

**This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.**

**Author(s):** Lahtinen, Hanna-Mari; Laitila, Aarno; Korkman, Julia; Ellonen, Noora; Honkalampi, Kirsi

**Title:** Children's Disclosures of Physical Abuse in a Population-Based Sample

**Year:** 2022

**Version:** Accepted version (Final draft)

**Copyright:** © 2020 Sage Publications

**Rights:** CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

**Rights url:** <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

**Please cite the original version:**

Lahtinen, H.-M., Laitila, A., Korkman, J., Ellonen, N., & Honkalampi, K. (2022). Children's Disclosures of Physical Abuse in a Population-Based Sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(5-6), 2011-2036. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520934443>

## Children's disclosures of physical abuse in a population-based sample

*Key words: child physical abuse, child sexual abuse, disclosure, non-disclosure, disclosure rate.*

### Introduction

In child abuse cases, a child's disclosure is often crucial for getting help for the child and ending the abuse (Bottoms et al., 2016; Pipe et al., 2007). However, according to disclosure research, it appears that, regardless of the form of child abuse, a considerable number of victims fail to disclose their abuse (Bottoms et al., 2016). Only a few studies have explored the disclosure of child physical abuse (CPA) (Jernbro, Otterman, Lucas, Tindberg, & Janson, 2017; Thulin, Kjellgren, & Nilsson, 2019). The paucity of CPA disclosure research is striking compared to the large amount of research and debate on child sexual abuse (CSA) disclosure during the last two decades. As CPA prevalence is clearly higher than CSA prevalence (Finkelhor, Turner, Ormrod, & Hamby, 2009; Fagerlund, Peltola, Kääriäinen, Ellonen, & Sariola, 2014; Radford, Corral, Bradley, & Fisher, 2013) and as CPA is a known risk factor for several negative mental and physical health outcomes in the short- and long-terms (Mills, Scott, Alati, O'Callaghan, Najman, & Strathearn, 2013; Moffitt, 2013; Affifi et al., 2017), up-to-date research on CPA disclosure has major implications in the field. Almost 60 countries have currently outlawed violence toward children, including corporal punishment in the home (Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, 2020), and, at least in serious cases, suspected CPA may lead to criminal investigation in these countries.

1  
2  
3 Researchers (e.g. Bottoms et al. 2016; Lev-Wiesel, Gottfried, Eisikovits, & First, 2014; Foynes,  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Researchers (e.g. Bottoms et al. 2016; Lev-Wiesel, Gottfried, Eisikovits, & First, 2014; Foynes, Freyd & De Prince, 2009) have assumed that disclosure patterns and factors associated with the disclosure of abuse are similar, regardless of the form of abuse, since abuse is always potentially traumatic. Research evidence partially supports this idea. For example, Bottoms and colleagues (2016) have shown that the person most frequently disclosed to was a friend, regardless of the form of abuse. Only a few of the victims had disclosed to professionals (see also Jernbro et al., 2017; Annerbäck, Wingren, Svedin, & Gustafsson, 2010). Furthermore, both CPA and CSA victims were found more likely to disclose abuse if they were more frequently abused, worried about injury, or emotionally upset at the time of abuse. Disclosers were also found more likely to label themselves as victims, regardless of the type of abuse, than were non-disclosers (Bottoms et al., 2016).

Possible differences in disclosure patterns have also been found. A recent retrospective study by McGuire and London (2020) reported higher CSA disclosure rates compared to CPA disclosure rates. In contrast, Lev-Wiesel and First (2018) have concluded that CSA victims are more reluctant to disclose than victims of other forms of abuse, and that boys are more reluctant to disclose all forms of abuse than girls. They have examined the role of gender in willingness to disclose CSA compared to other forms of abuse in a population-based sample of children (12-17-year-olds) in Israel (Lev-Wiesel & First, 2018). In contrast to Bottoms et al. (2016), a recent study with this Israeli sample indicates that exposure to multi-type maltreatment in conjunction with high-emotional reactions predicted higher reluctance to disclose. Almost a third of the children had been exposed to two types, and a fifth to three or four types, of maltreatment in this sample (Lev-Wiesel, First, Gottfried, & Eisikovits, 2019).

Contradictory findings concerning CSA disclosure rates have created considerable debate (Pipe, Orbach, Lamb, & Cederborg, 2007; Rush, Lyon, Ahern, & Quas, 2014) and have

1  
2  
3 revealed many of the problems involved in studying disclosure that are also relevant to other  
4 types of abusive experiences. Due to the varying sources of information used in different  
5 studies (mainly retrospective surveys of adults or children undergoing forensic evaluations) and  
6 the variation in the definitions of both CSA and disclosure, comparing the results of different  
7 studies is complicated (Lahtinen, Laitila, Korkman, & Ellonen, 2018; London et al., 2008;  
8 Olafson & Lederman, 2006). As defining concepts and sources of information are crucial  
9 elements in evaluating implications of research, these should be the focus of attention also  
10 when reviewing studies on CPA disclosure.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 Some researchers have explored CPA disclosure rates in forensic or mental health settings.  
23 Different patterns of disclosure have emerged in these settings: CPA victims have been found  
24 to be more reluctant to disclose than CSA victims (Rush et al., 2014). For example,  
25 Hershkowitz, Horowitz, and Lamb (2005) have reported higher rates of disclosure for CSA  
26 (71%) than for CPA (61%). They explain this discrepancy with the fact that suspected  
27 perpetrators in the sample were parents/parent figures in almost all (93%) of the CPA  
28 allegations (Hershkowitz et al., 2005), whereas this was not true for the CSA cases. Rush and  
29 colleagues (2014) have suggested that the observed reluctance of children with CPA  
30 experiences to disclose may also be linked to the fact that CPA investigations are less likely  
31 than CSA investigations to be initiated as a result of prior disclosures, and they are more likely  
32 to be initiated by other evidence of abuse, such as bruises. Those authors also argue that, in  
33 CPA cases, the perpetrators confess more often than they do in CSA cases. Within forensic  
34 samples, however, there is often no way to assess the fundamental truth, namely, whether the  
35 suspicions are founded or not. Where suspicions are unfounded, the fact that children do not  
36 disclose abuse is obviously not a problem of nondisclosure, whereas in cases where suspicions  
37 are unfounded and children do disclose, there is a problem of “wrong” disclosure. In other  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 words, forensic samples are not suitable for investigating the prevalence of disclosure (Pipe et  
4 al., 2007b; London et al., 2007; Azzopardi, Eirich, Rash, MacDonald, & Madigan, 2019). To  
5  
6  
7  
8 conclude, it should be noted that, despite the different approaches discussed above, there is  
9  
10 agreement that delayed CSA disclosures are not rare, and there are children who do not disclose  
11  
12 even when questioned directly about their abuse experiences (Pipe et al., 2007b; Azzopardi et  
13  
14 al., 2019). Emerging evidence of CPA disclosures shows a similar trend (Foynes, Freyd, & De  
15  
16 Prince, 2009).  
17  
18  
19

20 Most studies exploring different types of abuse and disclosure have been retrospective  
21  
22 (Bottoms et al., 2016; Foynes et al., 2009). CPA disclosure rates reported in these retrospective  
23  
24 surveys vary between 61% and 73%, whereas CSA disclosure rates in retrospective surveys  
25  
26 are much lower, varying mostly between 31% and 45% (Jernbro et al., 2017; London et al.,  
27  
28 2008). Retrospective studies of adults with a self-reported CSA history have found that fear of  
29  
30 negative consequences often prevents disclosure (e.g., Anderson, Martin, Mullen, Romans, &  
31  
32 Herbison, 1993; Browne & Finkelhor, 1986; Conte & Berliner, 1988; Palmer, Brown, Rae-  
33  
34 Grant, & Loughlin, 1999).  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 Retrospective studies offer a population-based estimate of disclosure rates and factors related  
40  
41 to disclosure. However, retrospective approaches to disclosures have considerable  
42  
43 disadvantages. First, memory errors of omission and/or commission may change the data  
44  
45 (Schacter, 2001). For example, an adult may fail to recall having disclosed to someone as a  
46  
47 child. Adults may also be unable to remember abusive experiences or may have false memories  
48  
49 of maltreatment, or they may falsely deny remembering abuse (London et al., 2008). Second,  
50  
51 adults may reinterpret their experiences and the possible motives for keeping the abuse secret  
52  
53 in their childhood (Malloy, Brubacher & Lamb, 2011). Therefore, population-based child  
54  
55 victim surveys are relevant in exploring reasons behind non-disclosure (Lahtinen et al., 2018).  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Only a few surveys have explored CPA disclosure among population-based samples of  
4 adolescents or children. In a Swedish population-based sample, 52 percent of the adolescents  
5 who reported severe CPA experiences had disclosed the abuse, most of them to peers but only  
6 a few to professionals. According to Jernbro et al. (2017), a lack of trust in adults was reported  
7 to be the most significant reason for not disclosing CPA. Additional freely formulated answers  
8 by the adolescents also revealed that they often perceived the response of professionals to be  
9 ineffective (Jernbro et al., 2017).

