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Thesis: Investigating the Dynamics of Bystander Behavior in Child Sexual Abuse Cases

Abstract

It is well known that child sexual abuse is a long standing problem in society. Much has been researched concerning the pedophile and other child molesters who choose to sexually exploit minors. Too often the victims of these crimes have been abused over a protracted period—sometimes years. Even more disturbing is the discovery that the abuse was noticed, even witnessed by others who choose not to intervene. Many people have looked the other way, denied what has occurred, or simply refused to become involved in stopping child molesters. This exploratory research examines what bystanders choose to do once they recognize that a minor may be in sexual jeopardy. Using a mixed methods approach involving survey research and case study analyses, this study measures the characteristics of bystanders, their attitudes toward social responsibility and their choices regarding intervention. Results were mixed finding support for some but not all hypotheses. Gender effects are prominent in likelihood to intervene. Factors that explain failure to intervene include denial, fear of retaliation, religiosity and others. Policy implications regarding Bystander or Good Samaritan laws are discussed.

Introduction

It is the dark underbelly of America and is going on inside some of the finest houses and behind more closed doors than will ever possibly be known. Child sexual abuse (CSA) is such a despicable and loathsome crimes that the very mention of it makes people become amazingly quiet. On some levels, one could argue it is a crime worse than murder. Many sexual abuse victims, for example, lose all interest in living, withdraw from reality through the use of drugs or alcohol abuse, and become like the zombies in the television show ‘The Walking Dead.’ They’re physically alive, but dead on the inside since much of their hope or faith in the goodness of mankind may have been stripped away completely. It is also extremely common for CSA victims to be so traumatized by their sexual assault that they will block the painful memory all together
and say nothing for decades, allowing their attacker to escape prosecution when the statute of limitations expires.

The Problem

But the problem this study examines is not why victims don’t report or why the abusers commit their crimes, but it is about why bystanders do not report or act in the event of a child sexual abuse case. This failure to report or act is a dramatic let-down is because, as statistics maintain, a witnessed child molestation represents a rare opportunity to protect a child and hold a sex offender accountable (Johanson, personal communication, 2012). These heinous acts are usually carried out in private settings such as a bedroom and are rarely witnessed (Pappas, 2011). A study in South Africa, for example, found that child sexual abuse cases were exposed by a witness only 18 percent of the time (Collings, 2005). Many times there are no injuries or physical evidence left behind if a child is digitally raped or the victim takes years to remember the traumatic event. To further ensure the police are not notified, many child sexual abusers will also go to great lengths to keep their victims silent by threatening to inflict physical violence, death, or both. Often the suspect will also threaten to kill someone the child loves such as his or her mother or a sibling. A child, sometimes five years-old or younger, may now be so afraid of an adult they once trusted, that they will avoid that person and possibly wet their pants when seeing them. These victims will, more often than not, keep their abuse secret because they’re afraid or ashamed. (Salasky, 2011; Lisa, Vanessa, and Suzanne, personal communication, 2012). The victims often blame themselves or because they may have enjoyed the sexual contact be embarrassed. Male victims of male offenders will be afraid that such contact will make others think they are gay. Two thirds of these victims will not reveal their abuse to anyone (London, et al, 2005) Needless to say, bystanders, as a result of their inaction, let individuals who could
potentially be sexual predators (defined as child molesters who rape scores of children and then look for more wherever and whenever) get away with committing horrific acts that haunt victims and their families for the rest of their lives. Many of these victims commit suicide.

As a result of this secrecy, many of these cases never go to court. If these child molestation cases ever went to court, it may just be a toddler’s word against that of a full-grown man. So due to a lack of evidence and a witness, along with the desire to have the victim avoid re-living the abuse, causing him or her even more psychological damage, the prosecutors and police will often not pursue these cases (Johanson, personal communication, Nov 2012). Effective almost immediately, after escaping prosecution, the sexual abuser is free to find more victims and possibly ruin more lives.

So for the criminal justice process to go into effect, it is often necessary that bystanders report the abuse to a child protective service, police or authorities who then conduct and investigation and, if necessary, follow through with the prosecution. But unfortunately, even with a witness, child sexual abuse is still rarely reported to authorities. According to a survey by Safe Horizon, a victim’s services organization, 78% of their sample of 511 adults said suspicion of child abuse was enough of a reason to contact the authorities. Yet, when individuals within their sample actually faced suspected child abuse only 19% of them contacted a child protection service, only 6% contacted some authority figures, and only 6% notified the police (2008).

Additionally disturbing are the potential numbers of individuals who know what child molesters are up to, yet chose to be unresponsive bystanders. Naturally, these statistics are difficult to find, but according to Johanson of his three hundred cases, he estimated that two thirds of them had bystanders or witnesses who were in a position to report or take action against a child molester, yet failed to do so. These bystanders were usually family members who knew
or should have known when something was wrong with their child and recognize when their child was uncomfortable being around a particular person. There are numerous reasons for a low conviction rate, but the unresponsive bystander often has something to do with it. Of Johanson’s 300 arrests for sexual abuse, only 20 resulted in conviction since it was often just the victim’s word against the suspect’s (Johanson, personal communications, Nov 2012).

The question being asked, therefore, is what exactly are the dynamics behind a bystander’s failure to notify the authorities, the police, or a child protective service of known or suspected child sexual abuse? This study also goes further by asking then again why, on the other hand, do some bystanders take action by calling the police, notifying a child protective service, and/or deciding to take matters into their own hands? Some of the basic reasons listed in relevant studies include the following:

- Denial.
- Unwillingness to get involved.
- Fear of retaliation.
- Self-doubt
- Inability to recognize signs of child sexual abuse
- Lack of knowledge about child abuse and neglect
- Lack of familiarity with state reporting laws.
- Choosing instead to effectively intervene independent of the formal system.
- Unwillingness to get involved.
- Fear a report will make matters worse
- Concern that making a report will negatively impact an existing relationship with the child or others.
The factors listed above are very basic. This study is different from others because it attempts to go deeper into the motivations behind bystander reporting or failure to report. It questions whether politically incorrect motivations such as various forms of social inequality may influence a bystander’s reporting and interventionist patterns.

There also appear to be very few studies on a phenomenon called the Bystander Effect when it is linked with child molestation cases. The Bystander Effect, a term coined by researchers Bibb Latane and John Darley, describes the inaction of a group of witnesses who expect someone else to take responsibility or do something when a crime is occurring in front of them (Latane and Darley, 1968). This phenomenon has been applied to other crimes such as the murder of Kitty Genovese in New York in 1964 and many campus rapes that are observed at parties, but no one intervenes (Banyard, 2011). This social phenomenon is rarely linked to child sex abuse because such a crime usually goes on behind closed doors. It was not until the Penn State scandal that this term was extended to child sexual abuse, although it is debatable whether that is an appropriate application of the concept (Pappas, 2011).

Through the use of content analysis in historical cases involving James Porter, John Geoghan, Jerry Sandusky, Meier Dascalowitz, and Richard Chad Randall, in addition to a survey designed to measure factors which may influence action, we examine what prompts bystander behavior. We consider whether this behavior is influenced by the race, social positions, religions, and perceptions of the bystanders, suspects or victims involved. Men or women in positions of power, for example, seem to be less frequently reported as suspects than those who are poor or
homeless (Salasky, 2011). The survey also tests Bibb Latane and John Darley’s Model of the Interventionist process, which is described in detail in the next section. The dependent variable to be measured is bystander response (reporting or taking action), and the independent variables are the numerous reasons individuals don’t report – e.g., lack of information, uncertainty, the bystander effect, fear of retaliation, ignorance/naïveté, religion, race, inability to recognize the signs of CSA, etc. The results of the survey is compared and contrasted with the historical cases in order to present a complete picture of the dynamics underlying bystander reporting of child sexual abuse cases.

**Literature Review**

**Studies on Child Sexual Abuse (CSA)**

**Definition**

With the topic of this paper investigating the dynamics of bystander behavior in child sexual abuse cases, we start by examining the nature of child sexual abuse. It is important to have a complete definition of child sexual abuse since it may mean different things to different people or organizations, so we’ll do this using both Sociologist David Finkelhor’s and the American Humane Association’s definitions of child sexual abuse (CSA). Finkelhor, who has conducted numerous studies and authored multiple books on child sexual abuse during the last thirty years, includes in his definition of CSA the entire spectrum of sexual crimes and offenses in which children up to age seventeen are victims. But he also includes non-contact offenses like exhibitionism, portraying children in pornography, sexual fondling, and penetrative acts. He includes offenders who are adults as well as those offenders who are children (Finkelhor, 2009). The American Humane Association (AHA) adds specifically the touching offense of making a
child touch an adult’s sexual organs, and non-touching offenses such as deliberately exposing a child to the act of sexual intercourse and masturbating in front of a child. The AHA also considers child sexual abuse to include sexual exploitation, which include engaging a child or soliciting a child for the purposes of prostitution. They also make the point that in most states, the legal definition of child molestation is an act of a person—adult or child—who forces, coerces or threatens a child to have any form of sexual contact or to engage in any type of sexual activity at the perpetrator’s direction (American Humane Association, 2013).

**Scope**

Appreciating the scope of the child sexual abuse is problematic as the reported numbers vary. Recent studies and organizations have shown that the number of reported child sexual abuse cases being reported are going down (Finkelhor, 2009; Stop It Now. Org; Darkness to Light.org). But there remain multiple studies that suggest the numbers being as high as 1 in 3 girls or 1 in 7 boys who will be abused by their 18th birthday (Stopitnow!.Org;).

Finkelhor, however, questions these numbers and claims they do get tossed around too easily. His 1994 study, *Children as Victims of Violence*, is a telephone survey of 2000 children between the ages of 10 and 16, which has a number of important findings. His study revealed that of that sample 3.2 percent of girls and 0.6% of boys were sexual abuse victims. Sexual Abuse was more common among older kids with 9% of the 16 years old females reporting sexual assaults in 1994. As far as race was concerned, Finkelhor found that sexual abuse was more prevalent among black children and those who lived in the Mountain and Pacific Regions of the United States. Finkelhor also revealed that boys were more likely than girls to have violence done to their genitals, often by older peers but also by adult sexual offenders. Finkelhor believed these numbers to be much higher than had previously been reported prior to 1994.
However, he cautions that these numbers may not reflect the changing population and may be obsolete. He also believes that official crime statistics are largely irrelevant because only six percent of all these crimes are actually reported to the police (Finkelhor, 1994).

Other studies have also shown that crime statistics are deceiving since child sexual abuse is rarely reported to the authorities (Safe Horizon, 2008; Finkelhor, 1994). Department of Justice (DOJ) statistics based on the National Incident Based Reporting system (NIBRS) are still useful as they paint a disturbing picture of the scope of child sexual abuse. According to Howard Snyder, a US Justice Department researcher, children make up the majority of victims in sexual abuse crimes reported to police. Snyder’s study (2000) revealed that from 1991 to 1996, twelve states had 197,000 reported victims of sexual assault the vast majority (approximately two-thirds) of them were children. Of all the children, 33% of the victims were ages 12-17 and 34% of them were under the age of 12. And Snyder added: “Most disturbing is that one of every seven victims of sexual assault (or 14% of all victims) reported to law enforcement agencies were under age 6” (Snyder, 2000). Tom Johanson, a detective who has served in the sexual assault unit for over a decade in a major Massachusetts police department, informed me in an interview that the reason for these findings is that children make the perfect victims. They are unable to defend themselves, have difficulty standing up under cross examination, and the experienced adult sex offenders are well aware of this (Johanson, personal communication, 2012). A study by Kamala London, et al, added to this bleak picture by finding that 60-70% of all adults do not recall reporting that they were sexually abused as children. In other words, nearly two thirds of children may never report their abuse to anyone. For many of them, the survey study was the first time they mentioned the abuse to anyone. Moreover, only 10-18% of them reported their sexual abuse to the police (London, et al, 2005). As far as people concern
about false reports of child sexual abuse, approximately 4 to 8% of child sexual abuse reports are false. These usually occur during custody disputes, so all reports should be investigated thoroughly.

**The Sex Offenders**

Who are these individuals who would sexually abuse children? In the past, children were taught about “stranger danger” or to be afraid of the perverted old guy with the rain coat on with a bag of candy (Lanning, 2010; StopitNow!.org). However, studies show that as high as 93 percent of the time the child knows the suspect (Studies now show that approximately fourteen percent of child sexual abuse cases involve a person the child does not know. A family member is the perpetrator a little over 25 percent of all child sexual abuse cases, and almost 60 percent involve someone else from within the victim’s social circle (Finkelhor, 2009; Snyder, 2000). This last type of molester, Kenneth Lanning of the FBI pointed refers to as the ‘acquaintance molester.’ He describes the problem of acquaintance molesters as the following:

People seem more willing to accept a sinister, unknown individual or “stranger” from a different location or father/stepfather from a different socioeconomic background as a child molester than a clergy member, next-door neighbor, law-enforcement officer, pediatrician, teacher, coach, or volunteer. Acquaintance molesters often gain access to children through youth-serving organizations. The acquaintance molester, by definition, is one of us. He is not simply an anonymous, external threat. He cannot be identified by physical description and, often, not even by “bad” character traits. (Lanning, 2010, p. 24)

Tom Johanson added that the acquaintance molester is often the mother’s boyfriend or the male babysitter because men, for the most part, don’t offer to bathe your kids or take care of
your children, so you can go out on a Saturday night. Something like that should set off alarm bells, according to Johanson. As a result, the investigation of acquaintance molesters is difficult because children are often groomed and seduced by these individuals, and even taught since they were toddlers that such behavior is okay (Johanson, personal communication, 2012). Abuse by family members appears to be reported even less.

Moreover, one third of the offenders are usually older children. This abuse may not necessarily be the beginning of pedophilia, but the actions of children who are going through adolescence (Finkelhor, 2009). However, one study found that suggests one in two sex offenders began sexually abusive behavior when they were juveniles (Righthand and Welch, 2001). In general, there are two types of offenders and these are situational and preferential child molesters. Situational child molesters are individuals who don’t necessarily have a sexual attraction towards children. They may be the adolescents mentioned above or they may be adults who are under duress, perhaps unable to relate to other adults, and have easy access to children. This may be the Catholic priest who is having difficulty remaining celibate and altar boys are in close proximity. Preferential child molesters are individuals who are sexually attracted to children (Lanning, 2010). These individuals may be diagnosed as pedophiles, which the diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders defines as “intense sexually arousing fantasies, urges, or behaviors involving sexual activity with a prepubescent child (typically age 13 or younger). To be considered for this diagnosis, the individual must be at least 16 years old and at least 5 years older than the child” (Lanning, 2010; Hefner, 2014).

Studies on Bystanders regarding Crime

The most famous and perhaps earliest study on bystander behavior regarding crime was by Bibb Latane and John Darley who, like many people, took great interest in the story of
Catherine “Kitty” Genovese. Ms. Genovese, to the horror of many, was brutally murdered in New York in 1964. While murders are common, the reactions of bystanders were not well known. In this case, the New York Post reported 38 people had either observed what happened or heard Ms. Genovese’s screams, yet no one bothered to help her. No one called the police until she was already dead. The suspect had apparently stabbed her and fled the area, but then came back to finish her off when he saw she was still alive and no one was doing anything. Latane and Darley termed this inaction of the bystanders as “the Bystander Effect,” which they hypothesized occurred because the individuals who observed the crime occurring in front of them all expected someone else to do something. This inaction resulted from what they termed the ‘Diffusion of Responsibility’ (1970). Latane and Darley theorized that more decisive intervention would have taken place if there was only a single bystander who would have sole responsibility for reacting to what was happening. This individual would also have less social pressure or fear of being wrong in front of others.

A host of other studies in the 1970s supported Latane and Darley’s findings, particularly when it came to non-violent helping situations, but David Fischer, et al, however, argued that Latane and Darley’s theory did not necessarily apply to violent crimes where a bystander understood clearly that the situation was an emergency and the costs of not helping exceeded the cost of helping. They found that more often than not, bystanders were less likely to intervene in ambiguous situations, but when the event was clear cut emergency bystanders would put themselves in harm’s way (2006). Levine et al (2002) conducted two experiments, which showed bystanders more likely to intervene when the victims were similar to themselves or “in-group” rather than “out-group.” Another study by Jasmine Fledderjohann and David Johnson found the community or demographic characteristics played a role in helping behavior. They
found that women and sentinels (police, teachers, doctors, mandatory reporters etc.) were more likely to report observed cases of child neglect or mal-treatment (2012). Researcher Sara Nicksa’s study also found that females are willing to report sexual assault more than males (2014). Additionally, Melanie Carlson within her study on masculinity and the bystander effect noted that bystander research has consistently found that, as Latane and Darley claimed (1970), men are more apt to directly intervene physically while women are likely to call 911 (2008).

Of course, areas where the bystander effect has been identified as occurring more regularly are the sexual assaults on college campuses. Victoria Banyard and a number of other researchers have been working on instituting training on bystander intervention in these cases where, for example, a number of males will observe a sexual assault of a drunk female and do nothing to prevent it (2008).

Christy and Voight (1994) also conducted a study on Bystander Responses to Public Episodes of Child Abuse. They distributed surveys to 567 college students and faculty to a diverse group of academic programs and courses of study. They got 269 responses from individuals who had witnessed a child being abused, or possibly being abused in public and could remember the details of the incident. They found that bystanders who intervened were ones who felt personally responsible and that how parents treat their children “is my business.” They also found that situational characteristics bystanders intervened within were less ambiguous. Victims who the bystanders helped were often ones who the bystander knew, had some connection with, or whom the bystander perceived was similar to in attitude or belief. Their study also found that African-American children were the least likely to receive help from their mostly white sample.
There have been studies done on how to implement bystander training into the general public. One such program being implemented is called the Green Dot Strategy, which attempts to teach students how to become proactive and reactive bystanders. This program is based out of the University of Kentucky in Lexington, Kentucky and is being promoted also by the Center of Disease Control as a way to prevent violence before it starts (Center of Disease Control, 2014).

**Studies on Bystander Behavior in Child Sexual Abuse Cases**

There appear, however, to be very few studies on bystander behavior with child sexual abuse cases. The reasons are fairly obvious. Child Sexual Abuse usually involves just the perpetrator and the victim, so it is rare when the two of them are normally caught in the act. A content analysis of social work and medical files in South Africa by Steven Collings revealed eyewitnesses only report child sexual abuse 18% of the time (2005).

A study by Safe Horizon revealed that many people did not identify child sexual abuse as a form of abuse, but even when they did observe a victim they did not know the signs and symptoms. Safe Horizon also added that 97% of their respondents said they were concerned about child abuse, but 33% said that even when they suspected child abuse they did not report because they did not want to get involved. Moreover, only six percent of these cases were actually reported to the police (2008).

Yet, the number of cases where a bystander could have reported child sexual abuse is a mystery. Except for an interview with a detective in a sexual assault unit, there was no listing of these statistics. But these numbers could be very high. Tom Johanson, a police detective from a major Massachusetts police department, has investigated approximately 300 cases and helped prosecute James Porter and John Geoghan. He informed me in an interview that in
approximately two thirds of those cases there were individuals who knew what was going on, yet never reported the abuse to a child protective service or the police. The numbers of bystanders in these cases are difficult to determine, and he stated it is extremely rare when bystanders get held accountable (Johanson, personal communication, 2012). Moreover, even when bystanders did get noticed by law enforcement, not until after 2002 that new laws targeted bystanders for reckless child endangerment and other criminal penalties. These laws were enacted after the public realized the full magnitude of the Catholic Church scandal with its cover-ups (Reilly, 2003). Still to this day, it is rare when a bystander does get charged since there is usually a lack of evidence, and law enforcement has its hands full with the already very difficult task of prosecuting the perpetrators, never mind the bystanders.

One study by Cees Hoefnagels and Machteld Zwikker (2001), however, was unique because it examined bystander behavior in domestic violence situations through recorded phone calls from witnesses and parents about physically, emotionally, and neglected and sexually abused children. Their sample size was enormous; totaling 4117 recorded phone calls from incidents that had occurred five years prior to the study. This hotline for child abuse reporting had since been discontinued. This study was allowed in the Netherlands. It is uncertain whether similar research would be permitted in the United States without a subpoena, as communication providers do not routinely release such information about their customers.

The number of bystanders in Hoefnagel’s and Zwikker’s sample was 696. 76.7% were female and 23.1% were male. 51.3% were under 30 years old and 73.4% were under 40. A large proportion of the callers (38.8%) were under 20, and one in seven were the same age as the abused child. In 94.7% of the cases the bystander knew the victim personally; the majority of these bystanders were neighbors (30.4%). Parents were the next largest reporter at 16.7%, and
10.1% of the bystander had been married to the perpetrator. In four out of five cases, (82.1%, n=508) the offenders were allegedly the victim’s biological parents. The victims were fifty percent female. While female bystanders called more frequently about girls, the male bystanders called more frequently about boys. Female bystanders were almost 50% more certain of the abuse than male bystanders, which may reflect their being closer to the children when the abuse occurred. Also, in roughly six of ten cases the bystander was certain the case was physical abuse. The other 33.8% were not so sure.

There is also the Freeh report, which provided in-depth analysis on the Penn State scandal. It charges Joe Paterno, former University President Graham Spanier, former senior vice president of business and finance Gary C. Schultz and former athletic director Timothy Curley with acting as more than just bystanders, but as conspirators to cover-up and allow a sexual predator by the name of Jerry Sandusky to molest children for about a decade, if not longer, just so they can protect their institution. The Freeh report is in dispute, however. Wick Sollers and his associates at King Spalding Law firm maintain that the Special Investigative Council led by Louis Freeh rushed to judgment in maintaining that Joe Paterno covered up Sandusky’s crimes (Sollers, 2013). Graham Spanier has also filed a defamation character lawsuit against Freeh, but the results of these critiques and lawsuits have yet to be determined.

A study by Karen Terry on the Catholic Church examined the behavior of the Catholic Church and its sexual abuse scandal from 1950-2010. She and her staff provided a very large macro-study of how abusive priests committed their crimes and of how diocesan leadership pressured families of victims to stay quiet and not leak allegations of priest sexually abusing minors to the general public (2011).

