

An exploration of imprisoned fathers' needs in the Netherlands

Simon Venema is a PhD candidate at Addiction mental health care Northern Netherlands (VNN) and is affiliated with the research group of Addiction Science and Forensic Care at the Hanze University of Applied Sciences.

Eric Blaauw is professor in Addiction Science and Forensic Care at the Hanze University of Applied Sciences and senior researcher at Addiction mental health care Northern Netherlands (VNN).

Introduction

Roughly half of all men in prison are fathers of minor children.¹ Despite the high prevalence of fatherhood in prisons, little is known about imprisoned fathers' needs regarding fatherhood and family relationships. In prisons for men, limited attention is given to men's roles as fathers and the difficulties they and their families encounter. Prison policies generally prioritise safety, security, and good order rather than promoting men's identities as fathers and supporting families experiencing paternal imprisonment.

Research suggests that paternal imprisonment has negative consequences for children's wellbeing. Paternal imprisonment has been associated with increased internalising problem behaviours (e.g., depression, anxiety, and withdrawal), externalising problem behaviours (e.g., aggressive, violent, antisocial, rule-breaking, and delinquent behaviours),² and decreased educational performance.³ It is often hypothesised that the negative impact of paternal imprisonment on family relationships is one of the key

mechanisms in the link between paternal imprisonment and children's negative outcomes.⁴ Family relationships may be harmed by paternal imprisonment because of the physical separation between fathers and their families, and the limitations on quantity and quality of family contact. In prison settings, family contact takes place in restrictive environments which may inhibit developmentally promotive father-child interactions.⁵

Studies have shown that children with a father in prison often miss their fathers and face significant barriers for maintaining father-child relationships.⁶ Here it is important to note that paternal imprisonment may provide relief for children and families in harmful and abusive family situations. However, research suggests that many fathers in prison were actively involved in their children's upbringing before imprisonment.⁷ When combined, these notions imply that while paternal imprisonment may be harmful for many children, it may be beneficial for other children. The question, then, is what prisons can do to support imprisoned fathers and their families. In the current study, we explore the imprisoned fathers' needs regarding fatherhood and family relationships.

1. Henneken-Hordijk, I. and van Gemmert, A. A. (2011). *Gedetineerd in Nederland 2011: Een survey onder gedetineerden in het Nederlandse gevangeniswezen*. Den Haag; Maruschak, L. M., Bronson, J. and Alper, M. (2021) *Parents in prison and their minor children: Survey of prison inmates, 2016*. Available at: <https://bjs.ojp.gov/content/pub/pdf/pptmcspi16st.pdf>.
2. Murray, J., & Farrington, D. P. (2008a), Parental imprisonment: Long-lasting effects on boys' internalizing problems through the life course. *Development and Psychopathology*, 20(1), 273–290. doi: 10.1017/S0954579408000138; Murray, J., Farrington, D. P., & Sekol, I. (2012). Children's antisocial behavior, mental health, drug use, and educational performance after parental incarceration: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 138(2), 175–210. doi: 10.1037/a0026407.
3. Anker, A. S. T. (2021). Educational consequences of paternal incarceration: Evidence from a Danish policy reform. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*. doi: 10.1007/s10940-021-09531-8
4. Murray, J. and Farrington, D. P. (2008b). 'The effects of parental imprisonment on children', in Tonry, M. (ed.) *Crime and Justice: A review of research*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, pp. 133–206. doi: 10.1086/520070.
5. Dennison, S., Smallbone, H. and Occhipinti, S. (2017). Understanding how incarceration challenges proximal processes in father-child relationships: Perspectives of imprisoned fathers. *Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology*, 3(1), 15–38. doi: 10.1007/s40865-017-0054-9.
6. Boswell, G. and Wedge, P. (2002). *Imprisoned fathers and their children*. London, England: Jessica Kingsley Publishers; Sharratt, K. (2014). Children's experiences of contact with imprisoned parents: A comparison between four European countries. *European Journal of Criminology*, 11(6), 760–775. doi: 10.1177/1477370814525936; Venema, S. D., Haan, M., Blaauw, E., & Veenstra, R. (2022). Paternal imprisonment and father-child relationships: A systematic review. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 49(4), 492–512. doi: 10.1177/00938548211033636.
7. Dennison, S., & Smallbone, H. (2015). "You can't be much of anything from inside": The implications of imprisoned fathers' parental involvement and generative opportunities for children's wellbeing. *Law in Context*, 32(1), 61–86. doi: 10.26826/law-in-context.v32i0.73; Tasca, M. (2018). The (dis)continuity of parenthood among incarcerated fathers: An analysis of caregivers' accounts. *Child Care in Practice*, 24(2), 131–147. doi: 10.1080/13575279.2017.1420040.

