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Abstract

In the past, child sexual molestation was considered a less serious crime, and frequently involved blaming the victim, emphasis on the myth of the stranger rapist, and low public awareness of it as a problem. The purpose of this research was to examine recent newspaper coverage of "child sexual molestation" crimes as found in the Access World News NewsBank archives. Findings showed a definite trend in the sample articles to blaming the perpetrator, with some past remnants of blaming the victim found in a select few articles. Further, newspapers have sensationalized pedophiles by reporting mainly "unusual" child sex crimes. Finally, newspaper coverage of child sexual molestation places emphasis on the characteristics of the pedophile – age, sex, occupation, and relationship with the victim – rather than on that of the victim. Implications for future research are discussed.
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Introduction

Child sexual molestation has occurred in various times and locations (Rush, 1980, Porter, 1997, Finkelhor, 1994, and Gorham, 1978). It has long been unreported, undetected, labeled as a non-child sex crime, lacked sufficient evidence for an arrest or conviction, or other similarly problematic complications (Conte, 1982). As a result, a completely accurate estimate of the incidence and scope of child molestation may never be known, but improvements in reporting practices, definitions, and changing public perceptions of the problem have resulted in a better understanding of what child sexual molestation is, who commits it, and the characteristics of the victims. For example, national research suggests that the vast majority (96%) of perpetrators of child sex crimes are male (Snyder, 2000), which is consistent with recent research focusing on prison inmates in Georgia, which found that roughly 98% of prison inmates serving for child sexual molestation in 2007 were male ("Child sex offenders", n.d.). Also, recent statistics indicate that the majority of victims are female (one in four), although one in five males are also believed to be victimized ("Statistics Surrounding Child Sexual Abuse", 2001-2008, and Rudin, Zalewski, and Bodmer-Turner, 1995).

Public perception of child sexual molestation has been a particularly potent hurdle to overcome, as it has historically relied on rape myths and inaccurate beliefs concerning the roles of children and sex. Activist groups, particularly over the last two hundred years, have struggled to educate the public and reduce child molestation (Rush, 1980). Although female activist Josephine Butler attempted to end the Victorian "cult of the little girl" that led to dramatic demand for female children for sexual purposes (Rush, 1980, p. 59), Rush argues that Freud's backtracking from his initial findings in the early
1900s that girls incestuously abused were harmed by their sexual victimization helped to support two problematic public perceptions: first, that children are inherently sexual and may pursue sexual relationships with adults deliberately, and second, that females in particular want their fathers' attention and thus falsely imagine that their fathers had sexual relations with them (Rush, 1980). This second theory helped to perpetuate the myth that children always lie about sexual abuse, that family members do not sexually assault other family members and that if a child (particularly a female child) is sexually molested by a male relative, she must have desired it and pressured him into it. Although Philip Jenkins' (1998) book suggests that there was a brief period of belief from the 1940s to the 1950s that child predators were a major and terrifying threat, by the 1960s he says that the child blame theory was once again prominent. One method of conveying these surges in panic and myths is the media.

The media in general, and newspapers in particular, have long been used to try and present timely reports to the public, to keep the general population informed of current events ("organized gossip", according to Park, 1923, p. 277). Newspapers also indisputably have a long history of covering crime. The media, however, does not report all crimes, instead tending to focus on dramatic, disturbing, or violent crimes that will attract reader interest and thus sell more papers (Park, 1923, p. 275).

The combination of these two topics then, child sexual molestation, and media coverage of crime, lead to the question of what sort of child sexual molestation crimes are actually reported in the news. Due to their long history of news reporting, newspapers were specifically selected for my research in order to examine how newspapers report child sexual molestation in the modern day. In the past, child sexual molestation was
frequently not addressed, or blamed on rape myths such as stranger rapes, lying victims, or taking the other extreme and focusing excessively on incest cases alone (Jenkins, 1998, p. 2 and 13). Over the last several decades however, the news has gradually acknowledged that the majority (over 85%) of child molestations are committed by individuals known to their victims (Snyder, 2000, p. 10). The purpose of this study then was to examine how newspapers currently address child sexual molestation, and what implications any differences may have for the public perception of this crime.

**Hypotheses and Literature Review**

Due to the exploratory nature of much of this data, it was difficult to find prior research pertaining specifically to the questions presented here. As such, some hypotheses were based on logical reasoning. Where possible, supporting data was provided.

My primary overarching hypothesis tested in this research was newspaper sensationalism, and was based on four main sources. The first, "Bias in the Newspaper Reporting of Crime News" (Ditton & Duffy, 1983) concluded that news tends to be sensational and it is believed to be an important influence on public perception of crimes. "What hysteria? A systematic study of newspaper coverage of accused child molesters", by Cheit (2003) found that less than half of all child molesters in Rhode Island in 1993 were reported by the newspapers, and those that were had committed more violent or obviously immoral crimes, or had received long prison sentences.

Benedict's 1992 article, "Virgin or Vamp: How the Press Covers Sex Crimes", explains why news emphasizes sensationalism. Due to the highly competitive nature, emphasis on deadlines and "what sells", as well as reporters' ambitions to glory,
journalistic traditions, and more, newspaper sensationalism, particularly for those papers that aggressively try to outsell their competitors, is inevitable. Finally, "Victims, Crime and the Media: Competing Interests in the Electronic Society" (Viano, 1995), argues that "There is no doubt that the media must be counted among the forces that help define, measure, and interpret victimization and influence our perceptions of its nature and extent" (p. 42). Some of the most frequent accusations against the media have been to protest the media's emphasis on newsworthiness, sensationalism, and superficiality, as well as a biased portrayal of violence, generation of fear of crime, pro-police and pro-prosecution bias, and so on. Sensationalism in particular is noted as the reason news coverage of crime frequently focuses on the gruesome details and why news headlines have "selective emphasis" (p. 44).

Based on the evidence found in Benedict (1992), Viano (1995), Cheit (2003), and Ditton and Duffy (1983), I hypothesize that the majority of the news articles covered here will have sensational titles or sub-titles, and the majority of the news articles and cases covered here will be sensational through emphasis on "shocking". The research by Viano (1995) and Benedict (1992) indicate that at least a few individual article authors will write multiple articles on child sexual molestation cases in an effort to specialize and distinguish themselves to their papers by repeatedly handling sensational topics.

If cases are more "shocking", they are more likely to be repeated in multiple articles and published more frequently. The "shock" value of a case can be used to measure how sensational is a newspaper article. "Shocking" cases can be determined in six different ways: cases involving a family relationship between the perpetrator and the victim, cases involving very young victims (under the age of seven), cases involving perpetrators in
occupations that place them in a position of trust and close proximity to children, "unusual" cases, and cases involving multiple victims. Article "shock" value can be measured in one additional way; by the sensational quality of the title or sub-title of the article. Further details of these hypotheses are presented below.

In addition to sensationalism, I expect that sensational stories will be found in multiple articles, and that the newspapers covering the same multiple articles will be in the same location (town, city, etc.). When newspapers are in the same location (town, city, etc.) I expect the locations of the crimes covered in these papers will overlap (and that many of the newspapers will report on child sex crimes multiple times during the sample time frame in an attempt to monopolize their selling power). As a result, I expect that there will be a fairly even number of child molestation reports by these newspapers in each state. This follows the logic that if newspapers report sensational stories in one area, and that area is the source of most of their child molestation cases, these crimes will take place in the same state. If all newspapers report at the same rate, then all states should report roughly the same number of child sexual molestation cases that month. This hypothesis however, rests on several assumptions – namely that the limitations of this study (selection bias, a non-representative sample, etc.) do not make one state more or less likely to have newspapers archived in NewsBank, and that all states have, report, or discover child sexual molestation cases at the same rate at all times.

Newspaper articles addressing child sexual molestation will focus on sensational approaches to news coverage, so article types will likely be those topics (such as arrest or guilty pleas) that are easily manipulated into sounding more sensational. Similarly, I hypothesize that the majority of reported crimes will be alleged events only, so that the
information can be manipulated and speculated on to increase sensationalism. Further, in accordance with Cheit's (2003) research, I expect that the reported cases will be likely to involve more severe crimes, crimes with multiple counts, brutal crimes, and crimes with multiple victims. I also assume that the most reported punishments will be the most severe punishments. This is consistent with Viano's (1995) observation of crime reporting containing strong pro-police and pro-prosecution biases, and Cheit's (2003) conclusion that newspapers avoid reporting cases where guilty defendants were not sentenced to prison terms, and emphasize "cases resulting in long prison sentences" (p. 607). It also seems logical that, should an article mention bail the bail amount will be very high, because of Cheit's (2003) observation of newspaper reliance on harsher punishments, and Viano's (1995) conclusion that crime reports are generally very pro-police and pro-prosecution.

I expect that the majority of the perpetrators will be men, not just because men are statistically reported as perpetrating more than females (Snyder, 2000), but also because I expect reporters will find it easier to accuse men of this crime rather than women, whose stereotypical role includes child care, and whose liaisons with younger partners has received little traditional condemnation (Jenkins, 1998). Further, when females are the perpetrators, I expect that news articles will overdramatize the cliché situation of females committing sex crimes only with a male partner leading the way (Elliot, 1994, p. 10 and 229).

I do not expect that the newspaper articles will mention a perpetrator's spouse/significant other or children unless they are relevant to the crime (as in a partner collusion to commit abuse or because the children were the target of the abuse), or unless
they do or say something to the press that will make the article more sensational (such as a spouse insisting on a divorce due to the criminal charges/conviction).

**Methods Section**

The results of this study come from a content analysis of newspaper articles found through the NewsBank Access World News search engine. The articles were restricted to those found when searched under the words "child sexual molestation." The articles analyzed were further limited to 1) newspapers only, 2) newspapers in the United States of America only, 3) articles in the year 2008, and 4) articles published during the month of September. The restriction to newspapers only was due to the purpose of this research, which is to examine reports of child sexual molestation to the public by what could be considered a reliable source. For this reason, I excluded blogs, whose reliability cannot be determined, and scholarly journals and similar publications, which are generally not read by the average audience.

The time frame was in the year 2008 because it was recent, but not so recent that the year's articles may not yet have been fully archived. I wanted a year as close to the current date as possible, but did not want to compromise my data volume in the process. I selected September as the focus month because there are no major holidays to skew the data, the weather is moderate (so one cannot argue that the weather may have sparked increased or decreased sexual abuse – similar to how rape increases in the summertime), and most children are in school of some kind, guaranteeing interaction with a variety of adults that might not be available during the summer vacation, while not entirely excluding the possibility of data from perpetrators with summer jobs such as theme park employees, lifeguards, or camp counselors.
The articles located in the NewsBank search covered a variety of topics, from arrest to trial to victim outreach. The common theme was some description of a crime against children involving sexual activities. This was not limited to sexual molestation, but included a variety of crimes and criminals, such as perpetrators caught in online police stings, one of which involved a man who traveled from Tennessee to Georgia to have sex with what he believed to be a ten-year-old girl ("Chattanooga teacher arrested in Whitfield on sex-related charges", 2008, "Chattanooga: Baylor School teacher arrested, awaits court appearance", 2008, and "Inmate charged with battery after argument with cell mate", 2008). No real child was involved, but this was included in the data (including victim data) because I assumed he would have committed the crime had a real victim existed. Other articles included perpetrators who failed to report child sexual abuse, such as a wife ignoring her husband raping her daughters, or a man ignoring the blatant sexual abuse of a student by his co-worker ("Testimony begins in Grenemyer trial", 2008, "Testimony continues in Grenemyer trial", 2008 and "Jury finds Grenemyers guilty", 2008, and "2nd teacher charged in child abuse case", 2008).

As the purpose of this content analysis is to assemble quantitative data describing in-depth the child sex crimes reported in NewsBank archived newspapers during September 2008, the manner in which the numerical data was assembled required thorough explanation due to potential replication of this research.

**Article Data**

*Locations, Authors, and Newspaper Data*

One of the first things necessary to extrapolate meaningful findings was to ascertain the total number of articles. This final tally was comprised of single-copy articles,
duplicate articles (exactly the same), multiple articles (addressing the same perpetrator), and articles with identical titles but not identical contents (a combination of duplicate and multiple articles).

Authors were counted the same as the articles they write – one author per article, unless the author was not indicated. If an author wrote several different articles, or several articles on the same case, or even just sold duplicate copies to different newspapers, s/he was counted for as may articles as s/he wrote.

If the article location stated more than one location of crime, each location counted as a crime location. If the article said the crime was in a state different from the state the newspaper is located in and the article has multiple perpetrators, the location of the crime assigned to each perpetrator was counted separately.

Even though perpetrator crime locations can be two different locations, and perpetrators can have committed multiple crimes (for example, if they have a past history of molesting children in addition to the current crime), any perpetrator whose name appeared in multiple articles had his/her crimes summarized and then counted as though the data existed in a single article. The only difference is that the number of articles mentioning the perpetrator were still counted separately, as were the article authors and newspaper locations. Crime locations, however, were only counted once per crime.

When a single article detailed two or more different perpetrators committing different crimes at different (or the same) locations, it was recorded as one count for the article location, one count for the newspaper name, one count for the author name, and one count each for the crime location of each perpetrator's crimes. This is because although the article may have multiple criminal cases, it is still a single article. To count
it repeatedly every time the article described a crime would be to exaggerate the number of articles within the data set.

