

## SAFEGUARDING HISTORICAL REVIEW: PRELIMINARY INFORMATION on RESPONSES With a FOCUS on the PERIOD: 1943-2005.

**Ben Torsney**

First some comments on responses

There are 379 allegations. Two main features are:

- a) A large majority specify not one year, but an interval of years, in respect of their allegation; so a 'FirstYear' and a 'LastYear' This yields interval or censored data.
- b) A large majority specify more than one type of allegation.

Further points are:

- 1) 257 cite one group from a specific locality.
- 2) 27 have at least one of 'FirstYear' or 'LastYear' missing.
- 3) Some specify a 'LastYear' which is before before 1943.
- 4) Some specify, a 'FirstYear' before 1943, but a 'LastYear' of 1943 or after.
- 5) The largest value of the difference ('LastYear' - 'FirstYear') is 31 years

**There now follows 4 sections.**

### (A) Some summary BACKGROUND data

#### Years 1950-2005

Row	Variable	Count	Missing	Minimum	Mean	Maximum
1	Number of Priests: Scotland	56	0	791	1099	1309
2	Students: Major Seminaries	56	0	24	125	184
3	Parishes	56	0	333	442	506
4	Baptisms	56	0	7510	16312	26015
5	Marriages	56	1	2045	5571	8107
6	Estimated Catholic Popn	56	1	652015	778303	828300

#### Years 1943-2005

Row	Variable	Count	Missing	Minimum	Mean	Maximum
1	PriestsSeculars	63	1	647	863.56	1034
2	PriestsRegulars	63	1	25	217.27	288
3	Total	63	1	791	1080.84	1309
4	ReligHousesMen	63	1	0	50.87	61
5	ReligHousesWomen	63	1	0	126.87	171

#### Years 1975-2005

Row	Variable	Count	Missing	Minimum	Mean	Maximum
1	Brothers	29	0	61	100.17	156
2	Sisters	29	0	573	951.03	1302

**(B) Some summary BACKGROUND data of HISTORICAL REVIEW RESPONSES****Tally for Diocese/ReligCongregation**

i)Diocese/ReligCon	Count	
Archdiocese of Glasgow	16	
Archdiocese of St Andrews & Edinburgh	20	
Christian Brothers	13	
Congregation of the Holy Spirit (Spiritans)	2	
Congregation of the Passion	3	
Diocese of Argyll & The Isles	4	
Diocese of Dunkeld	2	
Diocese of Galloway	5	
Diocese of Motherwell	10	
Diocese of Paisley	3	
Marist Brothers FMS	34	
Motherwell Daughters of Charity	257	*****
Order of Preacher (Dominican Friars)	1	
Sisters of Nazareth	6	
Society of Jesus	3	
N=	379	

**No entries for Aberdeen diocese**

**Tally for 1)AgainstWhom****Code**

1	=	DiocPriest
1?	=	DiocPriest possibly
3,9	=	ChurchVolunteer or ReligSister
6	=	PermDeacon
7	=	ReligPriest
8	=	religBrother
9	=	ReligSister

1)AgainstWhom	Count
1	59
1?	5
3,9	1
6	1
7	9
8	47
9	257
N=	379

As mentioned above many allegations cite a set of categories of abuse.

Here are the frequency counts

Code: **1 = Sexual, 2 = Physical, 3 = Verbal, 4 = Emotional, 5 = Neglect, 0 = Other.**

### Tally for Discrete Variables: 2)AllegationType

AllegationType	Count
0	1
1	86
1,2	7
1,2,0	1
1,2,3,4	2
1,2,4	9
1,2,4,5	2
1,4 2?	1
2	13
2,3,4	21
2,3,4,5	5
2,3,4,6	1
2,4	182
2,4,0	1
2,4,5	18
2,4,5,6	4
2,4,6	5
2,5	1
3	1
4	4
4,6	1
6	7
7	5
8	1
N=	379

### (C) Investigations into Allegation Types by Accused Type

As noted above many respondents cite a set of categories of abuse (Citing a set of categories is also a feature of responses to Q9b) 'Outcome'.)

Note that it's possible that citing sets could in part be explained by several incidents of abuse over the period of years specified by a respondent. In contrast, only one respondent cites more than one category of type of abuser.

Physical and Sexual occur most commonly and Emotional mainly with one or other of these. Based on this feature, I've explored various groupings below. Results comprise some two-way tables giving a breakdown of number of allegations by 'set of 'type of allegation'/'alleged abuser'.

Sets of allegation types considered include: 'Physical at Least'; 'Sexual at least'; also 'Physical and/or Emotional at Least' and 'Sexual and/or Emotional at Least'.

