

Child Sexual Abuse in the Context of the Roman Catholic Church: A Review of Literature from 1981–2013

BETTINA BÖHM

University Hospital of Ulm, Ulm, Germany

HANS ZOLLNER

Pontifical Gregorian University, Rome, Italy

JÖRG M. FEGERT and HUBERT LIEBHARDT

University Hospital of Ulm, Ulm, Germany

Child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church has been increasingly recognized as a problem not limited to individual institutions. Recent inquiry commission reports provide substantial information on offense dynamics, but their conclusions have not been synthesized with empirical research to date. The aim of this systematic literature review was to bring together key findings and identify gaps in the evidence base. The three main focus points were (a) types of publications and methodology used, (b) frequency information on child sexual abuse in the Catholic Church, (c) individual factors in offending, and (d) institutional factors in offending. It was found that reports, legal assessments, and research on child sexual abuse within the Catholic Church provide extensive descriptive and qualitative information for five different countries. This includes individual psychological factors (static risk predictors, multiple trajectories) and institutional factors (opportunity, social dynamics) as well as prevalence rates illustrating a high “dark figure” of child sexual abuse.

KEYWORDS *CSA, Catholic Church, literature review, institutional child abuse*

Received 14 May 2013; revised 11 October 2013; accepted 26 November 2013.

Address correspondence to Bettina Böhm, Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University Hospital of Ulm, Steinhövelstr. 5, 89075 Ulm, Germany. E-mail: bettina.boehm@uniklinik-ulm.de

Child¹ sexual abuse (CSA) has been increasingly recognized as a worldwide phenomenon, affecting around 11.8% of children, with great variation in reporting between studies and countries (Stoltenborgh, vanIjzendoorn, Euser, & Bakermans-Kranenburg, 2011). Overall, female reporting rates for CSA are higher (18% mean) than male reporting rates (7.6% mean). However, the heterogeneity of definitions and methodologies employed and limited comparability of studies complicate an estimation of its true frequency.

Regarding CSA perpetrated by employed professionals within the Roman Catholic Church, prevalence estimates vary similarly. Public discourse began to focus on this institutional context largely through the reporting of individual cases of repeat offenders in the press (Rossetti, 1996). However, assessing prevalence and change over time has been more difficult, as the reporting structure of abuse differs from the event structure (Smith, Rengifo & Vollman, 2008, p. 570). This has frequently been explained in terms of individual psychological factors, although societal factors, such as the women's and child protection movement and associated attitude changes, are also likely to play a role (Rossetti, 1996). For instance, Smith Rengifo, and Vollman (2008) identified that 90% of the 3,000 incidents reported in 2002 had occurred more than 20 years earlier.

As a result of this surge in reporting and increased public discourse, several research projects have been commissioned. This study aims to bring together the published research and inquiries into CSA within the Catholic Church in a systematic review, to differentiate between theory and evidence, and to identify gaps where further research is needed. The key research questions were: (a) How prevalent is CSA perpetrated by employees of the Catholic Church? (b) Which methods have been used in obtaining these prevalence figures? (c) What are the explanations offered for the occurrence of CSA in this context on an individual psychological level? (d) What are the explanations offered for the occurrence of CSA in this context on an institutional/structural level? and (e) To what extent are these causal explanations supported by evidence?

METHODS

Systematic literature reviews are frequently used to synthesize results from primary research studies (Dixon-Woods et al., 2006). In this context, the aim was the construction of "a narrative account of information that is already currently available, accessible and published, which may be written from a number of differing paradigms or perspectives" (Jesson & Lacey, 2006, p. 140). This broad definition accounts for the different paradigms underlying multidisciplinary approaches to the issue at hand.

¹ The term "child" or "children" will be used to refer to children and adolescents below the age of 18 years.

This systematic literature review encompasses publications from 1981 to 2013. It is not purely based on empirical research, as information on CSA within the Catholic Church partly originates from external and internal inquiries into the issue, and institutional factors have been discussed from the perspectives of various disciplines. Therefore, the use of statistical, meta-analytic techniques was ruled out due to the heterogeneity of studies and their descriptive nature (Leucht, Kissling & Davis, 2009).

In order to identify sources, the databases PsycINFO, Web of Science, and the Social Sciences Citation Index were searched using different keyword combinations (in English and German) of: sex* abus*, sex* exploit*, child maltreat*, sex* violen* and Catholic, church, instit*, pastoral, priest* and profession* as mentioned in abstracts. Furthermore, published inquiries from different countries were identified using a “snowball” method through their referencing in research as well as through a search of English and German speaking online news media of the years 2010–2013. After this, a second search of the databases was carried out to look specifically for studies on CSA from a non-European/North American context.

At the next stage, abstracts or summaries were screened to include only sources that had a direct relation to the *perpetration* of CSA in the Catholic Church rather than, for instance, articles on a decline of church attendance as a result, that were obtainable, published in English, German, or French, and were not book reviews. Finally, studies were analyzed with a view to theoretical frameworks used and data provided (Jesson & Lacey, 2006) as well as gaps in the evidence base. The PRISMA Statement for Reporting Systematic Reviews (Liberati et al., 2009), which outlines 27 items to be addressed, was followed in reporting the findings.

RESULTS

Types of Publications

In the initial database search, approximately 170 results were identified that were specific to a Catholic Church context. Out of these, only publications meeting the criteria for relevance were included. Only six were accessible studies conducting research specifically with clerical offenders. Furthermore, 10 prevalence assessments were identified that were compared regarding the numbers listed and conclusions provided. All other sources cited here are secondary sources, and further analyses of data provided in studies (seven of which used data from the John Jay Report, 2004), theoretical works on institutional and social dynamics, and broader literature on the issue of CSA in institutions.

