



McGuire-Snieckus, R. (2023) 'The development of the strengths and risks matching tool for adoption in the United Kingdom', *Families in Society*. DOI: 10.1177/10443894231204170.

Official URL: <https://doi.org/10.1177/10443894231204170>

ResearchSPAce

<http://researchspace.bathspa.ac.uk/>

This pre-published version is made available in accordance with publisher policies.

Please cite only the published version using the reference above.

Your access and use of this document is based on your acceptance of the ResearchSPAce Metadata and Data Policies, as well as applicable law:-

<https://researchspace.bathspa.ac.uk/policies.html>

Unless you accept the terms of these Policies in full, you do not have permission to download this document.

This cover sheet may not be removed from the document.

Please scroll down to view the document.

1
2
3 Title: The development of the Strengths and Risks Matching Tool for Adoption in the United
4 Kingdom
5

6
7 Running title: Strengths and Risks Matching Tool
8

9 **Abstract**

10
11 Identifying the strengths and risks of prospective matches in adoption is crucial to adoption
12 placement stability (Quinton, 2012). With the aim to deliver a consistent and service-led approach
13 to matching children in care with prospective adopters, a tool to identify strengths and risks related
14 to adoption placement was developed. Using a mixed-methods approach, this tool was developed
15 in line with psychometric theory of test construction, from item generation using semi-structured
16 interviews and survey methods, and exploratory factor analysis to determine the factor structure
17 of the assessment to assessment of retest reliability and finalization. Comprising three main
18 components (adopter capabilities and skills, adopter profiles and characteristics, and adoption
19 plans, preparations, and transitions) this tool can be used by practitioners to identify strengths and
20 risks in proposed matches at any point during the linking and matching process.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 **Keywords**

36
37
38
39 Adoption, Qualitative research, Quantitative research, Strengths based practice
40
41

42 **Introduction**

43
44
45
46 The main purpose of adoption today is to ‘provide security and permanent family relationships for
47 some of society’s most vulnerable children’ (Thomas, 2013). In the United Kingdom, a **local**
48 **authority** can apply to the court for a ‘care order’ for a child understood to be suffering from, or at
49 risk of, significant harm, under the UK’s 1989 Children Act. An independent social worker will
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 then be appointed as guardian and a solicitor will be assigned to represent the child to determine
4
5 where the child should reside and who should care for them.
6

7
8 Children subjected to such a care order are described as ‘looked after’ or ‘in care’. In England,
9
10 Wales and Northern Ireland the definition of looked after refers to ‘children in out-of-home care
11
12 supervised by a local authority’ (McGhee et al., 2018). A total of 80,850 children were in the care
13
14 of local authorities in England in 2021: 66% for reasons of abuse or neglect, 14% for family
15
16 dysfunction, 8% due to families in acute distress, and 5% for absent parenting (UK Government,
17
18 2021). Most looked after children (71%) live in foster placements including with foster friends or
19
20 relatives (15%) and fostering by another carer (56%), while others are accommodated in secure
21
22 units (4%), with parents (7%), children homes and semi-independent living arrangements (4%) or
23
24 placed for adoption (3%) (UK Government, 2021).
25
26
27

28
29 In the UK, authorities are required to provide a permanence plan for any child in care (UK
30
31 Government, 2010). The court may make a placement order if it is determined that the child is at
32
33 significant risk and that needs of the child can’t be met by the parents or extended family within a
34
35 reasonable timescale and that the long-term welfare needs of the child would be best met by
36
37 adoption, appointing a child social worker as guardian and solicitor to represent the child. The
38
39 local authority is authorized by the placement order to place a child with approved prospective
40
41 adoptive parents. The rights of the child are predicated on the needs and welfare of the child and
42
43 are at the heart of all decisions relating to adoption (UK Government, 2002). Recommendation
44
45 decisions for child adoption are taken by the department of social services who maintain case
46
47 responsibility for the child. A total of 2,870 children were adopted in the year preceding March
48
49 2021 (UK Government, 2021). The average time for a child between entering care and being
50
51 placed for adoption is 16 months, with a further 10 months for the granting of an adoption order
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to complete the adoption (UK Government, 2021). Delays in adoption placements can occur where
4
5 birth parents do not give their consent to an adoption order and contest assessments and judgements
6
7 made by social services in the lower courts (Doughty, 2015).
8
9

10 Adoption reports are conducted by 'Act Qualified' professionals (a social worker who is
11
12 employed by a local authority or registered adoption agency who has completed social work
13
14 qualifications approved by the English or Welsh Councils, has had at least three years' post-
15
16 qualifying experience in child care social work, including direct experience of adoption work, and
17
18 is supervised by a qualified social worker employed by the same local authority or registered
19
20 adoption agency with at least three year's post-qualifying experience in child care or social work,
21
22 including direct experience of adoption social work) (UK Government, 2005). 'Child social
23
24 workers' are Act Qualified professionals representing children in care and adoption social workers
25
26 are Act Qualified professionals representing prospective adopters.
27
28
29
30

31 Using the Child Permanence Record (CPR), child social workers obtain information on
32
33 child characteristics, ethnic and religious background, family history and care chronology,
34
35 psychosocial development and current circumstances as well as descriptive and evaluative
36
37 information (Quinton, 2012). The CPR contains assessments of child needs detailed by both the
38
39 Adoption and Permanence Taskforce (UK Government, 2004) and the Assessment Framework
40
41 (UK Government, 2000), including: health needs, education needs, emotional and behavioral
42
43 development, needs, identity needs, family and social relationship needs, attachment needs,
44
45 contact needs, self-care needs, accommodation needs and any other specific needs to the child.
46
47 Statutory requirements (UK Government, 2013) emphasize the 'importance of the accuracy of the
48
49 CPR since it will not only form the basis on which decisions are made about whether the child
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 should be placed for adoption but will also assist the agency in matching the child with an
4
5 appropriate prospective adopter.’
6