10  
11  
12 In our previous study (2018), we studied CSA disclosure in a population-based sample of  
13 children (12-15-year-olds) in Finland. We found a CSA disclosure rate to be as high as 80%,  
14 indicating that most of the children disclosed CSA to someone. However, in line with previous  
15 research (e.g. Priebe & Svedin, 2008; Kogan, 2004; Helweg-Larsen & Larsen, 2006; Bottoms  
16 et al., 2016), our analysis suggested that children rarely disclosed to adults (26%). Disclosures  
17 to authorities were even more uncommon (12%). Nearly half (48%) of the children had  
18 disclosed to a friend. Mothers were the most frequent disclosure recipients (20%) followed by  
19 fathers (12%). The most frequent reason for non-disclosure was that the experience was not  
20 considered serious enough to tell anyone. Multivariate analyses showed that the age of the  
21 perpetrator and the victim at the time of abuse, as well as experiences of emotional abuse by  
22 the mother, were the factors in the sample associated with disclosing to an adult (Lahtinen et  
23 al., 2018).

### 24 25 26 **Aims of the present study**

27  
28 The overall aim of the present study is to contribute to the scientific literature on CPA  
29 disclosure by exploring the disclosure rates and factors associated with disclosure in a large  
30 population-based sample of children, the Finnish Child Victim Survey (FCVS). The focus of  
31 this study is specifically on factors associated with disclosing CPA to adults (parents and/or  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

professionals), since adults tend to serve as intermediaries who control access to treatment and investigation processes (Tashjian et al., 2016). Examining disclosure as part of the national Child Victim Survey enabled us to examine how much CPA is hidden from adult society and to consider a wide variety of factors (including other forms of abuse experienced) that possibly influence the tendency to disclose CPA to adults.

Since the study is based on the same data used in our previous analysis of CSA disclosure (Lahtinen et al., 2018), the CSA disclosure rates will also be compared to the CPA disclosure rates. However, in this comparison, only previously published information about the CSA disclosure rates is used, without new statistical analyses. It was expected that the CPA disclosure rates would be comparable to the rates reported in other representative studies of CPA experiences with samples of adolescents or young adults (Jernbro et al., 2017; Annerbäck et al., 2010; Lev-Wiesel & First, 2018).

## Method

### Participants

This study utilized data from the FCVS 2013. A stratified cluster sampling method based on county, type of municipality, and school size was used to obtain a nationally representative sample for the study. In all, 11,364 sixth and ninth graders from 483 schools in Finland responded to the survey. Of these, 55% were sixth graders (mainly 12-13-year-olds) and 45% ninth graders (mainly 14-15-year-olds). The gender distribution in the data was equal (Lahtinen et al., 2018). The response rate was 75%. Some of the schools ( $n = 142$ ) canceled or ignored the survey, despite having originally stated that they would participate (625 schools originally accepted the invitation to participate). The most frequent reason reported for not participating was a lack of computers. The representativeness of the final data was ensured by crosschecking

1  
2  
3 the distributions of gender, parental unemployment, parental education, and family structure  
4 compared to other representative youth surveys in Finland. Apart from a minor over-  
5 representation of children with highly educated parents, no systematic differences were found  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 (Fagerlund, Peltola, Kääriäinen, Ellonen, & Sariola, 2014; Lahtinen et al., 2018).

### 13 **Measures**

16 FCVS 2013 included a wide variety of questions related to different types of violence, such as  
17 violence in the home, street violence, cyber victimization, and sexual abuse, and reporting of  
18 these experiences to authorities, friends, or family members (for further details, see Ellonen,  
19 Kääriäinen, Salmi, & Sariola, 2008; Fagerlund et al., 2014). Most of the questions covered in  
20 the survey were based on Finnish modifications of well-known research instruments, such as  
21 the Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire (Finkelhor, 2007, 2008; Finkelhor, Ormrod, &  
22 Turner, 2007a, b, c), and the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, &  
23 Sugarman, 1994). The data were collected during the fall of 2013 by the Police University  
24 College in Finland. The participants responded to the questions via web-based questionnaires  
25 during school hours. Anonymity was guaranteed, and participation in the survey was voluntary.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
The survey was introduced by teachers who were closely instructed by the research team. The  
children accessed the questionnaire via a website that included information about the research  
project and violence in general. The mean time used to take the survey was 29 minutes.

CPA in this study was defined as agreeing with the question: “Have you been hit or attacked  
in the past 12 months.” All these types of acts are considered criminal according to the Finnish  
Penal Code. Since the scope of the study was to investigate the disclosure of adult-committed  
CPA, experiences among younger peers were excluded. Only experiences in which the  
perpetrator was at least 15 years of age (minimum age of criminal responsibility in Finland)  
were included in the analyses. The definition of CPA differs from many previous studies that



1  
2  
3 have focused solely on experiences of violence committed by caregivers (Jernbro et al., 2017;  
4 Hershkowitz et al., 2005; Lev-Wiesel & First, 2018).  
5  
6  
7

8  
9 Participants were also asked questions about the perpetrator (age, gender, nationality, who they  
10 were, if they were under the influence of alcohol [no/yes, a little, they were drunk or otherwise  
11 intoxicated, I don't know]), physical injuries (if injured, the type of injury: a small bruise, a  
12 scrape or cut, a large bruise, a major cut or black eye, sprain, broken bone or teeth, internal  
13 injuries, lost consciousness, other – specify), the number of times violence was experienced in  
14 the past 12 months, earlier experiences of violence (yes/no), the type of violence (pushed,  
15 shaken, slapped/kicked, hit with a fist or with an object, threatened with violence, thrown  
16 against furniture or a wall or down stairs, choked, assaulted with a knife or a gun, something  
17 else – specify), possible use of a weapon (stick, stone, knife, other – specify), if they visited a  
18 doctor/hospital (yes/no), and if the child was under the influence of alcohol or other substances  
19 when they were abused (no/yes, a little, I was drunk or otherwise intoxicated).  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34  
35 Corresponding to most of the survey studies (e.g., Priebe & Svedin, 2008; Helweg-Larsen &  
36 Larsen, 2006; Bottoms et al., 2016; Jernbro et al., 2017; London et al., 2008 review) on  
37 CSA/CPA experiences and disclosure, disclosure in the present study refers to telling someone  
38 about the CPA experience prior to completing the survey. This was measured by asking: “Think  
39 about the most serious incident in the past 12 months when you were hurt or were threatened  
40 to be hurt. Have you told anyone about the most serious incident? You can choose any one or  
41 more of the following options, if they apply.” The options were: mother, father, sister or  
42 brother, friend, teacher, police, school nurse, school counselor, social worker, nobody,  
43 someone else (specify who). The children who answered “nobody” were considered non-  
44 disclosers.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The non-disclosing CPA victims were also asked to select possible motives for the non-  
4 disclosure from six different choices (“I did not think it was so serious,” “I did not have the  
5 courage to tell,” “I did not believe that anyone would be interested,” “I did not believe that  
6 disclosure would help me,” “I was too ashamed to disclose,” and “Some other reason [specify  
7 what].” Gender, age, family structure, parents’ socio-economic status, and immigrant status  
8 were measured as background variables (for more details, see Fagerlund et al., 2014; Fagerlund  
9 & Ellonen, 2016).

