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The following corrections were made to the full version of the rapid evidence assessment on 8 November 2018:
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Page 62: Additions made in line with more contemporary Church of England guidance for dealing with abuse.

Page 63: A correction to a description of a research study.
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Executive summary
Background

The Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse (IICSA or ‘the Inquiry’) was set up to investigate whether public bodies and other non-state institutions have fulfilled their duty of care to protect children from sexual abuse in England and Wales.

The Roman Catholic and Anglican Churches in England and Wales are the focus in two of the Inquiry’s institution-specific investigations. The aim of this rapid evidence assessment (REA) was to review and synthesise the extant research evidence and expert commentary about child sexual abuse in the Catholic and Anglican Churches (this and all further references to the Catholic Church refer to the Roman Catholic Church). More specifically, it sought to summarise what is currently asserted about the scale and nature of child sexual abuse in the Churches; the institutional factors which may have contributed to the occurrence of such abuse, and the Churches’ responses to it. Although this report recognises that the Catholic and Anglican Churches are distinct institutions, and this is reflected in the report’s structure, common themes between the two Churches are drawn out within the report where appropriate. The report interweaves published research evidence with relevant insights from past inquiries and investigations and information about current safeguarding policy, practice and debate within the Churches.

Method

This review was carried out using a rapid evidence assessment (REA) method. Literature searches of relevant academic databases were carried out in Spring 2016 to identify literature relevant to the aim of the REA as set out above. The identified literature was sifted by relevance to the REA’s aims as set out above, resulting in the inclusion of 160 documents. These documents were reviewed, summarised and quality assessed prior to analysis by the IICSA research team.

Key findings

Catholic Church

Scale and nature of abuse

- Although there is a wide range of literature available on child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church, there are few robust primary studies into its prevalence. The most robust and detailed data on child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church comes from the US John Jay College of Criminal Justice study of the nature and scope of sexual abuse of minors by Catholic priests and deacons, which found that around four per cent of US Catholic priests had been the subject of allegations of child sexual abuse.1 A more recent study carried out by the Royal Commission in Australia, employing a similar methodology, found that around seven per cent of Catholic priests in Australia had been the subject of claims of child sexual abuse.2

- No such robust studies into prevalence of child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church exist for England and Wales and, due to differences between the two jurisdictions, the results of the John Jay study should not be generalised directly to England and Wales.

---


2 Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (2017a) Analysis of claims of child sexual abuse made with respect to Catholic Church institutions in Australia. Sydney: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse.
Factors contributing to the occurrence of abuse

- The structure of the Catholic Church and the authority vested in individual bishops has been cited by the research as a factor which has allowed child sexual abuse to occur in some dioceses and has meant that responses to child sexual abuse have been inconsistent.³

- Clericalism, the belief that the clergy is superior to the laity, has been identified in the literature as a factor which may enable child sexual abuse to occur and hinder an effective response to it.⁴

- Attitudes to sexuality within the Church have also been suggested as factors explaining the incidence of child sexual abuse in the Church and the Church’s response.⁵

Church response

- The Church’s response to allegations of child sexual abuse has been characterised by a range of sources as one of secrecy which seeks to protect the Church’s reputation.⁶

- Certain alleged practices, such as the relocation of offending priests to new dioceses, have seemed to put the needs of the perpetrator first and prioritise the perpetrator over the needs of victims and survivors and safety of children.⁷

- The literature suggests that the response to victims by the Church has not met their needs.⁸

---


⁴ Barth (2010), op. cit.; Doyle (2006), op. cit.


Anglican Churches

Scale and nature of abuse

- Evidence on the scale and nature of child sexual abuse in the Anglican Churches is very limited. Only two substantial studies exist which attempt to assess the incidence of child sexual abuse within the Anglican Churches. Both relate to the Anglican Church of Australia and involve a retrospective analysis of church personnel files. The earlier study by Parkinson, Oates and Jayakody\(^9\) identified 191 allegations made to the Church of Australia over an 18 year period (between 1990 and 2008) whilst a 2017 study published by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse\(^10\) identified 1,119 allegations made over a 35 year period (between 1980 and 2015). Both studies are, however, limited in the fact that they rely on information recorded by church dioceses only, rather than looking at other sources of allegation data, and neither includes comprehensive data relating to church schools and youth groups.

- Parkinson et al used their data to calculate a ‘rough estimate’ of well below one per cent of Anglican Church of Australia clergy having been accused of child sexual abuse between 1990 and 2008.\(^11\) However, this figure should be treated with caution due to the various assumptions involved in its calculation.

- In terms of the setting of the abuse, just under a quarter (22 per cent) of all the cases of alleged child sexual abuse in the Anglican Church of Australia identified by the Royal Commission study related to schools, whilst 13 per cent related to the Australian youth group the Church of England Boys’ Society (CEBS) and 14 per cent reportedly occurred in an orphanage or children’s home.\(^12\)

- The majority of alleged perpetrators in both studies were male, whilst three quarters (75 per cent) of the complainants in both studies were male. The average age of the complainants in the Royal Commission study was 11 years old.\(^13\)

- There is no publicly available data on the scale or nature of child sexual abuse in either the Church of England or Church in Wales. This represents a significant evidence gap. Due to differences between the institutions themselves and the jurisdictional context, findings on child sexual abuse in the Anglican Church of Australia should not be extrapolated to the Churches in England and Wales without further analysis to establish whether or not the settings are comparable.

---


\(^10\) Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (2017c) *Analysis of complaints of child sexual abuse received by the Anglican Church dioceses in Australia*. Sydney: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse.

\(^11\) Parkinson et al. (2012), \*op. cit.\*

\(^12\) Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (2017c), \*op. cit.\*

\(^13\) Parkinson et al. (2012), \*op. cit.; ibid.
Factors contributing to the occurrence of abuse

The literature has suggested that three main factors may have contributed to the occurrence of child sexual abuse in the Anglican Churches:

- A greater opportunity for the abuse to occur than would ordinarily exist due to the Churches’ previously prominent role in running multiple services and programmes for children in some jurisdictions.\(^\text{14}\)

- The position of authority, trust and influence that clergy have occupied within their communities which has both afforded perpetrators within the Churches regular, unsupervised access to children, and helped to suppress the disclosure of abuse by victims.\(^\text{15}\)

- An ineffective response by the Churches to reports of child sexual abuse, which has resulted in known or suspected perpetrators amongst the clergy being allowed to continue abusing.\(^\text{16}\)

Church response

- The research evidence that exists suggests that some Anglican Churches’ response to allegations of child sexual abuse has been one often characterised by denial, secrecy and the use of internal clergy discipline mechanisms.\(^\text{17}\)

- The literature posits that this response has been influenced by a number of factors within the Churches, including:
  - an unwillingness to acknowledge that clergy and people working for the Churches are capable of committing such abuse;\(^\text{18}\)
  - an overriding concern with protecting the Churches’ assets and reputation;\(^\text{19}\) and
  - an emphasis on Church clergy (and victims and survivors) forgiving the perpetrators for committing abuse at the cost of supporting victims and survivors and protecting children.\(^\text{20}\)


\(^{19}\) Parkinson et al. (2012), op.cit.; Morrison, Z. (2005) Reporting the abuse of children and young people and responding to adult sexual assault: A study into the attitudes and behaviours of clergy and church workers in the Anglican Dioceses of Adelaide when dealing with the abuse of children and sexual assault of adults.

• The evidence suggests that progress has been made within the Anglican Churches in recent decades in relation to both preventing and responding to child sexual abuse, and a range of safeguarding policies and practice guidance documents have been developed by both the Church of England and Church in Wales. However the complexity of the Churches’ structures and hierarchies may well pose challenges to the effective and consistent implementation of these policies.

Main themes in relation to the Catholic and Anglican Churches

• The literature in relation to both Churches suggests that the culture within the Churches has influenced responses to and potentially the incidence of child sexual abuse.

• Practice in both Churches is characterised in the literature as tending to keep the response to child sexual abuse within the church with limited outside involvement.

• Over recent decades, both Churches have developed their own safeguarding policies and procedures, however reviews and monitoring have indicated there may be some inconsistency in their implementation.

Research gaps

The following research gaps were identified during the review:

• The scale and nature of child sexual abuse within the Catholic and Anglican Churches, particularly within England and Wales and in respect of different groups; different settings; and over time.

• The response of the Catholic and Anglican Churches in England and Wales to allegations of child sexual abuse. In addition to victims and survivors’ experiences of and views on the Churches’ response and support provided by the Churches.

• The role of the structure and governance of both Churches in the incidence of and response to child sexual abuse.

• The influence (if any) of culture in both Churches on the incidence of and response to child sexual abuse.

• Current safeguarding practice in both Churches in England and Wales at a local level.

---


Section 1: Introduction
1.1 Background to the Inquiry

The Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse (IICSA or ‘the Inquiry’) was established by the Home Secretary under the Inquiries Act 2005 in March 2015. The aim of this statutory inquiry is to investigate whether public bodies and other non-state institutions have taken seriously their duty of care to protect children from sexual abuse in England and Wales.

1.2 Background to the rapid evidence assessment (REA)

To help inform its investigation process, the Inquiry is seeking to examine the prevalence and scale of child sexual abuse within specific types of institution as well as the response of these institutions to allegations of abuse. The Inquiry will also be exploring the factors that contributed to the occurrence of child sexual abuse in those contexts, together with those that have influenced institutional responses to it.

The Catholic and Anglican Churches in England and Wales are the focus of two of the Inquiry’s institution-specific investigations. This REA forms part of the research work that has been conducted to ensure the Inquiry’s activity is informed by the existing evidence base in the area of child sexual abuse in the Catholic and Anglican Churches. It sets out a summary of the research evidence against the wider background of the structure and safeguarding policies of the Catholic Church in England and Wales, the Church of England and the Church in Wales.

Whilst the Catholic and Anglican Churches are distinct institutions, by covering them within one review, we intended to be able to draw out common themes in relation to the occurrence and response to child sexual abuse between the two. There also exists significant crossover in the literature, with some studies relating to both Churches or drawing on research in relation to the other Church to reinforce or contrast with their findings.

1.3 REA aim and research questions

As set out above, the aim of this REA was to review and synthesise the available research evidence and expert commentary about child sexual abuse in the Catholic and Anglican Churches with a particular focus on England and Wales.

More specifically, the review sought to answer the following key questions:

1. What does the existing research evidence tell us about the prevalence of child sexual abuse within the Catholic and Anglican Churches and any trends over time?

2. What institutional factors does the research evidence suggest enabled child sexual abuse to occur within the Catholic and Anglican Churches?

3. What does the research evidence say about how both Churches have responded to such abuse?

4. How do the authors and experts in this area suggest institutional failures of the Catholic and Anglican Churches can be remedied for the future?

The review incorporates research evidence from England and Wales as well as international literature, although the applicability of the international research evidence to the English and Welsh context is appropriately caveated throughout the report.
Further information about the method used to robustly and rigorously identify, assess and synthesise relevant literature – including full details of the search strategy and inclusion criteria – is provided in Section 2: Method and in Appendix F.

1.4 Prevalence of child sexual abuse

Child sexual abuse involves forcing or enticing a child or young person under the age of 18 to take part in sexual activities. It includes contact and non-contact abuse, child sexual exploitation and grooming a child in preparation for abuse. In order to provide context to the findings presented in this report, recent measures of the prevalence of child sexual abuse in the general population and within key subgroups, both in England and Wales and internationally, are summarised. It is important in reviewing these, alongside data on prevalence within the Catholic and Anglican churches, that consideration is given to the challenges involved in attempting to robustly estimate the scale or prevalence of child sexual abuse.

The existence of child sexual abuse as a significant cross-national social problem is evident from victim and survivor testimonies, media reports, research evidence and government statistics. The phenomenon is, however, challenging to measure accurately and as a result the true scale of such abuse remains unclear. This is primarily due to the fact that victims and survivors constitute a largely 'hidden' population. Many wait decades to disclose their abuse for reasons that include feelings of humiliation and embarrassment, thinking they will not be believed, and a desire to protect their abuser (which may be particularly relevant in cases of intra-familial abuse). The majority of cases in England and Wales do not come to the attention of either social services or the criminal justice system as a result of the fact that the abuse often does not come to light until much later. With underreporting being a key issue, data sources on child sexual abuse are therefore likely to produce significant underestimates of the scale of the problem. Attempts to measure trends in the prevalence of child sexual abuse over time are especially problematic as it is often unclear whether any trends identified are the result of changes in the instance of such abuse, or changes in the disclosure/identification of it (or a combination of the two).

An additional challenge when attempting to draw conclusions about the scale of child sexual abuse from the available data relates to inconsistency in the definitions, measures and categories used to identify and record instances of it. For example, some sources exclude peer abuse and focus solely on abuse perpetrated by adults whilst others only ask about contact sexual abuse such as rape or penetration and do not include non-contact forms. These, along with other differences in methodology, limit the extent to which we can confidently compare the scale of child sexual abuse across settings and over time using different data sources.

It is also important to note that most data sources provide information on the prevalence of victims and survivors in the population rather than on the prevalence of perpetrators of child sexual abuse in the

---

23 A detailed definition of child sexual abuse, CSE and other key terms can be found in the glossary at Appendix A.


26 In self-report surveys, this includes the wording of questions asked as well as the number of questions.

27 By ‘peer’ we mean any person under 18 years of age.

28 The Inquiry’s definition encompasses any sexual abuse of people aged under 18, including contact and non-contact abuse perpetrated by adults or peers. Examples of contact abuse include rape/penetration, masturbation and fondling; examples of non-contact abuse include grooming, asking a child to witness a sexual act and the creation of some types of indecent images. See the glossary at Appendix A for further details.
population. This fact becomes significant when attempting to put prevalence rates in the Catholic and Anglican Churches in broader context, as will become apparent in sections 4 and 5.

With those major caveats acknowledged, there are a number of data sources from which the scale of child sexual abuse can be estimated. These are reflected in detail in the table in Appendix D. These sources; the information we can derive from them in relation to the scale/prevalence of abuse; and their key limitations are summarised. Whilst acknowledging the limitations of the data sources, available statistics provide an indicator of the prevalence and nature of child sexual abuse (both in England and Wales and internationally). The Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) 2015/16 found that one in 14 (7 per cent) of people aged between 16 and 59 reported experiencing sexual abuse before the age of 16.29 The study also found that the prevalence of child sexual abuse is four times higher in women than men (11 per cent compared with 3 per cent) and that the prevalence of self-reported child sexual abuse increased with the age of the respondents in the CSEW, from 3 per cent amongst 16–24 year olds to 9 per cent amongst 45–59 year olds. However, a 2011 NSPCC survey of 18–24 year olds in the UK found the lifetime prevalence of any child sexual abuse of a similar young adult cohort to be far higher, at nearly a quarter of respondents (24 per cent).30

1.5 Report structure

This report is structured as follows:

- Section 2 provides detail on the method used in this REA (with additional information provided in Appendix F).
- Section 3 sets out a summary of the evidence base.
- Sections 4 and 5 synthesise the key research evidence on child sexual abuse within the Catholic and Anglican Churches respectively.
- Section 6 provides a brief conclusion as well as a list of research gaps identified by the REA which could form the focus of future primary research.

---

29 Office for National Statistics (2016), op. cit.
Section 2: Method
2.1 Rapid evidence assessment methodology

This report presents the findings of a rapid evidence assessment (REA) of available literature on child sexual abuse within the Catholic and Anglican Churches. An REA method involves drawing on systematic review processes to identify and synthesise relevant literature, but placing limits on these processes such that the review can be carried out in less time and/or with less resources. An REA method was selected as it represents a more structured and rigorous approach to searching and reviewing the research evidence base than a standard literature review. However it should be acknowledged that, as the REA approach does not provide a full systematic review, this report does not provide a fully comprehensive summary of the evidence base. REAs are descriptive in nature and this report does not provide new analysis or seek to make its own findings.

2.2 Literature search

In order to reflect the scope of the REA and ensure all relevant literature was identified, specific search criteria were developed and used to search a number of academic databases as well as general internet searches. Appendix F contains a full list of search terms, alongside the inclusion criteria. Details of the quality assessment process are set out in Appendix G.

Alongside the database searches, the websites of relevant organisations were reviewed and contact was made with expert academics to ensure that the breadth of literature available was considered. Bibliographies of the journals and books read were also reviewed, highlighting additional sources not identified in original searches. The timeframe of the literature search spanned approximately a fifty year period, with literature published from the 1960s onwards eligible for inclusion. The literature reviewed ranged from academic studies and articles published in academic journals through to reports, organisational literature and policy documents published online by church bodies, charities and other organisations. The emphasis in this REA is placed on secondary literature. Primary sources including policy and practice documents from the Churches in England and Wales were, however, included to help fill gaps in the academic literature and to aid an understanding of the ways in which literature from churches in other jurisdictions may or may not be relevant to the Churches in England and Wales.

2.3 Data extraction, analysis and quality assessment

Following an initial sift to confirm the relevance of the articles and reports identified, the research team reviewed each relevant document, extracting and collating key information within a spreadsheet under broad headings reflecting the aims of the review. Study type and design, jurisdiction and period was recorded for each document where relevant. Documents were categorised based on which Church they related to: Anglican; Catholic; or a combination of both.

---


32 The term ‘evidence’ is used throughout the report to denote the literature reviewed by the IICSA research team, which includes research studies, published expert or academic commentary, inquiries, policy documents and organisational literature. This is not to be confused with legal evidence received by the Inquiry.

33 These databases included PSYCHINFO, Social Science Citation Index, Proquest, Applied Social Science Index, Directory of Open Access Journals, Access to Research, Social Policy and Practice.
The information collected relating to each Church was then coded under themes which had emerged from each researcher’s review of the literature and from the team’s initial analysis of the spreadsheet. Individual sections were completed for each Church, concluding with an overall summary of the main themes. To assess the quality of the literature included within the review, the research team used a bespoke tool, produced by the IICSA research team. The purpose of the quality assessment process was to highlight any particular methodological flaws with the studies and to enable the research team to compare their respective quality and thereby attach appropriate weight to their conclusions within the analysis. The tool is based on widely used research quality assessment (QA) instruments. Appendix G contains full details of the QA tool.

Further detail on the breakdown of the sources of literature reviewed is set out in Appendix H.

### 2.4 Limitations

As noted previously, the REA methodology does not provide a comprehensive overview of the available literature. In the case of this REA it should also be noted in particular that the majority of searches were carried out in Spring 2016. Whilst some additional supplementary searches were carried out following this and the authors have endeavoured to ensure key documents and developments since this time are reflected in the REA, it is possible that some relevant material has been omitted, especially that which has been published more recently. Section 3.2 describes the specific limitations in relation to the literature identified as part of the REA.
Section 3: Evidence base
This section provides an overview of the key characteristics of the literature reviewed as part of the REA. Further detail is provided in Appendix H.

3.1 Profile of the literature

The literature search identified 160 documents which were relevant to the REA research questions. These consisted of 55 primary research studies; 14 secondary research studies and critical reviews; 65 theoretical or opinion based papers; 16 policy, guidance or other items of organisational literature; and 10 inquiry documents.

Literature relating to the Catholic Church formed the vast majority of the literature, with 114 papers relating solely to the Catholic Church in comparison to 13 in relation to the Anglican Churches. The remainder related to either a combination of the two Churches or a combination of either or both Churches and other established religions.

The majority of the literature originated from or focussed largely or entirely upon the United States. Whilst the authors sought to include literature relating specifically to England and/or Wales, only 24 such documents were identified and half of these were policy or guidance documents (for example, annual reports or Church safeguarding policies).

3.2 Limitations of the evidence base

Whilst specific gaps in the evidence base and limitations or caveats in relation to the literature will be noted throughout the report, there are a number of overarching considerations which should be borne in mind when reading the report.

Given the lack of primary research on child sexual abuse in the Catholic and Anglican Churches in England and Wales, this report has drawn heavily on research from other jurisdictions, particularly the US in relation to the Catholic Church and Australia in relation to the Anglican Churches. When considering the findings summarised from these studies, it is important to note that there are significant differences in the governance and safeguarding arrangements of the Churches between jurisdictions as well as the socio-demographic context within which the Churches operate. It is outside of the scope of this REA to draw conclusions as to how relevant findings relating to the Churches in other jurisdictions are to those in England and Wales. Whilst these studies therefore give an important indication of what the scale of the problem might be and of themes which may underpin therefore the incidence of and response to child sexual abuse, they should not be generalised directly to England and Wales.

It should also be noted that a large part of the literature reviewed for the REA, just over two-thirds, was made up of theoretical or opinion based pieces. Whilst this sort of expert commentary can be a valuable addition to the topic, it is not a substitute for empirical evidence and can be of variable quality. Where conclusions from such papers have been cited within the REA they have been appropriately caveated and/or used only where they represent a consensus view or are supported by empirical evidence. However, readers should be aware that the dominance of such literature, in contrast to primary research studies, is a significant limitation of the evidence base in this area.