In practice, the general procedure for counting the crime location, article location, newspaper the article was written in, and article author can be summed up by the following example:

If:

A California newspaper article reported that

1) John Doe did one crime in LA, CA
2) James Maximillian did one crime in LA, CA
3) Jose Gucho did one crime in Philadelphia, PA and one crime in Pleasanton, CA

And all men had these crimes explained in the same article, then…

1) The Article Location is California (one count)
2) Crime Location is Los Angeles (two counts), Pleasanton (one count), and Philadelphia (one count)
3) Name of the newspaper the article was reported in (one count)
4) And name of the author of the article (one count)

If:

A Pennsylvania Newspaper reported that

Jose Gucho, in a second article, was again reported for the same crime in Philadelphia, PA

Then

1) The Article Location is Pennsylvania (one count)
2) The Crime Location is not counted because Philadelphia, PA was already recorded for the same crime as the first article (zero counts)

3) Name of the newspaper the article was reported in (one count)

4) And name of the author of the article (one count)

If an article indicated one location for John Doe's crime, and a second article did not indicate a location, that second article was counted as a not indicated crime location, which means that the final count of not indicated locations was higher than may have been reality. The reason they were placed in this category however was in the event that the article that did report a location had been inaccurate, or had only given a general location (such as a county) rather than a specific location (such as a town).

**Article Length**

In addition to article counting, all articles were given word counts in two separate categories – total word count, and word count pertinent to crime. While total word count encompassed the title, the author, the date, the newspaper, and the full contents of the article, word count pertinent to crime requires further explanation. This second category did not include the title if the title was not pertinent to the crime (for example, if the title described a stabbing, and the article itself contained three separate articles: one on the stabbing, one on a burglary, and one on child molestation). If a sub-title was provided for each separate article in the event that the title itself was not descriptive of the child sex crime, then the pertinent sub-title was counted. Article authors, newspapers, and dates were always counted, but if an article detailed three different topics – such as one sub-article on murder, one sub-article on burglary, and one sub-article on child molestation – then only those sections pertaining to child sex crimes were included. This means that
for the articles which detailed arrest warrants/reports in particular, only those sentences
detailing the arrest/warrant of/for an adult who perpetrated a sex crime against a child
were counted in the word count pertinent to the crime. Finally, for both of these
categories, I focused on the longest article, the shortest article, and the average length of
all articles.

Articles themselves were further categorized by Type and Event. Article Type
described my subjective summary of the function of the article. For example, "North
Marion Middle mentor on trial for child sex abuse" (2008) was categorized as a Trial.
"The Police Blotter" (2008), which was the title of three separate articles all detailing
arrest warrants for an entire county, was categorized as Crime in General. An article that
described the punishment of a convicted sex offender or their pending sentence hearing
was categorized as Punishment. The total list of article Types is as follows: Arrest,
Crime in General, Trial, Indictment, Community Reaction, Conviction, Punishment,
Official Misconduct (in the event of condemning the crimes of a highly respected
person/institution), Public Alert, Editorial, News Blurbs, Plea (Bargain or No Contest),
and Release.

Article Events were categorized somewhat differently. Rather than focusing on the
overall approach of the reporting, Events described the crime against children that
occurred within each article, placing each crime in one of five broad categories: 1) Online
contact (with or without a real child), 2) Physical Contact (Molestation, Sodomy, Rape,
Oral, Battery, Assault, Other, and Not Indicated), 3) Texting with a real child, 4) Non-
physical crimes against a child, and 5) Unknown. It should be noted that Article Events
exclude all crimes that did not involve children. This does not exclude non-sexual crimes
such as assault on a child, but does exclude crimes such as rape of an adult. Events were given one count for every time a crime occurred that fit one of these descriptors, and were further categorized into Concluded versus Alleged Events, again with one count per descriptor. Concluded Events can be described as crimes which were reported as ending in convictions, acquittals, plea bargains, no contest pleas, a ruling of mental illness or sexual dangerousness, or the dropping of charges. Alleged Events included suspected crimes in which no charges were ever filed, crimes that had not yet reached trial (ex, still in arrest phase), or crimes that were still in the middle of the trial process.

The event and type of Physical Contact is somewhat subjective. For example, Richard Daniel Vorreyer confessed to child molestation, however that was not the crime he was charged with in the two-victim case that did result in a guilty plea. Since the other thirteen victims did not appear to be mentioned at trial, it was counted as a separate physical contact/molestation crime, because although the article did not specifically categorize it as such it was definitely insinuated (“Perry man sentenced to 25 years without parole for child molestation", 2008, "MAN GETS 25 YEARS FOR CHILD MOLESTATION", 2008, and "Perry man gets 25 years for child molestation", 2008). On the other hand, "Three county men convicted of sex crimes" (2008) included a case with a prior "child sex crime conviction" with no elaboration. This was categorized as an Unknown event because no additional details could help discern what the actual crime might have been. The Robert C. Ragle trial involved five victims. Since only one actually went to trial (charges including battery, molestation, and sexual activity), the other crimes were inferred from the data provided. One victim was forced to have anal sex; this was counted as a Sodomy case and a Rape case. One victim said "sexual
advances" had been made; this was counted as Other, non-physical contact. The last two victims were reportedly "fondled", and were placed as a single case (since they were brothers) in the molestation/fondling category ("Former North Marion Middle mentor on trial for child sex abuse", 2008, "Ex-North Marion Middle mentor guilty of sex crimes", 2008, and "Former school mentor convicted in child -sex case - Defense opts not to halt trial as 3 new alleged victims emerge", 2008).

The counts ascribed to each Event category were basic, but did have some complex exceptions. In general, one count was placed in each category that had one crime matching the category. So if an article described the conviction of a rapist who had solicited and then raped one child, the count would be as follows: one count Physical Contact, one count rape, one count Other (not physical), and one count Concluded Event. If two different rapists partnered up to rape four victims and molested one in a single crime, then it was recorded as one count rape and one count molestation because it was a single crime of each despite the existence of multiple victims and perpetrators. Finally, I summarized all multiple articles and counted them as one case unless more cases were noted in their collective prior history (more details about prior history are noted below).

Exceptions had to be made however, for those cases involving multiple victims where some victims were not included in the trial and others were. A good example is the Grenemyer trial, in which the father had sexually abused his two biological daughters and his two step-daughters. The trial, however, was brought on behalf of the two biological daughters, as they were still underage; by the time the arrest was made the step-daughters were adults and no longer living in the home ("Testimony begins in Grenemyer trial", 2008, "Testimony continues in Grenemyer trial", 2008 and "Jury finds
Grenemyers guilty". 2008). The count for this crime would be two counts for each crime, and one count each for Alleged and Concluded Events. There are two counts made on the assumption that one count is for the two daughters who went to trial, and that had the other two daughters gone to trial, there would have been a single trial for them, rather than one trial per girl. This seems likely, since the crimes against the biological daughters were filed in a single, rather than a double, trial.

Another exception was each prior history was treated as a separate case. If another current case was being tried separately, that was also a separate case. But if a case had multiple victims or multiple perpetrators and no suggestion that they do not all take place in the same single trial, it was a single case, not multiple cases. I did make an exception for the articles about Richard Daniel Vorreyer, since the tone of the article suggested that the other thirteen child victims would have been tried in a single case and there was no suggestion that each would be tried separately. In fact, the tone of the article was distinctly to the contrary. Vorreyer reportedly confessed to over fifteen cases of child molestation. The articles described him as pleading guilty to molesting two children. It says nothing of the other thirteen or so children. Thus, I counted this as two cases in the data: one conclusion (plead guilty) and one alleged (thirteen unknown) ("Perry man sentenced to 25 years without parole for child molestation", 2008, "MAN GETS 25 YEARS FOR CHILD MOLESTATION", 2008, and "Perry man gets 25 years for child molestation", 2008). The Robert C. Ragle case was also unique. The trial involved a single victim, which was counted as one case, but during the trial a second victim came forward. This was not tried. After he came forward, a third victim spoke up and mentioned two other boys, brothers, who he knew had also been victimized. I counted
this as four separate cases - one for the trial victim, one each for the two who came forward (these were alleged because no charges have been brought), and one count for the two brothers since it seemed likely they would have been tried as a single case (also alleged because no charges have been filed) ("Former North Marion Middle mentor on trial for child sex abuse", 2008, "Ex-North Marion Middle mentor guilty of sex crimes", 2008, and "Former school mentor convicted in child-sex case - Defense opts not to halt trial as 3 new alleged victims emerge", 2008). "Berkeley Sea Scout leader sent to prison" (2008) also deviated because the man made a no contest plea for seven victims, but three victims were never brought to trial. Since the other seven were tried as a group, I assumed the remaining three, had they reached trial, would have been tried as a group. As a result, I counted this as one alleged crime (no charges filed) and one concluded crime (no contest plea).

Another unusual categorization was the article "Deaf School abuse *** Adults named in most-recent cases" (2008), which involved 29 unspecified incidents of sexual misconduct. These were placed in the Physical Contact/Other category, with all other cases of sexual misconduct. Since these were all unresolved, they were placed as 29 counts in the Alleged Events category. There was also one unusual case that I was not sure how to specify - the deaf school teacher who graphically taught her fourth-grade class about oral and vaginal intercourse and did things that might be construed as sexual harassment. This case was not placed in the Physical Contact category, but in the Unknown Event category. Finally, "Ex-teacher pleads guilty to sexual assault - Case involved two 2004 incidents with Millbury girl, 13" (2008) involved one count of "assault and battery". In events, this was counted as one Physical Contact, one battery,
and one assault category. It involved a no contest and a guilty plea on the part of the perpetrator, and so counted as one count in the Concluded Event category.

In the event that an article, such as "NOMMENSEN FOUND GUILTY AGAIN OF MOLESTING DAUGHTER - JURY REJECTS NOTION THAT VICTIM LIED ON WITNESS STAND" (2008) had the case tried in two separate counties, ending in acquittal in one, conviction in the second, but with the judge ordering a new trial for the second, thus overturning the conviction. I recorded this as one Alleged Event (new trial) and two Concluded (conviction and acquittal); "High court agrees: New trial for coach" (2008) also had a conviction and new trial ordered, so this was counted as one alleged event and one conclusion, as was "Trial opens for accused molester mom" (2008), "Father testifies in abuse case" (2008), "Son: My mother abused us" (2008), and "Daughter says doll caused pain Says mom abused her with Barbie dolls, but prosecution asks why girl would later ask for doll as gift" (2008).

"Shock" Value of Articles and Cases:

One of the main points of this paper is to determine the overall sensationalist approach of newspapers. I hypothesized that article titles pertaining to child sexual molestation cases would be sensational. I also hypothesized that cases involving "shocking" crimes would be perceived by newspapers and reporters as more sensational than other cases, and would thus show up more frequently in the article sample.

"Shocking" crimes involve 1) parents, 2) very young children (under the age of seven), 3) occupations of trust and close proximity to children, 4) priests, teachers, therapists, and similar adults whose occupation is a position of trust and close proximity to children, 5) crimes with "unusual" characteristics that might make them more shocking to the average
reader, or 6) instances of more than five victims (in the sense that the article is telling the reader about a den of sin, or a house of horror, that sort of thing). Upon finishing my data collection, I adjusted the first category (parents) to any perpetrator-victim relationship in which the perpetrator(s) and victim(s) were related to one another in some way. This included foster, adopted, and step-children, but excluded girlfriends' children. This was done because when calculating the data, any type of family relationship seemed more significant than parent-only relationships. I also altered the last category of "shocking" crimes. The intention of my initial hypothesis was to measure those cases and articles including five or more victims, but three or more victims and two or more victims seemed to occur much more frequently. To account for this, but to not ignore the original goal, I counted two or more, three or more, and five or more victims as separate categories. These categories were further separated by "articles" and "cases".

Two additional categories were measured in "shocking" articles, but not in "shocking" cases. These were the number of articles whose titles were "sensational", and the most frequently repeated article. The latter was included to further test the "shocking" hypothesis, the reasoning being that if newspapers want to shock audiences, the article most frequently repeated by papers would be one that satisfies one or more of the other "shocking" categories.

The category of "sensational" titles is similar to the "unusual" category in its subjectivity. When measuring the sensationalism of titles, I selected titles that I believed would be likely to elicit an emotional response from the reader, specifically if the title invoked sympathy ("Using one cycle to help break another", 2008), invoked antipathy ("North Marion Middle mentor on trial for child sex abuse", 2008), invoked a feeling of
vindication ("Convicted rapist faces life sentence in prison", 2008), or invoked concern ("New law could put sex offender on the streets", 2008). The titles were either the title of the article or a sub-title to the part of the article pertaining to child sexual molestation. In some cases where there were no pertinent sub-titles, the original title had very little to do with the crime I was researching. Titles that fell into this category were all categorized as non-sensational since is illogical to try and draw reader interest to the child sexual molestation case when the title did not indicate that the case existed within the article context. The total number of sensational titles and not sensational titles were added separately. These titles, for both categories, did include all multiple and duplicate articles, since the analysis was titles, not the number of times a title was used within the sample.

Next, the difference between article and case counting requires some elaboration. There were 280 cases in total and 260 articles. I separated the two when analyzing the data to see if there were any differences in the "shocking" outcome (for example, if there were three cases involving teachers in a single article, it would make it seem less "shocking" from the article perspective because articles would receive only one count for teachers, and cases would receive three counts, but if one case indicated the perpetrator was a teacher, and that case was noted in six different articles, then the articles received six counts, and cases received only one). To measure percentages, I generally subtracted non-applicable cases or articles from the original total (280 or 260, depending if it was a case or an article) so that only applicable cases or articles were used to generate the findings. To clarify, if I was measuring the number of cases indicating family relationships between the perpetrators and the victims, I first wanted to remove all cases
that did not indicate the relationship type between the perpetrator and the victim. This would help to better demonstrate the percentage of cases that were intended to be "shocking" through relationship types because it excluded all those articles that were just arrest warrants, and not really "articles" in the general sense. Arrest warrant lists of names and offenses, and general sense articles were news stories. I excluded arrest warrants and similar articles because they were not intended to be shocking. Their purpose was to alert the public, or to deliver a clipped and non-influenced version of the news. Since my main concern in the "shocking" section was the use of "shocking" measures to deliver news stories, I found excluding articles that did not indicate the topic in one way or the other to be the best approach. The result was that if, for example 100 cases did not indicate any form of relationship between perpetrators and victims (generally, if it just was not mentioned), then percentages would be calculated from 180 cases, and not 280. So if 52 cases included family relationships, then 52/180 = .288, or 28.8% of all cases.

