CI for PRE VALE NCE	95% CI for INCID ENCE	
					Never	Never					
GIRLS	URBAN	48,63	43,67	0,92	2,02	48,44	0,13	85,59	8 - 54	- 45,39	
	RURAL	45,22	39,77	0,38	1,88	52,53	0,00	14,41	9 - 42	- 43,93	
	Total	48,13	43,10	0,84	2,00	49,03	0,11	#####	2 - 41	- 44,7	
BOYS	URBAN	37,60	32,44	1,88	2,81	57,71	0,74	88,20	6 - 35	- 34,02	
	RURAL	34,60	29,91	0,89	3,79	60,71	0,44	11,80	19 - 7	- 34,15	
	Total	37,25	32,14	1,77	2,92	58,06	0,71	#####	1 - 35	- 33,62	

- Positive & Non-Violent Parenting

Positive and non-violent parenting rates were higher for girls than boys. When the urbanicity effect evaluated, students from urban areas reported more positive parenting experiences than boys.

Table 41. Prevalence-Incidence for Gender x Urbanicity (Positive& Non-violent Parenting)

Positive & Non Violent Parenting		Measure									
GENDER	URBANICITY	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+		Missing		95% CI for PRE VALE NCE	95% CI for INCID ENC E	
					Never	Never					
GIRLS	URBAN	94,91	91,91	0,09	1,39	3,60	0,09	85,59	5 - 96	- 92,86	
	RURAL	93,06	90,81	0,00	1,88	5,07	0,00	14,41	- 95	- 93,26	
	Total	94,65	91,75	0,08	1,46	3,81	0,08	#####	2 - 97	- 92,64	
BOYS	URBAN	93,35	90,12	0,21	1,99	4,45	0,12	88,24	1 - 91	- 91,12	
	RURAL	91,98	87,31	0,00	1,34	6,68	0,22	11,76	7 - 93	- 90,38	
	Total	93,19	89,79	0,18	1,91	4,71	0,13	#####	9 - 92	- 90,75	

Results about the Effects of Grade Group x Geographical Area on CAN

The joint effects of geographical area and grade group on each maltreatment forms are shown on the following four tables below. For each maltreatment forms, 16-year-old students tended to report high rates. For instance, when psychological violence table is evaluated, we see that 16-year-old general school students tended to reply it positively more than other age groups. For physical violence, 16-year-old general school students reported more adverse experience. In the 44th table, neglect rates under the effects on geographical area and grade group were presented. Neglect was reported by 16-year-old vocational school students. Finally, in the 45th table, the positive parenting strategies seemed to be experienced more by 16-year-old vocational school students.

Table 42. Prevalence-Incidence for Geographical Area x Grade Group (Psychological Violence)

Psychological Violence - %		Measure									
GEOG. AREA	GRADE GROUP	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+		Missing		95%	95%	
					Never	Never			CI for	CI for	
Geographical Area	11 - years old	56,60	48,41	0,00	5,69	37,71	0,06	33,19	7	56	50,85
	13 - years old	68,69	61,01	0,00	4,01	27,29	0,00	36,21	2	72	63,3
	years old (gen	86,55	77,68	0,00	2,00	11,44	0,00	14,51	2	83	80,77
	ears old (vocat	87,48	80,39	0,00	1,94	10,58	0,00	16,09	5	89	83,18
	Total	70,29	62,36	0,00	3,94	25,76	0,02	100,00			71,9
Geographical Area	11 - years old	49,56	41,05	0,00	4,37	46,07	0,00	32,64	8	54	45,55
	13 - years old	66,21	57,70	0,00	3,22	30,57	0,00	31,00	6	76	62,34
	years old (gen	87,62	77,14	0,00	0,95	11,43	0,00	7,48	2	91	85,17
	ears old (vocat	80,74	73,33	0,00	3,21	16,05	0,00	28,87	9	83	77,64
	Total	66,57	58,23	0,00	3,42	30,01	0,00	100,00			65
Geographical Area	11 - years old	64,48	59,05	0,00	2,49	33,03	0,00	33,87	2	67	63,63
	13 - years old	78,44	71,69	0,00	2,60	18,96	0,00	29,50	3	89	76,19
	years old (gen	84,78	80,43	0,00	1,45	13,77	0,00	10,57	9	92	87,05
	ears old (vocat	84,41	75,88	0,00	2,65	12,94	0,00	26,05	6	84	80,43
	Total	75,94	69,43	0,00	2,45	21,61	0,00	100,00			73

Table 43. Prevalence-Incidence for Geographical Area x Grade Group (Physical Violence)

Physical Violence - %		Measure									
GEOG. AREA	GRADE GROUP	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+		Missing		95%	95%	
					Never	Never			CI for	CI for	
Geographical Area	11 - years old	49,87	43,16	0,44	3,89	45,80	0,38	33,17	2	53	45,59
	13 - years old	57,54	46,66	0,35	4,26	37,86	0,34	36,17	1	52	49,01
	years old (gen	68,19	47,28	0,72	3,87	27,22	0,14	14,53	4	77	50,98
	ears old (vocat	69,81	50,45	0,00	2,19	28,00	0,00	16,13	7	73	53,97
	Total	58,52	46,20	0,37	3,75	37,36	0,27	100,00			59
Geographical Area	11 - years old	42,58	35,15	0,00	4,15	53,28	0,00	32,67	5	48	39,53
	13 - years old	54,48	44,83	0,23	2,99	42,30	0,00	31,03	3	54,5	49,5
	years old (gen	64,76	42,86	0,00	1,90	33,33	0,00	7,49	2	79	52,32
	ears old (vocat	63,37	48,02	0,00	2,72	33,91	0,25	28,82	7	65	52,89
	Total	53,92	42,44	0,07	3,21	42,80	0,07	100,00			55
Geographical Area	11 - years old	51,13	46,38	0,00	2,49	46,38	0,00	33,95	7	53	51,03
	13 - years old	66,93	56,77	0,00	2,86	30,21	0,26	29,49	2	72	61,73
	years old (gen	74,64	39,86	0,00	0,72	24,64	0,00	10,60	8	89	48,02
	ears old (vocat	68,05	49,11	0,30	3,25	28,40	0,59	25,96	8	78	54,44
	Total	62,67	49,46	0,08	2,61	34,64	0,23	100,00			65

Table 44. Prevalence-Incidence for Geographical Area x Grade Group (Feeling of Neglect)

Feeling of Neglect - %		Measure									
GEOG. AREA	GRADE GROUP	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+ Never	Never	Missing		95% CI for	95% CI for	
Geographical Area	11 - years old	25,94	23,30	1,07	2,58	70,40	0,75	33,12	79	- 22	- 25,38
	13 - years old	38,25	33,99	2,07	3,05	56,62	0,46	36,20	6	- 46	- 36,21
	years old (gen	61,17	53,44	1,43	1,29	36,10	0,14	14,56	6	- 64	- 5
	ears old (vocat	62,35	54,46	1,55	2,33	33,76	0,26	16,12	4	- 65	- 57,97
	Total	41,40	36,58	1,56	2,52	54,52	0,48	100,00			- 42,2 - 37,94
Geographical Area	11 - years old	25,11	22,05	0,22	2,62	72,05	0,00	32,74	4	- 26	- 25,85
	13 - years old	37,18	34,64	0,46	2,54	59,82	0,46	30,95	3	- 46	- 39,12
	years old (gen	60,95	57,14	0,00	4,76	34,29	0,00	7,51	2	- 78	- 66,61
	ears old (vocat	48,88	39,21	1,99	2,48	46,65	0,49	28,81			- 53,4 - 43,97
	Total	38,38	33,52	0,79	2,72	58,11	0,29	100,00	4	- 4,05	- 36
Geographical Area	11 - years old	35,97	32,58	0,90	2,04	61,09	0,00	33,97	5	- 41	- 36,95
	13 - years old	54,05	47,52	0,26	2,35	43,34	0,52	29,44	6	- 52	- 52,52
	years old (gen	60,14	50,72	0,72	0,72	38,41	0,00	10,61	8	- 68	- 59,07
	ears old (vocat	65,98	57,69	1,78	2,07	30,18	0,59	25,98	3	- 73	- 62,96
	Total	51,65	45,43	0,92	2,00	45,43	0,31	100,00	4	- 52	- 48,13