The range of publication dates was from 1991–2017, with only a minority of papers included being published prior to 2000. Whilst more recent papers were prioritised in analysis and reporting and effort has been made to note where research may no longer be relevant, the limitations inherent in using older research studies should be kept in mind when reading the REA. Related to this, it should be noted that whilst key developments and trends over time are noted within the report where they have been discussed within the literature (and timelines illustrating some of the relevant developments are included within Appendix B and Appendix C), this REA has not sought to provide a comprehensive historical overview of child sexual abuse within the Churches.
Section 4: Catholic Church
This section presents information gathered from the literature on child sexual abuse within the Roman Catholic Church (all further references to the Catholic Church refer to the Roman Catholic Church). The findings summarised relate to the scale and nature of abuse in England and Wales and within other jurisdictions. Consideration is also given to the institutional factors seen to influence the incidence of child sexual abuse within the Catholic Church and the response given to allegations of such abuse. Publicly available factual information regarding the structure of the Church internationally and its safeguarding structure is provided as contextual information.

**Summary of key themes**

**Scale and nature of abuse**

- Although there is a wide range of literature available on child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church, there are few robust primary studies into its prevalence. The most robust and detailed data on child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church comes from the US John Jay College of Criminal Justice study of the nature and scope of sexual abuse of minors by Catholic priests and deacons which found that around four per cent of US Catholic priests had been the subject of allegations of child sexual abuse.  
  

- A more recent study carried out by the Royal Commission in Australia, employing a similar methodology found that around seven per cent of Catholic priests in Australia had been the subject of claims of child sexual abuse.  
  
  35 Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (2017b) Analysis of claims of child sexual abuse made with respect to Catholic Church institutions in Australia. Sydney: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. Note that, whilst this study did include non-ordained employees of the Church, the figure cited here is the prevalence figure for priests only.

- No such robust studies into prevalence of child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church exist for England and Wales and, due to differences between the two jurisdictions, the results of the John Jay study should not be generalised directly to England and Wales.

- Studies from several jurisdictions, not including England and Wales, have indicated that the majority of victims of child sexual abuse within the Catholic Church are male and most are aged ten and over.

**Factors contributing to the occurrence of abuse**

- The structure of the Catholic Church and the authority vested in individual bishops has been cited by the research as a factor which has allowed child sexual abuse to occur in some dioceses and has meant that responses to child sexual abuse have been inconsistent.  
  

- Clericalism, the belief that the clergy is superior to the laity, has been identified in the literature as a factor which may enable child sexual abuse to occur and hinder an effective response to it.  
  
  37 Barth (2010), op. cit.; Doyle (2006), op. cit.
• Attitudes to sexuality within the Church have also been suggested as factors explaining the incidence of child sexual abuse in the Church and the Church's response.  

Church response

• The Church's response to allegations of child sexual abuse has been characterised by a range of sources as one of secrecy which seeks to protect the Church's reputation.  

• Certain alleged practices, such as the relocation of offending priests to new dioceses, have been seen by commentators to put the needs of the perpetrator first and prioritise the perpetrator over the needs of victims and safety of children.  

• The literature suggests that the Church’s response to victims has not met their needs.

4.1 Overview of the Catholic Church in England and Wales

The Catholic Church in England and Wales is made up of 22 dioceses. Five dioceses (Westminster, Southwark, Liverpool, Birmingham and Cardiff) are archdioceses and are headed by archbishops. All bishops, archbishops and auxiliary bishops from the 22 dioceses of England and Wales are members of the Catholic Bishops’ Conference of England and Wales (CBCEW). The Conference of Religious England and Wales (COR) is an association which represents the leaders of Catholic religious institutes (sometimes also referred to as orders, congregations or communities, although not all of these terms are interchangeable) in England and Wales. The superiors of Anglican religious communities are also able to join as associate members. The COR’s website lists 71 male religious orders and 176 female religious orders as members. The Pope is the head of the universal church and, together with a number of

---


42 Auxiliary bishops act as assistants to diocesan bishops.


organisations and bodies which support him, including the Roman Curia, the Synod of Bishops and the College of Cardinals, is known as the Holy See.\textsuperscript{45}

The national safeguarding structure of the Catholic Church in England and Wales consists of the National Catholic Safeguarding Commission which has a strategic role and directs the work of the Catholic Safeguarding Advisory Service (CSAS) which is responsible for improving safeguarding practice in the Church. The Commission is mandated by both the CBCEW and the COR. Each diocese or religious order/group of religious orders has a Safeguarding Commission appointed by the bishop who are responsible for dealing with reports of child abuse and who provide an annual report to the NCSC on safeguarding. The Commission appoints a Safeguarding Coordinator whose role is to disseminate best practice and launch national safeguarding policies in the diocese. Each parish and religious order has a Safeguarding Representative and a Clergy/Religious adviser who report to the Safeguarding Coordinator.\textsuperscript{46}

Data from the British Social Attitudes survey shows that 8.3 per cent of the population of England and Wales define themselves as Catholic.\textsuperscript{47} Catholicism is the second most popular Christian denomination next to Anglicanism in England and Wales. Catholic schools make up ten per cent of the total number of maintained schools in England and Wales.\textsuperscript{48}

Further information about the Catholic Church in England and Wales and its governance and safeguarding structure (including safeguarding and child protection timelines for the Church) can be found in Appendix B.

4.2 Prevalence and incidence of child sexual abuse within the Catholic Church as indicated by the literature

As highlighted in the introduction, prevalence of child sexual abuse in any context, including that of the Catholic Church is difficult to determine due to potential under-reporting and delays in reporting. There is no robust study of prevalence of child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church in England and Wales; most studies come from other jurisdictions.

The most extensive study of prevalence of child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church is the study commissioned by the US Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) and carried out by the John Jay College of Criminal Justice in the US in 2004.\textsuperscript{49} The study received surveys from 195 dioceses; representing 98 per cent of diocesan priests; and 140 religious communities, representing 60 per cent of religious communities and 80 per cent of religious priests.\textsuperscript{50}

The key findings of the study in respect of prevalence were that:


\textsuperscript{49} John Jay College of Criminal Justice (2004), op. cit.

\textsuperscript{50} The term ‘religious priests’ refers to priests within Catholic religious institutes (sometimes also referred to as orders, congregations or communities, although not all of these terms are interchangeable). See Glossary for further information.
Allegations\textsuperscript{51} of child sexual abuse had been made against approximately 4 per cent of all Catholic priests in active ministry in the US between 1950 and 2002; this can be broken down into 4.3 per cent of diocesan priests and 2.5 per cent of religious priests and varies across dioceses from 3 per cent to 6 per cent of priests.

Whilst this data is the most reliable source available, important caveats should be noted. In particular, the study looked at reported allegations of child sexual abuse and therefore includes unsubstantiated cases and does not include those cases which were not reported to the Church. It also does not include cases which were not known to the Church at the time of data collection but subsequently became known to them. Figures released annually by the USCCB show that a considerable number of allegations continue to be made each year relating to incidents allegedly occurring in the period covered by the John Jay study and it is possible that a number of these allegations are against priests who had not previously been subject to any allegations.\textsuperscript{52} Although the survey instruments were well designed and comprehensive instructions and support were provided, it is also possible that some surveys were not completed accurately. This is also a US study and therefore inferences should not be drawn directly from the study to England and Wales.

A more recent study, carried out by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse in Australia,\textsuperscript{53} analysed data held by the Catholic Church on claims for redress for child sexual abuse received by the Church and substantiated allegations of child sexual abuse made to the church.\textsuperscript{54} This study sent out a survey to all Catholic Church authorities in Australia asking for data on claims made between 1990 and 2014 against Catholic Church personnel (individuals who had an appointment with the Church at the time of the claim). This study found that 7 per cent of priests were alleged perpetrators; breaking this down into Catholic Church Authorities with diocesan priest members and those with religious priest members, the figures were 7.9 per cent and 5.6 per cent respectively.\textsuperscript{55} Many of the same caveats as the John Jay study apply to this study, in particular, that it is based on data provided by the Church using their own records and that it includes claims which were ongoing or settled without redress. This is also an Australian study, therefore the context is different to that in England and Wales. Despite this, and despite some differences between the methodologies of the two studies, the study does give similar results in respect of the percentage of priests with allegations to those found by the John Jay study. The overall prevalence figures are similar and in both cases, the prevalence figure associated with diocesan priests is higher than that for religious priests.

Considering prevalence in terms of victims, a large population study carried out in the Netherlands found that 1.7 per cent of Dutch nationals aged 40 years and older reported having experienced unwanted sexual contact abuse before age 18 by an employee of the Roman Catholic Church.\textsuperscript{56} In Ireland in a

\textsuperscript{51} The John Jay study defined ‘allegations’ as any accusation that is not implausible; an implausible accusation being defined as an accusation that something happened which could not have possibly done so under the given circumstances.


\textsuperscript{53} Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (2017a), op. cit.

\textsuperscript{54} The study included data on claims made against church personnel seeking redress through Towards Healing, the Melbourne Response or another redress process, regardless of the status or outcome of the claim, and claims of child sexual abuse where redress had not been sought but they had been investigated and found to be substantiated by the Church.

\textsuperscript{55} Whilst, unlike the John Jay study, this study did also collect data on claims made against non-ordained religious, the figures cited here relate solely to claims against priests. Data from this study in relation to claims against non-ordained religious is discussed later in the report.

smaller population survey, it was estimated that 3.9 per cent of respondents who had been sexually abused as children were abused by Roman Catholic clergy, or one per cent of all survey respondents.

The Holy See does not regularly release figures for cases of child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church internationally. Since 2001, in accordance with sacramentorum sanctitatis tutela, allegations of child sexual abuse should be referred to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in the Vatican. However, the figures kept in connection with this do not provide accurate information on the prevalence or scale of child sexual abuse within the Catholic Church. In 2010, the Church revealed that between 2001 and 2010 the Congregation had discussed allegations regarding improper sexual conduct relating to about 3000 priests. This therefore does not appear to provide an accurate representation of the number of priests subject to allegations of child sexual abuse, given the numbers suggested by other studies, for example, the John Jay study found that allegations had been made against 4392 priests in the US alone.

There are no studies on prevalence of child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church in England and Wales. However, in relation to incidence, statistics are available through the NCSC annual reports on the number of allegations reported by dioceses and religious congregations in England and Wales to statutory authorities. In 2014 the NCSC also conducted a review of ten years of this data. This review showed that between 2003 and 2012, 465 allegations of sexual abuse were reported to statutory authorities. The majority related to a diocesan or religious priest perpetrator. It is not reported how many of these allegations related to sexual abuse against children. However, the NCSC now publishes this data in more detail and their latest annual report shows that in 2016 there were 102 allegations of child sexual abuse and ten allegations of child abuse images.

4.2.1 Changes in incidence over time

While it is difficult to establish the true rate of variation in the incidence of child sexual abuse over time due to delays in reporting and underreporting, there appears to be a consensus in the literature that the incidence of abuse peaked around the 1970s/1980s. The John Jay data showed that the incidence of child sexual abuse appeared to steadily increase up until the early 1980s and then declined. Additional data on reported incidents of sexual abuse by Catholic clergy collected annually since 2004 by the Centre for Applied Research in the Apostolate (CARA) on behalf of the US Conference of Bishops also mirrors this distribution. Data from Australia also indicates that child sexual abuse within the Catholic Church peaked in this period, with 76 per cent of complaints made under the Australian Catholic Church’s response procedure Towards Healing relating to allegations of abuse between 1950 and 1980, more specifically, more recent analysis by the Australian Royal Commission shows that the latest proportion of claims of child sexual abuse made to the Catholic Church between 1990 and 2014 related to alleged incidents which took place in the 1970s. In keeping with this, data collected by the NCSC on reported allegations shows that the highest number of allegations made between 2002 and 2012 related to abuse (note that
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59 It is not clear exactly what behaviour the term ‘improper sexual conduct’ includes and to what extent this includes allegations of child sexual abuse.
61 Whilst this study covers a longer period than that reported by the Church (1950-2002 as opposed to 2001-2010), over four fifths of allegations were reported between 2000-2002. John Jay (2004) op. cit.
65 Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (2017b), op. cit.
this includes all forms of abuse, not solely sexual abuse) which allegedly occurred in the 1970s. The chart below based on the John Jay supplementary report illustrates this pattern in the US, showing the rate of allegations per priests in service over time. The date shown is that of when the alleged incident(s) took place, not the date reported.

Following further analysis carried out by the John Jay College on behalf of the US Conference of Catholic Bishops, the researchers suggested that the peak in child sexual abuse in the Church which occurred in the late 1970s related to wider societal changes. This suggestion is based on the concurrent rises in other 'deviant' behaviour, including divorce, use of illegal drugs and crime over the same period. There is a lack of empirical evidence of any causal links between these factors and the variation in the incidence of child sexual abuse in this period.

Figure 4.1: Accusation rate of Catholic priests over time


4.3 Nature of child sexual abuse within the Catholic Church

4.3.1 Characteristics of victims

Studies and inquiries from several jurisdictions have shown that boys are more likely than girls to be abused in the Catholic Church, with studies all reporting similar proportions of male victims at

69 The term victim is used here to describe any person who has made a claim of child sexual abuse against the Church.
around 70-80 per cent.\textsuperscript{70} In the John Jay study 81 per cent of victims were male.\textsuperscript{71} Whilst a study in the Netherlands found that 2.7 per cent of men and 0.7 per cent of women over 40 in a representative sample reported having experienced unwanted sexual contact abuse before age 18 by an employee of the Roman Catholic Church.\textsuperscript{72} Data collected from US Catholic dioceses on an annual basis on behalf of the US Conference of Catholic Bishops about new credible allegations of abuse (relating to historical and recent incidents) shows that the majority of allegations, around 80 per cent, relate to male victims.\textsuperscript{73} In the Murphy Report into child sexual abuse in the Dublin Archdiocese, the ratio of complaints relating to boys compared to girls was 2.3:1 (about 70 per cent boys). Similarly, a study of victims and survivors of child sexual abuse in an institutional context within the Roman Catholic who had called a German helpline for victims of child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church found that 70 per cent of these callers were male.\textsuperscript{74} The more recent Royal Commission study of claims of child sexual abuse received by the Catholic Church found that 78 per cent of claimants were male.\textsuperscript{75}

Studies have suggested that the higher rate of victimisation of boys is due to the greater access the Catholic clergy has to boys, for example through boys acting as altar servers,\textsuperscript{76} and because of the higher proportion of boys in residential institutions.\textsuperscript{77}

Studies indicate that most child sexual abuse perpetrated in the Catholic Church is against children aged ten and over.\textsuperscript{78} The John Jay study found that just over half of victims were aged 11–14 and just over a quarter were 15–17.\textsuperscript{79} Data collected annually on behalf of the US Conference of Catholic Bishops is consistent with this, with around half of victims being of ages 10–14.\textsuperscript{80} The average age of claimants in the data analysed by the Royal Commission was 11.4 years and 60 per cent of claimants were under the age of 13 at the time of the first alleged incident of abuse.\textsuperscript{81} Looking at age and gender together, female

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{71} John Jay College of Criminal Justice (2004) op. cit.
\bibitem{72} Langeland et al. (2015), op. cit.
\bibitem{75} Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (2017b) op. cit.
\bibitem{76} In 1994 the Holy See issued a circular letter which confirmed that a change to canon law in 1983 could be correctly interpreted as allowing female altar servers, at the discretion of the local bishop. Prior to this female altar servers were not permitted.
\bibitem{79} John Jay College of Criminal Justice (2004) op. cit.
\bibitem{81} Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (2017b) op. cit.
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victims in the John Jay sample were younger than male victims on average and over 40 per cent of all victims were boys aged 11–14.\textsuperscript{82}

Research on the Anglican Church in Australia indicates a similar profile of mostly male, adolescent victims as will be outlined in more detail in Section 5.

### 4.3.2 Characteristics of perpetrators

The NCSC safeguarding data for 2004-2012 shows that the largest group (42 per cent) of alleged abusers\textsuperscript{83} were diocesan clergy or in formation; 30 per cent were religious; and 28 per cent were laity. Furthermore, the majority (81 per cent) of the 598 allegations of abuse (77 per cent of which related to sexual abuse) reported to the statutory authorities by dioceses and religious congregations in England and Wales arose from a diocesan context and the remaining 19 per cent from a religious context.\textsuperscript{84} Whilst the two cannot be directly compared, due to different ways of categorising perpetrators, data from the Royal Commission in Australia appears to indicate a higher proportion of religious perpetrators. The Commission found that the biggest group of alleged perpetrators (37 per cent) of the claims subject to analysis within the study, was non-ordained religious. This was followed by priests (including both diocesan and religious) which made up 30 per cent of perpetrators. Lay people made up 29 per cent of alleged perpetrators, similar to the NCSC data.\textsuperscript{85}

Looking at the issue in terms of prevalence rates within each of the two contexts, which it is not possible to do with the NCSC data, the John Jay study found a lower rate of priests with allegations of abuse amongst religious priests (2.5 per cent) than amongst diocesan priests (4.3 per cent).\textsuperscript{86} A similar finding was made by the Royal Commission in Australia, with prevalence rates of 7.9 per cent and 5.6 per cent respectively.\textsuperscript{87}

A later research report by the John Jay College on the causes and context of sexual abuse in the Catholic Church\textsuperscript{88} makes a connection between the apparent lower prevalence rate amongst religious priests and the fact that most live within communities as opposed to the relative isolation of diocesan priests. There is, however, no empirical data in support of this hypothesis and it is difficult to compare the two contexts given the other different situational factors which may affect prevalence in each context (for instance, differential levels of contact with children). Religious brothers are also often not included in research into child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church. The John Jay study, for example, only collected data on allegations of child sexual abuse against religious brothers who had subsequently been ordained as priests and not those who had not. The US Conference of Catholic Bishops only began to collect information on allegations relating to Catholic religious brothers in 2015.\textsuperscript{89} Whilst the Royal Commission did not include an overall prevalence figure for non-ordained religious within their recent report, they did publish some of the prevalence rates for the ten religious institutes included in the survey, with the range being from 0.3 per cent to 40.4 per cent of non-ordained members having been subject to claims of child sexual abuse, taking into account the duration of their ministry (see Appendix E for further details of methodology). It is also striking that 41 per cent of the claims analysed by the Royal Commission were received by male religious institutes with only non-ordained religious members, despite these accounting

\textsuperscript{82} John Jay College of Criminal Justice (2004) \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{83} Note that this includes all forms of abuse, only 77 per cent of which consists of sexual abuse.

\textsuperscript{84} National Catholic Safeguarding Commission (2014), \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{85} Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (2017b) \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{86} John Jay College of Criminal Justice (2004) \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{87} Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (2017b) \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{88} John Jay College Research Team (2011), \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{89} United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) (2015), \textit{op cit.}
for only 5 per cent of the total number of Catholic Church authorities that received claims of child sexual
abuse.  

There is very little literature relating specifically to child sexual abuse perpetrated by female religious as most evidence on child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church focusses solely on abuse by diocesan and religious priests. There are also relatively few reported cases of sexual abuse, as opposed to physical abuse, perpetrated by female religious in comparison with the much higher number of reported cases of abuse by priests.

The most detailed data available on child sexual abuse by female perpetrators in the Catholic Church and specifically female religious comes from the Australian Royal Commission. This study found that overall 10 per cent of alleged perpetrators were female, this breaking down into 17 per cent of claims made against non-ordained religious being against a female alleged perpetrator and 9 per cent of claims against lay people being against a female alleged perpetrator. Overall, 5 per cent of alleged perpetrators were female religious. This data does not provide a similar comparison figure for prevalence amongst female religious as have been produced for male priests as the study does not report the total population of female religious in Catholic Church authorities in Australia over the relevant period.

The John Jay study gathered information only on allegations of sexual abuse against priests and does not cover female religious or any other female perpetrators in the context of the Catholic Church. Similarly, data collected on an annual basis for the US Conference of Catholic Bishops does not collect information on female religious or other female perpetrators. Annual audit data reported by the NCSC for England and Wales does not include information on the gender of alleged perpetrators of abuse. Data from the last two NCSC annual reports, breaking down the role of the abuser by type of abuse shows that in 2015, one of the 60 allegations of child sexual abuse related to an alleged perpetrator who was a female religious and in 2016, three of the 102 allegations of child sexual abuse related to perpetrators who were female religious. Data from a study of callers to a German helpline who were victims and survivors of child sexual abuse in an institutional context within the Roman Catholic Church found that, of cases where the gender of the perpetrator was known, in 86 per cent of cases they were male; in 9 per cent of cases they were female; and in 6 per cent of cases perpetrators were both male and female.

