1974

A study of adoption breakdowns in Ontario.

Mary Rose. Beaudry
University of Windsor

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR

THE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

A STUDY OF ADOPTION BREAKDOWNS IN ONTARIO

by

Mary Rose Beaudry

and

Claude Bertrand

A thesis presented to the School of Social Work
of the University of Windsor in
partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
degree of Master
of Social
Work

August, 1974

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

Research Committee

Professor Valentin Cruz	Chairman
Professor S. M. Monaghan	Member
Professor Neil Gold	Member

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We wish to express our gratitude to those people who made [redacted] possible to complete this research.

Our thanks are extended to the Ministry of Community and Social Services, especially Mrs. Victoria Leach, Provincial Adoption Supervisor, for her enthusiastic support and her cooperation.

Our gratitude is given to the members of our Research Committee, Professor S. M. Monaghan and Professor N. Gold, whose guidance was invaluable. A special thanks is extended to our Committee Chairman, Professor Valentin J. Cruz, for his valuable ideas, encouragement, and criticism.

Our gratitude is also extended to Mr. M. Baillargeon, programmer, Computer Centre, for his pertinent ideas and valuable assistance.

Finally, without the love, patience, and understanding that Dianne and Shona demonstrated to the missing member of their family, this study could never have been completed.

ABSTRACT

This research, exploratory in nature, examined adoption breakdowns in Ontario. This examination focused on the following purposes:

(1) To describe the adoption breakdowns in relation to the social characteristics of the placed child and the prospective adoption parents, the adoptive family composition, the Society-related child placement processes, and the reasons for breakdown;

(2) To identify some of the major factors in the Society-related child placement processes which may be associated with adoption breakdown;

(3) To consider how these factors are related to one another for the development of hypotheses for further investigation in the area of breakdown;

(4) To comment on the findings and their implications for adoption processes in Ontario.

To accomplish the above purposes, present adoption processes in Ontario were outlined and a review of the literature on attachment and separation was conducted. The examination of present adoption processes in Ontario revealed that the processes are geared towards the careful preparation of the child and the prospective adoption parents so that they may be able to better adjust to adoption and enjoy its benefits. The review of the literature on attachment and separation emphasized the traumatic experiences endured by children separated from their natural caretakers and the difficulties they may encounter in subsequent attachments to

substitute caretakers.

Our data for this research was gathered at the Adoption Branch of the Children's Services Bureau directly from the Information on Adoption Breakdown Forms with the use of a Master Data Sheet that we constructed.

The salient characteristics associated with adoption breakdowns were discussed in relation to the social characteristics of the placed child and the prospective adoption parents, the adoption family composition, the Society-related child placement processes, and the reasons for breakdown. This description led to the identification of significant factors associated with breakdown. These factors were analyzed to consider how and if they were related to one another to facilitate the development of hypotheses for future research.

Our findings reiterated the importance of the careful preparation of the child and the prospective adoption applicants before and after the child has been placed in the adoption home. We suggested that this preparation involve more effort than is already expended in assessing and evaluating the suitability of a child and the prospective adoptive parents to each other. We suggested that casework be one form of educating the prospective adoption parents and helping them handle the child's anxieties around separation, new attachments, and related adjustment phases.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements ii

Abstract iii

List of Tables vii

Chapter

I INTRODUCTION 1

II THE ADOPTION PROCESS 5

Adoption: Definition, Purpose, Value 5

A Review of Present Adoption Processes 8

Adoption Breakdown 15

III REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 18

The Family 18

Formation of Attachments and Attachment Behavior During Child Development. 19

Separation Behavior During Child Development. 22

The Adopted Child. 26

Adoptive Parents 30

Significant Factors in Adoption Breakdowns . . 35

IV METHODOLOGY. 38

Statement of Purpose 38

Operational Definitions. 38

Type of Study. 40

Population and Sample. 42

Data Collection 43
Limitations 48
Data Analysis 50
V DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS. 52
Description of Adoption Breakdowns. 52
The Significant Factors in Adoption Breakdown 75
Limitations in Data Analysis. 86
VI IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE 89
VII CONCLUSION. 93

APPENDICES

I ADOPTION HOMESTUDY DICTATION OUTLINE. 97
II INFORMATION ON ADOPTION BREAKDOWN 99
III MASTER DATA SHEET 101

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 109
VITAE 113

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Age of Child at Time of Placement	53
2.	Age of Child at Time of Placement by Sex	54
3.	Racial Origin of Child	54
4.	Religion of Child	55
5.	Children Born in Wedlock, Classified by Family Status at Time of Coming Into Care	55
6.	Length of Time in Care Before This Adoption Placement	56
7.	Total Number of Foster Home Placements	57
8.	Length of Time from Placement to Removal	58
9.	Reason for Coming Into Care	59
10.	Ages of Adoptive Parents at Placement of Child	60
11.	Religion of Adoptive Parents	61
12.	Racial Origin of Adoptive Parents	61
13.	Occupation of Adoptive Parents	62
14.	Number of Adoption Breakdowns Classified by the Number of Natural and Number of Adopted Children In the Prospective Adoption Family	64
15.	Special Resources Employed by the Society in Making the Adoption Placement	65
16.	What Prompted Adopting Applicants to Express an Interest in Adoption	66
17.	Removal Initiated By	67
18.	Number of Pre-Placement Interviews Excluding Home Study	68

Table

Page

19. Number of Post-Placement Interviews Excluding Home Study 69

20. Number of Visits Made by the Adoption Applicants to the Child and the Child to the Adoption Applicants 70

21. Reasons for the Adoption Breakdown 71

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Adoption is a social and legal process designed to create family environments for the benefit of couples and children who are not related by birth. Adoption is a means of providing permanent homes and physical and psychological growth-inducing family relationships for parentless children. Adoption enables infertile couples to become parents and have children of their own. Adoption provides a sound solution for married and unmarried couples who are unable, for many reasons, to care for the children they have borne.

A great number of adoptions are completed each year in Ontario through the work of the adoption departments of the 50 Children's Aid Societies. However, some adoptions are never completed for reasons that necessitate the removal of children from prospective adoption homes. These removals are referred to as adoption breakdowns.

This research project addressed itself to the problem of adoption breakdown. Adoption breakdown was defined as the removal of the child from a prospective adoption home, for any reason, after final placement and before adoption legalization by the Court. This was the definition we employed for the purposes of our project.

In the years 1966, 1967, and 1968, there had been 137, 132, 165 adoption breakdowns respectively, where the children had been placed by the Children's Aid Societies.[1] In 1972 and 1973, there had been 88 and 84 adoption breakdowns, respectively.[2] These numbers of adoption breakdowns represented a low failure rate of roughly 1.7 to 1.9 per cent in relation to the total number of adoption completions or successful adoptions: those that had been finalized through the Court in each of those years.

This low failure rate had not deterred us from proceeding with the project for a variety of concerns, some of which had emanated from the literature. Most of the research conducted in the area of success and failure in adoption had dealt with assessing placed child and family functioning some years after the children had been placed in adoption homes. In their study of adoption failure, Kadushin and Seidl pointed out that:

> Because of the many intervening variables between placement decision and family functioning five or more years later after placement, it might be more helpful to practice if a more proximate period of time were selected than has usually been the case.[3]

Lidkea added that "we should examine the reasons no matter

---

[1] Report of the Advisory Committee on Adoption and Foster Care, Stanley G. Mullins, Chairman (Toronto: Ontario Department of Social and Family Services, 1970), p. 69.

[2] Victoria Leach, Provincial Adoption Supervisor, Ontario, in an interview, April 16, 1974.

[3] Alfred Kadushin and Frederick W. Seidl, "Adoption Breakdown: A Social Work Postmortem," Social Work, XVI (July, 1971), p. 32.

how painful the process in order to avoid repeating the same mistakes."[4] Seglow et al. summarized our feelings by stating that "in spite of overall 'success' agency practice leaves room for improvement."[5] It was for the improvement of present adoption procedures that we decided to conduct this research project.

Other concerns had arisen from our experiences as graduate students at the University of Windsor School of Social Work and as employees of the Porcupine and District and Windsor Roman Catholic Children's Aid Societies.

We had been particularly concerned over the lack of research in the field of Child Welfare in Ontario. Information on adoption breakdowns was available, but there had been little research conducted in this area. This led us to wonder what was happening in the area of adoptions. More specifically, what was happening in the area of adoption breakdown? Who were the children involved in adoption breakdowns? Who were the adoptive applicants involved? What had been the role of the Societies in the adoption breakdowns? What were the reasons for the adoption breakdowns?

We believed that by studying adoption breakdowns, we would come up with the answers to these questions. These

---

[4]William Lidkea, "Why Some Adoptions Fail," Journal, Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies, IV (Nov., 1971), p. 1.

[5]Jean Seglow, Mia Kellmer Pringle and Peter Wedge, Growing up Adopted (London: John Gordner Printers Limited, 1972), p. 161.

answers, we felt, would lead to a better understanding of adoption breakdowns in Ontario. We also felt that this understanding would then allow for the identification and clarification of the possible connections (maybe indicators) and difficulties in the home study or child placement processes or both. Finally, we believed that the results obtained from our study would enable the development of hypotheses for future research in the area of adoption breakdown.

CHAPTER II

THE ADOPTION PROCESS

Adoption: Definition, Purpose, Value

A brief explanation of adoption, its purpose and its value is appropriate at this time. Adoption is an established practice of affiliating to "adoptive parents," a child who has not been born to them, so that they become for him his "psychological parents."

In the above explanation, the term "adoptive parents," is meant to define the parents other than the "biological parents," who have legally been assigned the rights and the responsibilities of parents to the child. The term "psychological parents" is meant to define the parents who are dutifully bound to ensure the healthy emotional development of the child:

> A psychological parent is one who, on a continuing, day-to-day basis, through interactive companionship, interplay, and mutuality, fulfills the child's psychological needs for a parent, as well as the child's physical needs.[6]

For additional clarity, the term "biological parents" is meant to define the parents who have physically borne the child.

---

[6]Joseph Goldstein, Anna Freud, and Albert J. Solnit, Beyond the Best Interests of the Child (New York: The Free Press, 1973), p. 98.

In adoption, the legal rights and responsibilities of the biological parents to the child are terminated. These rights and responsibilities are legally transferred to adoption parents who, in essence, are given "the biological parents' chance to develop a psychological parent-child relationship."[7]

Thus, the adoption parents are entrusted by law with the parental duties and responsibilities of rearing the child, of understanding and guarding his growth, and of providing every opportunity for the fulfillment of his always-changing, physical and psychological needs.

Adoption has a reciprocal purpose: that of providing parents for parentless children and that of providing a child for childless parents or for parents who want a child. This reciprocal purpose has not always been recognized. Earlier trends in adoption had focused more on the needs of parents. This focus changed to a more concentrated emphasis on the needs of the child.[8] [9] Now the focus is centered around a mutuality of needs, the needs of both the child and the parents in the adoptive family relationship.[10] [11]

---

[7]Goldstein et al., Best Interests, p. 22.

[8]Iris Goodacre, Adoption Policy and Practice (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1966), p. 15.

[9]Alfred Kadushin, "Adoption," Encyclopedia of Social Work, 16th issue, I, p. 107.

[10]Kadushin, "Adoption," p. 107.

[11]Doris E. Guyatt, "Adoption in Ontario," Journal: Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies, X (November, 1967), p. 14.

Adoption involves three sets of people: the child, the prospective adoption parents, and the biological parents. Each becomes involved in adoption for certain valid reasons. These reasons are rooted in the unfilfillment of some basic human needs, needs that cannot be satisfied within their own personal environment. The satisfaction of these needs are conducive to healthy human functioning. The frustration of these needs can and often does lead to serious emotional difficulties. Bernard stresses the emotional health aspects of adoption:

> Adoption can offer one of the soundest and happiest solutions to emotional problems resulting from frustrated basic needs of parentless children, childless parents, and those who cannot fulfill the role of parent for the children they have borne.[12]

Children need parents to protect them and to care for them in a healthy emotional way. They need parents to prepare them for their eventual step into society. In its section on adoption, the Task Force on Selected Issues and Relationships cites the assumption on which the above needs are based: " . . . the best environment for the healthy emotional and social development of a child is within the security of a family."[13] This security of a family is possible through adoption where children can be "provided with the parental love, nurture, and family life that is so

---

[12]Viola W. Bernard, "Adoption," The Encyclopedia of Mental Health, I, p. 70.

[13]Report on Selected Issues and Relationships, H. R. Hanson, chairman (Toronto: Ministry of Community and Social Services, January, 1974), p. 57.

important for their healthy mental and emotional development."[14]

Couples who for some reason cannot bear their own children have many anxieties related to this biological deprivation. These anxieties can be lessened considerably though the adoption of a child which gives them the "opportunity for the emotional fulfillment of parenthood."[15]

Parents, married and unmarried, who for some reason cannot provide the necessary care for their biological children, "can nevertheless provide for their children's future welfare"[16] through adoption. In addition, adoption "can often prevent overburdening their capacity for life adjustment."[17]

A Review of Present Adoption Processes

A review of present adoption processes is required before discussing adoption breakdown.

Adoption agencies are agencies established to bring about and safeguard the benefits of adoption and to ensure the legal rights of all parties involved. Their mandate to carry out these broad functions comes from the enactment of laws that protect the rights of the persons concerned in adoption: the child, the adoption parents, and the biological

---

[14]Bernard, "Adoption," p. 70.

[15]Ibid.

[16]Ibid.

[17]Ibid.

parents.

The principal duty of an adoption agency is to safeguard the interests of the child. Broader duties consist of the investigation of the circumstances of the adoption which entails a sequential series of tasks leading up to a Court Order that finalizes the whole adoption process. As a result of this whole process, the adoption parents and the child assume the same rights and obligations toward each other that existed previously between the child and his biological parents.

The tasks associated with the investigation of the circumstances of the adoption involve: 1) determining the eligibility of the child for adoption; 2) studying and assessing the child's particular needs; 3) determining the eligibility of the adoptive applicants; 4) studying and assessing the adoption applicants' capacities for parenthood; 5) selecting the adoption applicants and the child who are best suited for each other in terms of their personal needs; 6) studying and assessing the adoption applicants and the child during preplacement, placement, and post placement; 7) offering counselling services after placement as the "new" family adjusts to its "new" experience.[18] [19] [20]

---

[18] Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies, Standards of Practice and Procedure in Adoption, Revised, 1968, pp. 1-12.

[19] Child Welfare League of America, Guidelines for Adoption Service, revised, 1968, pp. 8-15.

[20] A. E. Leeding, Child Care Manual for Social Workers (second edition; London: Butterworths, 1971), pp. 124-138.

In Ontario, adoption work is carried on by the adoption departments of the fifty Children's Aid Societies under the authority of Part IV of the Child Welfare Act (1965). Adoption work involves certain procedural steps and these will now be outlined from the initial intake process to the final decree issued by the Court.

Once a couple who have decided to adopt come to the Children's Aid Society, they are referred to an adoption intake worker. The adoption intake worker records basic information on the couple and provides general information "relating to legal and Society requirements and to the sort of study in which the applicants will be expected to participate."[21] The legal requirements are that the adoption applicants be at least twenty-one years of age and legally married.[22] The Society requirements refer to the application form, the needed medical examination, and the reference letters.

A booklet[23] explaining some facts on adoption is given to the prospective adoption applicants. Additional interviews on an individual or group basis are employed to clarify what they can realistically expect from adoption and to dispel some of the misconceptions associated with it.

---

[21]Ontario, Standards of Practice and Procedure in Adoption, p. 7.

[22]Child Welfare Act, Revised Statutes of Ontario, Vol. I, Part IV, Sec. 72 (1970).