7
8 Prospective adopters must engage in a two-stage adoption assessment process established
9
10 by the Department for Education (UK Government, 2013) with guidelines for preparation (stage
11
12 1) and assessment (stage 2) over a timescale of approximately 6 months. In the first stage statutory
13
14 references including background and medical checks are completed before a formal application to
15
16 adopt is made. Preparatory training focuses on child development, birth families, understanding
17
18 and managing behavior as well as reflection on how one’s own experiences and background may
19
20 influence parenting. Prospective adopters with successful applications are assigned an adoption
21
22 social worker to manage the assessment process. In the second stage, several home visits are
23
24 arranged with a focus on the assessment of the skills, experiences and support network of the
25
26 prospective adopters. All assessments are detailed in the Prospective Adopter's Report (PAR)
27
28 which specifies adopter characteristics identified by the Adoption Agencies Regulations that must
29
30 be taken into account, including: (Section A) basic demographic and family information; (Section
31
32 B) evaluation and suitability of applicants; (Section C) other reports including family tree,
33
34 ecomaps, chronology, preparation, home study, medical report, referees; (Section D) reference
35
36 checks; (Section E) adoption competencies (this includes the prospective adopter's capacity to care
37
38 for children, to provide a caring and safe environment, to work as part of a team with individuals
39
40 and organizations, to see adoption as a lifelong process, and to attend to one's own development)
41
42 (Quinton, 2012) and is in line with Department for Education and Skills (UK Government, 2006)
43
44 guidance on Preparing and Assessing Prospective Adopters.
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 While one or more prospective families are identified as having the capacity to meet the
52
53 needs of a particular child through linking processes, a local authority determines one family to be
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 most suitable to meeting the needs of a specific child through matching processes (Dance et al.,
4 2010). According to the Statutory Guidance on Adoption: ‘Making a good match between a child
5 and prospective adopter is a highly skilled task and is vital for both the child and the prospective
6 adopter’ (UK Government, 2013). The decision regarding whether a proposed match can proceed
7 is determined by a Matching Panel, which takes into consideration all documents including the
8 Adoption Placement Report (APR) which details a profile of child and summary of family finding,
9 a profile of prospective adopter/s, areas considered in matching (including specific needs of the
10 child and the ability of prospective adopters to meet those needs), details of the adoptive and birth
11 families, and prospective adopters’ views.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 In a review of 149 case files of children recommended for adoption in 10 local authorities
25 and follow-up interviews regarding 67 cases with case workers and families using two independent
26 raters the quality of matches was rated according to “how much compromise had been made on
27 the matching requirements for the child or on the adopter’s preferences” (Farmer and Dance,
28 2016). While most matches were of good quality - 27% were identified as of fair or poor quality,
29 requiring compromise on the part of the adoptive families with poorer outcomes 6 months later
30 related to poor quality matches (Farmer and Dance, 2016). Disruption to placements carries
31 significant risks to children. Mismatches between families and children are identified as a factor
32 in disruption, particularly with respect to expectations and parental lack of skills and ability to
33 manage the behavioral or psychological needs of the children (Hanna and McRoy, 2011).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 A survey of experiences of nearly 3000 adopters (Evans, 2018) revealed that while nearly
48 three quarters of the respondents described their experience of adoption as either ‘challenging but
49 stable’ or ‘fulfilling and stable,’ -- more than a quarter were facing ‘serious challenges that had an
50 impact on the wider family,’ were ‘at risk of breakdown or disruption’ or had ‘already disrupted’.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 While this provides a useful snapshot of the experiences of adopters drawn from a large sample, it
4 does not detail the specific challenges experienced by the family or the reasons specified for the
5 risk of breakdown or disruption.
6
7
8
9

10 There exists a paucity of research that explores factors predicting adoption placement
11 stability and disruption, with some exceptions. With the aim to explore factors in making a good
12 match, factors that preclude a match, and barriers to linking and matching, open-ended questions
13 were asked on an online survey conducted by Dance et al. (2010) with of 74 local authorities and
14 29 voluntary agencies in England and Wales. Themes relating to practice, process and organization
15 (i.e., accurate information about the child, stretching of adopter preferences), adopters'
16 characteristics (i.e., support network, birth children), and adopters' attitudes and understanding
17 (i.e., realistic expectations, flexibility) emerged. While the qualitative data suggest themes
18 regarded by professionals as pertinent to the matching process, it does not indicate the relative
19 strength of each theme in determining the outcome of successful or unsuccessful matches.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Identifying the strengths and risks of prospective matches in adoption is crucial to adoption
34 placement stability and outcome success (Quinton, 2012). However, in the survey of 74 local
35 authorities and 29 voluntary agencies in England and Wales conducted by Dance et al. (2010)
36 considerable variation in matching practices was revealed. While 70% of agencies used a
37 formalized meeting to discuss matches, they were not used in all cases and decision about which
38 family to proceed with ultimately rested with the child's allocated social worker. Only 10 of the
39 authorities reported using a structured method for linking and matching assessment to consider
40 information in an objective manner (which were not used consistently by the authorities) and only
41 4 of the agencies reported using grids or matrices to compare children's needs with adopters'
42 capacities. The authors concluded: 'matching as a task is relatively unexplored and conceptually
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 underdeveloped'. At the core of child protection systems – whether the UK, Netherlands, US,
4 Spain, or Russian Federation – are the core aims of seeking permanence and stability for the child
5 (Palacios et al., 2019). Finding a permanent home for children in care relies on systems of matching
6 to determine the skills and capacities of prospective adopters to meet the needs of the child.
7 Realistic expectations focused on the needs of the child (Brodzinsky & Smith, 2019) and an
8 understanding of the risk and protective factors related to a proposed match is key to disruption
9 prevention and placement stability (Barbosa-Ducharne & Marinho, 2019).

10
11
12 **With the aim to support Adoption Workers and minimize adoption disruptions, a consistent**
13 **and service-led approach to matching is needed. Collaborating with local authorities and voluntary**
14 **agencies across the South West Adoption Consortium in England, taking a service-led approach,**
15 **the aim of this study is to develop a matching tool to identify the strengths and risks for proposed**
16 **matches between prospective adopters and children in care.**

30 **Method**

31
32
33 Using a mixed-methods approach, a strengths and risks matching tool for adoption was developed
34 in three stages. In Stage 1, semi-structured interview and questionnaire survey methods were used
35 to generate items for the first version of the strengths and risks matching tool. In Stage 2, **Act**
36 **Qualified professionals** used the tool to rate their confidence in existing and recent matches. To
37 determine the factor structure, the items were subjected to Principal Components Analysis (PCA)
38 using Varimax rotation. The re-test reliability of the tool was determined in stage 3. All stages
39 were approved by the University research ethics committee, including informed consent, in line
40 with British Psychological Society research ethics requirements and GDPR regulations.