The reports in Table 1 are listed in more depth as they represent the largest available data sets on CSA within the Catholic Church. Initiated as inquiries into the issue, the majority of them involved appointed commissions

TABLE 1 Summary of the Findings of the 10 Inquiry Reports

Country	Time Frame	Source	Method	Accused Staff Members (no.)	Accused Staff (% of total)	Victims (no. and/or %, gender, age)
Belgium	2010	Adriaenssens Rapport (2010, Belgium)	Self-report Follow-up questionnaire	320 (any profession)	Nearly all dioceses affected	507 victims (64% male, 32% female) 1:1 below/over 12 years old increased risk for boys aged 10–14
Germany	2011	UBSKM (2011, Germany)	Self-report	N/A	N/A	451 complainants (404 victims) 70% male, 30% female N/A
	1945–2009	Archdiocese Munich/Freising (2010, Germany)	File review	159 priests* 15 deacons*	N/A	
	–2012	Hotline für Opfer sexuellen Missbrauchs (2013, Germany)	Self-report	26 convicted of CSA 479 priests* 122 priests in religious orders* 79 nuns* 62 volunteers* 11 religious brothers*	N/A	753 victims (62% male, 38% female)*
Ireland	1936–2009	Ryan Report (2009, Ireland)	Witness hearings Investigation of “required” documents	246 reported by male witnesses 188 reported by female witnesses	N/A	253 male victim testimonies 128 female victim testimonies

1974–2004	Murphy Report (2009, Dublin)	“Representative sample” file review Follow-up questionnaires Hearings for complainants	46 in sample (172 initially accused)	N/A	450 complainants
1996–2009	Cloyne Report (2011, Cloyne)	File review Hearings for complainants	19 priests/deacons	7.6% of clerics in 1996	40 complainants
Netherlands	1945–2010 Deetman Eindrapport (2011, Netherlands)	Self-report Follow-up questionnaire Population survey	Approx. 800 (any profession) tracked*	N/A	10,000–20,000 in schools/institutions from 1945–1981* (~20% of all children in institutions) 1,795 reports
United States	1950–2002 John Jay Report (2004, United States)	Census of all dioceses	4,392 (priests/deacons)	3–6% of all priests 95% of all dioceses	10,667 (81% male, 19% female)
	1940–2003 Boston Report (2003, Boston)	File review	250 (217 priests, 13 other)	N/A	51% 11–14 years old 789 complainants

*Physical and/or sexual violence, no differentiation.

as investigators, which included members with a multi-professional (e.g., legal, psychological) background. One report (Westpfahl, Spilker & Wastl Rechtsanwälte, 2010) was not published in its entirety, while another, the *Adriaenssens Report*, was the result of a prematurely ended investigation. These investigations employed different methods, ranging from self-reports (of victims and witnesses) over questionnaires to file reviews. All of them analyzed the data using individually developed concepts, which involved descriptive and qualitative analyses. Data from the John Jay Report (John Jay College, 2004) was also used for further statistical analyses. The method of data analysis was less clearly stated in the two investigative and legal inquiries (Office of the Attorney General, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 2003; Westpfahl et al., 2010). The only study using a form of systematic sampling was the Murphy Report (Dublin Archdiocese Commission of Investigation, 2009), which selected a proportion of cases reported for closer analysis following consultation with a statistical expert.

Definitions of what constituted CSA and what constituted a “case” varied. Self-report studies did not provide an a priori definition, while file reviews conceptualized cases as allegations recorded in files. The Dublin Archdiocese Commission of Investigation (2011) most clearly defined CSA as follows: “Child sexual abuse occurs when a child is used by another person for his or her gratification or sexual arousal or that of others” (p. 26). This is the broad definition implied, but not always stated, in much of the literature.

Extent and Response Information on CSA

According to Scicluna (2010, 2013), former prosecutor/promotor of justice at the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF), 4,000 cases of CSA have been dealt with in Rome over the past 50 years. Roughly 60% of these cases concern offenses against adolescents of the same sex as the (male) offender, 30% adolescents of the opposite sex, and 10% offenses against prepubescent children. This indicates that regarding victimization, male adolescents have been at the greatest risk in the past. In terms of the consequences, some form of trial followed in 20% of cases. In 60% of cases, no action was taken due to the advanced age of the accused. Only 10% of the accused were dismissed from clerical office due to the severity of their offenses, while the majority of offenses were dealt with through disciplinary measures and instructions to lead a “withdrawn life of prayer.”

However, information from the 10 inquiries listed in Table 1 indicates that the prevalence of CSA likely exceeds the number of cases reported to the CDF. In the United States, a large-scale review of all reported accusations between 1950 and 2002 found that allegations had been made against 4% of all U.S. priests active at the time, affecting 10,667 children (Terry & Tallon, 2004). An investigation was undertaken in 72% of allegations, with only 3%

resulting in criminal convictions, while 37% of priests were referred to some form of sex offender treatment (John Jay College, 2004). The John Jay Report remains the largest attempt to assess the prevalence of CSA in the Catholic Church in an individual country. It describes the occurrence of repeated, serious victimization. This pattern was reflected in the Boston Report (Office of the Attorney General, 2003), in which the attorney general concluded that sexual victimization of children had been widespread and known.

Another government-commissioned project supported by an independent research board (Fegert, Spröber, Rassenhofer, Schneider, & Seitz, 2013; Fegert et al., 2011) to assess the occurrence of CSA in Germany was contacted by 451 complainants of sexual abuse within the Catholic Church. This was not a prevalence study, as individuals reported abuse to a federal hotline. Data from this study were analyzed to compare the confessional to the nonconfessional context. No significant difference between contexts was found in terms of time of abuse, severity, quantity, and sex of offenders, although victims in the confessional group were more likely to be male and were older at the time of calling than victims in the nonconfessional context (Spröber et al., 2014). A parallel self-report project commissioned by the Catholic Church in Germany (Hotline für Opfer sexuellen Missbrauchs, 2013) collected reports on 753 sexual and violent offenses against children within a church context, with 479 having been committed by diocesan priests and 122 by priests in religious orders. As in John Jay Report (John Jay College, 2004), most of these offenses dated back to the 1950s to 1970s. Smaller, regional assessments have been conducted within archdioceses, but their results are not always clear. For example, one assessment issued a statement referring to 26 priests convicted of sexual offenses against minors, while mentioning without explanation that a further 17 had likely been guilty (Westpfahl et al., 2010).

In Ireland, the Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse (2009) reviewed abuse in institutions in relation to historical and social developments. The resulting Ryan Report was based on the statements of 1,090 men and women who described physical, sexual, or emotional child abuse and neglect in Irish institutions, approximately half of whom reported sexual abuse. Most of these institutions were reformatory and industrial schools run by Catholic orders. This was shortly followed by the Murphy Report (Dublin Archdiocese Commission of Investigation, 2009) and the Cloyne Report (Dublin Archdiocese Commission of Investigation, 2011). The latter specifically considered cases between 1996 and 2009, as the Irish Catholic Church had issued safeguarding guidelines in 1996 that specified that allegations of CSA were required to be passed on to the Irish Garda (police force). However, out of the 19 cases the archdiocese had been dealing with, nine had not been reported to civil authorities, including at least two current cases.

