![Durham University Centre for Catholic Studies logo]

Boundary Breaking: The Research Methodology

The Boundary Breaking research project took place within the Centre for Catholic Studies at Durham University from 2019-2024. The main project report, titled *The Cross of the Moment*, is available on the CCS webpages here Boundary Breaking - Durham University

This essay describes the evolution of the research.

_____

1   Origins, Background, Structures

There is always a journey which leads to the beginning of a research project. For Boundary Breaking (BB), the journey began with a challenge to the Centre for Catholic Studies in Durham University by a retiring priest; in the light of its mission, should the child abuse crisis in the Catholic Church become an object of its research and study? An initial scoping and planning colloquium was held. The aim of the colloquium was to foster a series of critical and constructive conversation to help generate a focused research proposal for a major European grant. The event included survivors from the English context, and former offenders from the Irish context, along with a host of specialists from a variety of disciplines and institutions, including the author of a major study of sexual abuse and the Catholic Church in the Irish context - Dr Marie Keenan. [1]

In January 2016 Dr Marcus Pound submitted a research proposal on 'Boundary breaking: the implications of the clerical sexual abuse crisis' to the European Research Council (ERC) which reached the second round of the application process before rejection. However, following subsequent conversations with the Porticus Trust, we were encouraged to submit a revised application for their support, which was obtained in 2018. Two other funders, the English Benedictine Province (EBC) and the British Jesuit province, later joined the project.

The project team comprised three full-time posts, with additional part-time administrative support, as well as an allocation of time from the CCS director, Professor Paul D. Murray, acting as co-investigator. Marcus Pound was released from teaching and assigned substantially to the research from 2019. Dr Guiseppe Bollota was appointed as assistant professor(research) and took up his post in October 2019. Dr Catherine Sexton joined as a second assistant professor (research) in July 2020. When Guiseppe Bollota left the project in December 2020, his post was re-structured to create two part-time posts from April 2021 onwards; a post-doctoral research associate post taken up by Dr Pat Jones and a one-year post engaging a doctoral student, Adrian Brooks, to develop a literature review.

---

[1] Marie Keenan, *Child Sexual Abuse and the Catholic Church: Gender, Power and Organizational Culture* (OUP, 2011)

From the beginning, the project sought and built connective and collaborative structures and relationships. A steering group was set up in 2018 and met several times. It was agreed that the project required an additional run in year to foster relations before the formal start date of the project in September 2019. A stakeholder group was later added, bringing together key individuals from relevant structures and fields of activity. Both groups met at intervals throughout the research, contributing advice and relevant expertise. The membership of both groups is found in appendix one.

During this period, Marcus Pound also built contacts with other academic institutions working in this area in Europe and globally. In 2020, through the activities of the Boundary Breaking Project, the Centre for Catholic Studies was one of a group of eight institutions to have agreed the creation of a Global Safeguarding Alliance (GSA).[2] Some of these contacts led to conference participation and international conversations at various points during the research.

2   Research aims

The research aimed to explore the ecclesial-cultural dimensions of the abuse crisis in the Catholic Church in England and Wales, in dialogue with theological perspectives and sources, and to offer a constructive account of how relevant aspects of Catholic understanding and practice might be re-articulated or repaired.

Marie Keenan had argued in her conclusions that systemic cultures in the Catholic Church and particular theological concepts are implicated in facilitating not only the abuse, but also the failure in response. Her argument that the culture of Catholicism bears responsibility has become widely recognised in other literature. Keenan's research was based on clinical work and in-depth interviews with clergy who had offended and drew on her own expertise as a forensic psychotherapist and criminologist.

The Boundary Breaking project wanted to address the thesis in four distinct ways.

1. First, we wanted to explore the general thesis within the context of the Catholic community in England and Wales.
2. Second, we wanted to make the voices of the survivors' primary within the research.
3. Third, we wanted to break the dyad of offender/victim-survivor by listening to the wider set of voices that constitute the Church as well as the wider social-discourse.
4. Fourth, we wanted to maintain a primacy of theological interpretation with a view to finding constructive ways forward for the Church.

Throughout the research we maintained a primary commitment to the survivor. Following early advice from the Survivors' Trust we sought to incorporate aspects of the *Charter for Survivor Engagement* and the *Survivor Involvement Ladder* produced by Survivors' Voices.[3] This included involving survivors at all levels of governance, not just on the advisory board as we had initially thought, but also on the Steering Group, bringing relevant professional expertise as well as their own experience to bear upon the considerations.

---

[2] The GSA is intended to promote the common goal of safeguarding; it is a voluntary association of academic, teaching, and research institutions, as well as practice-oriented professional schools and individual experts.
[3] *Turning Pain into Power: A Charter for Organisations Engaging Abuse Survivors in Projects, Research & Service Development* Survivors Voices

Although we did not achieve the highest level set out in the Ladder, of co-production, there remained nonetheless informal elements of co-production at work. For example, survivor insights were often the catalyst for the inclusion of a category in the later stages of coding. It was important that survivors were involved in the governance of the project and acted as advisers when needed on points of practice and content. They were also among the peer reviewers of the texts produced. They were a priority group among research participants, forming just over a quarter of those interviewed, and took part in other elements of the research described below. Their stories remain with the researchers.

3   Evolution of the methodology and structures

The first phase: ethnographic exploration: September 2019 – January 2021

As we were exploring the culture of the Church, we wanted to employ the tools of ethnography. Ethnographic methods cover a range of research practices and methods often including long/short-term/multi-sited/repeated fieldwork/visits. Fieldwork can be carried out by means of casual conversations with a wide range of participants but also interviews (usually open-ended, qualitative and in-depth). In the first phase, overseen by Guiseppe Bollota, an ethnographic mapping of the landscape was undertaken through exploratory conversations with key individuals and groups. These included survivors of abuse and survivor-led organisations, those currently working in safeguarding within the Catholic Church and in secular settings such as experts working in agencies like the Lucy Faithfull Foundation and others. This phase of mapping provided valuable advice and insight which would inform the research project's work with survivors in particular. Some of these people remained throughout the project as 'informants' in the sense that they did not wish to be formally identified with the project, but nonetheless maintained interested links often providing valuable insight.

The project's structures also developed in this period. The steering group had begun work in 2018 and was further strengthened when Dr Julie Clague from Glasgow University took up the chair in October 2020. The stakeholder group was established and included the bishop responsible for safeguarding and the general secretary of the Bishops' Conference as well as representatives of religious communities and agencies such as Circles UK.

