

## ABSTRACT

Title of Document: FOSTERING CHILDREN: THE IMPACT OF CAREGIVERS' ATTITUDES ABOUT PARENTING AND FOSTER CARE ON THE HOME ENVIRONMENT.

Anne G. Geary, M. A., 2007

Directed By: Dr. Brenda Jones Harden, Department of Human Development

This study examines the parenting of foster caregivers, the quality of the home environment and the caregivers' attitudes regarding child rearing and foster parenting. Previous research on typical families has shown that positive parenting attitudes help to create a context that is developmentally appropriate. This study employed secondary data analysis to examine parenting among 39 non-kinship and 36 kinship foster caregivers. The constructs addressed were parental attitudes of warmth, attachment, and motivation, as well as the overall home environment, and the cognitive stimulation and emotional support aspects of the home environment. The findings showed that the type of caregiver was the most significant predictor of the home environment. Parental warmth also contributed to the total HOME score and cognitive stimulation, and marginally influenced emotional support. The findings from this study have important implications for child welfare practice as it relates to training, support, and intervention with foster caregivers.

FOSTERING CHILDREN: THE IMPACT OF CAREGIVERS' ATTITUDES  
ABOUT PARENTING AND FOSTER CARE ON THE HOME ENVIRONMENT.

By

Anne G. Geary

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the  
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts  
2007

Advisory Committee:  
Dr. Brenda Jones Harden, Chair  
Dr. Charles H. Flatter  
Dr. Christy Corbin

© Copyright by  
Anne G. Geary  
2007

## Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Brenda Jones Harden who served as my advisor through out my Master's program. Through all the ups and downs over the past years, her guidance and advice have been greatly appreciated. I extend special thanks to Dr. Charles Flatter and Dr. Christy Corbin for serving on my thesis committee. Their expertise and suggestions were invaluable.

My undying gratitude goes to my friends, Jeff and Evelyn Sarver and Robert Doss, for being patient and supportive throughout the process of the thesis. Finally, I would like to dedicate this Master's thesis to my children, Victoria, Catherine, Jessica and James. It was their unwavering love, dedication, and support that helped me to reach this point.

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Table of Contents.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Methodology.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Chapter 3: Results.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Chapter 4: Discussion.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Appendix A: Biological Parent Consent Form.....	37
Appendix B: Foster Parent Consent Form.....	38
Appendix C: Background Questionnaire.....	39
Appendix D: Questionnaire on Parenting Attitudes (PACR).....	49
Appendix E: Foster Parent Attitudes Questionnaire.....	53
Appendix F: Early Childhood HOME.....	56
References.....	58

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

The foster care system has provided a haven for children who are subjected to maltreatment. Currently, there are over 500,000 children in the foster care system (US Department of Health and Human Services [USDHHS], Administration for Children and Families, 2006). Given that so many children are in the foster care system, it is important to examine the caregiving environments that they experience. Additionally, because the well-being of foster children is a legislative mandate, it is crucial to explore the parenting practices and attitudes in this population (see Jones Harden, 2004).

The literature on low-risk families suggests a link between parenting attitudes and practices, including the creation of the home environment (Bradley, 2006). This study is designed to fill the gap in the literature on the parenting processes among foster caregivers by exploring the parenting attitudes, practices, and the home environment of kinship and non-kinship foster parents. A secondary data analysis will be conducted using data from a larger study that examined the functioning of preschool foster children.

### Theoretical framework

The most fitting theoretical framework to understand the role of the home environment is Bronfenbrenner's bioecological theory. It stresses the importance of considering the context in order to understand human development. Developmental

processes are dependent on available resources that should be stable and consistent over time (Bronfenbrenner, 2005). The basis of the theory is a set of systems that are nested within each other. The first system, the microsystem, is the most significant since it involves the child and his or her immediate environment.

Within the microsystem, the family is the most important setting since it is the primary setting in which a child matures. The child interacts with the parents, siblings, and other individuals involved in his or her care. The personalities, attitudes, and behaviors of these people are important aspects of the relations between the person and the environment. In addition, there are three distinctive traits of the individual that affect the person-environment interactions: dispositions that set and maintain processes; bioecological resources of ability, experience, knowledge, and skill; and demand characteristics that invite or discourage interactions (Bronfenbrenner, 1979).

The microsystem can be considered the most important context to a child. Safe and supportive environments help sustain positive developmental outcomes for a child. Specific to foster care settings, it is important that the child welfare system facilitate the provision of safe and supportive environments for foster children (Jones Harden, 2004). Such contexts promote foster children's safety and enhance their developmental outcomes (Jones Harden, 2004).

## Background on U.S. Foster Care

### *Policy and Epidemiology*

Although originally a part of the Social Security Act of 1935, foster care did not become a federal program until 1961 (Allen & Bissell, 2004). The program was established to provide care for children who could not remain with their families (Allen & Bissell, 2004). Foster care policy has undergone significant changes over the past few decades to improve the care that foster children receive. Two main modifications include defining the timing of reunification of children and parents and including family relatives as permanent placement options (Allen & Bissell, 2004).

Currently, over 60% of children who are in foster care are there due to neglect (i.e., failure to provide or failure to supervise; USDHHS, National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being [NSCAW], 2005). The majority of the children are Caucasian (41%) and African-American (32%). There are more males (52%) than females (48%) in foster care (USDHHS, 2006). Seventy percent of these children live in either relative or non-relative foster family homes (USDHHS, 2006). Slightly more than 50% are to be reunited with parent(s) or caregiver(s), and another 20% will be adopted (USDHHS, 2006).

#### *Foster parent characteristics*

National data provide a profile of the current population of foster caregivers. Most foster caregivers are aged 40 or older, while only 24% are under the age of 35 (USDHHS, 2005). The ethnic breakdown of foster caregivers is as follows: 42% African-American; 36% Caucasian; and 15% Hispanic. Forty-five percent are single and 53% are married (USDHHS, 2005). Over half (56%) have a high school diploma or less and only 14% have a bachelor's degree or higher. Approximately one third (31%) of foster caregivers have an income level at or above \$50,000 and a little over



half (59%) have incomes ranging from \$15,000 to slightly under \$50,000. The household composition consists of two adults and three children on average (USDHHS, 2005).

## Parenting, Family Structure and Processes in Typical Families

### *Parenting Attitudes*

There is an abundance of research on parenting and its effects on child development. Based on the seminal work of Baumrind (1967) on parenting styles, there are four styles of parenting: indulgent, uninvolved, authoritarian, and authoritative. These styles encompass two dimensions: responsiveness (warmth) and demandingness (behavioral control). Indulgent parents give their children more warmth, exert less behavioral control, and avoid confrontation (Baumrind, 1991). Uninvolved parents are very low in both responsiveness and demandingness with their children, showing very little warmth and no behavioral control (Baumrind, 1991). Authoritarian parents are highly demanding and less responsive with their children, raising them in a well-ordered and structured environment with clearly stated rules (Baumrind, 1991). Authoritative parents are demanding and responsive with their children, acting assertive and supportive without intrusion or restriction (Baumrind, 1991).

Authoritative parenting is a combination of acceptance/warmth, behavioral supervision, and psychological autonomy granting (Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992; Pettit, Bates, & Dodge, 1997). An authoritative parent directs and engages in activities with his or her child that maintains and enhances all aspects of

development: physical, social, and cognitive. Further, authoritative parenting has distinct behavioral manifestations (Steinberg et al., 1992). The parent uses proactive teaching, is responsive and interested in the child's activities, and uses calm discussion when discipline is required (Pettit et al., 1997). Parents, who have regular encounters with family and friends and involvement in community organizations, serve as models of social interactions for the child. Children who experience this type of parenting have better school performance and engagement (Steinberg et al., 1992).

On the other hand, some research has documented that authoritarian parenting can be beneficial to a child's development. While authoritative parents are low in psychological control, authoritarian parents expect their children to accept their decisions without question (Baumrind, 1991). This type of parenting may benefit a child living in a high risk community environment. For example, a study of gang involvement found that higher levels of control along with parental warmth were related to lower levels of gang involvement and delinquency, especially for African-American children (Walker-Barnes & Mason, 2001).

Research has investigated parenting differences in different ethnic groups and, in particular, African-American parents. Most ethnic groups use the same techniques to teach socialization (e.g., modeling and reinforcement) as Caucasian parents: however, these techniques are based in the cultural values and behaviors of the ethnic group (Julian, McKenry, & McKelvey, 1994). This racial socialization has been found to lead to better socioemotional and academic outcomes for African-American children when the socialization is founded in pride and self-esteem rather than mistrust (Caughy, O'Campo, Randolph, & Nickerson, 2002). Additionally, African-

American parents have been found to have high parental warmth and high behavioral control (Dunifon & Kowaleski-Jones, 2002). For example, Pittman and Chase-Lansdale (1999) found no significant differences in authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles on adolescent outcomes in African-American adolescents. It is possible that other factors contribute to the parenting styles of African-American parents.

On the other end of the parenting spectrum is the parent who endangers the child. This parent engages in behavior that is maladaptive for the child. These behaviors range from family conflict and violence to child maltreatment and abuse (Ayoub, 2006). Children who experience these parental behaviors view the world fundamentally differently from children who have not experienced them (Ayoub, 2006). A child with this type of parent could develop externalizing or internalizing behavior problems, have poor social skills, and delayed cognitive development that affects his or her school performance. These are the children who comprise the foster care population in the United States.

Overall, it is evident that parental warmth and responsivity are very beneficial to the positive development for any child. A caregiver's warmth and support helps to promote children's development, even under stressful conditions (Masten & Coatsworth, 1998). Warmth and responsivity encourage positive development in different ethnic groups (Walker-Barnes & Mason, 2001) and in different non-stress and stress-producing environments (Magnus, Cowen, Wyman, Fagen, & Work, 1999). Thus, the experience of parental warmth may be protective for foster children, who have typically experienced many stressors in their home environments.

### *Home environment*

Optimal parenting is a term used by Bradley (2006) to define a facilitative home environment. This context contains interactions and surroundings that are conducive to a positive developmental trajectory for a child. Variability in these experiences lead to different developmental pathways (Bradley, Corwyn, Burchinal, McAdoo, & Coll, 2001). A child's experience in the home environment is impacted by the type of ecological niche in which he or she lives (Bradley et al., 2001).