Table 45. Prevalence-Incidence for Geographical Area x Grade Group (Positive & Non-Violent Parenting)

Positive & Non Violent Parenting		Measure									
GEOG. AREA	GRADE GROUP	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+ Never	Never	Missing		95% CI for	95% CI for	
Geographical Area	11 - years old	90,62	86,62	0,25	3,13	6,00	0,06	33,23	9	- 95	- 88,29
	13 - years old	92,99	89,20	0,17	1,44	5,40	0,17	36,18	9	- 94	- 90,66
	years old (gen	96,28	94,84	0,29	1,00	2,44	0,14	14,51	7	- 92	- 96,48
	ears old (vocat	96,77	94,57	0,00	0,78	2,45	0,13	16,08	2	- 98	- 96,17
	Total	93,29	90,02	0,19	1,83	4,70	0,12	100,00	8	- 98	- 90,87
Geographical Area	11 - years old	92,14	87,12	0,00	3,06	4,80	0,00	32,67	8	- 95	- 90,19
	13 - years old	94,01	92,86	0,00	1,15	4,84	0,23	30,96	8	- 93	- 95,28
	years old (gen	97,14	95,24	0,00	0,00	2,86	0,00	7,49	5	- 116	- 99,31
	ears old (vocat	94,07	90,86	0,00	1,48	4,44	0,00	28,89	7	- 96	- 93,67
	Total	93,65	90,58	0,00	1,78	4,56	0,07	100,00	8	- 96	- 92,11
Geographical Area	11 - years old	95,02	92,53	0,00	1,13	3,85	0,00	33,90			- 97,8 - 94,98
	13 - years old	95,84	93,77	0,00	1,82	2,34	0,00	29,52	5	- 95	- 96,18
	years old (gen	98,55	94,93	0,00	0,00	1,45	0,00	10,58	5	- 117	- 98,59
	ears old (vocat	98,23	94,10	0,29	0,59	0,88	0,29	26,00	3	- 99	- 96,61
	Total	96,47	93,56	0,08	1,07	2,38	0,08	100,00	7	- 93	- 94,89

Results about the Effects of Grade Group x Urbanicity on CAN

The effects of grade group and urbanicity on the maltreatment forms are shown in the tables below. It can be inferred from the tables that, 16-year-old students seem to report each maltreatment form more than other grade groups. For psychological violence, students from urban areas reported more experience than students from rural areas except 16-year-old vocational students from rural areas. For physical violence,

students from rural areas reported more adverse experience than students from urban areas, except 11-year-old children. For feeling of neglect, again, students from rural areas reported more experience than students from urban areas except 11-year-old children. Finally, for positive& non-violent parenting, students who are living in the urban areas reported to experience non-violent parenting more than students who are living in rural areas, except 16-year-old vocational school students.

Table 46. Prevalence-Incidence for Urbanicity x Grade Group (Psychological Violence)

Psychological Violence - %		Measure						95% CI for PREVALENCE	95% CI for INCIDENCE
URBANICITY	GRADE GROUP	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+ Never	Never	Missing		
Urban	11 - years old	57,28	49,48	0,00	4,68	38,04	0,05	32,35	7 - 55 - 51,61
	13 - years old	69,90	62,42	0,00	3,70	26,41	0,00	33,92	9 - 71 - 64,43
	years old (gen	86,47	77,89	0,00	1,65	11,88	0,00	13,90	4 - 89 - 80,59
	ears old (vocat	84,66	77,64	0,00	2,78	12,57	0,00	19,83	7 - 87 - 79,91
	Total	71,04	63,40	0,00	3,55	25,41	0,02	100,00	5 - 73 - 64,57
Rural	11 - years old	53,66	46,07	0,00	6,02	40,31	0,00	38,86	6 - 57 - 51,07
	13 - years old	68,70	59,71	0,00	3,48	27,83	0,00	35,10	3 - 73 - 64,89
	years old (gen	84,85	81,82	0,00	6,06	9,09	0,00	3,36	2 - 96 - 94,98
	ears old (vocat	87,00	76,68	0,00	0,45	12,56	0,00	22,69	8 - 93 - 82,23
	Total	67,55	59,00	0,00	3,87	28,59	0,00	100,00	2 - 73 - 62,08

Table 47. Prevalence-Incidence for Urbanicity x Grade Group (Physical Violence)

Physical Violence - %		Measure						95% CI for PREVALENCE	95% CI for INCIDENCE
URBANICITY	GRADE GROUP	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+ Never	Never	Missing		
Urban	11 - years old	49,36	42,78	0,33	3,60	46,71	0,28	32,35	47,23 - 51,49 40,67 - 44,89
	13 - years old	58,41	47,51	0,32	3,57	37,70	0,32	33,90	56,35 - 60,46 45,43 - 49,59
	years old (gen	68,28	44,60	0,44	3,30	27,97	0,11	13,92	65,25 - 71,31 41,37 - 47,84
	ears old (vocat	67,47	51,00	0,08	2,94	29,52	0,23	19,83	64,91 - 70,02 48,28 - 53,73
	Total	58,65	46,27	0,29	3,42	37,64	0,26	100,00	57,46 - 59,85 45,06 - 47,48
Rural	11 - years old	45,55	39,53	0,00	4,19	50,26	0,00	38,86	40,56 - 50,54 34,63 - 44,43
	13 - years old	58,55	50,14	0,00	5,51	35,94	0,00	35,10	53,35 - 63,75 44,87 - 55,42
	years old (gen	81,82	75,76	3,03	0,00	15,15	0,00	3,36	68,66 - 94,98 61,14 - 90,38
	ears old (vocat	69,06	40,81	0,00	0,45	30,49	0,00	22,69	62,99 - 75,13 34,36 - 47,26
	Total	56,66	44,76	0,10	3,66	39,57	0,00	100,00	53,57 - 59,76 41,65 - 47,87

Table 48. Prevalence-Incidence for Urbanicity x Grade Group (Feeling of Neglect)

Feeling of Neglect - %		Measure									95% CI for PREVALENCE	95% CI for INCIDENCE
URBANICITY	GRADE GROUP	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+ Never	Never	Missing					
Urban	11 - years old	27,98	25,23	0,95	2,28	68,79	0,57	32,32	26,06 - 29,9	23,37 - 27,08		
	13 - years old	40,40	35,82	1,72	2,85	55,03	0,50	33,90	38,35 - 42,45	33,82 - 37,82		
	years old (gen	60,90	53,08	0,99	1,65	36,45	0,11	13,94	57,73 - 64,08	49,84 - 56,33		
	ears old (vocat	59,13	51,39	1,93	2,48	36,46	0,39	19,84	56,45 - 61,81	48,67 - 54,12		
	Total	42,96	37,89	1,41	2,43	53,20	0,44	100,00	41,76 - 44,16	36,72 - 39,07		
Rural	11 - years old	25,39	21,99	0,52	3,66	70,42	0,00	38,94	21,03 - 29,76	17,84 - 26,14		
	13 - years old	40,70	38,08	0,29	2,91	56,10	0,29	35,07	35,51 - 45,89	32,95 - 43,21		
	years old (gen	63,64	63,64	6,06	0,00	30,30	0,00	3,36	47,22 - 80,05	47,22 - 80,05		
	ears old (vocat	62,16	49,55	0,45	1,35	36,04	0,45	22,63	55,78 - 68,54	42,97 - 56,13		
	Total	40,37	35,27	0,61	2,75	56,27	0,20	100,00	37,3 - 43,44	32,28 - 38,26		

