



Gender Differences in Disclosing Child Sexual Abuse

R.L.J. de Jonge
ANR: 378309
Submission Date: 26-06-2013

Supervisor: P. Okur MSc MA
Second Evaluator: dr. L.M. van der Knaap

Tilburg University
Victimology & Criminal Justice
Faculty of Law

Abstract

This quantitative research focuses on exploring the gender differences in disclosing child sexual abuse and reasons for nondisclosure. Using data from a study among Dutch students ($N=1.352$), several aspects of disclosure and nondisclosure will be discussed for boys as well as for girls. The influence of gender, guilt, relationship with the perpetrator, severity of abuse and honour on disclosure and reasons for nondisclosure will be discussed. Using logistic regression, the fact whether someone discloses or not is tested. Girls appeared to be more likely to disclose child sexual abuse than boys. This effect of gender on disclosure remains significant after adding the control variables. In addition, victims who were abused by family appeared to be almost three times more likely to disclose than victims of child sexual abuse by strangers. Indifference is a more important reason for nondisclosure for boys than for girls. Besides, compared to girls, boys prefer more often not to answer the question why they did not disclose. The author concludes that this study leads to a better understanding of and better response towards victims of child sexual abuse.

Keywords: Sexual abuse, disclosure, nondisclosure, gender differences, quantitative study

Introduction

Child sexual abuse (CSA) is a widespread problem in today's society, showing a 10 to 20% prevalence rate for women and a prevalence rate below 5% for men (Pereda et al., 2009). The distinction between genders has always been under the attention of academics. Especially child sexual abuse among women has been extensively researched in the past since it is more prevalent than child sexual abuse among men (Bolen & Scannapieco, 1999; Pereda et al., 2009; Ullman, 2003). Research on male child sexual abuse is less common (Alaggia, 2008). In line with this, literature on the disclosure of male victims of CSA is scarce. However, according to Alaggia (2005) disclosure of negative sexual experiences has generally been an understudied area of CSA, for male victims as well as for female victims. Academic and professional interest in the phenomenon of disclosure has risen since the existence of community-based sexual abuse prevention programs and a growing number of cases became public, due to better identification and the increased reporting of sexual abuse by victims to the police (Sas & Cunningham, 1995).

Sexually abused children experience various negative outcomes, such as fear, anger, hostility and aggression (Browne & Finkelhor, 1986). Besides these short-term outcomes, they also experience negative outcomes on the long-term, such as posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), self-destructive behaviour, a victim-perpetrator cycle, depression, sexual promiscuity and sexual maladjustment, difficulty in trusting others, feelings of isolation and stigma, substance abuse and poor academic performance (Browne & Finkelhor, 1986; Kogan, 2005; Paolucci, Genuis & Violato, 2001). These consequences make CSA a very sensitive topic in society and are detrimental for victims; therefore the disclosure of CSA could make it more difficult for victims. Self-disclosure of sexual abuse is important to decrease the likelihood of a negative long-term outcome (Paine & Hansen, 2002).

When specifically looking at the disclosure and nondisclosure of victims of CSA, multiple studies have appeared to extend our knowledge of this concept. Research has for example been done on the social reactions to disclosures of sexually abused children and on the victim's healing process after disclosing CSA. The research on social reactions to CSA disclosures generally showed that a negative reaction on the disclosure leads to negative outcomes for the victim (Fontes & Plummer, 2010; McGregor et al., 2010; Ullman, 2003). Research on the healing process after disclosing the secret of CSA showed that there were significant effects on the victim's health related to the way victims disclosed (Burke Draucker et al., 2011; Kogan, 2005). Only for the past decade, a vast amount of studies have been

focusing on the emotionally laden and multifaceted topic of disclosure of CSA (Alaggia, 2004, 2005; Fontes & Plummer, 2010; Goodman-Brown et al., 2003; Kogan, 2004, 2005; Lovett, 2004; McElvaney, Greene & Hogan, 2011; McGregor et al., 2010; O’Leary, Coohy & Easton, 2010; Paine & Hansen, 2002; Pipe et al., 2007; Schaeffer, Leventhal & Gottsegen Asnes, 2011; Schönbucher et al., 2012; Ullman, 2003, 2007). In the preceding decade more attention was paid to the broader topic of CSA, which was at that point in time a relatively novel topic in academic literature (Browne & Finkelhor, 1986; Finkelhor & Browne, 1985; Glaser & Frosh, 1988). However, the majority of the before mentioned studies on the disclosure of CSA were qualitative studies. Instead of trying to find a collective pattern in society, the aim of these qualitative studies was to selectively examine a small number of cases intensively (Alaggia, 2005). One of the few exceptions was the study of Schönbucher et al. (2012) who combined qualitative and quantitative analysis. In their research, they emphasize that previous research has mainly been investigating either retrospective reports by adults or alleged victims evaluated by forensic or clinical professionals. Due to recall bias, retrospective reports of adolescents are believed to be the most accurate way to examine disclosures of child sexual abuse (Schönbucher et al., 2012). An additional advantage compared to minors is that adolescents can participate without knowledge or consent of the parent. Besides, a majority of all studies have included only women in their sample (Alaggia, 2005). A difficulty that Schönbucher et al. (2012) also experience in their study, is that small numbers of male participants make analysis of gender differences not feasible.