What do they overlook?
These studies are all very good, but they appear to overlook the deeper areas of motivation behind bystander intervention. Such things as personal characteristics and beliefs including gender, race, politics, religion and naiveté among others seem to drive both bystander intervention and non-intervention in child sexual abuse cases. While many of these studies have examined child physical abuse cases that have occurred in public, they tend to overlook child sexual abuse cases in general because it is rare when people see such cases in public. Freeh’s report, which rightly deals with facts instead of speculation, seems to overlook the possibility that Mike McQueary may have been involved in helping to cover-up the Sandusky crimes. Terry’s study (2011) is comprehensive, but being a macro-study it doesn’t go after specific individuals like Geoghan and Porter and certainly not the specific bystanders who could have stopped them within the Catholic Church. It also doesn’t go far enough into potential cover-ups of sexual abuse within the church.

This study is unique because, unlike other studies that use only one measurement, this one attempts to measure when bystanders will most likely intervene through survey data and also an exploration of case studies using the content method to find moments when bystanders have actually intervened or failed to intervene. This study will also fill a void simply because there just don’t seem to be enough studies on bystander behavior in child sexual abuse cases. There are plenty of studies on sex offenders, which explain why they commit their crimes, and also studies on victims, which explain why they remain silent or what their symptoms are. These studies are valuable, but there is that third party, that ‘invisible’ bystander who knows or should have known what happened to his or her child, the children across the street, or the ones in the daycare or at the church. This person remains anonymous more often than not, and his or her numbers and crimes are virtually uncounted. While there are plenty of statistics that will tell you
how often a child is sexually abused, there are hardly any that will tell you how many people looked the other way when it happened. To this day, most bystanders still do not get prosecuted or just receive a slap on the wrist because of their inaction when they know they should do something to stop the abuse. What will make this study also unique is that it will provide a comprehensive examination of the multitude of reasons why some bystanders will protect children while other bystanders in the form of regular people but also institutions including Penn State, the Catholic Church, and the Orthodox Jewish community in Brooklyn, New York could possibly do the unthinkable and allow children to be sexually abused. This study will name names and detail some of methods these individuals used to cover-up their crimes. But this paper will also do just the opposite as well: show how some bystanders dared to make a difference and stop child sexual abusers.

D. Methodology

A Mixed Methods Approach – Survey Research and Content Analysis of Case Studies

This study was conducted using a mixed methods approach to investigate bystander behavior during child sexual abuse cases. It employs a survey to measure how bystanders perceived their level of social responsibility and their perceived responsibility to act or report in potential child sexual abuse cases. First we will discuss how the survey data was measured.

The survey data was analyzed with the Chi Square ($X^2$) application of the SPSS 19 data analysis program. Fox et al describes the Chi Square measurement as a “non-parametric test of significance where expected frequencies of variables are compared against observed frequencies” (1999). They further maintain that non-parametric is a “statistical procedure that makes no assumptions about the character being studied is distributed in the population and
requires only ordinal or nominal data” (Ibid, 1999). The variables from the survey are entered into the SPSS as “nominal data, which is placed into categories and their frequency of occurrence is counted. The expected frequencies are the cell frequencies under the terms of the null hypothesis, which states there is no relationship between the variables and any observed difference is a chance occurrence resulting from sampling error. The observed frequency, on the other hand, is the result [or statistical relationship] actually observed during the study. The observed frequency is reflected in the research hypothesis, [which is the polar opposite of the null hypothesis]. The research hypothesis considers the observed differences of samples as reflecting a true population difference, or one that is statistically significant, not a sampling error as the null hypothesis maintains” (Fox, et al, 1999).

SPSS performed all of the calculations and provided the obtained value, which was determined from its analysis. In the SPSS results, the obtained value can be found within the box entitled Chi Square tests. The number is listed within the value column, in the row just to the right of Pearson Chi Square label. To determine if the Chi Square value is significant, the researcher must check the number two columns to the right under the heading Asymp. Sig. (2-sided). If this number is less than .05 then it is statistically significant. If the number is greater than .05 then there is no statistically significant relationship (Mehta and Patel, 2010).

This obtained value can also be checked against the Chi Square ($X^2$) critical value, which is constant and can be found in the Chi Square distribution table at the intersection of the corresponding degree of freedom (df) and column with the $X^2 .050$ or .05 level of confidence. The reason for this .05 alpha level is this is the standard by which the researcher can report there is a 95% probability the results are statistically significant and not a chance occurrence. If the obtained value is less than the critical value, then the results are not statistically significant. But
if the obtained value is larger than the critical value, then the null hypothesis is rejected and the research hypothesis is accepted. However, should the researcher reject a null hypothesis, which is true, then a Type I error has occurred. The acceptance of a null hypothesis that is false, conversely, is a Type II error (Fox, et al, 1999). This researcher applied Chi Square in analyzing the data obtained from all parts of the survey including the demographics, the perceived responsibility, and all of thirteen of the survey scenarios.

This study also included a content analysis of actual cases, which contain elements similar to some of the scenarios included in the survey. The intent is to compare and contrast how survey participants acting in the role of the bystander perceive their level of social responsibility in the survey and how the actual bystanders responded in real criminal cases. I will discuss the survey data first and then move on to the content analysis portion, but first the survey instrument.

The Survey Instrument:

This study employed a 25 question survey to measure the respondent’s demographic data, the respondent’s level of perceived personal responsibility, and how the respondent would perceive their level of personal responsibility to act or report after reading scenarios of possible child sexual abuse cases. We tried to make some of the scenarios ambiguous to create some doubt in the respondents’ minds if there was an emergency or not. Other scenarios were more clear examples of definite child sexual abuse. These scenarios were loosely based on actual child sexual abuse cases. Some of these scenarios are within the case studies to follow, but some of the scenarios were based on other cases that were investigated, but not included within the case studies portion of this thesis due to lack of information. The intent of this is to also
compare and contrast how bystanders perceived their level or responsibility in the survey and how they actually responded in real cases.

The survey was also based on and designed to measure the accuracy of the work of Bibb Latane and John Darley who in their classic work on the Bystander Effect noted the five conditions under which bystanders were most likely to report a crime:

**A Model of the Intervention Process**

An intervener must make a series of decisions. First, he must notice the event and then interpret it as an emergency. Then he must decide if he has responsibility to act, and if so what form of assistance he should use. Should he help directly or call the police? Then he must decide how to act and implement his choice. (Latane and Darley, 1970)

This current survey measures the first two steps this process. The respondent must, however, read and interpret the scenario as a potential child sexual abuse situation which he/she may or may not have a responsibility to act or report. From there, we can cautiously interpret whether the respondent would or would not report or take action in a real life scenario. Below is an example of one of the scenarios:

**Scenario 5:**

Your son is in the Boy Scouts, and you have just read about numerous scout masters or personnel who have been accused of molesting young boys. To date there have been no arrests in these cases. Your son tells you that on the camping trip this past weekend that he saw one of the scout leaders sleeping in the same sleeping bag with one of the young boys. How do you feel about this situation?
Answers:

A) There is no danger. I have no responsibility to act.

B) I’m not sure of the child’s safety, therefore, I have no responsibility to act.

C) I don’t like the child’s situation – but I have no responsibility to act.

D) I may have some responsibility to act here.

E) I definitely have a responsibility to act or report this.

To break up the pattern of the questions, some scenarios ask the questions of how he/she (the respondent) judges the actions of the bystander. Below is example:

Scenario 10

A janitor at a major university was cleaning inside the men’s locker-room late on a Sunday night when he heard two people in the shower making moaning and grunting sounds. You observe the defensive coordinator of the football team, a man who has achieved an amazing record, giving oral sex to a young boy who appears to be no more than 12. At the time, this janitor made a little more than minimum wage and had children in school. He believed that if he did anything, he would probably lose his job because the football program and the school would close ranks to protect their interests. He spoke with his supervisor and other janitors about what he saw, and they all agreed that he would lose his job if he reported it. The football program was highly successful and, as a nationally ranked powerhouse, wielded tremendous influence on the community. As a result, the janitor never said anything. How do you feel about the janitor’s actions?
Answers:

A) Morally correct and above reproach

B) Morally questionable, yet understandable given he could lose his job. It is nothing that should be reported.

C) Morally reprehensible and something that should be reported regardless of the potential costs to the staff member.

Upon completion of each question, the respondents also had the option of explaining in one to two sentences why they made their choice. The objective of this optional section was to help us understand why they made their particular choice.

The target sample of the survey included teachers, daycare providers, library staff members, and a local YMCA staff because all of these people work closely with children. Child sexual abuse cases are rarely observed by an outsider, but if anyone outside of the victim’s family is going to be in a position to notice signs of child abuse, maltreatment, or neglect, it will probably be individuals in these types of occupational areas. I also distributed the survey to people who were taking the Darkness to Light (D2L) Stewardship of Children training at a church in a neighboring town. D2L is a national organization dedicated to educational campaigns and training sessions regarding child sexual abuse. Participants are often individuals who had either been sexually abused or were there to protect children from sexual abusers. This topic is complex and all of these individuals may have first-hand experience in either observing potential cases of child sexual abuse or they may possibly observe a case. The assumption is that individuals who hold positions of responsibility involving children, or individuals who were generally civically engaged would serve as a good indicators of awareness of child
endangerment and the responsibility of action. Any deficiency among socially aware adults would not bode well for adults less sensitive to this problem.

The convenience sample included individuals come from a variety of multicultural and/or religious backgrounds. These sample included large number of individuals who worked in Boston, Massachusetts and some of its outlying communities as well.

Problems

Upon taking the survey, some individuals skipped the very first page so some demographic data did not appear in the results. Additionally, some respondents either did not answer a question or made more than one choice. What minimized the damage was that they wrote why they made their choice in the optional section, and based on their answers I was able to choose the most logical answer for them. This only happened on two-three occasions so the impact of any wrong answer I may have chosen was minimal.

I wanted to make the results as accurate as possible I declined their offer. The survey was kept to adults (those over 18) and people who were non-police officers. There were two individuals who told me afterwards that they were special or auxiliary police officers. I kept their surveys within the group since child sexual abuse cases are rarely investigated by special or auxiliary police officers. These cases would normally be handled by an experienced full-time patrolman, a sergeant, or a detective unit.

The total surveys included in the analyses is 209.

The Selected Case Studies
The second part of this study is a content analysis of five different cases to analyze the dynamics of why bystanders did or did not intervene in actual child sexual abuse situations. These cases included Catholic Church priests James Porter and John Geoghan, Jerry Sandusky from Penn State University, Meier Dascalowitz from Brooklyn, New York and a registered level three sex offender named Richard Chad Randall of Utah. Through a process of elimination, I chose these cases in part because there was a great deal of information available on the Catholic Church scandal as well as on Penn State. Moreover, Porter and Geoghan were all very local cases and information on them was in abundance both online and at local courthouses. The Dascalowitz case was interesting because it was a look into the Orthodox Jewish culture, one in which the political and religious relationships are unique and quite different from the culture I have grown up in. The sexual abuse scandals involving the Jewish community may be as widespread and as controversial as the Catholic Church scandal, but it does not seem to get nearly the same media coverage. The Dascalowitz and Randall cases were also chosen because they involved courageous actions by bystanders, which unfortunately seems to be very rare.

For information on these individuals, I used a myriad of sources including newspaper articles, court documents such as grand jury indictments, an Attorney General’s report, as well as various studies, and personal interviews to find cases with documented bystander behavior. The objective was to identify the various bystander behaviors by those who observe, receive reports, or have strong suspicions that a child was sexually abused. I specifically wanted to see and understand why these bystanders intervened by acting or reporting, or did nothing, allowing a child to be molested.

Because this was a content analysis, or more specifically a conceptual analysis, I looked for the reasons or the dynamics, which described the bystander behavior and essentially let the
words of the documents speak for themselves. With the concept of my research question defined as ‘What are the dynamics underlying a bystander’s failing to report or successfully reporting child molesters?’ I looked for situations in which the following phrases or concepts were written explicitly, implied, or similar situations appeared. Applying the aforementioned reasons for bystander failure to report by the American Humane Association (2013), Kenneth Lanning of the FBI (2010), and Safe Horizon (2008), along with observations from this study’s content analysis, I developed a content analysis key below to identify the concepts, phrases, or terms relative to the dynamics underlying bystander reporting. In the key, the definition and source of the terms are provided.

Content Analysis Key

Cover-up: These phrases and terms when used in the context of a crime situation such a child sexual abuse case imply that individuals are trying to keep victims, witnesses, or bystanders from releasing their incriminating information to the general public, police, or child protective service. They may use such phrases (or something with a similar meaning) such as ‘Quiet down,’ ‘Keep it quiet,’ ‘silence,’ ‘Let’s keep it between us,’ Keep the matter to yourself, ‘don’t tell anyone,’ ‘don’t discuss this outside this room,’ etc. For example, one that appeared in some of the cases was the witness ‘never said anything about child sexual abuse’ when there was evidence he/she had (Deposition of Joanne Mueller, Leary vs Geoghan, in Podles, 2008; Krohn 2011; Freeh, 2012).

Denial: Kenneth Lanning, a research and special agent of the FBI described denial as the following: “Most people do not want to hear about it [child sexual abuse] and would prefer to pretend such victimization just does not occur” (2010). In other words, it is the sad reality that many people just don’t want to admit or believe that child molestation is or could be happening
within their own home or their city, town, or institution. In many cases, bystanders such as parents have blamed the victim for the crimes committed by someone who may be a sexual predator (Deposition of Maryetta Dussourd, Leary vs. Geoghan, in Podles, 2008). Denial is what many researchers believe is the number one reason why people will not even want to talk about what happened and certainly not report it (Lanning, 2002; Johanson, personal communication, November 14, 2012). For the content analysis key the following terms or phrases were looked for in the overall context of CSA allegations:

That’s impossible. No one would ever do that. A priest would not do that. He’s a nice man; He could never do such a thing. My son would never do that. He/she did not or could not believe their own son/daughter. He/she was treated as a trouble-maker. Are you crazy? What are you some kind of a pervert?

Naïveté or inexperience: Children in particular may seriously underestimate or have no idea how dangerous these individuals can be. They may also have been sexually abused since they were infants, so such behavior could be considered normal. Adults who have never dealt with child molesters could be considered a little naïve as well. They may not know the behavior patterns or characteristics of the different types of child molesters. These individuals may have no idea they have been ‘groomed’ or led to believe that a person close to them is very nice and very helpful when the reality is these ‘nice’ individuals are molesting their children. These could be the male baby-sitters or priests who are going out of their way to ‘help’ a single mother (Lanning, 2010; Johanson, 2012). Phrases which may indicate naïveté include: ‘He would never do that. He would never do a thing like that in public. He’s just like a big kid. He was probably just horsing around. We never thought it could happen to us’ (Leonard, 1986).
Religious: Individuals may be driven to perform certain acts because they feel these actions may secure them a place in heaven or some type of good after-life. But then again, it may be a religious belief, which caused them as a bystander to not take action or be in denial of what was actually happening because it went against everything they had been taught. Such phrases may include the following or something similar:

‘I pray to God that he never does this again’ ‘The Priest was God.’ ‘It was a sin to think that way.’

Inability to recognize the signs of Child Abuse: According to a survey in 2008 by Safe Horizon, a large number of people do not recognize the signs or behavioral patterns of sexually abused children. Such behaviors included but are not limited to: anger, sexual promiscuity or incredibly sexual behavior by a young child, drinking alcohol and/or taking drugs, not bathing, and poor school work performance from someone who was normally good student (American Humane Association 2013, Leonard, 1986).

We or I had no idea why he/she was acting like that. He/she did not believe their own son/daughter. He/she was treated as a trouble-maker.

The Bystander Effect: This is the social phenomenon identified by Bibb Latane and John Darley (1968), which occurs when a group of people witnesses a crime or an unsafe act, bystanders often don’t intervene if no one else is doing anything. Phrases may include or be similar to: ‘If nobody else did anything or reacted, then there probably was nothing wrong. Nobody else seems to care, so why should I? I figured someone else had to have reported it.’

Fear of Retaliation: ‘I could get fired by reporting. They will close ranks and fire all of us. The police will target us. The Church / institution is bigger than us. He/she will exact
revenge. Do you realize what they could do to us?’ (Deposition of Maryetta Dussourd in Podles, 2008; Freeh, 2012).

Some of these involved interpretation and analysis of what was written. For instance, fear of retaliation or the bystander effect may have been expressed by words and/or the subsequent actions or lack of action by the subject in question. It may be a witness dramatically changing his or her story without giving a good explanation, although it may be implied that they were threatened.

Hypotheses

As an exploratory study, I’ve taken the liberty to construct a number of research questions, followed by linked hypotheses. Although each represents a valid theory, some may be considered to be more critical than others. Nevertheless, each is a substantive question and presupposition as it relates to the understanding of bystander behavior.

**Research Question: Bystanders that demonstrate conventionality are more likely to perceive a personal social responsibility to intervene in child danger**

H1: There is a relationship between education and perceived responsibility.

H0: There is no relationship between education and perceived responsibility

### Employment Variable and Perceived Responsibility

H2: There is a relationship between employment status and perceived responsibility.

H0: There is no relationship between employment status and perceived responsibility.

### Religiosity Variable:
H3: There is a relationship between religiosity and perceived responsibility.

H0: There is no relationship between religiosity and perceived responsibility.

**Research Question: Do the attributes of suspects influence bystander behavior?**

H4: There is a relationship between powerful social status of the suspect and the perception of danger and willingness to act by the bystander. [Case scenario #1, #2, #3, #5, #7, #10]

H0: There is no relationship between powerful social status of the suspect and the perception of danger and willingness to act by the bystander. [Case scenarios #1, #2, #3, #5, #7, #10]

**Research Question: Do the attributes of the victim influence bystander behavior?**

H5: There is a relationship between the perceived disadvantaged social status of the victim and the perception of danger and willingness to act by the bystander. [Case scenarios #12, #9, #6]

H0: There is no relationship between the perceived disadvantaged social status of the victim and the perception of danger and willingness to act by the bystander. [Case scenarios #12, #9, #6]

**Research Question: Does age make a difference in perceived responsibility?**

H6: There is a relationship between age of the participant and perceived responsibility

H0: There is no relationship between age and levels of responsibility to report or take action

**Research Question: Does gender make a difference in bystander behavior?**

H7: There is a relationship between gender and feeling the responsibility to report or take action.

H0: There is no relationship between gender and feeling the responsibility to report or take action
Research Question: Does religion make a difference in bystander behavior?

H8: There is a relationship between religiosity and levels of reporting

H0: There is no relationship between religiosity and levels of reporting

Variables of Employment and levels of reporting

H9: There is a relationship between social statuses of the suspect, bystander and the perceived levels of responsibility to report.

H0: There is no relationship between social status of the suspect and the perception of danger and willingness to act by the bystander

Research Question: Does race of the bystander and suspect influence bystander behavior?

H10: There is a relationship between race and levels of responsibility to report or take action

H0: There is no relationship between race and levels of responsibility to report or take action.

The Case Studies

The five cases chosen for the case studies analyses were selected based on the following indicators of inclusion:

(1) The serious nature of the reported child sexual abuse suggests an increased likelihood of a third party suspecting that abuse may be occurring; (2) access to substantial material written about the case so that information could be cross-checked and; (3) sufficient reporting on bystander behavior involved in the case. Two exceptions were the cases of Meir Dascalowitz and Richard Chad Randall, which were selected
because they represented interventionist bystander behavior. The five cases include: James Porter and John Geoghan of the Catholic Church, Jerry Sandusky of Penn State, Meir Dascalowitz of Brooklyn, New York, and Richard Chad Randall of Sandy, Utah. We will discuss the background of the each of these individuals, followed by their crimes, and finally the bystanders who either intervened or failed to intervene and the reasons why.

**Case Study 1 - James Porter**

**Background**

James Porter was born on January 2, 1935, and was a native of Revere, Massachusetts. Growing up, Porter appeared to be a devout Catholic, always attending church, and desiring to be a priest. He was ordained in 1960 at Baltimore Seminary and was assigned to St. Mary’s Church in Attleboro, Massachusetts, where he appeared to be a promising young priest at 25 years of age. He was very charming, charismatic, highly into sports, and worked as a coach and mentor for hundreds of young people. Porter was admired very much.

"One of the reasons why I wanted to be an altar boy was so I could be close to Porter, says Fred Paine. "Up till then, St. Mary's had been an old-fogy kind of parish. He was the one person I looked up to more than anyone and wanted to emulate" (Matchan, “Town Secret,” Aug 29, 1993).

Appearances, however, were deceiving. James Porter was about to take Attleboro and other cities and towns by storm, altering people’s lives forever. One of his victims, of course, was to be Fred Paine (Ibid, August 29, 1993; Levitz, May 17, 2002).

**The Crimes**
The youth of St. Mary’s Church in North Attleboro found out nearly immediately about the dark side of James Porter. He was not just a child molester, but the numbers of his victims and his various search habits suggest a sexual predator as well. For decades, during and after his time at St. Mary’s, Porter constantly sought out new victims, male or female, he did not discriminate. It took over forty years, but at least 222 victims came forward to make complaints of sexual abuse by Porter (Associated Press in Newton, 2001).

This definition, according to Webster’s is a person who has committed a sexually violent offense and especially one who is likely to commit more sexual offenses (2014). As the numbers shown above and some of his physical attacks shown below suggest, Porter appears to define the term sexual predator like few others. Porter patrolled beaches, baseball games, parks or playgrounds anywhere children were present looking for victims. Being assigned to St. Mary’s, he conveniently targeted this church, since children went there after school, not to just get more Catholic education, but to also play sports and socialize. Most of the children became well aware of Porter’s sexual desires and called him ‘the Horn’ because he was always looking to grope or molest the students (Matchan & Kurkjian, Porter Personnel files, 1992). If one of the students saw Porter, he or she would sound the alarm and the other kids would turn their backs to the wall so they would not be groped (Hewitt, 1992). According to Michael Newton’s research, the attacks proceeded like this:

Within a week of his arrival in North Attleboro, Porter claimed his first victim in the person of Paul Merry, a fifth-grade student and prospective altar boy who lived next door to St. Mary’s. Luring Merry into his quarters with an offer of cake and soda, Porter then requested a massage, complaining that he was stiff from moving furniture. Moments later, he dropped his pants and placed Merry’s hand on his groin while fondling the boy’s
genitals - a ritual that continued at least once a week for the next three years. Porter’s first female victim at St. Mary’s was another fifth-grader, Patty Poirier. Again he asked for help - this time in preparing a basketball roster - then fondled the 10-year-old girl in his office, the first of countless groping attacks she endured in classrooms and hallways for years to come. (Newton, 2001)

Eventually, in accordance with the sexual predator definition, Porter’s attacks became bolder and more vicious, particularly when it was clear no one was reporting him. At one point he was caught by an eleven year-old girl raping a young boy. The little girl bravely tried to stop him, but instead Porter sodomized her as well. Porter allegedly told her he had the power of God (Newton, 2001).