Table 49. Prevalence-Incidence for Urbanicity x Grade Group (Positive& Non-Violent Parenting)

Positive & Non Violent Parenting		Measure									95% CI for PREVALENCE	95% CI for INCIDENCE
URBANICITY	GRADE GROUP	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+ Never	Never	Missing					
Urban	11 - years old	92,01	88,28	0,19	2,88	4,91	0,05	32,38	90,86 - 93,17	86,91 - 89,65		
	13 - years old	93,82	90,61	0,14	1,35	4,69	0,14	33,91	92,81 - 94,82	89,4 - 91,83		
	years old (gen	96,81	95,04	0,22	0,66	2,31	0,11	13,89	95,66 - 97,95	93,63 - 96,46		
	ears old (vocat	96,14	93,20	0,08	1,08	2,70	0,15	19,82	95,09 - 97,19	91,83 - 94,58		
	Total	94,11	90,99	0,15	1,70	4,04	0,11	100,00	93,54 - 94,68	90,29 - 91,68		
Rural	11 - years old	89,79	85,08	0,00	2,09	8,12	0,00	38,90	86,75 - 92,83	81,51 - 88,65		
	13 - years old	92,15	89,83	0,00	2,03	5,81	0,29	35,03	89,31 - 94,99	86,63 - 93,02		
	years old (gen	93,94	90,91	0,00	3,03	3,03	0,00	3,36	85,8 - 102,08	81,1 - 100,72		
	ears old (vocat	97,76	95,07	0,00	0,00	2,24	0,00	22,71	95,81 - 99,7	92,23 - 97,91		
	Total	92,57	89,21	0,00	1,63	5,80	0,10	100,00	90,93 - 94,21	87,26 - 91,15		

Results about the Effects of Gender x Grade Group x Geographical Area on CAN

The joint effects of gender x grade group x geographical area on each maltreatment type are shown in the following tables. It can be inferred from the ... table that, in Izmir and Denizli 16-year-old girls from vocational schools reported to experience psychological violence more than other grade groups. However, in Zonguldak, 16-old-boys from vocational schools reported to experience psychological violence more than other grade groups. In the 51th table about the physical violence, it is shown that, in Denizli and Zonguldak, 16-year-old boys from general schools reported higher rates than others. However, in Izmir, 16-year-old girls from vocational schools reported highest rates. In the 52th table, there are the results about feeling of neglect. It can be inferred from the table that, in all three geographical areas 16-year-old girls from vocational schools

reported the highest rates of neglect feeling. Finally, for positive & non-violent parenting, 16-year-old general school girls from Izmir and Zonguldak reported higher experience than others. For Denizli, 16-year-old vocational school girls reported the highest experience.

Table 50. Prevalence-Incidence for Gender x Grade Group x Geographical Area (Psychological Violence)

Psychological Violence - %		Measure									
GEOG. AREA	GENDER	GRADE GROUP	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+ Never	Never	Missing		95% CI for PREVALENCE	95% CI for INCIDENCE
İZMİR	GIRLS	11 - years old	52,69	44,36	0,00	5,90	41,41	0,00	31,58	49,19 - 56,24	40,87 - 47,85
		13 - years old	70,54	63,20	0,00	3,30	26,16	0,00	33,12	67,41 - 73,66	59,9 - 66,51
		years old (gen)	88,36	78,86	0,00	0,71	10,93	0,00	17,04	85,3 - 91,42	74,96 - 82,76
		ears old (vocat)	88,69	82,93	0,00	1,77	9,53	0,00	18,26	85,77 - 91,61	79,45 - 86,4
		Total	71,26	63,52	0,00	3,40	25,34	0,00	100,00	69,47 - 73,04	31,62 - 65,42
	BOYS	11 - years old	60,32	52,26	0,00	5,49	34,19	0,12	34,90	56,97 - 63,67	48,84 - 55,68
		13 - years old	67,06	59,07	0,00	4,64	28,29	0,00	39,45	64,04 - 70,09	55,9 - 62,24
		years old (gen)	83,81	75,90	0,00	3,96	12,23	0,00	11,84	79,48 - 88,14	70,87 - 80,93
		ears old (vocat)	85,80	76,85	0,00	2,16	12,04	0,00	13,80	82 - 89,6	72,26 - 81,44
		Total	69,28	61,14	0,00	4,52	26,20	0,04	100,00	67,41 - 71,15	59,17 - 63,11
	Total	70,29	62,36	0,00	3,94	25,76	0,02	100,00	69 - 71,58	0,99 - 63,7	
ZONGULDAK	GIRLS	11 - years old	46,67	36,67	0,00	3,75	49,58	0,00	42,86	40,35 - 52,98	30,57 - 42,76
		13 - years old	66,00	59,00	0,00	3,50	30,50	0,00	35,71	59,43 - 72,57	52,18 - 65,82
		years old (gen)	85,71	75,71	0,00	1,43	12,86	0,00	12,50	77,52 - 93,91	55,67 - 85,76
		ears old (vocat)	84,00	72,00	0,00	0,00	16,00	0,00	8,93	73,84 - 94,16	59,55 - 84,45
		Total	61,79	52,68	0,00	3,04	35,18	0,00	100,00	57,76 - 65,81	48,54 - 56,81
	BOYS	11 - years old	52,75	45,87	0,00	5,05	42,20	0,00	25,86	46,13 - 59,38	39,26 - 52,49
		13 - years old	66,38	56,60	0,00	2,98	30,64	0,00	27,88	60,34 - 72,42	50,26 - 62,93
		years old (gen)	91,43	80,00	0,00	0,00	8,57	0,00	4,15	82,15 - 100,73	67,75 - 93,25
		ears old (vocat)	80,28	73,52	0,00	3,66	16,06	0,00	42,11	76,14 - 84,42	38,93 - 78,11
		Total	69,75	61,92	0,00	3,68	26,57	0,00	100,00	66,65 - 72,85	58,64 - 65,2
	Total	66,57	58,23	0,00	3,42	30,01	0,00	100,00	64,1 - 69,04	5,65 - 60,8	
DENİZLİ	GIRLS	11 - years old	65,40	59,49	0,00	2,53	32,07	0,00	35,22	59,34 - 71,46	53,24 - 65,74
		13 - years old	80,51	73,33	0,00	2,05	17,44	0,00	28,97	74,95 - 86,07	57,13 - 79,54
		years old (gen)	84,29	81,43	0,00	1,43	14,29	0,00	10,40	75,76 - 92,81	72,32 - 90,54
		ears old (vocat)	86,55	76,02	0,00	1,17	12,28	0,00	25,41	81,44 - 91,66	69,62 - 82,42
		Total	77,12	69,99	0,00	1,93	20,95	0,00	100,00	73,94 - 80,29	36,52 - 73,45
	BOYS	11 - years old	63,41	58,54	0,00	2,44	34,15	0,00	32,44	56,82 - 70,01	51,79 - 65,28
		13 - years old	76,32	70,00	0,00	3,16	20,53	0,00	30,06	70,27 - 82,36	63,48 - 76,52
		years old (gen)	85,29	79,41	0,00	1,47	13,24	0,00	10,76	76,88 - 93,71	69,8 - 89,02
		ears old (vocat)	82,25	75,74	0,00	4,14	13,61	0,00	26,74	76,49 - 88,01	69,28 - 82,2
		Total	74,68	68,83	0,00	3,01	22,31	0,00	100,00	71,29 - 78,07	55,22 - 72,44
	Total	75,94	69,43	0,00	2,45	21,61	0,00	100,00	73,62 - 78,21	6,93 - 71,9	