This phase also included work to ensure that key figures were aware of the research and to listen to any concerns they expressed. The research held a high level of sensitivity in several directions: first, in relation to survivors whom we hoped to engage; secondly, in relation to the current experience of the Catholic Church in the midst of the IICSA process;[4] and thirdly, in relation to the reputation and integrity of the Centre for Catholic Studies and the University. Conversations took place with Cardinal Nichols as president of the CBCEW, after which Cardinal Nichols appointed Dr Jim McManus to represent him on the project's steering group,

---

[4] The Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse (IICSA) was a statutory inquiry set up by the British Government in 2014 which concluded in 2022. Its task was to investigate where and how institutions such as children's homes, local authorities and faith-based institutions had failed to protect children in their care. The Inquiry gathered evidence through fifteen investigations which generated nineteen reports. Several of these investigations focused on Catholic institutions, including case studies on Ampleforth, Downside and St Benedict's Ealing schools and their connected monasteries within the English Benedictine Congregation, and also Birmingham Archdiocese. A report on child protection in the Catholic Church in England and Wales as a whole was published in November 2020, *Safeguarding in the Roman Catholic Church in England and Wales.*[4] This overarching report considered policies, leadership and canon law as well as reviewing whether the Church's own commissioned reviews of child protection had improved policy and practice.

During this phase, the ethical framework for the research was developed. The research proposal, aims and plan, and associated tools such as the participant information form, were reviewed and approved by the relevant University research ethics committee. Subsequent alterations to the research plan were also approved by the same committee. Research team members undertook mandatory training in research ethics. The ethical commitments informing the research, especially in relation to anonymity for participants and their safety and well-being, remained operative throughout and tested through our interactions with field sites.

As part of the groundwork for the research, Marcus Pound produced a substantial paper reviewing the then-current scientific data on child abuse within the context of global prevalence studies. Titled *Child Sexual Abuse in the Catholic Church in England and Wales* [unpublished]**,** the paper presented a critical appreciation of existing streams of research in the area of child sexual abuse including criminology, psychology, institutional abuse and comparative lines of investigation. Completed in January 2020, the paper was circulated to key stakeholders in order to demonstrate the contextual awareness underpinning the research. The paper also served to make the case for an ethnographic approach. Pound further developed the underpinning research with the Irish historian Mary E. Daley through their co-written contribution to *The Oxford History of British and Irish Catholicism* on 'Clerical Abuse'.[5]

The second phase: the shift to a different research strategy: data gathering and analsyis January 2021-April 2023

January 2021-March 2022	**Interviews and focus groups take place.**
April-July 2022	**Development of coding structure and coding of the transcripts**
September 2022-April 2023	**Thematic analysis of code clusters and writing of memos**
April 2023-January 2024	**Writing the report**

The research strategy shifted in a significant way early in 2021 as a result of two factors. The Covid pandemic was erupting, with successive periods of lockdowns and other restrictions on proposed field work, meetings and face-to-face work. Academic life was severely affected and research strategies had to be re-thought. For the Boundary Breaking project, this led to a more focused interview-based methodology which could be adapted to remote and online working, in place of the broader ethnographic approach trialled in the first phase. Around the same time, Dr Bollota left the team as he secured a tenured post in Italy.

The research aims were now re-formulated into a tighter set of research questions to facilitate this changed strategy. The questions and sub-questions were as follows:

1. Is there any evidence that wider ecclesial-cultural factors have contributed to the sexual abuse of children and the subsequent mishandling of such cases within the Catholic Church in England and Wales? Are there any distinctive aspects to cases of child sexual abuse within institutions and organisations of the church, at national, diocesan and parish levels?
2. What have been the main doctrinal/theological and organisational/cultural elements which have shaped the response of the Catholic Church in England and Wales to allegations of abuse and its treatment of victims and survivors?

---

[5] Mary E. Daley, Marcus Pound, 'Clerical Abuse' in Alana Harris (ed.), *The Oxford History of British and Irish Catholicism, Volume V, Recapturing the Apostolate of the Laity, 1914-2021*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2023).

3. What factors have informed the development of safeguarding policy and practice in the Catholic Church in England and Wales? What is missing in the policy, practice, and approach?

4. How might relevant aspects of Catholic doctrine, self- understanding, and practice be re-articulated so as to preserve and renew what is essential to the Catholic tradition while protecting against any weaknesses and distortions of interpretation?

We developed a matrix of interview questions based on the research questions, recognising that the questions would need to be adapted for different categories of participants whilst still covering the same core areas.[6]

In practice, as the qualitative work progressed, we recognised that the data collection strategy would not cover all these questions and sub-questions evenly. The first part of question three, for example, would have required a different set of interviewees from those we contacted, and a more historical approach to relevant literature. The qualitative work did shed light on the second part of this question however, although from an experiential rather than systematic perspective. As our interest was increasingly in interpretative approaches to the experience of research participants, our angle of vision on the research questions evolved.

The revised research plan envisaged four categories of participants from whom we sought to gather data through interviews:

- Survivors of clerical sexual abuse
- Clergy including religious clergy
- Male and female Religious
- Laypeople involved in Catholic safeguarding and in parishes or organisations directly affected by the issue.

In practice, these categories were expanded as each contained various subsets. We included several family members of survivors, and survivors who had been abused in Catholic settings by those in trusted roles other than clergy. We included monastic religious priests as well as a deacon and several bishops. We sought out priests who had been the subject of an allegation and returned to ministry, as well as one priest-participant living on a safeguarding plan; and we interpreted the fourth category broadly, ensuring, for example, that we included those who held or had held trustee positions related to safeguarding at different levels in the Catholic Church. People from directly affected parishes and religious communities became a key group of participants. We also made a conscious decision to ensure we heard the voices of Catholic women working at different levels of the Church.

When we concluded the interviews, we had listened to:

- Twenty-two survivors of abuse by a priest or a person with authority in a Catholic institutional setting.
- Twenty-five priests and deacons, including three priests who had been the subject of allegations, two of whom had returned to ministry, and one who remains on a safeguarding plan.[7]

---

[6] See appendix for sample interview questions

[7] A safeguarding plan aims to ensure that those about whom there are concerns or where allegations have been made or who have been convicted of relevant offences against children or adults and have served their sentences, are supervised and supported. They are agreements which identify risks and set in place strategies to manage these. For more information, see the CSSA website; Practice Guidance (catholicsafeguarding.org.uk)

- Seventeen laypeople, mostly from parishes directly affected by a case of abuse involving a priest they had known, and several young adults with broader experience of the Church. In this group, thirteen were women.
- Two family members of survivors.
- Fourteen professional safeguarding staff, eleven who worked in Catholic institutions and three who worked in secular safeguarding roles.
- Eighteen members of religious communities, ten from male communities, eight from female communities, including some from monastic life. Three of the male religious were brothers, i.e. not ordained; and seven were religious priests.
- Five diocesan bishops.