After several complaints, Porter was removed from St. Mary's, only to be sent to Sacred Heart Church in Fall River for one year, and then after another complaint he was sent to St. James Church in New Bedford, Mass. Church officials such as Monsignor Humberto Medeiros and Bishop James L. Connelly were made very aware of each complaint of child sexual abuse. In March 1964, Medeiros apparently told Connelly he knew of thirty children Porter had molested or raped (Matchan and Kurkjian, 1992; Newton, 2001). Neither man reported him to the police, but Connelly did send him home to repent on one occasion. Porter was arrested for raping a non-Catholic boy, but the New Hampshire State Police obliged the Catholic Church and gave him a ride to the Massachusetts border rather than charge him (Newton, 2001). Porter was sent for treatment at various facilities (Hewitt, 1992). Later, in 1970, he was assigned to St. Philip's Catholic Church in Bemidji, Minnesota. But in 1971, Porter was dismissed from St. Philip's after new charge of sexual abuse arose. He then moved to nearby small town in Minnesota, and began work as a bank teller. That same year, he entered Parakeet treatment center in St. Louis and
decided to leave the priesthood. Eventually in 1974, Porter was officially terminated or defrocked as a priest by the Catholic Church, but he still had not been charged criminally. He moved to Maplewood, Minnesota where he continued to molest children.

In 1989, though one Porter victim named Frank Fitzpatrick was a private detective who had an incident where he suddenly remembered the time Porter had sexually abused him in 1960. Fitzpatrick, incensed, methodically tracked Porter down and legally taped recorded a confession. He appeared on WBZ and began an advertising campaign entitled “Remember James Porter?” This effort was very successful, as many 222 victims came forward and file claims of sexual abuse (Hewitt, 1992). Eventually, James Porter got convicted of molesting his children’s teenage babysitter in 1987, and, on October 4th, 1993, he pled guilty to molesting 28 children. On December 6, 1993, he was sentenced 18-20 years in prison. Porter finished his prison sentence in 2004, but was being held for a civil commitment hearing and died of cancer at New England Medical Center in Boston on February 11, 2005 (Associated Press, 2/11/2005).

Bystander Behavior

For over thirty years, James Porter was able to avoid criminal punishment because many bystanders never reported him to the police. The reasons were many, but they included naïveté, inexperience with child molesters, religion, denial, and, of course, cover-up. In Linda Matching’s article for the Boston Globe entitled “Town Secret,” she and the Globe Staff through numerous interviews captured social and cultural reasons why bystanders did not believe the victims and did not report James Porter to the police. One of the main reasons the phenomenon occurred appears to be a result of the society’s collective naïveté. This was reflected in their lack of knowledge about child molesters. Their reluctance to report Porter was also because of religious beliefs, which facilitated denial. Unlike today, reported sex abuse scandals were rare during the
1950s and 1960s. America was more conservative. Most people did not speak of sex, certainly not child molestations. Matchan described North Attleboro as the following:

“This was a small New England town before the days of Oprah, a more trusting and innocent period when words like "pedophile" and "sexual molestation" were not part of most vocabularies, when the actions of Catholic priests were not questioned, the judgment of their superior’s never second-guessed (Town Secret, 1993).

Supporting Matchan’s observation was the quote below:

[Pedophilia was] “a totally foreign concept,” said Rita Fitzpatrick, Frank Fitzpatrick’s mother. "The only thing we heard about was incest, and you thought that happened in some far, distant place, in some uneducated family" (Matchan, “Town Secret” 8/29/1993).

But another psychological reason an individual did not report priests like James Porter was because they were intensely religious during the era of the 1950s and 1960s; a time before the sexual revolution which challenged many of the conservative outlooks (Terry, 2011). At this time, as many of them truly believed in God and the innate goodness of the Catholic Church. In examining the quotes of individuals in the Porter case, again and again references to priests being God were mentioned. Examine the following paragraph found in the Boston Globe:

This, after all, was a priest, and "as Catholics we are brought up to think priests are God," says Janet Blythe, one of Frank Fitzpatrick's sisters. Many say they feared their parents would punish them if they dared speak against Porter at home. They had been taught that the hands of priests were sacred. How could they explain that Father Porter's hands had defiled them -- particularly in Catholic North Attleborough, which was so Victorian in its
sexual attitudes that "you couldn't say the word "pregnant?," according to Bob Van Ness. (Matchan, “Town Secret,” 1993)

"We were taught they were Christ's representatives on Earth, and that's a direct quote," Fred Paine remembers. "A priest would walk in, and nuns would bow to him." (Matchan, “Town Secret,” 1993)

In a culture like this, the notion a priest could have sexual designs on children was more than a concept which many could not fathom: It was anathema. "It was a sin even to have had the thought pass through your head," says Bea Gaboury, who sent her five children to St. Mary's School and has learned that her youngest son is among Porter's accusers (Matchan, “Town Secret,” 1993). Like Mrs. Gaboury, many may have believed they would go to hell for thinking Porter was molesting little children.

As a result of the strong religious beliefs within the town, naturally denial was a dynamic that caused many bystanders in the town not to report. Matchan’s article captured quote after quote of people in Attleboro who either would not believe Porter could do such a thing or perhaps did not report it because they felt no one would believe them. The quotes below say it all:

A North Attleborough mother who says she found Porter fondling her 12-year-old son in his bedroom while the priest was visiting never spoke of what she saw, because, "My husband said, 'Who would believe you? It's his word against yours.'" Another who remembers telling "10 or 20" other mothers that Porter had touched her son improperly said not one would believe her. (Matchan, Town Secret, 1993)
One mother who said her son, an altar boy, had confessed to her that Porter had been fondling him called a meeting of other mothers to alert them. But not one of them believed her, nor did her husband. "I told them he was touching boys where he shouldn't be," she said. "But it was all, 'He's a priest, and he couldn't do things like that,'" says the woman, who now lives out of state and asked not to be identified. "And then I saw the same ones I told on Prime Time Live on a July 1992 program featuring Porter's victims and their parents, and it just made me ill." (Ibid, 1993)

So not only were Porter’s attacks a severe shock, particularly to the young children who had never thought of having sex before, but Porter’s victims also had to grapple with the fact that others within the church were protecting their molester.

The Fall River Diocese as a Catholic institution behaved as a bystander. One reason for this was the Church simply did not understand how to deal with priests who were child molesters. Consider the following statement made by Catholic Church spokesman Reverend Kenneth Doyle in the wake of the investigation of the church covering up the crimes of James Porter:

"In the past, the church, along with the rest of society, tended to view the problem as society viewed alcoholism 30 or 40 years ago -- as a moral fault from which, if a person were repentant, he could recover." (Bass, May 13, 1992)

Science or knowledge about the true nature of child sexual abusers was truly lacking during the early part of the twentieth century - particularly regarding preferential child molesters. The church had been sending their troubled priests for treatment and some had received electro-shock therapy in which electric eels were used. Porter received this type of therapy on more than one
occasion and he informed one of his victims that it was completely ineffective (Matchan & Kurkjian, Porter Personnel Files, 1992; Newton, 2001).

According to a study by Karen Terry, et al for John Jay College, up until 1984-85 there were still many bishops and even medical personnel who felt the sexual urges of a pedophile was a personal fault that discipline and repentance could fix rather than a compulsion impossible to control (Terry, 2011). Nevertheless, people such as Margaret Gallant, who will be discussed in detail later, recognized that sexual abusers may not be able to be cured (Gallant, 1982; Gallant, 1984). Cardinals Medeiros received complaints for years that Porter and others had committed vast numbers of sexual assaults. They had sent Porter, Geoghan and others for treatment, received questionable medical advice, and then put them back into parishes, at times with even less supervision and just as much access to children (Medeiros, 1974; Medeiros, 1981; Law, 1984; Reilly, 2003). It appeared to Attorney General Tom Reilly that these officials were looking for any medical clearance, no matter how shaky it seemed, to be able to put these individuals back to work. What was really damaging in Reilly’s report was how these individuals never did anything to limit these priests’ access to children when they knew that nothing they had tried previously had stopped them from offending (Reilly, 2003). These church leaders intervened as bystanders, but their intervention was far from effective. Moreover, as the police and the district attorney began their investigations into sexual assault cases involving Porter and others priests, it became increasingly evident that numerous Catholic Church officials knew far more than they revealed to the police in interviews (Reilly, 2003).

Reverend Armando Annunziato also represents bystander behavior within the James Porter case. A girl by the name of Cheryl Porter (no relation) was a victim of Porter’s who saw the priest with his fly down in front of two boys. She complained first to Father Annunziato,
who promptly yelled at her, saying “What are you trying to do? Stir up trouble?” Annunziato then slammed the door in her face. Cheryl then complained to a nun who forced her to stand before the class and apologize for lying and trying to ruin Father Porter’s good name (Newton, 2001). It must have appeared to many victims that people just refused to accept the fact that Porter could commit these crimes. There is little mention about those same nuns being involved as bystanders, but Annunziato, however, seemed to know much more than he let on, at least to the media. The Boston Globe reported the following:

As Porter was allegedly molesting 11-year-old Peter Calderone in the rectory office of St. Mary's, Father Armando Annunziato knocked on the door and entered, pointedly telling Porter as the priest hastily zipped up his fly, "'It's getting late. It's time for everyone to go home.'" Calderone is one of at least 10 complainants who say they recall Annunziato interrupting molestations by knocking on doors and entering rooms where Porter was ensconced with youngsters, according to MacLeish, who is representing them (Matchan, “Anguished Cries,” 7/2/92)

After another report claimed a boy named John Robitaille saw Annunziatio walk in while he was being raped by Porter, Allison Bass of the Boston Globe reported that Annunziato had little to say on the matter:

Annunziato, a priest at St. Mary's Church in Mansfield, who was in North Attleborough in the early 1960s, said he had heard about the sexual abuse allegations but only "after the fact." He declined to say precisely when he learned of the alleged abuse. "I was only an associate at the time," Annunziato said in a brief telephone interview yesterday. "I feel very sorry for the people who have suffered. But I don't wish to comment any further."

How he was just “an associate at the time” when he was a priest who worked alongside Porter? This does not make much sense and does nothing to remove him from being a bystander. It is a clear attempt to distance himself from the perpetrator (Porter).

In another twist to the Annunziato drama was how Bishop Sean O’Malley promoted Annunziato to monsignor the scandal had broken out. In an article in The Anchor, the diocese's official newspaper, the bishop defended this decision by saying of the victims' testimony: "I believe that memory can play tricks on us." This statement of course infuriated many Porter victims. But, as Linda Matchan of the Globe reported that Bishop Sean O’Malley insists Annunziato is innocent. Annunziato “was the first one to blow the whistle on James Porter. He came immediately to the bishop.” (Town Secret, 1993)

The main question to be asked about the Annunziato situation is what kind of bystander was he? If the allegations are true, he was the ultimate bystander, having definitely observed these children get raped by James Porter and doing nothing to stop it. Why he did not do anything is a mystery. He could have been afraid of Porter and/or concerned with being considered untrustworthy by other priests if he notified the police. But then again, Annunziatio could have just been a pervert who was into pedophilic voyeurism. At best, he may have been a spy trying to collect information for Porter’s supervisor Bishop James L. Connelly. As O’Malley claimed, Annunziato reported to the Bishop that he knew of at least nine youths who Porter had molested (Matchan and Kurkjian, Porter Personnel Files, 1992). This may have been Annunziato’s attempt to remove Porter from the priesthood, which eventually it did, but not until ten years and at least one or two hundred victims later. At this point it is a fifty year-old mystery, and Annunziato, unfortunately, died of throat cancer in 1993, so we will never know.
So to conclude the Porter case, while he molested possibly as many as 222 victims, there were bystanders who knew or suspected what he was doing, yet did nothing. There were the many nameless people of North Attleboro who received reports from mothers and victims, yet these individuals, like Kenneth Lanning said, appeared to live in denial. How many knew what was happening to their children or others and did nothing will probably never be known. Because of their religious beliefs, the teachings that the priest was “Christ’s representatives on earth,” many of these victims suffered years of abuse because these individuals, such as the nuns who punished the poor girl for making the complaint about Porter many of whom remain nameless did would not believe it and certainly not call the police. Other bystanders of the kind were in positions of power included Monsignor Humberto, before he became Cardinal, and Bishop James L. Connelly, both of who knew about his abuses and could have ended Porter’s career years earlier, but chose to move him to different parishes and get him medical treatment, which we know today will not work. Then there were the bystanders like Armando Annunziato who apparently saw with his own eyes what Porter was doing to children, and he did nothing to stop it. Some of the major dynamics, and this list is far from complete, for bystander non-intervention appear to be denial, inexperience, religion, and perhaps a cover-up to protect a fellow priest or perhaps the Catholic Church.

Case Study #2 - John Geoghan

Background

John Geoghan was born on June 4, 1935 in Cambridge, Massachusetts. At age five, he lost his father, but took an interest in heaven since he was convinced his father was in heaven (Montana and Ruttenberg, 1989 in Podles, 2008). Geoghan began training for the priesthood and eventually was ordained as a Catholic Priest in 1962 at Cardinal O’Connell Seminary. That
same year, he began his first assignment at the Blessed Sacrament Church in Saugus, Massachusetts.

The Crimes

Shortly after Porter’s case was over and he was in prison, the Catholic Church scandal died down. However, in 2002 the scandal started up again with even more ferocity as more than 150 victims claimed Father Geoghan molested them over a 36 year time frame (Rezendes, Documents Show Church long supported Geoghan, 2002; Murphy, 2003). This pattern of molesting child after child began when Geoghan first arrived in Saugus. In his first week as a priest, Geoghan molested several children within the Sacco family (Podles, 2008). According to Andre Estes:

His modus operandi continued to be the same over 30 years: he sought out boys without fathers, or with absent fathers, and offered to be a father to them. He would take them out, get acquainted to them, put them to bed, masturbate them, and perform oral sex on them –usually boys, rarely girls (Boston Herald, Jan. 29, 1997; Podles, 2008).

Like Porter, Geoghan was probably worse than the average sexual offender. The numbers indicate he was most certainly a sexual predator having eventually molested approximately 150 boys and one girl. Geoghan appeared to be a preferential child molester who ‘groomed’ his victims and their families before taking advantage of the situation. In other words, he assisted single parent or poor families by ‘helping out’ when the mother had to work (Pfeiffer, 2002). Geoghan befriended these children by using his position of priest to get into their homes, or he used a child’s love of ice cream to his advantage. One of the altar boys named John Collins was not molested by Geoghan, but he remarked how Geoghan was his favorite priest who “was all
about fun, games, and treating kids to ice cream.” Geoghan, according to Collins, had “a trick Superman handshake” (Collins, 2003 in Podles, 2008). There also did not appear to be any violence, so Geoghan did not appear to be sadistic. But Geoghan was not above using threats to keep children quiet. He tried to keep numerous victims quiet by threatening to bar their family members from the Catholic Church (Podles, 2008).

For years, the Catholic Church allowed Geoghan to get away with this child sexual abuse, but there was a single case the church was unable to bury. John Geoghan was found guilty of indecent assault and battery for grabbing a young boy’s buttocks in a YMCA swimming pool in Waltham (Lombardi, 2002). Geoghan was sentenced to 8-9 years, but quickly filed an appeal. While he was at the maximum security Souza-Baranowski correctional institute in Shirley, Massachusetts, however, Geoghan stuck out because he befriended other sex offenders, talked openly of how he molested a lot of victims, and how he could beat the charges (Murphy, 2003; Podles, 2008). This arrogance would prove to be his undoing.

Another inmate named Joseph Druce was an angry individual. He had been sexually abused as a child and was serving a life sentence for killing a man who had groped him (Murphy, 2003). When Druce overheard Geoghan tell another inmate how he was sure he could beat the charges easily, he went into a rage. Almost immediately, Druce decided to kill Geoghan rather than see him win any appeal. Druce got into Geoghan’s cell one day and strangled him with a bed sheet. Geoghan had been in the middle of an appeals process, so because he died in the midst of the appellate process he was, legally speaking, not guilty (Podles, 2008).

**Bystander Behavior**
What sets Geoghan’s case apart from a number of other cases was that multiple bystanders were in a position to report Geoghan to the police or authorities and yet, for reasons all their own, they chose not to. Again, the Catholic Church was a bystander – not necessarily complicit in committing Geoghan’s crimes, but not doing much of anything to stop him either. As it did with plenty of other priests, the church moved John Geoghan from three parishes for molesting children: St. Paul's in Hingham in 1974, St. Andrew's in Jamaica Plain in 1980, and St. Brendan's in Dorchester in 1984 (Medeiros, 1974; Medeiros 1981; Flatley, 1996; Deposition of Cardinal Law, 2002). These transfers came after he had molested kids at Blessed Sacrament in 1962 followed by more victims at St Bernard’s Parish in Concord in 1967 (Podles, 2008; Flatley, 1996.

The following deposition of Thomas Daily seems to shed some light on just what the Catholic Church was thinking by moving Geoghan around:

Daily, now the bishop of the Brooklyn diocese, acknowledged in his deposition that fear of public exposure was one of the reasons for the way Geoghan was handled. Daily, who was for a time the top deputy to Medeiros and then Law, was asked about the words "public perception" in his notes.

Q. What does that mean?

A. I don't know. It might well have referred to the thought of scandal, if it became public, this whole thing -- I don't know. Public perception. In other words, I am underlining that because of the concern of the public reaction.

Q. Was it a policy in the archdiocese when you were in Boston to avoid scandal where possible?
A. Yes.

Q. And were these events types of events that would cause scandal for the church?

A. Yes. (Deposition of Thomas Daily in Rezendes, “Documents Show Church Long Supported Geoghan,” 2002)

Clearly, the actions of the church officials in not calling the police and allowing children to get raped by Geoghan, Porter and others was largely because they were concerned about protecting the image of the church. The Catholic officials would also use their religious positions to amazingly justify their actions:

In another document, Bishop Thomas V. Daily was asked why he did not respond more decisively when a parishioner at St. Thomas Church told him in 1980 that Geoghan had abused her sons and nephews. The bishop answered: "I am not a policeman; I am a shepherd." (Rezendes, Church allowed Abuse by Priest for years, 2002)

---

Reverend Anthony Benzevich

Reverend Anthony Benzevich was also apparently a bystander who had seen enough himself to know that Geoghan was molesting young boys. His story goes as follows:

In 1999 [Reverend Anthony Benzevich] told newspapers that he had noticed that “Geoghan often took young boys up to his rectory room in the rectory and closed the door” and that the boys “would come out in various states of undress.” Benzevich reported Geoghan’s behavior to “church superiors” and was therefore branded a “troublemaker”; church officials “hinted he could be sent to do missionary work in Peru
if he persisted.” But after he consulted with Wilson Rogers III, the son of Cardinal Law’s attorney, Benzevich said that he had not told this information to the archdiocese and in fact had never told the reporters that he had notified archdiocesan officials. The reporters testified under oath that Benzevich had told them the information that they reported, but Benzevich said of the sworn testimony of the reporters, “That’s a lie.” (Podles, 2008).

In this situation, it appears that the Catholic Church engaged in witness intimidation to keep Benzevich quiet. Wilson Rogers III somehow persuaded Benzevich to change his story, no matter how bad it looked. Michael Rezendes of the Globe added that Rogers told Benzevich the church was trying to keep him from being a defendant (“Church Allowed Abuse,” 2002). There was a conspiracy here not only to protect Geoghan, but also the reputation of the Catholic Church.

Reverend Paul E. Miceli

Another bystander who chose a particular course of action regarding Geoghan was the Reverend Paul E. Miceli. In 1974, Joanne McLean Mueller’s sons were victims of Geoghan. She brought that information to Miceli, a parish priest at St. Mary's in Melrose. Miceli assured her that Geoghan would be handled by appropriate church authorities and would "never be a priest again." Mueller also said that Miceli asked her to keep the matter to herself: "Bad as it was, he said, `Just try - don't think about it. It will never happen again.'” (Deposition of Joanne Mueller, Leary v. Geoghan, Deposition of Joanne Mueller, 2000 in Podles, 2008).

Miceli, it appears, by telling Mueller to “keep the matter herself” was attempting to silence these victims. Why he would do this unknown. It may have been politics since he was perhaps trying to protect a fellow priest or perhaps the reputation of the Catholic Church. Either
way, Miceli never reported the incident to the police and, as the passage below indicates, he later denied that the incident ever took place.

Miceli was a member of Law's cabinet and contradicted Mueller in his own deposition. He said he did not recall her name, and never received a visit of the sort she described. But Miceli acknowledged receiving a call from a woman saying Geoghan was spending too much time with her children. Miceli testified that the caller said nothing about sexual abuse. Nonetheless, Miceli said he drove to Geoghan's new parish in Jamaica Plain to relay the woman's concerns to Geoghan face-to-face.

Miceli did, however, confirm part of Mueller’s story saying a woman told him “Geoghan was spending too much time with her children.” If the complaint was that Geoghan was simply spending too much time with this woman’s children, why did Miceli feel the need to drive to Geoghan’s house and meet with him in person about it? The telephone was very much in use during the 1970s, so a phone call should have sufficed. Miceli’s statement does not seem credible and more of an indication that Mueller was telling the truth about a serious situation, one he felt compelled to rush across town to deal with. He may have forgotten the woman’s name, but the situation too? Miceli’s other statement that “the caller said nothing about sexual abuse” also seems not just disingenuous, but part of a pattern of cover-up typical in these child sexual abuse cases.

