

1950

THE NATURE AND SCOPE OF SEXUAL ABUSE OF MINORS
BY CATHOLIC PRIESTS AND DEACONS
IN THE UNITED STATES 1950-2002

2002

A RESEARCH STUDY CONDUCTED BY THE JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK • FEBRUARY 2004



FOR THE UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS

Washington, D.C.

In June 2002 the full body of Catholic bishops of the United States in their General Meeting in Dallas approved the Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People. The Charter created a National Review Board, which was assigned responsibility to commission a descriptive study, with the full cooperation of the dioceses/eparchies, of the nature and scope of the problem of sexual abuse of minors by clergy. The National Review Board engaged John Jay College of Criminal Justice of The City University of New York to conduct research, summarize the collected data, and issue a summary report to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops of its findings. This report by the John Jay College is authorized for publication by the undersigned.

Msgr. William P. Fay
General Secretary
USCCB

First Printing, June 2004

ISBN 1-57455-627-4

Copyright © 2004, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Washington, D.C. All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the copyright holder.

Contents

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	1
CREDITS: THE JOHN JAY COLLEGE RESEARCH TEAM	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
PART ONE: The mandate for the study	
1.1 Introduction	11
1.2 Methodology: How the study was carried out	14
1.3 Study terminology	20
PART TWO: Prevalence of abuse of youths under 18 by Catholic priests and deacons	
2.1 Estimation of prevalence of sexual abuse of youths under 18 in the United States	23
2.2 Summary results: Prevalence of sexual abuse of youths under 18 by Catholic priests and deacons	26
2.3 Detailed data on prevalence of sexual abuse of youths under 18 by Catholic priests	28
PART THREE: The priests and deacons accused of sexual abuse	
3.1 Introduction	36
3.2 Summary results: Priests and deacons who have allegations of sexual abuse	39
3.3 Demographic characteristics of priests and deacons accused of sexual abuse of youths under 18	40
3.4 Priests with behavioral problems	45
3.5 Priests and deacons and the allegations	51
3.6 Serial abusers: Priests with multiple allegations	57
3.7 Criminal prosecutions and penalties	59
PART FOUR: Incidents and allegations of child sexual abuse	
4.1 Introduction	66
4.2 Summary results: Characteristics of the incidents of alleged sexual abuse by priests	68
4.3 Characteristics of children who alleged sexual abuse by Catholic priests	69
4.4 Characteristics of acts of sexual abuse by Catholic priests	72
4.5 Circumstances of the abuse allegations	78
PART FIVE: The response from the dioceses and religious communities	
5.1 Introduction	84
5.2 Reporting of allegations of sexual abuse	89
5.3 Responses to child sex abuse allegations by dioceses and religious communities	94

5.4 Sex offender treatment 99

PART SIX: Costs to dioceses and religious communities

6.1 Total costs 103

APPENDIX

A.1.1.1 Questions
A.1.1.2 Diocesan Profile
A.1.1.3 Religious Order Profile
A.1.1.4 Cleric Survey
A.1.1.5 Victim Survey
A.1.1.6 Written Instructions
A.1.1.7 Research Participation Statement
A.1.1.8 DHHS Letter

A.1.2.1 Regions

THE MANDATE FOR THE STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

In June 2002, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) met in Dallas, Texas, and promulgated the Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People, in order to address the problem of child sexual abuse by Catholic priests. This Charter included a commitment to provide a thorough accounting of the nature and scope of the problem within the Catholic Church in the United States. Through the Charter, the USCCB formed two entities to address the problem of child sexual abuse in the Church: a group of lay Catholics who would comprise the National Review Board and the Office of Child and Youth Protection (OCYP), led by Kathleen McChesney, who served as executive director. The two groups would share a mandate to investigate and review the prevalence of sexual abuse in the Church, the causes of the abuse, and the procedures for responding to clergy who have been accused of abuse.

To carry out this mandate, the USCCB Charter indicated that two studies would be conducted -- the first to describe the nature and scope of the problem and the second to examine its causes and context. This first study, entitled, "The Nature and Scope of the Problem of Sexual Abuse of Children by Catholic Priests and Deacons within the United States," was commissioned by the National Review Board and funded by the USCCB. The objectives of this study were to collect, organize, and summarize information available in Church files about the sexual abuse of minors (children under 18 years of age) by priests and deacons in the Catholic Church of the United States from 1950 through 2002. Specifically, Article 9 of the Charter states:

The work of the Office for Child and Youth Protection will be assisted and monitored by a Review Board, including parents, appointed by the Conference President and reporting directly to him. The Board will approve the annual report of the implementation of this Charter in each of our dioceses/eparchies, as well as any recommendations that emerge from this review, before the report is submitted to the President of the Conference and published. To understand the problem more fully and to enhance the effectiveness of our future response, the National Review Board will also commission a descriptive study, with the full cooperation of our dioceses/eparchies, of the nature and scope of the problem within the Catholic Church in the United States, including such data as statistics on perpetrators and victims.

In December 2002, Kathleen McChesney, Director of the OCYP, approached the president of John Jay College of Criminal Justice, Gerald Lynch, Ph.D., to discuss the feasibility of the college conducting the first of the two mandated studies, as established by the Charter. The college was selected because it is a secular institution, with a national reputation in the fields of criminal justice, criminology, and forensic psychology.

President Lynch convened a group of faculty with relevant expertise who met with Kathleen McChesney and representatives of the USCCB to discuss the framework for the study on the nature and scope of child sexual abuse by priests in the Catholic Church. After a number of discussions, a contract was signed by USCCB and the Research Foundation of the City University of New York on behalf of John Jay College to conduct the study. Funding for the study was

provided by the USCCB, with oversight by the National Review Board. The overall purpose of the study was to provide the first-ever, complete accounting, or census, of the number of priests against whom allegations of child sexual abuse were made and of the incidents alleged to have occurred between 1950 and 2002.

To guide the study, Kathleen McChesney, on behalf of the USCCB, gave the College a specific set of questions to be answered, which defined the scope of the study. The questions focused on four specific areas of concern (see Appendix A.1.1.1 for a complete list of the questions). The first category involved information about the alleged offenses themselves (e.g., the number of allegations, the location in which the behavior is alleged to have occurred). Information about the priests against whom allegations were made was the focus of the second category of questions. These included questions about the age, status and duties at the time of the alleged offense, background information about the priest, whether the Church took action in response to the allegation, and what form that response took. The third category focused on information about those who made the accusations (e.g., their age at the time of the offense, their gender, the time between the offense and the report). Finally, information about the financial impact of these allegations on the dioceses and religious communities was requested.

In response to this mandate, a team of criminologists, forensic psychologists, and methodologists drawn from the John Jay faculty John developed three data collection instruments, or surveys (see Appendices A.1.1.2 – 5). The surveys were pre-tested, revised, and distributed to each of the 202 United States dioceses and eparchies (i.e. Eastern Church dioceses). The Catholic Church in the United States also includes 221 religious orders of men, formally called Religious Institutes of Men. Many of these groups are divided into provinces and include autonomous cloistered communities, monasteries or abbeys. The major superiors, leaders of the religious institutes, agreed to participate and sent the survey materials to the individual provinces or communities, where files on individual priests are kept. As a result, survey responses were submitted by three different types of religious communities: by religious institutes; by provinces of religious institutes; and by autonomous monasteries or abbeys. In this report, all three kinds of communities will be referred to as religious communities, to be understood in contrast to the dioceses and eparchies.

The John Jay College faculty developed detailed procedures to ensure complete confidentiality of the survey responders, which are discussed in chapter 1.2 (see also Appendices A.1.1.6 – 7). The faculty worked with the USCCB to maximize compliance with the survey by actively responding to questions and developing procedures to ensure that state-level confidentiality laws were not violated by any institution participating in the study. Surveys were returned by 195 of the 202 dioceses and eparchies, which constitutes a 97% compliance rate. Surveys were returned by approximately 60% of religious communities representing 80% of the religious priests in the United States.

The remainder of this report will describe in detail the findings of the study. The next sections of Part One explain in detail the methodology used in this study, the limitations of the study design, and the terminology used. Part Two presents an overview of the findings about the overall number and distribution of allegations. Part Three focuses on the characteristics of the accused priests themselves and Part Four provides details about and circumstances of the allegations.

Parts Five and Six discuss the reporting of these allegations and the actions taken by the dioceses and religious communities. Each Part begins by introducing the research context for the understanding the data and continues with a summary of the findings and subchapters that give detailed tables of data. Appendices to each Part contain additional statistical information.

In presenting these findings in as clear, objective, and comprehensive manner as possible, it is the hope of the study team that an accounting of the scope of the problem over the last 50 years will ground future research and reform efforts.

1.2 METHODOLOGY - HOW THE STUDY WAS CARRIED OUT

The specific research questions posed by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) (see Appendix A1.1.1) required a careful and thorough accounting at the national level of the number of priests against whom allegations of child sexual abuse had been made as well as the number of overall allegations that had come to the attention of the Church over the last 50 years. The study team had a unique opportunity to solicit this information from all 202 dioceses and 221 religious institutes, together comprising the population of Catholic priests in the United States. The study had the full backing of the USCCB to ensure, to the greatest extent possible, full cooperation from all levels of church hierarchy throughout the country.

STUDY APPROACH

It was clear from the outset that the study team would not itself have access to the confidential Church files, nor did we have sufficient time to conduct a study that would reach all 50 states including every diocese and religious community within the United States, and cover a 52-year timeframe. Given this framework, the research team decided to collect the data necessary by constructing survey instruments and mailing them to each diocese, eparchy and religious institute in the country. Such a population-based survey approach provided the optimum strategy for fulfilling the mandate of the study to produce as complete a census as possible of the scope of the problem of sexual abuse of minors within the Catholic Church. Additionally, such an approach could make a significant contribution to the literature on child sexual abuse since no previous population-based research had been conducted. While research on child sexual abuse in the general population by professionals and academic researchers is substantial, there has been, to date, no population-based research on the characteristics or patterns of behavior of sexual abuse in any single population. The information that was previously available on child sexual in the Catholic Church had been obtained from small samples, largely clinical samples, focused on a specific sub-population (e.g., one parish or diocese) or taken from public records. Therefore, it was our hope that by taking this approach, we would both fulfill the mandate of the Charter and make a significant contribution to this important literature.

STUDY DESIGN

As with any study, the questions to be answered drove the construction of the survey instruments. The study mandate suggested that we needed to address three specific targets: the dioceses/eparchies/religious communities, the priests against whom allegations had been made, and the incidents described in those allegations. Thus, each diocese, eparchy or religious community would complete one survey focused on their institution as a whole, one survey for each priest against whom allegation(s) of abuse had been made, and one survey for each alleged incident(s) of abuse connected with each priest. As a result we were able to construct three separate surveys, which taken together, provided a more comprehensive assessment of the scope of the problem.

The Diocesan Profile. The first survey was the “Diocesan/Order Profile” (Appendices A.1.1.2 and A.1.1.3). The aim of this survey was to establish aggregate numbers for the particular diocese/eparchy or religious community – the number of priests against whom allegations had been made and the total number of individuals making allegations. We were able to obtain a census of active and retired priests in the diocese/eparchy/religious community during the study period, 1950 – 2002. The survey consisted of ten questions, half of which provided us with demographic information about the units, and the other half, a profile of the scope of the problem within that unit. Dioceses and eparchies were asked to indicate the church region, the Catholic population, and the number of parishes within their boundaries. Religious communities were asked for the total number of members in the community. Because survey responses contained no identifying information (see our discussion of confidentiality issues later in this section), the broad demographic characteristics, presented in deciles, assisted us in evaluating the survey response rate. The survey then asked for a global number, based on the review of the church records, of the number of priests against whom allegations of abuse had been made and, of those, how many had been completely exonerated. It also requested the total number of individuals who made the allegations and asked specifically for the number of those allegations that had been shown to be false or that had been withdrawn. These unfounded or withdrawn allegations were not included in any further reporting.

The Cleric Survey. The second survey sent to study respondents was the “Cleric Survey” (Appendix A.1.1.4). This instrument included 17 questions, with 18 follow-up questions, and focused on individual priests. It was to be completed from existing files and records for each and every priest who had been named in a complaint or allegation of sexual abuse of a minor that was known to a diocese, eparchy or religious community. We were seeking answers to several types of questions in this survey. First, we wanted information related to the history of the individual priest who was accused of abuse, including specifications of the seminary he attended and the history of where he ministered in the Catholic Church (e.g., whether the priest had been transferred within or between dioceses). The relevant history also included information from the file concerning whether he himself had been abused and whether he had a known substance abuse problem or other medical/psychological conditions. The next set of questions related to the individuals who had made allegations against this particular priest, including their number, their age(s) and gender(s). The final section of the “Cleric Survey” focused on the actions taken by the Church in response to the allegations of abuse against this particular priest. These questions focused on the action taken by the church in response to the allegation (e.g., whether the priest was reprimanded, referred for treatment, or removed from duty). They also asked more specifically whether the priest participated in and/or completed any type of treatment, and the years in which those interventions would have occurred. The responses to the three sets of questions in this survey thus provided information on the scope and nature of the problem, information about those against whom allegations were made, and information about the church’s response to the alleged offenses.

The Victim Survey. The third survey, titled the “Victim Survey,” focused on incidents of alleged abuse. The aim of this survey was to capture information about each allegation that was made against a particular priest (Appendix A.1.1.5). In other words, for every priest against whom allegations were made, a separate and unique third survey was completed for each one of the alleged incidents. So, for example, if the “Cleric Survey” indicated that this particular priest had

five allegations made against him, then five incident surveys would have been completed and submitted as part of the package of material on that particular priest. Surveys were neither requested nor submitted for those allegations that had been shown to be false or were withdrawn, or those for which the priest had been exonerated. This survey included 36 questions, with 18 follow-up questions. Like the "Cleric Survey," it was to be completed based on the information about the victim in the alleged abuser's file.

This incident survey was divided into two sections. The first section of the survey sought basic information on the person who brought an allegation against this particular priest¹ and about the incident or incidents themselves. This included information on the individual's gender; age at both the time of offense and time the offense was reported; method by which the allegation and follow-ups to the allegation were made; timeframe and type of alleged incident(s); threats, gifts, or enticements used to coax or coerce the individual into participating in sexual conduct and action(s) taken by the Catholic institution and/or civil authorities as a result of the incident(s). The second part of the survey sought information on the financial impact of the incident or incidents of alleged abuse reported in the preceding section. These questions asked about monies paid for treatment of both the victim and the priest, legal fees associated with the incident(s), and overall compensation to the accuser.

Pilot Testing of Surveys. During the development of the survey instruments, in February and March 2003, the research team consulted with many individuals associated with the Church, including members of the National Review Board, the Office of Child and Youth Protection, as well as numerous diocesan and religious priests who agreed to provide feedback to us on the content and wording of the survey instruments. Numerous meetings were held in which terminology categories of responses were refined, e.g., types of responses a diocese might have taken and manners in which allegations might have come to the Church's attention.

A formal pre-test was also conducted in one diocese. For this pre-test, a high-ranking official within the diocese, at the direction of the presiding bishop, completed the draft survey instruments using actual data from diocesan files, and provided detailed comments to the principal investigator about their content, readability and accessibility. These comments and suggestions were used to refine the study instruments.

STUDY PROCEDURE

In April 2003, a package containing one copy of each of the three separate survey instruments was sent to all 202 dioceses and eparchies in the United States. Prior to that mailing, a letter was sent to all dioceses and eparchies from Bishop Gregory, President of the USCCB, alerting bishops to the study, reminding them of the mandate to comply with the study as stated in the Charter, and requesting full compliance with it.

Unlike the dioceses and eparchies, whose participation was mandated by the Charter, the religious communities of men were invited to participate in the study. When their agreement was given in June 2003, the survey materials were sent to the 140 religious institutes of men in the United States. These religious orders then distributed the surveys to their provinces and autonomous monasteries or abbeys. The organization of religious communities is such that the

files with the information being sought for the study were held in the provinces and autonomous communities of many religious orders, rather than at their central offices, so this second level of distribution by the religious institute was required.

Reliability of Data. With so many separate entities within the Catholic Church in the United States preparing to complete the surveys, a number of affirmative steps were taken to maximize the reliability and consistency of the data. First, the surveys were mailed to each diocese, eparchy and religious community with a packet of information that included two forms of instruction - written instructions (see Appendix A.1.1.6) and, a videotape with detailed instructions about how to fill out the surveys, how to handle the process of mailing the surveys once they were completed, and how to obtain additional guidance and information if needed during survey completion. Second, the research team provided anonymous telephone and email support five days a week from 10 am to 6 pm, adding an 800 number during the summer months. A number of research assistants were specially trained to answer the telephone and to keep a log of all calls, each of which was reviewed by a member of the study team. Notes were kept on the caller questions, and written responses were regularly updated. Third, as the volume of calls grew during the summer and a pattern of questions was discerned, a highly secure website with answers to frequently asked questions² was made available in July 2003. The telephone, email and web site support was continued throughout the study period until February 2004. Fourth, members of the John Jay College research team attended the biannual meeting of the USCCB in St. Louis to meet with the bishops and answer any questions they had about the study. And, finally, the structure of the survey instruments themselves assisted in ensuring reliability. The three surveys employed multiple measures of the same information, thus providing additional internal reliability checks for the results.³

Survey Responses. The data collection process lasted approximately eleven months. At first, many bishops and religious superiors had reservations about the study, and some explicitly opposed it. Through discussion, consultation, and the exchange of questions and responses, the research team was able to resolve the concerns of most of the bishops and major superiors, especially their worries about concealing the identities of accused priests. Because all states present unique legal issues, the research team also worked with diocesan attorneys around the country to reduce their concerns and to ensure that the data collection process would not affect pending or potential law suits involving the Catholic Church.⁴ Ultimately, 97% of the dioceses and eparchies returned the surveys, an extraordinarily high response rate for any type of survey research, though perhaps not surprising given the mandate from the Charter and the significant efforts made by all parties to guarantee confidentiality and alleviate concerns. In general, the surveys were complete and showed careful attention to detail, as indicated by the many specific comments provided in the surveys. There was not, however, uniformity in terms of the amount of support, staff and resources that were available around the country, and so the responses did vary in terms of completeness and level of detail provided.

Data Entry. All aspects of data coding, entry, and analysis were directed by a data analyst, working in consultation with the study's principal investigator. Actual coding and data entry were done by 16 research assistants. All research assistants were thoroughly trained by both the principal investigator and data analyst, not only in the specific procedures for dealing with the survey data, but, most importantly, to equip them to understand the importance of the study's

complex confidentiality provisions. All study materials and documents were recorded when they were received by John Jay College during the entire study period. Information from the surveys was recorded in files using both statistical and database software.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Ensuring the confidentiality of individuals mentioned in the Church's files was an important element that influenced the design of the study and, ultimately, allowed dioceses and religious communities to participate fully in the study. The research team was concerned about the confidentiality of and risks to those individuals who reported sexual abuse; their friends and family members; priests and deacons against whom allegations had been made; Church employees and the dioceses and religious institutes themselves.

A number of steps were taken to ensure confidentiality. The first decision was that no one on the John Jay College team would have direct contact with the files or records that were the property of the Church. The only persons who had any direct contact with the Catholic Church files used to complete the survey instruments were those persons designated by their bishop or major superior.

Secondly, the study team put into place complex procedures to ensure that no identifying information about any individual who made an allegation of abuse, any priest against whom an allegation had been made, nor any individual diocese, eparchy or religious community would be included on any study materials that came to John Jay College.

Our files contain no personal identifying information beyond age at the time of the alleged incident and gender for those persons who made allegations of abuse against priests. The information for the surveys was taken from existing files, so no new contact was initiated with any person who reported abuse by a priest or any member of his or her family.

With respect to the priests against whom allegations had been made, a challenge arose because one interest of the USCCB was to determine whether individual priests had allegations of child sexual abuse in more than one diocese, eparchy or religious community. In order to answer this question, the researchers needed to be able to give a unique identifying number to each priest, which would then permit us to track information about him from more than one diocese. To do this accurately the researchers needed to collect, at a minimum, the initials and date of birth of each priest who had been the subject of an allegation.

Given this necessity, the following steps were taken to protect the confidentiality of each priest and his community:

1. No survey, nor any study communication of any kind bearing a postmark, was sent directly to John Jay College from any Catholic Church group. An independent auditor, a certified public accountant at a nationally known accounting firm, was designated to receive all communications from Catholic Church representatives.

2. Clear instructions were provided to respondents that all completed survey instruments were to be placed in blank envelopes that were then sealed. Those sealed, blank envelopes were then placed in another envelope or box with a piece of diocesan or religious community stationery and sent to the auditor. When these packages were received by the auditor, the outer envelope and the letterhead were used to make a record of the sender, for purposes of response rate calculation only. A random code number was then assigned to each respondent unit of the Catholic Church. The codes were recorded on the blank envelopes, and the materials boxed and sent to John Jay College. From the time of receipt by John Jay College, the materials were only known by their code numbers. Only the completed surveys that had been placed in sealed envelopes and mailed were seen by the John Jay College research team.

3. All external envelopes, packaging and records that linked the sender to the survey data were destroyed by the auditor.

4. The study's principal investigator opened each one of the envelopes. She recorded the identifying information for each priest—initials and birthdate—and then removed that page from the survey. The identifying data was immediately encrypted and the surveys numbered with a unique numerical code for each priest. The pages with initials and dates of birth were segregated in a secure location, separate from the study office, until data collection was complete. These paper records, and the digital record, have been destroyed.

5. The principal investigator carefully inspected all surveys for accidental disclosure of sensitive or identifying data. If there was any identifying information written on the survey itself, this information was immediately redacted before the surveys were given to the research assistants for coding.

6. Although the formal procedures made it very unlikely that any accidental disclosure of sensitive data would occur, it is always possible that there would be a lapse and sensitive data about victims or abusers be transmitted. Accordingly, the study design included several levels of training in confidentiality protections for diocesan staff and study research assistants in order to reduce the possibility of accidental exposure.

The John Jay College research team sought and was granted approval to conduct the study by the College's Institutional Review Board which oversees protection of human subjects in research. Additionally, the team applied for a Certificate of Confidentiality, which can be granted by the United States Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) to protect against "compelled disclosure of identifying information about subjects of biomedical, behavioral, clinical, and other research." The certificate protects the researchers against involuntary disclosure about the identities of research participants and is understood to bar any legal demand for testimony in court. Such a certificate does not prevent any individual priest, victim, diocese or religious community from voluntarily releasing data. After a number of meetings and discussions, DHHS in November 2003 declined not to grant a Certificate of Confidentiality for the study. A major reason for denying the certificate was the determination that the John Jay College researchers had taken adequate measures to ensure that all identifying information would be removed and the surveys would be confidential, thereby

precluding the need for a certificate. Additionally, since the primary purpose of the certificate is to protect human subjects who have given their consent to participate in research related to confidential matters that may adversely affect them, this framework did not apply to the John Jay study since the priests were not voluntary research participants, and their consent had not been sought nor granted. Therefore, they were uncertain as to whether it was legally possible to issue a certificate, which is primarily used as a vehicle to encourage human subjects to participate in a research project. In their letter explaining the rejection of a certificate, it was stated that the confidentiality plan for the study “includes multiple and wide-ranging protections for subject identifiers” and as such, “a certificate is not necessary to achieve your research goals.” (See Appendix A.1.1.7 for a copy of the letter.)

¹ The survey did not request any personal information about those making the allegations, other than age and gender.

² The study website employed multiple levels of security to ensure that the public could not locate the site or access the questions and answers. The identification name and password were sent directly to each bishop or major superior so that he or his staff could access the website.

³ Although we worded the definitions carefully to ensure that those filling out the questionnaires would do so in a uniform manner, in a study of this type, it is impossible to create an infallible operational definition with criteria so specific that everyone supplying the information would do so in exactly the same way. Therefore, some degree of variance in the responses is inevitable.

⁴ For instance, California law prohibits the disclosure of any identifying information related to sexual behavior. As a result, we worked out complicated procedures whereby identifying information (which was used only to allow us to identify priests who had been moved from one diocese to another) was encrypted prior to being sent to the study headquarters so that California respondents did not transmit any identifying information.

1.3 STUDY TERMINOLOGY

Allegation

Any accusation that is not *implausible* (see definition below). This includes allegations that did not necessarily result in a criminal, civil or diocesan investigation and allegations that are unsubstantiated.

An *implausible* allegation is one that could not possibly have happened under the given circumstances (e.g., an accusation is made to a bishop about a priest who never served at that diocese). Erroneous information does not necessarily make the allegation implausible (e.g., a priest arrived at the diocese a year after the alleged abuse, but all other facts of the case are credible and the alleged victim might have mistaken the date).

Boundary Problem

Inability to maintain a clear and appropriate interpersonal (physical as well as emotional) distance between two individuals where such a separation is expected and necessary. Boundary problems can be mild to moderate, such as the case of a therapist or teacher who develops a personal relationship with his/her student or patient; or, they may be severe, as in the development of an intimate relationship.

Canon law

According to <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/09056a.htm>, canon law is the body of laws and regulations made by or adopted by ecclesiastical authority, for the government of the Christian organization and its members. The word *adopted* is here used to point out the fact that there are certain elements in canon law borrowed by the Church from civil law or from the writings of private individuals, who as such had no authority in ecclesiastical society.

Diocese

A geographical division of the Catholic Church led by a bishop that includes Catholic communicants ("the faithful") and parishes.

Eparchy

A Catholic Church jurisdiction, similar to a diocese, of Eastern-rite Catholics living in the United States.

Ephebophile (also called hebophile)

A clinical term (though not included in the DSM-IV) that denotes one who is sexually attracted to adolescent or post-pubescent children.

Extern

A priest who has not been incardinated to the diocese where he is working and living.

False allegation

An allegation that was proven to be untruthful and fabricated.

Incardinated

A priest who has been formally affiliated to a diocese is said to be incardinated in that diocese

Incidence

Used to convey the number of new events occurring in a specific time period.

Institutional Review Board (IRB)

Each institution engaged in research involving human subjects that is supported by a department or agency to which the federal policy applies must establish an IRB to review and approve the research. Under the regulations, an institution can also establish more than one IRB, which may be necessary or appropriate, depending on the structure of the institution or the kinds of human subjects research that is performed at that institution. Alternatively, an institution can designate another institution's IRB to review its research upon approval of the appropriate department or agency. If the research is supported by the Department of Health and Human Services, such designations must have the prior approval of the Office for Protection from Research Risks.

Laicization

Conversion from an ecclesiastical to a lay condition.