### 20 **Ethical considerations**

21  
22  
23 This study followed the Finnish research ethics guidelines in social research. Parental consent  
24 for children to participate in the study was not required. According to the Finnish Constitution,  
25 hearing children is a priority, and Finland is also committed to following the United Nations  
26 Convention on the Rights of the Child, one of the core principles of which is the right to  
27 participate. Therefore, parental approval for children’s participation is necessary only in  
28 medical research. Furthermore, the Ombudsman for Children in Finland has published a  
29 statement (2012) declaring that sixth and ninth graders can decide for themselves whether they  
30 want to take part in a study or not. Thus, parents were not informed about the study until it had  
31 been completed, with one exception: in the capital city, Helsinki. Authorities in the city  
32 required that parents could exclude their children from such a study. For a more detailed  
33 reflection on the ethical issues related to conducting the FCVS, see Ellonen and Pösö (2011a,  
34 b) and Fagerlund and Ellonen (2016).

### 51 **Statistical analyses**

52  
53  
54 The analyses in this study focus on the subsample of 464 children and adolescents who reported  
55 being hit or attacked during the past 12 months and a perpetrator who was at least 15 years old.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The 127 cases in which the age of the perpetrator was unknown (the participant had either left  
4 the question unanswered [n = 66] or answered “I do not know” [n = 61]) were excluded from  
5 the sample. In addition, along with the cases where the age of the perpetrator could not be  
6 assessed, all the cases (685) in which the perpetrator was under 15 years of age were excluded.  
7  
8 First, a series of Chi-square tests was performed to examine potential variables associated with  
9 disclosure to at least one adult (mother, father, teacher, police, school nurse, school counselor,  
10 and/or social worker) compared to non-disclosure or disclosure only to peers. Logistic  
11 regression analyses (method enter) were performed to examine which of the variables predicted  
12 disclosure of CPA to adults when the influence of other variables was controlled. All data were  
13 analyzed using IBM SPSS for Windows version 25.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

## 27 **Results**

28  
29  
30 Among the total sample of 11,364 children, the prevalence of CPA was 4.1% (n = 464). Most  
31 of the children who reported CPA experiences were ninth graders (81%, n = 374). The gender  
32 distribution of the victims was almost equal, with 52% (n = 240) girls. Approximately half of  
33 the children (49%, n = 229) reported having experienced CPA more than once during the past  
34 12 months (number of incidents M = 6.4, SD = 28.4, Mdn = 2), and 65% (n = 302) of the  
35 children reported experiences of CPA before that. Most often, they reported being pushed,  
36 shaken, or slapped (55%, n = 254). Being kicked, hit with a fist or with an object (32%, n =  
37 147), or being threatened with violence (25%, n = 117) were also quite common. More serious  
38 forms of abuse, such as being thrown against furniture or a wall or down the stairs (12%, n =  
39 54), or being choked, or assaulted with a knife or a gun (7%, n = 33), were less reported.  
40  
41 Seventeen percent (n = 80) of the victims selected the response option “something else,”  
42 typically specified as hitting (mentioned 11 times) or hair pulling (mentioned 9 times). Thirteen  
43 percent (n = 57) of the children reporting CPA experiences also reported CSA experiences, and  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 45% (n = 208) of these respondents reported experiences of both CSA and emotional abuse by  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

45% (n = 208) of these respondents reported experiences of both CSA and emotional abuse by parents. They were all included in the further analyses.

Thirty one percent (n = 145) of the CPA victims had been injured because of the incident. The most prevalent injury was a small bruise, scrape, or cut (19%, n = 87). A large bruise, major cut, or a black eye was reported in 14% (n = 66) of the cases. Serious injuries, such as broken bones/teeth, sprains or internal injuries, or losing consciousness, were rarely reported (by less than 9% [n = 40] of the CPA victims).

In most of the cases (75%, n = 344), the perpetrator was a male aged 15-17 years (61%, n = 284) or over 25 years old (30%, n = 137). The most common perpetrator was a friend or acquaintance (30%, n = 137). In 22% (n = 102) of the cases, the perpetrator was a parent or their spouse (parental CPA in further analyses). Mothers (n = 40) were perpetrators almost as often as fathers (n = 43), and the father's spouse (n = 8) was the offender almost as often as the mother's spouse (n = 11). A minority of the victims (16%, n = 72) reported that the perpetrator was a sibling or a half sibling, and 13% (n = 62) of the victims reported that the perpetrator was unknown to them. A dating partner or ex-dating partner was rarely the perpetrator (5%, n = 22) in this sample.

### **Disclosure rate and recipients of disclosure**

The overall disclosure rate of CPA in the sample was 74%. However, less than half of the children (42%) disclosed to at least one adult (mother, father, teacher, police, school nurse, school counselor, social worker), and only twelve percent disclosed to at least one of the professionals named in Table 1. Parental CPA disclosure was analyzed separately. However, the Chi-square tests showed no significant differences in the rates of overall disclosure or disclosure to adults compared to CPA by other perpetrators. As Table 1 illustrates, differences

1  
2  
3 were found only regarding disclosing to a father, school counselor, or social worker. Parental  
4 CPA was disclosed less to fathers, whereas it was disclosed to school counselors and social  
5 workers more often than CPA by other perpetrators. The Chi-square tests indicated that sixth  
6 graders disclosed to adults more often than ninth graders ( $\chi^2(1) = 19.12, p < 0.001$ ). As Table  
7 1 shows, sixth graders also disclosed to their mothers more often than ninth graders ( $\chi^2(1) =$   
8 14.18,  $p < 0.001$ ) and less often to friends ( $\chi^2(1) = 5.84, p < 0.05$ ). An analysis of gender  
9 differences in disclosure revealed that girls disclosed to adults significantly ( $\chi^2(1) = 5.68, p <$   
10 0.05) more often than boys, and that girls also tended to disclose more to friends ( $\chi^2(1) = 8.63,$   
11  $p < 0.01$ ). Table 1 also illustrates that disclosure to authorities was rare.

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Children who reported that they had not disclosed to anyone ( $n = 120$ ) responded to the  
question of why they had not disclosed by choosing one of the given options. The most popular  
reason for non-disclosure was considering that the experience was not serious enough (53%,  $n$   
= 62). The remaining responses were distributed between the other options: “I did not believe  
that disclosure would help me” (20%,  $n = 23$ ), “I did not believe that anyone would be  
interested” (11%,  $n = 13$ ), “I was too ashamed to disclose” (4%,  $n = 5$ ), and “I did not have the  
courage to tell” (3%,  $n = 4$ ). Nine percent of the children ( $n = 11$ ) reported having some other  
reason not to disclose (such as “I did not want to” or “it was only a joke”).