Also in the Geoghan case was apparently a classic case of denial by bystanders who received a report of child sexual abuse:

In 1980 [Maryetta] Dussourd discovered that seven of her children and her niece’s children had been molested. Geoghan told her son Ralph that “I [Maryetta] would never
believe him, that I loved the Church too much, that I would not believe my own son.” She had her other son Danny, nine years old at the time, tell his father, and the father’s reaction demonstrates why boys were so reluctant to tell their parents what had happened. The father screamed at the boy: “How could you do this to me? How could you do this? You know what it’s like to be a man. Are you some kind of pervert? What is wrong with you?” (Deposition of Maryetta Dussourd, Leary v. Geoghan, in Podles, 2008)

The father’s reaction seems to be not only a classic example of denial, but also a case of blaming the victim for something the suspect did, and a symbol of the difficulties that many devout Catholics had when faced with these sexual abuse scandals for the first time. Unlike today, Mr. Dussourd probably had very little background or experience in child molestation cases. The year was 1980, and there were simply few major examples of prior scandals like this before (Terry, 2011). But an additional possibility is that Mr. Dussourd knew full well that his children were telling the truth and now he had to do something. This is indicated by his statement: “How could you do this to me? How could you do this? You know what it’s like to be a man.” In other words, he knew the onus of putting a stop to the abuse was in his hands now and “to be a man” in this situation meant he had to take on the power of the Catholic Church, where clergy members were pretty much above the law, and he was probably very afraid.

Maryetta Dussourd also told the Rev. John Thomas, whom she knew through her charismatic prayer group, that she suspected Geoghan had molested probably a total of fifteen children, two of whom had set fire to their bedroom to get away from him. Thomas asked her what the families wanted done. She told him they wanted Geoghan removed immediately, and that her husband wanted to beat Geoghan up and then call the police. Then, according to Dussourd:
[Thomas] said both families had problems, and that the Catholic Church was bigger than we were, and that probably no body would believe us, and that we probably couldn’t afford legal counsel. He also told me that I was a sinner and what Geoghan had done also was a sin, and the difference was that we were talking about his career of which he had sacrificed many years for (Deposition of Maryetta Dussourd, Leary vs Geoghan, 2002 in Podles, 2008).

If Maryetta Dussourd’s story is true, this is a classic case of witness intimidation. First Thomas threatens her by saying the “Catholic Church is bigger” than her family was, possibly insinuating it has greater numbers of people and maybe money, and its power is tremendous. This could also be a hint that her family members could get hurt, maybe physically or maybe economically, by going after Geoghan. And this is clearly intimidating no matter which way one evaluates it. Second, he said “Nobody will believe [you]”, possibly hinting that they’ll think you’re insane, and you could end up in an institution, and this statement could easily be argued is a form of intimidation. Third, Thomas said, “I was a sinner and what Geoghan had done also was a sin, and the difference was that we were talking about his career of which he had sacrificed many years for.” By calling Dussourd “a sinner” at is also intimidation because knowing that Dussourd is devout Catholic this could be considered a real threat that she could go to hell. In decades or maybe centuries ago, this threat was truly believed. As a result of this, and perhaps other factors such as the Dussourds wanting compensation for their damages, the police were not notified and the family settled out of court. Maryetta, though, was one of the plaintiffs in the 2002 civil trial of Leary v. Geoghan (Podles, 2008).

Margaret “Marge” Gallant
Margaret “Marge” Gallant, the sister of Maryetta Dussourd, was the bystander whom her nephews first told that they had been molested by Father John Geoghan for over a year. This must have been a shock, but she did not fall victim to the bystander effect, fear of retaliation or anything of the kind. Gallant was a devout Catholic who loved the church, but unfortunately instead of going to the police, she apparently felt it best to handle it by going through the church’s chain of command first. Her letter to Cardinal Medeiros is shown below:

August 16, 1982

Dear Eminence,

As you know, our family had a conference with Bishop Daly over two weeks ago. Since that priest is still in his parish, it appears that no action has been taken. Am I to assume now that we were patronized? Our family is deeply rooted in the Catholic Church, our great-grandparents and parents suffered hardship and persecution for love of the Church. Our desire is to protect the dignity of the Holy Orders, even in the midst of our tears and agony over the seven boys in our family who have been violated. We cannot undo that, but we are obligated to protect others from this abuse to the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ. It was suggested that we keep silent to protect the boys -- that is absurd since minors are protected under law, and I do not wish to hear that remark again, since it is insulting to our intelligence.

I have a tremendous love and respect for you Cardinal, and regret now for not writing to... (at this point in letter, part of text is cut off)...humility and holiness, but I am very angry with you now, and do not understand this.
While it is true that a layman in the same situation would only be confined for observation for a limited time -- he would also be exposed (word "exposed" is underlined twice). Parents would know then not to allow children near this type person. In this case, not only do they not know, but by virtue of his office he gains access quite easily, which compounds our responsibility! His actions are not only destructive to the emotional well-being of the children, but hit the very core of our being in our love for the church -- he would not gain access to homes of fallen away Catholics.

Regardless of what he says, or the doctor who treated him, I do not believe he is cured; his actions strongly suggest that he is not, and there is no guarantee that persons with these obsessions are ever cured. Truly, my heart aches for him and I pray for him, because I know this must tear him apart too; but I cannot allow my compassion for him to cloud my judgment on acting for the people of God, and the children in the church.

My own children were not directly... (at this point in the letter, part of the text is cut off)...sensitive to my nephews and grandnephews who were involved; I am far enough removed to be slightly more objective. I have not told my sister or my niece that that priest is still functioning -- I fear the consequences of telling them. I have told my brother, and he and I will take this case to the Holy Father if need be. We did not question the Authority of the Church two years ago, but left it entirely in your hands. Now, we will not settle for this, but must insist on knowing what action is taken -- where he is sent, etc. I will not allow this Temple of God to be overshadowed by a sin of omission. We, our family and all of us who look to the Authority of the Church -- (word illegible) the Church -- and have the right to expect service from the Ordained.
My two sisters and my niece never as much as received an apology from the church, much less any offer for counseling for the boys. It embarrasses me that the Church is so negligent. Father Damien the leper went after a child molester once and beat him up. His cause was held up because of it. Now the curse of Damien is in the Vatican. I am praying to him now to bring this cause to Jesus Christ. Father Damien would not sit on his fanny -- he would act. My heart is broken over this whole mess -- and to address my Cardinal in this manner has taken its toll on me too. May Almighty God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit have mercy on all of us.

Here is a classic case of a bystander outraged by what happened. Gallant knew what happened to her nephews was a crime. She knew that Geoghan, even though he was a priest, was a child molester, and she was demanding that the church take action. Although she is amazingly compassionate towards Geoghan’s feelings (“Truly, my heart aches for him and I pray for him, because I know this must tear him apart too”) she is also no fool. As she said, “I cannot allow my compassion for him to cloud my judgment on acting for the people of God, and the children in the church… My two sisters and my niece never as much as received an apology from the church, much less any offer for counseling for the boys. It embarrasses me that the Church is so negligent” (Gallant, 1982). There’s no sense that she was in awe of the Catholic Church or intimidated in the slightest.

Cardinal Humberto Medeiros

While Gallant seemed to be both very head-strong and loyal to the church, her criticism, on the other hand, was sharp and biting since she obviously felt not mincing words was what the church needed. She had appealed to Cardinal Humberto Medeiros for help, but based on his letter (see below) and his actions, Medeiros appeared to be an apathetic bystander - both
indifferent and out of touch with the harsh reality of what Geoghan had done. It seems he was indifferent with a purpose: to protect the Catholic Church from scandal. After receiving her letter, which had its emotional appeal for help, Cardinal Medeiros replied to Mrs. Gallant in letter, an excerpt of which is shown below:

August 20, 1982,

Dear Mrs. Gallant,

Thank you for your letter of August 10, 1982 and your candid expression of opinion concerning the priest of the Archdiocese of Boston who has caused hardship to your family and most especially to several of the boys.

While I am and must be very sensitive to a very delicate situation and one that has caused great scandal, I must at the same time invoke the mercy of God and share in that mercy in the knowledge that God forgives sins and that sinners indeed can be forgiven. To be sure, we cannot accept sins but we know well that we must love the sinner and pray for him. I take great comfort in noting these thoughts in your letter to me and at your compassion for Father. Please be assured that, I am speaking to the priest in order to find the most Christian way to deal with the problem with him and at the same time remove any source of scandal for the sake of the faithful. (bishopaccountability.org, 2014)
Throughout this letter, Medeiros seems more interested in avoiding “scandal” than helping the victims of John Geoghan. Not once did he really acknowledge there were victims. Instead, he appears to downplay Geoghan’s sexual assaults as mere “hardship” for Gallant’s nephews. What seemed equally condescending and evasive is that he also referred to their abuse as a “delicate situation,” which apparently was not delicate because of the children’s psychological and/or physical injuries the abuse may have caused, but “delicate” because it would make the church look awful if news of it leaked out - and preventing this information from leaking out seemed to be Medeiros’s objective here.

Medeiros also subtly refers to Gallant’s letter and her claims as her “candid opinion” rather than the truth: There were multiple rapes of little boys committed by one of his priests. This was the awful truth, and Medeiros knew it. Geoghan’s molestations were a pattern of behavior that had lasted over a decade. Medeiros had reportedly been well aware of James Porter’s child molestations, and now he apparently was equally aware of Geoghan’s sexual assaults as well. Yet, being a ‘great’ boss, he allowed both priests to persist (Matchan and Kurkjian, “Porter personnel files show what church knew,” 1992; Flatley, 1996; Carroll and Robinson, “Documents Show,” 2002).

**Cardinal Bernard Law**

In 1984, two years later, Cardinal Law replaced Medeiros who was deceased as head of the Boston Archdiocese. He remained in that position until 2002. Many of his policies and procedures for handling sexual abuse cases, as well as the case against him, were laid out in the Attorney General’s 2003 report entitled The Sexual Abuse of Children in the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Boston:
Although Cardinal Law delegated responsibility for handling clergy sexual abuse matters, his senior managers kept the Cardinal apprised of such matters directly or through the Vicar of Administration, who supervised the Secretary of Ministerial Personnel and the Delegate. Moreover, throughout his tenure, Cardinal Law personally participated in decisions concerning the final disposition of clergy sexual abuse cases including decisions on whether to permit accused priests to return to ministry duties. For the most part, his involvement included the review and approval of recommendations on such matter from his Vicar for Administration or Secretary for Ministerial Personnel, or after adoption of the 1993 policy, from the Review Board…Cardinal Law by no means bears sole responsibility for the harm done to children in the Archdiocese… With rare exception, none of the Cardinal’s senior managers advised him to take any of the steps that might have ended the systemic abuse of children. (Reilly, 2003)

So, if these allegations are true, Law was directly responsible for moving abusive priests like Geoghan to different churches. He knew exactly what Geoghan had done through multiple sources, and Cardinal Law had the last word on whether these men worked as priests. He did not seem to really care what happened to the local children in New England as evidenced by the fact he moved priests like Geoghan to other parishes and ones where he had little or no supervision at times (Reilly, 2003). Much like his predecessor(s), Law seemed more interested in protecting the Catholic Church from scandal.

The method of dealing with the issue remained shuffling priests like John Geoghan and others across state lines to avoid prosecution. Daryl Hufford, a clinical pastoral psychotherapist at Andover Newton Theological School, put it this way: Church officials evidently relied on "the geographical cure: relocate, forget, sweep under the rug” (Matchan, Aucoin and Kurkjian,
“Anguished Cries Fell,” 7/2/1992. Detective Tom Johanson investigated Porter and later Geoghan, and he echoed these same sentiments adding that the church would wait until the statute of limitations passed before bringing the accused priests back to Massachusetts (Johanson, 2012). And Cardinal Bernard Law was no help either. As the Boston Globe carried out its relentless coverage, Law insisted on denying that nothing had been done wrong and attacked the newspaper directly. In the end, however, Law resigned in disgrace, and many of his priests including Porter, Geoghan, Shanley, Lane, and many others went to prison.

To summarize, the case of John Geoghan had multiple bystanders who could have reported him to the authorities, yet chose not to. For 36 years Geoghan was able to get away with molesting approximately 150 children. If two-thirds of his victims never told anyone, in accordance with London et al’s study (2005), he may have 450 victims. The dynamics at play that allowed Geoghan’s abuse included witness intimidation of former priest Anthony Benzevich, the desire of leaders like Cardinals Medeiros and Law, Daily and others to protect the church from scandal. In addition, though, are the dynamics that caused bystanders to intervene and make complaints. Joanne McLean and Maryetta Dussourd were parents whose love of their children drove them to make complaints to church officials and, after nothing was done, testify in court. For Margaret Gallant, outrage over her seven nephews being molested appeared to give her the motivation to write Cardinals Medeiros and Law scathing, poignant letters demanding Geoghan be dealt with either through treatment or removal. Yet her religion and love of the Catholic Church kept Mrs. Gallant a bystander who never brought law enforcement in to deal with what she was knew was not a sin, but a crime.

Case Study 3 - Jerry Sandusky

Background
Gerald “Jerry” Arthur Sandusky was born in 1944 and grew up in Washington, Pennsylvania. He attended Washington High School and excelled at sports and did well in school. Sandusky went to Penn State University where he finished first in his class, earning a bachelor’s degree in health and physical education 1966 before joining the school’s football coaching staff that same year (Viera, Nov 7, 2011). Sandusky worked as an assistant coach at Penn State for 32 years and was considered an outstanding coach and potential replacement for Joe Paterno. In 1977, he became the linebackers coach and created such a phenomenal defense that Penn State became known as Linebacker U. Sandusky’s defenses were stout and helped the team win national championships in 1982 and 1986. The championship in 1986 earned Sandusky’s defense a stunning upset on the brightest stage, winning 14-10 over the number one ranked Miami Hurricanes in the Fiesta Bowl. The Penn State Defense rattled Miami’s Heisman Trophy-winning quarterback Vinny Testaverde, who threw five interceptions and zero touchdowns for the first time all season (Viera, Nov 7, 2011). Sandusky also coached numerous NFL players including LaVarr Arrington, Jack Ham, and Brandon Short (Biography.com).

In 1977, Sandusky also founded the Second Mile, a charitable organization designed to help at-risk kids. Sandusky had apparently gotten the idea from his parents, Art and Evie, who during his youth had run a community center known as the Brownson House, which offered programs disadvantaged kids “I saw so many kids come through there who never really had a family or anybody to care about them or give them any guidance at all,” Sandusky told Sports Illustrated in 1982. “It always bothered me” (Biography.com). As will be shown, however, the Second Mile appears to be more than just a charity, but also a place for Jerry Sandusky to find numerous victims.
But in 1998, there was an incident that Joe Paterno and the brass of Penn State became aware of that must have given them pause. One of Jerry Sandusky’s Second Mile children came home from an outing with Sandusky and his hair was soaking wet from showering. When the boy’s mother asked what happened, he said he had showered with Coach Sandusky. The mother immediately notified Penn State Campus Police who investigated the incident. Sandusky admitted that the incident had happened and “wished he was dead.” The original district attorney assigned to the case went missing and remains presumed dead to this day. Sandusky was never charged criminally since no sexual contact was admitted. The investigators who spoke with him, according to Louis Freeh, were inexperienced. Sandusky told them that he would never shower with boys again and they took him at his word. Shortly after, Paterno, for an unknown reason, informed Sandusky that he would not be the next head coach. Sandusky then retired in 1998, but was brought back out of necessity in 1999 for one last season (Freeh, 2012).

The Crimes

On November 4, 2011, the past caught up with Jerry Sandusky as Pennsylvania State Police placed him under arrest for sexually molesting at least ten young boys between 1998 and 2011. There were perhaps other victims as well, but Sandusky denies doing anything wrong to this day. Many of the molestations reportedly occurred on the Penn State campus property and in other areas. Sandusky committed most of these crimes when he was either the defensive coordinator or after he retired from coaching but had Penn State Professor Emeritus Status, which carried with it unrestricted access to the university’s football facilities (Freeh, 2012). Sandusky’s victims were all young boys and members the Second Mile Organization. Most likely a preferential child molester, Sandusky seduced these children with both his adult status and power by giving these kids gifts such as tickets to Penn State football games and dream-like
access to the Penn State football locker room (O’Neil, 2012). Eventually, 26 victims came forward to accuse Sandusky of molesting them. One of the victims was Sandusky’s adopted son. In June 2012, Sandusky was found guilty of 45 counts of child sexual abuse and convicted of molesting ten boys over a 15-year period (Scolforo, 2012).

**Bystander Behavior**

There were both numerous bystanders who received reports of Sandusky’s behavior by victims who had been molested for years, as well as bystanders who caught Sandusky engaged in outright oral sex and anal sex with multiple young boys. There was an unknown school official(s), a janitor named Jim Calhoun, and a graduate assistant named Mike McQueary, who were all unquestionably bystanders who could have taken action against Sandusky for various reasons failed to do so. Then there were others who received reports from witnesses and failed to do anything including legendary head coach Joe Paterno and the campus leadership of Graham Spanier, Vice President of Business and Finance Gary Schultz, and the athletic director Timothy Curley. Their stories will be analyzed for possible reasons why the inaction occurred.

To start, there had been a long history of abuse between Victim 1 and Jerry Sandusky. According to Victim 1’s testimony to the grand jury:

School Official (Unnamed)

Victim 1 told jurors he was about 13 by the time these assaults happened. He had already known Sandusky for a few years, and was uncomfortable by some of the stuff that led to the oral sex -- like the kissing and back rubbing. He wasn't sure what to think of that, he said. But he knew this was wrong, and the assaults caused an upheaval in his life. His grades dropped in school. He quit the football team at Central Mountain High School,
where Sandusky was a volunteer coach. He was labeled as a trouble-maker, since the head football coach and assistant principal would call him out of class so Sandusky could talk privately with him. Too embarrassed to tell anyone, he testified that he would go to Sandusky's home as planned but then hide in closets or under pool tables, hoping not to be found. He quit The Second Mile and joined Big Brothers Big Sisters instead to try to distance himself, he said. In detail, he described one time that Sandusky stalked him, following him in his car as he walked home from school.

It was around that time that his mother began to get suspicious about how much Sandusky was calling her son. She had the school principal talk to Victim 1 after he asked her about the Megan's Law website for sex predators, he said. When a school official asked him if he was abused, he broke down and said yes, he testified. Then he cried again when he said the school told him to "think about" reporting his abuse. "They said he has a heart of gold and wouldn't do something like that, so they didn't believe me," he said, sniffling, (Ganim, 2012).

This situation is a classic case of denial by the school official(s) who said Sandusky had “a heart of gold and wouldn’t do something like that.” For the unknown school official, who apparently had enough training to recognize that Victim 1 had been abused, to turn around and then claim this same kid would make up something like this, is atrocious. The official should have at least done some type of investigation and have come up with solid evidence to the contrary before ever making such a claim. It is this disbelief in their claims that is a major reason why many kids simply do not report child sexual abuse. But what appears to have happened, perhaps for as long as decades, is that Sandusky had been grooming not just his victims, but also everyone he had contact with and worked for. For a school official to believe unquestionably that he had
“heart of gold” was not just foolish of the administrator, but also apparently a masterpiece of brain-washing by Sandusky.

Jim Calhoun

Another incident in 2000 involved a bystander named Jim Calhoun who caught Sandusky in the act of committing child sexual abuse, but according to the Grand Jury and Freeh reports never reported it to the authorities. The details of the Grand Jury report are below:

In the fall of 2000, a janitor named Jim Calhoun observed Sandusky in the showers of the Lasch building giving oral sex to a young boy who he had pressed against the wall. Another janitor Ronald Petrosky testified that he saw Sandusky with the little boy as they were leaving the shower area. They acknowledged him and then Sandusky took the boy’s hand and they left holding hands. Shortly after, Petrosky began to clean the shower and Calhoun approached him and was visibly upset. Petrosky testified that Jim said he “fought in the Korean War…seen people with their guts blowed out, arms dismembered…I just witnessed something I’ll never forget” and then began describing Sandusky giving the little boy oral sex (Grand Jury Indictment, 2011)

Petrosky testified that all the employees working that except [Jay] Witherite, [Calhoun’s supervisor], were relatively new employees. In discussions held later that shift, the employees expressed concern that if they reported what Jim had seen, they might lose their jobs. Jim’s fellow employees had him tell Jay Witherite what he had seen…Witherite testified that Jim was “very emotionally upset”, “very distraught”, to the point where Witherite was “afraid the man was going to have a heart attack or something the way he was acting.” Jim reported to Witherite that he observed Sandusky performing
oral sex on the boy in the showers. Witherite told him to whom he should report the incident, if he should choose to report it. (Grand Jury Indictment, 2011)

Here was an example of how fear of retaliation, a well-documented inhibitor of bystander intervention, affected the Penn State janitors. One of them explained to the Special Investigative Counsel that “I know Joe Paterno has so much power, if he wanted to get rid of someone, I would have been gone” and that “football runs this university.” He had no doubt “the University would have closed ranks to protect the football program at all costs.” According to the Freeh report, these janitors felt that the football program ran the university, and that to go against Joe Paterno would be like “going against the President of the United States.” An example of this can be seen below:

Some of them provided an example of Paterno’s excessive influence on policy as an incident in April 2007 when players on the football team got into a fight at an off-campus apartment and “severely injured” some other individuals. The former official in charge of the disciplinary process perceived pressure from the athletic department, especially the football program, to treat the players in ways that would maintain their ability to play sports, including the 2007 incident. When the Student Affairs Office (“SAO”) sanctioned the players involved, the sanctions were subsequently reduced by Spanier to enable players to participate in football practice. [ ] Interview (3-22-12) a senior staff member in the SAO advised that his office handles 4,000 cases a year of off-campus student conduct violations. [ ] In all of the cases he has managed over the years, this incident and one other incident involving a football player were the only one incidents in which issued sanctions were reduced. (Freeh, 2012)
This section appears to reveal how influential Joe Paterno was. It seems a stretch to say that based on this incident with the football team such a case of child sexual abuse could be covered up, but these individuals are more familiar with the Penn State culture than I am. There may have been other incidents that occurred we on the outside are not aware of. The District Attorney disappearing and presumed dead after the Sandusky shower investigation in 1998 may have been such an incident, although it is unclear if these janitors were aware of his disappearance and the circumstances surrounding it. If they were, then this fear of reporting is probably very justified.