Some participants fell into more than one category so these figures add up to a greater total than the number of interviews.

In research methodology, the decision in relation to when to finish interviewing is often described as a judgement about whether sufficient data has been gathered that we have reached 'saturation point', that is, that all relevant points of interest have been covered. In this project, we knew we had a vast amount of data in the 82 interviews completed, easily suggesting 'saturation'. Our concern in deciding when to stop was both practical, that is, related to project timescales and funding – we needed to move into the phase of analysis and writing – and also a discernment in relation to a significant dynamic. The distinctiveness of this research project was in part emerging from the strategic choice to listen to as wide a range of voices as possible, representing many fields of lived Catholic faith and vocational experience. We termed this a 'whole church approach', recognising and claiming this as a significant ecclesiological characteristic. This approach also reflected and resonated with the development of synodal ways of working at all levels of the Church. We continued interviewing until we had covered the expanded range of categories of experience and roles that we judged would provide a 'whole church' narrative.

We recognised however that some voices were only marginally heard; we interviewed only one permanent deacon, for example. It would have been desirable to listen to more voices from their specific perspective as deacons are part of the clergy and active in pastoral ministry but bringing deep experience of secular work and family life. We did not manage to arrange any interviews with seminarians, although three people currently working in seminaries and at least three former members of seminary staff took part in interviews. Further work to listen to these voices would be desirable.

We had already adopted a further crucial boundary which supported both the judgement of saturation and the strategy of listening to 'the whole Church'. Our focus was on the experience of the abuse crisis specifically in the English and Welsh Catholic community. The research was concerned with the culture, habits and practices of this local church, recognising its character and its history. Whilst the themes we explore undoubtedly have resonances with experiences elsewhere, the narrative of this research is particular to this context.

The exclusion of perpetrators

As the second phase evolved, we considered whether to seek participation from priests who had been found guilty of sexual offences and imprisoned. We explored ways to reach potential interviewees and reached the conclusion that none were viable. More importantly, after much reflection, and with advice from steering committee members and others, we accepted that such interviews and subsequent analysis of any data obtained required a specialised professional background and a different skillset from those available in the research team. We also noted that

we had access to Dr Marie Keenan's research with this group, and to insights from further research with offending male religious brothers which was nearing completion by Brother Brendan Geary SM, a member of our steering committee.

We were also aware from the literature and from listening to those with relevant expertise that there are cautions against researching perpetrators and victims/survivors at the same time. The empathetic dimension of how we listened to research participants was important and reflected both an awareness of trauma and a theological and ecclesiological option. Trying to be empathetic to both perpetrators and victims in the same process was potentially destabilising.

How participants were recruited

We used a combination of methods to find potential participants and invite them to consider an interview. Some responded to invitations and information about the research circulated via intermediaries or through public outreach. Some came through the recommendations of those already participating, the snowball or chain sampling method of finding further participants. Some came from research team members' personal contacts or previous work. To some extent we used a stratified or criterion based method of sampling based on the audiences we wanted to engage. We also factored in geographical spread to ensure reasonable coverage of different diocesan experiences and remained aware of the gender balance (whilst recognising that given the all-male clerical structure of the Catholic Church, we would not achieve gender parity; just over a third of interview participants, 30 in total, were women). Whilst we were not aiming to get a fully balanced demographic cross-section, it was important for the credibility of the research to ensure sufficient diversity of perspective and experience. The interview participants were drawn from fourteen of the twenty-one dioceses in England and Wales and from sixteen religious orders working in these countries.

When we approached a potential interviewee, or responded to an offer or expression of interest, we followed a two-stage process. We first invited each potential participant to an initial brief pre-interview, usually lasting around 30 minutes. Most of these took place on zoom or on the telephone. The purpose of the pre-interviews was three-fold: first, to introduce ourselves and explain the research; secondly, to ask how each individual had been affected by the abuse crisis; and thirdly, to discern their readiness in relation to an interview and as appropriate, to agree practical arrangements and explain the consent form and the information sheet. We held to a single criterion for inclusion in the research; that each person interviewed had some direct experience of the impact of the clerical sexual abuse crisis in the Catholic community in England and Wales. In other words, each was either a victim or survivor; or a family member of a victim or survivor; or a member of a parish or organisation or religious community that had been directly affected by a case of clerical sexual abuse; or was or had been directly engaged in handling cases or developing or operating safeguarding policies or structures.

The pre-interviews proved valuable although with some disadvantages. The primary gain was in the relational base established which helped to communicate that the interviews would be safe spaces. This might typically involve gender considerations. We introduced ourselves as research team members and invited any questions that potential interviewees wished to ask of us personally. In most cases we already knew that the individuals were certain or highly likely to meet our primary criterion; in a few cases, it was not clear, and we sometimes reflected as a team about whether to include some individuals.

The disadvantage lay in the risk of having to decline an interview if the pre-interview did not evidence that the criterion was met, but in practice this rarely happened. It was also a delicate

matter to invite potential interviewees to explain their experience without repeating the ground we hoped to cover in the interview itself. We wrote up anonymised field notes from each pre-interview and shared these within the research team, but we did not record and transcribe these meetings, nor analyse them as data.

The interview process

Each interview participant received the consent form and information sheet in advance, and signed and returned the former before the interview began. Interviews lasted 45-90 minutes and were transcribed externally and then anonymised by the interviewer to ensure that both personal identities and contextual information were protected. All three members of the data team (Marcus Pound, Catherine Sexton, Pat Jones) arranged and led pre-interviews and interviews. In the early stages, we largely worked in pairs. Later we reverted to working alone. We met online weekly to debrief each other and practice reflexive review of our experiences with participants.

Although the policy of carrying out interviews using Zoom or telephone arose from necessity, and raised some new questions for us, in practice it worked well and arguably had advantages. Participants could choose the space in which they wished to speak; many took part from their own homes. They could anonymise their surroundings if they wished. They did not have to come into an interviewer's space, nor did they need to travel. Our concerns and questions related to the relational quality of the interview as an encounter; would we be able to convey sufficient and appropriate care, commitment and attention when interviews took place online? As interviewers, we had to learn how to give quality attention in an online space. The discipline of avoiding unnecessary movement or distractions and maintaining a gaze of engagement is more challenging in online spaces when we are tempted to multi-task or simply to fidget.

We sometimes experienced technical difficulties; a participant's ill-adjusted camera which meant the interviewer could only see the top of their head; or interference or sound problems which meant loss of some answers. It does not help the flow of an interview if it is necessary to pause and experiment with technical fixes. Despite these concerns, our overall experience of this method of interviewing was good; and none of the participants fed back any negative reactions. As the pandemic eased, a few interviews took place face to face, usually at the request of the participants. As soon as we could, we offered this option.

