

Hardiness Among Foster Families

Hardiness of Foster Families and the Intent to Continue to Foster

Sarah K. Hendrix MSW, CEAP
University of Louisville
Kent School of Social Work
Louisville, Kentucky
sarahh@iglou.com

Janet Ford, Ph.D.
University of Kentucky
College of Social Work
619 Patterson Office Tower
Lexington, KY 40506-0027
jpford01@uky.edu

Abstract

Recent research in the area of foster care has examined a number of external factors that may influence foster family retention. However, insufficient research has been devoted to the question of foster family hardiness or internal strengths of foster families and how these may affect retention. Hardiness in families assumes that they possess a belief that they can control or influence events of their experience, feel deep commitment, and anticipate change as a positive challenge. Additionally, hardy families exhibit a confidence in their abilities. Utilizing the Family Hardiness Index, this research reports findings from a study of 82 foster families from one southeastern United States metropolitan area. Foster families who reported an intent to continue to foster scored higher on the Family Hardiness Index than families from a non-clinical sample. Foster families who reported an intent to continue also scored higher than those foster families who reported they did not intend to continue. Logistic regression indicated that higher levels of hardiness and fewer years of licensure as foster parents were significantly associated with intent to continue to foster. This study also discusses the potential benefits of hardiness screening, at the preservice point, with potential foster families including retention of foster parents for the children they serve.

Introduction

In 1999 there were approximately 133,000 family foster homes providing care for non-related children licensed in the United States. For the more than 568,000 children in substitute care, approximately seventy five percent reside in family foster care settings (Child Welfare League of America., 1999).

Family foster care is an essential child welfare option for families and children (National Commission on Family Foster Care, 1991). Foster care is also considered the least restrictive form of placement for children. Care is delivered in private homes with foster parents who take on the daily parenting and nurturing activities required in caring for children. Foster care is also considerably less expensive than residential treatment center placements for the same period of time (Rubenstein , Armentrout , Levin, & Herald, 1978). In addition, foster family entry rates are not significantly affected by unemployment levels in the community or by initial offer of financial incentives. It is clear that foster parents do not take on the responsibility of caring for children based on economic conditions or needs (Tucker, Hurl, & Ford, 1994).

Becoming a foster parent is a complicated choice. Ninety four percent of foster parents receive pre-service training of up to 15 days plus annual update training (Child Welfare League of America, 1998). Prospective foster parents also undergo extensive background, credit, and personal history investigation. Their homes, families, and history are closely scrutinized. Over 40 percent of the potential foster parents who do complete the lengthy process of training and licensure discontinue fostering before the second year (Chamberlain, Moreland, & Reid, 1992). A number of attempts have been made, both qualitatively and quantitatively, to identify items such as

reimbursement levels, education, age of foster mother, and agency support as critical to the retention of foster parents. But external factors alone do not guarantee the retention of foster parents. It is for these reasons that this study examined the hardiness of the foster *family* as a component of their intent to continue to foster. This pilot study attempted to answer the following questions: 1) Do foster families who plan to continue to provide foster care demonstrate hardiness at higher levels than the general population; 2) Do foster families who intend to continue to foster report higher hardiness levels than those foster families that do not intend to continue; 3) Is hardiness predictive of foster families' intent to continue ? ; 4) What other foster family characteristics are predictive of their intent to continue fostering? The answers to these questions may have important implications for effective recruitment and retention of foster families.

Literature Review

The concept of hardiness was first identified in the literature in relation to the health status of individuals. It has been argued that the *ability* to cope (i.e. demonstrate hardiness) with difficult situations was linked with improved outcomes in physical and psychological health. On the other hand, a lack of this ability was characterized by increased risk to physical and psychological well being (Kobasa, 1979) (Kobasa, Maddi, and Kahn., 1982) (McCubbin & McCubbin., 1992) (McCubbin, McCubbin & Thompson., 1991).

State Child Welfare Agency Surver [Electronic Data]. (1999). Washington, D.C.: Child Welfare League of America [Producer and Distributor].

Rhodes, Orme, & Buehler. (2001, March). A Comparison of Family Foster Parents Who Quit, Consider Quitting, and Plan to Continue to Foster. The Social Service Review, 75(1), 84-114.

Hardy persons were considered to possess three general characteristics: a) the belief that they can control or influence events of their experience, b) an ability to feel deeply involved or committed to the activities of their lives, and c) the anticipation of change as an exciting challenge to further development (Kobasa, 1979, p. 3).

