The Economics of Adoption of Children from Foster Care

Mary Eschelbach Hansen and Bradley A. Hansen

Federal initiatives since 1996 have intensified the efforts of states to achieve adoption for children in foster care. For many waiting children, the path to adoption is long. The authors offer an economic analysis of adoption from foster care, with an emphasis on the reasons why achieving the goal of adoption for all waiting children may be so difficult. The authors then estimate the determinants of adoptions from foster care across the states using data for fiscal years 1996 and 1997. Adoption assistance subsidy rates stand out as the most important determinant of adoptions from foster care, followed by use of alternatives (e.g., intercountry adoption). Adoptive matching on the basis of race does not appear to prevent adoptions from foster care in the aggregate, leaving flaws in the matching process, such as a lack of information and difficulty using the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC), as a primary reason why children wait.

Mary Eschelbach Hansen, PhD, is Assistant Professor of Economics, American University, Washington, DC, and Fellow, Center for Adoption Research, University of Massachusetts Medical School, Worcester, MA; Bradley A. Hansen, PhD, is Associate Professor of Economics, University of Mary Washington, Fredericksburg, VA.

0009-4021/2006/030559-25 \$3.00 © 2006 Child Welfare League of America

President William Clinton's Adoption 2002 and President George W. Bush's unveiling of www.AdoptUSKids.org are emblems of the renewed attention of federal policy to the adoption of children from foster care. The 1997 Adoption and Safe Families Act (P.L. 105-89) changed the regulations states must follow and the incentives states received when they improved performance in adoptive placements (Spar, 1997). The 2001 Tax Relief Act (P.L. 107-16) changed adoption incentives again by offering a \$10,000 unqualified tax credit to families who finalize the adoption of children with special needs after January 1, 2003. Changes in public policy concerning adoption should be informed by an understanding of the factors that influence the adoption decision of the family and adoptive placement by social workers, but relatively little research has been done on the factors that influence adoptions from foster care across the states.

In this article, the authors present an economic analysis of the adoption of children from foster care. Using the theory of consumer behavior. the authors estimate a statistical model of the determinants of adoptions from foster care across the United States using data for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, finding that the size of the adoption assistance payment is the only policy variable that is clearly and positively correlated with success in achieving adoption for waiting children. Evidence shows that adoptions from foster care and intercountry and private adoptions are negatively correlated, suggesting that policy that reduces the cost of alternatives to adoption from foster care may prevent adoptions of some waiting children. The authors find no evidence of a negative effect of adoptive matching on the basis of race in the cross-section. More spending on child welfare services does not result in more adoptions of waiting children, which leads to the conclusion that flaws in the match process itself, such as incomplete information about children and

Acknowledgements: Thank you to Jeremy Atack, David Carr, Georgia Deoudes, Trudy Festinger, Peter Gibbs, and Rita Simon for helpful conversations. Errors, of course, are the property of the authors.

families, and deficiencies in the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC) likely explain why many waiting children are not placed with adoptive families.

An Economic Model of Adoption from Foster Care

Although economic analyses of adoption are rare, they are not entirely absent. Perhaps most provocatively, Landes and Posner (1978) developed an analysis of the market for infant adoption, with an eye toward recommending policies that reduce the shortage of infants available for adoption. They view infant adoption as a market in which parental rights are exchanged. They also conclude that the cost of adoption should be allowed to rise until enough infants are offered to meet the desires of approved families willing to pay a high price. Critics such as Zelizer (1981) and Freundlich (2000) view this argument as "baby-selling." Landes and Posner's argument is inappropriate for the study of the adoption of waiting children for three reasons.

First, adoption is not a market for a child, or even a market where parental rights are sold. Despite well-publicized aberrations, children who are adopted through agencies (public, private, and international), lawyers, and facilitators are not simply allocated to those most willing to pay (Pertman, 2000). Adoption is a professional service. Potential adoptive families pay to be matched with the children who they are well-suited to parent, either by the best judgment of the family or by the best judgment of a social worker.

Second, more than one market exists for adoption services, and the markets are separated by the characteristics of the children to be adopted. Most private and international adoption agencies promise to match families with healthy, light-skinned, young children or babies. In this article, the authors do not directly consider demand for adoption services from private and international sources of adoption, focusing only on adoption from foster care. Most of the children who wait in foster care are not babies. Maza (2002) estimates that the mean age of waiting children was 7.9 years in 1999; in 2001, the mean age was 8.4. African American children wait longer for adoptive placement (Kapp, McDonald, & Diamond, 2001), and according to Maza, 41% of children waiting in foster care at the end of 1999 were African American. The children waiting in foster care often belong to a sibling group or have other special needs. Families who choose to adopt children with special needs are aware that, while their emotional reward is great, parenting their adopted child requires extra time, effort, and expense.

Finally, the adoption of a child from foster care provides a benefit to all of society, not just a benefit to the adoptive family. As Barth (1997) describes, the adoption of a waiting child reduces the fiscal burden of foster care for the state and improves outcomes for the child and the community by improving education and reducing problem behaviors. Markets in which the decisions of a few benefit everyone are said to have "positive externalities." Other markets with positive externalities include educational television and fuel efficient cars. To encourage television producers to make educational programs and drivers to buy fuel efficient cars, Congress subsidizes people who engage in these beneficial activities. Likewise, the authors expect subsidies to encourage more families to choose adoption from foster care.