After each interview, we made contact with participants to express thanks and give an opportunity for any concerns to be raised. Our participant information sheet contained messages regarding agencies that provide support and advice to victims and survivors of abuse.

Focus groups and case studies

Focus groups add a different element to qualitative data, enabling a discursive exploration of fewer questions. One focus group had taken place in the initial ethnographic phase of the research; we decided to add several more. The first focus group had gathered six members of a directly affected parish community, a parish whose previous parish priest had been imprisoned for abuse offences. The later focus groups gathered:

- Four members of a mutual support group of priests
- Three members of a survivors' action group
- Six young adult Catholics who worked or had worked in Catholic agencies or diocesan structures.

The latter group did not fully meet our interview criterion of having been directly affected, but they were professionally engaged in areas of Catholic ministry and mission during the period of the IICSA Inquiry and had grown up in Catholic life under the shadow of the abuse crisis. Crucially, they brought a perspective from a different generation. We did not select interview participants by age group, and we were aware that most of our participants were from older generations. Two focus groups were held as face-to-face meetings; two were held online.

We were aware during the research that several of the sites from which we had engaged participants either in interviews or focus groups were also potential case studies. The narratives that emerged held significance as collective as well as individual experiences. But we also recognised that in each case the circumstances and particularity of context made them easier to identify, which in turn meant that the ethical commitment to anonymity was at risk. We decide we could not treat these sites as case studies in writing up the research. We sought other ways to present insights from collective experience in the main research report.[8]

Data analysis

As the data gathering reached what we saw as sufficient saturation, we prepared the next steps of analysis and reflection. We used the method of thematic analysis as outlined by Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke and others.[9] Braun and Clarke define thematic analysis as 'a method for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within data'.[10] They describe the method as based on a principle of 'thematising meanings' and able to provide 'a rich and detailed, yet complex account of data'.[11] They also draw attention to the active role of the researcher in identifying patterns and themes, cautioning against assumptions that such themes 'emerge' in a passive process.[12] Since this research had a theological interest and intention, questions of meaning were of primary significance. We also recognised that our combination of insider and outsider perspectives as researchers, as well as our commitment to reflexive working, cohered with Braun and Clarke's observations about the active role of researchers.[13]

We took an inductive and iterative approach to the analysis, identifying themes within the data corpus rather than working from theoretical themes derived from the research aims and questions. We therefore built the coding framework from the ground up. We began by selecting ten transcripts which were broadly representative of the data corpus which we each read and analysed in tentative thematic maps or lists. We then met for a day to moderate our work and develop a shared coding structure. In the following weeks we edited and clarified this structure, negotiating as necessary and learning from using the coding structure in practice. We introduced some clustering of codes (termed parent and child codes) and added further codes needed, but only in the initial weeks, in

---

[8] See, for example, *The Cross of the Moment,* (CotM) Chapter Five, pp.93-95 The-Cross-of-the-Moment_digital.pdf (durham.ac.uk)

[9] V. Braun and V. Clarke, 'Using thematic analysis in psychology', *Qualitative Research in Psychology,* 3 (2) 2006, pp.77-101. See also Gerry W. Ryan and H. Russell Bernard, 'Techniques to Identify Themes' in *Field Methods* 15.1 (2003) 85-109.

[10] Braun and Clarke, p.6.

[11] Braun and Clarke, p.5.

[12] Braun and Clarke, p.8.

[13] For discussion of the combination of insider and outsider perspectives, see Sonia Dwyer and Jennifer L. Buckle, 'The Space Between: On Being an Insider-Outsider in Qualitative Research', *International Journal of Qualitative Methods,* 2009, 8(1) 54-63 and Gladys Ganiel and Claire Mitchell, 'Turning the Categories Inside-Out: Complex Identifications and Multiple Interactions in Religious Ethnography', *Sociology of Religion*, 67 (2006), 3-21.

order to avoid the need to return to transcripts already coded. The finalised coding structure comprised 204 codes.[14]

We recognised early in the analysis work that this was a huge and unwieldy number of codes with which to work. It was also perhaps inevitable, the result of the decision to listen to a range of different ecclesial groups each raising or connecting to further constellations of themes and issues. This decision was an intentional strength of the project, but it also led to limitations in the analysis strategy. We could not pursue analytical work to the same level on all the codes.

When we reflected on the codes we had identified, we noted that many were practical and descriptive. Others concerned perceptions, and others were broader or more conceptual and already interpretative. We also noticed that we had more codes for pathologies and distortions and fewer for any positive experiences. In a conversation about the codes in the theological reflection group we noticed that few of the codes were explicitly theological; but part of our standpoint was a supposition that all the material was implicitly theological.

For such a large data corpus, use of a data software programme was necessary. Within the team we had experience of both NVIVO and Dedoose, and decided to use the latter as it was, at that point, better adapted to simultaneous use by a team of researchers.[15] Coding of 86 transcripts using just over 200 codes, resulting in a database of 4810 excerpts, took some months but also proved invaluable. Each of us in the research team knew the content of our own interviews and had checked and anonymised the relevant transcripts. Coding some of each other's transcripts enabled each of us to extend our knowledge of the data. We continued to meet weekly during this process, raising queries with each other and resolving any problems that arose.

Once we had completed the coding of the data, we began the next stage of analysis. We now had access to a document for each code which compiled excerpts on that theme or sub-theme from all the transcripts. They varied greatly in size: the largest code - '*positive responses and experiences: what is working well*' - contained 220 excerpts over 89 pages; in contrast, 31 codes contained less than 10 excerpts.[16] We first clustered the codes into twenty-three thematic areas and developed what we described as stage one analysis, developing inventories of themes and capturing illuminating details, usually tackling a cluster of codes but in a few cases, tackling a single code, and then progressing to reflective comments drawing in theological and other sources.[17]

This stage was perhaps the most complex part to navigate in terms of research process. The volume of data and themes was immense. We could not analyse all the data and recognised we had to prioritise which codes and clusters we analysed, and at what level. For example, it would have been possible to analyse data by specific audience, but the data corpus was too vast and the time

---

[14] Discussion at this stage covered several of the themes discussed by Braun and Clarke; what constitutes a theme; what 'size' a theme needs to be; what level of prevalence in the data etc. When we reflected on the codes we had identified, we noted that many were practical and descriptive; others concerned perceptions; others were broader or more conceptual.

[15] More recent versions of NVIVO may be better equipped to enable simultaneous collaborative working.