41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49 *Stage 1: Item generation for draft tool*
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Themes identified as relevant to Act Qualified professionals with prospective adopters were
4 identified in two substages: semi-structured interview; and survey methods.
5
6

7 *Semi-structured interviews*

8
9
10 Purposive sampling (Kalton, 1983) was used by inviting 12 senior Act Qualified
11 professionals across the South West Adoption Consortium (SWAC) from 12 different locations (7
12 local authorities and 5 voluntary adoption agencies) to take part. In line with Bearman (2019), the
13 interview schedule was designed to explore ‘core’ events related to the phenomena of interest, in
14 this case, factors related to subjectively perceived ‘good’ and ‘poor’ matches, and those, by
15 experience, related to placement stability and disruption.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Interviews were audiotaped and transcribed, and data-driven thematic analysis was used to
25 allow themes to emerge from the data (Braun and Clarke, 2006). The structure of the analysis was
26 facilitated using the software NVivo. Participants were asked to identify factors relevant to
27 successful and unsuccessful matches and what they have learned from disruptions. Themes raised
28 by 25% or more of the sample were included as items in the first draft of the Strengths and Risks
29 tool.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 *Survey*

39
40 The semi-structured interviews were followed by an online survey that included themes identified
41 as key to successful and unsuccessful outcomes derived from a free-text open ended survey with
42 74 local authority and 29 voluntary agencies conducted by Dance et al. (2010). Participants were
43 asked to rate the importance of each factor in successful matching and unsuccessful matching
44 /disrupted placements on a scale from 0 (= not at all) to 10 (= completely) with the opportunity for
45 free text explanation for each. Factors ranked at 5/10 or higher in terms of importance were
46 included as items in the first draft of the tool.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Stage 2: Identifying components and item reduction*
4

5 Items generated in the first stage were amalgamated into one assessment tool. The scale consisted
6 of an information sheet describing the academic rationale, aims procedure and ethics address,
7 consent form, questions regarding role and location (local authority or adoption agency) and the
8 41 strengths and risks in adoption matching items derived from stage one to be rated on a scale
9 from 0 (=not at all) to 4 (=completely) and debrief information. Act Qualified professionals across
10 the South West Adoption Consortium were invited to take part to complete the first draft version
11 of the tool for recent and current matches using purposive sampling.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 In total 87 scales were completed representing current and recent matches considered by
23 professionals that are responsible for matching. Participants were recruited from across 12 Local
24 authorities and 5 Adoption Agencies from the South West Adoption Consortium. 18 (22%) of the
25 scales were completed by child social workers, 39 (47.6%) by adoption social workers, 18 (22%)
26 by family finding social workers, 3 (3.4%) by adoption service managers, (3.4%) by adoption
27 service practitioners, and 1 (1.1%) by an adoption team manager. The role of the practitioner was
28 not declared on 5 of the completed scales. 47 (55.3%) of the scales pertained to matches within a
29 local authority and 37 (42.5%) to matches within an adoption agency. The location of the match
30 was not declared in three of the completed scales.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Principal Components Analysis PCA with Varimax rotation was used to determine the factor
43 structure and reduce the scale to the most discriminating items (Cohen et al., 2017; Shah & Yeoh,
44 2018). Noting factors with eigenvalues greater than 3, items with factor loadings of 0.6 or greater
45 were retained (Cohen et al., 2017; Shah & Yeoh, 2018). Components with three or more items and
46 an acceptable internal consistency (i.e., Cronbach's $\alpha > 0.65$) were retained for subscale
47 construction, in line with Cohen et al. (2017) and Shah and Yeoh (2018).
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Stage 3: Retest reliability*
4
5

6 Items retained in the first stage contributed to the second version of the Strengths and Risks
7 matching tool for adoption. The scale consisted of an information sheet describing the academic
8 rationale, aims procedure and ethics address, consent form, questions regarding role and location
9 (local authority or adoption agency), a prompt question to match pairs, and the 37 retained
10 strengths and risks in adoption matching items retained in stage two to be rated on a scale from 0
11 (=not at all) to 4 (=completely) and debrief information. **Act Qualified professionals** across the
12 South West Adoption Consortium were invited to take part to complete the second draft version
13 of the tool twice for current matches during the most stable period of the matching process to
14 determine the retest reliability of the tool. Participants were asked to complete the tool at any time
15 from the agreement of the matching panel (Time 1) and a second time with a minimum of one-
16 week interval (Time 2) provided there was no further information that came to light that might
17 impact on the rating of the scale. In total 43 matched scales were completed. Participants were
18 recruited from across 12 Local authorities and 5 Adoption Agencies from the South West Adoption
19 Consortium. 19 (21%) of the scales were completed by child social workers, 19 (44.2%) by
20 adoption social workers, 11 (25.6%) by family finding social workers and 4 (9.3%) by assessing
21 social workers. 13 (30.2%) of the scales pertained to matches within a local authority and 30
22 (69.8%) to matches within an adoption agency. Bivariate correlations (Pearson's r) **were** used to
23 determine the reliability of each item at the two time points. Items with the lowest retest reliability
24 on each factor were discarded (Burnett & Fanshawe, 1997).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 The new data set was subjected to repeated Principal Components Analysis (PCA) with Varimax
51 rotation (again retaining factors with eigenvalues greater than 3 and items with factor loadings of
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 0.6 or greater) to determine if the component structure identified in stage two still fit the model, in
4
5 line with Ferguson and Takane (1989) and Nunnally and Bernstein (1994).
6
7

8 **Findings**

9 *Stage 1: Item generation for draft tool*

10
11
12 Items for the draft tool were generated by two substages: semi-structured interview; and survey
13
14 methods. In total 41 themes emerged from at least 25% of the interview sample (33 items) and /
15
16 or were given an average rating of 5/10 or higher in the survey (15 items) based previous research
17
18 (Dance et al., 2010), with 7 items that overlapped (themes arose in the preceding interview that
19
20 were also in the survey based on the work by Dance et al. (2010).
21
22
23

24 *Semi structured interviews*

25
26 A total of 33 themes emerged, each representing the views of at least one quarter of the sample, in
27
28 the semi-structured interviews (with 7 themes that overlapped with the survey based previous
29
30 research (Dance et al., 2010). Table 1 details each theme, the percentage of the sample that raised
31
32 each theme, and an example quote pertaining to each theme in the interviews [Insert Table 1 here].
33
34

35 *Survey*

36
37 A total of 15 items in the survey based on the work by Dance et al. (2010) were given an average
38
39 rating of 5/10 or higher, with 7 items that overlapped with themes in the preceding semi-structured
40
41 interviews. Table 2 details each item and the average rating by the sample for each item. [Insert
42
43 Table 2 here].
44
45

46 *Stage 2: Identifying components and item reduction*

47
48
49 Three components with an eigenvalue >3 were revealed by Principle Components Analysis using
50
51 Varimax Rotation, explaining 89.18% of the variance (37.4%, 26.47% and 25.31%, respectively).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 A clear break after the third component was revealed by an inspection of the scree plot and these
4 three components were retained using Cattell's scree test (1996).