Mean

The average value of a set of numbers.

Median

The mid-point in a set of numbers. In other words, fifty percent of cases fall above and fifty percent of cases fall below the median.

National Review Board (NRB)

Established by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops in 2002 to commission a study on the "nature and scope" of child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church. See <http://www.usccb.org/ocyp/nrb.htm>.

Ordained/Ordination

The sacramental rite by which a "sacred order" is conferred (diaconate, priesthood, episcopacy). The ceremony of consecration to the ministry.

Permanent Deacon

According to the Official Catholic Directory (A-14), they are sometimes referred to as "married deacons," although the permanent diaconate is open to both married and unmarried men, with the understanding that after ordination, they may not marry even after the death of a spouse. Under the authority of the diocesan bishop, they perform the same functions as transitional deacons while, at the same time, retaining their roles in society as family and business men.

Prevalence

The total number (or estimate of the total number) of cases or events at a given time.

Region (of the Catholic Church in the United States)

One of fourteen geographical areas, or divisions, of the Catholic Church in the United States.

Reliability

Data that is consistent, yielding the same or similar results in different clinical experiments or statistical trials.

Religious community

A group that may include ordained clerics and/or non-ordained brothers who are professed members of a religious order, and who live subject to the rules of that order. This term is used in

this study to include members of religious orders or institutes as well as those who reside in cloistered communities, monasteries, and abbeys.

Restricted ministry/ restricted faculties

An administrative decision made by a bishop or major superior to limit the ecclesiastical and/or parish or community functions of an individual priest.

Seminary

An educational institute for men that are preparing for the Holy Orders. Major seminary--A school for the spiritual, academic, and pastoral education and formation of priesthood candidates. Focus is on philosophical and theological teachings. Minor seminary--A prerequisite to the major seminary. Focus is on required courses in the humanities and the sciences.

Sexual abuse of a minor

As per the Charter, sexual abuse includes contacts or interactions between a child and an adult when the child is being used as an object of sexual gratification for the adult. A child is abused whether or not this activity involves explicit force, whether or not it involves genital or physical contact, whether or not it is initiated by the child, and whether or not there is discernible harmful outcome.

Suspension (in Canon Law)

Usually defined as a censure by which a cleric is deprived, entirely or partially of the use of the power of orders, office, or benefice.

Transitional Deacon

The diaconate is the first order or grade in ordained ministry. Any man who is to be ordained to the priesthood must first be ordained as a transitional deacon (also see Permanent Deacon). Deacons serve in the ministry of liturgy, of the work, and of charity (see A-14 of The Official Catholic Directory).

Universe

The set of individuals, items, or data from which a statistical sample is taken.

THE PREVALENCE OF SEXUAL ABUSE OF YOUTHS BY PRIESTS

2.1 ESTIMATES OF THE PREVALENCE OF SEXUAL ABUSE OF YOUTHS UNDER 18 CHILDREN IN THE UNITED STATES

The estimation of any form of deviance in the general population is a very difficult task. It is impossible to assess the extent of sexual offending, either in general or with children as targets. Most estimates of the distribution of sexual offenders in the general population are derived from forensic sources, that is, samples of those who are arrested or convicted for sex offenses. All researchers acknowledge that those who are arrested represent only a fraction of all sexual offenders. Sexual crimes have the lowest rates of reporting for all crimes. Not all potential participants in such studies can be known or contacted, not all would use the same language to describe their experiences, and not all are willing to share information. The sexual abuse of children by Catholic priests and deacons is part of the larger problem of sexual abuse of children in the United States. This chapter is a summary of the estimates of child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church.

RESEARCH ESTIMATES

The prevalence of some event or behavior in a specific population represents the proportion of a population which has experienced the event or behavior. Since it is not known how many people in the United States experience a form of sexual abuse as children, some researchers select groups, or samples, of individuals to study and direct questions to them. If the selection of the group to be surveyed is not biased, the results of this study provide estimates of the prevalence of sexual abuse in the population from which the group is selected. In order to avoid bias in a sample, every person in the part of the population to be used as a framework for selecting the sample must have an equal chance of being asked to participate. Researchers use the data gathered from those who participate to estimate the proportion of the United States population who are sexually abused during childhood.

Studies of the incidence, as opposed to the prevalence, of sexual abuse of children concentrate on estimating the number of new cases occurring over a particular period of time and on whether the number of events or incidents is increasing or decreasing. Scholarly studies of both the incidence and the prevalence of sexual abuse of children in the United States began emerging in the 1960s and gained greater urgency after the cluster of day care center child abuse cases in the 1980s made the issue one of acute public interest. A look at victimization studies that focus on the sexual abuse of minor children suggests that the scope of this problem is extensive.

Although we do not have data reflecting the prevalence of abusers, there are data from several studies reporting the prevalence of victimization. The prevalence rates reported in these studies vary somewhat.

- 27% of the females and 16% of the males disclosed a history of childhood sexual abuse; 42% of the males were likely to never have disclosed the experience to anyone whereas 33% of the females never disclosed.¹
- 12.8% of the females and 4.3% of the males reported a history of sexual abuse during childhood.²
- 15.3% of the females and 5.9% of the males experienced some form of sexual assault.³
- Only 5.7% of the incidents were reported to the police; 26% of the incidents were not disclosed to anyone prior to the study.⁴
- In summary, when compared with their male counterparts, females were more likely to have been sexually abused during childhood. Furthermore, females were more likely than males to disclose such information; however, disclosure rates are quite low regardless of the victim's gender.

Finkelhor and Jones have used data from National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS) to make a national estimate of the number of sexual abuse cases substantiated by child protective service (CPS) for the period from 1992 to 2000. Using data from more than forty states, they report that the number of substantiated sexual abuse cases peaked at approximately 149,800 in 1992, followed by annual declines of 2 to 11 percent per year through 2000 when the number of cases reached a low of approximately 89,355.⁵

Professional opinion is divided about why this drop occurred and how much of the drop is real or the result of factors such as changes in definitions, reporting and investigation by the states. Finkelhor and Jones examined other indicia of sex abuse rates and conclude that, taken together, they suggest that at least part of the drop in cases has resulted from a decline in sexual abuse of children.⁶ The National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS)—which asks about rape and sexual assault for victims ages 12 and older (including acts counted within the broader definition of child sexual abuse)—shows that sex offenses against children ages 12-17 declined 56 percent between 1993 and 2000. Virtually all the decline, 72 percent, occurred in offenses committed by known perpetrators (family and acquaintances) which declined.⁷ Finkelhor and Jones observe that cases involving known perpetrators are the ones most likely to be categorized as sexual abuse.⁸

Another source of self-report data on sexual abuse is the Minnesota Student Survey, which has been administered to 6th, 9th, and 12th-grade students in Minnesota in 1989, 1992, 1995, 1998, and 2001.⁹ Between 90 and 99 percent of Minnesota's school districts and more than 100,000 students have participated in the survey each year. The survey includes two questions about sexual abuse. Results indicate that sexual abuse by family and nonfamily perpetrators showed a slight rise between 1989 and 1992 followed by a 22-percent drop from 1992 to 2001.¹⁰

At the same time reports of sexual abuse have declined, there has been a significant drop in crime rates and measures of family problems such as violence among adult intimates, and a drop in out-of-wedlock teenage pregnancies and live births to teenage mothers (some of which are attributable to child sexual abuse)—all of these suggest a general improvement in the well-being of children.

Additionally, Finkelhor and Jones suggest that rates of sexual abuse have perhaps been reduced as a result of increased incarceration for sexual abuse offenders. They report that surveys of state correctional facilities indicate that between 1991 and 1997, the number of individuals incarcerated in state correctional facilities for sex crimes against children rose 39 percent, from 43,500 to 60,700, having already more than doubled from 19,900 in 1986. They further note that these totals do not include large numbers of sexual abusers who receive sanctions which do not involve incarceration for a year or more.¹¹

¹ David Finkelhor et al., "Sexual Abuse in a National Survey of Adult Men and Women: Prevalence, Characteristics, and Risk Factors." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 14 (1990): 20-21.

² Harriet L. MacMillan and Jan E. Fleming, "Prevalence of Child Physical and Sexual Abuse in the Community." *Journal of the American Medical Association* 278 (1997): 131-135.

³ K. Moore, K. Nord, and J. Peterson, "Nonvoluntary Sexual Activity Among Adolescents." *Family Planning Perspectives* 21 (1989): 110-114.

⁴ Sue Boney-McCoy and David Finkelhor, "Psychosocial Sequelae of Violent Victimization in a National Youth Sample." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 63 (Oct. 1995): 726-736.

⁵ Lisa Jones and David Finkelhor. "Explanations for the Decline in Child Sexual Abuse Cases." *OJJDP Bulletin*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (2004).

⁶ Lisa M. Jones and David Finkelhor, "The Decline in Child Sexual Abuse Cases." *OJJDP Bulletin*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (2001); Lisa M. Jones, David Finkelhor, and Kathy Kopiec. "Why is sexual abuse declining? A survey of state child protection administrators." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 25 (2001): 1139-1158.

⁷ Rennison, C.M. "Criminal Victimization 2000: Changes 1999-2000 with Trends 1993-2000." *Bulletin*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2001.

⁸ Jones, 2004.

⁹ Harrison, P.A., Fulkerson, J.A., and Beebe, T.J. "Multiple substance use among adolescent physical and sexual abuse victims." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 21 (1997): 529-539.

¹⁰ Minnesota Department of Children, Families & Learning, Minnesota Department of Human Services. *Minnesota Student Survey: Key Trends Through 2001*. Roseville, MN: Minnesota Department of Children, Families & Learning, 2001.

¹¹ David Finkelhor and Richard K. Ormrod, "Factors in the Underreporting of Crimes Against Juveniles" *Child Maltreatment* 6 (2001): 219-230.

2.2 SUMMARY RESULTS: PREVALENCE OF SEXUAL ABUSE OF YOUTHS UNDER 18 BY CATHOLIC PRIESTS AND DEACONS

A paramount concern for all involved with the study has been the determination of the prevalence of the problem in the Catholic Church in the United States. The survey responses make it clear that the problem was indeed widespread and affected more than 95% of dioceses and approximately 60% of religious communities. Of the 195 dioceses and eparchies that participated in the study, all but seven have reported that allegations of sexual abuse of youths under the age of 18 have been made against at least one priest serving in ecclesiastical ministry in that diocese or eparchy. Of the 140 religious communities that submitted surveys, all but 30 reported at least one allegation against a religious priest who was a member of that community.

Researchers asked each diocese, eparchy and religious community to provide the total number of priests who were active, or serving in ministry, between 1950 and 2002 so that the number of the accused could be presented as a part of an overall total. In our effort to understand the scope and distribution of the problem for the dioceses and eparchies, researchers collected information on the region, a geographical division of the Catholic Church, the number of Catholics per diocese, and the number of parishes per diocese. Dioceses and eparchies were asked to indicate these numbers by choosing one of ten equal ranges for the number of Catholic communicants and the number of parishes. The range, i.e., 88,501 – 122,000, 122,001 – 170,000, and so forth, in Catholic population, was used to ensure confidentiality of each study participant. Religious communities were grouped into ten equal groups by their total membership and clerical membership, as reported in the Official Catholic Directory 2002. These different ways of looking at the scope of the problem were used to examine the extent of sexual abuse of youths under 18 by Catholic priests and deacons.

- Dioceses and eparchies reported that allegations of child sexual abuse had been made against 4,692 priests and deacons for incidents that took place while these men were serving in ecclesiastical ministry. Individual survey forms were submitted for 4,557 of these priests. Of these, some surveys had to be eliminated because the victim's was 18 or older or the date of the alleged incident was prior to 1950 or after 2002.
- Religious communities reported that allegations of sexual abuse had been made against 647 priests who were members of their communities. Dioceses reported additional religious priests, for a study total of 929 religious priests.
- When the multiple surveys for the 143 priests who were the subject of allegations in more than one diocese or religious community are condensed to a single record, the total number of Catholic priests and deacons in the United States who have been accused of sexual abuse of children is 4,392.
- When dioceses are grouped by the fourteen geographical regions of the Church, the average percent of all incardinated priests in a region's dioceses to have been

accused of sexual abuse is consistent: all regions averaged between 3% and 6% of priests accused.

- If the total number of priests in religious communities who have had allegations made against them is presented as a percentage of all religious priests in ministry, as estimated from the study data, the percentage accused of child sexual abuse is 2.7%.

The consistency of the findings in dioceses across the United States is remarkable: whether region, number of Catholic communicants or number of parishes is used to array the dioceses, the results show allegations of sexual abuse have been made against 2.5% to 7% of diocesan priests. Similarly, whether religious priests are ranked by overall membership of religious clerical membership, the percent of priests in communities who have been accused ranges from 1% to 3%, or approximately half of that of the diocesan priests.

To estimate the percentage of all priests in ecclesiastical ministry between 1950 and 2002 who have been the subject of allegations requires a reliable overall total of priests in ministry during that time period. This calculation was done two different way—first by using the data collected through the Diocesan and Religious Order Profiles and then by using the estimates produced by the Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate¹. These different methods both yielded the same statistic: approximately 4% of Catholic priests and deacons in active ministry between 1950 and 2002 have been accused of the sexual abuse of a youth under the age of 18.

Surveys for 90% of the priests and deacons reported to have had allegations of child sexual abuse included the year of ordination. If the yearly ordination totals for diocesan priests accused are compared to the overall number of diocesan priests ordained in that year, the percentages of accused priests range from a maximum of almost 10% in 1970, decreasing to 8% in 1980 and to fewer than 4% in 1990.


These prevalence estimates alone do not describe the extent of the problem of sexual abuse. Another way to understand the extent of the problem is to ask how many incidents of sexual abuse were alleged to occur each year of the study period or, alternatively, to ask how many priests were accused in each year. This distribution of alleged abuse events over time shows the pattern of the reported sexual abuse. When the incidents recorded in the surveys are tallied for each year of occurrence (of each incident), the resulting figure shows that 75% of the events were alleged to occur between 1960 and 1984. This result should be considered together with the declining percentage of priests ordained in each year. Additionally, understanding about sexual abuse and the treatment of sexual offenders has changed markedly between 1950 and 2002, and as a result both reporting and response to the problem are like to have been affected.

¹ Bryan T. Froehle, "Numbers of Priests in the United States 1960 – 1996" (working Paper, Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate, Georgetown University, Washington DC, 1997).

2.3 DETAILED DATA ON PREVALENCE OF SEXUAL ABUSE OF YOUTHS UNDER 18 BY CATHOLIC PRIESTS

The red (upper) line in Figure 2.3.1 represents the total incidents of alleged abuse for each year of the study while the blue (lower) line charts the total number of priests accused in each year of the study.


Figure 2.3.1



The calculation of an overall percentage of priests in ministry was initially derived using information from the Diocesan Profiles for total numbers of priests and deacons subject to allegations compared to the total of those in ministry between 1950 and 2002. The surveys reported 75,694 diocesan priests and approximately 34,000 religious priests in ministry with 4,392 accused of abuse. If the total of the accused priests (4,392) is divided by the total of all priests in ministry between 1950 and 2002 (109,694), the result is 4%; for diocesan priests only, (3,282/76,694), the percentage is 4.27% and for religious priests, (929/34,000), 2.7%.¹

Alternatively, the total of priests in ministry estimated by the Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate is 94,607 between 1960 and 2002. If the number of priests who had no allegations after 1959 is removed (265), the total of surveys for priests and deacons with allegations of child sexual abuse is 4,127, and the resulting percentage is slightly more than 4%.

Figure 2.3.2 DISTRIBUTION OF ALLEGED INCIDENTS OF ABUSE, BY DATE OF FIRST INSTANCE



The tables that follow show in detail the distribution of the allegations of child sexual abuse for each diocese or religious community, arrayed by a series of demographic variables. The results are fairly uniform across each of the three diocesan tables: the percentage of incardinated priests and deacons accused of child sexual abuse is consistently between 3% and 6% and the overall average is 5%. For the religious communities, a similar uniformity is evident although it is approximately half of the diocesan level. The tables that follow do not include priests who have been exonerated, or those who were determined to be ineligible for the study because they did not meet the protocol criteria.

Table 2.3.1 shows the average number of incardinated clerics who have been accused of sexual abuse and the percentage of accused clerics within the total number of incardinated clerics in an individual diocese, grouped by Catholic Region. These tables also show the dioceses with the lowest number (and percentage) of accused priests in a Region and the dioceses with the highest number (and percentage). Table 2.3.2 shows the United States dioceses grouped by the size of the Catholic population and Table 2.3.3 repeats this display by the number of parishes.

Tables 2.3.4 and 2.3.5 show the average number of religious community members who have been accused of sexual abuse, grouped by the overall membership of the community and then by clerical membership.

The average number of incardinated clerics in individual diocese or eparchy who have been the subject of an allegation of sexual abuse is 19. Another way of expressing this statistic is that the average diocese or eparchy had records or knowledge of allegations against 19 clerics. The total number of accused clerics incardinated to an individual diocese or eparchy, between 1950 and 2002, ranges from a minimum of 0 to a maximum of 165.

Table 2.3.1. PERCENT AND NUMBER OF INCARDINATED CLERICS PER DIOCESE OR EPARCHY ACCUSED OF SEXUAL ABUSE, GROUPED BY REGION

United States Dioceses Grouped by Catholic Region	Accused Clerics as a Percent of All Accused of Abuse			Number of Incardinated Clerics Accused of Abuse		
	Average Per Diocese	Minimum	Maximum	Average per Diocese	Minimum	Maximum
1	5%	0%	10%	40.42	0	165
2	4%	1%	9%	38.22	4	73
3	5%	0%	24%	26.13	0	69
4	5%	0%	10%	17.00	0	46
5	5%	0%	11%	8.24	0	30
6	3%	0%	8%	17.71	0	93
7	4%	1%	7%	24.47	5	116
8	5%	2%	16%	13.45	3	26
9	3%	1%	5%	16.50	2	64
10	5%	0%	19%	7.44	0	31
11	4%	1%	9%	15.07	1	71
12	4%	2%	9%	6.80	2	21
13	6%	0%	11%	9.89	0	24
14	5%	1%	10%	8.38	2	12

Table 2.3.2. PERCENT AND NUMBER OF INCARDINATED CLERICS PER DIOCESE OR EPARCHY ACCUSED OF SEXUAL ABUSE, GROUPED BY CATHOLIC POPULATION

United States Dioceses Grouped by Catholic Population	Accused Clerics as a Percent of All Incardinated Priests, 1950 - 2002			Number of Incardinated Priests Accused of Sexual Abuse		
	Average In Diocese	Minimum	Maximum	Average In Diocese	Minimum	Maximum
Group 1 (5,000 - 45,000)	4%	0%	9%	3.00	0	10
Group 2 (45,001 - 66,000)	4%	0%	11%	5.00	0	12
Group 3 (66,001 - 88,500)	6%	0%	19%	9.35	0	41
Group 4 (88,5001 - 122,000)	3%	0%	6%	7.63	0	23
Group 5 122,001 - 170,000)	5%	0%	10%	12.53	0	35
Group 6 (170,001 - 239,000)	4%	0%	10%	15.55	0	34
Group 7 (239,001 - 350,700)	4%	1%	9%	21.17	3	52
Group 8 (350,701 - 475,000)	4%	2%	7%	18.31	1	39
Group 9 (475,001 - 778, 700)	5%	0%	24%	23.85	0	64
Group 10 (788,701 - 4,500,000)	4%	0%	10%	45.47	0	165

Table 2.3.3. PERCENT AND NUMBER OF INCARDINATED CLERICS PER DIOCESE WHO HAVE BEEN ACCUSED OF SEXUAL ABUSE, GROUPED BY NUMBER OF PARISHES

United States Dioceses Grouped by Number of Parishes	Accused Priests as a Percent of All Incardinated Priests, 1950 - 2002			Number of Incardinated Priests Accused of Sexual Abuse		
	Average in Diocese	Minimum	Maximum	Average In Diocese	Minimum	Maximum
1 (1 - 35)	3%	0%	9%	1.10	0	3
2 (36 - 46)	5%	0%	11%	4.36	0	12
3 (47 - 56)	4%	0%	19%	5.73	0	23
4 (57 - 71)	5%	0%	12%	8.41	0	31
5 (72 - 84)	3%	0%	7%	7.42	0	17
6 (85 - 97)	5%	1%	9%	15.37	3	41
7 (98 - 119)	6%	2%	24%	16.80	5	35
8 (120 - 138)	5%	1%	10%	23.67	6	52
9 (139 - 185)	4%	1%	8%	27.04	9	93
10 (186 +)	4%	2%	8%	55.67	11	165


Table 2.3.4 PERCENT AND NUMBER OF ALL CLERICS IN RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES ACCUSED OF SEXUAL ABUSE, GROUPED BY THE OVERALL MEMBERSHIP

U.S. Catholic Religious Communities Grouped by Overall Membership	Accused Priests as a Percent of All Priests in a Religious Community, 1950 - 2002			Number of Religious Priests Accused of Abuse		
	Average Per Community	Minimum	Maximum	Average Per Community	Minimum	Maximum
1 (1 - 10)	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
2 (11 - 20)	2%	0%	9%	.67	0	3
3 (21 - 30)	2%	0%	5%	1.55	0	4
4 (31 - 40)	3%	0%	13%	2.10	0	7
5 (41 - 75)	3%	0%	8%	2.71	0	9
6 (76 - 110)	3%	0%	7%	6.62	0	17
7 (111 - 150)	1%	<1%	2%	4.38	1	8
8 (151 - 305)	2%	<1%	5%	10.19	1	21
9 (306 - 540)	1%	<1%	4%	16.00	4	55
10 541 +	1%	<1%	1%	10.50	6	15

Table 2.3.5 PERCENT AND NUMBER OF ALL CLERICS IN RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES ACCUSED OF SEXUAL ABUSE, GROUPED BY THE CURRENT CLERICAL MEMBERSHIP

U.S. Catholic Religious Communities Grouped by Clerical Membership	Accused Clerics as a Percent of All Clerics in a Religious Community, 1950 - 2002			Number of Religious Clerics Accused of Abuse		
	Average Per Community	Minimum	Maximum	Average Per Community	Minimum	Maximum
1 (1 - 6)	2%	0%	9%	.17	0	1
2 (7 - 14)	2%	0%	7%	1.57	0	4
3 (15 - 21)	2%	0%	5%	1.00	0	2
4 (22 - 35)	3%	0%	13%	2.45	0	9
5 (36 - 57)	2%	0%	5%	2.71	0	6
6 (58 - 80)	3%	0%	7%	5.58	1	17
7 (81 - 110)	2%	0%	5%	6.30	0	17
8 (111 - 176)	2%	0%	5%	9.41	1	21
9 (177 - 399)	2%	0%	4%	13.93	1	55
10 (400 +)	1%	0%	1%	8.67	4	15

FIGURE 2.3.3 PRIESTS ACCUSED AS A PERCENT OF ALL ORDINATIONS, BY YEAR



This figure shows the percentage of all priests ordained in each year from 1960 to 2002 who were subsequently accused of child sexual abuse. Data was not available for the total number of Catholic priests ordained for the years 1950 through 1959. The upper, or darker, line represents the percentage of ordained diocesan priests and the lower, or lighter, line is the percentage of all who were ordained. The Official Catholic Directory and the Center for Applied Research were the sources for the total numbers of yearly ordinations.

¹ Surveys were included in the study for 181 priests who were reported by their dioceses to have had allegations, but whose clerical status was not reported. The total number of individual priests and deacons includes the diocesan priests, the religious priests and those whose status was not identified.

THE PRIESTS AND DEACONS ACCUSED OF SEXUAL ABUSE

3.1 INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM OF CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE BY ADULT MEN

For many years, scholars and practitioners have attempted to describe and categorize adult men who engage in sexually abusive behavior with children under the age of 18. One clear finding is that child sexual abusers are a heterogeneous population of individuals. There are sexual offenders in all racial, ethnic, age, and socioeconomic categories. In describing child sexual abuse, researchers in this area have focused on the characteristics of the abusers themselves (e.g., static personal variables, such as sexual attraction preferences, and personality) and variables related to the context in which the abuse occurs (e.g., access to victims, isolation of the offender, and presence of substance abuse) as well as personal and situational characteristics of their victims in an effort to create typologies of abusers for assessment and treatment purposes.¹

One way of categorizing offenders, for example, is by the type of victim they choose. Some child sexual abusers are diagnosed as pedophiles, meaning that they exhibit recurrent, intense, sexually arousing fantasies, urges or behaviors related to sexual contact with a prepubescent child over a period of at least six months duration.² However, not all sexual abuse occurs with young children, and not all child sexual abusers fit this clinical diagnosis. Some researchers have identified a similar condition, ephebophilia, which refers to individuals who exhibit these same fantasies, urges or behaviors towards post-pubescent youths.³ While some offenders evidence a clear preference for particular types of victims with regard to age and gender, many do not. Individuals who molest children may be heterosexual, homosexual, or bisexual with regard to victim selection. Child sexual abusers who prefer female victims are more likely to be diagnosed as pedophiles than those who prefer male children while child sexual abusers who prefer male victims tend to target boys who are slightly older.⁴

A second way of categorizing offenders is based on the factors believed to produce the offending behavior. The most widely accepted classification of child molesters follows a dichotomous model consisting of fixated offenders and regressed offenders.⁵ A fixated offender is characterized as having a persistent, continual, and compulsive attraction to children. In contrast, regressed offenders are individuals who are primarily attracted to adults, but who are perceived to engage in sexual activity with children in response to particular stressors (e.g., marital problems and unemployment) or contextual variables (e.g., stress or loneliness).⁶ Subsequent research has demonstrated that while these two concepts are still important in terms of describing sexual abusing types, this classification alone is not sufficiently nuanced to describe the complexities of child sexual abusers.⁷ Instead, fixation can be understood to exist on a continuum, meaning that all offending behavior is likely to result from some varying degrees of a combination of stable personal characteristics (e.g., substance abuse) with contextual variables (e.g., depression).⁸ It is clear that multiple subtypes of offenders exist within

the population of sex offenders; however, there is no single classification system that has strong empirical support.

Empirical studies on child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church are limited. However, a number of descriptive studies have been reported which have examined small, often clinical samples of clergy. These studies suffer from a number of methodological weaknesses, such as small, non-representative samples, which limit their findings and make it impossible to draw any type of meaningful generalization about child sexual abuse in the Church. This literature, however, has focused attention on a number of important topics to be considered in studying the issues within the Church, including the difference between sexually offending and non-offending priests,⁹ the difference between sexually offending priests and sexual offenders in the general population,¹⁰ personality characteristics or backgrounds of sexually offending priests,¹¹ the link between child sexual abuse and substance abuse,¹² and the emotional or psychological development of abusive priests.¹³ The survey instrument completed for each priest against whom allegations of abuse had been made incorporated questions associated with these topics.