The definition of a relationship was if the article indicated how the victim and perpetrator knew one another. This included babysitter and the child the babysitter was responsible for, strangers, acquaintances, priests and children of parishioners, teachers and students, students and students, parents and children, and so on. If an article or case just said "John Doe raped Mary Jane in 2007," with no further elaboration, the relationship was labeled as not indicated.

I also labeled cases or articles "shocking" if they involved a child age seven or younger. The premise for this age limit is my subjective belief that audiences would perceive cases involving children ages seven or younger to be more shocking than
articles involving children eight and older. Since a cutoff point was necessary, this seemed reasonable. A secondary rationale for this range was that common law initially viewed children under age seven to be incapable of extreme criminal acts such as murder, because it was believed that they lack the capacity to understand the consequences of their actions prior to this age. As such, it would seem logical that the sexual molestation of children who have been historically perceived as lacking capacity to understand consequences would be more "shocking" than the molestation of a child who might be perceived as understanding what was being done to them.

The third and fourth categories of "shocking" deal with perpetrator occupations, specifically those occupations traditionally associated with 1) close proximity to children, and 2) a perception of the occupation as a position of trust (trusting the person within the occupation to not harm the children they come into contact with in the course of the job). In position of trust and proximity occupations, I included only priests, teachers, therapists and guidance counselors, coaches and referees, Boy Scout leaders/counselors, and babysitters. While doctors, police officers, church workers, and so on might arguably be included in this category, I excluded them because they are not usually left alone with children (generally, in everyday interactions there is a parent accompanying a child save for school – including Sunday school and confession – camping, therapy, babysitting, and extracurricular activities) and because it seems to be more "shocking" if an adult who spends a great deal of time with a child is a sexual predator. Doctors, police officers, and church workers may come into contact less frequently and for a smaller time period than those occupations which I included, because doctors see a patient for a few minutes before moving on to the next (even pediatricians), police officers generally interact with
adults unless dealing with a juvenile offender or assisting a lost child, and church workers
interact more with fellow workers in the course of the day than with children, unless they
happen to be Sunday school teachers or priests, or if a minor volunteers at the church on a
regular basis. This measure is subjective. The reason I utilized such a subjective
measure however is because I am trying to determine a subjective measure ("shocking"
cases and articles). This work is exploratory. I do not have data determining the average
person's perception of the job of police officers, teachers, or priests in terms of their
proximity to children or the level of trust placed in their occupation.

As for "unusual" cases, my initial assumption was that most crimes are fairly generic
- molestation at home or church or school by a trusted or powerful adult, possible rapes,
pornography, etc. "Unusual" is used to describe cases that might seem out of the
ordinary to the average reader, such as underground criminal operations or extreme
brutality in the course of the crime. For example, the article describing two men who
were using local city children in a large-scale child pornography operation, and were
discovered sexually abusing a three-month-old baby girl was categorized as "unusual"
("Man sues city, police for tearing out catheter", 2008). Another example of "unusual"
would be the stranger who kidnapped six-year-old boys and sexually abused them ("Trial
begins in 2003 child abduction, abuse", 2008), or the man who took a girl and
psychologically manipulated her to pose as his daughter for months in public while he
sexually abused her in private ("Girl imprisoned by 46-year-old man", 2008, "Man
charged with keeping, raping 13-year-old girl // ARRAIGNED: Allegations of
molestation were made in 2007 but not pursued because evidence lacked.", 2008, and
"Man allegedly kept teen girl captive in Moorpark", 2008). A "typical" case would be
like the man who fondled a teenage store clerk ("MANY WITH CRIMINAL PASTS FOUND ON PIAA'S ROSTER OF SPORTS REFEREES", 2008, and "Checks needed on backgrounds of sports officials", 2008). An "unusual" case would be the same man who later rubbed the crotch of a five-year-old with a hanger in a store ("MANY WITH CRIMINAL PASTS FOUND ON PIAA'S ROSTER OF SPORTS REFEREES", 2008, and "Checks needed on backgrounds of sports officials", 2008). Another unusual case would be the instance of nine teenage boys who raped and sexually abused a thirteen-year-old girl in her home over a period of several months ("Nine arrested in sexual assault of girl", 2008). I would consider the instance of Arturo Adame unusual - he sexually molested and raped his female relative from when she was nine to twenty years old ("Deliberations begin in sex abuse trial", 2008, "Jury begins to deliberate in Adame abuse trial", 2008, "Convicted rapist will probably spend life in prison", 2008, and "Convicted rapist faces life sentence in prison", 2008). Another example of an "unusual" case was the Molester Mom - she allegedly raped her youngest daughter with a Barbie doll while watching her son and older daughter perform oral sex on one another ("Trial opens for accused molester mom", 2008, "Father testifies in abuse case", 2008, "Son: My mother abused us", 2008, and "Daughter says doll caused pain Says mom abused her with Barbie dolls, but prosecution asks why girl would later ask for doll as gift.", 2008). The tennis instructor molester was categorized as both "unusual" and typical - in one instance he forced oral copulation while his victim was unconscious, but others were "simple" molestations ("Judge increases bail for tennis coach accused of sexual molestation", 2008, "Tennis pro facing more sex charges", 2008, "More charges against Castlewood Country Club tennis instructor", 2008, "Pleasanton", 2008, and "TENNIS COACH
FACES MOLESTATION CHARGES", 2008). Cases were also included if they involved children ages five and under, but these were counted separately in case they skewed the data unnecessarily. Using "unusual" as an area of categorization is very vague in terms of definitions because the range of cases addressed by my data pool is so broad. As a result, the full listing of "unusual" cases can be found in Appendix A, so that the rationale for each case can be better understood.

The number of articles describing number of victims differs from the number of cases describing number of victims in several ways. First, the number of cases counts the number of victims per perpetrator, so if for example a husband and wife molested four victims, this would be counted as two cases with three or more victims, and no cases with five or more. Second, the number of articles counts all articles involving three or five or more victims, including multiples of the same article, or duplicates of the same case. Some of the articles may have indicated "numerous" victims in the first article and then specified eleven victims later. Had this been a single article and a single case, three victims would have been assumed for "numerous" and no more, but in the case of multiple articles I used the final concluding tally of victims, rather than the number specified in each individual article since what is being measured is the assumption of the reporter's desire to relay crimes involving multiple victims, and not what the reader receives from what the reporter actually wrote. Again, the hypothesis was that newspapers perceive crimes with multiple victims attracting more readers, so those crimes will be what reporters write about. This does not mean that reporters cannot err in writing the actual report, resulting in apparently more or fewer victims than is reality. The end result of this is if there were six articles pertaining to a single case, and five of
those articles reported four victims, and one of those articles noted that six more victims had come forward in addition to the original four victims, the final tally would be counted as six articles in both the five or more and the three or more categories.

Third, when counting number of articles as compared to number of crimes with no data on the number of victims, all crimes were counted as so designated even if there were, for example, six crimes mentioned in one article (not uncommon in articles listing police warrants for arrest, etc.). This was not so for the articles since the point was to count articles with no data on number of victims. If an article did not detail victim numbers for at least one of the crimes it relayed, it was counted as having no data. If, as was the case in "Four indicted for sex crimes in Beauregard" (2008), several crimes were noted with no data on victimology - including number of victims - then only one count was added to the number of articles with no data on the number of victims. In contrast, four counts were recorded in number of crimes with no data because there were four crimes noted in "Four indicted for sex crimes in Beauregard" (2008), and none of those had data on the number of victims. Although this may skew results to show more articles with no data on number of victims than seems practical upon closer examination, the count of crimes with no data will balance this potential misinterpretation as the crime count is much more detailed in that regard.

Finally, although some cases were labeled as "no data" on number of victims, each case with "no data" was assumed to have at least one victim (because without the victim, it seemed unlikely there was a crime), and these victims were placed in the Not Indicated Sex and Not Indicated Age (as one count) for the victim statistics. The reason these were categorized as "no data" was because it was not indicated how many or how few victims
there actually were; the bare minimum of one victim was assumed. For the purposes of measuring article shock value however, it was more practical to locate the number of crimes and articles that did not report victim numbers so that this could be subtracted from the total number of crimes and articles. Doing this allowed for a more accurate percentage to be taken of those articles and crimes that reported multiple victims, because if no victim data was mentioned the entire point of this hypothesis becomes moot. This was due to the number of articles that were simple arrest reports, arrest warrants, public safety alerts, and so on. The purpose of such articles is assumed to not be for shock value, but merely to inform. As such, they have no bearing on those articles whose purpose is assumed to be shock value, and would therefore skew the data in favor of multiple victims having no bearing on child sex crime reporting in newspapers.

**Bail**

Bail excludes the majority of articles and includes only those that noted the results of a bail hearing. This did at times include articles whose trials had concluded, but the majority of articles noting bail amounts were yet to be tried. Very few articles mentioned bail or the lack thereof at all, which made this a very small sample size.

Bail was divided into a series of potential outcomes: released on own recognizance, released upon payment of bail or bond, held without bail, unable or unwilling to pay bail, not indicated if bail was paid or not, total bail amount, and results of any bail increases or decreases. These outcomes were then later used to calculate two separate bail totals and averages. The first bail total and average was the original amount of bail charged. Bail averages excluded the number of those released on their own recognizance or those held without bail in the calculations, since I was measuring amount of money required when
bail was administered, and not the result of each bail hearing. The second bail total and average category includes both the final increase in bail sums (for example, one bail amount was increased twice. For the second average, only the very last bail increase was added) and the final reduction in bail.

**Crime Data**

One of the main sections of this paper is of course the crime statistics. This was done by listing the main crimes addressed in the articles, grouping them by similar categories, and then adding the number of crimes each individual perpetrator was charged with for each category. If the perpetrator did not commit rape, for example, but did commit two counts of molestation, the overall rape count did not increase, but the molestation tally increased one count. If the perpetrator was arrested for sexual battery, but charged with (or convicted for) assault on a minor, I recorded only the crime(s) s/he was ultimately charged with (or convicted for), and not the initial arrest. If the perpetrator plead guilty to three counts of child molestation, I recorded this as one crime of child molestation. Crimes were counted only once. If there were multiple articles concerning the same crime, the data was summarized and counted once only.

In addition to sexual crimes against children, other categories were included. The Other category was included for all non-sexual crimes involving children that were included in the charges against the perpetrators of sexual crimes against children (such as kidnapping or a burglary that led to the rape of a minor), one Other category for all crimes not involving children, such as crimes of criminal mischief or violating a court order of protection, or even other rape charges whose victim was not specified to be a minor. There was also an Unknown category for all those crimes that were known to
exist, but lacked sufficient detail to place in any other category. An example of this is a deaf school teacher who taught her fourth-grade class about oral and vaginal sex, put a thong on a boy's head, and stuck sanitary napkins on another student's back ("Deaf School abuse *** Adults named in most-recent cases", 2008).

Crimes were not analyzed by degree of severity because plea bargaining renders the results that could be obtained from that fairly meaningless since it is impossible to know if the degree matches the actual crime. Additionally, the data recording could not be uniform because articles were not reported in exactly the same way. For example, one article might be an arrest warrant for "John Doe, convicted in 1999 for rape of a minor," and another an appeal from a child victim to the wider community. The arrest warrant lacks data on victimology and details such as past history, and the child victim article might lack data on perpetrator data, victim data, and/or details. These situations have the potential to skew nearly all areas of data counting (crime, perpetrator data, and victim data). In the event that the crime was not detailed, but the type of crime was inferable – for example, if a man raped a girl, and the charges were not specifically indicated, I recorded it as one crime of rape. Since the goal of this research however is to ascertain newspaper reporting of such crimes, rather than critiquing the veracity of criminal sentencing, this is not an unacceptable measure for the purposes of this study. It should be noted however, that the quantitative data here may not accurately report the real number of crimes of child sexual abuses that were reported in September 2008 by those newspapers archived in NewsBank.

The next measurement issue involved the quantification of convictions/plea bargains/no contest pleas per crime, the number of acquittals, the number of charges
dropped or never filed, then number of crimes with unresolved conclusions (often because they had not yet been tried), the number of crimes with unknown conclusions (not indicated if arrested or tried), the number of punishments (in the event that conviction/etc. occurred) that were indicated, the number of punishments not indicated (this includes vague punishments such as "incarcerated" or "in prison"), and the number of crimes that were known to occur more than five years prior to 2008.

**Punishment Summaries**

Where punishments were indicated, they were recorded in sentence format and later summarized as total punishments for each category. In practice, this means that if four punishments were indicated for child molestation, and the punishments were a $2,145 fine and three months probation, 318 months prison plus two years probation, and seven years prison with twenty years probation, the total punishment for child molestation would be summarized. It would be indicated as four punishments indicated for twenty crimes of child molestation, which added up to a $2,145 fine, 22 years and three months probation, and 34 years and two months prison plus "incarceration." This summary is somewhat vague, but consistent.

The provision of punishments for each individual criminal category means that a full punishment summary potentially includes punishments indicated elsewhere. For example, if a crime involved both rape and molestation, and the punishment was one year prison, then the punishment total for both would include that one year prison. This is to provide a better idea of what punishments were reported as resulting from each category, rather than the crime as a whole, since it was generally not known how much of each
punishment resulted from each exact crime when, for example, a perpetrator was sentenced to three years for sexual assault and child molestation.

Punishments summarized were the ones most frequently observed, such as years in prison, years of probation, and years of community service. Due to extreme infrequency, I excluded certain other punishments, such as no parole, but included those infrequent punishments that appeared significant in relation to the crime – such as forbidding contact between the perpetrator and the victim, the revocation of a teaching license, or being sent to a mental institution. If the punishment indicated a minimum but not a maximum prison or probationary term, that minimum was counted as both the minimum and the maximum. If the maximum and not the minimum were indicated, then only the maximum was entered and the minimum given a value of zero, since it could not be estimated.