Table 51. Prevalence-Incidence for Gender x Grade Group x Geographical Area (Physical Violence)

Physical Violence - %		Measure									95% CI for	95% CI for
GEOG. AREA	GENDER	GRADE GROUP	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+	Never	Never	Missing		PREVALENCE	INCIDENCE
Geographical Area 1	GIRLS	11 - years old	43,52	37,10	0,39	3,85	52,25	0,13	31,56	40,04 - 47	33,71 - 40,4	
		13 - years old	54,52	43,03	0,12	3,55	41,81	0,00	33,14	51,11 - 57,94	39,64 - 46,4	
		years old (gen	67,38	45,95	0,24	3,10	29,29	0,24	17,02	62,9 - 71,86	41,19 - 50,7	
		years old (vocat	72,06	54,10	0,00	1,55	26,39	0,00	18,27	67,92 - 76,2	49,5 - 58,7	
		Total	56,44	43,68	0,20	3,20	40,15	0,08	100,00	54,49 - 58,4	41,72 - 45,6	
	BOYS	11 - years old	55,95	48,96	0,49	3,93	39,63	0,61	34,87	52,54 - 59,36	45,53 - 52,3	
		13 - years old	60,22	49,89	0,54	4,89	34,35	0,65	39,37	57,05 - 63,38	46,66 - 53,3	
		years old (gen	69,42	49,28	1,44	5,04	24,10	0,00	11,90	64,01 - 74,84	43,4 - 55,1	
		years old (vocat	66,67	45,37	0,00	3,09	30,25	0,00	13,86	61,53 - 71,8	39,95 - 50,7	
		Total	60,72	48,87	0,56	4,32	34,40	0,47	100,00	58,74 - 62,7	46,84 - 50,8	
Total		58,52	46,20	0,37	3,75	37,36	0,27	100,00	57,13	- 59,9	4,79 - 47,	
Geographical Area 2	GIRLS	11 - years old	39,58	30,42	0,00	4,17	56,25	0,00	42,86	33,4 - 45,77	24,6 - 36,2	
		13 - years old	50,50	42,50	0,00	2,50	47,00	0,00	35,71	43,57 - 57,43	35,65 - 49,3	
		years old (gen	57,14	38,57	0,00	1,43	41,43	0,00	12,50	45,55 - 68,74	27,17 - 49,9	
		years old (vocat	58,00	42,00	0,00	2,00	40,00	0,00	8,93	44,32 - 71,68	28,32 - 55,6	
		Total	47,32	36,79	0,00	3,04	49,64	0,00	100,00	43,19 - 51,46	32,79 - 40,1	
	BOYS	11 - years old	45,87	40,37	0,00	4,13	50,00	0,00	25,89	39,26 - 52,49	33,85 - 46,6	
		13 - years old	57,87	46,81	0,43	3,40	38,30	0,00	27,91	51,56 - 64,19	40,43 - 53,3	
		years old (gen	80,00	51,43	0,00	2,86	17,14	0,00	4,16	66,75 - 93,25	34,87 - 67,9	
		years old (vocat	64,12	48,87	0,00	2,82	33,05	0,28	42,04	59,13 - 69,12	43,66 - 54,0	
		Total	58,31	46,20	0,12	3,33	38,24	0,12	100,00	54,98 - 61,64	42,83 - 49,9	
Total		53,92	42,44	0,07	3,21	42,80	0,07	100,00	51,31	- 56,5	9,85 - 45,	
Geographical Area 3	GIRLS	11 - years old	51,90	46,84	0,00	3,38	44,73	0,00	35,22	45,54 - 58,26	40,48 - 53,3	
		13 - years old	66,15	56,41	0,00	1,54	32,31	0,00	28,97	59,51 - 72,8	49,45 - 63,3	
		years old (gen	68,57	37,14	0,00	1,43	30,00	0,00	10,40	57,7 - 79,45	25,82 - 48,4	
		years old (vocat	69,59	48,54	0,00	2,92	27,49	0,00	25,41	62,7 - 76,49	41,05 - 56,6	
		Total	62,26	49,03	0,00	2,53	35,22	0,00	100,00	58,6 - 65,92	45,26 - 52,3	
	BOYS	11 - years old	50,24	45,85	0,00	1,46	48,29	0,00	32,59	43,4 - 57,09	39,03 - 52,3	
		13 - years old	67,72	57,14	0,00	4,23	28,04	0,53	30,05	61,06 - 74,39	50,09 - 64,0	
		years old (gen	80,88	42,65	0,00	0,00	19,12	0,00	10,81	71,54 - 90,23	30,89 - 54,0	
		years old (vocat	66,47	49,70	0,60	3,59	29,34	1,18	26,55	59,31 - 73,63	42,12 - 57,2	
		Total	63,12	49,92	0,16	2,70	34,02	0,47	100,00	59,35 - 66,89	46,01 - 53,3	
Total		62,67	49,46	0,08	2,61	34,64	0,23	100,00	60,05	- 65,3	6,75 - 52,	

Table 52. Prevalence-Incidence for Gender x Grade Group x Geographical Area (Feeling of Neglect)

Feeling of Neglect - %		Measure									95% CI for	
GEOG. AREA	GENDER	GRADE GROUP	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+ Never	Never	Missing		PREVALENCE	INCIDENCE	
Geographical Area 1	GIRLS	11 - years old	25,87	23,17	0,90	2,32	70,91	0,38	31,51	22,79	28,95	
		13 - years old	45,84	40,59	0,61	2,32	51,22	0,00	33,17	42,43	49,26	
		years old (gen	67,62	60,71	0,95	0,95	30,48	0,24	17,03	63,14	72,09	
		years old (vocat	70,29	62,31	1,77	1,77	26,16	0,00	18,29	66,07	74,51	
		Total	47,73	42,50	0,97	1,99	49,31	0,16	100,00	45,76	49,7	
	BOYS	11 - years old	26,02	23,43	1,23	2,84	69,91	1,10	34,82	23	29,04	
		13 - years old	31,48	28,10	3,38	3,70	61,44	0,86	39,42	28,48	34,49	
		years old (gen	51,44	42,45	2,16	1,80	44,60	0,00	11,94	45,56	57,31	
		years old (vocat	51,24	43,48	1,24	3,11	44,41	0,62	13,83	45,78	56,7	
		Total	34,69	30,31	2,19	3,09	60,03	0,81	100,00	32,76	36,63	
Total			41,40	36,58	1,56	2,52	54,52	0,48	100,00	40	42,79	
Geographical Area 2	GIRLS	11 - years old	25,83	23,33	0,00	2,92	71,25	0,00	42,86	20,3	31,37	
		13 - years old	41,50	38,50	0,00	1,50	57,00	0,00	35,71	34,67	48,33	
		years old (gen	60,00	57,14	0,00	4,29	35,71	0,00	12,50	48,52	71,48	
		years old (vocat	64,00	54,00	2,00	2,00	32,00	0,00	8,93	50,7	77,3	
		Total	39,11	35,71	0,18	2,50	58,21	0,00	100,00	35,07	43,15	
	BOYS	11 - years old	24,31	20,64	0,46	2,29	72,94	0,00	25,98	18,62	30,01	
		13 - years old	33,48	31,33	0,86	3,43	62,23	0,85	27,77	27,42	39,54	
		years old (gen	62,86	57,14	0,00	5,71	31,43	0,00	4,17	46,85	78,86	
		years old (vocat	46,74	37,11	1,98	2,55	48,73	0,56	42,07	41,54	51,95	
		Total	37,90	32,06	1,19	2,86	58,05	0,47	100,00	34,62	41,19	
Total			38,38	33,52	0,79	2,72	58,11	0,29	100,00	35,84	40,9	
Geographical Area 3	GIRLS	11 - years old	37,13	32,91	0,84	2,53	59,49	0,00	35,22	30,98	43,28	
		13 - years old	64,10	56,41	0,51	1,54	33,85	0,00	28,97	57,37	70,84	
		years old (gen	70,00	64,29	1,43	0,00	28,57	0,00	10,40	59,26	80,74	
		years old (vocat	71,35	66,08	1,17	1,17	26,32	0,00	25,41	64,57	78,12	
		Total	57,06	51,41	0,89	1,63	40,42	0,00	100,00	53,32	60,8	
	BOYS	11 - years old	34,63	32,20	0,98	1,46	62,93	0,00	32,64	28,12	41,15	
		13 - years old	43,62	38,30	0,00	3,19	53,19	1,05	29,94	36,53	50,71	
		years old (gen	50,00	36,76	0,00	1,47	48,53	0,00	10,83	38,12	61,88	
		years old (vocat	60,48	49,10	2,40	2,99	34,13	1,18	26,59	53,06	67,89	
		Total	45,86	39,01	0,96	2,39	50,80	0,63	100,00	41,96	49,76	
Total			51,65	45,43	0,92	2,00	45,43	0,31	100,00	48,94	54,3	