[16] The size of this code indicated that we had underestimated the material within the data that related to positive aspects of experience of the abuse crisis and the ecclesial response. In contrast, we had eight separate codes covering aspects of mishandling of victims and cases. The type of imbalance becomes clear during the coding work; but by that time it was impractical to revise the structure further as this would mean repeating coding work already done. For large codes such as this, the first stage of analysis of the code then requires differentiation of themes that works as sub-coding.

[17] See the appendix for the coding structure in thematic clusters.

available too limited to allow this.[18] During the analysis we also continued to engage with theological perspectives as well as making use of relevant insights from other literature.

Theological reflection and ethnographically aware reflexive practice

Throughout the second phase of the research, we met each month as a theological reflection group comprising the three members of the data team with Professor Paul D. Murray and Adrian Brooks. Adrian Brooks worked for a year on a literature review of three major themes related to the research aims: theological writing related to ecclesiology; to clericalism in Catholic culture; and to celibacy, gender and sexuality. He also produced an extensive bibliography. His work proved invaluable as a resource during the analysis phase and later in writing the report on the qualitative research, *The Cross of the Moment.* The meetings of the theology reflection group were particularly valuable as spaces for generative thinking. In each meeting, we discussed either academic texts – usually journal articles – that explored issues we saw as highly relevant, or some of the transcripts, a process which assisted us to verify and expand our instincts about themes and insights within the data.[19] We also listened to podcasts made by survivors.[20] The conversations in these meetings were often circular and cumulative; we looked for and made connections between the experience of deep engagement in qualitative listening and emerging theological themes.

Alongside the focused theological reflection, we maintained a practice of continuing conversations with individuals whom we felt might have particular insights in relation to the research. These conversations with 'key informants' were not recorded or analysed as data, although we kept notes. Their purpose was to aid us with a continuing level of reflexive and expansive thinking about the research through conversations in which we could engage more actively and range more widely than in the semi-structured interviews which provided the core project data. This element of the research practice reflected and to some extent continued the early ethnographic intentions of the research. Within this strand of work, one of the research team joined a community of practice which brought together survivors, clergy and others interested in seeking ways forward in the abuse crisis.[21]

These elements of the process further reinforced an insight we recognised. All that we hear and read and learn as researchers interacts with our previous experience and theological formation as we work with the data within our academic disciplines. We were aware that we ourselves are members of the Catholic Church, with diverse experiences and areas of deep knowledge and expertise. We were not neutral.

Our awareness of our own standpoints reflects principles discussed in writing on practical theology. Claire E. Wolfteich sets out five basic principles for the discipline, including that it deals with 'two areas of meaning: one inherent to the practice or expression being examined, and one invoked by

---

[18] Although we did not analyse by audience or gender or other descriptors, in practice we knew our participants' ciphers well enough to be aware of each audience voice within the codes and in key areas of analysis. Later, in writing the report, we paid attention to the collective voices of specific audiences such as women with experience of leadership, bishops and religious.

[19] For example, we focussed in one meeting on material relating to the sinfulness of the Church. In another, we read 'Beyond Scandal and Shame? Ecclesiology and the longing for a Transformed Church' by Richard Lennan (Theological studies 80.3 (2019) 590-610. James Keenan's articles on hierarchicalism ('Vulnerability and Hierarchicalism', *Melita Theologica* 68.2 (2018) 129-142) particularly helpful, as was Massimo Faggioli and Mary Catherine O'Reilly Gindhart, 'A New Wave in the Modern History of the Abuse Crisis in the Catholic Church: Literature Overview, 2018-2020', *Theological Studies* 82.1 (2021) 156-185.

[20] For example, see Andrew Taylor, Voices of Awareness | Podcast on Spotify

[21] Due to the sensitive nature of this group, we cannot give any further details.

the researcher' and the methodology is 'determined by the way these two are made to interact'.[22] John Swinton and Harriet Mowat describe it as a '*the* most crucial dynamic' of qualitative research. They usefully distinguish between epistemological reflexivity, self-critical examination of the research design, methods and assumptions, and personal reflexivity, a recognition that 'the researcher becomes the primary tool that is used to access the meanings of the situation being explored' and so must be aware of the impact of her own history.[23]

Writing memos

In the initial stages of analysis of the codes and themes, we were sorting and arranging the data, identifying patterns, connections, paradoxical or contradictory elements and noting narratives. This was productive but we were beginning to sense a lack of direction. The next breakthrough came from a piece of work in which Catherine Sexton took a single code that drew her interest, on bystanders, and wrote a discursive and exploratory memo (or stage two analysis: our terminology varied) discussing the data in relation to theoretical sources, broadening the horizons and beginning interpretative work. This model indicated a generative way to work with the data which we then followed, although in diverse ways.

Within the data team we had different theological interests and previous research experience. In distributing thematic clusters of data for analysis, it made sense to take these into account, as we each brought depths of knowledge and reading in particular areas. We also took slightly different approaches to writing memos. When this stage concluded, we had accumulated some twenty memos, each exploring in a more or less structured way insights and questions from the data and engaging with relevant normative and formal theological sources.[24] We made some limited by significant use of concepts from other sciences: Marcus Pound, for example, drew on concepts from Goffman and Foucault, and Pat Jones made use of Miranda Fricker's work on epistemic injustice. We also discussed some of the memos in the theological reflection group.

We paused the process of analysis and memo development around Easter 2023 as we needed to move into writing a research report. We had been able to analyse around 80%-90% of the data and had specific reasons for deciding not to analyse the remaining codes. For example, we regarded some as less central or as containing insufficient data to translate into a significant theme.

We were then ready to begin writing and developed a draft outline structure for a report. Catherine Sexton and Pat Jones began drafting the early chapters, and Pat continued on an extended contract when the contractual time available for both Catherine Sexton and Marcus Pound ceased In July 2023. Once the full report was drafted, all the research team members as well as several members of the steering group and the stakeholder group, acted as peer reviewers and contributed to the final editing process. The report was finalised in January 2024.[25]

---

[22] Wolfteich, Claire E. ed. *Invitation to Practical Theology: Catholic Voices and Vision* (New York: Paulist Press, 2014) (p. 324).

[23] John Swinton and Harriet Mowat, *Practical Theology and Qualitative Research* (London: SCM Press, 2006) (p. 60).

[24] In describing sources as normative or formal, we make use of the concept of four voices outlined in Helen Cameron and others, *Talking about God in Practice: Theological Action Research and Practical Theology* (London: SCM Press, 2010).

[25] See a separate essay on authoring *The Cross of the Moment* by Pat Jones (forthcoming).