The following sections of the report present information about the priests and deacons alleged to have committed child sexual abuse.

¹ Robert A. Knight & Raymond A. Prentky, "Classifying Sexual Offenders: The Development and Corroboration of Taxonomic Models." in *Handbook of Sexual Assault: Issues, Theories, and Treatment of the Offender*, 3rd ed., ed. William L. Marshall (New York: Plenum Press, 1990), 23-52; and Barbara K. Schwartz, "Characteristics and Typologies of Sex Offenders." in *The Sex Offender: Corrections, Treatment and Legal Practice*, 2nd ed., ed. Barbara K. Schwartz and Henry R. Cellini (New Jersey: Civic Research Institute, Inc., 1995)

² American Psychiatric Association, *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders: DSM-IV* (Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association, 1999).

³ Martin P. Kafka, "Sexual Molesters of Adolescents, Ephebophilia, and Catholic Clergy: A Review and Synthesis," in *Sexual Abuse in the Catholic Church: Scientific and Legal Perspectives*, ed. R. Karl Hanson, Friedemann Pfäfflin, and Manfred Lütz (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2004).

⁴ American Psychiatric Association, *DSM-IV*.

⁵ A. Nicholas Groth, William F. Hobson, and Thomas G. Gary, "The Child Molester: Clinical Observations," in *Social Work and Child Sexual Abuse*, ed. Jon R. Conte and David A. Shore (New York: Haworth, 1982).

⁶ Groth, Hobson, and Gary; David Finkelhor, *Child Sexual Abuse: New Theory and Research*, (New York: The Free Press, 1984).

⁷ Lenore M. Simon, Bruce Sales, Alfred Kaszniak, and Marvin Kahn, "Characteristics of Child Molesters: Implications for the Fixated-Regressed Dichotomy," *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 7 (2, 1992): 211-225.

⁸ Simon, 211-225.

⁹ Robert J. Camargo, "Factor, Cluster, and Discriminant Analyses of Data on Sexually Active Clergy: The Molesters of Youth Identified," *American Journal of Forensic Psychology* 15 (2, 1997): 5-24.

¹⁰ Thomas W. Haywood et al., "Psychological Aspects of Sexual Functioning Among Cleric and Non-cleric Alleged Sex Offenders," *Child Abuse & Neglect* 20 (6, 1996): 527-536; and R. Langevin, S. Curnoe, and J. Bain, "A Study of Clerics Who Commit Sexual Offenses: Are They Different From Other Sex Offenders?" *Child Abuse & Neglect* 24 (4, 2000): 535-545.

¹¹ Calvin S.L. Fones et al., "The Sexual Struggles of 23 Clergymen: A Follow-up study." *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy* 25 (1999): 183-195; Richard Irons and Mark Laaser, "The Abduction of Fidelity: Sexual Exploitation by Clergy- Experience with Inpatient Assessment." *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity* 1 (2, 1994): 119-129; and Thomas G. Plante, "Catholic Priests Who Sexually Abuse Minors: Why Do We Hear So Much Yet Know So Little?" *Pastoral Psychology* 44 (5, 1996): 305-310.

¹² Mary F. Ruzicka, "Predictor Variables of Clergy Pedophiles," *Psychological Reports* 80 (1997): 589-590.

¹³ Eugene C. Kennedy, Victor J. Heckler, and Frank J. Kobler, "Clinical Assessment of a Profession: Roman Catholic Clergymen," *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 33 (1, 1977): 120-128; and Thomas P. Doyle, "Roman Catholic Clericalism, Religious Duress, and Clergy Sexual Abuse," *Pastoral Psychology* 51(3, 2003): 189-231.

3.2 SUMMARY RESULTS: PRIESTS WHO HAVE ALLEGATIONS OF SEXUAL ABUSE

Priests who have allegations of sexual abuse of minors are a heterogeneous group of individuals. This is also the case with the general population of child sexual abusers, who have no consistent pattern of age, socioeconomic status, race or psychological problems. The purpose of this chapter is to explain the characteristics of these priests, including their demographic characteristics (e.g., age at time of ordination and offense), their status in the Church, any behavioral and psychological problems they have experienced and any criminal penalties resulting from the allegations of abuse.

The study produced a number of interesting findings:

- The majority of priests with allegations of abuse from 1950-2002 were ordained between the 1950s and 1970s.
- The majority of priests with allegations of abuse are diocesan. Religious priests have slightly more than half as many allegations as diocesan priests. Additionally, religious priests have fewer multiple allegations and fewer allegations of "severe" offenses (e.g., those with penetration).
- Surveys indicated that some priests with allegations of sexual abuse also showed a variety of behavioral problems, the most common of which were personality problems.
- Few incidents were reported to the police. It is possible to speculate that one reason for this is because of the delay in reporting of abuse; consequently, the abuse was alleged beyond the statutes of limitation in many instances.
- When allegations were made to the police, they were almost always investigated, and about one in three priests were charged with a crime. Overall, few priests with allegations served criminal sentences; only 3% of all priests with allegations served prison sentences. The priests with many allegations of abuse were not more likely than other priests to be charged and serve prison sentences.

3.3 DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PRIESTS AND DEACONS ACCUSED OF SEXUAL ABUSE OF YOUTHS UNDER 18

This chapter is based on survey data that describes 4,392 individual men ordained as Catholic priests or deacons. The following steps were taken to achieve that number:

- 4,627 surveys were submitted based on files of individual priests and deacons.
- 68 surveys were removed as ineligible for the study.
- 143 priests were accused of sexual abuse of minors in more than one diocese or religious community. These individuals were identified as having identically encrypted initials and birth dates. All were also confirmed by ordination year and seminary. The information about these men from multiple surveys has been collected into a single entry, and the duplicate entries deleted.
- There were 41 permanent deacons, 20 transitional deacons and 22 seminarians (who were later ordained) among the group of men accused of sexual abuse of minor children. Since there were few deacons, it should be understood that they are included when priests are mentioned.
- Not all questions were answered on each survey; *as a result, each table shows the available responses, and the total will change from table to table.*

Birth dates of the clerics accused of sexual abuse of minors during the study period span more than a century—from 1867 to 1973 (Table 3.3.1). The ordination dates show a similar range, from 1890 to 2000 (Table 3.3.2). However, the majority of men in this study were born between 1920 and 1950, and were ordained in their mid- to late-twenties. Almost 50% of these men were ordained at ages 26 or 27, and 75% were ordained between the ages of 26 and 30. The majority were ordained after 1950.

Table 3.3.1 DECADE OF BIRTH

Decade	Count	Percent	Cumulative	
1860 - 1899	88	2.2%	2.2%	<i>The year of a priest or deacon's birth was provided for 4,019 individuals, or 91.5% of those reported in the surveys.</i>
1900 - 1909	189	4.7%	6.9%	
1910 - 1919	430	10.7%	17.6%	
1920 - 1929	839	20.9%	38.5%	
1930 - 1939	1,049	26.1%	64.6%	
1940 - 1949	1,003	25.0%	89.5%	
1950 - 1959	336	8.4%	97.9%	
1960 - 1969	80	2.0%	99.9%	
1970 - 1979	5	.1%	100.0%	
Total	4,019	100.0%		

Table 3.3.2 DECADE OF ORDINATION

Decade	Count	Percent	Cumulative
1890 - 1919	33	.8%	.8%
1920 - 1929	79	2.0%	2.8%
1930 - 1939	245	6.1%	8.8%
1940 - 1949	501	12.4%	21.3%
1950 - 1959	931	23.1%	44.3%
1960 - 1969	1,021	25.3%	69.7%
1970 - 1979	791	19.6%	89.3%
1980 - 1989	339	8.4%	97.7%
1990 - 2002	94	2.3%	100.0%
Total	4,034	100.0%	

The year of ordination was provided for 4,034 priests and deacons, or 91.6% of those reported in the surveys.

Canon law establishes the age for ordination. In 1983, Canon Law established the minimum age for ordination as 24. In earlier years, it would have been possible to be ordained to minor orders at a younger age. With respect to those ordained before the mid-1950s, we cannot be sure how those who completed the surveys understood ordination date and whether the date reported is ordination to a minor order or ordination to the priesthood.

The average age at the time of ordination of those included in this study did not change between 1880 and 1979, but has risen significantly in the last 20 years to 35 in the period between 1990 and 2002. This change in age at time of ordination, observed in this subset of all men ordained to the Catholic priesthood, is consistent with an overall trend in the Catholic Church. If all are considered, the average age at the time of ordination for a diocesan priest in this study is 28 and for a religious priest, 29.

Table 3.3.3 AGE AT TIME OF ORDINATION

Age	Count	Percent
18 - 24	175	4.4%
25 - 29	2,837	71.9%
30 -34	649	16.4%
35 - 39	172	4.4%
40 - 49	77	2.0%
50 - 59	28	.7%
60 +	7	.2%
Total	3,945	100.0%

The age at ordination was calculated by subtracting the year of birth from the year of ordination. Information on both ages was available for 3,945 priests and deacons.

Only 1% of the men in this study were married at the time an allegation of sexual abuse was made against them.

Table 3.3.4 CLERIC'S MARITAL STATUS

Status	Count	Percent
Married	51	1.2%
Not Married	4,218	98.8%
Total	4,269	100.0%

The clerical status at the time the allegation was made is shown below in Table 3.3.5. 172 individual priests held more than one status during the period covered by the accusation of abuse. Overall, 69.4 % of the accused priests were diocesan priests and 22.1% were religious priests.

Table 3.3.5 CLERICAL STATUS AT TIME OF ALLEGATION

Clerical status	Count	Percent
Diocesan Priest	2,915	69.4%
Religious Priest	929	22.1%
Extern Priest	208	4.9%
Eparchian Priest	14	.3%
Transitional Deacon	19	.5%
Permanent Deacon	42	1.0%
Bishop	12	.1%
Seminarian	21	.5%
Other	51	1.2%
Total	4,211	100.0%

As a whole, the known population of sexual offenders is older than the population of other types of offenders. However, those who have more victims and are more serious offenders tend to have an earlier age of onset. Paraphilias often develop prior to adulthood, and adult sex offenders who had sexual convictions as adolescents generally commit both more offenses and more serious offenses as adults when compared with those who were not juvenile-onset offenders.

The deaconate is the first stage of ordained ministry. Both married and unmarried men may be ordained as permanent deacons.

Some priests held more than one clerical position during the period of alleged abuse. Twelve priests held the status of bishop at some point during the period of alleged abuse. Nine bishops who were the subject of allegations held more than one clerical status.

Seminarians or brothers who had been the subject of allegations before they were ordained were included in the study as long as they proceeded to ordination.

The total of 4,211 shown in Table 3.3.5 is less than the overall total of 4,392 because not all survey forms provided information about clerical status.

Table 3.3.6 AGE OF PRIEST AT FIRST INSTANCE OF ALLEGED ABUSE

Age in Years	Count	Percent
18 – 24	105	3.3%
25 – 29	541	17.0%
30 – 34	718	22.6%
35 – 39	570	17.9%
40 – 44	406	12.8%
45 – 49	316	9.9%
50 – 59	345	10.9%
60 – 69	125	3.9%
70 – 90	50	1.6%
Totals	3,176	100.0%

Table 3.3.7 AGE OF PRIEST AT FIRST INSTANCE OF ALLEGED ABUSE, DIOCESAN & RELIGIOUS

Age in Years	Diocesan Count	Diocesan Percent	Religious Count	Religious Percent
18 - 24	86	3.4%	18	3.1%
25 – 29	488	19.3%	45	7.7%
30 – 34	587	23.3%	112	19.2%
35 – 39	438	17.4%	123	21.1%
40 – 44	308	12.2%	89	15.3%
45 – 49	229	9.1%	77	13.2%
50 – 59	259	10.3%	75	12.9%
60 – 69	95	3.8%	28	4.8%
70 - 90	32	1.3%	15	2.6%
Total	2522	100.0%	582	100.0%

The average age of a priest at the first incident or allegation of child sexual abuse is 39 if all surveys are considered, and the median is 35. The average and median both rise gradually from late 30s to late 40s between 1950 and 2002.

Table 3.3.8 CHANGE IN AGE AT FIRST INSTANCE OF ALLEGED ABUSE, 1950 – 2002 BY DECADE

Time Period	Average Age	Median Age
1950 - 1959s	38	36
1960 - 1960s	37	35
1970 - 1970s	37	35
1980 - 1980s	42.5	39
1990 - 1990s	47	45
2000 - 2002	48	48
Overall	39	35

3.4 PRIESTS WITH BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS

Mental health and treatment professionals have found that it is not uncommon for those who engage in child sexual abuse to demonstrate other behavioral and psychological problems as well. Studies on co-occurrence of sexual offending and other problems have consistently found high rates of personality dysfunction¹ as well as major mental disorders such as anxiety or depression.² Similarly, alcohol or substance abuse problems are frequently present among those who engage in child sexual abuse.³ Studies which have examined clergy who sexually abuse minors with co-occurring problems have found them to exhibit fewer psychological problems than other sex offenders.⁴ However, methodological limitations preclude firm conclusions about groups of clergy who offend.

To examine the co-existence of child sexual abuse and other problems, the study instruments inquired about other types of problems that were evident from a priest's files. The question asked specifically about whether the priest had a history of abuse that was either indicated in the record or known to the diocese; whether he had a history of substance abuse; whether there had been questions raised about his fitness for ministry and whether he had manifested other behavioral problems. Records of 1,400 priests and deacons, nearly one in three of those against whom allegations of sexual abuse of a youth under 18 were made, showed a history of substance abuse, questions about his "fitness for ministry" or behavioral problems.

According to information contained in Church records, very few priests accused of sexual abuse had themselves been victims of abuse. It should be kept in mind, however, that unless a priest self-disclosed his own prior abuse or it had been specifically raised as an issue, there might not have been an indication of abuse in Church files. Of the 4,392 priests and deacons, 279, or 6.8% of the total number, were reported to have been abused (see Table 3.4.1 for breakdown of this number by type of abuse). Of these, a smaller number, 67 reported multiple forms of abuse. Almost half of the priests whose records indicated prior sexual or physical abuse also suffered verbal and emotional abuse.

Table 3.4.1 PRIESTS WITH A HISTORY OF VICTIMIZATION,
BY TYPE OF ABUSE

Type of Abuse	Count	% of Total
Physical abuse	40	14.60%
Sexual abuse	178	64.96%
Physical & Sexual	20	7.3%
Emotional abuse	32	11.68%
Other	4	1.46%
Total	274	100%

The files for 68 priests included information indicating that they had experienced more than one form of abuse during childhood.

When there was a history of childhood abuse, the most frequent abuser was an adult man. As shown in Table 3.4.2, of the 274 priests reported to have been abused themselves, nearly half of them were abused by someone in their family. Thirty-five percent were abused by a parent and 25 percent by a father.

Table 3.4.2 PRIESTS WITH A HISTORY OF VICTIMIZATION,
BY TYPE OF ABUSE

Decade	Count	% of Total
Mother	25	9.36%
Father	67	25.09%
Sibling	14	5.24%
Other family	24	9%
Teacher	5	1.87%
Peer/acquaintance	31	11.61%
Authority figure	23	8.61%
Priest	47	17.60%
Deacon	1	.38%
Other	30	11.24%
Total	267	100%

A total of 48 priests were reported to have been abused by a priest or deacon. This illustrates that 18 percent of priests with allegations of abuse had themselves been abused by a priest or deacon.

A history of substance abuse was reflected in the files of slightly fewer than one in five of the priests and deacons accused of sexual abuse. Alcohol abuse was reported much more frequently than drug abuse, implicated in 96% of the 753 priests with substance abuse information in their records.

Table 3.4.3 SUBSTANCE ABUSE HISTORY

Substance	Count	% of Total
Alcohol only	669	89%
Drugs only	23	3%
Alcohol & drugs	61	8%
Total	753	100%

The survey did not ask for a formal diagnosis of substance abuse or dependence. It was deemed sufficient that the personnel file included an indication that the problem of substance abuse had been observed.

Table 3.4.4 COMPARISON OF PRIEST VICTIMS

	Abuse History		No Abuse History	
Substance Abuse	93	34.4%	646	17.4%
No Substance Abuse	177	65.6%	3024	82.6%
	270	100%	3660	100%

Priests who had themselves been victims of abuse were twice as likely to have a history of difficulties with alcohol, illegal drugs or both.

For those priests with information about substance abuse problems in their files, nearly 72% were referred for evaluation or treatment, with no action reported for nearly 16% (see Table 3.4.5). However, it should be noted that evaluation and treatment referrals are likely to have been documented in the files whereas less formal handling of substance abuse issues might not have been included in the files, so these numbers need to be interpreted cautiously in terms of efficacy. Of those who were referred for treatment, Table 3.4.6 shows that more than 85% were sent for treatment outside of the diocese (76% of whom were referred for inpatient treatment).

Table 3.4.5 CHURCH RESPONSE TO SUBSTANCE ABUSE

Action by Church	Count	% of Total
Referred for evaluation	317	45.7%
Referred for treatment	180	25.9%
Provided spiritual counseling	12	1.7%
Recommended spiritual counseling	9	1.3%
Provided intervention	10	1.4%
No action taken	109	15.7%
Other	57	8.2%
Total	694	100%

Table 3.4.5 shows the initial response undertaken by dioceses and religious communities to care for a priest with a substance abuse problem. In the majority of cases, more than one response was made. According to data from the surveys, 63% of those priests recognized to have a substance abuse problem were referred for treatment.

Table 3.4.6 SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT

Type of treatment	Count	% of instances of SA treatment
Inpatient / in diocese	46	9.8%
Inpatient / outside the diocese	357	76%
Outpatient / in diocese	71	15.1%
Outpatient / outside diocese	44	9.4%

This is a Multiple Response Table. The categories are not mutually exclusive, since an individual may have participated in substance abuse treatment more than once.

Table 3.4.6 includes all instances of treatment reported in the surveys.

Forty six priests were treated twice for substance abuse problems and four were treated three times.

Church records for 476 priests, or 10.9% of the total in the study, raised questions about those priests' fitness for ministry. Another 774 were identified as having behavioral problems. The handwritten notes documenting these problems indicated they were largely psychological in nature (82.2% of those with noted behavioral or fitness for ministry problems were described as having psychological problems). If fitness and behavioral problems are considered together with other noted problems, 1,400 priests and deacons, or 32% of those who were later the subject of an allegation of sexual abuse had been recognized as having behavioral problems.

Table 3.4.7 CLASSIFICATION OF FITNESS AND/OR BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS

Classification of Problem	Count	% of all responses
<i>Sexual Relationship Problems</i>		
Coercive Sex with Males	18	.8%
Coercive Sex with Females	10	.4%
Sex with Adult Women	131	5.8%
Sex with Adult Men	164	7.3%
Other Sexual Behavior	53	2.4%
<i>Mental Health Problems</i>		
Suicide	12	.5%
Depression	75	3.5%
Bipolar Symptoms	16	.7%
Other Axis 1	75	3.3%
Anxiety / Stress	36	1.6%
<i>Personality Problems</i>		
Social Inhibition, Immaturity	78	3.5%
Boundary Problems	479	21.3%
Narcissism	38	1.7%
Hostility	170	7.5%
<i>Other Problems</i>		
Substance Abuse	149	6.6%
Financial / Gambling	45	2%
Medical	90	4%
Legal -- Civil or Criminal	275	12.2%

Table 3.4.7 provides a classification of the types of problems that were described in the surveys.

Table 3.4.7 includes information about 1,400 priests.

The table is a Multiple Response Table. The categories are not mutually exclusive, as a priest may have exhibited multiple problems.

¹ Lisa J. Cohen et al. "Personality Impairment in Male Pedophiles," *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry* 63 (10, 2002): 912-919

² Peter J. Fagan, Thomas N. Wise, Chester W. Schmidt Jr., and Fred S. Berlin. "Pedophilia," *Journal of the American Medical Association* 288 (19, 2002): 2458-2465; and Nancy C. Raymond, Eli Coleman, Fred Ohlerking, Gary A. Christenson, and Michael Miner. "Psychiatric Comorbidity in Pedophilic Sex Offenders," *American Journal of Psychiatry* 156 (5, 1999): 786-788.

³ Stephen H. Allnutt, John M.W. Bradford, David M. Greenberg, and Susan Curry. "Co-morbidity of Alcoholism and the Paraphilias," *Journal of Forensic Sciences* 41 (2, 1996): 234-239.

⁴ Martin P. Kafka, "Sexual Molesters of Adolescents, Ephebophilia, and Catholic Clergy: A Review and Synthesis," in *Sexual Abuse in the Catholic Church: Scientific and Legal Perspectives*, ed. R. Karl Hanson, Friedemann Pfäfflin, and Manfred Lütz (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2004).

3.5 PRIESTS AND DEACONS AND THE ALLEGATIONS

Statistics from recent United States Justice Department studies of the prevalence of youth victimization confirm what other surveys have found: a startling proportion of young people experience sexual victimization¹ In a sample of 4,023 adolescents ages 12 to 17 across racial and ethnic groups, the lifetime prevalence for sexual assault is 8.1%²

Of all female victims of forcible rape whose ages were reported to enforcement agencies in 1992 (from 15 states), girls under the age of 18 represented approximately half of the victims.³ The younger the victim, the more likely that she knew the person who assaulted her.⁴

When similar research was done with data on all victims of sexual assault known to law enforcement between 1991 and 1996, juveniles represented the large majority of all victims of forcible fondling (84%), forcible sodomy (79%), and sexual assault with an object (75%)⁵ One in seven victims of a reported sexual assault was under the age of six.⁶ The single age with the greatest proportion of sexual assault victims among all victims reported to law enforcement was age 14.⁷

Table 3.5.1 ALLEGATIONS AGAINST PRIEST / DEACONS, GROUPED BY NUMBER OF ALLEGATIONS

Number of Allegations	Count	Percent
1	2,411	55.7%
2-3	1160	26.9%
4-9	600	13.9%
10+	149	3.5%
Total	4,311	100.0%

The Cleric Survey asked for the total number of victims who made allegations in the reporting diocese and for the total number of potential allegations that might be made about a particular priest or deacon. Respondents were also asked to complete a Victim Survey for each person making an allegation.

Table 3.5.1 is based on the data from the Cleric Survey.

If accused diocesan and religious priests are compared using the above classification into four groups, the results do not differ greatly

- 54% of diocesan priests had a single allegation compared to 61% of accused religious priests;
- 14.7 of diocesan priests have 4-9 allegations, compared to 10.9% of the accused religious priests;
- 4.2% of diocesan priests have ten or more allegations, compared to 1.5% of the religious priests.

Question 23 on the Cleric Survey asked the respondent to report the number of victims who had made formal allegations known to the diocese and religious community about an individual priest. These allegations are referred to in Table 3.5.2 as “Formal Allegations.” The following survey question asked “Is there any indication that the cleric has abused more victims than the official allegations made?” The affirmative responses, and the numbers associated with them, are referred to as “Potential Allegations.”

Table 3.5.2 FORMAL AND POTENTIAL ALLEGATIONS AGAINST PRIESTS, IN FOUR GROUPS

Number of Allegations	Count	Percent of all
1	2,154	50%
2-3	1138	26.4%
4-9	767	17.8%
10+	252	5.8%
Total	4,311	100%

If the formal allegations made against an individual priest or deacon are added to the potential allegations known to the diocese or religious community, the result is shown in Table 3.5.2.

Table 3.5.3 GENDER OF ALLEGED VICTIMS, BY NUMBER OF ALLEGED ABUSERS

Gender	Count	Percent of all
Male and Female	157	3.6%
Female only	991	22.6%
Male only	2,805	64%
Gender unknown	429	9.8%
Total	4,230	100%

Table 3.5.3 shows the percentage of all priests with allegations, grouped by the gender of the person who made the allegation.


In 429 surveys, the gender of the alleged victim was not identified.

Table 3.5.4 ALLEGED VICTIMS OF SEXUAL ABUSE INCIDENTS, GROUPED BY GENDER AND AGE

Gender	1 - 7 years	8 - 10 years	11 - 14 years	15 - 17 years
Male	203 41.7%	992 71.4%	4,282 85.4%	2,892 85.2%
Female	284 58.3%	398 28.6%	734 14.6%	502 14.8%
Total per group	487	1,390	5,016	3,394
% of all incidents	5.8%	16%	50.9%	27.3%

The data for Table 3.5.4 are drawn from the Cleric Surveys. The question on that survey that asked for a listing of alleged victims' ages and gender was not completed for all surveys. Therefore the totals in Table 3.5.4, when summed, are not the same as the total number of alleged incidents.

Figure 3.5.1 GENDER RATIO OF ALLEGED VICTIMS, BY DECADE OF ACCUSATION



The year 1944 appears in this figure because one incident of abuse began in 1944, along with others that began in the late 1940s, but continued after 1950. The years of abuse before 1950 are not counted when the totals by year are derived, but are included here.

Table 3.5.5 ALLEGED MALE VICTIMS, AGE AT FIRST INSTANCE OF ABUSE BY DECADE

Decade	Ages 1 - 7	Ages 8 - 10	Ages 11 - 14	Ages 15 - 17	Decade Total
1950 - 1959	20	115	266	87	488
	4.1%	23.6%	54.5%	17.8%	100%
1960 - 1969	74	298	950	314	1636
	4.5%	18.2%	58.1%	19.2%	100%
1970 - 1979	80	354	1461	668	2563
	3.1%	13.8%	57%	26.1%	100%
1980 - 1989	48	170	818	585	1621
	3%	10.5%	50.5%	36.1%	100%
1990 - 2002	10	29	141	222	402
	2.5%	7.2%	35.1%	55.2%	100%

Table 3.5.6 ALLEGED FEMALE VICTIMS, AGE AT FIRST INSTANCE OF ABUSE, BY DECADE

Decade	Ages 1 - 7	Ages 8 - 10	Ages 11 - 14	Ages 15 - 17	Decade Total
1950 - 1959	79	87	89	24	279
	28.3%	31.2%	31.9%	8.6%	100%
1960 - 1969	92	129	207	98	526
	17.5%	24.5%	39.4%	18.6%	100%
1970 - 1979	46	97	164	119	426
	10.8%	22.8%	38.5%	27.9%	100%
1980 - 1989	28	48	110	75	261
	10.8%	18.5%	41.7%	29%	100%
1990 - 2002	11	16	75	43	145
	7.5%	11%	51.7%	29.7%	100%

The information in Tables 3.5.5 and 3.5.6 is taken from the Victim Surveys and available only for those surveys that included answers to the three questions about gender, date of incident and age at the time of the incident. Complete responses were received for 82%, or slightly more than four out of five, of the incident-level surveys.