Individual Factors in Sexual Offending

STATIC RISK FACTORS

Beyond the frequency of CSA within the Catholic Church, some research has focused on characteristics of offenders. One aspect of this is risk factors for offending or multiple offending. Static risk factors are historical factors that cannot change, unlike dynamic risk factors, which can change over time (Hanson & Thornton, 2000).

A logistic regression analysis of John Jay Report data found that factors predictive of multiple offending were young victim age, young cleric age at the first offense, more male victims, and a history of victimization (Perillo, Calkins Mercado & Terry, 2008). These static risk predictors are similar to those identified in other forensic samples. However, it emerged that the average age of onset of offending was comparatively high at 38.91 years (Piquero, Leeper Piquero, Terry, Youstin & Nobles, 2008). This was attributed to priests' older age at ordination. However, an alternative interpretation proposes that early-onset paraphilia is unlikely to be causal in a criminal career that begins late in life. In fact, persistent/repeat offenders, the minority of the sample, were the only subgroup that began offending significantly earlier (Terry & Ackerman, 2008). Moreover, according to the personnel files, a minority of 274 priests had themselves been victims of abuse, while 753 had had substance misuse problems (Terry, 2008). A history of victimization, although predictive of repeat offending, was therefore not reported for the majority of offenders.

DEVIANT SEXUAL INTERESTS

One dynamic risk factor in predicting sexual offending are deviant sexual interests (Hanson & Thornton, 2000), which are part of both the *International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems*, 10th Revision (ICD-10), and the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4th Edition*, Text Revision (DSM-IV-TR). The ICD-10 classifies pedophilia as a disorder of personality and behavior encompassing a sexual preference for children of prepubertal or early pubertal age (World Health Organization, 1992). The DSM-IV-TR defines pedophilia as intense and recurrent sexual urges and fantasies about prepubescent children that have either been acted out or that cause distress or interpersonal difficulty (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). These diagnostic criteria stayed in DSM-5, although the label has been changed to pedophilic disorder, categorized as a paraphilic disorder (American Psychiatric Publishing, 2013).

However, pedophilia insufficiently explains sexual offending against adolescents, which makes up the larger proportion of offenses perpetrated by priests (Cucci & Zollner, 2010). An alternative concept was proposed for addition to the DSM-5: hebephilia (sexual preference for pubescent children

aged 11–14) in the context of a pedohebephilia concept. Some evidence for this disorder comes from Blanchard and colleagues' (2009) study using phallometric testing and self-report with 881 men referred for assessment. Among them was evidence for a subgroup that showed sexual arousal to images of 11- to 14-year-olds rather than younger children or older adolescents. However, this concept lacks support from prior phallometric research (e.g., Barbaree & Marshall, 1989).

Research specifically with priests who have sexually abused children and adolescents has focused on ephebophilia as sexual attraction to “post-pubescent male minors” (Cimboic & Cartor, 2006, p. 350). Cimboic, Wise, Rossetti, and Safer (1999) combined items from two personality inventories (MCMI-II and MMPI-2) into one Combined Objective Ephebophile Scale and tested whether this scale could distinguish between priests who had abused male adolescents and nonoffending priests with a psychiatric disorder of a nonsexual nature. It correctly classified 67% of their sample. However, the scale did not assess sexual arousal but rather personality features correlated with offending against adolescents. It is therefore not a measure of deviant *sexual* interests.

Finally, a German analysis of 78 forensic evaluations with offending priests found that 12% of offenders met diagnostic criteria for pedophilia, while 5% met criteria for ephebophilia (Leygraf, König, Kröber, & Pfäfflin, 2012). Roughly a quarter of offenders abused only children, only adolescents, or both, respectively.² Furthermore, 54% of the sample reported a heterosexual, 37% a homosexual, and 9% a bisexual orientation. Pedophilia and ephebophilia were therefore present in a minority of the sample but did not explain the etiology of sexual offending against children for the majority, who did not “specialize” toward one age group and who identified as sexually attracted to adults.

PERSONALITY FACTORS

In contrast to sexual interests, more research has been carried out on personality factors. A cluster analysis (Falkenhain, Duckro, Hughes, Rossetti, & Gfeller, 1999) with 97 sexually offending priests and brothers identified four major personality clusters: sexually and emotionally underdeveloped (42.3%), undefended characterological (35.1%), defended characterological (17.4%), and significantly psychiatrically disturbed (5.2%). Notably, the largest cluster showed no clinically elevated MMPI-2 scores, and those who exhibited “significant psychiatric disturbance” made up the smallest cluster. This seems to be supported by Leygraf and colleagues' (2012) analysis, which

² The sample included clerics who had sexually offended against adults or both adults and children. This subgroup makes up the missing quarter.

states that only 5% of the sample met diagnostic criteria for a personality disorder, while 18% met criteria for “another psychological disorder.”

This finding indicates that creating a “profile” of a potential abuser is difficult. Rossetti (1996) lists six early “red flags” for sexual offending, based on clinical experience: uncertainty about one’s own sexual identity, childlike interests/behaviors, a lack of relationships with peers, hypersexualization or a lack of sexual experiences in childhood/adolescence, sexual victimization in childhood, and a passive/dependent/overly compliant personality. Such characteristics are, to an extent, supported by evidence. Plante, Manuel, and Bryant (1996) compared hospitalized clerical sexual offenders to hospitalized nonoffenders and found that the group who had abused children scored significantly higher on overcontrolled hostility, which describes passive, conflict-avoidant, and compliant behavior toward others, especially authorities, and a denial of unpleasant affect. Brehob (2006) likewise discovered that unintegrated sexuality, an impairment in an individual’s awareness/acceptance of emotional, cognitive, and behavioral elements of sexuality, distinguished between ephebophiles and other diagnostic and control groups.³

No further empirical research supporting this pattern could be identified for the purpose of this study, although one diocesan inquiry commented that certain behaviors, such as persistent help-seeking for everyday activities, were especially common among offending clerics (Westpfahl et al., 2010).

Institutional Factors in Sexual Offending

OPPORTUNITY

In order to develop a comprehensive explanation for CSA, institutional aspects must likewise be considered. Calkins-Mercado, Tallon, and Terry (2008) discovered that clerical offenders with many victims were more likely than nonpersistent offenders to abuse in their own home. In fact, 41% of all abuse in the John Jay Report took place within the priest’s residence (Terry & Ackerman, 2008). Terry and Ackerman (2008) listed further evidence for the role of opportunity in CSA: the late average onset of criminal behavior, the lack of chronicity, a minority of paraphilic tendencies, the low incidence of priests abusing children who are strangers, and the low use of child pornography. The fact that a majority of priests had only one allegation of abuse and began offending rather late in life was suggested to indicate that the majority of offending is not caused by a chronic pathology. Furthermore, many victims in Fegert and colleagues (2011) described being abused during one-to-one situations such as confession, suggesting a situational risk.