Table 53. Prevalence-Incidence for Gender x Grade Group x Geographical Area (Positive& Non-Violent Parenting)

Positive & Non Violent Parenting		Measure										
GEOG. AREA	GENDER	GRADE GROUP	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+ Never	Never	Missing		95% CI for PREVALENCE	95% CI for INCIDENCE	
Geographical Area 1	GIRLS	11 - years old	89,99	85,75	0,26	2,82	6,93	0,13	31,58	87,88 - 92,1	83,3 - 88,21	
		13 - years old	94,98	91,80	0,00	0,86	4,16	0,12	33,12	93,48 - 96,48	93,92 - 93,68	
		years old (gen	97,14	95,95	0,24	0,48	2,14	0,24	17,02	95,55 - 98,74	94,07 - 97,84	
		years old (vocat	97,12	95,34	0,00	0,44	2,44	0,00	18,28	95,57 - 98,66	93,4 - 97,29	
		Total	94,16	91,24	0,12	1,34	4,38	0,12	100,00	93,24 - 95,09	90,13 - 92,36	
	BOYS	11 - years old	91,22	87,44	0,24	3,41	5,12	0,00	34,97	89,28 - 93,16	85,17 - 89,71	
		13 - years old	91,23	86,90	0,32	1,95	6,49	0,22	39,40	89,41 - 93,06	84,73 - 89,08	
		years old (gen	94,96	93,17	0,36	1,80	2,88	0,00	11,86	92,39 - 97,53	90,2 - 96,13	
		years old (vocat	96,28	93,50	0,00	1,24	2,48	0,31	13,77	94,22 - 98,35	90,81 - 96,19	
		Total	92,37	88,74	0,26	2,35	5,03	0,13	100,00	91,29 - 93,44	87,46 - 90,02	
Total			93,29	90,02	0,19	1,83	4,70	0,12	100,00	92,58 - 93,95	91,18 - 90,87	
Geographical Area 2	GIRLS	11 - years old	91,67	86,67	0,00	4,58	3,75	0,00	42,86	88,17 - 95,16	83,37 - 90,97	
		13 - years old	93,00	92,00	0,00	1,50	5,50	0,00	35,71	89,46 - 96,54	88,24 - 95,76	
		years old (gen	98,57	95,71	0,00	0,00	1,43	0,00	12,50	95,79 - 101,39	90,2 - 100,48	
		years old (vocat	98,00	98,00	0,00	0,00	2,00	0,00	8,93	94,12 - 101,88	92 - 101,88	
		Total	93,57	90,71	0,00	2,50	3,93	0,00	100,00	91,54 - 95,6	88,31 - 93,12	
	BOYS	11 - years old	92,66	87,61	0,00	1,38	5,96	0,00	25,89	89,2 - 96,12	83,24 - 91,99	
		13 - years old	94,87	93,59	0,00	0,85	4,27	0,43	27,79	92,05 - 97,7	90,45 - 96,73	
		years old (gen	94,29	94,29	0,00	0,00	5,71	0,00	4,16	86,6 - 101,98	86,6 - 101,98	
		years old (vocat	93,52	89,86	0,00	1,69	4,79	0,00	42,16	90,96 - 96,08	86,72 - 93	
		Total	93,71	90,50	0,00	1,31	4,99	0,12	100,00	92,07 - 95,35	88,52 - 92,48	
Total			93,65	90,58	0,00	1,78	4,56	0,07	100,00	92,38 - 94,93	90,06 - 92,17	
Geographical Area 3	GIRLS	11 - years old	95,78	92,83	0,00	1,69	2,53	0,00	35,22	93,22 - 98,34	93,54 - 96,11	
		13 - years old	96,92	96,41	0,00	1,54	1,54	0,00	28,97	94,5 - 99,35	93,8 - 99,02	
		years old (gen	98,57	94,29	0,00	0,00	1,43	0,00	10,40	95,79 - 101,38	88,85 - 99,72	
		years old (vocat	99,42	94,15	0,00	0,00	0,58	0,00	25,41	98,27 - 100,59	90,64 - 97,67	
		Total	97,33	94,35	0,00	1,04	1,63	0,00	100,00	96,11 - 98,54	92,61 - 96,1	
	BOYS	11 - years old	94,15	92,20	0,00	0,49	5,37	0,00	32,49	90,93 - 97,36	88,52 - 95,87	
		13 - years old	94,74	91,05	0,00	2,11	3,16	0,00	30,11	91,56 - 97,91	86,99 - 95,11	
		years old (gen	98,53	95,59	0,00	0,00	1,47	0,00	10,78	95,67 - 101,39	90,71 - 100,41	
		years old (vocat	97,02	94,05	0,60	1,19	1,19	0,59	26,62	94,45 - 99,59	90,47 - 97,63	
		Total	95,56	92,71	0,16	1,11	3,17	0,16	100,00	93,96 - 97,17	90,68 - 94,74	
Total			96,47	93,56	0,08	1,07	2,38	0,08	100,00	95,47 - 97,47	92,23 - 94,81	

Results About the Effects of Gender x Urbanicity x Grade Group on CAN

In the following four tables, the joint effects of gender, urbanicity and grade group on each maltreatment forms are being evaluated. For psychological violence, girls from urban areas reported more experience than boys, except 11-year-old students. In the rural areas, boys of 11 and 13 year old reported more experience while girls from 16-year old vocational and general schools reported higher rates. For physical violence, 16-year-old boys from general schools who live in urban areas reported higher rates than others. In rural areas, 16-year-old girls from general schools reported highest rates. For feeling of neglect, 16-year-old girls from vocational schools reported the highest experience both in urban and rural areas. Finally, for positive& non-violent parenting strategies, students from each grade group and gender reported high rates. For urban areas, 16-year-old girls from general schools reported higher rates. In rural areas, 16-year-old students from vocational schools declared higher rates of experience.