Suspended sentences counted as zero years of punishment because, although the sentence is announced, it is not administered. The only instances in which suspended sentences include a number is if there is a set minimum of years to be served in prison prior to the activation of the suspended sentence (for example, if sentenced to 12 years prison to be suspended after four years served, then four years prison was the minimum and maximum sentence).

If the punishment indicated was too vague to result in any assumption of time served, it was re-designated into the Punishment Not Indicated category of the Crimes findings. An example of a punishment that would result in this re-categorization is if an article says the perpetrator was “incarcerated” but does not indicate the location or duration of the sentence.
Any punishments described as running "concurrently" were still counted separately and added together. If for example an offender was sentenced to thirteen years probation plus nine years probation to run concurrently, then total probation was estimated to be 22, and not thirteen. If a sentence was described as "life", with no elaboration, it was categorized as 100 years.

If the information specified which punishments were assigned for which criminal activity, for example if it designated three years prison for rape, and two months prison for molestation, then only the three years are counted for the rape, and only two months for the molestation, rather than summing them up. Total sum is only used when the crimes and their punishments cannot be separated to try and be as specific as possible. Unfortunately, most cases did not designate between these areas.

Punishments were included even if the conviction was later overturned because the purpose of the punishment summary is to attempt to examine what punishments are administered once a conviction does occur, rather than an ultimate legal determination of guilt or innocence.

When punishment years were averaged, only those punishments that indicated any number of years (from eight months prison to two years to a suspended sentence amounting to zero total years in prison) were included in the analysis. For example, if there were six punishments described, but only two of them indicated years for a prison sentence, then the prison sentence average was equal to X years divided by two, rather than X years divided by six. I used this method because it gave a less biased determination of average years sentenced than if I averaged including all punishments,
including those punishments that amounted to 'revocation of teaching license,' or
'registered sex offender', with no further elaboration.

**Perpetrator and Victim Data**

A third major category of data was perpetrator and victim data. Perpetrators were
separated by sex, age, occupational indication, and relationship with the victim, and then
by the number of victims per perpetrator (this particular data was later used to measure
the "shock" value of cases and articles), perpetrators with significant others, perpetrators
with children, and female perpetrators. Victims were separated by sex and age.

**Perpetrator Age, Sex, and Number of Victims**

Total perpetrator count was calculated as one count per individual who committed
any crime. This excluded multiple counts when a perpetrator committed more than one
crime – the rule was one perpetrator, one count. Perpetrators were then separated by age
and sex, but this approach was a somewhat more complex.

First, perpetrators were categorized by age and sex at the time of each crime and at
the time the article was published and further divided by the number of victims at the
time of each crime they committed, the victim ages, and victim sex in order to obtain a
master list from which the rest of the data could be more accurately counted. If
perpetrator or victim sex was not determinable, it was categorized as not indicated (NI).
This happened once with a perpetrator who had a foreign name of indeterminate gender,
and more frequently where there were no details provided other than that a crime had
occurred, such as in the case of the deaf school abuse ("Deaf School abuse *** Adults
named in most-recent cases", 2008).
The number of victims would be the same for each line or vary depending on which crime occurred first. For example, if a perpetrator, age 30 in 2008, committed his first crime at age 22 on a six-year-old male and his second crime at age 28 with three males age 6, 8, and 9, the data will be recorded differently than a perpetrator, age 45 in 2008, who committed a single crime at age 43 against two victims. The first crime would be counted as age 30 at the time of the article, age 22 at first crime, one victim at first crime, victim age six, victim sex male. The second crime would be counted as age 30 at the time of the article, age 28 at the time of the crime, and four victims total by the time this crime was completed with victims aged six, eight, and nine, all male sex. The 45-year-old male would be counted as 45 at the time of the article's publication, 43 at the time of the first crime, two victims total, victim age not indicated, and victim sex not indicated.

To ensure the accuracy of this data count, I avoided double-counting these cases. If a perpetrator had the same victim as another perpetrator (for example, if they partnered up to commit the crime), it was distinguished from the other articles so that victims were not double-counted. To keep from double-counting the number of perpetrators, those perpetrators with two or more victims were also distinguished from the rest of the articles.

When calculating the number of victims per crime and age per crime, there were a few situations that required further consideration. For example, "Berkeley Sea Scout leader sent to prison" (2008) involved a no contest plea for seven victims molested at age 62, and three victims never brought to trial because the statute of limitations ran out. Since the other seven were tried as a group, I assumed the remaining three, had they
reached trial, would have been tried as a group. As a result, I counted this as one crime at age 62 and one crime at a Not Indicated (NI) age.

Perpetrator age and sex were counted again, excluding victim data, in three additional ways: minimum age of perpetrators at the time of the crime (per known crime, but not necessarily per victim), minimum age of perpetrators at the time of the first crime, and minimum age of perpetrators at the time of the article's publication. The last was the category that was most frequently indicated, since it was easier for reporters to determine this as it would not require the perpetrator to admit to a crime prior to the final determination of his or her guilt or innocence. Despite the fact that if the age for any of these categories was not specified exactly it was usually categorized as not indicated, if the age at the time of the crime was not indicated, but could be assumed from the data (for example, if the article said that s/he was 52 in 2008 and committed a prior crime in 1998, I would assume the perpetrator was 42 at the time of the crime) it was included under the assumption, and not categorized as Not Indicated. If the assumption required a stretch of the imagination however, it was not included. For example, if a man molested his oldest son years prior, and the man's age in 2008 was not indicated, although it seemed logical that he was at minimum eighteen years of age at the time of that crime, it would not be included. Some exceptions to this last requirement were made.

One major exception was made in the case of "Court told bishop is liable in abuse case - The state Supreme Court must decide whether to hold him liable for a priest's molestation of William Picher." (2008). Here, I did calculate a "minimum age" that required a certain amount of logical guesswork. The priest at issue in this case was definitely a full priest in 1998 when the first molestation occurred, so I assumed that he
was at least 22 at the time of the first molestation (this allows for time to graduate from the seminary) which would make him at least 32 at the time of the article (2008 minus 1998 equals 10 year difference). The problem with this procedure, of course, is that the real age is not known which may skew the data in favor of younger years, but at the same time minimum age provides some measure of at what minimum age the perpetrator could have been at the start of his/her crime(s) against children.

When calculating each of the three possible ages (first crime, time of each crime, and age at the time of the article's publication), perpetrators were further subdivided by sex into male, female, or indeterminate/unknown sex. Age ranges were staggered by five years (age not indicated, age 10-15, age 16-20, age 21-25…age 66 and up). Once the full data were calculated, percentages were determined for each category to obtain, for example, the percentages of males aged 51-56 at the time of their first crime. This means that the percent of men/women/not indicated is the percentage of men/women/not indicated per age group, rather than sum total for all three. A practical example is as follows: when examining the percentage of men who were ages 26-30 at the time of the article, I calculated \( \frac{20}{220} = .09\% \), rather than \( \frac{20}{261} \), because I wanted the percentage of men, and not the percentage of all perpetrators. The total number of male perpetrators is 220, but the sum total of all perpetrators is 261. The number \( \frac{x}{261} \) was used to calculate the total percentages for all age groups regardless of gender, and to calculate the total percentages of all genders regardless of age. An example would be that for the age group 26-30, there were a total of 21 perpetrators in that range at the time of the article. This was calculated as \( \frac{21}{261} \), or 8%. An example of gender regardless of age is
220/261 (or the sum total of men divided by the total number of perpetrators), which is 84.3%. An identical procedure applied to calculating percentages for victim data.

Finally, female perpetrators were further separated according to whether they had acted with a partner, the type of crime they committed, and whether the crime was, at the time of the article and alleged or concluded event.

**Girlfriends/Wives/Significant Others**

Very few perpetrators were indicated as having significant others. Those that were, were separated into perpetrators currently married, currently divorced, currently dating, and those who were dating at the time of the crime. The number of perpetrators definitely married now does includes those who are married to other perpetrators, like the Grenemeyers, but does not include those who are probably married but are not specifically labeled as such or those whose marital status is not indicated ("Testimony begins in Grenemyer trial", 2008, "Testimony continues in Grenemyer trial", 2008, and "Jury finds Grenemyers guilty", 2008).

When calculating the number of perpetrators currently divorced, the Molester Mom was counted as being both married and divorced as she was divorced during the majority of her crimes against her children but is now remarried to a police officer ("Trial opens for accused molester mom", 2008, "Father testifies in abuse case", 2008, "Son: My mother abused us", 2008, and "Daughter says doll caused pain Says mom abused her with Barbie dolls, but prosecution asks why girl would later ask for doll as gift", 2008). Also, when counting the number of perpetrators who had a dating relationship with the victims' mother, the results included current or ex-girlfriends whose children the perpetrator abused.
**Perpetrators with Children or with Significant Others with Children:**

Children were only counted once, even if, for example their mother and the mother's boyfriend both abused them. If the child's age or sex was not indicated, it was categorized as unknown. Fifteen children were missing from boy/girl children the perpetrator/significant other had because data on their age and sex was not provided.

Just because the perpetrator was married, divorced, or had a girlfriend at the time of the article did not mean that any of these individuals had children, and just because a perpetrator had children or had a girlfriend with children did not necessarily mean that s/he is married, divorced, or dating currently. The data reflects this.

An extra category was created to estimate the minimum number of these children who were known to be sexually abused by the perpetrator. The victims recorded in this category are only those victims who are the children of the perpetrator or the children of the significant other and not necessarily the total number of victims for the perpetrator. Some of these children were also missing age and sex data, and thus their data were marked as not indicated.

**Occupation**

When measuring percentages for perpetrator occupations, it was first determined what percentage of perpetrators had occupations indicated (about half). The total of occupations indicated was then used to calculate percentages – meaning, what percentage of perpetrators whose jobs were indicated were (for example) teachers? In this way I hoped to avoid skewing the data by offering percentages of occupations that were lower than in reality through creating separate percentages for known occupations. These
separate percentages give a better idea of what occupations reporters focus on if they are mentioned at all within the article.

In addition to the actual occupation, I also counted the number of times the occupation in question was used to assist a perpetrator in victimizing one or more children. This not only allows for observation of victimization rates for childcare-related jobs as compared to non-childcare but also helps in estimating the use of sensationalism in articles by newspapers. For example, my findings showed that although very few Boy Scout leaders/counselors were reported as perpetrators, those that were reported victimized a higher number of children, which makes it doubly newsworthy.

Calculating occupations per perpetrator was based on three criteria. First, the occupation was recorded if it was known what job the perpetrator had at the time of the crime. Second, if more than one occupation was indicated (such as "Family relates LaPorte minister's abuse of teen" (2008), in which the perpetrator was both a youth minister and a janitor) the occupation pertaining to the crime (in this example, youth minister) was recorded, and not the other occupation. Third, if the occupation at the time of the crime was not known, whatever current job was mentioned in the article was recorded. If neither the occupation at the time of the crime nor the occupation in September 2008 was mentioned, it was categorized as not indicated (NI). Fourth, if the perpetrator had two jobs relating to children, both were noted. Two further distinctions were that Sunday School teachers were counted as teachers and not as church workers, and one perpetrator used his wife's job (she ran a daycare) to access his second victim. This daycare perpetrator was not indicated in the data, but needed to be noted regardless ("Husband of day care provider charged with sexual assault", 2008)
**Relationship with Victim**

When examining the level of "shocking" cases, I isolated family relationships specifically but in this section family relationships were sub-divided by type (mother/biological child, father/foster child, etc.), and are only one type of relationship group. Other indicated relationship groups include strangers, acquaintances, student/student, teacher/student, priest/parishioner's child, "knew each other", and so on. These categories are further used to indicate how many times per victim each relationship could have been considered a position of trust. This second category, as well as the "knew each other" and "family friend" categories, was slightly subjective and frequently depended on the content of the article.

Perpetrator relationship is subjective based upon the tone and facts in the article. For example, in "Not guilty plea made in child molest case" (2008) I assumed the perpetrator was a family friend at minimum since the article facts suggested that he was the only adult in the house at the time of the crime or at least sleeping over or having the victim sleep over at his house. Sometimes however, even if the perpetrator was likely a trusted adult and probably trusted by family (was allowed in the home alone with the child) the tone of the article may have suggested a lesser or greater status than family friend. In this case, the perpetrator's relationship was categorized as both "knew each other" and a relationship of trust. The rationale for skipping the family friend category was most frequently done when it was not possible to discern if the perpetrator may have been a family friend, a neighbor, a relative, or a babysitter (or some combination). In these cases, the category of "family friend" was too narrow because it implied some relationship that might or might not be accurate.
Many of the perpetrators categorized as "family friends" had some kind of relationship with the victim(s) mother(s). In the 'Holy Hip-Hop Artist' article, the perpetrator had a sexual relationship with the victim's mother. The public library perpetrator in "Library attack detailed - New Hartford man previously accused of child molestation" (2008) and "Suspect had a history of - accusations - Complaints were filed with state" (2008) had also been accused of molesting his ex-girlfriend's children. These perpetrators were kept in the Family Friend category because it was not always obvious if the relationship was official (the child knew he was the mother's boyfriend) or if the child was only aware that he was a "special friend" of the mother.