5
6
7 Components with three or more items and an acceptable internal consistency ($\alpha > 0.65$) were
8 retained. Four items with insufficient factor loadings (<0.6) were dropped. All three components
9
10 had more than three items with good internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.92, 0.87$ and 0.89 , respectively).
11
12 Component 1 had 17 items that clustered around themes relating to "Adopter capabilities and
13
14 skills. Component 2 had 10 items relating to "Adopter profile and characteristics." Component 3
15
16 had 10 items relating to themes of "Plans, preparations and transitions." Table 3 shows the three
17
18 retained components and the item loadings. [Insert Table 3 here].
19
20
21
22
23

24 *Stage 3: Reliability of items and finalizing the scale*

25
26 In total 43 scales were completed twice with a minimum one-week interval (from time of
27
28 agreement of match to proceed to matching panel) by professionals that are responsible for
29
30 matching children in care to adopters across the South West of England. Bivariate correlation was
31
32 used to test the reliability of the items. The retest reliability for all items ranged from $r = .36$ to
33
34 0.91 . The reliability of the retained items ranged from 0.66 to 0.99 ($p < 0.05$). Three items with
35
36 insufficient reliability ($r < 0.4, p > 0.05$) were discarded. Principal Components Analysis PCA
37
38 with Varimax rotation (Ferguson & Takane, 1989) was conducted, explaining 91.65% of the total
39
40 variance, confirming the original three-factor structure model (each component explained 66.77% ,
41
42 13.60% and 11.27% of the total variance, respectively).
43
44
45
46

47 The final version of the STrengths And Risks (STAR) adoption matching tool has a total
48
49 of 34 items with three components (16 items comprising 'Adopter capabilities and skills', 9 items
50
51 comprising 'Adopter profile and characteristics', and 9 items comprising 'Plans, preparations and
52
53 transitions').
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Completing the scale usually takes 15 minutes or less. Scores can be obtained for the total
4 scale, subscales and individual items. While there is no threshold score for a ‘good match’, in the
5 sample in which the scale was developed, the mean sum score of STAR was 116.06 (S.D =11.38)
6 [minimum score = 100, maximum score = 136]. On the subscales, mean sum scores were 50.1(SD
7 = 5.4) for ‘Adopter capabilities and skills’, 34.4 (SD = 3.77) on ‘Adopter profile and
8 characteristics’, and 28.63 (SD = 11.39) on ‘Plans, preparations and transitions’.
9

10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 **Discussion**

18
19 The first component, ‘Adopter capabilities and skills’, emphasizes the ability of the prospective
20 adopter to meet the needs of the child (i.e., social needs, emotional and behavioral need) and the
21 capability and skill required to manage the especial challenges that may come with adoptive
22 parenting (i.e., realistic expectations of the unknown challenges, disruptive behavior and potential
23 painful disclosure and resilience and demonstrated ability to face challenges and difficulties). As
24 there is a strong link between early deprivation and the chance of becoming looked after (McGhee
25 et al., 2018) the needs of children in care are often complex. Among adopted children, early
26 adversity predicts enduring emotional and behavioral problems in childhood, including post
27 traumatic mental health symptoms (Paine et al., 2021). A systematic review by Brown et al. (2017)
28 revealed that compared with non-adopted children, adopted children exhibit higher levels of
29 behavior problems with lower academic attainment across childhood, adolescence and emerging
30 adulthood. Research evidence consistently demonstrates an association between adoption
31 disruption risk and family factors such as domestic violence and child maltreatment and child
32 related factors such as behavior difficulties (Selwyn et al., 2014). **Sharma et al.** (1996) explored
33 the emotional and social adjustment of 4682 adopted adolescents in the US revealing that as age
34 at adoption increased, the level of overall adoptee adjustment decreased. Based on interviews with
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 102 children adopted between the ages of eight and ten, Soares et al. (2019) explored the
4 experiences of adapting to post adoption life, revealing the complex and often ambivalent
5 experiences of older children and the need for adopters to have the skills and capacities to help
6 them ‘make sense’ of their life stories.
7
8
9
10
11

12 Items relating to the second component, ‘Adopter profile and characteristics’ relate to the
13 adopter’s motivation (i.e., reflection on, and resolution of, their reasons for adoption and
14 preferences are not stretched) and child-centered approach to adoption (i.e., commitment to the
15 long-term needs of the child, readiness of adopters to prioritize the needs of the child over their
16 own emotional or lifestyle needs. Cousins (2003) highlighted a ‘fundamental mismatch’ between
17 the characteristics of children available for adoption and the ‘kinds’ of children whom adopters
18 seek to adopt, and the limitations of adopter assessment and child profiling calling for an approach
19 that is ‘led by the needs of the real child’ as opposed to ‘hypothetical matching’ categories and a
20 process that tends to highlight child ‘deficits’, failing to portray the ‘whole child’.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 The final component, ‘Plans, preparations and transitions’ refers to the importance of
34 information (i.e., information regarding the personal history and needs of the child is as detailed,
35 specific and up to date as possible and good communication between all parties), planning (i.e.,
36 quality of introduction plan and quality of support plan) and transition and
37 preparation for the child and receiving household (i.e., preparation of child for introduction and
38 consideration of proposed match on existing birth children and adopted children). Beyond ‘general
39 preparation for adoption’, Rushton and Monck (2009) emphasize the importance of preparing for
40 the adoption of a particular child– to take account the best means, timing, preparation and support
41 needed for best outcomes. An in-depth survey of 319 adoptive parents conducted by Neil et al.
42 (2020) revealed detrimental effects resulting from poorly managed transitions. A systematic
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 review of Liao (2016) of empirical post-permanency outcomes revealed the importance of
4 adoption preparation as a protective factor affecting adoption and guardianship adjustment. The
5 importance of pre-adoption training and post-adoption support was highlighted by Moyer and
6 Goldberg (2017) where adoptive parents expressed especial stress where there was a lack of
7 preparation and support for the unexpected needs of the child.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 **Implications for practice**