Fatherhood and imprisonment in the Netherlands

In the Netherlands, families have various options to maintain family contact during imprisonment, including face-to-face visits, parent-child activities, telephone calls, video calls, and mail. Depending on their behaviour, prisoners have the right to one or two visiting hours per week. Regular visits take place in visiting rooms, which are split into two sections by a low barrier. The visitors and imprisoned person are seated on opposite sides of the barrier. There is a maximum of three visitors (children under the age of two are not counted) and visits are supervised by prison guards. Visiting times, rules, and facilities for children may differ between prisons.⁸ Prisons also offer the possibility to make use of family rooms for visits for one hour once per month, which take place in a private room. Access to the family room is conditional on good in-prison behaviour. Telephone calls generally take place on prison wings, although some Dutch prisons have telephones in prison cells. Video calls generally take place in the visiting rooms or video calling booths, which serve as an alternative for face-to-face visits. Volunteer organisations organise parent-child days in all prisons in the Netherlands, during which imprisoned parents can spend time with their children in a child-friendly area for the duration of one hour. The frequency of parent-child days differs across prisons, ranging from four times per year to once every month.⁹ During these moments, fathers and children can play games, and are largely unrestricted in their movement. Lastly, families can send each other mail and postcards to maintain contact.

As part of a special family approach project, two prisons (Veenhuizen and Leeuwarden) provide the possibility for visits in child-friendly visiting rooms which aim to create a homely atmosphere. In the family approach project in Veenhuizen and Leeuwarden, participating fathers are placed on a family unit on which only fathers reside, can make use of a private

family-friendly visiting room, and can make video calls from their prison cell. This programme was inspired by Invisible Walls Wales in HMP Parc Prison.¹⁰

Methods

To explore imprisoned fathers' needs regarding fatherhood and family relationships, we used data from a study in the Netherlands on the impact of paternal imprisonment on families, involving both a quantitative and a qualitative component. The quantitative component consisted of a questionnaire study carried out with 139 fathers in Veenhuizen prison. The qualitative component consisted of 39 in-depth interviews with fathers in Veenhuizen and Lelystad prisons. For this article, we examined the responses to

questionnaire items and interview questions which were relevant to exploring fathers' needs regarding fatherhood and family relationships. Participants provided informed consent for both components of the study. All study procedures were approved by the Ethical Review Board of the Hanze University of Applied Sciences. The data were collected between November 2021 and April 2022.

For the quantitative section of the study, all fathers in Veenhuizen prison were approached to participate in a questionnaire study on fatherhood and imprisonment. In total, 68 per cent of the approached fathers participated. We restricted the analyses to 109 fathers who had a focal child of 18 years or younger. In this article, we made use of seven items from the parent-child contact scale of the Dutch prison survey which measures fathers' satisfaction with support and facilities for maintaining family contact during imprisonment.¹¹ Participants could answer on a 5-point scale, with answers ranging from '*completely disagree*' to '*completely agree*'. We added two additional questions specifically relating to fatherhood: 'I find it difficult to fulfil my role as a father from prison', and 'I need more support to fulfil my fathering role from prison'. We further added two questions about

Prisons also offer the possibility to make use of family rooms for visits for one hour once per month, which take place in a private room.

8. Berghuis, M., Palmen, H., & Nieuwbeerta, P. (2020). Bezoek in Nederlandse gevangenissen. *Proces*, 99(2), 110–132. doi: 10.5553/proces/016500762020099002004.

9. Berghuis, M., Palmen, H., & Nieuwbeerta, P. (2020). Bezoek in Nederlandse gevangenissen. *Proces*, 99(2), 110–132. doi: 10.5553/proces/016500762020099002004.