The basis of this approach is found in the theory of consumer behavior. The authors assume that the demand for adoption services for waiting children is similar to the demand for other goods and services in that more is desired at a lower price than at a higher price. If the price of adoption services is high, then few prospective adoptive families will seek to adopt a waiting child (for a lengthier treatment of the consumer theory, see Chapters 4, 7, and 21 of Mankiw, 2001; for a mathematical treatment, see Deaton & Muellbauer, 1980. A graphical representation of the model is available from the authors at http://academic2.american.edu/~mhansen).

Price is measured not only in money, but in the value of time. Parents consider the time to fill out paperwork, time to meet with the social worker, and time spent waiting for adoptive placement as part of their payment for adoption services. Nonmonetary costs are, in fact, the main costs associated with the adoption of children from foster care; monetary costs generally are covered by the states (with federal assistance), as will be discussed later.

Demand is negatively correlated with price for two reasons. First, when the price of adoption services is high (recall that "price" includes time spent in the adoption process), then few prospective adoptive families can afford to adopt waiting children. Second, when the price of adoption services for waiting children is high, prospective adoptive families are more likely to choose one of the alternatives to adoption from foster care, such as traditional conception and childbirth, infertility treatment or surrogacy, foster parenting, or private or international agency adoption. Of course, the number of children in need of adoptive families does not depend on the price of adoption services; the number of children who are available for adoption depends only on the termination of parental rights by the courts.*

A potential solution to the problem of for finding permanency for waiting children, then, is to increase subsidy support for adoption. A bigger subsidy lowers the price of adoption services, increases the number of adoptions, and reduces the number of children who wait in foster care. Indirect evidence that increasing subsidy support may increase adoptions comes from a recent study of the longest waiting children in New York State. Avery (1999) finds that 60% of social workers responsible for placement of the longest waiting children say that higher subsidies might improve their chances of adoption.

The effectiveness of increasing subsidies will depend on how responsive families are to changes in the subsidy. Other studies of the adoption assistance subsidy focus on who receives the subsidy

^{*} If Posner is correct, then the supply of infants relinquished for adoption may increase with the price. The supply of infants relinquished for adoption is discussed by Gennetian (1999) and Medoff (1993). The number of waiting children will be sensitive to nonprice elements of subsidy. For example, the "15 of 22" rule for seeking TPR in ASFA would be expected to increase the number of waiting children.

and how quickly children are placed (Avery and Mont, 1993, 1997; and Avery, 1996; Sedlack and Broadhurst, 1993). These studies find that similar children receive different subsidies and that subsidies are not always sufficient to meet expenses of raising adopted children.

Insufficient demand for adoption services may not be the only reason children wait in foster care. Children are matched individually with adoptive families by a social worker. Adoptive matching requires resources, especially social worker time and adequate information about potential adoptive families and waiting children. After child protective services has provided emergency services to children, reunification services to birthfamilies, and support services to foster families, few resources may remain to provide adoption services.

Indirect evidence to support the hypothesis that limited appropriations prevent some adoptions comes from recent federal funding initiatives. When states acquired additional funding for child welfare services under the 1997 Adoption and Safe Families Act, 13 of 46 states used some or all of their funds to hire or contract additional social work staff (U.S. General Accounting Office [GAO], 2002).

Children also may wait in foster care if the matching process is flawed. Melosh (2002) describes how the criteria for matching families and children have changed considerably since 1960s, but the instrument for obtaining the information used in matching has hardly changed. Social workers perform a home study for each prospective adoptive family. The narrative of the home study includes a statement by the family regarding the preferred characteristics of children, plus the opinion of the social worker regarding the capacity of the family to parent children with different characteristics. Social workers have to compare families and children along numerous dimensions: family size; attitude toward siblings; age of parents and child; physical, emotional, and mental disabilities; and other concerns. The information conveyed in a home study completed by one social worker may not be the information desired by another social worker seeking an adoptive family. Because the content and format of the home study is not always uniform across jurisdictions within a state, much less across states, social workers may find it impossible to obtain enough information to match all waiting children with families (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services [DHHS], 2001).

Evidence is strong that institutional constraints do prevent some adoptions of waiting children. In Grow's (1970) study of 261 adoption agencies, 32,645 families were approved for an adoptive placement, while 32,288 children were waiting adoption—357 more families than available children. Barth and Berry (1989) find that during the mid-1980s only about 6,000 of more than 13,000 requests for information about adoption from foster care in California resulted in an application for adoption. Only about 1,500 adoptive placements were made to the families who applied. A complete analysis of the reasons that families might wait, even if there are many waiting children, is beyond the scope of this article. Possibly, some families are unwilling or unable to accept placement of a child with special needs. Some other reasons that families might wait, including adoptive matching on the basis of race, are discussed later. Available data do suggest, however, that while many states have more waiting children than waiting families, some continue to have more families (Child Welfare League of America [CWLA], 1996a; Simon, Alstein, & Melli, 1994).