Positions of trust were somewhat subjective, so examples of practical application are necessary to explain my rationale in some of the more unique cases. First, I categorized a pediatrician as a trusted acquaintance because of their position of authority and close proximity to children, but not in a greater relationship than acquaintance because of the low amount of time a pediatrician is usually left alone with a child patient ("Using one cycle to help break another", 2008). Second, "Library attack detailed - New Hartford man previously accused of child molestation" (2008) and "Suspect had a history of - accusations - Complaints were filed with state" (2008) involved a man who committed an oral sexual assault against a seven-year-old while playing tea party with her in a public library. Although he was a stranger to the victim, he was categorized as being in a position of trust with her because he used his two-year-old daughter as a lure to play with her and gain her trust before committing the assault. Third, I assumed that children under the age of five would be socialized to trust the adults in their lives, so all victims age five and below were marked as having a relationship where they trusted their victimizer.
Fourth, online friends were considered relationships of trust unless it was a sting initiated by law enforcement or a civilian task force. It was still considered a relationship of trust if initial contact was between the perpetrator and a real minor, even if the police took over from the minor at a later date. Fifth, in "Immokalee man charged with battery on teen" (2008), the perpetrator had a relationship of some kind with the victim, and the mother became concerned that it was inappropriate (which it later proved to be). Since it was not specified, I placed this in the "trust" and "knew each other" categories since this was what the tone of the article suggested. Finally, in "Man held on charges of molestation" (2008) and "Man faces molestation charges – Suspect held in connection with alleged incidents involving two youngsters" (2008) the tone used in the article suggested the two victims had reason to trust the perpetrator, so these were counted as positions of trust.

Although the general rule was one relationship per victim, the final relationship tally was greater than the total number of victims, because sometimes a victim was abused by more than one perpetrator. In that event, there would be as many relationships as there were perpetrators.

**Victim Age and Sex**

Victims were counted only once by their minimum age at the time of their first victimization. This was done to avoid double-counting victims, since they were not subdivided by age at first victimization, age at each victimization, and current age (the pattern of counting used with perpetrator age). The single age/sex count here was due to the lack of data on victim ages. Usually, the age at the time of the crime was the only age noted, and the vast majority of victims were only mentioned in one crime. Since it was
the exception for a victim to be reported as being abused more than once, there was insufficient data to justify including this as a separate category.

There were several unique characteristics of victim counting that must be kept in mind when interpreting the data. First, many ages and/or sex were not indicated. These were categorized as such. In the event that the victim's current age was indicated but the age at the victimization was not, the age was counted anyway, but if it was known that the current age differed from the age of victimization (and not by how much) it was categorized as not indicated. Second, the victim count includes only the bare minimum known number of victims. For many cases, it is likely there are more that were not known or mentioned at the time of the article. Examples of this include a case in the "Deaf School abuse *** Adults named in most-recent cases" (2008) article regarding a deaf school teacher and her fourth-grade class. Since no specifics were given as to the number of students in this class, a minimum number of four was estimated and this number was used when calculating victim statistics. Because the victims were fourth-graders, I estimated their age to be around ten, and placed them in the NI/under-10 category. Similarly, "Getting serious about bullying in Sunnyvale" (2008) did not specify the total number of victims. Since it involved middle school students perpetrating sexual assaults on other middle school students, I assumed a minimum of two victims. These victims and their perpetrators were counted as under the age of fifteen (10-15 in the perpetrator age count, and "under-15" in victim count) because I assumed a middle school student would be under the age of fifteen.

Third, cases involving child pornography with no elaboration on victim data for the pornography victims were excluded from the victim count. This was done for example in
the case of "MANY WITH CRIMINAL PASTS FOUND ON PIAA’S ROSTER OF SPORTS REFEREES" (2008) and "Checks needed on backgrounds of sports officials" (2008), where 176 pictures of pornography involved young boys; these were excluded from the victim count because it was unknown how many (if any) pictures were repeats of the same victim or consisted of entirely new victims, and no ages were specified.

Fourth, any child witnesses to victimizations were included in the victim count, since it was assumed they were victims by proxy. This was the case for "A sex offender strikes again – EDITORIAL" (2008), "Man gets 30 years for molesting girl" (2008), "Man gets 30 years for molestation at Disney" (2008), "Library attack detailed - New Hartford man previously accused of child molestation" (2008) and "Suspect had a history of - accusations - Complaints were filed with state" (2008).

The fifth measurement was that the victim count includes the age the perpetrator believed the victim to be even if he was in reality communicating with an adult police officer because s/he did intend to sexually abuse that child either through online communication or by traveling to have sex with him/her. The sixth characteristic was that if there was a child victim of a not explicitly sexual crime, but there were undertones of potential sexual motivation, the victim was included in the data count. This included "Former LDS bishop pleads guilty to molesting girls" (2008), "Ex-LDS bishop pleads guilty in child sex case" (2008), and "McCleve pleads guilty to sex charges" (2008) where one fourteen-year-old was the victim of a non-sexual but "inappropriate" relationship, and was thus included in the victim statistics. Another example of this was "'Sexual sadist' gets 30 years for child abduction" (2008), where the perpetrator's second crime was a knife attack on a fifteen-year-old female. Although this was not in itself a
sex crime, I believe it was likely it had a sexual motivation as the man was believed to have been a sexual sadist. His other two crimes were fairly similar to the attack on the fifteen-year-old, except that he also violently sexually abused the other two girls in addition to his regular violence.

Seventh and last, when calculating victim ages, extra categories were created when the data required it. For example, the teacher in "Hart deals with sexual assault allegations - n Counselor, volunteer coach, 3 teachers still under investigation" (2008) had two male victims whose ages were not indicated, but she had sex, gave them drugs, was a high school counselor, and tried to check into a hotel with one of them. I placed them in a "teen" category. In "Registered sex offender indicted on 120 counts" (2008) the perpetrator sexually abused eight children ranging from one to eight years old. One child was placed one in the not indicated sex/age one or younger and one in not indicated sex/age 8 category, and the other six were labeled as 'between 1 and 8'. The same procedure was done for other articles, resulting in categories of ages 4 to 12, 3 to 5, and so on.

**Findings**

This study is based on the content analysis of 260 articles. The focus of this research is on the sensationalism of child sexual molestation crime reporting, measured by how many times an author wrote an article with content that matched my search criteria, crime and newspaper locations, state of crime locations, the number of articles per newspaper, article types, bail, article events, article length, "shocking" article characteristics, crimes and punishment reported, reported perpetrator characteristics, and reported victim characteristics. Due to the large and varied amount of data, the findings have been
separated into the same categories and are presented in the same order as the variable
description in the methods section.

**Author Count**

Although I had hypothesized that specific authors would be more likely to write
about child sexual molestation than others, the number of unique authors for each article
was so large that no real conclusions could be drawn about the likelihood of authorship.

**Crime and Newspaper Locations**

Similarly, despite expectation that there would be repeats of locations within the
states, there were very few locations that reported more than five child sexual molestation
crimes in the same location, the exceptions being the deaf school cases in Baton Rouge,
Louisiana ("Deaf School abuse *** Adults named in most-recent cases", 2008) and the
cases in Cobb County, Georgia ("The Police Blotter", 2008, and "Sexual Offender
Notices", 2008). It was very rare that any location had more than one newspaper
reporting in it, even if multiple articles came from that location.

**State Crime Locations**

It was found that the child sexual molestations reported in the articles occurred over
a sum total of 361 locations ranging across 36 states. The reason there is a larger number
of state crime locations than article and case locations is due to the fact that some crimes
occurred over a period of time and the perpetrator may have crossed state or county lines.
The full listing of the number and percentage of times a child sexual molestation was
reported in each state can be seen in Table 1.

[Table 1 about here]
Newspaper Count

There were no patterns found in the number of times each newspaper reported a child sexual molestation case. This is consistent with the findings for authors and locations. There were so many newspapers covering the articles I researched that there was very little overlap for any one paper. The only exception was The Advocate, which reported on child sexual molestation ten times.

Article Type

I found that the most common article type was Arrest, followed by Punishment and Trial. The full listing of article types and the number of articles categorized within each can be seen in Table 2.

[Table 2 about here]

Bail

Out of the 280 cases, only 66 (23.6%) mentioned bail. Most of the cases that did not mention bail were those cases that had reached a conclusion or the perpetrators had not yet been identified and/or arrested. The findings support this since 54 of the 66 cases mentioning bail (82%) were alleged crimes, and only 12 cases, or 18%, had been concluded. Of these, two perpetrators were released on their own recognizance, sixteen were held without bail, eighteen could not pay bail, sixteen paid bail and were released, and seventeen cases did not indicate if the perpetrator paid bail or not. The sum total of all bail added together was $19,129,350, and of those who were assigned a bail amount, the average bail amount was $398,528.13 per perpetrator. Since some bail amounts were later adjusted by increasing or decreasing the bail requirement, the total bail amount including maximum bail increases and reductions was $21,494,350, and the average bail
amount per perpetrator including maximum bail increases and reductions was $447,798.96.

**Events**

Unsurprisingly, it was found that the vast majority of crime events described within the cases was physical contact crimes – 250 physical events out of 271 total events. Two cases involved texting with a real child, four cases involved an online crime with a real child, four cases involved online crimes without a real child, and eleven crimes had some portion of the event not known or not indicated. Alleged and concluded event cases summed up to more than the number of actual events due to the fact that some cases resulted in a conviction (which is a conclusion) and were later overturned and had a new trial pending (alleged). As a result, those cases were counted more than once, depending on the specifics of the situation. In total, there were 176 alleged criminal cases, and 122 conclusions.

The physical events category was further divided into subgroups. Of these subgroups, 45.2% of cases dealt with some form of molestation or fondling. The category 'other', which includes sexual contact, deviant conduct, and sexual abuse, comprised 38% of physical events, followed by rape (20%), and assault (16.4%). The last categories were battery (13.2%), not indicated (5.6%), sodomy (4.4%), and oral sex (1.2%).

**Word Length**

The sum total word count of all 260 articles was 146,685 words, and the average was 571 words per article. For the word count of those portions of the article pertinent to the crime, the total was 109,503 words per article, with an average of 390 words per article.
The longest article, in total word count and in total word count pertinent to the crime, was 2,944 words ("Deaf School abuse *** Adults named in most-recent cases", 2008). The shortest article in total word count was 118 words ("Molester admits to 2 charges", 2008), and the shortest article in total word count pertinent to the crime was 21 words ("Listings for Sept. 24, 2008", 2008).

"Shocking" Cases

When calculating the number of shocking cases, I began by locating the total number of child sexual molestation cases (n= 280). The various measures of "shocking" were calculated from this original number.

1) To obtain the percentage of those cases describing a family relationship between victims and perpetrators, I first located the number of cases with no data on perpetrator-victim relationships. This number, 135, was then subtracted from 280. The result (145) was used to generate a percentage to represent the number of cases involving a family relationship between the victims and perpetrators when relationship is indicated at all. The total number of cases was 26, or 17.9% of all cases that indicated some kind of relationship.

2) Similar to the measurements of relationships, to determine the number of cases involving very young children (age seven or younger), I first isolated the number of cases with no data on at least one victim's age, which is 80, and subtracted this from 280. As a result, the percentage of cases involving very young children was calculated as 29% (or 58 cases total) of a group of 200 cases.

3) Measuring the number of cases describing a perpetrator whose occupation is one traditionally associated with children and a position of trust with children also required
that the total number of cases be reduced by the number of cases in which the occupation was not indicated (155). The total 125 events were used to find that 45.6% (or 57 cases that did indicate perpetrator occupation) of cases indicated a perpetrator with an occupation traditionally associated with children and a position of trust.

4) The cases that indicated perpetrator occupation also helped to locate the percentages of cases involving priests (eleven cases, or 8.8%), teachers (23 cases, or 18.4%), therapists/guidance counselors (three cases, or 2.4%), principals (one case, or .8%), coaches/referees (eleven cases, or 8.8%), Boy Scout leaders/counselors (two cases, or 1.6%), and babysitters (six cases, or 4.8%).

5) A total of 111 cases were found to meet the criteria to label them as an "unusual" case. Of these 111 cases, ten were placed in the "unusual" category based solely on the victims' very young ages at the time of the crime. This means that 39.6% of all cases were "unusual".

6) To measure the number of cases describing multiple victims, I first determined that 77 cases had no data on the number of victims save that a crime of some kind had occurred. These 77 cases were excluded from the percentiles of two-, three-, and five or more victims, meaning that only 203 cases were considered here. Eleven cases, or 5.4% of the 203 cases, described five or more victims for a single perpetrator. Thirty-one cases, or 15.3%, described three or more victims, and 75 cases, or 36.9%, described two or more victims.
"Shocking" Articles

There were a total of 260 articles used in the NewsBank search for "child sexual molestation" in September 2008. The findings were calculated in the same manner used to determine "shocking" cases.

1) One hundred and three articles had no data on perpetrator-victim relationships, so out of 157 remaining articles, 25.5% (or 40 articles) involved a family relationship of some kind between the victims and the perpetrators.

2) Fifty-six articles had no data on at least one victim's age, so out of 204 remaining articles, 69, or 33.8% involved very young children.

3) One hundred and forty-five articles did not include any perpetrator occupations. One hundred and two of the remaining 115 articles (88.7%) indicated that the occupations reported were traditionally associated with children and a position of trust.

4) Of the 102 positions of trust with close proximity to children, 28 articles, or 24.3% involved priests, 27, or 23.5% involved teachers, and 26, or 22.6% involved coaches or referees. There were fewer articles (7.8%, or nine cases) dealing with Boy Scout leaders/counselors, and even less for babysitters (six, or 5.2%), therapists/guidance counselors (five, or 4.3%), and principals (one, or .8%).

5) There were 180 articles describing an "unusual" incident; eleven of these were included due to very young victim age (under five). In other words, 69.2% of all articles described an unusual incident.

6) Forty-seven articles had no data on the number of victims, so percentages were calculated as though there were only 213 articles. As a result, 17.4% (or 37 articles) of
articles described five or more victims. Ninety-six articles, or 45%, described three or more victims, and 70.4%, or 150 articles, described two or more victims.