10. Clancy, A., & Maguire, M. (2017). *Prisoners' children and families: Can the walls be 'invisible'? Evaluation of Invisible Walls Wales*. Available at: <https://cpa.org/library/prisoners-children-and-families-can-the-walls-be-invisible-evaluation-of-invisible-walls-wales/?download>.

11. Henneken-Hordijk, I., & van Gemmert, A. A. (2011). *Gedetineerd in Nederland 2011: Een survey onder gedetineerden in het Nederlandse gevangeniswezen*. Den Haag.

how often respondents spoke with prison staff and with other fathers in prison about children or fatherhood, to which participants could answer 'never', 'sometimes' or 'often'.

For the qualitative part of the study, we analysed 39 interviews with fathers in prison, which were recorded and transcribed. Participants were selected by prison staff based on their knowledge of whether prisoners had children. The interviews covered fathers' perceptions of fatherhood and family relationships, the impact of paternal imprisonment on family relationships and children's wellbeing, and participants' thoughts and ideas to mitigate the negative impact of paternal imprisonment on family relationships and child wellbeing. Of particular relevance to this study were questions directly relating to fathers' needs: 'Do you encounter any difficulties as a father in prison? Can you tell me about this?', 'What could this prison or an external organisation do to support you, your children, or other fathers in prison?', and 'Is there anything you need during this imprisonment period regarding fatherhood or family contact?'. We conducted an inductive thematic analysis to identify patterned responses and meanings regarding imprisoned fathers' needs.¹² After data familiarisation, the transcripts were coded using Atlas.ti 22 (software for qualitative data analysis).

Results

Questionnaire study

Fathers' responses to the quantitative measures are displayed in Tables 1 and 2. As can be seen, only one

item was rated positively: the majority of fathers (63.4 per cent) evaluated prison staff's treatment of visiting children positively. Other aspects of prison life were evaluated more negatively. Most notable was that the vast majority of fathers (79.4 per cent) experienced difficulties in fulfilling their role as a father from prison. Around half of fathers (50.5 per cent) reported requiring more support in fulfilling their fathering role from this setting. Furthermore, the majority of fathers (63.8 per cent) experienced the visiting areas as unsuitable for children. More than half (55 per cent) stated that it is difficult to see their children due to difficulties with visiting times. A little less than half (46.7 per cent) stated that prison does not provide sufficient support to maintain contact with their children, and a similar proportion (45.7 per cent) preferred their children not to visit them in prison. Almost half of the fathers (44.6 per cent) reported that their children cannot visit them often enough. A similar proportion (42.2 per cent) reported that they could approach prison staff with questions regarding their children. However, the majority of fathers (51.4 per cent) did not do so, as they reported to never speak with prison staff about children or fatherhood. Only 7.3 per cent of fathers reported speaking often to prison staff about children or fatherhood. Speaking to other fathers in prison about children or fatherhood was more common; 46.8 per cent of fathers reported sometimes speaking with other fathers about this topic and 35.8 per cent reported doing so often. A minority of fathers (17.4 per cent) stated they never spoke with other fathers about children or fatherhood.

Table 1: *Imprisoned fathers' experiences of family-related issues in prison (N = 109)*

Questionnaire item	Response		
	(strongly) disagree	Neutral	(strongly) agree
This prison provides sufficient support for me to maintain contact with my children	46.7 per cent	16.8 per cent	36.5 per cent
Prison staff treats visiting children well	22.0 per cent	14.6 per cent	63.4 per cent
The regular visiting areas are suitable for children	63.8 per cent	10.6 per cent	25.5 per cent
I can ask prison staff when I have questions regarding my children	36.3 per cent	21.6 per cent	42.2 per cent
My children can visit me often enough	44.6 per cent	7.6 per cent	47.8 per cent
It is difficult to see my children because of the visiting times	34.1 per cent	11.0 per cent	55.0 per cent
I prefer my children not to visit me here	45.7 per cent	11.4 per cent	42.9 per cent
I find it difficult to fulfil my role as a father from prison	10.3 per cent	10.3 per cent	79.4 per cent
I need more support to fulfil my fathering role from prison	36.2 per cent	13.3 per cent	50.5 per cent

12. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2012). 'Thematic analysis', in Cooper, H. et al. (eds) *APA handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol 2: Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological*. Washington: American Psychological Association, pp. 57–71. doi: 10.1037/13620-004.