The inherent problems of adoptive matching are exacerbated if interstate placement of waiting children is difficult. The ICPC was created in 1960 to facilitate adoption across state lines, but it has not been particularly effective (DHHS, 2001; GAO, 1999; Freundlich, 1997). Although potential adoptive families may find information about waiting children across the United States on Web sites such as www.AdoptUSkids.org, interstate placement may delay or prevent placement.

Finally, children may wait in foster care because of adoptive matching on the basis of race. While delay of adoptive placement on account of race is prohibited by the Multi-Ethnic Placement Act and the Interethnic Adoption Provision (P.L. 103-382 and P.L. 104-188), attitudes concerning racial matching may affect the decisions

of social workers or prospective adoptive families. About twothirds of waiting families in 1996 were Caucasian, non-Hispanic (CWLA, 1996b). Waiting children are mainly African American and Hispanic (CWLA; Maza, 2002). Even before transracial adoption became a hotbed of conflict within the field of social work, surveys conducted in the 1960s and 1970s suggest that race of the adoptive child was a particularly important area of concern for adoptive families (Kossoudji, 1989). More recent surveys of adoptive families find a much smaller role for race (Bryon & Deoudes, 2002), but some families still express strong preferences about race, age, number of siblings, and disabilities (Brooks & James, 2002; Sedlack & Broadhurst, 1993).

Just as families have opinions about appropriate matches, social workers may have their own opinions about matching children and families with certain characteristics. Kossoudji (1989, 1997) and Fenster (2002) raise some important questions about racial bias in child welfare practice. Using Michigan Department of Social Services data on case openings and closings, Kossoudji finds that social workers choose termination of parental rights earlier and more often for white children who enter child protective services than for African American children. African American children who cannot be reunified with their birthfamilies, therefore, move towards permanency more slowly. Avery (1999) reports that 43% of social workers responsible for the longest waiting children in New York State considered transracial adoption inappropriate. Fenster finds negative attitudes towards transracial adoption are more common among African American social workers than white social workers. In a survey of California families who adopted in the 1980s, about 64% said they were willing to adopt a black child, but only 5% of the willing families actually adopted transracially (Brooks & James, 2002). The 1987 National Health Interview Survey revealed that just 8% of all adoptive families include parents and children of different races, including parents who adopted Asian-born children. The National Adoption Information Clearinghouse reports that an estimated 15% of the 36,000 adoptions in fiscal year 1998 were transracial or transcultural (NAIC, 1994).

The discrepancy between the survey estimates and national reports indicates further statistical analysis of the incidence and trends in transracial adoption require much more study. Nonetheless, a strong preference for racial matching by either prospective families or social workers may have the same effect as limited resources or limited information: some waiting children may remain in foster care.

More than one, and possibly all, of these explanations could contribute to long waits in foster care. For the purposes of public policy, policymakers must both validate the explanations and ascertain the relative importance of each one. Each explanation leads to a different conclusion about how resources should be allocated to achieve the goal of adoption. The policy implications of validation of the first two explanations (price and insufficient resources) are clear. If the price of adoption services for waiting children is set too high, legislators can resolve to increase adoptions from foster care by increasing subsidies. If insufficient child welfare resources prevent the adoption of some children, then legislators can resolve to increase funding for child welfare agencies. If neither differences in adoption subsidies nor differences in child welfare resources explains differences in adoptions from foster care, then perhaps the most important barriers to adoption of waiting children are found in the matching process or racial matching, in which case increases in appropriations may not be the most effective way to increase adoptions from foster care. More fundamental changes in the recruitment of potential adoptive families or in the way waiting families are matched with waiting children may be required.

Empirical Analysis of Adoption from Foster Care

The authors estimate differences in the adoptions from foster care between the states as a function of the variables that affect the demand for adoption services for waiting children and the ability to match families and children. That is, the authors estimate the linear model:

$$\log A_i = a + b_1 D_i + b_2 M_i + e_i$$

A is adoptions from foster care in state *i*; a, $b_{1'}$ and b_{2} are the parameters to be estimated; and e, is an error term. The vector D contains information about adoption assistance and other subsidies, substitutes for adoption from foster care, and other variables that affect demand for adoption services, such as income and age structure of the state population. As described in the previous section, the ability of social workers in a state to match waiting children with families will depend on child welfare resources, the matching process, and racial matching. These are the variables in the vector M. Observations of the independent and dependent variables are available for most states for fiscal year 1996.