Table 3.5.7 SUMMARY OF ALLEGED ACTS OF SEXUAL ABUSE

	Number of priests accused	Number of incidents reported	Percent of priests accused of each act
Verbal Abuse	626	1,105	15.2%
Victim Disrobed	1,057	1,442	25.17%
Priests Disrobed	695	1,129	16.9%
Touching over Victim's Clothes	2,161	3,600	52.6%
Touching over Priest's Clothes	494	968	12.0%
Touching under Victim's Clothes	1,848	4,022	44.9%
Touching under Priest's Clothes	553	968	13.4%
Shown Pornographic Video	107	150	2.6%
Shown Pornographic Magazine/Photo	149	240	3.6%
Photos of Victim	126	202	3.1%
Masturbation	466	741	11.3%
Mutual Masturbation	587	1,089	14.3%
Manual Penetration	283	389	6.9%
Penetration with Object	64	87	1.6%
Cleric Performed Oral Sex	1,068	1,477	26.0%
Victim Performed Oral Sex	585	922	14.2%
Penile Penetration/Attempt	920	1,219	22.4%
Hugs and Kissing	339	501	8.2%
Other	363	580	8.8%
No Record	754	991	18.3%
Unspecified Sexual Abuse	853	1,184	20.7%
Sexual Games (Strip Poker, Skinny Dipping)	78	104	1.9%
Group Sex or Coerced Sex w/ Others	14	52	0.3%
<p><i>This table is a Multiple Response Table. The categories are not mutually exclusive, as an individual may have participated in more than one act during the course of an incident.</i></p>			

¹ Dean G. Kilpatrick, Benjamin E. Saunders, and Daniel W. Smith. *Youth Victimization: Prevalence and Implications. NIJ Research in Brief*. (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, 2003), 1.

² Kilpatrick, 7.

³ Patrick A. Langan and Caroline Wolf Harlow, *Child Rape Victims, 1992*, (U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1992, Washington, D.C.), 1.

⁴ Langan., 2.

⁵ Howard N. Snyder, *Sexual Assault of Young Children as Reported to Law Enforcement: Victim, Incident, and Offender Characteristics, NIBRS Statistical Report*, (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2000), 2.

⁶ Snyder, 2.

⁷ Langan, 2.

3.6 SERIAL ABUSERS: PRIESTS WITH MULTIPLE ALLEGATIONS

Many individuals who commit a sexual offense, such as child sexual abuse, do so as a result of situational or impulsive factors. These are often single-victim offenders who may never repeat their crime or may repeat the act only if the same or similar circumstances recur. For example, such individuals may only act out when their controls are reduced due to intoxication, when experiencing significant situational stress, or when an opportunity is present. Thus, their behavior is often unplanned and considered a "regression," triggered largely—but not entirely—by external conditions.

However, there is a much smaller number of serial sex offenders who act out not as a result of the effects of external stress or a weakening of inhibitory controls; instead, they behave in a more methodical fashion using a high degree of planning. In these cases, there is a strong compulsion to act—a compulsion derived from a fixation on the type of victim desired and the type of acts performed. These offenses are often preceded by years of intense fantasy in which the act is rehearsed and strategies are developed. Offenders of this type have a very high potential to repeat their crimes. Such individuals can be quite manipulative in the way they approach victims and in the methods they employ to avoid apprehension. Because their crimes are highly planned and often target particular types of victims, they may abuse large numbers of children before they are apprehended.

Those priests who have been accused of abusing a large number of young people have attracted significant, often sensationalized, nationwide attention. These cases are frequently discussed along with the cases of those priests who have been transferred from diocese to diocese and who have continued to be accused of sexual abuse of youth under 18. Data from this study has found these two groups to be different in many aspects. Those priests who have ten or more allegations differ in many respects from the average for all priests in the study, but this is not as true for the group having allegations in more than one diocese or religious community. The study received 149 surveys for priests who had ten or more allegations of child sexual abuse—although if potential allegations (from potential victims known to the diocese) are included, the number of priests is 252. After careful analysis, 143 priests out of the total number of 4,392, were identified as having been the subject of allegations in more than one diocese. Of that group, nine had allegation made in three dioceses and one priest was accused of sexual abuse in four dioceses.

- The group of 149 priests, the "10+ group," account for 26% of all incidents reported in the study. The 143 priests who were accused in more than one diocese, the "Transfers," had a lower rate of accusation, but account for 8.7% of all incidents reported in the study (see Table 3.6.1).
- The group of 143 priests who received accusations in at least two dioceses or religious communities were more likely to be identified with substance abuse and behavioral problems and more likely to be reported to the police. Overall, 64% of the "Transfer" group saw their ministry restricted.

Table 3.6.1 PRIESTS WITH MULTIPLE ALLEGATIONS:
COMPARISON OF TWO GROUPS

	Transfers (N=143)	10+ Group (N=149)	All Priests (N=4,392)
Total Allegations	992	2,960	11,404
	8.7%	26%	100%
Median for Allegations, per Priest	4	14	1
Allegations And Potential Allegations	1,078	3,248	4,840
	9.5%	28%	100%
Substance Abuse	30%	22%	18.7%
Behavioral Problems	36%	33%	23%
Ministry Restricted	64.5%	53.7%	27%
Police Contact	7.6%	4%	14%
Charged with a Crime	4.6%	3%	3%

These data are taken from the Cleric Surveys. The total number of allegations reported there exceeds the number of Victim Surveys received.

The Cleric Survey asked for the total number of allegations that had been made against a priest or deacon in the responding diocese or religious community. It also asked for the number of other incidents not yet reported that were associated with or suspected of a particular priest.

The distribution of the number of allegations per priests is similar for diocesan and religious priests except with respect to 10+ group. There are only 14 religious priests in the 10+ group of 149.

Table 3.6.2 SERIAL ABUSERS BY CLERICAL STATUS

No. of Allegations	Diocesan Priests		Religious Priests	
	No.	%	No.	%
1	1,752	54%	558	61%
2 - 3	883	27.2%	244	26.7%
4 - 9	476	14.6%	99	10.8%
10+	135	4.2%	14	1.5%
Total	3,246		915	

3.7 CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS AND PENALTIES

Despite the gravity of the crime of child sexual abuse and the public policy interest in dealing effectively with it, very little systematic data has been collected that would provide a clear profile of those who are prosecuted, convicted or incarcerated for child sexual abuse.¹ As a U.S. Department of Justice publication explains, despite a few highly publicized cases of sexual assaults of young children, “there is little empirically-based information on these crimes.”² The National Crime Victimization Survey, for example, collects data on victims over the age of 12. There is reason to believe, however, that sexual assault crimes against juvenile victims comprise a large proportion of sexual assaults handled by law enforcement agencies.³

In the last ten years or so, a new reporting system has been in place, the National Incident-Based Reporting Systems (NIBRS), which has the potential to provide much more detailed information about those who are arrested for sexual assaults against children and the methods of arrest clearance.⁴ However, it is limited in representativeness because law enforcement agencies are not mandated to participate; for example, data from a July 2000 report draws from only 12 states.⁵ Nevertheless, it does provide relevant contextual information. It reports that, in general, sexual assaults of juvenile victims were more likely to result in an arrest (29%) than were adult victimizations (22%) although rates were lower for victims under 6 (19%) versus approximately 32.5% for victims ages 6 to 17.⁶ Overall, these results indicate that juvenile victims of sexual assault who were reported to law enforcement agencies were more likely to be male (18%) than were adult victims (4%); nearly one-fourth of the victims under 12 were male. Sexual assaults of children under the age of 6 were “the least likely of all such crimes to result in arrest or be otherwise cleared.”⁷ Law enforcement was able to identify the offender in just a third of the sexual assaults of children under age 6 and 45% of those for victims between 6 and 11.⁸

The following tables summarize whether each particular incident or allegation of abuse against a priest led to follow-up in the criminal justice system. Of course, the range of behaviors described in the allegations varied substantially (see Table 4.4.1), which might have affected whether law enforcement contact was initiated or resulted in any follow-up. Overall, fifteen percent of priests were reported to the police by a victim. A much smaller number were reported by a diocese or religious community.

A report to the police resulted in an investigation in almost all cases (see *Tables 3.7.1 and 3.7.2*). Only 384 of the 4,392 priests and deacons were criminally charged (see *Table 3.6.3*). The comparative percentages for diocesan, religious and extern priests investigated by the police and subsequently charged are generally equivalent.

Table 3.7.1 ABUSE REPORTED TO THE POLICE, BY CLERICAL STATUS

	Diocesan	Religious	Extern	Total
Police Report	778	191	54	1,021
	25.2%	20.6%	26%	24.2%
No police report	2,298	738	174	3,190
	74.8%	79.4%	74%	75.8%

According to the information in the Church's files, approximately 24% of priests accused of abuse were reported to the police, and some were independently detected.

Tables 3.7.1 – 3.7.4 report information on 4,211 priests and deacons, the total number for whom data was available on both clerical status and police contact.

Table 3.7.2 ABUSE INVESTIGATED BY POLICE

	Diocesan	Religious	Extern	Total
Police investigation	709	174	56	939
	23.1%	18.7%	26.9%	22.3%
No police investigation	2,365	755	152	3,272
	76.9%	81.3%	73.1%	77.7%

Table 3.7.3 PRIEST CHARGED WITH A CRIME

	Diocesan	Religious	Extern	Total
Priest charged	285	70	29	384
	9.3%	7.5%	13.9%	9.1%
Priest not charged	2,789	859	179	3,827
	90.7%	92.5%	86.1%	90.9%

Overall, 9.1% percent of priests were charged with a criminal offense (see Table 3.7.3). Although this is 41% of those cases in which a police investigation was carried out, the percentage of charges that proceeded to adjudication would be smaller.

Of the 384 priests who were charged with a crime, a majority (252) were convicted.

Table 3.7.4 PRIESTS CONVICTED OF A CRIME

	Diocesan	Religious	Extern	Total
Priests convicted	193	48	11	252
	6.3%	5.2%	5.3%	6%
Not convicted	2,881	881	197	3,959
	93.7%	94.8%	94.7%	94%

Table 3.7.4 is based on a total number of 4,211 priests.

Of those who were convicted (priests), the following table summarizes the type of sentence the priest was given for the offense. Criminal penalties are specific to localities or jurisdictions, and the charges against the priests varied widely.

Table 3.7.5 CRIMINAL PENALTIES

Penalty	Number of Priests	Percent
Prison	100	73%
Jail	61	44%
House arrest or electronic monitoring	7	5%
Probation	122	88%
Fine	25	18%
Community service	18	13%
Other	28	20.5%

This is a Multiple Response Table. The categories are not mutually exclusive, since an individual may have been sentenced to several different penalties by the court.

Three men were sentenced to spend the rest of their lives in prison, and two others were required to register as sex offenders.

Table 3.7.6 PRIESTS, BY NUMBER OF INCIDENTS CHARGED

Incidents	Count s	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	166	62.2%	62.2%
2	49	18.4%	80.5%
3	12	4.5%	85%
4	16	6%	91%
5	8	3%	94%
6	2	.7%	94.8%
8	3	1.1%	95.9%
9	1	.4%	97.3%
10 - 19	5	1.9%	98.1%
20 - 33	3	1.1%	99.2%
55	1	.4%	99.6%
131	1	.4%	100.0%
Total	226	100%	

In trying to better understand the types of incidents that led to criminal justice system involvement, the allegations made against priests have been divided into two categories: those involving direct sexual contact either by mouth to genitals (e.g., oral sex, penetration or masturbation) and those without such direct sexual contact (e.g., hugging, kissing or sex talk). The type of incident did not seem to influence whether the alleged victim contacted the police or whether the priest was ultimately charged or convicted (see Tables 3.7.7, 3.7.8 and 3.7.9).

Table 3.7.7 POLICE REPORT BY SEVERITY OF ALLEGATION

	<i>Severity of Offense</i>		
	<i>Acts Involving Sexual</i>	<i>Acts Not Involving Sex</i>	<i>Row Total</i>
Police Contacted	437	620	1,057
	28.4%	21.7%	24.1%
Police Not Contacted	1,103	2,232	3,335
	71.6%	78.3%	75.9%
Total	1,540	2,852	4,392
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tables 3.7.7 – 3.7.9 show the comparative criminal justice system contact for priests accused of acts or attempts involving penetration or oral sex and those involving an act of masturbation. All other incidents, including those with allegations of unspecified “sex abuse” or “other” abusive behavior are counted in these tables as not involving sex.

Table 3.7.8 CRIMINAL CHARGE BY SEVERITY OF ALLEGATION

	<i>Severity of Offense</i>		
	<i>Acts Involving Sex</i>	<i>Acts Not Involving Sex</i>	<i>Row Total</i>
Priest Charged	173	223	396
	5.1%	4.9%	5.0%
Priest Not Charged	1,367	2,629	3,996
	94.9%	95.1%	95.0%
Total	1,540 100.0%	2,852 100.0%	4,392 100.0%

Table 3.7.9 CRIMINAL CONVICTION BY SEVERITY OF ALLEGATION

	<i>Severity of Offense</i>		
	<i>Acts Involving Sex</i>	<i>Acts Not Involving Sex</i>	<i>Row Total</i>
Priest Convicted	107	152	259
	6.9%	5.3%	5.9%
Priest Not Convicted	1,433	2,700	4,133
	93.1%	94.7%	94.1%
Total	1,540 100.0%	2,852 100.0%	4,392 100.0%

If the accused priests are grouped not just by the number of formal allegations, but by the number of actual and potential allegations (to include the number of potential victims) the results show that investigation, arrest, and conviction are more likely for priests with more allegations.

Table 3.7.10 POLICE INVESTIGATION–ALLEGATIONS PLUS POTENTIAL VICTIMS

	<i>Allegations and Potential Victims per Priest</i>			
	<i>1</i>	<i>2-3</i>	<i>4-9</i>	<i>10+</i>
Police Investigation	357	264	232	110
	16.5%	23.2%	30.3%	43.7%
No Police Investigation	1,807	874	534	142
	83.5%	76.8%	69.7%	56.3%
Total	2,164 100.0%	1,138 100.0%	766 100.0%	252 100.0%

The term “potential victims” refers to Question 24 on the Cleric Survey, which asks for any third-party allegations noted in the records. Tables 3.7.10 - 3.7.2 include both actual and “potential” allegations.

Table 3.7.11 PRIEST CHARGED - ALLEGATIONS AND POTENTIAL VICTIMS

	<i>Allegations and Potential Victims per Priest</i>			
	<i>1</i>	<i>2-3</i>	<i>4-9</i>	<i>10+</i>
Priest Charged	117	113	105	59
	5.4%	9.9%	13.7%	23.4%
Priest Not Charged	2,047	1,025	661	193
	94.6%	90.1%	86.3%	76.6%
Total	2,164 100.0%	1,138 100.0%	766 100.0%	252 100.0%

Table 3.7.12 PRIEST CONVICTED—ALLEGATIONS PLUS POTENTIAL VICTIMS

	<i>Allegations and Potential Victims per Priest</i>			
	<i>1</i>	<i>2-3</i>	<i>4-9</i>	<i>10+</i>
Priest Convicted	69	72	72	44
	3.2%	6.3%	9.4%	17.5%
Priest Not Convicted	2,095	1,066	694	208
	96.8%	93.7%	90.6%	82.5%
Total	2,164 100.0%	1,138 100.0%	766 100.0%	252 100.0%

¹ David Finkelhor and Lisa M. Jones. "Explanations for the Decline In Child Sexual Abuse Cases," *ODJJP Bulletin*, (Washington, DC: OJJDP, January 2004): 11.

² Howard N. Snyder. *Sexual Assault of Young Children as Reported to Law Enforcement: Victim, Incident, and Offender Characteristics*, (Washington, DC: U.S Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, 2000), 1.

³ Snyder, 12.

⁴ Snyder, 1.

⁵ Snyder, 1.

⁶ Snyder, 11.

⁷ Snyder, 13.

⁸ Snyder, 13.

INCIDENTS AND ALLEGATIONS OF CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

4.1 INTRODUCTION TO INCIDENTS AND ALLEGATIONS OF CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

Child sexual abuse is complex problem that encompasses psychological, social and legal considerations. Research and theory have sought to understand the various motivations for abuse as well as characteristic offender behaviors that lead up to and occur during abuse. In order to understand child sexual abuse, it is important to understand the motivation to begin offending (the preconditions to child sexual abuse), how child sexual abusers get children to participate in sexual activity (“grooming”), and how and why the abusers are able to maintain this course of abusive actions through rationalizations of the behavior.

When considering why men sexually abuse children and adolescents, researchers have identified a number of preconditions to child sexual abuse. These include, but are not limited to: the offender’s “emotional congruence” to youths (the link between the offender’s emotional needs and the children’s characteristics), low self esteem, deviant sexual arousal, “developmental blockage” (the failure to develop the appropriate social skills and self-confidence necessary to form effective intimate relations with adults), “situational blockage” (when an adult’s sexual interests are blocked from normal sexual expression owing to the loss of a relationship or some other transitory crisis), and disinhibition (the factors that help a child sexual abuser overcome his inhibitions so that he allows himself to abuse a child or adolescent, e.g., use of alcohol or other substances).¹ These preconditions are each variable in strength; while some abusers may act out as a reaction to transitory stress, others seem to be driven by such a strong compulsion that situational factors play only a minor role, if any at all.

In order to get the children to go along with the abuse, many child sexual abusers indulge in what is termed “grooming,” or premeditated behavior intended to manipulate the potential victim into complying with the sexual abuse.² Grooming tactics include verbal, emotional and/or physical intimidation, seduction, and the use of enticements such as candy, money, or other gifts. Emotional manipulation and verbal coercion seem to be the most common tactics used by offenders to groom their victims, including doing favors for the victim in exchange for sex and/or emotionally blackmailing the victim into compliance.³

In order for the child sexual abuse to continue, child sexual abusers often rationalize their behavior through “cognitive distortions,” or distorted thinking patterns. Like any other type of offender, child sexual abusers may subconsciously use a “neutralization technique” to defuse any feelings of remorse or guilt they have for committing the abusive act or for the consequences of that act.⁴ They do so by excusing or justifying their actions, often acknowledging their guilt but not taking responsibility for the acts. Commonly, they blame the victims for their offenses or justify their offenses through the victims’ actions.

We used the extensive body of research findings that describe offender characteristics and the circumstances of childhood victimization as a guide in crafting the questions (e.g., the type of enticements used to “groom” children and to understand this sub-group of abusers.

¹ David Finkelhor, *Child Sexual Abuse: New Theory and Research* (New York: The Free Press, 1984).

² American Psychiatric Association, *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders: DSM-IV TR* (Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Association, 2000).

³ Douglas W. Pryor, *Unspeakable Acts: Why Men Sexually Abuse Children* (New York, NY: New York University Press, 1996).

⁴ Gresham M. Sykes and David Matza, “Techniques of neutralization: A theory of delinquency,” *American Sociological Review*, 22 (1957):664-670.

4.2 SUMMARY: CHARACTERISTICS OF THE INCIDENTS OF ALLEGED SEXUAL ABUSE BY CATHOLIC PRIESTS

One of the most important tasks of this report is to provide a better understanding of the situations in which sexual abuse of children by Catholic priests occurred. The purpose of this chapter is to describe who has alleged child sexual abuse in the Church, his or her situational characteristics (e.g., age, gender and family situation), the relationship between the priest and the accuser, and the circumstances of the abuse (when and in what situation the abuse allegedly occurred). Through an appreciation of these characteristics, the Church would be better able to design policies aimed at removing opportunities in which such abuse could occur.

The study produced some important findings about the nature of child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church.

- Unlike in the general population, more males than females were allegedly. In fact, there was a significant difference between genders, with four out of five alleged victims being male.
- The majority of alleged victims were post-pubescent, with only a small percentage of priests receiving allegations of abusing young children.
- The allegations of sexual abuse involved a variety of sexual acts, and most of the priests involved were alleged to have committed multiple acts per victim. Indeed, much of the sexual abuse reported involved serious sexual offenses.
- According to the allegations of sexual abuse, the most frequent context of the sexual incidents occurred during a social event. Additionally, many of the priests with allegations of abuse socialized with the family of the alleged victim.
- The most common place of occurrence was the residence of the priest though incidents of abuse allegedly occurred in a wide variety of locations.

Whatever the motivation of men to sexually abuse children, the abuse is less likely to occur if there are fewer opportunities for the abuse to happen. This chapter paints a picture of priests who are friendly with the families of their alleged victims and who spend much social time with those they allegedly abused. Several of the priests allegedly bought gifts or gave other types of enticements (e.g., let the youths drive cars or took them to sporting events) to those who made allegations against them. Thus, like in the general population, child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church appears to be committed by men close to the children they allegedly abuse. Many appear to use grooming tactics to entice children into complying with the abuse and the abuse frequently occurs in the home of the alleged abuser or victim.

4.3 CHARACTERISTICS OF CHILDREN WHO ALLEGED SEXUAL ABUSE BY CATHOLIC PRIESTS

This chapter is based on survey data that describes 10,667 incidents of alleged sexual abuse of youths under 18 by a Catholic priest or deacon, at least part of which occurred between the beginning of 1950 and the end of 2002. The following steps were taken to achieve that number:

- Dioceses, eparchies and religious communities submitted 10,822 incident-level surveys based on files for individual priests and deacons who had been accused of child sexual abuse.
- Allegations determined to have been documented by more than one survey have been unified as a single incident-level file.
- 155 surveys that were submitted for allegations made about acts that occurred when the person making the allegation was 18 or older, and about alleged events that occurred or ended before 1950, or that were associated to seminarians or religious brothers not eligible for the study were deleted and diocesan/religious community totals corrected.
- Not all questions were answered on each survey; as a result, each table shows the available responses, and the totals change from table to table.

The extent of childhood sexual victimization is difficult to estimate though it is a phenomenon that has been studied extensively over the last few decades. Despite the claim by many that it occurs in epidemic proportions, most of these studies have disagreed with respect to the true prevalence figure. Prevalence estimates of childhood sex abuse range from 2 to 62 percent, depending largely upon the methodology used in the research design (including the definition of child sexual abuse, sampling procedures, type of questions asked during one-on-one interviews, and gender of the respondents). One analysis of the various studies on victim prevalence found that the overall prevalence for male children who are sexually abused is 13 percent, and the prevalence of female children who are sexually abused ranges from 30 to 40 percent.¹ This study also identified three significant explanations as to why there is such a wide range in childhood sexual victimization rates, including the number of screening questions used to identify abuse victims, the size of the sample, and the year in which the study was conducted.²

The results of our study indicated that of all victims whose gender was reported, (Table 4.3.1) 81% were male and 19% were female.

Table 4.3.1 GENDER OF ALLEGED VICTIM

Gender	Count	% of Total
Male	8,499	80.9%
Female	2,004	19.1%
Transsexual	2	.0%
Total	10,505	100.0%

98.5% of surveys reported the gender of the alleged victim.

Table 4.3.2 represents the age of the alleged victim at the time of the alleged event. If the event continued for multiple years, this table represents the age at which the abuse allegedly began. Each alleged victim is only represented once. Therefore, this table does not represent the duration of abuse or the ages of the alleged victims throughout the time they were abused. For instance, if a child was sexually abused from the age of three to nine, he or she is represented in this table at age three.

The majority of victims are males between the ages of 11-17, and just over half (50.7%) of all individuals who made allegations of abuse were between the ages of 11-14. The average age of all alleged victims is 12.6. This number has increased over time, however. In the 1950s, the average age was 11.5; in the 1960s it was 12; in the 1970s it was 12.87; in the 1980s it was 13.2; and by the 1990s it was 13.87.

Table 4.3.2 VICTIM'S AGE AT FIRST INSTANCE OF ABUSE

Age in Years	Count	% of Total
1	4	.0%
2	11	.1%
3	22	.2%
4	41	.5%
5	82	1.0%
6	158	1.8%
7	220	2.5%
8	369	4.1%
9	362	4.0%
10	752	8.4%
11	895	10.0%
12	1,323	14.7%
13	1,141	12.8%
14	1,188	13.2%
15	1,042	11.6%
16	769	8.6%
17	577	6.5%
Total	8,956	100%

Eighty-four percent of surveys included the age of the alleged victim at the time the abuse occurred or at the time the abuse began. It is important to understand that in retrospective studies, particularly where there is a delay in the reporting of the events, the possibility that alleged victims did not remember the specific dates correctly must be considered. (See Section 5.1 for a review of the research on this phenomenon, called "telescoping.")

The substantial majority of alleged victims of child sexual abuse, or almost four out of five, lived with both parents. Information about the residence of the alleged victim was provided on 70% of the Victim Surveys.

Table 4.3.3 VICTIM'S RESIDENCE / LIVING SITUATION

	Count	% of Total
Mother only	843	11.2%
Father only	81	1.1%
Both parents	5,905	78.6%
Brother(s)	29	.4%
Sister(s)	14	.2%
Other guardian	17	.2%
Grandparents	53	.7%
Boarding school	172	2.3%
Foster parents	29	.4%
Orphanage	159	2.1%
Home of priest	67	.9%
Church-related residence	53	.7%
Other	92	1.2%
Total	7,514	100%

¹ Rebecca Bolen and Maria Scannapieco, "Prevalence of Child Sexual Abuse: A Corrective Metanalysis" *Social Service Review* (1999): 281.

² Bolen and Scannapieco.

4.4 CHARACTERISTICS OF ACTS OF SEXUAL ABUSE BY CATHOLIC PRIESTS

Many efforts have been made to assess the abuse experiences of those who have been victims of child sexual abuse, from attempts to collect population data at the national level to small clinical studies done with a few survivors of sexual abuse. These studies generally tend to chronicle the types of behaviors engaged in by child sexual abusers, and primarily report percentages of the sample that experienced each form of abuse (e.g., intercourse, oral sex, fondling, pornography). A number of studies have compared male and female victims, although most of the male victim samples have been too small to allow for broad generalizations.