### **Relationship to parents and situational factors**

An analysis of other variables using Chi-square tests showed that, in addition to the  
demographic factors reported above (gender and grade level at school), some situational and  
child–parent relationship factors were associated with disclosing CPA to an adult instead of  
not disclosing or disclosing to peers only. Table 2 shows the results of a series of Chi-square  
tests performed to examine each relationship. Two situational factors were significantly  
associated with disclosure to an adult: children who were not using alcohol or drugs at the time

1  
2  
3 of the incident and who had no previous experiences of violence disclosed to adults more often  
4 than children who used alcohol or drugs and who had previous experiences of violence.  
5  
6 Furthermore, three child–parent relationship factors were significantly related to disclosing to  
7 adults: 1) if the parents knew who the child spends their spare time with, 2) if the child felt they  
8 were able to talk with their parents about what happens in their life, and 3) if the child did not  
9 see their parents drunk often (maximum a couple of times a year). All these circumstances were  
10 associated with the child being more likely to disclose to adults instead of not disclosing at all  
11 or disclosing to peers only.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 No statistically significant relations between disclosing to an adult and measured offence-  
23 related variables (such as severity of CPA, use of a weapon, or sustaining injuries) were found.  
24 Neither were significant associations found between disclosure to adults and individual  
25 background characteristics (such as experiences of other forms of abuse, such as sexual or  
26 emotional abuse by parents; divorced parents; parental education; socio-economic status; or  
27 cultural background). Perpetrator-related factors, such as the perpetrator being a  
28 caregiver/parent, and the perpetrator’s age or closeness to the victim, were also tested.  
29 However, no statistically significant associations were found. Analyses of factors associated  
30 with parental CPA disclosure to adults are not presented here separately, as the findings were  
31 similar to the findings of disclosing CPA outside the home environment.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

#### 46 **Multivariate prediction of disclosing CPA to an adult**

47  
48

49 Logistic regression analyses were performed for the variables significantly associated with  
50 disclosure to an adult in order to examine whether they individually predicted disclosure of  
51 CPA experiences to an adult when the influence of other variables was controlled. Table 3  
52 presents the results of logistic regression analyses (method enter). The first model includes  
53 only the demographic variables. Both gender and grade level were found to be significant in  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 predicting disclosure to an adult. The model correctly classified 63.3% of the cases. However,  
4  
5 as the Nagelkerke  $R^2$  value (.067) indicates, this model explains only a small amount of the  
6  
7 variation in disclosure to adults. The second model introduces situational variables as  
8  
9 predictors. These variables improved the model, and all the variables remained significant,  
10  
11 correctly classifying 63.3% of the cases. Nevertheless, the variance explained was still  
12  
13 relatively low (Nagelkerke  $R^2 = .102$ ). After entering the child–parent relationship variables as  
14  
15 predictors in the final model, the Nagelkerke  $R^2$  value improved (.180), and the proportion of  
16  
17 correctly classified cases increased to 65.1%. Demographic variables were found to be  
18  
19 significant predictors of disclosure in the final model: girls and sixth graders were more likely  
20  
21 to disclose to an adult than boys and ninth graders. If parents were aware of who their child  
22  
23 was spending their spare time with, it was more likely that the child would disclose to an adult.  
24  
25 In contrast, having earlier experiences of CPA decreased the likelihood of disclosure to an  
26  
27 adult.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 Since gender differences were found in disclosure to adults, we also tested separate logistic  
35  
36 regression analyses for boys and girls. However, no significant models predicting disclosure to  
37  
38 adults were found.  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 Discussion

44  
45  
46 The present study focused on exploring characteristics of CPA disclosures in a large,  
47  
48 population-based sample of children. The overall CPA disclosure rate in the present study was  
49  
50 74%, indicating that most of the children disclosed CPA to someone. However, further analyses  
51  
52 revealed that fewer than half of the CPA victims (42%) disclosed to adults, and that disclosure  
53  
54 to professionals was even rarer (12%). The most common self-reported reason for non-  
55  
56 disclosure was that the experience was not evaluated as sufficiently serious to tell anyone about  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 it. While these findings were largely in line with the CSA disclosure rates in our previous study,  
4  
5 multivariate analyses indicated that the factors predicting disclosure to an adult were rather  
6  
7 different in CPA compared CSA. The strongest factors predicting CPA disclosure to an adult  
8  
9 were younger age (sixth grade level at school compared to ninth grade), female gender, and  
10  
11 parents being aware of who the child spends their spare time with. In contrast, previous  
12  
13 experiences of CPA significantly decreased the likelihood of disclosure to an adult. Findings  
14  
15 are discussed below in detail and compared to previously published findings on CSA disclosure  
16  
17 from the same data.  
18  
19  
20  
21

### 22 **CPA disclosure rate and recipients of disclosure**

23  
24  
25 As hypothesized, the overall disclosure rate of 74% is consistent with rates reported by  
26  
27 retrospective surveys with samples of young adults (varying between 61% and 73%) (Jernbro  
28  
29 et al., 2017). However, the disclosure rate was slightly higher than the 52% rate discovered in  
30  
31 another representative Scandinavian study exploring the CPA experiences of adolescents  
32  
33 (Jernbro et al., 2017). The finding that only a minority of the children with CPA experiences  
34  
35 reported disclosure to professionals and the relatively low disclosure rate to adult recipients  
36  
37 overall are in line with previous research (Jernbro et al., 2017; Annerbäck, 2010; Bottoms et  
38  
39 al., 2016). Previous studies of CPA disclosure (Jernbro et al., 2017; Annerbäck et al., 2010;  
40  
41 Bottoms et al., 2016) have reported that peers are clearly the most frequent choice as a  
42  
43 disclosure recipient among adolescents and young adults. The most popular disclosure recipient  
44  
45 in the present study was the child's mother (36%), closely followed by disclosure to a friend  
46  
47 (33%). This slight difference might be explained by the fact that the present study also includes  
48  
49 children as young as 11 years old, whereas participants in previous studies were older.  
50  
51 Compared to CSA disclosures in this same population-based sample of children (Lahtinen et  
52  
53 al., 2018), it appears that disclosing CSA to adults may be more difficult than disclosing CPA.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Children most frequently disclosed CSA to a friend (48%), and CSA disclosure to adults was  
4 even more uncommon (26%) than CPA disclosure in the present study (42%). Regardless of  
5 the form of abuse, the low disclosure rates to adults create the risk that the abuse will continue  
6 for years and may take on more serious forms. In addition, without adult involvement, children  
7 are unlikely to obtain professional support (e.g. psychotherapy) or legal assistance (Bottoms et  
8 al., 2016; Pipe et al., 2007).  
9

10  
11 Interestingly, separate analyses comparing parental CPA disclosure to disclosure of CPA  
12 outside the home environment showed no differences except for more frequent disclosures to  
13 social workers and school counselors and fewer disclosures to fathers. It is to be noted that in  
14 intrafamilial CPA cases, the mothers were reported to be perpetrators as often as the fathers.  
15 The fact that social workers and school counselors were more often disclosed to in cases of  
16 parental CPA compared to CPA outside the home is understandable but also promising, since  
17 it signals that the professionals whose task it is to help children with difficulties at home are  
18 being trusted by the children. Also, it increases the opportunities for these children and their  
19 families to get help. However, the number of disclosures to social workers (8%) and school  
20 counselors (7%) was still the tip of the iceberg of total cases of parental CPA.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 The current results showed that many children considered their experiences of violence not to  
42 be serious enough to report, which is worrying. In line with the previously reported findings  
43 from the CSA sample from the same data (Lahtinen et al., 2018), the most common self-  
44 reported reason for non-disclosure of CPA was that the experience of physical abuse was not  
45 considered sufficiently serious to report to anyone. The present finding can be related to  
46 children who do not recognize their experiences as abusive (at least in less serious cases) or  
47 who define some of the abusive acts as a normal part of everyday life. In line with these  
48 findings, a recent retrospective study comparing CSA and CPA disclosures (McGuire &  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 London, 2020) reported that not realizing the experience was abusive when it occurred was the  
4 most common reason for non-disclosure. In addition, reviews of qualitative CSA disclosure  
5 studies (Reitsema & Greitens, 2016; Brennan & McElvaney, 2020) have recurrently reported  
6 that one of the most important facilitators of disclosure is understanding that what happened  
7 was abusive. Owing to the paucity of surveys that investigate children's self-reports of reasons  
8 for non-disclosure of CPA (Jernbro et al., 2017), this is a significant theme that should be  
9 explored further in future research.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 Another worrying finding was the fact that many adolescents with CPA experiences reported  
21 a distrust toward adults. In line with the findings by Jernbro and colleagues (2017), the children  
22 in the present study also reported a lack of trust in adults by responding: "I did not believe that  
23 disclosing would help me" (20%), or "I did not believe that anyone would be interested" (11%).  
24 Similar results were also found regarding CSA disclosures (Lahtinen et al., 2018), suggesting  
25 that the lack of a trusted friend/adult seems to be a common factor affecting the likelihood of  
26 disclosing different forms of abuse. McGuire and London (2020) reported that, both in CSA  
27 and CPA cases, adults reported having a trusted friend as the most popular reason for  
28 disclosure. However, differences have also been found. In the present study, only a minority  
29 of the respondents reported lacking the courage to tell someone (3%) or being ashamed (4%)  
30 as reasons for non-disclosure. Non-disclosers of CSA gave these reasons more often  
31 (corresponding percentages are 14% and 10%, see Lahtinen et al., 2018) than non-disclosers  
32 of CPA in the present study. This suggests that adolescents may experience CSA as, to some  
33 extent, more intimate and shameful than CPA.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