But another interesting incident occurred shortly after the incident in the shower, which could have been an act of witness intimidation, however this is not clear. Below is an excerpt from the Grand Jury indictment and its placement within the indictment could represent a number of things:

Witherite testified later that same evening, Jim found him and told him that the man he had seen in the shower with the young boy was sitting in the Lasch building parking lot, in a car. Witherite confirmed visually that it was Sandusky who was sitting in his car in the parking lot. Witherite says that this was between 10 PM and 12:30 AM. Petrosky also saw the car drive very slowly through the parking lot about 2 to 3 hours after the incident was reported to him by Jim, at approximately 11:30 PM to 12:00 AM. Petrosky recognized Sandusky in his vehicle. Petrosky testified that Sandusky drove by another time, about two hours later, again driving by very slowly, not stopping. The second drive-by was between 2:00 and 3 AM. Petrosky testified that Sandusky did not enter the building either time. The area is well lit and the coaches’ cars were known to Petrosky.
This incident is interesting because it is unclear just what the heck Sandusky was doing. Sandusky could be possibly have been confused, simply driving around all night aimlessly and perhaps paranoid that someone had seen him. The janitors told the special investigative council that they believed he was checking to see if someone had called the police, so it may be that Sandusky wanted to get caught (Freeh, 2012). Criminals going back to the scene of a crime is a fairly common occurrence.

However, it may be that Sandusky knew Jim Calhoun had seen him raping that boy in the shower and now was displaying a show of force and trying to intimidate Calhoun. His being parked in the lot and driving slowly around all night past the scene of the crime and an area where he probably knew the janitors could see him may have been Sandusky’s way of saying ‘I know you saw what I did. What are you going to do about it? I’m still here.’ Sandusky may have been waiting for the janitor to come outside, hopefully alone, and kill him. If he did have a hand in the DA’s disappearance in 1998, then why would he be afraid of removing a janitor? Whatever Sandusky was doing, Calhoun was clearly intimidated. As previously mentioned, Jim Calhoun was visibly distraught and appeared on the verge of a breakdown. And indeed he was.

According to the Grand Jury indictment, sadly:

Jim was a temporary employee at the Lasch building, working there for approximately 8 months. No report was ever made by Jim Calhoun. Jim currently suffers from dementia, resides in a nursing home and is incompetent to testify. Victim 8’s identity is unknown. (2011)

Fortunately, the other janitors testified for Calhoun, but the damage was done. For another eleven years, Sandusky was able to molest victim after victim because Sandusky’s presence and the perceived power of the Penn State football program on campus policy had successfully silenced these bystanders. Their testimony later was crucial in convicting Jerry Sandusky.
Mike McQueary

Bystander Effect or Cover-up?

In 2002, however, the most famous and controversial incident occurred to turn the child molestation crimes of Jerry Sandusky into the Penn State Scandal, which sent shockwaves throughout the country and almost ten years later would serve as a reminder of the Catholic Church Scandals. According to the Grand Jury indictment of Jerry Sandusky, the incident occurred as following, which I will cover in the next three paragraphs that come straight from its report:

On March 1, 2002, a Penn State graduate assistant ("graduate assistant") [later identified as Mike McQueary] who was then 28 years old, entered the locker room at the Lasch Football Building on the University Park Campus on a Friday night before the beginning of Spring Break. The graduate assistant, who was familiar with Sandusky, was going to put some newly purchased sneakers in his locker and get some recruiting tapes to watch. It was about 9:30 p.m. As the graduate assistant entered the locker room doors, he was surprised to find the lights and showers on. He then heard slapping sounds. He believed the sounds to be those of sexual activity. As the graduate assistant put the sneakers in his locker, he looked into the shower. He saw a naked boy, Victim 2, whose age he estimated to be ten years old, with his hands up against the wall, being subjected to anal intercourse by a naked Sandusky. The graduate assistant was shocked but noticed that both Victim 2 and Sandusky saw him. The graduate assistant left immediately, distraught. (Grand Jury Indictment, 2011)
The graduate assistant [then] went to his office and called his father, reporting to him what he had seen. His father told the graduate assistant to leave the building and come to his home. The graduate assistant and his father decided that the graduate assistant had to report what he had seen to Coach Joe Paterno ("Paterno"), head football coach of Penn State. The next morning, a Saturday, the graduate assistant telephoned Paterno and went to Paterno's home, where he reported what he had seen. Joseph V. Paterno testified to receiving the graduate assistant's report at his home on a Saturday morning. Paterno testified that the graduate assistant was very upset. Paterno called Tim Curley ("Curley"), Penn State Athletic Director and Paterno's immediate superior, to his home the very next day, a Sunday, and reported to him that the graduate assistant had seen Jerry Sandusky in the Lasch Building showers fondling or doing something of a sexual nature to a young boy. (Grand Jury Indictment, 2011)

Approximately one and a half weeks later, the graduate assistant was called to a meeting with Penn State Athletic Director Curley and Senior Vice President for Finance and Business Gary Schultz ("Schultz"). The graduate assistant reported to Curley and Schultz that he had witnessed what he believed to be Sandusky having anal sex with a boy in the Lasch Building showers. Curley and Schultz assured the graduate assistant that they would look into it and determine what further action they would take. Paterno was not present for this meeting. The graduate assistant heard back from Curley a couple of weeks later. He was told that Sandusky's keys to the locker room were taken away and that the incident had been reported to The Second Mile. The graduate assistant was never questioned by University Police and no other entity conducted an investigation until he
testified in Grand Jury in December, 2010. The Grand Jury finds the graduate assistant's testimony to be extremely credible. (Grand Jury Indictment, 2011)

So here we have a rare case where Mike McQueary, then a graduate assistant, was a bystander who caught Jerry Sandusky in the act of raping a young boy. McQueary’s shock and trauma at seeing something like this had to be absolutely incredible, particularly when he knew it was Jerry Sandusky committing it. It will be an image he will never forget. But instead of reporting it to the police, which he probably should have done, he reported it to his dad and then the Penn State leadership. The question is why would he handle it this way?

Stephanie Pappas theorized that McQueary may have been a victim of the “bystander effect,” which is when a person sees something awful happening, yet freezes and delays, expecting that someone else will do something, but then the incident is over (Darley and Latane, 1968). Moreover, she noted, according to a 1985 study, the bystander effect often happens to those with masculine or aggressive personalities who freeze up because they don’t want to be embarrassed when they don’t know what to do (Pappas, 2011). This theory makes some sense because McQueary was not just any graduate assistant. He had been a Nittany Lions football player and in 2004, he became the wide receivers coach. McQueary, therefore, appears to fit the macho profile inherent in that 1985 study. However, the bystander effect usually affects people when they are in a group that witnesses a crime occurring in front of them. McQueary was alone and he testified to the following:

"I stepped back and didn't want to see it anymore. I slammed the locker shut, and when I looked in, they had separated. I know they saw me, they both looked directly into my eyes, and neither said anything to me. Seeing that they both saw me, I left the locker
room. I can’t describe what I was thinking or feeling: shocked, horrified, distraught,” he said. (Curry, Dec. 16, 2011)

"You left an adult man and a boy in a locker room where you just saw them in a sexual position," Rominger said during the cross examination.

"Yes, sir," McQueary said.

"Didn't call the police," Rominger continued.

"Yes, that's right," McQueary said.

"And you assumed that nothing else would happen," Rominger said.

"I was extremely frustrated and flustered, once I saw them separated it's safe to assume that I assumed it was over," McQueary explained. "I've said repeatedly I didn't do anything physically to stop it. It’s been well publicized. (Wetzel, 2012)

These reactions to what he saw in front of him certainly fit with Pappas’s description and are understandable. Seeing something like that, when one has no inkling that a person like Sandusky would do something like that ever, has to be a shock to the system. The problem with Pappas’s application of the Bystander Effect Theory is that no one else was there. Therefore, there was no diffusion of responsibility since all of it was on Mike McQueary’s shoulders, and he did report it.

Todd Krohn insightfully stated, McQueary’s lack of reporting instead seemed to fit the definition of criminal conspiracy:

The Bystander Effect refers to the reaction of onlookers as an event happens, not what happens afterward. The fact that no one at Penn State followed up on these crimes has nothing to do with the psychological impotence of witnessing a traumatic event. Instead,
what happened at PSU was a very calibrated, orchestrated, criminal conspiracy; a cover-up of massive proportion that involved all echelons of university administration and athletics; a true power-elite disappearance of the childhood victims of molestation and rape (Krohn, 2011).

Compounding this insight was the fact that in 2004 McQueary accepted the position as the wide receivers coach and appeared to keep his mouth shut for until 2010 when he was called to testify before the grand jury. It may be just that McQueary became passive, perhaps feeling he had ‘passed the buck,’ after doing his part and informing the administration. But one could speculate that after seeing the Penn State leadership do nothing, one may argue that his silence was purchased with that coaching position. McQueary testified that he “made a strong attempt to not be associated with anything Jerry was involved with” (Wetzel, 2012), but still he stayed with the team in a position he coveted despite the fact the Penn State administration was letting Sandusky have full access to the building. According to McQueary, the sight of Sandusky really bothered him to the point other people noticed. "People became suspicious, so I would say something to the effect that I saw something and I didn't want to be around him again.”(Wetzel, 2012).

"The last few years, as the rumors about Jerry Sandusky began, I'd say, 'what the heck are we letting him in the building for?'" But when asked why he didn’t quit, McQueary replied:

"I would never resign from Penn State University"(Wetzel, 2012).

Finally, in 2010, for his own reasons or perhaps he was summoned to make a grand jury deposition, McQueary finally did the right thing, made a full report, and eventually testified against Sandusky. The damage from his delay seems incalculable. In other words, the number of victims who suffered as well as their family members because of McQueary’s inaction may
never be known. In 2012, Penn State did not renew McQueary’s coaching contract. Whether this move by Penn State was to improve the team, a symbolic break from the scandalous past, or pay-back for his whistle-blowing, we will probably never know. McQueary believes it was revenge, and he has filed a $4 million whistleblower lawsuit against the university, but perhaps if he had notified the police immediately he may still have a job at Penn State (Van Natta, 2014).

Graham Spanier, Gary Schultz, and Tim Curley

According to the Grand Jury indictment, the 2002 incident, which Schultz, Curley, and Spanier were all very much aware of, was never reported to the Department of Public Welfare, Child and Youth Services, and local, state police or the university police “in contravention of Pennsylvania law” (2011). Louis Freeh in his July 12, 2012 report added dramatically:

These men concealed Sandusky’s activities from the Board of Trustees, the University community, and authorities. They exhibited a striking lack of empathy for Sandusky’s victims by failing to inquire as to their safety and well-being, especially by not attempting to determine the identity of the child who Sandusky assaulted in the Lasch Building in 2001. Further they exposed this child to additional harm by alerting Sandusky, who was the only one who knew the child’s identity, of what McQueary saw in the shower on the night of February 9, 2001. (Freeh, 2012)

Freeh’s description of these individuals makes them seem much worse than apathetic bystanders – it makes them appear to be criminal conspirators who could care less what happened to the child. If Freeh’s and the grand jury indictment’s allegations are true, it appears that to these men as long as Penn State’s squeaky clean reputation (i.e. no sex offenders could be working there) was more important than the victimization of children. Was there confusion as to what
McQueary told them? It does not appear to be that way at all. McQueary stated under oath both for the grand jury and during the Sandusky trial that he told them specifically Jerry Sandusky was engaged in anal sex with that young boy (Grand Jury indictment, 2011; Freeh, 2012, Testimony of Mike McQueary in. At one point, the three men were communicating in code, apparently to avoid anyone from understanding what they were discussing (Freeh, 2012).

Joe Paterno

What Joe Paterno knew of Jerry Sandusky’s sexual abuse is a matter of debate and currently there are individuals who are suing Louis Freeh for his unfair portrayal of Paterno as essentially a bystander who did nothing. According to Mike McQueary’s testimony, he was never used the words sodomy or anal sex out of respect for Paterno, but he made sure that Sandusky was involved in something “extremely sexual” and “very wrong.” According to Paterno, he told McQueary at this meeting: “You did what you had to do. It is my job now to figure out what we want to do” (Jenkins, 2012). Paterno did not call Curley or Schultz right away, so as to not disturb their weekend (Freeh, 2012). On the following Monday, he notified Timothy Curley and arranged a meeting, which only McQueary, Curley and Schultz attended (Freeh, 2012). Shortly after Sandusky’s arrest, Joe Paterno, reportedly told McQueary the “Old Main screwed up.” Paterno later told the media:

I didn't know exactly how to handle it and I was afraid to do something that might jeopardize what the university procedure was. So I backed away and turned it over to some other people, people I thought would have a little more expertise than I did. It didn't work out that way. (Watson, 2012)
Paterno also said on the situation: “This is a tragedy. It is one of the great sorrows of my life. With the benefit of hindsight, I wish I had done more” (KDKA, 2011). Despite Penn State students who rioted in support of their football coach, public sentiment, particularly in the wake of the Penn State scandal, was that Paterno should have done a lot more back in 2001 after he got the initial report from McQueary. Apparently Penn State felt he was too much of a bystander who should have acted. A week later, Paterno was impersonally and symbolically fired over the telephone. On January 22, 2012, Paterno died of a heart attack (CBS Sports, 2012). In July 2012, six months after his death, Penn State took down the statue of Joe Paterno (Van Natta, 2012).

The cases against Spanier, Schultz, and Curley are still going forward. On November 1, 2012, prosecutors officially charged Spanier with eight crimes including five felonies. Spanier, Schultz, and Curley are each charged with deceiving investigators and withholding important information from the campus police, other Penn State officials, and the Board of Trustees during the course of the investigation (Isikoff, Nov 1, 2012; Grand Jury indictment, 2011).

To summarize the Jerry Sandusky case, the bystanders who saw Sandusky commit sexual abuse Jim Calhoun, and Mike McQueary, yet neither did anything to stop him. The dynamics appear to be Calhoun’s fear of retaliation, which may have been instigated by the Penn State history of not supporting discipline against football players and the district attorney who may have been murdered. Sandusky’s actions later than night can be also interpreted as witness intimidation. Other bystanders included the unknown school official who chose not to believe victim 1, even though this official appeared to know the signs and symptoms of child sexual abuse. The dynamic of denial was apparently the reason for this individual’s inaction. The other bystanders here appeared to involve Joe Paterno, President Graham Spanier, Gary Schultz and
Timo thy Curley who were all individuals in positions of power, who received reports of Sandusky’s sexual assaults, yet chose to protect him, apparently because of the dynamic called protecting the institution.

Case Study 4 - Meir Dascalowitz

Background

There is very little known about Meir Dascalowitz, age 27, from Brooklyn, New York. He may have been mentally unstable, but he was also a child molester who sexually assaulted untold numbers of children (Otterman, 2012). Dascalowitz also claimed to have been raped by a convicted child molester Rabbi Baruch Lebovits, therefore if true, he is one of the large percentages of sexual offenders who was molested as a child. As will be explained, because of cultural norms in Brooklyn, New York, unfortunately, the numbers of victims by Dascalowitz may never be known.

There are three major religious branches within Judaism: Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform. The Orthodox branch has the highest degree of adherence to traditional Jewish law followed by the Conservative and Reform (Neustein, 2008). Jewish communities like Brooklyn’s have been referred to as ultra-Orthodox or extremely orthodox, as many within the community consider the outside world as a threat to their way life. There Jewish population who live in Brooklyn mainly follow the rules of the highly prestigious Beth Din, or rabbinical court. As Neustein and Lesher put it, Orthodox Jewish culture considers it a sin to report crimes or using a non-Jewish court to anyone other than rabbis, particularly when the suspect is favored by them (Neustein, 2008; Otterman, 2012). According to the interpretation of a rule called “mesirah,” a large number of rabbis maintain that it is forbidden under Jewish law for Jews informing on
other Jews to secular authorities like the police without rabbinical permission (Riconda, 2013; Terry, 2011). Sarah Otterman added that to publicly make allegations of sexual abuse or any crime against fellow Jews is considered to be “Chillul Hashem, a desecration of God’s name” (Otterman, 2012).

Additional concerns of reporting Jews, particularly rabbis, on abuse allegations are the damages of such a charge whether true or false can brought upon the accused. As Rabbi Mark Dratch pointed out, a rabbi imprisoned for child sexual abuse may be attacked by other prisoners. Moreover, such charges cause a shame or ‘shondeh’ on the family name that will cause his children and relatives to have severe difficulty finding suitable marriage partners (Neustein, 2008) Another Rabbi Chaim Dovid Zwiebel added: “You can destroy a person’s life with a false report.” Zwiebel happens to be the executive vice president of Agudath Israel of America, a powerful ultra-Orthodox organization, which last year said that observant Jews should not report allegations to the police unless permitted to do so by a rabbi. Rabbinic authorities “recommend you speak it over with a rabbi before coming to any definitive conclusion in your own mind,” Rabbi Zwiebel said, (Otterman 2012).

There is a certain amount of truth to Dratch and Zwiebel’s commentary. Dratch, it seems however, should not be confused with Zwiebel, who appears to be concerned primarily with protecting the power of the Rabbis. According to researchers Neustein and Lesher, who identify themselves claim as Orthodox Jewish, Dratch is apparently a messenger of change. He advocates that rabbis lecture on abuse-related issues. Rabbi Dratch believes doing this breaks the pattern of silence and empowers CSA victims to start speaking out (Neustein, 2008).

In Otterman’s article in the New York Times, they noted that the community did take a major step forward by warning the community to stay away from a child molester who was a
danger to the community, but there was still no report made to the New York Police Department (Otterman, 2012). Neustein added that in some cases the rabbinical court (or beth din) will occasionally remove a suspected pedophile from the community, but the beth din has no power to detain, charge or convict a prisoner. Because the rabbis fear secular interference or losing some of their power, they will not turn over the suspect to the police. More often than not, the child molester who may be a sexual predator removed from a community, but can easily move into another one and harm more children (Neustein, 2008). Then there are suspects who appear to have more influence like the school official noted in the case below:

Pearl Engelman, 64-year old great-grandmother told the NY Times of her ordeal when her son Joel told rabbinical authorities of being repeatedly groped by a school official at the United Talmudical Academy in Williamsburg. The school denied the accusation, removed the official, and then brought him back to grope others, as soon as Joel turned 23 and barred from filing charges under the state’s statutes of limitations. Engelman said, “Our community protects molesters. Other than that, we are wonderful.” (Otterman, 2012)

It appears from this passage that the Brooklyn Community, if this story is true, has a long way to go if it wants to put children first and protect them from child sexual abuse. Here clearly the school had put its official first and played the role of not an apathetic bystander, but a bystander with an agenda to protect its own.

The Crimes
There was one case of child sexual abuse, however, that Meir Dascalowitz, a favorite of the rabbis, did not get away with. The details were in this New York Times article by Sarah Otterman:

[Like Pearl Engelmann mentioned above], Mr. Jungreis, the Williamsburg father, had a similar experience. He first suspected that his son was being molested after he came home with blood in his underwear at age 12, and later was caught touching another child on the bus. But, Mr. Jungreis said, the school principal warned him to stay silent. Two years later, the boy revealed that he had been molested for years by a man he saw at a mikvah, a ritual bath that observant Jews visit for purification (Otterman, 2012).

Despite the principal’s attempt to keep the matter under wraps, a bystander notified the police who then arrested 27 year-old Meir Dascalowitz. Dascalowitz was charged with child rape and, despite the odds and various forms of public pressure for acquittal, on Thursday April 18, 2013, Dascalowitz pled guilty and was convicted of rape of a child. Dascalowitz received only a five-year sentence, which because of its short length was extremely controversial. It was believed the District Attorney was eager to maintain the votes of the Jewish community, so he did not pursue the case very strongly and allowed easy terms on the plea deal. Jungreis’s son who has a disability did not have to testify, so despite the short sentence Jungreis claimed a major victory (Yaniv, 2013).

Bystander Behavior

Unlike the other cases with the Catholic Church and Penn State, the question to be asked in this case is why was there bystander intervention? The answer: mandatory reporting. The bystander who notified the police was a local psychologist and a mandatory reporter under New
York state law. Jungreis’s son had come into see him and told him everything including Dascalowitz’s name. Unlike the Catholic Church officials prior to 2002, the psychologist whose name is unknown was mandated by law to report child sexual abuse, so to protect himself from criminal and civil liability, and perhaps to help Mr. Jungreis, he made the report. But what is also important was the victim’s appointment with the psychologist was no accident, but a deliberate move to bring this case into the open.

Mordechai Jungreis, the father of the victim, however, was really the crucial bystander. All the evidence was in front of him. As stated earlier, his son had been showing the signs of sexual abuse. The blood on his underwear as well as his engagement in sexual activity with other children despite his only being 12 years old were clear signs of this (Leonard, 1986; StopitNow!.org). The admission by his son that it was Dascalowitz who raped him in a mikvah or ritual bath must have sent Jungreis into a rage. Jungreis did not hesitate to report this case to local rabbis because obviously it was his own son who he loves, but also because all five of the elements that Latane and Darley put together in their model for bystander intervention were in place for a bystander to report were in place. This model is as follows:

An intervener must make a series of decisions. First, he must notice the event and then interpret it as an emergency. Then he must decide if he has responsibility to act, and if so what form of assistance he should use. Should he help directly or call the police? Then he must decide how to act and implement his choice. (Latane and Darley, 1970)

Jungreis definitely noticed the event and interpreted it as an emergency. His son had a mental disability, so Jungreis knew that he had the responsibility to act. The question was how? Jungreis, apparently devout Orthodox Jewish man, knew there would be issues such as social ostracism and definitely the wrath of the rabbis could be unleashed if he notified the police
directly. He needed help, however, to take action here. Like Marge Gallant, who looked to the Cardinals of the Catholic Church for help in her case, Jungreis reportedly did the right thing according to Hasidic law by checking with the rabbis first. Otterman described his bystander intervention as the following:

Mr. Jungreis, knowing the prohibition on calling secular authorities, asked several rabbis to help him report the abuse, but, he said, they told him they did not want to get involved. Ultimately, he found a rabbi who told him to take his son to a psychologist, who would be obligated to notify law enforcement. “That way you are not the Moser,” he said the rabbi told him, using the Hebrew word for informer. The police arrested Meir Dascalowitz, then 27, who is now awaiting trial, (Otterman, 2012).