Table 54. Prevalence-Incidence for Gender x Urbanicity x Grade Group (Psychological Violence)

Psychological Violence - %			Measure									
GEOG. AREA	GENDER	GRADE GROUP	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+ Never	Never	Missing		95% CI for PREVALENCE	95% CI for INCIDENCE	
Urban	GIRLS	11 - years old	54,68	46,17	0,00	4,64	40,68	0,00	33,34	51,68 - 57,68	43,16 - 49,17	
		13 - years old	71,84	64,37	0,00	3,16	25,00	0,00	32,93	69,11 - 74,57	61,46 - 67,27	
		years old (gen	87,57	78,53	0,00	0,75	11,68	0,00	16,75	84,76 - 90,38	75,04 - 82,02	
		years old (vocat	87,17	80,11	0,19	1,86	10,78	0,00	16,97	84,35 - 90	76,74 - 83,48	
		Total	71,36	63,34	0,03	3,03	25,58	0,00	100,00	69,78 - 72,93	61,67 - 65,02	
	BOYS	11 - years old	59,87	52,79	0,00	4,72	35,41	0,09	31,41	56,92 - 62,82	49,78 - 55,79	
		13 - years old	68,17	60,68	0,00	4,17	27,66	0,00	34,85	65,51 - 70,83	57,89 - 63,47	
		years old (gen	84,92	76,98	0,00	2,91	12,17	0,00	11,21	81,31 - 88,53	72,74 - 81,23	
		years old (vocat	82,76	75,79	0,00	3,42	13,82	0,00	22,54	80,08 - 85,45	72,74 - 78,83	
		Total	70,73	63,43	0,00	4,03	25,24	0,03	100,00	69,19 - 72,27	61,81 - 65,06	
Total			71,03	63,39	0,02	3,55	25,41	0,02	100,00	69,93 - 72,13	62,22 - 64,51	
Rural	GIRLS	11 - years old	50,25	43,72	0,00	6,03	43,72	0,00	37,34	43,3 - 57,2	36,83 - 50,61	
		13 - years old	68,64	62,72	0,00	2,96	28,40	0,00	31,71	61,64 - 75,63	55,43 - 70,01	
		years old (gen	86,67	83,33	0,00	3,33	10,00	0,00	5,63	74,5 - 98,83	70 - 96,67	
		years old (vocat	89,63	80,74	0,00	0,00	10,37	0,00	25,33	84,49 - 94,77	74,09 - 87,39	
		Total	68,11	61,35	0,00	3,38	28,52	0,00	100,00	64,15 - 72,06	57,22 - 65,48	
	BOYS	11 - years old	57,38	48,63	0,00	6,01	36,61	0,00	40,67	50,21 - 64,54	41,39 - 55,88	
		13 - years old	68,75	56,82	0,00	3,98	27,27	0,00	39,11	61,9 - 75,6	49,5 - 64,14	
		years old (gen	66,67	66,67	0,00	33,33	0,00	0,00	0,67	13,32 - 120,01	3,32 - 120,0	
		years old (vocat	82,95	70,45	0,00	1,14	15,91	0,00	19,56	75,1 - 90,81	60,92 - 79,99	
		Total	66,89	56,22	0,00	4,44	28,67	0,00	100,00	62,54 - 71,24	51,64 - 60,81	
Total			67,55	59,00	0,00	3,87	28,59	0,00	100,00	64,62 - 70,48	55,93 - 62,01	

Table 55. Prevalence-Incidence for Gender x Urbanicity x Grade Group (Physical Violence)

Physical Violence - %			Measure									
GEOG. AREA	GENDER	GRADE GROUP	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+ Never	Never	Missing		95% CI for PREVALENCE	95% CI for INCIDENCE	
Urban	GIRLS	11 - years old	44,79	38,16	0,28	3,50	51,42	0,09	33,33	41,79 - 47,79	35,23 - 41,09	
		13 - years old	55,75	44,73	0,10	2,68	41,48	0,00	32,95	52,73 - 58,76	41,72 - 47,75	
		years old (gen	65,28	42,08	0,19	2,83	31,70	0,19	16,73	61,23 - 69,34	37,87 - 46,28	
		years old (vocat	71,00	55,76	0,19	2,23	26,58	0,00	16,98	67,17 - 74,84	51,57 - 59,96	
		Total	56,28	43,97	0,19	2,90	40,63	0,06	100,00	54,55 - 58,01	42,24 - 45,7	
	BOYS	11 - years old	53,93	47,39	0,38	3,70	41,99	0,47	31,42	50,93 - 56,94	44,38 - 50,41	
		13 - years old	60,79	50,00	0,51	4,37	34,33	0,60	34,78	57,99 - 63,59	47,13 - 52,87	
		years old (gen	72,49	48,15	0,79	3,97	22,75	0,00	11,26	67,98 - 76,99	43,11 - 53,19	
		years old (vocat	64,86	47,56	0,13	3,43	31,57	0,39	22,54	61,46 - 68,26	44 - 51,11	
		Total	60,87	48,42	0,42	3,90	34,81	0,44	100,00	59,22 - 62,52	46,73 - 50,11	
Total			58,64	46,26	0,31	3,42	37,63	0,26	100,00	57,45 - 59,84	50,5 - 47,4	
Rural	GIRLS	11 - years old	42,21	35,18	0,00	5,53	52,26	0,00	37,34	35,35 - 49,07	28,54 - 41,81	
		13 - years old	55,62	47,34	0,00	5,33	39,05	0,00	31,71	48,13 - 63,11	39,81 - 54,86	
		years old (gen	83,33	76,67	0,00	0,00	16,67	0,00	5,63	70 - 96,67	61,53 - 91,8	
		years old (vocat	67,41	35,56	0,00	0,74	31,85	0,00	25,33	59,5 - 75,31	27,48 - 43,63	
		Total	55,16	41,46	0,00	3,94	40,90	0,00	100,00	50,94 - 59,38	37,28 - 45,65	
	BOYS	11 - years old	49,18	44,26	0,00	2,73	48,09	0,00	40,67	41,94 - 56,42	37,07 - 51,46	
		13 - years old	61,36	52,84	0,00	5,68	32,95	0,00	39,11	54,17 - 68,56	45,47 - 60,22	
		years old (gen	66,67	66,67	33,33	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,67	13,32 - 120,01	3,32 - 120,0	
		years old (vocat	71,59	48,86	0,00	0,00	28,41	0,00	19,56	62,17 - 81,01	38,42 - 59,31	
		Total	58,44	48,67	0,22	3,33	38,00	0,00	100,00	53,89 - 63	44,05 - 53,28	
Total			56,66	44,76	0,10	3,66	39,57	0,00	100,00	53,57 - 59,76	46,5 - 47,8	

Table 56. Prevalence-Incidence for Gender x Urbanicity x Grade Group (Feeling of Neglect)