Findings of quantitative research could lead to helpful suggestions for institutions dealing with CSA, since it could help find a pattern in society and therefore can lead to better guidance of victims of sexual victimization. It could also help to develop appropriate interventions for this type of victims to minimize negative outcomes. A child’s self-disclosure of sexual abuse is essential to initiate legal and mental help as Paine and Hansen (2002) explain. In addition, research on disclosures of CSA is limited in the Netherlands, let alone research on gender differences in disclosures of CSA that are quantitatively examined. Therefore this study will further elaborate on the gender differences in disclosing CSA among students in the Netherlands.

Gender Differences in Disclosing

According to Alaggia (2005) little is known about how gender affects disclosure of CSA. Therefore, this study aims to quantitatively explore the effect of multiple factors that encourage or obstruct disclosure on gender. Reasons to delay disclosure are often the same

reasons to not disclose sexual abuse at all (Alaggia, 2005; Pipe et al., 2007). This study focuses on gender differences in disclosing negative sexual experiences and gender differences in reasons not to tell someone about the unwanted sexual experience.

Both genders have different motives to delay their disclosure, or even not to disclose. According to Alaggia (2005) reasons for boys to delay, or not to disclose, are the fear of being seen as a homosexual and feelings of stigmatization or isolation because of the belief that boys are rarely victimized, and the fear of becoming an abuser. This last reason was also seen as a precipitant for disclosure (Alaggia, 2005). For girls, a reason to delay or to not disclose is if they affect others with their disclosure. Besides they fear more for being blamed or disbelieved (Alaggia, 2005). According to Goodman-Brown et al. (2003) girls fear significantly more for the negative consequences to others than boys, however, they did not find a significant result for the correlation between gender and time to disclosure in their study on delay of disclosure. Fontes and Plummer (2010) examined the cultural issues in disclosures of CSA, finding several reasons not to disclose, such as; shame, taboos and modesty, sexual scripts, virginity (mainly for girls), status of girls, honour, respect and patriarchy.

Guilt

Being blamed for the child sexual abuse often appears to be a reason specifically for girls not to disclose their abuse (Alaggia, 2005; McGregor et al., 2010). McGregor et al. (2010) note that the victims of CSA often have an inability to disclose abuse and relate this to the insensitivity of health practitioners. Young women in the study thought they would not be helped since they were the one to blame and reported feelings of embarrassment, shame, and unworthiness (McGregor et al., 2010). Feelings of guilt are reported in many studies as a reason not to disclose (Goodman-Brown et al., 2003; Palmer et al., 1999; Sauzier, 1989; Schönbacher et al., 2012). These feelings of guilt often correlate with feelings of not being believed (Lovett, 2004). Research also implies that gender is possibly related to children's attributions of responsibility for abuse, girls seem to be more likely to blame themselves than boys (Hunter, Goodwin, & Wilson, 1992). According to Finkelhor (1984) this could be explained by the fact that girls more often than boys fall victim to intrafamilial child sexual abuse. By conducting 60 phone interviews, Lamb and Edgar-Smith (1994) found that male victims disclosed less often than female victims. Consistent with this notion Lamb and Edgar-Smith (1994) reported that not being blamed was perceived as the most supportive response that they can get of recipients of their disclosure.