There are six basic duties that parents perform: sustenance and safety, stimulation, support, structure, surveillance, and social integration (Bradley, 2006). Sustenance and safety require that the parent(s) provide food and shelter for the child. In addition, precautions are taken to prevent accidents to the child. Parents need to provide stimulation for the child that cultivates cognitive and social development. This is accomplished by doing such things as providing books, reading to the child, and having toys that are developmentally appropriate. Parental support encourages emotion regulation and positive developmental outcomes (Bradley, 2006). Surveillance refers to the parental monitoring of the child's whereabouts and activities. Parents nurture social integration by close ties with friends and family. Involvement in the community, church, and other organizations allows parents to provide examples of social integration, by modeling how to interact with many different types of people.

### *Family structure*

Currently, more children live in diverse family structures than ever before. Two-parent families, single parent families, remarriages, and cohabitation each

provide a different developmental environment for a child (Dunifon & Kowaleski-Jones, 2002; Carlson & Corcoran, 2001). It has been suggested that an optimal family configuration for a child's positive development is that of living with both biological parents. They are more involved with their children and report more cooperative parenting relationships with each other (Bronstein, Clauson, Stoll, & Abrams, 1993). These households usually have greater financial resources (Thomas & Sawhill, 2005). This family structure generally leads the child to have favorable social, psychological and academic adjustment (Bronstein et al., 2003).

Clearly, two-parent homes characterized by conflict, violence, and other dysfunctions lead to poorer outcomes for children (Katz & Woodin, 2002). Children living in single parent families, with remarried parents, or in situations of cohabitation also have more compromised developmental outcomes (Carlson & Corcoran, 2001)). They have higher levels of behavioral problems and lower cognitive test scores (Carlson & Corcoran, 2001). Parents in these family structures have been found to be less involved with their children (Carlson & Corcoran, 2001). However, other research has suggested there is variability in how other family structures affect children.

For example, children living in single parent households may experience less conflict than those in two-parent households. According to the 2001 U.S. Census Bureau, almost 51% of African-American children lived in single parent households. Research on these single parents has found that single African-American mothers who are engaged in supportive and nurturing parenting have children who have good

social skills, greater school readiness, and fewer behavior problems (Jackson, Brooks-Gunn, Huang, & Glassman, 2000; McGroder, 2000).

*Relationship between parenting styles, family structure, and the home environment*

Children living in higher quality environments have higher levels of competence and lower levels of behavior problems (Bradley et al., 2001). A favorable developmental environment for a child is a home with parents who are responsive, supportive, and stimulating. The contributors to the creation of such environments include individual parent characteristics, as well as their attitudes toward parenting. Additionally, other factors play a role in the creation of the home environment.

Older mothers who are married and have high levels of education provide stronger home environments for their children (Menaghan & Parcel, 1991). Higher levels of education afford the opportunity to obtain employment that is more skilled and has higher wages. The home environment may be more developmentally appropriate within families who have higher income levels (Menaghan & Parcel, 1991).

Socioeconomic status (SES) and being a single parent can lead to family adversity (e.g., Carlson & Corcoran, 2001; Pettit et al., 1997; Bronstein et al., 1993), and may affect the caregiving environment that children experience. Risk factors (e.g., very little education, high mother-child ratio in the home, and stressful life events) can impair the quality of the home environment. In a study of young children, poverty and a high number of risks were associated with less maternal warmth and a less stimulating home environment (Brooks-Gunn, Klebanov, & Liaw,

1995). When there is an extremely high level of these risk factors, parenting becomes impaired to the point that the child or children are removed from the home environment by the child welfare agency and placed in foster care (Pinderhughes, Jones Harden, & Guyer, 2007).

### Parenting, family structure, and processes in foster care families

#### *Parenting in foster care*

Although limited, the parenting literature in foster care creates a very diverse picture of foster caregivers. Orme and colleagues (2004) documented that foster parent applicants had high levels of social support and used alternatives to corporal punishment. Only moderate functioning was found in parent-child role clarity, empathy for children, appropriate developmental expectations, and general family functioning (Orme, Buehler, McSurdy, Rhodes, Cox, & Patterson, 2004). Other studies have examined a variety of foster parental characteristics, such as attachment, temperament, attitudes, and perceptions. Dozier and colleagues (2001) found that approximately half of foster caregivers who had secure attachments as children are able to develop a secure attachment with a foster child. Relationships between caregivers and foster children were positive in both kinship and non-kinship homes. Foster caregivers also have been rated high on support for foster children's health needs, educational development, and extracurricular activities (Berrick, 1997).

To a limited extent, literature on foster caregivers has focused on parenting attitudes (Orme et al., 2004; Jones Harden et al., in press). Among the attitude constructs found to be salient among foster caregivers are attachment/commitment to

the foster child, motivation, perspective-taking, and developmental expectations. Jones Harden and colleagues (in press; 2004) have documented that differences in parenting attitudes between kinship and non-kinship caregivers were based on demographic differences between the two groups (e.g., marital status, income, education). Specifically, kinship caregivers reported being less warm, being more overprotective, and having more conflict and anger only when they were older and single (Jones Harden et al., 2004). Fewer resources and lack of child welfare agency support could leave kinship caregivers at a disadvantage (Coakley, Cuddeback, Buehler, & Cox, 2007).

#### *Home environment*

The literature is limited and mixed on the home environments experienced by children in foster care. In their review of foster family characteristics, Orme and Buehler (2001) note that studies varied in their results. The assessment of the physical home environment ranged from 99% of the homes being comfortable and safe in one study to a significant number having poor quality environments in another. The evaluation of the socioemotional climate across studies placed the number of foster families at-risk from none to 18%. Income is one variable that is associated with better quality living environments among foster caregivers (Simms & Horwitz, 1996).

Income plays a significant role in parenting behavior and the home environment they create (Berger, 2004). Compared to two-parent families, cohabiting couples invest little in the home environments they create (Berger, 2004). Lower income families, especially single parents, have fewer resources with which to



construct a healthy environment for children's development. In addition, Berger (2004) found that lower income families have a propensity to use harsh discipline practices, such as spanking. These findings are particularly relevant to kinship foster families, who have been documented to have fewer resources than non-kinship foster families.

Home environment was also examined in a study comparing parenting between biological and foster parents (Linares, Montalto, Rosbruch, & Li, 2006). The biological parents of the foster child were younger, more likely to be unmarried, and had higher levels of psychological distress (Linares, et al., 2006). However, both the biological parents and the foster parents were found to be similar in disciplines on all levels except one. Foster parents had higher clear expectations than the biological parents (Linares et al., 2006).

A burgeoning strand of research has examined the role of the type of foster caregiver with respect to the quality of the home environment. Data collected on the physical environment of the home showed that the general upkeep of the home was very good for both kinship and non-kinship caregivers (Berrick, 1997). However, kinship caregivers scored lower than non-kinship caregivers where safety was concerned. Specifically, kinship caregivers scored lower regarding home repairs (e.g., walls or electrical fixtures) and general safety precautions (e.g., having a fire extinguisher or first aid kit). The neighborhood conditions were slightly better for non-kinship caregivers when compared to kinship caregivers although there was not a significant difference (Berrick, 1997).

The NSCAW longitudinal study assessed the home environment in the One Year in Foster Care data analysis report. Scores were similar in both kinship and non-kinship home environments on all individual indicators (USDHHS, 2005). In the home environment subscales, kinship caregivers reported higher emotional responsiveness but were similar to non-kinship caregivers in cognitive stimulation and use of discipline. Age of the caregiver was found to be a salient predictor of the quality of the home environment. For children under the age of three and between the ages of six and ten, there was a more favorable social and emotional environment if the caregiver was between the ages of 35 and 44 (USDHHS, 2005).

#### Rationale and overview for current study

Although there is a limited but growing literature on parenting processes among foster families, no studies were found that assessed the relation between foster care home environment and the parenting attitudes of the foster caregivers. The home environment has been defined in studies as an assessment of supportive parenting (Pettit et. al., 1997), safety and emergency preparedness (Berrick, 1997), and has been examined in relation to family structure and behavioral outcomes (Carlson & Corcoran, 2001). As Bradley (2006) stated, parental provision of sustenance and safety, stimulation, support, structure, surveillance, and social integration constitute a high quality home environment. Clearly, the home environment is an important context for a child to thrive developmentally. It is important to examine these parenting processes among foster caregivers. If the attitudes of the caregiver are highly positive on both general childrearing and specific to their roles as foster

caregivers, the home environments provided to foster children should enhance the social, emotional, and cognitive aspects of their development.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the parenting of foster caregivers. Specifically, the study will employ secondary data analysis to examine the quality of the home environment and the caregivers' attitudes regarding child rearing and foster parenting. In addition, a major goal is to discern if there are differences between kinship and non-kinship foster care environments. Finally, this study aims to explore the contribution of caregiver characteristics and parenting attitudes to the quality of the home environment. With this in mind, the following hypotheses were proposed:

*Hypothesis 1.* Foster caregivers' positive attitudes about child rearing will be associated with a high quality home environment.

*Hypothesis 2.* Foster caregivers' positive attitudes about foster parenting will be associated with a high quality home environment.

*Hypothesis 3.* Kinship caregivers will have fewer resources, more compromised parenting attitudes, and provide lower quality home environments than non-kinship caregivers.

*Hypothesis 4.* Foster caregiver attitudes will contribute to the quality of the home environment beyond the influence of foster home type.

## Chapter 2

### Methodology

This study employed secondary data analysis, using data from a larger study investigating the cognitive and socioemotional functioning of preschool foster children. The study was conducted in a suburban county in the mid-Atlantic region. The county was comprised of a diverse population with a relatively high number of children in the foster care system.

#### *Participants*

Seventy-five foster caregivers agreed to participate in this study; the female caregiver was the main respondent. Each foster family had one foster child in the home. The average age of the foster child ranged from four to seven with a mean of 5.3 years ( $SD = .83$ ). Fifty-two percent were boys and 48% were girls. The majority of the foster children were African-American (76%). Twenty-four percent had two children under the age of 18 in the home, 25% had three, 20% had four, and 31% had five or more children under 18. Over 52% had two adults in the household and 35% had only one. Household size varied from two up to eleven.

The majority (71%) of the foster caregivers were African-American. The mean age of the foster caregiver was 48.4 ( $SD = 11.6$ ) with an age range from 19 to 80. More than half (53%) of the participants had more than five years experience as a foster caregiver, 38% had less than five years, and 10% had less than one year experience. The level of education varied among the participants. Eight percent had less than a high school education, 30% graduated from high school, 42% had an

associate's degree or some college education, 11% earned a bachelor's degree, and 9% had a master's degree or higher. The employment status of the foster caregivers was reported as 31% not working and 69% working either full-time or part-time. Fifty-two percent of the participants were non-kinship caregivers and 48% were kinship caregivers. See Table 1 for a breakdown of demographic characteristics of the sample by caregiver type.