Looking at Table 4.4.1, it is clear that many of the allegations of abuse include more than one type of sexual act¹. Several points are significant:

- The categories are not mutually exclusive. In other words, the abusers could have committed multiple types of abuses.
- Very few priests have allegations of only the least severe of the abuses. Only 148 priests (2.9%) allegedly committed act of verbal abuse and/or pornography offenses without more severe offenses. Only 395 priests (9.0%) allegedly committed offenses involving touching over the clothes only without also committing a more severe offense.
- Touching under the victim's clothes is the most common act alleged. However, only 695 (15.8%) priests committed that as the only or the most serious of their alleged offenses. This means that when this abuse was alleged, it usually included a more serious offense as well.
- There are 69 incidents for which the most serious act alleged is sexual talk. These incidents represent seven-tenths of one percent, or .7% of the 9,630 surveys that reported details about the behavior that was alleged to have taken place. If sexual talk and the use of pornography are counted together, for cases where no further sexual abuse was alleged, there are 141 incidents, or 1.5% of the total.
- If talk and/or pornography use are considered together with either touching under the priest's or victim's clothing, and nothing more serious is alleged, the total number of such incidents is 1,196, or 12.4% of the total.
- If hugging and kissing, the removal of clothing, or masturbation is counted along with the acts outlined above, the total number of incidents jumps to 4,167, or 43% of the total.
- If incidents that include acts of oral sex or sexual penetration are counted alone, they total 3,280, or 34%.

Table 4.4.1 ALLEGED ACTS OF ABUSE, BY GENDER

Behavior Alleged	GENDER		Combined
	Males	Females	Totals
Verbal (sexual talk)	885	215	1,100
	11.5%	12%	11.6%
Shown Pornography	223	9	232
	2.9%	.5%	2.4%
Shown Porn videos	142	6	148
	1.8%	.3%	1.6%
Touch Over Cleric's Clothes	704	165	869
	9.1%	9.2%	9.2%
Touch Over Victim's Clothes	2,862	691	3,553
	37.2%	38.6%	37.4%
Touch Under Victim's Clothes	3,280	701	3,981
	42.6%	39.2%	42%
Cleric Disrobed	944	177	1,121
	12.3%	9.9%	11.8%
Victim Disrobed	1,112	303	1,415
	14.4%	16.9%	14.9%
Photos of Victim	169	32	201
	2.2%	1.8%	2.1%
Sexual Games	96	8	104
	1.2%	.4%	1.1%
Hugging & Kissing	324	175	499
	4.2%	9.8%	5.3%
Masturbation	663	71	734
	8.6%	4.0%	7.7%
Mutual Masturbation	1,049	29	1,078
	13.6%	1.6%	11.4%
Cleric Perform Oral Sex	1,186	274	1,460
	15.4%	15.9%	15.4%
Victim Performed Oral Sex	799	115	914
	10.4%	6.4%	9.6%
Manual Penetration	192	195	387
	2.5%	10.9%	4.1%
Penetration with Object	61	26	87
	.8%	1.5%	.9%
Penile Penetration	990	213	1,203
	12.9%	11.9%	12.7%
Group or Coerced Sex	48	4	52
	.6%	.2%	.5%
Unspecified Sex Act	942	204	1,146
	12.2%	11.4%	12.1%
Other	490	87	577
	6.4%	4.9%	6.1%

The category of "other" includes a wide array of behaviors, including voyeuristic and sadistic acts. Unspecified sex act refers to surveys that indicate sexual acts but do not identify particular acts.

This is a Multiple Response Table. The categories are not mutually exclusive.

The majority of allegations of sexual abuse were made against priests who were accused of having committed abusive acts more than one time. Only slightly more than one quarter (29%) of the allegations involve only a single instance of abuse.

Table 4.4.2 NUMBER OF TIMES ABUSED, PER VICTIM

No. of times abused	Count	Percent
Once	2,759	29%
More than once	1,734	18.3%
Numerous times	5,002	52.7%
Total	9,493	100%

Question 8 on the Victim Survey asked how many times the victim was abused. The choices were 'once,' 'more than once,' and 'numerous.'

Child sexual abusers who plan their abusive acts indulge in what is termed "grooming" behavior. Grooming is a pre-meditated behavior intended to manipulate the potential victim into complying with the sexual abuse. Some methods by which child sexual abusers approach and initiate sexual activity with their victims include verbal and/or physical intimidation, seduction, emotional blackmail, and the use of enticements such as candy, money, or other gifts. The tactics used by offenders depend somewhat on the potential victim's response to the tactic. If an offender encounters little to no resistance from the potential victim, he will continue to use the same tactic repeatedly. If, however, some resistance is encountered, the offender may either change the tactic and/or become more forceful in his endeavor. Table 4.4.3 shows the number of priests who allegedly threatened those who accused them of abuse, and Table 4.4.4 shows the type of threat that was used. Both tables display the information by gender.

Table 4.4.3 THREATS BY VICTIM'S GENDER

Victim Threatened?	Male	Female	Total
Yes	527	208	835
	14%	16.8%	14.6%
No	3,853	1,033	4,886
	86%	83.2%	84.5%
Gender Totals	4,480	1,241	100%

Approximately half of the incident-level surveys (5,761) included information on the use of threats. Table 4.4.3 is therefore based on only 50% of the reported incidents. If the number of incidents that involved a threat to the victim is expressed as a percentage of all reported incidents, 7.8% of all alleged victims were threatened in some way.

Table 4.4.4 TYPE OF THREATS BY VICTIM'S GENDER

Type of Threat	GENDER		
	Male	Female	Totals
Physical Threat with Weapon	30	13	43
	3.6%	5.0%	4.0%
Physical Threat without Weapon	74	21	95
	8.9%	8.1%	8.7%
Verbal (Harm to Victim)	179	65	244
	21.6%	25%	22.4%
Verbal (Harm to Cleric)	34	8	42
	4.1%	3.1%	3.9%
Threatened Family	26	12	38
	3.1%	4.6%	3.5%
Threatened Exposure	65	24	89
	7.9%	9.2%	8.2%
Spiritual Manipulation	173	55	228
	20.9%	21.2%	21%
Other	128	40	168
	15.5%	15.4%	15.4%
All of the Above	128	22	141
	14.4%	8.5%	13%
Gender Totals	828	260	1088
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The use of gifts and other enticements to participate in sexual behavior is a common method of grooming potential victims. Tables 4.4.6 and 4.4.7 show the extent of and types of gifts and enticements made to alleged victims of sexual abuse by Catholic priests and deacons. Gifts and enticements were recorded separately, and surveys showed that in 837 alleged incidents, a gift had been given. Accused priests used enticements in 1,834 incidents, or 17% of the total number of reported incidents.

Table 4.4.5 GIFTS TO VICTIMS

Gifts Given to Victim?	Count	Percent
Yes	837	18.2%
No	3,769	81.8%
Total	4,606	100%

Table 4.4.6 ENTICEMENTS OFFERED BY PRIEST

Type of Enticement	Count	Percent of Incidents
Allowed to Stay Up	130	7.1%
Allowed to Drive	148	8.1%
Access to Pornography	151	8.2%
Special Church Activities	89	4.9%
Alcohol/Drugs	712	38.8%
Taken to Sports/Rec. Events	427	23.3%
Stay Overnight with Cleric	559	30.5%
Sports-Related	22	1.2%
Travel	67	3.7%
Food	33	1.8%
Toys, Other Gifts	7	.4%
Money	377	20.6%
Other	281	15.3%

This is a Multiple Response Table. The categories are not mutually exclusive, as a priest may have employed more than one form of enticement. Percentages are of the 1,834 incidents involving enticements.

If the number of incidents that involved gifts is added to the number of incidents that involved enticements, the results is 2,231 incidents, or 20.9% of all reported incidents of abuse.

Some sex offenders in the general population use alcohol or drugs as a disinhibitor, or as a way to reduce their inhibitions and allow them to offend with reduced feelings of guilt and shame. Some sex offenders also offer drugs and/or alcohol to their victims to entice them to participate in sexual behavior. Tables 4.4.8 and 4.4.9 display drug/alcohol use by alleged offenders and victims respectively.

Table 4.4.7 DRUG/ALCOHOL USE BY PRIEST

Priest Used Drugs/Alcohol	Count	Percent
Yes	988	21.6%%
No	3,596	78.4%
Total	4,584	100%

Question 31 on the Victim Survey asked whether the victim was under the influence of alcohol or drugs at the time of the alleged incident, and Question 32 asked about the accused priest or deacon. The study does not have detailed information about the source or type of intoxicant used.

Table 4.4.8 DRUG/ALCOHOL USE BY VICTIM

Victim Used Drugs/Alcohol	Count	Percent
Yes	854	15.1%
No	4,789	84.9%
Total	5,643	100.0%

The percentages in Tables 4.4.7 and 4.4.8 are based on the total number of surveys that included answers to the Questions 31 and 32.

¹ A very substantial number of surveys recorded sexual acts without giving any further information about them.

4.5 CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE ABUSE ALLEGATIONS

The following section describes characteristics of the alleged abuse. Information from this section was obtained through the surveys of the incidents completed for each allegation of abuse of a child by a priest or deacon. These data present contextual factors associated with the reported incidents including where and when the event took place. This section also describes the social relationships of the priests with the alleged victims' families: their Church assignment at the time the abuse was alleged to have occurred; their relationship (if any) with the family of the child involved; and any relationship with the siblings of the alleged victim.

These variables paint a picture of the circumstances surrounding reported incidents of abuse, which may aid clinicians in their understanding of such behaviors in the population of priests who abuse children. Most importantly, however, these factors may be useful in designing policies and procedures to prevent abuse from occurring in the future. Table 4.5.1 represents the decades in which the abuse allegedly occurred, or the date it began if it occurred over multiple decades.

Table 4.5.1 ALLEGED INCIDENTS, BY DECADE

<i>Decade</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Cumulative Percent</i>	
1950s	913	9.94%	9.94%	<i>This table summarizes the total numbers of acts alleged by the decade when they began. It is important to note that it does not include the duration of the alleged abuse if it occurred in more than one time period.</i>
1960s	2,402	26.14%	36.08%	
1970s	3,245	35.32%	71.4%	
1980s	2,048	22.29%	93.69%	
1990s	500	5.44%	99.13%	
2000-2002	80	.87%	100%	
Total	9,188	100.0		

As Table 4.5.2 makes clear, the majority of priests, approximately 67%, were serving as either the pastor or associate pastor in their parish when the abuse was alleged to have occurred. A little over 10% of priests were resident priests at the time and approximately 9% were serving in the parish in some other capacity. Thus, the bulk of incidents were reported to have occurred in the context of the priest serving in leading capacity within the parish. Other roles, such as teacher in a school, were present as well but characterize far fewer incidents.

Table 4.5.2 PRIEST'S PRIMARY FUNCTION AT TIME OF ALLEGED INCIDENT

Priest's Function	Count	Percent of accused priests
Pastor	2,463	25.1%
Associate Pastor	4,150	42.3%
Resident Priest	1,023	10.4%
Teacher (grades 1-8)	55	.5%
Teacher (grades 9-12)	654	6.7%
Seminary Administrator/Faculty	184	1.8%
Chaplain	264	2.7%
Bishop, Vicar, Cardinal, Chancellor.	33	.3%
Deacon or Seminarian	77	.8%
Other Parish Roles	883	9%
Relative of alleged victim	39	.4%
Total	9,822	100%

Some priests were serving multiple functions in the community at the time allegations were made against them. This list, however, included the primary function of the priests at the time of their allegations.

Table 4.5.3 contains categories representing reported incidents of abuse, some of which were single- instances and others based upon multiple instances of abuse over a period of time. Therefore, some incidents reflect abuse in more than one location. However, the most commonly reported location where the incident took place was the priest’s residence/parish residence. This was the location of at least one instance of abuse for 41% of reported allegations. Incidents were reported to have occurred in the church in approximately 16% of the cases, and in the victim’s home in approximately 12% of the cases. In almost one quarter of the cases, no record of location was reported.

Table 4.5.3 LOCATION OF ABUSE

Place	Count	Percent of cases
In school	939	10.3%
In a hotel room	675	7.4%
Retreat house	133	1.5%
Priest’s home / Parish residence	3730	40.9%
Vacation house	941	10.3%
Other residences (friends, family, etc.)	49	.5%
Congregate residences	51	.6%
In victim’s home	1131	12.4%
Priest’s office	685	7.5%
In church	1483	16.3%
In the hospital	75	.8%
In a car	897	9.8%
Outings (camp, park, pool, etc.)	757	8.3%
Other location	571	6.3%
No record of location	2109	23.1%

This is a multiple response table. The categories are not mutually exclusive since an incident of abuse may have taken place over time and in more than one place,

Table 4.5.4 shows the situations when the abuse allegedly occurred. These varied widely. Social events were the most common context (20%), followed by travel with the priest (17.8%) and visiting or working at the rectory or priest's place of residence (approximately 15%), and travel with the priest to church-related activities. It should be noted that 168 (or almost 2 percent of incidents) were alleged to have occurred during the sacrament of reconciliation. No record of the situation when abuse occurred was present in 30% of cases.

Table 4.5.4 SITUATIONS WHEN THE ABUSE ALLEGEDLY OCCURRED

	Count	Percent of cases
During a retreat	100	1.0%
Church service (before, during, after)	687	7.2%
During travel	1702	17.8%
During counseling	677	7.1%
During social event	1953	20.4%
During reconciliation	168	1.8%
During sporting event	442	4.6%
Outings	296	3.1%
School hours	492	5.1%
Church service/training	39	.4%
Priest visited home of alleged victim	394	4.1%
Hospital visit	13	.1%
Visiting/working at priest's home/rectory	1405	14.7%
Other	752	7.9%
No record of location	3035	31.8%

This is a multiple response table. The categories are not mutually exclusive, since an incident of abuse may have taken place over time and in more than one place.

Table 4.5.5 indicates the relationship between the allegedly abusive priest and the family of his alleged victim. In a little less than half of the cases, no relationship was reported, but in just over one quarter of the cases, records indicated that the priest engaged in a social relationship with the alleged victim's family.

Table 4.5.5 PRIEST/FAMILY SOCIAL RELATIONS

Did the priests socialize with the alleged victim's family?	Count	Percent
Yes	2,638	49.6%
No	2,657	50.4%
Total	5,295	100%

Table 4.5.6 describes the way in which the priests socialized with the families of their alleged victims. In cases where there was information in the records to indicate that the family of the child socialized with the priest, the majority of socializing, approximately 80%, reportedly occurred in the family's home. A little under half off the socializing was reported to have occurred at the church or in activities sponsored by the Church. Records indicated that in almost a quarter of reported incidents, families socialized with the priest in his residence. It should be noted that these were not mutually exclusive categories, so many families saw the priest socially in one of several contexts.

Table 4.5.6 TYPE OF PRIEST/FAMILY SOCIALIZING

Type of socializing	Count	Percent
In the church	702	27.5%
In his residence	620	24.3%
Vacations/social activities	436	17.1%
Church day activities	537	21.0%
In family's residence	2,031	79.6%
Other	152	6.0%

This is a multiple response table. The categories are not mutually exclusive, since priests may have socialized with the family of the alleged victim in more than one way.

Table 4.5.7 describes the number of alleged victims whose siblings were also allegedly abused. This information was available in about 60% of reported cases. In 1,842 cases, or 29% of all surveys with a response to this question, siblings of the alleged victim were also alleged to have been abused by a priest. If this number is expressed as a percentage of all incidents of abuse reported in the study, 17% of victims reported abuse of a brother or sister by a priest.

Table 4.5.7 SIBLINGS ABUSED

Were any of the alleged victim's siblings abused?	Count	Percent
Yes	1,842	29%
No	4,508	71%
Total	6,350	100.0%

THE RESPONSE FROM DIOCESES AND RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES

5.1 INTRODUCTION TO THE REPORTING OF CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

Every published empirical study on the disclosure of child sexual abuse indicates that a high percentage of those child sexual abuse victims who report their abuse to authorities delay disclosure of their abuse and that a significant number of children do not disclose the abuse at all¹. The delay between the initial occurrence and the subsequent disclosure of the abuse varies, depending on a number of factors such as the abused child's age at the time of abuse, the relationship between the perpetrator and the child, the gender of the child, the severity of the abuse, developmental and cognitive variables related to the abused and the likely consequences of the disclosure.

Consequently, child sexual abuse is significantly underreported. When victims do report that they were abused, they often do so years after the abuse occurred. Adult retrospective studies of childhood sexual abuse underline the delay in disclosure. In a study of 228 adult female victims of childhood incest who were predominantly abused by males, Roesler and Weissmann-Wind found that the average age of first abuse was 6 years, and the abuse lasted on average 7.6 years. Only one-third of the subjects in this sample disclosed the abuse before the age of 18, and the average age of disclosure was 25.9.² Arata found that only 41% of the 204 female participants in her study, whose average age at the time of victimization was 8.5, disclosed the abuse at the time it occurred.³ Lawson and Chaffin found that only 43% of their child subjects disclosed their abuse when they were initially interviewed.⁴ Lamb and Edgar-Smith conducted a study with 45 adult female and 12 adult male victims of childhood sexual abuse, and they found that although the average age at the time of victimization was 10, 64% of the victims disclosed their abuse in adulthood.⁵ In a study of childhood rape of girls, Smith, Letourneau and Saunders found that approximately half of the women waited more than eight years to disclose the abuse.⁶

If abuse is reported years after it occurred, there may be errors in the accuracy of the report due to "telescoping," or the likelihood that an individual will report the event as happening earlier or later than it actually occurred⁷. Several social science studies have tested the telescoping phenomenon. Several studies found that forward-telescoping, or recalling a past event as having occurred more recently than it actually did, is more prevalent than backward telescoping.⁸ One study showed that memory disorientations, such as telescoping, occur more often in survey respondents 55 years or older than respondents less than 55 years of age.⁹ Another study portrayed survey participants as showing a tendency to forward-telescope events that were prominent in their lives.¹⁰ In other words, these survey respondents showed a higher likelihood of recalling significant life events, such as crime victimization, as occurring more recently in time than the event actually did. Yet another study examined the existence of telescoping in crime victimization surveys and found that non-reported incidents were telescoped by respondents to a slightly greater extent than incidents reported to the police.¹¹

This notion reveals a propensity for crime victims to telescope forward victimizations from their past, particularly if the crime was never reported to the police or criminal justice officials. Though telescoping has consistently been an issue in temporal reporting of a variety of abuses¹², no empirical studies have examined this problem specifically with sexual abuse disclosure.

The process of disclosing childhood sexual abuse varies, though it is often described within two axes: as purposeful or accidental and as spontaneous or prompted.¹³ DeVoe and Coulborn-Faller found that child subjects in their study required assistance with disclosure.¹⁴ Sorenson and Snow noted that accidental disclosure was more common in preschool children whereas purposeful disclosure was more common in adolescents. They also found four stages of disclosure in their retrospective study of 630 subjects who were aged 3 to 17 at the time of abuse: denial, disclosure (tentative and active), recantation and reaffirmation. These researchers also found that 72% of their subjects originally denied the abuse; 78% of the subjects who tentatively revealed their abuse progressed to active disclosure; 22% recanted their reports, and of those who recanted 93% later reaffirmed the original report.¹⁵ Lawson and Chaffin found that a significant factor in the disclosure process was the belief of the caretaker in the veracity of the disclosure.¹⁶ Bradley and Wood's research also supported the notion that the role of the caretaker is essential. Although recantations of disclosure were rare in their sample, they found that 50% of children who recanted did so under pressure from a caretaker.¹⁷

One model of child sexual abuse, the Child Sexual Abuse Accommodation Syndrome, helps explain the hindrance to disclosure. This syndrome is not intended to be diagnostic, but rather it is intended as a clinical tool to assist in putting abuse victim behavior in context. It consists of five components: secrecy (the abuse occurs when the victim and perpetrator are alone, and the perpetrator encourages the victim to maintain secrecy); helplessness (children are obedient to adults and will usually obey the perpetrator who encourages secrecy); entrapment and accommodation (once the child is helplessly entrenched in the abusive situation, he or she assumes responsibility for the abuse and begins to dissociate from it); delayed disclosure (because the victims who report child sexual abuse often wait long periods of time to disclose, their disclosures are subsequently questioned); and retraction (as in the recantation stage described by Sorenson and Snow, the victims may retract their disclosures of abuse after facing disbelief and lack of support after their disclosure).¹⁸ Of course, not all victims react in predicted ways, but some broad patterns can be discerned.

FACTORS INFLUENCING DISCLOSURE

VICTIM'S RELATIONSHIP TO THE PERPETRATOR

If the perpetrator is a relative or acquaintance, victims of child sexual abuse are less likely to report the offense, or they are likely to disclose the abuse after a delay.¹⁹

In Arata's study, 73% of the victims did not disclose the abuse when the perpetrator was a relative or stepparent, and 70% did not disclose when the perpetrator was an acquaintance.²⁰ Goodman-Brown, Edelstein, and Goodman found that those children who felt responsible for the abuse, often because the abuse occurred within the family, took longer to report the abuse.²¹ Wyatt and Newcomb found that the women who did not disclose their abuse to anyone were likely to have been closely related to the perpetrator and abused in close proximity to their home.²²

SEVERITY OF SEXUAL ABUSE

Research results vary in regard to disclosure of abuse in relation to the severity of that abuse. Arata found that child victims who experienced more severe levels of sexual abuse were less likely to disclose this type of abuse.²³ This is consistent with the findings of Gries, Goh, and Cavanaugh, who reported that fondling was reported by 80% of their subjects who disclosed.²⁴ In contrast, however, Hanson found that of their 341 adult females who were victims of childhood rape, the more severe assaults were likely to be reported.²⁵ DiPietro et al (1998) also found that contact sexual offenses were those most commonly reported in their sample of 76 children.²⁶

DEVELOPMENTAL AND COGNITIVE VARIABLES

Lamb and Edgar-Smith speculate that "more astute" children may not disclose because they may "anticipate unsupportive reactions".²⁷ They also maintain that such children may wait until adulthood to disclose when they can choose appropriate people to tell. White, as cited in Campis, found that older victims of child sexual abuse were less likely to disclose than their younger counterparts and noted that the knowledge of social consequences was a significant hindrance to disclosure.²⁸ Keary and Fitzpatrick concluded that children over the age of five, who had previously disclosed sexual abuse, were more likely to disclose this information during formal assessment, but the converse was true for children under five.²⁹ Similarly, DiPietro found that "developmental maturation clearly facilitates" disclosure.³⁰

FEAR OF NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES

Sorenson and Snow found that fear of further harm had an impact on a child's motivation to disclose abuse and that child victims often only felt safe enough to disclose after the departure of the perpetrator.³¹ Berliner and Conte also noted that the fear about perceived reactions of others prevent some children from disclosing sexual abuse.³² Roesler and Weissmann-Wind found that 33.3% of their subjects did not disclose their abuse during childhood because they feared for their safety. They also found that 32.9% of their subjects did not report their abuse during childhood because they felt guilt or shame as a result of the abuse.³³

GENDER DIFFERENCES

DeVoe and Coulborn-Faller; Gries, Goh, and Cavanaugh; Lamb and Edgar-Smith; and Walrath, Ybarra, and Holden all found that girls are more likely to report abuse than boys.³⁴ Reinhart found that sexual abuse of males was more likely to be disclosed by a third party.³⁵ There are no methodologically sound empirical studies that indicate that males disclose at a higher rate than females. Gender does not appear to be as important, however, as victim-perpetrator relationship in disclosure of abuse.³⁶

¹ For a comprehensive review of the literature on disclosure of childhood sexual abuse, see Paine, M.L. and Hansen D.J. (2002) Factors influencing children to self-disclose sexual abuse. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 22: 271-295.

-
- ² Roesler, T.A., & Weissmann-Wind, T.A. "Telling the Secret: Adult Women Describe Their Disclosures of Incest," *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 9 (3, 1994): 327-338.
- ³ Arata, C.M. "To Tell or Not to Tell: Current Functioning of Child Sexual Abuse Survivors who Disclosed Their Victimization," *Child Maltreatment: Journal of the American Professional Society on the Abuse of Children* 3 (1, 1998): 63-71.
- ⁴ Lawson, L., & Chaffin, M. "False Negatives in Sexual Abuse Disclosure Interviews: Incidence and Influence of Caretaker's Belief in Abuse in Cases of Accidental Abuse Discovery by Diagnosis of STD," *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 7 (4, 1992): 532-542.
- ⁵ Lamb, S., & Edgar-Smith, S. "Aspects of Disclosure: Mediators of Outcome of Childhood Sexual Abuse," *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 9 (3, 1994): 307-326.
- ⁶ Smith, D.W., Letourneau, E.J., & Saunders, B.E. "Delay in Disclosure of Childhood Rape: Results From a National Survey," *Child Abuse & Neglect* 24 (2, 2000): 273-287.
- ⁷ Sudman & Bradburn, (1973), as cited in Schneider, Anne L. & Sumi, David. "Patterns of Forgetting and Telescoping." *Criminology*. Vol. 19, No. 3. (November 1981): p. 401.
- ⁸ Schneider et al., (1978); NRC, (1976), as cited in Schneider, Anne L. & Sumi, David. "Patterns of Forgetting and Telescoping." *Criminology*. Vol. 19, No. 3. (November 1981): p. 401. This article discusses telescoping patterns as well as the Portland Forward Records Check.
- ⁹ Sudman & Bradburn (1974), as cited in Gottfredson, Michael R. & Hindelang, Michael J. "A Consideration of Telescoping and Memory Decay Biases in Victimization Surveys." *Journal of Criminal Justice*. Vol. 5. (1977): p. 206. This article describes characteristics and tendencies of telescoping commonly found in social science research.
- ¹⁰ Neter & Waksberg, (1964), as cited in Gottfredson, Michael R. & Hindelang, Michael J. "A Consideration of Telescoping and Memory Decay Biases in Victimization Surveys." *Journal of Criminal Justice*. Vol. 5. (1977): p. 206. This article describes characteristics and tendencies of telescoping commonly found in social science research.
- ¹¹ Schneider et al., (1978); NRC, (1976), as cited in Schneider, Anne L. & Sumi, David. "Patterns of Forgetting and Telescoping." *Criminology*. Vol. 19, No. 3. (November 1981): p. 409. This article discusses telescoping patterns as well as the Portland Forward Records Check.
- ¹² Skogan, (1975), as cited in Levine, James P. "The Potential for Crime Overreporting in Criminal Victimization Surveys." *Criminology*. Vol. 14, No. 3. (November 1976): p. 318; Schneider et al., (1978), as cited in Schneider, Anne L. & Sumi, David. "Patterns of Forgetting and Telescoping." *Criminology*. Vol. 19, No. 3. (November 1981): p. 402.
- ¹³ Devoe, E.R., & Coulborn-Faller, K. "The Characteristics of Disclosure Among Children who May Have Been Sexually Abused," *Child Maltreatment: Journal of the American Professional Society on the Abuse of Children* 4 (3, 1999): 217-227; Reinhart, M.A. "Sexually Abused Boys," *Child Abuse & Neglect* 11 (2, 1987): 229-235; and Sorenson, T., & Snow, B. "How Children Tell: The Process of Disclosure in Child Sexual Abuse," *Child Welfare* 70 (1, 1991):
- ¹⁴ Devoe & Coulborn-Faller.
- ¹⁵ Sorenson and Snow, 4.
- ¹⁶ Lawson and Chaffin.
- ¹⁷ Bradley, A.R., & Wood, J.M. "How Do Children Tell? The Disclosure Process in Child Sexual Abuse," *Child Abuse & Neglect* 20 (9, 1996): 881-891
- ¹⁸ Summit, R.C. "The Child Sexual Abuse Accommodation Syndrome," *Child Abuse & Neglect* 7 (2, 1983): 177-193.
- ¹⁹ Arata, p#; Elisabeth Kahl, Desmond K. Runyan, and Doren D. Fredrickson, "Predictors of Disclosure During Medical Evaluations for Suspected Sexual Abuse," *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse* 6 (1, 2003): 133-142; Rochelle F. Hanson, Heidi S. Saunders, Benjamin E. Saunders, Dean G. Kilpatrick, and Connie Best, "Factors Related to the Reporting of Childhood Rape," *Child Abuse & Neglect* 23 (6, 1999): 559-569; Smith Letourneau and Saunders, p#; and Wyatt, G.E., & Newcomb, M.D. "Internal and External Mediators of Women's Sexual Abuse in Childhood," *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology* 58 (6, 1990): 758-767.
- ²⁰ Arata.
- ²¹ Goodman-Brown, T.B., Edelstein, R.S., & Goodman, G.S. "Why Children Tell: A Model of Children's Disclosure of Sexual Abuse," *Child Abuse & Neglect* 27 (5, 2003): 525-540.
- ²² Wyatt & Newcom.
- ²³ Arata.
- ²⁴ Gries, L.T., Goh, D.S., & Cavanaugh, J. "Factors Associated With Disclosure During Child Sexual Abuse Assessment," *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse* 5 (3, 1996): 1-20.