A closed symposium

In the original research plan it has been envisaged that there would be a major international conference held around the conclusion of the research to promote its findings. As the research evolved, we had misgivings about this element of the plan. Our primary concern was about whether such an event could, in practice, give primacy to survivor voices. The usual architecture of an academic conference seemed unsuited to this task. We were also aware that such a conference would ask research participants to give up their anonymity, which many might not wish to do. Our interest turned therefore to a different model, the idea of a smaller closed invitation-only symposium with a cross section of research participants, in which anonymity could be largely maintained. The purpose of the symposium was determined as 'to honour contributions to the BB research project and deepen understanding of the reception of the findings' and included the hope that the research would gain a deeper understanding of how to present the findings and 'everyone who attends will feel their contributions have been honoured'. [26]

We prepared the two-day symposium with immense care. The key decision was to appoint skilled and empathetic facilitators, Paul Cummings from the Kinharvie Institute and Jo Kennedy from Animate Consultancy.[27] We worked with Paul and Jo for some months to refine the purpose and plan the process. Despite the complication of last minute train strikes, we gathered 26 research participants with research team members and representatives of the steering committee, as well as two facilitators and a counsellor. Judging by the feedback afterwards from those who took part, it was a profoundly moving and valuable encounter for all who took part.[28]

What we learned from the Symposium was somewhat different from what we anticipated. We had prepared to explain the themes emerging from our analysis, responding to the areas which were of interest to participants (based on an outline document circulated in advance) and inviting their feedback). In practice, what we learned was concerned with how to have the kind of conversations that enable honest and truthful recognition of the impact of abuse and the imperative of deeply attentive listening in relation to the specific pain, harm and profound anguish that arises from the abuse crisis in the Catholic Church. In other words, the process discovered and modelled what is required in restorative conversations.

The symposium also gave us some confidence that the research enterprise was able to be generative. The fact that the research exists enables conversations that would not otherwise happen. We learned also about what is involved in creating a safe space; a neutral venue, and an invitation to participants to leave aside clothing and objects associated with Catholic life, as a sign of sensitivity to the experience of survivors.

Problem-solving

A narrative of research process written afterwards can give the impression of uncomplicated progress and methodological clarity, but this is not how we experienced it. Rather, our process was characterised by questions and uncertainties and required frequent problem-solving. Is our focus so broad that we will not be able to achieve clear results? What is the proper response when we have chased a potential episcopal participant three times, who seems willing but eventually fails to reply? How do we interpret what we hear when participants describe a single reality in deeply contradictory ways, illustrating contested standpoints? Do we need to use descriptors for a further stage of data analysis? Some issues were resolved within the team; others were discussed with the

---

[26] *BB Research Symposium Orientation Pack*, 07.02.2023 p.1.
[27] Kinharvie and Animate Consulting
[28] The symposium is described in detail on p. 162 of *The Cross of the Moment.*

steering group. In particular the steering group engaged with the research team in thinking through the question of how to engage survivors in the research; whether the project should engage with IICSA in any way; and in developing strategies and options for disseminating the research, including planning the symposium. They also provided a valuable sounding board for our instincts and judgements at turning points in the research strategy.

Data and ethics

The responsibility for ethical commitment does not end when research is completed. Throughout the research process, we had taken steps to ensure that any material which identified participants was kept only in a password protected secure data storage vault managed by Marcus Pound. All the anonymised data (transcripts and field notes) was kept in an online storage facility protected by password access and restricted to the research team and the project administrator. This material will be kept for ten years, during which time it may be accessed by other legitimate researchers. All participants were given information about what would happen to their data in the information sheet they received, and they were explicitly asked to consent to the arrangements proposed.

4   Evolution of research themes

Any empirical research process is likely to be exploratory and iterative. In this project, given our theological intentions and our research aims, and our commitment to reflexive practice, it was crucial to pay attention to emergent issues and perspectives. As the research progressed, we accumulated thematic strands that gradually grew in significance and fed into interpretation and writing.

Perhaps the most significant of these was a stage where we deliberated about whether to adjust the research focus to prioritise *how the Church has responded to the abuse crisis* over the question of how or which cultural and systemic ideas and practices are implicated in *how abuse happens - al*though the two questions are related. The cultural dynamics that allowed abuse to take root in the church were also those that appeared to be impeding the Church's recovery. We found ourselves more engaged with the issues raised by what some survivors term 'secondary abuse', the impact of being ignored, disbelieved, treated unjustly and without compassion.[29]

We were turning towards understanding the abuse crisis as a collective experience, an experience of the whole Church, as an institution and as a community. At this point, we were also exploring theological themes relating to the sinfulness of the Church, a theme which arose directly from the instincts and insights of research participants and some of the material from survivors that we read or listened to. For some survivors, the Church is irredeemably flawed and there is no good to find; for others, there is a powerful commitment to ensure it changes. The insistent voice and instincts of survivors nudged our theological agenda.

Some themes returned repeatedly to our reflection. The theme of clericalism, for example, was ever present. Other themes arose from the interviews even before we had begun coding and analysis. For example, the puzzle of why so many Catholics would rather avoid knowing or talking about the abuse crisis, which pointed towards the problematic of bystanders/bystanding, or the recurring experience of contested viewpoints where survivors and office-holders described widely divergent perspectives on their experience. For researchers, this challenges the basic commitment to believe

---

[29] See CotM, p. 34 for further explanation.

what an interviewee has said; in this research, in which 'being believed' was a crucial theme in itself, it was epistemologically and theologically complex.

Other themes emerged but were not taken forward so substantively. We touched on trauma theology, for example, and on theologies of forgiveness, and although both have some minor treatment in subsequent analysis, memos and writing, neither were fully expanded as they could have been. The data contained material on themes such as celibacy and sexuality, the family as a site of abuse and a site in which distorted theology is created or handed over, and ideas about God in relation to parental roles. It would have been desirable to pursue these further, but the data in these areas was not as extensive as in other areas. One of the most difficult challenges in working with empirical data is deciding what to leave out as the research moves towards finding a coherent shape within and from the analysis. There is a necessary narrowing down of focus; and once narrowed down, we were able to expand again by opening up relevant theological perspectives. The theological reflection sessions enabled us to propose interpretative themes and see how far they 'stuck'; for example, at one point we considered the concept of the *sensus fidelium* as a way of framing the significance of empirical listening, and it remains in the background of the report although not explicitly discussed.

Paul Murray had introduced the idea of untying knots in Catholic theology, aspects of our ecclesiology in particular that had become unbalanced or distorted. We found this useful as we moved iteratively between the voices of that data, the analytical and reflective memos and our wider reading and reflection. In research of this kind, the theological reflection does not finish; rather, each thematic and problematic opens up further questions and horizons. Whilst it is necessary within research disciplines to produce a report, any such text is substantially a prompt to further work and enquiry.