7) There were 209 articles, or 80.4%, with titles categorized as "sensational", and 51, or 19.6%, with titles categorized as not sensational. A full listing of these titles and their categorization can be found in Table 3. The most frequently repeated article (there were sixteen articles addressing this single case) is "Pastor accused of child sexual abuse now faces forgery charges" (2008)/"Russell faces new charge" (2008).

Crime Conclusions

Most crimes did not end in acquittal, but the information included in the articles did not suggest that most crimes resulted in a conviction or guilty plea either. Crime results were fairly evenly split between convictions and unresolved crimes, with some crimes having charges dropped or never filed. A good portion of crimes (32.5% of all molestation crimes, 20% of all battery/assaults, and 21.4% of all rapes) appeared to have occurred five or more years prior to the publication of the article or were indicated in their articles as a crime that occurred prior to the crime discussed in the article. The majority of cases with an unknown conclusion were those crimes involving some form of sexual conduct or illegal contact with a child (50%). The complete list of crimes, their results, and past history can be seen in Table 3.

Punishment

Prison and probation sentences for child sex crimes ranged wildly from a few months to a few years to suspended sentences (which might amount to no time served at all). When examining the sum total and averages of punishments in Table 4, it should be
noted that corruption of a minor, solicitation, sexual abuse, travel to have sex with a child, use of children in a sexual performance, abuse of a corpse, and crime not indicated had very few punishments indicated at all, which makes the total and average punishments seem higher than they may be in official data. This is particularly true for travel to have sex with a child, use of children in a sexual performance, and abuse of a corpse, which all had only one punishment indicated for them. As a result, the total and averages for those crimes are exactly the same, and are fairly high in comparison to (for example) sexual contact, which has an average of fourteen years prison as compared to 20 years prison for travelling to have sex with a child.

[Table 4 about here]

In addition to the more common prison and probation sentences, some alternative or additional punishments to prison/probation were observed. These ranged from fines to imprisonment in mental institutions, to a sexual deviancy evaluation and treatment, to being registered as sexually violent. The total amount of fines charged was $33,160, making the average for all fines levied $8,290. Most of this was for molestation ($16,745).

Only eighteen cases specifically stated that the perpetrator(s) were required to register as a sex offender. Six of the eighteen were for child molestation specifically; four were for sexual contact, two each for rape/sodomy and pornography, and one each for battery/assault, corruption of a minor, sexual abuse, and Other (not sexual or not involving children). Five were labeled as sexually violent predators. Four of the five had committed battery/assault, and the last had committed child molestation.
There were a variety of other punishments. One of these was five sentences of community custody (100.75 years total for molestation, 1.75 years total for battery/assault, and 100 years total for rape/sodomy) with an average sentence of 50.375 years community custody for molestation, .875 years for battery/assault, and 100 years for rape/sodomy. Another punishment was a total of 100 hours of community service for molestation. A fourth was a death sentence for murder (which is in the Other category). There were also two sentences (sexual contact and Other) requiring electronic monitoring of the perpetrators. A few punishments were time served in mental institutions in lieu of or in addition to prison – one perpetrator who was convicted of pornography and battery/assault was committed to a state hospital after serving time in prison for an indeterminate amount of time, and was sentenced to supervised release after completion of the hospital's treatment program. Another perpetrator, who was convicted for sexual contact and battery/assault was declared mentally incompetent and committed to a state mental hospital for an indeterminate period of time. Two more perpetrators were placed in custody of the Department of Corrections until they can prove to psychologists that they are not a threat to children. Their crime was also battery/assault.

One perpetrator was forbidden to contact the victim or the victim's family, one had a teaching license permanently revoked, and one had treatment and strict monitoring as a prerequisite for probation, all for sexual contact crimes. Another perpetrator, who was convicted of corruption of a minor, was required to attend an accelerated rehab disposition program during his probation. Finally, one perpetrator of child molestation was sentenced to a sexual deviancy evaluation and treatment.
**Perpetrator Data**

*Men*

Out of a total of 261 perpetrators, the overwhelming majority (nearly 85%) were male. Of these males, about 50% were between the ages of 26-50 at the time the information was published in the paper. At the time of the first known crime, about 50% were between ages 21-45. Thirty percent of males however did not have their age at first known/suspected crime indicated, as compared to only 15.5% of males at the time of the article.

There were 327 perpetrator ages indicated for all various sexual crimes against children mentioned in these articles. Again, the majority of ages belonged to men, and roughly 50% of male crimes were found to occur between ages 21-45.

*Women*

There were a total of 11 female perpetrators, who have not yet been convicted of fourteen crimes and had been convicted for two crimes, making an average of 1.7 crimes per female perpetrator. Four of these crimes were not direct physical contact crimes, but were listed as "failure to protect" from abuse (such as if a wife knew her husband was sexually abusive toward the children and did nothing to stop it).

Seven females, or 63.6%, perpetrated their crimes alone, while three committed the crime with their husbands, and one with her boyfriend. At the time of the article, six were between the ages of 31-35, one was age 26-30, one was age 36-40, one was age 51-55, and two did not have their ages indicated. At the time of the first known/suspected crime, two were ages 21-25, one was age 26-30, two were ages 31-35, one was age 41-45, and five women's ages were not indicated. At the time of each individual crime, two
women were ages 21-25, two were ages 26-30, two were ages 31-35, one was age 36-40, two were ages 41-45, and five ages were not indicated.

Omissions

Fifty-three perpetrator names were not provided in the articles. Four of these were omitted to protect victim identity, fourteen were omitted to protect the identity of an underage perpetrator, and 35 were either not provided or not known to the reporter at the time of the article. Most of this last category was due to the deaf school case, in which the school blacked out the records, including the names of all perpetrators ("Deaf School abuse *** Adults named in most-recent cases", 2008).

Wife and Children

Out of 261 perpetrators, only around thirty had their current dating/marriage situation indicated within their respective articles. Seventeen perpetrators were definitely married at the time of the article and six had definitely been divorced by the time the article was printed, regardless of remarriage or dating. Five had a girlfriend or boyfriend at the time the article was published, and seven had a girlfriend or boyfriend at the time of a crime. Nine male perpetrators had a dating relationship with one of their victims' mothers. Thirty-two perpetrators had some form of fatherly relationship with a total of 62 children (biological, adopted, step, foster, or child of the girlfriend) regardless of whether s/he was married or not at the time of that relationship. Although the gender was not indicated for 21 children, ten were boys, and thirty-one were girls.

Thirty-four of the 62 children (54.8%) were victimized by this group of perpetrators. Gender was not indicated for five of these victims, but six of the thirty-four (17.6%) were boys and twenty-three (67.6%) were girls. Fifteen of the victims (44.1%) were the
perpetrators' biological children, three (8.8%) were adopted, four (11.8%) were step-
children, one (2.9%) was a foster child, and eleven (32.4%) were the children of their
girlfriends.

**Occupation**

As indicated earlier, there were 261 perpetrators total. The articles lacked
occupational information for 140 of these perpetrators. Of the remaining 121
perpetrators, ten had some kind of religious occupation such as priest or bishop. This
religious occupation was used to assist in carrying out their victimization of children at
least 23 times.

Twenty-five perpetrators were teachers (one was a principal), and this occupation
was related to their victimization of children at least 35 times. Nine perpetrators were
coaches or men who refereed children's sports, and this position was related to their
selection of victims 30 times. Two men were Boy Scout leaders or camp counselors.
This occupation was related to the victimizations fifteen times. Six perpetrators were
babysitters, who abused their position sixteen times. Two were therapists or guidance
counselors, and the job was related to victimizations four times. Finally, 41 crimes were
perpetrated by underage students against other students 47 times.

For a full list of all reported occupations and the number of times each occupation
was related to victimization by the perpetrator in question, see Table 5. The occupations
listed above were those that were most related to children and positions of trust, and those
with such a large quantity of perpetrators within that occupation or using that position to
aid their victimizations. Most of the other occupations tended to be occupations that I
would categorize as "surprising" – occupations that would not naturally make a reader
think of the perpetrator as prone to child abuse, but of such high position that the act of
abusing a child is as much a betrayal of the trust society places on that position as is the
betrayal of someone in an occupation with a closer proximity to children. Three
examples of "surprising" occupations attributed to perpetrators are the vice president of a
company, a police officer, and a businessman with a highly respected position in the
community ("Man sentenced for intended child molestation", 2008, "Molester gets 24
years in prison", 2008, and "Assault victim speaks out with message to others", 2008).
These positions don't necessarily need to have anything to do with the abuse (although
the last one did), but with the shock value attributable to their places in society ("Assault
victim speaks out with message to others", 2008).

A few jobs that were related to children in direct or abstract ways but were not
reported frequently enough to be included in the above summary are a clown, a theme
park ride operator, and a doctor ("Clown admits abuse", 2008, "Clown Oks Plea Deal",
Molestation - Inland Valley News", 2008, "FORMER WATER COUNTRY WORKER
REMAINS JAILED IN MOLESTATION CASE", 2008, and "More rape charges face
South L.A. doctor", 2008). Other jobs were noted as well, though most of the remaining
occupations had little to do with their victim selection – such as the homeless, the truck
driver, and the dishwasher ("Molestation arrest decade after incident - Victim accuses
man of assaulting him at age 10", 2008, "Three county men convicted of sex crimes",

[Table 5 about here]
Relationships

Earlier, family relationships were examined for articles and cases. In this section family relationships are divided up by type, and are included with all other indicated relationship groups, including strangers, acquaintances, student/student, teacher/student, and so on. These categories are further used to indicate how many times per victim each relationship could have been considered a position of trust. A brief summary of all categories can be seen in Table 6.

[Table 6 about here]

A percentage summary reveals that of all indicated relationships (325), 24.3% of victims had a teacher/student relationship of some kind, 14.5% had a student/student relationship, 9.5% of victims saw the perpetrator as a family friend, 8.6% of victims and perpetrators "knew each other", 7.1% were victims of a religious figure such as a priest or bishop, 5.5% were victimized by an acquaintance, 5.8% by a stranger, 4.9% by their babysitters, 3.4% by their biological fathers, and 3.4% were abused by a relative (with the proximity of the relationship not indicated).

Victim Data

Out of a total of 471 victims, fully half were female, about 16% were male, and 34% had an unknown gender. Of those with indeterminate gender, 64.4% were also of indeterminate age. The majority of these were from arrest warrant articles and cases, which did not describe the victim characteristics or number of victims.

When calculating percentages of ages solely for the 75 male victims, 9.3% were described as being under fourteen years of age. A further 6.7% were categorized as being
in their teens, and 6.7% more were age twelve. Over 30% of males were between the ages of ten and fifteen, and over 65% were definitely under the age of fourteen.

About 6% of the 236 female victims were age fifteen. At least 70.5% were under the age of fourteen. About 30% were between the ages of ten and fifteen, and roughly 10% were between ages three and five. Over 27% of females were definitely below the age of ten.

Regardless of gender, 17.6% of children were definitely under the age of ten, 47.2% were age fourteen or less and 24.3% were age ten or more. A complete summary of victim age and gender is presented in Table 7.

[Table 7 about here]

Discussion

This research points to several interesting findings. As hypothesized, newspapers do select more sensational topics, focusing on "unusual" cases, cases with very young victims, cases involving adults in trusted occupations, and cases involving adults in trusting relationships with children. Similarly, it was found that the vast majority of article titles were sensational, and those that were not were usually arrest warrants outside the definition of "traditional" article.

No support was found for the hypotheses that the crimes would occur in similar locations, that at least a few individual article authors would write multiple articles on child sexual molestation cases, newspaper count, or that multiple newspapers would report from the same general location on the same case. Even when multiple articles appeared on the same case in the same location, it was frequently reported by the same paper. Even the most frequently repeated article - "Pastor accused of child sexual abuse
now faces forgery charges" (2008)"Russell faces new charge" (2008) - was reported by newspapers in different locations (towns, etc.). Finally, although California was the state that had the most child sex crimes reported by the NewsBank newspapers in September 2008, any significance in the data may be due solely to California’s size and participation in the NewsBank archival effort rather than because of higher levels of reporting in general.

Most article types involved arrest, punishment, or trial, which supports my hypothesis on the focus of the articles. This is probably because the term "child sexual molestation" suggests crime, and if an article focuses on a crime it is more likely to utilize one of these categories. It is also potentially another symptom of traditional media sensationalism and expediency, since it may be easier to dramatize and produce a story revolving around an arrest, punishment, or trial than to hunt down a new angle like the victim’s history and current circumstances, or the community’s reaction to the crime.

There were more alleged crimes than conclusions, which I hypothesized would be due to easy information manipulation to make them seem more sensational. There were nearly as many concluded events as alleged however (122 to 176), which should be taken into consideration. Although it does not necessarily mean the hypothesis is not supported, it could mean that alleged and concluded events are not general criteria for reporters looking for stories that can be easily sensationalized, and that the crime, the perpetrator, the number of victims, or some other factors carry more weight when seeking sensational stories.

Most cases and articles did in fact utilize stories with "shocking" qualities such as victims of a very young age, adults in positions of trust and close proximity to children,
adults with some family relation to their victims, multiple victims (most noticeable with two- and three-or-more victims), and "unusual" cases. The differences between cases and articles (such as 17.9% of cases involving perpetrators with a family relationship to the victim as compared to 25.5% of articles) suggest that reporters and/or newspapers find most (or some combination) of these "shocking" characteristics successful in selling their product. For example, although 39.6% of cases were classified as "unusual", when all multiple articles were considered these "unusual" cases made up nearly 70% of articles. A similarly dramatic difference can be seen in the percentage of perpetrators in an occupation of trust or close proximity. This category made up 45.6% of cases, but 88.7% of articles. Finally, the vast majority of articles had sensational titles or sub-titles. Taken as a whole, these facts appear to support my initial hypothesis that these specific categories can help to measure the sensational approach of newspapers to crimes of child sexual molestation.

