

Female Genital Mutilation in the Netherlands: Prevalence, incidence and determinants

This study includes estimations of number of women and girls living in the Netherlands in 2012, who have undergone or are at risk of FGM. A mixed-method approach was used combining a quantitative and a qualitative component.

The main sources of information used included DHS and MICS (for FGM prevalence data in countries of origin), female migrant population data in 2012 from FGM countries derived from Central Statistical Office, data from Central Office of Asylum for female asylum seekers in 2012, and data about risk of FGM in girls under the age of 19 with one or two parents from an FGM risk country, derived from Youth Health Care and the Advice and Reporting Centres for Child Abuse and Neglect (AMK).

In total, this study estimates that 29.120 women living in the Netherlands have undergone FGM. Between 557 and 3.477 girls might be at risk of being subjected to FGM.

Data Collection

Author(s)

Marja EXTERKATE

Year of data collection

2012

Study population

Female migrant population residing in the Netherlands and female asylum seekers living in reception centres.

Prevalence data on FGM

In total, this study estimates that 29.120 women living in the Netherlands have undergone FGM. Between 557 and 3.477 girls might be at risk of being subjected to FGM.

Disaggregated data per country of origin

29 countries where FGM is documented.

Disaggregated data per age

0-5, 5-19, 29-49, 50+

Other disaggregation

The female migrant population was disaggregated by first and second generation, place of birth, and length of stay in the Netherlands.

Limitations of study

- The literature review might not have provided an exhaustive overview of determinants, risk of FGM and behaviour change, as only papers on quantitative data on FGM prevalence and incidence, and its determinants, were included.
- DHS and MICS that were used do not include FGM data for the female population < 15 yrs and > 49 years.
- The FGM status in DHS and MICS surveys is self-reported by mothers.
- The study did not take into account undocumented migrants.
- The report mentions that risk taxation is done based on certain criteria and not on medical check-up, hence why a risk estimation might contain a bias.
- The report states that the study might suffer from under-registration of (risk of) FGM as national aggregated data on FGM are not available.
- The influence of migration, assessed through the focus groups, was not done through a representative sample of all migrant groups, and recruitment was biased, as the hard to reach groups were difficult to include (those not linked to migrant organisations or not involved in the anti-FGM activities).

Source

Metadata

TYPE: Study / Survey, Database

LANGUAGE: Dutch, English

TYPES OF GBV: Female Genital Mutilation

KEYWORDS: female genital mutilation, data collection