The interpretation of the row labels is:

```

0  Other
1  DiocPriest
2  ChurchEmployee
3  ChurchVolunteer
4  Parishoner
5  Seminarian
6  PermDeacon
7  ReligPriest
8  ReligBrother
9  ReligSister
10 Religious

```

So in respect of tables below:

```

1    = DiocPriest
1?   = DiocPriest possibly
3,9  = ChurchVolunteer or ReligSister
6    = PermDeacon
7    = ReligPriest
8    = religBrother
9    = ReligSister

```

Rows: 1)AgainstWhom Columns: SexualOrNot

	NS	S&S+	All	(NS=NotSexual, S&S+=SexualOnlyOrIncludesSexual)
1	4	55	59	
1?	3	2	5	
3,9	1	0	1	
6	0	1	1	
7	0	9	9	
8	13	30	43	
9	244	11	255	
All	265	108	373	

Cell Contents: Count

**So in the main, out of 108 allegations of sexual abuse at least, 55 against diocesan priests, 9 against Relig priests, 30 against Relig Brothers, 11 against Relig sisters**

Rows: 1)AgainstWhom Columns: Sex&EmotAllOrNot

	NSE	SE&SE+	All	(NSE=NotSexual/Emot, SE&SE+=Sexual&OrEmotOnlyOr IncludesAtLeastOneOfThese,
1	4	55	59	
1?	1	4	5	
3,9	0	1	1	
6	0	1	1	
7	0	9	9	
8	13	30	43	
9	5	250	255	
All	23	350	372	

**So of 350 allegations of at least Sexual &/or Emotional abuse, 4 and possibly 3 more v priests, 30 v relig brothers and 250 were made v relig sisters.**

Rows: 1)AgainstWhom Columns: PhysicalOrNot

	NP -2	P&P+ 2	All All	(NP=NotPhysical, P&P+=PhysicalOnlyOrIncludesPhysical
1	54	4	58	
1?	2	3	5	
3,9	0	1	1	
6	1	0	1	
7	9	0	9	
8	28	15	43	
9	6	249	255	
All	100	272	372	

Cell Contents: Count

**So of 272 allegations of at least Physical abuse , , 4 and possibly 3 more v priests, 15 v relig brothers and 249 were made v relig sisters.**

Rows: 1)AgainstWhom Columns: Physical&EmotAllOrNot

	NPE	PE&PE+	All	(NPE=NotPhysical/Emot, PE&PE+=Physical&OrEmotOnlyOr IncludesAtLeastOneOfThese,
1	54	4	58	
1?	2	3	5	
3,9	0	1	1	
6	1	0	1	
7	9	0	9	
8	28	15	43	
9	1	254	255	
All	95	277	372	

**So of 277 allegations of at least Physical &/or Emotional abuse, 4 and possibly 3 more v priests, 15 v relig brothers and 254 were made v relig sisters.**

**(D) Time Related Investigations – based on a Worse Case Scenario**

As a starting point I calculated a **maximum** number of allegations for each year cited, from which (worse case scenario) measures such as rates/percentages rates can be calculated. This is one attempt to deal with the interval ('FirstYear','LastYear') feature of the data.

(Such data, known as censored or interval censored data, arises in other contexts, particularly medical ones; e.g. time to death (survival times) or time to recurrence of a disease is often right censored; a drug trial can't wait until all subjects have died! There are a variety of methods for analysing such data, some basic, some more sophisticated.)

Note that one justification for this approach is that one completed historical review form, in a substantial (?) number of cases, is unlikely to be an allegation of just one incident, but rather of repeated incidents. So the counts for each of the years 1943 to 2005, in the table below, could conceivably be, in some cases, a possible minimum. For example in 1943 the count of 22 could point to at least 22 incidents in that year. This consideration should be kept in mind when considering all the plots which follow, including those of percentages.

Note: There are  
10 cases in which both YearFirst and YearLast are missing  
14 cases with only YearLast missing

```
MTB > prin c440 c441
```

**Data Display**

Row	Years	MaxAllegs1943-2005
18	1943	22
19	1944	23
20	1945	19
21	1946	13
22	1947	12
23	1948	11
24	1949	5
25	1950	85
26	1951	90
27	1952	120
28	1953	124
29	1954	121
30	1955	114
31	1956	117
32	1957	101
33	1958	75
34	1959	80
35	1960	93
36	1961	83
37	1962	67
38	1963	67
39	1964	69

**22 JAN 2018**

**8-10)**

40	1965	58
41	1966	41
42	1967	37
43	1968	40
44	1969	32
45	1970	32
46	1971	27
47	1972	25
48	1973	24
49	1974	24
50	1975	24
51	1976	21
52	1977	16
53	1978	18
54	1979	19
55	1980	16
56	1981	15
57	1982	14
58	1983	15
59	1984	11
60	1985	11
61	1986	11
62	1987	11
63	1988	12
64	1989	12
65	1990	5
66	1991	4
67	1992	4
68	1993	4
69	1994	4
70	1995	3
71	1996	6
72	1997	2
73	1998	4
74	1999	4
75	2000	1
76	2001	0
77	2002	1
78	2003	1
79	2004	3
80	2005	2