Punishment averages seemed to be moderate to long-term consequences. Although Cheit (2003) warns that mass media coverage of child molestation cannot be generalized to the reality of criminal court, the articles as a whole promote an image to the average reader that the justice system has reached a good middle ground when punishing criminals for child sex crimes. Although it is possible that the punishments that were not indicated were much less severe than the punishments that were indicated, it would be speculation to state this as fact although it is likely, according to "What hysteria? A systematic study of newspaper coverage of accused child molesters" (Cheit, 2003). As such, taking only those indicated punishments into account, the average number of years in prison for child molestation (that crime for which I had the most data) was 21.7 years.
Despite the fact that some very low punishments were observed in relation to the child sex crimes noted, the overall picture newspapers present to their readers suggests that punishments have increased. If nothing else, it tells the public that these crimes are being taken – and punished – more seriously. Even if it cannot be assumed to be an accurate reflection of the criminal justice system, the belief it instills in mainstream media viewers will likely increase public belief in the justification of harsher sentencing, and theoretically serves as deterrent to criminals who might not want to risk a longer sentence.

Even when a final punishment had yet to be determined, articles that covered perpetrator arrests, bail, or pre-trial hearings generally reported only the maximum potential punishment for the perpetrator, ignoring potential minimum sentences. Despite the fact that the maximum punishment is not guaranteed to be the final outcome, the public perception will be keyed to two main words: "maximum punishment". The use of maximum punishment in reporting of crimes suggests to readers that if the perpetrator is found guilty, the maximum will be the punishment administered, because the reporter offers the reader no middle ground for sentencing outcomes. This, perhaps even more strongly than the actual final punishment, can alter the public perception of child sex crimes, and since the media does influence the public it may result in increased public belief in, and support of, longer prison sentences for child sex crimes.

Half of the perpetrators were described as being between 21-45 years of age at the time of their crimes. It is difficult to determine, however, why perpetrators are in this age range. As this was not a representative sample, it cannot be assumed that this range reflects reality, but these findings are similar to Georgia's finding that 70% of
incarcerated child molesters are between the ages of 20 and 40 ("Child sex offenders", n.d.). This similarity was expected because the sample was weighted heavily in favor of isolating child molesters due to the selection bias. Also, it should be noted that the age range is not likely due to older perpetrators having been caught at that age range (and thus are still in jail), because these older perpetrators would have received lighter punishments than given today. Support for this theory can been seen in "Old molestation case" (2008), which noted that the perpetrator would receive a lighter sentence (up to eight years less time in prison) since he committed the crime in the 1980s, and the judge felt he should be punished according to 1980s standards.

Although it was expected that the majority of perpetrators were male, over half of the female perpetrators were not known to have committed their crime with a male partner (or any partner). This is an unexpected finding for news coverage since I hypothesized that news articles would overdramatize the cliché situation of a female committing sex crimes only with a male partner leading the way.

Most cases and articles did not mention the marital status of the perpetrator, or whether the perpetrator had children or not. Those that did appeared to use this information either to further sensationalize the story (an attitude of "can you believe that a father of three could do such a thing?") or because the child or partner had something to do with the crime (54% of children involved in some form of father-child relationship with the perpetrator were sexually abused by the perpetrator in some way, and roughly half of the partners appear to have either been used to gain access to their children or used to aid and abet the sexual victimization of children by the perpetrator). The
breakdown between whether this data are pertinent to the case or useful for sensational purposes appears to be an even split, which further supports the hypothesis that newspaper articles work to sensationalize crimes involving child sexual molestations.

Most perpetrators in the September 2008 newspaper sample were in occupations or relationships with close proximity to their victims and were in a position where they were naturally trusted to be alone with and have power over a child. Despite sensationalism of newspapers, this is a more accurate picture of the child molester than the stranger rapist myth, because most child molesters know and are known by their victims (Conte, 1982).

An interesting pattern that was seen with adults who were in these positions of proximity and trust with children is that many of the articles, when taken together, emphasize those perpetrators whose positions allowed them to systematically abuse their victims – cases where the job or relationship (or both) seemed a deliberate first step toward the ultimate victimization goal. Examples of this are the babysitters accused of abusing all of their charges ("A sex offender strikes again – EDITORIAL", 2008, and "Child molester pleads guilty to 9 counts", 2008), the doctor who systematically sexually abused patients, including a fifteen-year-old girl and an undercover police officer ("More rape charges face South L.A. doctor", 2008), the man who invited his neighbors' children to come over and watch children's movies and then systematically used them in pornography ("We didn't think nothing about it", 2008), the Boy Scout leader who practically made it a right of passage for his scouts to be sexually abused by him ("Jury trial near in Kellis sex abuse case :Former Clarkston assistant band director and scout official accused in alleged incidents at Camp Grizzly", 2008, "Jury chosen in molestation trial :Former Boy Scout camp counselor accused of abusing four boys", 2008, and "Kellis
expected to take stand in abuse trial: More Boy Scouts testify" (2008), the theme park ride operator who molested the people he assisted onto the ride ("FORMER WATER COUNTRY WORKER REMAINS JAILED IN MOLESTATION CASE", 2008), and the man who adopted children for (apparently) the sole purpose of sexually abusing them ("Three county men convicted of sex crimes", 2008).

Victim data findings are consistent with my initial hypothesis – there were twice the number of victims under the age of ten than above the age of ten, despite official statistics indicating that the majority of child sexual crime victims occur to children between the ages of seven and thirteen (Finkelhor, 1994). In addition to this however, attention should be given to an unexpected finding: there was a massive lack of victim data. Arrest reports, for example, did not include the number of victims, the victim age, or the victim gender. What was more surprising was the lack of this data in the regular articles. A full 34% of known or suspected victims did not have their gender indicated, and at least 64% of all victims whose ages were not indicated also did not have a specified gender. Thirty one percent of victims were of indeterminate or unknown age.

This lack of victim data may be due in part to a desire to protect victim identity, or because reporters were not permitted access to those sections of crime reports. Even if this is the case however, the lack of victim data reporting only serves to emphasize the one major connecting characteristic of the articles: a focus on the perpetrator and the crime, rather than on the victim. Although some argue that there is enough (or too much) invasion of victim privacy currently (Viano, 1995), I find the overemphasis on the perpetrator throughout this article sample to be as troubling as the media's overemphasis on a serial killer, rather than his/her victims. This is an ethical dilemma, for while it
would be incorrect to intrude on victim privacy (in particular I do not advocate the releasing of the names of juveniles), I strongly believe that there should be more emphasis on the victim's story than on the perpetrator. It is too easy to generate an attachment to, an investment in, or a sympathy for a perpetrator when a news story tells readers about the perpetrator's job, family, and life story, and then briefly summarizes the crime against the victim. Although probably not intentional, this can trivialize the suffering inflicted on the victim, and exaggerate the suffering of the perpetrator, thus harming the victim's rights against being re-victimized by the press. I find this to be ethically questionable, even if it is traditional news coverage.

A few articles did address the victim, rather than the perpetrator ("Assault victim speaks out with message to others", 2008, "Family relates LaPorte minister's abuse of teen", 2008, and "Using one cycle to help break another", 2008). Most of these were editorials, but "Family relates LaPorte minister's abuse of teen" (2008) was a particularly good example of how reporters can relate the story, keep it sensational and saleable, and still not lose sight of the victim in the midst of all the data.

What was found throughout the tone of the articles in this sample, though it could not be seen by the numerical data alone, was the fact that none of the news articles engaged in victim-blaming. Those few articles that proposed doubts as to the veracity of the abuse charges did so in a neutral manner with sufficient evidence to support those doubts ("High court agrees: New trial for coach", 2008, "Daughter says doll caused pain Says mom abused her with Barbie dolls, but prosecution asks why girl would later ask for doll as gift", 2008, "Molestation trial begins", 2008, "Jury in district court finds man not guilty of molestation", 2008, and "Sex crimes dominate trial docket", 2008), or refuted
the arguments of doubters ("Family relates LaPorte minister's abuse of teen", 2008, and "Molestation victim: Justice has been served", 2008). This is highly encouraging, and a potential sign of increased media sensitivity, decreased use of rape myths, and potentially increased public awareness of some of the truths of child sex crimes.

**Limitations**

*Representative Sample*

Newspaper reporting does not provide representative samples of actual child molesters, so despite the fact that some findings from the present study seem to agree with conviction percentages, none of the findings can be generalized to the wider population of actual crimes and convictions (Cheit, 2003). The accuracy of the data cannot be known without further and more intensive research.

*Selection Bias*

The sample included only those articles that had all three search terms ("child", "sexual", and "molestation") within their word count. This excludes articles that did not mention the word molestation, child, or sexual, which biases the sample to include more articles relating to molestation crimes than otherwise. Thus, it is unknown to what extent newspapers reported (for example) child rapes, even though some child rapes were included in the results.

*Inconsistency*

Due to the nature of newspaper reports, there was no guarantee of consistency in the data. Where one article might include the location of every crime committed by a perpetrator, the perpetrator name, age, gender, number of victims, and age and gender of victims, another article might exclude one or more of these categories but have more data
on the relationship between the perpetrator and the victim. These inconsistencies mean that all the data samples are incomplete and inherently flawed.

*Sensationalism*

Finally, newspaper emphasis on sensationalism suggests that even if the search terms used to gather data for this study did not create a selection bias, and even if newspapers reported all data areas consistently and accurately, a representative sample could never be achieved because sensational stories are still more likely to make it into the paper than others (Cheit, 2003). The result is that news stories cover crimes that are more likely to attract readers, rather than a representative sample of what proportion of crimes are actually occurring.

*Seasonal Workers, Seasonal Sample*

The fact that the research takes place in September, while including many summer workers, does potentially exclude winter-exclusive workers, and I would like to address this gap in future research by replicating this study for winter, summer, and spring months respectively.

**Conclusion**

The significance of this research is not found in what percentages of perpetrators actually exist, or in what relationships perpetrators are likely to have with their victims. Rather, this research is significant for two reasons. First, it provides support for prior research findings of newspaper sensationalism. Second, it shows changes in exactly what is perceived to be sensational. This second part is significant due to what it suggests about public perceptions of child sex crimes – and specifically child sexual molestation – as a whole. In the past, rape myths, low punishment rates, and low news coverage rates
meant that the public was unable to see child sexual molestation as a valid, real threat. The data presented in this study suggests that this has changed. While fear of the threat may now be disproportionate in the opposite direction to the past (high levels of fear for a relatively infrequent crime rather than the very low levels of fear observed in the past), newspaper reporting has made the public realize that the threat does actually exist. Additionally, news coverage has increasingly addressed the fact that child sex crimes are frequently committed by adults who have been traditionally trusted with children. Although this does likely contribute to increased and irrational fears, it has also helped to decrease mass media perpetuation of the stranger rapist myth.

The potential bias in newspaper reports of crimes resulting in harsher prison sentences (or to report maximum possible sentences) and to maintain a tone favorable to the police and prosecution's work means that what the public reads is going to promote harsher sentencing. If the public perceives that sentences are and should be harsher, this media sensationalism could benefit the justice system in two ways. First, it may deter timid criminals, who want to avoid harsh sentencing, and second it may increase public support for stricter laws prohibiting child sex crimes, and more severely punishing the perpetrators.

Finally, increased public awareness through the media can help to dispel rape myths. Although the media disproportionately focuses on priest abuses and other "unusual" crimes, it has also stepped out of the stranger rapist role, and most of the sample articles addressed the fact that any child sex crime is heinous, not just the extremely violent crimes. This is evident in the fact that while most of the crimes were "shocking" because they were "unusual," the majority of the "unusual" crimes were not extremely violent,
instead addressing a variety of case types such as preying on girlfriends' children, abusing children for pornography, trusted adult abuses, brazen solicitations, and abuses of very young children. The sheer variety of abuses, although it unfairly biases the public into thinking those crimes covered by newspapers are the norm, opens the public from the very narrow view of "this only happens very rarely to children who are kidnapped by strangers", to a realization of the wider spectrum of potential abuses. It can only be hoped that this wider view will help those responsible for children's welfare to watch for warning signs, to educate the children they are responsible for, and to believe these children if they do come forward to confide their abuse.