In Ireland the report of the Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse (‘the Ryan Report’) received evidence relating to physical abuse perpetrated by nuns and in some cases a lack of awareness of risk of child sexual abuse or poor handling of incidents. However, the report does not include evidence of a high incidence of, or systemic issues in relation to, sexual abuse carried out by nuns/female religious.

A number of studies have attempted to make findings around the background and psychological profile of clergy who have perpetrated child sexual abuse. There are several methodological limitations with
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90 Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (2017a) op. cit.
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97 Sprober et al. (2014), op. cit.
98 The Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse (2009) op. cit.
many of these studies which must be taken into account when considering their findings. Some studies, such as the John Jay study, have looked at available existing data in relation to the background and characteristics of perpetrators of child sexual abuse. There may be issues with some of the resulting data as it was not originally collected for the purpose of research and therefore information may be missing or inaccurate. There are also some issues with the sampling approach of some studies. Where samples have been recruited through psychological treatment centres, the extent to which findings can be generalised is reduced as those priests who enter treatment programmes may differ from those who do not and are not included in the sample. Sample sizes in these studies have also tended to be small and have tended to lack adequate control groups against which clergy perpetrators can be compared. A summary of some of these studies is provided in this section despite these caveats as it forms a significant part of the literature on child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church.

Seven per cent of priests accused of child sexual abuse in the John Jay sample were reported to have been physically, sexually or emotionally abused as children and 17 per cent had alcohol or substance abuse problems. A much higher figure is cited by another study of the records of a Catholic psychiatric treatment centre which found that 66 per cent of a sample of priest offenders had been sexually abused as children. Both of these figures should however be treated with caution. In the first case because this survey was not completed by the priest directly and those completing it may not have had full information; and the second because the source of the data is not clear and concerns a subpopulation of offending priests who are likely to have different characteristics to the population as a whole.

There have been a number of studies which have examined psychological characteristics of clergy sexual abusers, some comparing them with control groups of any or all of the following: other non-clergy sexual offenders; clergy who have not been subject to allegations; non-clergy who have not been subject to allegations. However, due to methodological issues with these studies, for example, that they use small samples drawn from only those referred for assessment or treatment and that control groups are often not truly comparable, and a lack of consensus between the studies on many issues, they do not provide compelling evidence on psychological factors specific to clergy sex offenders. One area where there does appear to be some level of consensus is that clergy sexual offenders appear to be less likely to have severe psychopathologies or be less psychologically disturbed than non-clergy sex offenders. Another qualitative study examining cognitive distortions in clergy sexual offenders (almost all Catholic priests) also found that they held cognitive distortions which denied and minimised the harm to the victim, in common with sexual offenders more generally.

102 Langevin et al. (2000), op. cit.; Haywood et al. (1996a), op. cit.; Haywood et al. (1996b), op. cit.
103 Gerard et al. (2003), op. cit.; Haywood et al. (1996a), op. cit.
104 Haywood et al. (1996a), op. cit.; Haywood et al. (1996b), op. cit.
105 Haywood et al. (1996a), op. cit.; Haywood et al. (1996b), op. cit.
One study which compared a small group of clergy sex offenders with a small control group of male sex offenders along with a large general dataset on sex offenders matched only for offence type, found similar rates of alcohol abuse amongst all groups, with around one third being alcoholics. Note, however, that samples were small and not all of the clerics had committed sexual offences against children.\textsuperscript{107}

4.3.3 Setting of abuse

There are two different ways of considering the setting of abuse. At one level this can be recorded as the location where the incident(s) took place. Whilst this information may be valuable in terms of evidence of safeguarding practice and failures in safeguarding, it does not necessarily show how the abuse was or was not linked to a particular institution (in this case the Church). An alternative way of considering the location or setting of the abuse is the location where the perpetrator met the victim or where the relationship between the victim and perpetrator developed. The latter may also be inferred from the relationship between the perpetrator and the victims, for example, if the perpetrator was the child’s teacher then the institutional context can be inferred as likely to have been a school.

The John Jay College data showed that the most common location for abuse was the priest’s home or parish residence (40.9 per cent), followed by the church (16.3 per cent) and the victim’s home (12.4 per cent). Boys were more likely than girls to be abused in social settings, such as outings or retreats, or church settings.\textsuperscript{108}

Despite the range and number of institutions and organisations which are run by or involved with the Catholic Church, such as schools and children’s homes, this review found limited numbers of research studies that focus specifically on child sexual abuse within Catholic run institutions. The Royal Commission’s recent report into claims of child sexual abuse received by the Catholic Church found that just under half (46 per cent) of all claims related to child sexual abuse in schools, with the next most common institution type being orphanages or residential facilities, which accounted for 29 per cent of all claims.\textsuperscript{109} Just over 10 per cent of alleged incidents of abuse reported in the John Jay study occurred in school (day or boarding); and 7.2 per cent of alleged perpetrators were teachers at the time of the incident. It should be noted, however, that the John Jay study did not include allegations made against non-ordained religious, and therefore any allegations made against non-ordained religious working in schools were not included in this data. A study from the Netherlands found that those who had lived in Catholic run institutions, such as boarding schools or children’s homes, were almost twice as likely to report having experienced child sexual abuse (26.4 per cent) as the national average (14 per cent).\textsuperscript{110} Respondents to a UK survey carried out by the Minister and Clergy Sexual Abuse Survivors organisation included those reporting that they had experienced child sexual abuse in the context of a Catholic school, boarding school or home/orphanage. Other respondents indicated that abuse had taken place in their parish community. However, as respondents were self-selecting and the sample was not representative, the differing proportions of respondents reporting abuse in these various contexts and locations should not be used to draw wider inferences.\textsuperscript{111}

\textsuperscript{107} Langevin et al. (2000), op. cit.
\textsuperscript{109} Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (2017b) \textit{op. cit.}
\textsuperscript{110} Langeland et al (2015), \textit{op. cit.}
4.3.4 Number of victims

Both the John Jay study and the Royal Commission study collected information on the number of victims or claims made against each alleged perpetrator. There were an average of 2.4 claims per alleged perpetrator in the Royal Commission study. In 74 per cent of all cases there was only one claim made against the alleged perpetrator, this figure being lower, at 64 per cent, when considering only allegations against priests (i.e. not including non-ordained religious and lay people). A small number of alleged perpetrators (4 per cent) had more than ten claims against them.112 Figures from the John Jay study are very similar, just over half of the priests (56 per cent) had only one victim, and over a quarter (27 per cent) had two or three victims. A small number of priests (3.4 per cent) had more than ten victims and these priests together accounted for 27 per cent of all incidents.113

Additional analysis of the John Jay data has highlighted relationships between the number of victims and other characteristics of the abuse. The data shows a positive correlation between the duration of abuse and the number of victims.114 Those with only one victim are more likely to have a female victim and the proportion of male victims increases with the number of victims; from 78 per cent for those with two or three victims to 90.6 per cent for those with ten or more victims.115 Those with the most victims were also more likely to perpetrate against younger children.116

4.3.5 Sexual exploitation and ‘grooming’

As with child sexual abuse perpetrated outside of the Church, research evidence indicates that a range of ‘grooming’ techniques are used by clerical abusers. Data from the John Jay study shows that enticements were commonly used by priests; with 7.8 per cent of victims having been given gifts by the priests and 17 per cent having received other types of enticement. Enticements included alcohol, drugs, and privileges, such as permission to stay with the priest. A minority of incidents involved the victim being threatened (14.6 per cent of those incidents where data on threats was reported or 7.8 per cent of all incidents), the most common threats being verbal threats of harm to the victim (22.4 per cent) and spiritual manipulation (21 per cent).117 Inquiries into child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church have also highlighted that priests may have used their position and access to children to groom both children and their families.118 This offending strategy increases the level of access the offender has to the victim and inhibits disclosure, as will be discussed in more detail in the following section.119

4.4 Disclosure

Research evidence shows that it is common for victims and survivors of child sexual abuse to delay disclosure.120 In the case of the Catholic Church, the only currently available robust quantitative data
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comes from the John Jay study which showed that only 11.5 per cent had reported the abuse within one year, 17.1 per cent had reported within five years; 21.4 per cent within ten years; and 65.9 per cent within 30 years.\textsuperscript{121} Data from an Australian study involving an opportunity sample of victims of child sexual abuse by personnel within Christian institutions showed a similar pattern, with 18 per cent disclosing at the time the abuse was happening or within a year of the abuse starting.\textsuperscript{122}

In contrast to other studies regarding disclosure of child sexual abuse, the data from the John Jay study did not show significant differences between children of different ages and genders in patterns of delayed reporting. Analysis of the data also reported that the severity of the abuse and the acquaintance between the perpetrator and the child’s family prior to the abuse also did not appear to have an effect on timing of disclosure.\textsuperscript{123} Research evidence from other sources on the former is mixed; in that severity of abuse has been found to both trigger and to delay disclosure.\textsuperscript{124} However, the lack of correlation between the perpetrator’s acquaintance with the child’s family and the timing of disclosure is surprising and contradicts other evidence regarding the relationships offending priests cultivate with children’s families and the difficulty this causes children in disclosing the abuse.\textsuperscript{125} Further research may be beneficial in exploring the influence of the family relationship with the church and local clergy on disclosure and seeking reparation.

### 4.5 Factors contributing to the occurrence of child sexual abuse within the Catholic Church

This section sets out the institutional factors which the literature suggests have influenced the occurrence of and response to child sexual abuse within the Catholic Church. These include:

- the structure of the Church;
- the position of the Church in society;
- church attitudes to child sexual abuse and to sexuality;
- the recruitment and formation of priests; and
- ‘clericalism’, a phenomenon associated with all of the above factors.

#### 4.5.1 Structure and governance

Much of the literature discusses the governance of the Catholic Church as a factor influencing the occurrence of abuse and response to it.\textsuperscript{126} The international governance of the Church has been criticised, in particular, by the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) which reported on the Holy See in 2014. The UNCRC and a number of civil society organisations’ submissions to the UNCRC criticised the Holy See for not acknowledging or taking responsibility for child sexual abuse perpetrated by Catholic clergy outside of the Vatican City State and thus not taking enough action to prevent it from occurring.\textsuperscript{127}
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The Holy See responded to the UNCRC arguing that they had misunderstood the legal status of the Holy See. In particular, stating that the Holy See ‘does not have the capacity or legal obligation to impose [the UNCRC principles] upon the local Catholic churches and institutions present on the territory of other states’.

It has been claimed that the Church vests considerable power and autonomy in individual bishops over their diocese and that this means that the response to child sexual abuse within a given diocese will depend upon the individual bishop, who, it is argued, receives little oversight or accountability from above or below. Individual bishops have been criticised for how they have handled allegations of child sexual abuse, for example, by inquiries such as the Murphy Report into the Dublin archdiocese. However, such an approach which focusses on the failures of individual bishops has been criticised for failing to take into account systemic issues and the wider context to the actions of individuals.

As a consequence of the authority held by bishops in individual dioceses, it has been suggested by commentators and victims and survivor groups that there has also been variation in how child sexual abuse has been dealt with at a diocesan level and a contrast between national safeguarding policy and local safeguarding practice. Between 2011 and 2013 the Catholic Safeguarding Advisory Service (CSAS) carried out audits of safeguarding practice in the 22 dioceses in England and Wales. The audit identified shortfalls in compliance in a number of areas. For example, inconsistent compliance with timescales for reporting and inconsistent use of covenants of care.

4.5.2 Position of the Church within society

The Catholic Church’s position in society has been cited as a factor both enabling sexual abuse to occur and hindering an effective response to abuse. A number of inquiries, for example the Westchester Grand Jury in the US and the Murphy Report in Ireland, have found that a priest’s powerful role in society as a spiritual leader and a community figure prevents children from disclosing abuse and makes children less likely to be believed with parents failing to confront the church. Where abuse took place in the context of institutions such as schools and care homes, children disclosing abuse to those responsible for their care could provoke recriminations from them. At an institutional level, the Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse in Ireland found that the Department for Education’s ‘deferential’ attitude to

133 ‘Covenants of care’ are agreements put in place to manage risk with regard to individuals working in the Church about whom allegations have been made pending an investigation by the statutory authorities or individuals who have a history of offending against children or vulnerable adults. In 2017 these will be replaced by ‘safeguarding plans’ (NCSC Annual Report 2016/17).
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the Catholic religious congregations running residential institutions for children hampered its ability to properly inspect and monitor those institutions.\textsuperscript{139}

4.5.3 Sexuality

The Catholic Church makes a distinction between homosexual acts which are viewed as a grave sin and homosexual tendencies which can ‘constitute a trial’ for those who have them. The Catholic Church does not admit ‘\textit{those who practise homosexuality, present deep-seated homosexual tendencies or support the so-called “gay culture”}’ to the seminary or holy orders and requires that, where tendencies are part of a transitory problem, they \textit{must be clearly overcome at least three years before ordination to the diaconate}.\textsuperscript{140}

Whilst homosexuality is discussed in the literature on child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church, research evidence both in relation to clergy sexual abuse and more generally indicates that there is no correlation between sexual orientation and child sexual abuse.\textsuperscript{141}

Much of the literature on child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church discusses the potential role celibacy may play in its incidence. Researchers have suggested that there is a relationship between the requirement for priests to be celibate\textsuperscript{142} and child sexual abuse.\textsuperscript{143} However, it has been contended that, as celibacy has been a constant within the Catholic Church, it cannot be seen as responsible for the rise in child sexual abuse in the Church between 1950 and 1980.\textsuperscript{144} This argument does not disprove a link between child sexual abuse in the Church and celibacy as celibacy could still be a contributory factor to its occurrence, with other factors being responsible for the variation in incidence over time.

Although there is no empirical evidence to prove or disprove a link between celibacy and child sexual abuse\textsuperscript{145} researchers have considered sexuality within the Church more broadly, suggesting that early entry into seminaries may have ‘stunted’ the sexual development of priests. This, coupled with what has been characterised by commentators as the Church’s negative attitudes to sexuality and the body (in particular, the female body) and the association of sexuality with sin, has been suggested as a factor in the prevalence of child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church.\textsuperscript{146} Research with Catholic priests in Ireland who had perpetrated abuse revealed narratives of guilt and anxiety around sex and sexual suppression during adolescence and in the years leading up to entering the priesthood. The participants associated these issues with the teaching they had received from the Church.\textsuperscript{147} Another small qualitative study, also involving Irish Catholic priests found that a common theme in the priests’ accounts was ‘psychosexual foreclosure’; where the priests’ psychosexual development had been hindered. Most of the priests in the
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sample had grown up in households where sex was not discussed and in a culture which fostered sexuality related guilt.\textsuperscript{148}

### 4.5.4 Clericalism

Literary discussions have also considered the significance of clericalism in the incidence and response to child sexual abuse within the Church. Clericalism is defined by the Australian Truth, Justice and Healing Council as ‘approaches or practices involving ordained ministry geared to power over others, not service to others’.\textsuperscript{149} Clericalism describes the perception of clerics as being spiritually superior to lay people. It can also be conceptualised as an example of group bias where the needs of a specific group within an organisation are identified as the needs of the organisation as a whole.\textsuperscript{150} The hierarchy of the Church; the divine attribution of this hierarchy; the requirement of celibacy and association between celibacy and spiritual purity; and the insular nature of the priesthood have all been identified as contributing to clericalism.\textsuperscript{151} Pope Francis has spoken out against clericalism, commenting that ‘Clericalism forgets that the visibility and sacramentality of the Church belong to all the People of God ... not only to the few chosen and enlightened.’\textsuperscript{152}

It has been argued that clericalism both inhibits the disclosure of child sexual abuse and causes the Church to behave defensively and protectively in response to such abuse.\textsuperscript{153} For example, spiritual grooming and threats to victims can be seen as manifestations of clericalism which enable child sexual abuse. The belief of children, parents and communities that clerics are closer to God and in that sense, superior to lay people may inhibit disclosure.\textsuperscript{154} In a small US qualitative study of women who had been abused by clergy as children and adults, some victims spoke of feeling that they needed to protect the Church.\textsuperscript{155} The actions taken by the Church in response to child sexual abuse, as outlined in the literature, have been characterised as having prioritised the needs of the clergy over those of lay people and being symptomatic of an attitude that the clergy are a superior class.\textsuperscript{156}

### 4.5.5 Formation and selection of priests

The process of becoming a priest (called ‘formation’) and thus entering the clergy is markedly different to entering other professions. To be ordained as a priest, men enter a residential institution called a seminary where they typically spend six years preparing to enter the priesthood, including a placement within their local diocese. There are six seminaries which prepare men to serve as priests in England and Wales: three in England; two in Italy; and one in Spain.\textsuperscript{157}
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In England and Wales, the Charter for Priestly Formation (2015), developed by the Bishops’ Conference of England and Wales in 1990 and revised in 2015, sets out the selection process for priests. Prospective priests are subject to psychological assessments, DBS checks, referencing and interviews with the bishop and in some cases a selection advisory panel before being accepted to a Seminary. The Charter incorporates recommendations made by the Nolan review in 2001. A database of applicants is maintained by the National Office for Vocation in order that new applicants can be checked against this. The Charter also reiterates the Nolan Review’s recommendation that, in selecting candidates, bishops should not overrule the Selection Advisory Panel where the Panel expresses reservations about the candidate’s suitability on the basis of risks to children. The document notes that students in seminaries with qualities including ‘a lack of sexual integration’ are unlikely to progress in formation for the priesthood and that any candidates who are sexually attracted to children should be dismissed from the seminary. The Church also has a policy on recruitment applying to both clerical roles and other employed roles covering DBS checks and referencing.

The formation process for Catholic priests has been criticised in the context of the issue of child sexual abuse, with the theological focus eclipsing the training and awareness in the pastoral and social aspects of priestly life and sexuality and preparation for celibacy not being covered. There is some evidence from Ireland that training has improved in recent decades, however, there remain concerns. Seminaries have also been criticised as providing an unrealistic, all male environment which does not equip trainee clergy with the necessary skills for real life as a priest. The separation of seminarians from their communities has also been seen as a factor in the phenomenon of clericalism discussed above. In the US, the John Jay causes and context study which tracked the development of the curriculum of priestly formation, concluded that the inclusion of human formation in the curriculum is critically important. The researchers argued that ‘the development of the curriculum of human formation is consistent with the continued low levels of abuse by Catholic priests’. However, it should be noted that the fall in incidence of abuse occurred prior to the introduction of human formation to seminary education and this review has not identified research specifically evaluating the impact of human formation on rates of child sexual abuse.

The Charter for Priestly Formation sets out guidance on the elements of formation, which includes a programme for human formation. This programme covers formation for celibacy including psychosexual, social and spiritual development.
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4.6 Response to child sexual abuse by the Catholic Church

This section describes the key themes identified in the literature in relation to the Catholic Church’s response to child sexual abuse. Many of these factors also arguably may have a direct or indirect bearing on the incidence of child sexual abuse within the Catholic Church.

4.6.1 Secrecy and upholding reputation

A common theme running throughout the research literature is that the Church’s response to child sexual abuse has been concerned primarily with protecting the Church’s reputation. This perceived attitude within the Church has been said to have lead to a failure to believe or take action regarding allegations or suspicions of child sexual abuse. In addition it has been suggested that there has been a repression or ‘cover up’ of information regarding child sexual abuse in the church and a tendency to deal with cases of sexual abuse internally.167 The literature has identified potential evidence of this approach in some of the responses taken to allegations, for example the transfer of priests to new locations or to duties which limit contact with children.168

In addition to accusations of specific ‘cover ups’, the Church has also been criticised for a general lack of transparency in its handling of child sexual abuse. In response to a request from the UNCRC for information on cases of child sexual abuse brought to the Holy See’s attention and actions taken in response, the Holy See responded that it refuses to provide information on the religious discipline of members of the clergy.169 Clarity on the Holy See’s policies on specific aspects of child protection, such as reporting abuse to relevant statutory authorities, has also been lacking and canon law has been described as imposing secrecy requirements in dealing with cases of child sexual abuse,170 as described in the sections below.