### 53 **Characteristics associated with disclosure to adults**

54

55  
56 The present study focused specifically on factors associated with disclosing CPA to adults.  
57 This perspective was chosen because adults can take responsibility for ensuring that the child  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 receives proper support, and they can also report to authorities, such as child protection services  
4 and/or the police (Tashjian et al., 2016). The multivariate analyses showed that girls and  
5  
6 and/or the police (Tashjian et al., 2016). The multivariate analyses showed that girls and  
7  
8 younger children tend to disclose to adults more often than boys and older children, even when  
9  
10 the effect of other variables is controlled. In contrast, adolescents preferred to disclose to  
11  
12 friends significantly more often than younger children. This is in line with findings on CSA  
13  
14 disclosures using the same data, suggesting that a younger age at the time of the incident  
15  
16 increases the likelihood of disclosing to adults (Lahtinen et al., 2018), and it is also in line with  
17  
18 some earlier CSA disclosure studies (London et al., 2007; Kogan, 2004). As research in the  
19  
20 field of developmental psychology (Arnett & Hughes, 2012) shows, peers are generally the  
21  
22 primary reference group with whom teenagers are likely to share their thoughts and experiences  
23  
24 with. Thus, it is anticipated that peers may be favored as disclosure recipients in the context of  
25  
26 abuse experiences, as well.  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 The finding that girls disclosed to adults more often than boys is in line with previous research  
32  
33 on CPA disclosure (Jernbro et al., 2017), and with several studies on CSA or multiple forms of  
34  
35 abuse and disclosure (see e.g. Okur, van der Knaap, & Bogaerts, 2017; Lev-Wiesel & First,  
36  
37 2018), suggesting that gender differences may not be specific to CSA, and that boys as victims  
38  
39 of abuse may need more support for to disclose as compared to girls. Even if different patterns  
40  
41 of disclosure to adults in separate analyses for boys and girls were not found in the present  
42  
43 study, within larger groups, differences may occur. Consequently, more research is needed  
44  
45 before definite conclusions can be drawn. Recent research (Okur et al., 2017) suggests that  
46  
47 there are gender differences in the reasons for not disclosing CSA.  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 In addition to demographic factors, situational and child–parent relationship factors were  
53  
54 associated with disclosing CPA to an adult, compared to not disclosing at all or disclosing to  
55  
56 peers only. The finding that previous experiences of violence decrease the likelihood of  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 disclosure to adults is consistent with a recent population-based study of adolescents in Israel,  
4 which found that multiple exposures to maltreatment, in conjunction with high emotional  
5 reactions, are associated with greater reluctance to disclose (Lev-Wiesel et al., 2019). Contrary  
6 to the findings of the present study and Lev-Wiesel et al. (2019), Bottoms and colleagues  
7 (2016) have found that both CPA and CSA victims are more likely to disclose the abuse if they  
8 are more frequently abused, worried about being injured, and emotionally upset at the time of  
9 abuse. In the present study, sustaining injuries was not associated with disclosure (being  
10 emotionally upset was not measured). However, it should be noted that results are not easily  
11 comparable. The study by Bottoms and colleagues (2016) is a retrospective survey for adults,  
12 and it only includes female participants. Adults responding retrospectively can add the  
13 understanding of hindsight to their experiences; for instance, an awareness of the risk of being  
14 injured might have evolved later. The present study (as well as Lev-Wiesel et al., 2019), in  
15 contrast, is a survey for children, both girls and boys. It is possible that, at the time of the  
16 survey, the children in the present study had not yet reached the point at which the urge to  
17 disclose is stronger than the reluctance to disclose. As qualitative research on CPA disclosure  
18 (e.g. Alaggia, 2019; Foster & Hagedorn, 2014; Thulin, Kjellgren, & Nilsson, 2019) has  
19 suggested, disclosure is often a process that includes several judgments by the child. In  
20 addition, the missing association between sustaining injuries and disclosure can be explained  
21 by the fact that children may see the severity of abuse differently compared to adults. Whereas  
22 adults may think that injuries are a sign of severe abuse, children and adolescents may have  
23 other criteria for defining abuse as severe. As the present study showed, children and  
24 adolescents do not always recognize abuse. This is in line with the findings on CSA disclosure  
25 utilizing the same data (Lahtinen et al., 2018). Two abuse-related variables measuring the  
26 severity of the CSA experience (*ibid.*) were associated with disclosures to an adult in the  
27 bivariate analyses, namely, the perpetrator's use of violence and the use of force, intimidation,  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 or blackmail. Nevertheless, other variables measuring severity, such as an experience including  
4 penetration, the frequency of the CSA, or the perpetrator using bribery, were not related to  
5 disclosing to adults. This underlines the need for further studies on abuse severity and how it  
6 may be associated with disclosure.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

12  
13 Many researchers (see e.g. Ellonen & Salmi, 2011; Finkelhor et al., 2007a, c) have criticized  
14 the fragmented way in which child abuse in general has been studied and how the connection  
15 between poly-victimization and its influences has been consequently neglected. Recent studies  
16 (Lev-Wiesel et al., 2019; Jernbro et al., 2017) have also found that experiences of multiple  
17 forms of abuse are related to reluctance to disclose abuse and a distrust of adults. In the present  
18 study, 13% of CPA victims also had experiences of CSA, and 45% of them had also  
19 experienced emotional abuse by their parents. However, no associations between experiences  
20 of multiple forms of abuse and disclosing CPA to adults were found. In contrast, in the same  
21 data, experiences of emotional abuse by the mother decreased the likelihood to disclose CSA  
22 to adults (Lahtinen et al., 2018). This difference may be explained by the fact that the gender  
23 distribution was different in these samples of children. CSA experiences were mostly reported  
24 by girls (79%), whereas CPA experiences were reported almost equally often by boys and girls.  
25 This may also affect other differences observed in disclosing CSA and CPA.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 In addition to earlier experiences of CPA, child–parent relationship factors were associated  
45 with disclosing CPA to an adult. The strongest of these factors was parental awareness of who  
46 their child spends their spare time with. This is probably a reflection of an adequate relationship  
47 between a child and a parent: parents are available to help and provide support when needed.  
48 Bivariate level analyses showed that the experience of being able to talk with parents and not  
49 seeing them drunk may also increase the likelihood of a child disclosing to adults. These  
50 findings are not surprising in consideration of the fact that the children in this sample most  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 often preferred to disclose to their parents instead of any other adults. If the parents are not  
4 interested in their child's life, and/or they are not the ones the child feels they can talk to, and/or  
5 the parents drink a lot, it can be difficult for the child to trust adults in general. This conclusion  
6 is supported by the finding of Priebe and Svedin (2008), who concluded that children who  
7 perceived their parents as caring (but not overprotective) were more likely to disclose CSA. In  
8 addition, Tashjian and colleagues (2016), among others, have suggested that maltreated  
9 children are more likely to be insecurely attached, which is associated with difficulties in  
10 trusting parental figures to provide safety in times of stress. Lastly, it can be hypothesized that  
11 children with unengaged parents may be less well informed about abusive behavior and how  
12 to protect themselves from it. Instead, a safe, stable, and nurturing relationship with parents is  
13 known to be a significant protective factor against child abuse (see e.g. Jaffee et al., 2013;  
14 Schultz et al., 2013).