18
19 The STrengths and Risks (STAR) matching tool for adoption was developed to support the practice
20 of Act Qualified professionals to identify strengths and risks in proposed matches and can be used
21 at any point during the linking and matching process for a variety of purposes. Social workers
22 using the tool can consider scores for each question, each subscale and/or a whole score. The total
23 STAR score can be obtained by adding the scores for each of the 34 questions (range 0-136). The
24 differences for each subscale can also be considered. These scores can be obtained by summing
25 the items for each section: theme 1 (range 0-60), theme 2 (range 0-40) and theme 3 (range 0- 36).
26 While there is no threshold to denote a ‘good’ match, the relative difference between scorings
27 provides the opportunity for professionals to reflect on their confidence in the relative strengths
28 and risks regarding each proposed match and each family. In practice, the STAR tool can be used
29 at any point during the linking and matching process. This tool could be used to shortlist in the
30 linking process when considering more than one prospective adoptive family or foster carers
31 wishing to adopt a child in their care. To identify gaps in information within the Prospective
32 Adopter’s Report (PAR) in relation to the proposed link this tool can also be used. Act Qualified
33 professionals can use the tool to reflect on and assess their confidence in a proposed match by
34 exploring potential strengths or areas of risk that they may not have considered and to articulate
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 'gut feeling' intuitions by exploring a range of strengths and risks. To strengthen decision making
4 when matching children with additional / complex needs this tool might be helpful for Act
5
6 Qualified professionals to use with prospective adopters to discuss expectations. This tool might
7
8 also be helpful to support conversations when giving feedback to prospective adoptive families
9
10 and to assist in developing a shared view and understanding between Act Qualified professionals.
11
12 Over the matching process, this tool could be used as an indicator of increased confidence in a
13
14 proposed match as the link progresses. This tool could also be used to mitigate risks by considering
15
16 a range of potential vulnerabilities and put in place appropriate support and as a final checklist
17
18 before going to Panel. Future research could explore the usefulness of this tool in practice at
19
20 different stages and for different purposes in the linking and matching process.
21
22
23
24
25

26 **Limitations**

27
28 Some limitations of the development of the scale should be considered. The scale was developed
29
30 and tested within a necessarily selective sample, namely, those professionals that consented to take
31
32 part in the research. The scale was developed with and for the South West Adoption Consortium
33
34 and it remains to be tested outside of this context. Further research might test the generalizability
35
36 of the scale in wider regions nationally, as well as internationally. The ability of this matching
37
38 scale to improve placement stability and to minimize disruptions, might also be tested in future
39
40 research.
41
42
43

44 **Conclusion**

45
46 The STrengths And Risks (STAR) adoption matching tool was specifically developed with and
47
48 for professionals responsible for matching in adoption with good psychometric properties. A
49
50 systematic and rigorous development process through all stages was conducted in line with
51
52 psychometric theory of psychological test construction, from item generation using open
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 interviews, to preliminary test construction to the assessment of the retest reliability and
4
5 finalization of the tool. Parental perspectives of experiences of disruption revealed a lack of
6
7 information about the child that some parents felt they lacked about the child at the matching stage
8
9 (Lyttle et al., 2021). The ability to determine the effectiveness of this tool in minimizing
10
11 disruptions will be revealed by its use.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Barbosa-Ducharne, M. & Marinho, S. (2019). Beyond the child's age at placement: Risk and protective factors in preadoption breakdown in Portugal. *Research on Social Work Practice, 29* (2), 143-152. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731518783855>
- Bearman, M. (2019). Eliciting rich data: A practical approach to writing semi-structured interview schedules. *Focus on Health Professional Education: A Multi-disciplinary Journal, 20* (3), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.11157/fohpe.v20i3.387>
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology, 3* (2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Brodzinsky, D., & Smith, S. (2019). Commentary: Understanding research, policy, and practice issues in adoption instability. *Research on Social Work Practice, 29* (2), 185-194. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10497315187826>
- Brown, A., Waters, C. & Shelton, K. (2017). A systematic review of the school performance and behavioural and emotional adjustments of children adopted from care. *Adoption & Fostering, 41* (4)34, 6-368. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0308575917731064>
- Burnett, P. & Fanshawe, J. (1997). Measuring school-related stressors in adolescents. *Journal of youth and adolescence, 26* (4), 415-428. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024529321194>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2017). *Research Methods in Education*. Routledge. ISBN 9781315456539
- Cattell, R. (1966). The scree test for the number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1*(2), 245-276. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr0102_10
- Cousins, J. (2003). Are We Missing the Match?: Rethinking Adopter Assessment and Child Profiling. *Adoption & Fostering, 27* (4), 7-18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030857590302700403>