[23]Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies, The Adoption Story in the 1970's, 1973, pp. 1-12.

If they are still interested, they are given an application form. As soon as the completed application form is returned to the Society it is assigned to an adoption caseworker who follows it up within the time limit outlined in the Child Welfare Act (1965) which states that:

> 20. Every society shall,
> (a) within thirty days after receiving an application to board or adopt a child, begin an investigation of the application;[24]

The adoption home study begins. In a series of interviews, separately and jointly, with the male and female applicants, the adoption caseworker attempts to appraise their capacities for parenthood. A number of publications elaborate on some general areas that adoption caseworkers should deal with in this appraisal of adoption applicants' suitability for parenthood. The Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies' publication, Standards of Practice and Procedure in Adoption,[25] outlines the following important areas: 1) emotional maturity of the applicants; 2) the quality of their marital relationship; 3) their feelings about children and childlessness; 4) their motivation to adopt; and 5) their intellectual capacity. Other publications, including some from research, also reflect the same general areas.[26]

---

[24]Regulation 86 under the Child Welfare Act, Revised Regulations of Ontario, Vol. 1, Sec. 20 (a), (1970).

[25]Standards of Practice and Procedure in Adoption, pp. 6-7.

[26]Bernard, "Adoption," pp. 86-87; F. G. Brown, "What Do We Seek in Adoptive Parents?" Social Casework, XXXII

The number of interviews required to appraise the adoption applicants is entirely dependent on the worker. The Child Welfare Act (1965) sets no minimum or maximum standard; it states the following:

> 20. Every society shall,
> (a) interview separately and jointly the male and female applicants and assess the consequences for other children in the home of the applicants, of granting the application;[27]

When the assessment is completed, a report[28] is written and a decision is made to accept or not to accept their home. The assessment of the adoption applicants is based entirely on the adoption caseworker's judgement, but, the decision to accept or not to accept is made conjointly with the supervisor of adoption or the local director, the person in charge of the society.

The adoption applicants are then advised of the decision. A favourable decision initiates another process, assuming that there is an available child of the particular age range desired by the adoption applicants and that he is

---

(March, 1951), pp. 155-61; A. J. Simon, "Evaluation of Adoptive Parents," in a Study of Adoption Practice, Vol. II, ed. by M. Shapiro (New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1956), pp. 160-163; Raymond Mundloh, "Changing Practice in the Adoptive Home Study," Child Welfare, LXVIII (March, 1969), pp. 148-156; M. Shapiro, A Study of Adoption Practice, Vol. I (New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1956), pp. 79-81; Guidelines for Adoption Service, pp. 11-12.

[27] Revised Regulations of Ontario, Sec. 20(b).

[28] See Appendix I for one sample of an adoption home-study dictation outline employed by a Children's Aid Society in Ontario.

eligible[29] for adoption. This process involves the task of evaluating the child's and the adoption applicants' suitability for each other. The eligible child's particular needs have already been assessed. The adoption caseworker then begins to discuss the child with the prospective adoption couple. The discussion with the prospective adoption couple entails the sharing of information about the child that will help them to better understand his particular needs and problems and to decide whether or not they can accept him into their home. This information includes the reasons why the child was brought into care, the particulars about his biological family, and the details of his physical and emotional health such as his developmental history, feeding or eating habits, medical history, personality and temperament, and known hereditary factors that may influence his future development.[30] The adoption couple then must decide for themselves whether or not to accept the child.

When the adoption couple decides to accept the child, the adoption caseworker begins to explain and plan the placement process with them. The placement process is composed of three sub-processes: the pre-placement process, the placement process, and the post-placement process.

The pre-placement process is devoted to the careful preparation of the child for imminent adoption. Visits are

---

[29]Revised Statutes of Ontario, Sec. 73 (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8).

[30]Standards of Practice and Procedure in Adoption, p. 10.

arranged, inconspicuously at first, to give the prospective adoption couple the opportunity to view the child and to meet with him without his knowing their adoption intention.

The placement process involves the child actually visiting with his prospective adoption parents in their home. These visits are brief ones, initially, with the adoption caseworker present "to try to make the move with as little disturbance as possible."[31] Gradually, the visits are extended and with the adoption worker absent until both the adoption couple and the child are ready for the final placement, the child moving into their home. Of course,

> the number and place of meetings should be decided on an individual basis taking into account the age, the personality and the security the child develops in being with the adoptive parents.[32]

The post-placement process involves the supervision of the adoption placement:

> Supervision following the placement of a child on an adoption is a casework service, having a dual purpose of providing (1) protection for the child and (2) casework help that may be needed by the adopting parents and the child in helping them become a family.[33]

The Child Welfare Act (1965) requires only that the adoption caseworker visit the home within seven days after the final placement.[34] The number of further visits by the adoption

---

[31] Gordon Asquith, "Adoption and the Placement Process," Social Worker, XXXVI (February, 1968), p. 25.

[32] Standards of Practice and Procedure in Adoption, p. 11.

[33] Ibid.

[34] The Revised Statutes of Ontario, Sec. 75(a).

caseworker to the adoption home is dependent upon the satisfactory or dissatisfactory adjustment of both the child and the adoption parents. There is a minimum of six months in which to follow-up the decision of placing the child in the adoptive home.[35] This six months is referred to as the adoption probation period.

Once the six month probationary period is over and the adoption caseworker is satisfied that it is in the best interests of the child to be adopted by the adoptive parents, an adoption order is made through the Court:

> 83. (1) For all purposes, as of the date of the making of an adoption order,
>
> (a) the adopted child becomes the child of the adopting parent and the adopting parent becomes the parent of the adopted child;
>
> and
>
> (b) the adopted child ceases to be the child of the person who was his parent before the adoption order was made and that person ceases to be the parent of the adopted child,
>
> as if the adopted child had been born in lawful wedlock to the adopting parent.[36]

This is the final step. It alters the status of the child as well as that of the adoption parents. The child is given "new" parents, and the parents are given a child.

Adoption Breakdown

Not all of the adoption placements reach the stage where they can be legalized through the court. Some break

---

[35] The Revised Statutes of Ontario, Sec. 75 (a).

[36] The Revised Statutes of Ontario, Sec. 83, Sub-Sec. (1), (a), (b).

down in the adoption post-placement process. These breakdowns are explained as those that occur after the final placement of the child in the adoption home and before a legal adoption decree is issued by the Court. This explanation is confined within the limits of the adoption probation period which varies anywhere from a minimum of six months in Ontario to one year in Newfoundland and New Brunswick.[37]

An adoption breakdown, a failed adoption, and an abortive adoption placement are all terms that mean the removal of a child from an adoption home for any reason within the time limit of the probationary period. In effect, a failure in adoption is a breakdown in the post-placement process which can be attributed to the child, the adoption parents, the role of the adoption agency involved.

This definition of failure equivocally defines a successful adoption as an adoption that is legalized through the Court at the end of the probationary period. However, it is highly conceivable that failures occur after legalization.

In Ontario, those adoption placements that require the removal of the child from the adoption home after final placement and before legalization are referred to as adoption breakdowns.

When an adoption breaks down, the Children's Aid Society involved is required by the Children's Services Bureau, formerly known as the Child Welfare Branch, to complete a

---

[37]Adoption Act, Revised Statutes of New Brunwick, Vol. I, Section 19, Welfare of Children Act, Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, Vol. I, Section 140.

form. This form is called an Information on Adoption Breakdown form. It is composed of information on the social characteristics of the placed child and the adoption parents and some facts related to Society processes in carrying out the adoption. The form is completed by the adoption caseworker, the supervisor of adoptions or the local director, usually within thirty days after the adoption breakdown.[38] The Information on Adoption Breakdown form is explained in greater detail in a subsequent chapter on methodology.

---

[38]Victoria Leach, Provincial Adoption Supervisor, Ontario, in an interview, April 16, 1974.

CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In order to present a clearer picture of the dynamics involved in adoptions and adoption breakdowns, we will examine some of the literature concerning families, attachment and separation behaviour during child development, adopted children, adoptive parents and some significant factors in adoption breakdowns.

The Family

> Family . . . is generally perceived as the fundamental unit responsible for and capable of providing a child on a continuing basis with an environment which serves his numerous physical and mental needs during immaturity.[39]

Children have no psychological conception of relationship by blood-tie until late in their development.[40] What is significant to them, however, is the daily interchanges with the adults who take care of them and who, as a result, become their parent figures.

Parents carry out important socializing functions such as increasing the child's capacity to postpone gratification, laying the foundations for the child's own control of his drives and impulses, beginning his consideration of others

---

[39] Goldstein et al., Best Interests, p. 13.

[40] Ibid.

and representing a set of values and attitudes toward work and community with which the child can identify.

Experiences with siblings strengthen the capacities which parents encourage, enabling the child to "... gain a sense of community and to provide additional opportunities for the child to form his conceptions of sharing, fair play and justice."[41]

Bowlby states that no variables have more far-reaching effects on personality development than have a child's experiences within his family, for during his development, in his relations with his family he builds working models of how attachment figures are likely to behave toward him in any of a variety of situations.[42]

Formation of Attachments and Attachment Behaviour During Child Development

Child development is considered to be a result of successive interactions between genetically determined and environmentally influenced behaviours and the physical and social environment which, in infants, usually consists of the caretaking provided in a family by parents or parent surrogates.[43]

The first attachment which develops during infancy is a social relationship and the infant does not form a

---

[41] Goldstein et al., Best Interests, p. 14.

[42] John Bowlby, Attachment and Loss, Vol. 1: Attachment (New York: Basic Books Inc., 1969), p. 369.

[43] John A. Rose, "A Reevaluation of the Concepts of Separation in Child Welfare," Child Welfare, Vol. 41, p. 455.

psychological relationship to a particular parent figure. As evidenced by much research, the infant cannot perceive and distinguish mother as a particular individual to whom he has an emotional tie until about six months of age.[44] As long as he is tenderly, consistently and continually cared for, his mother is interchangeable with any other person. He believes in an object only for as long as he sees it and he has no sense of permanence.[45] The infant's smile is a primary reaction to social stimuli and not a recognition of a familiar person.[46]

Chess et al. view this primary reaction behaviour in infants as the formation of a social tie.[47] Rose also discusses the special social tie that exists between parents and offspring and describes it as " . . . an aspect of species survival mechanism by which the experience of the social group is utilized in the guidance of the immature organism."[48]

Since, then, during the first six months of life, infant responses are primarily social in nature as opposed to

---

[44]Rene Spitz, The First Year of Life (New York: International Universities Press, Inc., 1965) and John Bowlby, Attachment.

[45]John Piaget, The Construction of Reality and the Child (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1954).

[46]Spitz, The First Year of Life, p. 88.

[47]S. Chess, H. G. Birch, A. Thomas and M. Hirtzig, "Implications of a Longitudinal Study of Child Development for Child Psychiatry," American Journal of Psychiatry, 1960, p. 436.

[48]Rose, "Reevaluation," p. 447.

emotional, and mother can be interchangeable with any other person, psychological relationships are not developed in early infancy and removal from mother is not a disrupting experience for the infant.

In discussing attachment behaviour Bowlby states:

> . . . attachment behavior is regarded as what occurs when certain behavioral systems are activated. The behavioral systems themselves are believed to develop within the infant as a result of his interaction with his environment of evolutionary adoptedness and especially of his interaction with the principle figure in that environment, namely his mother.[49]

The physical realities of conception and birth are not the direct cause of the child's emotional attachment to his parents.[50] When his emotional demands for affection and companionship are met reliably and regularly, the emotional relationship begins to develop. After about twelve months when the child acquires some locomotion and ability to broaden his exploratory and learning behaviour, fairly typical attachment behaviour is seen.

> By that age [12 months] in most children the integrate of behavioral systems concerned is readily activated especially by mother's departure or by anything frightening, and the stimuli that most effectively terminate the systems are sound, sight or touch of mother.[51]

At about age three, the systems to which Bowlby refers, become less easily activated and they also undergo other changes that make proximity to mother less urgent.

---

[49]Bowlby, Attachment, pp. 179-180.

[50]Goldstein et al., Best Interests, p. 17.

[51]Bowlby, Attachment, p. 179.

During adolescence and adult life, yet further changes occur, including change of figures toward whom attachment behaviour is directed.

Separation Behaviour During Child Development

After about the sixth month, the child reacts with anxiety to separation from his principle caretaker and to being with a stranger.[52] However, his capacity to cope with physical separation without experiencing disorganizing anxiety is dependent upon age and attained physical and social maturity, which in turn are functions of previous environmental experience[53] including continuity of relationships. Small dosages of separation, according to Hoopes et al., and properly timed brief breaks in the closeness between mother and child are needed for ego development and growing differentiation.[54] John Rose has observed that children highly involved in the stimulation pattern of a particular caretaker with little experience in being cared for by others will react catastrophically to separation when it takes place abruptly.[55] The younger the child, in general, the more definitive the reaction will be with the exception of

---

[52]Bernard, "Adoption," p. 76.

[53]Rose, "Reevaluation," p. 447.

[54]Janet L. Hoopes, Roberta H. Andrews, Elizabeth A. Lawder, Katherine D. Laurer and Edmund A. Sherman, A Followup Study of Adoptions, Vol. II: Post-Placement Functioning of Adopted Children (New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1969), p. 11.

[55]Rose, "Reevaluation," p. 453.

infants under the age of six months. "Likewise, children with previous inadequate or inconsistent supervision will fear strange caretaking environments and will react to them as potentially dangerous and punitive."[56] Bowlby has also stated:

> When an insecure individual uncertain whether his attachment figures are going to be accessible and responsive, or even alive, is faced with potentially fear - arousing situations, he is more likely to respond with intense fear than an individual who feels secure and confident in his attachment figures.[57]

Erikson[58] and Goldstein et al.[59] discuss the importance of continuity of relationships. Erikson states that a sense of basic trust is considered the earliest criterion of healthy personality development as it provides the child with a sense of identity, " . . . a sense accrued throughout the stages of childhood that there is continuity, sameness and meaning to one's life history."[60] Goldstein et al. state:

> Continuity of relationships, surroundings and environmental influence are essential for a child's normal development. The instability of all mental processes needs to be offset by stability and uninterrupted support from external sources. Smooth growth is arrested or disrupted when upheavals and changes in the external world are added to the internal ones.[61]

---

[56]Rose, "Reevaluation," p. 453.

[57]John Bowlby, Attachment and Loss, Vol. II: Separation (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1969), p. 313.

[58]Henry W. Maier, Three Theories of Child Development. Revised ed. (New York: Harper & Row Publishers Inc., 1969).

[59]Goldstein et al., Best Interests.

[60]Maier, Three Theories, p. 34.

[61]Goldstein et al., Best Interests, pp. 31-32.

Bowlby has observed three main phases of the separation process, experienced to different degrees at different ages: (1) Protest: during this phase the child protests and tries vigourously to recover his mother. He displays separation anxiety; (2) Despair: during this phase although he despairs of recovering mother, the child remains preoccupied with her and remains vigilant for her return. He displays grief and mourning; (3) Detachment: during this phase the child seems to lose his interest in his mother and to become emotionally detached from her. This is displayed in the form of a defense mechanism.[62] Some of Bowlby's findings in regard to particular age groups are: in children from about 11 months up to three years, reactions of intense anxiety and distress are displayed when separated from mother, but they quickly recover when rejoined either by mother or a stranger; a child of three years is less likely to be upset and he is also quick to recover; a child of four may be either little affected or very distressed; and a girl, in the absence of mother, tends to make friends more readily with strangers than a boy.[63]

When infants and young children find themselves abandoned by the parent, they not only suffer separation distress and anxiety, but also setbacks in the quality of their next attachments, which will be less trustful.[64]

---

[62]Bowlby, Separation, p. 27.