Table 2: Degree to which fathers speak about children or fatherhood with other people in prison (N = 109)

Questionnaire item	Response		
	Never	Sometimes	Often
Speaks with other fathers in prison about children or fatherhood	17.4 per cent	46.8 per cent	35.8 per cent
Speaks with prison staff about children or fatherhood	51.4 per cent	41.3 per cent	7.3 per cent

Interview study

By analysing, categorising, and connecting all coded extracts pertaining to imprisoned fathers’ needs, three overarching themes were constructed. We labelled them as: i) facilities to promote everyday family life, ii) support from others, and iii) gradual transition to release.

Theme 1: Facilities to promote everyday family life

The first theme related to fathers’ needs for family interactions in prison to mimic interactions outside of prison as closely as possible, and to resemble everyday family life at home as much as possible. Across the interviews, many fathers commented on the facilities for family contact during imprisonment or the lack thereof. Although fathers valued the moments of family contact, many underscored limitations of the frequency of such contact. Furthermore, they felt that the prison context in which family contact took place impeded meaningful, high-quality contact. Many of the fathers’ needs within this theme focused on in-person visits from children. The following interview excerpt illustrates this particularly well:

‘It would be nice if you could just be with your kid for a while, and live a normal life for a while, like you do at home. Instead of sitting across each other like you do here [...]. Because you want to keep that connection with your child’.

High frequency contact was often considered a prerequisite for maintaining or developing a father-child bond. In line with this, many fathers expressed the need for more frequent face-to-face contact in particular. Some fathers noted that more family contact would have positive consequences for their in-prison

behaviour and assist them with coping with confinement. Fathers expressed a strong preference for more father-child days in particular, as these provide a setting for better quality contact. Other fathers noted that the duration of parent-child days was too short. High frequency contact seemed particularly relevant for fathers with younger children who had limited time to build a connection with their child before imprisonment, and were dependent on face-to-face father-child interactions whilst in prison to develop a relationship:

‘[my child] recognises me and [when he’s here] he knows; ‘this feels familiar’. And I enjoy that a lot, and it’s also important. And yes, I’d like to keep it that way, that’s why I want more contact with my little one’.

Perhaps even more important than the frequency of contact was the quality of contact. Fathers described various factors that negatively affected visiting quality: restriction of free movement, lack of physical interaction, lack of privacy, unfriendly attitudes of some prison staff towards children, limitations on the maximum number of visitors (particularly for fathers with many children or children with multiple mothers), unpleasant atmosphere of the prison and visiting area for children, and lack of facilities for children (e.g. toys and a play area). Fathers expressed the need to be able to interact, play and be active with their children during visits; much like father-child interactions at home. Other fathers expressed the wish for educational toys, such as abacuses or toys that support children to learn how to read.

‘If you could play a game together, then it won’t be all just about talking. [...] [Visits] are also about being together, and doing things you’d also do at home. And that’s pretty bad, here.’

Although fathers valued the moments of family contact, many underscored limitations of the frequency of such contact.

'During visits, I can't touch them, they can't sit on my lap, I can't draw with them, I can't count with them, I can't write down the alphabet. I like to teach my children things. I don't always just want to play with them.'

Various fathers expressed the desire to have visiting moments which are specifically dedicated to visits for children. Fathers suggested that these visits could take place in a private room like the family room, with the preference that this room would be decorated in a child-friendly manner and would give a homely feeling. Other fathers suggested having such visits outside or in the gym area, as is done with father-child days in some prisons in the Netherlands. Some noted that participation in such days should be based on the fathers' motivation for maintaining family bonds and on their good behaviour in prison. Many expressed the need to allow the child's mother to participate in these child-focused visits, and also in parent-child days, as this would enable full family interactions. This need seems rooted in the desire for family interactions in prison to resemble family interactions outside the prison walls.

The limited privacy during visits, video calls, and telephone calls was further experienced as inhibiting meaningful family interactions. One father described that he wanted to discuss a serious matter with his family, but would not do this in the visiting room due to the lack of privacy. Various fathers also expressed the need for more privacy during video visits.

'So you're busy with your kids, and then perhaps two other people are watching along, then you can't.. uhm.. be yourself.'