4.6.2 Canon law procedures

Child sexual abuse is regarded as a grave offence in canon law and penalties can include laicisation from the clerical state (which is discussed further in this section). The current applicable law is the Apostolic letter issued motu proprio by the pope Sacramentorum sanctitatis tutela 2001171 and the 1983 Code of Canon Law. The Code can also impose sanctions on bishops who fail to implement canon law correctly in such cases.172 In addition, an Apostolic letter issued motu proprio by Pope Francis in February 2016 clarifies that negligence in relation to cases of child sexual abuse can constitute sufficient grounds to remove a bishop from ecclesiastical offices.173

---
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There has been criticism that the Church’s failure to deal effectively with child sexual abuse amounts to a failure in implementing canon law.\textsuperscript{174} When faced with a potential violation of canon law, bishops may attempt to resolve the matter in a pastoral way without recourse to the administrative processes set out in canon law. Alternatively bishops may either follow an administrative process or a judicial one, with more severe penalties potentially being imposed via the latter.\textsuperscript{175} The literature identifies a tendency for bishops to take a pastoral approach to dealing with perpetrators of child sexual abuse. This seems to have been confirmed in the letter of Pope Benedict XVI to the Catholics of Ireland which stated that there had been ‘a well-intentioned but misguided tendency to avoid penal approaches to canonically irregular situations’. This letter appeared to identify the apparent avoidance of the use of the canonical process to impose penalties on offending priests as a failure of individual bishops rather than a systematic failure. Whilst some commentators concur with this view,\textsuperscript{176} others have identified issues inherent in canon law which have led to ineffectual ways of dealing with child sexual abuse in the Church.\textsuperscript{177}

Some of the literature proposes that bishops have lacked knowledge of the correct canonical procedures to follow in cases of suspected or alleged child sexual abuse due to the complexity of canon law and inadequate dissemination of information.\textsuperscript{178} Prior to 2001, an instruction issued in 1922 and reissued at the Vatican Council in 1962, \textit{Crimen sollicitationis}, set out the procedures to be followed by bishops in cases of child sexual abuse. The 1922 instruction was only given to bishops ‘as needed’ and was not widely publicised.\textsuperscript{179} The document was reissued in 1962 and copies were printed to be given to bishops at the Vatican Council in 1962, however, most copies were not distributed.\textsuperscript{180} After the update to canon law in 1983, there was some confusion as to whether the 1962 document was still in force.\textsuperscript{181} The 2001 instruction, \textit{Sacramentorum sanctitatis tutela}, which replaced \textit{Crimen sollicitationis} was distributed to all bishops.\textsuperscript{182}

It has also been suggested in the literature that failures in dealing with child sexual abuse have stemmed from problems inherent in canon law in addition to poor implementation of it.\textsuperscript{183} For example, the requirement of a high standard of proof that an offence has been committed and is ‘imputable’, that is, that the offender is personally responsible for the action taken (e.g. they do not lack the use of reason),\textsuperscript{184} Canon law has also been criticised for encouraging or even imposing secrecy with respect to child sexual abuse in part due to the emphasis placed on protecting the reputations of accused whilst investigations are ongoing.\textsuperscript{185} This is, however, disputed by the Church which has emphasised that canon law is a separate and parallel procedure to civil and criminal law and that confidentiality only applies to the
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internal disciplinary process and does not prevent churches from reporting cases of child sexual abuse to the relevant civil authorities.  

4.6.3 Reporting

Failure to report allegations or suspicions of abuse to the civil authorities has been identified in the literature as a significant problem in the Catholic Church. In England and Wales, the NCSC has stated that it is a requirement to refer allegations of abuse reported to a bishop, diocese or religious congregation to civil authorities and detailed guidance for doing so is set out in the CSAS safeguarding procedures manual. The NCSC collects figures on allegations which are reported to civil authorities, however, this does not give an indication as to whether there are allegations made to the church that are not reported to the statutory authorities and, if so, how many. Similar guidance has been issued in other jurisdictions, however, neither these documents nor the NCSC guidance has official recognition (‘recognitio’) from the Holy See, as recommended by the Cumberlege Commission. Indeed, guidance issued by the US Conference of Catholic Bishops was not given recognition until a number of changes were made making it more coherent with canon law, including a change from a statement that allegations would be referred to public authorities to a statement that the Church would comply with civil laws.

Official guidance issued by the Holy See does state that the laws of the relevant country should be followed but does not go so far as to place any requirement on clergy to report suspected or alleged abuse to civil authorities in any circumstances (except in those cases where the relevant civil laws require this). The lack of such guidance is criticised in much of the literature and is seen as evidence of the Church’s desire for secrecy and to protect and uphold its reputation. More recently, a statement was issued by the President of the Pontifical Commission for the Protection of Minors in February 2016 which stated that ‘our obligations under civil law must certainly be followed, but even beyond these civil requirements, we all have a moral and ethical responsibility to report suspected abuse to the civil authorities who are charged with protecting our society’. Evidence on the extent to which this reflects the Church’s position more generally and operates in practice locally has not been identified in the course of this review and is worthy of further exploration.

Where abuse is disclosed in the context of ‘confession’, there is less clarity in how this should be handled by the Church. Confession is common to many religions as a means of acknowledging and absolving sinfulness and wrongdoings for both clergy and lay people. In the Catholic Church the confessional is a sacrament and whatever information is shared is held in confidence by the seal of the confession. Confidentiality provides congregants with the opportunity to share concerns and problems without fear of disclosure. In a study involving interviews with a small sample of perpetrators from the Catholic

190 It is to be assumed that this reference relates to both civil and criminal law within individual jurisdictions, i.e. as opposed to canon law.
clergy in Ireland, several interviewees reported that they had disclosed their offences during confession. Some described this as an emotional support mechanism and as a way of easing their conscience in respect of the abuse they had committed. One of the men recounted that, out of all of the times he had discussed the abuse, he was only challenged about it in one case. Without being challenged he felt that confession allowed him to ‘minimise what was really happening’.193 The Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse in Australia also heard evidence from a number of witnesses on clergy perpetrators disclosing their offending during confession and, additionally, victims and survivors who reported disclosing during confession that they had been abused by clergy.194

Whilst mandatory reporting laws applying to clergy and to information disclosed during confession have been implemented in a number of jurisdictions, such as some states in the US, in many states in the US such information can remain confidential under ‘clergy-penitent privilege’.195 Similar exceptions apply in a number of states in Australia.196 Whilst for some this excludes the disclosure of child sexual abuse (or any abuse and neglect) the interpretation of the religious laws on the rights of the confessional within state law is ambiguous.197 There have been calls to extend mandatory reporting to include information disclosed within confession (in those jurisdictions where this is not already the case) and in August 2017 the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse recommended that the failure to report child sexual abuse in institutions, including where this information was disclosed within confession, is made a criminal offence in Australia.198 Greater consideration is needed outside the scope of this report of the compatibility between religious practices and ecclesiastical laws and statutory guidance and laws, particularly in relation to reporting practices and statutory duty of care. It should, however, be noted that disclosure during confession is likely to be one of the less common ways in which the Church becomes aware of abuse199 and the existence of mandatory reporting laws for clergy will not necessarily improve the reporting of child abuse.200

4.6.4 Covenants of care/safeguarding plans

‘Covenants of care’ are agreements put in place to manage risk with regard to individuals working in the Church about whom allegations have been made pending an investigation by the statutory authorities. It also applies to individuals who wish to work in the Church and have a history of offending against children or vulnerable adults. The total number of covenants of care rose steadily between 2008 and 2014 but has fallen to 428 in 2016 (the most recent year for which data is available) from a peak of 462 in 2014. Similarly, the number of new covenants of care drawn up each year has also fallen, from 104 in 2014 to 88 in 2016.201 One survivors’ group, MACSAS, has suggested that a covenant of care that exists for clergy should also be in place for victims and survivors.202 This REA has not identified any literature on the
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efficacy of such arrangements in the context of the Catholic Church. During 2017 covenants of care will be replaced with safeguarding plans.203

4.6.5 Treatment centres

Referrals to treatment centres for priests who had offended became common towards the end of the 20th century, with the peak decade for referrals in the US Catholic Church being the 1980s.204 Referrals declined throughout the 1990s in the US according to the data from the John Jay study. The use of treatment centres reflected a psychological approach being taken by the Church.205 Prior to this, responses might instead consist of: sending priests for psychological evaluation; placing them on retreat; or giving them non-serving administrative duties (i.e. duties where they will not be ministering to the public).206 Of the priests subject to allegations in the John Jay data, 37 per cent had participated in treatment programmes.207 Robust evidence of the effectiveness of such treatment centres in treating members of the clergy is lacking.208

There is evidence that some priests were returned to ministry following such treatment and yet detailed information about the nature of the priest’s offences was not always given to the treatment centre209 thus compromising any risk assessment subsequently provided to the Church. It has also been suggested that this practice served to protect the Church from claims of negligence.210 Criticism has also been made of the church’s response to ‘treating’ offending clergy, with this being seen as reflecting a greater focus on the needs of the perpetrator rather than the victim.211

4.6.6 Relocation of priests and laicisation

There is significant criticism in the literature of the Church’s approach to responding to child sexual abuse internally. In particular the alleged practice of relocating offending clergy to another parish or to a position with limited contact with children has been widely criticised.212 The literature suggests that this practice has been evident across a number of jurisdictions and has been seen as a way of protecting priests without giving due regard to the safety of children. Concerns have also been raised that, when priests are transferred, the new parish, diocese or religious institute are not provided with full information about the priest and their history. The Catholic Church responded to questions from the UNCRC on this by stating that guidelines had been issued for local churches on the protection of children and that greater scrutiny should be exercised in exchanging information when priests transfer from one area
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to another. In England and Wales guidance was issued by the Catholic Office for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults (COPCA) in 2007 on the placement of priests across boundaries.

A further stage of response is the removal of an individual from the clerical state, known as laicisation. According to canon law, laicisation is an available penalty for clergy who have committed child sexual abuse. Whilst noting that perpetrators can arguably be better supervised if they have not been laicised, the Nolan Review recommended that a sentence of twelve months or more should be the threshold for when laicisation may be a proportionate response. Whilst, as of 2015, 55 priests had been laicised in England and Wales as a result of the recommendations made by the Nolan review in 2001, it has been suggested that practice in this area remains inconsistent.

Individuals may also be moved from ministry, meaning that they would no longer perform any clerical duties, without being laicised. This may be temporary, for example, during an investigation into allegations made against them, or permanent, for example, following allegations which are found to be substantiated.

A retrospective audit of 425 diocesan allegations carried out by CSAS in 2014 and reported in the 2014 NCSC annual report found that, of the 238 allegations which had not been unsubstantiated and which concerned living alleged perpetrators, 203 (85.3 per cent) had been withdrawn from ministry. This includes those in respect of whom laicisation had been pursued and non-clergy who had been dismissed from their posts.

Annual figures collected in the US on behalf of the USCCB show that 181 (80 per cent) of diocesan priests and deacons subject to an allegation made in 2014-15 (but which may relate to incidents allegedly occurring before 2014-15) were already dead, laicised, removed from ministry or missing. Of the remaining priests, 13 had been permanently removed from ministry, 20 had been temporarily removed pending completion of investigation, three had returned to ministry following investigation and three were still in active ministry pending investigation.

Practice in relation to the removal of non-ordained employees (such as non-ordained members of religious institutes) or volunteers from duties or office was not covered within the identified literature, which focussed largely on the laicisation of priests.

4.6.7 Response of the church to victims

Some victims of child sexual abuse within the Catholic Church have reported feeling blamed by the Church for what has happened to them. The Church’s response has been characterised in the literature as attacking rather than supporting victims.

---

Some authors have contrasted the support offered to alleged perpetrators with the response to victims which has been described as ‘inadequate’ and the importance placed by the Church on the forgiveness and pastoral care of perpetrators has been identified as detracting from the needs of victims and even, in some cases, causing victims further harm. MACSAS have highlighted their concerns about the emphasis the Church has placed on the forgiveness of perpetrators. In particular, the harm caused to victims and survivors by being asked to forgive their abuser.

Participants in the 2006 MACSAS survey mentioned above reported negative experiences of how they had been treated and supported by the Church during and following disclosure. In particular they were not satisfied with communication throughout the process and some reported that they had not been directed to support services by the Church. In addition, some reported that they had not been offered counselling or funding for counselling. It has also been suggested that the Church has been advised by insurers not to provide counselling to victims. The Church has also been criticised for offering counselling only on condition of the victim keeping the case confidential.

The current procedures for supporting victims and survivors in the Catholic Church in England and Wales state that all those who allege they have been abused within a church setting, whether historical or current, should be offered pastoral support by the Church. The policy states that support beyond this (i.e. formal counselling or financial support) will not be appropriate in most cases. Where this is requested the Safeguarding Coordinator will liaise with the Insurance Officer in making a decision about what support should be offered. The 2015 NCSC annual report announced the national roll out of an approach to victims and survivors piloted in the Diocese of Hallam. The project, called ‘Hurt by Abuse’ involves encouraging victims and survivors to speak about their abuse and supporting them through this process as well as signposting them to services which can provide additional support. Subsequently, it has been confirmed in the NCSC 2016/17 annual report that a National Pastoral Support Service will be established, shaped by the experiences of the ‘Hurt by Abuse’ pilot in the Diocese of Hallam. The service will consist of a telephone helpline for victims and survivors commissioned from an external provider.

4.6.8 Accountability and compensation

The UNCRC has criticised the Holy See for imposing confidentiality as a condition of compensation for victims and for obstructing efforts in some countries, such as the US, to extend the statute of limitations for child sexual abuse. A review carried out in the Australian State of Victoria found that approaches to compensation by religious organisations, including the Catholic Church, doesn’t make clear the basis for decisions about financial payments nor obligations regarding confidentiality. In a very small and non-representative survey of victims and survivors carried out by Minister and Clergy Sexual Abuse Survivors...
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(MACSAS) in the UK in 2006 as part of a submission to the Cumberlege Commission, respondents felt that financial compensation packages offered by the Church were insufficient given the impact of abuse on their lives. The study recommended that better offers of compensation may reduce the need for victims and survivors to go to court, thus avoiding any further potential re-traumatisation through the court process.

In their submission to the Cumberlege Committee, MACSAS also reported that discussions between the Church and victims and survivors were dominated by concerns around insurance claims. In an Irish study carried out in 2001, a small, unrepresentative sample of victims and their families reported that they felt that legal concerns had taken precedence over a pastoral approach to victims.

Interviews with victims who had entered into litigation against the Catholic Church in the US highlighted the range of motives that victims had in pursuing this action. Financial compensation was not identified as the fundamental goal. Exposure and recognition of the truth of their allegations was a key motive along with a number of other non-monetary motives. In some cases victims were unhappy with the financial focus of the litigation.

It was not within the scope of this review to consider in detail the accountability and reparative role of religious organisations.

4.7 Conclusion

There is research evidence that child sexual abuse in the Catholic church has been a significant issue and there exists a large body of literature exploring and analysing both the factors influencing the incidence of child sexual abuse and the Church’s response to it. Church structure and governance, including the use of canon law, have been identified within the research literature reviewed here as making the Church vulnerable to the occurrence of abuse. In particular, whilst the Church is a hierarchical organisation, significant power and autonomy is vested in individual bishops over their diocese, enabling them to deal with sexual abuse in varied and, it has been alleged, at times, inadequate ways. Therefore, whilst there has been a proliferation of safeguarding guidance and policy in the Catholic Church in England and Wales over the last two decades, the available literature and data suggest that there may remain areas of inconsistent local practice.

More generally, within the literature a number of aspects of Church culture and Church attitudes have been identified as influencing the incidence and response to child sexual abuse. The literature suggests that reverence and respect for members of the clergy appears to have facilitated abuse and inhibited disclosure. Similarly, the attitude that the clergy are a separate, superior class to the laity (‘clericalism’) has been identified in the literature as a factor in the Church’s response to sexual abuse which has been characterised as secretive and protective, both of individual clerics and the Church as an institution.

229 The Cumberlege Commission was established in 2006 to review the Church’s progress in implementing the safeguarding recommendations made by the Nolan Review 5 years earlier, it’s final report was published in 2007. The Cumberlege Commission (2007) Safeguarding with confidence; Keeping children and vulnerable adults safe in the Catholic Church. London: Incorporated Catholic Truth Society.

230 Minister and Clergy Sexual Abuse Survivors (MACSAS) (2006a) Betrayed or supported? Clergy abuse survivors’ experiences of the Catholic Church’s response to clergy sexual abuse: Cumberlege Commission.

231 Minister and Clergy Sexual Abuse Survivors (MACSAS) (2006c), op.cit.
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Although there exists a general consensus in the literature on some of the factors influencing the incidence and response to child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church, it should be noted that the literature draws on only a very small number of empirical studies, as is discussed in greater detail below.

4.8 Research gaps

Whilst there is a significant body of literature on child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church, there remain a number of gaps in empirical research evidence. Much of the literature is based on a small number of empirical studies from the US, in particular the John Jay study carried out in 2004. Whilst the results of this study are similar to those of a study by the Australian Commission in 2017, supporting the idea that these studies have international relevance, and both studies are robust and come from jurisdictions that are in many ways comparable to England and Wales, further research in an England and Wales setting could be beneficial in establishing the extent to which the findings from these studies apply in this jurisdiction.

Particularly relevant to the Inquiry, there is also a lack of research evidence on the scale and nature of abuse in institutions run and staffed by the Catholic Church in England and Wales, such as schools and residential homes. Inquiries such as the Irish Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse234 and case studies in the Australian Royal Commission have focussed on abuse in specific establishments, however, the societal context is different in both cases to that of England and Wales in terms of the level of social provision linked to or under the control of the Church. A related area which also lacks research is the specificity of abuse carried out in religious institutes, including female religious institutes, as opposed to in dioceses. These areas are related as many religious institutes run or have historically run establishments such as schools and children's homes.

Data coming from the US indicates that child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church peaked in the late 1970s/early 1980s,235 however, there is insufficient data available in respect of England and Wales to be confident that this trend was replicated here. There is also a lack of research evidence available on reasons behind this trend.

In England and Wales safeguarding policy has developed significantly over recent years, in particular since the Nolan Review236 in 2001. Whilst some data is collected by the NCSC through safeguarding audits, this does not provide detailed information or qualitative information on how well policies and guidance are being implemented and followed ‘on the ground’ in individual parishes. Evaluative information on the efficacy of different strategies and responses to child sexual abuse, including for example, treatment programmes or management strategies, such as covenants of care, also appears to be lacking and may be another area worthy of attention.

---
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Section 5: Anglican Churches
This section focuses on evidence and policy relating to the Anglican Churches. It provides an overview of the structure of the Anglican Communion and the Church of England and the Church in Wales for context, then summarises the available international literature on child sexual abuse within the Anglican Churches. The chapter covers the prevalence and nature of child sexual abuse; the factors contributing to its occurrence; and the Anglican Churches’ response to it.

**Summary of key themes**

### Scale and nature of abuse

- Evidence on the scale and nature of child sexual abuse in the Anglican Churches is very limited. Only two substantial studies exist which attempt to assess the incidence of child sexual abuse within the Anglican Churches. Both relate to the Anglican Church of Australia and involve a retrospective analysis of church personnel files. The earlier study by Parkinson, Oates and Jayakody\(^ {237} \) identified 191 allegations made to the Church of Australia over an 18 year period (between 1990 and 2008) whilst a 2017 study published by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse\(^ {238} \) identified 1,119 allegations made over a 35 year period (between 1980 and 2015). Both studies are, however, limited in the fact that they rely on information recorded by church dioceses only rather than looking at other sources of allegation data, and neither includes comprehensive data relating to church schools and youth groups.

- Parkinson et al. used their data to calculate a ‘rough estimate’ of well below one per cent of Anglican Church of Australia clergy having been accused of child sexual abuse between 1990 and 2008.\(^ {239} \) However, this figure should be treated with caution due to the various assumptions involved in its calculation.

- In terms of the setting of the abuse, just under a quarter (22 per cent) of all the cases of alleged child sexual abuse in the Anglican Church of Australia identified by the Royal Commission study related to schools, whilst 13 per cent related to the Australian youth group the Church of England Boys’ Society (CEBS) and 14 per cent reportedly occurred in an orphanage or children’s home.\(^ {240} \)

- The majority of alleged perpetrators in both studies were male, whilst three quarters (75 per cent) of the complainants in both studies were male. The average age of the complainants in the Royal Commission study was 11 years old.\(^ {241} \)

---


238 Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (2017c) *Analysis of complaints of child sexual abuse received by the Anglican Church dioceses in Australia*. Sydney: Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse.
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• There is no publicly available data on the scale or nature of child sexual abuse in either the Church of England or Church in Wales. This represents a significant evidence gap. Due to differences between the institutions themselves and the jurisdictional context, findings on child sexual abuse in the Anglican Church of Australia should not be extrapolated to the Churches in England and Wales without further analysis to establish whether or not the settings are comparable.