As Stolley (1993) and Maza (1985; 1999) describe, data on adoptions from foster care are incomplete. Data on adoption prior to 1995 are notoriously scarce; from 1975 to 1995, no federal collection of data took place. The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1986 (P.L. 99-509) mandated DHHS to again collect data on adoption from foster care from the states. It took nine years for the resulting Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS) to come into operation. State-level summaries of the AFCARS data and other data reported to the Children's Bureau are available on the DHHS Web site (DHHS, 2005). Because states were required to submit data to the Children's Bureau to receive adoption incentive payments under the Adoption and Safe Families Act, the AFCARS data are considered to be more accurate than other sources. Two other sources of data exist, however, on 1996 adoptions in the states. The private National Council for Adoption (formerly the National Committee for Adoption) published 1996 data in the third of its Adoption Factbook series (National Committee for Adoption [NCA], 1999). The American Public Human Services

568

Association collected data under auspices the Voluntary Cooperative Information System (VCIS), and CWLA supplemented the VCIS data with its own survey of the states and published the results on the Internet (CWLA/NDAS, 1996).

Table 1 shows the differences between the sources for the 1996 data. Although none of the sources of adoption data is complete (Maza, 1985; 1999; Stolley, 1993), the differences between the states in adoptions recorded are about the same in each data set. A strong linear coorespondence occurs between the data sets: the correlation coefficients between the sets are high, ranging from 0.88 (between the CWLA/NDAS and NCA data) to 0.99 (between the AFCARS and CWLA/NDAS data). The data of CWLA and National Council for Adoption, however, appear to have undercounted adoptions. Maza (1999) also reports that earlier data on adoption collected in VCIS contained an undercount. The authors limit attention, therefore, to the state-level data published by the Children's Bureau using AFCARS.

Though the AFCARS data are the best available numbers and the Children's Bureau data constitutes the source of official numbers used for bonus payments to states under the Adoption and Safe Families Act, the data are not perfect or complete. In its *User's Guide and Codebook* to the AFCARS data files, the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect (2002, p. 9) cautions that data for fiscal years 1995 through 1997 may not be "credible" according to the states. Results using the AFCARS data, even at the state level, should be viewed as preliminary. Nonetheless, the high coefficients of correlation between the sources of the available data give the authors some confidence that the overall conclusions of the study will be confirmed by future research.

The choice of data for the dependent variable is complicated additionally by the nature of adoption proceedings. After a child is placed in the home of an adoptive family, a required waiting period usually takes place before the family may file a petition asking the court to finalize the adoption. Waiting periods vary by state. The date that the adoption is finalized also might be subject

·	N	Average	Standard Deviation
Adoptions from foster care in 1996 (AFCARS)*	51	544.0	825.0
Adoptions from foster care in 1996, National Data Analysis System (CWLA) ^b	45	514.0	744.0
Adoptions from foster care in 1996, National Council for Adoption (NCFA)*°	49	490.0	770.0
Average of 1995–1997 (AFCARS) ^a	51	547.0	850.0
Adoptions from foster care in 1997 (AFCARS) ^a	51	608.0	928.0
1996 AFCARS per 100,000 population ^d	51	12.2	14.7
1995-97 average AFCARS per 100,000 population	51	11.5	15.1
1996 CWLA per 100,000 population	45	10.1	6.1
1996 NCA per 100,000 population	49	10.6	15.9
1997 ACF per 100,000 population	51	11.9	14.8

TABLE 1

Adoption Statistics Compared

^a U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Children's Bureau, "Adoptions of Children with Public Child Welfare Agency Involvement by State, revised May 18, 2001," http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/cb (last accessed June 1, 2002).

^b The Child Welfare League of America, National Data Analysis System, "Number of Children in State Custody, by Adoption Status (Archive), 1996," http://ndas.cwla.org (last accessed January 5, 2003).

National Council for Adoption (1989).

^e State Population from U.S. Census Bureau, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1997.

* Observations of zero adoptions counted as missing values.

to influences beyond the control of either social workers or adoptive families (e.g., court delays). For these reasons, using the average number of adoptions across several years as a dependent variable or introducing a year's time lag into the model may be wise. Table 1 provides descriptive statistics for the average of adoptions reported by the Children's Bureau for 1995–1997 and for adoptions finalized in 1997. Adoptions from foster care rose during the late 1990s, so that the 1997 figures pull up the average of the earlier years. The standard deviation of the number of adoptions from foster care is large, about 1.5 times the average. Part of the reason for the great variation in the number of adoptions is the variation in the size of the states. To correct for differences in state size, the authors calculate the number of adoptions against 100,000 persons in each state. The average and standard deviations of adoptions per 100,000 persons appear at the bottom of Table 1. The average number of adoptions per 100,000 in 1997 is 11.9, the standard deviation is 14.8. The number of adoptions per 100,000 ranges from about 3.2 (in Alabama) to 27.4 (in New York State).

The first type of subsidy for adoption that the authors consider is the Title IV-E monthly adoption assistance subsidy.** Although federal Title IV-E reimbursements are limited to the maximum of the payments that could be made for foster care reimbursements, states may choose to set monthly adoption assistance payments at whatever level deemed appropriate in the state. According to Laws and O'Hanlon (1999), in 1996 the basic adoption assistance subsidy paid by the states under P.L. 96-272 to a family of a 9-yearold child averaged \$361 each month, with a standard deviation of \$116. After adjusting for variations in the cost of living between states, the standard deviation of the adoption assistance subsidy fell to \$82.

