**Correction one to Marthijn’s article: the one percent**
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Marthijn Uittenboogaard wrote on June 3, 2016, named “Find the truth … tell it”

([http://www.seksencyclopedie.nl/columns/ca/20160603\_Truth.html](http://www.seksencyclopedie.nl/columns/ca/20160603_Truth.html%20) ):

“Let's take a look at the Rind research. … When a boy had a consensual sexual contact with an adult then there was no harm to be found. A girl with a man slightly showed harm: one percent of them.”

Now and then, I have said that the research of Rind c.s. should prove that a sexual experience during childhood in only *four percent* should result in lasting harm, and only for girls and only for cases of incest and force. This is not correct.

I discovered this in a shock after Marthijn has said that this was only *one percent*. In my text to correct this into 4%, I wanted to place a link to this cipher in Rind’s meta-analysis. This 4% cannot be found there!

The 1% can be found in Rind’s meta-analysis, but this cipher has another meaning.

Here below, I give a short explanation. The whole text with several links is here:

< <https://www.ipce.info/library/web-article/forget-four-percent-remember-one-percent> >, English, and here: < <http://www.jorisoost.nl/lees/onderzoek/rbt/vergeet_de_vier_procent.html> >, Dutch.

**The four percent**

The 4% lasting harm is mentioned there for males; for females, the authors give us 13% lasting harm.

There is more, knowingly also "Harmful at the time, but no lasting effects”. For males this is 33%, for females 51%. "No effect" counts for males 57% and for females 34%.

"Improved quality of life" is also mentioned: male 6%, female 2%.

In my humble opinion, ‘temporary harm’ is also harm. If we sum ‘lasting’ and ‘temporary’, we arrive at 37% for males and 64% for females. This is quite more than the supposed 4%.

However, another cipher may put this in perspective.

**The one percent**

This percentage can be found in the meta-analysis, but its meaning is quite different, knowingly “effect size”.

This is a cipher that, after statistical computations, tells us how much effect phenomenon A (here: sexual experience during childhood) has on phenomenon B (here: lasting harm, more precisely ‘problems with psychological; adjustment during adulthood’). Thus, not the *frequency* of phenomenon B (‘1% of the cases’), but the *effect* that A has on B (‘1% of the possible factors’). After all, there are more factors or influences possible working on B than only A.

It appears that the effect size differs per type of sample. In clinical samples (people who receive treatment) the cipher is higher than in non-clinical samples (which represent ‘the population’).

In their own research about national community samples, the Rind team found

- for males an effect size between 0,16% and 1,44%, the mean is 0,49

- for females between 0,25% and 4,00%, the mean is 1%.

- The combined mean is 0,81%.

In their research with college samples, they found

- 1% for females and

- 0,5% for males.

For simplicity and memory, the authors speak about 1%.

So, it appears that the factor ‘(problematic) family environment’ is a factor nine stronger than the factor ‘sexual experience during childhood’. It also appears that the effect size is higher in cases of unwanted contacts.

**Snakes in the grass**

**Snake 1** is the so-called *dark number*, the cases in which people do not give any information. During the recent last decennia, a lot of *dark cases* have come into the light. So the ciphers here above may be outdated, be it that we may suppose that also the wanted contacts have *dark number*. We simply cannot know all cases, thus the whole truth. Reality and truth are double and complex.

**Snake 2** is the fact that harm may have two faces

- *Primary harm* stamms from the sexual experience itself;

- *secundary harm* comes from the reactions of the environment.

- A combined type of harm is *holding a secret,* which is a burden for children and adults.

**Snake 3** is the distinction between temporary harm and lasting harm. Rind c.s. especially searched for the latter. Yet, we may call ‘temporary harm’ also ‘harm. Harm is harm.

**Snake 4** is the fact that nobody is able to foresee how a contact afterwards will be experienced, neither directly after it, nor in the future.

**Snake 5** is the fact that in research often no distinction is made between wanted and unwanted contacts, as well as between lightly erotically fondling and penetration, and all kinds of contacts in-between both.

So, the problem arises that literature and media usually mention only the most heavy cases, and continue by naming the lighter forms harmful and scandalous.

There appear protocols which forbid to caregivers, teachers, educators, *all* forms of bodily contact with *any* child, until absurdities as giving a sticker plaster or smear in against sunburn. Just these kinds of interdiction seems me harmful.

**A short peroration**

There is one thing we know surely: that children need relations, intimacy and contact, including bodily contact, loving contact. These contacts do surely not need to be of a sexual nature, not as such meant and not as such felt, not more than a tiny bit erotic, or simply pretty and healing for both.