Conclusion

Any research is a process of learning. Empirical research in the field of theology is likely to remain open and emergent throughout, both in terms of methods and methodology, and in terms of outputs. In this research, we found that we continually needed to return to our originating concern and to the focus and boundaries which would structure our enquiry. The specific focus on sexual abuse, when other grievous forms of abuse also happen within the Church, was questioned by some. For others, the focus (largely but not exclusively) on clerical abusers was too narrow, as their concern and experience related to familial abuse in Catholic families. The tension between allowing the research process to evolve and maintaining sufficient focus to enable us to gather meaningful insights and undertake analysis was operating throughout.

Dr Pat Jones
Dr Marcus Pound
Dr Catherine Sexton

Appendix

One: Sample interview questions

Clergy/religious priests: menu of questions

	Can you remember when you first came to realise that child abuse by clergy was happening? And how you felt or understood it?
1	What do you believe the abuse is about? What do you believe are the factors that contribute towards it happening? Do you think that any of these factors are specific to Catholic Church contexts? If so, which and why? Is there anything distinctive about Catholic clergy and religious who become abusers?
2	How far does sexuality play a part in explaining how or why it happens?
3	How far is clericalism a part of the explanation? Where do you see it operating nowadays? What can we do to change it?
4	We are particularly interested in exploring cultural and doctrinal factors which are implicated here, both in the abuse happening and in its mishandling. What aspects of Catholic culture do you think have been conducive to abuse happening? What aspects of Catholic teaching do we need to investigate and possibly re-think?
5	Have you been able to listen to any survivors face to face? What impact has that had on you?
6	How do you evaluate the church's response to the crisis, both in terms of response to victims and how clergy who have been the subject of allegations? How do we understand and explain mishandling?
7	What do you think has been the impact of the abuse crisis on the majority of clergy i.e. those who have not offended?
8	What do you think about any continuing pastoral response to those who have served their sentences?
9	If this isn't too personal, did it have an impact on your personal faith or spirituality?
10	What still needs to change in the pastoral response of the church? How is its moral authority or pastoral mission affected?

Two: Coding structure in clusters with count of excerpts

1. **Bishops- their role and experience**
- Bishops (34 excerpts)
- Bishops' perceptions of their accountabilities (22 excerpts)
- Bishops' relations with their priests   (63 excerpts)
- Bishops' responsibility for offenders, ABE & not proven (56 excerpts)
- Impact of Bishops meeting & listening to survivors   (32 excerpts)
- Perceived absence of accountability of Bishops (14)
- Problematics of episcopal power (39) (Modified – to include leadership/power of Provincials)
- Unrealistic expectations of Bishops (8)
- Lack of supervision & Spiritual Direction for Bishops (7)
- Leadership & culture within the CBCEW   (93)
- Hierarchicalism (34)
- Bishops infantilising clergy (2) (Also under Clericalism)

2. **The child**
- The child (11)
- Inadequate theology of the child (6)
- Lack of recognition of agency/personhood/voice of the child (14)
- Paramountcy of the child (5)
- Survivor desire to protect other children (13)

3. **Church's response - Mishandling/Failures in the Church's response**
- Absence of safeguarding procedures (11)
- Church hides behind complex & unique structures (13)
- Failure to understand impact of abuse on victims   (35)
- Failures of processes & responses in historical cases/continuing today   (67)
- Failures of trust between survivors & institutional figures (67)
- Contrast between secular & CC responses & support for survivors (27)
- Inadequate processes in relation to allegations (27)
- Institution protecting itself & reputation (62)
- Institutional appeal to societal understanding of prevalence (19)
- Mishandling by CC institutions (157)   (Parent code)
- Cover-up (43)
- Denial   (28)
- Failure to understand & minister to survivors' needs (50)
- Lack of transparency   (18)
- Mishandling of allegations against clergy (21)
- Protection of perpetrators (10)
- Slowness of response   (24)
- Retraumatising impact of not being believed
- Overreliance on lawyers & insurers shaping the response (54)
- Perception of continuing failure to listen to survivors (28) (See also Survivors in the Church)
- Significance of money (36) (See also Survivor perspectives)
- Negative impact of legal processes (17) (See also Survivor perspectives)
- Spiritual abuse (11)

- Perception of power & powerlessness (30)
- What does penance look like? (15)

4. **Church identifying/struggling to identify how to respond as Church**
- How to do care for survivors (17)
- Challenge of providing authentic responses to survivors (42)
- Significance of providing independent spaces of care for survivors (27)
- Lack of confidence in what it is to be Church shaping the response (26)
- Perceived limits of SFG initiatives/protocols   (96)
- Tension between gospel-based response and protocols (78)
- Tension between redress or healing for survivors (25)

5. **Clericalism**
- Clerical abuse of trust   (30)
- Clericalism as abuse & misuse of power   (57)
- Clericalism as arrogance, entitlement and exceptionalism (93)
- Lay collusion with clericalism (40)
- Laity challenging clericalism (32)
- Women & collusion   (1)
- Infantilisation   (11)
- Infantilisation of laity by clergy (10)
- Infantilisation of clergy by laity (3)
- Infantilisation of priests by other priests (2)
- Infantilisation of priests by Bishops (2)
- Perception of younger priests as conformist/traditionalist (45)
- Unable to build equal partnerships with women (8)

6. **Clergy lives**
- Benefits of community living for priests (13)
- Positive experience of priests   (32)
- Struggles with chastity/celibacy (41)
- What constitutes authentic priesthood (set of attitudes) - the ideal & what clergy they are describing (43)
- Hardship & isolation of priests' lives (38)
- Impact of technology on clergy lifestyles (9)
- Other unhealthy aspects of clergy lifestyle (9)
- Lack of accountability processes & frameworks for priestly ministry (64)
- Lack of supervision & Spiritual Direction for clergy (39)

7. **Clergy - Impact of CSA on pastoral ministry**
- Impact of CSA on pastoral ministry (142)
- Clergy attitudes to SFG training & support (33)
- Clergy vulnerability to allegations (41)
- Clergy perceptions of vulnerability (12)
- Impact of listening to/working with victims & survivors (14)
- Clergy attitudes to offenders and accused priests (27)

8. Catholic cultures (Cultural/organisational pathologies shaping Church's response)
- Barriers to healing (18) See also Survivor perspectives
- Barriers to disclosing (34) (Modified – to include narratives of disclosure) – See also Survivor perspectives
- Being believed (26)
- Cultural habits of avoiding scandal and not criticising (27)
- Cultures of violence (70)
- Irish cultural practices: role & influence (31)
- Cultural practices (37)
- Culture of deference in SFG structures (6)
- Practices of secrecy   (89)
- Practices of silencing   (38)
- Cultures of belief/disbelief (76)