On the other hand, the degree of grooming as reported by victims retrospectively, as well as the build up of smaller transgressions into sexual

³ The studies cited here focused specifically on offenders treated at one U.S. center.

abuse, suggests a certain degree of planning (Hotline für Opfer sexuellen Missbrauchs, 2013). “Opportunity” therefore does not mean “spontaneous” or “triggered entirely by the situation.” Rather, offenders were also active agents in creating opportunities where sexual abuse was possible.

SOCIAL DYNAMICS

Subcultural phenomena. Institutions not only provide access to children but professional roles do as well. Marcotte (2008) related findings from the John Jay Report to practices in the Catholic Church up to the second half of the 20th century as well as social unrest in the 1960s and 1970s when the frequency of CSA appears to have peaked. He argues that up to the 1960s, the life of priests, who entered the seminary at a young age, was strongly isolated and rigid in its prescriptions, preventing the accomplishment of “normal” developmental tasks of early adulthood. This puts the findings into a societal context, although Marcotte does not explain why the rate of CSA should have dropped from the 1980s onward (Commissie misbruik, 2010) in an age of increased ease of access to child pornography.

Considering specific working culture, White and Terry (2008) drew a comparison between the working environments of the Catholic Church and of the police in cases of police brutality. Both the position of priest and that of police officer share authority, trust, isolation, discretion, lack of supervision, limited career mobility, and a subculture (secrecy, esprit de corps, maintaining the status quo). Some evidence for a “subculture” of this kind comes from studies such as the Deetman Eindrapport, which explicitly mentions an “esprit de corps” (Onderzoekscommissie, 2011, p. 13) that served to facilitate abuses of power.

The theme of “power” was discovered to play a role in many self-report studies (e.g., Fegert et al., 2011), as priests used situations of dependency and isolation (e.g., confession) to intimidate the victim, for example by suggesting that a disclosure of the abuse would result in eternal damnation or by emphasizing their own proximity to God. The perception of their social role in relation to the victim therefore may have played a role in the offense itself. This power or authority aspect has likewise been reported in other professional contexts, particularly where children are sexually abused in a situation when they are highly vulnerable and the abuse can be disguised as “necessary treatment” (e.g., medical examinations, psychotherapy). This sometimes extends to the revictimization of children who disclose abuse or neglect in the family through the professional they have turned to for help (Fegert et al., 2013). While this occurs in different helping professions, offenders within a religious context tend to exploit the specific symbolic character of rituals such as confession as well as their moral authority for their purposes (Hotline für Opfer sexuellen Missbrauchs, 2013).

Failure of management. The Cloyne Report (Dublin Archdiocese Commission of Investigation, 2011) observed that the correspondence of officials in the archdiocese indicated a culture unsupportive of external review and “little or no active interest” (p. 5) in the management of CSA cases until 2008, disregarding church guidelines from 1996. This was also found in the Boston Report, which concluded that “the widespread abuse of children was due to an institutional acceptance of abuse and a massive and pervasive failure of leadership” (Office of the Attorney General, 2003, p. 2). This failure to take action and concern for minimizing the risk of public awareness effectively protected offenders.

Where allegations were taken seriously by dioceses, offenders were frequently referred to the mental health system rather than the criminal justice system (Onderzoekscommissie, 2011; John Jay College, 2004), with an emphasis on treatment and rehabilitation. On the other hand, the Deetman Eindrapport also concluded that although the way cases were dealt with was inadequate, the amount of later supervision of offenders provided within the Catholic Church still exceeded supervision provided for released sex offenders in the general community. The responsibility for management and mismanagement of cases therefore rested with the institution rather than outside agencies.

Differentiating environments. When discussing CSA in the Catholic Church, it is important to distinguish between types of Catholic institutions in existence. The Hotline für Opfer sexuellen Missbrauchs (2013) commented on differences between CSA taking place in the parish and CSA within residential institutions. Particularly noticeable in this report is the dependency of gender differences on the institutional context: where religious brothers were the perpetrators, 91% of the victims were male and only 9% female, as opposed to priests, who had relatively fewer male victims (58% male, 42% female). The study differentiates between two types of institutions run by religious brothers: “elite” or boarding schools, which have historically been attended mainly by boys, and institutions for children in care, who have often experienced previous abuse and neglect. In both residential environments, sexual abuse occurred in combination with physical violence, although particular brutality was reported in a care context where children were viewed as sinful and in need of “improvement.” This could not be said to the same extent for CSA in the parish, where the circumstances and acts of abuse were more diverse. Overall, sexual abuse was more likely to be enduring in residential settings than in parishes, as victims had no opportunity to escape.

The Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse (2009) likewise concluded that in Ireland, most abuse had occurred within an institutional climate that imposed oppressive, humiliating discipline on children. In fact, the commission described the abuse in boys’ residential institutions run by the Christian Brothers as “endemic” (p. 21) rather than an action of isolated individuals.

In its most extreme form, this extended to offenders forming “circles,” providing one another with access to vulnerable victims. Most victims who then disclosed the abuse to someone described being silenced, punished, or blamed for the abuse.

Regarding CSA perpetrated outside of residential institutions, less has been reported on the context. The John Jay Report (John Jay College, 2004), which investigated only allegations against priests and deacons, does not differentiate responses by type of institution but by severity and credibility of allegation. As a result, this file review makes no comment on the environment as opposed to self-report investigations (Adriaenssens Rapport, Deetman Eindrapport). The latter describe a particular reverence given to “our parish priest” by the community (Fegert et al., 2011; Hotline für Opfer sexuellen Missbrauchs, 2013). Outside of a closed context, therefore, an emphasis was still placed on high esteem.

Overall, this illustrates three points made in the studies: (a) management of allegations in different countries was mainly done internally without outside consultation, (b) working culture and the environment have played an important role in how cases were managed, and (c) subcultural phenomena were vital to the perpetration of the offenses themselves. Institutional factors therefore played a role at every level of the process of offending, disclosure, and management, although differentiating between types of contexts is necessary.