Sixty-one percent of the foster caregivers were not married. Thirty-nine percent of the foster caregivers were married and provided demographic information on the male foster caregiver. The majority (69%) of male caregivers were African-American. The mean age was 48.4 (SD = 11.09) with an age range from 29 to 70. The educational level of the male caregivers was reported as follows: 13% had less than a high school education, 31% graduated from high school, 31% had an associate's degree or some college education, 9% had earned a bachelor's degree, and 16% had earned a master's degree or higher. Thirteen percent of the male caregivers were not employed at the time of this study and 87% were employed either full-time or part-time. The yearly income for the participants was quite varied. The mean annual income was \$54,618 with a range from no earnings to over \$160,000 a year.

### *Procedure*

This study is part of a larger study on the cognitive and socioemotional functioning of preschool foster children (Jones Harden et al., 2004). Two local child welfare agencies in a Mid-Atlantic region were contacted to participate in a study on the quality of foster family care. The child welfare agencies were located in a suburban county that had a diverse population characterized by a wide range of yearly

Table 1. Demographic differences of non-kinship and kinship foster caregivers

Characteristics	Non-kinship caregivers (n = 39) %	Kinship caregivers (n = 36) %
<b>Marital status</b>		
Married	51	25
Unmarried	49	75
<b>Age</b>		
<20	0	3
21 – 30	5	6
31 – 40	13	22
41 – 50	41	30
51 – 60	23	25
> 61	18	14
<b>Race</b>		
African American	62	81
Other	38	19
<b>Years of education</b>		
< High school	8	9
High school graduate	18	43
Associate degree	49	34
Bachelor degree	10	11
Advanced degree	15	3
<b>Employment</b>		
Part/full time	67	72
Unemployed	33	28
<b>Yearly income</b>		
<10,000	0	6
10,000 – 19,999	8	14
20,000 – 29,999	3	14
30,000 – 39, 999	5	11
40,000 – 49,999	5	17
50,000 – 59,999	23	22
60,000 – 74,999	25	8
>75,000	31	8
<b>Years as foster caregiver</b>		
< 1 year	8	11
< five years	36	40
> 5 years	56	49
<b>Number of children in home</b>		
1 – 2	36	31
3 – 4	44	47
5 – 6	15	14
7 – 8	5	8

incomes, ethnicities, and ages. A letter from the program administrator was provided as written approval for the research staff to conduct the study.

Initially, the agency caseworkers informed the foster families of the study. A letter describing the project was then sent to each foster family by the research staff. Each family was later contacted by a staff member of the project to request their participation. Seventy-five families agreed to do so. The study employed census sampling and recruited exactly 75 participants who met study criteria.

Before any contact was made with the participating families, informed consent was received. In cases in which parental rights had been terminated, the child welfare agency responsible for the child gave informed consent. If the parental rights were not terminated, the biological parent of the foster child was contacted and the nature of the study was explained to them.

After the informed consent was received from the child welfare agency or the biological parent, the participating foster families were contacted. The research study was explained to foster caregivers and informed consent was received from each foster family. Each family received monetary compensation for their participation and each child received a developmentally appropriate gift.

There were two data collection sessions. The measures utilized in this study were part of the first session. A research staff member arranged to visit the foster family home. Observational data on the home environment were collected by the staff member, as well as maternal report data from several questionnaires. Specific to this study, each foster caregiver participating in the study was administered the

demographic questionnaire, the Parental Attitudes towards Child Rearing (PACR), and the Foster Parent Attitude Questionnaire (FPAQ).

### *Measures*

*Demographic questionnaire.* Each participant completed a background questionnaire by self-report. The information collected included family background such as the total number of children and adults in the home and the age, gender, and ethnicity of the foster child. The caregivers provided information as to the type of caregiver, age, education, income, employment status, marital status, and the number of years as a foster parent.

*Parental Attitudes towards Child Rearing (PACR; Easterbrooks & Goldberg, 1984).* This instrument is a 65-item measure used for the assessment of parental attitudes and is completed by participants using self-report. It uses a six-point Likert scale and the responses range from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” The instrument has three subscales: warmth and sensitivity, conflict and anger, and strictness and overprotectiveness. Warmth and sensitivity are evaluated by such questions as “I express affection by hugging, kissing and holding my child” and “I encourage my child to be curious, to explore and question things.” Conflict and anger are assessed by items such as “When I am angry with my child, I let him/her know it” and “I often feel angry with my child.” Strictness and overprotective are shown in the following items: “I do not allow my child to question my decisions” and “I try to keep my child away from children or families who have different ideas or values from our own.” Internal reliability on the sub-scales ranged from .58 to .78 (Goldberg & Easterbrooks, 1984) and from .69 to .89 (Jones Harden et al., 2004)



using Cronbach's alpha. Because warmth is a construct that has been documented as salient in predicting parenting practices in typical and atypical families, this was the only subscale used in the current study.

*Foster Parent Attitudes Questionnaire* (FPAQ; Jones Harden, D'Amour, Vick, & Pandohie-Johnson, in press). This measure was developed for use in the current study and is designed in two different forms. The instrument for non-kinship foster caregivers consists of 27 questions. The instrument for kinship caregivers has 31 questions. The additional questions focus on the caregiver's attitude on fostering a relative's child. Responses are given on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." Participants complete the questionnaire using self-report. The measure assesses six constructs: attachment, negative experience, developmental expectations, motivation, self-reliance, and perspective-taking. In addition, a seventh factor relating to biological parents was found to add to the explanatory variance (Jones Harden et al., in press). Attachment is assessed by items such as "My foster children are my own children" and "Raising my foster child in the most important thing in my life." Motivation is evaluated with items such as "I decided to take foster children to fill a space in my life." Developmental expectations are found in items such as "When foster children have to change placements, they are able to bond to their new parents easily." Negative experience is assessed with items such as "I do not get too attached to my foster children because they always have to leave." Self-reliance is shown in items such as "When I need help with my foster child, I find it on my own." Perspective-taking is evaluated with items such as "It is best for foster children if foster parents learn to let them go when they have to leave."

How caregivers perceived biological parents were shown in items such as “Visits with biological parents generally cause pain for foster children.” Internal reliability using Cronbach’s alpha was .83 and test-retest reliability was also .83 (Jones Harden et al., in press). Because the constructs of attachment and motivation were found to be the most robust, these were the only subscales used in the current study.

*Early Childhood Home Observation for the Measurement of the Environment* (EC-HOME; Caldwell & Bradley, 1984). Different versions of this measure have been created for different age groups and the EC-HOME focuses on children ages four and five. It contains 55 statements and data is collected by a member of the research staff during a home interview through observation and maternal report. The EC-HOME consists of eight subscales: learning stimulation, language stimulation, physical environment, responsivity, academic stimulation, modeling, variety in experience, and acceptance. Learning stimulation is based on items such as “Child has at least ten children’s books.” Language stimulation is assessed by items such as “Parent teaches child simple verbal manners (please, thank you, I’m sorry).” The physical environment is evaluated on items such as “Building appears safe and free of hazards.” Responsivity is noted in such items as “Parent answers child’s questions or requests.” Academic stimulation is measured by items such as “Child is encouraged to learn numbers.” Modeling is assessed by items such as “TV is used judiciously.” Variety of experience is evaluated with such items as “Child has been taken to museum in the past year.” Acceptance is shown in such items as “Parent neither slaps nor spansks the child during visit.” Two larger subscales, emotional support and cognitive stimulation, can be obtained from the smaller subscales (Menaghan &

Parcel, 1991). Internal consistency reliability has been found to greater than .80 using Cronbach's alpha and there is reasonable concurrent and predictive validity (see Bradley, 1993).

## Chapter 3

### Results

In this section, the results of the data analysis are presented. Two of the subscales of the Foster Parent Attitudes Questionnaire (FPAQ) and one subscale from the Parenting Attitudes on Child Rearing (PACR) were examined as predictors of the home environment. These subscales are Attachment and Motivation from the FPAQ and Warmth from the PACR. The dependent variables were the total Early Childhood Home Observation for the Measurement of the Environment (EC-HOME) score and the EC-HOME subscales of Emotional Support and Cognitive Stimulation. A significance level of .05 was used in all analyses.

#### *Relation between demographic characteristics and key variables*

T-tests were conducted on the demographics characteristics related to the female foster caregiver to examine differences between kinship and non-kinship foster caregivers (see Table 2). The seven characteristics included age, ethnicity, years of education, employment status, marital status, yearly income, and years as a foster caregiver. Significant differences between kinship and non-kinship foster caregivers were found on three of these characteristics. Non-kinship foster caregivers had higher yearly incomes ( $t = 4.14, p = .00$ ) than kinship foster caregivers. Non-kinship foster caregivers were more likely to be married ( $t = 2.39, p = .019$ ) and to have more education ( $t = 2.37, p = .02$ ) than were kinship foster caregivers.

Table 2. T-tests comparing demographic characteristics and parenting of kinship and non-kinship caregivers

Demographic Characteristics	Non-kinship caregivers (n = 39)		Kinship caregivers (n = 36)		t
	M	SD	M	SD	
<i>Demographic Characteristics</i>					
Marital status	.51	.51	.25	.44	2.39*
Age	49.41	11.22	47.39	12.08	.75
Race	.62	.49	.81	.40	-1.82
Years of education	14.38	2.60	13.11	1.91	2.37*
Employment	.67	.48	.72	.45	-.52
Yearly income	67001	30881	41203	21996	4.14*
Years as caregiver	2.49	.64	2.37	.69	.75
<i>Parenting Variables</i>					
Cognitive stimulation	24.61	3.58	21.22	5.95	3.01*
Emotional support	14.01	1.56	12.67	3.46	2.20*
Total HOME	39.99	3.90	36.64	4.73	3.34*
Warmth	117.79	8.06	115.50	8.45	1.20
Attachment	12.32	2.42	12.61	2.03	-.57
Motivation	11.82	2.28	10.42	2.61	2.46*

\* p < .05

Differences were also found between kinship and non-kinship caregivers on the key parenting variables. Specifically, non-kinship caregivers provided better home environments, as evidenced by higher cognitive stimulation, emotional support, total HOME scores. Additionally, non-kinship care providers reported higher levels of foster parent motivation than kinship caregivers (see Table 2 for results of t-tests).

Bivariate correlations were used to examine the relationship between key variables (see Table 3). The first correlation looked at the relationship between warmth, attachment, and motivation and emotional support, cognitive stimulation,

and the total HOME score. Parental warmth was significantly associated with cognitive stimulation

( $r = .27, p = .02$ ). The total HOME score was significantly correlated with foster parent motivation ( $r = .34, p = .00$ ) and parental warmth ( $r = .33, p = .00$ ). No significant results were found for foster parent attachment.