So here it is clear, Jungreis was caught between a rock and a hard place. He tried to get rabbinical support to help his son, but like Cardinals Medeiros and Bernard Law, the rabbi leadership were mostly apathetic bystanders who may have been concerned but were not going to get involved. But there was at least one rabbi who helped him come to the decision on taking the boy to a psychologist, and his advice was crucial to helping Jungreis formulate his plan (Otterman and Rivera, 2012; CBS News, 2012). By using the mandatory reporting status of the psychiatrist, Jungreis made sure that the police were notified. However, as a result he unleashed a firestorm of criticism and debate within the Jewish Community.

Dascalowitz was arrested by the police and his son was safe for the moment, but despite his having the psychologist make the report to the police, somehow it became known that Jungreis broke the Hassidic rules and used the psychologist to inform the secular authorities. As a result, and like many other cases (Neustein, 2008), Dascalowitz the accused appeared to be not be as hated by the community, as much as Jungreis the accuser was. Mr. Jungreis received hate
messages and on his voice mail and was kicked out of his apartment. Jungreis was also forbidden to pray inside the synagogue and was forced to do so outside in a local park. Additionally, his son was expelled from a private schools. People who Jungreis had known for years refused to look or speak to him when they walked past him. A woman in a wheel chair supposedly confronted Jungreis’s mother in law, saying that she “did not report this crime, so why did your son-in-law have to?” (Otterman and Rivera, 2012).

Jungreis, with his brave act of defiance and protecting his son, took on the cultural norms and mores that have existed for centuries (Neustein, 2008). His message that the children should come first is out there and has started more intense discussion within the Jewish community. It appears that he may still be shunned by much of Brooklyn Jewish population, but it appears nationwide that his cause is getting more support. The District Attorney in Brooklyn has come under much more scrutiny and criticism for catering to the beth din than ever before, so it appears the seeds of change may have been planted by Jungreis and others who have dared challenge the culture of the Ultra-Orthodox Jewish community.

To conclude, the case of Meir Dascalowitz, had multiple bystander dynamics at play to inhibit any intervention. Some of these factors included witness intimidation in the form of religion, which individuals were warned it was sin to inform another Jew to secular authorities, but also allegedly threats of violence, the silent treatment, as well as the victim being kicked out of his school and the bystander who intervened was kicked out of his apartment. However, Mordechai Jungreis refused to be a passive bystander for several reasons. He cared about his son first of all, and he appeared to have all the elements of Latane and Darley’s model of intervention to successfully intervene. The use of the mandatory reporter was another element that sparked intervention and led to an arrest and conviction.
Case Study 5 - Richard Randall

Background

There is not much information on the background of Richard Chad Randall. In 1999, Randall had been convicted of attempted sexual abuse of a child, but this crime, which had been labeled a second degree felony, was reduced to a class A misdemeanor for which he served just 90 days in jail (Reavy, 2010). In 2002, Randall completed his parole, and prior to 2010 he had been compliant with the terms of his parole (Adams, 2010); that, however, was about to change. According to Jerry Buie, a therapist with Pride Counseling who treats sex offenders and was familiar with Randall’s case, said there were no safeguards in place to keep Randall from reoffending. According to Buie, "He didn't exercise or use the things that he was disciplined to use,” (Yi, 2010).

The Crimes

In Sandy, Utah, September 2010, a mother and her four year-old daughter were shopping at a Deseret Industries department store. The four year-old went to the toy section, reportedly just a “short walk” from her mother when she ran into Richard Chad Randall, who lured her into the men’s room and proceeded to rape her (Kotz, 2010). When she realized her daughter was missing, the mother began a panic-filled search for her daughter and elicited help from the store staff. A few minutes later, she checked the restrooms, and heard her daughter screaming from inside the men’s room. "Her daughter called out, 'Mom, Mom,' " jail records state. The mother told her daughter to open the door, and she replied, "I can't" (Reavy, 2010). Randall had locked the door, but soon unlocked it and ran out of the store. The mother saw that his pants had been down and so were her daughter’s. Her four year-old daughter had allegedly been raped and
possibly sodomized by Randall who then tried to make his escape. Randall, however, was unable to escape due to the actions of a few bystanders. Sandy Police arrived to make the arrest and charged Randall with aggravated kidnapping, aggravated sexual abuse of a child, rape of a child, sodomy. He was booked at Salt Lake City jail where he refused to speak to police without an attorney (Dougherty, 2010; Reavy, 2010).

Five months later, in February 2011, Randall pleaded guilty to aggravated kidnapping and sexual abuse of a child both of which are first degree felonies according to Utah state law, but the more serious charges of rape and sodomy were dismissed. Based on interviews with the girl, investigators believed Randall had raped and molested her. However, the victim apparently had low-level autism, which made communication difficult. As a result, the charges of rape and sodomy seemed “shaky” according to the district attorney Michael Masse who added that the victim did not provide much evidence of injuries, bruising, or other signs of trauma during a medical examination done later that day. Randall did enter a plea deal and this was what the family wanted in order to keep their daughter from re-living the experience as she testified (Koepp, 2011). After his guilty plea, Randall addressed the victim and her family:

"I'm so sorry. I'm sorry I brought you into my hell," Randall told them, sobbing. "It was my hell to bear and not yours. I'm so sorry. I hope you'll be OK…I let my resentment and despair become so blinding that I even believed God himself wanted to see me fail," Randall said. "Today I will deservedly reap what I have recklessly sown…Before committing this crime, I wanted to tear my hair out. Now I want to tear my heart out." (Koepp, 2011).

Despite Randall’s tearful apology and his guilty plea, sadly, the damage was already done. According to the victim’s mother, the little girl was so traumatized that she suffered from
nightmares and did not even trust her own father (Koepp, 2011). This is unfortunate because during that incident one man was apparently able to make to a difference.

Bystander Behavior

Shortly after the mother discovered her daughter was trapped inside the men’s room, one bystander, identified only as Gabriel, heard the mother scream for help. He then saw Randall knocking items over and struggling to flee the store. Within seconds, and despite Randall being larger than he was, Gabriel reportedly ran after Randall into the parking lot, across 9400 street and into the Taco Time parking lot. There, Gabriel was able to catch Randall and tackled him down to the ground. Gabriel struggled with him for what seemed an eternity before managing to subdue him. Two other bystanders moved in to assist Gabriel. The three of them held Randall down until the police showed up to make the arrest (Dougherty, 2010; Kotz, 2010; Reavy, 2010).

KSL news interviewed Gabriel shortly after the incident. He appears to be a foreigner to the United States, and his grammar is incorrect at certain points, but his words appear to be very revealing:

One bystander, who wanted KSL News to identify him only as Gabriel, says he heard the girl's mom yell for help Tuesday afternoon. "When I got there I saw somebody was crying, some people run to the main door; so when the guy running, he throw everything out of his way," Gabriel said. That's when Gabriel took off after the man. The chase began through the front doors and continued through the parking lot. "Yeah, when I grab him he had more tall than me, he more strong. So when he try run again, because he try fighting, but when I grab him I put my knee in his back," Gabriel said. In what seemed like a long time, but was really just a couple of minutes, Gabriel struggled with the man. Thankfully, he had help from two other customers. "'Hey!' he told me, ‘Hey, I can't
breathe! I can't breathe.' I say ‘I don't care. I don't care you can't breathe,' Gabriel recalled. \"Let me stand up,\" [he said]. \'No. Uh-uh, no,\' [I said]. \'You break my back,\' [he said]. \'I don't care. You hurt somebody. I don't care if I hurt you. Sorry,\' [I said].\"

Like the case out of Brooklyn, Gabriel as a bystander appeared to have had all five parts of Latane and Darley’s model of bystander intervention. The cry of help from the mother and the suspect running and throwing everything out of his way was apparently enough for Gabriel to 1) notice the event and 2) interpret it as an emergency. After that, Gabriel committed himself in seconds. How far he had thought it through is unclear. Since the incident occurred so quickly, he probably just reacted on instinct. In accordance with Fischer et al’s study, there seemed to be little ambiguity in this situation, and it definitely was an emergency, so Gabriel’s intervention was, strange as it may seem, predictable (2006). Melanie Carlson (2008) in her study on masculinity and bystander intervention noted research has often shown that men, more than women, are more apt to directly intervene, and that was what happened here. But whether Gabriel was aware of what he was doing or not, he continued the five steps of bystander intervention by 3) taking responsibility for acting, 4) deciding how to Act, and 5) choosing to Act (Latane & Darley, 1970). Step 3, taking responsibility for acting, may not have come until after the pursuit was finished. To think he could have considered all the pros and cons of his actions before committing himself seems a major stretch. In a situation like that there isn’t enough time to calculate risk versus reward. But, however he thought it through, Gabriel apparently had the courage (or perhaps the insanity) to risk his own bodily injury and make a difference. This statement may seem fantastic, but it’s no stretch to say his quick response may have been all that stopped a rapist from escaping and possibly harming an incalculable amount of
people. The police made the arrest and charged him with aggravated kidnapping, rape of a child and aggravated sexual abuse of a child (Yi, 2010).

But there may have been more involved than just Latane and Darley’s theory, which caused Gabriel to intervene. Based on his statements, Gabriel may have been religious and it may have been this background that inspired him to take action. Other quotes by Gabriel in his interview provide this insight:

Gabriel is relieved police have a suspect in custody. If Randall is found guilty, he said he hopes that Randall is severely punished. "I hope the judge [gives him] his whole life there in jail," Gabriel said. "Every night I pray for he be there and not get out."

These comments may have multiple meanings. His hoping that Randall serves a life sentence seems to indicate that Gabriel believed in a harsh punishment for such a crime. This belief in a severe punishment and the desire not to let him get away with it, may have been one of the things that spurred his aggression in pursuing and subduing Randall. Additionally, his other statement how he prays every night for Randall to not get out, when taken literally, suggests that Gabriel may be extremely religious. It may have been this same religious fervor to do the right thing, perhaps to go to heaven upon death, which drove him to intervene in the first place.

Other traits that have historically helped bystanders to engage in what Latane and Darley identify as direct intervention are physical prowess and fighting ability or intervention skills (1970). Research has shown that men have consistently been more willing to directly intervene than women who prefer to use indirect methods such as calling 911 (Carlson, 2008). From Gabriel’s words it can be surmised that he knew how to fight "Yeah, when I grab him he had more tall than me, he more strong. So when he try run again, because he try fighting, but
when I grab him I put my knee in his back” it seems evident that Gabriel probably knew how to fight or perhaps how to wrestle. Randall was taller and stronger, but despite these advantages Gabriel had the confidence and the ability to take him on and get the better of him. Had Gabriel not had these physical and psychological advantages, he may not have intervened at all.

The other possibility to also note was that Gabriel was a foreigner, and this fact may make a difference in whether he decided to take action or not. Numerous people who grew up here, who are familiar with the criminal justice system and the outrageous amounts of civil lawsuits are not motivated to intervene for fear of being sued civilly. Gabriel speaks as if he were a foreigner, so he may not be as familiar with the reality that he could be sued in America for putting his hands on Randall. Gabriel, however, appears to be following the values he believes in and simply wanted to help.

To conclude, the bystander dynamics in the case of Richard Chad Randall included ones that inspired intervention, instead of ones that inhibited it. Gabriel had all the elements of Latane and Darley’s model of bystander intervention being so close the scene of the crime. He appeared to know how to fight and was able to directly intervene physically. Gabriel also appeared to be religious and it may have been this, along with his own moral values that had him in the state of mind to make a difference and help the victim and her mother.
Results and Discussion

I. Survey Results

For this section, we’ll cover the demographic results, followed by statistical findings in the perceived responsibility section and then significant findings in the case scenarios. There were a number of hypotheses that did not have statistically significant results. Their data was saved and may be used for future studies, but their bar charts and data will not be on display here.

A. Demographic Results

Racial Demographics

Two hundred and nine total people were surveyed. Two hundred and four responded or filled out the complete demographic section. The breakdown of the numbers of each race is as follows: One hundred and thirty five or 66.2% were white. Forty seven (23%) were black or African-American. Four (2.0%) were Asian. Ten (4.9%) claimed to be “Other.” Seven (3.4%) participants classified themselves as multi-racial, and one (.5%) claimed to be American Indian or Alaska Native. For ethnicity, of the 209 respondents, 203 responded, 182 listed themselves as Not-Hispanic, and 21 listed themselves as Hispanic or Latino. Six did not fill out the information required.

Age

The ages of the participants were as follows: Of the 209 respondents, 207 filled out the age portion of the demographics. Thirty (14.4%) were 18-29 years old, 50 (23.9%) were aged 30-39, 47 (22.5%) were aged 40-49, 80 (38.3%) were 50 and up. The majority of the respondents was fifty and up, and the smallest sample were those ages 18-29 were mainly
Gender

For gender, of the 209 respondents, only 207 filled out the gender portion of the demographics. One hundred and sixteen (55%) were female and 91 (43.5%) were male. No one who reported themselves as transgender took the survey.

Education

The education levels of the participants were as follows: 66 (31.6%) of the participants were the majority and they had some college education. The next highest (54) had a just high school diploma or GED and they were 25.8% of the sample. 10 individuals (4.8%) had a Master’s Degree or a Doctorate and 12 individuals (5.7%) had some graduate level education. 6 (2.9%) of those individuals who had less than a high school diploma or GED.

Employment

The vast majority (80.9%) of the participants were 169 full-time employees followed by 23 part time employees (11.0%). 10 respondents (4.8%) reported that they were retired and 6 participants (2.9%) reported being unemployed. 1 participant (.5%) did not fill out his/her employment status.

Have Children?

146 (69.9%) participants reported having children. 61 (29.2%) reported that they did not have any children. 2 respondents did not answer the question.
Religiosity

Of the 209 respondents, 20 (9.6%) reported they were extremely religious. 68 (32.5%) reported they were fairly religious. 79 (37.8%) reported they were somewhat religious. 41 (19.6%) reported they were not religious at all. 1 participant did not answer the question.

Worship Service Attendance

The majority of participants (47.1%) were 98 individuals who reported they rarely attend worship services. 57 people (27.3%) who responded said they don’t attend worship services made up the next highest total. 42 (20.2%) participants stated they attend worship services once a week. 9 individuals said they attend worship services two to three times a week. Two (1.0%) people reported that attend worship services every day.

B. Perceived Responsibility Significant Findings

Perceived Responsibility Section

In Question 11, we asked participants how strongly they agreed with the following statements: A. “I think people should assist those in their lives who are in need of help.” 2) “I think it is important for people to follow rules and laws.” 3) “I try to help when I see people in need.” 4) I am willing to help others even at my own risk.” And 5) “I think it is important to tell the truth.” Response categories were structured using the Likert scale. For instance, the participants had to answer if they “strongly agree,” “agree,” are “uncertain,” “disagree,” or “strongly disagree” with the statement.

We began by comparing the perceived responsibility answers to test the hypothesis that risk described in option #4 of Question 11 would significantly reduce the levels of agreement
and by extension the levels of reporting. To do so, we utilized a T-Test with paired samples, but also a single sample. The hypothesis and results, followed by analysis is as follows:

Research Question: Bystanders that demonstrate conventionality are more likely to perceive a personal social responsibility to intervene in child danger

**Education and perceived responsibility variables**

H1: There is a relationship between education and perceived responsibility

H0: There is no relationship between education and perceived responsibility

Results: We fail to reject the null hypothesis. P>.05. in all five questions. There is the possibility of a Type II Error.

Thus, there is no statistically significant relationship between education and perceived responsibility.

**Employment Perceived Responsibility variables**

H2: There is a relationship between employment status and perceived responsibility

H0: There is no relationship between education and perceived responsibility

Results: We fail to reject the null hypothesis. P>.05. in all five questions. There is the possibility of a Type II error. Thus, there is no statistically significant relationship between employment status and perceived responsibility.

**Hypothesis 4: Religiosity and Perceived Responsibility Hypothesis**

H3: There is a relationship between religiosity and perceived responsibility.

H0: There is no relationship between religiosity and perceived responsibility.
Results: We reject the null hypothesis. $P < .05$ (.038). $X^2 = 27.340$ at 16 df. There is the possibility of a Type I error. We accept the research hypothesis. There is a statistically significant relationship between religiosity and perceived responsibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>27.340a</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>31.896</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Ass</td>
<td>18.778</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL OF RELIGIOSITY</td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>UNCERTAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY RELIGIOUS</td>
<td>Count: 0 0 0 2 18 20</td>
<td>% of Total: 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 1.00% 8.60% 9.60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRLY RELIGIOUS</td>
<td>Count: 0 0 0 20 48 68</td>
<td>% of Total: 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 9.60% 23.00% 32.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT RELIGIOUS</td>
<td>Count: 1 1 5 29 43 79</td>
<td>% of Total: 0.50% 0.50% 2.40% 13.90% 20.60% 37.80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT RELIGIOUS AT ALL</td>
<td>Count: 0 0 5 19 17 41</td>
<td>% of Total: 0.00% 0.00% 2.40% 9.10% 8.10% 19.60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count: 0 0 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>% of Total: 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.50% 0.00% 0.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Perceived Responsibility: I think it is important for people to follow rules and laws**

- **Extremely Religious**: 48 Agree, 2 Strongly Agree
- **Fairly Religious**: 20 Agree
- **Somewhat Religious**: 29 Agree, 43 Strongly Agree
- **Not Religious at All**: 19 Agree, 17 Strongly Agree

*SPSS 19 Chi Square*
Analysis: Here some degree of religion appears to have an impact on this sample of participants. The majority felt that it was important to follow rules and laws, and Chi Square found a significant correlation between higher religiosity and stronger belief in the importance of following rules and laws. It appears that this relationship was concentrated among the fairly and somewhat religious respondents because these individuals comprised the highest percentages who strongly agreed it was important to tell follow rules and laws. The majority of all respondents who claimed some degree of religiosity strongly agreed that it was important to follow the rules and laws.

But what is also striking is that those 19 individuals who claimed to not be religious at all only agreed that it was important to follow rules and laws compared to 17 of those who strongly agreed. Additionally, those who were not religious at all had the most respondents who were uncertain along with those who were somewhat religious at five. Those who were somewhat religious had 1 person who disagreed that it was important to follow rules and laws and 1 person who strongly disagreed that it was important to follow rules and laws. Whether these individuals were joking will never be known, but for those who were extremely religious or fairly religious there was no apparent uncertainty, disagreement, or strong disagreement as to whether it was important to follow rules and laws.

To continue with “risk,” we applied the risk variable to see if it would have an impact on reporting in the various scenarios where individuals had job or political positions. The hypothesis is as follows:
Research Question: Do the attributes of suspects influence bystander behavior?

Hypothesis 4: Social Class of the Suspect and Perception of danger Hypothesis

H4: There is a relationship between social class status of the suspect and the perception of danger
[IV = I am willing to help others at my own risk] and willingness to act by the bystander (DV)
[Case Scenarios 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 10].

H0: There is a relationship between social class status of the suspect and the perception of danger
[IV = I am willing to help others at my own risk] and willingness to act by the bystander (DV)
[Case Scenarios 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 10].

Results: For scenarios, 1, 3, 5, 7, and 10, we fail to reject the null hypothesis. There is no statistically significant relationship between the risk statement and the levels of reporting.

For scenario 2: We reject the null hypothesis. There is a statistically significant relationship between the risk statement and the levels of reporting in scenario 2, which is when the teacher sexually assaults the student. P <.05 (.044) \(X^2 = 26.812\) at 16 df. However, there is the possibility of a Type I error.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>26.812</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>21.849</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>5.109</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is no danger here. I have no responsibility to act. There may be a problem here, but I'm unsure. Therefore, I have no responsibility to act. I don't like the student's situation, but I have no responsibility to act. I may have some responsibility to act. I definitely have a responsibility to act.

I am willing to help others even at my own risk.
Analysis

By the numbers alone it is difficult to tell why Chi Square has found this significant. The participants who reported they “agree” with the risk statement had the majority of those who definitely had a responsibility to act or report with 35, and also the majority of those who believe they “may have some responsibility to act” with 37. Those reported they were “uncertain” with the risk statement had the second most “definitely have a responsibility to act or report” total with 28.

Scenario 10: Janitor in the Shower & Risk Variable

As stated before in scenario 10 with the element of “risk” applied, there was no statistically significant relationship between the variables. $P > .05\ (0.054)$. See below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>15.302a</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>12.156</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>9.807</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Scenario 10: Janitor and the Shower

**Crosstab**

**Scenario 10 Janitor and the Shower**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I AM WILLING TO HELP OTHERS EVEN AT MY OWN RISK</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>UNCERTAIN</th>
<th>AGREEE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCERTAIN Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
<td>26.70%</td>
<td>29.10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>41.70%</td>
<td>42.70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>23.30%</td>
<td>23.30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>95.60%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Scenario 10: Janitor and the Shower**

- **Morally Correct and Above Reproach**
- **Morally Questionable, yet understandable given he could lose his job. It is nothing that should be reported.**
- **Morally Reprehensible and something that should be reported regardless of the potential costs to the staff member**

I am willing to help others even at my own risk SPSS 19 Chi Square
Analysis: What appears to give these variables a stronger relationship are the high numbers of individuals who strongly agreed and agreed with the risk statement, but also reported they found the janitor’s behavior to be morally reprehensible. All 48 who strongly agreed with risk believed this to be morally reprehensible and reportable. 55 of 60 who were uncertain in risk strongly agreed it was morally apprehensible. In all 197 of 206 respondents agreed the actions were morally reprehensible.

Research Question: Do the attributes of the victim influence bystander behavior?