Relationship with perpetrator

The relation between victim and perpetrator is often not only a familiar relationship, but is also often an emotionally close relationship (Paine & Hansen, 2002). In prior research the distinction between intrafamilial and extrafamilial is often made (Goodman-Brown et al., 2003; McElvaney, Greene & Hogan, 2011; Russell, 1983; Schönbacher, 2012; Ullman, 2003). Russell (1983) did research on the incidence and prevalence of intrafamilial and extrafamilial sexual abuse of girls. At the time of her research, the concept of child sexual abuse was not yet defined. Extrafamilial child sexual abuse was defined as unwanted sexual experiences with persons unrelated by blood or marriage, in contrast to intrafamilial child sexual abuse in which the unwanted sexual incident was experienced with a relative, no matter how distant the relationship (Russell, 1983). Unfortunately, no attention was paid to the relationship between intrafamilial and extrafamilial child sexual abuse and the disclosure of the abuse. Luckily other researchers noticed this relationship between the disclosure of CSA and the child's relationship to the perpetrator later in time (Arata, 1998; Goodman-Brown et al., 2003; Sas & Cunningham, 1995; Smith et al., 2000). Ullman (2003) reports that disclosure of CSA is less likely when performed by people that are known to the victim. Victims of intrafamilial abuse find it harder to disclose than victims of extrafamilial abuse, since they fear family disruption or negative consequences for loved ones when they disclose (Smith et al., 2000). Girls fear significantly more for negative consequences to others than boys, which is partly explained by the fact that girls fall more often victim to intrafamilial abuse than boys (Finkelhor, 1984; Goodman-Brown et al., 2003). Potential punishment might also be an issue that complicates disclosing intrafamilial child sexual abuse (Goodman-Brown et al., 2003). In addition, children see their home as a safe haven, this concept of territorial safety may prohibit children from disclosing, because of the confusion and the commitment and loyalty to family members (Sas & Cunningham, 1995).

Severity of abuse

According to Ullman (2003) disclosure was less likely for victims of more severe assaults than for victims of less severe assaults. Because of fears of being perceived as homosexual, boys are more hesitant than girls to disclose child sexual abuse (Paine & Hansen, 2002). If a boy is penetrated by a man he might fear for this and consequently delays his disclosure, or does not disclose at all. Therefore, the severity of the abuse might be different

for boys than for girls. Boys grow up to be strong and invulnerable men and want to uphold that self-image (Richter-Appelt, 2002).

Besides, not only the type of abuse can influence disclosure, how many times the victim came into contact with abuse should be taken into account as a measure of severity as well. According to Schönbucher et al. (2012) there is a positive correlation indicating that there is a relation between disclosing CSA and the fact that it only happened once. Ullman (2003) also concludes that disclosure is marginally less likely in case of polyvictimization. Sas and Cunningham (1995) emphasize as well that duration of the abuse influences the decision making of the child in whether they disclose or not.

Honour

Whether victims think sexual abuse influences the honour of the family might affect disclosure. The fear of a tarnished family honour might withhold victims of sexual abuse to disclose the abuse in order to protect the family honour. Fontes and Plummer (2010) report that in some cultures, girls who have been sexually abused, are seen as a disgrace for the family and might be punished in order to restore the honour of the family and the family name. These kinds of punishments make it harder for girls that have been sexually abused to disclose their victimization (Fontes & Plummer, 2010). In addition, girls could be dishonoured because sexual abuse with penetration leads to losing her virginity (Fontes & Plummer, 2010). Losing her virginity can be a reason for a tarnished family honour. Since people that hold these values will probably have an unsupportive reaction to a disclosure, victims will be more likely not to disclose as a consequence.

Research questions of the current study

The main goal of this research is to answer questions concerning gender differences in disclosing or not disclosing child sexual abuse. The main question is whether there are different factors that influence disclosure of CSA for boys and girls. In order to explain this, the before mentioned factors guilt, relationship with the perpetrator, severity of the abuse, and honour will be taken into account. In addition, the differences in reasons for boys and girls not to disclose will be assessed.

By answering this question, a gap in the existing literature will be filled. This study adds additional value to the existing literature, since there has not been done prior research specifically in the Netherlands on this subject. New insights can be given and used as a basis

for upcoming research. In addition, it can be useful for social policy, because it could lead to better help for victims of CSA.

Method

Sample characteristics

In order to examine whether there are differences in gender on the disclosure of child sexual abuse, a Dutch survey among students was used (Okur, forthcoming). The preliminary goal of this survey is to provide insights in cultural differences in child sexual abuse and help seeking behaviour ($N=3.613$). All respondents of the survey were still in school at the moment they filled in the survey, and filled in the survey without the parents' knowledge or consent. All respondents signed an informed form of consent.