Future research should examine the findings from this research in greater detail. The current study was preliminary and exploratory. In future, the connections between the changes in mass media reporting and public perception of child sexual victimization should be more closely examined. The results of public perception changes should also be studied – have there been changes in the way parents or caregivers educate their children about bad touches (for example, more of an emphasis on "no adult should touch" rather than "no stranger should touch") – and any changes in child sex crime laws in response to societal pressures. Finally, it would be interesting to observe any changes in offender perception of punishment potential, to see if increased perception of punishment does or does not deter the audacity or incidence of child sex crimes.
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# Appendix A. "Unusual" Child Sex Crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included only due to very young age</th>
<th>&quot;Unusual&quot; regardless of victim age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masturbated in front of his three-year-old son</td>
<td>Man sexually abused and raped young female relative for eleven years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molested a boy and girl (ages five and seven) for two months</td>
<td>Husband and wife molested a boy together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molested the four-year-old daughter of a friend</td>
<td>Sex crimes by a tennis coach included oral copulation where the victim was unconscious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blindfolded a five-year-old girl to &quot;play a game&quot;</td>
<td>Repeated kidnap-and-rape of six-year-old boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted to molesting a three-to-five-year-old girl (&quot;School janitor accused of possessing porn&quot;, 2008)</td>
<td>Middle-school mentor molested a former student, his foster child, and two young fellow church members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molested his five-year-old stepdaughter</td>
<td>Molested a seven-year-old girl after befriending her family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While awaiting trial for molesting a four-year-old, he molested a fourteen-year-old</td>
<td>Couple sexually abused a girl together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babysitter sexually abused nine of his charges, ages four to twelve</td>
<td>Public library molester used his two-year-old daughter as bait to orally assault a seven-year-old girl in a public library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man invited children, aged five and six to his house where he used them in pornography</td>
<td>Public library molester was previously investigated for molesting his four-year-old son and his ex-girlfriend's children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-year-old pornography victim found after man was arrested for porn relationship with 12-year-old online</td>
<td>A stranger solicited two young girls to undress while he touched himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Recruiter molested young girls who visited his home for sleepovers for several years, starting when they were six.</td>
<td>Female accused of performing oral sex on a four-year-old boy she was babysitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual touching of students and thousands of child porn images with his students faces photocopied onto the images</td>
<td>After he plead guilty to molesting his eleven-year-old student, his young relative told police he molested her when she was four or five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist sexually abused two autistic child patients</td>
<td>Theme park ride operator molested a mother and her kids (and others) on the ride - unusually brutal because seemed so brazen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man confessed to molesting over fourteen children in the last 30 years</td>
<td>Students committed gang sexual assaults on fellow middle school students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man gave two under-ten girls Chlamydia</td>
<td>Man adopted special needs children and immediately sexually abused them for the next ten years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man molested the five-year-old of a friend of the family</td>
<td>Boy scout leader molested at least six boys in his care during summer camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man molested three sisters in his apartment pool. This seems brazen.</td>
<td>24-year-old man raped a thirteen-year-old girl more than five times and molested a ten-year-old boy in the boy's bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign priest molested the three-year-old daughter of a parishoner</td>
<td>Mother sexually abused her three children, including molesting the youngest with a Barbie doll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man communicated online with what he thought was a mother and flew down to have sex with her fictitious daughter</td>
<td>The husband of a day-care owner molested his wife's five-year-old female charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence strongly suggested that he was systematically hiring his preferred victim type (teenage boys) as his employees so that he could sexually abuse them.</td>
<td>Two men molested a three-month-old baby on film; they were suspected of a full-scale child porn operation involving city children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man committed sexual acts on a ten-year-old female relative, and the police say &quot;he's done some pretty vicious stuff&quot;</td>
<td>Man sexually assaulted a five-year-old girl in a store with a coat hanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He molested the mother 36 years prior. In the current case, he molested her daughter</td>
<td>Man communicated with a three-year-old girl for immoral purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor locked himself and his victim, a relative, in the bathroom and sexually assaulted her while another child was in the home</td>
<td>&quot;Parent, guardian, or custodian&quot; molested an eight-year-old girl in his care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually assaulted a six-year-old girl</td>
<td>Man broke into a house and raped a sixteen-year-old girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmhand raped and murdered a twelve-year-old female</td>
<td>Woman and her boyfriend used her children in sex acts, made the kids watch them have sex, and forced them to view pornography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor molested patients, including an undercover cop and a fifteen-year-old girl</td>
<td>Man molested his four-year-old daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A friendly man with a “kids spoiled here” sign on his front door was found naked with three naked boys in his home</td>
<td>Babysitter molested his three charges, ages seven, ten, and eleven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man raped and molested his two stepdaughters and then this two biological daughters</td>
<td>Man sexually molested his nine-year-old female relative while his girlfriend slept in the next room, and made her perform sex acts in his car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man kidnapped a nine-year-old and molested her with a sharpened broomstick; drove his car into a thirteen-year-old, slashed her with a knife, beat her with a tree limb &amp; sexually abused her; and chased and cut a fifteen-year-old girl</td>
<td>Bishop molested daughters of parishoners in their home while the parents were away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man held a teenage girl physically and psychologically captive for several months and sexually abused her.</td>
<td>Two teenagers shoved a McDonald’s apple pie box up a younger boy's rectum on a school bus while other teens laughed and took pictures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man molested a ten-year-old girl at a family picnic and propositioned a fourteen-year-old at a different location</td>
<td>Gymnastics coach accused of molesting 19 underage female gymnasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molested four-year-old boy and a teenage girl over thirty years prior to 2008; case is only now being brought</td>
<td>Sexually abused two females, ages four and seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleven-year-old boy saw man exposing himself and fondling a young girl at a Disney World hotel</td>
<td>Predatory sexual assault of a five-year-old girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband and wife molested four teens, ages fourteen to seventeen</td>
<td>Man molested his underage friend and coworker. When the victim's father took steps to stop the abuse, he murdered the father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest molested, sodomized, raped, created pornography of, and fondled at least four women over the last two decades</td>
<td>Perpetrator got drunk and put his hand down a four-year-old girl's pants and touched her genitals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man forced a now-teenage girl to have sex with him for over seven years</td>
<td>Man showed up for a sexual liaison with what he thought was a fourteen-year-old girl wearing a &quot;World's Greatest Dad&quot; T-shirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man raped a thirteen-year-old girl and claimed she lied and told him she was sixteen. A nurse testified that the girl's injuries made her &quot;the worst rape victim case&quot; she'd ever seen</td>
<td>Man convinced a fifteen-year-old girl to run away with him. He gave her drugs and raped her; she was found hiding naked in his closet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeated rapes of two five-year old girls over a period of five years</td>
<td>Man says he molested a young girl to 'comfort' her</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B

Table 1. Percent of child sexual molestation cases reported in newspapers by state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of locations within the state where a child sexual molestation was reported</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Percentage distribution showing the articles by type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article Type</th>
<th>Number of Articles</th>
<th>Percentage of Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indictment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Reaction</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Misconduct</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Alert</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Blurbs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime in General</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plea (Bargain or No Contest)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Summation of crime results, history, and missing punishment data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crimes</th>
<th>Total number of cases including at least one count of X</th>
<th>Number of cases resulting in conviction/ no contest/ plea bargain/ mentally incompetent</th>
<th>Number of cases resulting in not guilty/ dismissed</th>
<th>Number of cases resulting in charges dropped or not filed, or no arrest made, etc.</th>
<th>Number of cases unresolved (at trial, just arrested, not yet arrested, etc.)</th>
<th>Number of cases with unknown conclusion (not indicated if arrested or tried)</th>
<th>Number of cases that occurred five or more years prior OR is past history</th>
<th>Punishment not indicated if convicted - including past histories that lack this detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fondling/ Molestation</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery/Assault</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency/ Corruption of a Minor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitation/ Indecent Communication/ Internet Solicitation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape/Sodomy</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Conduct/ Illegal Contact</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Abuse</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porn</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to Have Sex with Children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecent Exposure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Children in Sexual Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse of a Corpse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, not sexual or not involving children</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Summation of punishments per crime category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crimes</th>
<th>Total Years in Prison Minimum</th>
<th>Average Years in Prison Minimum</th>
<th>Total Years in Prison Maximum</th>
<th>Average Years in Prison Maximum</th>
<th>Total Years Probation</th>
<th>Average Years Probation</th>
<th>Total Possible Life Sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Molestation</td>
<td>499.37</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>499.37</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery/Assault</td>
<td>260.92</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>471.92</td>
<td>27.76</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption of a Minor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitation</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape/Sodomy</td>
<td>612.25</td>
<td>68.03</td>
<td>816.5</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Contact</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Abuse</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pornography</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to Have Sex with a Child</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Kids in Sexual Performance</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse of a Corpse</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (not sexual or not involving children)</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Perpetrator occupation and relationship to victimization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perpetrator Occupations</th>
<th>Number of Perpetrators in this Job</th>
<th>Job Related to Victimization (Number of times)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NI/Unknown</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishwasher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest/Bishop/Religious Figure (includes youth ministers)</td>
<td>10 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Official (referee, instructor, coach)</td>
<td>9 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>25 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy Scout Leader/Camp Counselor</td>
<td>2 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Owner</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Recruiter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Security Firm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babysitter</td>
<td>6 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>3 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church worker (ex: choir director, acolyte, etc.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist/Guidance Counselor/Psychiatrist</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President of a payroll and tax management company</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Councilman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme Park Ride Operator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>41 47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm hand</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police officer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Cafeteria Worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet shop worker</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck driver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clown</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>261</strong></td>
<td><strong>180</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Perpetrator relationships with victims and positions of trust.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perpetrator relationship to victim (per victim)</th>
<th>Number of perpetrators with this type of relationship</th>
<th>Was this likely a position of trust or power with the victim? (Number of times)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NI/Unknown</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/Student (including coach, principal, and camp counselors)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/Former Student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father/biological child</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father/foster child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father/adopted/step child</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother/biological child</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Student</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Friend (including mom's boyfriend)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest/Religious Figure</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss/Employee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling/Sibling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babysitter</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caretaker/NI parent/Guardian/Custodian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Friend</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandfather/grandchild (includes step-grandchildren)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative (NI)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;knew each other&quot;</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor/patient</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Breakdown of victim age and gender at first victimization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age - Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>% Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>% Female</th>
<th>NI/Unknown</th>
<th>% NI</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NI/Unknown</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;young&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;minor&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;teen&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;prepubescent&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;under-10&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;under-12&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;under-13&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;under-14&quot;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;under-15&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;under-16&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 1 and 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 3 and 11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 3 and 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 4 and 12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 6 and 13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 9 and 12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 12 and 14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 14 and 17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or younger</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vita
Tatiana H. Gochez-Kerr
259 Simmons Hall Shortlidge Rd. * University Park, PA * (570) 814-6758 * thg5010@psu.edu

EDUCATION

Anticipated Graduation, May 2010

The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA
Anticipating a B.S. in Crime, Law, and Justice Legal Studies Option
The Schreyer Honors College
Bishop Hoban High School (Name change: “Holy Redeemer High School”)
Graduated with honors, May 2006

AWARDS

Dean's List, all semesters
Major Charles Dennis McKee Memorial Scholarship Spring 2009
Certificate of Excellence in Scholarship, UMBC 2009
Certificate of Achievement, Exemplary Work and Presentation of Research, PSU 2009
The Schreyer Honors College Endowment for Academic Excellence Scholarship, PSU 2006-2009

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

Phi Beta Kappa
Phi Kappa Phi
Alpha Phi Sigma
McNair Scholars Program
Justice Association
Mock Trial Association
National Society of Collegiate Scholars
International Golden Key Honors Society

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Undergraduate Honors Thesis Research

2009-2010
Thesis Title: *Pedophiles Among Us: Newspaper coverage of child sexual molestation in September, 2008*
Research advisors:
Dr. Laurie K. Scheuble, Department of Sociology
Dr. Jeffrey T. Ulmer, Department of Crime, Law, and Justice

- Content analysis, quantitative research
  - Content analysis of newspapers for data
  - Shock value of newspaper articles and use of "unusual" cases
  - Graph data to examine offender age, sex, victim age, sex, and number, offender punishment, location of the newspaper, and month/year
Investigate links between offense and offender occupation and other data
Newspaper coverage of the topic in the present day

The Ronald E. McNair Summer Undergraduate Research Program, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA

Summer 2009
Research Title: Sexploitation of Children: Exploratory analysis of data availability and reliability
Research advisor:
Dr. Laurie K. Scheuble, Department of Sociology, The Pennsylvania State University

Content analysis research
- Examined the United States of America, Japan, and Thailand
- Used journal articles, news resources, and books to determine levels of child sexploitation over time

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Teaching Assistant
Introduction to Criminal Justice (CRIM 113), The Pennsylvania State University
Fall 2008, Senior Lecturer Jose L. Texidor
- Took attendance
- Graded exams in a timely manner
- Assisted in class as needed
- Offered extra tutoring sessions prior to each exam – not required, but done with teacher approval

Tutor
Volunteer
2001-2003, Mercy Services
- Assisted with homework
- Assisted with general questions

Tutor
Privately hired
2001-2002, St. Jude School
- Set writing and spelling tasks
- Assisted when student encountered difficulties

PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Publications
Oral Presentations

"The Sexploitation of Children: Data availability, reliability, and validity." Presentation offered at the University of Maryland at Baltimore County McNair Scholars Research Conference, September 19, 2009.


LEADERSHIP/SERVICE

**Ronald E. McNair Post-Baccalaureate Achievement Program**  
Fall 2008-present  
- Participate in weekly professional development workshops and seminars related to graduate school and research preparation  
- Fulfill program requirements, including maintaining a high GPA, completing a research methodology course, and participating in an eleven-week summer research internship

**The Penn State Anime Organization**  
Librarian, Fall 2007-Spring 2008  
- Organized and maintained the library (books, CDs, DVDs)  
- Alerted members to library list  
- Helped to create library webpage  
- Dispensed materials and notified members of due dates

**Global Kids**  
Volunteer Host, Spring 2009  
- Acted as tour guide, discussed why college was a good option, hosted student overnight

**Diversity Chat**  
Volunteer, Fall 2008  
- Assisted in set-up and greeting recruiters

WORK EXPERIENCE

**Undergraduate Research Assistant**  
Fall 2008-Spring 2009  
The Association of Religion Data Archives, Dr. Gail Ulmer  
- Data entry, editing, research, and clerical duties

**Notetaker**  
Spring 2009  
Disability Services, The Pennsylvania State University  
Nominated for the position by Senior Lecturer Jose L. Texidor  
- Typed class notes and announcements and submitted in a timely manner
FELLOWSHIPS

Ford Foundation Predoctoral Fellowship
  2009 applicant for 2010 school year

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Graduate College McNair Fellowship
  2010 recipient of a three-year, $17,000 fellowship

University of Missouri at Columbia Gus T. Ridgel Fellowship
  2010 recipient of a five-year, $10,000 fellowship in conjunction with a five-year, $13,000 assistantship

CONFERENCES ATTENDED

  2010 Achievement Conference, The Pennsylvania State University
  2009 University of Maryland at Baltimore County McNair Scholars Research Conference
  2009 Penn State McNair Summer Research Conference
  2009 Achievement Conference, The Pennsylvania State University
  2009 University of Maryland National Research Conference: McNair Scholars & Undergraduate Research
  2007 National Society of Collegiate Scholars Summer Conference

My electronic portfolio can be found at
http://www.personal.psu.edu/thg5010/landing.htm