DISCUSSION

Sources and Figures

The first aim of this literature review was the identification and evaluation of source material on CSA within the Catholic Church. The most recent, large-scale data came from commissioned inquiries into the issue. These used multi-professional boards as investigators and different methods such as self-report, file reviews, and surveys of dioceses. All employed descriptive and qualitative methods of data analysis, although further quantitative research was carried out on the data of the John Jay Report (Terry, 2008) and the Unabhängige Beauftragte für Fragen des sexuellen Kindesmissbrauchs (UBSKM) (Spröber et al., *in press*). The transparency of methods varied and was generally less clear in investigations involving file reviews. As different methodologies were used, drawing comparisons between countries is difficult, if not impossible. In general, the fact that these inquiries come from five countries only, and that each of these studies suggests hundreds to thousands of victims of CSA, warrants the conclusion that the prevalence of CSA within the Catholic Church has been far higher than suggested by the 4,000 (Scicluna, 2013) cases the CDF has dealt with and whose data has not been published to date. This is also suggested by the fact that there was no

obligation to report allegations to Rome prior to 2001, which means that the handling of cases was in the hands of individual bishops (Sciicluna, 2013).

Second, these 10 inquiries indicate that the bulk of offenses took place in the 1940s to 1970s. However, this finding must be regarded with caution, as CSA is an area with a high “dark figure” of unreported offenses, both in cases of intrafamilial abuse and in power relationships (Fegert & Wolff, 2002). In this context, it is perpetrated by individuals in a position of authority (Fegert, 2004), which makes it difficult for victims to discuss. It may be something they can only disclose years later or never, as indicated by the Hotline für Opfer sexuellen Missbrauchs (2013), who reported that one-third of their callers hung up, remained silent on the line, insulted staff, or talked about something unrelated to CSA. Studies relying on file reviews rather than self-report, on the other hand, depend on both impeccable record keeping of allegations over decades and the cooperation of dioceses in opening all records (Sipe, 2004). Thus there are inherent limitations to the different methods used. Nevertheless, discounting these studies on the basis of their methodology would disregard the context of institutional child abuse and field research, which is unsuitable to a controlled approach.⁴

However, one limitation of this literature review is that it has aimed to cover a diverse field not limited by a strict protocol of inclusion criteria (Leucht et al., 2009). Further research should focus on obtaining this kind of information from other countries, particularly developing countries, where churches are often important social service providers, which creates another dimension of dependency and power.

Individual and Social Factors: Implications for Practice

A second aim of this literature review was the identification of theories on causal factors for CSA within the Catholic Church. These studies can be divided broadly into offender research focusing on individual psychological causal factors and studies and theories on social factors. Within the Catholic Church, sexual offenses against children have largely been discussed in terms of individual factors and psychopathology, most notably in the context of pedophilia, hebephilia, and ephebophilia, even though pedophilia has not, to date, been empirically confirmed as a major causal factor in institutional CSA (Hogan, 2011; Keenan, 2009).

Pedohebephilia was once proposed as a diagnosis for the DSM-5, but this concept has been criticized for not providing clear diagnostic criteria for a mental disorder (DeClue, 2009; Prentky & Barbaree, 2011), lack of clarity about its predictive and construct validity (O’Donohue, 2009), and

⁴ A discussion of “what counts” as evidence is beyond the scope of this article. For one discussion of how qualitative research can be incorporated into literature reviews, see Dixon-Woods and colleagues (2006).

selective sampling in the Blanchard and colleagues study (Franklin, 2009). Franklin (2009) also criticized the public policy implications of identifying a disorder among sexual offenders that exists as a prevalent sexual interest in the general population. She pointed out that marriage between older men and young adolescent girls is common in many parts of the world and that using this proposed disorder to “excuse” sexual offending is problematic (Franklin, 2010). This raises some questions about reasons for and implications of proposing ephebophilia as a distinct diagnosis for offending priests, especially in light of a lack of published outcome research regarding treatment for this subgroup. Zollner (2013) argued that a discussion of diagnostic labels cannot exist in an ethical or moral vacuum. On the other hand, from a clinical perspective, the mere existence of men who offend against adolescents alone does not implicate an underlying distinct paraphilia. Furthermore, the term “ephebophilia” in its usage is often confounded with its suggested causes or correlates (e.g., dependent personality features). A reliable diagnostic label would necessitate a clearer distinction between nonoffending “ephebophiles,” offending “ephebophiles,” nonoffending men who are not sexually attracted to male adolescents and offending men who have abused children but do not show evidence of a paraphilic *preference* for adolescents.⁵

Causal explanations focusing on the individual need to consider the different contributors leading to sexual offending. Ward and Siegert’s (2002) Pathways Model of CSA emphasizes that sexual deviance is only one of several key motivators. Their identified avenues include intimacy and social skills deficits, deviant sexual scripts and relationship schemas, emotional dysregulation, antisocial cognitions, and multiple dysfunctional mechanisms. Research testing this model specifically with clerics who sexually abuse children is lacking, but the intimacy and social skills deficits pathway in particular is implicated in personality research with offending priests, which indicates immaturity in the social domain. Such deficits in interpersonal relationships are hypothesized to occur due to insecure attachment (Ward & Siegert, 2002). The passive, autonomy-lacking behavior described could explain why an individual might find it easier to relate to children, who are perceived as less threatening (Plante et al., 1996). However, general adjustment difficulties must be differentiated from specific issues. For example, McGlone (as cited in Keenan, 2009) found that 59% of clerics in a non-offender sample had previously sought psychological support, mainly regarding depression, alcoholism, and matters of sexual orientation/identity. A finer distinction between general and specific risk factors is therefore needed.

⁵ Blanchard (2009) points out in his response to comments that it was relative preference for 11- to 14-year-olds over other age groups, not absolute “amount” of arousal that his study of hebephilia focused on to delineate a distinct subgroup.

Moreover, sexual offenders are not necessarily an outwardly deviant, homogeneous group, which complicates the creation of one “profile.” In fact, self-report studies on CSA have shown that victims were frequently not believed when reporting CSA because the offender was a highly respected person (e.g., Fegert et al., 2011). Individual factors insufficiently explain the reported “culture of silence” surrounding CSA and the “endemic” nature of abuse in Irish reformatory schools in the 20th century. In summary, they fail to explain the well-documented failures of systems in which sexual offending was minimized and appeared permissible. This is often attributed to a lack of guidelines and external review (De Fuentes, 2004), but the Cloyne Report (Dublin Archdiocese Commission of Investigation, 2009) specifically notes that guidelines released in 1996 were deliberately counteracted in order to protect the institution’s reputation. As the average first (recorded) incident of abuse occurred 11 years after ordination in the John Jay Report (Terry, 2008), this likewise suggests that experience in the institutional environment such as normalization processes play a role. Addressing such failures is vital in initiating change (Scicluna, Zollner & Ayotte, 2012).