For this thesis, the survey is used to clarify gender differences in the disclosure of child sexual abuse. Respondents below the age of 18 or above the age of 25 were removed from the data, leaving 3.464 respondents that are aged between 18 and 25 years of age. Because this thesis centres around the question whether someone disclosed or not, only the respondents who answered the question whether they had disclosed or not are left in the sample that will be used ($N=1.352$). Victims who chose the option to indicate that they did not want to answer this question were excluded from analysis. Of these 1.352 respondents 23% are boys ($N=310$) and 77% are girls ($N=1.042$) (See Table 1).

Measures and variables

Disclosure is defined as the fact that a victim of CSA told others about his or her unwanted sexual experiences. There is no distinction in disclosing to a parent, other family, peers or professionals. The respondents indicated in the survey whether they told someone in their surroundings about their negative sexual experience.

An issue on which researchers do not agree on when discussing the definition of CSA is whether the abuse should be defined as an act involving physical contact or whether it can also be seen as CSA if there is no physical contact involved (Salter, 1992). Following Goodman et al. (1992) the severity of the abuse was categorized in non-genital acts, genital acts without penetration and lastly penetration. This distinction was made since penetration is believed to be more traumatic for the victim (Feiring, Simon & Cleland, 2009).

Polyvictimization was categorized in three categories. The first category encloses victims who had only one experience with child sexual abuse. When victims experience

multiple, meaning two to ten, incidents of CSA, they were put in the second category. Victims who had experienced sexual abuse more than ten times were put in the third category.

To measure whether someone had the idea that he or she is the one to blame has an impact on the disclosure of the victim, a variable with three categories was computed. Respondents could indicate whether the perpetrator, they themselves, someone else or both the perpetrator and themselves were to blame for the abuse. In the first category are respondents who feel they are the one to blame for the incident. Respondents who thought that the perpetrator was the one to blame are in the second category. In the third category are respondents who thought that both they as victim as well as the perpetrator were to blame. The fourth category consists of victims who thought that someone else was to blame for the child sexual abuse.

To determine the relationship between victim and perpetrator, a variable with four categories was computed. The relationships were divided in family, (ex)-intimates, acquaintances and strangers. Concerning the category with family, it did not matter how distant this family was. It is often the case that stepfamily has the same role as actual family, but also uncles, grandfathers, cousins and other family was categorized in this category since they have a special familial relationship with the victim. If the abuse was perpetrated by family it was intrafamilial, if the abuse was perpetrated by someone who was not family, the abuse was perceived to be extrafamilial. Only the first perpetrator is taken into account, since logistic regression would lead to deletion of every case that has only one or two perpetrators involved.

When respondents indicated in the survey that they did not disclose, they were asked for what reason they did not disclose. Respondents could select multiple reasons for nondisclosure. The reasons victims could choose from were; 'I was afraid of the reaction', 'I did not want my surroundings to find out', 'I was afraid that people would not believe me', 'I was afraid to be blamed', 'I thought it was unnecessary', 'I thought it was not worse enough', 'I took care of it myself', 'I found it too much hassle', 'I did not know what to do', 'I did not want it to have negative consequences for the perpetrator', and lastly, 'I was afraid of gossip'. Besides, a category of victims that did not want to answer the question will be included. Since victims could choose multiple answers, every answer will be looked at separately. When a victim answered to have two reasons, that victim will be counted in both categories. Victims that indicated to have another reason, which could be classified under one of the eleven before mentioned reasons, were counted in the already existing category.

For the variable of honour, respondents could answer the question whether the family was dishonoured if a boy was not a virgin anymore before marriage. The same question about family honour was posed in case it was a girl. The two questions were pooled to make one new variable.

Plan of analysis

Because many variables are measured on a categorical scale, nonparametric tests will be used. Logistic regression makes assumptions of linearity, and no multicollinearity for the independent variables. Multicollinearity was not detected (max. VIF=1.44) and linearity was assumed. The chi-square test for independence will be used to determine whether two categorical variables are related (Pallant, 2007). The correlation coefficients will provide a numerical summary of the direction and the strength of the linear relationship between two variables (Pallant, 2007). If there is no significant relationship found between the independent variable and the dependent variable, the independent variable will not be included in logistic regression. Given the fact that the first dependent variable is a dichotomous variable, binary logistic regression analysis will be performed.

The second question about reasons for nondisclosure will be explained by the use of frequencies. Percentages will be reported and compared.