Table 3. Correlations of Parenting Attitudes and Cognitive Stimulation, Emotional Support, and total HOME.

Parenting Attitudes	Cognitive Stimulation	Emotional Support	Total HOME
Attachment	.11	.06	.22
Motivation	.14	.07	.34**
Warmth	.27*	.22	.33**

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

These same relationships were examined by caregiver type (see Table 4).

Several significant results were found for non-kinship foster caregivers. Foster parent attachment was associated with cognitive stimulation ( $r = .44, p = .00$ ) and the total HOME score ( $r = .39, p = .02$ ). Foster parent motivation correlated with cognitive stimulation ( $r = .35, p = .03$ ), emotional support ( $r = .38, p = .02$ ), and the total HOME score ( $r = .45, p = .00$ ). Parental warmth was associated with cognitive stimulation ( $r = .44, p = .00$ ) and the total HOME score ( $r = .38, p = .02$ ). No significant findings were found between these variables for kinship foster caregivers.

Table 4. Correlations of Parenting Attitudes and Cognitive Stimulation, Emotional Support, and total HOME by caregiver type.

Parenting Attitudes	Cognitive Stimulation	Emotional Support	Total HOME
---------------------	-----------------------	-------------------	------------

	Non-kinship caregivers (n = 39)		
Attachment	.44**	.30	.39*
Motivation	.35*	.38*	.45**
Warmth	.44**	.17	.38*
	Kinship caregivers (n = 36)		
Attachment	-.08	-.04	.13
Motivation	-.11	-.16	.11
Warmth	.13	.23	.23

\* p < .05. \*\* p < .01.

Table 5. Correlations of Demographic characteristics with Attachment, Motivation, Warmth, Cognitive Stimulation, Emotional Support, and total HOME.

Demographic Characteristics	Attach	Motivation	Warmth	Cognitive Stimulation	Emotion Support	Total HOME
Income	-.14	.18	.16	.26*	.03	.32**
Marital status	-.19	.32**	.04	-.11	.12	.02
Education	.06	.10	.25*	.34*	.12	.40**
Race	-.09	-.25*	-.18	-.06	-.00	-.28*

\* p < .05. \*\* p < .01.

Bivariate correlations were also conducted to examine the relation between demographic and key study variables separately for kinship and non-kinship foster caregivers (see Table 5). Yearly income correlated with the total HOME score for non-kinship foster caregivers but was associated with emotional support for kinship foster caregivers. Marital status correlated with motivation for non-kinship foster caregivers and with both cognitive stimulation and emotional support for kinship foster caregivers. The level of education was found to be associated with both cognitive stimulation and the total HOME score for non-kinship foster caregivers. Education correlated with warmth for kinship foster caregivers.

Table 6. Hierarchical regression analysis for parenting attitudes on total HOME.

Attitude	R <sup>2</sup>	ΔR <sup>2</sup>	B	t	p
Caregiver type	.13(a)	.13	3.28	3.23	.00
Warmth	.21(b)	.08	.16	2.68	.01
Attachment	.25(c)	.04	.43	1.95	.06
Motivation	.27(d)	.02	.27	1.21	.23

(a) Predictors: Cg type (numeric)  
(b) Predictors: Cg type, PACR Warmth  
(c) Predictors: Cg type, PACR Warmth, FPAQ Attachment  
(d) Predictors: Cg type, PACR Warmth, FPAQ Attachment, FPAQ Motivation

Table 7. Hierarchical regression analysis for parenting attitudes on cognitive stimulation.

Attitude	R <sup>2</sup>	ΔR <sup>2</sup>	B	t	p
Caregiver type	.11(a)	.11	3.30	2.91	.01
Warmth	.16(b)	.05	.14	2.14	.04
Attachment	.17(c)	.01	.22	.88	.38
Motivation	.17(d)	.00	-.08	-.32	.75

(a) Predictors: Cg type (numeric)  
(b) Predictors: Cg type, PACR Warmth  
(c) Predictors: Cg type, PACR Warmth, FPAQ Attachment  
(d) Predictors: Cg type, PACR Warmth, FPAQ Attachment, FPAQ Motivation

### *Influences on the home environment*

To examine the influence of warmth, attachment, and warmth on the home environment, three hierarchical regression analyses were performed. Given the differences found among the relations between variables by caregiver type, this variable was entered first in all regressions. Caregiver type was followed by warmth, attachment, and motivation. Three dependent variables were examined: the total HOME score, cognitive stimulation, and emotional support. For the HOME total score, two significant predictors were found (see Table 6). They were caregiver type



( $R^2 = .13$ ;  $p = .00$ ) and warmth ( $R^2 = .19$ ;  $\Delta R^2 = .08$ ;  $p = .01$ ). A trend showed for attachment ( $R^2 = .25$ ;  $\Delta R^2 = .04$ ;  $p = .06$ ).

Hierarchical regression analyses were also conducted for the two subscales of the HOME. Caregiver type ( $R^2 = .11$ ;  $p = .01$ ) and warmth ( $R^2 = .16$ ;  $\Delta R^2 = .05$ ;  $p = .04$ ) significantly predicted the cognitive stimulation aspect of the home environment (see Table 7). Similarly, caregiver type ( $R^2 = .06$ ;  $p = .03$ ) was the only significant predictor of the emotional support aspect of the home environment (see Table 8). Warmth was marginally predictive of emotional support ( $R^2 = .10$ ;  $p = .09$ ).

Table 8. Hierarchical regression analysis for parenting attitudes on emotional support.

Attitude	$R^2$	$\Delta R^2$	B	t	p
Caregiver type	.06(a)	.06	1.35	2.18	.03
Warmth	.10(b)	.04	.06	1.70	.09
Attachment	.10(c)	.00	.06	.41	.69
Motivation	.10(d)	.00	-.07	-.48	.63

(a) Predictors: Cg type (numeric)

(b) Predictors: Cg type, PACR Warmth

(c) Predictors: Cg type, PACR Warmth, FPAQ Attachment

(d) Predictors: Cg type, PACR Warmth, FPAQ Attachment, FPAQ Motivation

## Chapter 4

### Discussion

The home environment is a vital context for the development of a child. Arguably, the family setting is the critical context which can promote or impede health child development (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Similarly, the quality of the home environment is important for healthy child development. With this in mind, this study examined the family and home environments of children in foster care. Specifically, the study investigated the contribution of parental warmth, foster parent attachment, and foster parent motivation to the home environments provided by both kinship and non-kinship foster caregivers.

#### *Parental warmth*

The findings support the first hypothesis that the foster caregiver's positive attitude about child rearing would have a positive impact on the home environment for children in foster care. Parental warmth contributed to the presence of cognitive stimulation and a good home environment in general. Parental warmth has been found to be a major determinant of positive parenting (e.g., Pettit et al., 1997). It has been linked in multiple studies to optimal child outcomes (Steinberg et al., 1992). Further, parental warmth is a key aspect of authoritative parenting (Baumrind, 1991). This parenting style promotes cognitive skill development (Ayoub, 2006) and positive school adjustment (Pettit et al., 1997). The provision of stimulating interactions and learning materials in the home, the processes tapped in the cognitive stimulation component of the HOME scale, is also more likely with this approach to

parenting (Ayoub, 2006). Warmth on the part of foster caregivers can facilitate the adjustment of the foster child to his or her new surroundings. Additionally, it can enable the foster caregiver to be more tolerant of a child's behavior and more likely to use less harsh discipline (Doelling & Johnson, 1989).

*Foster parent attachment and motivation*

The findings were ambiguous regarding the second hypothesis that the foster caregiver's positive attitude about foster parenting would be associated with a high quality home environment for children in foster care. The foster parenting attitudes examined were attachment and motivation.

It was surprising to find that foster parent attachment was not associated with the overall quality of the home environment, although a small trend was found. Attachment is related to the parent-child relationship and is based on the emotional security that a child has towards his or her parent, which should be stable over time. In foster care, stability and security are in question. As a consequence, many foster children have disordered attachments (Jones Harden, 2004). Because a foster caregiver does not know what length of time a particular child will be living in the home, they may be reluctant to develop an attachment to a foster child (Coakley et al., 2006). Thus, attachment may not have the same meaning for positive parenting processes with foster parents as it does in more permanent families.

However, foster parent motivation did influence the general quality of the home environment, a finding consistent with the second hypothesis. Foster parent motivation has been implicated in the stability and quality of the foster home (Tyebjee, 2003). The assumption was that foster parent motivation would also

influence home environment quality. The motivation to become a foster parent centers on the benefits to the child (making a difference in the child's life and providing a positive family experience) and the adult (increasing family size and adding meaning to life) [see Tyebjee, 2003]. Helping abused and/or neglected children, as well as social concern in general and for the community, may facilitate emotional connections between foster children and both kinship and non-kinship caregivers (Cole, 2005). Additionally, kinship caregivers agree to become a foster caregiver to keep the child within the family domain and to prevent the child from entering the foster care system (Cole, 2005). Thus, motivated foster parents may be more committed to providing a high quality home experience for the children in their care.

#### *Non-kinship and kinship caregivers*

More non-kinship foster caregivers were married in comparison to kinship foster caregivers, the majority of whom were unmarried. Single parent families have demonstrated more compromised functioning on the overall home environment, as well as the cognitive stimulation and the emotional support subscales (Berger, 2004). This does not support previous research on single African-American mothers, who can have a supportive, nurturing parenting style (Jackson, Brooks-Gunn, Huang, & Glassman, 2000; McGroder, 2000).

Other demographic factors, such as income, also have a great impact on the home environment. Non-kinship foster caregivers had higher incomes than kinship foster caregivers. Since more non-kinship caregivers were married, it would be expected that they would have a higher household income than kinship foster

caregivers. In today's society, it is a norm for two spouses to be employed. Additionally, education has an impact on income. Non-kinship foster caregivers had on average an educational level of associate's degree and higher. The highest level of education for kinship foster caregivers was an associate's degree. These demographic differences could be related to the diversity noted in the location of the study.

However, the participants in this study greatly differed from the foster caregivers who are participating in the NSCAW research project. In this study, there were more African-American foster caregivers (71%) than in the NSCAW study (52%) [USDHHS, 2005]. More foster caregivers in this study were unmarried (61%) and, in the NSCAW, the majority of foster caregivers were married (55% kinship and 73% non-kinship) [USDHHS, 2005].

Education is another area of difference. The NSCAW based education at the high school level (i.e., GED or higher) [USDHHS, 2005]. A higher proportion of non-kinship caregivers have a GED or higher and twice as many kinship foster caregivers had no degree (USDHHS, 2005). This makes it difficult to determine the approximate level of education that these foster caregivers did have. Over half of the participants in this study had yearly income over \$50,000 compared to 34% of the participants in the NSCAW study (USDHHS, 2005). These discrepancies in the demographic characteristics can be related to each type of study. This study was conducted in one particular geographic location whereas the NSCAW study is a longitudinal, nationwide research project.