Hardiness

Building upon Kobasa's work, McCubbin, McCubbin and Thompson developed the *Resiliency Model of Stress, Adjustment, and Adaptation*. Within their work, hardiness refers to both internal strengths and durability and is demonstrated by an ability to find solutions in difficult situations, a willingness to accept change, and a sense of control over the outcomes to life events and setbacks. This same model also suggests that, within families, hardiness is positively related to resilience or to favorable outcomes for stressful events (McCubbin & McCubbin 1992). Family hardiness refers to family members' ability to work together to solve problems, their perception that they have choice or control over outcomes in life events, their notion that change may be both beneficial and growth producing, and an active (as opposed to passive) style under duress (McCubbin & McCubbin, 1996)

Resilience

Resilience refers to the capacity for successful adaptation despite challenging or threatening circumstances. Resilience has been used to describe three types of

phenomena: 1) good outcomes despite high-risk status or “overcoming the odds”, 2) sustained competence under threat, and 3) recovery from trauma (Marsten, Best, and Garmezy, 1990). Resiliency may also be, in part, learned behavior (Cicchetti & Garmezy, 1993).

Methods

The sample included all currently state licensed foster parents within a metropolitan area of 300,000 located in the southeastern United States. Potential subjects were mailed a personalized letter and survey packet. All returned surveys were included in the sample. Data were collected at a single point in time and subjects were asked only about intent.

Data collected included gender and age of respondent, highest education level of parent(s), number of years of licensure as a foster parent, intent to continue to foster, and length of time projected to continue to foster. Survey packets included a letter, a demographic questionnaire, a return envelope, and one Family Hardiness Index (FHI) instrument. The FHI is a 20-item instrument designed to measure the hardiness in families. Participants were required to respond on a 4 point Likert scale ranging from 0 = false, 1 = mostly false, 2 = mostly true, and 3 = true. The FHI measures control, commitment, and challenge as described by Kobasa in 1979, as well as family confidence as described by the scale developers. (McCubbin et. al, 1986) According to McCubbin and Thompson, the overall score is the best indicator of family hardiness. For this reason, and because this was intended to be an exploratory research endeavor, only the total score was used in the analysis. The FHI has good internal consistency with an alpha of .82. The scale developers did not provide normative data, but stated

that the sample of 304 non-clinical families used in their initial study provided meaningful comparison data. The overall mean for that sample was 47.4 (SD = 6.7) (McCubbin & Thompson, 1991).

Results

A return rate of 43% (n=82) provided sufficient sample size for analysis. In the eighty-two participating families, 95% of the respondents who completed the survey on behalf of their families were female. Educational level was nearly equally divided between those with less than a four year degree (54%) and those with a four year college degree or above (46%). Seventy nine percent of those responding were between 36 and 55 years of age.

Specific to fostering, 30% of those families represented had 2 years or less of experience as licensed foster parents. Seventy percent reported experience above that two years. Eighty four percent (n=76) of those responding to the question reported that they intended to continue to foster. Sixteen percent reported that they intended to continue two years or fewer. Demographic information for the total sample and for those who intended to continue to foster vs. those who did not plan to continue to foster are shown in Table. 1. Overall, respondents who reported their intent to continue as foster parents were slightly younger, less educated, and had fewer years of experience as licensed foster parents as compared to those who reported that they were planning to discontinue their foster parenting.

The FHI scores were calculated for the two groups of foster parents to determine 1) if foster parents who expressed intent to continue fostering had higher levels of hardiness than the comparison family sample tested by the scale developers and 2) if

their hardiness scores were higher than those of the foster parents who did not intend to continue fostering. The original family sample consisted of 304 families associated with a large nationally recognized insurance company (McCubbin, et. al., 1986). A one-sample t test was conducted to compare the hardiness scores of those who reported that they intended to continue to foster with those of the non-fostering comparison group families. The hardiness scores of the "intent to continue" fostering sample ($M=49.42$, $SD=5.33$) were significantly higher than those of the non-fostering comparison sample ($M=47.4$, $SD=6.7$), $t(81) = 3.44$, $p = .001$.

An independent samples t -test was conducted to compare the hardiness scores of those who reported "intent to continue" and those who reported they "did not intend to continue to foster." Again, the hardiness scores of the "intent to continue" group ($M=49.98$, $SD = 5.12$) were found to be significantly higher than those reported by the "do not intend to continue to foster" group ($M=46.91$, $SD = 6.17$), $t(63) = 4.80$, $p < .001$.