Results

Disclosure

To check whether the independent variables should have been included in the binary logistic regression, the independent variables were cross tabulated with the dependent variable. Relationships that were significant were included in the binary logistic regression (see Table 2). This led to the inclusion of the variables gender ($\chi^2(1)=24.89$, $p=.000$), relationship with the perpetrator ($\chi^2(3)=16.70$, $p=.001$), severity of abuse ($\chi^2(2)=18.92$, $p=.000$), and guilt ($\chi^2(3)=14.17$, $p=.003$) in the binary logistic regression. The variables for polyvictimization ($\chi^2(2)=1.75$, $p=.416$) and honour ($\chi^2(8)=14.69$, $p=.066$) are excluded from further analysis.

The binary logistic regression including the variables for gender, the relationship with the perpetrator, severity of abuse and guilt is presented in Table 3 (see Appendix). Because of the use of logistic regression, cases will be deleted listwise, meaning that if one case misses the answer for one variable, the entire case will be deleted. Of 1352 respondents, 776 respondents answered all relevant questions and were included in the logistic regression to

answer the first research question. Logistic regression was performed to assess the impact of those variables on the likelihood that respondents would disclose child sexual abuse. The binary logistic regression was first performed with only the variable for gender, later adding the control variables relationship with the perpetrator, severity of abuse and guilt. The first model containing the predictor variable for gender was statistically significant ($\chi^2(1)=19.76$, $p<.01$), indicating that gender is a significant predictor in who discloses and who do not. The first model as a whole correctly classified 61.3% of the cases. As shown in Table 3, gender made a unique statistically significant contribution to the model, showing an odds ratio of 2.45. This means that girls are almost two and a half times more likely to disclose than boys. The second model containing the predictor variables gender, relationship with perpetrator, severity of abuse and guilt was also statistically significant ($\chi^2(9)=46.32$, $p<.01$). The model as a whole correctly classified 61.5% of the cases. Gender still was the strongest predictor of disclosure, reporting an odds ratio of 2.04. Therefore we can state that the girls in the sample were two times more likely to disclose their CSA than boys in the sample. Besides, victims of CSA by family reported an odds ratio of 2.84. This indicated that victims who were abused by family were almost three times more likely to disclose the abuse than victims who were abused by a total stranger, controlling for all other factors in the model. When controlling for other factors in the model, it appeared that gender still remained significant, even when other predictor variables were added to the model.

Reasons for nondisclosure

A total of 472 victims of CSA did not disclose the abuse. Of those 472 victims, 365 were girls and 107 were boys. When looking at the differences in frequencies of boys and girls in reasons for nondisclosure, it is apparent that boys and girls both gave an average of two answers (See Table 4). Remarkable is that boys have higher percentages for the reasons; 'I thought it was unnecessary', 'I thought it was not worse enough', 'I took care of it myself', 'I found it too much hassle'. This shows that boys seem to be more indifferent about disclosing than girls. Noteworthy is also the fact that boys are far more likely not wanting to answer the question than girls.

Discussion

The present study was designed to explore the effects of gender on disclosure and reasons for nondisclosure. A few findings are apparent from this study on gender differences in disclosure and reasons not to disclose. Concerning the disclosure of child sexual abuse it is

striking that results indicate that girls are two and a half more likely to disclose sexual abuse than boys. This contests the literature that stated that boys are more likely to disclose, compared to girls (Lamb & Edgar-Smith, 1994; Goodman-Brown et al., 2003). However, this matches explanations that state that boys are less likely to disclose than girls because of fear of stigmatization such as being seen as vulnerable or homosexual (Richter-Appelt, 2002; Sauzier, 1989). Since more prior research indicates that boys are more likely to never disclose than girls (Finkelhor, 1990), it is conceivable that this sample is representative of the larger population of male child abuse victims.

When adding control variables, results show that chances of victims of intrafamilial abuse to disclose their victimization almost tripled compared to victims who were abused by a complete stranger. This refutes the statement of Goodman-Brown et al. (2003) that victims, especially girls, are more reluctant to disclose in case of intrafamilial abuse than victims of extrafamilial abuse. But also the statement of Ullman (2003), explaining that victims are less likely to disclose if the perpetrator is known is not in line with the results. A possible explanation for this difference is that victims who experienced extrafamilial abuse are more indifferent about the abuse and therefore are more likely to not disclose than victims of intrafamilial abuse. According to the results, honour, severity of the abuse, polyvictimization and guilt did not make a significant contribution to whether someone disclosed or not, contradicting findings of several authors (Alaggia, 2005; Fontes & Plummer, 2010; McGregor et al., 2010).