### 31 **Strengths and limitations**

32  
33  
34 This study has some limitations. First, there is the possibility of both under- and over-reporting  
35 of CPA experiences. Nevertheless, in large samples such as this, the influence of these biases  
36 has been found to be small, even if these biases cannot be neglected (Ellis, Hartley, & Walsh,  
37 2010). In addition, computerized questionnaires, such as the one used in the present study, have  
38 been found to increase confidentiality while also improving the accuracy of responses  
39 (Helweg-Larsen & Larsen, 2006). Second, the model developed in the present study only  
40 explains a limited amount of the variance in factors predicting disclosure to adults, which  
41 suggests that more research is needed to increase our knowledge of factors influencing  
42 disclosure. There is also the risk of excluding potentially significant factors, since some of the  
43 background information was collected using a single question. This risk can increase when the  
44 focus is only on the most serious cases within a limited time frame, which is reflected in the  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 question about the most serious incident in the past 12 months. It is possible that the  
4 respondents had disclosed other incidents of CPA but not the most serious one. Finally, the  
5 number of observations for some variables, such as CSA experiences, ethnic background, and  
6 self-reported mental health problems, was so low in this sample that the power of statistical  
7 analyses to detect any differences may be weakened. It should be noted that children  
8 participating in special education (known to be a high-risk group for abuse, see e.g.  
9 Hershkowitz, Lamb, & Horowitz, 2007) were not included in this study. Thus, the findings  
10 herein may not be descriptive of disclosure factors among more vulnerable groups of children,  
11 and more research is needed. More research is also needed on possible delays in disclosure and  
12 the number of children who refuse to disclose, even if they are asked about their CPA  
13 experience. The FCVS did not include inquiries into these themes.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 Despite the limitations of the present study, the findings contribute to a broader understanding  
30 of CPA disclosures and, in particular, the possible characteristics related to disclosure to adults.  
31 In the field of CPA (and CSA) disclosure research, only a few previous studies have used  
32 population-based samples, and many of those surveys were retrospective. The present study  
33 examined disclosure as part of the FCVS, which enabled taking a wide variety of factors into  
34 consideration. This sample also allowed access to children who had not disclosed to anyone  
35 before the survey. Furthermore, not requiring parental consent and ensuring anonymous  
36 responses probably enabled children to provide more honest answers and minimized the risk  
37 of missing participants who had experience of CPA. Compared to retrospective studies, the  
38 present study had the advantage of entailing a reduced risk of memory bias and avoiding adult  
39 reinterpretation of experiences, since the participants were children (mainly twelve- and  
40 fifteen-year-olds).  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

## 58 **Conclusions and implications**

59  
60

1  
2  
3 As studies examining CPA disclosures are few, and studies with nationally representative  
4 samples are almost non-existent (Jernbro et al., 2017), the need for further research on the  
5 subject is obvious. This study contributed to research on CPA disclosure by offering a  
6 population-based estimate of CPA disclosure rates and a model that explains some of the  
7 variation in disclosure to adults. Studying disclosure as part of the FCVS also enabled the  
8 analysis of differences and similarities in disclosing CSA and CPA. The finding that children  
9 may not recognize their experiences as abusive regardless of the form of abuse, highlights the  
10 importance of exploring how children define CPA and CSA, as well as their attitudes toward  
11 violence, in future studies. The findings also indicate that safety education and teaching about  
12 children's rights at school are necessary to encourage children and adolescents to disclose  
13 abuse to adults, and especially to professionals. As earlier studies (e.g. Thulin et al. 2019;  
14 Reitsema & Grietens, 2016; Brennan & McElvaney, 2020; Jensen et al., 2005) have shown,  
15 disclosures of both CPA and CSA are often facilitated by addressing the topic at school or  
16 watching a TV program dealing with abuse. In addition, if the recipients of disclosure are peers  
17 (as they often are), they are probably faced with a moral dilemma of not disclosing confidential  
18 information and need guidance on how to report to a trusted adult (McGuire & London, 2020).  
19 Experiences of CPA and other forms of abuse remain largely hidden from adult society  
20 otherwise, and the potential to intervene in abuse will be limited.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

## 48 **References**

49  
50  
51 Affifi, T.O., Ford, D., Gershoff, E.T., Merrick, M., Grogan- Kaylor, A., Ports, K.A.,  
52 MacMillan, H.L., Holden, G.W., Taylor, C.A., Lee, S.J., & Bennet, R.B. (2017). Spanking and  
53 adult mental health impairment: The case for the designation of spanking as an adverse  
54 childhood experience. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 71, 24–31. doi: 10.1016/j.chiabu.2017.01.014  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Alaggia R, Collin-Vézina D, Lateef R. (2019). Facilitators and barriers to child sexual abuse  
4 (CSA) disclosures: A research update (2000–2016). *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, 20, 260–283.  
5 doi:10.1177/1524838017697312  
6  
7

8  
9 Anderson, J., Martin, J., Mullen, P., Romans, S., & Herbison, P. (1993). Prevalence of  
10 childhood sexual abuse experiences in a community sample of women. *Journal of the*  
11 *American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 32, 911–919. doi:10.1097/00004583-  
12 199309000-00004  
13  
14  
15

16  
17 Annerbäck, E-M, Wingren, G., Svedin, C.G, & Gustafsson, P.A. (2010). Prevalence and  
18 characteristics of child physical abuse in Sweden -findings from a population-based youth  
19 survey. *Acta Paediatrica*, 99 (8), 1229-1236. doi: 10.1111/j.1651-2227.2010.01792.x  
20  
21  
22

23 Arnett, J.F., & Hughes, M. (2012). *Adolescence and emerging adulthood: a cultural approach*.  
24 Essex: Pearson.  
25

26  
27 Azzopardi, C., Eirich, R., Rash, C.L., MacDonald, S., & Madigan, S. (2019). A meta-analysis  
28 of the prevalence of child sexual abuse disclosure in forensic settings. *Child Abuse & Neglect*,  
29 93, 291–304. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2018.11.020  
30  
31  
32

33 Brennan, E., & McElvaney, R. (2020). What Helps Children Tell? A Qualitative Meta-Analysis  
34 of Child Sexual Abuse Disclosure. *Child Abuse Review*, 29, online. doi: 10.1002/car.2617  
35  
36

37 Browne, A., & Finkelhor, D. (1986). Impact of child sexual abuse: A review of the research.  
38 *Psychological Bulletin*, 99, 66–77. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.99.1.66  
39  
40

41 Bottoms, B.L., Rudnicki, A.G., & Epstein, M.A. (2007). A retrospective study of factors  
42 affecting the disclosure of childhood sexual and physical abuse. In Pipe, M.E., Lamb, M.,  
43 Orbach, Y., & Cederborg, A.-C. (Eds.), *Child Sexual Abuse: Disclosure, Delay, and Denial*  
44 (175–194). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 Bottoms, B.L., Peter-Hagene, L.C., Epstein, M.A., Wiley, T.R.A., Reynolds, C.E., & Rudnicki,  
50 A.G. (2016). Abuse characteristics and individual differences related to disclosing childhood  
51 sexual, physical, and emotional abuse and witnessed domestic violence. *Journal of*  
52 *Interpersonal Violence*, 31, 1308–1339. doi:10.1177/0886260514564155  
53  
54  
55

56  
57 Conte, J.R., & Berliner, L. (1988). *The impact of sexual abuse on children: Empirical findings*.  
58 New York, NY: Springer.  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Ellis, L., Hartley, R.D., & Walsh, A. (2010). *Research methods in criminal justice and*  
4 *criminology: an interdisciplinary approach*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

5  
6  
7 Ellonen, N., Kääriäinen, J., Salmi, V., & Sariola, H. (2008). Lasten ja nuorten  
8 väkivaltakokemukset. [Experiences of violence among children and adolescents]. Reports of  
9 Police College of Finland, no. 71 and The National Research Institute of Legal Policy 87.  
10  
11 Tampere: Police College of Finland.