Hypothesis 5: Perceived disadvantaged social status of victim & Risk

H5: There is a relationship between the perceived disadvantaged social status of the victim and the perception of danger and willingness to act by the bystander. [Case scenarios #12, #9, #6]

H0: There is no relationship between the perceived disadvantaged social status of the victim and the perception of danger and willingness to act by the bystander. [Case scenarios #12, #9, #6]

Results: We fail to reject the null hypothesis. There is no statistically significant relationship between the perceived social status of the victim and the perception of danger [I am will to help other even at my own risk (IV)] and willingness to report or act by the bystander [case scenarios #12, #9, # 6]. However, there is the possibility of a Type II error.

Research Question: Does age make a difference in levels of perceived responsibility?

Hypothesis 6: Age and Perceived Responsibility

H6: There is a relationship between age of the participant and perceived responsibility

H0: There is no relationship between age and levels of responsibility to report or take action
Results: We reject the null hypothesis. $P < .05 (.015)$. $X^2 = 25.046$ at 12 df. However there is the possibility of a Type I error. There is a statistically significant relationship between age and perceived responsibility with the statement “I think it is important for people to follow rules and laws.”

**I Think It is Important for People to follow Rules and Laws**

Analysis: SPSS appears to find it significant that less than half of respondents ages 18-29 strongly agree that it is important for people to follow rules and laws ($P < .05; N=207$) The sample size of 30 of the 207 is small, but it could be something that should receive further research. This was the lowest percentage of all the age categories, and the percentages went up possibly reflecting the more experience people accrue in age. In the other age bracket of 30-39, 29 of the 50 (58%) respondents strongly agree it was important to follow rules and laws. In ages 40-49 30 of 47 (64%) strongly agreed it was important. For those ages 50 and up, 53 of 80 (66%) strongly agreed that it was important to follow rules and laws.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crosstab</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I THINK IT IS IMPORTANT FOR PEOPLE TO FOLLOW RULES AND LAWS</td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNCERTAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question: Does age make a difference in perceived responsibility?

**Hypothesis 6: Age and Perceived Responsibility – Telling the Truth**

H6: There is a relationship between age of the participant and perceived responsibility

H6: There is no relationship between race and levels of responsibility to report or take action

Results: We reject the null hypothesis. P < .05 (.015). $X^2 = 25.046$ at 12 df. However there is the possibility of a Type I error

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>20.462a</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>22.327</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>2.632</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I THINK IT IS IMPORTANT TO TELL THE TRUTH</th>
<th>UNCERTAIN</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 AND UP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis: The numbers here appear to show that the older participants (50 and up) in this sample believed it was much more important to tell the truth than the younger participants, particularly those in the age 18-29 range. Only 18 participants aged 18-29 believed this was important compared to 48 of the age 50 and up group. This appears to be the significant finding and it may reflect the younger generation’s lack of experience or the older generation’s appreciation for people who tell the truth.

Hypothesis 7: Gender and Reporting

Research Question: Does gender make a difference in bystander behavior?

H7: The gender of the participant compared to the gender of the suspect will make difference in the level of responsibility to act or report

H0: There is no relationship between gender and the level of responsibility to act or report.

Results: We reject the null hypothesis and accept the research hypothesis.
P < .05 (.045); (N=206). X^2 = 17.785 at 8 df. There is a statistically significant relationship between gender of the victims and suspects and the levels of responsibility to act or report. However, there is the possibility of a Type I error.
### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>9.724a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>9.906</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>8.376</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario 2 High School Teacher</th>
<th>There is no danger here, I have no responsibility to act.</th>
<th>There may be a problem here, but I'm unsure, therefore, I have no responsibility to act.</th>
<th>I don't like the student's situation, but I have no responsibility to act.</th>
<th>I may have some responsibility to act.</th>
<th>I definitely have a responsibility to act or report this.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using Chi Square, there was a strong correlation between gender and higher levels of reporting in scenario 2, which was when a female teacher sexually assaulted by groping the buttocks a male student. $P < .05$ (.023); $(N=206)$. $X^2 = 17.785$ at 8 df. This significant relationship appears to be based on the fact that almost twice as many females than males felt strongly about reporting. 61 females out of 115 (53%) felt they definitely had a responsibility to act or report the incident compared to just 31 out of 90 men (34%) who felt the same. 38 females and 35 men felt they may have a responsibility to act there. Seven men, which are more than 3 times as many women (2), said there is no danger, so they have no responsibility to act.
here. 10 females and 13 males said there may be a problem, but they’re not sure, so they have no responsibility to act or report this. 4 females and 4 males said they did not like the child’s situation, but they had no responsibility to act or report this.

This view of having no responsibility to act or report is perhaps because the suspect is a female and the victim is a male. If the suspect had been a male and the victim a female it seems doubtful that this question would have the same results. There most likely would have been perhaps many more respondents of both sexes who felt they definitely had a responsibility to act or report this.

**Case Scenario #5: Gender and Reporting**

Research Question: Does gender make a difference in bystander behavior?

H7: The gender of the participant compared to the gender of the suspect will make difference in the level of responsibility to act or report

H0: There is no relationship between gender and the level of responsibility to act or report.

Results: We reject the null hypothesis and accept the research hypothesis. $P < .05$ (.014); (N=206). $X^2 = 12.479$ at 4 df. There is a statistically significant relationship between gender of the victims and suspects and the levels of responsibility to act or report. However, there is the possibility of a Type I error.
### Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>12.479a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>12.952</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>3.729</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario 5 Boy Scout leader</th>
<th>There is no danger here. I have no responsibility to act.</th>
<th>There may be a problem here, but I'm unsure, therefore, I have no responsibility to act.</th>
<th>I definitely have a responsibility to act or report this.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis: Ninety five out of 116 females definitely felt the responsibility to report. These high numbers appear to be the driving force for Chi Square to consider it significant data. These numbers nearly double the amount of males who also felt the responsibility to report. The males are a smaller sample size, but the results follow the other significant gender scenarios. There is one significant difference from the other scenarios. Neither the victim nor the suspect is female, but the woman’s son is also in the boy scouts and a potential victim, so this fear of having
possibly having their own child victimized is what probably concerns both the male and female respondents.

**Case Scenario #8**

H7: The gender of the participant compared to the gender of the suspect will make difference in the level of responsibility to act or report.

H0: There is no relationship between gender and the levels of responsibility to act or report.

Results: We reject the null hypothesis and accept the research hypothesis.

P < .05 (.010) (N=202). \( X^2 = 13.235 \) at 4 df. However there is the possibility of a Type I error. There is a statistically significant relationship between gender and the perceived levels of responsibility in this scenario.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>13.235a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>14.066</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>5.932</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crosstab</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario 8 White male/ black female fight</th>
<th>There is no danger here. I have no responsibility to act.</th>
<th>There may be a problem here, but I’m unsure, therefore, I have no responsibility to act.</th>
<th>I don’t like the girl’s situation, but I have no responsibility to act.</th>
<th>I may have some responsibility to act.</th>
<th>I definitely have a responsibility to act or report this.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>MALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis: Here again, the number of females (69) who felt they strongly had a responsibility to report more than doubled the number of males who felt the same (34). This appears to be the significant numbers.
Case Scenario #11

Another scenario where gender played a role in reporting or feeling the responsibility to act or report was in scenario 11.

H7: The gender of the participant compared to the gender of the suspect will make difference in the level of responsibility to act or report.

H0: There is no relationship between gender and the levels of responsibility to act or report.

Results: We reject the null hypothesis and accept the research hypothesis.

P < .05 (.005); (N=204). \( X^2 = 12.945 \) at 3 df. However there is the possibility of a Type I error.

The scenario can be seen below followed by Chi Square results and analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>12.945a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Scenario 11 1976 counseling session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There may be a problem here, but I'm unsure, therefore, I have no responsibility to act.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It appears that gender definitely had an impactful role to play with 85 females out of 113 (75%) definitely feeling the responsibility to act or report this compared to just 48 males out of 90, a little more than half (53%) of their total of 90, who felt the same. In addition, combining the far left columns reveals that 15 males (2.5 times more than women) felt they had no responsibility to act here, compared to 6 women who felt the same. Chi Square results show a very strong correlation apparently between the gender of the respondents and the gender of the
victim (the girl) and perhaps the suspect (the stepfather). As you can see, (P< .01 (.005),
\(X^2=12.945\) at 3 df. (N=204)

49 (27 males and 22 females) felt they might have a responsibility to report this. The large numbers of women feeling the need to report this suggests they take this very seriously, perhaps more than the men who responded. The vast majority of studies have shown that women are undoubtedly victims of sexual abuse overwhelmingly more often than men are, so this scenario seems to have struck a nerve (Finkelhor, 1986). Here the suspect is in the same room with the victims; so many victims would be too terrified to say anything with the perpetrator right there. Moreover, it is not uncommon for a wife to protect her husband who has been accused of sexual abuse even at the expense of her own daughters.

The good news is that the majority of the respondents 133 of 204 (65.2%) definitely felt there was a responsibility to report this. The bad news is that this is based on a true story where the counselor and the mother did absolutely nothing. The police or child protective services were never notified. The sexual abuse abated, but only because the girls had reached puberty while physical abuse was allowed to continue. The stepfather, Charles Hamblin, had been raping the three girls since 1969, but it was not until 1982 when one of the victims wrote a letter to her stepmother detailing the allegations that anything was done (Lisa, personal communication, 2012; Vanessa, personal communication, 2012; Suzanne, personal communication, 2012; Leonard, 1986).

**Hypothesis 8: Gender will make a difference in reporting**

Blonde and Child on an MBTA Orange line Train
H7: The gender of the participant compared to the gender of the suspect will make difference in the level of responsibility to act or report

H0: There is no relationship between gender and the levels of responsibility to act or report.

Results: We reject the Null hypothesis. $P < .05$ (.009), $X^2 = 5$ df. There is the possibility of a Type I Error

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>15.385a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>16.217</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>2.902</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N of Valid Cases                      | 202    |    |                       |

Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Scenario 13 Blonde and Child on the Orangeline train</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no danger here. I have no responsibility to act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scenario 13: Blonde with child on Orange line Train

Chi Square shows a significant relationship here that appears to be the number of females who nearly double the number of males who both feel they definitely have a responsibility to act or report here. The suspect is also a female, and it may be a female’s greater concern about the child’s welfare, along with familiarity with how women think, that is driving the female belief she is a threat. The men were much more divided on the issue as 44 felt no responsibility to report while 46 definitely felt the responsibility to act or report. One male seemed to epitomize how the men perceived this situation, as he wrote how he wished that happened to him.

Hypothesis 8: Religiosity and Levels of Reporting

Scenario 2: High School Teacher

Research Question: Does religion make a difference in bystander behavior?

H8: There is a relationship between religiosity and levels of reporting

H0: There is no relationship between religiosity and levels of reporting

Results: We reject the null hypothesis. P < .05 (.011). X^2=31.751 at 16 df. However, there is a possibility of a Type I error.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>31.751a</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>29.739</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>16.095</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF RELIGIOSITY</th>
<th>Scenario 2 High School Teacher</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Religious</td>
<td>There is no danger here. I have no responsibility to act.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There may be a problem here, but I'm unsure, therefore, I have no responsibility to act.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don't like the student's situation, but I have no responsibility to act.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I may have some responsibility to act.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I definitely have a responsibility to act or report this.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly Religious</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Religious</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Religious at all</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>35.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>44.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis: In all 93 of the 208 participants definitely believed they had a responsibility to report this. Of those 93, 83 were either extremely religious (15), fairly religious (35), and somewhat religious (33). Ten of those were not religious at all. Only one group of the four did the majority not believe they definitely had a responsibility to report this: the not religious at all group. For the non-religious group, the majority only felt they may have a responsibility to report. In fact, more participants in the not religious at all group felt they may have a responsibility to report, but they were unsure, so they had no responsibility to act or report. Religion, it appears, is a factor in determining whether individuals will act or report, particularly the ambiguous scenarios like this one. SPSS found the religious variable to be statistically significant here.
**Hypothesis 8: Religiosity and Levels of Reporting**

Research Question: Does religion make a difference in bystander behavior?

H8: There is a relationship between religiosity and levels of reporting

H0: There is no relationship between religiosity and levels of reporting

Results: We reject the null hypothesis. $P < .05$ ($0.029$) $X^2=33.540$ at 20 df. There is the possibility of a Type I Error

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>33.540a</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>26.867</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Crosstab

**Scenario 13 Blonde and Child on the Orange line train**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF RELIGIOSITY</th>
<th>EXTREMELY RELIGIOUS</th>
<th>FAIRLY RELIGIOUS</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT RELIGIOUS</th>
<th>NOT RELIGIOUS AT ALL</th>
<th>5.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There may be a problem here, but I'm unsure, therefore, I have no responsibility to act.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't like the child's situation, but I have no responsibility to act.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I may have some responsibility to act.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I definitely have a responsibility to act or report this.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no danger here. I have no responsibility to act.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chi Square also shows a significant relationship between religiosity and reporting in this scenario involving the blonde female and young boy. This was one of the more vague scenarios that may or may not be child sexual abuse. Those who were extremely religious and fairly religious made up the majority who definitely felt there was an issue here that needed to be reported. On the other hand, it appears that those who were not religious at all or somewhat religious made up the bulk of the participants who felt there was no danger there, so they had no responsibility to act or report. So the reporting parties may have been divided on religious grounds.
Hypothesis 9: Social Status of the Suspect and Employment

Research Question: Is there a relationship between the social statuses of the suspect and bystander and the perceived levels of responsibility to report

H0: There is no relationship between the social statuses of the suspect and the bystander and the perceived levels of responsibility to report

Results: We reject the null hypothesis and accept the research hypothesis.

P < .05 (.013). X² = 25.294 @ 12 df. (N=204). There is the possibility of a Type I error.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>25.294a</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>18.003</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>4.276</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crosstab</th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT STATUS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNEMPLOYED</td>
<td>RETIRED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 12 Homeless man &amp; girl on the MBTA Bus</td>
<td>There is no danger here, I have no responsibility to act.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There may be a problem here, but I'm unsure, therefore, I have no responsibility to act.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t like the child’s situation, but I have no responsibility to act.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I may have some responsibility to act.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I definitely have a responsibility to act or report this.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This scenario when cross-tabulated with employment status appears to reveal a bias on the part of the full time employees who said they definitely have a responsibility to act or report this. 109 full time employees out of 165 felt they definitely had to report this. 165 out of the 204 respondents were all employed full time and SPSS might be considering this to be significant. Only six were unemployed so to improve the survey, more unemployed workers should be surveys as well. The suspect being homeless and touching the little girl’s leg was enough for the full time employees to report, so there appears to be a bias against the homeless. All he wanted was the newspaper. Well he got the bonus plan since most of the respondents felt they had to report the situation. This is understandable since many homeless are sex offenders who cannot get hired in decent paying jobs. In the real situation, the suspect was not homeless, but he was an
elderly Asian male who had touched a girl’s outer thing to get her to pass him the newspaper. This is barely a simple assault and battery charge and does not meet the elements of an indecent assault and battery (SC heft, 2011).

**Hypothesis 10: Race and Reporting**

Research Question: Does race of the bystander and suspect influence bystander behavior?

H10: There is a relationship between race and levels of responsibility to report or take action

H0: There is no relationship between race and levels of responsibility to report or take action

Results: We reject the null hypothesis. P < .05 (.003). X²=41.984 @ 20 df. There is however the possibility of a Type I error

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>41.984a</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>28.196</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario 1 Redline Train</th>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>BLACK OR AFRICAN AMERICAN</th>
<th>ASIAN</th>
<th>AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKA NATIVE</th>
<th>MULTI-RACIAL</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no danger. I have no responsibility to act</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm not sure of the child's safety, therefore, I have no responsibility to act</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't like the child's situation, but I have no responsibility to act</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I may have some responsibility to act here.</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I definitely have a responsibility to act or report this</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis: The sample of races other than white is small, but it appears to have made a difference here, as more whites appear to feel that this is not a sexual abuse situation. Blacks, in particular, don’t seem to agree. 22 whites for example felt there was no danger here, while only one black felt the same. I believe more research and a larger sample size will be needed to confirm this finding.
Hypothesis 10: Race and Responsibility

Research Question: Does race of the bystander and suspect influence bystander behavior?

H10: There is a relationship between race and levels of responsibility to report or take action
H0: There is no relationship between race and levels of responsibility to report or take action

Results: We reject the null hypothesis. P < .05 (.003). $X^2=41.984 @ 20$ df. Chi Square has found a statistically significant correlation of the race variable and the level of reporting. Race appears to have a strong relationship here. The large number of whites who feel they may have a responsibility to report or act (54) and feel they definitely have a responsibility to report or take action (41) stands out as the numbers driving this correlation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>41.984</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>28.196</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 4 Town Selectman</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no danger here. I have no responsibility to act.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There may be a problem here, but I'm unsure, therefore, I have no responsibility to act.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't like the boy's situation, but I have no responsibility to act</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I may have some responsibility to act.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I definitely have a responsibility to act or report this.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN</th>
<th>ASIAN</th>
<th>AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKA NATIVE</th>
<th>MULTI-RACIAL</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the town selectman scenario, 54 whites out of 134 (40%) felt they may have a responsibility to act or report compared to just 12 blacks out of 47 (25%). This appears to be the only significant difference. Otherwise the percentages are same for both races. 41 out of 134
whites (31%) and 16 out of 47 blacks (34%) felt they definitely had a responsibility to act or report this. 24 out of 134 = 18% were unsure and didn’t feel they had responsibility, while 11 out 47 blacks (28%) were unsure so they had no responsibility to act or report. 19 of 47 blacks (40% with 3 categories combined) felt they had no responsibility to act or report while 39 out of 134 whites (29% with three categories combined) felt they had no responsibility to act or report.

F. Conclusion

To conclude, based on the survey results from the statistical analyses, gender, religion, race appear to be dynamics that strongly influence bystander intervention. Gender in particular had a significant effect on ambiguous scenarios such as the teacher in the classroom, the Boy Scout leader, the fight in the street between the white stepfather and his black daughter, and the blonde female on the train levels of religiosity appeared to make a statistically significant difference. Women appear to take sexual assault more seriously since all studies have shown they are sexually abused at much higher rate than men (Finkelhor, 2005). They also seem more willing to report all crimes, but particularly sexual assault (Fledderjohann and Johnson, 2012; Nicksa, 2014; Christy and Voight, 1994). This finding appears to comport with other studies such as Levine’s (2002) finding of that bystanders are more willing to intervene on the in-group and also Fledderjohann and Johnson’s finding that women are also more willing to report than men. Religiosity and reporting also had significant data for scenarios 2, which was the female teacher assaulting the student, and scenario 13, the blonde with the child on the bus. Religion may provide a significant factor for bystander intervention, so it should be explored further.

Race had produced significant data on some of the ambiguous scenarios such as the town selectman and the little boy at the YMCA pool, as well as scenario one on the Redline train.
These results could be deceiving though. The sample size of races other than white was fairly small, so a larger, more diverse sample size is recommended for future studies.

**Comparison and Contrast: Content Analysis Results vs. the Survey Results**

The findings in the survey appear to have mixed results compared to the content analysis of the case studies in which bystanders have actually intervened or failed to intervene. Factors such as risk, gender, and religion all seemed to have an impact on intervention or non-intervention. In the case studies, as far as gender was concerned, two of the most famous bystanders who intervened in the case of John Geoghan were Marge Gallant and Maryetta Dussourd were not only females, but they were parents or aunts so the issue was much more personal to them. These findings

Unfortunately, Gallant’s love of the church appeared to keep her from reporting John Geoghan to the police. Whether she did or not is unclear, but from the available writings she too seemed to want to keep the Church untarnished from scandal.

Religion appeared to be another dynamic that influenced bystander behavior. As the survey results showed, religiosity had a statistically significant relationship on bystander’s perceived responsibility to follow rules and laws, as well as strong responsibility to act or report in several scenarios. Religion, however, seems to be a double-edged sword for bystanders historically. In the Catholic Church scandal involving James Porter, bystanders were religious and were taught to believe that priests were “Christ’s representatives on earth” and to even think a “priest could have sexual designs on children was a sin” (Matchan, Town Secret, 1993). Religious teachings and beliefs that a man could be such a holy and infallible figure led the type of bystanders, like Mr. Dussourd and the nuns who worked with James Porter, to blame and
punish the victim for what the offender did. Such individuals were probably living in denial that a priest could even do such a thing. As Kenneth Lanning stated, “Moreover, these deeply held beliefs made it incredibly difficult for numerous church followers to believe Catholic Church officials could behave like apathetic bystanders and even protect enormous numbers of priests like Porter and Geoghan. Maryetta Dussourd, for example was so disillusioned by the experience of seeing Geoghan, the man who molested her three children and four nephews get protected, that she stopped being a member of the Catholic Church altogether (Lombardi, 2002)

In the case study involving Richard Chad Randall, the bystander named Gabriel appeared to be very religious by his words, and it may have been his faith that helped drive him to intervene when he saw Randall, the suspect in the rape, attempt to flee. Gabriel probably also had a set of values within him that helped propel him, along with a knowledge of how to fight that gave him confidence, but it may have been religion that also spurred his actions.

Case Scenario #3

Your best friend says that you should be disgusted because your favorite priest has a “thing” for young boys. Your own son is in the choir. This priest has been working in your church for nearly 20 years and has done much work for charity, the community, and the church. He has also taken your son, many altar boys, as well as many disadvantaged youth out for ice cream and trips to the local YMCA where they went swimming and played sports. Later that afternoon, well after church is over, you see the same priest and a young boy come out of a room with their clothes disheveled. They both give you a look of concern, but say nothing. What do you do?

This scenario was based on the real case study of John Geoghan who the Reverend Anthony Benzevich reported going in and out of his bedroom or rectory with multiple
young boys who came out in various states of undress. The Bystander behavior or level of reporting could be considered very similar in the survey and the actual incident. In the survey, the majority (144 out of 204) of participants and especially those who were Catholics (71 out of 95) definitely felt the need to act or report. Benzevich, to his credit, reported Geoghan’s behavior to his superiors right away, but was threatened to be sent to Peru Later, in 2002, Benzevich also informed some local newspaper reporters. Unfortunately, Benzevich never informed the police and later, after receiving what appeared to be some intimidation or perhaps a bribe, he changed his story (Rezendes, 2002).