Furthermore, statements about significance of the relationship between reasons for nondisclosure and gender cannot be made, since they were assessed through the use frequencies. However, remarkable was the result that boys preferred not to answer the question about nondisclosure. This indicates that Lamers-Winkelman (2008) was right in stating that, although the Netherlands is known for its tolerance, Dutch society is not interested in child sexual abuse or its victims. Besides, boys seemed to be more likely to be indifferent about the abuse compared to girls. The relative lack of boys in the sample made it harder to compare the frequencies of answers of boys to the answers of girls.

Limitations of the Present Study

A few limitations of the present study can be defined. Firstly, by making use of self-reports, data is sensitive for social desirability bias. Even though conducting the survey was anonymous, the risk of bias is present. Secondly, if victims were sexually assaulted multiple times, they could indicate who the first, second and third perpetrator was. However, because

of the use of logistic regression, including the second and third perpetrator as a variable was impossible. Since logistic regression would lead to exclusion of a lot of variables, excluding the second and third perpetrator from analysis was the best choice. This only left the first perpetrator to take into account, which was randomly chosen by the victim when filling in the questionnaire.

Besides this, Alaggia (2005) points out that some victims of CSA also try to disclose in behavioural, nonverbal, and indirect ways. Unfortunately the distinction between disclosing in a behavioural, nonverbal or indirect way is impossible to make with the data that was used for this specific research. Nevertheless, significant relationships were observed.

Conclusions and Future Prospects

A clear gender difference in disclosing child sexual abuse is found in the current study, namely that girls are more likely to disclose than boys. Victims of intrafamilial abuse tend towards disclosing the abuse, unlike victims who were abused by strangers. Furthermore, boys seem to be more indifferent about the CSA, and therefore would not disclose. Besides, when compared to girls, boys prefer more often not to answer the question about why they did not disclose. Aside from the limitations of the present study, these results have value for the existing literature. Although disclosure of CSA remains a multifaceted topic in society, this study might add to its understanding. In future studies researchers should stay focused on differences between victims and their disclosure or reason not to disclose. For example, more attention could be paid to the interaction between the severity of the abuse and the relationship with the perpetrator in relation to disclosure or nondisclosure. In order to provide better help it is important to obtain such information. Disclosure of CSA remains an important subject in the field of CSA since it is crucial to initiate legal and mental help for the victim.

References

- Alaggia, R. (2004). Many Ways of Telling: Expanding Conceptualizations of Child Sexual Abuse Disclosure. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, Vol. 28, pp. 1213-1227.
- Alaggia, R. (2005). Disclosing the Trauma of Child Sexual Abuse: A Gender Analysis. *Journal of Loss and Trauma*. Vol. 10, pp. 453-470.
- Alaggia, R. (2008). Male Child Sexual Abuse: A Phenomenology of Betrayal. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, Vol. 36, pp. 265-275.
- Arata, C. M. (1998). To Tell or Not To Tell: Current Functioning of Child Sexual Abuse Survivors who Disclosed their Victimization. *Child Maltreatment*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 63-71.
- Bartlett, M.S. (1954). A Note on the Multiplying Factors for Various Chi Square Approximations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*. Vol. 16, pp. 296-298.
- Bolen, R.M. & Scannapieco, M. (1999). Prevalence of Child Sexual Abuse: A Corrective Meta-Analysis. *Social Service Review*, Vol. 73, pp. 281-313.
- Browne A. & Finkelhor D (1986). Impact of Child Sexual Abuse: A Review of the Research. *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 99, No. 1, pp. 66-77.
- Burke Draucker, C., Martsof, D.S., Roller, C., Knapik, G., Ross, R. & Warner Stidham, A. (2011). Healing from Childhood Sexual Abuse: A Theoretical Model. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, Vol. 20, pp. 435-466.
- Feiring, C., Simon, V. A., & Cleland, C. M. (2009). Childhood Sexual Abuse, Stigmatization, Internalizing Symptoms, and the Development of Sexual Difficulties and Dating Aggression. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, Vol. 77, No. 1, p. 127.
- Finkelhor, D. & Browne, A. (1985). The Traumatic Impact of Child Sexual Abuse: A Conceptualization. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, Vol. 55, pp. 530-541.
- Finkelhor, D. (1984). *Child sexual abuse: New theory and research*. New York: Free Press.
- Finkelhor, D. (1990). Early and Long-Term Effects of Child Sexual Abuse: An Update. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, Vol. 21, pp. 325-330.
- Fontes, L.A. & Plummer, C. (2010). Cultural Issues in Disclosures of Child Sexual Abuse. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, Vol. 19, pp. 491-518.
- Glaser, D. & Frosh, S. (1988). *Child Sexual Abuse*. London: Macmillan.