- 1
2
3 Dance, C., Ouwejan D., Beecham, J. & Farmer, E. (2010). *Linking and matching: A survey of*
4 *adoption agency practice in England and Wales*. British Association for Adoption and
5 *Fostering*. <https://kar.kent.ac.uk/id/eprint/24880>
6
7
8
9
10 Doughty, J. (2015). Where nothing else will do: Judicial approaches to adoption in England and
11 *Wales*. *Adoption & Fostering*, 39(2), 105-118. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0308575915586298>
12
13
14 Evans, R. (2018). Adopting: A better approach. *Community Practitioner*, 91 (8), 39-41.
15 [https://www.proquest.com/openview/0208669cebaca2aca2ed22a7f44ac4ba/1?pq-](https://www.proquest.com/openview/0208669cebaca2aca2ed22a7f44ac4ba/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=47216)
16 [origsite=gscholar&cbl=47216](https://www.proquest.com/openview/0208669cebaca2aca2ed22a7f44ac4ba/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=47216)
17
18
19
20
21 Farmer, E. & Dance, C. (2016). Family Finding and Matching in Adoption: What Helps to Make
22 a Good Match? *British Journal of Social Work* 46 (4), 974-992.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcv003>
24
25
26
27
28 Ferguson, G. & Takane, Y. (1989). *Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education* (6th Ed.).
29 McGraw-Hill. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1961-00060-000>
30
31
32
33 Hanna, M. & McRoy, R. (2011). Innovative practice approaches to matching in adoption. *Journal*
34 *of Public Child Welfare* 5 (1), 45-66.
35 [https://www.tandfonline.com/action/showCitFormats?doi=10.1080%2F15548732.2011.5](https://www.tandfonline.com/action/showCitFormats?doi=10.1080%2F15548732.2011.542722)
36 [42722](https://www.tandfonline.com/action/showCitFormats?doi=10.1080%2F15548732.2011.542722)
37
38
39
40
41
42 Kalton, G. (1983). Models in the practice of survey sampling. *International Statistical Review*,
43 175-188. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1402747>
44
45
46
47 Liao, M. (2016). Factors affecting post-permanency adjustment for children in adoption or
48 guardianship placements: An ecological systems analysis. *Children and Youth Services*
49 *Review*, 66, 131-143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2016.05.009>
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Lyttle, E., McCafferty, P. & Taylor, B. (2021). Experiences of adoption disruption: Parents'
4 perspectives. *Child Care in Practice*, 1-20.
5
6 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13575279.2021.1941767>
7
8
9
10 McGhee, J., Bunting, L., McCartan, C., Elliott, M., Bywaters, P. & Featherstone, B. (2018).
11 Looking after children in the UK—convergence or divergence? *British Journal of Social*
12 *Work*, 48 (5), 1176-1198. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcx103>
13
14
15
16
17 Moyer, A. & Goldberg, A. (2017). 'We were not planning on this, but...': Adoptive parents'
18 reactions and adaptations to unmet expectations. *Child & Family Social Work*, 22, 12-21.
19
20 <https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12219>
21
22
23
24 Neil, E., Morciano, M., Young, J. & Hartley, L. (2020). Exploring links between early adversities
25 and later outcomes for children adopted from care: Implications for planning post adoption
26 support. *Developmental Child Welfare*, 2 (1), 52-71.
27
28 <https://doi.org/10.1177/2516103220908043>
29
30
31
32
33 Nunnally, J. & Bernstein, I. (1994). *Psychometric Theory* (3rd Ed.). McGraw-Hill.
34
35
36 Paine, A., Fahey K., Anthony, R. & Shelton, K. (2021). Early adversity predicts adoptees' enduring
37 emotional and behavioral problems in childhood. *European child & adolescent psychiatry*,
38 30, 721-732. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-020-01553-0>
39
40
41
42 Palacios, J., Rolock, N., Selwyn, J. & Barbosa-Ducharne, M. (2019). Adoption breakdown:
43 Concept, research, and implications. *Research on Social Work Practice* 29 (2), 130-142.
44
45 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731518783852>
46
47
48
49 Quinton, D. (2012). *Rethinking matching in adoptions from care: A conceptual and research*
50 *Review*. British Association for Adoption and Fostering.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Rushton, A. & Monck, E. (2009.) Adopters' experiences of preparation to parent children with
4 serious difficulties. *Adoption & Fostering*, 33(2), 4-12.
5
6 <https://doi.org/10.1177/030857590903300202>
7
8
9
10 Selwyn, J., Wijedasa, D. & Meakings, S. (2014). *Beyond the Adoption Order: challenges,*
11 *interventions and disruptions.* Department for Education.
12
13 [https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:2f2cfd06-0aa8-4cc8-9f38-](https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:2f2cfd06-0aa8-4cc8-9f38-74662ceaf7bf/files/stm70mw29m)
14 [74662ceaf7bf/files/stm70mw29m](https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:2f2cfd06-0aa8-4cc8-9f38-74662ceaf7bf/files/stm70mw29m)
15
16
17
18
19 Shah, M. & Yeoh, W. (2018). *Applying Business Initiatives in Healthcare and Organizational*
20 *Settings.* IGI Global. ISBN 1522557180
21
22
23
24 Sharma, A., McGue, M. & Benson, P. (1996). The emotional and behavioral adjustment of United
25 States adopted adolescents: Part II. Age at adoption. *Children and Youth Services Review*,
26 18 (1-2), 101-114. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0190-7409\(95\)00055-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0190-7409(95)00055-0)
27
28
29
30
31 Soares, J., Ralha, S., Barbosa-Ducharne & Palacios, J. (2019). Adoption-related gains, losses and
32 difficulties: The adopted child's perspective. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*,
33 36(3), 259-268. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10560-018-0582-0>
34
35
36
37
38 Thomas, C. (2013). *Adoption for looked after children: Messages from research.* British
39 Association for Adoption and Fostering.
40
41 http://www.adoptionresearchinitiative.org.uk/docs/ARi%20overview_WEB.pdf
42
43
44
45 UK Government. (2021, March). Office for National Statistics. Children looked after in England
46 including adoptions. [https://explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk/find-](https://explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk/find-statistics/children-looked-after-in-england-including-adoptions/2021)
47 [statistics/children-looked-after-in-england-including-adoptions/2021](https://explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk/find-statistics/children-looked-after-in-england-including-adoptions/2021)
48
49
50
51
52 UK Government. (2013). Department for Education. *Statutory Guidance on Adoption For local*
53 *authorities, voluntary adoption agencies and adoption support agencies.*
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/270100/adoption_statutory_guidance_2013.pdf

4
5
6
7
8 UK Government. (2010). Government Legislation. *The Children's Act 1989 Guidance and*
9
10 *Regulations Volume 2: Care Planning, Placement and Care Review*. DCSF Publications.
11
12 https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1000549/The_Children_Act_1989_guidance_and_regulations_Volume_2_care_planning_placement_and_case_review.pdf

13
14
15
16
17
18
19 UK Government. (2006) Department for Education and Skills. *Preparing and Assessing*
20
21 *Prospective Adopters: Practice Guidance*.
22
23 https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/266125/preparing_and_assessing_prospective_adopters_-_2006.pdf

24
25
26
27
28 UK Government (2005). *The restriction on the preparation of adoption reports regulations*.
29
30 <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukdsi/2005/0110723473/regulation/3?voew=plain>

31
32
33 UK Government (2004). Department of Health Adoption and Permanence Taskforce. *Permanence*
34
35 *Planning: Notes for Practitioners*. Social Care Institute for Excellence. <https://www.scie-socialcareonline.org.uk/permanence-planning-notes-for-practitioners/r/a11G0000001824xIAA>

36
37
38
39
40
41
42 UK Government. (2002). Government Legislation. *Adoption and Children Act*.
43
44 <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2002/38/contents>

45
46
47 UK Government. (2000). Department of Health. *Framework for the Assessment of Children in*
48
49 *Need and their Families*.
50
51 <https://bettercarenetwork.org/sites/default/files/Framework%20for%20the%20Assessmen>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

[t%20of%20Children%20in%20Need%20and%20Their%20Families%20-%20Guidance%20Notes%20and%20Glossary.pdf](#)