There are other issues that have an impact on kinship foster caregivers. There is a lack of resources available to kinship foster caregivers that are possessed by non-

kinship foster caregivers. Although all foster parents receive training, preparation for placement, ongoing supervision by the appropriate child welfare agency, health and mental health services, and financial support (USDHHS, 2006), it may be that kinship caregivers require a more intensive set of services given their vulnerability.

Additionally, kinship foster caregivers not only interact with the foster child and the child welfare agency but with family member or members for whom they took in the child (Coakley et al., 2007). These can all be perceived as stressors for kinship foster caregivers, which may affect their parenting attitudes and behaviors.

Findings from this study revealed that non-kinship foster caregivers had higher levels of cognitive stimulation, emotional support, and the quality of the total HOME environment, and of foster parent motivation than kinship caregivers. Thus, evidence from this study confirmed the third hypothesis that parenting attitudes and the quality of the home environment of kinship caregivers would be more compromised than those of non-kinship caregivers.

Similarly, different patterns of relationships were found for key variables between kinship and non-kinship foster caregivers. Although no relations between key variables were found for kinship foster parents, linkages for non-kinship parents were documented between home environment quality and parental warmth, foster parent attachment and foster parent motivation. This suggests that non-kinship foster parents with positive attitudes in these areas are more likely to provide high quality home environments for these children.

These findings are in contrast to the findings in the NSCAW research project. For the home environment, kinship caregivers rated higher on emotional support than

non-kinship caregivers and were approximately the same as non-kinship caregivers on cognitive stimulation and the total HOME (USDHHS, 2005). The findings from this study on parenting attitudes cannot be considered in the context of the NSCAW study, as it did not include an explicit parenting attitudes measure.

The literature is replete with evidence that indicates that warm parenting is linked to a high quality home environment (e.g., Bradley et al., 2001). There is also emerging evidence that foster parent attachment and motivation are at least associated with positive parenting attitudes overall (Jones Harden et al., in press). The findings from this study extend this evidence to document the relation between these parenting attitudes and the provision of a high quality home environment, for non-kinship foster parents. It is important to note that the measure used to assess foster parent attitudes may be more appropriate for non-kinship foster parents than kinship parents.

Finally, the fourth hypothesis stated that foster caregiver attitudes will impact the home environment beyond the influence of foster home type on the home environment. This hypothesis was partially supported in that parental warmth contributed to higher quality home environments. This is consistent with multiple studies of typical and atypical families which underscore the positive value of parental warmth (e.g., Steinberg et al., 1992). However, the type of caregiver was a more robust predictor of the home environment than were warmth, attachment, and motivation. This finding suggests that variables relevant to the type of foster family (i.e., demographic variables) may have more influence on the quality of the home environment than their parenting attitudes. As such, evidence from this study is consistent with the work of Bradley et al. (2001), which underscores the linkage

between income and family structure (e.g., marital status) to the overall quality of the home environment.

### *Limitations and Research Directions*

Overall, this study makes an important contribution to the limited literature on parenting processes among foster families. However, limitations to the study need to be taken into consideration. First, the sample size of the study was small. Future studies should recruit a larger sample that is more representative of kinship and non-kinship foster caregivers, and that would allow for more complex questions and data analytic approaches. Another limitation is that the participants were limited to a specific geographic region and the findings cannot be generalized to the general population.

A nationally representative study, such as the National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being, can answer important policy questions and include families from a variety of geographic regions and family constellations.

In addition, information as to how long the foster child was in the foster care home was not available. Future research should consider obtaining this information. A further limitation is that some of the data was obtained through self-report methods. Future research should entail multiple methods and more refined assessments of the variables under study. It is particularly important to include more comprehensive and observational assessments of parenting practices among foster caregivers.

### *Conclusions*

Research on the parenting processes of foster caregivers is limited. Further, given the increase in the number of kinship care providers, there is a need to examine



these processes in both non-kinship and kinship families. This study contributed to this literature by examining the parenting attitudes and home environments of kinship and non-kinship foster caregivers. The findings from this study suggest that parental warmth is an important contributor of the quality of the home environment, particularly among non-kinship foster caregivers.

In the current study, kinship caregivers had poorer parenting attitudes and home environments than non-kinship caregivers. Kinship foster caregivers may require more intensive services, training, and support than what are provided for non-kinship caregivers. However, non-kinship foster care providers who do not demonstrate positive attitudes toward parenting are also in need of support. Programs that promote positive parenting attitudes and assist with stress reduction would be beneficial for kinship foster caregivers as well as non-kinship foster caregivers. Ultimately, such interventions would benefit the vulnerable population of foster children, who arguably are the child population in most need of optimal home environments.

## Appendix A

### Biological Parent Consent Form

#### FOSTER FAMILIES AND CHILDREN PROJECT

#### BIOLOGICAL PARENT CONSENT FORM

Project Title: Foster Families and Children Project

Principal Investigator: Brenda P. Jones, Ph.D.  
Institute for Child Study  
3304 Benjamin Building  
University of Maryland  
College Park, MD 20742  
301-405-2580

---

I state that I am over 18 years of age, in good physical health, and wish for my biological child to participate in a program of research being conducted by Dr. Brenda Jones at the Graduate School, University of Maryland College Park, Department of Human Development.

The purpose of this research is to assess the functioning of foster families and children. The procedures involve three sessions. The first session will be a home visit, and will include a foster parent interview, a videotaped observation of parent-child interaction, and several videotaped structured tasks. The second session will be a laboratory visit which will include another foster parent interview, an assessment of the child, and videotaped structured exercises. The third session will be a follow-up visit conducted at a later date. The specific measures and exercises which will be used, and estimated time requirements, are detailed on a separate sheet titled "Foster Care Research Project Measures List." I have read and reviewed this list and have had my questions answered by the researchers.

All information collected in the study is confidential, except any incidence of child maltreatment. I understand that my name will not be identified at any time. Additionally, I understand that the information provided by the children involved in this study is confidential. I understand that only the results of the standardized child assessments will be shared with the child's Department of Social Services caseworker and the foster parent, for purposes of supporting the child's development. I understand that there are no measurable risks to my participation in this study. I also understand that a goal of this study is to learn more about the experiences of children and families involved in the foster care system. I understand that I am free to ask questions or to withdraw from participation at any time without penalty.

---

Signature of Study Participant

---

Date

## Appendix B

### Foster Parent Consent Form

#### FOSTER FAMILIES AND CHILDREN PROJECT

#### FOSTER PARENT CONSENT FORM

Project Title: Foster Families and Children Project

Principal Investigator: Brenda P. Jones, Ph.D.  
Institute for Child Study  
3304 Benjamin Building  
University of Maryland  
College Park, MD 20742  
301-405-2580

---

I state that I am over 18 years of age, in good physical health, and wish to participate in a program of research being conducted by Dr. Brenda Jones at the Graduate School, University of Maryland College Park, Department of Human Development.

The purpose of this research is to assess the functioning of foster families and children. The procedures involve three sessions. The first session will be a home visit, and will include a foster parent interview, a videotaped observation of parent-child interaction, and several videotaped structured tasks. The second session will be a laboratory visit which will include another foster parent interview, an assessment of the child, and videotaped structured exercises. The third session will be a follow-up visit conducted at a later date. The specific measures and exercises which will be used, and estimated time requirements, are detailed on a separate sheet titled "Foster Care Research Project Measures List." I have read and reviewed this list and have had my questions answered by the researchers.

All information collected in the study is confidential, except any incidence of child maltreatment. I understand that my name will not be identified at any time. Additionally, I understand that the information provided by the children involved in this study is confidential. I understand that only the results of the standardized child assessments will be shared with the child's Department of Social Services caseworker and with me, for purposes of supporting the child's development. I understand that there are no measurable risks to my participation in this study. I also understand that a goal of this study is to learn more about the experiences of children and families involved in the foster care system. I understand that I am free to ask questions or to withdraw from participation at any time without penalty.

---

Signature of Study Participant

---

Date

# Appendix C

## Background Questionnaire

Subject # \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

### BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

Date 3 months ago \_\_\_\_\_

#### TARGET CHILD

1a. DATE of assessment (mm/dd/yy) \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

1b. DATE OF BIRTH (mm/dd/yy) \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

1c. AGE at assessment (yy/mm) \_\_\_/\_\_\_

#### 2. SEX

1..... Female

2..... Male

#### 3. ETHNICITY/RACE/REGIONAL BIRTHPLACE

1..... African American/Black USA

2..... African

3..... Caucasian/White USA

4..... Caribbean

5..... Central American

6..... Chinese

7..... Eastern European

8..... Japanese

9..... Korean

10..... Mexican American

11..... Middle Eastern

12..... Puerto Rican

13..... South American

14..... Southeast Asian

15..... Mixed Parentage

16..... Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

98..... Don't know

#### 4. PREGNANCY HISTORY

1..... Normal/Nonremarkable

2..... Complications

2b..If complications, Specify \_\_\_\_\_

98..Don't know

#### 5. BIRTH STATUS

1..... Full-term

2..... Premature/Low birth weight

3..... Birth Complication (e.g., toxemia; drug-addicted)

3b..... Specify \_\_\_\_\_

4..... Significant Birth Defect (e.g., cranio-facial anomaly; congenital heart defect)

4b..... Specify \_\_\_\_\_

98.....Don't know

Subject # \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**6. MEDICAL HISTORY**

**6a. Illnesses:**

- 1..... None/Developmentally normal
  - 2..... Recurrent/Acute (e.g., recurrent otitis media)
  - 3..... Chronic/Persistent (e.g., asthma; persistent otitis media req. prophylaxis/tubes)
  - 4..... Physical Disability/Handicap (e.g., blind, deaf)
  - 5..... Mental Retardation (i.e., severe to profound, documented with testing, etc.)
- Please specify illness/disability \_\_\_\_\_

**6b. Number of times [NAME] stayed overnight in the HOSPITAL in the past year?** \_\_\_\_\_ (Number) 98 Don't know

**6c. Reason(s) for visit(s) (Specify)** 98 Don't know

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**6d. Number of Emergency Room visits in the past year for [NAME].**  
\_\_\_\_\_ (Number) 98 Don't know