- Goodman-Brown, T.B., Edelstein, R.S., Jones, D.P.H. & Gordon, D.S. (2003). Why Children Tell: A Model of Children's Disclosure of Sexual Abuse. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, Vol. 27, pp. 525-540.
- Goodman, G.S., Taub, E.P., Jones, D.P., England, P., Port, L.K., Rudy, L., Prado, L. & Melton, G.B. (1992). Testifying in Criminal Court: Emotional Effects on Child Sexual Assault Victims. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, i-159.
- Hunter, J. A., Goodwin, D. W., & Wilson, R. J. (1992). Attributions of Blame in Child Sexual Abuse Victims: An Analysis of Age and Gender influences. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, Vol. 1, pp. 75-89.
- Kaiser, H. (1970). A Second Generation Little Jiffy. *Psychometrika*, Vol. 35, pp. 401-415.
- Kogan, S.M. (2004). Disclosing Unwanted Sexual Experiences: Results from a National Sample of Adolescent Women. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, Vol. 28, pp. 147-165.
- Kogan, S.M. (2005). The Role of Disclosing Child Sexual Abuse on Adolescent Adjustment and Revictimization. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, Vol. 14, pp. 25-45.
- Lamb, S. & Edgar-Smith, S. (1994). Aspects of Disclosure: Mediators of Outcome of Childhood Sexual Abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 307-326.
- Lamers-Winkelmann, F. (2002). Child (Sexual) Abuse: A Universal Problem, and Sri Lanka is No Exception. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 115-124.
- Lovett, B.B. (2004). Child Sexual Abuse Disclosure: Maternal Response and Other Variables Impacting the Victim. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, Vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 355-371.
- McElvaney, R., Greene, S. & Hogan, D. (2012). Containing the Secret of Child Sexual Abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 27, No. 6, pp. 1155-1175.
- McGregor, K. Jülich, S., Glover, M. & Gautam, J. (2010). Health Professionals' Responses to Disclosure of Child Sexual Abuse History: Female Child Sexual Abuse Survivors' Experiences. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, Vol. 19, pp. 239-254.
- Okur, P. (forthcoming). Sexual Abuse of Adolescents with a Non-Western Ethnic Background.
- O'Leary, P., Coohy, C. & Easton, S.D. (2010). The Effect of Severe Child Sexual Abuse and

- Disclosure on Mental Health during Adulthood. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, Vol. 19, pp. 275-289.
- Paine, M.L. & Hansen, D.J. (2002). Factors Influencing Children to Self-Disclose Sexual Abuse. *Clinical Psychology Review*, Vol. 22, pp. 271-295.
- Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS Survival Manual*. Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.
- Palmer, S., Brown, R., Rae-Grant, N., & Loughlin, J. M., (1999). Responding to Children's Disclosure of Familial Abuse: What Survivors Tell Us. *Child Welfare*, Vol. 78, No. 2, pp. 259-282.
- Paolucci, E.O., Genuis, M. L., & Violato, C. (2001). A Meta-Analysis of the Published Research on the Effects of Child Sexual Abuse. *The Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 135, pp. 17-36.
- Pereda, N., Guilera, G., Forns, M. & Gómez-Benito, J. (2009). The International Epidemiology of Child Sexual Abuse: A Continuation of Finkelhor (1994). *Child Abuse & Neglect*, Vol. 33, pp. 331-342.
- Pipe, M.-E., Lamb, M.E., Orbach, Y. & Cederborg, A.-C. (2007). *Child Sexual Abuse: Disclosure, Delay and Denial*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Richter-Appelt, H. (2002). *Verführung, Trauma, Missbrauch* [Seduction, Trauma, Abuse]. Giessen, Germany: Psychosozial-Verlag.
- Russell, D.E. (1983). The Incidence and Prevalence of Intrafamilial and Extrafamilial Sexual Abuse of Female Children. *Child abuse & Neglect*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 133-146.
- Salter, A. (1992). Epidemiology of child sexual abuse. In O'Donohue, W. and Geer, J. H. *The Sexual Abuse of Children: Theory and Research Volume 1*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 108-138.
- Sas, L.D. & Cunningham, A.H. (1995). *Tipping the Balance to Tell the Secret: The Public Discovery of Child Sexual Abuse*. London: London Family Court Clinic.
- Sauzier, M. (1989). Disclosure of Child Sexual Abuse: For Better or Worse. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, Vol. 12, pp. 455-469.
- Schaeffer, P., Leventhal, J.M. & Gottsegen Asnes, A. (2011). Children's Disclosures of Sexual Abuse: Learning from Direct Inquiry. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, Vol. 35, pp. 343-352.
- Schönbucher, V., Maier, T., Mohler-Kuo, M., Schnyder, U. & Landolt, M.A. (2012).