9. Impact on victims and survivors
- Impact of CSA on survivors (57)
- Impact of finding other survivors abused by same perpetrator (13)
- Impact of shame/guilt   (40)
- Impact on attitude to CC and priests (50)
- Impact on education and life chances (10)
- Impact on gender relations (8)
- Impact on physical and mental health (63)
- Impact on relationships and intimacy (22)
- Impact on spiritual life/faith (26)
- Retraumatising impact of not being believed (7)

10. Individual pathologies within the CC/characterisation? Whether/is the Church a conducive context for abuse?
- Characteristics and behaviour traits of offenders (45)
- Distinctiveness of CSA in Catholic Church contexts
- Pastoral relations used to groom families (22)
- Use of paedophilia language   (20)
- Lay offenders in the Church (4)
- Does the priesthood attract paedophiles? (29)
- Distorted theologies of priesthood (26)
- Does the priesthood attract paedophiles? (29)
- Emotional/sexual immaturity as possible cause of abuse (67)

11. Relational dynamics in the community of faith
- Laity & clergy shared experience of grieving   (23)
- Impact of cases of abuse on laity/parishes on faith & attitudes towards CC (144)
- Parishioners defending abusive priests/refusing to believe allegations (27)
- Lay collusion with clericalism   (Also in Clericalism) (40)
- Laity challenging clericalism   (Also in Clericalism) (32)
- Women & collusion   (1)

12. Narratives/acceptance of CSA as a reality in the Church
- Abuse event narrative other observers (44)
- Abuse event narrative survivor (53)
- Allegation event narrative (29)
- Awareness of first encounter with and understanding of CSA (50)
- Bystander experience: role and dilemmas (also culture…) (58) CS

13. Need for change in the Church/Drivers of Change/Ways forward
- Abuse scandal is damaging the Church (39)
- Abuse scandal as vehicle for change   (26)
- Acts of resistance? (45)
- How/where the spirit is at work in the crisis (7)
- Need for conversion in the whole body of believers   (55)
- Need for culture change (94)
- Need to recognise our collective responsibility - as one body (40)
- Synodality (12)

14. Priestly formation
- Formation based on outdated ecclesiology/psychology   (75)
- Access to pornography among seminarians (2)
- Alternative models of formation(14)
- Human formation not taken seriously (46)
- Lack of space for vulnerability in formation model (15)
- Male dominated culture in seminaries (16)
- Limited presence of women/women not affecting the culture (9)
- Physical structure (1)
- Preparation for celibacy (38)
- Selection & assessment systems (58)
- Seminary as monastic/total institution (25)
- What is working well in seminaries (23)

15. Religious orders & abuse: causes and responses
- Religious life specific aspects (137)
- Abusive aspects of religious formation and life (45)
- Distinctiveness of abuse involving religious   (35)
- Impact of allegations/cases on community & mission (79)
- Impact of allegations/cases on individuals   (41)
- Impact of Elliott Review on religious orders - cost to religious (29)
- Importance of healthy community life (26)
- One Church: exclusion of Religious (23) (Tensions between religious & bishops & dioceses)
- Positive experiences of religious (25)
- Religious communities dealing with offending members (53)
- Women religious specific aspects (32)
- Struggles with chastity/celibacy (41)

16. Response from wider Church
- Lack of leadership from Pope & curia   (37)

- *Recognitio* - slowness   (2)
- How CSA is recognised in canon law (9)
- Other problems with canon law (20)

17. Sexuality
- Sexuality (64)
- Inability to talk about sex/sexuality (21)
- Overly spiritualised concept of sexuality (2)
- Sex seen/taught as sinful (21)
- Masturbation   (4)

18. Safeguarding in E & W context PJ
- SFG staff becoming institutionalised   (17)
- Absence of safeguarding procedures (11) (See also Church – mishandling)
- Elliott Review (26)
- Elliott Review & new SFG project: will they change anything? (25)
- Perceptions of Elliott Review work and structures (67)
- Culture of deference in safeguarding structures (6)
- Safeguarding as a ministry/vocation (22)
- Need for explicit theology of safeguarding (21)
- Perceptions of problematic safeguarding structures and work (61)
- Lack of prevalence statistics or research (9)
- One Church: problems and tensions (35)
- Perceptions of IICSA   (37)
- Reactions to IICSA reports (30)
- Positive responses & experiences: what is working well   (220)
- Day of prayer for survivors (13)

19. Sites of abuse/culture in Catholic communities & institutions (Pathologies in communities)
- Role of family   (98)
- Impact of abuse on family (36)
- Role of father   (14)
- Role of mother (14)
- School/home/church as total institution (61)
- Family as site of creating and handing down distorted theology (10)
- Private projection vs public reality/the good Catholic family (15)
- Catholic schools in relation to abuse (31)
- Catholic schools in relation to abuse (44)

20. Survivor perspectives/experiences
- Sources of hope & healing (8)
- Healing/on becoming a survivor (41)
- Being believed (26) (
- Barriers to disclosing (34)
- Barriers to healing (18)
- Transmuting the experience of abuse (eg through comedy)   (14)
- Significance of money (36)

- Sense of injustice (20)
- Role of spirituality & faith in bringing about healing   (38)

21. Survivors & Victims in the Church
- Negative perceptions of survivors   (31)
- Perception of continuing failure to listen to survivors (28)
- Lack of survivor voice   (8)
- Survivor roles in developing new practices & culture (57)
- Use & misuse of survivors   (7)
- Vulnerability and exploitation (30)
- Primacy/power of the victim, survivor voice & experience   (23)

22. Theological pathologies/aspects of theology
- Distorted ecclesiologies (46)
- Distorted theologies of forgiveness   (61)
- Distorted theologies of priesthood (See clericalism) (26)
- Catholic practices of confession (35)
- Confession: cycle of guilt and shame (4)
- CSA as insolvable: mystery of evil (13) (conceptualisation/characterisation of abuse)
- The idea of God that people are working with (40)
- Conflation of the father and God (9)
- Conflation of the mother and Mary (2)
- Use of Gospel sources (22)
- The theological significance of survivors (13)
- Theological perspectives on vulnerability   (15)
- Theological reasoning applied to abuse   (33)
- Theology of perfection: nature vs grace (47)

23. Women and/in the Church
- Women   (17)
- CC is male dominated: women still unequal   (35)
- Negative roles of/for women   (7)
- Women need to be part of dismantling & reform   (30)

Miscellaneous
- Impact of interviews on individual interviewees (35)
- Reception of the research   (22)