Factors contributing to the occurrence of abuse

The literature has suggested that three main factors may have contributed to the occurrence of child sexual abuse in the Anglican Churches:

• A greater opportunity for the abuse to occur than would ordinarily exist due to the Churches’ previously prominent role in running multiple services and programmes for children in some jurisdictions.\(^{242}\)

• The position of authority, trust and influence that clergy have occupied within their communities which has both afforded perpetrators within the Churches regular, unsupervised access to children, and helped to suppress the disclosure of abuse by victims.\(^{243}\)

• An ineffective response by the Churches to reports of child sexual abuse, which has resulted in known or suspected perpetrators amongst the clergy being allowed to continue abusing.\(^{244}\)

Church response

The research evidence that exists suggests that some Anglican Churches’ response to allegations of child sexual abuse has frequently been one characterised by denial, secrecy and the use of internal clergy discipline mechanisms.\(^{245}\)


The literature posits that this response has been influenced by a number of factors within the Churches, including:

- an unwillingness to acknowledge that clergy and other people working for the Churches are capable of committing such abuse;\textsuperscript{246}
- an overriding concern with protecting the Churches’ assets and reputation;\textsuperscript{247} and
- an emphasis on Church clergy (and victims) forgiving perpetrators for committing abuse at the cost of supporting victims and protecting children.\textsuperscript{248}

The evidence suggests that progress has been made within the Anglican Churches in recent decades in relation to both preventing and responding to child sexual abuse, and a range of safeguarding policies and practice guidance documents have been developed by both the Church of England and Church in Wales.\textsuperscript{249} The complexity of the Churches’ structures and hierarchies may pose challenges to the effective and consistent implementation of these policies, however.\textsuperscript{250}

5.1 Overview of the Anglican Church in England and Wales\textsuperscript{251}

The Anglican Communion consists of a worldwide family of 38 autonomous national and regional Christian churches, plus six additional provincial churches and dioceses. All these churches consider themselves to be ‘in communion’ (i.e. in a reciprocal relationship). In England and Wales, there are two Anglican Churches: Church of England and the Church in Wales.

The Church of England is the established church of England and the reigning monarch is its Supreme Governor. It is the largest Christian denomination in England in terms of worshippers; on average over one million people attended Church of England services and acts of worship each week in 2016.\textsuperscript{252} The Church of England is split into two provinces – Northern and Southern – which are overseen by the Archbishop of York and Archbishop of Canterbury respectively, with the Archbishop of Canterbury being the senior archbishop. Both archbishops exercise unifying functions in relation to their provinces, but neither has the authority to direct bishops within their own dioceses on how to undertake their religious

---


\textsuperscript{247} Parkinson et al. (2012), op.cit.; Morrison, Z. (2005) Reporting the abuse of children and young people and responding to adult sexual assault: A study into the attitudes and behaviours of clergy and church workers in the Anglican Dioceses of Adelaide when dealing with the abuse of children and sexual assault of adults.


functions. The provinces are made up of 41 English dioceses. The General Synod is the legislature of the church. It creates law in the form of Measures (which have the same authority as Acts of Parliament and are approved by parliament and receive royal assent) and Canons (which receive royal assent). The Church of England has connections to a wide range of organisations including Church schools and colleges, religious communities and seminaries. The Church is also involved in running a wide range of youth groups and schemes. Safeguarding within the Church of England is overseen by the House of Bishops and delivered by a National Safeguarding Team (NST) who work to support the development and implementation of safeguarding policies at a diocesan level.

The Church in Wales has been an independent Anglican church since 1920 and, unlike the Church of England, is not an established church. It is led by the Archbishop of Wales and divided into 6 dioceses. Its services were attended by an average of around 40,000 people per week in 2016, and, like the Church of England, it also comprises a number of Church schools and other bodies/communities and runs or is linked to a range of youth groups. Responsibility for safeguarding and child protection sits with the Church's Representative Body, overseen by the Governing Body, and safeguarding policy is both developed and implemented by a dedicated safeguarding team.

Further information about the Church of England, Church in Wales and their respective safeguarding teams (including safeguarding and child protection timelines for both Churches) can be found in Appendix C.

5.2 Prevalence and incidence of child sexual abuse within the Anglican Churches as indicated by the literature

As noted above there is a relative paucity of publicly available evidence on child sexual abuse in the Anglican Churches compared to the Catholic Church. Robust evidence on the scale and nature of child sexual abuse in this setting comes from two main studies. Both of these identify and analyse complaints of child sexual abuse made to the Anglican Church of Australia. No studies were identified which attempt to assess the scale and nature of child sexual abuse in relation to the Anglican Churches in other countries, including England and Wales.

The older of the two Australian studies, conducted by Parkinson, Oates and Jayakody, involved a retrospective analysis of concluded cases of alleged child sexual abuse which appeared in Anglican Church of Australia personnel files between 1990 and 2008. These cases included sexual abuse allegedly perpetrated by members of the clergy as well as by other church workers such as non-ordained or ‘lay’


255 A study of police records in the Australian state of Victoria also exists, however this study was very small in scale and provides only limited information so has not been included in this report.

paid employees and volunteers. Information on these cases was submitted to the authors via a survey by 17 of the 23 dioceses that make up the Church in Australia. Key findings from the study were:

- 191 cases of alleged abuse which concluded between 1990 and 2008 were identified. These cases involved 180 complainants, who made complaints against 135 members of clergy or other Church staff;

- using this data the authors calculate a ‘rough estimate’ of well under one per cent of Anglican Church of Australia clergy having been accused of child sexual abuse between 1990 and 2008.257

When considering these figures it should be noted that the study involved an analysis of Anglican Church of Australia records only. It therefore did not capture abuse that was not disclosed to the Church, for example abuse which was disclosed only to the police and/or social services, as well as abuse which was not disclosed to any authorities. Additionally, the study findings do not constitute a comprehensive list of all cases of alleged child sexual abuse disclosed to the Church during the 18 year study period. Staffing constraints on the part of the dioceses required to locate the files; the non-participation of three dioceses;258 and the fact that the study excluded church schools, children’s homes and other church-run organisations meant that not all cases of child sexual abuse reported to the Church were captured in the data. It is also not clear how comprehensively or systematically the Church recorded complaints of abuse made against its clergy or staff during this period. Taken together these limitations mean that the 191 cases of alleged abuse identified by the study are likely to represent only a proportion of all cases of alleged child sexual abuse involving the Anglican Church of Australia during this period. The one per cent perpetration rate should therefore be treated with caution.

The more recent study, published in 2017 by the Australian Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, provides an important counterpoint to the Parkinson study. This research also involved a retrospective analysis of records held by the 23 dioceses making up the Anglican Church of Australia. It required each diocese to supply information on all reports of alleged child sexual abuse received by the Church, this time over a 35 year time period between 1980 and 2015 (which encompasses the 18 year period of the Parkinson et al study).259 Twenty-two of the 23 dioceses had records of at least one complaint of child sexual abuse being received during this period. The study found that the Church received 1,119 reports of alleged child sexual abuse over the 35 year period, made by 1,085 complainants against 702 clergy or church workers. Unlike the Parkinson study, the authors of this report do not attempt to calculate the prevalence of perpetrating clergy members on the basis of this data.

A range of reasons could account for the significant difference in the number of cases of alleged child sexual abuse identified by the two studies (the number of cases was just under six times greater in the Royal Commission research compared to the Parkinson study). These include:

- the longer time period of the Royal Commission study (35 years compared to the 18 years of the Parkinson study);
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257 A ‘conservative estimate’ of 10,000 clergy serving in parishes over the study period was used to calculate the one per cent figure (Parkinson et al. (2012), op. cit.). This estimate focuses on clergy only and does not take into account non-ordained or lay church employees and volunteers.

258 A further three dioceses reported that they had no cases meeting the Parkinson study criteria in their records, hence the survey only being completed by 17 of the 23 dioceses.

259 Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (2017a), op. cit.
• the higher response rate for the Royal Commission study reflecting the fact that the Royal Commission had the power to compel institutions to provide them with evidence (all 23 dioceses responded to the Royal Commission study, whereas three dioceses declined to participate in the Parkinson study);

• the fact that the Royal Commission study did not specify that the cases of alleged abuse be ‘closed’, unlike the Parkinson study; and

• the fact that (unlike the Parkinson study) the Royal Commission data included some allegations made within the context of church schools in cases where the dioceses in question required these allegations to be referred to them.

Further information on the differences between the approach and methods adopted by the two studies can be found in Appendix E. It is important to note that several of the limitations discussed in relation to the Parkinson study – such as the fact that it only involved Church records – also apply to the Royal Commission research.

Due to differences in practices across dioceses, the figures from the Royal Commission study relating to sexual abuse within Anglican Church of Australia schools cannot provide a reliable estimate of incidence within Church schools. However, they do help to give a sense of the possible scale of the issue. The Royal Commission study found that 22 per cent of all complaints made to the Church (247 out of 1,119 cases) related to Anglican Church of Australia schools, however almost half (47 per cent) of allegations reported by the Diocese of Brisbane specifically related to Anglican schools. The Diocese of Brisbane appears to be the only Australian diocese which requires all the schools within its geographical borders to refer cases of alleged abuse to it.

In a similar vein, some dioceses require allegations made to the Church of England Boys’ Society (CEBS) within that diocese to be referred to them, whilst others do not. The Royal Commission study found that, in total, complaints relating to CEBS made up 13 per cent of all allegations (147 out of 1,119 cases). However, in the Diocese of Adelaide over four in ten (45 per cent) of allegations related to CEBS. These figures serve as a reminder of the importance of consistent and comprehensive recording practices if we are to understand the true scale of child sexual abuse within and between different contexts.

Whilst it is not clear how many Church run children’s homes were covered by the Royal Commission study, it did find that in around one in seven cases (14 per cent) the location of abuse was reported to be an orphanage or residential home.

Critically, and as noted earlier, no publicly available data was found on the prevalence of child sexual abuse in either the Church of England or Church in Wales. This represents a significant evidence gap. Due to differences between the institutions and country context the prevalence rates found within the Anglican Church of Australia should not be extrapolated to the Churches in England and Wales.

5.2.1 Changes in incidence over time

The Royal Commission study suggests that the incidence of child sexual abuse in the Anglican Church of Australia increased steadily each decade from the 1930s until a peak in the 1970s (25 per cent of all cases identified started during this decade), after which it has steadily declined. However, the large delays often observed between the occurrence of abuse and the reporting of it, in combination with

260 It is unclear how ‘closed’ was defined in the Parkinson study.
261 CEBS was a national youth group for boys aged six to 16.
262 Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (2017a), op. cit.
changing societal understanding and recognition of child sexual abuse, means that any conclusions about trends in incidence over time should be made with some caution.

5.3 Nature of child sexual abuse within the Anglican Churches

Unless otherwise indicated the information in the following sections on the characteristics of complainants and alleged perpetrators and the nature and setting of child sexual abuse in the Anglican Church comes from the Anglican Church of Australia studies by Parkinson et al and/or the Royal Commission.263 As mentioned above, these findings should not be extrapolated to the Church of England or Church in Wales as they do not necessarily reflect patterns of abuse in the Anglican Churches in other countries. However, they can help to inform a more general understanding of abuse within this setting.

5.3.1 Characteristics of complainants

‘Complainants’ is the term used by the studies in question to refer to the individuals who had made allegations of abuse against the Anglican Church of Australia. Three quarters (75 per cent) of all complainants in both Australian studies were male and 25 per cent female,264 mirroring the pattern seen in the Catholic Church data and running counter to those seen in child sexual abuse cases in a non-religious context. The average age of both male and female complainants found by the Royal Commission study was 11 years, with the youngest complainant being seven years.

In the Parkinson study 17 per cent of complainants reported having been abused by another person or people (including Church workers, teachers, and family and friends) in addition to the person they were making abuse allegations against. Seven per cent of the male complainants reported having been abused by more than one clergy member.

5.3.2 Characteristics of perpetrators

Almost all (over 98 per cent) of the alleged perpetrators in the Parkinson study were male, whereas in the Royal Commission study 94 per cent were male and six per cent female.265 The Royal Commission study found that 36 per cent of alleged abusers were ordained clergy whilst 42 per cent were lay people. In 22 per cent of cases the religious status of the alleged abuser was unknown. Unsurprisingly, given the Church’s position on female ministers during the time period of the study, the majority of the female abusers were lay people.

A breakdown of the role of alleged abusers in this same study shows that:

- over one third (35 per cent) were ministers (the vast majority of whom were ordained);
- 13 per cent were school staff;
- 12 per cent were youth workers; and
- eight per cent were welfare workers.

The Royal Commission study calculated the average number of complaints per alleged perpetrator, split by the role the individual held. They found the highest number of complaints was made against youth workers.

263 Parkinson (2013a), op. cit.; Parkinson (2013b), op. cit.; Parkinson et al. (2012), op. cit.; Parkinson et al. (2010); Parkinson et al. (2009), op. cit.; Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (2017c), op. cit.
264 Parkinson et al. (2012), op. cit.
265 Ibid.; Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (2017a), op. cit.
(3.2 complaints per alleged perpetrator), with an average of 2.6 complaints for school staff, 1.8 complaints for ministers and 1.6 for welfare workers.

5.4 Disclosure

As seen in studies of child sexual abuse in other contexts, including the Catholic Church, there was frequently a long delay between the alleged abuse and disclosure by complainants in the data relating to the Anglican Church of Australia. The average length of time between alleged abuse and disclosure was just under 24 years in the Parkinson study (breaking down into 25 years for male and 18 years for female complainants) and 29 years in the Royal Commission study.

Despite this, the Parkinson study found that in 12 per cent of cases overall the complainant had in fact disclosed the abuse to another person within one year of the alleged incident, and female complainants were significantly more likely to disclose within a month of the incident (20 per cent compared to four per cent of males). Consistent with this, female complainants were on average younger at the time of making the complaint (31 per cent were under 19 compared with 10 per cent of boys).

Possible reasons posited by the literature for the general delays in disclosure include:

- confusion, denial and self-blame on the part of the victim – potentially partly as a result of grooming by the clergy abusers and the position of moral and social authority they occupied;
- a belief that their disclosure will be ignored or not believed;
- threats by the abuser; and
- a lack of awareness about whom to report the abuse.

5.4.1 Trends in disclosure over time

Three quarters of all complaints in the Parkinson study were made after 2000, with a peak in numbers in 2002-2004. Parkinson et al suggest that the dramatic increase in disclosures over this period was driven by the media coverage of abuse cases and the resulting increase in public awareness of the issue of child abuse within churches. Although the authors note that few new cases identified by their study were disclosed in relation to the Anglican Church of Australia in 2007, they also point out that this does not mean that the numbers will not increase again in the future, particularly if further high-profile cases emerge.

5.5 Factors contributing to the occurrence of child sexual abuse in the Anglican Churches

Three main factors have been suggested in the literature as having a bearing on the occurrence of non-recent child sexual abuse within the Anglican Churches:

---
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• Greater opportunity for child abuse to occur than in the general community as a result of the Anglican Churches’ involvement in a range of children’s programmes and services, including summer camps, children’s homes, schools and youth clubs. This may also help to explain the predominance of male victims as some studies have suggested there was a greater likelihood that boys would have been left unsupervised with clergy and other church workers than girls.272

• The position of authority, trust and influence occupied by clergy within their communities. This meant they were generally trusted to be alone with children (see also ‘greater opportunity’ above) and occupied an ideal position to groom both children and their families. It has been suggested that this grooming process often saw the clergy deploying their spiritual and moral authority as a tactic, known as ‘positional grooming’.273 Accounts suggest that their authority and status often resulted in victims and survivors feeling they would not be believed if they disclosed their abuse, thus suppressing disclosure and leaving offending clergy free to abuse repeatedly.274

• An ineffective response by the Churches’ authorities to suspicions and disclosures of clergy abuse which enabled offending clergy to abuse repeatedly over a number of years (more detail on which is contained in the ‘Response to child sexual abuse’ section below).275

5.6 Response to child sexual abuse by the Anglican Churches

This section of the report examines key themes emerging from the literature on the Anglican Churches’ response to allegations of child sexual abuse perpetrated by its clergy or other church workers. Many of the themes raised are similar to those arising in relation to the Catholic Church and discussed in the previous section.

As with the previous sections, much of the evidence relates to the Anglican Church of Australia and care must be taken not to extrapolate too far from these studies to other countries and contexts. However, potential parallels with and implications for the Anglican Churches in England and Wales are identified where possible.

5.6.1 Unwillingness to accept the existence of clergy abuse

A consistent theme in the literature centres around the Churches’ unwillingness to acknowledge or confront the problem of clergy child sexual abuse, even in the face of mounting evidence. This is an attitude which authors have suggested only started to change in the last few decades. It has been suggested that these denials were underpinned by a belief held by those within the Churches that the clergy were above reproach and incapable of such acts, and that the accounts of those children reporting abuse could not be trusted.276

Much of the available literature relates to the Anglican Church in Australia. However, such a reaction is also recognisable from reviews and inquiries into the handling of historic child sexual abuse cases within the Church of England,277 as well as from the personal accounts of victims and survivors captured by the

277 Chichester reviews and visitation, Elliott Review etc.
organisation Minister and Clergy Sexual Abuse Survivors (MACSAS). In the words of the Rt Revd Paul Butler, Bishop of Southwell and Nottingham, when addressing the General Synod in 2013 prior to their vote to acknowledge the Church’s failings in this area and apologise for ‘past safeguarding wrongs’:

'We cannot do anything other than own up to our failures. We were wrong. Our failures were sin just as much as the perpetrators sinned. By failing to listen or act appropriately we condemned survivors to live with the harm when we should have been assisting them into whatever measure of healing might be possible.'

5.6.2 Protecting the Churches’ assets and reputation

In addition to denial and disbelief, multiple studies have attributed a perceived historic lack of action by the Anglican Churches to an overriding focus on protecting the Churches’ assets and reputation in the face of a threat of financial claims and damage to its status and moral authority. Church insurers, advisers and senior clergy are said to have put pressure on more junior clergy members not to respond to abuse allegations as a means of managing that threat. The literature suggests that Church officials hoped a lack of action on the Church’s part would result in victims becoming disheartened and giving up pursuing their (often difficult and psychologically painful) cases. It is suggested within the research literature that this strategy had the desired effect in many cases.

Studies also suggest that the acknowledgment of accountability for clergy abuse and offers of financial reparation or other support from the Churches have been inconsistent at best. Parkinson et al found that compensation or other forms of reparation were offered by the Anglican Church of Australia in just over a third (36 per cent) of all cases of alleged child sexual abuse brought to the Church’s attention between 1990 and 2008, while the Royal Commission found that the Church in Australia made monetary payments in response to a slightly higher 42 per cent of allegations made between 1980 and 2015. The Australian Churches’ response has had to change in recent years, with various claims for damages having been settled for undisclosed amounts or awarded by the courts over the last decade. However, evidence from the case study of the North Coast Children’s Home undertaken by the Australian Royal Commission showed that, between 2005 and 2013, the Anglican Church of Australia made inconsistent offers of financial compensation to victims abused within the same children’s home by the same perpetrators (although they took action to change their policies in 2013). The Royal Commission survey found that, overall, Australian Anglican dioceses reported making 472 payments to complainants via a combination of diocesan redress schemes, civil proceedings and ‘other’ redress processes averaging 72,000 Australian dollars each (equating to around £42,000).

The Royal Commission study also found that a quarter (25 per cent) of all cases received an apology from the relevant Australian diocese. The Church of England made a public apology to the victims of Peter
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Ball in 2015 and agreed financial settlements with them. However, while the Church of England is now accepting moral liability for clergy abuse, some authors have argued that the lack of successful vicarious liability claims made against the Church through the UK civil courts means that its legal culpability in such cases is still unclear. According to these authors this situation is a result of the Church's 'complex and arcane legal position' as an organisation, and poses an ongoing challenge for victims seeking redress (financial or otherwise) for the harm the Church has caused them. Recommendations made by the Elliott review, conducted in the wake of the Peter Ball case, included:

- the development of written guidance on the Church’s approach to compensating victims;
- that the Church should not focus on potential financial considerations where these conflict with an appropriate pastoral response; and
- that an adversarial approach should be avoided.

In 2016 the Archbishop of Canterbury publicly committed to implementing these recommendations as soon as possible.

### 5.6.3 Prioritisation of forgiving the abuser over supporting the victim

Some literature suggests that, as with other Christian denominations, forgiving people who have sinned against God or against other people is a core element of Anglican doctrine and has been viewed by some members of the Churches as the appropriate response to an admission of wrongdoing regardless of the nature or magnitude of that wrongdoing. Some authors have claimed that this has, historically, resulted in the Churches’ response to child sexual abuse focusing on forgiving and supporting the perpetrator at the expense of acknowledging the needs and wishes of the victim and protecting other children.

Current Church of England and Church in Wales safeguarding policies suggest that the Churches are attempting to redress this balance through a greater emphasis on the provision of pastoral support for victims, the involvement of statutory authorities and the provision of financial and other means of redress. The Church of England’s policy also states that if the individual stating their sins discloses that they have committed child sexual abuse (or another serious crime), the priest must require the penitent to report their conduct to the police or other statutory authority. Absolution can be withheld should said individual refuse to do so.

