

Fair Play For Children (FPFC) calculations

The figures presented by FPFC in their press release entitled “6.2% of Child Offenders may account for at least 55% of Victims” do not provide evidence for the claims made.

Table 1 shows the original figures provided by FPFC:

Table 1. Original FPFC figures

	% Offenders	Victim rate	No. Victims
Professional	6.2	5	556
Family	89.6	2	222
Other	4.2	2	222
Total			1000

Here, FPFC have estimated that each Professional perpetrator has 5 victims, whereas both the Family and Other perpetrators have 2 victims per offender. The ratio of Victim to Group therefore is 5:9 for Professional, 2:9 for Family, and 2:9 for Other.

FPFC appears to use these ratios to calculate the No. of Victims using the following formula:

$$\text{Total Victims} / \text{Victim Ratio}$$

And so we see that for Professional perpetrators

$$(1000/9)*5 = 556$$

In light of this the press release makes the claim that “If the Professional abuser has 5 victims over such a period the immediately obvious result is that of 1000 child victims in that period, 55.6% of those victims will come from Professional abusers, whereas 22.2% will be victims of Family Abusers.”

This is inaccurate and misleading.

The calculation used fails to account for the fact that Professional perpetrators are a much smaller proportion of the whole group. For example, if we take a sample of 1,000 offenders using the same victim rate, but taking account of the proportions, we can calculate the number of offenders in each group. We can then multiply this by the victim rate to obtain the number and proportion of victims for each group:

Table 2. Figures for 1,000 offenders at 5 victim rate for Professional group

	% Offenders	No. of Offenders	Victim rate	No. Victims	%
Professional	6.2	62	5	310	14%
Family	89.6	896	2	1792	82%
Other	4.2	42	2	84	4%
Total		1000		2186	

Table 2 shows that by using those proportions and victim rates, 1,000 offenders would create 2,186 victims. If the Professional perpetrators have 5 victims over such a period they will account

for 310 (14%) of the total victims, not 55.6%, and 82% of the victims will be accounted for by Family perpetrators.

To put this in the context of the original FPFC figures, we can amend the sample of offenders (from 1,000) to calculate the number and proportions of offenders that would account for 1,000 victims (or as close as we can get). This would approximately look like this:

Table 3. Figures for 1,000 offenders at 5 victim rate for Professional group

	% Offenders	No. of Offenders	Victim rate	No. Victims	%
Professional	6.2	28.4	5	142	14%
Family	89.6	410.4	2	821	82%
Other	4.2	19.2	2	39	4%
Total		458		1001	

Again in Table 3 we can see that once the proportions of the group are accounted for, with 5 victims each over such a period, the result is that of 1,000 child victims the Professional perpetrators will be responsible for 142 victims (14%), and 821 (82%) will be victims of Family perpetrators.

These figures can be extrapolated out in terms of increasing victim rates. These figures show that using the scale provided in the press release (5; 10; 20; 35; 50; 100), Professional perpetrators would need to have a victim rate of **35** per offender (compared to 2 for Family and 2 for Other) before they are responsible for a greater proportion of total victims than the Family group (see Tables 4-8 below).

Table 4. Figures for 1,000 offenders at 10 victim rate for Professional group

	% Offenders	No. of Offenders	Victim rate	No. Victims	%
Professional	6.2	24.9	10	248.6	24.8
Family	89.6	359.3	2	718.6	71.8
Other	4.2	16.8	2	33.7	3.4
Total		401		1000.9	

Table 5. Figures for 1,000 offenders at 20 victim rate for Professional group

	% Offenders	No. of Offenders	Victim rate	No. Victims	%
Professional	6.2	19.9	20	398.0	39.8
Family	89.6	287.6	2	575.2	57.5
Other	4.2	13.5	2	27.0	2.7
Total		321		1000.2	

Table 6. Figures for 1,000 offenders at 35 victim rate for Professional group

	% Offenders	No. of Offenders	Victim rate	No. Victims	%
Professional	6.2	15.3	35	536.0	53.6
Family	89.6	221.3	2	442.6	44.3
Other	4.2	10.4	2	20.7	2.1
Total		247		999.4	

Table 7. Figures for 1,000 offenders at 50 victim rate for Professional group

	% Offenders	No. of Offenders	Victim rate	No. Victims	%
Professional	6.2	12.5	50	623.1	62.3
Family	89.6	180.1	2	360.2	36.0
Other	4.2	8.4	2	16.9	1.7
Total		201		1000.2	

Table 8. Figures for 1,000 offenders at 10 victim rate for Professional group

	% Offenders	No. of Offenders	Victim rate	No. Victims	%
Professional	6.2	7.7	100	768.8	76.8
Family	89.6	111.1	2	222.2	22.2
Other	4.2	5.2	2	10.4	1.0
Total		124		1001.4	

As such, the original claims made in the press release are not based on the proportion of Professional perpetrators quoted. The conclusions of the press release are therefore misleading.

Ian Elliott

Research Psychologist

The Lucy Faithfull Foundation

Note: The details above are the opinion of the author and may not necessarily represent the opinions of The Lucy Faithfull Foundation.

9 December 2010