²⁵ DiPietro.

²⁶ Hanson, 566

²⁷ Lamb & Edgar Smith, 321.

²⁸ Campis, L.B., Hebden-Curtis, J., & DeMaso, D.R. "Developmental Differences in Detection and Disclosure of Sexual Abuse," *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry* 32 (5, 1993): 920-924.

²⁹ Keary, K., & Fitzpatrick, C. "Children's Disclosure of Sexual Abuse During Formal Investigation," *Child Abuse & Neglect* 18 (7, 1994): 543-548.

³⁰ Dipietro 2003. 140

³¹ Sorenson & Snow.

³² Berliner, L., & Conte, J.R. "The Effects of Disclosure and Intervention On Sexually Abused Children," *Child Abuse & Neglect* 19 (3, 1995): 371-384.

³³ Roesler & Weissmann-Wind.

³⁴ Walrath, C., Ybarra, M., & Holden, E.W. "Children With Reported Histories of Sexual Abuse: Utilizing Multiple Perspectives to Understand Clinical and Psychosocial Profiles," *Child Abuse & Neglect* 27 (5, 2003): 509-524.

³⁵ Reinhart

³⁶ Paine and Hansen

5.2 REPORTING OF ALLEGATIONS OF SEXUAL ABUSE

The shape of the distribution of incidents of alleged abuse, as was shown in Figure 2.3.1 in Part Two of this report, follows a regular curve, rising steadily from 1950 to its height in the mid-1970s and then steadily decreases until the end of the study period. Although the reporting of child sexual abuse follows a completely different pattern, as is shown in Figure 5.2.1, the distribution of abuse allegations over time that are reported in the peak year 2002, are not different from the overall pattern of events. As Figure 5.2.2 shows, the distribution of incidents reported in 2002 is very similar to that shown for all allegations reported over the 52 years that is the time frame of this study.

Figure 5.2.1 YEAR OF ABUSE REPORT





Figure 5.2.2 CASES REPORTED IN 2002, BY BEGIN DATE



**Table 5.2.1 INCIDENT BEGIN DATES REPORTED IN 2002
COMPARED TO ALL INCIDENTS**

<i>Decade</i>	<i>Overall Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Percent in 2002</i>
1950 - 1959s	939	9.7%	416 / 13.3%
1960 - 1969s	2,533	26.1%	966 / 30.7%
1970 - 1979s	3,445	35.5%	1,196 / 36%
1980s - 1989	2,074	20.6%	473 / 15%
1990s - 2003	603	6.2%	95 / 2.8%
Total	9,714		


Table 5.2.1 compares the decade by decade totals of alleged incidents for all reported incidents and for those reported in 2002. The pattern of abuse alleged in 2002 and over the entire study period is very similar.

Table 5.2.2 ABUSE REPORTS BY DECADE

<i>Decade</i>	<i>Overall Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>
1950s	53	.5%
1960s	190	1.8%
1970s	266	2.6%
1980s	1,146	11.2%
1990s	4,022	39.4%
2000 - 2002	4,533	44.4%
Total	10,210	100%

Table 5.2.2. shows the remarkable clustering of reports of child sexual abuse in and after the decade of the 1990s.

Figure 5.2.3 TIME FROM INCIDENT TO REPORT



Half of the incidents of abuse were reported by individuals who experienced the victimization. Attorneys reported one in five incidents, followed by family members, who reported approximately 17%.

Table 5.2.3 SOURCE OF ABUSE REPORT

Who reported abuse?	Count	Percent
Victim	5,327	51.6%
Teacher	36	.35%
Cleric	278	2.7%
Parent/Guardian	1,450	14.05%
Police Officer	174	1.69%
Lay Person	202	2%
Doctor	28	.3%
Attorney	2,165	21%
Self-report	174	1.7%
Other	104	1%
Siblings/Other family	328	3.2%
Anonymous	12	.1%
Counselor/Therapist	40	.4%
Total	10,318	100%

The reports of abuse came to the Church in many and varied ways. Phone calls and letters were the most common forms of contact, followed by a legal filing by an attorney.

Table 5.2.4 FORM OF ABUSE REPORT

How was the abuse reported?	Count	Percent
Called Parish	290	2.85%
Signed letter to parish	97	.9%
Anon. letter to parish	6	.1%
In person/parish	189	1.8%
Told trusted cleric	658	6.5%
Media	114	1.1%
Called diocese	3,216	32%
Signed letter to diocese	2,433	24%
Anon. Letter to diocese	107	1%
In person/diocese	709	7%
Called P/MS	299	2.94%
Signed letter to P/MS	171	1.6%
Anon. Letter to P/MS	13	.1%
Legal filing	1,118	11%
Other	281	2.7%
Diocese contacted victim	10	.1%
Other unrelated adult	35	.35%
Cleric self-reported	86	.8%
Police/any CRJ	246	2.4%
SNAP, victim hotline	34	.3%
School representative	33	.3%
Total	10,145	100%

There was at least one effort made to follow up the initial report in half of the incidents of sexual abuse reported from the Church files for this study.

TABLE 5.2.5 FOLLOW UP EFFORTS BY ALLEGED VICTIM OF ABUSE

Second contact about incident	Count	Percent
Yes, at least one follow up effort	4,938	49.7%
No follow up	4,986	50.3%
Total	9,924	100%

5.3 RESPONSE FROM DIOCESES AND RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES

The response to the allegations of child sexual abuse by the bishops, major superiors and other priests who were presented with the problem was first shaped by the timing of the allegation. When all allegations are considered, only one in four allegations was made within ten years of the incident that gave rise to the allegation. Half of all allegations were made between ten and thirty years after the incident and the remaining 25% were reported more than 30 years after the incident.

Study data provided the researchers with two ways to understand the responses to allegations of child sexual abuse undertaken by dioceses and religious communities—responses to the formal survey questions and the notes and explanations that were added by those who completed the incident-level Victim Surveys. The Victim Survey questions addressed investigations, the results of those investigations and the actions prompted by the results. The handwritten notes on both Cleric and Victim Surveys were recorded and coded into a credibility scale to indicate whether the Church files on an individual priest reflected a conclusion that the allegation about his actions was credible or not credible.


The actions and responses of the Church to allegations are various and multiple: an individual priest may have been counseled, evaluated, provided with treatment, suspended, or limited in his priestly capacity. These actions are present whether the allegation was found to be or not to be credible or substantiated, but with different distributions. The survey data results for actions taken as a result of the allegations of child sexual abuse include the following:

- The Diocesan and Order Profiles reported that 298 priests and deacons had been completely exonerated. No surveys were completed for priests who were exonerated, and these individuals are not included in the study statistics.
- The handwritten annotations on the surveys indicated that for 1,671 priests the allegations were thought to be credible, and not credible for 345 priests.
- 9,281 Victim Surveys had information about an investigation. In 6,696 cases, or 72%, an investigation of the allegation was carried out.
- Of the alleged incidents investigated by the dioceses and religious communities, a definitive result of the investigation was reported for 5,681 cases. Of these cases, 4,570, or 80%, were substantiated; 1,028, or 18%, were unsubstantiated; 83, or 1.5%, were found to be false. Priests were reported to deny the allegations in 56 cases. Of the investigations that did not produce a definitive result, in many cases the priest was deceased at the time of the allegation or the investigation was ongoing at the time the survey was submitted to the study.
- When all Cleric Surveys are considered, 27% of all priests subject to an allegation had their ministry restricted by a superior.


The figures that follow show the distribution of responses and actions by the Church to allegations of abuse. The percentages apply to the number of surveys within each subgroup that had a response.

ACTIONS OF DIOCESES AND RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES PRIESTS WITH CREDIBLE ALLEGATIONS


Of the 1,671 surveys with written support for the credibility of the allegation,
notes on 525 indicated strong support.
The percentages in this figure apply to the strongly-supported cases.




**ACTIONS OF DIOCESES AND RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES
PRIESTS WITH STRONGLY NON-CREDIBLE ACCUSATIONS
N = 215**



ACTIONS OF DIOCESES AND RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES PRIESTS WITH SUBSTANTIATED ALLEGATIONS



ACTIONS OF DIOCESES AND RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES PRIESTS WITH UNSUBSTANTIATED ALLEGATIONS



5.4 SEX OFFENDER TREATMENT

Although the majority of the priests and deacons accused of child sex abuse have had only one allegation, there were two types who had inspired more concern – those priests who had multiple victims and those who abused one victim for a lengthy period of time. The aims and types of treatment for sexual offenders have changed significantly throughout the past century, which is important when understanding the types of treatment clergy have undergone since the 1950s. In the early 20th century, psychologists thought sexual offending was the result of individual psychological conflicts. As a result, many of the first treatments were psychoanalytic in nature. They were based upon a model, which implied that offending was out of the individual's control. Early psychoanalysts believed that if treatment were to occur it would have to be lengthy in order to adequately address and resolve the problem. ¹

In the 1950s, psychological methods of treatment for sexual offenders began to change.² Many researchers at this time believed that deviant sexual practices resulted from deviant sexual arousal, and therapeutic practices were developed to modify deviant fantasies. They took various forms, such as operant conditioning,³ aversion therapy,⁴ orgasmic reconditioning,⁵ and shaping.⁶ The focus was not only on modifying serious sexual fantasies, such as those about children, but also on eliminating homosexual desires.

The first behavioral treatment programs were limited in scope and concentrated upon single elements of deviant behavior. Some researchers then expanded upon these and made the programs multi-modal in nature. Through the addition of treatment components, such as social skills training, clinicians attempted to address the many factors shown by research to be associated with offending behavior. Treatment providers such as Abel recognized that sex offenders evidenced had a high prevalence of cognitive distortions, or thought processes that allowed the offenders to neutralize their feelings of guilt and shame. He and other treatment providers began to modify behavioral treatment programs so that they were cognitive-behavioral in nature in order to address these distortions.⁷ In the 1980s, the cognitive behavioral treatment programs were further expanded to include the therapeutic technique of relapse prevention, which is a strategy for maintaining treatment-induced changes through self-management. This was originally developed as a model for controlling substance abuse and was later adapted by Pithers and his colleagues to address deviant sexual behavior. ⁸

Relapse prevention is said to be one of the most important developments for sex offender research of that decade since offenders were finally trained to recognize and manage their own fantasies and behavior.⁹ Other developments in the 1980s involved cognitive restructuring, victim empathy training, the refinement of sexual arousal monitoring, and an increased validity of phallometric testing (a measure of arousal assessment).¹⁰ The most significant addition to treatment in the 1990s was the use of the polygraph. Though polygraph results are generally not admissible on trials of guilt or innocence, the polygraph does produce usable information about deception and gives treatment providers deeper insight into the acts committed by offenders and shows whether they are being truthful during the treatment programs.

Although it is clear that there is no cure for sex offenders, certain treatment regimes appear to be successful at reducing rates of recidivism for certain types of offenders. Unfortunately, it is not possible to present definitive statistics on the reduction of recidivism due to the numerous methodological problems associated with sex offender treatment.

The study data showed that 1,627 priests had been provided with some form of sex offender treatment, and 1,394 had been sent to a specific sex offender treatment facility at least once. Of those whose problems had prompted sex offender treatment, a substantial number, 744, or 45.7%, received more than one type of treatment. Of this group of 744 priests, a majority of 425, or 57%, participated in some form of treatment three times and 244, or 32.8%, four times. The handwritten notes on the surveys for these latter two groups of priests detailed the continuing efforts of diocesan and religious community leaders to respond constructively to sex abuse problems.

Table 5.4.1. TYPE OF SEX OFFENDER TREATMENT

Type of Treatment	Count	Percent of cases	
Specialized program for clergy sex offenders	666	41%	<i>Individual priests often received multiple forms of treatment either simultaneously or consecutively. This table describes 3,041 instances of treatment or evaluation of 1,627 individual priests.</i>
Specialized program for sex offenders	212	13%	
General treatment/program	283	17.4%	
Individual psychological counseling	679	41.7%	
Psychotherapy	412	25.3%	
Relapse prevention program	170	10.4%	
Evaluation, but not treatment	293	18%	
Spiritual counseling	224	13.8%	
Other	102	6.3%	

This is a multiple response table. The categories are not mutually exclusive, since a priest may have received more than one form of treatment.

Table 5.4.2. TREATMENT FACILITIES USED

Facility Name	Count	Percent of all cases
Behavioral Medicine Institute / -Atlanta, GA	8	.6%
Issac Ray Center / -Chicago, IL	50	3.6%
John Hopkins Medical Center/ Baltimore, MD	10	.7%
Progressive Clinical Services /-Cincinnati, OH	5	.4%
St. Luke Institute / -Suitland, MD	465	33.4%
Servants of the Paraclete / St. Louis, MO	115	8.2%
Shalom Center / Splendora, TX	23	1.6%
Southdown / Ontario, CANADA	113	8.1%
Servants of the Paraclete / Jemez Springs, NM	197	14.1%
Servants of the Paraclete /Albuquerque Villa, NM	36	2.6%
St. Louis Consultation Service / St. Louis, MO	61	4.4%
Institute of Living / Hartford, CT	99	7.1%
Menninger Clinic / Topeka, KS	4	.3%
New Life Center / -Middleburg, VA	8	.6%
Villa St. John Vianney / -Dowington, PA	138	9.9%
Other	337	24.2%

This is a multiple response table. The categories are not mutually exclusive, since a priests may have been treated in the same facility more than once, or in more than one facility.

The survey respondents reported that 158 priests had been treated at a residential facility more than once.

¹ Organic, or medical, treatments for sexual offenders surfaced in the 1940s. These treatment approaches are not discussed at length here because they have rarely been used for clergy abusers. The first hormonal treatment in the 1940s was an estrogen called, which proved to be fairly successful at reducing deviant sexual behavior. Despite its benefits, it was not widely used because of its side effects which included vomiting, nausea and feminization. The idea that sexual offending was a medical problem continued through the 1950s and the 1960s, with the introduction of medical treatments such as medroxyprogesterone acetate (MPA), which is still used today with "chemical castration" (more commonly referred to as Depo Provera).

² It was Eysenck's criticism of traditional psychotherapy that facilitated the move towards behavioral therapy as the preferred form of psychological treatment (Marshall et al, 1999).

³ B.F. Skinner. *Science and Human Behavior* (New York, NY: The Free Press, 1953).

⁴ R. McGuire and M. Vallance. "Aversion Therapy by Electric Shock: A Simple Technique," *British Medical Journal* 2 (1964): 594-597.

⁵ John N. Marquis, "Orgasmic Reconditioning: Changing Sexual Object Choice Through Controlling Masturbation Fantasies," *Journal of Behavior Therapy & Experimental Psychiatry*, 1(1970): 263-271.

⁶ John Bancroft. "The Application of Psychophysiological Measures to the Assessment and Modification of Sexual Behavior," *Behavior Research and Therapy* 9 (1971):119-130.

⁷ Gene G. Abel. "Behavioral Treatment of Child Molesters," in *Eating, Sleeping, and Sex: Perspectives in Behavioral Medicine*, ed. Albert J. Stunkard and Andrew Baum (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1989): 223-242.

⁸ Pithers note

⁹ William L. Marshall, "Assessment, Treatment, and Theorizing about Sex Offenders: Developments During the Past Twenty Years and Future Directions," *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 23(1996):162-199.

COSTS TO DIOCESES AND RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES

6.1 TOTAL COSTS

This section reports the costs to dioceses and religious communities of responding to allegations of child sexual abuse by priests between the years 1950 and 2002. Costs to dioceses are reported separately from costs to religious communities. Some dioceses and religious communities did not report cost data for certain questions because either there were no expenditures or the survey contained missing data. The data in the following tables are limited to the number of dioceses and religious communities that reported expenditures. With the exception of Table 6.1.1, which is based on reports from Diocesan/Order Profiles only, dollar amounts are based on data from the Victim Surveys.

Of all dioceses and religious communities that had submitted a Diocesan/Order Profile, approximately 80% contained a reportable figure for compensation paid to those who had alleged abuse. Total costs by type of expenditure are shown in Table 6.1.1 and the proportions of dioceses and religious communities reporting expenditure figures are shown in Table 6.1.2. The total compensation paid by dioceses to alleged victims by region of the country is shown in Table 6.1.3. The proportion of diocesan expenditures for victim compensation that was covered by insurance was about 60% (see Table 6.1.4). Nearly three-quarters of dioceses had a reportable figure for alleged victim treatment expenditures (see Table 6.1.5) but only 30% of the dioceses reported insurance coverage cost data for such treatment (see Table 6.1.6). Just over 60% of the dioceses reported cost data for priest treatment (see Table 6.1.7), and roughly 30% of the dioceses gave an insurance coverage figure for this treatment (see Table 6.1.8). Sixty-two percent of the dioceses also reported a figure for attorney fees paid for allegations of child sexual abuse by priests (see Table 6.1.9).

Of all religious communities participating in the study, approximately 60% reported a figure for total compensation for alleged victims (see Table 6.1.10) and one-quarter were able to give an insurance coverage figure (see Table 6.1.11). Nearly half of all religious communities reported cost data for victim treatment (see Table 6.1.12), but only 10% had data for insurance coverage of victim treatment (see Table 6.1.13). About 40% of the respondent religious communities had data for priest treatment costs (see Table 6.1.14), and just over 10% reported insurance coverage for this treatment (see Table 6.1.15). Half of the religious communities reported cost figures for attorney fees (see Table 6.1.16).

These cost figures have several limitations. The total compensation figures in Table 6.1.3 are not reliable since some reports include victim treatment costs in the total compensation figure (one of the survey questions asked for the approximate total compensation or payment to the victim), thereby inflating the compensation sum in these reports. Additionally, there are more than one thousand pending legal cases that have not yet reported a compensation figure for alleged victims, or resolved the amount of attorneys' fees. In cases where large-scale settlements have been made, some dioceses were unable to report a compensation figure at the victim level because the victims' attorney had not yet dispersed the money to the victims.

Similarly, some dioceses were unable to report an attorney fee at the victim level because the attorney for the diocese may have represented the diocese in cases brought by multiple victims concurrently. An additional limitation to consider regarding the reported treatment costs for priests is that many victim surveys for one particular priest also contained the same cost figure for priest treatment. The priest treatment figures, then, may be inflated due to multi-counting. A further caution about the overall costs arises because some respondents reported overall cost data on the Diocesan/Order Profile, but did not send in the Cleric and Victim Surveys providing details for how this money was spent.

Several steps were taken to assure the validity of these cost statistics. All potential duplicative victim treatment costs were identified, and double counting was eliminated. Because attorney fees were reported at the victim level, those which were deemed to represent representation of a group, were divided by the number of victims that generated that attorney fee. For example, 25 Victim Surveys associated with a single priest and showing a \$25 million fee would be divided by 25, resulting in a \$1 million attorney fee for that survey. Most dioceses and religious communities that sent expenditure information on the Diocesan/Order Profiles provided detailed information about those costs in the Victim Surveys.

Table 6.1.1 TOTAL COSTS PAID BY DIOCESES AND RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES,
BY TYPE OF EXPENDITURE

Type of Cost	Diocese and Eparchy Costs	Religious Order and Province Costs	Sum Total Costs for Years 1950 to 2002
Alleged Victim Compensation Costs	\$420,112,633.03*	\$55,562,202.70	\$475,674,835.73*
Compensation Costs Covered by Insurance	(\$182,800,358.58)	(\$22,765,455.82)	(\$205,565,814.40)
Alleged Victim Treatment Costs	\$19,828,656.56	\$5,148,031.36	\$24,976,687.92
Alleged Victim Treatment Covered by Insurance	(\$5,019,729.33)	(\$524,994.36)	(\$5,544,723.69)
Priest Treatment Costs	\$27,607,676.21	\$5,785,963.49	\$33,393,639.70
Priest Treatment Costs Covered by Insurance	(\$6,230,276.31)	(\$1,182,575.14)	(\$7,412,851.45)
Attorney Costs for Legal Representation	\$32,033,226.55	\$6,428,704.05	\$38,461,930.60
Total Cost**	\$499,582,192.35*	\$72,924,901.60	\$572,507,094.00*

**These figures do not include the highly publicized settlement figure of \$85 million in the Archdiocese of Boston. No Diocesan Profile contained a data point with this specific total compensation amount.*

***The total cost represents rows 1,3, 5, and 7 because insurance coverage is already included in these figures. The insurance figures are placed in parentheses to indicate that they are not additive, as they are part of the total compensation and treatment.*

Table 6.1.2 NUMBER AND PERCENT OF DIOCESES AND RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES REPORTING COSTS, BY TYPE OF EXPENDITURE

Type of Cost	Diocese/Eparchy	Religious Community
Alleged Victim Compensation	193	127
	82.4%	61.4%
Compensation Costs Covered by Insurance	193	127
	58%	25.2%
Alleged Victim Treatment Costs	193	127
	74.1%	47.2%
Alleged Victim Treatment Covered by Insurance	193	127
	29%	12.6%
Priest Treatment Costs	193	127
	62.2%	40.9%
Priest Treatment Costs Covered by Insurance	193	127
	31.1%	13.2%
Attorney Costs for Legal Representation	193	127
	62.2%	51.2%

Table 6.1.3 COMPENSATION PAID BY DIOCESES TO ALLEGED VICTIMS,
BY REGION

United States Dioceses/Eparchies Grouped by Catholic Region	Average Payment Made by a Diocese/Eparchy	Minimum Payment Made by a Diocese/Eparchy	Maximum Payment Made by a Diocese/Eparchy
1	\$5,823,164.05	\$1,600.00	\$17,339,047.00*
2	\$1,072,596.64	\$25,000.00	\$3,007,220.00
3	\$1,610,752.91	\$298,920.00	\$5,178,605.46
4	\$1,395,907.31	\$900.00	\$4,122,000.00
5	\$4,444,040.50	\$180.00	\$24,719,972.19
6	\$567,284.57	\$500.00	\$1,457,953.00
7	\$1,952,707.83	\$41,281.15	\$15,309,988.42
8	\$1,345,152.32	\$90,587.00	\$5,429,554.00
9	\$1,010,562.26	\$12,454.00	\$6,169,884.00
10	\$3,247,078.08	\$1,200.00	\$37,429,326.45
11	\$3,406,149.14	\$9,000.00	\$9,425,000.00
12	\$6,915,500.06	\$25,000.00	\$44,863,453.75
13	\$3,885,674.12	\$200.00	\$28,068,887.00
14	\$891,844.27	\$1,395.00	\$2,959,496.04

This Table does not include the highly publicized settlement figure of \$85 million in the Archdiocese of Boston. No Diocesan Profile contained a data point with this specific total compensation amount. Payment figures may reflect either payment to a group or a single individual.

Table 6.1.4 VICTIM COMPENSATION PAID BY DIOCESES AND COVERED BY INSURANCE, BY REGION

United States Dioceses/Eparchies Grouped by Catholic Region	Average Payment made by an Insurance Company	Minimum Payment Made by an Insurance Company	Maximum Payment Made by an Insurance Company
1	\$2,625,477.77	\$651,000.00	\$8,300,180.00
2	\$585,489.90	\$25,000.00	\$2,793,462.86
3	\$706,212.99	\$112,500.00	\$2,232,905.00
4	\$1,256,124.48	\$75,000.00	\$2,710,500.00
5	\$2,619,321.98	\$5,000.00	\$24,047,211.96
6	\$372,204.90	\$29,835.00	\$1,101,248.00
7	\$614,422.47	\$60,000.00	\$1,189,000.00
8	\$957,185.94	\$20,000.00	\$3,637,314.00
9	\$570,447.12	\$400.00	\$3,476,000.00
10	\$1,259,092.39	\$50,000.00	\$8,721,612.92
11	\$1,934,119.16	\$45,000.00	\$7,534,000.00
12	\$7,817,763.40	\$379,000.00	\$27,151,000.00
13	\$4,764,002.00	\$163,800.00	\$18,426,983.00
14	\$422,730.80	\$26,500.00	\$814,000.00

In some instances the insurance carrier paid a greater sum to an alleged victim than a particular diocese. This table does not include the highly publicized settlement figure of \$85 million in the Archdiocese of Boston. No Diocesan Profile contained a data point with this specific total compensation amount. Payment figures may reflect either a group's or a single individual's payment.