[63]Ibid., pp. 52-53.

[64]Goldstein et al., Best Interests, p. 33.

Goldstein et al. explain:

> Where continuity of such relationships is interrupted more than once, as happens due to multiple placements in the early years, the children's emotional attachments become increasingly shallow and indiscriminate. They tend to grow up as persons who lack warmth in their contacts with fellow beings.[65]

Further to this, Rose comments that in such situations the child is less able to use adult caretakers for guidance and support.[66]

For young children up to five years every disruption in continuity also affects those achievements which are rooted and develop in the intimate interchange with a stable parent figure. The more recently the achievement has been acquired, the easier it is for the child to lose it.[67] An example which commonly occurs is a breakdown in toilet-training.

In school-age children, disruptions in continuity with parent figures

> . . . effect above all, those achievements which are based on identification with the parents' demands, prohibitions and social ideals. Such identifications develop only where attachments are stable, and tend to be abandoned if the child feels abandoned by the adults in question . . . Resentment toward the adults who have disappointed them in the past makes them adopt the attitude of not caring for anybody; or of making the new parent the scapegoat for the short comings of the former one. In any case, multiple placement at this age . . . becomes the direct cause of behavior which the schools experience as disrupting, the courts label as dissocial, delinquent or even criminal.[68]

---

[65]Goldstein et al., Best Interests, p. 33.

[66]Rose, "Reevaluation," p. 454.

[67]Goldstein et al., Best Interests, p. 33.

[68]Ibid., pp. 33-34.

In the developmental stage of adolescence, the teenager is attempting to establish his own independent adult identity. His actions during this stage indicate a desire to discontinue parental relationships and search for his own identity.[69] For a healthy resolution of this developmental crisis it is important that any disruptions in continuity come exclusively from his side and not be imposed on him by any form of abandonment or rejection on the part of his parent figures.[70]

It is thus evident that experiences of separation from attachment figures whether of short or long duration and experiences of discontinuity of relationships all act, as Bowlby states,

> . . . to divert development from a pathway that is within optimum limits to one that may be outside them. Often the diversion is neither great nor lengthly so that return to the mainline remains fairly easy. At other times, by contrast, a diversion is both greater and lasts longer or else is repeated; then a return to the mainline becomes far more difficult and it may prove impossible.[71]

The Adopted Child

In the following discussion of the adopted child, the main emphasis is placed on children who are past infancy, for two reasons: (1) Since it has been shown that children under six months do not experience attachment and separation emotions, adoption before this age does not carry with it

---

[69]Maier, Three Theories, p. 35.

[70]Goldstein et al., Best Interests, p. 34.

[71]Bowlby, Separation, p. 370.

the problems of separation and replacement experienced by older children, and age of the child in these cases would therefore not be a factor in adoption breakdowns; and (2) It has been found in previous studies that most children coming into care today do so because

> . . . the home environment has become disadvantageous for their development . . . and in the case of each individual placement of a child, there is greater than random probability that replacement will be unsuccessful at a later time.[72]

In placing the emphasis on the potential problem areas of the adopted child at different stages in his development, it will be our intention to illustrate some of the possible variables involved in adoption breakdowns.

A high rate of adopted children seen in clinical practice has prompted much research in the area of the adopted child.[73] Florence Clothier has summed up the central issue in the problems of adopted children in the following statement:

> A deep identification with our forbears as experienced originally in the mother-child relationship, gives us most fundamental security . . . Every adopted child at some point in his development has been deprived of his primitive relationship with his mother. This trauma and the removing of the individual from his

---

[72]Rose, "Reevaluation," p. 455.

[73]Marshall Schechter, "Observations on Adopted Children," Archives of General Psychiatry, Vol. 3, No. 1 (July, 1960), pp. 21-32; Nathan Simon and Audrey Senturia, "Adoption and Psychiatric Illness," American Journal Of Psychiatry, Vol. 122 No. 8 (February, 1966); H. David Kirk, Kurt Jonassohn and Ann D. Fish, "Are Adopted Children Especially Vulnerable to Stress?" Archives of General Psychiatry, Vol. 14, No. 3 (March, 1966), pp. 291-298; Florence Clothier, "The Psychology of the Adopted Child," Mental Hygiene, Vol. 27 (April, 1943).

racial anticedents, lie at the core of what is peculiar to the psychology of the adopted child.[74]

In a study of 120 children seen in private psychiatric practice, Schechter found twenty-one to be adopted children.[75] This is 13.3 per cent of his child caseload, whereas in the general population he calculated approximately .134 per cent of children under the age of twenty-one are adopted. The reasons for referral were as varied as is generally found in pediatric psychiatric practice. However, one of the main differences was that many of the adoptive parents reported "... an aloofness and a distance that made closeness impossible."[76]

Littner traces the adopted child from the beginning of placement and outlines the main psychological crises he must resolve to explain some of the observed behaviour of adopted children.[77] First, some children must master the painful feelings aroused by the separation from their natural parents. Then they must resolve for themselves the initial feeling of being placed with new parents. During the transition period until the child is able to discover what his new parents are really like, he tends to displace into them and to expect from them the punishment which he feels he

---

[74]Clothier, "Adopted Child," p. 722.

[75]Schechter, "Observations on Adopted Children," p. 21.

[76]Ibid., p. 26.

[77]Ner Littner, Some Traumatic Effects of Separation and Placement (New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1967).

deserves for causing the separation.[78] The child is unconscious of many of these feelings and fears because they are repressed. Since many of his separation and placement-induced feelings are repressed, a great deal of anxiety can be observed. As discussed in the previous section, this anxiety is often expressed in abnormal behaviour.

Littner describes the existence of a third problem in the adopted child as an emotional Achilles heel.[79] His explanation for this is that the child may be unduly sensitive to any experience that for him implies a threat of separation and replacement from his new parents. As the child forms a relationship with his new parents he also becomes afraid of getting too close to them emotionally, for in the past, emotional closeness has in many cases resulted in rejection and replacement. Also, loving his new parents implies disloyalty to the old.[80]

A fourth problem the adopted child has, involves learning how to accept his wish to be close to his new parents and how to ". . . come to peace with the anticipation of rejection by them and the associated separation-induced painful feelings and fears about his own parents."[81] His behaviour may reflect a need to fend off his new parents and

---

[78] Littner, Traumatic Effects, p. 10.

[79] Ibid., p. 11.

[80] Ibid., p. 12.

[81] Ibid., p. 13.

so keep them at a safe emotional distance to the degree that he cannot tolerate these painful emotions but must instead keep them repressed.[82]

This problem of emotional distance of adopted children is mentioned also by Tousseing in relation to the adolescent, in a personal communication to Schechter. As discussed earlier, the adolescent is searching for his own identity, and in this process, gains independence from his parents. Tousseing states:

> The adolescence of adopted children seems to be a particularly difficult one because it is harder for adoptive adolescents to accept their rebellion against the adoptive parents, to give them up as love objects. Furthermore, I have now seen a number of cases in which children in adolescence start roaming around almost aimlessly . . . They seem to be seeking the fantasied 'good, real parents.'[83]

Tousseing also suggests that the emotional distance of many adopted children is an identification with the distant real parents.

Each child experiences adoption in a different way. Some of the child's concern about emotional closeness may have existed with his own parents prior to separation. It is also possible that the child may experience realistic problems with the new parents themselves. He may not even experience any serious problems at all.

Adoptive Parents

A study of the child is only one aspect of the

---

[82]Littner, Traumatic Effects, p. 13.

[83]Schechter, "Observations of Adopted Children," p. 30.

problem of adoption breakdowns. The potential difficulties inherent in being an adoptive parent must also be examined to contribute to a balanced perspective of adoption breakdowns.

Although adoption is a process which is designed to create families, adoptive families differ from biological families. In writing about adoptive parents, Schechter has said:

> There is evidence that parental infertility and the circumstances surrounding raising someone else's child create stresses in the adoptive situation that are different from those occurring in the biologically derived family . . . It is important to analyze the particular and unusual strains and stresses to which this nonbiologically derived relationship can be subjected.[84]

There are many reasons why couples adopt, but the prevalent reason in our society today is infertility.[85] When confronted by an inability to bear children, an adult must make a major revision in his body image and self concept. "To be infertile represents an enormous narcissistic blow to the male and female both."[86] The adoptive couple must undergo repeated physical examinations, intense scrutiny from adoption agencies and questions from family and friends, before they are granted the privilege of becoming parents.

---

[84]Marshall Schechter, "About Adoptive Parents," in Parenthood: Its Psychology and Psychopathology, ed. James Anthony and Therese Benedek (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1970), p. 355.

[85]Ibid., p. 353.

[86]Ibid., p. 360.

One adoptive couple describes their experience in these words:

> . . . we did feel entirely at their [agency's] hands and nervous about antagonizing them in any way - after all, they had the babies! There is a feeling of utter helplessness.[87]

The biological parents are independent in their procurement of a child, but adoptive couples are dependent on the services of the adoption agency and ultimately the adoption worker.

"The period of pregnancy provides a couple with a known timetable that moves them imperceptibly toward progressive involvement in their coming parental tasks."[88] Pregnancy is a developmental phase during which

> . . . fantasies are actively stimulated and parental attitudes develop, shift and modify . . . This development (which helps place the final stamp on male and female identification) is not the living experience of the non-fecund couple.[89]

Preparation for adoptive parenthood tends to be abrupt and although there is usually a lengthy waiting period, it lacks this clear-cut timetable by which the couple or family can shape their feelings and thoughts in preparation for their new roles.

Some couples respond to the need to adopt with intense feelings of deprivation and anger, which may be reflected in

---

[87]Noel Timms, ed., The Receiving End (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973).

[88]H. David Kirk, Shared Fate: A Theory of Adoption and Mental Health (Toronto: Macmillan and Co.,1964), p. 7.

[89]Schechter, "About Adoptive Parents," p. 360.

their child-rearing attitude. Some parents decline from telling their child he is adopted for fear this will activate in them the feeling of being defective.[90]

A problem can also lie in the adoptive parents' inability to allow normal separation and individuation since " . . . any disengagement from themselves heralds an attachment to others, and places them in the state of being childless once again."[91] Kirk describes this situation in the adoptive family as "incongruity . . . in adoptive role obligations."[92] He explains that the norms of a family require progressive differentiation on a firmly established base of integration and in the biological family this progression from dependence to autonomy is facilitated by their ascribed blood-familial status. Adoptive parents, however, are expected to reveal the fact of adoption to the child and allow normal progression from dependence to autonomy, thus engaging in differentiating aspects, while at the same time integrating their adopted child into their family. This is a particularly difficult task for the adoptive parents when the child is in adolescence and may, in his search for identity, attempt to locate his natural parents. In these cases the anxiety is that the child will never return to them but

---

[90] Schechter, "About Adoptive Parents," p. 363.

[91] Ibid.

[92] H. David Kirk, "A Dilemma of Adoptive Parenthood: Incongruous Role Obligations," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1959, Vol. 21, p. 317.

rather that " . . . he will discard them in favour of his blood relatives."[93] This fear can unconsciously force the adoptive parents to prove their family unity, thus provoking stronger rebellion in their adolescent child.

At the birth of their first child, parents are usually in their twenty's and have been married about 1 1/2 to 2 years, whereas adopting parents are typically seven to eight years older than biological parents.[94] Both these factors, in the biological parents, i.e. the spouses ages and the length of their marriage at the birth of their first child, may be considered in favour of relatively easy transition to the changes which parental roles imply. On the other hand, adoptive parents have had more time to solidify their marriage and may therefore be better prepared for parenthood. In a longitudinal study of children adopted between infancy and three years of age, Jaffee and Fanshel found that the age of the adoptive couple at the inception of the adoption process was a "relatively insignificant" factor in the life adjustment of the child.[95] Hoopes et al. in a follow-up study of adoptions also found that the ages of the adoptive parents at the time of the adoption placement made no difference in later adopted child functioning.[96]

---

[93]Schechter, "About Adoptive Parents," p. 366.

[94]Kirk, Shared Fate, p. 9.

[95]Benson Jaffee and David Fanshel, How They Fared in Adoption: A Follow-up Study (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970), p. 258.

[96]Hoopes et al., Post-Placement Functioning, p. 74.

We have discussed here some of the factors which distinguish adoptive parents from natural parents and which also have the potential to make the adoption process more vulnerable.

Significant Factors in Adoption Breakdowns

Adoption in infancy gives to the adoptive parents the same opportunity that the biological parents have to develop a close emotional parent-child relationship. This chance is diminished if adoption occurs at a later stage, after the child has had earlier placements, where he has formed or broken earlier attachments or experienced separations. It is also diminished by the statutory probationary period before adoption is finalized.[97] Adoptive parents have, at the point of placement, already been approved, but must wait for at least six months before the adoption is finalized. During this time the Children's Aid Society has the opportunity to interrupt the developing relationship and remove the child. This presents an uncertainty for both the child and the parents which may inhibit the development of the parent-child relationship.

In several studies it has been found that girls adjust better in adoptive placements than boys.[98] Weinstein attributes this to the fact that norms for girls tend to be more

---

[97]Kirk, Shared Fate, p. 11.

[98]Eugene Weinstein and Paul Geisel, "An Analysis of Sex Differences in Adjustment," Child Development, Vol. 31, No. 4 (Dec. 1960), pp. 721-728 and Alfred Kadushin and Frederick W. Seidl, "Adoption Breakdown: A Social Work Postmortem," Social Work, Vol. 16 (July, 1971), pp. 32-38.

consistent, clear-cut and consonant with avenues of behaviour open to the child than is the case for boys."[99]

In Jaffee and Fanshel's study, they found that children when adopted between infancy and three years, fared better in adoption homes containing one or more other children than adoptees placed with childless couples.[100] Consonant with these findings, adoptive parents who had had other children prior to adopting were prone to express relatively little dissatisfaction with their adoptive experience as compared with couples whose first child was the adoptee. Jaffee and Fanshel also found that the number of placements experienced by a child who was placed between infancy and three years bore very little relation to his subsequent life adjustment.[101]

The child under the age of six years seems to be more vulnerable than a child over the age of six years to the effects of placement.[102] This does not, of course, include the new-born infant up to about six months, who cannot experience separation effects, as he has not yet formed a close parent-child relationship.

In a study on adoption failures before legalization, Kadushin and Seidl found that age at placement was clearly

---

[99]Weinstein and Geisel, "Sex Differences," p. 727.

[100]Jaffee and Fanshel, How They Fared, p. 254.

[101]Ibid., p. 253.

[102]Littner, Traumatic Effects, p. 20.

related to placement failure, ". . . older children being over-represented in the failure group at a statistically significant level."[103] Fifty-six percent of the breakdowns were of children between two and six years of age. Kadushin and Seidl also found that multiple placements, which involve the simultaneous placement of more than one child is highly associated with placement failure.[104]

In a study of 10,000 placements in Great Britain by Kornitzer and Rowe, it was found that 64 per cent of adoption failures were among the second child placed in the adoptive home.[105] Although this is contrary to Jaffee and Fanshel's findings of better adjustment of children in homes where there were other siblings, it must be kept in mind that Jaffee and Fanshel studied only adoptees up to three years and the Kornitzer and Rowe study included children of all ages.

In this chapter we have explained the dynamics involved in adoption breakdowns by reviewing the literature on such related areas as the family, attachment and separation behaviour during child development, special characteristics of the adopted child and the adoptive parent, and some past findings from studies concerned with adoptions.

---

[103]Kadushin and Seidl, "Adoption Breakdown," p. 34.

[104]Ibid.