The authors first use univariate regression to test the strength of the correlation between the size of the adoption assistance subsidy payment and the number of adoptions per 100,000 from the various sources. The model using 1997 adoptions and 1996 subsidy rates outperforms the contemporaneous model for all sources of data on adoption. A scatter diagram of adoptions per 100,000 people and the cost-of-living adjusted subsidy rate is shown in Figure 1. The variations in the logarithm of the monthly adoption assistance

^{**}Other subsidies also are available in some states to cover the cost of child-rearing; for example, Illinois waives tuition at state colleges for children adopted from foster care, while Florida subsidizes the cost of postsecondary education of any kind for children adopted from its foster care system. More research on the historical evolution of these subsidies is necessary.



subsidy rates for 1996 between the states explain nearly 25% of the variation in the logarithm of adoptions per 100,000 in 1997. The point estimate of the coefficient on the adoption assistance subsidy variable is statistically significant and equal to 1.5. That means an increase in the monthly adoption assistance subsidy payment of 1% is associated with a 1.5% increase in the number of adoptions per 100,000 persons. For the average state, an increase of \$36 in the adoption assistance subsidy is associated with an increase of 1.785 adoptions per 100,000 persons, or nearly 10 additional adoptions.

The first column in Table 2 introduces into the regression other independent variables that are part of state and federal budgets. In addition to monthly adoption assistance subsidies, federal law (P.L 99-514) subsidizes the up-front costs of adoption from foster care, including the cost of the home study and legal fees. The

TABLE 2

Multivariate Regression Results of Independent Variables: Adoptions per 100,000 Population

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Log of C-O-L Adjusted Adoption Assistance Subsidy *. b	0.99*	1.41*	1.22*
	(0.48)	(0.55)	(0.63)
Up-front Cost Subsidy < \$2k °	-0.02	-0.04	0.11
	(0.18)	(0.15)	(0.25)
doption Subsidy > Foster Care Rate *	0.39	0.10	0.99*
	(0.32)	(0.28)	(0.31)
Log of Child Welfare Spending per Child in Foster Care d. •	0.01	0.06	0.21
	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.19)
Percent with Goal of Adoption and Special Needs •			.005
			(.006)
Log of Median Income ¹		0.24	
		(1.37)	
Percent of Pop. Age 25-44 '		0.15	
		(0.10)	
Births per 1000 Women Age 15-44 '		-0.02	
		(0.02)	
Percent Private Adoptions		-0.01	
		(0.01)	
Percent Intercountry Adoptions		-0.03*	
)		(0.12)	
African Americans as Percent of Population *		-0.02	
		(0.01)	
African Americans as Percent of Foster Care Population •		0.02*	
		(0.008)	
Native Americans >= 10 % of Foster Care Population •		0.49*	
		(0.21)	
ICPC Total as Percent of Adoptions 9		-0.001	
		(0.001)	
N *	43.00	33.00	20.00
R-Squared	0.27	0.68	0.27
F	3.07	13.52	3.01

Notes: Weighted by population of the state. Standard errors in parentheses, adjusted for heteroskedasticity.

 indicates statistical significance at the 95% level. Incomplete data for CA, DE, IA, HI, MD, PA, TX, and VA. Additional states missing from column (2) estimate are CO, DC, KS, MT, ND, NE, OH, OR, and WY. Additional states missing from column (3) are AK, AR, KE, ME, MA, MI, NH, OK, RI, TN, VT, WA, WV, and WY.

Sources:

Laws and O'Hanlon (1999).

 Cost of living index for 1995 from American Federation of Teachers, AFT Interstate Cost of Living Index, http:// www.aft.org/research/salary/stgrave/col/97.htm (last accessed January 20, 2003).

 North American Council on Adoptable Children, "Reimbursement of Non-Recurring Adoption Expenses," http:// www.finallyfamily.com/reimbursement.htm (last accessed June 1, 2002).

 Urban Institute, Assessing the New Federalism Databases, State Database, http://www.urban.org/content/Research/ Databases/Databases.htm (last accessed January 5, 2003).

 Foster Care population data from Child Welfare League of America, National Data Analysis System, http://ndas.cwla.org (last accessed June 10, 2003).

¹ U.S. Census Bureau, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1997.

National Council for Adoption (1989).

* U.S. Census Bureau, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1998.

maximum federal reimbursement is \$1,000 per adoption, so a state that reimburses families up to \$2,000 can recover half of its costs. Most states, but not all, use the full amount of federal matching funds; the maximum subsidy for up-front adoption expenses averages \$1,587. The regression includes a dichotomous variable that equals one of the state chooses a reimbursement maximum of \$2,000. States that do not reimburse at least \$2,000 of up-front costs have lower adoption rates, but the effect is not statisically significant. A correlation exists, however, between offering a high monthly adoption assistance subsidy and offering a high level of reimbursement of up-front costs, so the standard errors of the coefficients may be deflated.