12  
13  
14  
15 Ellonen, N., & Pösö, T. (2011a). Children's experiences of completing a computer-based  
16 violence survey: Ethical implications. *Children & Society*, 25(6), 470–481. doi:10.1111/j.1099-  
17 0860.2010.00292.x

18  
19  
20  
21 Ellonen, N., & Pösö, T. (2011b). Violence experiences in care: Some methodological remarks  
22 based on the Finnish Child Victim survey. *Child Abuse Review*, 20(3), 197–212.  
23 doi:10.1002/car.1181

24  
25  
26  
27 Ellonen, N., & Salmi, V. (2011). Poly-victimization as a life condition: correlates of poly-  
28 victimization among Finnish children. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and*  
29 *Crime Prevention*, 12, 20–44. doi: 10.1080/14043858.2011.561621

30  
31  
32  
33 Fagerlund, M., Peltola, M., Kääräinen, J., Ellonen, N., & Sariola, H. (2014). Lasten ja nuorten  
34 väkivaltakokemukset. [Experiences of violence among children and adolescents]. *Reports of*  
35 *Police College of Finland*, no. 110. Tampere: Juvenes Print.

36  
37  
38  
39 Fagerlund, M., & Ellonen, N. (2016). Children's experiences of completing a computer-based  
40 violence survey: Finnish Child Victim Survey revisited. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 25(5),  
41 556–576. doi: 10.1080/10538712.2016.1186769

42  
43  
44  
45 Finkelhor, D. (2007). Developmental victimology. The comprehensive study of childhood  
46 victimization. In: Davis R., Luigiro, A., & Herman, S. (Eds.), *Victims of Crime* (9–34).  
47 Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

48  
49  
50  
51 Finkelhor, D. (2008). *Childhood Victimization. Violence, Crime, and Abuse in the Lives of*  
52 *Young People*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

53  
54  
55  
56 Finkelhor D., Ormrod R., & Turner, H. (2007a). Polyvictimization and trauma in a national  
57 longitudinal cohort. *Development and Psychopathology* 19, 149–166.  
58 doi:10.1017/S0954579407070083

1  
2  
3 Finkelhor, D., Ormrod R., & Turner, H. (2007b). Re-victimization patterns in a national  
4 longitudinal sample of children and youth. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 31, 479–502.  
5 doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2006.03.012  
6  
7

8  
9 Finkelhor, D., Ormrod R., & Turner, H. (2007c). Poly-victimization: A neglected component  
10 in child victimization. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 31, 7–26. doi:/10.1016/j.chiabu.2006.06.008  
11  
12

13 Foynes, M., Freyd, J., & DePrince, A. (2009). Child abuse: Betrayal and disclosure. *Child*  
14 *Abuse & Neglect*, 33, 209–217. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2008.11.001  
15  
16

17  
18 *Countdown to universal prohibition: progress* (2019). Retrieved 25.10.2019 from Global  
19 Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children Web site:  
20 <https://endcorporalpunishment.org/countdown/>  
21  
22

23  
24 Helweg-Larsen, K., & Larsen, H.B. (2006). The prevalence of unwanted and unlawful sexual  
25 experiences reported by Danish adolescents: Results from a national youth survey in 2002.  
26 *Acta Paediatrica*, 95, 1270–1276. doi:10.1080/08035250600589033  
27  
28

29  
30 Hershkowitz, I., Horowitz, D., & Lamb, M.E. (2005). Trends in children's disclosure of abuse  
31 in Israel: A national study. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 29, 1203–1214.  
32 doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2005.04.008  
33  
34

35  
36 Hershkowitz, I., Lamb, M.E., & Horowitz, D. (2007). Victimization of children with  
37 disabilities. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 77, 629-35. doi: 10.1037/0002-  
38 9432.77.4.629  
39  
40

41  
42 Jaffee, S., Bowes, L., Quillet-Morin, I., Fisher, H., Moffit, T., Merrick, M., & Arseneault, L.  
43 (2013). Safe, stable, nurturing relationships break the intergenerational cycle of abuse: A  
44 prospective nationally representative cohort of children in the United Kingdom. *Journal of*  
45 *Adolescent Health*, 53, 4-10. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2013.04.007  
46  
47  
48

49  
50 Jensen, T. K., Gulbrandsen, W., Mossige, S., Reichelt, S., & Tjersland, O. A. (2005). Reporting  
51 possible sexual abuse: A qualitative study on children's perspectives and the context for  
52 disclosure. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 29, 1395–1413.  
53  
54

55  
56 Jernbro, C., Otterman, G., Lucas, S., Tindberg, Y., Janson, S. (2017). Disclosure of child  
57 physical abuse and perceived adult support among Swedish adolescents. *Child Abuse Review*,  
58 26, 451–464. doi: 10.1002/car.2443  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Kogan, S.M. (2004). Disclosing unwanted sexual experiences: Results from a national sample  
4 of adolescent women. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 28, 147–165. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2003.09.014  
5  
6  
7 Lahtinen, H-M., Laitila, A., Korkman, J., & Ellonen, N. (2018). Children’s disclosures of  
8 sexual abuse in a population-based sample. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 76, 84–94. doi:  
9 10.1016/j.chiabu.2017.10.011  
10  
11  
12  
13 Lev-Wiesel, R., Gottfried, R., Eisikovits, Z., & First, M. (2014). Factors affecting disclosure  
14 among Israeli children in residential care due to domestic violence. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 38,  
15 618–626. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2014.02.002  
16  
17  
18  
19 Lev-Wiesel, R., & First, M. (2018). Willingness to disclose child maltreatment: CSA vs other  
20 forms of child abuse in relation to gender. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 79, 183–191. doi:  
21 10.1016/j.chiabu.2018.02.010  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 Lev-Wiesel, R., First, M., Gottfried, R., & Eisikovits, Z. (2019). Reluctance versus urge to  
27 disclose child maltreatment. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 34, 3888–3914. doi:  
28 10.1177/0886260516672938  
29  
30  
31  
32 London, K., Bruck, M., Wright, D.B., & Ceci, S.J. (2008). Review of the contemporary  
33 literature on how children report abuse to others: Findings, methodological issues, and  
34 implications for forensic interviewers. *Memory*, 16(1), 29–47.  
35 doi:10.1080/09658210701725732  
36  
37  
38  
39 London, K., Bruck, M., Ceci, S.J., & Shuman, D.W. (2007). Disclosure of child sexual abuse:  
40 A review of the contemporary empirical literature. In Pipe, M.E. et al. (Eds.), *Child Sexual*  
41 *Abuse* (11–39).  
42  
43  
44  
45 Malloy, L.C., Brubacher, S., & Lamb, M.E. (2011). Expected consequences of disclosure  
46 revealed in investigative interviews with suspected victims of child sexual abuse. *Applied*  
47 *Developmental Science*, 15(1), 8–19. doi:10.1080/10888691.2011.538616  
48  
49  
50  
51 McGuire, K., & London, K. (2020). A retrospective approach to examining child abuse  
52 disclosure. *Child abuse & Neglect*, 99, 104263. doi: 10.1016/j.chiabu.2019.104263  
53  
54  
55  
56 Mills, Scott, Alati, O’Callaghan, Najman & Strathearn, (2013). Child maltreatment and  
57 adolescent mental health problems in a large birth cohort. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 37, 292–  
58 302. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2012.11.008  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Moffitt, T.E. (2013). Childhood exposure to violence and lifelong health: Clinical intervention  
4 science and stress-biology research join forces. *Development and Psychopathology*, 25, 1619–  
5 1634.  
6  
7