**6e. Reason(s) for visit(s) (Specify)**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**CAREGIVERS**

**MOM**

**7. ETHNICITY/RACE/REGIONAL BIRTHPLACE**

- 1..... African American/Black USA
- 2..... African
- 3..... Caucasian/White USA
- 4..... Caribbean
- 5..... Central American
- 6..... Chinese
- 7..... Eastern European
- 8..... Japanese
- 9..... Korean
- 10..... Mexican American
- 11..... Middle Eastern
- 12..... Puerto Rican
- 13..... South American
- 14..... Southeast Asian
- 15..... Mixed Parentage
- 16..... Other (specify)
- 99.....refuse (do not read)

Subject # \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**8. EDUCATION**

- 1..... 6<sup>th</sup> grade or less
- 2..... 7<sup>th</sup> grade
- 3..... 8<sup>th</sup> grade
- 4..... 9<sup>th</sup> grade
- 5..... 10<sup>th</sup> grade
- 6..... 11<sup>th</sup> grade
- 7..... high school graduate
- 8..... Associate's degree/trade school graduate
- 8..... partial college (1-3 years)
- 9..... college graduate/Bachelor's degree
- 10..... Master's degree
- \*1..... PhD, MD, JD, or other professional degree
- 99..... refuse (do not read)

**9. OCCUPATION**

- 1..... FT employment
- 2..... PT employment only
- 3..... Stay-at-Home parent by choice
- 4..... Unemployed by choice
- 5..... Unemployed
- 99..... refuse (do not read)

**IF EMPLOYED . . .**

9b. Current job position/Title (get details re: position)

---

9c. Profession/Skill/Trade (get details re: skill)

---

9d. If Self-Employed, please describe/specify employment

---

10. Date of Birth (mm/dd/yy) \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_  
99.....refuse (do not read)

10b. AGE at assessment (yy/mm) \_\_\_/\_\_\_  
99.....refuse (do not read)

Subject # \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**DAD**

(NOTE: Collect data for any partner of primary caregiver residing in home.)

**11. ETHNICITY/RACE/REGIONAL BIRTHPLACE**

- 1..... African American/Black USA
- 2..... African
- 3..... Caucasian/White USA
- 4..... Caribbean
- 5..... Central American
- 6..... Chinese
- 7..... Eastern European
- 8..... Japanese
- 9..... Korean
- 10..... Mexican American
- 11..... Middle Eastern
- 12..... Puerto Rican
- 13..... South American
- 14..... Southeast Asian
- 15..... Mixed Parentage
- 16..... Other (specify)
- 99.....refuse (do not read)

**12. EDUCATION**

- 1..... 6<sup>th</sup> grade or less
- 2..... 7<sup>th</sup> grade
- 3..... 8<sup>th</sup> grade
- 4..... 9<sup>th</sup> grade
- 5..... 10<sup>th</sup> grade
- 6..... 11<sup>th</sup> grade
- 7..... high school graduate
- 8..... Associate's degree/trade school graduate
- 8..... partial college (1-3 years)
- 9..... college graduate/Bachelor's degree
- 10..... Master's degree
- 11..... PhD, MD, JD, or other professional degree
- 99.....refuse (do not read)

**13. OCCUPATION**

- 1..... FT employment
- 2..... PT employment only
- 3..... Stay-at-Home parent by choice
- 4..... Unemployed by choice
- 5..... Unemployed
- 99.....refuse (do not read)

**IF EMPLOYED . . .**

13b. Current job position/Title (get details re: position)

---

Subject # \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

13c. Profession/Skill/Trade (get details re: skill)

---

13d. If Self-Employed, please describe/specify employment

---

14. Date of Birth (mm/dd/yy) \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_  
99.....refuse (do not read)

14b. AGE at assessment (yy/mm) \_\_\_/\_\_\_  
99.....refuse (do not read)

**FAMILY**

(Household = all adults in household; use best estimate)

15. INCOME SOURCE(s)                      Approx monthly \$ figures in household

- 15a. Employment \_\_\_\_\_
- 15b. Child support \_\_\_\_\_
- 15c. Pension \_\_\_\_\_
- 15d. Foster care payments \_\_\_\_\_
- 15e. Adoption subsidies \_\_\_\_\_
- 15f. TANF (Public Assistance) \_\_\_\_\_
- 15g. Social Security \_\_\_\_\_
- 15h. SSI/SSDI \_\_\_\_\_
- 15i. Other/Specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- 15j. Total \_\_\_\_\_

98....don't know (do not read)

99....refuse (do not read)

NOTES: \_\_\_\_\_

---

16. INCOME LEVEL (All Household, before taxes)

- 1.... >\$100,000
- 2.... \$90,000-\$99,999
- 3.... \$80,000-\$89,999
- 4.... \$70,000-\$79,999
- 5.... \$60,000-\$69,999
- 6.... \$50,000-\$59,999
- 7.... \$40,000-\$49,999
- 8.... \$30,000-\$39,999
- 9.... \$20,000-\$29,999
- 0.... \$10,000-\$19,999
- 7 .... \$5,000-\$9,999
- 8.... under \$5,000
- 98....don't know (do not read)
- 99....refuse (do not read)



Subject # \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**17. MARITAL/RELATIONSHIP STATUS**

- 1.... Married
- 2.... Married but not living together
- 3.... Legally Separated
- 4.... Divorced
- 5.... Widowed
- 6.... Never married
- 97... Other (SPECIFY: \_\_\_\_\_)
- 99... Refuse

17b. Are you currently living with a partner with whom you have lived for at least 3 months?

- 1...yes 2...no
- 99....Refuse

**18. HOUSING STATUS**

- 1.... Own house/condo/townhouse
- 2.... Rent house/condo/townhouse
- 3.... Own apartment
- 4.... Rent apartment
- 5.... Other/Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

19. Living in SUBSIDIZED housing?

- 1.... No
- 2.... Yes

20. Living with other ADULT relatives besides spouse/partner?

- 1.... No (IF NO, SKIP TO QUESTION 22)
- 2.... Yes
  - 2a. If yes, Specify \_\_\_\_\_  
(in relation to respondent)

21. Are you having to provide significant caretaking/help for this/these other ADULT relatives?

- 1.... No
- 2.... Yes
  - 2b. If yes, Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

22. How many MOVES in past 3 years?

- 1.... None
- 2.... Once
- 3.... Two to three times
- 4.... Four or more

**23. MEDICAL STATUS OF PRIMARY CAREGIVER**

23a. \_\_\_\_\_ # of times in hospital for medical problem in last year

23b. \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_ (mm/dd/yy) date of last hospitalization?

23c. \_\_\_\_\_ # of days experienced medical problem in the last 30 days

23d. \_\_\_\_\_ # of visits to physician in last year

23e. Do you have a chronic medical problem? 1 YES 2 NO

- 23f. Are you regularly taking prescribed medication? 1 YES 2 NO  
 23g. Are you currently receiving treatment for a medical problem? 1 YES 2 NO

**24. CARE OF CHILD**

- 24a. Who cares for [NAME] during the day during most of the year?  
 1.....respondent (primary caregiver) 2.....babysitter/nanny/family child care provider  
 3.....relative Please specify \_\_\_\_\_  
 4.....attends center-based program (i.e. child care, nursery school, Head Start program)

- 24b. Since Child Welfare officially placed [NAME] into your care, has he/she ever attended a Head Start program?  
 1.....yes 2.....no 98.....don't know

- 24c. How many hours per week is [NAME] cared for by caregivers other than you?  
 1.....not at all 2.....<=10 hours per week  
 3.....11-20 hours per week 4.....21-30 hours per week  
 5.....31-40 hours per week 6.....>40 hours per week

- 24d. In the last month, how often has [NAME] gone to a babysitter?  
 1.....not at all 2.....<once a month  
 3.....1-3 times per month 4.....once a week  
 5.....2-3 times per week 6.....> 3 times per week

- 24e. Who is [NAME] with most of the time during the week?  
 1.....primary caregiver/respondent 2.....babysitter/nanny/family child care provider  
 3.....relative (please specify who) \_\_\_\_\_

- 24f. How many persons provide care for [NAME] during a week? \_\_\_\_\_

**25. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION**

First Name	Age	Sex 1-female; 2 male	*Relationship (use code # below)
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			

\*relationship to primary caregiver/respondent

- 1 - self                      4 - stepdaughter                      7 - foster son                      10 - spouse  
 2 - biological daughter    5 - stepson                      8 - adopted daughter    11 - mother  
 3 - biological son            6 - foster daughter            9 - adopted son            12 - father  
 97 - other/specify \_\_\_\_\_

Subject # \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

### MY EXPERIENCES AS A FOSTER/RELATIVE CAREGIVER

1. How long have you been a caregiver for all the children you have cared for who are not your biological children?

- 1... < 6 months      2... 6 months – 1 year      3... 1-3 years  
4... 3-5 years      5... 5-10 years      6... > 10 years

2. When was the first time that {Prince George's or Montgomery County} Child Welfare or any other kind of placement agency officially placed a child into your care? Please include foster children as well as children of relatives or friends?      | \_\_ / \_\_ | {mm/yy}

3. Did you know [NAME] before s/he was placed with you?

- 1... yes      2... no      {IF NO, SKIP TO Q.3b}

3a. If yes, for how long?

- 1... < 6 months      2... 6 months – 1 year      3... 1-2 years  
4... 2-3 years      5... 3-4 years      6... 4-5 years

3b. What was the date you first met [NAME]? | \_\_ / \_\_ | {mm/yy}

4. Does [NAME] know that you are not his/her birth mother/father?

- 1... yes      2... no      98... don't know

5. Have you ever hoped or planned to adopt [NAME]?

- 1... yes      2... no      98... don't know

#### 6. YOUR RELATIONSHIP TO CHILD

- |                               |                                |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. _____ biological mother    | 9. _____ paternal grandmother  |
| 2. _____ biological father    | 10. _____ paternal grandfather |
| 3. _____ maternal aunt        | 11. _____ step-mother          |
| 4. _____ maternal uncle       | 12. _____ step-father          |
| 5. _____ maternal grandmother | 13. _____ sister               |
| 6. _____ maternal grandfather | 14. _____ brother              |
| 7. _____ paternal aunt        | 15. _____ foster mother        |
| 8. _____ paternal uncle       | 16. _____ foster father        |

17. Unrelated/Please explain: \_\_\_\_\_

97. Other/Specify: \_\_\_\_\_

Subject # \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

7. Are you a: {READ}

1... Relative of 's [NAME]'s birth family?

2... Friend of [NAME] 's birth family?

3... Foster parent?

4... Other/specify \_\_\_\_\_

---

8. In your lifetime, how many children including [NAME] have you raised or taken care of full time for one (1) month or more. I'll walk you through this.