Table 1. Semi-Structured Interview Themes

Theme	%	Example
Adopter's commitment to the long-term needs of the child	83%	"Are they going to be committed, they are going to be caring for the child from 18 and beyond, they may be globally delayed and it is appreciating that they are still going to need help and support beyond that."
Quality of adopter's support network (that they understand and accept the potential challenges of adoption and are able to offer both practical and emotional support) *	83%	"That adopters have a robust support network because what we know about placements that are struggling is that that they become very inward looking and isolated and supporters go away and can't help or don't like what the child is doing and parents become isolated, and that is not healthy."
Quality of support plan / post adoption support for family *	83%	"Services need to be diverse and available throughout the life of the placement."
Adopter's ability to recognize from their own life experience their expectations, triggers and responses	75%	"Someone who is aware of their triggers, are able to manage their feelings if they are triggered and reflect on it afterwards."
Realistic expectations of the unknown challenges, disruptive behavior and potential painful disclosures *	75%	"We have had very few disruptions but one factor that has been common in all has been the level of behavior, difficult and challenging behavior that the adopters were finding themselves faced with was way beyond something they had expected."
Readiness of adopters to priorities the needs of the child over their own emotional or lifestyle needs	75%	"Prepared to change to their current lifestyle."
Adopter's ability to reflect on and achieve some resolution of their own experiences of being parented *	75%	"Their own experiences of being parented. Whether we like it or not our own parenting experience is our default and sometimes people are learning that"
Adopter's capacity to be an advocate on behalf of the child, to work with and challenge professionals and schools, to seek help and access services	67%	"Being able to advocate. If the child has specific needs to be able to stand up and get whatever services that child needs"

1			
2			
3	Playfulness of the adopter's ability to	67%	"To be playful, have fun, be a bit stupid
4	get on child's level to play, have a		and not go straight to boundaries, yes it
5	sense of humor and have fun		important to feel safe, but do not
6			prioritize boundaries ahead of having
7			fun and a connection and developing
8			that relationship."
9			
10			
11	Ability to meet health needs (including	67%	"What the child's needs are, what are
12	physical and mental) of the child		the likely health issues."
13	Ability to meet the emotional and	67%	"To have an understanding of all the
14	behavioral development needs of the		behaviour that you see in your child as
15	child (especially with respect to		a communication of their emotional
16	attachment and behavior impact		state, so an understanding of that and
17	resulting from trauma)		responding to the emotion."
18			
19			
20	Adopter's understanding of the	58%	"That it is going to be a rough ride, that
21	known/unknown and uncertain impact		they really get the child's history and
22	of trauma (i.e., parental substance		what that might mean for a child, the
23	abuse during pregnancy, experiences of		impact, that they get that."
24	neglect, loss and violence) on child		
25	behavior and lifespan development *		
26			
27			
28	Participant's confidence that the	58%	"Good information, up to date
29	information regarding the personal		information, accurate information."
30	history and needs of the child is as		
31	detailed, specific and up to date as		
32	possible		
33	Ability to meet familial and social	50%	"Open and honest, safe and reliable
34	relationship needs of the child		relationships."
35	Adopter's capacity for empathy for the	50%	"The capacity to walk in the child's
36	feelings a child may have arising from		shoes, so a deep sense of empathy, and
37	their experiences and losses, however		understanding and being able to see
38	they are expressed		beyond a behaviour."
39			
40			
41	Adopters present as flexible and open *	42%	"Being able to be flexible and going
42			with what the child needs, not just to
43			start with, but what about when they go
44			back to work."
45			
46			
47	Consideration of impact of proposed	42%	When there are birth children, or
48	match on existing birth children and		already an adopted child you have to
49	adopted children (if relevant) *		tread carefully about what will fit into
50			that kind of family. It would depend on
51			the child's needs and that family."
52			
53			
54	Adopter's resilience and demonstrated	42%	A lot of it is about resilience of
55	ability to face challenges and		adopters, there can be huge challenges
56	difficulties.		– their strength and resilience
57			individually and as a couple.
58			
59			
60			

1			
2			
3	Adopter's acceptance of the child and	33%	"You have to accept where the child is.
4	that their history, however difficult,		You can't go back and change it, you
5	cannot be changed, and may result in		have to accept where the child is now
6	behavioral challenges and		and that is very hard because parents
7	developmental delays		really want to go back and rescue the
8			child."
9			
10	Chemistry felt by the adopter towards	33%	"...observe them from a distance and it
11	the child ('connection to', 'fallen in love		can really help them to see if there is
12	with', 'attraction to', 'claiming of' child)		initial, some sort of connection."
13			
14	Quality of the adopter relationship with	33%	"If the adopters and foster carers get
15	the child's foster carer (if relevant)		on then we know that the transition is
16			going to go well, we know that later on
17			that they are likely to keep in contact
18			which is massively beneficial for the
19			child."
20			
21	Adopter ability to meet the needs	33%	"To meet the criteria in the Adoption
22	identified by Adoption Placement		Placement Report (APR) to identify
23	Report (APR)		strengths and vulnerabilities"].
24			
25	Adopter's ability to meet the wider	33%	"Adopters certainly need to find
26	social needs of the child (i.e.,		commonality, shared interests -
27	interests, hobbies)		otherwise it's very difficult to look
28			forwards when things are difficult -
29			easier to give up if there's no sense of
30			bond."
31			
32	Adopter's ability to meet the self-care	33%	"We now insist on all adopters getting
33	needs of the child		voluntary experience ideally in a
34			children center or similar. If the
35			adopters don't have this, they can
36			experience shock in reaction to
37			unrealistic expectations in what it takes
38			to care for a child"
39			
40	Adopter's ability to meet education	33%	"To work with professionals and
41	needs of the child		schools, the ability to seek help and
42			access services."
43			
44	Adopter ability to meet identity needs	33%	"Adopters need to understand
45	(ethnicity, religion, culture, language)		difference and be able to promote the
46	of the child		child's ethnicity, culture and religion."
47			
48	Adopter's curiosity, characterized by a	25%	"Wondering about the child's previous
49	non-judgmental stance of wondering		experiences, wondering about why they
50	and questioning engagement with		might be behaving in a way, wondering
51	respect to the child's personal history,		why the parents ended up parenting the
52	presenting needs and behavior		child in that way, that is really
53			important."
54			
55	Adopter's reflection on, and resolution	25%	"That they have come to terms with
56	of their reasons for adoption		their reasons for adoption."
57			
58	Adopter attitudes towards birth family	25%	"That they are enquiring about the
59	(empathy, not judgemental, openness to		family and aren't immediately
60	contact if no safeguarding issues)		judgmental."