The professional role of caregiver implies a power imbalance (Hardman-Cromwell, 1981), particularly within a strongly hierarchical organization. An institutional emphasis on authority and obedience over compassion can create an environment in which those lower in authority are put at risk, particularly where power is understood as unaccountable and absolute (Hogan, 2011). Where a hierarchical relationship exists, an understanding of boundaries is important in limiting the potential for abuses of power (Hansen-Robison, 2004). Much has been written about this institutional climate, particularly from a pastoral practice point of view and with regard to the issue of celibacy (Sipe, 2004). However, CSA cannot be exclusively understood as an expression of sexual desire but in many cases a way of exercising power over others (Ward et al., 2006). This raises the question how collectives understand and deal with power. Overall, there is a shortage of longitudinal data on institutional cultural factors that facilitate CSA, particularly in a global context. A greater understanding of this issue appears vital in order to develop effective prevention strategies.

Meanwhile, prevention efforts should focus on concrete risk scenarios. Terry and Ackerman (2008) related their John Jay Report findings to situational crime prevention, a model based on the assumption that offenders are rational actors who consider the benefits and costs of their actions, which means that crime is prevented where opportunities are blocked (Terry & Ackerman, 2008). The focus of this approach is on the environment rather than the individual. Increasing effort and risk, controlling prompts (reducing situational triggers for the offender), and reducing permissibility of offending should therefore reduce crime (Smallbone, Marshall, & Wortley, 2008). Environmental strategies could involve reducing opportunity and increasing risk through surveillance, while the permissibility of offending could be

reduced through improved education about its consequences and zero tolerance policies. Many organizations working with children and adolescents already employ such situational crime prevention strategies, for example by limiting one-to-one interaction, creating open meeting places, and encouraging group activities (Hanson & Price, 2004). Unfortunately, such concrete prevention strategies are difficult to evaluate in the short-term as the desired outcome is a nonoccurrence of measurable incidents, although the effectiveness of deterrence for some crimes has been demonstrated on a societal level (Smallbone et al., 2008).

Conclusion

In conclusion, the recent increase in knowledge about cases of CSA within institutions, particularly the Catholic Church, warrants the development and adjustment of response strategies to the sexual victimization of children. Inquiries have rendered a substantial body of evidence to inform this strategy. These data sets may not be quantitatively comparable due to the different methods used, but they nevertheless provide substantial qualitative information on offense dynamics. In particular, they highlight the role of social dynamics and institutional failures in the perpetration of CSA. The narratives of adult survivors included in these reports also illustrate the significance of power relationships, intimidation, and “silencing” of victims. At the individual level, studies indicate different trajectories that may lead to abusive behavior. However, there is a shortage of research regarding contributors at the level of the individual institution and amenability to change through intervention. There is also a strong cultural bias in the literature, which may conceive of CSA within the Catholic Church as an exclusively North American/European problem, despite indications from international research that sexual abuse occurs worldwide. Avenues for further research include inquiries into CSA from a non-European/North American context, offender research using matched control groups, empirical research regarding social dynamics and protective factors, research on the overlap between CSA and other forms of child maltreatment in institutions, and outcome evaluation research involving prevention and intervention measures. This could support practitioners in identifying factors helpful in preventing and dealing with cases of CSA in a more responsive and responsible manner.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank all supporters of the Centre for Child Protection, particularly Msgr. Klaus-Peter Franzl and the Archdiocese of Munich and Freising, who are the main financial supporters and are actively involved in the integration of our project into education and training

structures of the archdiocese. We would also like to thank our international project partners for their active contribution to the program.

REFERENCES

- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed., text revision). Washington, DC: Author.
- American Psychiatric Publishing. (2013). *Highlights of changes from DSM-IV-TR to DSM-5*. Retrieved from <http://www.psychiatry.org/dsm5>
- Barbaree, H. E., & Marshall, W. L. (1989). Erectile responses among heterosexual child molesters, father–daughter incest offenders, and matched non-offenders: Five distinct age preference profiles. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, *21*, 70–82.
- Blanchard, R. (2009). Reply to letters regarding pedophilia, hebephilia, and the DSM-V. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *38*, 331–334.
- Blanchard, R., Lykins, A. D., Wherrett, D., Kuban, M. E., Cantor, J. M., Blak, T., Dickey, R., et al. (2009). Pedophilia, hebephilia, and the DSM-V. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *38*, 335–350.
- Brehob, K. A. (2006). Clinical and statistical classification of sexual disorders: The case of unintegrated sexuality applied to a clergy sample. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, *67*(3-B), 1693.
- Calkins-Mercado, C., Tallon, J. A., & Terry, K. J. (2008). Persistent sexual abusers in the Catholic Church: An examination of characteristics and offense patterns. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *35*(5), 619–642.
- Cimboric, P., & Cartor, P. (2006). Looking at ephebophilia through the lens of cleric sexual abuse. *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity*, *13*, 347–359.
- Cimboric, P., Wise, R. A., Rossetti, S., & Safer, M. (1999). Development of a combined objective ephebophile scale. *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity*, *6*, 253–266.
- Commissie misbruik. (2010). *Rapport des activités de la Commission pour le traitement des plaintes pour abus sexuels dans une relation pastorale* [Report on the activities of the Commission for the Treatment of Complaints about Sexual Abuse within a Pastoral Relationship]. Retrieved from http://www.kerknet.be/admin/files/assets/subsites/2343/rapport__version_finale.pdf
- Commission to Inquire Into Child Abuse. (2009). *Final report of the commission to inquire into child abuse dated 20th May 2000: Executive summary*. Retrieved from <http://www.childabusecommission.com/rpt/pdfs/CICA-Executive%20Summary.pdf>
- Cucci, G., & Zollner, H. (2010). Missbrauch in der Kirche: Anmerkungen aus psychologischer Sicht [Abuse in the church: Comments from a psychological perspective]. *Ordenskorrespondenz*, *51*, 261–274.
- De Fuentes, N. (2004). Clergy sexual misconduct oversight review boards. In T. G. Plante (Ed.), *Sin against the innocents: Sexual abuse by priests and the role of the Catholic Church* (pp. 47–59). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- DeClue, G. (2009). Should hebephilia be a mental disorder? A reply to Blanchard et al. (2008). *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *38*, 317–318.