As shown in Table 2., logistic regression analysis was also conducted to examine the predictive value of age, education, number of years of licensure, and hardiness score on the intent to continue to foster. Hardiness scores and years of licensure were statistically significant predictors of intent to continue to foster at the .10 level. Specifically, higher levels of reported hardiness were associated with increased likelihood that respondents expressed their intent to continue to foster ($p=.06$), but respondents with more years of licensure were less likely to report that they planned to continue ($p= .08$). Neither age nor education were found to be significant predictors of intent to continue to foster within this sample group.

Discussion

Foster parents and foster care workers report, anecdotally, that life experiences, both good and bad, are important sources of strength for foster parents. The results of this research indicate that foster families who intend to continue to foster report hardiness above the levels found in non-fostering families. In addition, they report higher levels of hardiness than those families who report that they do not intend to continue to foster. The Family Hardiness Index considers four areas: commitment, confidence, challenge, and control. These are areas of specific concern within foster family retention and recruitment literature.

Consider reasons identified for loss of foster homes: 1) a lack of support for or *commitment* to foster parents by foster care agencies, 2) a poor public image of the foster care system or a lowered *confidence* in the foster care system, 3) changes in employment patterns of society, including an increase in *commitment* of women to full time employment, 4) psychological, emotional, and/or legal threats or *challenges*, 5) disillusionment with agency goals or a lack of *control* over same, or 6) specific problems or *challenges* with the children placed in the home (Baring-Could, Essick, Kleindaug, & Miller, 1983; Brown & Calder, 1999; Chamberlain et al., 1992; Cummins & Rindfleisch, 1994). Foster parents are also repeatedly caught in the double bind of assuming responsibility (including advocacy) for the foster child but not having the authority or *control* to accomplish what is needed in any given situation (Silver, Amster, and Haecker, 1999).

In 1999, Denby, Rindfleisch, and Bean stated in regard to foster parent recruitment that “an effective recruiting protocol would highlight applicants who

possess the qualities which are thought to best predict foster parent satisfaction and the likelihood of continuing to foster”, however, they concluded that a “recommendation of specific categories for inclusion ... is premature at this point” (p. 301). The findings of this study suggest that hardiness may be a quality for inclusion within recruiting protocol.

Implications for Practice

With recent legislative changes, the child welfare system has begun to make strides to provide mentoring programs, specific training for workers and foster parents, and open communication between communities and agencies. Indeed, recent research has identified several factors predictive of intent to continue to foster. These include the ability to cope with children’s difficult behaviors, affiliation with a private agency, and access to social support and services (Rhodes, Orme, & Buehler., 2001). These items might also be considered external predictors but cannot be consistently operationalized across large populations. Family hardiness, at the preservice point, may be measured quickly, consistently, and accurately for comparison. Further research with larger samples is warranted.

Hardiness is often associated with resiliency. Resiliency is characterized by positive outcomes in the face of adversity (Marsten, Best, and Garmezy, 1990). In the instance of foster parents, these outcomes may well be demonstrated as permanency for children. Certainly, as foster parents stay in the system longer, the children they care for have more of an opportunity for fewer and more stable placements.

Weaknesses or Limitations of the Study

Self-report is subjective. The “intent to continue to foster” question required subjective answers on the part of the participants. Recollection and intent do not always translate directly into actions. The circumstances of this study provided the researcher with no means of comparing actual continued service with intent. The small number of respondents who do not plan to continue to foster significantly reduced the amount of analysis that could be conducted on that group alone. In addition, the participants self-selected. Fifty-eight percent of those solicited did not respond, and the reasons for their choice not to participate are unknown. The sample was drawn from a relatively metropolitan area, but the respondents represented only one, albeit the largest, of several agencies that maintain foster homes in this area. Thus the study is somewhat limited in its generalizability, even though some findings are congruent with national statistics.

Although somewhat limited by the characteristics of the sample, this study should be considered an initial inquiry into the existence and support of hardiness as an identified asset of foster families who intend to continue to foster.

Implications for Further Research

Research in the area of hardiness within foster families should continue utilizing a larger and more nationally representative sample. In addition, other variables, such as rapport or relationships between workers and foster families, unsubstantiated allegations of abuse, and participation in formal and informal support networks should be considered. Access to items such as health insurance and regular respite care may also be interesting secondary variables for investigation.

Family hardiness is inclusive of a shared commitment to work together to attack and solve a presenting problem; the family then redefines the hardships it experiences as challenges. The family views itself as having a sense of control and influence over the outcome.

Based upon the limited scope of this research, there is basis for further research into foster family hardiness activities. In considering hardiness as a precursor of resilience, it can be suggested that the identification and measurement of the hardiness of potential foster families may promote better retention and stability of foster family placements. The potential impact on both foster families and the children they foster are longterm in both nature and rewards.