Table 6.1.5 VICTIM TREATMENT COSTS PAID BY DIOCESES, BY REGION

United States Dioceses/Eparchies Grouped by Catholic Region	Average Payment made by a Diocese/Eparchy	Minimum Payment Made by a Diocese/Eparchy	Maximum Payment Made by a Diocese/Eparchy
1	\$91,263.17	\$60.00	\$482,565.63
2	\$227,825.60	\$4,500.00	\$668,250.00
3	\$249,422.65	\$8,400.00	\$1,038,565.00
4	\$266,583.81	\$900.00	\$887,500.00
5	\$255,220.06	\$1,200.00	\$1,209,519.00
6	\$85,521.08	\$500.00	\$289,143.00
7	\$252,494.98	\$5,184.00	\$1,110,000.00
8	\$67,892.66	\$7,584.68	\$346,177.00
9	\$71,420.28	\$2,454.00	\$378,200.00
10	\$82,352.76	\$1,000.00	\$416,061.00
11	\$72,945.52	\$1,375.00	\$226,587.00
12	\$91,829.64	\$10,000.00	\$255,222.00
13	\$176,151.28	\$200.00	\$944,329.00
14	\$33,195.26	\$1,395.00	\$72,076.78

These amounts represent the combined total of victim treatment costs incurred by both dioceses and insurance companies. This Table does not include the highly publicized settlement figure of \$85 million in the Archdiocese of Boston. No Diocesan Profile contained a data point with this specific total compensation amount. Payment figures may reflect either a group's or a single individual's payment.

Table 6.1.6 VICTIM TREATMENT COSTS PAID BY INSURANCE COMPANIES FOR DIOCESAN PRIESTS, BY REGION

United States Dioceses/Eparchies Grouped by Catholic Region	Average Payment Made by an Insurance Company	Minimum Payment Made by an Insurance Company	Maximum Payment Made by an Insurance Company
1	\$122,347.21	\$10,600.00	\$234,094.40
2	\$62,861.08	\$1,590.00	\$217,049.40
3	\$181,040.82	\$2,003.00	\$592,961.80
4	\$136,545.15	\$56,000.00	\$296,780.60
5	\$105,739.12	\$0.00	\$255,758.00
6	\$99,206.18	\$250.00	\$455,375.00
7	\$38,973.84	\$10,000.00	\$96,000.00
8	\$69,814.33	\$6,644.00	\$150,000.00
9	\$52,054.80	\$200.00	\$127,124.00
10	\$45,250.00	\$0.00	\$126,000.00
11	\$45,374.89	\$2,000.00	\$158,450.00
12	\$255,042.00	\$255,042.00	\$255,042.00
13	\$76,520.00	\$3,040.00	\$150,000.00
14	\$75,750.00	\$26,500.00	\$125,000.00

This Table does not include the highly publicized settlement figure of \$85 million in the Archdiocese of Boston. No Diocesan Profile contained a data point with this specific total compensation amount. Payment figures may reflect either a group's or a single individual's payment.

Table 6.1.7 TREATMENT EXPENDITURES FOR DIOCESAN PRIESTS, BY REGION

United States Dioceses/Eparchies Grouped by Catholic Region	Average Payment Made by a Diocese/Eparchy	Minimum Payment Made by a Diocese/Eparchy	Maximum Payment Made by a Diocese/Eparchy
1	\$141,091.31	\$1,050.00	\$527,560.40
2	\$692,239.40	\$3,000.00	\$1,273,277.50
3	\$462,503.47	\$33,000.00	\$1,657,907.00
4	\$259,958.73	\$70,000.00	\$775,300.40
5	\$212,753.60	\$0.00	\$833,500.00
6	\$183,556.87	\$800.00	\$400,000.00
7	\$301,798.08	\$16,428.00	\$843,851.10
8	\$155,687.59	\$2,259.00	\$440,583.00
9	\$313,554.59	\$45,000.00	\$1,264,444.76
10	\$61,692.82	\$3,853.75	\$213,000.00
11	\$84,493.72	\$3,000.00	\$253,896.00
12	\$115,250.00	\$15,000.00	\$245,000.00
13	\$54,901.80	\$1,183.00	\$133,000.00
14	\$112,426.33	\$30,000.00	\$375,000.00

This Table does not include the highly publicized settlement figure of \$85 million in the Archdiocese of Boston. No Diocesan Profile contained a data point with this specific total compensation amount. Payment figures may reflect either a group's or a single individual's payment.

Table 6.1.8 TREATMENT EXPENDITURES FOR DIOCESAN PRIESTS COVERED BY INSURANCE, BY REGION

United States Dioceses/Eparchies Grouped by Catholic Region	Average Payment Made by an Insurance Company	Minimum Payment Made by an Insurance Company	Maximum Payment Made by an Insurance Company
1	\$268,724.90	\$2,060.60	\$535,389.20
2	\$217,016.00	\$13,500.00	\$509,657.00
3	\$158,159.66	\$10,000.00	\$370,699.00
4	\$234,506.48	\$35,000.00	\$761,715.00
5	\$55,766.97	\$0.00	\$133,362.00
6	\$157,336.73	\$800.00	\$345,000.00
7	\$21,153.91	\$1,532.00	\$87,200.00
8	\$3,631.07	\$1,994.27	\$5,202.46
9	\$34,750.00	\$18,000.00	\$56,000.00
10	\$45,717.19	\$1,194.84	\$185,000.00
11	\$46,852.00	\$2,000.00	\$86,700.00
12	\$60,500.00	\$20,000.00	\$101,000.00
13	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
14	\$24,600.00	\$3,000.00	\$50,000.00

This Table does not include the highly publicized settlement figure of \$85 million in the Archdiocese of Boston. No Diocesan Profile contained a data point with this specific total compensation amount. Payment figures may reflect either a group's or a single individual's payment.

Table 6.1.9 ATTORNEYS FEES PAID BY DIOCESES, BY REGION

United States Dioceses/Eparchies Grouped by Catholic Region	Average Payment Made by a Diocese/Eparchy	Minimum Payment Made by a Diocese/Eparchy	Maximum Payment Made by a Diocese/Eparchy
1	\$385,369.24	\$55,000.00	\$890,615.05
2	\$159,144.60	\$31,000	\$311,595.14
3	\$608,074.68	\$11,933.25	\$4,590,039.20
4	\$169,217.69	\$9.00	\$712,000.00
5	\$217,945.44	\$470.00	\$1,004,607.22
6	\$166,099.96	\$1,744.00	\$668,698.00
7	\$516,807.54	\$1,500.00	\$2,913,626.00
8	\$194,805.16	\$12,000.00	\$781,000.00
9	\$226,719.65	\$1,250.00	\$1,192,258.00
10	\$337,218.00	\$800.00	\$2,948,102.00
11	\$74,947.35	\$12,500.00	\$165,200.00
12	\$161,105.65	\$10,000.00	\$431,318.60
13	\$83,534.30	\$3,160.82	\$438,000.00
14	\$306,480.05	\$610.00	\$1,208,000.00

This Table does not include the highly publicized settlement figure of \$85 million in the Archdiocese of Boston.

Table 6.1.10 VICTIM COMPENSATION PAID BY RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES,
BY SIZE OF RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY

Religious Communities Grouped by Clerical Membership	Average Payment Made by a Religious Community	Minimum Payment Made by a Religious Community	Maximum Payment Made by a Religious Community
Group 1 (1-10)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Group 2 (11-20)	\$54,764.17	\$10,292.53	\$84,000.00
Group 3 (21-30)	\$121,873.75	\$22,495.00	\$350,000.00
Group 4 (31-40)	\$160,000.00	\$2,500.00	\$400,000.00
Group 5 (41-75)	\$593,712.31	\$375.00	\$5,291,300.00
Group 6 (76-110)	\$2,035,110.69	\$10,000.00	\$6,232,500.00
Group 7 (111-150)	\$683,933.75	\$2,990.00	\$3,000,000.00
Group 8 (151-305)	\$485,296.73	\$15,000.00	\$2,461,308.00
Group 9 (306-540)	\$1,817,300.00	\$175,000.00	\$7,590,500.00
Group 10 (541 and up)	\$5,327,032.80	\$189,110.00	\$15,309,988.00

Table 6.1.11 COMPENSATION FOR ALLEGED VICTIMS COVERED BY INSURANCE, BY SIZE OF RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY

Religious Communities Grouped by Clerical Membership	Average Payment Made by an Insurance Company	Minimum Payment Made by an Insurance Company	Maximum Payment Made by an Insurance Company
Group 1 (1-10)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Group 2 (11-20)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Group 3 (21-30)	\$75,000.00	\$75,000.00	\$75,000.00
Group 4 (31-40)	\$12,500.00	\$12,500.00	\$12,500.00
Group 5 (41-75)	\$1,462,710.41	\$25,000.00	\$4,285,000.00
Group 6 (76-110)	\$715,924.99	\$391,250.00	\$1,256,525.00
Group 7 (111-150)	\$803,333.33	\$20,000.00	\$3,000,000.00
Group 8 (151-305)	\$183,581.53	\$0.00	\$507,500.00
Group 9 (306-540)	\$1,456,006.25	\$21,025.00	\$4,951,000.00
Group 10 (541 and up)	\$758,038.00	\$330,000.00	\$1,186,076.00

In some instances the insurance carrier paid a greater sum to an alleged victim than a particular religious community.

Table 6.1.12 TREATMENT COSTS FOR ALLEGED VICTIMS, BY SIZE OF RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY

Religious Communities Grouped by Clerical Membership	Average Payment Made by a Religious Community	Minimum Payment Made by a Religious Community	Maximum Payment Made by a Religious Community
Group 1 (1-10)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Group 2 (11-20)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Group 3 (21-30)	\$41,883.50	\$41,883.50	\$41,883.50
Group 4 (31-40)	\$20,312.08	\$2,500.00	\$70,566.00
Group 5 (41-75)	\$31,953.70	\$375.00	\$125,000.00
Group 6 (76-110)	\$24,727.10	\$2,000.00	\$59,126.00
Group 7 (111-150)	\$70,771.83	\$2,990.00	\$312,000.00
Group 8 (151-305)	\$174,183.14	\$500.00	\$2,094,484.00
Group 9 (306-540)	\$91,220.00	\$6,000.00	\$195,000.00
Group 10 (541 and up)	\$225,502.49	\$4,755.00	\$521,752.50

Table 6.1.13 VICTIM TREATMENT COSTS COVERED BY INSURANCE,
BY SIZE OF RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY

Religious Communities Grouped by Clerical Membership	Average Payment Made by an Insurance Company	Minimum Payment Made by an Insurance Company	Maximum Payment Made by an Insurance Company
Group 1 (1-10)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Group 2 (11-20)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Group 3 (21-30)	\$60,000.00	\$60,000.00	\$60,000.00
Group 4 (31-40)	\$2,519.70	\$1,589.40	\$3,450.00
Group 5 (41-75)	\$20,625.00	\$2,500.00	\$50,000.00
Group 6 (76-110)	\$14,729.00	\$2,000.00	\$27,458.00
Group 7 (111-150)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Group 8 (151-305)	\$48,856.70	\$0.00	\$200,000.00
Group 9 (306-540)	\$6,000.00	\$6,000.00	\$6,000.00
Group 10 (541 and up)	\$33,384.50	\$33,384.50	\$33,384.50

Table 6.1.14 TREATMENT COSTS FOR RELIGIOUS PRIESTS,
BY SIZE OF RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY

Religious Communities Grouped by Clerical Membership	Average Payment Made by a Religious Community	Minimum Payment Made by a Religious Community	Maximum Payment Made by a Religious Community
Group 1 (1-10)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Group 2 (11-20)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Group 3 (21-30)	\$60,000.00	\$60,000.00	\$60,000.00
Group 4 (31-40)	\$44,364.17	\$10,000.00	\$74,820.87
Group 5 (41-75)	\$119,063.32	\$3,700.00	\$289,750.00
Group 6 (76-110)	\$58,736.90	\$2,500.00	\$112,577.80
Group 7 (111-150)	\$67,614.00	\$16,000.00	\$175,570.00
Group 8 (151-305)	\$126,429.69	\$0.00	\$652,000.00
Group 9 (306-540)	\$183,851.83	\$6,700.00	\$350,000.00
Group 10 (541 and up)	\$446,950.57	\$50,050.00	\$843,851.10

Table 6.1.15 TREATMENT COSTS FOR RELIGIOUS PRIESTS COVERED BY INSURANCE, BY SIZE OF RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY

Religious Communities Grouped by Clerical Membership	Average Payment Made by an Insurance Company	Minimum Payment Made by an Insurance Company	Maximum Payment Made by an Insurance Company
Group 1 (1-10)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Group 2 (11-20)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Group 3 (21-30)	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00
Group 4 (31-40)	\$38,223.18	\$24,446.36	\$52,000.00
Group 5 (41-75)	\$249,600.00	\$249,600.00	\$249,600.00
Group 6 (76-110)	\$33,211.39	\$21,011.13	\$45,411.65
Group 7 (111-150)	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00
Group 8 (151-305)	\$51,994.44	\$0.00	\$187,144.00
Group 9 (306-540)	\$123,578.00	\$99,000.00	\$148,156.00
Group 10 (541 and up)	\$1,532.00	\$1,532.00	\$1,532.00

Table 6.1.16 ATTORNEY FEES PAID BY RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES,
BY SIZE OF RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY

Religious Communities Grouped by Clerical Membership	Average Payment Made by a Religious Community	Minimum Payment Made by a Religious Community	Maximum Payment Made by a Religious Community
Group 1 (1-10)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Group 2 (11-20)	\$117,646.26	\$10,292.53	\$225,000.00
Group 3 (21-30)	\$5,049.93	\$1,000.00	\$10,000.00
Group 4 (31-40)	\$19,600.00	\$5,000.00	\$32,400.00
Group 5 (41-75)	\$78,150.02	\$1,500.00	\$578,000.00
Group 6 (76-110)	\$166,164.62	\$2,260.00	\$775,085.50
Group 7 (111-150)	\$30,286.37	\$1,021.23	\$85,000.00
Group 8 (151-305)	\$158,291.78	\$0.00	\$1,309,105.00
Group 9 (306-540)	\$86,200.00	\$28,000.00	\$230,000.00
Group 10 (541 and up)	\$986,417.00	\$10,625.00	\$2,913,626.00

APPENDIX A1.1.1 QUESTIONS

The President of John Jay College, Dr. Gerald Lynch, and members of the faculty met with Ms. McChesney and representatives of the USCCB to discuss possible approaches to the study of the nature and scope of child sexual abuse in the Church. After several weeks of discussion, Kathleen McChesney, on behalf of the USCCB, gave the John Jay College faculty group a specific set of questions to be answered, and thus defined the scope of the study. These questions were divided into four categories, as follows:

Information about the alleged offenses

- How many offenses were alleged or confirmed by conviction about any Catholic priest or deacon in the diocese?
- What was the time frame(s) of the alleged and confirmed offenses?
- Were alcohol and/or drugs used by the victim or offender at the time of the offense?
- In what location(s) did the offense occur?

Information about those who have made accusations

- The age and gender of the victims at the time of the offense.
- With whom did the victim live at the time of the offense?
- What was the relationship between the victim and the offender at the time of the offense?
- Where there any threats to the victim or grooming behavior on the part of the offender at the time of the offense?
- How long did the victim wait to report the offense?
- When was the offense reported?

Information about the accused clerics

- What diocese or religious order did the offender belong to at the time of the offense and what status did he hold in that order?
- What was the offender's job description/duties?
- If the offender was a deacon, was he married or unmarried at the time of the offense?
- What age was the offender at the time of the first and last alleged and/or confirmed offense?
- How many years was the offender ordained at the time of the first offense?
- How many alleged or confirmed victims did the offender have?
- Was there a civil or criminal action against the offender and what were the consequences?
- Was the offender a victim of any type of child sexual abuse?
- Did the offender receive any type of psychological treatment (i.e., for either psychological, sex offending, and/or substance abuse)?
- Was the offender transferred to another ministerial assignment subsequent to offending, and if so, did he re-offend?
- Did the offender have a record of having been abused by a fellow priest and/or deacon?

APPENDIX A1.1.1
QUESTIONS

Information about the financial impact on the dioceses and religious community

- What was the financial cost to the Dioceses or religious community as a result of each alleged or confirmed offense?

In addition to these questions, the Board and USCCB asked for the best estimates that could be made of the extent of child sexual abuse in the United States.

DIOCESAN PROFILE: CONFIDENTIAL

**ORDER PROFILE:
CONFIDENTIAL**

FORM #1: RELIGIOUS INSTITUTE PROFILE

Please answer these nine questions to the best of your knowledge. It should include information between 1950-2002.

1. Is this institution a: (Please check one)

- Religious Institute Province of a Religious Institute

2. List the approximate number of active and retired clerics who have ministered in your religious institute or province from 1950 (or since the establishment of the religious institute) to 2002:

- a. religious priest members: _____
b. permanent deacon members: _____

3. What is the approximate membership of the religious institute or province at this time?

- 1 - 10 31 - 40 111 - 150 541 and up
 11 - 20 41 - 75 151 - 305
 21 - 30 76 - 110 306 - 540

4. What is the approximate number of priests and fathers who are now members the religious institute or province?

- 1 - 6 22 - 35 81 - 110 400 and up
 7 - 14 36 - 57 111 - 176
 15 - 21 58 - 80 177 - 399

5. Based on your review of the records, indicate how many member religious priests or permanent deacons have had allegations made against them while ministering within your province or religious institute. If any religious priests (not counted as members of your province or religious institute - but perhaps visiting from another province) were subject of such allegations while ministering in your province, please give that information on the second line in the category of "Others."

Religious priests _____ Permanent deacons _____
Others _____

6. How many clerics with allegations have been completely exonerated? _____

7. Based on your reviews of the records, please indicate the total number of victims who have made allegations against clerics in your province or religious institute. _____

8. Based on your reviews of the records, please indicate the total amount of money paid out by your province or religious institute to alleged victims of sexual abuse between 1950 and 2002.

9. For how many of the victims in Question #8 have:
_____ all of their allegations been shown to be known false
(# of victims)
_____ all of their allegations been withdrawn
(# of victims)

(NOTE: do not include these victims in the remainder of the survey)

**CLERIC SURVEY:
CONFIDENTIAL**

Please complete the following information. To ensure confidentiality, this information will be encrypted for data analysis and this page will be destroyed.

Cleric's first initial _____

Cleric's last initial _____

Date of Birth ____/____/____

REMINDER: DO NOT WRITE IN THE NAMES OF ANY CLERICS OR VICTIMS ANYWHERE ON THIS SURVEY. IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS AND YOU CALL THE JOHN JAY COLLEGE RESEARCH TEAM HOTLINE AT (212) 237-8539, PLEASE DO NOT SAY YOUR NAME, THE NAME OF YOUR DIOCESE, OR THE NAME OF ANY ALLEGED VICTIMS OR ABUSERS.

Please fill out this form to the best of your knowledge for every cleric against whom there are or have been allegations of sexual abuse between 1950 and 2002. Do not fill this out for clerics against whom the only allegations were known to be false. For the purpose of clarity and flow, the term "diocese" is used to refer to all diocesan, eparchial and religious orders, societies and communities.

FIRST, WE ARE GOING TO ASK YOU TO PROVIDE SOME BASIC INFORMATION ABOUT THIS PARTICULAR CLERIC.

1. Year of birth: _ _ _ _

2. At the time of the alleged offense(s), was this cleric a(n): (check as many answers if necessary if the allegations against this cleric extended over a period of time)

- Diocesan Priest
- Eparchian Priest
- Extern Priest
- Religious Priest
- Transitional Deacon
- Permanent Deacon
- Eparch
- Bishop
- Cardinal
- Other (specify): _____

3. If ordained, year of ordination: _ _ _ _

4. What seminary/seminaries did the cleric attend? _____

5. Was cleric married at time of alleged offense(s)?

- Yes
- No

6. Does the cleric have a history of being a victim of abuse?

- Yes
- No known abuse (If No, skip to Question 9)

7. If yes, the type of abuse indicated in the record or known to the diocese is best described as (check all that apply)

- Physical abuse
- Emotional Abuse
- Sexual Abuse
- Verbal Abuse
- Physical & Sexual Abuse
- Neglect
- Other (specify): _____

8. This abuse was allegedly committed by: (check all that apply)

- Mother
- Peer/acquaintance
- Father
- Person in a position of authority (e.g., babysitter, coach)
- Sibling
- Priest
- Other family member
- Deacon
- Teacher
- Other (please specify): _____

9. Are there indications in the record that the cleric had problems with alcohol or substance abuse?

- Yes, Alcohol
- Yes, Drugs
- Yes, Alcohol & Drugs
- No (If no, skip to question 13)

10. If you answered "Yes" to Question 9, then please indicate what action(s) was taken to address the alcohol or drug abuse problem? (check all that apply)

- Referral for Evaluation
- Referral for Treatment
- Spiritual Counseling Recommended
- Other action taken (describe) _____
- Spiritual Counseling Provided
- Intervention
- No action taken

11. If treatment was provided, where did it occur? (if none, skip to question 13)

- inpatient substance /alcohol abuse treatment within the diocese
- inpatient substance/alcohol abuse treatment outside diocese
- outpatient within diocese (specify type of program) _____
- outpatient outside of diocese (specify type of program) _____

12. During treatment for alcohol/drug abuse, did the cleric admit to sexual abuse(s) of a minor(s)?

- Yes
- No

13. Are there other specific medical or psychological problems that raised concerns about this cleric's fitness for ministry? (if no, skip to question 18)

- Yes
- No

14. Please describe the problem to the extent possible _____

15. Was the problem recognized before any allegation of abuse?

- Yes
- No

16. What is the approximate date the problem was recognized? _____

17. If the cleric has multiple medical or psychological problems, please specify the year each was recognized (if more than three, please continue question 16 on the back.)

- Year _____ problem _____
- Year _____ problem _____
- Year _____ problem _____
- Check here if continued on back _____

18. How many dioceses has this cleric served in? _____

19. How many times has this cleric transferred within your diocese?

- Parishes _____
- Congregations _____

20. Does this cleric have allegations of sexual abuse against him at any of these other dioceses in which he served?

- Yes
- No
- No information in file

21. If yes, how many victims made allegations of abuse against this cleric in each diocese, parish and congregation in which he served?

- Dioceses _____
- Parishes _____
- Congregations _____

22. Is it known from the files, or by other means, that this cleric had behavioral/boundary problems other than allegations of sexual abuse of minors (e.g., letters of complaint from parishioners)?
- Yes (specify) _____
- No

NOW WE ARE GOING TO ASK ABOUT THIS CLERIC’S ALLEGED VICTIM(S) FROM YOUR DIOCESE

23. How many victims made allegations of sexual abuse against this cleric in your diocese? _____

24. Is there any indication that the cleric has abused more victims than there are official allegations made (e.g., victims who made a complaint claim that there are other victims who do not want to come forward)?
- Yes No

25. If yes, please indicate how many other alleged victims there are who have not officially made a complaint against this cleric. _____

26. How many allegations of abuse of minors does the cleric have in each of the following age ranges and genders at your diocese? (give your best approximation of the age range based on information in the file)

# of victims under 8 years of age	_____	# male	_____	# female	_____
# of victims 8 - 10 years of age	_____	# male	_____	# female	_____
# of victims 11-14 years of age	_____	# male	_____	# female	_____
# of victims 15 - 17 years of age	_____	# male	_____	# female	_____

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS HAVE TO DO WITH THE INSTITUTION’S RESPONSE TO THE SEXUAL ABUSE ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THIS PARTICULAR CLERIC

27. What did the diocese do in response to the allegation(s) of sexual abuse against this cleric? (check all that apply)
- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cleric reprimanded, returned him to duties | <input type="checkbox"/> Cleric referred for spiritual retreat |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cleric referred for evaluation | <input type="checkbox"/> Cleric referred for treatment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cleric given administrative leave | <input type="checkbox"/> Cleric given medical leave |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cleric resigned or retired | <input type="checkbox"/> Cleric sought laicization |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cleric reinstated | <input type="checkbox"/> Cleric removed from clerical state |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cleric suspended from ministry | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No action taken | |

28. If the cleric was reinstated, was it:
- Within the diocese, same parish
- Within the diocese, different parish
- Different diocese
- Restricted ministry

29. What year(s) did the diocese take action against the cleric?

FORM #2: CLERIC SURVEY

CLERIC # _____

Year _____

Action _____

Year _____

Action _____

Year _____

Action _____

30. If the cleric participated in any type of treatment to address the sexual abuse allegations, what kind of treatment was it? (check all that apply) If no treatment, skip to question 35.

- Specialized sex offender treatment program specifically for clergy
- General treatment program not specifically for sex offenders
- Psychotherapist
- Evaluation by mental health professional or expert, but no indication of treatment
- Other (specify): _____
- Specialized sex offender treatment program for all sex offenders, not just for clergy
- One-on-one counseling w/ psychiatrist, psychologist, or other mental health expert
- Relapse prevention treatment program
- Spiritual counseling or direction provided by the church

31. If the cleric participated in treatment, at which facility?

- Behavioral Medicine Institute of Atlanta, GA
- Issac Ray Center, Chicago, IL
- Johns Hopkins Medical Institutions, Baltimore, MD
- Progressive Clinical Services, Cincinnati, OH
- St. Luke Institute, Suitland, MD
- Servants of the Paraclete, St. Louis, MO
- Shalom Center, Inc., Splendora, TX
- Southdown, Aurora, Ontario, CN
- Servants of the Paraclete, Jemez Springs, NM
- Servants of the Paraclete, Albuquerque Villa, NM
- St. Louis Consultation Service, St. Louis, MO
- Institute of Living, Hartford, CT
- Menninger Clinic, Topeka, KS
- New Life Center, Middleburg, VA
- Villa St. John Vianney, Downingtown, PA
- Other (specify) _____

32. How many times did the cleric participate in a sex offender treatment program? _____

33. Did the cleric complete a treatment program?

- Yes
- No
- No information in file

34. If cleric received treatment, did he re-offend after he finished treatment?

- Yes
- No
- No information in file

35. Provide additional information known or from the record that would assist in understanding the behavior of this cleric.