1			
2			
3	Quality of the proposed introduction	25%	"Planning is crucial. Introductions
4	plan		should be on an individual basis."
5			
6	Preparation of child for introduction	25%	"... to be plonked somewhere where
7			there weren't adequate introductions or
8			transitions."
9			
10	Alignment in partner motivation to	25%	"One adopter wanted a child and the
11	adopt the child (both partners equally		other adopter didn't and the adopters
12	committed to the adoption) (if relevant)		have always chosen their partner over
13			the child."
14			
15	Individual needs are considered with	25%	"Very difficult to look after with
16	respect to the proposed match (if part		competing needs."
17	of a sibling group)		
18			
19			

20 *Note.* * = Items overlap with survey

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

Table 2. Survey item themes

Survey theme	Average
Adopter's understanding of the known/unknown and uncertain impact of trauma (i.e., parental substance abuse during pregnancy, experiences of neglect, loss and violence) on child behavior and lifespan development *	9.5/10
Adopters present as flexible and open *	9.5/10
Views of the child regarding adoption	9.5/10
Adopter's time to meet the needs of the child	9.4/10
Good communication between all parties involved	9.4/10
Realistic expectations of the unknown challenges, disruptive behavior and potential painful disclosures *	9/10
Quality of support plan / post adoption support for family *	9/10
Foster carer involvement in planning child's introductions and move (if relevant)	9/10
Adopter's ability to reflect on and achieve some resolution of their own experiences of being parented *	8.75/10
Adopters are comfortable with contact plans with birth family	8.7/10
Quality of adopter's support network (that they understand and accept the potential challenges of adoption and are able to offer both practical and emotional support) *	8.6/10
The ability of adopters to offer an experience of secure attachment	8.25/10
Consideration of impact of proposed match on existing birth children and adopted children (if relevant) *	8.2/10
Understanding and consideration of sibling dynamics (rivalry, alliances, exploitation, scapegoating, caregiving, sexualised behaviour) (if relevant)	8.2/10
Adopter preferences are not stretched	7.6/10
Any geographical considerations	5.3/10

Note. * = overlap with interview

Table 3. Components and items of the Strengths and Risks Scale for Adoption

Components and items	Factor loading	Cronbach Alpha
<i>Component 1: “Adopter capabilities and skills.” (37.4% of variance; eigenvalue = 23.75)</i>		<i>$\alpha = 0.92$</i>
Adopter's time to meet the needs of the child	0.98	
Ability of adopters to offer an experience of secure attachment	0.98	
Adopter’s ability to meet the wider social needs of the child (i.e., interests, hobbies)	0.93	
Adopters present as flexible and open	0.88	
The playfulness of adopter and their ability to get on child’s level to play, have a sense of humour and have fun.	0.83	
Adopter’s capacity to be an advocate on behalf of the child, to work with and challenge professionals and schools, to seek help and access	0.81	
Adopter’s ability to reflect on, and achieve some resolution of their own experiences of being parented.	0.81	
Adopter’s ability to meet the familial and social relationship needs of the child	0.8	
Adopter’s understanding of the known/unknown and uncertain impact of trauma (i.e., parental substance abuse during pregnancy, experiences of neglect, loss and violence) on child behaviour and lifespan development.	0.79	
Adopter’s ability to meet the emotional and behavioural development needs of the child	0.77	
Adopter’s ability to recognise from their own life experience their expectations, triggers and responses	0.77	
Realistic expectations of the unknown challenges, disruptive behaviour and potential painful disclosures.	0.77	
Quality of adopter’s support network (that they understand and accept the potential challenges of adoption and are able to offer both practical and emotional support)	0.77	
Adopter’s resilience and demonstrated ability to face challenges and difficulties.	0.72	
Adopter’s ability to meet education needs of the child	0.72	
Alignment in partner motivation to adopt the child (both partners equally committed to the adoption) (If relevant)	0.72	
Adopter’s ability to meet the self-care needs of the child	0.68	
<i>Component 2: “Adopter profile and characteristics.” (26.47% of variance; eigenvalue = 6.28)</i>		<i>$\alpha = 0.87$</i>
Adopter’s reflection on, and resolution of, their reasons for adoption	0.96	
Adopter’s commitment to the long-term needs of the child	0.93	

1		
2		
3	Understanding and consideration of sibling dynamics (rivalry,	
4	alliances, exploitation, scapegoating, caregiving, sexualised	0.92
5		
6	Adopter's ability to meet the identity (ethnicity, religion, culture)	
7	needs of the child	0.87
8		
9	Adopter's curiosity, characterised by a non-judgemental stance of	
10	wondering and questioning regarding child's history and presenting	0.77
11	needs and behaviour	
12		
13	Individual needs are considered with respect to the proposed match	
14	(if part of a sibling group) (if relevant)	0.72
15		
16	Readiness of adopters to priorities the needs of the child over their	
17	own emotional or lifestyle needs	0.72
18		
19	Adopter's capacity for empathy for the feelings a child may have	
20	arising from their experiences and losses, however they are	0.79
21		
22	Adopter attitudes towards birth family (empathy, not judgemental,	
23	openness to contact if no safeguarding issues)	0.67
24		
25	Adopter's preferences are not stretched	0.66
26		
27	<i>Component 3: "Adoption plans and preparation" (25.31% of</i>	
28	<i>variance; eigenvalue = 5.64)</i>	
29		<i>$\alpha = 0.89$</i>
30	Consideration of impact of proposed match on existing birth children	
31	and adopted children (if relevant)	0.99
32		
33	Preparation of child for introduction	0.93
34		
35	How confident are you that the information regarding the personal	
36	history and needs of the child is as detailed, specific and up to date as	0.92
37		
38	Adopter comfortable with contact plans with birth family	0.88
39		
40	Quality of the support plan / post adoption support for family	0.88
41		
42	Views of the child regarding adoption	0.84
43		
44	Quality of introduction plan	0.82
45		
46	Good communication between all parties involved	0.82
47		
48	Foster carer involvement in planning child's introductions and move	
49	(if relevant)	0.75
50		
51	Chemistry felt by the adopter towards the child ('connection to',	
52	'fallen in love with', 'attraction to', 'claiming of the child').	0.68
53		
54		
55		
56		
57		
58		
59		
60		