Scenario 5 was also based on the John Geoghan case study. In the scenario a little boy yells “Stop touching me daddy!” and was adjusting his trunks. He was whiny brat and this is typical. This scene actually occurred although it was no town selectman, but John Geoghan who being a priest was considered “Christ’s representative on earth” (Matchan, Town Secret, 1993). Geoghan did grope this child and later was convicted of it. Geoghan’s behavior caught the attention of another person who did report it to one of the bishops. The mother of the child did not report the incident until nine years later, so the bishop’s notes were key to securing the conviction because it showed something did happen. (Lombardi, 2002). In the survey, the majority who felt it was a strong enough to report were few (62 of 206 respondents) since there was little to report, and the question was designed to be vague. Fischer et al and others have noted that bystanders are less likely to report when the situation is ambiguous (2006).

Scenario 6 was based on an incident that occurred in 1998 at Penn State when Jerry Sandusky showered with a young boy whose mother noticed her son’s wet hair when he came home. She immediately notified campus police who investigated. In the survey, the majority (161 of 206) strongly felt the responsibility to report. There was no mention of sexual contact in
the scenario, so that made the situation ambiguous enough for 15 people to feel they had no responsibility to act or report and 30 to think they may have a responsibility there.

Another scenario based on the case studies was scenario #7, which had the college wrestling coach who walked in on the football coach and young boy rolling on the mat. This scenario was based on an actual event that occurred at Penn State University. The results of the survey appear to reflect exactly what happened. Joe Miller walked in on Jerry Sandusky while he was rolling on the mat with Victim 1. Miller did not see enough to make a report, but he thought something was wrong since there was another room with more mats, and Sandusky was not a wrestling coach. The survey results reflected the ambiguity of the situation too. Only 73 individuals (41 females and 32 males) felt they definitely had to report this. 48 said they had had no responsibility to act, and 82 said they may have a responsibility to act. My guess is that Miller would fit into “may” group as well. When Jerry Sandusky got arrested, that was the final piece of the puzzle for Miller and he testified, corroborated Victim 1’s story, and helped secure Sandusky’s conviction for 45 counts of sexual abuse of a child (Grand Jury Indictment, 2011). The lesson to be learned here is for many bystanders to intervene they need to be sure of what they are seeing, particularly in this age of defamation of character lawsuit being rampant. But what can also taught is that they don’t need to know all the facts. They can make an anonymous call to a child protective service or the police who will do an investigation, which may or may not uncover what is going on, but it’s better than doing nothing.

Scenario 8 was also based on a real case, which unfortunately did not have enough information available to be included in the content analysis. This was the fight in 1976 between Charles Hamblin, 39-40 years old at the time and his 13 year-old step-daughter who he had been sexually abusing for years. The results from the survey did not match the actual results that
occurred. We designed the question to be ambiguous, yet provided enough information to raise suspicions. 103 participants answered that they strongly felt the responsibility to act or report. Not one of these participants was apparently at the actual scene. Because there, although many people saw it, not one bystander called the police or an ambulance, and no one asked the girl if she was okay after suffering two black eyes. She also got her head slammed repeatedly on the pavement. It appears that race, the bystander effect as well as some other factors were in play there. Levine noted in his study that bystanders do not intervene when it is family members who are engaged in a domestic (2002). Christy and Voight noted that children who were black received less help in their study with a largely all white participants (1994). In the survey, one of the participants also made a comment that she would expect someone else to do something. This statement represented the bystander effect, and she was not at the scene (Latane and Darley, 1968).

Another scenario based on a real case was the janitor and the shower, which was mentioned earlier in the case of Jim Calhoun at Penn State. Unlike what Calhoun did, the overwhelming majority 195 of 204 in the survey felt what happened was morally reprehensible and should have been reported. The survey participants did not have the same element of risk (possibly losing their job or ending up dead like the district attorney) that Calhoun had, so what the participants say may not actually be what they would do. Calhoun had his own physical issues as well, perhaps post-traumatic stress from the Korean conflict, and he needed that job, so a situation like that was the last thing he wanted.

Case Scenario 11, the 1976 counseling session was also based on the Charles Hamblin case (Marshfield Man, 1984). The situation actually happened and a counselor as well as the children’s mother found out that day that Hamblin had been abusing the girls. For their own
reasons, neither person ever reported the situation to the police or child protective service. For the counselor, this was in violation of mandatory reporting laws, which had been enacted in 1974. In the survey, the participants sharply disagreed with the actions of the counselor and the mother. Eighty five females of 113 felt the strongly had the responsibility to act or report, and 48 men felt the same. Again, though, the element of risk was not with the participants, who did not have to live in the same household with Hamblin who was reportedly physically abusive as well as sexually abusive. However, the results of that finding are encouraging that things perhaps have changed since 1976 as far as reporting child sexual abusers. Although the numbers of cases have been going down, in the late 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s there were floods of reports of cases going back to the 1960s, so it appears that people are reporting, and child molesters are given more severe sentences (Finkelhor, 2009).

Limitations

The clear limitation with this study is the fact that the data comes from a survey, which represents how bystanders feel, but not necessarily if they will actually intervene in a real situation. That was apparent by the way the low number of respondents answered how strongly agreed with the statement “I am willing to help others even at my own risk.” Another limitation is that the survey got the opinions of mostly full time employees. To have gotten a larger sample of those who were part-time employees or unemployed or perhaps self-employed may have made a difference.

The school system I targeted for the survey was completely uncooperative and their refusal to participate in the survey eliminated a large number of potential bystanders who may be the first to recognize sexually abuse children. Many teachers may be already experienced in seeing signs and symptoms so their input could have been valuable. For those teachers who are
unfamiliar with child sexual abuse situations or when to report, this survey could have provided some valuable training and ideas for future training.

Policy implications

There are multiple changes that can occur to current policy to address the issues of the dynamics underlying bystander intervention in child sexual abuse scenarios. One way to perhaps increase bystander intervention is to change the current list of mandatory reporters of child abuse to include all adults over the age of 18. But in addition, such a change in the law has to be enforced in order to send a message that children are worth protecting.

Education is another area where policy can be changed. Children for years have been taught about stranger danger, but this needs to go further to unfortunately include the scary reality that the sex offender will most likely be someone they know. There needs to be a more focus on how to implement bystander intervention in a practical form so that it can make a difference. Training programs like Victoria Banyard has discussed on college campuses need to be extended to all school children. This may not be recommended for young children such as those under 7 years of age, but it needs to be addressed. The Green Dot Strategy for increasing bystander intervention is one such option that could be introduced. It includes methods on how to teach children how to be proactive and reactive bystanders (CDC, 2014). But parents, teachers, and others need to also be continually informed of how to recognize the signs and symptoms of child sexual abuse. They also need to talk to their children. Many sexually abused children never tell about their abuse, and this is often because no one ever asks.

Another change is broader, and addresses the levels of risk bystanders face in intervention in child sexual abuse cases. As with individuals who provide CPR, there should be
a protection against civil liability for individuals who, in good faith, report possible cases of child sexual abuse. Connecticut has such a law protecting bystanders who make such reports in good faith, so why not Massachusetts? (Katz, 2014) Liability seems to be preventing many good people from wanting to get involved and make a difference. This has to change.

Additionally, one of the risks bystanders face in getting involved is their participation within the criminal justice system. Bystanders face losing large amounts of money they could be earning, as they miss work due to court appearances that often are continued for another day. There needs to be an increase in the compensation to match or come close to matching what the bystander risks losing.

Another change to current policy affects the job status of individuals charged with being sex offenders. Employers should not be allowed to fire employees simply because they have been charged with being child sexual abuse. More than once an individual has been falsely accused, usually because of a vicious custody battle or part of a divorce proceeding. Termination should only be authorized in the event of a finding of guilty or not guilty. This option should assist bystanders who are hesitant to come forward and make an accusation in an ambiguous case because they don’t want to see someone lose their job if they are wrong. The employer should face hefty fine if they terminate someone wrongfully.

**Recommended future studies from this issue**

Future studies on this issue should include more concentrated efforts to find out who was a bystander in a child sexual abuse case or knew of a bystander(s) and what they did or did not do to intervene and why. There should also be studies on families and bystander intervention from within. Most bystanders, it appears, will not report a family member. An examination into
the threshold of what will trigger this reporting is necessary since many of these abusers have multiple victims both inside and outside the family. Future studies could also include more of a focus on race and/or religion on bystander intervention in child sexual abuse cases. There are also so many other cultures to be examined as well because child sexual abuse seems to be everywhere, but, as Simon Hallsworth and Tara Young suggested, there can’t be crime without silence. There are bystanders in many of these cases, and they need to rise and make a difference whoever they are, wherever they are.
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Appendix 1
The Survey

Child Sexual Abuse Response Survey Questions

1) Please select the category that best describes your racial identity.
   A) White
   B) Black or African-American
   C) Asian
   D) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Highlander
   E) American Indian or Alaska Native
   F) Multi-racial
   G) Other ____________

2) Please select the category that best describes your ethnicity.
   A) Hispanic or Latino
   B) Not Hispanic or Latino

3) Please select the category that includes your age.
   A) 18-29
   B) 30-39
   C) 40-49
   D) 50 and up

4) Please identify your gender
A) Female
B) Male
C) Transgender

5) Please identify your current educational level
A) less than high school diploma or GED
B) high school diploma or GED
C) some college
D) Associates Degree
E) Bachelor’s Degree
F) Some graduate school
G) Master’s or Doctorate degree

6) Employment status
A) Part – time employee
B) Full – time employee
C) Unemployed
D) Retired

7) Do you have children?
A) Yes
B) No

8) Please identify your religious faith?
A) Catholic
B) Protestant (Episcopalian, Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian)
C) Muslim
D) Baptist
E) Jewish
F) Mormon
G) Other:

9) How often do you attend worship services?
A) Once a week
B) Two-three times a week
C) Every day
D) Rarely
E) I don’t attend worship services

10) How would you identify your level of religiosity (religiousness)?
A) Extremely religious
B) Fairly religious
C) Somewhat religious
D) Not religious at all

11. Perceived Personal Responsibility

Please enter an (X) under your chosen response category for questions a thru g in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Uncertain</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>I think people should assist those in their lives who are in need of help.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>I think it is important for people to follow rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>I try to help when I see people in need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>I am willing to help others even at my own risk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>I think it is important to tell the truth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12) **Case Scenario #1**

You are on board a Redline Train heading towards South Station. Across from you is a man with a little girl, approximately 3-5 years-old, who appears to be his daughter. You observe him place his hand on the little girl’s rear-end consistently as he holds her. The man appears to also have his hand on her inner thigh. The little girl did not seem to be upset. The man appears to be
a well-dressed businessman who is wearing a wedding band and has even spoken to someone on
the cellphone and this person seemed to be his wife. What is your perception of this?

A) There is no danger. I have no responsibility to act.
B) I’m not sure of the child’s safety, therefore, I have no responsibility to act.
C) I don’t like the child’s situation – but I have no responsibility to act.
D) I may have some responsibility to act here.
E) I definitely have a responsibility to act or report this.

*Optional: In one to two sentences explain why you made your choice

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

13) Case Scenario #2

You are a teen-age student at your high school. You are heading to your favorite class for some
extra help, and it is late in the afternoon. So far you have earned nothing but high marks in this
class, and you and the teacher get along great. You walk to the door of your classroom and find
the door closed and locked. You look through the window and observe your teacher with
another student who is about fourteen years-old. You see this teacher place her hand on the
buttocks of the student. She quickly moved her hand away, but it seemed deliberate. The boy
did nothing to stop her and didn’t seem to mind the touching. What is your perception of this
situation?

A) There is no danger here. I have no responsibility to act.
B) There may be a problem here, but I’m unsure, therefore, I have no responsibility to act.
C) I don’t like the student’s situation, but I have no responsibility to act.
D) I may have some responsibility to act.
E) I definitely have a responsibility to act or report this.

*Optional: In one to two sentences explain why you made your choice
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

14) Case Scenario #3

Your best friend says that you should be disgusted because your favorite priest has a “thing” for young boys. Your own son is in the choir. This priest has been working in your church for nearly 20 years and has done much work for charity, the community, and the church. He has also taken your son, many altar boys, as well as many disadvantaged youth out for ice cream and trips to the local YMCA where they went swimming and played sports. Later that afternoon, well after church is over, you see the same priest and a young boy come out of a room with their clothes disheveled. They both give you a look of concern, but say nothing. What do you do?

A) There is no danger here. I have no responsibility to act.
B) There may be a problem here, but I’m unsure. Therefore, I have no responsibility to act.
C) I don’t like the boy’s situation, but I have no responsibility to act.
D) I may have some responsibility to act.
E) I definitely have a responsibility to act or report this.

*Optional: In one to two sentences explain why you made your choice.
________________________________________________________________________
15) Case Scenario #4

You are with a group of people, and you see a father with his son in the local swimming pool. The father happens to be a local town selectman that you voted for and who has devoted money and resources to work on projects that you support. You suddenly hear the child yell: “Stop touching me Daddy!” The little boy is not smiling and does not appear to be joking. He is also adjusting his swim trunks. He is about seven years old. He has constantly been a whiny brat in the past, and this is typical. The others in your group appeared to see and hear this as well.

How do you perceive this situation?

A) There is no danger here. I have no responsibility to act.
B) There may be a problem here, but I’m unsure. Therefore, I have no responsibility to act.
C) I don’t like the boy’s situation, but I have no responsibility to act.
D) I may have some responsibility to act.
E) I definitely have a responsibility to act or report this.

*Optional: In one to two sentences explain why you made your choice.

______________________________________________________________________________

16) Case Scenario #5
Your son is in the Boy Scouts, and you have just read about numerous scout masters or personnel who have been accused of molesting young boys. To date there have been no arrests in these cases. Your son tells you that on the camping trip this past weekend that he saw one of the scout leaders sleeping in the same sleeping bag with one of the young boys. What do you do?

A) There is no danger. I have no responsibility to act.

B) The child may be in danger but I’m unsure, therefore, I have no responsibility to act.

C) I don’t like the child’s situation, but I may have some responsibility.

D) I definitely have a responsibility to report this.

*Optional: In one to two sentences explain why you made your choice.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

17) Case Scenario #6

You are in college and are a player on the basketball team. You walk into the locker room and see one of the assistant coaches showering with a young boy who is perhaps ten years-old. You know this coach does not have kids, but is involved in the Big Brothers / Big Sisters Organization. You can’t see everything, but you believe you see the coach rubbing soap onto the child’s back. How do you feel about this situation?

A) There is no danger. I have no responsibility to act.

B) The child may be in danger but I’m unsure, therefore, I have no responsibility to act.

C) I don’t like the child’s situation, but I may no responsibility.
D) I may have some responsibility to report.
E) I definitely have a responsibility to report this.

*Optional: In one to two sentences explain why you made your choice.

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

18) Case Scenario #7

You are a college wrestling coach. You walk by one of the smaller gym rooms and you are just putting some equipment away. It is 7 PM on a Sunday night when you see the defensive coach of the football team rolling on a wrestling mat with a young boy who is about 12 years-old. The defensive coach was a major part of winning the college football team two NCAA titles. You know this coach does not have kids, but is involved in the 7th Heaven charity organization for disadvantaged children. This is one of those kids. The coach sees you and gets up quickly and said to you that he and the boy were practicing some wrestling moves. He is not a wrestling coach.

A) There is no danger. I have no responsibility to act.
B) The child may be in danger but I’m unsure, therefore, I have no responsibility to act.
C) I don’t like the child’s situation, but I have no responsibility to act or report this.
D) I might have a responsibility to act or report this.
E) I definitely have a responsibility to act or report this.

*Optional: In one to two sentences explain why you made your choice.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

19) Case Scenario #8

You come out of your house and you see an adult male having a fight with a young girl who is 13 years old. He is a white male. The girl is a black female. She is his step daughter. The girl is a known trouble-maker and has been acting out for years. You see lots of other people outside and everyone is watching. The man has never been a problem. The girl is swearing at him, calling him a “F@@king diddler” and “Sick F@@k!!.” She yells at the top of her lungs “What are you going to do? Rape me again in front of all these people?” What is your perception of this?

A) There is no danger. I have no responsibility to act.
B) The child may be in danger but I’m unsure, therefore, I have no responsibility to act.
C) I don’t like the child’s situation, but I have no responsibility to act or report this.
D) I might have a responsibility to act or report this.
E) I definitely have a responsibility to act or report this.

*Optional: In one to two sentences explain why you made your choice

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

20) Case Scenario #9

One of the senior staff members walked into his boss’s office in order to get a stapler and pen. As he approached the desk, on his boss’s computer he observed what appeared to be a large picture of a naked child engaged in sexual intercourse with an adult man. The picture was on a website called ‘Dreamboard.com.’ On the borders of the large picture were numerous smaller pictures of naked children in sexual positions with adults. The child appeared to be a young girl, perhaps age 12 at the most, and she seemed to be in pain while the man having sex with her had a smile on his face. The boss suddenly came in and saw him looking at the screen. The boss immediately became visibly upset, and said that he clicked on that website by accident. The boss advised his staff member to not tell anyone about it. The staff member decided to keep his mouth shut. Before this incident, the boss had just promoted the staff member to a position with a six-figure salary. How would you characterize the actions of the staff member?

A) Morally correct and above reproach

B) Morally questionable, yet understandable given he could lose his job. It is nothing that should be reported.

C) Morally reprehensible and something that should be reported regardless of the potential costs to the staff member.

*Optional: In one to two sentences explain why you made your choice

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

21) Case Scenario #10
A janitor at a major University was cleaning inside the men’s locker-room late at night on a Sunday night when he heard two people in the shower making moaning and grunting sounds.

You observe the defensive coordinator of the football team, a man who has achieved an amazing record, giving oral sex to a young boy who appears to be no more than 12. At the time, this janitor made a little more than minimum wage and had children in school. He believed that if he did anything, he would probably lose his job because the football program and the school would close ranks to protect their interests. He spoke with his supervisor and other janitors about what he saw, and they all agreed that he would lose his job if he reported it. The football program was highly successful and, as a nationally ranked powerhouse, wielded tremendous influence on the community. As a result, the janitor never said anything. How do you feel about the janitor’s actions?

A) Morally correct and above reproach
B) Morally questionable, yet understandable given he could lose his job. It is nothing that should be reported.
C) Morally reprehensible and something that should be reported regardless of the potential costs to the staff member.

*Optional: In one to two sentences explain why you made your choice

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

________
In 1976, before there were mandatory reporting requirements of child abuse, a mental health counselor met with an African-American mother, her three daughters (also African-American) and their stepfather who was a white male. With the family all together in her office and gathered around a round table, the mother stated how the girls complained to her that the stepfather may have been touching them inappropriately. Two of the girls refused to discuss it, saying the whole thing was “Much ado about nothing” and it was “no big deal.” One of the girls said the stepfather was “diddler” and forced her to have sex against her will. The stepfather, after much questioning, admitted to “maybe touching the girls playfully as they were horsing around,” but denied doing anything inappropriate. He said that one of the girls in particular (the one who complained) was a serious drama queen and just wanted attention. The girls’ mother told the counselor that she did not want the police to get involved. She said she would put a stop to the “foolishness” one way or the other. As she put it: “This was not going to continue in her house.” The girls had not said anything about child abuse to anyone else, not even their real father who had custody of them on weekends. The stepfather also had no criminal record and had a great reputation in the community. If you were the mental health counselor, what would your perceptions be about this situation?

A) There is no danger. I have no responsibility to act.
B) The child may be in danger but I’m unsure, therefore, I have no responsibility to act.
C) I don’t like the child’s situation, but I have no responsibility to act or report this.
D) I may have some responsibility to act or report this.
E) I definitely have a responsibility to act or report this.

*Optional: In one to two sentences explain why you made your choice

______________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

24) Case Scenario #12

You are on board an MBTA bus and heading to work. You’re running a little late for the second day in a row. While on board, you observe what appears to be a homeless man sitting on the seat in the back of the bus. He is a black male and his clothes appear dirty and disheveled. A little girl, who is white and appears to be about 7-8 years-old, is sitting next to him. The little girl’s mother is sitting on the other side of the girl. The mother is talking on her cellphone and has a laptop in front of her, so she appears oblivious to what is going on around her. The homeless man places his hand on the girl’s thigh and rubs her leg a little bit, as he asks if she can pass him a copy of the newspaper. The girl seems disturbed by this. What are your perceptions of this situation?

A) There is no danger. I have no responsibility to act or report what happened
B) The child may be in danger, but I’m unsure, therefore, I have no responsibility to act.
C) I don’t like the child’s situation, but I have no responsibility to act or report this.
D) I may have a responsibility to act or report what happened.
E) I definitely have a responsibility to act or report what happened.

*Optional: In one to two sentences explain why you made your choice
25) Case Scenario #12

You are at South Station waiting for your commuter rail train and on your way home from a long day at work. You observe what appeared to be a homeless white male sit down at a table next to a small child, a little boy who is five or six years old. The child’s father was just there and went to the restroom. The child seemed a little afraid when he was all alone, but the homeless man then gave the child some candy and spoke to him. The child then seemed happy again. How do you feel about this situation?

A) There is no danger. I have no responsibility to act or report what happened.
B) The child may be in danger, but I’m unsure, therefore, I have no responsibility to act.
C) I don’t like the child’s situation, but I have no responsibility to act or report this.
D) I might have a responsibility to act or report what happened.
E) I definitely have a responsibility to act or report what happened.

*Optional: In one to two sentences explain why you made your choice.

26) Case Scenario #13

You are on board a fairly crowded Orange line train and observe an adult female with blonde hair and blue eyes standing awfully close to young boy. The blonde female is pretty with blue
eyes, a shapely figure, and appears to be about 23 years old. The child appears to be around the age of 14. The blonde appeared to be pressing her breasts onto the arm of the child, who seemed to be totally comfortable with the whole situation. The female kept her breasts pressed against him for what appeared to be several minutes. What are your perceptions of this situation?

A) There is no danger. I have no responsibility to act.
B) The child may be in danger but I’m unsure, therefore, I have no responsibility to act.
C) I don’t like the child’s situation, but I have no responsibility to act or report this.
D) I might have a responsibility to act or report this.
E) I definitely have a responsibility to act or report this.

*Optional: In one to two sentences explain why you made your choice

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________