Feeling of Neglect - %		Measure										
GEOG. AREA	GENDER	GRADE GROUP	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+ Never		Missing		95% CI for PREVALENCE	95% CI for INCIDENCE	
Urban	GIRLS	11 - years old	28,56	25,81	0,85	2,18	68,41	0,28	33,29	25,83 - 31,28	23,16 - 28,45	
		13 - years old	48,47	42,82	0,57	2,20	48,75	0,00	32,98	45,44 - 51,5	39,81 - 45,82	
		years old (gen	66,98	60,38	0,75	1,32	30,94	0,19	16,74	62,98 - 70,98	56,21 - 64,54	
		years old (vocat	70,07	63,75	2,04	2,04	25,84	0,00	16,99	66,2 - 73,94	59,69 - 67,82	
		Total	48,61	43,65	0,95	2,02	48,42	0,13	100,00	46,87 - 50,35	41,92 - 45,38	
	BOYS	11 - years old	27,40	24,64	1,05	2,38	69,17	0,85	31,39	24,71 - 30,1	22,04 - 27,25	
		13 - years old	33,16	29,55	2,75	3,44	60,65	0,94	34,77	30,46 - 35,87	26,93 - 32,17	
		years old (gen	52,38	42,86	1,32	2,12	44,18	0,00	11,29	47,35 - 57,42	37,87 - 47,85	
		years old (vocat	51,26	42,52	1,99	2,78	43,97	0,66	22,55	47,69 - 54,82	38,99 - 46,04	
		Total	37,60	32,44	1,88	2,81	57,71	0,74	100,00	35,96 - 39,25	30,85 - 34,02	
Total			42,95	37,89	1,43	2,43	53,19	0,44	100,00	41,75 - 44,16	36,71 - 39,02	
Rural	GIRLS	11 - years old	25,13	21,11	0,00	4,02	70,85	0,00	37,34	19,1 - 31,15	15,44 - 26,78	
		13 - years old	45,56	42,60	0,00	1,18	53,25	0,00	31,71	38,05 - 53,07	35,15 - 50,06	
		years old (gen	66,67	66,67	3,33	0,00	30,00	0,00	5,63	49,8 - 83,54	49,8 - 83,54	
		years old (vocat	69,63	57,78	0,00	0,74	29,63	0,00	25,33	61,87 - 77,39	49,45 - 66,11	
		Total	45,22	39,77	0,19	2,06	52,53	0,00	100,00	40,99 - 49,44	35,62 - 43,93	
	BOYS	11 - years old	25,68	22,95	1,09	3,28	69,95	0,00	40,85	19,35 - 32,01	16,86 - 29,04	
		13 - years old	36,00	33,71	0,57	4,57	58,86	0,57	39,06	28,89 - 43,11	26,71 - 40,72	
		years old (gen	33,33	33,33	33,33	0,00	33,33	0,00	0,67	-20,01 - 86,68	20,01 - 86,68	
		years old (vocat	50,57	36,78	0,00	3,45	45,98	1,14	19,42	40,07 - 61,08	26,65 - 46,91	
		Total	34,60	29,91	0,89	3,79	60,71	0,44	100,00	30,19 - 39	25,67 - 34,15	
Total			40,37	35,27	0,51	2,85	56,27	0,20	100,00	37,3 - 43,44	28 - 38,2	

Table 57. Prevalence-Incidence for Gender x Urbanicity x Grade Group (Positive & Non-Violent Parenting)

Positive & Non Violent Parenting		Measure										
GEOG. AREA	GENDER	GRADE GROUP	Prevalence	Incidence	D.W.A.	D.W.A.+ Never		Missing		95% CI for PREVALENCE	95% CI for INCIDENCE	
Urban	GIRLS	11 - years old	91,57	87,41	0,19	3,03	5,21	0,09	33,34	89,9 - 93,25	85,4 - 89,41	
		13 - years old	95,59	93,10	0,00	0,77	3,64	0,10	32,93	94,34 - 96,84	91,56 - 94,64	
		years old (gen	97,55	95,85	0,19	0,38	1,89	0,19	16,74	96,23 - 98,86	94,15 - 97,55	
		years old (vocat	97,40	94,42	0,19	0,37	2,04	0,00	16,99	96,05 - 98,74	92,48 - 96,36	
		Total	94,88	91,89	0,13	1,39	3,60	0,09	100,00	94,12 - 95,65	90,93 - 92,84	
	BOYS	11 - years old	92,45	89,15	0,19	2,74	4,62	0,00	31,46	90,86 - 94,04	87,28 - 91,02	
		13 - years old	92,24	88,41	0,26	1,88	5,63	0,17	34,82	90,71 - 93,77	86,57 - 90,24	
		years old (gen	95,77	93,92	0,26	1,06	2,91	0,00	11,22	93,74 - 97,8	91,51 - 96,33	
		years old (vocat	95,12	92,22	0,13	1,58	3,17	0,26	22,50	93,58 - 96,65	90,31 - 94,12	
		Total	93,35	90,12	0,21	1,99	4,45	0,12	100,00	92,51 - 94,19	89,11 - 91,12	
Total			94,09	90,97	0,17	1,70	4,04	0,11	100,00	93,52 - 94,67	90,28 - 91,6	
Rural	GIRLS	11 - years old	90,45	86,93	0,00	2,51	7,04	0,00	37,34	86,37 - 94,54	82,25 - 91,62	
		13 - years old	91,12	89,35	0,00	2,96	5,92	0,00	31,71	86,84 - 95,41	84,7 - 94	
		years old (gen	96,67	93,33	0,00	0,00	3,33	0,00	5,63	90,24 - 103,09	44,1 - 102,2	
		years old (vocat	98,52	97,78	0,00	0,00	1,48	0,00	25,33	96,48 - 100,56	5,29 - 100,2	
		Total	93,06	90,81	0,00	1,88	5,07	0,00	100,00	90,9 - 95,22	88,35 - 93,26	
	BOYS	11 - years old	89,07	83,06	0,00	1,64	9,29	0,00	40,76	84,55 - 93,59	77,63 - 88,49	
		13 - years old	93,14	90,29	0,00	1,14	5,71	0,57	38,98	89,4 - 96,89	85,9 - 94,67	
		years old (gen	66,67	66,67	0,00	33,33	0,00	0,00	0,67	13,32 - 120,01	3,32 - 120,0	
		years old (vocat	96,59	90,91	0,00	0,00	3,41	0,00	19,60	92,8 - 100,38	84,9 - 96,92	
		Total	91,98	87,31	0,00	1,34	6,68	0,22	100,00	89,47 - 94,49	84,23 - 90,38	
Total			92,57	89,21	0,00	1,63	5,80	0,10	100,00	90,93 - 94,21	76 - 91,1	

E. DISCUSSION (OF THE RESEARCH FINDINGS)

Child abuse and neglect is a worldwide problem that needs special intervention (Who, 1999). Children from a variety of ages and cultural backgrounds experience maltreatment in home setting or outside (WHO, 2006). In this study, 11,13,16 years old children at 5th, 7th and 10th grades in schools were reached in three provinces – Izmir, Zonguldak and Denizli – in Turkey for the purposes of searching adverse childhood experiences of children at home by using ICAST-C tools. These tools consisted of physical victimization, psychological victimization, neglect and positive parenting questions. Children were additionally asked for their demographic characteristics of gender, age, settlement of their schools, family characteristics of the identity of people living together. The findings of this study will be evaluated for the each type of victimization, positive parenting discipline styles, child characteristics, and familial characteristics.

In this study, total of 7526 children were reached with almost equal distribution of gender. One of the most important information about children was the marital status of their parents. In this study, 89 percent of the children had married parents. In the report of America's child and family statistics in 2011, 69 percent of children ages 0-17 found to live with two parents and 65 percent of them were married.

Children reported high levels of exposure to all types of victimization. The highest levels of victimization were reported for psychological abuse at home that followed by physical abuse and then neglect. Psychological abuse is difficult to find out due to its characteristic features, however, it is found to be the most common abuse type reported by children (UNICEF, 2012). In a study on cases who applied to child psychiatry services in Turkey, 36% of children found to be exposed to physical abuse and 52% of them experienced emotional abuse (Oral, 2001). These rates are similar to our study, however our cases were not recorded. Interestingly, positive parenting discipline styles in which abuse acts do not occur was also found in very high levels. As a general evaluation, children are exposed to adverse childhood experiences at home and positive discipline methods at the same time in high rates.

In child characteristics, gender differences were found in the reports of children to be exposed to abusive acts at home. In physical abuse, boys reported that they were exposed to physical acts at home more than girls. This finding was compatible with the findings of WP4 Case-Based Surveillance Study that in physical abuse cases, males were

recorded in agencies more than females. This is a significant finding for male children to be at more risk for being exposed to physical acts at home than females.