'When you're video calling in the regular visiting area, there's lots of other people around you. They can hear you talk. You're wearing headphones so luckily they can't hear your family talk. And then there's also four prison officers sitting at a distance. I don't like that'

Theme 2: Support from others

The second theme we identified centred around support from other people with family-related

issues. Fathers identified a wide variety of needs for support from others, which depended on their personal family situation. Support could come from various sources, such as prison staff, qualified professionals, volunteers, or other fathers in prison. Support could also come in various forms, such as parenting courses, support groups, talking with prison staff, support for family members at home, and support from qualified professionals in family services. However, a relatively large group of fathers explicitly stated they did not need any support from others.

Some, but not many, fathers expressed an interest in attending parenting courses. One father noted that he would be interested if the course also involved his family. Another father stated that he would be interested in exchanging fatherhood experiences in a support group-setting. A third father expressed interest in learning about first-aid for children. Other fathers, however, did not consider courses to be relevant for them as they considered themselves to be good parents and did not experience any major difficulties in life, such as addiction or violence in the home.

'A course could help, but I think I'm a good father, so I don't know how they could help me. You know, I'm not addicted or anything.'

'I think I'm a good father, and I don't think I need another person's help. [...] A course on 'how to love my child' is not on the top of my list. [...] But I can imagine that other men in here need this, because they've never created a bond with their child because they were never there. But that's not the case for me.'

Some fathers felt they lacked parenting skills and knowledge. One explained that his daughter was only four weeks old when he was arrested. He talked of knowing little about childrearing, except for what he's experienced in the prison visiting room. Another father expressed difficulties about talking to his child: *'he's 18, and he reacts very differently than a 12 or 13-year old'*. These two examples suggest that the amount of time spent with the child before imprisonment, combined with the amount of time spent away from the child, influenced fathers' perceptions of their own parenting skills and knowledge. However, such reflections on their own parenting skills and knowledge were relatively

The limited privacy during visits, video calls, and telephone calls was further experienced as inhibiting meaningful family interactions.

rare, and not necessarily linked to the need for a course to learn about parenting.

Some fathers expressed that it could be useful to speak to someone in prison about their family situation at home. One father stated that prison staff could play an active role in supporting fathers and children, and making family-related matters a part of the reintegration programme. Others felt there was a need for specific expertise, such as from a peer mentor. One father talked of needing someone *'who knows what's going on inside here, and knows how I interact with my children'* to mediate between him and the foster care agency. Fathers in more complex family situations were more likely to require specialised expertise, which was not perceived to be available in prison.

Interestingly, there was a relatively large group of fathers who explicitly stated they did not need any support from others during imprisonment. These fathers generally expressed confidence in being able to manage their family-related situation themselves.

Theme 3: Gradual transition to release

The last theme related to release and re-entry back into family life, and centred around fathers' need for a gradual transition back to family life outside of prison. Fathers experienced the transition from fatherhood in prison to fatherhood outside as abrupt, which could lead to feelings of fear and anxiety. This seemed particularly salient for fathers with longer prison sentences, who had been away from home for a long period of time. One father expressed the central concept of this theme well:

'What do I know about dealing with children during dinner, or when they have to go to sleep? I know nothing. I'll be going outside, and they leave me to my own devices. This could lead to tensions and stress in the family, discussions with my wife. I think [the transition back home] should be easily introduced in the reintegration programme. [...] I've got a job, a house. I just want to bring the bond with my family back to the level it was before.'

When asked about family life after imprisonment, many fathers expressed optimism, believing that their family relationships would go back

to normal, and expressed the intention to spend more time with their family after imprisonment and *'make up for lost time'*. Others talked of fearing the sudden change for them and their family on their release.

'When I'm outside I'm going to do my best to catch up. Do fun things with him that I should've done much earlier.'

'They're totally used to life without me, and then I'll be there again all of the sudden. That's not a small thing.'

The fathers gave suggestions to tackle the abruptness of this transition. One suggestion related to gradually increasing the frequency and duration of father-child contact towards the end of their term of imprisonment. Another proposed organising special events for families towards the end of the imprisonment period, to help prepare families for re-entry.

'Maybe that when you reach the end of your sentence, that, perhaps, he can be here more often and longer. To build it up. First two and a half hours, then four hours.'

So you can get used to the situation at home.'