8  
9 Okur, P., van der Knaap, L.M., & Bogaerts, S. (2017). A Quantitative study on gender  
10 differences in disclosing child sexual abuse and reasons for nondisclosure. *Journal of*  
11 *Interpersonal violence*, 32, 1-27. doi:10.1177/0886260517720732  
12  
13

14  
15 Olafson, E., & Lederman, J.C.S. (2006). The state of the debate about children's disclosure  
16 patterns in child sexual abuse cases. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, 57, 27–40.  
17 doi:10.1111/j.1755-6988.2006.tb00112.x  
18  
19

20  
21 Palmer, S.E., Brown, R.A., Rae-Grant, N.I., & Loughlin, M.J. (1999). Responding to children's  
22 disclosure of familial abuse: What survivors tell us. *Child Welfare Journal*, 78, 259–282.  
23  
24

25  
26 Pipe, M-E., Lamb, M.E., Orbach, Y., Sternberg, K.J., Stewart, H.L., Esplin, P.W. (2007).  
27 Factors associated with nondisclosure of suspected abuse during forensic interviews. In Pipe,  
28 M.E. et al. (Eds.), *Child Sexual Abuse* (77–96).  
29  
30

31  
32 Pipe, M-E., Orbach, Y., Lamb, M., & Cederborg, A.-C. (2007b). Seeking resolution in the  
33 disclosure wars: An overview. In Pipe, M.E. et al. (Eds.), *Child Sexual Abuse* (3–10).  
34  
35

36  
37 Priebe, G., & Svedin, C.G. (2008). Child sexual abuse is largely hidden from the adult society:  
38 An epidemiological study of adolescents' disclosures. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 32, 1095–1108.  
39 doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2008.04.001  
40  
41

42  
43 Reitsema AM, & Grietens H. (2016). Is anybody listening? The literature on the dialogical  
44 process of child sexual abuse disclosure reviewed. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse* 17(3): 330–340.  
45 doi:10.1177/1524838015584368  
46  
47

48  
49 Rush, E.B., Lyon, T.D., Ahern, E.C., & Quas, J.A. (2014). Disclosure suspicion bias and abuse  
50 disclosure: comparisons between sexual and physical abuse. *Child Maltreatment*, 19(2): 113–  
51 118. doi:10.1177/1077559514538114  
52  
53

54  
55 Schacter, D. L. (2001). *The seven sins of memory: how the mind forgets and remembers*. Boston  
56 and New York: Houghton Mifflin.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Schultz, D., Jaycox, L., Hickman, L., Setodji, C., Kofner, A., Harris, R., & Barnes, D. (2013).  
4 The relationship between protective factors and outcomes for children exposed to violence.  
5 *Journal of Violence and Victims*, 28, 697-714. doi: 10.1891/0886-6708.VV-D-12-00005  
6  
7

8  
9 Straus, M.A., Hamby, S.L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D.P. (1994). The Revised Conflict  
10 Tactics Scales (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family*  
11 *Issues*, 17, 283–316.  
12  
13

14  
15 Tashjian, S.M., Goldfarb, D., Goodman, G.S., Quas, J.A., & Edelstein, R. (2016). Delay in  
16 disclosure of non-parental child sexual abuse in the context of emotional and physical  
17 maltreatment: A pilot study. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 58, 149–159.  
18 doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2016.06.020  
19  
20  
21

22  
23 Thulin, J., Kjellgren, C., & Nilsson, D. (2019). Children’s disclosure of physical abuse –the  
24 process of disclosing and the responses from social welfare workers. *Child Care in Practice*.  
25 doi:10.1080/13575279.2018.1555139  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 1.** Disclosure rate and recipients of disclosure in the sample, compared with Pearson's correlation coefficient.

	CPA (n=464)	Parental CPA (n=102)	6 <sup>th</sup> grade (n=90)	9 <sup>th</sup> grade (n=374)	Boys (n=224)	Girls (n=240)
Disclosed to adult	42% (194)	48% (49)	62% (56)	37% (138)***	36% (81)	47% (113)*
Mother	36% (168)	42% (43)	53% (48)	32% (120)***	30% (66)	43% (102)**
Father	21% (97)	7% (7)***	28% (25)	19% (72)	25% (55)	18% (42)
Sibling	14% (65)	11% (11)	13% (12)	14% (53)	12% (26)	16% (39)
Friend	33% (153)	39% (40)	22% (20)	36% (133)*	26% (59)	39% (94)**
Teacher	5% (24)	3% (3)	9% (8)	4% (16)	5% (12)	5% (12)
Police	3% (13)	3% (3)	3% (3)	3% (10)	4% (8)	2% (5)
Social worker	3% (15)	8% (8)**	6% (5)	3% (10)	2% (5)	4% (10)
School counselor	3% (16)	7% (7)*	3% (3)	4% (13)	2% (5)	5% (11)
School nurse	2% (11)	2% (2)	4% (4)	2% (7)	2% (4)	3% (7)
Disclosed professionals	12% (56)	14% (14)	21% (16)	11% (40)	11% (24)	13% (32)
Someone else	5% (22)	4% (4)	3% (3)	5% (19)	5% (10)	5% (12)
Nobody	26% (120)	26% (26)	20% (18)	27% (102)	26% (58)	26% (62)
Overall disclosure	74 % (344)	74% (76)	80% (72)	73% (272)	74% (214)	74% (178)

CPA = Child physical abuse perpetrated by any perpetrator

Parental CPA = Child physical abuse perpetrated by a parental figure (parent/parent's spouse)

\* $p < .05$  \*\*  $p < .01$  \*\*\*  $p < .001$

**Table 2.** Demographic, situational, and child–parent relationship factors associated with disclosure to adults.

	Disclosed to adult (n = 194)	Disclosed to peers only/No disclosure (n = 270)	Cramer V
<i>Demographic factors</i>			
Gender			
Female	47%	53%*	0.111
Male	36%	64%	
Grade level at school			
6 <sup>th</sup> grade	62%	38%***	0.203
9 <sup>th</sup> grade	37%	63%	
<i>Situational factors</i>			
Use of alcohol/drugs at time of incident			
Yes	22%	78%**	0.158
No	45%	55%	
Previous experiences of violence			
Yes	38%	62%*	0.115
No	50%	50%	
<i>Child–parent relationship</i>			
Parents are aware of who you spend your spare time with			
Yes	56%	44%***	0.169
No	9%	91%	
Parents often drunk			
Yes	23%	77%**	0.174
No	55%	45%	
Can you talk with your parents			
Yes	45%	55%**	0.161
No	25%	75%	

\* $p < 0.05$  \*\*  $p < 0.01$  \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$



**Table 3.** Logistic regression models for variables predicting disclosure of CPA to an adult.

Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
	OR (95%CI)	OR (95%CI)	OR (95%CI)
<b>Demographic factors</b>			
<b>Gender</b>			
Female	1.522 [1.041 – 2.225]*	1.480 [1.004 – 2.181]*	1.685 [1.018 – 2.790]*
Male (ref)			
<b>Grade level at school</b>			
6 <sup>th</sup> grade	2.759 [1.711 – 4.448]***	2.474 [1.509 – 4.597]***	2.398 [1.245 – 4.620]**
9 <sup>th</sup> grade (ref)			
<b>Situational factors</b>			
<b>Use of alcohol/drugs</b>			
Yes		.430 [.227 – .817]**	.594 [.266 – 1.328]
No (ref)			
<b>Previous experiences of violence</b>			
Yes		.603 [.403 – .904]**	.565 [.339 – .941]*
No (ref)			
<b>Child–parent relationship</b>			
<b>Parents are aware of who you spend your spare time with</b>			
Yes			11.713 [1.413 – 97.115]*
No (ref)			
<b>Parents often drunk</b>			
Yes			.562 [.280 – 1.130]
No (ref)			
<b>Can you talk with your parents</b>			
Yes			1.709 [.815 – 3.583]
No (ref)			
Nagelkerke R Square	.067	.107	.180
Hosmer & Lemeshov test	.967	.970	.977

\* $p < .05$  \*\* $p < .01$  \*\*\* $p < .001$