Disclosure of Child Sexual Abuse by Adolescents: A Qualitative In-Depth Study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. Vol. 27, No. 17, pp. 3846-3513.

Smith, D.W., Letourneau, E.J., Saunders, B.E., Kilpatrick, D.G., Resnick, H.S. & Best, C.L. (2000). Delay in Disclosure of Childhood Rape: Results from a National Survey. *Child Abuse & Neglect*. Vol. 24, No. 2, pp. 273-287.

Ullman, S.E. (2003). Social Reactions to Child Sexual Abuse Disclosures: A Critical Review. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, Vol. 12, pp. 89-116.

Ullman, S.E. (2007). Relationship to Perpetrator, Disclosure, Social Reactions, and PTSD Symptoms in Child Sexual Abuse Survivors. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 19-36.

Appendix

Table 1

Descriptive Table of Independent Variables For
Question 1 (N=1352)

Variable	N	%
Gender		
Boys	310	22.9
Girls	1042	77.1
Relationship with perpetrator		
Family	45	3.3
(Ex-)Intimate	164	12.1
Acquaintance	509	37.6
Stranger	205	15.2
Missing	429	31.7
Severity of abuse		
Non-contact	167	12.4
Contact without penetration	802	59.3
Contact with penetration	229	16.9
Missing	154	11.4
Polyvictimization		
1 time	560	41.4
2-10 times	239	17.7
More than 10 times	45	3.3
Missing	508	37.6
Guilt		
Perpetrator	753	55.7
Victim	74	5.5
Perpetrator and victim	116	8.6
Other	25	1.8
Missing	384	28.4
Honour	1352	

Table 2

Chi-square Values of the Independent Variables With Disclosure

Variable	χ^2	df	Sig.
Gender	24.89**	1	.000
Relationship with perpetrator	16.70**	3	.001
Severity of abuse	18.92**	2	.000
Polyvictimization	1.75	2	.416
Guilt	14.17**	3	.003
Honour	14.69	8	.066

* = $p < 0.05$; ** = $p < 0.01$ **Table 3**

Logistic Regression Predicting Likelihood of Disclosing Child Sexual Abuse

	B	S.E.	OR	95% CI	
				LL	UL
<i>Model 1</i>					
Constant	-.427*	.188	.653		
Gender (boys ^a)	.895**	.204	2.446	1.640	3.648
<i>Model 2</i>					
Constant	-.217	.365	.805		
Gender (boys ^a)	.712**	.215	2.039	1.337	3.109
Relationship with perpetrator					
Family	1.042*	.422	2.836	1.240	6.487
(Ex-)Intimate	.363	.258	1.437	.867	2.383
Acquaintance	-.058	.193	.944	.647	1.378
Stranger ^a					
Severity of abuse					
Non-contact	-.480	.288	.619	.352	1.087
Contact without penetration	-.296	.198	.744	.505	1.096
Contact with penetration ^a					
Guilt					
Perpetrator	.227	.235	1.254	.791	1.989
Victim	-.466	.350	.628	.316	1.247
Other	-.960	.639	.383	.109	1.339
Perpetrator and victim ^a					

Note. OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit.

^a Reference category.

* = $p < 0.05$; ** = $p < 0.01$

Table 4

Frequencies of Boys and Girls in Reasons for Nondisclosure

Reason	Boys		Girls	
	N	%	N	%
I was afraid of the reaction	7	6.5	44	12.1
I did not want my surroundings to find out	6	5.6	52	14.2
I was afraid that people would not believe me	4	3.7	24	6.6
I was afraid to be blamed	2	1.8	18	4.9
I thought it was unnecessary	66	61.6	210	57.5
I thought it was not worse enough	31	29.0	103	28.2
I took care of it myself	30	28.0	81	22.2
I found it too much hassle	14	13.1	40	10.9
I did not know what to do	5	4.7	33	9.0
I did not want it to have negative consequences for the perpetrator	1	0.9	6	1.6
I was afraid of gossip	6	5.6	21	5.8
I do not want to answer this	39	36.4	62	17.0
Total	211	196.9%	694	190.0%