### 5.6.4 Use of internal church discipline systems

The literature suggests that child sexual abuse was commonly dealt with solely or primarily through internal mechanisms in the Anglican Churches across many countries, including Australia, America and
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England. The authors suggest that this response has been driven largely by the Churches’ concerns around protecting their power, reputation and assets (as mentioned above) and therefore by their desire to keep such allegations out of the public domain. It has been argued that this lack of engagement with secular authorities has shielded religious institutions from government involvement which might have lead to earlier institutional changes and in some cases has helped to create a culture of ‘almost unchallengeable authority’. It is important to note, however, that it is not always possible to ascertain from the literature whether or not these internal systems were used as a substitute for or in addition to secular criminal justice systems.

Within the Church of England specifically, historical research into the Church’s response to child sexual abuse over a 100 year period between 1870 and 1970 shows that the ecclesiastical courts were used to discipline clergy for a range of violations of ecclesiastical law, including sexual offences. Bishops met two or three times a year to update and maintain a ‘cautionary list’ of clerics who had been found guilty of offences by the ecclesiastical courts. The updated list was then circulated to diocesan bishops to share information about offending clergy and to prevent clerics who had been removed from office from unwittingly being reemployed in another diocese. Clerics with a ‘P’ against their name – which indicated that they had committed a more serious offence such as sexual abuse – should not, in theory, have been re-deployed in the Church without consultation with the relevant archbishop. However, the study was not able to say how effective this system was in preventing offending clerics from ministering in the Church.

The author of the research concluded that Criminal Justice System responses were not prominent in the Church archives. The study did find evidence of bishops frequently sending clerics who had been accused or convicted of sexual offences for psychological and psychiatric treatment, as was also commonplace in the Catholic Church. However, it also found it was routine for such clerics to be sent to ‘religious communities’ for a period of time instead. These communities offered no treatment and after their stays, the historical evidence suggests that it was not uncommon for the clergy in question to relapse into their previous patterns of sexual offending once reinstalled in the Church.

The Parkinson study, which looked at more recent practice in the Anglican Church of Australia, found that the Church conducted their own investigation into three quarters of the complaints of clergy child sexual abuse made to them between 1990 and 2008 and only referred the allegations to the police in four in ten cases (42 per cent). The Church took the disciplinary action of dismissing the abuser, removing their licence or deposing them from Holy Orders following investigation in two in ten cases overall (19 per cent). The accused clergy member or church worker was transferred to another position or location as a result of the allegations in a small minority of cases. Interestingly, the study found it was less common for cases to go to secular courts after 2000 than prior to it (20 per cent after 2000 compared with 34 per cent before it). The authors suggested that this may be due to the increased likelihood of the alleged perpetrators being deceased or retired and the challenges of substantiating abuse increasing over time, rather than changes in Anglican Church of Australia practice.

296 Arnold (2008), op. cit.
298 However, whether the offences were committed against adults or against children was unfortunately not recorded, partly as a result of Church of England law being less clear or explicit about the specific harms of sexual offences against children.; Jones (2015), op. cit.
299 Ibid.
300 Parkinson et al. (2012), op. cit.
In terms of current practice in the Church of England, the national legislation found in the Clergy Discipline Measure 2003\textsuperscript{301} ‘provides a structure for dealing efficiently and fairly with formal complaints of misconduct against members of the clergy’.\textsuperscript{302} Under this process complaints about clergy who are alleged to have breached the measure are made to the bishop or archbishop of the relevant diocese who then subjects the complaint to ‘preliminary scrutiny’ and decides on the appropriate course of action. Possible courses of action involve dismissing the complaint; recording it for five years on a conditional basis; referring it to a conciliator; imposing a disciplinary penalty, or (in the most serious cases) requiring that the complaint be investigated by a Church of England Designated Officer who is a trained barrister. If the last option is pursued the Designated Officer produces a report on the matter for the President of Tribunals who then decides whether or not the case should go to a disciplinary tribunal. In instances where a penalty is imposed (either by the bishop or at tribunal) the case is recorded in the Archbishops’ list (in other words the ‘cautionary list’ mentioned above) which is maintained at Lambeth Palace.\textsuperscript{303} The most severe penalties are removal from office and prohibition for life, or in lesser cases for a shorter limited period of time, from serving as a member of clergy in the Church.

The Church of England Clergy Discipline Commission Guidance on Penalties\textsuperscript{304} states that:

‘Clergy who commit sexual misconduct should be dealt with firmly, and in a way which will protect those who could be harmed if the respondent were otherwise to be allowed to remain in ministry... Indecent assault on children is a gross violation, and can cause insecurity and lasting trauma to the victims. Removal from office and prohibition for life are normally called for.'\textsuperscript{305}

The same penalty is recommended for any member of the clergy convicted of possessing or viewing indecent images of children.

The Church of England’s written determinations of disciplinary tribunal hearings\textsuperscript{306} (available for tribunal cases since 2007) do not contain any explicit cases of child sexual abuse,\textsuperscript{307} although one does relate to the voluntary resignation of a member of the clergy as a result of his being placed on the Children’s and Adult’s Barred Lists by the Independent Safeguarding Authority.\textsuperscript{308} Whether or not the reasons for his barring related to conduct in his Church/clerical role is unclear from the determination. Further investigation would be valuable to establish the effectiveness of the Clergy Discipline Measure.

The Church in Wales also has a Disciplinary Tribunal that appears to operate in a similar way.

\begin{enumerate}
\item The measure came into force in 2006 and was later amended in 2013.
\item This list also contains the names of any clergy who are included on the Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA)’s barred list.
\item The guidance was first published in 2006 and revised in 2016.
\item The Church of England (2016a), op. cit., p.5.
\item This is probably because, as a result of the Clergy Discipline Measure 2013 amendment, bishops have the power to impose penalties without further proceedings in cases where clergy have received a criminal conviction, whether or not it has resulted in a custodial sentence.
\end{enumerate}
5.6.5 Confession and confidentiality

The literature also suggests that beliefs about the confidentiality of disclosures of abuse made to members of the Anglican clergy in the context of a formal confession (also referred to as the ‘ministry of absolution’\textsuperscript{309}) appear to have inhibited the Churches from responding effectively to such disclosures.\textsuperscript{310} Although not as widely practised in the Anglican as the Catholic Church,\textsuperscript{311} and lacking the status of a sacrament in Church of England doctrine, the confidentiality of the confessional is something that has been enshrined in canon law in the Church of England since 1603. Canon law dictates that the ‘seal of the confessional’ is a confidential exchange in which confessors must feel able to disclose any sins and seek absolution for them from God and the Church. The latest version of the Church of England’s Guidelines for the Professional Conduct of the Clergy (2015) states that:

‘If a penitent makes a confession with the intention of receiving absolution the priest is forbidden (by the unrepealed Proviso to Canon 113 of the Code of 1603) to reveal or make known to any person what has been confessed. This requirement of absolute confidentiality applies even after the death of the penitent.’\textsuperscript{312}

The guidelines do, however, go on to state that if the penitent discloses that they have committed a serious crime such as child abuse the priest should withhold absolution unless and until the individual reports themselves to the police or other statutory authorities. The guidelines also state that priests must follow ‘established procedures for reporting abuse of children or vulnerable adults’\textsuperscript{313} in response to disclosures made outside of the context of the ministry of absolution, although they do not specify what these ‘established procedures’ are. Protecting all God’s children also recommends that, where a disclosure is made by a perpetrator to a priest, the priest should urge them to report it to the police or local authority. This approach relies on a perpetrator voluntarily turning themselves in to the authorities.

The challenge that the duty of absolute confidentiality in the context of confession poses to effective responses to child sexual abuse was raised in the final report of the Archbishop’s Chichester Visitation\textsuperscript{314} and also debated by the Church of England’s General Synod in 2014, although such discussions have not yet resulted in any changes to the relevant Canon Law.

On the other hand, the Anglican Church of Australia revised their position on confidentiality within confession in 2014 to bring it in line with mandatory reporting requirements. This revision (the Canon Concerning Confessions 1989 (Amendment) Canon 2014) allows priests to break the seal of the confessional if they have received a confession of a serious offence (such as child sexual abuse) and are not reasonably satisfied that the offence has been reported to the police. Whilst no evidence was found as part of this review about the effectiveness of this change in canon law in increasing the number of reports of child sexual abuse made by members of the Church to the police, the Australian Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse has recommended that the failure

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Formal confession is primarily practised in the Anglo-Catholic wing of Anglicanism.
\item Church of England (2013) Final report of the Commissaries appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury in relation to a Visitation upon the Diocese of Chichester.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
to report suspicions of child sexual abuse in institutions (including in religious institutions where this information was disclosed within the context of a confession) is made a criminal offence in Australia.\textsuperscript{315}

5.6.6 Structural and cultural challenges to implementing child safeguarding policies

The Anglican Church in Australia first developed its national approach to safeguarding and child protection in 1998, and has been viewed by some authors as one of the religious organisations leading the way in regard to safeguarding practice.\textsuperscript{316} However, a 2005 study of Australian Anglican clergy and church workers which explored their experience and knowledge of safeguarding policy and practice within the Church highlighted some of the challenges to the successful and consistent implementation of such policies in organisations as large and complex as the Anglican Church.\textsuperscript{317} The study found low levels of reporting of suspicions of child sexual abuse, particularly to the statutory authorities, despite a mandatory reporting requirement. It was suggested that this was, in part, because of a reluctance on the part of the clergy to take on the role of ‘reporter’, which they viewed as more appropriate for other professions such as social workers (also see ‘confession and confidentiality’ section above). This suggests that communication and training about the national safeguarding policy had not, at that point, managed to overcome all of the cultural barriers to its successful implementation at the parish level.

The study also found that the clergy believed that the hierarchical nature of the Church reduced the level of accountability they felt in regard to child protection cases, which reportedly reduced their likelihood of taking action as a result of their suspicions. Lastly, the study found a discrepancy between self-reported levels of child protection knowledge amongst the clergy and other church workers, with the former group having fairly high levels of self-reported knowledge and the latter group much lower levels.

The case study of the North-Coast Children’s Home in Australia similarly found that both national and diocesan-level policies (this time relating to responding to non-recent cases of historic abuse) were not followed between 2005 and 2013, partly as a result of the Church’s organisational structure. In this case it was suggested that the autonomy of each diocese meant that the Primate or Head of the Anglican Church in Australia did not have the authority to compel individual diocese to follow national policies, and was therefore powerless to intervene when the local bishop failed to act in accordance with them.\textsuperscript{318}

Both the Church of England and the Church in Wales have their own national safeguarding policies.\textsuperscript{319} The Church of England has an additional policy relating specifically to responding to disclosures of non-recent child sexual abuse.\textsuperscript{320} Both organisations’ safeguarding policies cover:

- the selection, vetting and training of clergy and other church workers;
- responding appropriately to suspicions of child abuse;
- challenging abuse within the church;
- supporting victims; and
- supporting and taking disciplinary action against perpetrators.

\begin{footnotes}
316 Blake (2006), op.\textit{cit}.
317 Morrison (2005), op.\textit{cit}.
318 Australian Royal Commission into Institutional responses to child sexual abuse (2014) \textit{op. cit}.
320 Church of England (2011) \textit{Responding well to those who have been sexually abused}, London: Church House Publishing.
\end{footnotes}
The Church of England’s policy is also supported by a range of more detailed practice guidance documents, as well as diocesan and cathedral-level safeguarding policies. Additionally, the Church of England’s Safeguarding and Discipline Measure 2016 was designed to provide a national statutory framework to make the church a safer place for children and young adults by making the disciplinary processes under the Clergy Discipline Measure 2003 more effective where safeguarding issues arise and to reduce the risk of abuse taking place.

However, the Archbishop of Canterbury’s 2013 statement in response to the Chichester Visitation suggests similar challenges to the successful and consistent implementation of these safeguarding policies within the Church of England to those seen in the Anglican Church of Australia:

‘...We not only have to deal with processes, but we have to deal with culture, and our culture change is by far the hardest one to do.’

Dioceses as well as other bodies that form part of, or are associated with, the Church of England – such as cathedrals, religious communities, theological colleges, missionary agencies and music schools – are required to adopt the national safeguarding policies and practices alongside any of their own. The literature suggests that in practice the breadth and diversity of the bodies involved has posed significant challenges to the consistent implementation of these policies, as well as to monitoring compliance with them. The Elliott review recommended that training be provided to all those within the Church who might receive a disclosure of sexual abuse, and that information on disclosures is recorded consistently across diocese and bodies.

In 2008 a parish priest was disciplined through the Church of England tribunal system for not following the relevant diocesan safeguarding policy by appointing someone to a youth worker post in the parish without conducting the necessary Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. It subsequently came to light that the youth worker had received a murder conviction many years earlier, and (whilst there was no suggestion that he had harmed children in his Church role) he was removed from post and the priest responsible for the appointment ‘formally rebuked’ and barred for five years from making any appointments for roles involving work with children and young people.

The independent safeguarding audit of each diocese, whilst not specifically aimed at improving the General Synod’s understanding of safeguarding arrangements, has to some extent had this effect. In 2013, following the Chichester Visitation, the General Synod committed to commissioning an independent audit of diocesan safeguarding practice. The aim of this exercise is to improve the Synod’s understanding of current safeguarding arrangements within each diocese and the degree of compliance with the Church’s national policies, and to identify areas requiring further training, support and guidance from the National Safeguarding Team (NST).
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The independent audit is being conducted by the Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE) throughout 2016/17. The approach was piloted in four dioceses in 2015 to test and refine the methodology prior to national roll out. Completed audits are published online along with action plans for improving practice in individual diocese.

An overview report was published in April 2017 which summarised the learning from the 11 dioceses audited before July 2016. Cross-cutting areas for improvement highlighted in the report include:

- clarity over safeguarding roles and responsibility within dioceses;
- information management systems for sharing information on Church workers’ training and DBS status; and
- support for the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor.

When completed this exercise should yield very valuable information about the areas in which current diocesan safeguarding practice is meeting the expected national standards, and those in which it is falling short, as well as identifying potential solutions to any challenges identified.

5.7 Conclusion and research gaps

The evidence on child sexual abuse in the Anglican Churches is very limited. What does exist on the question of prevalence suggests that the rates of abuse could be lower in the Anglican Churches than the Catholic Church. However, no publicly available data exists on the prevalence of such abuse in the Church of England and Church in Wales (or, indeed, in the Catholic Church in England and Wales). This constitutes a significant evidence gap. Research on the scale and nature of abuse perpetrated within Anglican religious communities, schools and children’s homes in England and Wales is similarly lacking.

The limited literature available suggests that the Anglican Churches’ response to allegations of child sexual abuse has historically been characterised by denial, closing ranks in order to protect Church reputation and assets, and the use of internal disciplinary procedures to deal with criminal offences. The Church of England and Church in Wales have developed and rolled out safeguarding policies and policies for supporting those who have been abused by clergy and other church workers over recent years.

However there is a need for further evidence on the extent to which these policies are being successfully implemented on the ground currently within the many bodies and smaller organisations that make up both the Church of England and Church in Wales. This will enable a robust assessment of whether or not these Churches are now successfully protecting children from sexual abuse, as well as making adequate reparation to victims and survivors of past child sexual abuse.
Section 6: Conclusion and research gaps
6.1 Conclusion

This concluding section reflects on emerging themes from the literature and identifies key research gaps. The aim of this rapid evidence assessment was to review and synthesise literature, nationally and internationally, on child sexual abuse in the Catholic and Anglican Churches. The review sought to summarise the evidence of the scale and nature of child sexual abuse within both of these Churches, the institutional factors that have enabled child sexual abuse to occur and the response by both Churches to such abuse. The lack of empirical research relating to child sexual abuse in the Anglican Churches generally, and both the Anglican and Catholic Churches in England and Wales specifically, is apparent following this review.

The review’s ability to address the question of prevalence of child sexual abuse within the Catholic and Anglican Churches is limited by the paucity of data and the limitations in that which does exist. The literature does suggest that the culture and regulatory frameworks of religious institutions play a significant role in the incidence of child sexual abuse and their response to it. This has been discussed individually for both Churches in this report, with commonalities between the two religions identified.

Institutional failures of both the Catholic and Anglican Churches in their response to child sexual abuse have been highlighted in a number of research studies, independent investigations and inquiries. Findings from across these sources have highlighted the past tendency of both Churches to keep any response to child sexual abuse within the church, and to minimise the involvement of statutory authorities. In recent years the Catholic and Anglican Churches have responded to evolving safeguarding practice in statutory and voluntary bodies by establishing their own safeguarding policies and procedures. Details of these for each Church have been discussed in this report, alongside an acknowledged need for regular monitoring of national and local practice in measuring adherence to these policies.

6.2 Research gaps

This review of literature, including policy and practice documents, has identified clear gaps in the research in this area, particularly in relation to the Catholic and Anglican Churches in England and Wales. Key gaps include:

- The current and past scale and nature of child sexual abuse within the Catholic and Anglican Churches in England and Wales.
- The experience of victims and survivors of clergy abuse in disclosing child sexual abuse to the Churches and the response given by the Churches and wider authorities.
- The support and redress both received and wanted by victims and survivors of child sexual abuse in Catholic and Anglican churches.
- The experience of perpetrators following either a personal disclosure or allegation of abuse being made to both Churches.
- The role of religious governance structures in facilitating the perpetration of child sexual abuse by clergy and the commonalities and differences with other institutions.
- The extent to which structural and cultural aspects of the Catholic and Anglican Churches influence the incidence and response to child sexual abuse.
- The extent to which national safeguarding procedures have been effectively implemented and are being adhered to at a local level, both within dioceses and religious orders.
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## Appendix A: Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>A person under the age of 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td>Activity that is undertaken to protect children who are suffering, or are likely to suffer, significant harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child sexual abuse</td>
<td>Sexual abuse of children involves forcing or enticing a child or young person to take part in sexual activities. The activities may involve physical contact, and non-contact activities such as involving children in looking at, or in the production of, sexual images, watching sexual activities, encouraging children to behave in sexually inappropriate ways, or grooming a child in preparation for abuse including via the internet. Child sexual abuse includes child sexual exploitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child sexual exploitation</td>
<td>Sexual exploitation of children is a form of child sexual abuse. It involves exploitative situations, contexts and relationships where a child receives something, as a result of them performing, and/or another or others performing on them, sexual activities. Child sexual exploitation can occur through the use of technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grooming</td>
<td>The criminal offence of building a relationship with a child in order to gain their trust for the purposes of sexual abuse or exploitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Means the same as 'organisation'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay people (laity)</td>
<td>Those working within or on behalf of the Church, such as employees in Catholic institutions or volunteers who have not been ordained and are not members of a religious institute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laicisation</td>
<td>The process by which members of the clergy are permanently removed from the clerical state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime prevalence of child sexual abuse</td>
<td>The proportion of an adult population who experienced sexual abuse during their childhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ordained religious</td>
<td>Members of a religious institute who have not been ordained, for example religious sisters and brothers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of child sexual abuse</td>
<td>The proportion of a population who have experienced child sexual abuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest (Catholic)</td>
<td>A man who has been ordained into the priesthood by a bishop. A religious priest is a priest who is also a member of a religious institute, in contrast to a diocesan priest who is not a member of a religious institute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Evidence Assessment (REA)</td>
<td>A research methodology used in the identification, quality assessment and synthesis of existing literature on a particular topic. More structured and rigorous than a standard literature review, it is not as exhaustive as a systematic review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>Members of a religious institute, for example religious priests and religious sisters or brothers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious institute</td>
<td>Religious institutes, including religious orders and congregations, are societies in which members undertake vows of chastity, poverty and obedience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Structure and governance of the Catholic Church in England and Wales, including child safeguarding structures and timelines

This section presents factual information on the general governance arrangements and safeguarding arrangements of the Catholic Church in England and Wales at time of writing, drawn primarily from the websites of the Vatican, the National Catholic Safeguarding Committee and the Catholic Safeguarding Advisory Service. The information is presented to provide relevant background information regarding safeguarding arrangements in the Church for readers of the REA, and does not represent any conclusions arrived at by IICSA on such arrangements.

Context

Data from the British Social Attitudes survey shows that 8.3 per cent of the population of England and Wales define themselves as Catholic. This figure has remained relatively stable over the last three decades. Whilst just over a quarter of English and Welsh Catholics report that they attend Church (with the exception of special occasions such as weddings and baptisms) once a week or more, almost a fifth report that they attend Church rarely or never. Catholic schools make up 10 per cent of the total number of maintained schools in England and Wales.\(^{327}\)

Structure of the Catholic Church

This section sets out the structure of the Catholic Church, both on an international level and within England and Wales. The safeguarding structure at the national and diocesan/religious level is also described.