Because one of the primary resources for waiting children is the foster family, the authors test to see if setting adoption subsidy rates above foster care board rates increases the number of adoptions, no matter how high the monthly rates are. In seven states, adoption assistance payments exceed foster care board rates. These seven states have more adoptions from foster care per 100,000 persons in the state. This finding underscores the importance of further study of incentives in adoption. The authors would not argue that foster care board rates should be lowered, of course, since foster care board rates do not even equal the average amount spent on children (Laws & O'Hanlon, 1999). The authors would argue, however, that states ought to pay close attention to the matter of the adoption assistance rate relative to the foster care board rate.

The authors previously hypothesized that the ability to match waiting children with families is likely depends on the resources provided to social workers by state legislatures and Congress. The measure of child welfare resources is 1996 appropriations for child welfare services in each state, as collected by the Urban Institute (Scarcella, Bess, Zielewski, Warner, & Geen, 2004). The Urban Institute reports on both appropriations made for adoption and appropriations made for foster care; however, by 1996, many states had begun to provide concurrent planning for children in foster care. With concurrent planning of reunification and adoption, dividing child welfare spending into discrete adoption and foster care categories is nearly impossible. Moreover, appropriations for adoption also include the adoption assistance subsidy, which already is accounted for in the regression equation.

Child welfare spending per child in care varied greatly between the states. The average child welfare spending per child was \$13,996, and the standard deviation was \$8,799. Child welfare spending per child does not appear to influence the adoption rate. The regression results in Table 2 confirm that after controlling for adoption incentives paid to families, child welfare spending per child is not strongly associated with an increase in adoptions from foster care. Even if the authors attribute the low level of statistical significance of the coefficient to multicolinearity, the size of the coefficient is so small that to increase adoptions per 100,000 by one would require additional child welfare expenditures in the representative state of about \$1,100 per child in foster care. In 1996, the average of the number of children in foster care in the states was 10,442. Therefore, the representative state would need additional appropriations of at least \$11.5 million annually, or more than a 10% increase over average state spending on child welfare services in 1996, to achieve an increase in adoptions of less than 1%.

Together, the variables that represent direct state and federal spending on behalf of foster and adopted children and their families explain 27% of the variation in the log of adoptions per 100,000. Considerably more of the variation in adoptions from foster care can be explained when other determinants of demand for adoption services and the ability of social workers to match children with families are introduced into the model, as shown in the third column of Table 2.

Other variables that affect the demand for adoption services are the income and age of the population. The median household income for each state is the measure of income. The average household income across the states was \$37,995, with a standard deviation of \$5,594. The percentage of the population between ages 25 and 45 is a measure of the proportion of the population that are likely to be building families. The coefficients on these variables are positive and comparatively large, but neither of the coefficients is statistically significant.

Prospective adoptive families choose between childbirth (with or without infertility treatment), private adoption, intercountry adoption, and adoption from foster care. The authors control for use of these alternatives to adoption from foster care in the specification shown in the second column of Table 2. The authors expected that in states with high birth rates per 1,000 women, high percentages of unrelated adoptions that are private, and high levels of intercountry adoptions to have lower adoption rates. Their expectations were confirmed. States with a large percentage of intercountry adoptions have lower adoption rates, and the coefficient is statistically significant.

Suppose two states are identical, except that in State A, intercountry adoptions are 1% higher than in State B. The empirical results suggest that three-tenths of 1% fewer foster care adoptions occur for every 100,000 people in State A. The negative relationship between intercountry adoption and adoption from domestic foster care underscores the importance of studying carefully the alternatives to adoption from foster care in the formulation of public policy. For example, tax benefits that go mainly to those who choose intercountry adoption may reduce, at the margin, the number of families who consider adoption from foster care.

The final group of independent variables represents potential difficulties social workers face in matching waiting children with families. Both the race of potential adoptive families and the race of waiting children have been cited as relevant variables. Some researchers (Melosh, 2002) suggest that African American families avoid adopting strangers. When circumstances require, African Americans tend to prefer using informal networks of extended family care. The authors, therefore, control for the size of the African American community and expect that the greater the percentage

of African Americans in the state population, the lower the adoption rate will be. States with larger African American communities have fewer adoptions from foster care per 100,000 people, as expected, but the effect is not statistically significant.

As discussed previously, some prospective adoptive families may be reluctant to adopt African American children, and some social workers are reluctant to match African American children with non-African American families. The authors find that concentration of African American children in foster care is positively associated with the number of adoptions per 100,000. Taken together, the coefficients on size of the African American community in the state and the concentration of the African American children in foster care present an encouraging picture. The empirical results may reflect the success of efforts to recruit African American adoptive families for the African American children who wait, including efforts to promote kinship adoption.

The authors control for the number of Native American children in foster care because placements of Native American children are regulated by the Indian Child Welfare Act (P.L. 95-608). The act "created powerful preferences for placing children with extended family, or within their own tribe, or within the Native American community" (Bartholet, 1999, p. 125). Additionally, under the act, states must meet the "beyond a reasonable doubt" standard (rather than "clear and convincing evidence") when attempting to terminate parental rights of a Native American. For these reasons, states with large populations of Native American children in foster care are expected to have lower adoption rates. Again, the authors were surprised to find that states with larger populations of Native American children have more adoptions per 100,000. More research into the reasons for these unexpected positive correlations is required. Quite probably, states with higher concentrations of waiting children who are African American or Native American have been more successful at developing strategies for matching the children to families.