[105]Ibid., p. 36.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

The methodology we employed in carrying out this project is described under the following headings: (1) Statement of Purpose; (2) Operational Definitions; (3) Type of Study; (4) Population and Sample; (5) Data Collection; (6) Limitations; and (7) Data Analysis.

Statement of Purpose

The purposes of this project were to explore adoptive breakdowns in Ontario in order to establish a descriptive profile of the salient characteristics of breakdown. Stated more specifically, the purposes were:

(1) To describe the adoptive breakdowns in relation to the social characteristics of the placed child and the prospective adoption parents, the adoptive family composition, the Society-related child placement processes, and the reasons for breakdown;

(2) To identify some of the major factors in the Society-related child placement processes which may be associated with adoption breakdowns;

(3) To consider how these factors are related to one another for the development of hypotheses for further investigation in the area of breakdown;

(4) To comment on the findings and their implications for adoption processes in Ontario.

Operational Definitions

This section defines some of the terms employed in

the study. The definitions of the terms are referred to as operational definitions and serve to indicate precisely what the terms meant to us. It should perhaps be noted that as employees of the Children's Aid Society, we were quite familiar with some of the terms that deal with the adoption process and adoption breakdowns.

The term Adoption Breakdown was defined in this study as the return of a Society-placed child to an Ontario Children's Aid Society at any time, for any reason, following adoption placement and prior to legalization of the adoption through the Court.

The term Society was employed to define any one of the 50 Children's Aid Societies in Ontario.

The term Society-related child placement processes was employed to refer to the following:

(a) What prompted adopting applicants to express an interest in adoption;

(b) Inter-agency placements;

(c) Resources used by the Society in making the adoption placement;

(d) Pre-placement interviews;

(e) Post-placement interviews;

(f) Visits of prospective adoptive applicants to child and visits of child to prospective adoptive applicants;

(g) Multiple placements;

(h) Removal of the child.

The term Pre-Placement Interviews referred to the interviews conducted by the Society before the child was placed in the prospective adoption home.

The term Post-Placement Interviews referred to the interviews conducted by the Society after the child was placed in the prospective adoption home.

The term Inter-Agency Placement referred to a placement where two Societies were involved (a child in one Society's care being adopted by parents in another Society's jurisdiction).

The term Multiple Placement was employed to mean the simultaneous placement of more than one child in the same prospective adoption home.

The term Younger Children was employed to mean those children three years of age and younger, whereas the term Older Children was meant to characterize those children older than three years of age.

Type of Study

With respect to the purpose of, and methods used in the present study, the exploratory design was the most appropriate of any other design. The major purpose of exploratory research is

> . . . to refine concepts and to articulate questions and hypotheses for subsequent investigation. A variety of data collection procedures may be used, but less attention is devoted to the accurate description of quantitative relations among variables.[106]

Experimental and quantitative-descriptive studies generally are concerned with testing hypotheses or evaluating

---

[106]Tony Tripodi, Phillip Fellin and Henry J. Meyer, The Assessment of Social Research (Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1969), p. 25.

programmes.[107] Exploratory studies, on the other hand, have as their purpose the formulation of a problem for more precise investigation or of developing hypotheses[108] in a field which " . . . as yet has had limited development and therefore is not prepared for elaborate experimental designs to test complex, abstract hypotheses.[109]

There had been little research conducted in the area of adoption breakdowns and hypotheses had not been developed in this area. Because of the lack of established empirical research in this area, we used as our design the exploratory study which is oriented to theory development.

Our exploratory research on adoption breakdowns was categorized under the subtype of combined exploratory-descriptive. The purpose of this type of study is

> . . . to develop ideas and theoretical generalizations. Descriptions are in both quantitative and qualitative form, and the accumulation of detailed information by such means as participant observation may be found. Sampling procedures are flexible and little concern is usually given to systematic representativeness.[110]

Although we did not use participant observation as a mode of data collection, we produced quantitative and

---

[107]Phillip Fellin, Tony Tripodi and Henry J. Meyer, Exemplars of Social Research (Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1969), p. 139.

[108]Claire Selltiz, Marie Jahoda, Morton Deutsch and Stuart W. Cook, Research Methods in Social Relations (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1959), p. 51.

[109]Alfred Kahn, "The Design of Research," Social Work Research, ed. Norman A. Polansky (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960), p. 51.

[110]Ibid., p. 256.

qualitative descriptions of adoption breakdowns and factors involved therein, from the accumulation of detailed information.

Population and Sample

"A population is the aggregate of all of the cases that conform to some designated set of specifications."[111] The population for the purpose of the present study consisted of all cases of adoption breakdowns in Ontario.

> It is generally much more economical in time, effort and money to get the desired information for only some of the elements than for all of them. When we select some of the elements [cases] with the intention of finding out something about the population from which they are taken we refer to that group of elements as a sample.[112]

We chose as the sample for our study the adoption breakdowns which occurred during the years 1972 and 1973. This represented a sample of 172 cases or elements. The rationale used in selecting these two years for study included the following considerations: they are the two most recent years on which data is complete and therefore would reflect any contemporary trends; it was considered important to study more than one year so as to eliminate any bias which may have occurred during a particular year; while it is recognized that this sample is large in relation to the total adoption breakdowns for 1972-73, it was considered necessary in this study to examine the predominant and most prevalent variables in all

---

[111] Selltiz et al., Research Methods, p. 509.

[112] Ibid., p. 510.

the elements in order to provide an accurate description.

In relation to sampling theory, the method we chose could be described as nonprobability sampling as opposed to probability sampling. "In nonprobability sampling there is no way of estimating the probability that each element has of being included in the sample and no assurance that every element has some chance of being included."[113] This was applicable to our study sample as we chose not to examine breakdowns which occurred prior to 1972. While it was recognized that by studying only the most recent breakdowns, we would not be able to identify characteristics of the previous years' breakdowns, it was felt that only the characteristics of the most recent years were pertinent to the purpose of this study.

The reason that we chose to study breakdowns across the province of Ontario was because Child Welfare laws are provincial and all 50 Children's Aid Societies in the province are governed by the same Child Welfare Act of 1965. Also, all 50 Societies are required to complete a standard form and forward a copy to the Ministry of Community and Social Services within 30 days of an adoption breakdown, so the information is centrally located.

Data Collection

Data for our study was obtained from the Children's Services Bureau's own records. The Bureau had developed its

---

[113] Selltiz et al., Research Methods, pp. 514-515.

own schedule, the Information on Adoption Breakdown form, for reporting pertinent information on adoption breakdown cases. The information in the schedule concentrated on four areas:

1. Placed child characteristics
2. Adoptive parent characteristics
3. Information on Society-related child placement processes
4. Reasons given for the adoption breakdown

Information on the child consisted of age, sex, racial origin, religion, marital status of his natural parents, guardianship status, reason for coming into care, number and duration of foster home placements, whether or not the child had been placed on adoption before, reasons for removal, length of adoption placement, physical health, intellectual disabilities and psychological disabilities.

Information on the adoptive parents consisted of age, religion, racial origin, occupation, whether or not the wife had been employed during the adoption placement, source of interest in adoption, experience as foster parents, and family composition.

Information on Society-related child placement processes consisted of the resources used in making the adoption placement: number of preplacement interviews, visits, and postplacement interviews carried out individually and jointly, with the husband, the wife, and the child.

Information on the reasons for the adoption breakdown consisted of a full, frank statement of the agencies'

opinion as to what the reasons for the breakdown were.

This Information on Adoption Breakdown schedule was adapted for use in the present study and served as our principal source of information. When an adoption breakdown occurred, the agency was required to complete the schedule and to forward it in duplicate to the Adoption Branch of the Children's Services Bureau.[114] The schedule was filled out by the adoption worker who worked with the case, the supervisor of adoptions or, in some instances, the local director generally within 30 days after the breakdown occurred.

We constructed a precoded Master Data Sheet[115] in which the responses were categorized. This was done to facilitate the compilation of the data which was transposed on IBM coding forms. The categories we chose reflected the objectives of our exploratory study which were discussed earlier in this chapter. We attempted to meet what Lazarsfeld and Barton called "the requirement of logical correctness"[116] by adhering to the following basic principles outlined by Selltiz et al.:

1 - The set of categories should be derived from a single classificatory principle.

2 - The set of categories should be exhaustive; that is, it should be possible to place every response in one of the categories of the set.

---

[114]This is a policy of the Adoption Branch, Children's Services Bureau.

[115]See Appendix III.

[116]A. H. Barton and P. Lazarsfeld, "Qualitative Measurement in the Social Sciences: Classification, Typologies, and Indices," The Policy Sciences, eds. H. D. Lasswell and D. Lerner (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1951), pp. 155-192.

3 - The categories within the set should be mutually exclusive; it should not be possible to place a given response in more than one category within the set.[117]

Consequently, we included residual, "catch-all" categories such as "other" or "not ascertainable."

In categorizing some of our data we made use of available methods. These methods appeared to fit our requirements very well. For example, when we classified the reasons for coming into care, we employed Part II, Section 19, sub-section 1(b) of the Child Welfare Act (1965) where twelve reasons are listed. In categorizing occupation, we employed the United States Bureau of Census' classification of occupations[118] which listed several occupations under the general headings we employed. The availability of many occupations listed under a small number of concentrated, general headings made the compilation of the data pertaining to occupation much more simple. In categorizing the reasons for breakdown we made use of some of the classifications employed by Kadushin in his study of adoption failures.[119]

In the early phases of our thinking, we corresponded with Mrs. Victoria Leach, Provincial Head of the Adoption Branch of the Children's Services Bureau, to outline our ideas for this research and to obtain permission for the use

---

[117]Selltiz et al., Research Methods, p. 392.

[118]U. S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1969 (90th Edition) Washington, D. C., 1969, pp. 223-225.

[119]Kadushin and Seidl, "Adoption Breakdown," p. 37.

of the records that were available at the Branch. With her permission and full cooperation, in April of 1974, we compiled all our data directly from the Information on Adoption Breakdown Forms that was facilitated by the use of our Master Data Sheet. We transposed the data in categorized or numbered states onto IBM coding forms. Code numbers and column numbers were listed on the Data Sheet, thus enabling us to record all the information contained in each Information on Adoption Breakdown schedule in a quick, easy, manner.

Selltiz et al.,[120] and Shyne[121] listed several advantages in using available material for research purposes. The obvious ones, as reflected in our procedures, were related to time and economics. Another was reflected in the fact that the Adoption Breakdown Information forms had to be completed very soon after the "occurrence" when the information was very fresh in the recorder's mind, "right on the spot." Selltiz et al., stated:

> since such data are collected in the ordinary course of events, the measurement procedure is less likely to reveal the investigator's purpose or to change the behavior in which he is interested than are some of the other data-collection techniques.[122]

This minimized the dangers of researcher bias. Another advantage lay in the fact that we did not require the co-

---

[120]Selltiz et al., Research Methods, pp. 316-317.

[121]Ann W. Shyne, "Use of Available Material," in Social Work Research, ed. Norman A. Polansky (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960), pp. 106-124.

[122]Selltiz et al., Research Methods, pp. 316-317.

operation of the adoptive parents, the adoption workers or the Children's Aid Societies, about whom information was examined.

Limitations

The disadvantages, though not numerous, were important considerations when we decided to use available material in our study. They had to do with what Shyne[123] referred to as "consistent availability" and with the familiar problems of reliability and validity.

In terms of "consistent availability," the Information on Adoption Breakdown Forms are required to be completed by the Society within thirty days of the occurrence of an adoption breakdown. However, we are not certain whether or not the total number of forms we examined for the years 1972 and 1973 at the Adoption Branch of the Children's Services Bureau reflected the total number of forms completed or that should have been completed. Despite the Bureau's expectation that Information on Adoption Breakdown Forms be completed for every adoption breakdown, it was entirely possible that it was not fulfilled in practice. However, we have no reason to believe that this practice was not consistently carried out.

In terms of reliability and validity, some Information on Adoption Breakdown Forms were incomplete. We disregarded the adoption breakdowns where the information was too in-

---

[123]Shyne, "Available Material," pp. 112-113.

complete. However, we encountered some forms where only one or two parts had not been filled out, such as the Number of Foster Home Placements and the Number of Postplacement Interviews conducted by the Society. We choose to include these forms as part of our study sample because we considered that the lack of information on only one part of the form for one adoption breakdown would not influence our results to any great extent.

Another factor that affected the reliability and validity of our data, in addition to the incompleteness of some Information on Adoption Breakdown Forms, was the terminology employed by the Society person who filled them out. Because workers in adoption come from professional as well as non-professional backgrounds, different uses of some of the terminology required to complete the forms were encountered. This varied use of terminology could have been evidenced in the Society person's recording of the intelligence of the child or his physical health.

Still another factor centered around the subjectivity attached to certain sections of the form such as the sections on Intelligence, Physical Health, and Reasons for Breakdown. However, we had no reason to believe that the Children's Aid Society personnel did not employ honest, discrete judgement in completing these sections or any other section of the Information on Adoption Breakdown Forms.

The preceeding brief discussion on consistent availability and the problems of reliability and validity outlined

the limitations of this research. These limitations were considered in the formulation and reformulation of our instrument, the Master Data Sheet, as, "the more highly structured the material to be coded, and the simpler the categories used, the higher the reliability will be."[124]

Data Analysis

With the aid of our precoded Master Data Sheet, we compiled our data on IBM coding sheets. The data was key-punched on computer cards from these IBM coding sheets. The computer cards enabled us to run two programs, Codebook[125] and Crosstabs,[126] with the use of the computer. These two programs are outlined in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences manual.

The program, Codebook, provided us with printed sheets containing frequency tables that enabled us to easily determine the number of adoption breakdowns that fell into the various categories we had listed under the variables we were examining. We used the information from these frequency tables to accomplish one of the purposes of our study which was to describe the adoption breakdowns in relation to the social characteristics of the placed child and the adoptive applicants, the adoptive family composition, the Society-

---

[124]Sellti[redacted]., Research Methods, p. 406.

[125]Dale H. Bent, C. Hadlai Hull, and Norman Nie, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970), pp. 102-105.

[126]Ibid., pp. 115-126.

related child placement processes, and the reasons for breakdown.

To identify the major factors associated with adoption breakdowns and to consider how these factors are related to one another, we cross-tabulated all the variables we were studying with the use of the computer and the program, Crosstabs. We examined thoroughly the computer output that outlined the variable relationships. The examination of the variable relationships related to adoption breakdowns enabled us to accomplish the previously mentioned aims, to develop hypotheses and to formulate ideas for further research in the area of adoption breakdowns.

The only statistic we used in the analysis of our data was the Chi-Square test of significance. This statistic enabled us to determine which variable relationships were significant and which were not. The significance levels we employed for the Chi-Square were the .05 and the .01 significance levels or less.

CHAPTER V

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

This part of the research report is divided into two basic sections. The first section is essentially a description of the adoption breakdowns in relation to the social characteristics of the placed child and the adoptive parents, the adoptive family composition, the Society-related child placement processes, and the reasons for breakdown. The second section deals with the identification and the analysis of the significant factors associated with adoption breakdown.

Description of Adoption Breakdowns

The number of Information on Adoption Breakdown forms that we examined totalled 88 for the year 1972 and 84 for the year 1973. We disregarded the data of 13 adoption breakdowns. The following was our rationale for doing so:

(a) 7 adoption breakdowns involved children who had been placed in 1969 or earlier. It was impossible to ascertain whether or not these breakdowns had occurred before or after legalization by the Court.

(b) 3 adoption breakdowns had occurred in 1974.

(c) 3 Information on Adoption Breakdown forms were either too illegible or too incomplete.

Thus, the analysis of the data and the findings are based on a sample of 159 adoption breakdowns that occurred in the years 1972 and 1973.