- Dixon-Woods, M., Bonas, S., Booth, A., Jones, D. R., Miller, T., Sutton, A. J., et al. (2006). How can systematic reviews incorporate qualitative research? A critical perspective. *Qualitative Research*, 6(1), 27–44.
- Dublin Archdiocese Commission of Investigation. (2009). *Report by Commission of Investigation Into Catholic Archdiocese of Dublin*. Retrieved from <http://www.justice.ie/en/JELR/Pages/PB09000504>
- Dublin Archdiocese Commission of Investigation. (2011). *Report by Commission of Investigation Into Catholic Diocese of Cloyne. Archdiocese of Cloyne*. Retrieved from http://www.justice.ie/en/JELR/Cloyne_Rpt.pdf/Files/Cloyne_Rpt.pdf
- Falkenhain, M. A., Duckro, P. N., Hughes, H. M., Rossetti, S. J., & Gfeller, J. D. (1999). Cluster analysis of child sexual offenders: A validation with Roman Catholic priests and brothers. *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity*, 6, 317–336.
- Fegert, J. M. (2004). Consequences of sexual abuse of children and adolescents by priests and other persons in clerical functions. In R. K. Hanson, Y. Pfaefflin, & M. Luetz (Eds.), *Sexual abuse in the Catholic Church: Scientific and legal perspectives* (pp. 160–184). Città del Vaticano: Liberia Editrice Vaticana.
- Fegert, J. M., Rassenhofer, M., Schneider, T., Seitz, A., König, L., & Spröber, N. (2011). *Endbericht der wissenschaftlichen Begleitforschung zur Anlaufstelle der Unabhängigen Beauftragten zur Aufarbeitung des sexuellen Kindesmissbrauchs Dr. Christine Bergmann, Bundesministerin a. D.* [Closing report of the accompanying scientific research on the contact point of the Independent Commissioner on the Reappraisal of Child Sexual Abuse Dr. Christine Bergmann, Federal Minister a.D.] Retrieved from <http://beauftragter-missbrauch.de/course/view.php?id=28>
- Fegert, J. M., Spröber, N., Rassenhofer, M., Schneider, T., & Seitz, A. (2013). *Sexueller Kindesmissbrauch—Zeugnisse, Botschaften, Konsequenzen* [Child sexual abuse—Testimonies, messages, consequences]. Juventa, Germany: Weinheim/München.
- Fegert, J. M., & Wolff, M. (2002). Einleitung [Introduction]. In J. M. Fegert & M. Wolff (Eds.), *Sexueller Missbrauch durch Professionelle in Institutionen: Prävention und Intervention* [Sexual abuse by professionals in institutions: Prevention and intervention] (pp. 11–20). Münster, Germany: Votum Verlag GmbH.
- Franklin, K. (2009). The public policy implications of “hebephilia”: A response to Blanchard et al. (2008). *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 38, 319–320.
- Franklin, K. (2010). Hebephilia: Quintessence of diagnostic pretextuality. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 28, 751–768.
- Hansen-Robison, L. (2004). The abuse of power: A view of sexual misconduct in a systemic approach to pastoral care. *Pastoral Psychology*, 52(5), 395–404.
- Hanson, R. K., & Price, S. (2004). Sexual abuse screening procedures for positions of trust with children. In R. K. Hanson, Y. Pfaefflin, & M. Luetz (Eds.), *Sexual abuse in the Catholic Church: Scientific and legal perspectives* (pp. 77–96). Città del Vaticano: Liberia Editrice Vaticana.
- Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (2000). Improving risk assessments for sex offenders: A comparison of three actuarial scales. *Law and Human Behavior*, 24(1), 119–136.
- Hardman-Cromwell, Y. C. (1981). Power and sexual abuse in ministry. *Pastor's Corner*, 38(1), 65–72.

- Hogan, L. (2011). Clerical and religious child abuse: Ireland and beyond. *Theological Studies*, 72, 170–186.
- Hotline für Opfer sexuellen Missbrauchs. (2013). *Bericht zum Abschluss der Tätigkeit der Hotline der Deutschen Bischofskonferenz für Opfer sexuellen Missbrauchs* [Report on the conclusion of the activity of the Hotline of the German Bishops' Conference for Victims of Sexual Abuse]. Retrieved from http://www.dbk.de/fileadmin/redaktion/diverse_downloads/presse_2012/2013-008d-Taetigkeitsbericht-Hotline_Teil-1.pdf; http://www.dbk.de/fileadmin/redaktion/diverse_downloads/presse_2012/2013-008e-Taetigkeitsbericht-Hotline_Teil-2.pdf
- Jesson, J., & Lacey, F. (2006). How to do (or not to do) a critical literature review. *Pharmacy Education*, 6(2), 139–148.
- John Jay College. (2004). *The nature and scope of the problem of sexual abuse of minors by Catholic priests and deacons in the United States*. New York: John Jay College of Criminal Justice.
- Keenan, M. (2009). "Sie und wir"—Das Täterbild des Anderen bei sexueller Kindermisshandlung durch Kleriker. Gekürzte Fassung ["Them and us": The clergy child sexual offender as "other"] (pp. 180–231). In T. Flannery (Ed.), *Responding to the Ryan Report*. Dublin: Columbia.
- Leucht, S., Kissling, W., & Davis, J. M. (2009). How to read and understand and use systematic reviews and meta-analyses. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 119, 443–450.
- Leygraf, N., König, A., Kröber, H.-L., & Pfäfflin, F. (2012). *Sexuelle Übergriffe durch katholische Geistliche in Deutschland—Eine Analyse forensischer Gutachten 2000–2010* [Sexual assaults by Catholic clerics in Germany—An analysis of forensic assessments 2000–2010]. Retrieved from http://www.dbk.de/fileadmin/redaktion/diverse_downloads/presse/2012-198b-Analyse-forensisch-psychiatrische-Gutachten-Praesentation-Prof-Leygraf.pdf
- Liberati, A., Altman, D.G., Tetzlaff, J., Mulrow, C., Gotzsche, P.C., Ioannidis, J. P. A., et al. (2009). The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: Explanation and elaboration. *PLOS Medicine*, 6(7), 1–28.
- Marcotte, D. (2008). The role of social factors in the sexual misconduct of Roman Catholic clergy: A second look at the John Jay data. *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity*, 15, 23–38.
- O'Donohue, W. (2010). A critique of the proposed DSM-V diagnosis of pedophilia. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 39, 587–590.
- Office of the Attorney General, Commonwealth of Massachusetts. (2003). *The sexual abuse of children in the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Boston: A report by the Attorney General*. Retrieved from http://www.boston.com/globe/spotlight/abuse/investigations/ag_report_072303.pdf
- Onderzoekscommissie. (2011). *Summary of the Deetman Eindrapport in English*. Retrieved from <http://www.onderzoekr.nl/english-summery.html>
- Perillo, A. D., Calkins Mercado, C., & Terry, K. J. (2008). Repeat offending, victim gender, and extent of victim relationship in Catholic Church sexual abusers: Implications for risk assessment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35(5), 600–614.
- Piquero, A. R., Leeper Piquero, N., Terry, K. J., Youstin, T., & Nobles, M. (2008). Uncollaring the criminal: Understanding criminal careers of criminal clerics. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35(5), 583–599.