Finally, states' use of the ICPC is considered. The authors control for the total ICPC placements (both into the state and out of the state) relative to the number of adoptions from foster care. Greater propensity to use the ICPC is expected to be indicative of more aggressive recruitment, and therefore, the authors expected to find a positive sign on ICPC use. Use of the ICPC, however, does not correlate with adoptions from foster care.

In the third column of Table 2, the authors control for the proportion of adoptive children who have special needs, as according to their state's definition. The authors perform this separate specification because data on the special needs status of waiting children was available for very few states. Children with special needs probably are harder to place, so that fewer adoptions per 100,000 are expected in the states where nearly all of adoptive children had special needs. After controlling for the other policy variables, however, the prevalence of special needs among adoptive children does not appear to influence adoptions from foster care. This finding is consistent with a study of photolisted children in New York State by Avery (1999). She finds that the special needs of children who were adopted and children who experienced long waits were very similar.

Differences in adoption assistance subsidy payments alone explain 25% of differences in adoptions. Differences in the set of independent variables used in the second column of Table 2 explain a combined 68% of variation in adoptions. The failure of variations in child welfare spending and use of the ICPC to explain differences in adoptions from foster care, together with the positive relationship between concentrations of Native American and African American children in foster care and adoptions, leads the authors to suspect that institutional differences in the adoptive recruitment and matching processes between states might explain much of the remaining 32% of the variation in adoptions from foster care. Future research will extend the analysis in two ways. First, the authors plan add institutional details (e.g., the use of databases for matching, the use of adoption specialists, the use of childspecific recruitment, and demonstration project funding) to the analysis. Second, because use of a simple cross-section may not uncover correlations that can be revealed with a panel of data on states over time, the authors plan to construct histories of adoption policy and practice in the states.

Conclusion

The economic analysis of adoption from foster care suggests that adoption assistance subsidy policy is the most important determinant of adoptions from foster care that is under the direct control of policymakers. Also, because adoptions from foster care strongly and negatively relate to intercountry adoptions, the analysis suggests that policymakers might be able to increase, on the margin, adoptions from foster care by removing tax benefits that artificially reduce the cost of intercountry adoption. The analysis leads the authors to predict that, if publicized, the introduction of the unqualified Adoption Tax Credit for special needs adoptions of \$10,000 that went into effect January 1, 2003, may be an effective tool for increasing the number of adoptions from foster care. The credit was increased to \$10,6300 for tax year 2005, which indicates continuing Congressional committment to special needs adoptions, even though neither the Internal Revenue Service or GAO has yet released data on the number of families who used the credit.

Racial matching in adoptive placement is not implicated as a barrier to adoption in the statistical snapshot of adoptions from foster care in 1996–1997. Because increasing spending on child welfare services and increasing use of the ICPC do not appear to be an effective way to increase adoptions for waiting children, the authors suspect that the most important remaining barriers are flaws in the matching process itself. Additional research is needed to distinguish the strategies of states that are most successful in meeting the needs of waiting children.

References

- Avery, R. (1996). Adoption assistance under P.L. 96-272: A policy analysis. Children and Youth Services Review, 18(3), 1-31.
- Avery, R (1999). Identifying obstacles to adoptions in the New York State's out-of-home care system. *Child Welfare*, 77(5), 653–671.
- Avery, R., & Mont, D. (1992). Financial support of children involved in special needs adoption: A policy evaluation. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 11, 419–441.
- Avery, R. & Mont, D. (1997). Federal financial support of special needs adoption. In R. Avery (Ed.), Adoption policy and special needs children (pp. 153–170). New York: Auburn House.
- Barth, R. P. (1997). The value of special needs adoption. In R. Avery (Ed.), Adoption policy and special needs children (pp. 171–203). New York: Auburn House.
- Barth, R. P., & Berry, M. (1989). Child abuse and child welfare services. In M. Kirst (Ed.), Conditions of children in California (pp. 225–256). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University, Policy Analysis for California Education.
- Brooks, D., & James, S. (2002). Willingness to adopt black foster children: Implications for child welfare policy and recruitment of adoptive families. Unpublished manuscript, University of Southern California.
- Byron, J., & Deoudes, G. (2002). 2002 national adoption attitudes survey. Presented at the Child Welfare League of America, National Adoption Conference, November 2002, representing the Dave Thomas Foundation for Adoption and the Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute. Accessed June 2006 at www.adoptioninstitute.org/survey/ Adoption_Attitudes_Survey.
- Child Welfare League of America and National Data Analysis System. (1996a). Number of children with a goal of adoption and legally free for adoption. Accessed May 2006 at http://ndas.cwla.org.
- Child Welfare League of America and National Data Analysis System. (1996b). Number of licensed or approved adoptive families, by race/ethnicity (archive), 1996. Accessed May 2006 at http://ndas.cwla.org.
- Deaton, A., & Muellbauer, M. (1980). Economics and consumer behavior. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Fenster, J. (2002). Transracial adoption in black and white: A survey of social worker attitudes. *Adoption Quarterly*, 5(4), 33–58..