The Placed Child

In the 159 adoption breakdowns that we studied, 61 involved children less than 6 years of age and 98 involved children 6 years of age and older. Table 1 illustrates the range of the ages of the children at time of placement.

TABLE 1

AGE OF CHILD AT TIME OF PLACEMENT

Age	Number of Children	Percent of Children
Less than 6 months	19	11.9
6 months less than 3 years	11	7.0
3 years less than 6 years	31	19.5
6 years less than 9 years	50	31.4
9 years and over	48	30.2
Total	159	100.0

The various age categories were almost equally represented by both male and female children. Table 2 shows the number of children involved in adoption breakdowns classified by age at time of placement and by sex.

TABLE 2

AGE OF CHILD AT TIME OF PLACEMENT BY SEX

Age at Time of Placement	Number of Males	Number of Females	Total Number of Males and Females
Less than 6 months	11	8	19
6 months less than 3 years	6	5	11
3 years less than 6 years	13	18	31
6 years less than 9 years	25	25	50
9 years and over	28	20	48
Total	83	76	159

Most of the children, 81.2 percent, involved in adoption breakdowns were of the white race. Table 3 illustrates the racial origin of the children.

TABLE 3

RACIAL ORIGIN OF CHILD

Racial Origin	Number of Children	Percent of Children
White	129	81.2
Native	12	7.5
Black	1	.6
Mixed	17	10.7
Total	159	100.0

Children involved in adoption breakdowns were of two religious faiths, protestant and catholic. Table 4 shows the number of children classified by religion.

TABLE 4

RELIGION OF CHILD

Religion	Number of Children	Percent of Children
Protestant	91	57.6
Catholic	67	42.4
Total*	158	100.0

*The religion of one child involved in adoption breakdown was not ascertainable.

The majority, 50.3 percent, of the children involved in adoption breakdowns were children of unmarried parents. The remaining children were children born in wedlock. Their status is illustrated in Table 5.

TABLE 5

CHILDREN BORN IN WEDLOCK, CLASSIFIED BY FAMILY STATUS AT TIME OF COMING INTO CARE

Family Status	Number of Children	Percent of Children
Both parents living and marriage broken	35	44.3
Both parents living and together	34	43.0
One parent dead	10	12.7
Total	79	100.0

With the exception of private and independent adoptions, children usually spend a certain amount of time in the Society's care before becoming available for adoption. Table 6 shows the number of children involved in adoption breakdowns classified by total length of time in care before

this adoption placement.

TABLE 6

LENGTH OF TIME IN CARE BEFORE THIS ADOPTION PLACEMENT

Length of Time	Number of Children	Percent of Children
Less than 6 months	23	14.8
6 months less than 3 years	57	36.7
3 years less than 6 years	52	33.6
6 years less than 9 years	15	9.7
9 years and over	8	5.2
Total*	155	100.0

*The length of time in care before this adoption placement was not ascertainable for four children involved in adoption breakdowns.

The length of time in care consists of one or more foster home placements with the exception of newborn infants who are sometimes placed in adoption directly from hospital. In our sample, 39.5 percent of the children had had 2 and 3 foster home placements and 24.2 percent had had 4 or more foster home placements. Table 7 shows the number of children involved in adoption breakdowns, classified by the total number of foster home placements.

TABLE 7

TOTAL NUMBER OF FOSTER HOME PLACEMENTS

Total Number	Number of Children	Percent of Children
0	4	2.6
1	53	33.7
2-3	62	39.5
4-6	32	20.4
7 and over	6	3.8
Total*	157	100.0

*The total number of foster home placements were not ascertainable for two children involved in adoption breakdowns.

The Child Welfare Act of Ontario (1965) requires that there be a minimum of six months expire between the time a child is placed into his prospective adoption home and before the adoption is finalized. This period is referred to as the probationary period. The principal aims of the probationary period are to insure that the decision to place the child in the prospective adoption home was a sound one and to provide casework help to both the child and his prospective adoptive parents in their new adjustments as a family. In our sample of adoption breakdowns, 47.6 percent of the children were in their prospective adoption home 6 months or more before removal. This may indicate that the Society was not aware of any difficulties until preparations for legalization were considered or discussed with the prospective adoptive applicants. Table 8 illustrates the number of children involved in adoption breakdowns, classified by

length of time from placement to removal.

TABLE 8

LENGTH OF TIME FROM PLACEMENT TO REMOVAL

	Number of Children	Percent of Children
less than 3 months	43	27.9
3 months less than 6 months	38	24.7
6 months less than 12 months	57	37.0
12 months and over	16	10.4
Total*	154	100.0

*Length of time between this adoption placement and removal from the prospective adoption home was not ascertainable for five children involved in adoption breakdowns.

The majority, 84 percent, of the children involved in breakdowns were reported as physically healthy with no illnesses or handicaps. A small number, 11 percent, were considered minimally handicapped. These children could function independently and had such disorders as partial deafness, heart murmur, eczema, club foot, or cleft palate.

Most of the children, 85 percent, were considered to be of average or above average intelligence. Fourteen percent were below average in intelligence. Intelligence was not ascertainable for two children involved in adoption breakdowns.

Physical health and intelligence, thus, could not have been a major factor in adoption breakdowns.

Twenty-five children or 15.7 percent had been placed in a prospective adoption home that had resulted in previous

adoption breakdowns. A total of 32, 20.1 percent, of the adoption breakdowns involved multiple placements, the simultaneous place of more than one child in the same home.

The reasons for coming into care were classified according to the Child Welfare Act (1965), Part II, section 19, subsection (1)(b). Table 9 illustrates the number of children involved in adoption breakdowns who came into the care of a Children's Aid Society for a particular reason under this section of the Act. It must be noted that the category *cannot care properly for child* included many cases where the child was admitted to care at the request of the natural parent(s).

TABLE 9

REASON FOR COMING INTO CARE

Reason for Coming Into Care	Number of Children	Percent of Children
Orphan	3	1.9
Deserted	20	12.6
Cannot care properly for child	110	69.8
Living in unfit place	0	0.0
Child associating with unfit person	1	.6
Child found begging	0	0.0
Child breaks the law	0	0.0
Child uncontrollable	2	1.3
Child truant from school or home	0	0.0
Medical neglect	0	0.0
Emotional or mental deprivation, rejection	10	6.3
Child's life, health or morals endangered	12	7.5
Total*	158	100.0

*Reason for coming into care was not ascertainable for one child involved in adoption breakdown.

The Adoptive Parents

The adoptive parent characteristics which we studied included age, religion, racial origin and occupation.

The distribution of ages of both the adoptive father and mother are seen in Table 10.

TABLE 10

AGES OF ADOPTIVE PARENTS AT PLACEMENT OF CHILD

Age	Adoptive Fathers		Adoptive Mothers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Less than 25	0	0.0	6	3.8
25, less than 30	27	17.6	35	22.7
30, less than 35	32	20.2	37	24.1
35, less than 40	36	23.5	33	21.3
40, less than 45	33	21.5	28	18.1
45, less than 50	14	9.2	7	4.7
50, less than 55	7	4.7	7	4.7
55 and over	5	3.3	1	.6
Total*	154	100.0	154	100.0

*There were five adoption breakdowns in which the age of the adoptive parents was not ascertainable.

Most of the adoptive parents, 82.8 percent of the adoptive fathers and 86.2 percent of the adoptive mothers, were in the age group of 25 to 45 years.

There were 6 more protestant adoptive mothers than adoptive fathers. This indicated that there were 6 mixed marriages. Also, there were 15 more protestant adoptive fathers and 21 more protestant adoptive mothers than there were protestant children. Table 11 illustrates the number of adoptive parents, classified by religion.

TABLE 11

RELIGION OF ADOPTIVE PARENTS

	Adoptive Fathers		Adoptive Mothers	
Religion	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Protestant	106	66.7	112	70.4
Catholic	50	31.4	44	27.7
None	2	1.3	2	1.3
Other*	1	.6	1	.6
Total	159	100.0	159	100.0

*The religion of one adoptive father and mother was Greek Orthodox.

In terms of racial origin, there were at least 22 more adoptive parents of the white race than there were children of the white race. This indicates that in at least 22 cases of breakdown, mixed racial placements were involved. Cultural differences, therefore, was an added difficulty in these placements. Table 12 shows the number of adoptive parents classified by racial origin.

TABLE 12

RACIAL ORIGIN OF ADOPTIVE PARENTS

	Adoptive Father		Adoptive Mother	
Racial Origin	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
White	151	95.5	155	98.1
Black	2	1.3	2	1.3
Native	3	1.9	1	0.6
Mixed	2	1.3	0	0.0
Total*	158	100.0	158	100.0

*There was one Information on Adoption Breakdown Form which did not report the racial origin of the adoptive parents.

The occupation of the adoptive parents was classified under eight broad categories. The eighth category, *"Other"* included only two adoptive fathers, but 99 adoptive mothers. This can be explained by the fact the category of housewife was included in the *"Other"* column. In all 99 cases the adoptive mother was a housewife prior to placement. The distribution of occupation of adoptive parents is shown in Table 13.

TABLE 13

OCCUPATION OF ADOPTIVE PARENTS

	Adoptive Fathers		Adoptive Mothers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1. Professional and technical workers	34	21.6	27	17.0
2. Managers and Administrators	33	21.0	1	.6
3. Salesworkers	6	3.8	0	0.0
4. Clerical workers	4	2.5	24	15.1
5. Craftsmen and Kindred Workers	24	15.1	0	0.0
6. Operatives	38	24.0	2	1.3
7. Services workers	17	10.7	5	3.1
8. Other	2	1.3	99	62.9
Total*	158	100.0	158	100.0

*There was one Information on Adoption Breakdown Form which did not specify the occupation of the adoptive parents.

One hundred and fourteen or 71.7 percent of the adoptive mothers were not employed during placement. Fifteen adoptive mothers terminated employment at the time of placement. Twenty-five or 15.7 percent of the adoptive mothers

were employed part time during placement and 20, or 12.6 percent were employed full time. Absence of the mother from the home, then, because of employment was not a major factor contributing to breakdown.

Family Composition (Prospective Adoption Family)

Out of a total of 159 Adoption Breakdown cases examined, 3 were not ascertainable for the variable—family composition of the prospective adoption family. The number of children placed in adoption families where there were no other children, natural or adopted, was 31 or 19.9 percent of the children. The number of children placed in adoption families where there was one child, natural or adopted, already in the family, was 55 or 35.2 percent. The number of children placed in adoption families where there was more than one child, natural or adopted, already in the family, was 70 or 44.9 percent. One hundred and twenty-five or 78.7 percent of the children involved in breakdowns were placed in prospective adoption homes where there was one child or more already in the home. This could indicate that the other children in the home were not aptly prepared for the adopted child. It could also indicate that the placed child was not suitably prepared to enter a home with other siblings. This finding magnifies the importance of involving the entire adoptive family and the placed child in the adoption process. Table 14 shows the number of adoption breakdowns classified by the total number of natural and adopted children in the prospective adoption family.

The order of the placed child seemed to be concentrated at the two extremes: 57 or 52.3 percent of the placed children were the youngest in the adoption family and 33 or 30.3 percent were the oldest in the adoptive family. Only 19 or 17.4 percent were in between the youngest or the oldest. Out of 159 placed children 18 or 11.4 percent were the only child in the prospective adoption family and 32 or 20.1 percent were multiple placement children.

TABLE 14

NUMBER OF ADOPTION BREAKDOWNS CLASSIFIED BY THE NUMBER OF NATURAL AND NUMBER OF ADOPTED CHILDREN IN THE PROSPECTIVE ADOPTION FAMILY

Number of Other Children in the Adoptive Family	Natural Children		Adopted Children	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
None	52	34.0	123	79.0
One	46	29.0	25	16.0
More than one	58	37.0	8	5.0
Total*	156	100.0	156	100.0

*The family composition was not ascertainable for three adoption breakdowns.

Society-Related Child Placement Processes

The Society-related child placement processes that we studied included: whether or not this adoption placement was an interagency placement; the special resources used by the Society in making the adoption placement; what prompted the adoptive applicants to express an interest in adoption; by whom the removal was initiated; the number of preplace-

ment and post placement interviews, excluding home study, conducted by the Society; and the number of preplacement visits between the applicants and the placed child.

The 50 Children's Aid Societies in Ontario often cooperate with each other in the area of adoption. When one Society has a child available for adoption but no suitable applicants for the child, it often contacts another Society beyond its jurisdiction to ascertain the possibility of completing the adoption. The converse is also true.

Out of 159 Adoption Breakdowns we examined, 80 or 51.3 percent were inter-agency placements. A total of 76 or 48.7 percent were not. A small number, 3, were not ascertainable for this variable. The total number of breakdowns involving inter-agency placements appears to be very high. This implies that practices employed in inter-agency placements are a factor in breakdowns and therefore should be reexamined.

In attempting to find a suitable adoption home for the children it has in its care, a Society often makes use of resources other than its own. Table 15 shows the number of adoption breakdowns related to the resources employed by the Society in making this adoption placement.

TABLE 15

SPECIAL RESOURCES EMPLOYED BY THE SOCIETY IN MAKING THE ADOPTION PLACEMENT

Special Resource	Number of Adoption Breakdowns	Percent of Adoption Breakdowns
Adoption group meetings	32	21.4
Adoption resource exchange	12	8.0
Today's Child	16	10.7
Family Finder	2	1.4
None	88	58.5
Total*	151	100.0

*Special resources was not ascertainable for nine adoption breakdowns.

On the Information on Adoption Breakdown form, there is a question dealing with what prompted the adoptive applicants to express an interest in adoption. Table 16 shows the number of adoption breakdowns related to this prompting factor.

TABLE 16

WHAT PROMPTED ADOPTING APPLICANTS TO EXPRESS AN INTEREST IN ADOPTION

Prompting Factor	Number of Adoption Breakdowns	Percent of Adoption Breakdowns
Press, Classified ads, Today's Child	43	27.6
Radio, Television, Family Finder	6	3.8
Friends, Neighbours, Relatives	9	5.7
Experience as foster parents to child adopted	6	3.8
Previously adopted a child or children	18	11.5
Desire to enlarge family	51	32.8
Other	23	14.8
Total*	156	100.0

*The prompting factor was not ascertainable for three adoption breakdowns.

The process of breakdown usually involves a decision made by one or more of the concerned parties in adoption to remove the child from the prospective adoption home. Table 17 shows the number of breakdowns related to the party who initiated the removal. In 127 adoption breakdowns the Society had no involvement in the initiation of removal. This leads us to question the Society's awareness of the difficulties being experienced by the prospective adoption family and the placed child and also the extent of their involvement with the family after placement.

TABLE 17

REMOVAL INITIATED BY

Removal Initiated By	Number of Adoption Breakdowns	Percent of Adoption Breakdowns
Husband	12	7.7
Wife	46	29.7
Child	5	3.2
Society	15	9.7
Husband, Wife	57	36.8
Husband, Wife, Child	7	4.5
Husband, Wife, Society	13	8.4
Total*	155	100.0

*The party who initiated the removal was not ascertainable for four adoption breakdowns.

The placement process, as stated in an earlier chapter, involves the pre-placement phase, the placement phase, and the post-placement phase. The purpose of each phase was aptly discussed in Chapter II. Table 18 shows the number of breakdowns related to the number of pre-placement interviews conducted by the Society with the prospective adoptive father, the prospective adoptive mother, both the prospective parents together, and with the child. Table 18 shows that in a high number of breakdowns there were no preplacements interviews, excluding the home study, with the adoptive father and with the adoptive mother. Although it is a policy of the Societies that a total of only three pre-placement interviews are necessary with the adoptive applicants and although the Societies are no doubt fulfilling the

minimum requirements, we believe that more interviews are necessary to ensure a successful placement. Our findings support this contention. Table 19 demonstrates the number of breakdowns related to the number of post-placement interviews. The findings illustrate that a minimum amount of work is being done with the prospective adoptive parents in the post-placement phase.