8a. How many of your own birth children: |\_\_|

8b. How many children of relatives or friends: |\_\_|

8c. How many children that you officially adopted: |\_\_|

8d. How many foster children: |\_\_|

8e. {CALCULATE TOTAL#}: |\_\_|

So, you have raised or taken full-time care of [TOTAL #].

9. Did you spend more than one month living with someone other than your biological parents when you were a child? 1-yes 2-no {IF NO, SKIP TO Q.10}

9a. If yes, for how long?

1... < 6 months

2... 6 months – 1 year

3... 1-3 years

4... 3-5 years

5... 5-10 years

6... > 10 years

9b. If yes, with whom did you live?

1... grandparents

2... aunt/uncle

3... other relatives

4... foster parents

5... adoptive parents

6... other/specify: \_\_\_\_\_

10. What childhood experiences have you had which affect the way you care for your foster/relative's child?

---

---

---

Subject # \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

11. How often do you see the agency caseworker?

- |                        |                     |                   |
|------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| 1... once a week       | 2... twice a month  | 3... once a month |
| 4... every other month | 5... 4 times a year | 6... 3 times/year |
| 7... 2 times/year      | 8... once a year    | 9... never        |

12. What are the usual reasons you contact your caseworker?

---

---

---

13. Do you believe you and the agency caseworker work as a team to meet the needs of your foster/relative's child? 1 – yes 2 – no

14. Do you feel that you are provided with enough financial support to care for your foster/relative caregiver's child? 1 – yes 2 – no

15. Do you believe that being a foster parent/relative caregiver means working with your foster/relative child's biological parents? 1 – yes 2 - no

16. (If caregiver has biological child) How is raising your biological child different from raising your foster/relative's child?

---

---

---

17. What was the reason you decided to care for this foster/relative's child?

---

---

---

## Appendix D

### Questionnaire on Parenting Attitudes (PACR)

Date \_\_\_\_\_

#### QUESTIONNAIRE OF PARENTAL ATTITUDES

The following statements represent matters of interest and concern to parents. Not all parents feel the same way about them. Read each statement carefully and circle the number at the left which most closely reflects YOUR degree of agreement or disagreement. If you have more than one child answer according to the child of kindergarten age.

---

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

---

(Circle One)

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (1) I respect my child's opinions and encourage him/her to express them.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (2) I encourage my child always to do his/her best.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (3) I put the wishes of my mate before the wishes of my child.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (4) I help my child when he/she is being teased by his/her friends.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (5) I often feel angry with my child.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (6) I punish my child by putting him/her off somewhere by him/herself for a while.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (7) I watch closely what my child eats and when he/she eats.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (8) I wish my spouse was more interested in our children.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (9) I feel my child should be given comfort and understanding when he/she is scared or upset.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (10) I try to keep my child away from children or families who have different ideas or values from our own.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (11) I try to stop my child from playing rough games or doing things where he/she might get hurt.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (12) I believe physical punishment to be the best way of disciplining my child.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (13) I believe that my child should be seen and not heard.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (14) I sometimes forget the promises I have made to my child.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (15) I express affection by hugging, kissing and holding my child.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (16) I find some of my greatest satisfaction in my child.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (17) I prefer that my child not try things if there is a chance he/she will fail.

Subject # \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

---

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

---

**(Circle One)**

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (18) I wish my child did not have to grow up so fast.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (19) I feel my child should have time to think, daydream and even loaf sometimes.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (20) I find it difficult to punish my child.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (21) I let my child make many decisions for him/herself.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (22) I worry about the bad and sad things that can happen to my child as he/she grows up.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (23) I do not allow my child to get angry with me.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (24) I feel my child is a bit of a disappointment to me.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (25) I expect a great deal of my child.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (26) I am easy going and relaxed with my child.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (27) I give up some of my interest because of my child.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (28) I tend to spoil my child.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (29) I talk it over and reason with my child when he/she misbehaves.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (30) I trust my child to behave as he/she should even when I am not with him/her.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (31) I joke and play with my child.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (32) I give my child a good many duties and family responsibilities.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (33) My child and I have warm, intimate times together.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (34) I have strict, well-established rules for my child.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (35) I think I should let my child take many chances as he/she grows up and tries new things.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (36) I encourage my child to be curious, to explore and question things.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (37) I sometimes feel that I am too involved with my child.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (38) I threaten to punish more often than I actually give it.

Subject # \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

---

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Moderately Disagree	3 Slightly Disagree	4 Slightly Agree	5 Moderately Agree	6 Strongly Agree
---------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------

---

(Circle One)

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (39) I believe in praising my child when he/she is good and think it gets better results than punishing when he/she is bad.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (40) I make sure my child knows that I appreciate what he/she tries to accomplish.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (41) I encourage my child to talk about his/her troubles.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (42) I teach my child to keep control of his/her feelings at all times.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (43) I try to keep my child from fighting.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (44) I dread answering my child's questions about sex.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (45) When I am angry with my child, I let him/her know it.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (46) I punish my child by taking away a privilege he/she otherwise would have had.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (47) I give my child extra privileges when he/she behaves well.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (48) I enjoy having the house full of children.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (49) I believe that too much affection and tenderness can harm or weaken my child.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (50) I believe that scolding and criticism makes my child improve.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (51) I believe my child should be aware of how much I sacrifice for him/her.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (52) I worry about the health of my child.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (53) I feel that there is a good deal of conflict between my child and me.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (54) I do not allow my child to question my decisions.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (55) I like to have some time to myself, away from my child.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (56) I let my child know how ashamed and disappointed I am when he/she misbehaves.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (57) I encourage my child to be independent of me.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (58) I make sure I know where my child is and what he/she is doing.



Subject # \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

---

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

---

**(Circle One)**

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (59) I find it interesting and educational to be with my child for long periods.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (60) I instruct my child not to get dirty while he/she is playing.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (61) I think jealousy and quarreling between my children should be punished.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (62) I think my child must learn early not to cry.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (63) I control my child by warning him/her about the bad things than can happen to him/her.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (64) I don't think my child should be given sexual information before he /she can understand everything.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 (65) I believe it is unwise to let my children play a lot by themselves without supervision from grown-ups.

## Appendix E

### Foster Parent Attitudes Questionnaire (FPAQ)

Subject # \_\_\_\_\_  
Date \_\_\_\_\_

#### **Foster Parent Attitudes Questionnaire (traditional)**

**Directions**

This questionnaire is to help us learn more about the thoughts and beliefs of foster parents. Please read each statement carefully and decide how strongly you agree or disagree with the statement. Please mark the answer which comes closest to describing your own reaction to the statement.

- Please circle "A" if you strongly agree with the statement.  
 Please circle "B" if you agree with the statement.  
 Please circle "C" if you neither agree nor disagree with the statement.  
 Please circle "D" if you disagree with the statement.  
 Please circle "E" if you strongly disagree with the statement.

		A Strongly Agree	B Agree	C Neither Agree nor Disagree	D Disagree	E Strongly Disagree
1.	Foster children have unique needs which are different from those of children living with their biological parents.				A B C D E	
2.	Building a strong attachment between me and my foster children is the most important thing I can do for them.				A B C D E	
3.	I decided to take foster children because I wanted to adopt children.				A B C D E	
4.	Things that have happened before to foster children cause them to have emotional problems.				A B C D E	
5.	I will feel a deep sense of loss when/if my foster child has to move.				A B C D E	
6.	Visits between foster children and their biological parents take too much time and energy from foster parents.				A B C D E	
7.	It is best for foster children if foster parents learn to let them go when they have to leave.				A B C D E	
8.	It is my responsibility to make sure my foster children get the services they need for any problems they have.				A B C D E	

Subject # \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date \_\_\_\_\_

Please circle "A" if you **strongly agree** with the statement.  
 Please circle "B" if you **agree** with the statement.  
 Please circle "C" if you **neither agree nor disagree** with the statement.  
 Please circle "D" if you **disagree** with the statement.  
 Please circle "E" if you **strongly disagree** with the statement.

	A Strongly Agree	B Agree	C Neither Agree nor Disagree	D Disagree	E Strongly Disagree
9.	I decided to take foster children because I wanted to help children in unfortunate situations.				A B C D E
10.	Foster children who have problem behavior should be punished like any other child who has problem behaviors.				A B C D E
11.	I talk to my foster children about their biological parents.				A B C D E
12.	Foster children grow out of any problems they may have.				A B C D E
13.	Foster children should have pictures or objects to help them remember their biological parents.				A B C D E
14.	When foster children have to change placements, they are able to bond to their new parents easily.				A B C D E
15.	Whenever I have a problem with my foster children, I contact my caseworker.				A B C D E
16.	Raising my foster children is the most important thing in my life.				A B C D E
17.	I feel it is my duty to protect and fight for my foster child.				A B C D E
18.	Biological parents generally cause emotional harm to their children who are in foster care.				A B C D E
19.	My feelings toward my foster child are the same as they are (or would be) toward my biological children.				A B C D E
20.	When I need help with my foster child, I find it on my own.				A B C D E

Subject # \_\_\_\_\_  
Date \_\_\_\_\_

Please circle "A" if you **strongly agree** with the statement.  
Please circle "B" if you **agree** with the statement.  
Please circle "C" if you **neither agree nor disagree** with the statement.  
Please circle "D" if you **disagree** with the statement.  
Please circle "E" if you **strongly disagree** with the statement.

	<b>A</b> <b>Strongly</b> <b>Agree</b>	<b>B</b> <b>Agree</b>	<b>C</b> <b>Neither</b> <b>Agree nor Disagree</b>	<b>D</b> <b>Disagree</b>	<b>E</b> <b>Strongly</b> <b>Disagree</b>
21.					
	Foster children do not think about their biological parents after they have spent a long time in their foster parents' homes.				A B C D E
22.					
	My foster children are my own children.				A B C D E
23.					
	I should have a close relationship with the biological parents of my foster children.				A B C D E
24.					
	I will adopt my foster children if they are free for adoption.				A B C D E
25.					
	When my foster children misbehave, they are trying to bother me.				A B C D E
26.					
	My goal is to help my foster children develop as much as they can while they live with me.				A B C D E
27.					
	I decided to take foster children because I enjoy children so much.				A B C D E

# Appendix F

## Early Childhood HOME

Subject # \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

### EARLY CHILDHOOD HOME

Place a plus (+) or minus (-) in the box alongside each item if the behavior is observed during the visit or if the parent reports that the conditions or events are characteristic of the home environment. Enter the subtotals and the total on the front side of the Record Sheet.