- Freundlich, M. (1997). Reforming the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children. Hybrid: The University of Pennsylvania Journal of Law and Social Change. Accessed June 2006 at www.adoptioninstitute.org/policy/inters1.html.
- Freundlich, M. (2000). The market forces in adoption. Washington, DC: The Child Welfare League of America for the Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute.
- Gennetian, L. A. (1999). The supply of infants relinquished for adoption: Did access to abortion make a difference? *Economic Inquiry*, 37(3), 412–431.
- Grow, L. (1970). A new look at supply and demand in adoption. New York: Child Welfare League of America.
- Kapp, S. A., McDonald, T. P., & Diamond, K. L. (2001). The path to adoption for children of color. Child Abuse and Neglect, 25, 215–229.
- Kossoudji, S. A. (1989). Pride and prejudice: Culture's role in markets. In S. Shulamn and W. Darity (Eds.), The question of discrimination: Racial inequality in the U.S. labor market (pp. 293-314). Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Kossoudji, S. A. (1997). Racial aspects of the move to adoption. In R. Avery (ed.), Adoption policy and special needs children (pp. 13–34). New York: Auburn House.
- Landes, E. M., & Posner, R. A. (1978). The economics of the baby shortage. Journal of Legal Studies, 7, 323-348.
- Laws, R., and O'Hanlon, T. (1999). Adoption and financial assistance. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.
- Mankiw, N. G. (2001). Principles of economics. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt College Publishers.
- Maza, P. (1985). What we do and don't know about adoption statistics. Permanent Families for Children, 3(2), 5-20.
- Maza, P. (1999). Recent data on the number of adoptions of foster children. Adoption Quarterly, 32(2), 71-81.
- Maza, P. (2002). Is the Adoption and Safe Families Act doing what it is supposed to do? Presented at Child Welfare League of America, National Adoption Conference, November 7, 2002.
- Medoff, M. H. (1993). An empirical analysis of adoption. Economic Inquiry, 31, 59-70.
- Melosh, B. (2002). Strangers and kin: The American way of adoption. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- National Adoption Information Clearinghouse (1994). *Transracial and transcultural adoptions*. Accessed June 2006 at http://naic.acf.hhs.gov/pubs/f_trans.cfm.
- National Committee for Adoption (1989). *Adoption factbook*. Washington, DC: National Committee for Adoption.
- National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect (2002). Adoption and foster care analysis and reporting system (AFCARS), 1995-1999: User's guide and codebook. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Family Life Development Center.
- Pertman, A. (2000). Adoption nation. New York: Basic Books.
- Sedlack, A., and Broadhurst, D. (1993). Study of adoption assistance impact and outcomes: Final report. Submitted to the Administration for Children, Youth and Families, DHHS, Contract No. 105-89-1607.
- Scarcella, C. A., Bess, R., Zielewski, E. H., Waner, L., & Geen, R. (2004). The cost of protecting vulnerable children IV. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. Accessed May, 25, 2006 at www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411115_VulnerableChildrenIV.pdf.
- Spar, K. (1997). Adoption promotion legislation in the 105th Congress. Congressional Reporting Service Report for Congress, Report 97-491 EPW. Accessed June 2006 at http:// digital.library.unt.edu/govdocs/crs/search.tk?type=creator_simple&q=Spar,%20Karen.
- Stolley, K. S. (1993). Statistics on adopt=ion in the United States. *The Future of Children: Adoption*, 3(1), 26–42.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (1998). Analysis of state child welfare data: VCIS survey data from 1990 through 1994. Washington DC: Caliber 1998.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2000). HHS adoption awards bonuses and grants. Accessed June 2006 at http://cbexpress.acf.hhs.gov/articles.cfm?issue_id=2000-11&article_id=178
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2001). Administration for Children and Families, Children's Bureau. Initiatives: Overcoming barriers to interstate adoptions. Accessed February 2006 at www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/initiatives/ photolts/sect4.htm.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2005). Adoptions of children with public child welfare agency involvement by state FY 1995-2003. Accessed June 2006 at www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/cb/stats_research/afcars/adoptchild03b.htm.

Hansen and Hansen

- U.S. Department of the Treasury. (2000). Report to the Congress on tax benefits for adoption (October 3, 2000) as per Small Business Job Protection Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-888, section 1807(d)). Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. General Accounting Office. (1999). Foster care: HHS could better facilitate the interjurisdictional adoption process (GAO/HEHS-00-12). Washington, DC: Author. Accessed June 2006 at www.gao.gov/new.items/he00012.pdf.
- U.S. General Accounting Office. (2002). Foster care: Recent legislation helps states focus on finding permanent homes for children but long-standing barriers remain. (GAO-02-585, June 2002). Washington, DC: Author. Accessed June 2006 at www.gao.gov/new.items/d02585.pdf.
- Zelizer, V. A. (1981). Pricing the priceless child: The changing social value of children. New York: Basic Books.

Copyright of Child Welfare is the property of Child Welfare League of America and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.