Holy See

The Pope is the head of the universal church and, together with a number of organisations and bodies which support him, including the Roman Curia, the Synod of Bishops and the College of Cardinals, is known as the Holy See.\(^{328}\) The Holy See acts as a permanent observer at the United Nations and holds Diplomatic relations with other states. The Roman Curia is the administrative structure of the Holy See and is made up of various bodies, including the Congregations. The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith is responsible for dealing with cases of child sexual abuse. In 2014, Pope Francis set up the Pontifical Commission for the Protection of Minors,\(^{329}\) a permanent commission to the Holy See, which aims ‘to promote the protection of the dignity of minors and vulnerable adults’.

Governance in England and Wales

The Catholic Church is divided into geographical areas called dioceses; each diocese receives oversight from a bishop. There are 22 dioceses in England and Wales and two national dioceses for specific groups (the Bishopric of the Forces and the Apostolic Exarchate for Ukrainians). Five of the dioceses are Archdioceses (Westminster, Southwark, Liverpool, Birmingham and Cardiff) and are headed by


Archbishops. Of these, Westminster is recognised as having seniority and the Archbishop of Westminster usually acts as the president of the Catholic Bishops’ Conference of England and Wales. All bishops, archbishops and auxiliary bishops from the 22 dioceses of England and Wales are members of the Catholic Bishops’ Conference of England and Wales (CBCEW).

The Conference of Religious England and Wales (COR) is an association which represents the leaders of Catholic religious institutes (sometimes also referred to as orders, congregations or communities, although not all of these terms are interchangeable) in England and Wales. The superiors of Anglican religious communities are also able to join as associate members. The COR’s website lists 71 male religious orders and 176 female religious orders as members.

Catholic religious institutes are societies of members (called ‘religious’) who have undertaken vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. Institutes may be erected or approved by the Holy See by formal decree or may be erected by bishops and may not have obtained a decree of approval from the Holy See.

**Safeguarding structure in England and Wales**

In 2000 the Archbishop of Westminster commissioned Lord Nolan to carry out an independent review of child protection arrangements in the Catholic Church in England and Wales. The final report published in 2001, *A Programme for Action*, recommended that a national child protection unit be set up for the Church. In response to the recommendation, the Catholic Office for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults (COPCA) was set up in 2002.

In 2006 the Cumberlege Commission was set up to review the Church’s compliance with the Nolan Review. The Commission’s report, published in 2007, *Safeguarding with Confidence*, recommended a new structure for safeguarding functions in the Church, replacing COPCA. In accordance with this recommendation, the National Catholic Safeguarding Commission (NCSC) was set up in 2008. The Commission has a strategic role and directs the work of the Catholic Safeguarding Advisory Service (CSAS) which is responsible for improving safeguarding practice in the Church. The Commission is mandated by both CBCEW and COR and has a lay chair appointed by both organisations and two vice chairs: a bishop appointed by CBCEW; and a religious appointed by COR.

In 2015 the NCSC approved the setting up of a Survivor Advisory Panel, the aim of which is to provide advice from a survivor perspective which will inform the work of the NCSC and consequently the Church’s safeguarding policies.

---


331 Auxiliary bishops act as assistants to diocesan bishops.


At a local level the safeguarding structure in the Catholic Church is as set out in the diagrams below taken from the CSAS website.

**Figure B.1: Safeguarding structures in the Catholic Church**


The roles and responsibilities are as follows:

**Safeguarding Commission**

The Commission is appointed by the Bishop and performs an advisory and support function. The Commission acts on new reports of abuse of children in a Church setting and works with statutory agencies in these cases. The Commission provides an annual report to the NCSC. Religious orders may align with a diocesan Safeguarding Commission or one or more orders may set up and maintain their own safeguarding commission.

**Safeguarding Coordinator**

The Safeguarding Coordinator is appointed by the Bishop on the advice of the Commission, but is not a member of the Commission. Their role is to disseminate best practice and launch national safeguarding policies in the diocese.

**Clergy/Religious Advisor for Safeguarding**

The Clergy/Religious Advisor for Safeguarding is a member of the Clergy or Religious who provides advice to the Commission and promotes safeguarding amongst the clergy/religious in their diocese/religious congregation(s).

**Parish/Religious Safeguarding Representative**

The role of the Parish Safeguarding Representative is to promote good safeguarding practice within the parish and to act as the link with the diocese. The Religious Safeguarding Representative undertakes the same role within the religious institute. The Safeguarding Representative is appointed by the Safeguarding Coordinator.
Catholic Church safeguarding timeline (1922-2016)

The timeline on the following page sets out the relevant safeguarding developments in the Catholic Church both at an international level, i.e. developments relating to the Holy See, and in England and Wales as identified by this literature review. A comprehensive timeline was outside the scope of this REA. However the timeline does include the key policies, inquiries, safeguarding bodies and policies relevant to the information presented within the REA.
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**Figure B.2: Catholic Church safeguarding timeline**

- **1922**: Holy See indult to the US to raise the age of canonical child sexual abuse crime to 18
- **1922**: holy see grant indult to the us to raise the age of canonical child sexual abuse crime to 18
- **1962**: Crimen Sollicitationis reprinted and limited number of copies distributed at second Vatican council
- **1983**: Code of Canon Law updated
- **1994**: Holy See indult for the US extended to Ireland.
- **2001**: Motu proprio Sacramentorum sanctitatis tutela issued, replacing Crimen Sollicitationis. Child sexual abuse included in list of canonical delicts reserved to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.
- **2004**: COPCA issues Child protection: responding to allegations and independent risk assessment policy
- **2006**: COPCA updates Healing the wound: national policy for the support of those who have suffered child sexual abuse and those accused of abuse
- **2008**: COPCA replaced by the National Catholic Safeguarding Commission (NCSC) & the Catholic Safeguarding Advisory Service (CSAS)
- **2011**: Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith sends circular letter to assist episcopal conferences in developing guidelines for dealing with child sexual abuse by clerics
- **2012**: Towards a culture of safeguarding published by NCSC following review of safeguarding structures and policy
- **2014**: Pontifical Commission for the Protection of Minors established
- **2016**: Safeguarding policy statement issued

**COPCA issues**
- 1994: Child abuse: pastoral and procedural guidelines
- 2006: Creating a safe environment
- 2008: Further updates Healing the wound guidance and issues Cross boundary placement policy
- 2011: Cumberlege Commission reviews progress on Nolan review recommendations (2006-2007) leading to Safeguarding with confidence report

**Bishops’ Conference of England and Wales and of Scotland set up Catholic Church Insurance Association**

1975

**COPCA Issues**
- 1983: Criminal Records Bureau policies and procedures and organisational structures policy
- 2001: COPCA issues Criminal Records Bureau policies and procedures and organisational structures policy
- 2005: COPCA issues Creating a safe environment
- 2006: COPCA issues Child protection: responding to allegations and independent risk assessment policy
- 2008: COPCA replaces the National Catholic Safeguarding Commission (NCSC) & the Catholic Safeguarding Advisory Service (CSAS)
- 2011: National safeguarding procedures for children and vulnerable adults made available in web-based format

**Pontifical Commission for the Protection of Minors**

2014

**Catholic Bishop’s Conference of England and Wales issues Child abuse: pastoral and procedural guidelines**

1994

**Motu proprio Sacramentorum sanctitatis tutela**

2001

**Motu proprio Sacramentorum sanctitatis tutela issued, replacing Crimen Sollicitationis. Child sexual abuse included in list of canonical delicts reserved to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.**

**Nolan review (2000-2001) resulting in report A program for Action**

**Catholic Office for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults (COPCA) established**

2001

**Sacramentorum sanctitatis tutela revised. Prescription of crimes of child sexual abuse extended to 20 years after victim’s 18th birthday**

**Pastoral letter from Pope Benedict XVI to the Catholics of Ireland**

2001

**Congregation for the Protection of Minors**

2014
Appendix C: Structure and governance of the Anglican Church in England and Wales, including child safeguarding structures and timelines

This section presents factual information on the general governance arrangements and safeguarding arrangements of the Anglican Church in England and in Wales at time of writing, drawn primarily from the websites of the Anglican Communion, the Church of England and the Church in Wales. The information is presented to provide relevant background information regarding safeguarding arrangements in the Church for readers of the REA, and does not represent any conclusions arrived at by IICSA on such arrangements.

Anglican Communion

The Anglican Communion consists of a worldwide family of 38 autonomous national and regional Christian churches, plus six additional provincial churches and dioceses. All these churches consider themselves to be ‘in communion’ (ie. in a reciprocal relationship) with the Communion’s spiritual head, the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Communion spans more than 165 different countries and has around 85 million members. Unlike the Roman Catholic Church there is no Anglican central authority and each church is responsible for its own laws, governance and decision-making (following guidance from the Archbishop). In England and Wales, there are two Anglican Churches, the Church of England and the Church in Wales. The Archbishop of Canterbury is the Focus for Unity for the three other Instruments of Communion within the Anglican Church.

Church of England

Attendance

The Church of England is the largest Christian denomination in the country in terms of worshipers; an average of 930,000 people a week participate in a Church of England service and an additional 180,000 attend its services for schools. It is worth noting, however, that attendance figures have declined significantly over the last decade; a fall of 12 per cent over this time period has taken the Church to less than half the attendance levels seen in the 1960s.

Status and hierarchy

The Church of England is England’s established or state church. As such, the reigning monarch is its Supreme Governor. She is responsible for approving the appointment of archbishops, bishops and deans as well as formally opening each new session of the General Synod and giving royal assent to new ecclesiastical laws in the form of Measures and Canons. The church is divided into two geographical provinces: the Southern Province headed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Northern Province headed by the Archbishop of York. The See of Canterbury (ie. the cathedral, parishes and other communities within the Diocese of Canterbury) is the ‘mother’ church or diocese of the Church of England, hence the Archbishop of Canterbury’s role as the spiritual head of the Anglican Communion.

For more information see: https://www.anglicancommunion.org/; https://www.churchofengland.org/; https://www.churchinwales.org.uk


Both archbishops, along with 24 senior bishops, sit in the House of Lords and as such play a role in the UK’s secular legislative process.

The two provinces are subdivided into 42 dioceses: 41 in England – 29 in the Southern Province and 12 in the Northern – and the Diocese in Europe. Each diocese has one diocesan bishop who has pastoral and legal responsibility for it; some additionally have suffragan or assistant bishops who aid the bishop in his or her duties. Each English diocese has a structure of boards and councils with responsibility for various aspects of the church's work in that diocese, including safeguarding and child protection. Each diocese also has a cathedral which is run independently from the bishop and overseen by a cathedral dean but the diocesan bishop acts as Visitor to the cathedral and oversees its compliance with the law applicable to cathedrals. Dioceses are further split into archdeaconries run by archdeacons with responsibility for administration in their part of the diocese, and then into deaneries which are collections of parishes.

Each parish will have its own parish priest, usually called a vicar or rector, who is sometimes assisted by a curate or deacon, and is governed by a Parochial Church Council composed of representatives of the laity.

In 2016, the Church of England had just under 20,000 ordained people serving in it in various roles. This number has been fairly steady since 2012, although it is in gradual decline. The Church also had an additional 8,680 lay readers and ministers in 2016, including 270 lay people living and serving in 36 different religious communities.

The Church also consists of 340 people living in religious communities in 65 ‘houses’, including monks, nuns and other laity or clergy living under a common rule.

Governance

The Church of England is led by its 108 bishops and archbishops, and its national laws and policies in the form of Measures and Canons are determined by the Church's governing body, the General Synod. The General Synod consists of members elected from the laity and clergy and meets twice a year to make and amend ecclesiastical/canon law. The General Synod consists of three houses:

- the House of Bishops
- the House of Clergy and
- the House of Laity.

The House of Bishops has responsibility for safeguarding policy.

In addition to the General Synod, the Archbishops’ Council was established in 1999 to develop delivery strategies for the House of Bishops’ overall vision. The Council’s purpose (in consultation with the House of Bishops and wider General Synod) is to ‘coordinate, promote, aid and further the work and mission of the Church of England’. It initiates legislative proposals for the General Synod, overviews the Church’s financial situation, and manages national staff working in safeguarding, ministry, mission and public

---

342 See preceding footnote.
343 See: http://www.anglicancommunion.org/community/religious-communities/locations.aspx
affairs, cathedrals and church buildings, educational, and ecumenical work. It has also worked on developing policy around clergy selection and training, developing policies related to the Church’s schools and colleges and furthering the Church’s ministry with children and young people. The Council is jointly presided over by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and consists of 19 elected members from the Houses of Bishops, Clergy and Laity of the General Synod, as well as other bodies.

**Safeguarding structure**

As mentioned above, the House of Bishops within the General Synod has ultimate responsibility for safeguarding within the Church of England. The Church has a National Safeguarding Team (NST) who lead on safeguarding policy and practice on a day-to-day basis. The team’s responsibilities include:

- updating policies concerning the safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults (in consultation with the House of Bishops);
- capacity building dioceses to implement those policies through the provision of advice and guidance on safeguarding issues and the development of national training frameworks; and
- providing a limited national safeguarding casework response for the most complex cases.

The Joint Safeguarding Liaison Group has been replaced by the National Safeguarding Steering Group (NSSG), and the National Safeguarding Panel (NSP). The NSSG comprises lay and clerical representation who are appointed by the archbishops, and amongst other duties carry out strategic oversight of national safeguarding. The NSP supports the development of national safeguarding response, promotes better safeguarding practice, undertakes scrutiny of the Church’s development of safeguarding policy and guidance, and works with survivors of abuse to provide a survivors’ perspective towards improvements in safeguarding responses. The Church’s over-arching safeguarding policy *Promoting a Safer Church* (2017), covers the safeguarding of children, young people, and adults, of which all policy and practice guidance is approved by the House of Bishops.

Under section 5 of the *Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline Measure* (2016) authorised clergy, bishops, archdeacons, licensed readers and lay workers, churchwardens and parochial church council must have due regard to safeguarding policy and guidance issued by the House of Bishops.

The Church’s safeguarding policy *Protecting all God’s children* (fourth edition) makes it clear that, despite the existence of a central safeguarding team, it is the responsibility of each diocese to ensure the policy is effectively implemented within that diocese. The policy states that each diocese should employ a

---
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Diocesan Safeguarding Adviser (DSA) – a dedicated safeguarding specialist – who is supported by a Parish Safeguarding Officer (PSO). The DSA role involves:

- ensuring the successful implementation of the national and diocesan safeguarding policy;
- raising awareness of the policies and processes amongst clergy and other Church workers; and
- delivering related training and being the first port of call for any safeguarding concerns within the diocese or parish.

The policy states that DSAs and PSOs are supported in their work by the system of boards and councils which operate within each diocese. They operate within the framework of the Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline Measure 2016.

The Church of England is also part of the ‘Anglican Communion Safe Church Network’; an international network of representatives from a variety of Anglican provinces whose aim is to promote and support effective safeguarding practice across the wider Communion.

**Church schools**

There are around 4,500 Church of England primary schools and over 200 Church of England secondary schools attended by approximately 1 million children and young people. The schools aim to be inclusive and accessible to children of all faiths (and none). Church clergy spend a million hours every year working with children in those schools, including providing holiday and after school activities.

The schools are connected to, but not managed by, the diocese in which they are situated, and each diocese has a Diocesan Board of Education.

---

351 For more information see: http://acscn.anglicancommunion.org/

Church of England child safeguarding timeline (1995-2016)

The following timeline sets out key child sexual abuse and safeguarding-related events in the Church of England from 1995 onwards\(^{353}\), as identified from the literature and relevant web content. These events include the issuing of new safeguarding policies and practice guidance as well as the undertaking of reviews and inquiries into past responses to child sexual abuse. Whilst the timeline does not represent an exhaustive list of all relevant publications, statements and reviews, it nonetheless provides a useful historical overview.

Church in Wales

Attendance

The Church in Wales is attended by an average of around 38,000 people a week (consisting of approximately 32,000 adults, and 6,000 children and young people under 18).\(^{354}\) As with the Church of England, the last few decades have seen a substantial drop in attendance though there is some evidence to suggest this decline in numbers is slowing.\(^{355}\)

Status and hierarchy

The Church in Wales has been independent from the Church of England since 1920. It was also disestablished at this time (under the Welsh Church Act 1914) and therefore, unlike the Church of England, is not an established church. Whilst the Church in Wales recognises the Archbishop of Canterbury as a focus of unity for the Anglican Communion of which it is part, the Archbishop has no formal authority within it.

The Province of the Church in Wales is led by the Archbishop of Wales and is divided into six dioceses each with its own bishop (the Archbishop also being one of the six). These bishops are not automatically entitled to sit in the House of Lords. The structure is similar to that of the Church of England; each diocese has two or three archdeaconries (15 in total) as well as one cathedral and a cathedral dean, and in total the dioceses are split into over 900 parishes, each overseen by a vicar or rector. Clerics of the Church of Wales can be appointed to posts in the Church of England and vice versa.

The Church in Wales covers the majority of Wales geographically. However, a small part of the country falls under the auspices of the Church of England as a result of the misalignment between the geographical boundaries of the dioceses and the national border.

The Church also consists of a religious community in Monmouth.\(^{356}\)

Governance

The Church in Wales is governed by its own constitution and a body of other regulatory instruments created by the church for itself following disestablishment of the Church of England in Wales in 1920 under the Welsh Church Act 1914. The Governing Body is the supreme legislature of the Church in Wales. It performs a similar role to the General Synod in the Church of England and meets twice a year to receive reports and make decisions about the Church’s faith, order and worship. As with the General synod, the Governing Body is composed of three ‘orders’:

- the Bench of Bishops (the six diocesan bishops, which includes the Archbishop)

---

353 The timeline begins in 1995 as this was the year the Church of England published their first safeguarding policy.
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356 See: http://www.anglicancommunion.org/community/religious-communities/locations.aspx
the Clergy (51 clerical representatives), and
the Laity (86 non-clerical representatives).

However, safeguarding and child protection sit within the remit of the Representative Body, overseen by the Governing Body. The Representative Body has responsibility for the Church’s assets and resources, as well as health and safety, human resources and safeguarding, amongst other areas. It meets three times a
year and is made up of up to 26 church members (including one elected lay person and one elected cleric from each diocese).

Unlike in the Church of England, all Church in Wales policies and procedures – including those relating to safeguarding – are controlled centrally and not by the individual diocese.

**Safeguarding structure**

As noted above, the Representative Body has responsibility for safeguarding within the Church in Wales. The Church has an Independent Provincial Safeguarding Team, made up of a full-time Head of Safeguarding and small team of part-time Provincial Safeguarding Support Officers. The Provincial Safeguarding Support Officers are based in each diocese and fulfil three main functions:

- implementing the 2016 *Church in Wales Safeguarding Policy* and responding to general safeguarding issues;
- advising and supporting on safe recruitment of new clergy and other Church workers; and
- delivering ‘Safe Church’ safeguarding training.

The Team also consists of two Provincial Safeguarding Officers who undertake safeguarding casework, including dealing with safeguarding concerns and allegations. Their work is supported by a Provincial Safeguarding Panel.

The Church is part of the Welsh Christian Safeguarding Forum (WCSF)\(^{357}\), a cross-denominational group of safeguarding practitioners working in Welsh Churches which was established in March 2016. The aim of the forum is to help develop and share best practice in safeguarding as well as to give Christian organisations a stronger voice in conversations about safeguarding in Wales.

Along with the Church of England the Church in Wales is also part of the ‘Anglican Communion Safe Church Network’, described previously.\(^ {358}\)

**Church Schools**

There are 172 Church in Wales primary and secondary schools with, in total, around 25,000 pupils. As with the Church of England schools, they aim to be inclusive and accessible to children of all faiths (and none). The schools are overseen by the education team led by a Diocesan Director of Education within the diocese they are situated, who work closely with the relevant Local Authority.\(^ {359}\)


\(^{358}\) For more information see: [http://acscn.anglicancommunion.org/](http://acscn.anglicancommunion.org/)

\(^{359}\) See: [http://www.churchinwales.org.uk/life/schools/](http://www.churchinwales.org.uk/life/schools/)
Church in Wales child safeguarding timeline (2002-2016)

The following timeline sets out key safeguarding-related events in the Church in Wales from 2002 onwards, as identified from the literature and relevant web content. As with the Church of England timeline, these events include the issuing of new safeguarding policies and practice guidance as well as the undertaking of reviews and inquiries into past and current responses to abuse. As previously it is not an exhaustive list of all relevant policies, statements and reviews issued by the Church in Wales, but nonetheless provides a useful historical overview.