References

Baring-Could, M., Essick, D., Kleindaug C., & Miller, M. (1983). Why do foster homes close? Arete (8), 49-63.

Brown, J., & Calder, P. (1999). Concept-Mapping the Challenges Faced by Foster Parents. Children and Youth Services Review, 2(6), 481-495.

Chamberlain, P., Moreland, S., & Reid, K. (1992). Enhanced services and stipends for foster parents: Effects on retention rates and outcomes for children. Child Welfare, 81, 387-401.

Child Welfare League of America. (1997). Child abuse and neglect: A look at the states (CWLA Stat Book)). Washington, D.C.: Petit, M., & Curtis, P.

Child Welfare League of America. (1998). State Child Welfare Agency Survey (Out of Home Care 1998). Washington D. C. :

Cicchetti, D., & Garmezy, N. (1993). Prospects and Promises in the Study of Resilience. Development and Psychopathology, 5, 497-502.

Cummins, L., & Rindfleisch, N. (1994). Reasons for leaving foster care: A qualitative study of foster parents who ceased fostering. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Denby, R., Rindfleisch, N., & Bean, G. (1999). Predictors of Foster Parents' Satisfaction and Intent to Continue to Foster. Child Abuse and Neglect, 23(3), 287-303.

Kobasa, Maddi, and Kahn. (1982). Hardiness and Health: A Prospective Study. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 168-177.

Kobasa, S.C. (1979). Stressful Life Events: Personality and Health: An Inquiry Into Hardiness. Journal of Personality and Psychology, 37, 1-11.

Marsten, A., Best, K., & Garmezy, N. (1990). Resilience and Development: Contributions from the study of children who overcome adversity. Development and Psychopathology, 2, 425-444.

McCubbin & McCubbin. (1992). Families Coping With Health Crisis: The Resiliency Model of Family Stress, Adjustment and Adaptation. In Danielson, Hamel-Bissell & Winstead-Fry (Eds.), Families, Health and Illness (pp. 21-63). New York: Mosby.

McCubbin, H. I. & Thompson, A. I. (eds.) (1991). Family Assessment inventories for Research and Practice. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin.

McCubbin, McCubbin & Thompson. (1991). Family Hardiness Index (FHI). In McCubbin & Thompson (Eds.), Family Assessment Inventories for Research and Practice (p. 312). Madison: University of Wisconsin.

National Commission on Family Foster Care (NCFFC) . (1991). A blueprint for fostering infants, children, and youth in the 1990's . Washington D.C.: Child Welfare League of America.

Rindfleisch, N., Bean, G., & Denby, R. (1998). Why Foster Parents Continue and Cease to Foster. Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 25(1), 5-24.

Rubenstein, J. S., Armentrout, J. A., Levin, S., & Herald, D. (1978). The parent-therapist program: Alternate care for emotionally disturbed children. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 48, 654-662.

Silver, J., Amster, B., & Haecker, T. (1999). Young Children and Foster Care. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co., p.282

Tucker, D., Hurl, L., & Ford, H. (1994, November). Applying Organizational Ecology to the Family: The Case of Who Persists in Providing Foster Care. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 56, 1005-1018.

Table 1.

Demographic Characteristics Related to Intent to Foster (n =76)

<i>Characteristic</i>	<i>Overall</i>		<i>Intend to continue</i>		<i>Do Not Intend</i>	
	N=76		N=64		N=12	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<i>Gender of respondent</i>						
Male	4	5	4	6	0	0
Female	72	95	60	94	12	100
<i>Age of respondent</i>						
25 - 35	14	18	12	19	2	17
36 - 45	26	34	23	36	3	25
46 - 55	27	35	22	34	5	41
56 - above	9	13	7	11	2	17
<i>Education*</i>						
< 4 years College	41	54	36	56	5	47
4 degree or more	35	46	8	45	7	53
<i>Years of Licensure*</i>						
Two years or less	23	30	22	34	1	8
> than two years	53	70	42	66	11	92

*Difference between foster parent groups significant at $p < .01$. Education: chi square (1,84) = 7.75, $p < .01$. Years of licensure: chi square (1,84) = 9.89, $p < .01$.

Table 2.

Logistic Regression Predicting Intent to Continue to Foster

<i>Predictor</i>	β	SE	Odds Ratio	Wald
Age	-.064	.405	.938	.025
Education	1.066	.707	2.903	2.269
Yrs Licensure	1.979*	1.127	7.233	3.434
FHI (hardiness)	-.118**	.064	.888	3.434

* $p = .08$. ** $p = .06$.