Table 20 shows the number of adoption breakdowns related to the number of visits made by the adoption applicants to the child and the child to the adoption applicants. In 27.3 percent of the breakdowns there were no visits of the adoption applicants to the child and in 28.8 percent of the breakdowns there were no visits of the child to the adoption applicants. These findings illustrate that some of the recommended adoption procedures, as discussed in Chapter II, are not being carried out.

TABLE 18

NUMBER OF PRE-PLACEMENT INTERVIEWS EXCLUDING HOME STUDY

Number	Adoptive Father		Adoptive Mother		Joint*		Child	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0	120	77.9	107	69.5	10	6.6	82	56.5
1 - 3	31	20.2	43	27.9	127	83.6	37	25.5
4 - 6	3	1.9	3	1.9	13	8.6	19	13.1
7 - 9	0	0.0	1	0.7	1	0.6	5	3.5
9 and over	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.6	2	1.4
Total**	154	100.0	154	100.0	152	100.0	145	100.0

*The term "joint" referred to interviews conducted with both the adoptive father and the adoptive mother present.

**Number of pre-placement interviews with the adoptive father and the adoptive mother was not ascertainable for five adoption breakdowns. Number of pre-placement interviews conducted jointly with the adoptive father and the adoptive mother was not ascertainable for seven adoption breakdowns. Number of pre-placement interviews conducted with the child was not ascertainable for fourteen adoption breakdowns.

TABLE 19

NUMBER OF POST-PLACEMENT INTERVIEWS EXCLUDING HOME STUDY

	Adoptive Father		Adoptive Mother		Joint*		Child	
Number	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0	83	56.1	37	25.5	27	18.8	44	30.8
1 - 3	44	29.7	44	30.3	49	34.0	39	27.4
4 - 6	11	7.4	22	15.2	36	25.0	27	18.9
7 - 9	9	6.1	18	12.4	11	7.6	14	9.7
9 and over	1	0.7	24	16.6	21	14.6	19	13.2
Total**	148	100.0	145	100.0	144	100.0	143	100.0

*The term "joint" referred to interviews conducted with both the adoptive father and the adoptive mother present.

**Number of post-placement interviews conducted with the adoptive father was not ascertainable for eleven adoption breakdowns. With the adoptive mother, the number was not ascertainable for fourteen adoption breakdowns. Jointly, they were not ascertainable for fifteen adoption breakdowns. With the child, the number of post-placement interviews was not ascertainable for sixteen adoption breakdowns.

TABLE 20

NUMBER OF VISITS MADE BY THE ADOPTION APPLICANTS TO THE CHILD AND THE CHILD TO THE ADOPTION APPLICANTS

	Adoption Applicants To the Child		Child to Adoption Applicants	
Number	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0	42	27.3	44	28.8
1 - 3	107	69.6	73	47.7
4 - 6	3	1.9	27	17.6
7 - 9	1	.6	8	5.2
9 and over	1	.6	1	.7
Total*	154	100.0	153	100.0

*The number of visits by the adoption applicants to the child was not ascertainable in five adoption breakdowns. The number of visits by the child to the adoption applicants was not ascertainable in six adoption breakdowns.

Reasons for Breakdown

Adoptions breakdown for a variety of reasons all of which cannot be attributed to one single person or one single factor. These reasons are complex and often times they do not reveal the total picture. One of our most difficult tasks in this project was to categorize the reasons for breakdown. We feel that the 8 categories we formulated reflect as closely as possible the recorders' written reasons as to what circumstances caused or helped to cause the adoption breakdowns.

It must be emphasized that although most of the recorded reasons were clearly classifiable, some, approx-

imately 4 percent, required our joint judgement as to what category would best fit the recorded reason.

Table 21 shows the number of adoption breakdowns classified by the reasons for adoption breakdown. The findings illustrated in this table are discussed in the succeeding section in relation to other significant variables.

TABLE 21

REASONS FOR THE ADOPTION BREAKDOWN

Reason for Adoption Breakdown	Number of Adoption Breakdowns	Percent of Adoption Breakdowns
1. Financial stress, marital conflict, death of adoptive parent or other outside influencing factors	20	13.0
2. Mental or physical illness of adoption parent	13	8.5
3. Child found to be seriously defective after placement; illness in child	4	2.6
4. Unfulfilled parental expectations including age, sex, intelligence and behavior of child	31	20.5
5. Failure to develop positive relationships between adoptive parents and child or child and adoptive parents	42	27.4
6. Child's disruptive behavior: demanding, antisocial behavior	21	13.7
7. Abuse, neglect or rejection of placed child	14	9.1
8. Inadequate homestudy, transfer of adoption worker, did not receive type of child requested and other society related reasons	8	5.2
Total*	153	100.0

*The reason for adoption breakdown was not ascertainable for six adoption breakdowns.

The Significant Factors in Adoption Breakdown

In this section we analyze and discuss the significant findings that resulted from the cross-tabulation of some of the variables related to adoption breakdowns. It must be mentioned that we cross-tabulated many variables. However, we deal only with those variable relationships that proved to be statistically significant in comparison to the others we examined.

Age of Child

As discussed in our Review of the Literature (Chapter III), past findings indicate that children of all age groups (except children six months of age and under) suffer the effects of separation from their principal caretaker to varying degrees. This separation affects the quality of the child's next attachments which revolves around his trust in his new caretaker.

When the age of the child was cross-tabulated with the number of preplacement interviews with the adoptive mother and the adoptive father, there were no statistically significant relationships. However, in the cross-tabulation of age of the child with the number of preplacement interviews with child, a statistically significant relationship resulted at the .05 level ($\chi^2 = 30.39$, 20 d.f.). More adoption breakdowns of children of all age groups occurred where there were no preplacement interviews with the child. While it is realized that in thirty of the breakdowns which we studied, the children were under three years of age and some of these children could not be interviewed, 80 percent of the breakdowns involved children three years or over who could and should have been interviewed, yet 46.6

percent of these children were not interviewed before placement. This implies inadequate preparation of the child for adoption and leads us to suggest that preplacement interviews with the child would decrease the risk of adoption breakdown.

Age of child showed a statistically significant relationship to age of adopted father at the .001 level ($\chi^2 = 25.35$, 8 d.f.). In 50 percent of the breakdowns which involved infants (0 - 6 months), the adoptive fathers were 25 - 30 years of age, while only 10.9 percent of the over 9 age group had adoptive fathers 25 - 30 years of age. Only one infant (0 - 6 month) that was placed with an adoptive father over 40 broke down, while 23 or 50 percent of the over nine age group that broke down involved adoptive fathers over 40. Thus, in our sample of adoption breakdowns, the age of the adoptive father varied directly with the age of the child; the younger the child the younger the father; the older the child the older the father. The same significant relationship existed between age of adoptive mother and age of child. Younger adoptive mothers (20 - 30 years) of young babies (0 - 6 months) and older adoptive mothers (40 and over) of older children (over 9) tended to be characteristic of breakdowns. There were no breakdowns reported where the mother was over 40 and the placed child was an infant (0 - 6 months) and only 8 cases or 5.2 percent of breakdowns where the mother was young (20 - 30 years) and the child was over 9 years. These findings seem to indicate that matching

young children with young parents and similarly older children with older parents is not always a criteria for successful adoption placement.

The variable, age of child, when cross-tabulated with sex of child showed no significant relationship. This is contrary to the findings of two studies cited previously in which girls adjusted better in adoptive placements than boys. There was no one age group in our study where breakdowns occurred more frequently or less frequently with male children than with female children.

The age of the child was found to have a statistically significant relationship to the number of foster home placements at the .0001 level ($\chi^2 = 56.23$, 20 d.f.). There were no breakdowns in children under the age of three years who had more than two foster home placements. Children over six years appeared to be more vulnerable to the effects of numerous foster home placements, since 45 percent of the breakdowns which occurred where the child had had two or more foster home placements, were children who were placed on this adoption at the age of six or over. However, this could have been a result of separation traumas experienced at an earlier age and that are now being more overtly manifested. This finding points out the importance of working closely with older children especially those who have had two or more foster home placements and with their prospective adoptive families.

The age of the child at placement also showed a

statistically significant relationship to his order in the adoptive family at the .0001 level (χ^2 = 41.97, 12 d.f.). In adoptive homes where there were other children, 57 or 35.8 percent of the children involved in breakdowns were the youngest in the adoptive home. Sixty percent of these children were between three and nine years old. From our observations as employees of Children's Aid Societies, this result could be a reflection of the Societies' policy of placing the child in a home where he will be the youngest. Our findings indicate that this policy is not necessarily sound in terms of successful placement especially when there are other children in the prospective adoption home.

Reasons for Breakdown

Reasons for breakdown showed a statistically significant relationship to age of the child at placement at the .001 level (χ^2 = 58.76, 28 d.f.). Forty-two or 27.5 percent of the breakdowns occurred because of failure to develop positive relationships between adoptive parents and child or child and adoptive parents. Of these 42 children, 40 or 95 percent were three years of age and over. Of the 31 breakdowns which occurred because of unfulfilled parental expectations, 27 or 87 percent were over three years of age. Twenty-five percent of the children in the over nine age group broke down because of the child's disruptive behavior. No breakdowns occurred with children under three years of age where the child's behavior was given as the reason for breakdown. In our sample we found, then, that the older

the child, the more likely the reason for breakdown was unfulfilled parental expectations, failure to develop positive relationships or child's disruptive behavior (all of which are closely related), since 61 or 43.7 percent of breakdowns occurred in children six years of age or older. The reasons given for infant (0 - 6 months) breakdowns clustered around financial stress, marital conflict, mental or physical illness or death of adoptive parent, with 64.7 percent of infant breakdowns occurring because of these reasons. This illustrates the previously cited theories that children react differently to attachment and separation at different stages of development. This knowledge could be applied to the adoption process in the placement of older children.

Reasons for breakdown was cross-tabulated with number of foster home placements and a statistically significant relationship resulted at the .01 level ($\chi^2 = 31.48$, 14 d.f.). A pronounced relationship appeared in the reason for breakdown, unfulfilled parental expectations, with 80.7 percent of breakdowns occurring for this reason involving children who have had 2 or more foster home placements. In the category of failure to establish positive relationships, 50 percent of these breakdowns involved children who had 0 - 1 foster home placement. Thus, in our study the fewer the foster home placements, the greater the chance that adoption broke down because of failure to establish positive relationships. It should be expected that children who have had two or more foster home placements will have difficulty

in adjusting to another placement. Parents adopting these children, therefore, should be receiving more intensive preparation than parents adopting children who have experienced fewer separation and attachment traumas. Our findings indicate that since parental expectations were not being met, that this work was not being done effectively in these placements.

There was no statistically significant relationship between the reasons for breakdown and preplacement interviews with the adoptive father. Examination of the categories classifying these variables, however, revealed that in an extremely high proportion or 78.8 percent of the breakdowns that occurred because of either unfulfilled parental expectations or failure to establish positive relationships there were no preplacement interviews, excluding the homestudy, with the adoptive father.

In 73.2 percent of breakdowns that occurred because of these two given reasons, there were no preplacement interviews excluding the homestudy with the adoptive mother. In 55.2 percent of breakdowns that occurred because of these two given reasons, there were no preplacement interviews with the child. These statistics imply that more interviews may have better prepared both parents and child for the adoption and that parental expectations may have thus been more realistic.

Reasons given for breakdown was cross-tabulated with the length of time the child was in care and this resulted

in a statistically significant relationship at the .01 level ($\chi^2 = 32.30$, 14 d.f.). The length of time a child was in care did not seem to be directly related to reasons for breakdowns. However, in 45 out of 72 or 62.5 percent of the breakdowns studied in which the child had been in care for three years and over, breakdowns occurred because of unfulfilled parental expectations or inability to establish relationships. This leads us to speculate that in some instances, children who have been in care for a lengthy period of time are placed on adoption probation without due consideration given to the possibility that adoption is not the most suitable plan for this child.

Reasons for breakdown was shown to have a statistically significant relationship to the age of the adoptive father at the .05 level ($\chi^2 = 25.94$, 14 d.f.). Twenty-two percent of the breakdowns occurred where the father was between 30 - 40 years of age and where the reason for breakdown was unfulfilled parental expectations or failure to develop positive relationships. Although more breakdowns in general occurred where the father was 30 - 40 years of age, in the two categories of failure to develop positive relationships and child's disruptive behavior, 56.4 percent of the fathers were forty or over. There were only two breakdowns which occurred where the child was under three and the father was over forty. We recognize that this may reflect the Societies' policy of avoiding placements of young children with older parents. However, this finding suggests that it

might have been more difficult for adoptive fathers to develop relationships with and accept the behavior of older children in the adoption experience. It could also suggest inadequate preparation of the prospective adoption fathers.

The age of the adoptive mother did not show a statistically significant relationship to the reasons for breakdown, although in 47.2 percent of the breakdowns which occurred because of unfulfilled parental expectations or failure to develop positive relationships, the adoptive mothers were 35 to 40 years old. Thus, 50 percent of the 35 - 40 year old mothers in our study, were involved in breakdowns because of unfulfilled parental expectations or failure to develop positive relationships.

Reasons for breakdown did not show a statistically significant relationship to occupation of adoptive father. The individual cell frequencies, however, showed that in 50 percent of the breakdowns which occurred because of failure to develop positive relationships or unfulfilled parental expectations, the adoptive fathers were professional, managerial or supervisory employees. This finding leads us to deemphasize the importance of using occupational status as a criterion for successful parenting. The focus should be on parenting skills as opposed to socioeconomic status.

Interagency Placements

More than half of the adoption breakdowns in our sample were interagency placements. This variable, interagency placement, showed a statistically significant relation-

ship to the resources used by the Societies at the .0001 level (χ^2 = 33.65, 3 d.f.). In 27.5 percent of the breakdowns which were interagency placements, adoption group meetings were employed in the placements. In only 15 percent of the breakdowns which used interagency placements, the Adoption Resource Exchange was used. In 17.5 percent of interagency breakdowns communication media (Today's Child and Family Finder) were used. In the remaining 40 percent of the interagency breakdowns, the Societies reported using no resources in the placement. These findings lead us to advocate a review of the procedures employed by the Societies in interagency placements. These findings also indicate that the involvement of two societies in the placement of a child is not always in his best interests.

There is a statistically significant relationship between interagency placement and joint preplacement interviews at the .05 level (χ^2 = 6.79, 2 d.f.). In 12 percent of the interagency breakdowns there were no joint preplacement interviews, whereas in the intra-agency breakdowns only 1.4 percent of the cases had no joint preplacement interviews. In 65.7 percent of the interagency placements there were no preplacement interviews with the child while in 48.6 percent of the non interagency placements there were no preplacement interviews with the child.

This suggests that although it may be difficult because of geographical distance to conduct preplacement interviews, lack of preplacement interviews increases the

risk of an adoption breakdown. These findings point out the need for a more coordinated effort among the Societies involved in interagency placements.

Length of Time in Adoption Home

The length of time a child remained in the adoption home showed a statistically significant relationship to the number of postplacement interviews with the adoptive father at the .05 level (χ^2 = 13.22, 4 d.f.). In 46.5 percent of adoption breakdowns the child remained in the home beyond the six month probationary period. Of this 46.5 percent, half of the breakdown reports indicated there were no postplacement interviews with the adoptive father. This finding implies a lack of involvement with the adoptive father in the post placement process. We believe the adoptive father's involvement is a necessary element in the completion of an adoption.