<b>I. LEARNING MATERIALS</b>	23. House has 100 square feet of living space per person.	
1. Child has toys which teach colors, sizes, and shapes.	24. Rooms are not overcrowded with furniture.	
2. Child has three or more puzzles.	25. House is reasonably clean and minimally cluttered.	
3. Child has record player or tape recorder and at least 5 children's records or tapes.	<b>IV. RESPONSIVITY</b>	
4. Child has toys or games permitting free expression.	26. Parent holds child close 10-15 minutes per day.	
5. Child has toys or games requiring refined movements.	27. Parent converses with child at least twice during visit.	
6. Child has toys or games which help teach numbers.	28. Parent answers child's questions or requests verbally.	
7. Child has at least 10 children's books.	29. Parent usually responds verbally to child's speech.	
8. At least 10 books are visible in the apartment or home.	30. Parent praises child's qualities twice during visit.	
9. Family buys and reads a daily paper.	31. Parent caresses, kisses, or cuddles child during visit.	
10. Family subscribes to at least one magazine.	32. Parent helps child demonstrate some achievement during visit.	
11. Child is encouraged to learn shapes.	<b>V. ACADEMIC STIMULATION</b>	
<b>II. LANGUAGE STIMULATION</b>	33. Child is encouraged to learn colors.	
12. Child has toys that help teach the names of animals.	34. Child is encouraged to learn patterned speech.	
13. Child is encouraged to learn the alphabet.	35. Child is encouraged to learn spatial relationships.	
14. Parent teaches child simple verbal manners (please, thank you, I'm sorry).	36. Child is encouraged to learn numbers.	
15. Parent uses correct grammar and pronunciation.	37. Child is encouraged to learn to read a few words.	
16. Parent encourages child to talk and takes time to listen.	<b>VI. MODELING</b>	
17. Parent's voice conveys positive feelings about child.	38. Some delay of food gratification is expected.	
18. Child is permitted choice in breakfast or lunch menu.	39. TV is used judiciously.	
<b>III. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT</b>	40. Parent introduces Visitor to child.	
19. Building appears safe and free of hazards.	41. Child can express negative feelings without harsh reprisal.	
20. Outside play environment appears safe.	42. Child can hit parent without harsh reprisal.	
21. Interior of apartment is not dark or perceptually monotonous.	<b>VII. VARIETY</b>	
22. Neighborhood is aesthetically pleasing.	43. Child has real or toy musical instrument.	

Subject # \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

44. Child is taken on outing by a family member at least every other week.		51. Parent lets child choose certain favorite food products or brands at grocery store.	
45. Child has been on trip more than 50 miles during last year.		<b>VIII. ACCEPTANCE</b>	
46. Child has been taken to a museum during past year.		52. Parent does not scold or yell at or derogate child more than once.	
47. Parent encourages child to put away toys without help.		53. Parent does not use physical restraint during visit.	
48. Child's art work is displayed some places in house.		54. Parent neither slaps nor spansks child during visit.	
50. Child eats at least one meal per day with mother (or mother figure) and father (or father figure).		55. No more than one instance of physical punishment occurred during the past week.	

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	TOTAL
<b>TOTALS</b>									

**COMMENTS:** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## References

- Allen, M. L. & Bissell, M. (2004). Safety and stability for foster children: The policy context. *The Future of Children, 14* (1), 49-73.
- Ayoub, C. C. (2006). Adaptive and maladaptive parenting: Influence on child development. In Hiram E. Fitzgerald, Robert Zucker, & Kristine Freeark (Eds.) *The crisis in youth mental health: Understanding the critical issues and effective programs Vol. 4* (pp. 121-143) Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 11* (1), 56-95.
- Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. *Genetic Psychology Monographs, 75*, 43-88.
- Berger, L. M. (2004). Income, family structure, and child maltreatment risk. *Children and Youth Services Review, 26*, 725-748.
- Berrick, J. D. (1997). Assessing quality of care in kinship and foster family care. *Family Relations, 46*, 273-280.
- Bradley, R. H. (2006). The home environment. In Hiram E. Fitzgerald, Robert Zucker, & Kristine Freeark (Eds.) *The crisis in youth mental health: Understanding the critical issues and effective programs Vol. 4* (pp. 89-120) Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Bradley, R. H. (1993). Children's home environments, health, behavior, and intervention efforts: A review using the HOME inventory as a marker measure. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 119* (4), 437-490.
- Bradley, R. H., Corwyn, R. F., Pipes McAdoo, H., & Garcia Coll, C. (2001). The home environments of children in the United States Part I: Variations by age, ethnicity, and poverty status. *Child Development, 72* (6), 1844-1867.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). Contexts of child rearing: Problems and prospects. *American Psychologist, 34* (10), 844-850.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (2005). Interacting systems in human development: Research paradigms present and future. In Urie Bronfenbrenner (Ed.) *Making human beings human: Bioecological perspectives on human development* (pp. 67-93) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Bronstein, P., Clauson, J., Stoll, M. & Abrams, C. L. (1993). Parenting behavior and children's social, psychological, and academic adjustment in diverse family structures. *Family Relations*, 42, 268-276.
- Brooks-Gunn, J., Klebanov, P. K., & Liaw, F. (1995). The learning, physical, and emotional environment of the home in the context of poverty: the Infant Health and Development Program. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 17 (1-2), 251-276.
- Carlson, M. J., & Corcoran, M. E. (2001). Family structure and children's behavioral and cognitive outcomes. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63, 779-792.
- Coakley, T. M., Cuddeback, G., Buehler, C., & Cox, M. E. (2006). Kinship foster parents' perceptions of factors that promote or inhibit successful fostering. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 29, 92-109.
- Cole, S. A. (2005). Foster caregiver motivation and infant attachment: How do reasons for fostering affect relationships? *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 22 (5-6), 441-457.
- Doelling, J. L., & Johnson, J. H. (1990). Predicting success in foster placement: The contribution of parent-child temperament characteristics. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 60 (4), 585-593.
- Dozier, M. Stovall, K. C., Albus, K. E., & Bates, B. (2001). Attachment for infants in foster care: The role of caregiver state of mind. *Child Development*, 72 (5), 1467-1477.
- Dunifon, R., & Kowaleski-Jones, L. (2002). Who's in the house? Race differences in cohabitation, single parenthood, and child development. *Child Development*, 73 (4), 1249-1264.
- Goldberg, W. A., & Easterbrooks, M. A. (1984). Role of marital quality on toddler development. *Developmental Psychology*, 26, 657-671.
- Jackson, A. P., Brooks-Gunn, J., Huang, C., & Glassman, M. (2000). Single mothers in low-wage jobs: Financial strain, parenting, and pre-schoolers' outcomes. *Child Development*, 71 (5), 1409-1423.
- Jones Harden, B., Clyman, R., Kriebel, D. & Lyons, M. (2004). Kith and kin care: Parental attitudes and resources of foster and relative caregivers. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 26, 657-671.
- Jones Harden, B. (2004). Safety and stability for foster children: A developmental perspective. *The Future of Children*, 14 (1), 31-47.



- Jones Harden, B., D'Amour, A., Pandohie-Johnson, L., & Vick, J. (In Press). Measuring parenting attitudes of substitute caregivers: The development of the Foster Parent Attitudes Questionnaire (FPAQ). *Children and Youth Services Review*.
- Julian, T. W., McKenry, P. C., & McKelvey, M. W. (1994). Cultural variations in parenting: Perceptions of Caucasian, African-American, Hispanic, and Asian-American parents. *Family Relations*, 43, 30-37.
- Katz, L. F. & Woodin, E. M. (2002). Hostility, hostile detachment, and conflict engagement in marriages: Effects on child and family functioning. *Child Development*, 73 (2), 636-651.
- Linares, L. O., Montalto, D., Rosbruch, N. & Li, M. (2006). Discipline practices among biological and foster parents. *Child Maltreatment*, 11 (2), 157-167.
- Magnus, K. B., Cowen, E. L., Wyman, P. A., Fagen, D. B., & Work, W. C. (1999). Parent-child relationship qualities and child adjustment in highly stressed urban black and white families. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 27 (1), 55-71.
- Masten, A. S., & Coatsworth, J. D. (1998). The development of competence in favorable and unfavorable environments: Lessons from research on successful children. *American Psychologist*, 53, 205-220.
- McGroder, S. M. (2000). Parenting among low-income, African American single mothers with preschool-age children: Patterns, predictors, and developmental correlates. *Child Development*, 71 (3), 752-771.
- Menaghan, E. G., & Parcel, T. L. (1991). Determining children's home environments: The impact of maternal characteristics and current occupational and family conditions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53, 417-431.
- O'Brien Caughy, M., O'Campo, P. J., Randolph, s. M., & Nickerson, K. (2002). The influence of racial socialization practices on the cognitive and behavioral competence of African-American preschoolers. *Child Development*, 73 (5), 1611-1625.
- Orme, J. G., & Buehler, C. (2001). Foster family characteristics and behavioral and emotional problems of foster children: A narrative review. *Family Relations*, 50, 3-15.
- Orme, J.G., Buehler, C., McSurdy, M., Rhodes, K. W., Cox, M. E., & Patterson, D. A. (2004). Parental and familial characteristics of family foster care applicants. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 26, 307-329.

- Pettit, G. S., Bates, J. E., & Dodge, K. A. (1997). Supportive parenting, ecological context, and children's adjustment: A seven-year longitudinal study. *Child Development, 68* (5), 908-923
- Pinderhughes, E. E., Jones Harden, B., & Guyer, A. E. (2007). Children in foster care. In J. Lawrence Aber, Sandra J. Bishop-Josef, Stephanie M. Jones, Kathryn Taaffe McLearn, & Deborah A. Phillips (Eds.) *Child development and social policy: Knowledge for action* (pp 201-216) Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Simms, M. D., & Horwitz, S.M. (1996). Foster home environments: A preliminary report. *Journal of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics, 17* (3), 170-175.
- Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S. D., Dornbusch, S. M., & Darling, N. (1992). Impact of parenting practices in adolescent achievement: Authoritative parenting, school involvement, and encouragement to succeed. *Child Development, 63*, 1266-1281.
- Thomas, A., & Sawhill, I. (2005). For love and money? The impact of family structure on family income. *Future of Children, 15* (2), 57-74.
- Tyebjee, T. (2003). Attitude, interest, and motivation for adoption and foster care. *Child Welfare Journal, 82* (6), 685-706.
- United States Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families (2006). *Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System, Preliminary FY 2005 Estimates as of September 2006*. Available from ACF website: [http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/cb/stats\\_research](http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/cb/stats_research)
- United States Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families. (2005). *The National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being: One year in foster care: Wave 1 data analysis report*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Walker-Barnes, C. J. & Mason, C. A. (2001) Ethnic differences in the effect of parenting on gang involvement and gang delinquency: A longitudinal, hierarchical linear modeling perspective. *Child Development, 72* (6), 1814-1831.