Some fathers expressed feelings of frustration and uncertainty regarding temporary prison leave. Prison leave was seen as a key way to achieve a gradual transition into family life outside of prison. Some fathers explained that their requests for prison leave for family-related motivations were denied. Another explained that the rules within prison regarding prison leave made it difficult for his family to prepare for his release. This complicated a gradual transition towards family life outside of prison.

'I think they don't take fathers and children into account with prison leave requests. I'm at the end of my sentence. I could request prison leave, and did so various times, to restore the bond with my daughter. But they're rejecting my requests. That's not good.'

'There's new rules. This gives me a lot of stress. You think you can go on prison leave, you file a request, that's being approved. Then you tell your family: 'I'll be home on [date]',

Fathers in more complex family situations were more likely to require expertise, which was not perceived to be available in prison.

and in the end you hear that your request is denied because there's some file missing or whatever. So you got your kids all excited, but then it's all for nothing. You can't keep your promises.'

Conclusion

In this study we explored family-related needs of fathers in prison. The majority of fathers (79.4 per cent) reported experiencing difficulties in fulfilling their father role from prison, and 50.5 per cent reported requiring more support. Fathers' needs centred around three themes. The first referred to their need for family life during imprisonment to resemble family life outside prison as closely as possible, in order to support father involvement and maintain meaningful family relationships during this time. This theme echoes the principle of normalisation, which refers to prison life resembling, as far as possible, life outside prison.¹³ The finding that many fathers are dissatisfied with the facilities to maintain family contact is consistent with this theme also. The second theme referred to fathers' need for support from others. Support from others could come in various forms and depended on each person's individual family situation. It is important to underscore that not all fathers in this study felt they needed such support. Our study showed that in practice, many fathers in prison did not often speak to others about fatherhood or their children, and did not speak about this topic with prison staff in particular. The third theme referred to fathers' need for a more gradual transition from custody to community, back into family life. The abrupt transition could lead to feelings of fear and anxiety. Fathers suggested gradually increasing the frequency and duration of family contact towards the end of their sentence, to help smooth this transition.

An important caveat of our study is the emphasis on family visits. In the qualitative component of the analysis, fathers' needs regarding family visits and parent-child days were highly prevalent. However, in an additional analysis of the questionnaire data (not presented in this article) we found that 44.8 per cent of

fathers reported not receiving visits from their children in prison at all, and 71.2 per cent of fathers reported not participating in parent-child days. We acknowledge that our qualitative data in particular is subject to selection bias, given that prison staff's knowledge of parental status was derived from participation in activities relating to fatherhood (e.g., participation on parent-child days, activities, and courses). It is possible that fathers who are not visited by, or do not maintain contact with, their children during imprisonment have unique family-related needs and require a different approach than indicated in the current study. This is an important avenue for further research.

The need-domains identified in this study provide an important foundation to build upon when developing family-focused prison policies. Such policies need to be tailored to families' needs in order to be effective. Family-focused prison policies could support father involvement and positive family relationships during imprisonment. This is important, as maintaining positive family relationships during imprisonment has been associated with increased child wellbeing and positive re-entry outcomes for fathers.¹⁴ However, it is crucial to take the best interests of children into consideration when developing family-focused prison policies. These policies should be sensitive to the fact that increased family contact may not always be in children's best interests. One way to achieve this is by actively involving children and families in decision-making procedures and policy development regarding family-related matters. When tailored to families' needs, family-focused prison policies have the potential to alleviate the negative consequences of paternal imprisonment for families, and support fathers' re-entry back into the community.

Acknowledgements

This study was financially supported by FNO GeestKracht (grant number 103.907). We are grateful to the Dutch Custodial Institution Agency who made this project possible. We further thank Petrick Glasbergen for his meaningful contributions to this project.

13. van de Rijt, J., van Ginneken, E., & Boone, M. (2022). Lost in translation: The principle of normalisation in prison policy in Norway and the Netherlands. *Punishment & Society*, 1–18. doi: 10.1177/14624745221103823.

14. Lösel, F. et al. (2012) *Risk and protective factors in the resettlement of imprisoned fathers with their families*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge; Ormiston Children's and Families Trust. Available at: <https://www.crim.cam.ac.uk/system/files/documents/final-report.pdf>.