The length of time between placement and removal was also statistically significant in relation to postplacement interviews with the adoptive mother at the .001 level (χ^2 = 20.77, 4 d.f.). There were more postplacement interviews with the adoptive mother and it was generally the case that the longer a child remained in the adoptive home, the more postplacement interviews there were with the adoptive mother. Again we would stress that the involvement of both the adoptive mother and the adoptive father is a necessary ingredient for the completion of the adoption.

Time between placement and removal was also found to

be significantly related to the number of joint postplacement interviews at the .0001 level (χ^2 = 26.61, 4 d.f.). In only 17.9 percent of breakdowns there were no joint postplacement interviews. In 43 out of 64 cases of 67.2 percent where the child had remained in the home longer than six months, there were four or more joint postplacement interviews. In 17 out of 37 or 45.9 percent of the cases where the child remained in the home for 3 to 6 months, there were four or more joint postplacement interviews. These statistics indicate that in many instances the Society is actually involved in helping the adoptive couple. It is not known, however, at what point during the probationary period that the Society became involved. It is quite possible that only after preparations for finalization of the adoption were being made, that problem areas began to surface, necessitating the involvement of the Society in these joint postplacement interviews.

Family Composition

The number of other children in the adoptive home showed a statistically significant relationship to the number of adopted children in the home at the .0001 level (χ^2 = 23.38, 4.d.f.). One hundred and four breakdowns or 66.7 percent of the breakdowns in this study occurred where there was one or more natural children and no other adopted children in the home. This suggests to us the necessity for involvement of the natural siblings in the placement process.

Only 10 percent of the breakdowns occurred where

there was one other adopted child in the home. This is contrary to the previously cited study by Kornitzer and Rowe in which it was found that 64 percent of adoption failures were among the second child placed in the adoption home.[127]

We also found that there were 31 breakdowns or 20 percent where there were no other children in the home, i.e., where this was the first parenting experience for the adoptive couple.

The analysis of the many variables and their relationships in this study has produced numerous findings. These findings identify several crucial areas in adoption breakdowns which are related to and have been discussed in terms of the five most significant variables: age of the child; reasons for breakdown; interagency placements; length of time in adoption home; and family composition.

Limitations in Data Analysis

We would like to emphasize that great care should be employed in interpreting the findings of our study and not all the purposes of the study could be realized because of the inadequate execution and concomitant limited use by the Societies and the Ministry of the Information on Adoption Breakdown Form.

In analyzing the data on adoption breakdowns it would have been ideal to compare it to the data on total

---

[127]Kadushin and Seidl, "Adoption Breakdown," p. 36.

adoption placements. However, this data was not available at the time of our study for the year 1973. Moreover, the Records Office of the Ministry of Community and Social Services reports a greater number of adoption breakdowns than is reported by the individual Societies on Information on Adoption Breakdown Forms.[128]

Another limitation which prevented us from arriving at some of our stated purposes was found in the Information on Adoption Breakdown Form itself. Some Societies misinterpreted the use of the form and completed the form for breakdowns occurring after legalization. Others consistently completed the Form by incorrectly filling in information in the wrong places, or neglecting to fill in the required information.

For those breakdowns which involved interagency placements, the Society completing the Information on Adoption Breakdown Form often did not have the required information on either the child or the prospective adoption family. Some Information on Adoption Breakdown Forms had been completed by the supervising Society while others had been completed by the child society.

Another difficulty encountered in doing this study was the limited amount of information asked for on the Information on Adoption Breakdown Form. For example, information such as date of marriage (Adoption parents),

---

[128]Conversation with a member of the Research Branch of the Ministry of Community and Social Services, June 19, 1974.

reasons given by the adoption parents for adopting, type of child requested and type of child placed and for what reasons, would have been beneficial for this type of research.

Until there is a more structured use of the Information on Adoption Breakdown Form, research in the area of adoption breakdowns in Ontario is necessarily limited.

CHAPTER VI

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss some of the crucial areas identified in the analysis of our data in relation to the placement of children on adoption.

The age of the child at placement was a very important factor in relation to several variables that we examined. Our findings concerning the age of the child at placement and the ages of the prospective adoption parents lead us to argue for the consideration of the age relationship in a new perspective. Matching young children with young couples and older children with older couples should not necessarily be viewed as a contributing factor to later positive adjustment. Similarly placements of younger children with older couples and older children with younger couples should not necessarily be viewed negatively.

The literature indicates that older children have a more difficult time accepting and adjusting to separation and its associated traumas. Therefore, it is important that careful and thorough preparation be made in the adoption of older children. Preplacement interviews with older children are important avenues wherein anxieties related to separation and new attachments can be dealt with.

It was highlighted in many Information on Adoption Breakdown forms that the placed children regressed during placement exhibiting behaviour which the prospective adoption parents considered inappropriate and unacceptable. Eventually this behaviour led to the prospective adoption parents' request for removal of the child. Such temporary regression is normal, however, and will not necessarily continue. Since the reasons for breakdown clustered around unfulfilled parental expectations, failure to develop positive relationships, and behaviour of placed child, it follows that concentrated efforts be expended in preparing prospective adoption parents for the adoption of older children. It is argued that the emphasis of such preparation should revolve around educating the adoptive parents and helping them to handle the traumas of separation, new attachments, and related adjustment phases. The adoption worker's role in the preplacement and post-placement processes should be more concentrated on the case-worker (facilitator, enabler, helper) aspect rather than on the evaluator-assessor aspect.

This research found that more than one half of the adoption breakdowns studied were interagency placements. Society-related child placement processes (interviews and visits) occurred less frequently in interagency placements than they did in intra-agency placements. We suggest, therefore, that more care and attention be given to the placement of children involved in interagency placements both in relation to the prospective adoption parent and the child.

This implies a more coordinated effort on the part of the Societies involved in interagency placements. Geographical distance should not be a hindering factor in carrying out the important adoption processes.

Another salient factor important in our findings is related to the length of time the child spent in the prospective adoption home before he was removed. Since approximately one half of the children were removed six months or more after they were placed, this leads us to speculate on the possibility that the prospective adoption parents were not adequately prepared for finalization of the adoption during the six-month minimum probationary period. If this was the case, our contention that the role of the adoption worker be casework-oriented in the pre-placement and the post-placement processes, is supported.

Turning our attention to the adoptive family composition, we found that 104 breakdowns occurred where there was one or more natural children and no other adopted children in the prospective adoption family. This suggests that much consideration be given to the other children present in the adoptive home and their attitudes toward and ability to accept the impending adoption. In light of this suggestion the natural children should be included for the most part in the preparation for adoption.

Another important implication for practice lies in suggested changes in the Information on Adoption Breakdown Form and its use. Additional information concerning the

prospective adoptive family should be included. We suggest that the following data be requested on the Form: DATE OF MARRIAGE (ADOPTIVE PARENTS), REASONS GIVEN BY THE ADOPTIVE PARENTS FOR ADOPTING, TYPE OF CHILD REQUESTED, AND TYPE OF CHILD PLACED AND REASONS, NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS WITH ADOPTIVE FAMILY (INCLUDING CHILDREN) DURING THE PRE AND POST PLACEMENT PHASE. The section in the Form, REASON FOR COMING INTO CARE, should specify the reasons according to the Child Welfare Act, Section 19, Subsection (1),(b) (see Appendix III), to ensure consistent reporting.

Since the Form and its contents are often misinterpreted by the Societies, we suggest that the Ministry of Community and Social Services endeavour to instruct all 50 Societies on its proper use. A form such as the Information on Adoption Breakdown Form should be used for more useful purposes such as further research in child welfare in Ontario.

In summary, this study as a whole emphasizes the crucial importance of the preparation of the child and the prospective adoption family for adoption and its ensuing adjustments for all concerned. This emphasis is not new. A decision that will affect the placed child and the adoptive parents for life deserves to be made with the utmost care and adequate preparation of those involved.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

This research investigated adoption breakdowns in Ontario to establish a descriptive profile of the salient characteristics of breakdown. To our knowledge, little or no research had been conducted in the area of adoption breakdown in Ontario. We felt not only that present adoption processes could be improved but also that considerably more research in Child Welfare in Ontario might be encouraged by the completion of such a study.

To accomplish the purposes of our study, present adoption processes in Ontario were outlined and a review of the literature concerning attachment and separation was conducted. The examination of present adoption processes in Ontario revealed that the processes are geared towards the careful preparation of the child and the prospective adoption parents so that they may be able to better adjust to adoption and enjoy its benefits. The review of the literature concerning attachment and separation emphasized the traumatic experiences endured by children separated from their natural caretakers and the difficulties they may encounter in subsequent attachments to substitute caretakers.

Our data for this research was gathered at the Adoption Branch of the Children's Services Bureau directly

from the Information on Adoption Breakdown Forms with the use of a Master Data Sheet that we constructed.

The salient characteristics associated with adoption breakdowns were described in relation to the social characteristics of the placed child and the prospective adoption parents, the adoption family composition, the Society-related child placement processes, and the reasons for breakdown. This description led to the identification of significant factors associated with breakdown. These factors were analyzed to consider if and how they were related to one another to facilitate the development of hypotheses for future research.

Our findings reiterated the importance of the careful preparation of the child and the prospective adoption applicants and their children before and after the child has been placed in the adoption home. We suggested that this preparation involve more effort than is already expended in assessing and evaluating the suitability of a child and the prospective adoptive parents to each other. We suggested that casework be one form of educating the prospective adoption parents and helping them handle the child's anxieties related to separation, new attachments, and related adjustment phases.

In light of our findings, we suggest the following hypotheses for future research:

1. That casework oriented preplacement and postplacement interviews beyond the minimum requirements would reduce the possibility of adoption breakdown.

2. That the involvement of both the parents and the children in the prospective adoptive family in all of the placement processes would minimize the risk of adoption breakdown.

We believe that more research would lead to other ideas for further research in the area of breakdown, research that is desperately needed to avert adoption breakdowns and the human traumas that are associated with them.

> *Placements should provide the least detrimental available alternative for safeguarding the child's growth and development.*[129]

---

[129] Goldstein, et al., Best Interests, p. 53.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

ADOPTION HOMESTUDY DICTATION OUTLINE

FAMILY NAME: HUSBAND: WIFE:

DATE OF CONTACTS DURING HOMESTUDY:

PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION OF APPLICANTS:

FAMILY CONSTELLATION:

INTEREST IN AND NEED FOR ADOPTION:
(reason for applying, feelings around childlessness, and general knowledge around adoption.)

UNDERSTANDING AND ACCEPTANCE OF AGENCY:
(explain agency and its relationship to adoption and feelings toward natural parents.)

WORKER'S INITIAL IMPRESSIONS OF THE COUPLE:
(Involvement, interaction, major concerns or problems identified.)

INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS:

CLIENT'S APPROACH TO INTERVIEW:

FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS:
(Extended family and/or present family)

APPROACH TO LIFE STRESSES:
A. Client's view of present situation
   (Marital relationship, parenthood, employment, other roles, interests, etc.)
B. Client's view of past situation
   (Traumatic events, education, adolescence, etc.)

CLIENT'S INDIVIDUAL FEELINGS ON ADOPTIVE PARENTHOOD:

MARRIAGE VERIFICATION:

WORKER'S IMPRESSIONS OF INDIVIDUAL:

HOME VISIT:
A. Observation of life style
   a) neighbourhood
   b) home and furnishings
   c) living space
   d) general home atmosphere
   e) family interests
B. Family Interaction
   a) observation of various roles in the home
   b) feelings of the children around adoption
   c) others in home
C. Couple's Expectations of child desired

D. Preparation of Family for child
   a) Placement procedure
   b) Physical and emotional preparation

E. Summary and Recommendations

Ministry of Community and Social Services
Ontario

INFORMATION ON ADOPTION BREAKDOWN

THE CHILD WELFARE ACT

(To be completed in triplicate at the time of breakdown. Agency to retain one copy and send two to the Child Welfare Branch.)

Society .....

1. Branch file no. ..... 2. Child's name ..... 3. Sex .....
4. Date of Birth ..... 5. Racial origin ..... 6. Religion .....
7. Marital status of parents ..... 8. Date of admission if non-ward .....
9. Date Society wardship ..... 10. Date Crown wardship .....
11. State briefly reason for coming into care .....
.....
.....
12. Number of foster home placements .....
13. Duration of each foster home placement .....
14. Was this child ever placed on adoption prior to this adoption placement? Yes ( ) No ( )

If yes, reasons for removal from prior adoption placement (s) .....
.....
.....
.....

15. Date of this adoption placement ..... 16. Date child removed .....
17. Physical health (include handicaps) .....
.....
.....
18. Intelligence .....
19. Personality assessment (include problems related to personality, behaviour, conduct) .....
.....
.....

ADOPTING PARENTS

	Husband	Wife
20. Name	.....	.....
21. Age	.....	.....
22. Religion	.....	.....
23. Racial origin	.....	.....
24. Occupation	.....	.....

(OVER)

25. Was wife employed during placement? Yes ( ) No ( ) Full Time ( ) Part Time ( )

26. What prompted adopting applicants to express an interest in adoption?

Classified Advertising ( ) Radio ( ) Television ( ) Press ( )

Friends ( ) Neighbours ( ) Relatives ( )

Experience as foster parents to child adopted ( ) General Experience as foster Parents ( )

Others (please explain) .....

.....

27. Was this an inter-society placement? Yes ( ) No ( )

28. What special resources, if any, did the society use in making this placement?

Adoption Group Meetings ( ) Adoption Resource Exchange ( )

Others (please explain) .....

.....

29. Were there other children in the home? Yes ( ) No ( )

	Age at Time of this Placement	
	Boys	Girls
Natural	.....	.....
Foster	.....	.....
Adopted	.....	.....

30. Number of pre-placement interviews, excluding home study, with

Husband..... Wife ..... Joint ..... Child .....

31. How many visits, prior to placement, of Applicants to Child ( ) Child to Applicants ( )

32. Number of post-placement interviews with

Husband..... Wife ..... Joint ..... Child .....

33. Was removal of child initiated by

Husband..... Wife ..... Both ..... Child ..... Society .....

34. Please state fully and frankly what you consider were the reasons for the breakdown

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Local Director

Date .....

APPENDIX III

MASTER DATA SHEET

COLUMNS (rows 9 and 99 reserved for "cannot be ascertained")

1, 2 — 1. BRANCH NUMBER (01, 02, 03, etc. see page 8)

3 — 2. SEX OF CHILD

1. male
2. female

4 — 3. AGE AT TIME OF PLACEMENT

1. less than 6 months
2. 6 months less than 3 years
3. 3 years less than 6 years
4. 6 years less than 9 years
5. 9 years and over

5 — 4. RACIAL ORIGIN OF CHILD

1. Caucasian
2. Negro
3. Native
4. Oriental
5. Mixed
6. Other

6 — 5. RELIGION OF CHILD

1. Protestant
2. Catholic
3. Jewish
4. None
5. Other

7 — 6. MARITAL STATUS OF NATURAL PARENTS

1. Unmarried parents
2. Both parents living: marriage broken
3. Both parents living: together
4. One parent deceased
5. Both parents deceased
6. Other

8 — 7. TIME IN CARE (TOTAL)

1. Less than 6 months
2. 6 months less than 3 years
3. 3 years less than 6 years
4. 6 years less than 9 years
5. 9 years and over

COLUMNS

9, 10 8. REASON FOR COMING INTO CARE (according to the Child Welfare Act, Part II, section 19. (1)(b), sub-section:

01. orphan . . . . . (i)
02. deserted . . . . . (ii)
03. cannot care properly for child . . . (iii)
04. living in unfit place. . . . . (iv)
05. child associating with unfit person. (v)
06. child found begging. . . . . (vi)
07. child breaks the law . . . . . (vii)
08. child uncontrollable . . . . . (viii)
09. child truant from school or home . . (ix)
10. medical neglect. . . . . (x)
11. emotional or mental deprivation, rejection. . . . . (xi)
12. child's life, health or morals endangered . . . . . (xii)

11 9. NUMBER OF FOSTER HOME PLACEMENTS

1. 0
2. 1
3. 2-3
4. 4-6
5. 7 and over

12 10. WAS THIS CHILD EVER PLACED ON ADOPTION PRIOR TO THIS PLACEMENT?