FORM #2: CLERIC SURVEY

CLERIC # _____

REMEMBER – DO NOT PROVIDE ANY NAMES OR OTHER IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

For research use only: Dio Code: _____

AB Code: _____

**VICTIM SURVEY:
CONFIDENTIAL**

FORM # 3: VICTIM SURVEY

CLERIC # _____

Prepare a separate profile for *each* victim who issued an allegation against this particular cleric. If a cleric had multiple allegations, prepare a separate victim profile for each victim who initiated an allegation. Please answer each of these questions to the best of your knowledge and indicate when an answer is approximate rather than specific. Remember to write the matching cleric's number in the upper right hand corner.

WE ARE NOW GOING TO ASK YOU TO PROVIDE SOME BASIC INFORMATION ABOUT EACH VICTIM WHO BROUGHT AN ALLEGATION AGAINST THIS PARTICULAR CLERIC.

- Gender of victim (check one)
 Male Female
- When did the alleged abuse occur? (Be as specific about the date or range of dates as possible)
 Month ___ Day ___ Year _____ OR range of dates _____
- When was this abuse reported? (Be as specific as possible)
 Month ___ Day ___ Year _____
- Who initially made the allegation?
 The victim The victim's parent(s) or guardian(s)
 A teacher A police officer
 A cleric A lay person in the Church
 Other (specify) _____ A doctor
 Victim's attorney
- How was the allegation initially made?
 Called the parish Called the diocese
 Sent a signed letter to the parish Sent a signed letter to the diocese
 Sent an anonymous letter to parish Sent an anonymous letter to diocese
 Went to the parish Went to the diocese
 Told trusted priest/deacon who brought complaint to diocese or order Called the Provincial or Major Superior of the order or congregation
 Information obtained through the media Sent signed letter to the Provincial or Major Superior of the order or congregation
 Other (specify): _____ Sent anonymous letter to the Provincial or Major Superior of the order or congregation
- Is there a record of the victim or victim's family following up on the allegation?
 No Yes (specify method of follow up): _____
- If the victim/victim's family did follow up, how many times? _____
- How many times was the victim allegedly abused?
 Once More than once (number _____) numerous (unknown number)
- Did the victim allege abuse by more than one cleric? (If no, skip to question 12)
 Yes No Information not in the file
- If yes, how many clerics allegedly abused this victim? _____
- Did the abuse by the other cleric(s) occur before, concurrent with or after this cleric? (check all that apply)
 Before Concurrent with After

FORM # 3: VICTIM SURVEY

CLERIC # _____

12. Age (in years) when alleged abuse began (or occurred, if only happened once). _____ years

13. Age (in years) when abuse ended (if occurred more than once). _____ years

14. Age (in years) when victim first told someone about the abuse. _____ years

15. Number of months/years the victim waited to report the abuse. _____

16. Where did the victim first meet the cleric?

- Mass
- Boys club/youth recreation
- Teacher in preschool, kindergarten, or elementary school (up to grade 6)
- Teacher in middle school (grades 7-8)
- Teacher in high school (grades 9-12)
- Orphanage
- Home of victim
- At a vocational inquiry
- At a social function w/ victim's family
- Other (specify) _____
- Choir
- Sunday school teacher
- At an altar service
- In the rectory
- Work in a hospital
- Seminary faculty
- In jail/prison/youth offender residence
- Home of cleric
- Seminary administrator
- While assigned to the victim's parish (e.g., as an extern priest)

17. What was the cleric's primary duty when he met the victim? (check all that apply)

- Pastor
- Resident priest
- Boys club/youth recreation
- Teacher in preschool, kindergarten, or elementary school (up to grade 6)
- Teacher in middle school (grades 7-8)
- Teacher in high school (grades 9-12)
- Seminary administrator
- Guidance counselor
- Other (specify) _____
- Associate pastor
- Seminary faculty
- Catechism teacher
- Choir
- Chaplain
- Worked in a hospital
- Saying Mass
- Bishop, Vicar, Chancellor, Cardinal
- Coach

18. Did the cleric socialize with the family of the alleged victim(s)?

- Yes
- No
- Information not in the file

19. If yes, in what way? (check all that apply)

- In the church
- Spent time with the family in his residence
- Vacations
- In church day activities (e.g., picnics)
- He spent time with the family in their residence
- Other (specify): _____

20. Type of behavior alleged by this victim (check all that apply):

- Verbal (sexual talk)
- Victim disrobed
- Cleric disrobed
- Sexual touching over clothes of victim
- Sexual touching over clothes of the cleric
- Sexual touching under clothes of victim (no penetration)
- Sexual touching under clothes of cleric (no penetration)
- Victim shown pornographic videos
- Photos taken of victim while victim was disrobed
- Masturbation in front of victim
- Mutual masturbation
- Manual (finger) penetration (of vagina or anus)
- Penetration with foreign object (e.g., sexual aid)
- Oral/genital contact where offender performed fellatio/cunnilingus
- Oral/genital contact where victim performed fellatio/cunnilingus
- Penile penetration (of anus or vagina)

FORM # 3: VICTIM SURVEY

CLERIC # _____

Victim shown pornographic magazines/photos Other _____

21. Was the victim threatened by the cleric in any way?
 Yes No Information not in the file

22. If yes, what type of threat?
 Physical threat, with weapon Physical threat, no weapon
 Verbal threat (of harm to the victim) Verbal threat (that harm will come to the cleric)
 Threatened family of victim Spiritual manipulation
 Threatened public exposure of victim's behavior to family or others Other (specify): _____

23. Where was the abuse reported to have occurred? (check all that apply)
 In the church In the parish residence
 In the home of the victim Cleric's office
 In school In the hospital
 In a hotel room In a car
 Retreat house Vacation house
 Other (specify): _____

24. When did the abuse reportedly occur?
 During a retreat During a social event
 During a church service During reconciliation
 During travel During a sporting event (e.g., swimming)
 During counseling session During other type of travel
 Other (specify): _____

25. Did the victim receive any gifts from the cleric?
 Yes No Information not in the file

26. If yes, what type of gift(s)? _____

27. Were there any other enticements given to this victim?
 Yes No Information not in the file

28. If yes, what were the enticements? (check all that apply)
 Given money Allowed to do special church activities (e.g., solo in the choir)
 Allowed to stay up late Given alcohol or drugs
 Allowed to drive a car Taken to sporting matches or other recreational activities
 Access to pornography, videos Allowed to stay overnight with the cleric
 Other (specify) _____ Sports-related enticement (e.g., put in starting position of a team)

29. Who did the victim live with when allegedly abused (check all that apply)
 Mother only Father only
 Both parents Brother(s)
 Sister(s) Other guardian
 Grandparents Boarding school
 Foster parents Orphanage
 With the cleric Other (specify) _____
 In the rectory or church-related residence

30. Were any of victim's siblings also abused by any cleric?

FORM # 3: VICTIM SURVEY

CLERIC # _____

Yes No Information not in the file

31. At the time of the alleged abuse, was the victim under the influence of alcohol or drugs?

Yes No Information not in the file

32. At the time of the alleged abuse, was the cleric under the influence of alcohol or drugs?

Yes No Information not in the file

33. Was there a diocesan investigation? (If no, skip to Question 37)

Yes No Information not in the file

34. If there was a diocesan investigation, what was the result? (check all that apply)

Allegation substantiated Allegation unsubstantiated
 Cleric admitted abuse Allegation found to be false
 Other (specify) _____

35. What action was taken regarding the cleric?

No action taken Transferred cleric to another parish w/in the diocese
 Cleric suspended w/ treatment ordered Transferred the cleric to another diocese
 Cleric resigned or retired Cleric was reinstated
 Cleric received treatment but continued in ministry Dismissed from clerical state
 Other (specify) _____

36. Was the victim or their family ever contacted regarding the results of the investigation?

Yes No Information not in the file

37. Did the victim report the incident to the police or district attorney?

Yes No Information not in the file

38. Was there a police investigation?

Yes No Information not in the file

39. Was the cleric charged with a criminal offense? (If no, skip to Question 45)

Yes No Information not in the file

40. If yes, what charge was brought? _____

41. Did the charges result in a conviction?

Yes No Information not in the file

42. If yes, for what offense? _____

43. If there was a conviction, what was the sentence? (check all that apply)

Fine Jail
 Probation Prison
 House arrest Electronic monitoring
 Community service Other (specify) _____

44. If there was a conviction, what was the length of the sentence imposed? _____

45. Was there any civil action taken against the cleric or the diocese for damages?

Yes No Information not in the file

FORM # 3: VICTIM SURVEY

CLERIC # _____

46. Was there any other form of legal action taken with respect to this cleric and this victim?
 Yes (specify) _____ No Information not in the file

NOW WE ARE GOING TO ASK ABOUT FINANCIAL INFORMATION IN REGARD TO THIS VICTIM. YOU MAY NEED ASSISTANCE FROM THE ACTING BUDGET/FINANCIAL OFFICER OR ACCOUNTANT WITHIN THE DIOCESE TO ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS.

47. Was the victim given any type of compensation to settle the allegation of abuse?
 Yes No Pending Information not in the file

48. What was the approximate total compensation or payment made to date to this victim from all sources? \$ _____

49. How much of this was covered by, or derived from, insurance? \$ _____

50. What was the approximate payment to date for treatment for this victim? \$ _____

51. How much of this was covered by or derived from insurance? \$ _____

52. What was the approximate payment to date for treatment for this cleric? \$ _____

53. How much of this was covered by or derived from insurance \$ _____

54. What was the approximate total payment to date made by the diocese to attorneys to represent the diocese related to this victim's allegations? \$ _____

APPENDIX A1.1.6
WRITTEN INSTRUCTIONS

WRITTEN INSTRUCTIONS

(PLEASE READ CAREFULLY AS YOU COMPLETE THE SURVEY FORMS)

APPENDIX A1.1.6
WRITTEN INSTRUCTIONS

SECTION 1: DIOCESAN PROFILE. Please complete this section and send it to the independent auditor no later than August 31st. The independent auditor's address is:

Roger C. Viadero, CPA, CGFM
Ernst & Young, LLP
1225 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036

1. Institution type.
2. Number of active and retired clerics by institution type. Make sure to include all clerics from 1950-2002, to the best of your knowledge.
3. Check the box that most closely describes the number of clerics in your religious institute at this time.
4. Check the box that most closely describes the number of parishes served by your religious institute.
5. Region code: I to XIV. You can find the regional code in the Catholic directory.
6. Write in the TOTAL number of clerics with allegations of abuse in your diocese. Make sure to include all clerics with allegations from 1950-2002.
7. Write in the number of clerics who have had allegations made against them but were completely exonerated. Exonerated means that the cleric was completely cleared of the charge.
8. Write in the TOTAL number of individuals who made allegations of sexual abuse against them as children in your dioceses between 1950 and 2002. This includes all false allegations and allegations where the victim later withdrew the allegation.
9. Write in the TOTAL amount of monies paid to victims between the years 1950 and 2002. You may need the assistance of your financial/budget officer to answer this question.
10. Explain how many of the alleged victims in Question #8 made false allegations or later withdrew their allegations. The reports made by these victims will not be counted in the remainder of the survey.

APPENDIX A1.1.6 WRITTEN INSTRUCTIONS

SECTION 2: CLERIC AND VICTIM SURVEYS. Please complete these surveys to the best of your knowledge. Please note that for purposes of clarity and flow, when the term diocese is used in a question, it will be understood to refer to dioceses, eparchies, and religious institutes.

Before you begin to fill in this survey, please make photocopies of the survey instrument. You must make enough for each cleric with allegations of abuse against him. Once you do this, please number each of the surveys from 1 to the total number of clerics with allegations, and write that number in the upper right hand corner of the cleric survey form. You must write this number on the cleric encryption page and the four pages of the survey. The purpose of this is to link each cleric with his victim(s). You will write this same number on his victim(s)' survey forms.

Cleric Encryption. The first and last initial and birth date are converted to a unique code to provide anonymity. Please make sure that this information has been provided so that the transformation can be applied correctly.

Cleric Survey.

1. Write in the cleric's year of birth.
2. Type of cleric at time of the offense. If the cleric committed numerous offenses over a period of time, and he fulfilled multiple roles during the time he abused, please check all that apply.
3. Year ordained, if applicable.
4. Write in the name/location of the seminary that the cleric attended.
5. If a married cleric, was cleric married at the time of the alleged offense. If the cleric has multiple allegations, check yes if he was married at the time of any of these alleged offenses.
6. Any event of any types of abuse anytime in cleric's life history including the types listed in Question 7.
7. Identify all the types of abuse that the cleric is known to have experienced or is indicated in the record.
8. Identify the most likely abusing actors of the abuses identified in Question 7.
9. Identify if the cleric has abused alcohol or drugs at any time in life history.
10. Identify the action taken as a response to the drug or alcohol abuse.
11. If there was treatment for the drug or alcohol abuse, where did this treatment take place?
12. If the cleric acknowledged, during the drug or alcohol treatment program, that he abused a minor, check yes.
13. Did the cleric have any medical or psychological problems that could lead the diocese to believe he may not be fit for ministry?
14. Describe this problem. Be as specific as possible.
15. Was the problem(s) in Question 14 identified prior to the allegations of abuse?
16. What was the date this problem became known?
17. For multiple problems, identify the dates that each problem became known. If there are more than three known problems, please check the box provided and continue to identify the problems and dates on the back of the page.
18. Number of dioceses this cleric has served in, including yours.
19. Number of parishes this cleric has served in.
20. Does the cleric have any known allegations of abuse in any dioceses other than yours listed in Question 18?
21. You need to write in the total number of allegations against this cleric in all dioceses (including yours).
22. Identify any problems noted in this cleric's file other than sexual or substance abuse problems.

Information on the cleric's victim(s)

23. The total number of victims who have made allegations against this cleric in your diocese. You must fill out a victim form for each of the alleged victims in the cleric's file.

APPENDIX A1.1.6
WRITTEN INSTRUCTIONS

24. Does your diocese have reason to believe that there are more victims than those listed official in the cleric's file? For instance, a known victim might have reported that he/she was abused as the same time as another minor, but the other minor did not come forward and make an allegation.
25. Number of other potential victims. You do not need to fill out a victim survey for the potential victims in this question.
26. Breakdown of ages of alleged victims. Only fill this in for the victims who have made allegations, not the potential victims listed in Question 25. If the exact age of a victim cannot be determined then approximate the age based upon the information available.

Responses to Allegations Made Against Cleric

27. Identify all the specific actions taken with this cleric in response to all the abuse allegations associated with this cleric.
28. If reinstated, identify where.
29. Identify years in which action(s) was taken. If multiple actions were taken, identify all years in which those actions were taken.
30. Identify all the specific treatment strategies and protocols attempted with this cleric. Questions 31-34 address the particulars of treatment. Clerics not assigned to any treatment will have no data in Questions 31-34.
31. Identify the specific facility where the cleric participated in treatment. If the treatment center is not listed, check other and write in the proximate location of the treatment site.
32. The number of different enrollments or discrete participations in sex abuse / offender treatment programs designed or intending to achieve this type of remediation is sought.
33. Did the cleric complete the programs? If the cleric participated in more than one and completion is mixed, please characterize the completions of the treatment programs.
34. Did the cleric have allegations made against him after participating in a treatment program?
35. After you have reviewed the record of this cleric there may be facts, entries or comments that you will have found that provide added understanding concerning the cleric and responses made to the allegation of sexual abuse. Please share your insights into your reading of the record.

REMEMBER, DO NOT WRITE IN THE NAMES OF ANY CLERICS OR VICTIMS OF ABUSE!!

APPENDIX A1.1.6 WRITTEN INSTRUCTIONS

Victim Survey. This must be completed for each victim of each cleric. Before you begin, photocopy the victim survey so that you have enough for all victims. If you need additional copies, you can print them out from the floppy disk. Remember to write the number of the cleric who allegedly abused this victim in the upper right hand corner of the survey instrument. Once you are finished, staple or clip together the associated cleric and victim survey instruments.

1. Gender as indicated.
2. Date alleged abuse of this victim *occurred* by this cleric. If the abuse occurred over a period of time, list the range of dates the abuse occurred. If there is no specific date(s) known, approximate the date or range of dates to the best of your knowledge based upon the files.
3. Date abuse was *reported*.
4. Person who made the allegation in Question 3.
5. How was the allegation made in Question 3.
6. Were any follow-ups made by the victim or anyone acting for the victim?
7. Number of follow-ups. Explain the method of follow up (letter, telephone, conversations).
8. Number of times this victim was abused by this cleric. If you do not know the specific number, check numerous.
9. Did other clerics allegedly abuse this victim?
Please note the clerics identified here will have data from their files developed for this victim.
10. Total number of clerics who allegedly abused this victim.
11. If other clerics abused this victim, explain the sequential position of this cleric's alleged abuse, relative to other clerics' alleged involvement with this victim.
12. Victim's age at the time of, or beginning of, the alleged abuse.
13. Victim's age when the abuse ended, if it occurred over a period of time.
14. Age of victim at the time the first complaint or first allegation was expressed in Question 3.
15. Elapsed time between when the time of the first reported abuse and when the abuse occurred. Specify months or years.
16. Situation where cleric and victim first encountered each other. If the record is not descriptive, then identify the earliest encounter available in the record.
17. Cleric's duty or role when encountering the victim initially.
18. Did the cleric have social contact of any kind with the victim's family?
19. Type of socialization had with victim's family. Enter all the types of interactions with any of the victim's family members.
20. Identify ALL types of abuse that allegedly occurred against this victim.
21. Did cleric make any overt or implied threats directed at the victim or family members or did the victim or family members perceive that a threat was made by the cleric?
22. Nature of all threats alleged by cleric directed at victim or family members.
23. Where the alleged abuse(s) occurred.
24. When the alleged abuse(s) occurred.
25. Did the victim or family receive or have offered any type of gift, inducement, favor, benefit that had a relationship to the abuse or in response to the allegation?
26. What gift(s) was offered?
27. Were any other enticements offered to encourage the victim to participate in the abuse?
28. What were the enticements?
29. With whom did the victim live at the time of the abuse or earliest abuse in the record?
30. Did this victim have any siblings who were also allegedly abused by this cleric?
31. Was the *victim* under the influence of drugs or alcohol at any time during the abusive period?
32. Was the *cleric* under the influence of drugs or alcohol at any time during the abusive with this particular victim?
33. At any time in the association between this cleric and this victim, was there a diocesan inquiry, investigation or fact finding related to the abuse or first abuse allegation?
34. What was the result of that inquiry?

APPENDIX A1.1.6
WRITTEN INSTRUCTIONS

35. As a result of that inquiry, investigation or fact finding what actions were taken against the cleric? If multiple actions were taken singly or together enumerate that range of actions applied against this cleric in response to this victim's allegation(s).
36. Did the Church report its findings to the victim or victim's family?
37. Any type of complaint reported to police or governmental representative involving this cleric and this victim?
38. Was there a criminal investigation?
39. Identify any criminal charge(s) brought against this cleric as a result of the victim's allegations.
40. Specific charges brought involving this cleric and this victim. If more than once charge brought, enter all those brought.
41. Any criminal convictions, including plea agreements associated with any charges in Question 40.
42. Specify the offense for which the cleric was convicted.
43. Sentence or penalty imposed as a result of the criminal conviction(s).
44. Length of sentence imposed as a result of any criminal convictions.
45. Any civil action brought against the cleric or religious institute?
46. Other legal actions, including secular administrative remedies sought related to this cleric and this victim.

Financial information

47. Compensation (monetary or things of value in any form) made directly or indirectly to the victim, victim's family, representative, etc.
48. Total value expended for victim's compensation from all sources.
49. Identify the amount of money in Question 48 that was derived from insurance.
50. Total value expended for victim's treatment.
51. Identify the amount of money in Question 50 that was derived from insurance.
52. Total value expended for the treatment of the cleric.
53. Identify the amount of money in Question 52 that was derived from insurance.
54. Identify the total amount of monies paid to the attorneys in regard to this victim.

REMEMBER, DO NOT WRITE IN THE NAMES OF ANY CLERICS OR VICTIMS OF ABUSE!!

When you complete all the surveys, please send them to the independent auditor. The independent auditor's address is:

**Roger C. Viadero, CPA, CGFM
Ernst & Young, LLP
1225 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036**

Appendix A1.1.7
RESEARCH PARTICIPATION STATEMENT
Catholic Bishops' Study

RESEARCH PARTICIPATION STATEMENT

To be retained by the study participant.

This letter explains the purpose of the work you have been asked to do for the Catholic Bishops' Study, the paramount importance we give to maintaining the confidentiality of those persons you will read about in the church or diocesan files, and your right to receive counselling if, as a result of this work, you become distressed or uncomfortable. If you wish to discontinue the work, you have the right to withdraw from the project and another person will be chosen to complete the work.

Purpose

The Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People, issued by the Conference of Catholic Bishops in June of 2002, calls for the promotion of healing and reconciliation within the Catholic Church in the United States, sets out a basis for an effective response to future allegations of abuse and establishes procedures for accountability for church leaders. A significant part of this last commitment is Article 9, which reads:

The work of the Office for Child and Youth Protection will be assisted and monitored by a Review Board, including priests, appointed by the Conference President and reporting directly to him. The Board will approve the annual report of the implementation of this Charter in each of our dioceses/eparchies, as well as any recommendations that emerge from this review, before the report is submitted to the President of the Conference and published. To understand the problem more fully and to enhance the effectiveness of our future response, the National Review Board will commission a comprehensive study of the causes and context of the current crisis. The Board will also commission a descriptive study, with the full cooperation of our diocese/eparchies, of the nature and scope of the problem within the Catholic Church in the United States, including such data as statistics on perpetrators and victims.

This project is the descriptive study, and its importance to the Catholic Church and to the larger research community cannot be overstated.

Confidentiality

All information that you report will remain completely confidential. It is of paramount importance that you not make any notation of any name or other personal information on the survey instruments as you complete them, or make any mention to anyone of any person whose name you read in a file while doing this work.

Specifically, you are asked to take particular care to ensure that:

Appendix A1.1.7
RESEARCH PARTICIPATION STATEMENT

- Any and all notes or scratch paper that you use to complete the work be destroyed at the end of each day.
- That you refrain from any discussion of the work with any person outside of the church or anyone who does not already have access to the files of alleged abusers.
- That if you call the researchers for assistance you prepare to ask your questions of them without using any names or other personal information.
- That no names are included in any material sent to the Review Board.
- That no identifying information that could link an individual to the information on a survey instrument be included when the material is sent to the Review Board.
- That completed surveys be placed first in one envelope with no external markings, then in another envelope for mailing to the Review Board.
- That you will not discuss the work you have done on this research study either during or after its completion.

Strict adherence to the principles of confidentiality will help ensure the quality of the results.

Counseling

There is a possibility that the materials you will be reviewing in the files will give rise to feelings of unhappiness, distress, embarrassment or worry. Should you find that this work becomes difficult to do or makes you sad or angry, and you wish to talk to a professional who is trained as a counsellor, you are asked to speak to the head bishop of your diocese immediately. He will remove you from this project and refer you to a counsellor to speak to about your feelings of distress.

If you ask that the responsibility for this work be given to another person, your request will be honoured.

If you understand and agree to all of the above information, please sign and date this form.

Name (written) _____

Signature _____

Date _____

Appendix A1.1.7
RESEARCH PARTICIPATION STATEMENT

Catholic Bishops' Study

AFFIRMATION

I have read the Research Participation Statement and understand each of its sections. I confirm that I understand both the purpose of and the procedures for this work

I am committed to the principles of confidentiality and the protection of human subjects and will adhere to both the spirit and the letter of what I have been asked to do to protect the privacy of the persons whose information is included in the files.

I affirm that I will seek assistance should I come to feel distressed by this work.

Print Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Public Health Service

National Institutes of Health
National Institute of Child Health
and Human Development
Bethesda, Maryland 20892

November 14, 2003

Karen Terry, Ph.D.
John Jay College of Criminal Justice
Department of Law, Police Science and Criminal Justice Administration
899 Tenth Avenue
New York, NY 10019

Dear Dr. Terry:

This letter responds to your request for a certificate of confidentiality under Section 301(d) of the Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 241(d), for a project entitled "The Nature and Scope of the Problem of Sexual Abuse of Children by Catholic Priests and Deacons within the United States." The project is funded through a contract from the National Review Board of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. Thank you for the extensive information you have provided in support of this application.

Your study offers the potential for new knowledge to be developed, and it is hoped that the causes of child sexual abuse may be better understood and that future harm to children may be prevented. NIH supports these goals and applauds your initiative in undertaking this important study. However, after careful deliberation concerning the relevant facts and circumstances, we have determined that a certificate is not necessary to achieve the research objectives.

Your study plan includes multiple and wide-ranging protections for subject identifiers such that the IRB reviewing your work determined the study design to be sufficiently subject-protective that it found no more than minimal risk to the subjects and waived the requirement for informed consent under 45 C.F.R. § 46.116. The authority to issue certificates of confidentiality is an extraordinary legal power vested with the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services and his delegates to promote the participation of subjects in sensitive research by assuring them that investigators cannot be compelled to release information that could be used to identify them. NIH issues them sparingly and generally requires that subjects be informed about the certificate.

Given your study design and other factors identified in the written application and follow-up meetings, we do not believe a certificate is necessary to achieve your research goals. Again, thank you for providing us with the extensive information on which we based this decision. I wish you every success in completing your research.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Charlotte Catz, M.D." with a stylized flourish at the end.

Charlotte Catz, M.D.
Special Assistant for Clinical Research

APPENDIX A1.2.1
CHURCH REGIONS

REGION 1

MAINE
VERMONT
NEW HAMPSHIRE
MASSACHUSETTS
CONNECTICUT
RHODE ISLAND

REGION 2

NEW YORK

REGION 3

PENNSYLVANIA
NEW JERSEY

REGION 4

DELAWARE
MARYLAND
VIRGINIA
WASHINGTON D.C.
WEST VIRGINIA

REGION 5

KENTUCKY
TENNESSEE
MISSISSIPPI
ALABAMA
LOUISIANA

REGION 6

MICHIGAN
OHIO

REGION 7

INDIANA
ILLINOIS
WISCONSIN

REGION 8

NORTH DAKOTA
SOUTH DAKOTA
MINNESOTA

REGION 9

NEBRASKA
KANSAS
IOWA
MISSOURI

REGION 10

OKLAHOMA
TEXAS
ARKANSAS

REGION 11

CALIFORNIA
NEVADA
HAWAII

REGION 12

OREGON
IDAHO
WASHINGTON
ALASKA
MONTANA

REGION 13

WYOMING
UTAH
COLORADO
ARIZONA
NEW MEXICO

REGION 14

NORTH CAROLINA
SOUTH CAROLINA
GEORGIA
FLORIDA