In psychological abuse cases, no significant differences between genders were reported. In a study about the predictors of child abuse and neglect, gender was not found to contribute child abuse and neglect significantly (Ozguluk, 2010). This is an indication of all children to be at risk for being exposed to inappropriate manners of their parents or brothers/sisters at home. On the other hand, neglect was reported more by girls compared to boys.

In terms of positive parenting, girls reported more exposure than boys. In parenting styles, girls are usually found to receive more verbal expression at home than boys. Additionally, girls also have tendency to present their home environment as better than they really experience.

Another child characteristic was grade group of children for being exposed to different types of victimization. As a general pattern as age increased, the children in 16 year-old group reported more exposure to all types of abusive acts. In the other research findings, results indicate that children in lower ages report more physical acts than elder children. In this study, physical abuse was more reported in 16 year-old children in general high schools. As a developmental characteristic, adolescents have higher capacities for self-expression.

F. FACILITATORS AND BARRIERS

1. What factors (if any) can be considered as facilitators to the implementation of the research?

It was a facilitator to collect the biggest part of the data from Izmir, the place where the center for the study (the office of Association of Emergency Ambulance Physicians) is located. All of the researchers knew a lot about the province. They met the specialists who work on child abuse and neglect topic and that facilitated to establish a connection between the academicians and the researchers.

2. What were the main problems/difficulties (if any) encountered during the implementation of the research? How were these solved?

Gaining permission for the study was the basic difficulty that continuously caused problems to the research team. There were bureaucratic procedures to be administered which gave rise to loss of time. Anyway, the permissions to conduct the survey in all three provinces were gained. Besides, sexual abuse questions and some demographic questions (asking about nationality and religious views) were omitted from the

questionnaire because of some cultural barriers. Losing this information affected the study negatively.

Turkey had one of the biggest samples due to its population density. Having such a large number of students to be reached was a difficulty. Arranging and controlling the process needed concentration and hard work. In addition, time limitation was another problem. Data collection had to be finished in a quite short time. However, the research team foreknew it and they planned every step of the field research carefully.

During the application, most of the school managers and teachers were helpful and easy-going. However, in some schools, the research team encountered problems depending on the attitudes of teachers or school managers. The field researcher team included psychologists and in such cases they communicated with those teachers and found a compromise.

G. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There were an enormous number of benefits obtained from this study for our country. To begin with, in Turkey, such an extensive study had never been conducted about child abuse and neglect before. There had been some studies though, however, they were local ones and had not have a standardized scale. ICAST is the first international scale that translated and used in Turkey. By means of this scale, our country gained comparable results at international level.

Child abuse and neglect is a problem that should be approached both from children's and parent's point of view. ICAST gives this opportunity with two different forms of questionnaires; child form and parent form which makes it easier to compare their answers.

When it is considered at children level, a total number of 7526 students read a document about child abuse and neglect apart from answering it. Even reading the questions created awareness that some of the students wanted explanations about some questions. They learned that experiencing such things was not fair and needed to be declared.

Parent questionnaires included questions about different types of maltreatment towards children and they were asked directly to the parents. Facing with the questions itself was a different experience for parents. In the questionnaires research team detected that, some of the parents confessed by writing to the blank parts of the papers that they

treat badly towards their children and they got aware of this by the help of this questionnaire.

This study will provide a wide knowledge about the child abuse and neglect profile of Turkey. Having such detailed percentages about each type of maltreatment will impel people who are in charge. Framing the problem is one of the main steps for the solution.

In the schools, it is widely known that counselor teachers are responsible for the students' psychological wellness. For this reason, it was beneficial to come together with counselor teachers and discuss about this very important topic. Within this project, a symposium was organized for counselor teachers. The symposium was held in Konak, Izmir and 43 counselor teachers from different schools were attended. Before they were informed about child abuse and neglect, a 10-question-survey was applied to the counselors. In the test, counselors were asked if they know the types of CAN, the risk factors of CAN, the obligation of reporting CAN cases and where to report. Results showed that all counselors knew about abuse types but 35% of them did not know the risk factors of CAN. Twenty per cent of the counselors did not know that they were obliged to report CAN cases and 25% did not know where to report. In the meantime, 51% of the counselors stated that they encountered CAN cases in their schools and 14,3% of them did not report about these cases. There were no significant different between working experience and noticing the CAN cases. After the implementation of this survey, counselors were informed about child abuse and neglect through a detailed program. Medical doctors told about the symptoms of abusive behaviours on children such as scars and bruises and warned them to be on the alert about these hints. They were also informed about the legal procedure of reporting CAN cases.

The process and preliminary results of the BECAN project were presented in plenty of congresses about physic and psychology. Presentations and posters were prepared in order to share the outcomes of this study with academicians, students and other participants. Apart from attending congresses, the team in Turkey also prepared two symposiums. First symposium was organized to share the preliminary results from two provinces (Izmir and Zonguldak) in 8 May 2012. The symposium aimed to introduce this study to academicians and field workers in Izmir. Pediatricians, a judge and social service experts attended to this symposium. The second symposium was a national one and organized in order to share the overall results in 14 January 2013. Academicians and field workers from different provinces were invited and this symposium was a great opportunity to discuss child abuse and neglect case at national level. Health care

personnel, child protection service workers and academicians came together and discussed how important a standardized scale usage was for case recording.

One of the most substantial targets of this study was to create awareness about child abuse and neglect. Apart from giving academic information, it was important to reach the families with different ways. Within this project, ten writers from Izmir were informed about child abuse and neglect briefly. After that they were asked to write short stories about CAN. When the writers wrote their stories, three psychologists evaluated the stories and then they were gathered in a book named “Growing Up Stories” and were delivered to parents living in Izmir. The book was also translated in English.

Recommendations

This project has too many different outcomes that can be useful for the participating countries. The main focus of the project should be the families and the healthy communication between the members of families. After applying these questionnaires, both parents and children realized the importance of the topic. However, the families need a comprehensive education about child abuse and neglect topic. Most of the families were not aware of their abusive behaviours and most of the children did not know that they were exposed to maltreatment. In consideration of the results of this study, awareness raising treatments may be prepared and both children and parents may be educated. In Turkey, psychological abuse and mild physical abuse are sometimes used as discipline methods. This cultural habit may be prevented by the help of education.

Last but not least, please make a recommendation on how often do you think that a survey on CAN should be conducted at your country in order to be able to follow the trends and to evaluate any preventive efforts implemented.

In Turkey, the survey was conducted in only three different provinces. For a better understanding about the victimization of children and abusive behaviours of parents/caregivers, the study should be conducted all over the country. After the implementation, results should be collected and evaluated and precautions should be taken to reduce the number of child maltreatment. A repetition of 5 years might be efficient in order to follow the effectiveness of the precautions.

H. REFERENCES (if any)

- Oral, R., Can, D., Kaplan, S., Polat, S., Ates, N., Cetin, G., Miral, S., Hanci, H., Ersahin, Y., Tepeli, N., Bulguc, A. G., Tiras, B. (2001). Child abuse in Turkey: an experience in overcoming denial and description of 50 cases. *Child Abuse & Neglect* 25, 279-290.
- Ozguluk, S. B. (2010). Prediction of attitudes towards child abuse by gender, age, income and education. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 5, 515-519.
- Retrieved in 19th January 2013 from
<http://www.childstats.gov/americaschildren/famsoc.asp>
- United Nations International Children's Emergency Fond (2012). Child maltreatment prevalence, incidence and consequences UNICEF East Asia and Pacific Regional Office (EAPRO)
- World Health Organization (1999). Report of the consultation on child abuse prevention, WHO, Geneva, 29-31.
- World Health Organization and International Society for Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (2006). Preventing child maltreatment: A guide to taking action and generating evidence. WHO Press, Geneva.