Figure C.2: Church in Wales safeguarding timeline

---

360 The timeline begins in 2002 as this was the year the Church in Wales published their first safeguarding policy.
Appendix D: Main data sources containing information on the scale of child sexual abuse

Table D.1: Main data sources on the scale of child sexual abuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>What it can tell us?</th>
<th>Main limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-report surveys of the general adult and/or child population, or specific population sub-sets (e.g. children in care)</td>
<td>The prevalence of self-reported experience of child sexual abuse (either as a victim or perpetrator) in the population of question. Can be used to calculate the prevalence of child sexual abuse (either from a victim or perpetrator perspective) in the population in question if total population figures are known.</td>
<td>Time lags in victim and survivor disclosure. Unwillingness to disclose on the part of the abuser (if prevalence of perpetration is being measured). Recall bias associated with retrospective measurement (primarily a problem in surveys of the adult population). Lack of inclusion of non-private residential addresses (e.g. prisons and residential schools) in many general population surveys. Non-representative samples (some but not all studies) which limit their generalisability to the wider population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported crime statistics</td>
<td>The number of sexual offences against children (often defined as under 16) recorded by the police during a specific time period.</td>
<td>Only a small proportion of child sexual abuse cases come to the attention of the police. Inconsistent recording across police forces and issues with data quality. Any trends over time in the statistics are likely to reflect changes in police practice in terms of both identifying and recording child sexual abuse (at least in part).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

361 This table is based on the main data sources available on child sexual abuse in England and Wales, but is also likely to apply to many other countries with similar policing and social care systems.

362 This refers to bias caused by inaccuracy or incompleteness in people’s recollection of past events e.g. failure to recall instances of child sexual abuse or misremembering their severity.

363 These statistics capture when the offence was reported to police not when it took place, so will include both recent and non-recent offences.

364 The UK Statistics Authority removed the National Statistics designation from recorded crime data in England and Wales in 2014 due to concerns about data quality.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>What it can tell us</th>
<th>Main limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child protection data</td>
<td>The number of children subject to a child protection plan or on the child protection register as a result of being at risk of sexual abuse.</td>
<td>Only a small proportion of child sexual abuse cases come to the attention of social services. Any trends over time in the statistics are likely to reflect changes in social work practice in terms of both identifying and recording child sexual abuse (at least in part).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative records held by individual institutions (eg. personnel files)</td>
<td>The number of cases of child sexual abuse (including allegations and substantiated cases) that have come to the attention of the institution in question.</td>
<td>Only a small proportion of child sexual abuse cases are likely to (have) come to the attention of the institutions in question. Information may not have been recorded consistently or accurately at the time, and may not have been retained consistently (relevant if looking at non-recent abuse). Accurate information about the size of the population of interest (eg. children coming into contact with the Church over a particular period) may not be available, making the calculation of prevalence rates difficult.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The four main types of data can, in theory, all be used to explore the scale and prevalence of child sexual abuse taking place within specific institutions of interest. However, in the case of self-report surveys this requires those involved in the institution in question to be included in the sample in sufficient numbers, and also requires the measures used to explicitly address the issue of who perpetrated the abuse and/or in what setting it took place. In the case of child protection and police statistics, it requires the nature of the potential or alleged perpetrator and their relationship to the victim, along with the setting of the abuse or risk of abuse, to be recorded consistently and for this information to be extracted from each report.

---

365 Assuming it is a survey of the wider population and isn't specifically about experiences within a particular institution.
### Appendix E: Key studies measuring incidence/prevalence of child sexual abuse in the Catholic and Anglican Churches

Table E.1: Key studies measuring the scale of child sexual abuse in the Catholic and Anglican Churches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview of study design</th>
<th>John Jay</th>
<th>Parkinson</th>
<th>Royal Commission (Case study 50)</th>
<th>Royal Commission (Case study 52)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overview of study design</strong></td>
<td>Survey of US dioceses, eparchies and religious institutes of men asking for information about allegations of child sexual abuse against priests based on church records.</td>
<td>Survey of Anglican dioceses in Australia gathering information on concluded cases of alleged child sexual abuse perpetrated by clergy and other Church workers from Church personnel files.</td>
<td>Survey of all Catholic Church authorities in Australia, which sought data relating to claims of child sexual abuse made against Catholic Church personnel.</td>
<td>Survey of all 23 Anglican dioceses in Australia, which sought data relating to complaints of child sexual abuse against church personnel received by the Anglican Church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church</strong></td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Anglican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jurisdiction</strong></td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time period</strong></td>
<td>All recorded allegations of child sexual abuse made against priests between 1950-2002 (52 years).</td>
<td>All closed cases of alleged abuse reported in the period 1990 to 2008 (18 years).</td>
<td>All claims received by a Catholic Church authority between 1 January 1990 and 28 February 2015 (14 years and 2 months).</td>
<td>All complaints received by an Anglican diocese between 1 January 1980 and 31 December 2015 (35 years).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data collection method</strong></td>
<td>Three survey instruments which were self-completed by the dioceses, eparchies and religious communities with reference to Church records.</td>
<td>Survey sent to the Professional Standards Directors of participating dioceses. In three dioceses the research assistant completed the surveys.</td>
<td>Survey sent to and completed by Catholic Church authorities.</td>
<td>Survey sent to and completed by Anglican authorities in each diocese.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases of child sexual abuse within scope</td>
<td>John Jay</td>
<td>Parkinson</td>
<td>Royal Commission (Case study 50)</td>
<td>Royal Commission (Case study 52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegations which were not implausible were recorded as allegations; an implausible allegation being defined as “one that could not possibly have happened under the given circumstances”. Allegations which were subsequently withdrawn or shown to be false were also removed from further reporting.</td>
<td>Allegations of child sexual abuse by a member of the church (ordained or lay workers) made to the diocese. Only closed cases were included in the study.</td>
<td>Claims made against Catholic Church personnel seeking redress through Towards Healing, the Melbourne Response or another redress process (regardless of the status or outcome of the claim) and any substantiated complaints of child sexual abuse against Catholic Church personnel where redress has not been sought.</td>
<td>An accusation of child sexual abuse made to a diocese in relation to Anglican Church personnel, irrespective of the outcome of that accusation. This includes accusations made by a victim, or their representative, either directly to the Anglican Church or to an associated institution which has referred the complaint to the relevant diocese.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Alleged perpetrators within scope | The study only includes allegations against priests and deacons and does not therefore include allegations against others within or involved with the Catholic Church (e.g. religious brothers and sisters, employees and volunteers etc). | The study includes clergy, candidates for clergy, pastoral employees and volunteers within the church. Excludes church schools and children's homes. As the survey was only administered to dioceses it may be assumed that religious institutes were also excluded (although this is not made explicit in the report). | Catholic Church personnel (individuals who had an appointment with the Church at the time of the alleged incident(s)), including religious and diocesan priests, non-ordained religious and lay people. | Anglican Church personnel (including ordained members and lay employees and volunteers) who were acting under the authority of the Anglican Church or its associated institutions at the time of the alleged abuse. Church schools were included in the study only in cases where dioceses required allegations of abuse made within the context of church schools to be referred to the diocese. |

366 It should be noted that the number of deacons included in the group of those subject to allegations was very small, 61 out of 4,627.
### Response rate and coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John Jay</th>
<th>Parkinson</th>
<th>Royal Commission (Case study 50)</th>
<th>Royal Commission (Case study 52)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveys sent out to all 202 dioceses and eparchies and to 140 religious institutes of men in the US. Participation by dioceses and eparchies was mandated and 97 per cent of dioceses and eparchies responded, representing 98 per cent of all diocesan priests in the US. 140 religious communities participated, representing approximately 60 per cent of all religious communities in the US and 80 per cent of all religious priests.</td>
<td>All 23 dioceses invited to participate, three declined and three did not have any relevant cases. Within the 17 which did participate, the majority but not all cases within scope were analysed, due to staffing constraints and inaccessible files.</td>
<td>A total of 201 Catholic Church authorities completed the claims data survey, including: 101 female religious institutes; 54 male religious institutes; 34 archdioceses and dioceses; 12 other.</td>
<td>All 23 Anglican Church dioceses completed the survey. All but one (22 dioceses) reported that they had received at least one complaint of child sexual abuse during the relevant time period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jay</td>
<td>Parkinson</td>
<td>Royal Commission (Case study 50)</td>
<td>Royal Commission (Case study 52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method for calculating prevalence rate</strong></td>
<td>The study used two estimates of the total population of priests to calculate the prevalence rate as the percentage of this population with allegations against them as reported in the survey. The first estimate was derived from the reported figures for priests and deacons in ministry between 1950-2002 within the surveys. The total number of priests subject to allegations was divided by this figure to obtain a prevalence estimate. The second estimate, supplied by the Centre for Applied Research in the Apostolate, for the number of priests in ministry between 1960-2002 was used with the number of priests subject to allegations minus those with no allegations after 1959 to obtain a prevalence estimate. Both estimates arrived at similar prevalence figures.</td>
<td>The study makes the assumption that there is at least one parish in each of the 8,726 state suburbs in Australia in 2006 and uses a conservative estimate of 10,000 priests based on this, together with the number of priests subject to allegations reported within the survey, to calculate the percentage of serving priests subject to allegations of child sexual abuse.</td>
<td>Number of non-ordained religious and religious/diocesan priests who ministered in Australia between 1950-2010 and their length of ministry estimated based on a survey of a sample of 10 Catholic religious institutes and 75 dioceses/archdioceses. Each priest/non-ordained religious both in the overall population of religious/priests and the group of those against which claims of child sexual abuse had been made was weighted according to their length of ministry. The weighted figure of those with claims made against them was then divided by the weighted overall population figure to obtain the percentage of those in ministry over the period 1950-2010 who were alleged perpetrators, taking into account the duration of ministry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key limitations

- Only complaints already contained within diocesan records were included in the study. It is not known how consistently complaints made to the church were recorded, and relevant complaints made to the police or social services and not taken forward would not have been captured in these records.

- The study only includes allegations against priests and deacons and does not therefore include allegations against others within or involved with the Catholic Church (e.g. religious brothers and sisters, employees and volunteers etc).

- Only complaints already contained within diocesan records were included in the study. It is not known how consistently complaints made to the church were recorded, and relevant complaints made to the police or social services and not taken forward would not have been captured in these records.

- Only complaints already contained within diocesan records were included in the study. It is not known how consistently complaints made to the church were recorded, and relevant complaints made to the police or social services and not taken forward would not have been captured in these records.

- Only complaints already contained within diocesan records were included in the study. It is not known how consistently complaints made to the church were recorded, and relevant complaints made to the police or social services and not taken forward would not have been captured in these records.

- Only complaints already contained within diocesan records were included in the study. It is not known how consistently complaints made to the church were recorded, and relevant complaints made to the police or social services and not taken forward would not have been captured in these records.

- There was inconsistent practice across dioceses with regards to whether or not complaints made to Anglican parachurch, out-of-home care and educational establishments were recorded in diocesan data. Therefore, not all complaints of child sexual abuse relating to institutions operated by the dioceses were reported in each case.

---
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Appendix F: Method – additional details

The initial literature search was carried out in Spring 2016, with supplementary searches carried out throughout 2016.

The search terms used are set out in the table below.

Table F.1: Search terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catholic Church</th>
<th>Child Sexual Abuse</th>
<th>Prevalence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Church</td>
<td>Child Sexual Exploitation</td>
<td>Incidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic Church</td>
<td>Child Protection</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith Group</td>
<td>Safeguarding</td>
<td>Other Jurisdictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church School</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable Groups</td>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These search terms were used to search the following databases:

- PSYCHINFO
- Social Science Citation Index
- Proquest
- Applied Social Science Index
- Directory of Open Access Journals
- Access to Research
- Social Policy and Practice

The abstracts returned from the search results were appraised and the articles sifted for their relevance to the specific questions for this REA, which served as the inclusion criteria, these being:

- What is known about the prevalence of abuse and the socio-demographics of victims and perpetrators in the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Church.
- The nature and extent of, and institutional responses to, child sexual abuse within the Catholic Church and Anglican Church in England and Wales.
- The adequacy of the Catholic and Anglican churches’ policies and practices in relation to safeguarding and child protection.
• The extent to which the culture of the Catholic Church and Anglican Church inhibits/inhibited the proper investigation, exposure and prevention of child sexual abuse.

• The adequacy of previous reviews of safeguarding and child protection in the Catholic and Anglican Churches and the extent to which recommendations made in such reviews have been implemented in policy and practice.

There was no set range for publication date for the literature search. Although the selection of articles from abstracts focussed on documents published recently (2000 and after), documents published prior to 2000 were also included where their content was particularly relevant.

The literature obtained through the literature search included journal articles, full research reports, annual reports, books, chapters and essays. As full articles were reviewed, 36 were sifted out based on a lack of relevance to research questions for the REA as set out above.

In addition to the database search terms, the research team at IICSA reviewed the bibliographies of included articles and liaised with expert academics to ensure that the breadth of literature available was considered.
Appendix G: Quality assessment process

The documents identified for inclusion in the review were coded into a framework devised by the IICSA research team. This summarised methods, approaches and findings for each of the documents. The review process classified articles into literature types based on their methods and content, as outlined in table G.1.

Table G.1: Literature types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature type</th>
<th>Subcategories/description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary research</td>
<td>Further split into subcategories of quantitative research, qualitative research, mixed methods and secondary quantitative analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary research</td>
<td>Including reviews of existing literature, other REAs and systematic reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>Research papers or grey literature which do not report results from specific studies. This included commentary, analysis and expert opinion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Further split into quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods and economic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy or guidance documents</td>
<td>Organisational or government policies, guidance documents and annual reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiries</td>
<td>Statutory or independent inquiries and reviews as well as internally commissioned inquiries and reviews (e.g. commissioned by the church).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The REA used a quality assessment tool designed by the research team at IICSA. The quality assessment tool ensures a consistent and transparent approach across the REAs undertaken to support the work of the Inquiry. It is a comprehensive tool, allowing for the assessment of all the literature types listed above. It was developed following a review of relevant published quality assessment tools. The headings for each item in the quality assessment are reproduced in table G.2.

The quality assessment tool takes a thorough approach to appraising literature, asking the reviewer to consider and rate not only on the design of research, but the execution (e.g. sample achieved), transparency (e.g. limitations discussed), accessibility and clarity of the piece and the contribution made to the body of literature. It also accounts for issues such as the standing and expertise of authors writing the literature reviewed, ethical considerations, and any obvious sources of potential bias in the work.

Each item in the quality assessment spreadsheet is a question answered either yes, no or non-applicable. Detailed guidance in the spreadsheet supports the researcher in deciding whether each item is adequate enough to be rated ‘yes’ or whether it falls below a reasonable level and is rated as ‘no’. Rating an item in the QA tool as a ‘yes’ gives a column score of one. These scores are added and recorded as a percentage score out of the potential maximum total (discounting any criteria for which the article has scored ‘non-applicable’) for each article.

Each type of article was scored for its quality, with the exception of policy, guidance and inquiry documentation which were summarised for their content but did not generate a score for quality assessment.
In this REA, the quality assessment was undertaken by both the IICSA Research Team and external researchers, with the latter performing the quality assessment of just over half of those studies eligible to be quality assessed. Initially, a small sample of the literature was rated by both teams independently (and done so ‘blindly’ i.e. without seeing each others’ scores). This was to test the interpretation and application of the QA tool as well as to check that judgements employed were largely consistent. While the QA tool systematises and standardises a quality appraisal across the design, execution, analysis and output of a piece of evidence, there is inevitably an element of subjective judgement involved in the process. Clarity on the parameters for these judgements was important to achieve across the reviewers. After the initial sample of articles the main body of quality assessment was split between the IICSA research team and the external contractor.

368 ResearchAbility were commissioned for this task in Spring 2017.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Appropriate analytical methods</th>
<th>Appropriate research design that addresses research question or objective (including appropriate integration of quantitative and qualitative data/results)</th>
<th>Appropriate sampling strategy</th>
<th>Adequate attention paid to ethical considerations</th>
<th>Source of opinion is clearly identified</th>
<th>Maryland Scale of Scientific Methods (MSSM) score (1-5)</th>
<th>Comprehensive description of alternatives</th>
<th>All relevant costs and outcomes are specified for each alternative (Where relevant) effectiveness of any interventions previously established</th>
<th>Well defined outcome measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed methods evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical study</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (critical) review</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary quantitative study</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary mixed methods study</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary study</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary qualitative study</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study type</td>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Primary quantitative study</td>
<td>Primary qualitative study</td>
<td>Primary mixed methods study</td>
<td>Secondary quantitative study</td>
<td>Secondary (critical) review</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>Quantitative evaluation</td>
<td>Qualitative evaluation</td>
<td>Economic evaluation</td>
<td>Mixed methods evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data collection</strong></td>
<td>Validity and robustness of data collection methods</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriate sample achieved</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriate search strategy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source and resources used to search for studies are adequate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriate inclusion/exclusion criteria applied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Validity and robustness of data extraction and recording methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costs and outcomes measured accurately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Appropriate analytical methods</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriate criteria applied to appraise studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical appraisal conducted by two or more reviewers independently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriate methods used to combine studies or to analyse data extracted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costs and outcomes valued credibly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study type</td>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Primary quantitative study</td>
<td>Primary qualitative study</td>
<td>Primary mixed methods study</td>
<td>Secondary quantitative study</td>
<td>Secondary (critical) review</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>Quantitative evaluation</td>
<td>Qualitative evaluation</td>
<td>Economic evaluation</td>
<td>Mixed methods evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>Reporting is accessible, clear and coherent</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusion supported by results</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference is made to existing literature</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research advances knowledge or understanding, or fills evidence gap</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limitations of research are discussed</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any theoretical perspectives, values or assumptions/presuppositions that have shaped the form and output of the research are clearly addressed</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any obvious sources of potential bias (e.g. interests of funder and commissioner) acknowledged</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H: The profile of the reviewed literature

This section describes the profile of the literature reviewed as part of this rapid evidence assessment.

The review identified 160 documents which were relevant to the REA’s research questions. The literature was categorised by study type as part of the quality assessment process. Further information on the respective study types can be found at Appendix G. Twenty-six of these documents were policy/guidance documents (or other items of organisational literature) or Inquiry reports. The remaining 134 documents were either primary research (n=55), secondary research and critical reviews (for example, literature reviews, REAs and systematic reviews) (n=14) and theoretical or opinion based papers (n=65). The majority of the remaining papers were in this latter category of theoretical or opinion based papers.

Table H.1: Breakdown of study types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary quantitative</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary qualitative</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary mixed</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary quantitative</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical review</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy or guidance</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a much more extensive literature available in respect of the Catholic Church than the Anglican Church, with 114 papers reviewed in which related solely to the former and 13 papers relating solely to the latter. The remaining 33 papers related either to both Churches or to either or both Churches and other established religions.

Table H.2: Church focus of studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure H.1 shows the profile of literature reviewed in terms of jurisdiction. The greatest number of papers (n=81) came from or were focused largely or entirely upon the United States. There were only 24 papers identified in relation to England and Wales and half of these were policy or guidance documents (for example, annual reports or Church safeguarding policies). Table H.3 further breaks down the jurisdiction of the literature by study type.

Figure H.1: Breakdown of studies by jurisdiction
Table H.3: Breakdown of studies by jurisdiction and study type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Primary studies</th>
<th>Secondary (including critical review) or theoretical</th>
<th>Policy or guidance</th>
<th>Inquiry</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England and Wales</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one jurisdiction (including England and Wales)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one jurisdiction (not including England and Wales)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The studies reviewed are broken down by publication date in Figure H.2. The range of publication dates was from 1991-2017, with only a minority of papers included being published prior to 2000. This should not, however, be taken as a representative picture of the available literature, as more recent literature was prioritised within the REA.

Figure H.2: Breakdown of studies by publication date
The quality of the literature was assessed using a framework developed by the Inquiry’s research team for the purpose of REAs, which was based on existing available tools. The quality assessment process was used to assist the research team in identifying those studies with serious methodological issues; comparing the relative quality of the studies; highlighting limitations in the available literature so that these could be taken into account when conducting the review and caveated as appropriate within this report. Whilst the following information therefore gives a general sense of the standard and variability thereof of the literature, it should not be taken as a comprehensive assessment of the quality of each study. Further detail on the quality assessment (QA) process is set out in Appendix G.

Each study was given a score and these were converted into percentages to allow for comparison between study types (which were scored using different tools with different numbers of items). The majority of studies (n=80, 60 per cent) were scored between 80-100 per cent, and only two studies (1 per cent) scored below 40 per cent.

Table H.4: Breakdown of quality assessment (QA) scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>0-20 per cent</th>
<th>20-40 per cent</th>
<th>40-60 per cent</th>
<th>60-80 per cent</th>
<th>80-100 per cent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary mixed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary qualitative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary quantitative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary quantitative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>