1. yes
2. no

13 11. REASONS FOR REMOVAL

1. Financial stress, marital conflict, death of adoptive parent or other outside influencing factors.
2. Mental or physical illness of adoptive parent.
3. Child found to be seriously defective after placement; illness in child.
4. Unfulfilled parental expectations including age, sex, intelligence and behavior of child.
5. Failure to develop positive relationships between adoptive parents and child or child and adoptive parents.
6. Child's disruptive behavior: demanding, antisocial behavior.
7. Abuse, neglect or rejection of placed child.
8. Inadequate homestudy, transfer of adoption worker and other society related reasons; did not receive type of child requested.

COLUMNS

14 12. LENGTH OF TIME FROM PLACEMENT TO REMOVAL

1. less than 3 months
2. 3 months less than 6 months
3. 6 months less than 12 months
4. 12 months and over

15 13. PHYSICAL HEALTH

1. Healthy (no known physical handicaps, illnesses or diseases).
2. Chronically ill, minimally limiting (can function independently)
3. Chronically ill, moderately limiting (needs some assistance)
4. Chronically ill, severely limiting (needs constant assistance)
5. Handicapped, minimally limiting (can function independently)
6. Handicapped, moderately limiting (needs some assistance)
7. Handicapped, severely limiting (needs constant assistance)

16 14. INTELLIGENCE

1. Below average (I.Q. below 90)
2. Average (I.Q. 90-110)
3. Above Average (I.Q. above 110)

17 15. AGE OF PROSPECTIVE ADOPTIVE FATHER

1. Less than 25
2. 25 less than 30
3. 30 less than 35
4. 35 less than 40
5. 40 less than 45
6. 45 less than 50
7. 50 less than 55
8. 55 and over

18 16. RELIGION OF PROSPECTIVE ADOPTIVE FATHER

1. Protestant
2. Catholic
3. Jewish
4. None
5. Other

19 17. RACIAL ORIGIN OF PROSPECTIVE ADOPTIVE FATHER

1. Caucasian
2. Negro
3. Native
4. Oriental

COLUMNS

5. Mixed
6. Other

20 18. OCCUPATION OF PROSPECTIVE ADOPTIVE FATHER

1. Professional and technical workers
2. Managers and administrators
3. Sales workers
4. Clerical workers
5. Craftsmen and kindred workers
6. Operatives
7. Service workers
8. Other

21 19. AGE OF PROSPECTIVE ADOPTIVE MOTHER

1. Less than 25
2. 25 less than 30
3. 30 less than 35
4. 35 less than 40
5. 40 less than 45
6. 45 less than 50
7. 50 less than 55
8. 55 and over

22 20. RELIGION OF PROSPECTIVE ADOPTIVE MOTHER

1. Protestant
2. Catholic
3. Jewish
4. None
5. Other

23 21. RACIAL ORIGIN OF PROSPECTIVE ADOPTIVE MOTHER

1. Caucasian
2. Negro
3. Native
4. Oriental
5. Mixed
6. Other

24 22. OCCUPATION OF PROSPECTIVE ADOPTIVE MOTHER

1. Professional and technical workers
2. Managers and administrators
3. Sales workers
4. Clerical workers
5. Craftsmen and kindred workers
6. Operatives
7. Service workers
8. Other

COLUMNS

25 23. WAS WIFE EMPLOYED DURING PLACEMENT?

1. no
2. part time
3. full time

26 24. WHAT PROMPTED ADOPTING APPLICANTS TO EXPRESS AN INTEREST IN ADOPTION?

1. Press, classified ads, Today's Child
2. Radio, television, Family Finder
3. Friends, neighbours, relatives
4. Experience as foster parents to child adopted
5. Previously adopted a child or children
6. Desire to enlarge family
7. Other

27 25. WAS THIS AN INTERAGENCY PLACEMENT?

1. yes
2. no

28 26. WHAT SPECIAL RESOURCES IF ANY, DID THE SOCIETY USE IN MAKING THIS PLACEMENT?

1. Adoption group meetings
2. Adoption resource exchange
3. Today's Child
4. Family Finder
5. None
6. Other

29 27. WERE THERE OTHER CHILDREN IN THE PROSPECTIVE ADOPTIVE HOME

1. yes
2. no

30 28. TOTAL NUMBER OF OTHER CHILDREN

1. none
2. one
3. more than one

31 29. TOTAL NUMBER OF ADOPTED CHILDREN

1. none
2. one
3. more than one

32 30. TOTAL NUMBER OF NATURAL CHILDREN

1. none
2. one
3. more than one

COLUMNS

33 31. NUMBER OF PREPLACEMENT INTERVIEWS EXCLUDING HOMESTUDY WITH PROSPECTIVE ADOPTIVE FATHER

1. 0
2. 1-3
3. 4-6
4. 7-9
5. over 9

34 32. NUMBER OF PREPLACEMENT INTERVIEWS EXCLUDING HOMESTUDY WITH PROSPECTIVE ADOPTIVE MOTHER

1. 0
2. 1-3
3. 4-6
4. 7-9
5. over 9

35 33. NUMBER OF JOINT PREPLACEMENT INTERVIEWS EXCLUDING HOMESTUDY

1. 0
2. 1-3
3. 4-6
4. 7-9
5. over 9

36 34. NUMBER OF PREPLACEMENT INTERVIEWS EXCLUDING HOMESTUDY WITH CHILD

1. 0
2. 1-3
3. 4-6
4. 7-9
5. over 9

37 35. HOW MANY VISITS (PRIOR TO PLACEMENT) OF ADOPTIVE APPLICANTS TO CHILD?

1. 0
2. 1-3
3. 4-6
4. 7-9
5. over 9

38 36. HOW MANY VISITS (PRIOR TO PLACEMENT) OF CHILD TO ADOPTIVE APPLICANTS?

1. 0
2. 1-3
3. 4-6
4. 7-9
5. over 9

COLUMNS

39 37. NUMBER OF POST-PLACEMENT INTERVIEWS WITH PROSPECTIVE ADOPTIVE FATHER

1. 0
2. 1-3
3. 4-6
4. 7-9
5. over 9

40 38. NUMBER OF POST-PLACEMENT INTERVIEWS WITH PROSPECTIVE ADOPTIVE MOTHER

1. 0
2. 1-3
3. 4-6
4. 7-9
5. over 9

41 39. NUMBER OF JOINT POSTPLACEMENT INTERVIEWS

1. 0
2. 1-3
3. 4-6
4. 7-9
5. over 9

42 40. NUMBER OF POSTPLACEMENT INTERVIEWS WITH CHILD

1. 0
2. 1-3
3. 4-6
4. 7-9
5. over 9

43 41. WAS REMOVAL OF THE CHILD INITIATED BY

1. Husband
2. Wife
3. Child
4. Society
5. Husband and wife
6. Husband, wife and child
7. Husband, wife and society

44 42. REASONS FOR BREAKDOWN

1. Financial stress, marital conflict, death of adoptive parent or other outside influencing factors.
2. Mental or physical illness of adoptive parent.
3. Child found to be seriously defective after placement; illness in child.
4. Unfulfilled parental expectations including age, sex, intelligence and behavior of child.

COLUMNS

5. Failure to develop positive relationships between adoptive parents and child or child and adoptive parents
6. Child's disruptive behavior: demanding, antisocial behavior.
7. Abuse, neglect or rejection of placed child.
8. Inadequate homestudy, transfer of adoption worker and other society related reasons, did not receive type of child requested.

45 43. WAS THIS A MULTIPLE PLACEMENT?
(ie. more than one child placed simultaneously in the same home)

1. yes
2. no

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Bent, Dale H.; Hull, C. Hadlai; and Nie, Norman. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.

Bowlby, John. Attachment and Loss. Vol. 1: Attachment. Vol. II: Separation. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1969.

Child Welfare League of America. Guidelines for Adoption Service. Revised. 1968.

Fellin, Phillip; Tripodi, Tony; and Meyer, Henry J. Exemplars of Social Research, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, 1969.

Goldstein, Joseph, Freud, Anna; and Solnit, Albert J. Beyond the Best Interests of the Child. New York: The Free Press, 1973.

Goodacre, Iris. Adoption Policy and Practice. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1966.

Hoopes, Janet; Andrews, Roberta H.; Lawder, Elizabeth A.; Lower, Katherine D.; and Sherman, Edmund. A Followup Study of Adoptions, Vol. II: Post-Placement Functioning of Adopted Children. New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1964.

Jaffee, Benson and Fanshel, David. How They Fared in Adoption: A Follow-up Study. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.

Kirk, H. David. Shared Fate: A Theory of Adoption and Mental Health. Toronto: Macmillan and Co., 1964.

Leeding, A. E. Child Care Manual for Social Workers. Second Edition. London: Butterworth's, 1971.

Littner, Ner. Some Traumatic Effects of Separation and Placement. New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1967.

Maier, Henry W. Three Theories of Child Development. Revised Edition. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 1969.

Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies. The Adoption Story in the 1970's, 1973.

Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies. Standards of Practice and Procedures in Adoption. Revised. 1968.

Piaget, John. The Construction of Reality and the Child. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1954.

Seglow, Jean; Pringle, Mia Kellmer; and Wedge, Peter. Growing Up Adopted. London: John Garder Printers Limited, 1972.

Selltiz, Claire; Jahoda, Marie; Deutsch, Morton; and Cook, Stuart W. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1959.

Shapiro, Michael. A Study of Adoption Practice. Vol. I. New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1956.

Spitz, Rene. The First Year of Life. New York: International Universities Press, Inc., 1965.

Timms, Noel. The Receiving End. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973.

Tripodi, Tony; Fellin, Phillip; and Meyer, Henry J. The Assessment of Social Research. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, 1969.

Articles

Asquith, Gordon. "Adoption and the Placement Process." Social Worker, XXXVI (February, 1968), 25-28.

Barton, A. H., and Lazarsfeld, Paul. "Quantitative Measurement in the Social Sciences: Classification Typologies and Indices." The Policy Sciences. Edited by H. D. Lasswell and D. Lerner. Stanford University Press, 1951.

Bernard, Viola W. "Adoption," The Encyclopedia of Mental Health, Vol. 1.

Brown, F. G. "What Do We Seek in Adoptive Parents?" Social Casework, XXXII (April, 1951), 151-161.

Chess, S.; Birch, H. G.; Thomas, A.; and Hertzig, M. "Implication of a Longitudinal Study of Child Development for Child Psychiatry." American Journal of Psychiatry, CXVII, 1960, 434-441.

Clothier, Florence. "The Psychology of the Adopted Child." Mental Hygiene, Vol. 27 (April, 1943).

Guyatt, Doris E. "Adoption in Ontario." Journal of Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies (November, 1967), 12-15.

Kadushin, Alfred. "Adoption." Encyclopedia of Social Work, 16th issue, Vol. I.

_____, and Seidl, Frederick W. "Adoption Breakdown: A Social Work Postmortem." Social Work, XVI (July, 1971), 32-38.

Kahn, Alfred J. "The Design of Research" Social Work Research Edited by Norman Polansky. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Kirk, H. David. "A Dilemma of Adoptive Parenthood: Incongruous Role Obligations." Journal of Marriage and the Family, Vol. 21 (1959), 316-328.

_____; Jonassohn, Kurt; and Fish, Ann D. "Are Adopted Children Especially Vulnerable to Stress?" Archives of General Psychiatry, Vol. 14, No.3 (March, 1966), 291-298.

Lidkea, William. "Why Some Adoptions Fail." Journal of Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies, XIV (November, 1971), 1-6.

Mundloh, Raymond. "Changing Practice in the Adoptive Home Study." Child Welfare, LXVIII (March, 1969), 148-156.

Rose, John A. "A Re-evaluation of the Concepts of Separation in Child Welfare," Child Welfare, Vol. 41 (1962), 444-458.

Schechter, Marshall. "About Adoptive Parents." Parenthood: Its Psychology and Psychopathology. Edited by James Anthony and Therese Benedek. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1970, 353-372.

_____. "Observations on Adopted Children." Archives of General Psychiatry, Vol. 3, No. 1 (July, 1960), 21-32.

Shyne, Anne W. "Use of Available Material." Social Work Research. Edited by Norman A. Polansky. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Simon, A. J. "Evaluation of Adoptive Parents." A Study of Adoption Practice. Edited by Michael Shapiro. Vol. II. New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1956.

Simon, Nathan, and Santuria, Audrey. "Adoption and Psychiatric Illness." American Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 122, No. 8 (February, 1966).

Weinstein, Eugene and Geisel, Paul. "An Analysis of Sex Differences in Adjustment." Child Development, Vol. 31, No. 4 (December, 1960), 721-728.

Reports

Report of the Advisory Committee on Adoption and Foster Care. Stanley G. Mullins, Chairman. Toronto: Ontario Department of Social and Family Services, 1970.

Report on Selected Issues and Relationships. H. R. Hanson, Chairman. Toronto: Ministry of Community and Social Services, January, 1974.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1969 (90th Edition) Washington, D.C., 1969.

Statutes and Regulations

Adoption Act. Revised Statutes of New Brunswick, Volume I, 1952.

Child Welfare Act. Revised Statutes of Ontario. Volume I, 1970.

Regulations under the Child Welfare Act. Revised Regulations of Ontario. Volume I, 1970.

Welfare of Children Act. Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, Volume I, 1952.

VITAE

VITA

Mary Rose Beaudry was born in Ottawa, Ontario on May 27, 1947. She attended elementary school in Ottawa and Toronto, and was graduated from St. Joseph's High School, Islington in 1965. She then attended the University of Windsor and in 1969 received her Bachelor of Arts degree in sociology and psychology.

In May 1969 she accepted employment with the Roman Catholic Children's Aid Society for the County of Essex as a social worker. She worked at this agency in the Unmarried Parents and Family Services Departments for three years.

In July 1972 she was accepted by the University of Windsor, School of Social Work in the Advanced Standing Programme. In the spring of 1973 she graduated with honours with her Bachelor of Social Work Degree. In the fall of 1973 she was admitted to the Master of Social Work Programme at the University of Windsor and expects to graduate in the fall of 1974.

VITA

Claude G. Bertrand was born in Timmins, Ontario, on November 11, 1947. He attended elementary and secondary schools in that community, graduating from College Sacré-Coeur Secondary School in June of 1966.

In September of 1966, he entered the University of Windsor where he pursued the study of Psychology. He graduated from this University in 1969 with a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Psychology.

For one year after graduating from the University of Windsor, he was in the employ of Rothman's of Pall Mall, Canada, Limited, in Toronto. He later accepted a position as a social worker in the Protection Department of the Porcupine and District Children's Aid Society. He then decided to pursue further his education.

To this end, he enrolled in the Social Work Advanced Standing Program at the University of Windsor in the summer of 1972. The following year he received a Bachelor of Social Work Degree with honours. In September of 1973, he was accepted into the Master of Social Work program at the same University. He expects to graduate in the fall of 1974.

Mr. Bertrand is married to Dianne (nee Payne) and is the father of a little 3 year old girl, Shona.