- Plante, T. G., Manuel, G., & Bryant, C. (1996). Personality and cognitive functioning among hospitalized sexual offending Roman Catholic priests. *Pastoral Psychology, 45*(2), 129–139.
- Prentky, R., & Barbaree, H. (2011). Commentary: Hebephilia—A would-be paraphilia caught in the twilight zone between prepubescence and adulthood. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and Law, 39*, 506–510.
- Rossetti, S. J. (1996). *A tragic grace: The Catholic Church and CSA*. Collegeville, MI: Interfaith Sexual Trauma Institute.
- Sciicluna, C. J. (2010, March 13). *Sexueller Missbrauch Vatikan: Topinterview mit Kirchenanwalt Sciicluna* [Sexual abuse at the Vatican: Top interview with church Lawyer Sciicluna]. Retrieved from <http://www.internetpfarre.de/blog/archives/240-SEXUELLER-MISSBRAUCH-VATIKAN-TOPINTERVIEW-MIT-KIRCHENANWALT-SCIICLUNA.html>
- Sciicluna, C. J. (2013, March 3). It was like a tsunami. *Frankfurter Allgemeine Sonntagszeitung*. Retrieved from <http://www.faz.net/aktuell/politik/ausland/sexual-abuse-it-was-like-a-tsunami-12099940.html>
- Sciicluna, C. J., Zollner, H., & Ayotte, D. (2012). *Toward healing and renewal: The 2012 symposium on the sexual abuse of minors held at the Pontifical Gregorian University*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Sipe, A. W. R. (2004). The crisis of sexual abuse and the celibate/sexual agenda of the church. In T. G. Plante (Ed.), *Sin against the innocents* (pp. 61–72). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Smallbone, S., Marshall, W. L., & Wortley, R. (2008). *Preventing CSA: Evidence, policy and practice*. Cullompton, England: Willan.
- Smith, M. L., Rengifo, A. F., & Vollman, B. K. (2008). Trajectories of abuse and disclosure: CSA by Catholic priests. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 35*(5), 570–582.
- Spröber, N., Schneider, T., Rassenhofer, M., Seitz, A., Liebhardt, H., König, L., et al. (2014). Child sexual abuse in religiously affiliated and secular institutions: A retrospective descriptive analysis of data provided by victims in a government-sponsored reappraisal program in Germany. *BMC Public Health, 14*, 282–293.
- Stoltenborgh, M., vanIjzendoorn, M. H., Euser, E. M., & Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J. (2011). A global perspective on CSA: Meta-analysis of prevalence around the world. *Child Maltreatment, 16*(2), 79–101.
- Terry, K. J. (2008). Stained glass: The nature and scope of CSA in the Catholic Church. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 35*(5), 549–569.
- Terry, K. J., & Ackerman, A. (2008). CSA in the Catholic Church: How situational crime prevention strategies can help create safe environments. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 35*(5), 643–657.
- Terry, K. J., & Tallon, J. (2004). *CSA: A review of the literature*. Retrieved from <http://www.ccoso.org/library%20articles/litreview.pdf>
- Ward, T., Polaschek, D. L. L., & Beech, A. R. (2006). *Theories of sexual offending*. Chichester, England: Wiley.
- Ward, T., & Siegert, R. J. (2002). Toward a comprehensive theory of child sexual abuse: A theory knitting perspective. *Psychology, 12*, 319–351.
- Westpfahl, Spilker, Wastl Rechtsanwälte. (2010). *Sexuelle Übergriffe durch Priester, Diakone und sonstige pastorale Mitarbeiter im Verantwortungsbereich der Erzdiözese München und Freising in der Zeit von*

- 1945–2009 [Sexual and other physical assaults by priests, deacons and other pastoral staff within the area of authority of the archdiocese of Munich and Freising in the time frame 1945–2009]. Retrieved from <http://www.erzbistum-muenchen.de/media/media14418720.pdf>
- White, M. D., & Terry, K. J. (2008). Child sexual abuse in the Catholic church: Revisiting the Rotten Apples Explanation. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35(5), 658–678.
- World Health Organization. (1992). *International statistical classification of diseases and related health problems ICD-10* (10th ed., text revision). Geneva, Switzerland: Author.
- Zollner, H. (2013). *Church and the abuse of minors*. Anand/Gujarat, India: Gujarat Sahitya Prakash.

AUTHOR NOTES

Bettina Böhm, MSc, forensic psychology, is a research staff member at the Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Psychotherapy at the University Hospital of Ulm. She currently works in the development and evaluation of an e-learning program on the prevention of child sexual abuse while completing her PhD at Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich.

Hans Zollner, SJ, is the dean of the Institute of Psychology at the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome as well as a member of the Pontifical Commission for the Protection of Minors of the Holy See. His research focuses on child protection and sexual abuse prevention, the psychology of priesthood and the psychology of religion and spirituality. He is the chair of the steering committee of the Centre for Child Protection and oversees the implementation of an e-learning program on the prevention of child sexual abuse in a worldwide context.

Jörg M. Fegert is the medical director of the Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Psychotherapy at the University Hospital of Ulm and the chair of child and adolescent psychiatry and psychotherapy at the University of Ulm. As president and member of the steering committees and advisory bodies of various professional associations, he has conducted extensive research in the area of child protection. He has also been asked to provide expertise for the German Federal Ministry of Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth.

Hubert Liebhardt was the head of the research group “Family, Time Policy and E-Learning” at the Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Psychotherapy at the University Hospital of Ulm and the director of the Centre for Child Protection. He has conducted research and developed various education and training programs in the area of child protection and has been teaching students on medical psychology and sociology as well as professional ethics. He currently works as a police counselor.